UNCOLLICS
Proceeding of Undergraduate Conference on Literature, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies
E-ISSN: 2985-9476
Published by Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Untag Surabaya

An analysis of apology strategies in characters' utterances in Zootopia duology movies

AINILYA SALWA ASYIVA
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: ainilyasalwa@gmail.com

EKA FADILAH
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: mref3k4@gmail.com

Abstract. Apology is an important speech act used to maintain social harmony and repair interpersonal relationships after an offense occurs. This study aims to identify the types of apology strategies used by the characters in the *Zootopia* duology movies and determine the most dominant strategy based on Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) theory. This research employed a descriptive qualitative method within a pragmatic approach. The data consisted of apology utterances produced by the characters in *Zootopia* (2016) and *Zootopia 2* (2025). The data were collected through documentation techniques by watching the movies, examining the scripts, identifying apology utterances, and classifying them according to the proposed theory. The findings revealed that four types of apology strategies were found in the movies: Expression of an Apology, Acknowledgement of Responsibility, Explanation or Account, and Offer of Repair. A total of 44 apology utterances were identified. Expression of an Apology was the most dominant strategy, occurring 20 times. It was followed by Explanation or Account with 12 occurrences, Acknowledgement of Responsibility with 10 occurrences, and Offer of Repair with 2 occurrences. Meanwhile, Promise of Non-Recurrence was not found in the data. The dominance of Expression of an Apology indicates that the characters tend to use direct apologetic expressions to express regret and maintain positive interpersonal relationships. In conclusion, apology strategies play an important role in character interactions and demonstrate how language is used to resolve conflicts, express responsibility, provide explanations for offenses, and maintain social harmony in the *Zootopia* duology movies.

Keywords: **apology strategies, pragmatics, speech act, *Zootopia* duology movies.**

INTRODUCTION

Apologizing is one of the speech acts that people perform almost every day, yet the way it is realized varies from one speaker to another. Some people apologize directly by saying "I'm sorry" or "I apologize," while others choose a more indirect route, admitting fault, giving an explanation, offering to fix the damage, or promising it will not happen again. A person who is late to a meeting, for instance, might simply say "The bus was delayed" instead of stating an apology outright, yet the utterance still functions as one. These

various expressions may look different on the surface, but they share the same goal: repairing a social relationship that has been disrupted by an offense.

This variation can be explained through speech act theory in pragmatics. Austin (1962) points out that when people speak, they are not only producing sentences but also performing actions, and Searle (1969) adds that these actions, requesting, promising, thanking, apologizing, are the basic units through which communication actually happens. Yule (1996) similarly frames speech acts as the actions carried out through utterances. Apology itself is categorized as an expressive speech act, since it conveys the speaker's psychological state, typically regret or a sense of responsibility, toward an offense (Searle, 1979). Holmes (1990) adds that an apology is directed at supporting a hearer who has been affected by a violation the speaker is responsible for, while Olshtain and Cohen (1983) describe it as a mechanism for restoring social balance.

The need for apology usually arises from miscommunication. As Hall (1980) suggests, communication does not always succeed, and misunderstandings are a normal part of social interaction. When a speaker's intended message is misread by the hearer, the result can be confusion, tension, or even damaged relationships (Keyton, 2011). An apology, in this sense, becomes a repair tool rather than merely a polite formality. To capture how varied these repair strategies can be, Ishihara and Cohen (2010) proposed five categories: Expression of an Apology (EXAP), Acknowledgement of Responsibility (RESP), Explanation or Account (EXPL), Offer of Repair (REPR), and Promise of Non-Recurrence (RECU). This framework makes it possible to see apology not as a single fixed phrase but as a set of linguistic choices shaped by context and intention.

Film dialogue offers a convenient window into these choices, since characters constantly negotiate conflict, misunderstanding, and reconciliation within a limited runtime. This study looks specifically at the Zootopia duology, Zootopia (2016) and Zootopia 2 (2025), which follow Judy Hopps and Nick Wilde as they navigate a city full of stereotypes, prejudice, and communication breakdowns between its anthropomorphic residents. Because the characters come from different backgrounds and constantly misread one another, the films generate a wide range of apology situations, direct and indirect alike, making them a fitting object for analysis under Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) framework.

