

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

FACULTY OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS



A Cross-cultural study of the speech act of apology by Saudi and Australian Females

By

Shatha Ahmed S Al Ali

Minor thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Applied
Linguistics (Language Testing) at the University of Melbourne

Melbourne, November 2012

Abstract

The current study investigates the speech act of apology made by female Saudi native Arabic speakers and female Australian native English speakers. The study recruited 40 participants of university students and a few staff members. All 40 participants were asked to complete eight different Discourse Completion Test (DCT) situations, which varied in terms of power between the interlocutors and level of imposition. The aim of my research was to investigate whether Saudi native Arabic speakers and Australian native English speakers differed from each other in terms of apology strategies. In addition, I investigated the role of culture in influencing the ways in which each group realized their apologies.

This study has shown that there were some similarities as well as significant differences between the Saudi (SA) and Australian (AU) females in terms of their use of apology strategies. Also, this study has shown that a number of features were utilized by the SA and AU groups in their use of apology strategies. The SA use of these features reflected some aspects of their religion and cultural traditions and provided valuable insights into the Saudi daily practice of apology. Moreover, this study has found that the SA and AU groups realized apology strategies sometimes similarly and other times differently. Overall, culture played a major role in influencing the two groups' behavior in the act of apology.

Declaration

I declare that this thesis comprises only my original work towards the masters and does not involve any material that has been already awarded for any degree or diploma in any university; nor does it involve any material that has previously been published or written by any other researcher, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis. The total word count of this minor thesis disregarding tables, references and appendices is 16,163 words.

Shatha Al Ali

November2012

Acknowledgments

I feel such huge gratitude to the following people for their assistance and support. First and foremost, I would like to give my thanks to my supervisor, Dr Carsten Rover, for his invaluable advice and great help. Thanks also go to Dr Celia Thompson for taking over my supervision and for her immeasurable support, invaluable advice and appreciated concern. Also, I am grateful to Dr Gruba for his help and great support. Moreover, I am grateful to the Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics at the University of Melbourne for the exceptional programme and sophisticated staff who draw success lines for their students. My thanks also go to my sponsor, King Faisal University in Saudi Arabia, for granting me the scholarship to do my Master Degree in Applied Linguistics at the University of Melbourne. In addition, I would like to greatly thank the participants who took part in this study. Also, great thanks go to Ms Fiona McCall who kindly edited and proof-read my thesis.

In addition, I am very honoured to give special thanks to the dean of Faculty Affairs at King Faisal University, Dr Mutlaq Al Otaibi, for his immeasurable support and encouragement, he is my great and finest example ever, and also my colleague, Mr Misha'al Al Obaid, for his help and wonderful support. Also, I am deeply grateful to the dean of Faculty of Arts at KFU, Dr Ali Al Bassam, for his great support and encouragement. Furthermore, I would like to thank all my dearest teachers, and friends, in Saudi, especially Ms Sumaiah Al Mubarak, being always there, Dr Rania Bin Dohaish, Ms Shumoukh Al Fayadh and Ms Waffa Al Ja'feri for their wonderful love and unforgettable encouragement. Also, deepest thanks go to my colleagues in Saudi, Dr Maha Al Majed, Ms Shaikhah Al Hamadi, Mr Salman Al Hassan, Mr Zafer Al Jalfan and Mr Saleh Al Zahrani, for their

support and assistance. Huge thanks also go to my fantastic colleagues and teachers in Melbourne and Saudi: first and foremost, my thanks go to Dr Mohammed Al Ghamdi for his kindness, helpful assistance, concern and encouragement, throughout my study in Melbourne, he was always there; secondly, thanks go to Dr Saad Al Gahtani for his guidance and unforgettable efforts; thirdly, a big thank you to Dr Ali Al Amir for his unwavering support and invaluable help. Moreover, heart-felt thanks go to all my wonderful friends in Saudi, Dalal Otaibi, Ghadah Al Dossary, Misha'al Al Qahtani, Athari Al Qahtani, Wadha Al Modhi, Anwar Al Motaia'b, Nora Al Nagmush, Fatimah Al Bakir, Muneerah Al Dossary, Maha Al Dossary, Aishah Al Hashim and in Melbourne, Manal Al Malki, Huda Al Omri, Yasmin Mussa, Huda Al Sonai'a, Shatha Al Mahmood, Huda Al Rokian, Manal Al Obdealatif, Misha'al Al Turki, Maha Al Bishi, Al Anoud Al Soba'i, Jood Al Oeari, Iman Al Khonain, Safiah Habeeb, Halah Al Sherif, Mishael Al Otaibi, Nada, Nahawi, Ahlam, Leen, Haneen, and Lujain.

Moreover and most importantly, I would like to thank my mother for her patience, being away from her daughter for almost two years, and for her heart-felt prayers and unwavering care. Also, I am incredibly thankful for my dearest brother, Mubarak, who stood by me all through my studies in Australia, for his great love, kindness and immeasurable support. I am also thankful to my father for his prayers and support. Also, I would like to thank my dearest sisters (Malak, Fatimah, Muneerah, Haya, Rehan), brothers (Hani, Hammad, Saad, Aseel), nieces (Manayer, Joman, Siba) nephews (Salim, Hadi) and uncle (Adel Al Salim) for their wonderful love and boundless support. I do not also forget to thank my dearest and greatest grandmother, Munnera, who passed away and who had loved me so deeply, always prayed for me and wished me a gorgeous life, and who always said " you will

reach your dreams, just wait for them and be patient", and I am telling her, here I am, can you see me?!

Finally, I am so honoured to dedicate this thesis to the love of my heart, my mother, for her tremendous love and endless support with all my love.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Declaration.....	2
Acknowledgement.....	3
Table of Contents.....	6
List of Tables.....	8
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	10
Chapter 2: Background.....	12
2.1 Pragmatics.....	12
2.2 Interlanguage pragmatics.....	13
2.3 Cross-cultural pragmatics.....	14
2.4 Speech acts.....	15
2.5 The speech act of apology.....	15
2.5.1 The influence of social variables.....	19
2.5.2 Research on cross-cultural apologies.....	21
2.5.3 Apology in Arabic.....	24
2.5.4 Apologies and gender.....	27
2.6 Research questions.....	30
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	31
3.1 Participants.....	31
3.2 Instruments.....	31
3.2.1 Discourse completion test (DCT).....	35
3.2.2 Questionnaire.....	37
3.3 Procedure.....	37
3.4 Data Analysis.....	37

Chapter 4: Results	40
4.1 Apology strategies.....	40
4.1.1 The total number of apology strategies.....	40
4.1.2 Types of apology strategies.....	41
4.1.3 The similarities and differences between the two groups in terms of apology strategies.....	42
4.1.3.1 IFIDs.....	42
4.1.3.2 Explanation or account.....	42
4.1.3.3 Taking on responsibility.....	43
4.1.3.4 Concern for the hearer.....	43
4.1.3.5 Offer of repair.....	44
4.1.3.6 Promise of forbearance.....	44
4.1.4 Strategies with significant difference.....	47
4.1.4.1 IFIDs.....	47
4.1.4.2 Taking on responsibility.....	48
4.1.5 Features of apology strategies used by the SA and AU groups	49
4.1.6 Realization of apology strategies.....	51
4.1.6.1 IFIDs.....	52
4.1.6.2 Explanation or account.....	54
4.1.6.3 Taking on responsibility.....	55
4.1.6.4 Concern for the hearer.....	58
4.1.6.5 Offer of repair.....	59
4.1.6.6 Promise of forbearance.....	60
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion	61
5.1 Types of apology strategies.....	61

5.2 The similarities and differences between the two groups in terms of apology strategies.....	61
5.3 Strategies with significant difference	66
5.4 Features of apology strategies used by the SA and AU groups	67
5.5 Realization of apology strategies.....	68
5.6 Implications.....	73
5.7 Limitations and suggestions for further research.....	74
5.8 Conclusion.....	75
References	77
Appendix 1: DCT situations and Questionnaire	84
Appendix 2: Plain language statement	88
Appendix 3: Consent form	90
Appendix 4: Pilot questionnaire.....	91

List of Tables

Table 1: The social variables of power and imposition embedded in the situations	36
Table 2: Apology strategies.....	37
Table 3: The total number of apology strategies.....	40
Table 4: Examples of all strategies used by SA and AU groups.....	44
Table 5: Significance level of apology strategies of the two groups.....	46
Table 6: Features identified in Saudi participants' use of apology strategies.....	50
Table 7: Features identified in Australian participants' use of apology strategies.....	51
Table 8: Comparison of the use of one expression of IFIDs between groups.....	52
Table 9: Comparison of use of IFIDs between groups.....	53
Table 10: Comparison of use of expression of regret and position in response between groups.....	54

Table 11: Methods used by SA group in their realization of concern for the hearer..... 58

Table 12: Examples of the Saudi groups' realization of offer of repair..... 59

Chapter One:

Introduction

The current study investigates the speech act of apology made by Saudi native Arabic speakers and Australian females. It examines the differences between these two groups of native-speakers in terms of apology strategies. The study also investigates the role of culture in influencing the ways in which each group realize their apologies.

The rationale behind selecting the speech act of apology as the main focus of the study is due to the fact that in the past two decades, there has been a number of studies conducted on speech act performance in general, and apology in particular. The focus of that research was on Western languages. However, a number of studies have been conducted recently on Eastern languages, but few on Arabic. So, research on apologies made by Arabic NSs or Arabic learners of English can be considered scarce.

