



Sudan University of Science and Technology
College of Graduate Studies



**A Corpus-based Analysis of Linguistic Politeness (Apology) in
Sudanese EFL Oral Discourse**

تحليل استخدام التهذيب اللغوي (الاعتذار) في الخطاب الشفاهي بالنظر الى المعرفه
التراكمية للطلاب السودانيين للغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية .

A thesis submitted to the degree of Ph.D in Applied Linguistics

Submitted by:

Rasha Mohammed Elbashir Salih.

Supervised by

Dr. Ishraga Bashir Mohammed Elhassan.

February 2012



Approval Page

Name of Candidate: *Rasha Mohammed EL Beshir Salih*

Thesis title: *A corpus-based Analysis of Linguistic Politeness (Apology) in Sudanese EFL Oral Discourse*

Approved by:

External Examiner

Name: *Dr. Amna Mohamed Bedvi*

Signature: *[Signature]* Date: *29/8/2016*

2. Internal Examiner

Name: *Dr. Mahmud Ali Ahmed*

Signature: *[Signature]* Date: *29/8/2016*

1. Supervisor

Name: *Khuraga Beshir Mohammed EL Hassan*

Signature: *[Signature]* Date: *9/9/2016*

Quran Verse

قال الله تعالى:

(يَعْتَذِرُونَ إِلَيْكُمْ إِذَا رَجَعْتُمْ إِلَيْهِمْ قُلْ لَّا تَعْتَذِرُوا لَنُؤْمِنَ لَكُم قَدْ نَبَأْنَا اللَّهُ مِنُ أَخْبَارِكُمْ وَسَيَرَى اللَّهُ عَمَلَكُمْ
وَرَسُولُهُ ثُمَّ تُرَدُّونَ إِلَىٰ عَالِمِ الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ فَيُنَبِّئُكُم بِمَا كُنتُمْ تَعْمَلُونَ)

صدق الله العظيم

سورة التوبة: الآية رقم 94

“They will make excuses to you when you have returned to them. Say, "Make no excuse - never will we believe you. Allah has already informed us of your news. And Allah will observe your deeds, and [so will] His Messenger; then you will be taken back to the Knower of the unseen and the witnessed, and He will inform you of what you used to do."

‘‘AT-TAWBAH (THE REPENTANCE) VERSE NO 94’’

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my father and mother,

To my husband,

To my sisters and brothers,

To my daughter and son; Nour and Ahmed,

To my students and colleagues.

Acknowledgment

The researcher would like to thank Dr. Ishraga Bashir for supervising this thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to my father Dr. Mohammed Elbashir Salih for his guidance and advice in writing this research.

I would then like to express my sincere and deep gratitude to Dr. Mahmoud Ahmed Ali and Dr. Amna Badri for their constructive feedback and proofreading.

I would also like to thank my husband Mr. Montaga Mariod for his assistance and support to conduct and complete this study.

My heartfelt thanks to Ms. Shaza Mohammed Zain for her help in completing the procedural part of the study.

Finally, I am thankful to my students and colleagues at Sudan University for their contribution in this study for their support and patience.

Table of contents

	Title	Page No
	Quran Verse	i
	Dedication	ii
	Acknowledgment	iii
	Abstract	iv
	Abstract Arabic version	v
	Table of contents	iv
	List of Tables	vii
	Abbreviations	viii
	Chapter one: Introduction	
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Statement of the problem	3
1.3	Questions of the study	3
1.4	Hypothesis of the study	4
1.5	Rational of the study	4
1.6	Methodology of the study	5
1.6	Population of the study	5
1.7	Sample of the study	5
1.8	Summary	6
2	Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework and Literature Review	7
2.1	Introduction	7
2.2	Theoretical Framework	8
2.2.1	Introduction	8
2.2.2	Speech Acts	9-10
2.2.3	Speech Acts Theory	10
2.2.4	Speech Acts and ELT	12
2.2.4.1	Austin's Model	15
2.2.4.2	The Influence of Grice	22

2.2.4.3	Strawson's objection to Austin	23
2.2.4.4	Searle's defense of Austin	24
2.2.5	Apology	25
2.2.5.1	Categorizing Apologies (Apologetic Strategies)	23
2.2.5.2	Apologies in oral Discourse	25
2.2.5.3	Apology as Speech Act	46
2.2.5.4	Apologies and Culture	48
2.2.5.4.1	Apologies in Arabic culture	52
2.2.6	Pragmatics	54
2.2.6.1	Ways of researching Pragmatics	55
2.2.7	Discourse Analysis	61
2.2.7.1	DA as a teaching tool	65
2.2.7.2	DA as a professional development tool	67
2.2.8	Conversation Analysis	70
2.2.9	Teaching F L in an intercultural world	73
2.2.10	Intercultural communicative competence	74
2.2.10.1	Intercultural competence and language teacher	79
2.3	Previous Studies	81
2.3.1	Comments On the Previous Studies	90
2.4	Summary	95
3	Chapter Three Research Methodology	99
3.1	Introduction	99
3.2	Methods of data collection	100
3.3	Population of the study	100
3.4	Sample of the study	100
3.4.1	Teachers	101
3.4.2	Students	103
3.5	Tools of the study	104
3.5.1	Questionnaire	104
3.5.2	Teachers' questionnaire	104

3.5.3	Students' questionnaire	105
3.5.4	Reliability and validity of the questionnaire	110
3.5.5	Multiple- Choice Discourse completion test	110
3.5.6	Validity and reliability of the multiple choice discourse completion test	110
3.5.7	Summary	111
4	Chapter four: Data Analysis, Results and Discussion	112
4.1	Introduction	112
4.2	Application of the Study's Tools	112
4.3	Teachers' answers	112
4.4	Students questionnaires	126
4.5	Multiple Choice Discourse Completion test	138
4.6	Test of the Study's Hypotheses	152
4.7	Results of the First Hypothesis	153
4.8	Results of the second Hypothesis	157
4.9	Results of the third Hypothesis	167
4.10	Summary	168
5	Chapter five: summary, Conclusions, findings, recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies	169
5.1	Summary of the study	169
5.2	Findings	170
5.3	Conclusion	171
5.4	Recommendations	171
	References	173
	Appendixes	179

List of Tables

Title	Page NO
Table 2.1 Basic Apology Strategies Used in Studies on Apologies	34
Table 2-2 Summary of Types of Offenses Requiring an Apology in Previous Studies on Apologies	38
Table 2- 3 Summary of Common Apology Strategies Given to Common Situations in Previous Studies on Apologies	40
Figure 1 Scenario 1	56
Figure 2 Scenario 2	57
Table 4 Components of intercultural competence	75
Table no (3-1) Study sample size	101
Table no.(3-2) The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the age	101
Table no(3-3) The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the gender	102
Table no (3-4) The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the qualifications	103
Table no.(3-4) The frequency distribution for the study students respondents according to the age	103
Table no (3-5) The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to gender	103
Table no (3-6) The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the university level	104
Table No (3-7) The questionnaire's referees , their jobs and places of work	106
Table no (3-8) The statistical reliability and validity of the pre-test sample about the study questionnaire	108
Table (3-9) The questionnaire's referees , their jobs and places of work	109

Abbreviations

EFL English as a foreign language

ELT English Language Teaching

L1 First Language

L2 Second Language

CBA Corpus-based analysis

DA Discourse Analysis

IFID Illocutionary Force Indicating Device

CCSARP Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project

MDCTs Multiple-Choice Discourse Completion Test

CDA Critical Discourse Analysis

CA Conversation Analysis

CL Corpus Linguistics

Chapter one

Introduction

Chapter one

Introduction

1.1 Background

Few studies were done in the area of linguistic politeness in Sudan that is why the researcher feels the need for this study. As a speaker of Arabic (Sudanese dialect) ,the researcher assume that our language does not include a great deal of polite expressions and the Sudanese are not very much considerate to the use of very polite and elegant expressions in daily life situations.

We might give examples of that ‘language which contains respectful forms of address like Sir or Madam’, ‘language that displays certain “polite” formulaic utterances like please, thank you, excuse me or sorry’, or even ‘elegantly expressed language’. And again we would encounter people who consider the polite use of language as ‘hypocritical’, ‘dishonest’, ‘distant’, ‘feelingless’, etc.

Polite language is characterized by the use of indirect language and respectable expressions.

Following the notions of behaviourist psychology, the researcher presumes that there will be transfer in learning .In the case of second /foreign language learning .This means the transfer of elements acquired or habituated in the first language to the target language .The transfer is positive for facilitating when the same structure is appropriate in both languages .The transfer is negative for interference ,when the first language structure is used inappropriately in the foreign language .

The researcher has adopted the corpus-based approach to discourse analysis. Corpus linguistics is a research approach that has developed over the past few decades to support empirical investigations of language variation and use, resulting

in research findings which have much greater generalizability and validity than would otherwise be feasible. Corpus studies have used two major research approaches: 'corpus-based' and 'corpus-driven'. Corpus-based research assumes the validity of linguistic forms and structures derived from linguistic theory.

Corpus-based approaches explore both written and spoken texts. The good things about CBA is that, it studies the word usage, frequency, collocation and concordance.

The fundamental features of corpus-based analysis include the following (Biber et al., 1998; Conrad, 1999): it is empirical, analyzing the actual patterns of use in natural texts, it utilizes a large and principled collection of natural texts as the basis for analysis, it makes extensive use of computers for analysis, using both automatic and interactive techniques, it depends on both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques, especially functional interpretations of language use.

The primary goal of research is to analyze the systematic patterns of variation and use for those pre-defined linguistic features.

The linguistic constructs themselves emerge from analysis of a corpus in corpus-driven research. This research illustrates the kinds of analyses and perspectives on language use possible from corpus-based approach.

Much "corpus linguistics" is driven purely by curiosity. It aims to improve language description and theory, and the task for applied linguistics is to assess the relevance of this work to practical applications. Corpus data are essential for accurately describing language use, and have shown how lexis, grammar, and semantics interact. This in turn has applications in language teaching, translation, forensic linguistics, and broader cultural analysis. In limited cases, applications can be direct. For example, if advanced language learners have access to a corpus, they

can study for themselves how a word or grammatical construction is typically used in authentic data.

An apology is a speech act used when the behavioral norm is broken. When an action or utterances has resulted that one or more person perceives themselves as offended, the guilty person needs to apologize. The speech act of apologizing aims at maintaining, restoring, and enhancing interpersonal relationship.

According to Olshtain (1983) when an action or utterance result in the fact that one or more persons perceive themselves as offended, the culpable party(s) needs to apologize. Apologizing is polite speech act used to restore social relations following an offence. Searle (1976) further emphasizes that both parties must recognize the offense and the need for repair. (Juhana, 2011, page 3)

1.2 Statement of the problem

As a foreign learner of English the researcher has noticed that the features of linguistic Politeness mainly (apology) has been neglected to a great extent in the Sudanese EFL oral discourse. Previous studies rarely go beyond the errors committed by learners on a contrastive level. Corpus-based approaches are therefore urgently needed to bridge the gap between the previous studies at the same area. It aims to deal with linguistic politeness (apology) at different levels, and to bridge the gap between former studies and recent ones in terms of a corpus-based methodology.

1.3 Questions of the study

- 1- To what extent are the methods of teaching apology to the Sudanese EFL learners effective?
- 2- To what extent do Sudanese EFL learners use apology in their oral discourse?

- 3- What are the apology strategies commonly used by Sudanese EFL learners' in their oral discourse?

1.4 Hypotheses of the study

- 1- Sudanese EFL teachers use proper methods for teaching apology speech act.
- 2- Sudanese EFL learners often use apology in their oral discourse.
- 3- Sudanese EFL learners commonly use “Providing a justification” as an apology strategy.

1.5 Rationale of the study

As a teacher of English, the researcher has noticed that Sudanese students do not use elegant expressions and very polite language when it comes to communication with their classmates or teachers in English. I could not forget how Sue –the British volunteering teacher- shouts at Adil –one of the most polite students in my class-when he keeps requesting her to repeat what she said by WHAT? Sue replied:"Adil do not say What? That is rude!." Adil used to smile and say OK, OK.

Ever since the episode raises many important questions in my mind

.Why does Adil keep using "What" and not excuse me? would you explain this point again please?! he did not even say sorry. He did not even realize that he should apologize for his rude language as Sue interpreted.

Is it language competence? interference of the sudanese Arabic? Masculine dominance culture? Ignorance of the target language? Adil was not the only student who behaves like that many other students do the same. That is what encouraged the researcher to conduct this study and try to answer all the raised questions.

Besides, being part of the cross-cultural dilemma the researcher has noticed the problems Sudanese EFL learners encounter when dealing with the target language. No doubt that one of the cross-cultural competencies that EFL learners should learn is the proper use of speech acts mainly apology. Studies on Politeness and speech acts will always reflect the language competencies EFL learners have and shed the light on the common features that all societies share.

1.6 Methodology of the Study

The researcher uses both quantitative method for data collection using corpus-based approach to discourse analysis. Corpora will be tested using Multiple-choice discourse completion test and questionnaires as tools. The elicited apologies are classified using Cohen and Olshtain's (1981) coding manual.

Population of the Study

This study is targeting Sudanese EFL Learners and EFL teachers at Sudan University of Science and Technology.

Sample of the Study

The sample of the study includes the following:

EFL teachers at Sudan university of Science and Technology- Education and Languages colleges- English language department.

EFL learners at Sudan University of Science and Technology, college of Education, English department - 4th and 3rd year.

1-9 Summary

Apology speech act is one of the important acts that reflects the speaker's competency in English language. The addressee can decide his addresser's politeness and education from the use of speech acts such as apologizing, promising and thanking.

Chapter one is an introduction of the study. It starts with a brief background of the study, statement of the problem, questions of the study, hypothesis of the study, methodology of the study, population and sample of the study and a summary. By the end of this study the researcher would like to find out whether the Sudanese EFL learners are competent enough to use the features of politeness; mainly apology strategies in their oral discourse.

The researcher has been teaching for almost ten years and has a good experience in teaching Sudanese EFL learners at tertiary level in the Sudan. Mistakes and errors in the use of speech acts and apology have been recognized by EFL teachers. This study is reflection to the reality of the Sudanese EFL teaching and the use of speech acts and the fruit of a long experience in the Sudanese EFL teaching context.

Chapter Two

**Theoretical Framework and
literature review**

Chapter Two

Theoretical Framework and literature review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher reviews the previous studies and the related literature. It is divided into two sections:

The first section is the literature review, where the researcher reviews what is written on the theme of this study which is an investigation of the use of apology in Sudanese EFL spoken discourse. For the sake of a thorough knowledge on the field of the study and a comprehensive idea about the position of research.

Section two is the previous studies where the researcher presents the related studies, compares and contrasts them with the present study. This is important because it shows the need for this study and the gap of research in this field of Politeness and Pragmatics in the Sudan. The researcher has found several studies that share the same theme of apology but chooses ten studies for this section. They were done in different ways and at different places, times and participants.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Introduction

This thesis focuses on three areas. First, the polite use of English language mainly Apology as a speech act, spoken discourse analysis and the Sudanese EFL intercultural context.

Apology has been the focus of many researchers in different parts of the world recently but few studies have been done in the Arab world mainly in the Sudan.

As a teacher of English, the researcher has noticed that Sudanese students do not use polite language when it comes to communication with their classmates or teachers in English. I could not forget how Sue –the British volunteering teacher– shouts at Adil –one of the most polite students in my class–when he keeps requesting her to repeat what she said by WHAT? Sue replied:"Adil do not say What? That is rude!." Adil used to smile and say OK, OK.

Since that time many questions raised in my mind. Why did Adil keep using "What" and not excuse me would you explain this point again please! And he did not even say sorry. He did not even realised that he should apologize for his rude language as Sue interpreted.

Is it language competence? Interference of the Sudanese Arabic? Masculine dominance culture? Ignorance of the target language? Adil was not the only student who behaves like that many other students do the same. That is what encouraged me to do this study and try to answer all the raised questions.

In this chapter, the researcher starts with apology and speech acts then teaching foreign language in an intercultural world and to what extent EFL teaching has been influenced by the changes occurring globally. The question of Intercultural Communicative Competence in Foreign Language Education? To what extent do our students and teachers are able to cope with intercultural experiences that requires a number of intercultural competencies and characteristics.

Analyzing spoken discourse is another area where the researcher focuses. A sample of Sudanese EFL spoken discourse will be taken and analyzed according to the rules of discourse analysis to arrive at an accurate results of the study.

2.2.2 Speech Acts

A description of the main features of foreign language teaching reasonably requires an account of its inherent intentionality. In other words, it has to be ascertained for what reason language is taught, and this will inevitably lead to decisions on methods to be applied. Although the question about the purpose of foreign language teaching has seemingly been answered since the rise of communicative language teaching, there are contexts in which language is taught for reasons that are not related to language use in the 'real world', i.e. in situations where, for instance, mastery of language at recognition level (to be successful in multiple choice exams) is in the focus of teaching. Against the background of past language teaching methods and approaches, a focus on the communicative aspect of language teaching is no matter of course.

A quick glance at the history of language teaching reveals that approaches such as the grammar translation method or the audio-lingual method, which was based on a behavioristic learning theory, emphasized the study of decontextualized language on sentence level in order to provide learners with mastery of structure, which, indeed, is of limited use in the 'real world' outside classrooms or exams, if it is not supported by a focus on how natural language is used for communicative purposes (Richards & Rogers, 2002). Such approaches are obviously highly problematic if not unethical since they open the door to a foreign language teaching for no obvious reason, being unrelated to the society/societies or culture(s) the foreign language is used in and, thus, not providing learners with tools to 'survive' in the foreign language.

Teaching a foreign language that aims at providing learners with a means to communicate effectively in real life situations cannot be restricted to instilling linguistic competence, but also has to consider the learner's need for acquisition of

pragmatic competence, and, thus, will reasonably provide contact with the culture related to the language. It is argued in this paper that speech act theory and discourse analysis have the potential to play a vital role in serving the described aim of foreign language teaching. The incorporation of speech acts and discourse analytical tools is manifold but not unproblematic.

It is, therefore, tried to position speech acts and discourse analysis in foreign language teaching (mainly using the example of English Language Teaching) as an important tool to integrate the language outside the classroom and to evaluate the language inside the classroom. Thus, a rationale for the incorporation of speech acts and discourse analysis in the foreign language classroom is developed.

2.2.3 Speech act theory

Speech act theory can be regarded as ‘revolutionary’ in conceptualising and studying language and foreign language teaching methodology due to the fact that it has enhanced insights in how language works when it is used by participants in interaction. The Chomskyan approach assumed that a native speaker’s grammatical competence allows the production of an unlimited number of utterances on the basis of acquired underlying linguistic categories and systems. This approach, however, has been regarded insufficient in that sole grammatical competence fails to explain how appropriate communication can be achieved in a given context. Thus, it has to be complemented by a course of communicative competence. To get the whole picture of language (in terms of language description and analysis as well as of acquisition), it is therefore necessary to focus on both linguistic and communicative competence; the emphasis on the quality of language as a means of communication in a specific context reveals that this approach is clearly developed from a sociolinguistic perspective (Schmidt & Richards, 1980, p. 129).

The role of speech act theory has been crucial in developing an approach that goes beyond the Chomskyan paradigm. By definition, speech acts perform an action, which means that an utterance has not only a locutionary meaning, i.e. the literal meaning, but also an illocutionary meaning, i.e. the intended meaning, and a perlocutionary force, i.e. the effect that is generated in the hearer of an utterance

So, the utterance, “The heat makes you really thirsty” may function as a request to get a cold drink (the illocution) and might prompt the listener to give the speaker a glass of water (the perlocution). The example shows that the descriptive form of the utterance in fact serves a specific purpose (a request) in order to be linguistically polite:

The act of requesting is performed through an indirect speech act. Less favourable and actually much less common are direct speech acts when, for example, an imperative is used for a request. A special case of a speech act is a performative utterance in which the speaker both describes and performs the act as in, “I promise to visit you tomorrow.”

Following Austin, Searle (1969) classified speech acts into five categories:

- representatives (assertion, claim, report, conclusion)
- directives (suggestion, request, order, command)
- expressives (apology, complaint, thank)
- commissives (promise, threat, refusal)
- declaratives (decree, declaration)

Crucial for the understanding of speech acts is the notion of felicity conditions. Felicity conditions are given when a speech act is appropriate in a given situation. So, when a marriage registrar says, “I now pronounce you man and wife”, there is

felicity in the act due to the authority of the speaker, while “Stop talking” said by a student to his teacher lacks felicity because status is not respected. Furthermore, an utterance lacks sincerity if it is clear that the speech act, e.g. congratulating someone for failing the driving test for the third time, is not performed earnestly.

This brief summary of speech acts might have illustrated in how far the ‘discovery’ of speech acts indeed brought new insights in the nature of language in use. It led to the deeper understanding that language study should not only deal with linguistic form per se, but analyse how linguistic choice meets the demands of a specific context so that effective communication is realized. In other words: there are functions of language (such as ordering, requesting or apologizing) and each function is characterized through a specific linguistic feature. Effective communication means making an appropriate linguistic choice.

2.2.4 Speech act and ELT

Functions have found its way into foreign language methodology. It has been widely accepted that “illocutionary competence consists of the ability to manipulate the functions of the language” .Thus, functions in its specific linguistic forms have to be taught in the foreign language classroom, so that learners can both understand and produce functional language that is effective in terms of communication.

Students have to learn that an utterance like “It’s quite loud here. I can’t concentrate” addressed to a teacher might be more suitable (in order to meet the demands of felicity conditions) than “Stop talking”. “Second language learners need to understand the purpose of communication, developing an awareness of what the purpose of a communication act is and how to achieve that purpose through linguistic form” (Brown, 2000, p. 223).

The consideration of functions in the ELT classroom becomes apparent in the implementation of functional syllabuses in language textbooks. A great deal of present-day language textbooks, which are based on principles of communicative language teaching, contain functional/notional syllabuses – often integrated in a structural syllabus - covering functions such as apologizing and thanking, complaining, offering and requesting to name but a few.

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (which almost every language textbook now refers to) considers pragmatic competences, which refer to “the functional use of linguistic resources (production of language functions, speech acts)” (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, n. d., p.13;), equivalent to linguistic and sociolinguistic competences in the acquisition of communicative language competence.

Obviously, the assumption that speech acts, and, thus, language functions as well as pragmatic appropriateness are teachable underlies these concepts, and by and large speech acts are teachable within constraints (Cohen, 1996). That being said, speech act examples to be taught in the classroom have to be taken from speech act data collected in natural occurrences. Boxer and Pickering (1995), however, reported that, in the ELT texts they examined, examples were generated rather based on the intuition of textbook developers and therefore remarkable different from naturalistic speech patterns; they therefore claimed a “critical need for the application of sociolinguistic findings to English language teaching through authentic materials that reflect spontaneous speech behaviour”.

McKay (2003) addresses further problematic issues in teaching pragmatic competence drawing the attention to the questionability of applying native

speakers' pragmatic competence as a model for learners of English for four reasons:

Firstly, pragmatic appropriateness is defined differently among English native speakers even within the same cultural context so that there is not the pragmatic competence of English speakers.

Secondly, maturational constraints may hinder adult learners to internalize and therefore to display linguistic behaviour that is in accordance with pragmatic rules.