Apology strategies in film have already drawn some scholarly attention. Maghfiroh and Ratih (2023) examined Captain Marvel and found apologies falling into expressive and directive types, while Nisa and Sutrisno (2018) looked at the Harry Potter series and connected apology strategy choice to social distance and power relations. Mbeleng and Marantika (2023) found that Illocutionary Force Indicating Device was the most common strategy in Yes Day, and Amalia and Mujazin (2023), using Trosborg's (1995) framework, found that asking for forgiveness dominated apologies in Little Women. Nabilah and Aliah (2016) reported that expressing regret accounted for half of all apology instances in The Proposal. Two studies are closer to the present one in framework: Harijanto and Pradipta (2024) applied Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) theory to the Spider-Man Home trilogy and found Expression of an Apology to be dominant, while Farhan and Pradipta (2024) used Klimczak and Pawlak's (2014) framework on Inside Out and found Acknowledgement of Responsibility most frequent.

What these studies have in common is that none of them, including the two that used the same theoretical framework as the present research, has examined the Zootopia duology. Harijanto and Pradipta's (2024) object was a superhero action franchise, and Farhan and Pradipta's (2024) was a different genre analyzed with a different theory altogether. Since genre and narrative setting can plausibly shape how often and in what form apologies

appear, an animated comedy-adventure series such as Zootopia may reveal a distribution of strategies that has not yet been documented. This gap is what the present study sets out to address.

Building on this gap, the present study is entitled "An Analysis of Apology Strategies in Characters' Utterances in Zootopia Duology Movies." It aims to (1) identify the types of apology strategies used by the characters in the Zootopia duology based on Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) framework, and (2) determine which strategy is most dominant and explain why it occurs most frequently. By focusing on an animated film series that has not been examined through this lens before, this study is expected to add to the existing body of pragmatic research on apology strategies in media discourse, particularly for readers interested in how speech acts operate within animated storytelling.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Speech Acts and Apology in Pragmatics

Pragmatics, as Yule (1996) defines it, is concerned with speaker meaning, how people communicate more than what is literally said, and how that meaning depends on context and the relationship between speaker and hearer. Speech act theory sits at the core of this field. Austin (1962) and later Searle (1969) argue that utterances are not merely descriptive but performative: saying something is, in many cases, doing something. Within Searle's (1979) classification, apology belongs to the expressive category, utterances that convey the speaker's psychological state rather than describe the world or commit the speaker to a future action. Holmes (1990) narrows this further by defining apology specifically as a remedial act directed at a hearer who has been affected by an offense the speaker is answerable for.

These definitions converge on a similar idea, but they are not identical in scope. Searle's (1979) account treats apology as one expressive act among several (thanking, congratulating, welcoming), which is useful for placing apology within a broader taxonomy but says little about how an apology is actually worded. Holmes (1990) and Olshtain and Cohen (1983), by contrast, focus more directly on the function of apology as social repair, which is closer to what the present study needs, since the object of analysis is not whether an utterance counts as an apology in the abstract, but how it is linguistically realized on screen.

Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) five-category framework, Expression of an Apology, Acknowledgement of Responsibility, Explanation or Account, Offer of Repair, and Promise of Non-Recurrence, is adopted here because it operationalizes apology at the level of linguistic strategy rather than treating it as a single speech act. This is a strength for coding actual dialogue, since it allows a single apology exchange to be broken into distinguishable, countable strategies. At the same time, the framework is comparatively coarse next to alternatives such as Trosborg's (1995) model, which separates apology into eight categories and twenty-one subcategories. The trade-off is between analytical simplicity and descriptive granularity: Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) categories are easier to apply consistently across a large dataset, but they may collapse distinctions, for instance, between different intensities of acknowledging responsibility, that a more fine-grained model like Trosborg's (1995) would capture separately.

Apology Strategies in Prior Film-Based Research

A number of studies have applied apology-strategy frameworks to film dialogue, and reviewing them together reveals both a consistent pattern and some notable

inconsistencies. Maghfiroh and Ratih (2023), analyzing Captain Marvel, grouped apologies broadly into expressive and directive types, a classification that is theoretically defensible but coarser than the strategy-level frameworks used in most other studies discussed here, which limits how directly its findings can be compared to the present research. Nisa and Sutrisno (2018) took a different angle in their study of the Harry Potter series, tying apology strategy choice to social distance and power relations; this adds a useful social dimension that purely linguistic classifications overlook, though it also means their findings speak more to sociolinguistic variation than to strategy frequency as such.