I also briefly discuss some important topics such as interlanguage pragmatics, cross-cultural pragmatics, speech act of apology and studies on apology. Then, I deal with the participants and methodology issues of this present study. Next, I provide a detailed analysis of the data followed by a discussion of the findings. I show that the study reveals that there were some similarities as well as significant differences between the Saudi and Australian females in terms of their use of apology strategies. Also, I demonstrate how the study has found that a number of features were utilized by the SA and AU groups in their use of apology strategies. The SA use of these features reflects some aspects of their religion and cultural traditions and provides valuable insights into the Saudi daily practice of apology. In addition, I discuss how this study has found that the SA and AU groups realized apology

strategies sometimes similarly and other times differently. I show that, overall, culture played a major role in influencing the two groups' behavior in the act of apology. Finally, I consider the implications and limitations of the study.

Chapter Two:

Background

Since the main focus of this study is on the speech act of apology by Saudi and Australian females, topics such as pragmatics, speech acts, the speech act of apology, cross-cultural studies on apologies, apologies in Arabic, studies on Arabic and apologies and gender will be reviewed in this chapter.

It is important to mention here that the information in the following review is mainly based on studies of Western culture, as the research on the speech act of apology in Arabic is small in comparison with the large corpus of research on Western apologies. It was found that the bulk of Arabic research on apologies was focused on defining the speech act of apology, in addition to a few comparisons between the strategies used in Arabic and other languages.

2.1 Pragmatics:

Realizing the importance of intercultural communications has motivated researchers to concentrate on the pragmatic rules to examine successful communication. Recently, investigation of intercultural problems and cross-cultural pragmatics have gained a great deal of attention.

Pragmatics has recently become an important subfield of linguistics. Crystal (2004, p. 301), defines pragmatics as “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social

interaction and the effects of their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication”.

Such an elaborate definition for pragmatics refers to the way people use language in a given situation and the kind of utterances they choose to convey a certain meaning. It also indicates the obstacles that people might encounter while interacting with others, such as ambiguity, which requires negotiation of meaning or might cause communication breakdown.

Moreover, it explains how context contributes to meaning, as meaning transfer depends on the context of the utterance, intent of the speaker, status of the interactants etc., and not only on the linguistic knowledge of the interactants. In short, pragmatics aims at understanding what the speaker intends to say.

2.2 Interlanguage pragmatics

Reinecke (1969) was the first to coin the term Interlanguage (IL). This term was then used by Selinker (1969, 1972) in the area of second language acquisition (SLA). IL refers to the learner's representation of the L2 system. A great deal of importance has been given to IL by SLA researchers.

The term interlanguage pragmatics, according to Kasper (1992), is defined as the area that is concerned with the learner's development of pragmatic knowledge of L2.

A large number of ILP studies have been conducted on the use of pragmatic strategies as well as pragmatic realization patterns on a number of different languages, such as English, French, and German. Although, there seems to be no single study which has been conducted to investigate the speech act of apology among Saudi female learners in particular, there are

some studies which have attempted to make some interlanguage pragmatic studies of Arab learners learning English as a foreign language. For instance, there is a study conducted by Rizk (1997) who investigated apology strategies used by 110 Egyptian, Saudi, Jordanian, Palestinian, Moroccan, Lebanese, Syrian, Tunisian, Yemeni and Libyan learners of English. The results of the study showed similarities between the apology strategies used by native and non-native speakers of English in all situations, except for one. The results also revealed that, Arabs do not apologize to children, unlike native speakers of English, but try to make the child forgive them through sentences such as "do not feel sad, baby". In addition, Arabs were found to offer food as an apology device, and it is acceptable as offering food in some cultures is a common practice that would alleviate the offense (Anonymous, 2010).

2.3 Cross-cultural pragmatics

The scope of pragmatics is to investigate the rules that control the use of language in a specific context. Cross-cultural pragmatics examines native speakers' production in different languages. For Young (1998), cross-cultural pragmatics is concerned with linguistic performance of language users coming from diverse language backgrounds. Thus, cross-cultural pragmatics can be defined as the study of the similarities and differences of language use in a given context in different cultures. One of the most known works in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics is Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) which investigates the speech acts of apology and requests in different languages (Blum-Kulka&Olshtain, 1984).

One obvious challenge for cross-cultural pragmatics is universality, as it aims to determine the level to which the rules of each language control the use of language in context and how they differ from one culture to another. Research on cross-cultural pragmatics

reveals the importance of cross-cultural communication and the findings of such research show implications for pedagogy as well. The field of cross-cultural pragmatics is beneficial as it provides insights into the ways of speaking between people from different societies and it also reflects different cultural values.

2.4 Speech acts

Speech acts, according to Austin (1962), are acts performed by utterances such as giving orders or making promises. Such utterances might be performed directly or indirectly through a word, phrase, sentence, number of sentences or gesture and body movement which serve to communicate an apology or gratitude, for example (Hatch, 1992). Also, speech acts involve real-life interactions and need not only the knowledge of the language, but also an appropriate use of the language in a given culture to avoid communication breakdown (Hatch, 1992; Cohen & Olshtain, 1981).

2.5 The speech act of apology

This study focuses on the speech act of apology. Studies on speech acts have notably increased because of researchers' growing awareness of the importance of achieving harmony within communities. Consequently, a growing body of literature in the field of apology started, which contributed to the emergence of a theory of apologizing. Thus, in pragmatic research and among other speech acts, a great deal of attention has been given to apology. In a speech community, participants need to be able to apologize for an offense. Goffman (1971) views apologies as remedial acts used to regain harmony in a society after an offense has been committed. An apology for Holmes (1995) is a speech act that is used as a remedy for an offense for which the offender is responsible, and thus social harmony is

regained between the interactants. Olshtain and Cohen (1983) define the speech act of apology as a kind of social event that takes place when the norms of a society are broken. This concept is supported by Bergman and Kasper (1993) as they claim that an apology aims at reestablishing social harmony after a commitment of an offense. Similarly, Márquez-Reiter (2000) defines it as a remedy or a compensation for an offense.

The speech act of apology differs across languages. Apology, along with request and refusal, has been largely investigated in recent pragmatic studies in a variety of languages, and in comparison with English in particular: Hebrew (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka 1985; Olshtain 1989), Hungarian and Italian (BARDOVI-HARLIG & Dörnyei, 1998), Venezuelan Spanish (Garcia, 2009), Thai (Limmaneeprasert, 1993), Danish (Trosborg, 1995), English (Kondo, 1997), Cantonese (Rose, 2000), South Korean and Australian English (Kim, 2008), and Spanish and French (Cohen & Shively, 2007). These studies on the speech act of apology reveal that the cross-cultural differences in the way the speech act of apology is perceived seem to be less salient than the way the speech act of request is perceived. Trosborg (1995) claims that people from different languages will perceive the speech act of apology similarly in situations where the social factors are on the same level.

There are a number of strategies that the apologizer chooses from to perform an apology. Goffman (1971) states that for an apology to be successful, the apologizer has to consider three factors: acknowledgment of an offense, taking responsibility for the offense and offering compensation.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983, p. 22), who established the notion of ‘the speech act set of apology’, presented five apology strategies:

1. An Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID).
2. An expression of the speaker's responsibility for the offense.
3. A statement or account of the cause which brought about the violation.
4. An offer of repair.
5. A promise of forbearance.

Specifically, the strategies encompass:

Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs). Using the formulaic IFIDs expressions, the offender offers explicit apology: e.g. 'I'm sorry', 'I apologize.'

Taking on Responsibility. The offender tries to show concern to the hearer by using some subcategories such as; expression of self-deficiency, e.g. 'I was confused', and explicit self-blame, e.g. 'It's my fault.'

Explanation or account. An action taken by the offender to justify the offense by explaining the reason, e.g. 'The bus was late.'

Offer of repair. When the damage can be compensated, the offender uses expressions such as; 'I'll pay for the damage.'

Promise of forbearance. When the offender feels so guilty, he/she needs to promise not to repeat the act, e.g. 'It won't happen again.'

When the offender intends to offer a verbal apology, he/she uses one or a combination of the above-mentioned strategies. Also, offenders can intensify or downgrade their

apologies in addition to these apology strategies. Olshtain (1989), states that the intensifiers that are most common in use are 'very' and 'really', while the expression of 'I'm sorry', for example, is considered to be a common manifestation that the offender intends to use to downgrade the apology.

In addition, there are other sets of apology strategies presented by Fraser (1981) and Trosborg (1987).

This study will draw specifically on the model of apology strategies outlined by Cohen and Olshtain (1981, pp. 113-134), Olshtain and Cohen (1983, pp. 22-23), and the CCSARP coding manual as well (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989, p. 289):

(1) Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs):

a. An expression of regret.

b. An offer of apology.

c. A request for forgiveness.

(2) Explanation or account:

(3) Taking on responsibility:

a. Explicit self-blame.

b. Lack of intent.

c. Expression of self-deficiency.

d. Expression of embarrassment.

e. Admission of facts but not responsibility.

f. Justify hearer.

g. Refusal to acknowledge guilt:

a-Denial of responsibility.

b-Blame the hearer.

c-Pretend to be offended.

(4) Concern for the hearer.

(5) Offer of repair.

(6) Promise of forbearance.

The above model consists of the same main strategies of Olshtain and Cohen (1983) but with one additional strategy which is concern for the hearer.

2.5.1 The influence of social variables

Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness assumes that interactants have, and consider the importance of, face, or a desirable image in front of people (Goffman & Best, 2005).

Brown and Levinson consider all speech acts as face threatening for both the hearer and the speaker. They divide face into two types; positive face and negative face. They

interpret the positive face as the person's need to be accepted by others, and the negative face as the person's need to be unimpeded by people. Any acts that collide with such needs may cause a threat to the speaker's or the hearer's face.

When the speaker intends to select any strategy for making any face threatening acts, he/she needs to consider the degree of face threat that would be evaluated according to some important social variables. Social variables might influence the language a person produces in a given context. Researchers consider the importance of these variables and try to control for them, in order to get reliable responses from their participants and thus support the validity of their studies.