Thirdly, in environments where English is not the dominant code, insufficient L2 input might not provide opportunities to develop native speaker like pragmatic competence. Interestingly, in such environments, when English is used on daily basis as a means of communication, e.g. between participants who do not share each other's mother tongue, rules of pragmatic appropriateness emerge which are remarkably different from those of native speakers.

Finally, alleged native speakers' pragmatic appropriateness is likely to collide with the L2 learner's own identity in a way that certain speech acts are regarded inappropriate in L1:

This suggests that finding pragmatic appropriateness in a foreign language cannot primarily be an act of accepting L2 pragmatics in an unreflected manner but is indeed a kind of negotiating through comparing linguistic behaviours in the learner's own language and in the foreign language. Indeed, using speech acts in the foreign language classroom should provide learners with opportunities to compare own with foreign pragmatic competence, thus contribute to the development of intercultural competence.

Speech act theory has had a huge influence on linguistics and ELT methodology. Its significance for communicative language teaching as a tool to generate

appropriate linguistic choices cannot be disputed. The focus on the functional quality of language generated the idea that language could be taught more or less exclusively over a functional/notional syllabus. However, “the teaching of functions and notions cannot replace the teaching of grammar”. This should remind us of the necessity to deal with both meaning and form in the foreign language classroom.

2.2.4.1 Austi’s Model

The modern study of speech acts begins with Austin's (1962) engaging monograph. *How to Do Things with Words*, the published version of his William James Lectures delivered at Harvard in 1955. This widely cited work starts with the observation that certain sorts of sentences, e.g., I christen this ship the Joseph Stalin; I now pronounce you man and wife, and the like, seem designed to do something, here to christen and wed, respectively, rather than merely to say something. Such sentences Austin dubbed (performative), in contrast to what he called (constatives), the descriptive sentences that until Austin were the principal concern of philosophers of language - sentences that seem, pretheoretically, at least, to be employed mainly for saying something rather than doing something. While the distinction between performatives and constatives is often invoked in work on the law, in literary criticism, in political analysis, and in other areas, it is a distinction that Austin argued was not ultimately defensible. The point of Austin's lectures was, in fact, that every normal utterance has both a descriptive and an effective aspect: that saying something is also doing something.

1.1 Locutions, illocutions, and perlocutions

In place of the initial distinction between constatives and performatives, Austin substituted a three-way contrast among the kinds of acts that are performed when language is put to use, namely the distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, all of which are characteristic of most utterances, including standard examples of both performatives and constatives.

Locutionary acts

according to Austin, are acts of speaking, acts involved in the construction of speech, such as uttering certain sounds or making certain marks, using particular words and using them in conformity with the grammatical rules of a particular language and with certain senses and certain references as determined by the rules of the language from which they are drawn.

Illocutionary acts,

Austin's central innovation, are acts done in speaking (hence illocutionary), including and especially that sort of act that is the apparent purpose for using a performative sentence: christening, marrying, and so forth. Austin called attention to the fact that acts of stating or asserting, which are presumably illocutionary acts, are characteristic of the use of canonical constatives, and such sentences are, by assumption, not performatives. Furthermore, acts of ordering or requesting are typically accomplished by using imperative sentences, and acts of asking whether something is the case are properly accomplished by using interrogative sentences, though such forms are at best very dubious examples of performative sentences. In Lecture XXI of Austin (1962), the conclusion was drawn that the locutionary aspect of speaking is what we attend to most in the case of constatives, while in the

case of the standard examples of performative sentences, we attend as much as possible to the illocution.

The third of Austin's categories of acts is the Perlocutionary act, which is a consequence or byproduct of speaking, whether intended or not. As the name is designed to suggest, perlocutions are acts performed by speaking. According to Austin, perlocutionary acts consist in the production of effects upon the thoughts, feelings, or actions of the addressee(s), speaker, or other parties, such as causing people to refer to a certain ship as the Joseph Stalin, producing the belief that Sam and Mary should be considered man and wife, convincing an addressee of the truth of a statement, causing an addressee to feel a requirement to do something, and so on.

Austin (1962: 101) illustrates the distinction between these kinds of acts with the (now politically incorrect) example of saying "Shoot her!," which he trisects as follows:

Act (A) or Locution

He said to me "Shoot her!" meaning by shoot "shoot" and referring by her to "her."

Act (B) or Illocution

He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her.

Act (C) or Perlocution

He persuaded me to shoot her.

Though it is crucial under Austin's system that we be able to distinguish fairly sharply between the three categories, it is often difficult in practice to draw the requisite lines. Especially irksome are the problems of separating illocutions and locutions, on the one hand, and illocutions and perlocutions on the other, the latter being the most troublesome problem according to Austin himself.

Austin's main suggestion for discriminating between an illocution and a perlocution was that the former is "conventional, in the sense that at least it could be made explicit by the performative formula; but the latter could not". This, however, is more a characterization of possible illocutionary act than a practicable test for the illocution of a particular sentence or an utterance of it. While the test can give direct evidence as to what is not an illocutionary act, it fails to tell us for sure what the illocution is. If, for example, someone says "The bull is about to charge," and thereby warns the addressee of impending danger, do we say that the speech act of warning is here an illocutionary act of warning because the speaker could have said "I warn you that the bull is about to charge"? Another reasonable interpretation would be that in this case, the warning of the addressee, i.e., the production of a feeling of alarm, is a perlocutionary by-product of asserting that the bull is about to charge.

Many authors, such as Searle (1969, 1975a) and Allan (1998), seem to accept the idea that potential expression by means of a performative sentence is a sufficient criterion for the recognition of illocutions, while others, e.g. Sadock (1977), do not. Austin himself says that to be an illocutionary act it must also be the case that the means of accomplishing it are conventional.

Though a great many subsequent discussions of illocutions are couched within some version of Austin's theory that illocutionary acts are just those speech acts that could have been accomplished by means of an explicit performative, there are

examples, such as threatening, that remain problematic. Nearly every authority who has touched on the subject of threats departs from the Austinian identification of illocutionary acts with potential performatives, since threatening seems like an illocutionary act but we cannot threaten by saying, for example, “I threaten you with a failing grade.”

As for the distinction between the locutionary act of using particular words and constructions with particular meanings and the illocution performed in using that locution, Austin says that there is a difference between the locutionary MEANING and the illocutionary force of the utterance. Without independent knowledge of the use of these two words in this context, however, the criterion seems circular. The contrast between locution and illocution is often intuitively clear, but problems and controversies arise in the case of performative sentences such as I christen this ship the Joseph Stalin. Is the performative prefix I christen to be excluded from the locutionary act or included within it? If it is included, is the primary illocutionary act that is done in uttering this sentence to state that one christens? Austin presumably would have said that to utter these words is to christen, not to state that one christens, but Allan (1998), for example, insists that the primary illocution is to state something. There is a considerable literature on the validity and determination of the differences among locutions, illocutions, and perlocutions, some of which will be discussed or mentioned below.

1.2 The doctrine of infelicities

An important aspect of Austin's inquiry concerns the kinds of imperfections to which speech acts are prey. The motivation for this interest in the way things can go wrong is that, at first sight, it appears that constatives are just those utterances that are false when they fail, whereas failed performatives are not aptly described as false, but rather as improper, unsuccessful, or, in general, Infelicitous. If, for

example, a passing inebriate picks up a bottle, smashes it on the prow of a nearby ship, and says, "I christen this ship the Joseph Stalin," we would not ordinarily say that he or she has said something false, whereas if I describe that event by saying, "The passerby christened the ship," I could properly be blamed for uttering a falsehood.

Austin distinguished three broad categories of infelicities:

A. Misinvocations, which disallow a purported act. For example, a random individual saying the words of the marriage ceremony is disallowed from performing it. Similarly, no purported speech act of banishment can succeed in our society because such an act is not allowed within it

B. Misexecutions, in which the act is vitiated by errors or omissions, including examples in which an appropriate authority pronounces a couple man and wife, but uses the wrong names or fails to complete the ceremony by signing the legal documents. Here, as in the case of misinvocations, the purported act does not take place.

C. Abuses, where the act succeeds, but the participants do not have the ordinary and expected thoughts and feelings associated with the happy performance of such an act. Insincere promises, mendacious findings of fact, unfelt congratulations, apologies, etc. come under this rubric.

As interesting and influential on subsequent investigations as the doctrine of infelicities is, Austin concluded that it failed to yield a crucial difference between performatives and constatives. In the case of both there is a dimension of felicity that requires a certain correspondence with "the facts." With illocutionary acts of assertion, statement, and the like, we happen to call correspondence with the facts truth and a lack of it falsity, whereas in the case of other kinds of illocutions, we do

not use those particular words. Acts of asserting, stating, and the like can also be unhappy in the manner of performatives when, for example, the speaker does not believe what he or she asserts, even if it happens to be true.

1.3 The performative formula

Austin investigated the possibility of defining performative utterances in terms of a grammatical formula for performatives. The formula has a first person singular subject and an active verb in the simple present tense that makes explicit the illocutionary act that the speaker intends to accomplish in uttering the sentence. Additionally, the formula can contain the self-referential adverb hereby:

(1) "I (hereby) verb-present-active X ... "

Such forms he calls explicit performatives, opposing them with Primary performatives (rather than with implicit or inexplicit performatives.) But as Austin shows, the formula is not a sufficient criterion, at least without the adverb hereby, since in general sentences that fit the formula can be descriptive of activities under a variety of circumstances, e.g., I bet him every morning that it will rain, or I protest against the verdict.

Nor is the formula a necessary criterion, since there are many forms that differ from this canon and nevertheless seem intuitively to be explicit performatives. There are, for example, passive sentences like You are fired, and cases in which the subject is not first person,

e.g., The court finds you guilty. Austin therefore came to the conclusion that the performative formula was neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the recognition of those sentences we might want to call performatives.

There still are numerous clear cases of performative formulae, but the fact that explicit performatives seem to shade off into constatives and other non-performative sentence types greatly weakens their utility as a litmus for illocutionary force, since there are clear cases of illocutionary acts that cannot be accomplished in terms of an explicit performative formulae, e.g., *I fire you. It can also be argued that the illocutionary act performed in uttering a sentence in one or another of the sentential moods cannot be accomplished by uttering a performative formula, since any such sentence will necessarily be more specific than what is accomplished by the use of the simpler sentence. For example, the illocutionary act that is accomplished by uttering Come here! can be reasonably taken to be not an order, request, command, suggestion, or demand, but some more general act of which all of these are more specific versions, a general act for which there is no English verb that can be used in the performative formula. (Compare Alston's notion of Illocutionary act potential discussed below.)

2.2.4.2 The Influence of Grice

Grice's influential articles (1957, 1967), while not dealing directly with the problems that occupied Austin; nevertheless have had a profound influence on speech act theory. In the earlier of these papers, Grice promulgated the idea that ordinary communication takes place not directly by means of convention, but in virtue of a speaker's evincing certain intentions and getting his or her audience to recognize those intentions (and to recognize that it was the speaker's intention to secure this recognition). This holds, Grice suggested, both for speech and for other sorts of intentional communicative acts. In his view, the utterance is not in itself communicative, but only provides clues to the intentions of the speaker.

A later part of Grice's program spelled out how various maxims of cooperative behavior are exploited by speakers to secure recognition of the speaker's intentions in uttering certain words under particular circumstances. Grice distinguished between what is SAID in making an utterance, that which determines the truth value of the contribution, and the total of what is communicated. Things that are communicated beyond what is said (in the technical sense) Grice called IMPLICATURES, and those implicatures that depend upon the assumption that the speaker is being cooperative he called "Conversational implicatures" .

2.2.4.3 Strawson's objection to Austin

Strawson (1971) criticized the Austinian view as wrongly identifying speech acts such as christening and marrying as typical of the way language works. He pointed out that such illocutionary acts ordinarily take place in highly formal, ritualistic, or ceremonial situations such as ship launchings and weddings. These do indeed involve convention, Strawson conceded, but what one says on such occasions is part of a formalized proceeding rather than an example of ordinary communicative behavior. He argued that for more commonplace speech acts, such as are accomplished by uttering declarative sentences of various sorts, the act succeeds by Gricean means - by arousing in the addressee the awareness that it was the speaker's intention to achieve a certain communicative goal and to get the addressee to reach this conclusion on the basis of his or her having produced a particular utterance.

Warnock (1973) and Urmson (1977) go one step farther than Strawson, arguing in essence that since the act of bidding in bridge, for example, is part of the institution of bridge, it does not even belong to the institution of (ordinary) language .

2.2.4.4 Searle's defense of Austin

Searle 1969, a work that is second only to Austin's in its influence on speech act theory, presents a neo-Austinian analysis in which convention once again looms large, contra Grice and Strawson.

While not denying the role of Gricean intentions in communication, Searle argued that such an account is incomplete because;

(1) it fails to distinguish communication that proceeds by using meanings of the kind that only natural languages make available, and

(2) it fails to distinguish between acts that succeed solely by means of getting the addressee to recognize the speaker's intention to achieve a certain (perlocutionary) effect and those for which that recognition is “in virtue of (by means of) H [earer]'s knowledge of (certain of) the rules governing (the elements of) [the uttered sentence] T”.

Searle labels these illocutionary effects. Of the various locutionary acts that Austin mentions, Searle singled out the propositional act as especially important. This, in turn, consists of two components: an act of reference, in which a speaker picks out or identifies a particular object through the use of a definite noun phrase, and a predication, which Searle did not see as a separate locutionary act (or any other kind of speech act), but only as a component of the total speech act, which for him is the illocutionary force combined with the propositional content.

Searle (1969) observed that quite often the form of an utterance displays bipartite structure, one part of which determines the propositional act, and the other part the illocutionary act. The parts of an utterance that together are used by a speaker to signal the propositional act he symbolized as p.

Formal features of the utterance that determine the literal illocutionary force (which are often fairly complex) he called the illocutionary force indicating device (IFID), which he symbolized as F. The form of a complete utterance used to accomplish a complete speech act, including the propositional portion of the locution and the IFID, he therefore wrote as: (2) F(p).

Among Searle's arguments for the validity of this formula was the claim that negation can be either internal or external to the IFID, at least at the abstract level of grammatical analysis that Chomsky (1965) called deep structure. Thus, if p is (underlying) I will come and F is I promise, there are two negations, namely I promise not to come and I do not promise to come, the second of which Searle said must be construed as an illocutionary act of refusing to promise something, not as an apology."Jerrold Sadock,2005"

2.2.5 Apology

Apology studies have attracted many EFL researchers. They analyzed apology as a speech act in the context of EFL or ESL with the focus on EFL speakers' production and perception of apology. Many studies have focused on apology from linguistic point of view describing the ways native speaker use this speech act.

The main aim of the present study is to investigate apology strategies used by the Sudanese EFL learners in spoken discourse. Using a corpus data gathered from actual language in use. "Gusztav Demeter ,2011,NP"

An apology according to Holmes (1995) is a speech act that is intended to remedy the offense for which the apologizer takes responsibility and, as a result, to rebalance social relations between interlocutors. Another explanation of the nature of apology is given by Fraser (1981) who argues that apologizing is at least taking responsibility for the violation and expressing regret for the offense committed.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983) perceive apology as a social event when they point out that it is performed when social norms are violated. Bergman and Kasper (1993) emphasize this view as they see that the purpose of apology is to restore social relational agreement after the offense is committed. Such forms are more conventional – used more often than for the loss.

Moreover sometime he/she shows his/her determination to be careful in future. Though all such apology strategies affect the speaker's positive face want but some are considered more dangerous than the others. IFIDs and EXPL moves are labeled as less dangerous while the other three moves (RESP, REPR, FORB) are taken as more dangerous for speaker's positive face want. Moreover IFIDs are the formulaic form of apology and rest of four are non-formulaic forms of apology.

There are different measures to measure these apology strategies. These measures mostly depend upon the speaker, the addressee or both. The social distance, sex, power, social status, age and situation also play their respective part in this regard. Apologies speech acts are performed by the individuals when they commit any mistake or nonsense to others who may have different kinds of relations with the speakers ranging from most formal to most informal. They may also have different social dispositions and power. Therefore apologies may vary according from highly apologetic to least apologetic depending upon the interlocutor. Moreover they also differ with the intensity and type of mistake or mishap. For measuring and calculating apologies different frameworks have been proposed especially by the western linguists. These frameworks place apologies in different places.

More recently many Japanese, Chinese, African and Middle Eastern scholars have started to probe into the field of politeness and apologies. In the last couple of decades many studies have been conducted to investigate apology speech acts in western languages particularly Arabic and Persian. The underlying assumption of

such studies of apology speech acts is to draw pragmatic rules that govern the use of speech acts in different socio-cultural backgrounds. Cross- Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) project initiated in 1982 by Blum Kulka and Olshtain, was an attempt to analyze speech acts (in this case requests and apologies) across a range of languages and,cultures aiming at investigating the existence of any,possible pragmatic universals and their,characteristics (Afghari, 2007). This project found out five,different apology speech acts that are similar to IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device). In this case speaker expresses an overt apology and takes responsibility for the offence. "AamirMajeed and Dr. FauziaJanjua, , 2014".

Olshtain defines apology as ‘‘ a speech act which is intended to provide support for the hearer who was actually or potentially malaffected by a violation’ When he agrees to offer an apology, the speaker is willing to humiliate himself to an extent which, by definition, makes an apology a face-saving act for the hearer and a face-threatening act for the speaker. Apology fall under expressive speech acts ,where the speaker tries to indicate his own state or attitude. In order for an apology to have an effect, it should reflect true feelings. A person cannot effectively apologize to another and truly reach him unless he portrays honest feelings of sorrow and regret for whatever he has committed . As Gooder and Jacobs point out:

The proper apology acknowledges the fact of wrong doing , accepts ultimate responsibility ,expresses sincere sorrow and regret, and promises not to repeat the offense.. Some of the features of the proper apology are;

The admission of trespass,

The implied acknowledgment of responsibility,

An expression of regret,

A promise of a future in which injury will not recur.

One important aspect in resolving a conflict is the fact that it takes two sides to start an interpersonal conflict and two sides to resolve it. If the wrongdoer decides to apologize and ends up with an unyielding injured person who does not even give him the time to defend his position, his apology will be useless. If the injured person waits for an apology that will not come because the wrongdoer does not think he should apologize, he might end up waiting forever to no avail.

Another important aspect is context. Not only does Butler state that context affects the apology strategies an offender uses, he also mentions that the act of apologizing is very complex and hazardous, especially for second language learners since an apologizer who fails to communicate the proper apology for given situation may seem unapologetic or even worse.

Certain elements may influence the effectiveness of an apology

Familiarity with the victim since intimacy and the period of relationship determine the apology style. This corresponds with Jarou's (2002) claim that the speaker to be more direct when he wants to show intimacy.

Intensity of the act warranting the apology since the more trivial it is, the less of an apology it needs and vice versa;

the relative authority of the offender and the victim since apology styles reflect how superior or inferior the victim is to the apologizer;

the relative ages of the offender and the victim;

sex of both offender and victim since females tend to apologize more to both males and females; and

place of exchange since it affects the formality and type of apology.

This is similar to what Hussein (1995) has come up with when he has examined Arabic speech acts and stated that the formulas of any speech act are determined by social distance, formality of the situation, age, level of education and status of the participants.

An apology should have the three R's: Regret, Responsibility and Remedy. According to Engel (2001) without one of those, the apology will not be sincere, and thus, it will have no result. The wrongdoer should portray the three aspects in order for the victim to take his apology into consideration.

The speech act of apology consists of the following components, listed in a descending order of importance from the most to the least expected:

An expression of apology, in which the wrongdoer vocalizes his feelings of regret.

An expression of the situation, in which the wrongdoer tries to reconstruct the incident for the victim to make him see he deserves forgiveness.

Acknowledgement of responsibility, whereby the wrongdoer claims his responsibility for what has happened as a part of his apology,

An offer of repair in which the wrongdoer tries to present a way to undo the harm, and a promise of nonrecurrence, whereby the wrongdoer promises not to repeat the offense and thus insure gaining the victim's sympathy for his awkward position.

Despite the fact that Brown and Attardo (2000) stress the need for the five components to take place in order for an act to be considered an apology, this is not always the case since the word "sorry" could suffice as an apology if a person is apologizing to a close friend. In such a case, the wrongdoer has only used the first component from the above list and done without the other four.

Two of the constituent components of righting wrongs are confession and compensation. The important issue is how a perpetrator shows he is sorry, or as Rajan (2000) puts it, 'The question is not, are we sorry? The question is, what lessons have we learned? The question is, what are we going to do now that we are sorry?'

2.2.5.1 Categorizing Apologies (Apologetic Strategies)

Generally speaking, human beings apologize when they commit a transgression under a low or high obligation. To offer an apology one needs to use one or a combination of apology strategies in order to be impressive in a remedial exchange. They are the available devices of the apology exchangers in order to maintain the social equilibrium.

Brown and Levinson (1987) imply that apologetic strategies are specific methods of approaching an offence, modes of operation for confirming or assuring of mutual solidarity and "planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain" speech acts. In the course of an ongoing interaction, apology makers recognize the degree of the offence, the relative power of the addressee over the addressor, the social distance, and the relative circumstance in order to revitalize the position of the previous camaraderie.

Holmes (1990) states "To apologize is to act politely. It is aimed at maintaining good relations between the participants". Owen (1983) restricts the meaning of apologizing to the expression of "sorry" and "I apologize"; Goffman (1976) looks at it as a remedy, finally Olshtain and Cohen (1983) specify the potential nature of apologizing. Holmes (1995) looked at gender differences in apologies and found both similarities and differences between males and females.

Fraser (1980) declared that apologies are rule-governed. The offender manages to correct his complainable behavior by uttering “I’m really sorry” for example. The offended person may either admit the apology or repudiate it. The denial or acceptance of excuse may involve a set of strategies. If you apologize, you are respected and answered; if you are apologized, the rule states that you respond politely. In that case, you will be revered. The ability to interpret, give and respond to apologizing appropriately is a social skill which can add greatly to the language learners opportunities to enter into friendly relationship with native speakers and incidentally gain needed practice in using the target language."Eslami-Rasekh& Mehdi Mardani, , 2010, Page 96"

The premise of the studies using the speech act theory framework is that speakers choose from a set of predefined choices the one that is most appropriate to the given situation. The chosen apology is referred to as an apology strategy. Speakers could use different strategies in order to mend the offense, and the choice of strategy depends on the severity of the offense. Studies have used different taxonomies, but none of them had an exhaustive list of apology strategies, different instruments and different subjects producing different sets of strategies.

The taxonomy that has probably been used by most studies on apologies was the one proposed by the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum- Kulka&Olshtain, 1984). This taxonomy includes the following strategies: using an illocutionary force indicating device (IFID) such as “I’m sorry;” taking on responsibility (e.g. “You know me, I’m never on time”), giving explanation or account of what happened (e.g. “The bus was late”), offering to repair the offending act (e.g. “I’ll pay for the damage”), and promising forbearance (e.g. “This won’t happen again”). Any of these strategies can potentially be used either by themselves or in any combination.

While the taxonomy presented above has been used by many subsequent studies, some of those studies expressed concerns about the validity of the taxonomy. One of the problems that Vollmer and Olshtain (1989) encountered when attempting to code and analyze the data in their own study was that the CCSARP methodology could not be used adequately for the combinations of different strategies that the German speakers used.

Thus, according to Vollmer and Olshtain the categories used by the CCSARP were too broad and nonspecific, while in the German data sometimes what would be a single category following the CCSARP methodology could actually be considered a combination.