Several studies converge on Expression of an Apology or a functionally similar direct-apology category as the dominant strategy: Nabilah and Aliah (2016) found expressing regret accounted for half of all apologies in The Proposal, Mbeleng and Marantika (2023) found the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device most frequent in Yes Day, and Harijanto and Pradipta (2024), using the same Ishihara and Cohen (2010) framework as the present study, found Expression of an Apology dominant in the Spider-Man Home trilogy. This pattern suggests that direct, formulaic apology expressions may simply be the default choice across many film genres, which raises a question the present study is well positioned to test: whether this dominance holds in an animated comedy-adventure setting as well, or whether the genre's more exaggerated, comedic style of conflict produces a different distribution.

Not all findings point the same way, however. Amalia and Mujazin (2023) found that asking for forgiveness, rather than a bare apology expression, was most common in Little Women, and Farhan and Pradipta (2024) found Acknowledgement of Responsibility dominant in Inside Out. Both studies, notably, relied on frameworks other than Ishihara and Cohen's (2010), Trosborg (1995) and Klimczak and Pawlak (2014) respectively, which makes it difficult to tell whether the different results reflect genuine differences in how the films portray apology, or simply an artifact of using different coding categories. This is a limitation running through the literature as a whole: because no two studies use identical frameworks, cross-study comparison of dominant strategies is only ever approximate.

A second limitation is that most of these studies, including the two that apply Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) framework directly, report frequency counts and offer only brief, largely intuitive explanations for why a given strategy dominates, without probing genre-specific conventions in much depth. Harijanto and Pradipta (2024), for example, attribute the dominance of direct apology expressions in Spider-Man to the characters' general communication style, but do not examine how the superhero-action genre itself might be shaping that pattern compared to other genres. This gap, connecting strategy frequency to genre-specific narrative conventions, is one the present study aims to address more directly by working with an animated comedy-adventure text.

Positioning the Present Study

Taken together, the reviewed literature establishes that apology strategies have been studied across a range of film genres using several competing frameworks, and that direct apology expressions are frequently, though not universally, dominant. What remains unexamined is the Zootopia duology specifically, and animated comedy-adventure film more broadly using Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) framework. Given that genre appears to correlate with which strategy dominates in the studies reviewed above, analyzing Zootopia (2016) and Zootopia 2 (2025) offers a genuinely untested case rather than a

replication of existing findings, and provides an opportunity to discuss more explicitly why a particular strategy recurs, rather than simply reporting that it does.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach with a descriptive design, since the aim was to identify and interpret the apology strategies used by characters rather than to measure them numerically. The analysis was grounded in speech act theory, particularly the work of Yule (1996) and Searle (1969) on speech acts, and it applied Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) apology strategy framework, which classifies apologies into five types: Expression of an Apology (EXAP), Acknowledgement of Responsibility (RESP), Explanation or Account (EXPL), Offer of Repair (REPR), and Promise of Non-Recurrence (RECU). Because the object of analysis was audiovisual dialogue rather than a human population in the conventional sense, the population of this study consisted of all utterances produced by characters in the Zootopia duology, Zootopia (2016) and Zootopia 2 (2025), while the sample consisted specifically of those utterances identified as containing an apology strategy.

The primary data source was the dialogue of both films, obtained from their official scripts. The transcript of Zootopia (2016) was retrieved from the Zootopia Fandom Wiki, and the transcript of Zootopia 2 (2025) was obtained from the same source. Three research instruments were used: the movie transcripts themselves as the main source of dialogue data, the researcher as the primary instrument responsible for identifying, coding, and interpreting the data, and internet access for retrieving the transcripts as well as supporting literature.

Data collection began with watching both films repeatedly, twelve viewings in total, to build familiarity with the characters, their relationships, and the situational context surrounding each conflict before any coding took place. Every utterance suspected of containing an apology strategy was noted during this process and then cross-checked against the official script to confirm its exact wording and to verify the surrounding context, a step that also served as a basic form of data validation by ensuring that no utterance was coded from memory or misheard dialogue alone. Once verified, each utterance was assigned a data code combining the apology strategy abbreviation, a sequence number, and the movie source, for example, EXAP1Z1 for the first Expression of an Apology utterance identified in Zootopia (2016). This coding system made it possible to trace every datum back to its specific strategy type and film of origin throughout the analysis.