The social variables that affect the speaker's use of strategy are: the degree of the imposition of the act (e.g. asking for a pen is less imposing than asking for a loan of \$10,000); the degree of power the hearer has over the speaker (e.g. a teacher has a degree of power over a student); and the degree of social distance between the two interactants (i.e. whether they have a close or distant relationship). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), all these variables contribute to the evaluation of the degree of threat to face involved with the act.

Research on the speech act of apology, both in Western and Eastern languages, has investigated the production of apology, in terms of the different types of strategies used and the influence of contextual factors on selecting these strategies.

Contextual and social factors may have an influence on the offender's use of apology strategies in a given situation. It has been found that severity of offense is the most representative factor that influences apology realization. Investigations on the use of apology

in English, Australian, Hebrew, German, and Canadian French assume that severity of offense is the strongest factor that affects apology performance (Olshtain, 1989).

Boon and Sulsky (1997) found that severity of offense influences the kind of judgment a person is asked to make. Olshtain (1989) assumes that some social factors, such as status and severity of offense affect the use of general strategies. She further suggests that the use of other strategies will be affected by the contextual factor that relates to the nature of a given situation. There seem to be some complications, however, as different societies perceive the social factors differently. For example, the most influential factor in Italians' use of apology is social status (Lipson, 1994). Responsibility for the offense seems to vary with the factor of social distance for Thai speakers (Bergman & Kasper, 1993), while cost to speaker was the most important factor for the languages under investigation in Olshtain's (1989) study. For speakers of Hebrew, social distance is the dominant factor.

The influence of social distance on apology production is varied with some few exceptions. Olshtain (1989), for example, found that the social distance and use of apology strategies had no relation. Bergman and Kasper (1993) found that if the interactants had a closer relationship, the offender seemed to assume taking responsibility for the infraction. On the contrary, Wolfson, Marmor and Jones (1989) found that expressing responsibility was greater among acquaintances.

2.5.2 Research on cross-cultural apologies

A considerable body of research in pragmatics has investigated the speech act of apology in different languages putting into consideration a number of variables employed such as the strategies used by native and non-native speakers (Trosborg, 1987). Such studies

on cross-cultural apologies aimed to identify the pragmatic rules that control the use of language across different cultures, as well as indicate how their findings would support communication among people coming from a great variety of socio-cultural backgrounds.

The most cited work on speech acts is the Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP), which is considered to be an empirical work in speech act realization. This work involved the speech acts of requests and apologies and its purpose was to investigate how native speakers realize these acts and to discover any similarities and differences between native speakers and non-native speakers in their realization of these two acts (Blum-Kulka&Olshtain, 1984). The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was used in collecting the data. The investigation of this work focused on eight languages: Australian English, American English, British English, Canadian-French, Danish, German, Hebrew and Russian. The results showed that participants from different groups used similar strategies and those cultural preferences influenced their use. For most of the participants, the main components of an apology were explicit apology expressions and accounts (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989).

Olshtain (1983) examined the use of the speech act of apology by English and Russian learners of Hebrew in their L1 and L2. She used the set of apologies employed by Cohen and Olshtain (1981) to investigate the realization patterns of the speech act of apology employed by native speakers of Hebrew, in order to set a comparison between the use of apology of native and non-native speakers. The results of her investigation showed that the Russian learners apologized more in Hebrew (L2) than the English learners who seemed to apologize more in their L1.

Olshtain (1989) also investigated the speech act of apology in terms of the most preferable apologies selected by speakers of English, German, Hebrew and French. In her study, she found that the participants were similar in their preference of some specific apology strategies, namely expression of responsibility and IFIDs. Olshtain summarized her findings by stating “different languages will realize apologies in very similar ways” (1989, p. 171).

In a similar study, Sugimoto (1998) examined the different apology styles used by American and Japanese college students, of both genders, in an open-ended questionnaire. Her study discussed a number of possible linguistic factors, such as cultural conception of language, the obscurity of ‘sumimasen’ in Japanese, and explanation in American apology that may consolidate the concept that Japanese apologize more than Americans. A number of researchers who observed the Japanese and American communication claim that Japanese seem to be more “apologetic” than Americans are (Kato & Rozman, 1988; Kitagawa, 1990; Naotsuka, 1990, as cited in Sugimoto, 1998). Sugimoto’s (1999) study attributes this to the fact that Japanese account for offenses that are committed by a far greater number of other individuals who are among their group, whereas Americans normally only apologize for offenses that are committed only by themselves or a close relative, for example, their young children. The results of her study showed that the Japanese and American styles of apology are crucially affected by the cultural differences in perceptions and use of linguistic practices.

In the following section, I will discuss the speech act of apology in Arabic. As mentioned earlier, the bulk of research on Arabic apologies consists of comparisons between the apology strategies employed by speakers of Arabic and Arab learners of other languages - mostly English.

2.5.3 Apology in Arabic

Arabic is originally the language of the Hejaz (western region of Saudi Arabia) and Najed (Riyadh) people (Dictionary, 2003). There is little research on apologies by Arab learners of English or Arab native-speakers. Although Arabic is now a widespread language in a great number of regions in southeastern Asia and northern Africa, it is particularly important to note that studies on apology by Saudi people in general, and especially on females, is an area of research that is underexplored.

However, there are a few studies that have investigated the use of the speech act of apology by speakers of different dialects of Arabic such as (Al-Zumor, 2011; Hussein & Hammouri, 1998; Soliman, 2003).

Hussein and Hammouri (1998) conducted a study on strategies of apology in Jordanian Arabic and American English. The sample of the study included 50 Jordanian male students, 50 female students, and 40 Americans. The analysis of their data showed that there was a difference in the use of the apology strategies between Jordanian and American participants. The strategies used by the Jordanian participants seemed to be more varied than the American ones. While there were only 7 strategies of apologies in the American data, there were 13 strategies of apology that characterized the Jordanian responses. The Jordanians were less direct and elaborated more complex strategies than the Americans, who preferred less elaborate ones. Among the strategies used by both groups were: explicit acknowledgment of responsibility, explanation or account, offer of repair and promise of forbearance. Strategies such as minimizing the degree of offense only occurred in the Arabic data. Both groups of participants seemed to share a number of apologizing strategies, though there were some strategies which were unique to the Jordanians, and may be explained by

their culture, religious orientation and ways of thinking. These strategies were: minimizing the degree of offense, praising Allah, proverbial expressions, and attacking. For interjections, they were employed in both data. However, in the Jordanian data, they were either employed separately or combined with other strategies, whereas in the American data they were always used in combination with other strategies. Moreover, as it has been shown by the findings of the research, the strategies of apology in Arabic and English cannot be necessarily considered as similar, and most of the time as diverse. In teaching apology forms in English, it is imperative, therefore, to teach not only the language forms through which apologies can be expressed, but also other cultural insights and patterns of thought, which are mostly considered as culture-specific, to support learners in developing pragmatic competence. A limitation of the study is that gender was not analyzed as a variable, despite the fact that data were gathered from male and female participants.

El-Khalil (1998) conducted a study on apology strategies of Jordanians and he stated that in the case of apologizing to friends, Jordanians used explicit apology to placate the hearer. They employed expressions such as “I am sorry” and “please forgive me”, accompanied often with an account of the offense with expressions like “sorry I wasn’t able to buy you a present”. Moreover, Jordanians seemed to use strategies to justify the offense, such as giving excuses. So, statements such as “I could not come because I got unexpected company” were frequently used. El-Khalil (1998) also reported that verses from the holy Quran and proverbs were also used in an attempt to alleviate the offense, a strategy attributed to the influence of the Islamic instructions and tradition on the performance of speech acts. Furthermore, he reported that the majority of the participants used implicit rather than explicit apology strategies. Unlike females, Jordanian males seemed to prefer using explicit apology

strategies, and there were only a few females who used the strategy of promise of forbearance.

Nureddeem (2008) conducted a study on apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. She attempted to determine the type and extent of use of apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic and focus attention on the sociocultural values and attitudes of the Sudanese community. She used a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and 1082 responses were examined. There were ten different social situations in which severity of offense, distance and power between the interlocutors were varied. The participants were 110 college educated adults in Khartoum, and the survey was written in Sudanese dialect. The corpus was analyzed to investigate the use and frequency of the used strategies. Although the results support the universality of apology strategies, the selection of apology strategies supports the culture-specific aspect of language use. The results of the study give a picture of the use of politeness in the Sudanese culture. However, the fact that the participants were all college students limits the results of the study, so more research is required employing participants from different social groups.

Al-Zumor (2011), in his inter-language and cross-cultural study on apologies in Arabic and English, investigated English apology strategies used by Arab learners of English in India. His study consisted of three groups. The Arab group (70 students), the American group (16) and the British group (16). He concluded that the linguistic realization of apology in the different apology situations showed that English speakers and Arabic speakers assign varied degrees of severity to the same situation which is attributed to cultural differences. In addition, his data showed that admitting one's deficiency to set things right caused less embarrassment in the Arab culture than in the Anglo-Saxon culture.

Jebahi (2011) carried out a study on the use of apology strategies in Tunisian Arabic. The participants were 100 university students, all native Arabic speakers, who completed a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that was used to elicit apology. He found that the participants tended to use a statement of remorse in three main situations: when the person being offended is old in age, a close friend or having power that might affect the future of the person who committed the offense. He also found that there was a significant number of participants who did not admit responsibility for the offense and used accounts to shift responsibility to other issues. The findings of this study seem to support the claim of the universality of the speech act of apology, in addition to the particularity of the ways in which the apology strategies were employed in different cultures. For example, children are not explicitly apologized to in Tunisia (this study) and in Egypt (Soliman, 2003).

As this study will focus on females, it is important to refer to some apology studies that investigated gender, so these will be explored in the following section.