An additional problem is that the strategies used in the CCSARP study were created on the assumption that all participants were willing to apologize in all the situations provided. Olshtain and Cohen (1983) proposed two additional strategies for the case when the speaker does not feel the need to apologize. These were a denial of the need to apologize (e.g. "There was no need for you to get insulted") and a denial of responsibility (e.g. "It wasn't my fault"). Additional categories were introduced by Bergman and Kasper (1993), who distinguished the following categories: an intensified IFID containing an intensifier for the speech act verb (e.g. "I'm terribly sorry"), minimizing the effects and severity of the action (e.g. "I'm only 10 minutes late"), and verbal redress (e.g. "It won't happen again").

These strategies were further specified by later studies, as subcategories were created for most of these basic strategies. Thus, Holmes (1990), delimited subcategories for the explicit expression of apology strategy, namely offer apology/IFID (e.g. "I apologize"), express regret (e.g. "I'm afraid"), request forgiveness (e.g. "forgive me").

The largest strategy, an acknowledgment of responsibility, was divided into accept blame (e.g. “It was my fault”), express self-deficiency (e.g. “I was confused”), recognize the hearer as entitled to an apology (e.g. “You’re right”), express lack of intent (e.g. “I didn’t mean to”), and offer repair/redress (e.g. “We’ll replace it for you”). Finally, some more radical strategies were suggested by Trosborg (1995), namely blaming someone else, attacking the complainer, and even not accepting that an apology is necessary.

Although the strategies mentioned above seem to be common to many languages, the studies did not make any claims about universality. Studies on languages other than English have found some culturally specific categories, as well, including, but not limited to, a “feel-good” apology (Kotani, 1999), acting helpless, leaving or resigning, and even committing suicide (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990). Kotani (1999) defines the “feel-good” apology as the apology strategy used by a speaker in order to make the person being apologized to feel good, whether responsible for the offense or not.

The strategies described by Barnlund & Yoshioka (1990), namely acting helpless, leaving or resigning, and committing suicide, are specific to speakers of Japanese. Unlike all other strategies described in this section that are verbal strategies, these three represent nonverbal strategies consisting of a certain behavior acting as an apology. The fact that such strategies are not present in all languages clearly shows the importance of context in the production of apologies, whether this context is cultural, social, or situational.

As we have seen in the discussion of different apology strategies, a large variety of taxonomies have been used in studies of apologies. However, there are a number of apology strategies that were common in most of these studies.

Table 1 shows the most commonly used strategies sampled in previous studies and provides examples for each of them.

Basic Apology Strategies Used in Studies on Apologies

Strategy	Example
Avoiding or postponing an apology.	'I want to be always the same! As you know me.'
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	'I'm sorry!'; 'I apologize!'
Intensified IFID	'I'm so sorry!'; 'I very, very sorry!'
Providing a justification	'I forgot at what time the wedding was and... I was fishing.'
Acknowledgment of responsibility	'I know I am late'
Offer of repair	'I promise I'll buy another set of plates.'
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	'The traffic was terrible.'
Promise of non-recurrence	'I promise you this will never happen again.'

While some of these strategies, such as promise of non-recurrence, for example, are clearly defined in different studies, other strategies are fuzzier insofar as their definition is concerned. Strategies such as the IFID, for example, seem to contain a

variety of apologies that may or may not actually be part of the same category. Most studies have considered apologies as set words or phrases, and no distinction has been made between the different meanings or functions that different instances of each category might have in different contexts. For example, by definition in speech act theory, when a speech act is performed, a certain linguistic form is uttered in order to perform an action (Austin, 1975), which is called the function of the speech act. The concept of strategy used in most studies represents a combination of form and function.

For example, as a strategy, the IFID was considered the generic explicit apology. However, one and the same form can have different functions. Consider the examples below

Bill Hemmer: OK. In our audience today, we have a number of daughters here, who have attended CNN work day with their fathers. And Natasha has a comment.

Go ahead, Natasha.

15th Audience Member: I don't think it's fair that boys don't get to come to work with their parents, because boys should just get to come same as girls.

Bill Hemmer: Come where? I'm sorry.

15th Audience Member: Come to work with their parents.

Bill Hemmer: Oh, I see, OK

(2) Rose: This one is Friday at nine thirty at the Mega Center.

Grant: The bank right?

Grant: That's the bank.

Grant: X X...

Rose: It's one of five West Adams on the seventh floor ...

Grant: At what time ?

Rose: Nine.

Rose: I'm sorry it's nine to ten+thirty .

Grant: Okay I have a clue that she gave me but I'll make arrangements on it.

From a taxonomic point of view, “I’m sorry” is an IFID in both examples. However, the form has different functions in the two examples. While in (1) it functions as a generic apology, in (2) the function of this apology seems to be more than just an IFID, as it also performs a function at the discourse level, in that it also acts as a discourse marker introducing a repair. The taxonomic categories used in the studies on apologies discussed above cannot account for this difference in function, as both examples would be labeled merely as IFIDs. More problematic issues concerning these categories will be discussed later during the data analysis part of the study.

In summary, there is a great variety in terms of the taxonomies used in the studies of apologies. While some of the categories described above seem to be a useful way of describing apologies, yet other categories are more problematic, as one and the same strategy appears to contain apologies functioning in different ways. Therefore, there is a need for a better way of categorizing apologies that would make use of those aspects of existing categories that have proved effective but also provide alternatives for the problematic ones.

In order to draw boundaries between different types of apology strategies:

The apologizer can choose any of these five apology strategies.

- An expression of an apology (use of IFID) e.g. I apologize.

- An acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) e.g. it was my fault.
- An explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) e.g. I'm sorry, the bus was late.
- An offer of repair (REPR) e.g. I'll pay the price.

Others, such as 'I'm sorry' in English and the word "اسف" "aasif" in Arabic which literally means 'forgiveness'. Blum- Kulka and Kasper (1993) state that speech acts differ in the extent to which conventionalized linguistic forms are used; some speech acts, such as apologizing and thanking, exhibit more conventional usage than others do. Linguists classify the apology act according to various criteria. Divisions are primarily based on external factors such as the situation or object of regret. Sometimes the speaker explicitly apologizes to the other person for his/her offence whereas sometime he/she admits his/her fault and considers him/her responsible for the mishap. Sometime speaker regrets and explains the reason of the mishap and sometime he/she shows his/her offer to pay

- A promise of forbearance (FORB) e.g. this won't happen again.

2.2.5.2 Apologies in oral Discourse

As we have already mentioned, most studies have examined the use of apologies in spoken discourse settings. Insofar as the findings reported are concerned, they have varied to some extent based on the source of the apologies analyzed. Most studies using elicited data collected by means of DCTs and role-plays have reported similar results, and therefore they will be discussed together. However, studies using naturally occurring language, whether collected by means of observation or language corpora, have reported somewhat different results than studies using elicited apologies, and therefore will be discussed separately.

Studies on native speakers of English using elicited data have reported apologies given in a large variety of situations requiring an apology, sometimes called offenses. These offenses have been classified into different types, including social gaffes, impolite talk / talk offenses, inconvenience / inadequate service, violating personal space, damage or loss to possessions, lack of consideration, mistakes and misunderstandings, forgetting something, hearing offenses, requests, breach of expectations and breach of consensus. A summary of these types of offenses and examples for each are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Types of Offenses Requiring an Apology in Previous Studies on Apologies

Type of Offense	Examples
Social gaffes	Speaking while eating (Holmes, 1990)
Impolite talk/talk offenses	Interrupting the speaker (Holmes, 1990)
Inconvenience	Shop assistant not being able to staple documents (Deutschmann, 2003; Holmes, 1990)
Space offenses	Violating one's personal space (Holmes, 1990)
Damage or loss to possessions	Losing someone's pen (Holmes, 1990)
Mistakes / misunderstandings	Misunderstanding someone (Deutschmann, 2003)
Breach of expectations or consensus	Not keeping an agreement (Deutschmann, 2003)
Being late / time offenses	Arriving late for an appointment (Holmes, 1990)

While most of these types of offenses seem self-explanatory, the last two, breach of expectations and breach of consensus seem to need clarification. The difference

between these two is that the situations categorized as breach of expectations imply not fulfilling something implicitly expected, while those categorized as breach of consensus imply not fulfilling something explicitly agreed upon. Also, the types of offenses presented in Table 2 have different degrees of severity. The most severe ones are, according to Holmes (1990) those that involve loss of or damage to possessions, followed by space and time offenses, while the least severe ones are social gaffes, talk offenses, and inconveniences.

Though different studies on English have reported different findings, mostly due to the fact that they used different taxonomies in their analysis of the data, some findings have been confirmed by multiple studies. A large number of studies on apologies in both English and other languages have shown that the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID), such as “I’m sorry,” for example, was by far the most frequently used form of apology, whether used by itself or in combination with other strategies. The apology strategies most often used by speakers in the most common situations are given in Table 2. The situations are ordered by the severity of the offense, with less serious offenses on top and more serious ones at the bottom. The level of severity is based on Holmes (1990) discussed above. The examples in the table are taken from the studies themselves.

Table 3 Summary of Common Apology Strategies Given to Common Situations in Previous Studies on Apologies

Type of Situation	Most Often Used Strategy	Example
Social gaffes	IFID	'I'm sorry'
Mistakes / misunderstandings	IFID (Often with interjections such as Oh!, Yeah!)	'Oh! Sorry!'
Inconvenience	IFID / IFID + Explanation	'I beg your pardon. I thought you said wine and soda'
Impolite talk/talk offenses IFID	+ Explanation or justification	'I'm sorry. I didn't mean to stop you'
Violating one's personal space	IFID + Explanation	'Sorry miss. I was in a hurry'
Being late	IFID / IFID + Explanation	'I'm sorry I'm so late' 'The bus was late'
Breach of expectations or consensus	(Intensified) IFID + Explanation	'I'm really sorry. I thought you meant tonight'
Damage or loss to possessions	Offer of repair or restitution	'I'll pay for the damage'

These findings were reported by studies mostly using DCTs and role-plays as a data collection method. Studies using natural data, whether collected through observation or in the form of language corpora, reported results that were both similar and different than the ones reported by studies using elicited data. Thus, Holmes (1990) confirmed the fact that “I’m sorry” was by far the most frequently used form of apology in New Zealand English, whether by itself or in combination with other strategies. Her study also showed that 95% of the apologies she investigated contained an explicit expression of apology, which is a much higher percentage than what had been reported by other studies. Furthermore, Holmes found that the more severe the offense, the more elaborate the apology, and thus several strategies would be used in one and the same apology. Overall, however, Holmes claims that her results confirm the viability of the existing taxonomies of apology strategies.

Findings such as Holmes’ (1990) that 95% of apologies contain an explicit expression of apology, open the possibility for language corpora studies to use explicit apology lexemes to search for apologies in large corpora. Aijmer (1996) investigated the use of apologies in the London-Lund Corpus. According to Aijmer, apologies containing sorry were indeed the most frequent ones when compared to apologies containing other lexemes such as apologize or forgive among others. The study also reported that apologies containing sorry tended to be neutral, unmarked apologies, while those containing apologize would be mostly used in formal situations.

One of the distinctions that Aijmer makes that had not been made in other studies is between retrospective and anticipatory apologies. The retrospective apology is used to apologize for offenses that already occurred; whereas, anticipatory apologies are used to anticipate an offense, such as in “I’m sorry, but I’m unable to

keep this appointment.” This distinction is very important, since anticipatory apologies had not been reported by studies using DCTs and role-plays as data collection methods. Those instruments provide an offense that requires an apology, and therefore all the elicited apologies are retrospective.

Another corpus used as source for apologies is the British National Corpus. Deutschmann (2003) examined the forms and functions of apologies using the interactions of over 1700 speakers in different contexts and situations, from formal to informal. Deutschmann searched the corpus for the IFIDs afraid, apologise, apology, excuse, forgive, pardon, regret, and sorry and investigated the apology strategies that occurred with the IFID. According to Deutschmann, strategies that involved minimizing responsibility were four times more frequent than strategies acknowledging responsibility. However, unlike Aijmer (1996), Deutschmann focused on the relationships between formulaic expressions of apologies and social variables, and only tangentially discussed the relationship between these forms and the apology strategies they involve. Instead, he classified the apologies into three main categories: those taking on responsibility, those minimizing responsibility, and those with double usage.

Finally, Ruzaitė & Čubajevaitė (2007) used a subset of the British National Corpus to investigate the use of apologies in business communication containing the expressions sorry, apologise, pardon, and excuse me. They found that apologies were highly routinized, with those containing “sorry” being the most frequent ones, which confirms previous findings. However, Ruzaitė & Čubajevaitė (2007) reported a category of apologies that had not been reported by studies using DCTs and role-plays, namely tentative apologies. These seem to be characteristic to some extent of business communication. An example of such an apology is “I should perhaps apologize on behalf of the hotel for the temperature in the room this morning” .

According to the authors, such apologies are less sincere, as they are mitigated by their tentativeness. The authors also acknowledge for the first time the fact that apologies are used for offenses involving interruptions and self-correction. However, the study considers all the apologies as formulaic expressions of apology, or IFIDs, without differentiating the functions of these apologies at the discourse level, considering them formulaic expressions of apology. The focus of the study is more on what forms occur for which offense rather than on what the specific function of the form is in different contexts.

The findings reported by studies using corpora as a source for apologies suggest that such an approach can allow researchers to find categories of apologies that exist in real language that cannot be obtained through data elicitation instruments such as DCTs or role-plays.

The last issue that needs to be discussed insofar as the findings of studies on apologies are concerned is the similarities and differences of findings reported in different languages. Most studies on languages other than English have shown that the choices of apology strategies are culture specific. Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) have shown that critical cultural variables determine the speakers' choice of apologies, such as the fact that Japanese speakers used more direct apologies, while American speakers tend to be less direct. For example, according to Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) Japanese speakers used explicit apologies such as "I am very sorry;" whereas, the American speakers preferred not to use explicit apologies but rather provide an explanation.

Moreover, studies on Japanese have also reported apology strategies specific to this culture, such as a "feel-good" apology, reported by Kotani (1999), acting helpless, leaving or resigning, and even committing suicide, reported by Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990), strategies we have already discussed in 2.1.2. Japanese is not

the only language for which language or culture specific apology strategies have been reported. Vollmer and Olshtain (1989) reported that in the case of German, the category IFID has a weak and strong form. For example, IFIDs that are truly sincere, are considered strong IFIDs, and are expressed with intensifiers or verbs expressing regret. Weak IFIDs are considered the ones merely expressing sympathy on the part of the speaker. Márquez-Reiter (2000), reported that intensified illocutionary indicating devices exist in most apologies in English, but that they are considered inappropriate in the case of Uruguayans. In Sudanese Arabic, speakers have been found to avoid strategies such as taking on responsibility, intensifying IFIDs, or promising forbearance for fear of losing face, preferring the more neutral category of IFID. Suszczynska (1999) also found that there are differences across the three languages she investigated, namely English, Hungarian, and Polish. For example, English speakers preferred to use IFIDs containing “I’m sorry” and “excuse me,” while with the

Hungarian apologies there was a high percentage of assuming responsibility, which was the most often used strategy after the IFID. As far as Polish apologies are concerned, 85% of the respondents used the Polish expression equivalent to “I’m sorry,” which was always intensified. Language specific findings have also been reported in Persian. The IFIDs were almost always used combined with a request for forgiveness (Shariati&Chamani, 2010). The existence of such differences in the use of apologies across languages suggests that there is a need to investigate how apologies are used in different languages, especially in those languages that have not been studied yet.

Insofar as Romanian is concerned, we have previously investigated the use of apologies in a thesis (Demeter, 2006). That study used a DCT to collect apologies from college level speakers of Romanian in a Romanian university. We reported

that an overwhelming proportion of apologies were combinations of strategies, rather than single ones. Also, the IFID was found to be the most often used apology, whether by itself or combined with other strategies.

This complexity and variety of apologies used in Romanian was confirmed by Trimbitas et al. (2007), the only published study of apologies in Romanian we have found. The study investigated how ethnic Romanians living in the United States apologize. In this study, Trimbitas et al. (2007) interviewed 15 participants, some in Romanian and some in English. The study found that the choice of apology depended on whether the person apologized to was a stranger or not, with formal apologies, such as “Please excuse me, that was my mistake,” being used with strangers, and informal ones, such as “Sorry, I shouldn’t have said that,” with known interlocutors. The apologies used in informal situations were also reported to be uttered in a more relaxed tone. Also, a wide range of apologies were found to be used, with preference being given to strategies such as remedy or promise in the case of people close to the person apologizing. The main forms reported as being used to apologize in Romanian are “Îmicerscuze, a intervenitcevasi n-am pututveni” [I apologize, something came up and I couldn’t make it] or “Iartă-mă, îmi pare rău, promitsănu se maiîntîmple,” [Please forgive me, I’m so sorry, I promise this won’t happen again] or “Scuzecă+ cauză+ lasacă+ soluŃie,” [I’m sorry that + cause + let me/I will + solution] or “Îmi pare răucăsa-întimplatasa,măvoirevansa” [I’m so sorry this happened, I will make it up to you] (pp. 412-413).

However, these are only a limited number of possible forms, which is a result of the fact that the methodology used was an interview, and only recollections of apologies were provided. Furthermore, the authors only describe the different forms used to apologize in Romanian, without discussing the relationship between

these forms and their functions, or between the forms and the situations in which they are used, except for a distinction between formal and informal contexts and use.

Both these studies of Romanian apologies used elicited data as the source for the apologies. Consequently, there is a need to investigate how this speech act is actually used in real, naturally occurring language. "Gusztav Demeter,2011,page28"

2.2.5.3 Apology as Speech Acts

Speech Act Theory aims to explain language exchange in terms of the effects on listeners and speakers. Austin (1962) first suggested speech act theory by claiming that constatives and performatives are the two main acts of speech. Constatives are statements that can be judged in terms of truth. Constatives in that sense are statements that do not cause actions.

On the other hand, performatives are statements that can be evaluated in terms of felicity, or in terms of their actions. These two types of acts of speech are the basis of the language classification that led to a deeper analysis of the language. Searle (1969) had a systematic approach and classified speech acts under five main categories:

Assertive, directives, commissive, expressives, and declarations. The explanation below was adopted from Verschueren (1999).

Assertive: Expressing a belief, committing the speaker to truth of what is asserted
.E.g. Statements:

We watched a movie yesterday.

Directive: Expressing a wish, making an attempt to get to hearer to do something.

E.g. requests: Bring me some hot water.

Commissives: Expressing an intention, commitment for the speaker to engage in a future action. E.g. Promises, offers: I promise, I will complete the work by tomorrow.

Expressive: Expressing a variety of psychological states.

E.g. Apologies: I am sorry for my disrespectful behavior.

Declarations Bring about a change via words. E.g. baptizing, declaring war, abdicating: Hereby I pronounce you husband and wife.

Under the category of expressive, apology speech acts hold an important place in human communication as a face saving act of speech. Thus it is crucial for people to understand what an apology is and how it functions. An act of apology can be considered a remedial act of speech, which means that the speaker is trying to save his or her face because of an action. Cohen &

Olshtain (1983) explains apologies as a speech act occurring between two participants in which one of the participants expects or perceives oneself deserving a compensation or explanation because of an offense committed by the other. In that situation, one participant has a choice to apologize or deny the responsibility or the severity of the action. Thus, an apology in that sense plays a role as a politeness strategy.

Apology speech strategies are classified by the seminal work of Cohen & Olshtain (1983), which has been mainly used by other researchers as formulaic expressions which are also can be referred as direct apologies, or indirect apologies which include an explanation or account, acknowledgement of responsibility, offer of repair, promise of forbearance. The apologies might be modified by using a

combination of apology strategies together or with intensifiers such as adverbs to intensify the apology, or they might be modified to decrease the responsibility of the offender. “Mehmet Aydin, 2013, page 9”

2.2.5.4 Apologies and Culture

Speech acts share some common characteristics in different cultures. Although different speech communities may conceive and express ideas in a variety of forms and patterns, the basic concepts are the common property of all cultures. They are used to have an action carried out. Promises, apologies, threats, to name a few are a component of the speech repertoire of different cultures. Yet, to say that they share common characteristics does not mean they do not differ in other aspects. Apologies, for example, differ with culture. They are always culturally specific, what obtains as a satisfactory expression of remorse between two parties involved in an automobile accident in New York may not work between two Caribbean peasants involved in a land feud. Soliman (2003) states that speech acts, and hence apologies, are difficult to learn because they are culture specific, and thus problematic for nonnative speakers of English whose first language affects their use of English speech acts.

Bulter (2001) arrives at the importance of context in a research instrument when discussing apologies since the way people apologize differs with each context. He says that meaning is construed according to the unique situation which also dictates what may be considered appropriate. This is the reason that is accepted as an apology at one point but is considered insufficient and rude at another.

There are significant East-West differences in causal reasoning and responsibility assessment when it comes to apologies. Westerners concentrate more on culpability and Easterners on consequences. Whereas an American would look at a person in fault

in a certain incident. For example, a Chinese would examine the results of the incident. Yet, both cultures look for a way to save face, thus ending up blaming each other; saving face is important in apology-warranting situations and thus explains Coates and Cameron's definition of apology as a politeness strategy that pays attention to

The addressee's negative face" and Holmes' definition of apology being "any utterance which aims at remedying the effect of an offense or face-threatening act and resorting to social harmony and equilibrium". It is the tendency in humans to favor in-groups over out-groups when it comes to attributions; people usually blame circumstances or the other group for any wrongdoing and commend a member of the group for any good deed. Apologies in China are less ritualistic and more goal-oriented. In the Chinese culture, apologies can be used to solve problems. If a person does something wrong, one should first of all apologize and then talk with the victim about what is to be done next. Apologies in China do not necessarily come with the risk of losing face or feeling humiliated. Unlike Americans, the Chinese are not afraid of litigation and thus are ready to apologize since a mere sorry can wipe off a multitude of sins

Americans are reluctant to admit their faults because it weakens their position. As individuals, they try to refrain from apologizing since "a written apology for example could be held against them as evidence in some ongoing social dispute or legal proceedings.. It is saddening to think that a written "I am sorry" has become a ticking time bomb".

Because of the fear of lawsuits, not only do Americans try to cut back on apologies, they also try to hide behind the pronoun-free statement. Mistakes were made. The Japanese apologize a lot. As quoted in Butalia (2001), a Japanese describes the Japanese culture as follows:

For us, an apology is like a smile, it's free and it means nothing... Perhaps we Japanese apologize, or at least try to, because we believe in we're all in some way accountable, that we all have a role to play in making the society we live in. It may sound like a cliché, but it is true..

Barr (1989) on the other hand, presents another side of the coin when it comes to the Japanese culture; apologies are important and should be sincere. They even have rituals that should be adhered to. He cites, as an example, the incident of Aoki, the Japanese diplomat who was forced to resign after being held captive for 127 days by Marxists because, in his press conference, he did not apologize for the crisis in a way that satisfied the Japanese, i.e. with a bow and some tears; the diplomat said that it was a difference in perception since he was addressing an international, not a Japanese, audience and thus acted accordingly. "Aoki acknowledges that his behavior must have struck his fellow citizens as very arrogant, very un-Japanese. In Japan, even executives apologize before they resign to atone for their mistakes. Some Japanese commit suicide as a way of taking responsibility for perceived personal or professional failures" Rula Fehmi, 2004, p.p 47-51".