The coded data were then analyzed in three stages. First, each utterance was classified according to the apology strategy it represented, based on Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) criteria, and organized into a data table. Second, the frequency of each strategy was tallied across both films to determine which type occurred most often. Third, each classified utterance was examined in relation to its immediate context, the conflict that prompted it, the relationship between the characters involved, and the reasoning behind assigning it to a particular strategy category, so that the analysis went beyond frequency counts to explain why each strategy was used in that specific situation. This contextual step was also where the reasoning behind the most dominant strategy's frequent use was developed, rather than treating the frequency count alone as a sufficient explanation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings and discussion based on the analysis of apology strategies found in Zootopia (2016) and Zootopia 2 (2025), using the framework proposed by Ishihara and Cohen (2010). The findings are organized according to the two research questions: the first part identifies the types of apology strategies used by the characters, and the second part discusses the most dominant strategy and the reasons behind its frequent use.

4.1. Types of Apology Strategies Used by the Characters in the Zootopia Duology Movies

To answer the first research question, every apology utterance in both films was identified and classified according to Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) framework. The frequency of each strategy is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Frequency of Apology Strategies

No	Types of Apology Strategies	Frequency
1	Expression of an Apology	20
2	Acknowledgement of Responsibility	10
3	Explanation or Account	12
4	Offer of Repair	2
5	Promise of Non-Recurrence	-
Total		44

A total of 44 apology utterances were identified across both films. Four of the five strategies proposed by Ishihara and Cohen (2010) appeared in the data: Expression of an Apology (20 instances), Explanation or Account (12 instances), Acknowledgement of Responsibility (10 instances), and Offer of Repair (2 instances). Promise of Non-Recurrence did not occur in either film. This absence is worth noting on its own: since this strategy typically appears when an offense involves a repeated or habitual behavior (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010), its absence suggests that most conflicts in the Zootopia duology are framed as one-time incidents, misunderstandings or prejudiced remarks that are resolved once, rather than recurring patterns of behavior the characters need to commit to changing going forward. Overall, these results indicate that the characters draw on a range of apology strategies depending on the situation, with explicit apology expressions occurring markedly more often than the others.

4.2.The Most Dominant Apology Strategy and Why It Is Frequently Used

The findings show that Expression of an Apology (EXAP) is the most dominant strategy, occurring 20 times out of 44 total apology utterances. This indicates that the characters generally favor apologizing directly, through explicit expressions such as "I'm sorry" or "I apologize," when responding to an offense or conflict.

Several factors help explain why this strategy dominates. First, a direct apology expression is communicatively efficient: it lets a speaker acknowledge an offense and move toward restoring harmony immediately, without needing a lengthy explanation to accompany it. Second, the nature of the conflicts in the Zootopia duology plays a role, since most offenses stem from misunderstandings, accidental remarks, or prejudice between predators and prey rather than from deliberate, calculated wrongdoing, which makes a direct apology a proportionate and sufficient response in most cases. Third, as an animated film aimed partly at a family audience, Zootopia foregrounds values such as

empathy and respectful conflict resolution, which likely inclines its characters toward clear, unambiguous apologies rather than indirect or evasive ones. Together, these factors make Expression of an Apology the strategy the characters return to most often across both films.

4.3.Discussion

4.3.1. Expression of an Apology

EXAP1Z1 // 14.03–14.12
CLAWHAUSER: "I am so sorry. Me, Benjamin Clawhauser, the guy everyone thinks is just a flabby, donut-loving cop, stereotyping you...?" JUDY HOPPS: "Haha it's okay."

This exchange is classified as Expression of an Apology, identified through Clawhauser's explicit apologetic phrase "I am so sorry." Ishihara and Cohen (2010) define this strategy as a direct conveyance of regret through expressions such as *sorry*, *apologize*, or *excuse me*. Clawhauser apologizes here after realizing he has unintentionally stereotyped Judy by calling her "cute." Judy had earlier explained that the term is acceptable between rabbits but can carry a different, more patronizing implication when used by a non-rabbit. Once Clawhauser recognizes this, he immediately expresses regret, which reflects a broader thread running through Zootopia: a society divided along predator-prey lines where casual remarks can unintentionally reinforce stereotypes. He goes on to compare Judy's experience to his own, noting that people often reduce him to "a flabby, donut-loving cop," a move that signals empathy but does not change the classification of the utterance, since the core apologetic act remains the direct phrase "I am so sorry."
This finding aligns with Harijanto and Pradipta (2024) and Nabilah and Aliah (2016), both of whom found direct apology expressions to be the preferred strategy for repairing relationships after an offense, in the Spider-Man Home trilogy and The Proposal respectively. The consistency across these three films, spanning superhero, romantic comedy, and animated genres, suggests that explicit apology expressions are a broadly preferred first response to an offense regardless of genre. What differs in Zootopia is the underlying cause of the offense: rather than a personal or romantic misstep, it stems specifically from casual stereotyping between social groups, meaning the same strategy is being used here to address a slightly different communicative problem than in the comparison studies.