2.5.4 Apologies and gender

There is a wealth of literature addressing the relationship between language and gender. Holmes (1995) argued that the use of the speech act of apology between males and females is distinct. The apologies corpus included 183 remedial interchanges. The results showed that the women participants used more apologies than men, and they offered apology mostly to those of the same power, whereas male participants offered apologies to women without considering the status. In addition, female participants apologized mostly to their female friends, while the male participants apologized mostly to women with whom the social distance is not close. Similarly, Lukasik (2000) conducted a study on the use of forgiveness by 485 American males and females. The participants were ninth- and twelfth-

grade students. He found that females were more forgiving than the males. Forgiveness was found to be expected when the participants seemed to be hurt deeply when the conflict happened, and when getting an apology from the offending friend. Participants who received an apology seemed to show forgiveness.

Along the same lines, Bataineh (2006) conducted a study on the use of apology by Jordanians and their sample consisted of two groups of one hundred Jordanian undergraduate EFL students. The data were collected through DCTs. The findings of their study revealed that although there were similarities between male and female respondents' use of primary apology strategies, both groups differed in the order of using these strategies. Moreover, while female participants tended to use non-apology strategies that were meant to avoid discussing offense, male participants tended to use those which were meant to blame the victim. So, it would appear that males and females differ significantly in their use of apology strategies. However, generalizing the findings of this study might be constrained by the fact that gender was the only variable, and that the data were collected through only one instrument (DCT).

In another study, Bataineh (2008) looked at the differences in the realization patterns of apology among native speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic, and differences between males and females in both groups were considered as well. The sample consisted of 100 American and 100 Jordanian undergraduate students (of 50 male and 50 female respondents each), and their ages ranged between 17 and 24 years. They collected their data using a questionnaire that consisted of 10 situations. The results of the study showed differences in the use of apology strategies. The differences included using a number of manifestations of explicit apology among other less explicit apology strategies. The

results also showed that there were more differences between the Jordanian males and females than between the American males and females, which may be explained by the fact that there is a greater degree of similarity in the way girls and boys are raised in the U.S. than between the way they are raised in Jordan. So, the differences in the use of apology strategies were found not only in both cultures, but also between the two genders of the same culture. Such results suggest that apologies may be problematic for ESL/EFL learners as strategy use in one's culture may be different from that in the target culture.

The earlier discussion of the speech act of apology and the gender variable shows a little controversy concerning the function of gender in language use. Moreover, the findings of the empirical research reviewed above contribute to the assumption that gender has an impact on language use, however more research is needed to substantiate this assumption (see, for example, Tannen, 1990).

After reviewing apology in Arabic and other non-Arabic L2 languages above, it is clear that there is a lack of research on apology by Saudi people in general and on females in particular. Thus, the present study intends to fill this gap in the body of pragmatics research by exploring the speech act of apology in Arabic. More importantly, this study will shed light on the use of apology by Saudi females in particular. This will help to understand how Saudi female Arabic speakers employ and perceive apology in comparison with Australian female English speakers.

2.6 Research Questions

Four research questions will guide this study in the investigation:

- (1) What apology strategies are employed by Saudi and Australian participants?
- (2) Do Saudi Arabic and Australian English participants vary in terms of apology strategies?
- (3) What characterizes the apology strategies used by Saudi and Australian participants?
- (4) How do Saudi and Australian participants realize their apology strategies?

Chapter Three:

Methodology

3.1 Participants

The study recruited 40 participants and all of them were females living in Saudi Arabia and Melbourne, Australia.

Participants were divided into two groups:

- A group of 20 NSs of Australian English (AU group): their ages ranged from eighteen to thirty-six years. Most of them were undergraduate students involved in different majors at the University of Melbourne in addition to one staff member. There were also three Ph.D. students studying at Monash University.

- A group of 20 NSs of Saudi Arabic (SA group): some of them were graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in different programmes at King Faisal University in Saudi Arabia, and others were students who had graduated from the same university, in addition to some staff members teaching at King Abdulaziz University. Also, this group involved students and recent graduates from different Melbourne universities and related language schools. Their length of residence in Australia was about two to five years. The participants' ages ranged from eighteen to thirty-six years.

3.2 Instruments

There has been much discussion in ILP research concerning data collection methods. Each data collection method has its advantages and disadvantages. In this section, three common data resources and collection instruments will be presented.

Authentic discourse is a data source that involves the collection of naturalistic data. In this respect, linguists differentiate between everyday conversation and institutional communication. Everyday conversation happens with friends, family members and strangers, while institutional communication is constrained by certain activities and rules (Kasper, 2008). Everyday conversation provides rich data for pragmatic and discourse researchers, and allows for identifying activities and episodes and capturing verbal and non-verbal behavior that help in making comparisons among groups (Fox, Hayashi & Jeperson, 1996, as cited in Kasper, 2008), in addition to observing frequencies of the occurrence of targeted features of participants coming from different cultures (Cheng, 2003, as cited in Kasper, 2008). In contrast, institutional interaction is often predictable and allows for cross-cultural, as well as intercultural and interlanguage, pragmatic comparisons (Kasper, 2008). It also has the benefit of a natural experiment (BARDOVI-HARLIG & Hartford 2005, as cited in Kasper, 2008).

In comparison to authentic data, elicited data are more commonly used in ILP research. Elicited data are another data source that refer to any conversation prepared for data collection. Role-plays are one of most preferable elicitation instruments in pragmatics. Role-plays can be defined as an activity in which participants have a role to play within a given scenario.

The Discourse Completion Test (DCT), along with role-play, is considered to be one of the major data collection methods in pragmatic research, according to Kasper and Dahl

(1991). The DCT was adapted by Blum-Kulka (1980) and its purpose was to examine speech acts. The DCT is a written questionnaire that consists of a number of designed situations used to elicit specific speech acts. Each situation contains a prompt to make it easy for the participants to respond to the situation in writing. The classic DCT format has a rejoinder that finishes the conversation. For example,

‘Walter and Leslie live in the same neighborhood, but they only know each other by sight. One day, they both attend a meeting held on the other side of town. Walter does not have a car but he knows Leslie has come in her car.’

Walter:-----

Leslie: I’m sorry but I’m not going home right away (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989, as cited in Nurani, 2009, p. 668).

Variation in rejoinder had an effect on the participants’ choice of strategies as also found by Kasper and Ross (1998).

Another type of DCT is an open item-verbal response only which is the type employed in this study. Participants in this format can write their responses without an interlocutor initiation or a rejoinder limitation. For example,

‘You have invited a very famous pedagogue to an institutional dinner. You feel extremely hungry, but this engineer starts speaking and nobody has started eating yet, because they are waiting for the guest to start. You want to start having dinner. What would you say?’ (Jordà, 2003, p.43-69).

Each of the mentioned data sources and collection instruments has its advantages and disadvantages. Authentic data are regarded as a source for genuine data (Kasper, 2008) and a support for results validity (Boxer, 1993). Unlike DCT, which provides unreal linguistic responses, authentic data are considered to be the most reliable data source that approximates real life discourse as claimed by Manes and Wolfson (1981), Kasper and Dahl (1991), and Cohen (1995). However, there are some difficulties in collecting authentic data, and one of them is having access to the study setting for a sufficient time. Secondly, it is time-consuming in terms of getting the target focal pragmatic features and comparable data (Kasper, 2008). Moreover, the collection of natural data has been criticized for being unsystematic (Beebe, 1992, as cited in Cummings, 2006) and not having control over social variables (Tran, 2004).

Unlike authentic data, contextual factors can be controlled in role-plays and DCTs (Golato, 2003; Kasper & Rose, 2002). Moreover, elicited data allow for observing a variety of interactional practices and resources.

Role-plays allow researchers to observe structures of discourse emerging in a specific context and, in contrast to authentic discourse, they allow for context and roles designed to make it possible to elicit targeted features (Kasper, 2008). Furthermore, role-play data are characterized by being more inclusive than DCT (Rintell & Mitchell, 1989) and even more representative of real-life performance (Mackay & Gass, 2005; Tran, 2004). However, role-plays have been criticized for not reflecting real life communication (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 2004; Golato, 2003). Furthermore, they are regarded as time-consuming concerning data transcription (Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

DCTs, among other data collection instruments, have their advantages and disadvantages. DCTs are easy to use in comparison to other data collection methods. Although Cummings(2006) see DCTs as incapable of depicting real-life interaction, they highly encourage the use of DCT in the field of pragmatics. They also add that one of the strengths of DCTs is their ability to provide rich data in a comparable short period of time. They further state that DCTs generate standard responses that probably appear in unplanned discourses and correspond with natural data in the basic formulas and pattern. Nelson, Carson, Al Batal, and El Bakary (2002) regard DCT as a suitable data collection tool for the field of interlanguage pragmatics. A DCT can be easily used with participants of diverse cultural backgrounds, compared with natural data, which is difficult to control in terms of variables such as status and cultural backgrounds. Kwon (2004) states that DCT can be controlled, and therefore allows for variation in participants' responses, as the status is being embedded in the given situations. This enables participants to know which strategy to use when they have a situation in which the status level differs, whether being lower, equal, or higher. Such advantages of the use of DCTs have led to their frequent use in the field of sociolinguistic research, including the most empirical work on speech acts, CCSARP as mentioned earlier. However, DCTs are not without criticism. Cummings (2006) note that DCTs fail to capture all the formulas in spoken discourse and that the elicited responses tend to be shorter than the spoken responses. Moreover, it has been found that DCTs do not give a picture of real language use (Golato, 2003). Kasper (2000) notes that DCTs cannot reflect the dynamic aspects of conversation, such as turn-taking. This lead Kasper and Dahl (1991) to consider DCTs, along with oral role-plays, to be a rather constrained method of data collection.