Soliman (2003), in his comparison of Egyptian and American apology styles, found the following similarities and differences between the two cultures :

- 1- Intensifiers are used in both cultures to show sincerity.
- 2- interjections like Oh are important to show that the offender really cares about what happened.
- 3- People in both cultures tend to express embarrassment for the offering act.

4- Egyptians tend to attack the victim when the offender thinks the victim cannot justify his position as in the incident where the headmaster blames the janitor he bumped into for the incident instead of apologizing to him.

5- Egyptians praise Allah(God) for everything that happens,whether good or bad.

Al-Hami (1993), in his study of the apology strategies used by native speakers of an arab learners of English ,has found that both groups use the same strategies to apologize although arabs express less regret than native speakers. He has also stated that native speakers of English acknowledge lack of intent,appeal to offer arepair, and give a promise of forbearance more than Arabs.

On the other hand, Arab learners usually offer more explanation of the circumstances that led to the offense. Al-Hami attributes these results to language transfer as well as linguistic incompetence.

Hussein and Hammouri (1998) have examined the apology strategies used by Americans and Jordanian speakers of English . They state that Jordanians use more strategies to apologize than Americans ,while both groups resort to the expression of apology, the offer of repair, the acknowledgment of responsibility ,and the promise of forbearance ,only Jordanians use strategies like praising Allah (God) for what happened ,attacking the victim ,minimizing the degree of offense and interjection. Another difference between the two groups lies in the Jordanians tendency to use less direct and more elaborate strategies. The researchers have attributed these differences to the influence of culture, patterns of thought and religious orientation.

Rizk(1997) has examined apology strategies used among Arab non-native speakers of English, studying the answers of 110 Egyptian , Saudi, Jordanian, Palestinian, Moroccan ,Lebanese, Syrian, Tunisian, Yemeni and Libyan speakers of English to

a questionnaire he designed .His results prove the conformity of apology strategies between native and non-native speakers of English in all situations that warrant an apology except for one. Unlike native speakers of English, Arabs do not apologize to children; instead they try to make the child forgive them through sentences like Do not feel sad,baby. In addition ,Arabs express their apologies through the following utterance: "never mind;if you take offense,I'll invite you to lunch after the meeting' .Which would seem offensive and rude to native speakers of English ,this is a cultural issue since food is an acceptable offering that has the power to wipe off a lot off hurt. "Rula Fehmi,2004,pp54-56'

2.2.5.2 Apologies in Arabic culture

Al-Abdi (1981) defines apology as the utterances and deeds a person tries to offer to lift punishment or blame due him for a malicious deed he has committed. He also states that no apology is needed when a person is sure he is not to blame for whatever happened since no innocent person is to be punished for the deed he has mot committed.

In his study of Jordanian apology strategies,El-khalil(1998) states that in the process of apologizing to friends, Jordainians –willinglimgly opt for employing convectional apology expressions,i.e. explicit apologies, to mitigate the negative impact of the offense. " they use various expressions including

Sorry

I am sorry

I apologize.

Please! Forgive me

These expressions are usually coupled with an account of the offense, as in the following utterance:

Sorry I was n't able to buy you a present. In addition, Jordanians tend to use justification strategies since they believe that providing overwhelming excuses has the power to justify the offense. Thus, statements like "I could not come because I got unexpected company" are customary. The offender's confession of committing the offense is also an important strategy especially since it is effectively coupled with the expression of distress as in utterances like, I had wanted to come. The loss is mine, and I owe you one.

The use of verses from the holy Quran as well as proverbs appeared in some of the responses El-Khalil (1998) received in his questionnaire –type study. This was explained as a method of mitigating the anger of the victim, as well as injecting some humor in the situation in some cases that would help the victim forgive the offender. The researcher states that this option indicates the impact of the Islamic teachings and popular folklore" on speech acts such as apology.

El-Khalil results include the following:

- 1- the majority of the respondent used implicit as opposed to explicit ,or traditional, apology strategies.
- 2- Unlike Jordanian females, Jordanian males preferred explicit or traditional , apology strategies and
- 3- although the researcher expected the offender to promise for never repeating the offense, this strategy was only used by a few females respondents.

Al-Zumor(2003), in a study of apologies in Arabic and English has observed that in the Arab culture, " admitting one's deficiency in order to set the things right is not

as embarrassing as in the Anglo-Saxon culture". He claims that people are more available to each other and thus careless about their own immunity . This leads Arabs to strongly emphasize giving accounts and apologizing for their offenses

Hussein and Musaab have concluded that both Iraqi males and females have been tactful with the victim in apology situations, but females try to be more tactful by insisting on using the strategy of compensation rather than reparation. Besides, females use friendly vocatives more than males to be more tactful and intimate. In addition, females try to be at the same strategy level or type although victims belong to various social statuses. On the contrary, males have been more prestige-conscious and rank-conscious. They rely on different strategies according to each status of the victims. Therefore, males can be said to be selective according to the tenor of the situation.

Concerning the semantic formula, which can be called ' pragmatic collocation' since certain speech acts tend to be used altogether in certain situations, seem to be generalized to both males and females.

This formula reflects a great deal of carefulness to the explicit use of regret and additional use of supportive strategies of justification and explanation such as those of compensation and reparation. "Hussein and Musaab ,ND,page 22".

2.2.6 Pragmatics

Pragmatics as an area of research is bound up with its link to meaning in context. According to Crystal it is the study of language from the point view of users specifically of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.

This definition accommodates not only speech acts but also the social context of discourse in its many different manifestations e.g. power and politeness, use of metaphor and irony and so on |It also focuses on the user and the intended meaning but all with in a social context. To use Leech's term ,it focuses on how writers and speakers ,as social actors ,both get things done with language and |(attend to their interpersonal relationships with other participants.(Anne O'Keeffe, et.al.2011, page 18)

2.6.1 Ways of researching pragmatics

Pragmatics is a framework for understanding a language use . In itself is not a methodology which can be applied. A number of methodologies are used in pragmatics-based research such as:

Attested data:

If you are interested in conducting a pragmatics-based study of language in context, the first issue which faces you is how to get data. There are a number of means to this end. There are two types of attested data:

Elicited and corpus –based .Attested data is language we have said ,heard, written or read and which we have recorded usually by noting it down or recording it. Attested data is the opposite of intuitive data

Intuitive data is the language which we have introspected about . For example one might reflect on which is more common : She helped me to wrap the presents or she helped me rap the presents. Both of these examples and the conclusion that one might reach as a result of one's introspection are intuitive; they are created and reflected upon within one's mind. They are not based on what you have attested, or witnessed. Basing your research on real data can bring rich rewards but it will

involve many challenges, a lot of time and effort and at times, expense. In research in the area of pragmatics ,there are different ways of gathering real language.

Elicited data:

Elicited data are those which are gained in a very focused way as opposed to data which are selected from an existing collection of recordings or texts or data, and so forth.

For example, if you want to look at how people make offers, apologies ,refusals. The most common method is to set up a type of task whereby you survey many speakers as to what they would say in a certain situation. Figure 1

You are a student. You are one day late with your end-of –term assignment. You knock on your tutor’s door . What do you say?

These tasks are usually referred to as Discourse Completion Tasks or Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs).

Discourse Completion Tests:

DCTs have been widely and successfully used in the study of speech acts and speech events. They are particularly favored as a methodology in the study of second language pragmatic competence. They are essentially a type of language questionnaire whereby you elicit what speakers think they would say in a situation. In addition to their use in the study of speech acts and events, they are used in dialect studies where they can focus on very specific structures.

DCTs can be written tasks or they can be presented orally. The degree to which they are controlled can vary.In figure 1 a scenario is presented and the informant

has a choice, albeit rather limited, as to the speech act which they opt for. DCTs can be more controlled when they are presented in a turn-based format. The example in figure 2 illustrates how a scenario is set up and then a turn is provided. This is followed by ‘write on lines’ which the informant must complete., and so on.

Figure 2

You are applying for a position with a multinational company . The interview committee has requested that you have your professors send letters of recommendations directly to the company .when you call the interview committee to check the status of your application., you are told that one of the recommendation letters has not arrived . You are concerned because you asked your professor for the letter over a month ago.

You stop by your professor’s office to find out what has happened.

Professor: Hi(your name)

You:.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Figure 2

The attraction of DCTS is their:

Discreteness: the researcher has a lot of control over the language which they want to elicit.

The focus can be limited to a very specific context of use.

According to Schauer and Adolphs 2006” the aim of DCT research is to investigate a linguistic act within highly predefined parameters.

Criticism to DCTs:

The level of control: it is argued that DCTs cannot be used to appraise pragmatic competence in the study of foreign language users because, apart from providing too little context, they cannot constraints discourse options without contaminating the response.

To avoid this Yoon and Kellogg 2002 used cartoon DCT so as to provide a pictorial context to constrain the response while allowing freedom to elaborate language.

Boxer and Cohen 2004 note that DCTs are used particularly when:

Gathering examples of rarely occurring speech acts, speech events or listener responses.

Researching speech acts that readily occur but which are difficult to capture on recorded data.(for examples request and complaints).

Looking at speech acts comparatively and it may be difficult to find corresponding acts that readily occur in data from two languages.

Role-play:

Role-plays offer another means of collecting data. According to Boxer and Cohen (2004) in certain contexts role-play data are similar to spontaneous spoken data, with the caveat that the researcher is able to set up a context for studying speaking.

Advantages of role-plays:

According to Demeter role-play is a method which brings the researcher closest to authentic data in the study of production of speech acts. He claims that role-play tries to provide as natural setting as possible while allowing for control of certain variables in the study.

Negative side of role-plays are:

Can sometimes result in unnatural behaviour.

Difficult and time-consuming to transcribe and code.

Offer less control over the situational variables and produce a wider range of speech act production strategies than DCTs as well as longer response.

Based at a Romanian university, Demeter(2007) used role-play as a means of data gathering for a study of apologies . One of the explicit aims of his study was to demonstrate that the use of role-plays is a valid and effective method of collecting data for the analysis of apologies.He compared data collected through role-plays with data collected via DCT.

Role-plays versus DCTs

Role-plays can offer a better choice. DCTs may not be an accurate representation of what the speaker would say in naturally –occurring situations in real time. Because role-plays require the participants to actually speak instead of

write Role-plays are dynamic .They are conducted in a spoken mode whereas DCTs are conducted in writing.

Interviews:

Interviews involve the elicitation of conversation using various prompts, they can also be unstructured. The recordings are then transcribed and used for analysis.

Questionnaire data

In addition to DCTs multiple –choice questionnaire can be used to give participants a number of plausible pragmatic options or interpretations of utterances in given situations. Another type of questionnaire involves scales response tasks where participants assess situational contexts and speech act or and discourse samples according to certain variables.

Advantages:

Quick to administer and analyse compared to role-plays.

Consistency.

Disadvantage:

Difficult to design.

Multiple choice studies which look at speech act realization strategies tend to achieve poor reliability scores.

Corpus data:

A corpus is a collection of spoken or written language which is stored on a computer and available for analysis. In order to build a small spoken corpus you need the following:

Before you start recording design speaker form to log details on each recording such as date, location and setting of recording, speaker age, gender, geographical origin, socio-economic background, the number and relationship of the speaker.

Electronically record your data

Transcribe your data using a coding system that suits your research questions.

Create a data base for each recording giving each sound file a number which will correspond with its transcription and the details from your speaker information form.

(Anne O’Keeffe, et.al.2011, pp20-28)

2.2.7 Discourse analysis

Analyzing discourse is another area where Corpus Linguistics CL has been adopted as a means of looking at language patterns over much larger datasets. Existing models for above-sentence analysis such as Conversation Analysis (CA), Discourse Analysis (DA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are all benefiting from the use of CL. CL can automate many (but certainly not all) of the processes of CA, DA and CDA through the use of wordlists, concordances and key word searches. The process is not one-way however. CL on its own is not the basis for the analysis of discourse. It can provide the means for analysis but researchers invariably draw on theories and applications of either CA, DA or CDA. One example is the use of the CA notion of ‘baseline’: that is, whereby the turn structure of an interaction, for example a telephone call opening, is compared to the ‘canonical’ or baseline interaction between ‘unmarked’ interactants. For example, O’Keeffe (2006) compared the turn sequence of an opening of a call to a radio station with the canonical sequence of a call between people who are neither strangers nor intimately related. In the same way, CL uses ‘reference corpora’

against which results are compared. ” Anne O’Keeffe and Michael McCarthy ,2010, page 3”

When we speak we can do all sorts of things, from aspirating a consonant, to constructing a relative clause, to insulting a guest, to starting a war. These are all, pre-theoretically, speech acts - acts done in the process of speaking. The theory of speech acts, however, is especially concerned with those acts that are not completely covered under one or more of the major divisions of grammar - phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics - or under some general theory of actions. Even in cases in which a particular speech act is not completely described in grammar, formal features of the utterance used in carrying out the act might be quite directly tied to its accomplishment, as when we request something by uttering an imperative sentence or greet someone by saying “Hi!” Thus, there is clearly a conventional aspect to the study of speech acts. Sometimes, however, the achievement cannot be so directly tied to convention, as when we thank a guest by saying, “Oh, I love chocolates.”

There is no convention of English to the effect that stating that one loves chocolates counts as an act of thanking. In this case, the speaker's INTENTION in making the utterance and recognition by the addressee of that intention under the conditions of utterance clearly plays an important role. Note that whether convention or intention seems paramount, success is not guaranteed. The person to whom the conventionalized greeting “Hi!” is addressed might not speak English, but some other language in which the uttered syllable means “Go away!,” or the guest may not have brought chocolates at all, but candied fruit, in which cases these attempts to extend a greeting and give a compliment are likely to fail. On the other hand, failure, even in the face of contextual adversity, is also not guaranteed. Thus, one may succeed in greeting a foreigner who understands nothing of what is

being said by making it clear through gesture and tone of voice that is the intent. Much of speech act theory is therefore devoted to striking the proper balance between convention and intention.

Real-life acts of speech usually involve interpersonal relations of some kind: A speaker does something with respect to an audience by saying certain words to that audience. Thus it would seem that ethnographic studies of such relationships and the study of discourse should be central to speech act theory, but in fact, they are not. Such studies have been carried out rather independently of the concerns of those philosophers and linguists who have devoted their attention to speech acts.

2.2.7.1 Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis, “a vast subject area within linguistics” refers to the study of spoken and written communication taking both linguistic and non-linguistic features into consideration.

Thus, discourse analysis has a wide scope regarding to its object since virtually every occurrence of language is potentially in the interest of discourse analysis. It is also significant that a wide range of academic disciplines is involved in discourse analysis and, consequently, a great variety of approaches and methods is applied in the study of discourse. This somehow ‘messy’ appearance has contributed to the difficulty in coming to an agreement what discourse and discourse analysis actually are. What is more, many of the various approaches of discourse analysis “proceed down their own paths without mentioning or even showing awareness of others” (Cook, 2011, p. 432). Yet to come if not to an agreement but to a convention as a base to work on, it seems useful to reach an understanding of what discourse means and what analytical tools discourse

analysis makes use of such a comprehension will help evaluate the potential (and actual) contribution of discourse analysis to foreign language teaching.

In a very general term, Brown and Yule (1983) defined discourse analysis as “the analysis of language in use” (p. 1) stating that it deals not only with formal elements of language but also with language functions. They distinguished between two main functions of language, the transactional one which refers to the communication of content, and the interactional one which refers to the role of language in establishing social relationship. This terminological distinction indicates a common understanding in that discourse analysis is not only and not primarily interested in language description at a formal level but in detecting how and for what reason language is used as a social practice (Woods, 2006; Gee, 2005). Thus, discourse is reasonably defined as a stretch of language beyond sentence level i.e. written or spoken texts that are coherent and meaningful to participants who are involved in the production and/or reception of those texts (Schiffrin, Tannen & Hamilton, 2001); consequently, the process in which discourse occurs is in the particular focus of discourse analysis. To carry out studies on discourse it is obviously not sufficient to look at language instances without noticing the situations surrounding them, i.e. to restrict to a sole linguistic study of text and talk. On the contrary, discourse analysts follow a multidisciplinary approach that considers social and cognitive factors. This “disciplinary diversity” is the reason for the indistinctness of discourse analysis but at the same time it provides discourse analysis with a powerful repertoire of approaches and tools to work with. To illustrate this, the article ‘Discourse analysis’ in the Routledge handbook of applied linguistics’ lists pragmatics, schema theory, conversation analysis, ethnography, language ecology, linguistic

ethnography, semiotics, paralinguistics and multimodality, genre analysis and critical discourse analysis as influential approaches to discourse analysis.

Taken for granted that discourse analysis deals with language in use beyond sentence level and tries to detect regularities and patterns through which discourse is generated, it is plausible to assume that different 'environments' have available different 'languages': the language used by doctors is different from that one of a judge or from that one used in advertisement. In other words, there are different discourses (e.g. the discourse of medicine, the discourse of law or the discourse of advertisement) and each of them follows its own patterns and regularities. The plural 'discourses' is therefore a specification considering that use of language is interwoven with context, thus changeable to generate a specific discourse. The ability to recognize patterns or regularities in order to identify discourse as well as to choose the adequate patterns and regularities to a discourse situation given, then, means to possess communicative competence (Woods, 2006, p. ix). For the issue of language learning, the consequence is that discourse analysis can and actually should be utilized when we assume that communicative competence is a meaningful goal: "successful language learning involves much more than acquiring a static formal knowledge of the new language, but must also entail an ability to achieve meaning in communication" (Cook, 2011, p. 433). In that way, discourse analysis is regarded as a tool in language teaching. Apart from that it can also be used as a powerful tool in analysing the language used in educational settings, particularly the language of teachers in the classroom. In that case discourse analysis serves as a tool in professional development.

2.2.7.1 DA as a teaching tool

Like speech act theory, the application of discourse analysis in communicative language teaching is justified on the grounds that it deals with language in the real

world, for real communication. The idea that teaching a foreign language should enable learners to communicate effectively is the rationale behind the decision to implement discourse analysis into foreign language teaching.

Following this rationale, methodologists have offered a variety of possible implementations of discourse analysis into foreign language teaching. An important contribution was made by McCarthy (1991). He discusses the application of discourse analysis in the following fields (for the following summary cf. also Wiśniewski, 2006):

Teaching grammar: grammatical items (e.g. pronouns, articles, tenses) are taught as functional devices in discourse, particularly to generate coherence and textuality (reference, ellipsis and substitution, conjunction), to indicate theme and rheme (the 'given' and the 'new' piece of information in a unit of discourse) or as a signal for a specific type of discourse (tense and aspect); teaching vocabulary: accepting the idea that vocabulary is best learned in a meaningful setting, discourse analysis in language teaching observes how vocabulary is selected in relation to context (the non-linguistic elements surrounding text) and co-text (language preceding or following the text being analyzed) in order to provide lexical cohesion through reiteration, use of hyponyms, synonyms and antonyms, to generate a particular register (degree of formality or informality) and to express modality. Collocations and chunks are significant elements in teaching vocabulary when discourse analytical tools are considered;

Teaching phonology: phonology, including pronunciation, intonation, rhythm, word stress and prominence is probably one of the most unaddressed features in non-communicative language teaching. Since discourse analysis deals with naturally occurring language and communicative teaching aims to teach naturally occurring language, the significance of discourse analysis in teaching phonology

for communicative language teaching is self-evident. I should like to make mention of two other applications of discourse analysis in language teaching, which I believe are particularly suitable to be adopted in language teaching: genre analysis and critical discourse analysis.

It has been stated that language in use is characterized by regularities and patterns (such as collocations or text structures), and discourse analysis is interested in detecting such regularities and patterns.

The choice of regularities and patterns in a particular communicative event is driven by its purpose; in order to classify communicative events according to their purposes the term 'genre' has been adopted, and teaching genres through genre analysis has been established in foreign language teaching, especially in the field of ESP . For instance, teaching the genre 'academic writing' will emphasise frequently used underlying structures in academic texts (e.g. from general to specific) or language foci (e.g. passive voice) .

As an influential approach within discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis has found its way into (foreign) language teaching. By analyzing texts holistically and in depth using concepts such as framing, fore-/ back grounding or connotations, critical discourse analysis seeks to detect how language is deliberately employed to transport ideologies and establish social relations, mostly to the benefit of the powerful. Thus, critical discourse analysis offers an opportunity to expose learners to texts that are related to their daily lives and therefore of their interest, and it enables them to read critically, to reveal hidden messages by considering the whole of a text as well as its details. Obviously, critical discourse analysis can make an important contribution to the realization of the goals of education in the democratic society.

2.2.7.2 DA as a professional development tool

Discourse analysts have shown particular interest in analysing classroom discourse (McCarthy, 1991). Obviously, analysing classroom discourse should not remain a sole documentation of what is happening in the classroom, but it should be evaluated in how far it is beneficial or detrimental for learning processes. Recent research has emphasised that teacher language used in interaction with learners is likely to elicit learning when it provides an opportunity for negotiating meaning (Harfitt, 2008; Walsh, 2003, Walsh, 2002); negotiating meaning is regarded crucial in the social constructivist theory of learning, a widely accepted approach in foreign language methodology (Walsh, 2002; Bruner, 1990). Particularly conversation analysis can give strong hints if classroom interaction is likely to generate learning opportunities (see, for example, the study by Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). Thus, classroom discourse analysis provides language teachers with a powerful tool to investigate their own teaching, since it reveals how actively learners are engaged in classroom discourse, which is an indicator for the presence (or absence) of learning opportunities (Walsh, 2002, p. 6). In that sense discourse analysis makes a contribution to professional development in the educational context.

Not differently from the implementation of other approaches, methods, techniques or contents, also the incorporation of speech act theory and discourse analysis must be legitimated by teaching aims.

The aims of communicative language teaching do justify the use of speech act theory and discourse analysis in the foreign language classroom because they help 'transport' the language outside the classroom into the classroom and provide meaningful contexts.

As a conclusion drawn from the points made in this paper, meaningful inclusion of speech acts into the foreign language classroom should not be limited to the presentation and practice of speech acts in role plays simulating real world situations as it is the case in many textbooks, but can additionally contain activities revealing further aspects:

- learners are asked to identify a speech act and to analyze its linguistic form. E.g. in analyzing “Why don’t you go to the doctor?” learners can understand that the interrogative “Why don’t you..?” is a formulaic expression for suggesting and preferable to an imperative. Such an activity can raise the learner’s awareness of significance of form to generate linguistic politeness;
- learners are asked to compare through what linguistic form(s) (e.g. interrogative, affirmative) a speech act (given in L2) is/can be expressed in their L1; such an activity will lead to the perception that in many cases speech acts cannot be translated literally, the concept of ‘softening’ language through indirect expression, however, is a universal linguistic feature;
- this leads to a third point worth dealing with in the foreign language classroom: Since speech acts transport values of the culture, a didactic focus could lie on the question in how far the values are shared in the learners’ culture. In this way the concerns expressed by McKay (2003) are not only addressed but also transformed into beneficial learning activities.

To some extent the conclusions for the implementation for speech acts in foreign language teaching can be transferred to discourse analysis: It has the potential to raise the learner’s awareness of the interrelatedness of form and meaning dependent on context. A comparison to the learner’s first language will possibly reveal that, for instance, the discourse of advertisement is realized through different linguistic concepts in different cultures because of a diversity of values.