4.3.2. Acknowledgement of Responsibility

RESP1Z1 // 24.24–24.30
JUDY HOPPS: "You're gonna wanna refrain from calling me Carrots..." NICK WILDE: "My bad. I just naturally assumed you came from some little carrot-choked podunk, no?"

This dialogue is classified as Acknowledgement of Responsibility, identified through Nick's admission "My bad," a direct acceptance of fault without an explicit expression of regret. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) describe this strategy as occurring when a speaker recognizes wrongdoing through expressions such as *my bad* or *it's my fault*.
Judy objects to being called "Carrots," a nickname tied to her species that, while not overtly hostile, reduces her identity to a stereotype. Nick's "My bad" acknowledges the offense, but he immediately undercuts it by repeating another stereotypical assumption about her background. This weakens the apology's effect: responsibility is acknowledged,

but not followed by the kind of repair or genuine remorse that would fully resolve the tension.
This finding is comparable to Farhan and Pradipta (2024), who found Acknowledgement of Responsibility dominant in Inside Out, where admitting fault typically preceded successful relationship repair. Nick's case diverges from that pattern: because his admission is immediately paired with a fresh stereotype, the acknowledgement does not lead to the same repair effect observed in Farhan and Pradipta's (2024) data. This suggests that acknowledging responsibility, on its own, does not guarantee relational repair, particularly when the admission is not accompanied by sincerity or a supporting apology strategy.

4.3.3. Explanation or Account

EXPL1Z1 // 32.00–32.04
CLAWHAUSER: "I'm sorry, sir, I tried to stop her..."

Mrs. Otterton rushes past the front desk into the police station after being turned away regarding her missing husband. Clawhauser, responsible for the front desk, was unable to stop her. His utterance contains two components: "I'm sorry," an Expression of an Apology, and "I tried to stop her," an Explanation or Account. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) note that a single utterance can realize more than one strategy, and here, the explanatory clause carries the primary communicative weight, since Clawhauser's main intention is to clarify that the incident occurred despite his effort, not merely to express regret. The utterance is therefore classified under Explanation or Account rather than Expression of an Apology.
This is consistent with Mbeleng and Marantika (2023), who found that explanations were frequently used to clarify the circumstances behind an offense. It also illustrates a point Ishihara and Cohen (2010) make explicitly: identifying an apology strategy requires attention to the speaker's primary communicative intent, not just the surface presence of a word like "sorry."

4.3.4. Offer of Repair

REPR1 // 1:20.26–1:20.44
JUDY HOPPS: "I know you'll never forgive me. And I don't blame you. I wouldn't forgive me either. I was ignorant and irresponsible and small-minded... But predators shouldn't suffer because of my mistakes. I have to fix this."

Judy reflects on the harm caused by her earlier public remarks about predators, which fueled fear and discrimination throughout Zootopia. The utterance combines Acknowledgement of Responsibility ("I was ignorant and irresponsible and small-minded") with Offer of Repair ("I have to fix this"), and the latter is treated as dominant here because Judy's intent shifts from admitting fault to committing to corrective action, which Ishihara and Cohen (2010) describe as the defining feature of this strategy.
This finding shares some ground with Nabilah and Aliah (2016), who also identified Offer of Repair in The Proposal. The two cases differ in scope, however: where Nabilah and Aliah's (2016) data involved repair directed at a single individual, Judy's commitment addresses a broader social harm affecting predators across the entire city. This suggests that in the Zootopia duology, Offer of Repair is not limited to mending a one-on-one

relationship but can extend to restoring harmony at a community level, a dimension that has not been highlighted in the apology-strategy literature reviewed so far.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to identify the apology strategies used by characters in the Zootopia duology and to determine which strategy dominates and why, based on Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) framework. Of the 44 apology utterances identified across both films, four of the five strategies were present, Expression of an Apology, Acknowledgement of Responsibility, Explanation or Account, and Offer of Repair, while Promise of Non-Recurrence did not occur at all. This absence is itself informative: the characters readily express regret, admit fault, explain themselves, and act to repair harm, but they are never shown committing to prevent an offense from recurring, which suggests that the conflicts driving these apologies are framed as isolated incidents rather than as recurring behavioral problems the narrative needs to resolve going forward.