3.2.1 Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

Considering the advantages of DCT discussed above, I chose DCT as a data collection method for this study, as DCTs are easy to use and provide comparable data in a short period of time.

In this study, the DCT questionnaire consists of eight apology situations (see appendix 1), representing different social contexts to enable the elicitation of various strategies. Although all the situations were controlled by social variables of power and imposition, and the variable of social distance was kept constant, findings relating to these variables were not the focus of the current study due to its small scale. The two variables, power and imposition, were represented in four levels: (P= / I-), (P- / I+), (P+ / I-), (P= / I+). These represent different degrees of power between the speaker and the hearer as well as different degrees of offense. For example, 'late for submitting a medical excuse for skipping classes' is a situation in which the student has no power over the professor and the imposition is described as mild. The following eight situations were used in this study: 'interrupting a professor in a meeting', 'spilling a glass of juice', 'forgetting an appointment', 'late for submitting a medical excuse for skipping classes', 'stepping on a student's foot', 'disturbing a student who is studying for an exam', 'breaking an expensive vase', and 'disturbing students studying in the library.'

Table 1: The social variables of power and imposition embedded in the situations

Apology situations	The role of the participant	The role of the person in the situation	The level of power	The level of imposition
Situation 1	Teaching assistant	Professor	Equal (=)	Low (-)
Situation 2	Lecturer	Secretary	Low (-)	High (+)
Situation 3	Professor	Student	Low (-)	High (+)
Situation 4	Student	Professor	High (+)	Low (-)
Situation 5	Student	Student	Equal (=)	Low (-)
Situation 6	Student	Student	Equal (=)	High (+)
Situation 7	Guest	Host	Equal (=)	High (+)
Situation 8	Student	Librarian	High (+)	Low (-)

3.2.2 Questionnaire

In this study, a questionnaire (see appendix 1) was used to collect some background information about the participants such as age, native language (L1), and current educational status.

3.3 Procedure

The first step was to provide the participants with the Plain Language Statement of this research project (see appendix 2), which provides information about the study and their participation and explains that they are free to withdraw from the research project at any time. After receiving their approval, they were provided with the consent form (see appendix 3). The DCT questionnaire was written in English for Australian English NSs and in Arabic for Saudi Arabic NSs. Participants were instructed to respond in their L1.

The questionnaire was piloted (see appendix 4) with three participants from each group of native speakers to rate the three social variables; power, distance and imposition. Following the piloting, some adjustments were made to the questionnaire.

3.4 Data analysis

Firstly, the participants' responses were identified and then coded according to the strategies presented in the model which is based on Cohen and Olshtain (1981, pp. 113-134), Olshtain and Cohen (1983, pp. 22-23), and the CCSARP coding manual (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989, p. 289). See Table 2 below.

Table 2: Apology strategies

Strategy	Definition / Example
(1) Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs), a. An expression of regret. b. An offer of apology. c. A request for forgiveness.	Using the formulaic IFIDs expressions, the offender offers explicit apology: e.g. I'm sorry e.g. I apologize e.g. Excuse me
(2) Explanation or account:	Justifying the offense by explaining the reason, e.g. The bus was late.
(3) Taking on responsibility: a. Explicit self-blame. b. Lack of intent. c. Expression of self-deficiency. d. Expression of embarrassment. e. Admission of facts but not responsibility. f. Justify hearer. g. Refusal to acknowledge guilt: -Denial of responsibility. -Blame the hearer. -Pretend to be offended.	In order to alleviate the offense, the offender expresses responsibility, which creates the need to offer an apology. The offender acknowledges that he/she made a mistake, e.g. My mistake. The offender states that he/she did not intend the offense, e.g. I didn't mean to upset you. The offender attributes the reason of the offense to herself/himself, e.g. I was confused. The offender expresses embarrassment, e.g. I feel awful about it. The offender does not deny responsibility of the committed offense but does not explicitly accept it, e.g. I didn't realize it was loud! The offender justifies the offended's reaction to the offense, e.g. You're right to be angry. The offender fully rejects responsibility: e.g. It wasn't my fault. e.g. It's your own fault. e.g. I'm the one to be offended.
(4) Concern for the hearer.	When the offender feels concerned about the hearer's feelings, e.g. I hope I didn't upset you.
(5) Offer of repair.	When the damage can be compensated, e.g. I'll pay for the damage.
(6) Promise of forbearance.	When the offender feels so guilty, he/she needs to promise not to repeat the act, e.g. It won't happen again.

Secondly, the data were analyzed in four stages in order to answer the research questions posed by this study. Stage 1 focused on identifying the kind of apology strategies used by each group. An independent t-test was run to make a comparison between the two

groups with regard to the apology strategies used. As this study ran more than one t-test, a Bonferroni adjustment for multiple t-tests was done: $(.05/ 16 \text{ t-tests} = .003)$. 16 t-tests were run, and the significance level was revealed to be $(.003)$. Following Salkind (2009), the Bonferroni is the alpha level divided by number of t-tests run $(.05/\text{number of t-tests})$. Stage 2 focused on examining the similarities and differences in the apology strategies employed by both groups. Stage 3 was concerned with exploring the kind of features employed by both groups which characterized their use of apology strategies. The focus of the fourth and last stage was on investigating the two groups' realization of apology strategies.

Chapter Four:

Results

This chapter will first report the results of the data analysis. The main focus is on the types of apology strategies used, significant differences between the Saudi and Australian groups in their choice of strategies, and the role of culture in influencing the ways in which each group realized their apologies.

4.1 Apology strategies

In this section, the following information will be presented: the total number of apology strategies used, types of apology strategies used, differences between the two groups in terms of apology strategies used, and strategies with significant differences.

4.1.1 The total number of apology strategies

Table 3 shows the total number of each apology strategy with the sub-strategies used by each group. It indicates that there were similarities and differences between the two groups; and the total number of most apology strategies was respectively higher in the SA group (N=20) than the AU group (N=20).

Table 3: The total number of apology strategies

Strategy		Mean	Std. Deviation
Expression of regret	SA	4.15	2.23077
	AU	6.45	1.19097
Offer of apology	SA	1.0	2.10263
	AU	.15	.36635
Request for forgiveness	SA	1.55	1.14593
	AU	.15	.36635
All IFIDs	SA	6.7	2.12999

	AU	6.75	1.20852
Explanation/ account	SA	.3	.47016
	AU	.2	.41039
Explicit self-blame	SA	.15	.36635
	AU	.4	.68056
Lack of intent	SA	1.65	.81273
	AU	1.6	.99472
Self-deficiency	SA	1.85	1.08942
	AU	.95	.75915
Embarrassment	SA	.3	.47016
	AU	.25	.44426
Admission of fact	SA	1.35	.98809
	AU	1.5	.82717
Blame the hearer	SA	.15	.36635
	AU	.0	.00000
Pretend to be offended	SA	.05	.22361
	AU	.0	.00000
All taking on responsibility	SA	5.5	2.13985
	AU	4.7	1.83819
Concern for the hearer	SA	1.05	1.19097
	AU	.65	.87509
Offer of repair	SA	3.9	1.74416
	AU	4.6	1.35336
Promise of forbearance	SA	.05	.22361
	AU	.0	.00000

4.1.2 Types of apology strategies

Six main apology strategies were used by participants in the study, as can be seen in Table 3. These strategies involved Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs): (expression of regret, offer of apology and request for forgiveness), explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer, offer of repair, and promise of forbearance. As shown in Table 3, there were minor differences between the two groups in terms of the apology strategies used. The SA group employed six apology strategies, whereas the AU group used five strategies.

The following section will address the first research question: What apology strategies are employed by Saudi and Australian participants?

4.1.3 The similarities and differences between the two groups in terms of apology strategies

The SA and AU groups used the same five strategies: Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs), explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer, and offer of repair. However, differences were also found between the two groups in terms of the apology strategies used. Although, there were some trivial variations between the two groups in terms of the apology strategies used, some strategies were only employed by the SA group.

4.1.3.1 IFIDs

This strategy contains three sub-strategies: expression of regret, offer of apology, and request for forgiveness. The most common sub-strategy for the SA and AU groups was expression of regret, which was used more frequently by the AU group (M=6.45) than by the SA group (M=4.15), while offer of apology and request for forgiveness were utilized more by the SA group (M= 1.0 and M=1.55), and the AU group used these two sub-strategies with the same frequency (M= .15 and M= .15).

Overall, the use of the IFID strategy shows that expression of regret was the most preferred sub-strategy. IFIDs are considered among the most frequently used by the two groups, and both groups utilized the IFIDs strategies with roughly similar frequency.

4.1.3.2 Explanation or account

This strategy was utilized by both groups and the extent to which they used this strategy was quite similar (M=.3 and M=.2).

4.1.3.3 Taking on responsibility

This strategy consists of six sub-strategies: explicit self-blame, lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency, expression of embarrassment, admission of facts but not responsibility, and refusal to acknowledge guilt, which also involves sub-strategies such as blame the hearer and pretend to be offended. Explicit self-blame was utilized by the AU group (M=.4) more than the SA group (M=.15). Expression of self-deficiency (M=1.85 and M=.95), and lack of intent (M=1.65 and M=1.6) were used marginally more by the SA group, whereas admission of facts but not responsibility was used slightly more frequently by the AU group (M=1.5 and M=1.3). Expression of embarrassment was similarly employed by both groups (M=.3 and M=.2). The SA group were the only participants to employ the sub-strategies of blame the hearer and pretend to be offended.

Overall, the SA group preferred to use the self-deficiency sub-strategy, while the AU group preferred lack of intent. Expression of embarrassment was the least used by the AU group (M=.25), and pretend to be offended was the least employed by the SA group (M=.05). The all taking on responsibility sub-strategies were used more by the SA group. Sub-strategies of 'all taking on responsibility' are among the most frequently used by the two groups.