Speech act and discourse analysis can be powerful teaching tools. A further significance of discourse analysis lies in its potential as a tool for evaluating classroom language. Either application is essential for improving language teaching."Stefan Rathert ,2013, Page 82-86"

2.2.8 Conversation Analysis

The primary focus of research in Conversation Analysis (CA) is talk rather than language. Talk is understood to be an occasion when people act out their sociality. The emphasis within CA on the social can be traced historically to its emergence within the discipline of sociology in the 1960s. In the decades since, it has become cross-disciplinary. CA scholars can now be found working not only within sociology, but also within anthropology, social psychology, communication studies, linguistics, and applied linguistics. Within these disciplines CA has always remained a minority, if not marginal, interest. The reason for this can be seen partly in the nature of the object of enquiry. Talk is a complex activity, where language (and other paralinguistic and visual semiotic systems), cognition, and sociality meet. Its study can thus be seen as being located somewhere in the no man's land between the disciplines of linguistics, psychology, and sociology/anthropology. Despite,

or perhaps because of, this position, its importance and influence has gradually grown over recent decades as the isolation of the various social sciences has, at least in part, been eroded.

What makes talk a worthy focus of study for social scientists from such a diversity of backgrounds? Talk is, first, "what appears to be the primordial site of sociality". This is an important notion with its implication that it is talk above all else that allows us to transcend isolation and to share our lives with others. Talk is a crucial

activity at the center of world-changing events: summit meetings between world leaders, policy decisions in board rooms of multinational companies, international conferences on environmental policies. It is also a means we use to do the mundane and routine in life: the exchange of greetings with a neighbor, polite chit-chat with workmates during a break, ordering a snack at lunch time. At the more personal level, the important life events of courtship, divorce, and death are pivotally talked through. Indeed they would not exist as specifically human activities without talk. Life's experiences – the ordinary and the everyday, the profound and the momentous – are first and foremost experiences that are shared socially through the activity of talk. It might be argued that talk is but one of a number of modes of communication and interaction available to humans, and so why privilege talk above, for example, writing or electronic modes? After all, virtually no complex modern activity – in politics, law, education, commerce, the electronic media, defense, finance, medicine, sport – can take place without written documents or computerized communication. The main question, however, is about which of these modes is most fundamentally human. Of these modes, only talk exists in all human social groups. Historically, and almost certainly phylogenetically, talk came first. And last but not least, talk is ontogenetically primary: children learn talk by mere exposure to their caregivers, whereas literate and electronic forms of communication need to be actively taught.

Whilst it can be argued that talk is the basic site of human sociality, this does not say why it may be of particular interest to applied linguists. Obviously language is a central and essential component of talk. This is made plain by talk on the telephone, which lacks the visual and the full audial channel, and is particularly heavily reliant on language. Also complex communication is impossible without language, even though, as all travelers know, certain basic needs can be met

without language. One of the central concerns of applied linguists has been to understand how language is used for communication, therefore it follows that an understanding of how language is used in talk must be a central foundation for the discipline.

CA is one of a number of approaches to the study of spoken language. It differs from other approaches in respect to certain theoretical assumptions, methodological principles, and analytic techniques. In terms of the object of the enquiry, there are certain aspects of talk that have, from the beginning, been central to CA to a greater extent than for other approaches. The first of these is the notion of interaction. Whilst most approaches to discourse tend to focus on the speaker, in CA talk is seen as a jointly accomplished activity, with the listener and the speaker given equal status as co-constructors of the emerging talk. Speakers design their contributions specifically for the recipients of the talk, and listeners in turn influence the speaker by the responses they give.

Each unit of talk builds upon the prior talk, and is understood by participants in light of their understanding of that prior talk. To take a simple example, if an utterance is understood by a listener to be a first greeting, then there are expectations that the most likely next utterance will be another greeting. It is in this way that talk is seen as co-constructed by listeners and speakers.

The second and related aspect of talk that CA pays particular attention to is temporality. One outcome of this is a focus on two sides of the “time” coin: silence and simultaneous talk in conversation. Thus a silence can profoundly affect how some talk that precedes or follows it is understood, and simultaneous talk may be indicative of how speakers are understanding or feeling about each other. A consideration of time also opens up questions relating to how talk emerges moment by moment, is highly locally organized, with participants showing split-second

sensitivities to others' contributions. These are evident in, for example, the onset of a speaker's turn, or a mid-utterance change in the formulation of an emerging turn.

These features of talk work together in complex ways. One of the major objectives of CA is to describe how the various sub-systems of talk combine, and to provide an account of the mechanics of talk. Such an account will then provide a focus not only on how speakers' utterances are constructed prosodically, grammatically, and lexically – turn design – but also on how speakers overwhelmingly cooperate in an orderly taking of turns, and how these turns are sequenced into sets of actions, as adjacent pairs and more extended sequence. "Rod Gardner, 2004 ,264"

2.2.9 Teaching F L in an intercultural world

The globe has witnessed great changes in the 21st century .Cross-cultural contact among diverse language groups has been extensive.

Predictions focus on an increasingly interconnected world, with global travel and instant international communications available to more and more people. Businesses and professions seek employees fluent in more than one language, to participate in the international marketplace as well as to serve growing ethnic and linguistic minorities living within each community. Employers increasingly want their employees to be interculturally competent. They want them to be skillful negotiators in increasingly intercultural work situations.

Change is not exclusive or selective in terms of the sectors of society which it affects. Industry, health, politics and business are affected, but also education. In different parts of Europe, just as elsewhere in the world, the presence of ethnic and linguistic minority children in schools is becoming an everyday phenomenon. Policy makers include intercultural objectives in curricula, and teachers find

themselves faced with the challenge of promoting the acquisition of intercultural competence through their teaching. This is true for teachers of a diversity of subjects. It is definitely true for teachers of foreign languages.

Foreign language education is, by definition, intercultural. Bringing a foreign language to the classroom means connecting learners to a world that is culturally different from their own. Therefore, all foreign language educators are now expected to exploit this potential and promote the acquisition of intercultural competence in their learners. The objective of language learning is no longer defined in terms of the acquisition of communicative competence in a foreign language. Teachers are now required to teach intercultural communicative competence. “Rod Gardner, 2004 page 2”.

2.2.10 Intercultural Communicative Competence

Being able to cope with intercultural experiences requires that a person possesses a number of intercultural competencies and characteristics.

These characteristics and competencies have been identified as the willingness to engage with the foreign culture, self-awareness and the ability to look upon oneself from the outside, the ability to see the world through the others’ eyes, the ability to cope with uncertainty, the ability to act as a cultural mediator, the ability to evaluate others’ points of view, the ability to consciously use culture learning skills and to read the cultural context, and the understanding that individuals cannot be reduced to their collective identities .

In the literature on the subject, the intercultural experience tends to be described as an uncomfortable one, requiring the revision of beliefs, concepts and attitudes that one has hitherto taken for granted. The process includes changes in attitudes, beliefs, identity and values. It requires people to revise their social identity, to

reconsider the ideas they have held about out-groups, and to reconsider their position towards these out-groups since they have now themselves become members of the out-group. The range of feelings experienced varies from anger and anxiety to excitement and relief. The emotions come from many sources: fear of encountering something new, excitement at the discovery of new and different ways of thinking, relief through self-expression, anger that a deeply held belief may have been challenged.

The common factor is the element of surprise which is the cornerstone of the intercultural experience. There are those who may respond with envy or embarrassment, others with pleasure and appreciation. One of the consequences of intercultural experiences may be that individuals retrench themselves in their pre-exposure beliefs and resist attempts to.

Table 4 Components of intercultural competence

Knowledge	Skills/behaviour	Attitudes/traits
<p>*Culture specific and culture general knowledge</p> <p>* Knowledge of self and other</p> <p>* Knowledge of interaction: individual and societal</p> <p>* Insight regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication</p>	<p>* Ability to interpret</p> <p>* Ability to discover and/or interact</p> <p>* Ability to acquire new knowledge and to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction</p> <p>*Metacognitive strategies to direct own learning.</p> <p>/</p>	<p>*Attitude to relativize self and value others</p> <p>*Positive disposition towards learning intercultural competence</p> <p>General disposition characterized by a critical engagement with the foreign culture under consideration and one's own</p>

look at their own cultural systems from the point of view of 'the other'. They may experience a high level of what is called acculturative stress, and experience feelings of marginality and alienation, identity confusion and heightened

psychosomatic symptoms, high levels of anxiety and depression (Sen Gupta, 2002). What, then, do people need to learn in order to be able to cope with intercultural contact situations? In the context of foreign language education, intercultural competence is linked to communicative competence in a foreign language. Communicative competence refers to a person's ability to act in a foreign language in a linguistically, sociolinguistically and pragmatically appropriate way (Council of Europe, 2001: 9). Intercultural communicative competence, then, builds on communicative competence and enlarges it to incorporate intercultural competence. So as to clarify the concept of intercultural competence to educators and teachers in the domain of foreign language education, the knowledge, skills and attitudes which together make up intercultural competence have been organized in a conceptual framework comprising five *savoirs* (Byram, 1997). These five *savoirs* should not be considered as isolated components, but rather as components that are integrated and intertwined with the various dimensions of communicative competence.

Communicative competence itself can in fact be considered a sixth *savoir*, namely *savoir communiquer*. In Table 4, we present the different components of intercultural competence under three main headings; namely knowledge, skills/behaviour and attitudes/traits.

The first *savoir*, *savoirs* with a plural 's', constitutes the knowledge dimension of the conceptual framework. It has been defined as 'knowledge about social groups and their cultures in one's own country, and similar knowledge of the interlocutor's country on the one hand, and similar knowledge of the processes and interaction at individual and societal levels, on the other hand' (Byram, 1997:35). These *savoirs* together constitute the frame of reference of the people living (in) a particular culture. The words and gestures which people use, the behaviours they display, the

values they believe in, the symbols they cherish, etc. are always culture-bound and carry meaning within a particular cultural frame of reference.

Therefore, in intercultural communication it is important always to be sensitive to potential referential differences. Apart from culture specific knowledge, the interculturally competent person also needs to acquire a certain amount of culture-general knowledge, which will allow him/her to deal with a large diversity of foreign cultures. *Savoir-apprendre* and *savoir-comprendre* together constitute the skills dimension of the conceptual framework. *Savoir-apprendre* refers to 'the capacity to learn cultures and assign meaning to cultural phenomena in an independent way' (Byram & Zarate, 1997:241). *Savoir-comprendre* is related to *savoir-apprendre*, and refers to the capacity to interpret and relate cultures. These two savors are clearly in line with the answers that theorists of education have formulated in response to the changing and expanding nature of the world in which people will need the knowledge, skills (and attitudes) to continue learning throughout their lifetime.

Thus, the terms reflect constructivist theories of autonomous learning, as they have been formulated in, for example, Scardamalia and Bereiter (1991, 1994), Wood and Wood (1996) or Richardson (1997). *Savoir-faire* refers to the overall ability to act in an interculturally competent way in intercultural contact situations, to take into account the specific cultural identity of one's interlocutor and to act in a respectful and co-operative way.

. *Savoir-e[^]tre* and *savoir-s'engager* are best considered together since they refer to a general disposition that is characterised by 'a critical engagement with the foreign culture under consideration and one's own' (*savoir-s'engager*) (Byram, 1997: 54) and 'the capacity and willingness to abandon ethnocentric attitudes and

perceptions and the ability to establish and maintain a relationship between one's own and the foreign culture" LiesSercu, Ewa Bandura [et al.], 2005, pp 4-6'.

2.2.10 Intercultural Competence EFL Teacher

From the above descriptions of the intercultural experience, the intercultural person and intercultural communicative competence in foreign language education, it is clear that, in order to support the intercultural learning process, foreign language teachers need additional knowledge, attitudes, competencies and skills to the ones hitherto thought of as necessary and sufficient for teaching communicative competence in a foreign language. This insistence on the development of learners' intercultural skills, attitudes and knowledge requires a revision of professionalism in foreign language teaching. Teachers need an adequate sociocultural knowledge of the target language community, frequent and varied contacts with it and a thorough command of the pragmatic rules of use of the foreign language in contexts that may be considered to belong to their professional sphere (e.g. staying with a foreign colleague to organise class exchanges and/or e-mail contacts). They understand that cultural models differ and that they pervade our outlook on life and communication with others. They are familiar with the levels of communication (e.g. notions, speech acts, non-verbal communication) at which intercultural misunderstandings may arise, and are able and willing to negotiate meaning where they sense cross-cultural misunderstanding. They define the objectives of foreign language education in terms of language learning and of intercultural competence acquisition.

In addition, they are skillful creators of (cross-curricular) learning environments that promote their learners' acquisition of intercultural communicative competence. They can employ teaching techniques that promote the acquisition of *savoirs*, *savoir-apprendre*, *savoir-comprendre*, *savoir-faire*, *savoir-s'engager* and

savoir-e[^]tre. They can help pupils relate their own culture to foreign cultures, to compare cultures and to empathise with foreign cultures' points of view. They are knowledgeable about their pupils' perceptions of and attitudes towards the foreign peoples and cultures associated with the foreign language they teach. They are willing to start from them when designing the learning process and know how to choose input materials with a view to modifying any wrongful perceptions learners may have.

To that end, they know how to assess learning materials from an intercultural perspective and how to adjust these materials should they not allow them to achieve the aims of intercultural competence teaching. Next to being skillful classroom teachers, teachers are able to use experiential approaches to language-and-culture teaching. With respect to attitudes, FL&IC teachers ought to be favourably disposed towards the integration of intercultural competence teaching in foreign language education and willing to actually work towards achieving that goal. In sum, teachers of intercultural communicative competence also need to be acquainted with basic insights from cultural anthropology, culture learning theory and intercultural communication. They need to be willing to teach intercultural competence and need to know how to do so.

The above suggests an important shift in emphasis in professionalism in foreign language teaching. Till recently, teachers could meet the demand to broaden their pupils' minds through familiarizing themselves with culture-specific information and passing that information on to their pupils. The expectations in the intercultural domain currently voiced towards foreign language teachers require them to acquire quite a different and more substantial body of cultural knowledge and develop a range of new skills that will allow them to promote their learners' acquisition of intercultural competence.

The assumption seems to be that teachers are already moving in the advocated direction and are willing to support the new objectives put forward. Teachers are supposed to already have left the traditional foreign-culture teaching approach far behind, and to have moved well in the direction of multicultural and intercultural teaching. The observation that this belief remains largely intuitive with little rigorous evidence to support it, constituted the rationale for the research project reported on here. "Lies Sercu, Ewa Bandura [et al.], 2005, pp 4-6".

2.3 Section 2 Previous studies

Fatima Nureddeen ' Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic – university of Khartoum

According to Nureddeen, many studies have been conducted to investigate speech act performance in general, and apology speech act in particular in the last two decades. This genus of research has focused on western languages. However, more recently a number of studies have been carried out in eastern languages, with only a few in Arabic language varieties. The underlying motivation of speech act studies is to outline the pragmatic rules that govern the use of language in different cultures and to show how findings can be used to facilitate communication between people from different socio-cultural backgrounds. Fatima's study was an attempt to outline the type and extent of use of apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic and hence shed light on the socio-cultural attitudes and values of this community. The corpus examined was 1082 responses to a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that consisted of 10 different social situations of varying severity of offense, strength of social relationship and power between hypothetical speakers and hearers. The informants were 110 college educated adults in Khartoum, Sudan.

The survey was written in Sudanese dialect to elicit responses that approximate verbal apologies that might be given in these situations. The corpus was analyzed to determine the strategies used and the frequencies of their use. Although this is a pioneering study in its societal context, results support earlier findings suggesting the universality of apology strategies; however, the selection of apology strategies in this study reinforces the culture-specific aspect of language use. Despite the fact that a more restricted classification of apology strategies was used as a model for analyzing the data, the results were expected to be conducive to cross-cultural comparisons.

Basem I. M. Al-Raba'a1, The Generic and Registerial Features of Facebook Apology Messages.

This paper aimed at investigating the generic and registerial features of Arabic and English apology messages written on Facebook by Jordanian and American university students. The data collected by means of distributing a simulated written paragraph to the participants via Facebook consist of one hundred Arabic and English messages (fifty Arabic and fifty English). The results demonstrate that Arabic and English apology messages written on Facebook share the same communicative purposes, but differ with respect to the number of moves and the lexical and stylistic choices employed by both the Jordanian and American students. The findings of this study have been attributed to the universality of expressing apology, diglossia of Arabic, and to a variation in the subjects' linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds and perceptions.

Sa'daand Mohammadib, A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' polite and impolite apologies

The present study aimed to investigate the politeness strategies employed by Iranian EFL learners in the speech act of apology. Data were collected from 30 EFL learners who responded to a discourse completion task (DCT) which realized the speech act of apology consisted of six situations. Data analysis consisted of three phases. First, to identify the apology strategies and politeness strategies, the study followed Olshtain and Cohen's (1983) taxonomy of apology strategies and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, respectively. Second, 90 apology utterances, comprising 50% of the total number of utterances, were assessed by two native speakers of English on a politeness Likert scale of 1=Polite, 2=Partially Polite and 3=Impolite. Finally, drawing on the native speaker assessment of (im)politeness of the apology utterances, the researchers analyzed the utterances qualitatively in terms of appropriacy and inappropriacy. The results indicated that a) Native speakers rated 27 (30%) apology utterances as polite, 40 (44.5%) as partially polite and 23 (25.5%) as impolite.; b) the most frequent apology strategies were an 'expression of regret', 'an explanation or account of the situation', 'expressing self-deficiency' and 'an offer of repair'; c) there was a significant difference between males and females with regard to their use of politeness strategies in apology; and d) the participants relied on negative and positive politeness strategies when apologizing. In conclusion, Iranian EFL learners were only partially sociolinguistically competent in apology.

Juhana, The Use of Apologizing Speech Acts Realization by Male and Female Students (A Case Study in Postgraduate Program of English Education Department)

The aim of this study was to investigate the act of apologizing used by males and females students in order to find out whether there are similarities and differences between them. The data were gathered by a Discourse Completion Test having 6 apology situations by using questionnaires. To analyze the data from all responses, they were categorized according to Cohen and Olshtain's (1983) and Tuncel (1999) apology speech acts set. The respondents of the study were post-graduate students of English education consisting of 10 males and 10 females. The study reveals that in general, there is no significant difference between males and females of postgraduate students of English education in using apologizing strategy. Gender does not become a strong factor that influences the realization of apologizing speech act. It is proven by the facts that both genders employed many similar categories and there was no highly different tendency between them to express their apologizing speech acts.

CileHatipoglu, Culture, Gender and Politeness: Apologies in Turkish and British English.

This study examined the apology strategies used by males and females in two different cultures, Turkish and British. The aim of the study is to investigate how the gender of the interlocutor, his/her social status and the type of offence affect the way males and females in these two cultures apologise. Turkish and British cultures were chosen as focal cultures for this project because they are defined by scholars as cultures belonging to two different categories. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) they are positive vs. negative politeness cultures; while for Hofstede (1991) they are High Power Distance Feminine Culture vs. Low Power Distance Masculine Culture respectively.

This research is important because it examines the use of apology strategies in Turkish, this study is also new in that a multiple-source approach to data collection

is used to investigate apology strategies. The data in the study are collected from Turkish and British university students in Istanbul and Bristol respectively, using DCTs and open role-plays. The collected material is transcribed in CHAT format and the elicited apologies are classified using Cohen and Olshtain's (1981) coding manual. The analyses include a frequency count of apologies, mean length of turn (MLT) comparison, and syntactic-semantic analyses. Later, statistical analyses are conducted on the data situation by situation to determine whether the social status and the gender of the interlocutor had an impact on the apology strategies performed by each gender group.

Results of the study reveal that context external as well as context internal features influence the choice of apology strategy. Stated differently, the social status and the gender of the interlocutor do affect the way males and females apologize in Turkish and British English, however, context internal factors such as the degree of imposition or reason for apologizing also modify the choice of strategy realization. It is believed that the current study will contribute to enhancing knowledge in this field, raising awareness about cultural differences and providing valuable insights into intercultural and inter-gender communication rules; knowledge that might prevent possible 'pragmatic failure' (Thomas 1983).

Gusztav Demeter, May,2006,A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies in Romanian.

The aim of this study was to examine the types of categories that Romanian speakers use to apologize in situations that require interaction among friends, as well as how these categories combine to form apology strategies. Some of the findings are similar to previous studies on other languages, while other findings are different than the ones reported on various languages.

The findings have shown that the most often used category, either as a standalone one or in combination with other categories, was the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device. This is consistent with Bergman and Kasper's (1993) findings on speakers of Thai and of American English. If the relatively high frequency of the intensified IFID is also considered, the conclusion is that Romanian speakers prefer explicit expressions of apology, which is consistent with previous findings on New Zealand English (Holmes, 1990) and Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Nagano, 1985; Taguchi, 1991). Also, the categories "providing a justification," "offer of repair," and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" had a higher frequency than the other categories. The preference for such categories suggests the fact that saving face is very important for the Romanian speakers in the survey. Also, the preference for combinations with categories that imply minimizing or denying responsibility rather than with categories that acknowledge responsibility is consistent with findings on British English (Deutschmann, 2003) but unlike those on German (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989).

Insofar as the combination of basic categories is concerned, the findings show that an overwhelming majority of the apologies were combinations rather than standalone categories. This is one of the areas where Romanian differs from findings about some languages, such as English, where the proportion of combinations has been found to be around half (Holmes, 1990), or Lombok, where combinations were found to be almost nonexistent (Wouk, In Press). However, there are other languages that have been found to prefer combinations over single categories, such as Akan (Obeng, 1999) and German (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989). While this is what the findings of the different studies showed, it is not possible to generalize this as absolute truth of what the situation is in each of these languages.

Also, the most often used combinations were by far “IFID” with “providing a justification” and “IFID” with “blaming someone else or denying responsibility,” which supports the idea presented above about the preference for minimizing or denying responsibility, especially in the case of the situations in which the person apologizing was late.

However, the qualitative analysis of the data has also shown that the respondents not only tried to save their own face in their apologies, but were also concerned with maintaining the friendship with the hearer, sometimes even explicitly mentioning that their friendship was more important than the action that brought about the apology. This would suggest an attempt to save what Nwoye (1992) called “group face,” even though the responses did not go to the extent of saving the face of the entire community or ethnic group.

The second question that the present study tried to answer was how the apology strategies in the survey compare to the ones actually given in each of the situations on the show from which they were taken. One of the most important differences was that even though on the show four of the situations produced apologies with a single category, and six produced combinations of categories, in the survey data the most frequently used strategies in all the situations consist of combinations of categories. Regarding whether the apologies in the data were the same, similar, or different from the ones on the show, the most frequently used apology in the data was the same as the one used on the show only in two out of the ten situations, namely “Wearing Wrong Clothes” and “Missing the Wedding Ceremony.” There were four other situations, “Smoking,” “Late for Birthday Dinner,” “Lying to Best Friend,” and “Taking Friend’s Jeans” that had similar strategies to the ones on the show. What I mean by similar is that one of the strategies used was slightly different, such as “IFID” instead of “intensified IFID,” or that only one of the

categories in the combination in the survey data was different from the one on the show. Four other situations had completely different apology strategies in the data than the ones on the show. These situations were “Breaking a China Plate,” “Being away for Christmas,” “Being Late,” and “Deleting Speech from the Computer.” In all of these situations, the apology on the show was a standalone category, whereas the respondents to the survey believed that the situations required a more complex apology.