Expression of an Apology emerged as the dominant strategy, accounting for 20 of the 44 instances. Beyond simply confirming that direct apologies are common, this finding points to something more specific about how Zootopia handles conflict: because most offenses in the films stem from stereotyping, prejudice, and misunderstanding between predators and prey rather than from deliberate harm, a direct, unambiguous apology is typically sufficient to de-escalate the situation and move the story forward, without needing to be paired with extended justification. This also fits the register of an animated family film, where clarity and directness in resolving conflict serve the broader moral throughline of empathy and mutual respect that runs through the narrative.

Taken together, these findings support Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) claim that apologies are not a single fixed act but a set of strategies chosen according to context and communicative purpose. What this study adds is a genre-specific observation: in an animated comedy-adventure text built around social prejudice as its central conflict, direct apology expressions do more than repair individual relationships, they also function narratively as a marker of a character's moral growth, as seen in how both Clawhauser's and Judy's apologies double as moments of self-recognition about the stereotypes they had unconsciously reinforced.

These contributions, however, should be read against the scope of the data. This study is limited to two films from a single franchise, so its findings cannot be generalized to other genres, media, or varieties of English, patterns of apology may well differ in live-action drama, sitcoms, or non-English-language media. It is also limited by its reliance on a single framework; applying Trosborg's (1995) more fine-grained categories or a socially oriented model such as Nisa and Sutrisno's (2018) approach to power and distance to the same data could surface distinctions this study's coding scheme was not built to capture. Future research could extend this line of work by comparing apology strategies across genres to test whether the genre-linked pattern observed here holds more generally, by examining how social variables such as power and familiarity shape strategy choice

within an animated context specifically, or by studying how apology strategies interact with other speech acts, such as forgiveness or refusal, in extended dialogue sequences.

REFERENCES

Amalia, R. A., & Mujazin (2023). An Analysis Speech Act of Apology Strategy Reflected in Little Women Movie Directed by Greta Gerwig. RETORIKA Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 9(3), 415-420. https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.9.3.7680.415-420

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words: The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches. SAGE Publications.

Farhan, W. (2024). *An analysis of apology strategies used by characters in Inside Out movie*. *Proceedings of the Undergraduate Conference on Language, Literature, and Culture Studies*. https://conference.untag-sby.ac.id/index.php/uncollcs/article/download/4625/2608

Hall, S. (1980). *Encoding/Decoding*. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & P. Willis (Eds.), *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972–79* (pp. 128–138). Hutchinson.

Harijanto, F. M., & Pradipta, B. (2024). *An analysis of apology strategies in characters' utterances in Spider-Man Home Trilogy movies*. *PARAFRASE: Jurnal Kajian Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan, 24*(2), 98–107. https://doi.org/10.30996/parafrase.v24i2.11820

Holmes, J. (1990). *Apologies in New Zealand English*. *Language in Society, 19*(2), 155–199. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500014366

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Pearson Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842

Keyton, J. (2011). *Communication and organizational culture: A key to understanding work experiences* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://collegepublishing.sagepub.com/products/communication-and-organizational-culture-2-234496

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/highereducation/isbn/9780511813313

Maghfiroh, E. A., & Ratih, K. (2023). Exploring apologizing strategies in the movie *Captain Marvel*. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra, 9*(2), 1212–1225. https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v9i2.2977. Jurnal Onoma Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Sastra, 9(2), 1212-1225.

Mbeleng, F. J., & Marantika. (2023). Apology strategies used by characters in *Yes Day* movie. *Austronesian Journal of Language Science & Literature, 2*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.2.1.2023.9-20

Nisa, & Sutrisno, A. (2018). Apology strategies in *Harry Potter* movie series. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal (ELTEJ), 1*(1), 1–12. https://www.academia.edu/download/125750435/pdf.pdf

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18–36). Newbury House. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=991897