4.1.3.4 Concern for the hearer

Both groups were similar in their use of this strategy (M=1.05 and M=.65).

4.1.3.5 Offer of repair

This strategy was favoured by both groups (M=3.9 and M=4.6) though it was used more often by the AU group than did the SA group.

4.1.3.6 Promise of forbearance

This strategy was not utilized by the AU group, and was only seldomly used by the SA group (M=.05).

Examples of the strategies used by the SA and AU groups and discussed above can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Examples of all strategies used by SA and AU groups

Strategy	SA	AU
1-Expression of regret	<p>انا اسفه asfahana Sorry I'm =I'm sorry.</p> <p>اسفه asfah Sorry =Sorry.</p> <p>اسفه عيوني oyoniasfah my eyes (dear) sorry =Sorry, dear.</p> <p>انا اسفه كثير katheerasfahana so sorry I'm =I'm so sorry.</p> <p>انا اسفه اختي okhtiasfahana my sister sorry I'm =I'm sorry sister.</p>	<p>I'm sorry.</p> <p>I'm so sorry.</p> <p>Oh, sorry.</p> <p>Oops, sorry.</p> <p>Sorry to be a pain.</p>
2-Offer of apology	<p>بسيعةنر لك likba'atithir bas for you I'll apologize just =I just want to apologize to you.</p>	<p>My apologies.</p>
3-Request for forgiveness	<p>سامحيني samhini Forgive me =Forgive me.</p>	<p>I beg your pardon.</p> <p>Excuse me.</p>

	<p>السموحه al smoha Pardon me =<i>Pardon me.</i></p> <p>ارجوا ان تعذريني ta'athorinianarjo excuse me to please =<i>Please, excuse me.</i></p>	
4-Explanation or account	<p>الوقت كان ضيق جدا و جدوليمزحوم mazhoomjadoiliwajedandhaeeqkan al waqit busy my schedule and too short was the time =<i>Time was too short and my schedule was busy.</i></p>	Something came up unexpectedly.
5-Explicit self-blame	<p>حقك علي alai haqik on me your right =<i>It is my fault.</i></p>	I'm so clumsy.
6-Lack of intent	<p>ما كان قصدي اقاطعك aqata 'akqasdikanma interrupt you my intention was didn't =<i>I didn't mean to interrupt you.</i></p>	I didn't realize. It wasn't my intention to interrupt you.
7-Expression of self-deficiency	<p>ما شفت العصير al aseershift ma the juice I see didn't =<i>I didn't see the juice.</i></p> <p>كنت مره مريضه mariedhamarakint sick very I was =<i>I was very sick.</i></p>	<p>Didn't see you there.</p> <p>I forgot to bring the medical certificate.</p>
8-Expression of embarrassment	<p>عياي فشلونني fashilonieiali embarrassed me my children =<i>My children embarrassed me.</i></p>	I really am embarrassed and terribly sorry.
9-Admission of facts but not responsibility	<p>ما قلتي لي ان عندك اختبار iktibarendikana li qlti ma exam you have that to me you tell didn't =<i>You didn't tell me you have an exam.</i></p>	I didn't know how to contact you.
10-Blame the hearer	<p>روحني جليسي بكرسي افضل من انك تجلسين بيمر bimamartajleseeninik min afdhalbikirsijelsirohi in a corridor sityou to from better on a chair sit go =<i>Go and sit on a chair better that sitting in a corridor.</i></p>	
11-Pretend to be offended	<p>مادم هذا ردك ما راح اخفض علي alaihakhafidh rah ma radik hatha madam on it put down going to not your reply this as long as =<i>As long as this is your reply, I won't put it down.</i></p>	
12-Concern for the hearer	<p>يمكنك الان متابعة حديثك hadithokmotaba'atala'anyoumkinik your talk continue now you can =<i>You can now continue your talk.</i></p>	Please, continue!
13-Offer of repair	<p>خلاص الحين اقصر على الصوت al soatalaaqasiralheenkalas the volume on put down now ok =<i>Ok, I'll put the volume down now.</i></p> <p>اعطيني مناديل لمساعدتك في تجفيف العصير</p>	<p>Oh no worries, I'll turn it down.</p> <p>Do you have any tissue or paper towel?</p>

	<p>al aseertajfeef fi limosa'aditikmanadeela'atini the juice wiping in tohelp you tissue give me =<i>Give me tissue to help you wipe the juice.</i></p> <p>سوف احضره غدا ان شاء الله inshallakhadinohdhirhsoufa ok tomorrow bring it I will =<i>Ok, I'll bring it tomorrow.</i></p>	Would it be ok if I brought it in tomorrow for you?
14-Promise of forbearance	<p>ان شاء الله انها اخر مره marahaqiranhainshallah time last it is ok =<i>Ok, it will be the last time.</i></p>	

In summary, the IFIDs, taking on responsibility and offer of repair were found to be the most frequently used strategies by the two groups. Furthermore, the most often used sub-strategy among all IFIDs by both groups was expression of regret, whereas explanation or account was the least used strategy by the AU group, and promise of forbearance was the least used by the SA group.

The following section will address the second research question which is: Do Saudi Arabic and Australian English participants vary in terms of apology strategies?

Table 5: Significance level of apology strategies of the two groups

Strategy		Mean	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Effect size
Expression of regret	SA	4.15	-4.068	29.017	.001	1.28
	AU	6.45				
Offer of apology	SA	1.0	1.781	20.153	.090	0.56
	AU	.15				
Request for forgiveness	SA	1.55	5.204	22.844	.001	1.64
	AU	.15				
All IFIDs	SA	6.7	-.091	38	.928	0.02
	AU	6.75				
Explanation/ account	SA	.3	.717	38	.478	0.22
	AU	.2				
Explicit self-blame	SA	.15	-1.447	29.158	.159	0.45
	AU	.4				

Lack of intent	SA	1.65	.174	38	.863	0.05
	AU	1.6				
Self-deficiency	SA	1.85	3.031	38	.004	0.95
	AU	.95				
Embarrassment	SA	.3	.346	38	.731	0.10
	AU	.25				
Admission of fact	SA	1.35	-.521	38	.606	0.16
	AU	1.5				
Blame the hearer	SA	.15	1.831	19.000	.083	0.57
	AU	.0				
Pretend to be offended	SA	.05	1.000	19.000	.330	0.31
	AU	.0				
All taking on responsibility	SA	5.5	1.268	38	.212	0.40
	AU	4.7				
Concern for the hearer	SA	1.05	1.210	38	.234	0.38
	AU	.65				
Offer of repair	SA	3.9	-1.418	38	.164	0.44
	AU	4.6				
Promise of forbearance	SA	.05	1.000	19.000	.330	0.31
	AU	.0				

4.1.4 Strategies with significant differences

The SA and AU groups differed significantly in their use of some apology strategies, such as Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs), and taking on responsibility.

4.1.4.1 IFIDs

As shown in Table 5, the two groups differed significantly in expression of regret and request for forgiveness at the level of $p < .001$, but they did not differ significantly in offer of apology. The effect size of expression of regret is ($d = 1.28$) which would be interpreted as large according to Cohen (1992). This indicates that the difference between the SA and AU groups in terms of their use of this sub-strategy is considered to be large, which is really interesting.

The effect size of request for forgiveness is ($d= 1.64$) which would be interpreted as large according to Cohen (1992). This reveals that the difference between the SA and AU groups in terms of their use of this sub-strategy is considered to be large and even larger than expression of regret, which is also noteworthy. For offer of apology, the effect size is ($d=0.56$) which would be regarded as medium. This shows that the difference between the two groups in their use of this sub-strategy is not large as that of expression of regret and offer of apology.

4.1.4.2 Taking on responsibility

The results showed that there were significant differences between the SA and AU groups only in one sub-strategy of ‘all taking on responsibility’, that is expression of self-deficiency ($p<.004$). In spite of this significance, there seemed to be no significance in the total of sub-strategies of ‘taking on responsibility’ ($p<. 212$).

The effect size of self-deficiency is ($d= 0.95$), which would be interpreted as large according to Cohen (1992). This shows that the difference between the SA and AU groups in their utilization of this sub-strategy is considered to be large, which is remarkable. The effect sizes of the rest of the sub-strategies of ‘taking on responsibility’ are shown to be either medium or small, as presented in Table 5. So, the difference between the two groups concerning their use of all sub-strategies of ‘taking on responsibility’ is not large.

No significant differences were found between the two groups in explanation or account ($p<.478$), concern for the hearer ($p>.234$), offer of repair ($p<.164$), and promise of forbearance ($p<.330$). Moreover, the effect sizes of those four strategies are shown to be

medium as presented in Table 5. This reveals that the difference between the SA and AU groups in terms of their use of those four strategies is not large, but rather medium.

In summary, significant differences between the two groups in using apology strategies were found in expression of regret and request for forgiveness, which are both sub-strategies of IFIDs. What is interesting is that the two groups did not vary significantly in IFIDs overall. Also, both groups varied significantly in self-deficiency, which is considered to be a sub-strategy of 'all taking on responsibility', however, no significance occurred in the total of all taking on responsibility sub-strategies, which seems to be noteworthy as well. Finally, no significant differences were observed in the four remaining strategies of explanation or account, offer of repair, concern for the hearer and promise of forbearance.

The following section will address the third research question which is: What characterizes the apology strategies used by the Saudi and Australian participants?

4.1.5 Features of apology strategies used by the SA and AU groups

A number of features, such as religious expressions, terms of endearment and use of the word 'sure', have been identified in the SA and AU data as characterizing these participants' use of the speech act of apology. The features are presented in Tables 6 and 7. The features identified in the Saudi Arabian context are quite complex and reflect specific social and religious aspects of Saudi Arabian behavior. The features presented in Table 6 include religious expressions such as 'inshallah', invoking God's name, and swearing by God's name. Moreover, features 5, 6 and 7 in Table 6 have been difficult to translate into English as they reflect a set of cultural beliefs that refer to the Saudi context and are therefore

difficult to capture through another language. Nevertheless, every effort has been made to represent the Saudi Arabian qualities through the English terms used in this table.