RulaFahmiBataineh, On Congratulating, Thanking, and Apologizing in Jordanian Arabic and American English

A mounting body of evidence suggests that despite the existence of shared underlying elements, politeness is realized differently across cultures. This study examined the politeness strategies used by 50 Jordanian native speakers of Arabic and 50 American native speakers of English. A 9-item Discourse-Completion Task was used to collect the data for the purpose of identifying potential similarities and differences in the use of (and response to) politeness strategies between Jordanian speakers of Arabic and American speakers of English. The two sample groups were found to employ similar politeness strategies with varying frequencies and realizations.

Hussein,et.al, A Socio-pragmatic Study of Apology in Iraqi Non-standard Arabic - A Socio-pragmatic Study of Apology in Iraqi Non-standard Arabic at University of Kufa - College of Arts

Apology has been the focus of many studies in west and east. Some of these studies have focused on Arabic, but none of which have dealt with the use of apology in Iraqi non-standard Arabic.

Besides, none has concentrated on the social value or gender differences in the use of such a speech act in Arabic. This study is an attempt to outline the most commonly existent differences between Iraqi males and females in the use of apology strategies. The corpus consists of responses to Discourse Completion Test, which includes three different situations. The informants have been 30 subjects: 15 males and 15 females. The sample is randomly selected from different places in Najaf to be more representative. The survey is written in Arabic to elicit responses that approximate verbal apologies for each different situation.

Dr. Mahmoud Ali, 2013, An analysis of apology as a politeness strategy expressed by Jordanian University students.

This study aimed at finding and analyzing the apology expressions used by Jordanian university students. It also aimed at exploring the apology strategies Arabic native speakers used in different situations. The participants of the study were eight university English majors at Irbid National university. Six situations were prepared, distributed, then collected and analyzed. The findings showed that the apology strategies used were apology and regret, explanation, offer of repair, equal-equal, low –high and responsibility. The researcher recommended teachers to train students to use apology expressions and strategies at school.

Marlyna Maros, Apologies in English by Adult Malay Speakers: Patterns and Competence

The speech act of apology has been much researched. Some of the research focused on one culture, others were cross-culturally compared. However, in the Malaysian context, the study of apology has yet to be ventured, be it to focus its manifestation in the people's mother tongues, nor to focus on how it is manifested in English, an alternative popular language used in the country.

This paper is an attempt to explicate the production of apologies in English by adult Malay speakers in Malaysia. The choice for English is made out of the ever mounting effort of the government in encouraging Malaysians to become competent speakers of English, the world's lingua franca. The choice for apology is due to its popularity as a study of speech act and being an illocutionary force so common to take place in daily context. The study found that despite years of exposure to English language, the apologies produced displayed influences of the Malay sociocultural rule.

2.3.1 Comments on the previous studies:

Nureddeen's study was done in the Sudan. So, it is considered as a local one. She attempts to outline the type and extent of use of apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic and hence shed light on the socio-cultural attitudes and values of this community. Thus it differs from this study that investigates the use of apology strategies by the Sudanese EFL learners in terms of the language, she focuses on the Sudanese Arabic. The participants were different too. They were college educated adults in Khartoum without specifications to their major. She uses a corpus of 1082 responses to a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that consisted of 10 different social situations of varying severity of offense, strength of social relationship and power between hypothetical speakers and hearers. So, she uses a similar tool of data collection to this study. Unlike this study, the survey was written in Sudanese dialect. On the findings level, her results support earlier findings suggesting the universality of apology strategies; however, the selection of apology strategies in this study reinforces the culture-specific aspect of language use. Despite the fact that a more restricted classification of apology strategies was used as a model for analyzing the data, the results were expected to be conducive to cross-cultural comparisons.

Basem's study aimed at investigating the generic and registerial features of Arabic and English apology messages written on Facebook by Jordanian and American university students. It addresses the same issue of apology in both English and Arabic his contrastive study serves as a good model of data collection for the researcher. He uses the same tool Discourse completion test. This study targeted apology in Jordanian Arabic and American students. The Jordanian society shares many traditions and cultural aspects with the Sudanese society like religion, language and some traditions. He targets a similar participants at university level. On the other hand his study differs from this study because it is a contrastive one and on written corpora.

Sa'daand Mohammadib study aimed to investigate the politeness strategies employed by Iranian EFL learners in the speech act of apology.

Sa'da's comparative study focuses on both polite and impolite apologies. They use a similar group of EFL learners and use the same tool for data collection which is discourse completion test. Their study is done in Iran. The researcher has benefited from their study a lot. It provides a good idea on the topic of apology and a perfect example of the tool for data collection. On the findings level, Sa'da's has found that the most frequent apology strategies are an 'expression of regret', 'an explanation or account of the situation', 'expressing self-deficiency' and 'an offer of repair'; thus, it corresponds to the findings of this study that most of the Sudanese EFL learners uses offer of repair as an apology strategy. The researcher can attribute that to the similarities between the Iranian and the Sudanese Societies. They share the have many things in common like Islamic culture and the masculine superiority.

Juhana's study aims to investigate the act of apologizing used by males and females students in order to find out whether there are similarities and differences between them.

Juhana uses discourse completion tests to collect data for the study. The researcher has learned a lot from her study in terms of the procedures she follows and the literature review she uses. As mentioned above Juhana focuses on apology speech act in terms of gender differences.s

Çiler Hatipoğlu's study examined the apology strategies used by males and females in two different cultures, Turkish and British. The aim of the study is to investigate how the gender of the interlocutor, his/her social status and the type of offence affect the way males and females in these two cultures apologies

Çiler Hatipoğlu's study addresses the same issue of male and female apology strategies but in different cultures. The British and Turkish. This study share the same subjectnof apology and uses the same tool of discourse completion test but it is a contrastive study and on both culture and gender. The researcher found this study very useful and unique. The Sudanese society has the same masculine ideas as the Turkish society and at the same time it was colonized by British people and has a thorough knowledge about the English culture.

The aim of Demeter's study was to examine the types of categories that Romanian speakers use to apologize in situations that require interaction among friends, as well as how these categories combine to form apology strategies. So, it addresses the same theme of this study which is apology strategies or categories as Demeter called it. Some of the findings are similar to previous studies on other languages, while other findings are different than the ones reported on various languages.

The findings have shown that the most often used category, either as a standalone one or in combination with other categories, was the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device. This is consistent with Bergman and Kasper's (1993) findings on speakers of Thai and of American English. If the relatively high frequency of the intensified IFID is also considered, the conclusion is that Romanian speakers prefer explicit expressions of apology, which is consistent with previous findings on New Zealand English (Holmes, 1990) and Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Nagano, 1985; Taguchi, 1991). Also, the categories "providing a justification," "offer of repair," and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" had a higher frequency than the other categories and it is consistent with this study too. According to Demeter "The preference for such categories suggests the fact that saving face is very important for the Romanian speakers in the survey". The researcher adapts this idea that face saving is very important for the Sudanese people too. Demeter study Apology in the Romanian among friends only while this study is more general. It includes Sudanese EFL learners at tertiary level with their different relations. Demeter's study was conducted in 2006 a decade before this study.

Rula's study is broader than this study. It examined the politeness strategies used by Jordanian native speakers of Arabic and American native speakers of English while this study is on apology strategies only. Rula's participants were native speakers of Arabic and English unlike this study which focuses on Foreign learners of English.. -Completion Task was used to collect the data for the purpose of identifying potential similarities and differences in the use of (and response to) politeness strategies between Jordanian speakers of Arabic and American speakers of English. The researcher found this study so useful and uses the same tool for data collection which is the discourse completion test.

Hussein 's study is an attempt to outline the most commonly existent differences between Iraqi males and females in the use of apology strategies. So, it shares the same topic of apology strategies but focuses on speakers of Iraqi Non-standard Arabic not English. Hussein's is done in Iraq, a society that share many cultures with the Sudanese. They both speak Arabic as a first language and most of them share the Islamic culture.

Dr. Mahmoud Ali's study aimed at finding and analyzing the apology expressions used by Jordanian university students. It also aimed at exploring the apology strategies Arabic native speakers used in different situations, the participants of the study were eight university English majors at Irbid National University. Six situations were prepared, distributed, then collected and analyzed. The findings showed that the apology strategies used were apology and regret, explanation, offer of repair, equal-equal, low –high and responsibility. The researcher recommended teachers to train students to use apology expressions and strategies at school.

Dr. Mahmoud's study is a recent one in 2013. It is very similar to the researcher's study. Both are focusing on the EFL learners at university level. Mahmoud's added the apology strategies used by Arabic native speakers too and uses discourse completion test as a tool for data collection. On the findings level, the researcher has found that most of the Sudanese EFL learners use offer of repair as an apology strategy. A similar result to Jordanian who uses apology, regret and offer of repair as one of the apology strategies.

Maros's paper is an attempt to explicate the production of apologies in English by adult Malay speakers in Malaysia. Thus it shares the same theme with this thesis. English in Malaysia is a foreign language too. The choice for apology is due to its popularity as a study of speech act and being an illocutionary force so common to take place in daily context. The study found that despite years of exposure to

English language, the apologies produced displayed influences of the Malay sociocultural rule. The researcher can say that, this is a similar case of this study in terms of addressing foreign language and reaching to the same results.

2.4 Summary

In this chapter, the researcher has reviewed the previous studies and the related literature. The researcher reviewed the studies which are done on the same theme of apology speech acts. Ten studies are selected to be contrasted with this study. The researcher has found some similarities and differences between them in terms of topic, participants, methods of data collection and findings. Studies are done in The Sudan, America, Great Britain, Jordan, Iran, Turkey, Romania, Iraq and Malaysia. Some of them are comparative studies between two languages and some are on one language. The researcher has found them so useful and guided her throughout the research. They were a rich source of information on the topic and the tools for data collection.

Another section on this chapter is the literature review where the researcher presented the related literature on the theme of apology and teaching apology to the EFL learners. Several references were read, reviewed and cited in this study. The researcher has tried to narrow her writing to meet the needs of this study only. Four topics are the main focus of this study; teaching foreign languages, Discourse analysis, Pragmatics, speech acts and Apology.

Teaching Foreign Languages in an intercultural world has brought a lot of linguistic phenomenon and changes that deserves thorough investigation and study. Thus the researcher tries to include related literature on intercultural communicative competence in foreign language education

To communicate in such a mobile world requires a number of intercultural competencies and characteristics. That brought another challenge for the language teacher who nowadays teaches in open global classes. Students own smart phones and tablets which provide them with a global view and who are sometimes more knowledgeable than the teacher himself on things related to technology and data search.

Global teachers should open himself to the world and study different cultures and languages. S/he should be aware of culture specific and culture general knowledge, Knowledge of self and other, Knowledge of interaction: individual and societal, insight regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication. S/he requires certain skills such as; ability to interpret and relate, ability to discover and interact, ability to acquire new knowledge and to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction, metacognitive strategies to direct own learning.

Speech includes variety of activities. Starting from production of vowels and consonants, movements of organs of speech, to the aspects of connected speech such as intonation and assimilation. Discourse analysis studies a vast subject area within linguistics. It refers to the study of spoken and written communication taking both linguistic and non-linguistic features into consideration.

Conversation Analysis focuses on talk rather than language. Talk is understood to be an occasion when people act out their sociality.

According to Chomsky, speech acts perform an action, which means that an utterance has not only a locutionary meaning, i.e. the literal meaning, but also an illocutionary meaning, i.e. the intended meaning, and a perlocutionary force, i.e. the effect that is generated in the hearer of an utterance. Austin assumes that every

normal utterance has both a descriptive and an effective aspect: that saying something is also doing something. Searle (1969) observed that quite often the form of an utterance displays bipartite structure, one part of which determines the propositional act, and the other part the illocutionary act.

Apology is one of the speech acts that we perform almost every day. People apologize for different reasons; to remedy the offense for which the apologizer takes responsibility and, as a result, to rebalance social relations between interlocutors, taking responsibility for the violation and expressing regret for the offense committed using different apology categories and strategies such as, avoiding or postponing an apology, Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID), intensified IFID ,providing a justification ,acknowledgment of responsibility, offer of repair, blaming someone else or denying of responsibility and promise of non-recurrence.

Different societies express and understand speech acts like apology in different ways and forms. But at the same time they share some concepts and ideas. Apology in the western culture is considered as a sign of civilization and part of the polite character. While in some middle east and African society's culture, it considered as a sign of weakness.

The researcher can conclude that one of the most obvious features of the Sudaese society is the use of indirect apology. Apology is considered as a sign of betrayal and weakness especially for men. Even if men apologize they usually use indirect strategies of apology. Apology is considered as a sign of a religious polite person. All the religions encourage mistaken people and sinners to apologize to God by making Duaa and performing prayers seeking forgiveness. In Islam for example there are many Quranverses which ask sinners to apologize for their deeds and the

Prophet Mohammed peace be upon him encourages worshippers to apologize for their sins.

Chapter Three
Research Methodology

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

3-1 Introduction

This study is “A corpus-based analysis of Linguistic politeness (Apology) in Sudanese EFL Oral Discourse”. (A case study at Sudan University of Science and Technology –Education College, English language Department –4th and 3rd years).

It is an applied study, the researcher explains the methodology and different tools used for collecting data. Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection are adopted using three different tools. A questionnaire for teachers, a questionnaire for the students, a multiple choice discourse completion test (MCDCT) in English for students.

In addition to Discourse completion tests, multiple –choice questionnaire is used to give participants a number of plausible pragmatic options or interpretations of utterances in given situations. Another type of questionnaire involves scales response tasks where participants assess situational contexts and speech act or and discourse samples according to certain variables. The researcher preferred to use questionnaires for its consistency , ease of administration and its ability to collect a large amount of data.

Discourse Completion Tests have been widely and successfully used in the study of speech acts and speech events. They are particularly favoured as a methodology in the study of second language pragmatic competence. DCTs are essentially a type of language questionnaire whereby you elicit what speakers think they would say in a situation. In addition to their use in the study of speech acts and events, they are used in dialect studies where they can focus on very specific structures

DCTs can be written tasks or they can be presented orally. The degree to which they are controlled can vary. The researcher preferred to use multiple-choice discourse completion test due to its discreteness, control over the language and the possibility to focus on limited items.

3-2 Methods of data collection

3-2-1 Population of the study

The population for this study is the Sudanese EFL teachers and learners at Sudan University of Science and Technology- College of Education- English language Department.

3-2-2 Sample of the Study

A random sample of 30 EFL teachers and 60 EFL Sudanese learners at 3rd and 4th year have participated in this study in the final data collection stage. 30 EFL learners/students from each class are randomly selected to participate voluntarily. The ages of the participants ranged from 20-24 years old of both genders.

The following table and figure show the number of distributed questionnaire, the number of received questionnaire with full-required information.

The study sample respondents differs according to the following characteristics:

The respondents from different ages (less than 30, 30 years, More than 30 years).

The respondents from different Gender (Male, Female).

The respondents from different education levels (BA, MA, Ph.D.).

Respondents' characteristics according to the above variables:

No.	Questionnaire	Distributed questionnaire	Received questionnaire	% of received
1	Teachers	30	30	100.0
2	Surdents	60	60	100.0
	Total	90	90	100.0

Table (3-1) Study sample size

Teachers

1- Age

Age class (year)	Number	Percentage %
Lessthan 30	8	26.7
30-40	18	60.0
More than 40	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(3-2)

The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the age

It is clear from the table (3-2), that most of the sample's respondents are of the age between (30) and (40) years, their number was (18) with the percentage of(60.0%).

2- The Gender:

Sex	Number	Percentage%
Male	20	66.7
Female	10	33.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no(3-3)

The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the gender. From the table above, it is shown that most of the study's respondents are male, the number of those was (20) with the percentage of(67%). The female respondents are (10) with the percentage of (33%).

3-The Qualification

Qualification	Number	Percent
Ph.D	10	33.3
M.A.	15	50.0
B.A.	5	16.7
Total	30	100.0

Table no (3-4)

The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the qualifications. From the table above, it is shown that most of the study's respondents have M.A. as qualification, the number of those are (15) with then percentage of(50.0%).

Students:

1- Age:

Age class (year)	Number	Percentage
Lessthan 25	12	20.0
20-25	30	50.0
More than 25	18	30.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(3-4)

The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the age

We note from the table (3-7) that most of the sample's respondents are of the age 20-25 years, ((30) with percentage (50.0%).

2- Gender

Gender	Number	Percentage
Male	20	33.3
Female	40	66.7
Total	60	100.0

Table no (3-5)

The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to gender

From above table, it is shown that most of the study's respondents are female, the number of those is (40) persons with percentage (67%).

3- University level:

Level	Number	Percent
Thirdyear	25	41.7
Fourthyear	35	58.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no (3-6)

The frequency distribution for the study respondents according to the university level

From above table, it is shown that most of the study's respondents university level are fourthyear, the number of those was (35) persons with percentage (41.7%).

3-2-3 Tools of the study

3-2-3-1 Questionnaires

Questionnaires are administered to gather more background information about the participants for both teachers and students.

A- The teacher's questionnaire

It consists of three sections. Section one includes two parts, the first part includes four personal information questions about name, gender, age and level of education. The second part is about experience in English environment. Section two is a multiple-choice statement questionnaire. Teacher's questionnaire consists of 15 statements and five alternatives ranging between strongly agree to strongly disagree. Section three is two open-ended questions.

B- Students' questionnaire

It consists of two sections. Section one includes two parts, the first part includes four personal information questions about name, gender, age and level of education. The second part is about experience in English environment. Section two is a multiple-choice statement questionnaire. It consists of 15 statements and five alternatives ranged between strongly agree to strongly disagree.

C-Reliability and Validity of the Questionnaire

1- Apparent Reliability and Validity:

In order to check the apparent validity of the study questionnaire and validation of its statements according to the formulation and explanation, the researcher showed the questionnaire to six Ph.D. holders referees who are specialists at the study field. Some of the referees makesome suggestions, and others agreed that the questionnaire is valid. The researcher has studied all suggestions, and some corrections were made. The following table is showing the referees and their jobs and places of work.

No	Name	Job	Title
1	Dr. Amna Badri	Associate Professor at Ahfad University for women	Associate professor
2	Dr. Tajelsir Bashoum	Assistant professor at Sudan University of Science and Technology (SELTI)	Assistant professor
3	Dr. Mohammed Ali	Associate professor at Alnilie nuniversity	Associate professor
4	Dr. Khalil Abdallah	Assistant professor at Alnilien university	Associate professor
5-	Dr. Sami Hussien	Assistant professor at The Holley Quran university	Assistant professor
6-	Dr. Hassan Mahil Abdallah	Assistant professor at Sudan university of Science and Technology	Assistant professor

Table (3-7) The questionnaire's referees , their jobs and places of work

2- Statistical Reliability and Validity:

The reliability of the test is to be obtained when the same result is scored if the same measurement is used more than once under the same conditions. In addition, if the same marks are obtained when repeating the test for the same group; under the same conditions; then we can describe this test as reliable. In addition, reliability is defined as the degree of the accuracy of the data that the test measures. Here are some of the most used methods for calculating the reliability:

1. Split-half by using Spearman-Brown equation.

2. Alpha-Cronbach coefficient.
3. Test and Re-test method
4. Equivalent images method.
5. Guttman equation.

On the other hand, validity is also a measure used to identify the validity degree among the respondents according to their answers on certain criterion. The validity is counted by a number of methods, among them is the validity using the square root of the (reliability coefficient). The value of the reliability and the validity lies in the range between (0-1). The validity of the questionnaire is that the tool should measure the exact aim, which it has been designed for. The researcher calculated the validity statistically using the following equation:

$$\text{Validity} = \sqrt{\text{Reliability}}$$

The researcher calculated the reliability coefficient for the measurement, which was used in the questionnaire using (split-half) method. This method stands on the principle of dividing the answers of the sample individuals into two parts, i.e. items of the odd number e.g. (1, 3, 5, ...) and answers of the even number e.g. (2, 4, 6 ...). Then Pearson correlation coefficient between the two parts is calculated. Finally, the (reliability coefficient) was calculated according to Spearman-Brown Equation as the following:

$$\text{Reliability Coefficient} = \frac{2 \times r}{1 + r}$$

r = Pearson correlation coefficient

For calculating the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire from the above equation, the researcher has distributed about (10) teachers and (15) student

questionnaires to respondents. In addition, depending on the answers of the pre-test sample, the above Spearman-Brown equation was used to calculate the reliability coefficient using the split-half method; the results have been showed in the following table:

Hypothèses	Reliability	Validity
Teachers	0.80	0.89
Surdents	0.85	0.92

Table (3-8)

The statistical reliability and validity of the pre-test sample about the study questionnaire

We note from the results of the above table that all reliability and validity coefficients for pre-test sample individuals about each questionnaire's theme, and for overall questionnaires, are greater than (50%), and some of them are nearest to one. This indicates the high validity and reliability of the answers, so, the study questionnaire is valid and reliable, and that will give correct and acceptable statistical analysis.

3-2-3-2 Multiple-choice discourse completion test in English

MDCTs consist of test items where the test taker is required to choose the correct response (the key) from the several given options. Most commonly, multiple-choice items include an instruction to the test taker and a stem (typically either a phrase or sentence to be completed, or a question). The stem and distractors assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge.

In this study the researcher has designed a multiple-choice discourse completion tests in English for 3rd and 4th year's students. It includes instructions for the candidates and two sections.

- Section A is a personal information which includes two questions about age and gender.
- Section two is a multiple-choice discourse completion test. Fifteen scenarios are provided with six alternatives. The key and five distractors.

The test was based on (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Trosborg, 1987) taxonomy of apology strategies. As shown in the table below:

Strategy	Example
Avoiding or postponing an apology	'I want to be always the same! As you know me.'
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	'I'm sorry!'; 'I apologize!'
Intensified IFID	'I'm so sorry!'; 'I very, very sorry!'
Providing a justification	'I forgot at what time the wedding was and... I was fishing.'
Acknowledgment of responsibility	'I know I am late'
Offer of repair	'I promise I'll buy another set of plates.'
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	'The traffic was terrible.'
Promise of non-recurrence	'I promise you this will never happen again.'

Table (3.8) Basic Apology Strategies Used in Studies on Apologies

3-2-3-2-1 Reliability and validity of the discourse completion test:

In order to check the apparent validity of the discourse completion test, the researcher showed the questionnaire to six Ph.D. holders referees who are specialists at the study field. Some of the referees made some suggestions, the researcher has studied all suggestions, and some corrections were made. The following table is showing the referees and their jobs and places of work.

No	Name	Job	Title
1	Dr. Amna Badri	Associate Professor at Ahfad University for women	Associate professor
2	Dr. Tajelsir Bashoum	Assistant professor at Sudan University of Science and Technology (SELTI)	Assistant professor
3	Dr. Mohammed Ali	Associate professor at Alnilie niversity	Associate professor
4	Dr. Khalil Abdallah	Assistant professor at Alnilien university	Associate professor
5-	Dr. Sami Hussien	Assistant professor at The Holley Quran university	Assistant professor
6-	Dr. Hassan Mahil Abdallah	Assistant professor at Sudan university of Science and Technology	Assistant professor

Table (3-9)**The questionnaire's referees, their jobs and places of work**

To ensure the test reliability, the discourse completion test was distributed twice to the same group, when comparing their answers at the two tests. The researcher has found that they are the same. This shows that the Multiple –choice discourse completion test is reliable.

3-3 Summary

This chapter is the methodology of the study including the population, sample, the tools of data collection which are a questionnaire for EFL teachers and EFL learners at Sudan University of Science and Technology, college of education, English department and a multiple- choice discourse completion test for the learners. A sample of each tool is attached at the appendix section.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis, Results and

Discussion

Chapter Four

Data Analysis, Results and Discussion

4-1 Introduction

In this chapter data analysis, the data was analyzed and the hypotheses were tested. To do that, first, the researcher considered the instruments of applied study that contain the description of the study's population and its sample, method of data collection, reliability and validity of the study tools, and the statistical treatments that used in the methodology of the study.

4-2 Application of the Study's Tools

After checking questionnaire reliability and validity, the questionnaire was distributed to the determined study sample (30) teachers and (60) students, and constructed the required tables for collecting data. This step consists of the transformation of the qualitative (nominal) variables (strongly disagree, disagree, Not sure, agree, and strongly agree) to quantitative variables (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) respectively, the graphical representation have been done for this purpose also.

4-2-1 Teachers' questionnaire

- **First hypothesis**
- Sudanese EFL teachers use proper method for teaching apology speech act.

Question No. (1): Modes of Linguistic politeness (apology) are included in the Sudanese University syllabus.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	2	6.7
Agree	14	46.7
Not sure	12	40.0
Disagree	2	6.7
Strongly disagree	00	00
Total	30	100.0

Table no (4-1)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no. (1). It is clear from table no. (4-1) that most of the candidates (14) with the percentage of (46.7%) strongly agreed with "Modes of Linguistic politeness (apology) are included in the Sudanese University syllabus".

Question No (2): The textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	6	20.0
Agree	7	23.3
Not sure	15	50.0
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly disagree	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no (4-2)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no (2).

It is clear from table no.(4-3)) that most of the candidates (15) with the percentage of (50%) are not sure about that, the textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students.

Question No (3): Communicative activities such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	7	23.3
Agree	12	40.0
Not sure	10	33.3
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total	30	100.0

Table no (4-3)

It is clear from table no.(4-4) that most of the candidates (12) persons with percentage (40.0%) agreed on that " Communicative activities such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology.

Question No. (4): Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	10	33.3
Agree	12	40.0
Not sure	7	23.3
Disagree	1	3.3

Total	30	100.0
-------	----	-------

Table no (4-4)

It is clear from table no.(4-4) that most of the candidates (12) persons with percentage (40.0%) agreed on that " Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence.

Question No.(5): As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	6	20.0
Agree	15	46.7
Not sure	7	23.3
Disagree	2	6.7
Strongly disagree	1	3.3□
Total	30	100.0

Table no. (4-5)

It is clear from table no.(4-5) that most of the candidates (14) persons with percentage (46.7%) agreed on that " As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology ".

Second hypothesis:

Sudanese EFL learners often use apology in their oral discourse.

Question No (1): Sudanese learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	5	16.7
Agree	8	26.7
Not sure	10	33.3
Disagree	6	20.0
Strongly disagree	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no (4-6)

It is clear from table no.(4-6) that most of the candidates (10) persons with percentage (33.3%) were not sure about that " Sudanese learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents ".

Question No.(2):Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participants relationships.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	3	10.0
Agree	12	40.0
Not sure	9	30.0
Disagree	5	16.7
Strongly disagree	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-7)

It is clear from table no.(4-7) most of the candidates (12) candidates with percentage (40.0%) agreed on that " Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participants relationships ".

Question No.(3): Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat”.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	6	20.0
Agree	10	33.3
Not sure	13	43.3
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly disagree	00	00
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-8)

It is clear from table no.(4-8) that most of the candidates (13) with percentage (43.3%) were not sure " Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat”.

Question No.(4): Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the context.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	7	23.3
Agree	9	30.0
Not sure	11	36.7
Disagree	2	6.7
Strongly disagree	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-9)

It is clear from table no.(4-9) that most of the candidates (11) with the percentage of (36.7%) were not sure that " Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the context ".

Question No.(5): Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the context.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	2	6.7
Agree	19	63.3
Not sure	7	23.3
Disagree	1	3.3□
Strongly disagree	1	3.3□
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-10)

It is clear from table (4-10) that most of the candidates (19) with percentage of (63.3%) agreed on that Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the effect of intonation ".

Question No.(6): Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness (apology) .

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	2	6.7
Agree	18	60.0
Not sure	8	26.7
Disagree	2	6.7
Strongly disagree	00	00
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-11)

It is clear from table no.(4-11)) that most of the candidates (18) in the study's sample with percentage (60.0%) agreed with that

Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness. (apology).

Question No.(7): As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	7	23.3
Agree	9	30.0
Not sure	11	36.7
Disagree	2	36.7
Strongly disagree	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-11)

It is clear from table no.(4-14) that most of the candidates (11) with the percentage of (36.7%) were not sure about “As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions”.

Question No.(8): Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the function of the exponents.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	9	30.0
Agree	12	40.0
Not sure	8	26.7
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly disagree	00	00
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-12)

It is clear from table no.(4-12)) that most of the candidates (12) with the percentage of (40.0%) agreed on that " Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the function of the exponents "..

Question No.(9): AS a foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	4	13.3
Agree	14	46.7
Not sure	11	36.7
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly disagree	00	00
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-13)

It is clear from table no.(4-13) that most of the candidates (14) with percentage of (46.7%) agreed on that " As a foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness".

Question No.(10): linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	9	30.0
Agree	15	50.0
Not sure	5	16.7
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly disagree	00	00
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-14)

It is clear from the table above that most of the candidates (15) with percentage of (50.0%) agreed on that " linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture ".

4-2-2 Students' questionnaire

First hypothesis

Sudanese EFL teachers use proper method for teaching apology speech act.

Question No.(1): Linguistic politeness is included in the Sudanese University syllabus.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	12	20.0
Agree	35	58.3
Not sure	11	18.3
Disagree	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-15)

It is clear from table no.(4-15) that most of the candidates (35) with percentage of (58.3%) agreed on that " Linguistic politeness is included in the Sudanese University syllabus ".

Question No.(2): Direct exposure to English language enhances the polite use of language.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	8	13.3
Agree	24	40.0
Not sure	22	36.0
Disagree	6	10.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-16)

It is clear from table no.(4-16) that most of the candidates (24) with percentage of (40.0%) agreed on that " Direct exposure to English language enhances the polite use of language ".

Question No.(3): As a native speaker of the Sudanese Arabic dialect, you use polite language in your daily expressions.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	15	25.0
Agree	22	36.7
Not sure	15	25.0
Disagree	6	10.0
Strongly disagree	2	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-17)

It is clear from table no.(4-17) that most of the candidates (22) with the percentage of (36.7%) agree on that " As a native speaker of the Sudanese Arabic dialect, you use polite language in your daily expressions ".

Question No.(4): As a foreign speaker of English, you use apology in your daily expressions.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	17	28.3
Agree	22	36.7
Not sure	11	18.3
Disagree	7	11.7
Strongly disagree	3	5.0
Total	30	100.0

Table no.(4-18)

It is clear from table no.(4-18) that most of the candidates (22) with percentage of (36.7%) agree on that " As a foreign speaker of English, you use apology in your daily expressions ".

Question No.(5): Sudanese learners face problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	33.3
Agree	18	30.0
Not sure	17	28.3
Disagree	2	3.3
Strongly disagree	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-19)

It is clear from table no.(4-19) that, most of the candidates (20) in the study's sample with percentage of (33.3%) strongly agree with " Sudanese learners face problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents ".

Students' questionnaire

Second hypothesis

Sudanese EFL learners often use apology in their oral discourse

Question No.(1): Learners may need to focus on politeness markers in isolation in order to understand and assimilate them.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	10	16.7
Agree	28	46.7
Not sure	16	26.7
Disagree	4	6.7
Strongly disagree	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-20)

It is clear from table no.(4-20) that most of the candidates (28) with percentage of (46.7%) agree on that " Learners may need to focus on politeness markers in isolation in order to understand and assimilate them.

Question No.(2): Teaching apology strategies in authentic context promotes EFL learners' ability to use appropriate discourse patterns.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	12	20.0
Agree	15	25.0
Not sure	25	41.7
Disagree	5	8.3
Strongly disagree	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-21)

It is clear from table no.(4-21) that most of the candidates (25) with percentage of (41.7%) are not sure that " Teaching apology strategies in authentic context promotes EFL learners' ability to use appropriate discourse patterns ".

Question No.(3): As a foreign Learner of English you recognize the social function of different speech acts.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	33.3
Agree	21	35.0
Not sure	8	13.3
Disagree	9	15.0
Strongly disagree	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-22)

It is clear from table no.(4-22) that most of the candidates (21) with percentage of (35.0%) agree with that " As a foreign Learner of English you recognize the social function of different speech acts ".

Question No.(4): As a foreign Learner of English you use different apology strategies .

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	18	30.0
Agree	25	41.7
Not sure	10	16.7
Disagree	6	10.0
Strongly disagree	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-23)

It is clear from table no.(4-23) that most of the candidates (25) candidates with percentage of (41.7%) agree on that " As a foreign Learner of English you use different apology strategies "..

Question No.(5): Apology is a common speech act in the Sudanese culture .

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	24	40.0
Agree	23	38.0
Not sure	7	11.7
Disagree	5	8.3
Strongly disagree	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-24)

It is clear from table no.(4-24) that most of the candidates (24) in the study's sample with the percentage of (40.0%) strongly agree with " Apology is a common speech act in the Sudanese culture ".

Question No.(6): Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the participants' relationships.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	8	13.3
Agree	26	43.3
Not sure	14	23.3
Disagree	9	15.0
Strongly disagree	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-25)

It is clear from table no.(4-25) that most of the candidates (26) with percentage of (43.3%) agree " Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the participants relationships ".

Question No.(7): Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of polite apology depending on the context.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	11	18.3
Agree	18	30.0
Not sure	17	28.3
Disagree	12	20.0
Strongly disagree	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-26)

It is clear from table no.(4-26) that most of the candidates (18) with percentage of (30.0%) agree with that " Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of polite apology depending on the context "..

Question No.(8): Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the forms of the exponent.(interrogative ,affirmative and negative).

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	15	18.3
Agree	17	28.3
Not sure	13	21.7

Disagree	12	20.0
Strongly disagree	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-27)

It is clear from table no.(4-27) that most of the candidates (17) with percentage of (28.3%) agree with that " Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the forms of the exponent.(interrogative ,affirmative and negative)".

Question No.(9): AS a foreign Learner of English you use different apology strategies.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	15	25.0
Agree	22	36.7
Not sure	15	25.0
Disagree	5	8.3
Strongly disagree	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-28)

It is clear from table no.(4-28) that most of the candidates (22) with percentage of (36.7%) agree on that " AS a foreign Learner of English you use different apology strategies ".

Question No.(10): Apology is a common speech act in the Sudanese culture.

Answer	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	24	40.0
Agree	20	33.3
Not sure	9	15.0
Disagree	2	3.3
Strongly disagree	5	8.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-29)

It is clear from table no.(4-29) that most of the candidates (24) in the study's sample with percentage of (40.0%) strongly agree with " Apology is a common speech act in the Sudanese culture ".

Summary

In this part of chapter four application of the Study's tools the researcher has analyzed the questionnaires for both EFL learners and teachers. This part will give the final results and findings for hypotheses one and two.

4-3: Students' Multiple Choice Discourse Completion Test

Third hypothesis

Sudanese EFL learners commonly use providing a justification as an apology strategy

Question No (4-2-1): Your friend stopped talking to you because you insulted him/her. What do you say to him/her?

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	33	55.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	11	18.3
Providing a justification	3	5.0
Offer of repair	7	11.7
Promise of non-recurrence	4	6.7
Avoiding or postponing an apology	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no (4-2-1)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no (4-2-1).

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' (33) (55%) use Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) as an apology strategy

Question No.(4-2-2):You showed up an hour late for a lecture. What do you say to your professor.

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	8	13.3
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	19	31.7
Providing a justification	15	25.0
Offer of repair	4	6.7
Promise of non-recurrence	13	21.7
Avoiding or postponing an apology	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

Table no (4-2-2)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-2).

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' (19) (31.7%) use Blaming someone else or denying as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-3):You borrowed your professor book but have lost it. Your professor now need the book back. What do you say to him/her? .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	6	10.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	17	28.3
Providing a justification	12	20.0
Offer of repair	21	35.0
Promise of non-recurrence	3	5.0
Avoiding or postponing an apology	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

Table no (4-2-3)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-3)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' (21) (35.0%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-4):You were supposed to go a senior colleague

graduation party but forgot because you had a paper to finish. What do you say to him/her?

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	10	16.7
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	10	16.7
Providing a justification	23	38.3
Offer of repair	8	13.3
Promise of non-recurrence	6	10.0
Avoiding or postponing an apology	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-4)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-4)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' (23) (38.3%) use Providing a justification as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-5):You forgot important meeting with the head of Sudan university students union. What do you say to him/her .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	13	21.7
Acknowledgment of responsibility	23	38.3
Providing a justification	10	16.7
Offer of repair	3	5.0
Promise of non-recurrence	9	15.0
Avoiding or postponing an apology	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-5)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-5)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (23) (38.3%) use Acknowledgment of responsibility as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-6):You were playing with a friends computer and erased the important paper she/he had been working on for the past two weeks.what do you say to him/her .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	7	11.7
Acknowledgment of responsibility	3	5.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	3	5.0
Offer of repair	36	60.0
Promise of non-recurrence	8	13.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-6)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-6)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (36) (60.0%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-7):You copied an essay for an assignment .what do you say to him/her .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	10	16.7
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	14	23.3
Providing a justification	9	15.0
Offer of repair	20	33.3
Promise of non-recurrence	5	8.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-7)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-7)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (20) (33.3%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-8):You stepped on one students foot a crowded cafe .what do you say to him/her .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	17	28.3
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	16	26.7
Providing a justification	10	16.7
Offer of repair	14	23.3
Promise of non-recurrence	3	5.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	0	0.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-8)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-8)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (16) (26.7 %) use Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-9):

You didn't visit a junior colleague at the at the hospital. what do you say tohim/her when she/he comes backs to university .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	6	10.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	3	5.0
Providing a justification	18	30.0
Offer of repair	30	50.0
Promise of non-recurrence	2	3.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-9)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-9)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (30) (50%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-10):You could not pay the university fee. The college registrar asked you to pay or you will not take the exam. What do you say to him/her .

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	8	13.3

Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	10	16.7
Providing a justification	17	28.3
Offer of repair	17	28.3
Promise of non-recurrence	6	10.0
Avoiding or postponing an apology	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-10)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(14-2-10

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (17) (28.3%) use providing a justification and offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-11):It is the deadline for an assignment submission but you did not write it. What do you say to your professor.

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	9	15.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	12	20.0
Providing a justification	9	15.0
Offer of repair	24	40.0

Promise of non-recurrence	4	6.7
Avoiding or postponing an apology	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-11)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-11)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (24) (40%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-12):You borrowed your classmates notebook but you lost it two days before the exam. What do you say tohim/her.

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	10	16.7
Acknowledgment of responsibility	6	10.0
Providing a justification	16	26.7
Offer of repair	19	31.7
Promise of non-recurrence	7	11.7
Avoiding or postponing an apology	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-12)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-12)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (19) (31.7%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No (4-2-13):You Told Ali about your close-friends secret. Her/she found out .what do you say to him/her

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	3	5.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	7	11.7
Providing a justification	16	26.7
Offer of repair	29	48.3
Promise of non-recurrence	5	8.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	0	0.0
Total	60	100.0

Table No (4-2-13)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no. (4-2-13)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (29) (28.3%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

Question No.(4-2-14):You spoke to your professor in loud voice .He/she what do you say to him/her

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	15	25.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	13	21.7
Providing a justification	12	20.0
Acknowledgment of responsibility	16	26.7
Promise of non-recurrence	4	6.7
Avoiding or postponing an apology	0	0.0
Total	60	100.0

Table no.(4-2-14)

The frequency distribution for the respondents' answers about question no.(4-2-14)

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the scenario given, most of the candidates' answers (16) (26.7%) use Acknowledgment of responsibility as an apology strategy.

Final result

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	161	19.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	135	15.9
Providing a justification	173	20.4
Offer of repair	232	27.3
Promise of non-recurrence	79	9.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	21	2.5
Acknowledgment of responsibility	48	5.7
Total	849	100.0

Table No(4-2-15)

Total frequency distribution for the respondents' answers of the multiple-choice discourse completion test from table 4-2-1 to 4-2-14

As shown in the table above, when counting the candidates answers for the 15 scenarios given, most of the candidates' answers (232) (27.3%) use offer of repair as an apology strategy.

4-4 Test of the Study's Hypotheses:

To answer on study questions and to test its hypotheses, the median will be computed for each question from the questionnaire that shows the opinions of the study respondents about the Problem: A Pragmatic- based study on Linguistic politeness (Apology) in The Sudanese EFL Oral Discourse” A study at Sudan University of Science and Technology . To do that, we will gives five degrees for each answer "strongly agree", four degrees for each answer "agree", three degrees for each answer " not sure", two degrees with each answer "disagree", and one degree for each answer with "strongly disagree". This means, in accordance with the statistical analysis requirements, transformation of nominal variables to quantitative variables. After that, we will use the non-parametric chi-square test to know if there are statistical differences amongst the respondents' answers about hypotheses questions.

4-4-1 Results of the First Hypothesis:

The first hypothesis in this study states the following:

“Sudanese EFL teachers use proper method for teaching apology speech act.”

The aim of this hypothesis is to show that the methods of teaching modes of linguistic politeness mainly apology speech act are effective .

To test this hypothesis, the trend of respondents' opinions about each question from the hypothesis's questions should be known, and for all questions. We compute the median, which is one of the central tendency measures, that uses to describe the phenomena, and it represents the centered answer for all respondents' answers after ascending or descending order for the answers.

No	Question	Median	Result
1	Linguistic politeness (apology) is included in the Sudanese University syllabus.	4	Agree
2	The textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students.	3	Not sure
3	Communicative activities such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology.	4	Agree
4	Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence.	4	Agree
5	As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology.	4	Agree
	Overall	4	Agree

Table no.(4-3-1)

The median of respondents' answers about the questions of the first hypothesis

From the table (4-3-1), it has shown that:

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 1st question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "Linguistic politeness (apology) is included in the Sudanese University syllabus".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 2nd question is (3). This value means that, most of the respondents' are not sure with that "The textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 3rd question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "Communicative activities such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 4th question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 5th question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' are either or with that "As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers about the all questions that related to the first hypothesis is (3). This value, in general, means that most of the respondents' agreed with what is mentioned about the first hypothesis

The above results do not mean that all the respondents in the sample agreed with the questions because as mentioned in the tables from table no.(4-12) to no.(4-16) there are some respondents who disagreed with the questions. So, to test the statistical significance of the differences among the answers of the respondents for the first hypothesis, the chi-square test will used to indicate the differences for each question of the first hypothesis

No	Questions	Degree of freedom	Chi-square value
1	Linguistic politeness (apology) is included in the Sudanese University syllabus.	3	16.13
2	The textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students.	4	22.00
3	Communicative activities such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology.	3	19.20
4	Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence.	3	19.20
5	As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology.	4	17.67

Table no.(4-3-1): Chi-square test results for respondents' answers about the questions of the first hypothesis.

According to the table, we can demonstrate the results as follows:

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 1st question was (16.13) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-12), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Linguistic politeness (apology) is included in the Sudanese University syllabus ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 2nd question was (22.00) which is greater than the

tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (2) and the significant value level (1%) which was (9.21). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-13), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who have not sure with that

“ The textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students.”

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 3rd question is (19.20) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-14), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who have agreed with that “ Communicative activistes such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 4th question is (19.20) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-15), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 5th question was (17.67) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (4) and the significant value

level (1%) which was (13.28). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-16), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who have agreed with that “ As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology”.

From the results above, the first hypothesis stating that :

**“ Sudanese EFL teachers use proper method for teaching apology speech act”
is approved**

4-4-2 Results of the second Hypothesis:

The first hypothesis in this study states the following:

“Sudanese EFL learners often use apology in their oral discourse.

The aim of this hypothesis is to investigate the use of apology by the Sudanese EFL learners.

To test this hypothesis, the trend of respondents' opinions about each question from the hypothesis's questions and for all questions should be known,. the median is computed, which is one of the central tendency measures, that uses to describe the phenomena, and it represents the centered answer for all respondents' answers after ascending or descending order for the answers.

No	Question	Median	Result
1	Sudanese learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents.	4	Agree
2	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participants relationships	4	Agree
3	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat”	4	Agree
4	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the context.	4	Agree
5	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the effect of intonation.	4	Agree
	Overall	4	Agree

Table no.(4-3-1)

The median of respondents’ answers about the questions of the second hypothesis

From the table (4-3-1), it has shown that:

The calculated value of the median for the respondents’ answers of the 1st question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents’ agreed with that “Sudanese

learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents”.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents’ answers of the 2nd question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents’ agreed with that “Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participant’s relationships”.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents’ answers of the 3rd question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents’ agreed with that “Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat””.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents’ answers of the 4th question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents’ agreed with that “Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the context”.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents’ answers of the 5th question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents’ agreed with that “Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the effect of intonation”.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents’ answers about the all questions that related to the second hypothesis is (4). This value, in general, means that most of the respondents’ agreed with all what mentioned about the second hypothesis.

The above results do not mean that all the respondents in the sample have agreed with the questions because as mentioned in the tables from table no.(4-3-1) to no.(4-3-2) there are some respondents who disagreed with the questions. So, to test the statistical significance of the differences among the answers of the respondents for the second hypothesis, the chi-square test was used to indicate the differences for each question of the second hypothesis.

No	Questions	Degree of freedom	Chi-square value
1	Sudanese learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents.	4	17.67
2	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participants relationships.	4	15.33
3	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat”	3	18.80
4	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the context.	4	16.67
15	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the effect of intonation.	4	39.33

Table no.(4-3-2): Chi-square test results for respondents’ answers about the questions of the second hypothesis

According to the table, we can demonstrate the results as follows:

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents’ answers in the 1st question was (17.67) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (4) and the significant value level (1%) which was (13.28). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-17), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed

with that “ Sudanese learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents’ answers in the 2nd question was (15.33) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (4) and the significant value level (1%) which was (13.28). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-18), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participants relationships ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents’ answers in the 3rd question was (18.80) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-19), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat” ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents’ answers in the 4th question was (16.67) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (4) and the significant value level (1%) which was (13.28). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-20), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “English Language programmes are assessed in teaching practice”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 5th question was (14.66) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (4) and the significant value level (1%) which was (13.28). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-21), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the effect of intonation ”

No	Question	Median	Result
1	Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness. .(apology)	4	Agree
2	As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions.	4	Agree
3	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the function of the exponents.	4	Agree
4	AS foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness.	4	Agree
5	linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture.	4	Agree
	Overall	4	Agree

Table no.(4-3-2)

The median of respondents' answers about the questions of the third hypothesis

From the table (4-5), it has shown that:

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 1st question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness. (apology) "

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 2nd question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 3rd question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "polite apology depending on the function of the exponents".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 4th question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents agreed with that "AS foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers of the 5th question is (4). This value means that, most of the respondents' agreed with that "linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents' answers about the all

questions that related to the third hypothesis is (4). This value, in general, means that most of the respondents' have agreed with all what mentioned about the third hypothesis.