Table 6: Features identified in Saudi participants' use of apology strategies

Number	Feature	Example	Situation
1	Religious expressions	ايه ان شاء الله اسفهز عجتك aza'ajtikasfahinshallaheih bothered you sorry ok yes =Yes, <i>ok</i> , sorry for bothering you.	8
1a	inshallah (ok).		
1b	sister.	اسفه يا أختي okhtiyaasfah my sister hey sorry = Sorry, you <i>sister</i> .	5
1c	invoking Allah's (God's) name swearing by God's (Allah's) name	ياربي اسفه جدا خليني امسحه عنك ankamsihakalinijedanasfahyarabi, for you wipe it let me so sorry oh God = <i>Oh, God</i> , I'm so sorry, let me wipe it for you.	2
1d		والله لاجيبك احسن منها minhaahsan la ajeeblikWallah one better bring you I swear = <i>I swear by God's name</i> I'll bring you a better one.	7
2	Use of the word 'ma'alaish (It's ok)	معليش امس كان عندي اجتماع ejtima'aendikanamsma'alaish meeting I had was yesterday it's ok طارئ ما قدرت اقابلك aqablikkidart ma taria'a meet you did able not urgent = <i>It's ok</i> , I had an urgent meeting yesterday I couldn't meet you.	3
3	English expressions	اووبس معليش ما كان قصدي qasdikan ma ma'alaishOoops, my intention was not it's ok Ooops = <i>Ooops</i> , it's ok, I didn't mean it.	2
		سوري Sorry = <i>Sorry</i>	5
		اوكي Ok = <i>Ok</i>	8
4	Terms of endearment	معليش حبيبتني habibtim'alaish darling it's ok = <i>It's ok darling</i> .	2
		ابشري من عيوني abshiri min oyouni	

		my eyes from wait for it = Alright, <i>dear</i> . على امرك amrikala Your order on =At your service <i>my dear</i> .	
5	Attribution of responsibility to children	فشلونى عيالي fashilonieiali embarrassed me my children = My children <i>are responsible for it</i> . (My children embarrassed me.)	7
6	Derogatory naming of children	البعيد سود وجهي wajhisaouid al ba'eed my face made it blackthe bad = <i>Bad</i> boy, embarrassed me. انا اسفه شيطان هالولد halwalidshaitanasfahana this boy evil sorry I'm = I'm sorry this boy is <i>evil</i> .	7
7	Praying to God (Allah) for children to be punished for their unacceptable behavior	يكافيه الله yikafih Allah punish him God = <i>May God punish him!</i>	7

Table 7: Features identified in Australian participants' use of apology strategies

Number	Feature	Example	Situation
1	Use of the word 'sure'	Oh <i>sure!</i> I didn't realize it was so loud. <i>Sure</i> , that's fine.	6 and 8

Compared with the seven idiosyncratic features that were used by the SA group, the AU group used only one idiosyncratic feature, as can be seen in Table 7. The function of the features used by the SA and AU groups was to lessen the level of offense.

The following section relates to the fourth and final question which is: How do Saudi and Australian participants realize their apology strategies?

4.1.6 Realization of apology strategies

There were some similarities and some differences between the SA and AU groups in their realization of their apology strategies, with respect to IFIDs, explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer, offer of repair, and promise of forbearance.

4.1.6.1 IFIDs

The SA and AU groups used different manifestations of IFIDs devices (expression of regret, offer of apology and request for forgiveness) as demonstrated below in Tables 8, 9 and 10. They used them as follows:

As can be seen in Table 8, both groups used one **expression of IFID** to show apology. Their expressions varied from the word *sorry* to utterances such as *I beg your pardon*, *pardon me*, *forgive me*, *apologies*, *excuse me* and *I apologize*. Moreover, it seems that the word ‘sorry’ is the most used IFID device by the AU group, so it is considered to be the most routinized word. The AU group did not use as big a variety of IFIDs as did the Saudi group, mainly relying on ‘sorry’, except in a few cases where they used the expressions ‘apologize’, ‘apologies’ and ‘excuse me’.

Table 8: Comparison of the use of one expression of IFIDs between groups

IFIDs	SA	Situation (SA group)	AU	Situation (AU group)
Expression of regret	اسفه asfah Sorry =Sorry. انا اسفه asfahana Sorry I'm =I'm sorry.	1	I'm sorry.	1
Offer of apology	لك اعذر lika'atithir to you I apologize =I apologize to you.	7	My apologies for yesterday.	3

Request for forgiveness	المعذره منك ارجوا alma'thirah mink arjo forgiveness from you I ask =I beg your pardon.	3	I beg your pardon. Excuse me.	1
	سامحيني samhini forgive me =Forgive me.	2		
	اعذريني ao'atherini excuse me =Excuse me.	7		

Also, both groups used **one or two intensifiers with an expression of regret**, as presented in Table 9. The use of two intensifiers occurred more frequently in the AU data. Their use of intensifiers might be attributed to the fact that they needed to show how sorry they were for the committed offense. Moreover, they used words such as please with the IFID devices to intensify the apology.

Table 9: Comparison of use of IFIDs between groups

Use of expression of regret and other IFIDs	SA	Situation (SA group)	AU	Situation (AU group)
One expression of regret with one or two intensifiers	انا اسفه كثير ktheerasfahana so sorry I'm =I'm so sorry.	2	I'm so sorry.	2
			I'm so so sorry.	3
			I'm very sorry.	3
	اووه مره اسفه asfahmarah ooh sorry so oh =Oh, I'm so sorry.	6	I'm really sorry.	4
			I'm terribly sorry.	7
			I'm really really sorry.	2
One expression of regret without intensifiers	انا اسفه asfahana sorry I'm =I'm sorry.	4	Sorry. I'm sorry.	5 3

Intensifiers with a combination of IFIDs	عفا اعتذر لك lika'atithirafon to you I apologize/pardon me بشده bishidah strongly =Pardon me, I really apologize to you.	1	I'm so sorry, I thought you had finished. My apologies.	1
'Please' with IFIDs	ارجوا ان تعذريني ta'athorini an arjo excuse me to please = Please, excuse me.	7	If you could please excuse my absence in class.	4
Two expressions of regret with or without intensifiers + a combination of IFIDs	اسفه جدا متاخره عن an mita'akhrhajjidanafah for late so sorry المحاضره almohadhirah the class اسفه مره ثانيه thaniahmarahasfah again once I'm sorry =So sorry, I'm late for class, sorry again.	5	Sorry, sorry.	5

As can be seen from Table 9, both groups used **two expressions of regret with or without intensifiers, or with a combination of two of IFIDs** devices. Their use of intensifiers typically involved a repetition of words, for example *very very sorry*, *so so sorry*, *really really sorry*.

Lastly, both groups used expression of regret mostly at the beginning of their responses to ensure sincerity of apology. Examples of this can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10: Comparison of use of expression of regret and position in response between groups

SA	Situation (SA group)	AU	Situation (AU group)
انتبه لم اسفه antbah lmasfah realize didn't sorry =I'm so sorry, I didn't realize.	2	I'm really sorry, I didn't realize.	1

4.1.6.2 Explanation or account

The two groups used explanations or accounts to explain what happened. They used it to give reasons for the committed offense. In Situation 3, in which the professor forgot about the meeting with the student, the two groups employed similar responses, as can be seen above in Table 4 (Strategy 4, p.45).

4.1.6.3 Taking on responsibility

(i) Explicit self-blame

Explicit self-blame was realized differently by the two groups. The AU group used self-dispraise expressions, such as *clumsy*, *clutzandstupid*, to blame themselves for the offense, but the SA group did not use such expressions. They instead used direct utterances to show self-blame such as (*haqik alai=It is my fault*), as can be seen above in Table 4 (Strategy 5, p.45). This humbling of oneself might signify a cultural aspect and intensity of apology as well.

(ii) Lack of intent

Both groups used this sub-strategy similarly to show that the offense was not intended but accidental. Examples of this can be seen above in Table 4 (Strategy 6, p.45).

(iii) Expression of self-deficiency

Admitting one's deficiency is embarrassing, however this strategy was employed by the SA and the AU groups in a relatively similar way. They used it with all power levels, but comparatively more with those of higher power status. Examples of this are;

Example 1

I have been sick. (directed at professor)

Example 2

كنت مره مريضه

mariedhamarakint

sick very I was

= *I was very sick. (directed at professor)*

(iv) Expression of embarrassment

The AU group used expression of embarrassment in short utterances such as *I feel terrible*, and in other cases with intensifiers such as *I really am embarrassed*. In contrast, the SA group used long utterances to show intensity of apology such as *I'm embarrassed and I don't know what I have to do*. They really aimed at showing how embarrassed they were. As can be seen from Table 6, SA participants also used some idiosyncratic features, such as invoking Allah's name and swearing as in the following example:

Example 1

يا رب والله اني منحرجه

minharjaaniWallahrabya

embarrassed me I swear God oh

= *Oh, God, I swear I'm embarrassed.*

Other features used include attributing responsibility to children, derogatory naming of children and praying to God for children to get punished for their wrong actions, as can be seen in Table 6 (p.51) above.

(v) Admission of facts but not responsibility

The SA and the AU groups were alike in their use of admission of facts, but the SA group differed in using some features to show sincere apology such as swearing. An example of this can be seen as follows:

Example 1

انشغلت امس والله

anshaqaltamsWallah

got busy yesterday I swear

= I swear I got busy yesterday.