The above results do not mean that all the respondents in the sample have no.(4-22) to no.(4-26) there are some respondents who disagreed with the questions. So, to test the statistical significance of the differences among the answers of the respondents for the third hypothesis, the chi-square test was used to indicate the differences for each question of the third hypothesis.

No	Questions	Degree of freedom	Chi-square value
1	Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness. .(apology)	3	22.80
2	As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions.	4	17.67
3	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the function of the exponents.	3	18.67
4	AS foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness.	3	14.53
5	linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture.	3	14.27

Table no.(4-3-2): Chi-square test results for respondents' answers about the questions of the third hypothesis

According to the table, the results are as follows:

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 1st question was (22.80) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-22), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness. .(apology) ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 2nd question was (17.67) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (4) and the significant value level (1%) which was (13.28). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-23), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 3rd question was (18.67) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what is mentioned in table no.(3-24), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the function of the exponents ”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 4th question was (14.53) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what mentioned in table no.(3-25), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ AS foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness”.

The calculated value of chi-square for the significance of the differences for the respondents' answers in the 5th question was (14.27) which is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square at the degree of freedom (3) and the significant value level (1%) which was (11.34). According to what mentioned in table no.(3-26), this indicates that, there are statistically significant differences at the level (1%) among the answers of the respondents, which support the respondents who agreed with that “ linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture ”.

From the results above, we see that the second hypothesis that states “Sudanese EFL learners often use apology in their oral discourse is approved”.

4-4-3 Results of the third Hypothesis

Sudanese EFL learners commonly use providing a justification as an apology strategy

The aim of this hypothesis is to show the commonly used apology strategy by the Sudanese EFL learners.

To test this hypothesis, the trend of respondents' opinions about each question from the hypothesis's questions and for all questions should be known,. The median is computed, which is one of the central tendency measures, that uses to describe the

phenomena, and it represents the centered answer for all respondents' answers after ascending or descending order for the answers.

Answer	Number	Percent
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	161	19.0
Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility	135	15.9
Providing a justification	173	20.4
Offer of repair	232	27.3
Promise of non-recurrence	79	9.3
Avoiding or postponing an apology	21	2.5
Acknowledgment of responsibility	48	5.7
Total	849	100.0

Table no.(4-3-2): Chi-square test results for respondents' answers about the questions of the third hypothesis.

As shown in the table above most of the candidates 232 use Offer of repair as an apology strategy with 27.3 %. This means the third hypothesis stating that “Sudanese EFL learners commonly use providing a justification as an apology strategy is not approved”.

4-3 Summary

Chapter four is the data analysis, after collecting the data through questionnaires and the multiple-choice discourse completion test. The researcher uses SPSS computer program to analyze the data to approve or disapprove the study's hypothesis. The answers were tested against the hypothesis and the first and second hypothesis are approved, while the third one is disapproved.

Chapter Five

**Summary, Findings, Conclusions,
Recommendations and Suggestions
for Further Studies**

Chapter Five

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies

5-1 Summary of the study

This study is entitled a corpus-based analysis of Linguistic politeness (Apology) in Sudanese EFL Oral Discourse , a study at Sudan University of Science and Technology –Education College ,English language Department –4th and 3rd years

Many studies have focused on linguistic politeness mainly apology most of them are conducted on ESL learners and few of them on EFL learners mainly in the Middle East and the Sudan. This study is an attempt to bridge the gap on the area of politeness and mainly apology, to outline the most commonly used apology strategies by Sudanese EFL learners and to investigate the effectiveness of the methods of teaching Apology to the Sudanese EFL learners.

The researcher uses three tools for collecting data. The first tool is a questionnaire for EFL teachers. A questionnaire was designed for the Sudanese EFL teachers at (Sudan University of science and Technology- Colleges of education and languages English department). A random sample of 30 EFL Sudanese teachers have participated in this study.

The second tool is a questionnaire for EFL learners. It was designed for the Sudanese EFL learners at (Sudan University of science and Technology- College of education English department). A random sample of 60 EFL Sudanese learners from 3rd and 4th years have participated in this study.

The Third tool is Multiple-choice discourse completion test. It consists of test items where the test taker is required to choose the correct response (the key) from the six given options. Most commonly, multiple-choice items including instruction to the test taker and a stem (typically either a phrase or sentence to be completed, or a question). The stem and distractors assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge. The MDCT was distributed to the same sample of learners of the questionnaire.

The data was analyzed using SPSS software. The researcher has found that Sudanese EFL learners use implicit apology in their spoken discourse, the Sudanese EFL learners prefer to use "an offer of repair" as an apology strategy, proper methods are used to teach apology speech act to the Sudanese EFL learners, the Sudanese EFL learners managed to adapt the English language culture and use apology strategies in the right way, the Sudanese EFL learners' curriculum includes the speech acts and mainly apology strategies.

5-2 Findings

This study aims to point out the linguistic politeness features -mainly apology - in the Sudanese EFL learners oral discourse and finding out the most commonly used apology strategy by the Sudanese EFL learners. After analyzing the data, the researcher has reached to the following findings:

- 1- The Sudanese EFL learners use implicit apology in their spoken discourse.
- 2- The Sudanese EFL learners prefer to use "an offer of repair" as an apology strategy.
- 3- Proper methods are used to teach apology speech act to the Sudanese EFL learners;
- 4- The Sudanese EFL learners managed to adapt the English language culture and use apology strategies in the right way.

5- The Sudanese EFL learners' syllabus contains the speech acts basically apology strategies.

This answers the main questions of the study whether the Sudanese EFL learners use implicit or explicit Apology and the other question of what is/are the apology strategy/ies commonly used by the Sudanese EFL learners' in their spoken discourse?

5.3 Conclusion

The main goal of this study is to find out whether the Sudanese EFL learners use implicit apology strategies or not and to point out the most commonly used apology strategy used by the Sudanese EFL learners.

The researcher can conclude that the Sudanese EFL learners use different apology strategies and most of them prefer to use "an offer of repair" as an apology strategy.

Another aim is investigating the effectiveness of the methods of teaching apology to the Sudanese EFL learners. From the results above, we see that the first hypothesis that proper methods are used to teach apology speech act to the Sudanese EFL learners is approved. The Sudanese EFL learners managed to adapt the English language culture and use apology strategies in the right way.

5.4 Recommendations

The researcher recommends the following:

- 1- The Sudanese EFL learners should be exposed to everyday English in order to learn the language properly.
- 2- The Study of Pragmatics should be included in the Sudanese EFL curriculum.
- 3- Textbooks should include activities on speech acts.

4- EFL teachers should use authentic materials.

5- More time should be allotted to teaching pragmatics and speech acts.

5.5 Suggestions for further studies

Further studies could be done on the area of pragmatics, mainly apology strategies and on the effectiveness of teaching the different speech acts such as: promising and thanking;

More studies could be done to find out why most of the Sudanese EFL learners use offer of repair as an apology strategy;

References

References

- Majeed A and Janjua F** .(2014).Apology strategies and gender: A Pragmatic study of apology speech acts in Urdu language, Merit Research Journal of Education and Review Vol. 2(3) pp. 054-061.
- O’Keeffe A**, 2011). Introducing pragmatics in use, Routledge, London,1st edition, page 18.
- Bagarić V., Mihaljević J.** 2007,Defining Communicative Competence, Metodika,,Vol. 8, br. 1, 15.04.2007,UDK: 378.678.
- Basem I. M**,2013,The Generic and Registerial Features of Facebook Apology Messages Written by Americans and Jordanians, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana, USA, Department of English Language and Literature, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- DawsonC**, 2009, Introduction to research methods a practical guide for anyone undertaking a research project- fourth edition-UK, page 48-49.
- Christopher N, Candlin ,Neil Mercer**,2001, English Language Teaching in its Social Context ,A Reader, The Open University ,London and New York in association with Macquavie University, Routledge, London.
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages**, n. d., p.13
- C.R.Kothari**, 2004,research Methodology, New Age International (P) Ltd,New Delhi, page 110.

Hatipoğlu Ç,2011,Culture, Gender and Politeness: Apologies in Turkish and British English. University of the West of England , Linguistics Department ,Linguistics.

Ancarno C, Press Representations of Successful Public Apologies in Britain and France . University of Reading ,L ANGUAGE STUDIES WORKING PAPERS,

Lee C ,The Cantonese apology style for personal offences in native and second languages in electronic communication ,Hong Kong Baptist University, China.

DEMETER G, 2011, Explicit Apologies in English and Romanian. A Construction Grammar Approach, page28.

Olshtain E, Cohen A , 1990, 'The Learning of Complex Speech Act Behaviour' TESL Canada Journal, VOL. 7, NO.2,.

Flores E ,The Pragmatics of Requests and Apologies.Developmental patterns of Mexican student ,Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México.

Rasekh E& Mardani M, 2010,Investigating the Effects of Teaching Apology Speech Act, with a Focus on Intensifying strategies, on Pragmatic Development of EFL Learners: The Iranian Context, The International Journal of Language Society and Culture-,Issue 30 Page 96”

Chang W and Haugh M ,Valuations of im/politeness of an intercultural apology Griffith University

Sharifian F et.al,2007, ”Applied Cultural Linguistics-Implications for second language learning and intercultural communication”-University of Nevada, Las Vegas,John Benjamins Publishing CompanyAmsterdam,Philadelphia,page 2”

Cenoz J,Requests and Apologies: A comparison between native and non-native speakers of English ,Atlantis Vol. 18, No. 1/2, REQUESTS AND APOLOGY.

McDonough J and McDonough S, 1997, Research methods for English language teachers, Hodder Arnold,Great Britain, page 122.

Juhana, The Use of Apologizing Speech Acts Realization by Male and Female Students .(A Case Study in Postgraduate Program of English Education Department)

Rasekh E& Mardani M,2010, Investigating the Effects of Teaching Apology Speech Act, with a Focus on Intensifying strategies, on Pragmatic Development of EFL Learners: The Iranian Context, , The International Journal of Language Society and Culture-,Issue 30 Page 96"

GusztavD, 2011,Explicit apology in English and Romanian. A construction grammar approach, Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor Of Philosophy.

GusztavD, May 2006,Apragmatic study of apology strategies in Romanian,Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master Of Arts.

Dhahi H ,et.al, A Socio-pragmatic Study of Apology in Iraqi Non-standard ArabicAsst. Lect Asst. Lect, University of Kufa - College of Arts.

Lenchuk I and Ahmed A,2013,In the Classroom(Teaching Pragmatic Competence: A Journey from Teaching Cultural Facts to Teaching Cultural Awareness) TESL Canada Journal ,Volume 30, special issue 7, page 85''.

Stifçi I,2009,The Use of Apologies by EFL Learners ,English Language Teaching, Vol.2, No 3 ,School of Foreign Languages, Anadolu University

' **SADOCK J**,2005,Speech Acts : The Handbook of Pragmatics : Blackwell Reference Online Page 2 .

Kirchhoff J and Wagner U ,Apologies: Words of Magic? The Role of Verbal Components,Anger Reduction, and Offence Severity ,University of Marburg ,Micha Strack ,University of Göttingen.

Juhana, The Use of Apologizing Speech Acts Realization by Male and Female Students .(A Case Study in Postgraduate Program of English Education Department)University of Pendidikan Bandung.

Linnell J, Lincln F, et.al , Can you apologize me? An investigation of speech act performance among non-native speakers of English ,University of Pennsylvania ,Graduate School of Education

Lotman J,2009, Culture and Explosion, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin ,page 132”.

Čubajevaitė L , Ruzaitė J, Apologies in Business Communication ,T 3, 67–81

Sercu L, Bandura E [et al.], 2005, Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence: An International Investigation/ Great Britain Cromwell Press Ltd.'

Maros M, Apologies in English by Adult Malay Speakers: Patterns and Competence ,Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

JACOBSSON M ,ND, Apologies and Apologetic Attitude in Early Modern English,Nordic Journal Of English Studies. VOL No 3,page 195.

Aydin M, 2011, Cross Cultural Pragmatics: A Study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey, Minnesota State University – Mankato, A Thesis Submitted for the Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts In Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) , Mankato , Minnesota, page 9.

Haugh M ,The Discursive Challenge to Politeness Research: AnInternational Alternative, School of Languages and Linguistics ,Griffith University ,Nathan, QLD 4111, Australia.

Micovic M, M.A ,Forms of Politeness Within the Speech Act of Apologies Compared to the Parameter Gender in the English Language ,Department for the English Language and Literature, Faculty of Philosophy ,University of Montenegro

Javad M ,Politeness in Persian and English Dissertation Acknowledgments Fraydan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran ,Bamshad Hekmatshoar Tabari, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran

Reiter R ,Politeness in Britain and Uruguay ,A contrastive study of requests and apologies ,The University of Surrey.

Fahmi R ,On Congratulating, Thanking, and Apologizing in Jordanian Arabic and American English ,Jordan University – Jordan.

Shokouhi S& Rezaei A ,2015 page 103,The Importance of Teaching Pragmatics in the Classrooms (Focus on Complimenting) Department of Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad Universiy, Zanjan, Iran.

Sa'da S , Mohammadib M, 2014 ,A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' polite and impolite apologies ,Journal Of languages and Linguistics Studies,Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 10(1), 119-136; Urmia University, Urmia, Iran.

Rathert S , 2013, The Language Outside and Inside the Foreign Language Classroom: Speech Act Theory and Discourse Analysis The Internet Journal Language, Culture and Society, , No 36, Page 82-86.

Mills S , 'I am sorry': Prime ministerial apology as transformational leadership, Australian National University, Studies in Australian Political Rhetoric

Sa'd, T & Mohammadi, M. (2014). A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' polite and impolite apologies. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 119-136.

Varghese et.al, 1996, , Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion, Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania, English Language Programs, Graduates School of Education, v12 n1p39-58.

Chang W and Haugh M, Evaluations of im/politeness of an intercultural apology , Griffith University

Zhang Y , 2006, An Analysis of Spoken Discourse between Two Native Speakers School of Foreign Languages, Qingdao University of Science and Technology Qingdao, China.

NOUARY , Linguistic competence, communicative competence, pragmatic competence and their implications for foreign language teaching and testing .

Appendixes

Appendixes

Appendix No 1: Teachers' Questionnaire

Sudan University of Science and Technology

College of Graduate Studies

PhD in Applied Linguistics

A questionnaire for teachers

This questionnaire is a part of PH.D thesis entitled “**A Corpus-based analysis of Linguistic politeness (Apology) in Sudanese EFL Oral Discourse**” A study at **Sudan University of Science and Technology –Education College ,English language Department –4th year .**

The researcher uses corpus-based method; therefore, your help is crucial .

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire. This will help analyze the written linguistic politeness(apology) of Sudanese EFL Learners.

I assure you that your responses will be used for academic purposes only.

I would appreciate if you could complete this questionnaire

Section A:

A- Personal information:

Please provide the following information about yourself:

- 1- Name
(optional):.....
- 2- Age:.....
- 3- Gender
- 4- University level:.....

B Yes/ No questions:

Please answer the following questions

1- Have you ever been to English speaking country?

Yes No.....

If yes where?.....

2- Have you ever been to a country where English is a second language?

Yes No.....if yes,
where?.....

3- Have you ever studied at English medium school?

Yes.....No.....if yes
specify.....

4- Have you ever studied at a private English Language institute?

YesNo.....if yes specify.....

Section B:

No	Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	Linguistic politeness (apology) is included in the Sudanese University syllabus.					
2	The textbook or materials is suitable for the needs of your own students.					
3	Communicative activities such as role play, pair work and group work are used in teaching apology.					
4	Apology exponents are presented and practiced in the context of an authentic sequence.					
5	As a Sudanese Teacher of English you had training on teaching apology.					
6	Teachers use proper methods for teaching linguistic politeness. .(apology)					
7	As a native speaker of the Sudanese dialect, you use apology in your daily expressions.					
8	Sudanese learners have problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents.					
9	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of apology depending on the participants relationships					
10	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the level of “threat”					
11	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending onthe context.					
12	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of polite apology depending on the effect of intonation.					
13	Sudanese learners fail to use different exponents of					

	polite apology depending on the function of the exponents.					
14	AS foreign teacher of English you teach the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness					
15	linguistic politeness is an important criteria in the Sudanese culture					

Section C: open questions:

1-Why do students often have difficulty with the area and the elements of linguistic politeness (apology)?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....
.....

2- What problems do students have when faced with a functional area like making and responding to apology situations?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank You

Rasha Mohammed Elbashir

Appendix 2

Appendix 2: Students' Questionnaire

Sudan University of Science and Technology

College of Graduate Studies

PhD in Applied Linguistics

Dear students,

The researcher is writing a thesis for the fulfillment of PhD in applied linguistics entitled "A Corpus-based analysis of Linguistic politeness (Apology) in Sudanese EFL spoken Discourse "A study at Sudan University of Science and Technology –Education College ,English language Department –4th& 3rd year .

Your responses will be dealt with in purely academic manner and will never be used for any other purposes than for this research. All information gathered for this project will remain anonymous

. A copy of the final thesis will be available at the end at the education college library.

I would appreciate it if you could complete this questionnaire as soon as possible. Thank you for your help and co-operation

Please provide the following information about yourself

B- Personal information:

1- Name (optional):.....

2-Age:.....

3-Sex:.....

4-University level:.....

B Yes/ No questions:

Please answer the following questions

- 1- Have you ever been to English speaking country?
Yes No.....
If yes where?.....
- 2- Have you ever been to a country where English is a second language?
Yes..... No.....if yes,
where?.....
- 3- Have you ever studied at English medium school?
Yes.....No.....if
- 4- yes specify.....
- 5- Have you ever studied at a private English Language institute? Yes
.....No.....if yes specify.....

Section C:

No	Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	Linguistic politeness is included in the Sudanese University syllabus					
2	Direct exposure to English language enhances the polite use of language					
3	As a native speaker of the Sudanese Arabic dialect, you use polite language in your daily expressions.					
4	As a foreign speaker of English, you use apology in your daily expressions.					
5	Sudanese learners face problems with the grammatical complexity of many of the apology exponents.					
6	Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the participants relationships					
7	Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of polite apology depending on the context.					
8	Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the forms of the exponent.(interrogative ,affirmative and					

	negative)					
9	Sudanese learners fail to recognize different strategies of apology depending on the effect of intonation.					
10	Sudanese learners fail to use different strategies of apology depending on the function of the exponents, example the use of politeness markers such as sorry.					
11	Learners may need to focus on politeness markers in isolation in order to understand and assimilate them.					
12	Teaching apology strategies in authentic context promotes EFL learners' ability to use appropriate discourse patterns.					
13	AS a foreign Learner of English you recognize the social function of different speech acts.					
14	AS a foreign Learner of English you use different apology strategies					
15	Apology is a common speech act in the Sudanese culture.					

Thank you

The researcher

Appendix 3

Appendix 3:

Multiple-choice Discourse Completion Test

Dear students,

The researcher is writing a thesis for the fulfillment of PhD in applied linguistics entitled "A Corpus-based analysis of Linguistic politeness (Apology) in Sudanese EFL spoken Discourse" A study at Sudan University of Science and Technology –Education College, English language Department –4th & 3rd year.

Your responses will be dealt with in purely academic manner and will never be used for any other purposes than for this research. All information gathered for this project will remain anonymous

. A copy of the final thesis will be available at the end in the education college library.

I would appreciate it if you could complete this questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you for your help and co-operation

. A- Personal information

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME

Sex: MALE -FEMALE

Age: _____ years

B: Multiple-Choice Discourse completion test

Please answer the following questions as realistically as possible.

1-Your friend stopped talking to you because you insulted him/her. What do you say to him/her?

-
- a- I'm sorry. Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to upset you.
 - c- I was upset, I had family problems.
 - d- I'll apologize to you in front of the whole class.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.

2. You showed up an hour late for a lecture. What do you say to your professor?

-
- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to arrive late.
 - c- The traffic was terrible
 - d- I'll discuss the missed part with my colleague.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.

3. You borrowed your professor's book but have lost it. Your professor now needs the book back. What do you say to him/her?

- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to lose it.
 - c- My bag was stolen.
 - d- I'll buy a new book for you.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

4 You were supposed to go a senior colleague graduation party but forgot because you had a paper to finish. What do you say to him/her?

- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to miss your party.
 - c- I was too busy with an assignment.
 - d- I'll invite you for a dinner at Corenthia restaurant.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

5 You forgot an important meeting with the head of Sudan university students' union. What do you say to him/her?

- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
 - b- It's my fault..
 - c- The traffic was terrible
 - d- I'll pay for the damage
 - e- This won't happen again.
-

f- You will not apologize.

6 You were playing with a friend's computer and erased the important paper she/he had been working on for the past two weeks. What do you say to him/her?

a- I apologize. Please forgive me.

b- It's my fault.

c- It seems there's a virus in your computer.

d- I'll help you to rewrite it.

e- This is the last time. I'll never touch it again.

f- You will not apologize.

7 You copied an essay for an assignment. Your teacher found out. What do you say to him/her?

a- I apologize. Please forgive me.

b- I didn't mean to copy. I was just having an idea.

c- The assignment is difficult. I did not have time to do it.

d- I'll write my own assignment. Please give me extra time.

e- This won't happen again.

f- You will not apologize.

8 You stepped on one student's foot in a crowded café. What do you say to him/her?

a- I'm sorry. Please forgive me.

b- I didn't mean to step on you.

- c- The crowd was terrible. I didn't see you.
 - d- I'll pay for your breakfast.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

9 You didn't visit a junior colleague at the hospital. What do you say to him/her when she/he comes back to university?

- a- I apologize. Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to upset you.
 - c- I was too busy. It was exams week.
 - d- I'll visit you at home.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

10- You could not pay the university fee. The college registrar asked you to pay or you will not take the exam. What do you say to him/ her?

- a- I'm sorry .Please give me extra time..
 - b- I didn't mean to delay it.
 - c- My father has retired. It's difficult to pay now.
 - d- I'll pay within two weeks.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

11- It is the deadline for an assignment submission but you did not write it. What do you say to your professor?

- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to upset you.
 - c- I was sick.
 - d- I'll submit it tomorrow.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

12- You borrowed your classmate's notebook but you lost it two days before the exam. What do you say to him/ her?

- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
 - b- It's my fault.
 - c- I forgot my bag at the café. I lost my notebooks too.
 - d- I'll photocopy Mohammed's notes for both of us.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.
-

13- You told Ali about your close-friend's secret. He/she found out. What do you say to him/her?

- a- I'm sorry Please forgive me.
- b- I didn't mean to upset you.

- c- Ali is my friend too. He is a trustable person.
- d- I promise Ali will not spread your secret.
- e- This won't happen again.
- f- You will not apologize.

14- You spoke to your professor in a loud voice. He/she is upset. What do you say to him/her?

-
- a- I apologize. Please forgive me.
 - b- I didn't mean to upset you.
 - c- The students were talking. I had to speak louder.
 - d- I deserve your punishment.
 - e- This won't happen again.
 - f- You will not apologize.