(vi) Blame the hearer

This sub-strategy occurred only in the SA data. The SA group realized it in two different ways: one way was by offering a piece of advice in an anxious manner as can be seen in the example in Table 4 (Strategy 10, p.45); the other was by blaming the offended in a sarcastic manner. For example,

Example 1

حد فالك تحطين رجلك هنا

hinarejliktohteenqalikhaid

here your foot put told you no-one

= *No-one told you to put your foot there.*

(vii) Pretend to be offended

Pretending to be offended was also employed only by the SA group. The SA group's realization of this strategy appeared to be more as blaming the victim but it was actually a tool to show that the offended made it easy for the offender to feel offended. Also, it was used in a conditional manner. An example of this can be seen in Table 4 (Strategy 11, p.45).

4.1.6.4 Concern for the hearer

The SA and the AU groups both used explicit utterances in this strategy, as can be seen in the examples above in Table 4 (Strategy 12, p.45). Furthermore, the SA group used other methods to show their concern, as can be seen in Table 11.

Table 11: Methods used by SA group in their realization of concern for the hearer

Number	Method	Examples	Function	Situation
1	Sense of humour	بس روقي المنجا al mangarougibas the mango relax just =Just calm down your nerves.	-alleviating the offense.	8
2	Swearing (Feature 1d, p. 50) in Table 6	والله ما تزعلي tiza'alima Wallah get upset don't I swear = I swear you don't get upset.	-ensuring the offended's satisfaction.	7
3	Intensive phrases	ما يصير خاطرک الا طيب taiebela'akhatirikyaseer ma good but yourself be don't = You'll be satisfied. ولا يهملك	- showing sincere apology.	6

		yhimikwala worry don't = Don't ever worry.		6
--	--	--	--	---

4.1.6.5 Offer of repair

There were some similarities and some differences between the SA and AU groups in their realization of this strategy. While the AU group used one single utterance or short answers such as 'sure', 'sure, no problem', the SA group employed long sentences in which they apologized and offered more than one way of compensation, and in some cases they even insisted on making it up to the offended. Examples can be seen in Table 12 below.

Table 12: Examples of the Saudi groups' realization of offer of repair

Offering more than one way of compensation	Insisting on making it up to the offended	Situation
<p>لتعويضك انامستعده le ta'aoidikmosta'aidaana to compensate you ready I'm بأخرى bi okhra with another one = I'm ready to compensate you with another one.</p> <p>أدورك زيها بالضبط حتى لو lohatabidhabidhzaihaadorlik even exactly the same I'll look for you من خارج المملكة ولا wlamamlakahkarij min or the kingdom outside from اعوضك قيمتها qimatahaa'aoudik its price compensate you =I'll look for exactly the same vase for you even from outside the kingdom or compensate you for its cost.</p> <p>بنظفلكالتتوره الحين alheen al tanourabaanadflik now the skirt I'll clean for you =I'll clean the skirt for you right now.</p>	<p>اتمنى انتسمحيلي tasmahilian atmna let me toI hope بتعويضك عن an bita'aoidik for to compensate you هذهالفازه وأصر على ذلك thalikalaoserwa al vazahathi that on insist and the vase this = I hope you let me compensate you for this vase and I insist.</p> <p>انا لازم اجيبك بدالها badalhaajeebliklazimana a replacementbring you have to I مهما تكلف tikalifmahma it costs whatever = I must get you a new one however much it would cost.</p>	2and 7

Although the AU group used long sentences and offers of replacement, when compared to the SA data, it is clear they say less. Examples can be seen in *'I'll go and get a cloth to wipe your skirt and the desk'*.

Moreover, it was observed that the SA group utilized (Feature 4 'terms of endearment', p. 50) as can be seen in Table 6, to placate the offended. They also used swearing to ensure repairing the damage (see Table 6, Feature 1d, p.50).

4.1.6.6 Promise of forbearance

This strategy only appeared in the SA data. As presented in Table 6, the SA group used the religious expression '*inshallah*' to alleviate the offense. An example of this can be seen above in Table 4 (Strategy 14, p.46).

Overall, the SA group responses were longer than the AU group in most of the situations. In addition, it has been observed that few members of the Saudi group used formal Arabic. The majority preferred colloquial Saudi Arabic in their responses. Most of the Australians also preferred to use informal English in their responses.

Chapter Five:

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study investigated the speech act of apology by Saudi female native speakers of Arabic (SA) and Australian female native speakers of English(AU). It examined the similarities and differences in the apology strategies employed by both groups. In addition, the study investigated the role played by culture in influencing the ways in which each group realized their apologies.

5.1 Types of apology strategies

Six main apology strategies were used by participants in the study, in addition to a combination of strategies in order to show sincere apology. These strategies involved Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs: expression of regret, offer of apology, request for forgiveness), explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer, offer of repair and promise of forbearance.

5.2 The similarities and differences between the two groups in terms of apology strategies

At a global level, the two groups showed similarities in their strategy choice; they all used similar five apology strategies. However, there seemed to be different preferences and language-specific features that characterized their use by each group.

With respect to the total number of apology strategies, the SA group differed from the AU group; the SA group utilized a higher total number of apology strategies (M=17.5) than did the AU group (M=16.9). This finding lends support to other apology studies, such as

Hussein and Hammouri's (1998) which found that Jordanians employed more apology strategies than the Americans in their corpus.

The findings of this study showed that there were similarities between Saudi and Australian females in terms of the most frequently-used apology strategies. Five apology strategies were shared by the two groups; these strategies were IFIDs, explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer and offer of repair. This indicates that there are some similarities between Saudi Arabic and Australian English females in terms of their choice of apology strategies. This finding is consistent with the study of Bataineh(2006) which found that Jordanian males and females were similar in their use of primary apology strategies. It also lends support to other apology studies that claim for universality of apology strategies (Nureddeen, 2008) and speech act of apology (Jebahi, 2011).

The most favoured strategy for both groups was the IFIDs, followed by taking on responsibility and offer of repair. This finding is consistent with Olshtain's (1989) study, which found that the participants preferred IFIDs and expression of responsibility in their use of apology strategies.

The most common sub-strategy among IFIDs for the SA and AU groups was expression of regret, which was used more frequently by the AU group (M=6.45) than by the SA group (M=4.15). This indicates that the word 'sorry' is the most routinized apology expression for both groups, and especially for the AU group, and suggests that Australian females tend to offer a routine-like strategy, which they prefer to offers of apology and requests for forgiveness. This supports the findings of Holmes (1990) and Owen (1983) who demonstrated that expression of regret is the overwhelming expression in English, while the less used are 'excuse me', 'forgive me', and 'I apologize', although the latter is observed to

be used more frequently in writing. On the other hand, offers of apology and requests for forgiveness were utilized more by the SA group (M= 1.0 and M=1.55). The SA use of performative verbs lends support to Vollmer and Olshtain's (1989) claim that such verbs help make the apology stronger than other IFID devices. Interestingly, their use of 'excuse me' contradicts Al-Zumor's (2011) finding that Arabs consider 'othran=excuse me' as a weak apology. Different use of IFIDs provides support for Wierzbicka's (1985, 1991) claim that speech acts are culture-independent interactive routines rather than language-specific. In addition, the high frequency of the use of IFIDs by both groups seems consistent with the claims that females are taught since childhood to apologize more for any committed offense to females and males as well (cf., for example, Brown & Attardo, 2005; Holmes, 1995).

Taking on responsibility was used relatively more by the SA group (M=5.5) than the AU group (M=4.7). The SA group preferred self-deficiency, although self-deficiency is considered to be embarrassing. This indicates that the SA group would tend to offer apologies in public in order to ease the offended and it would be explained more as a cultural attitude. This finding lends support to Al-Zumor's (2011) study, which reported that admitting one's deficiency in the Arab context does not cause the same degree of embarrassment as in the Anglo-Saxon context. On the other hand, the AU group preferred lack of intent, which might indicate culture preference in choice of apology strategies.

Expression of embarrassment was the least used sub-strategy among 'all taking on responsibility' by the AU group (M=.25), which might reveal that Australian females prefer not to show embarrassment in order to avoid damage to their positive face. Expressions indicating that the offender is so embarrassed and can't find an alternative way to apologize other than expressing deep concern, seem to be situation-specific. In contrast, pretending to

be offended was the least employed sub-strategy of 'all taking on responsibility' by the SA group ($M=.05$). Moreover, pretending to be offended and blaming the hearer were only employed by the SA group, which suggests a cultural preference.

The SA group used more 'all taking on responsibility' sub-strategies than the AU group, which might indicate that the SA group was relatively keener to take on responsibility than the AU group was. The use of 'all taking on responsibility' by the Saudi group contradicts Jebahi's (2011) study, which found that a significant number of Tunisian participants did not admit responsibility and used accounts to shift responsibility to other issues.

Offer of repair followed 'all taking on responsibility' in terms of the most used strategies. This strategy was employed by the AU group more than the SA group. The use of this strategy occurred more in Situation 2 'spilling a glass of juice' and Situation 3 'forgetting an appointment with a student'. This might suggest that a situation such as 'spilling a glass of juice' is considered to be less offensive in the Arabic culture than in the AU culture. This finding corresponds with Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University Students' (2010), which found that spilling juice was perceived as less offensive by Arabs than by English participants. In contrast, in Situation 3 'forgetting an appointment with a student', an offer of repair was used more by the SA group than the AU group, which suggests that this situation is considered more offensive in Saudi culture compared with Australian culture. The AU group did not use offer of repairs as much in this situation because they seem to be influenced by their culture. Such findings also suggest that offers of repair are context-independent.

Conversely, concern for the hearer was used more by the SA group than the AU group, which shows that the SA group tends to show concern more than the AU group and thus indicates a cultural influence on the choice of apology strategies.

Moreover, the strategy of explanation or account was employed by the two groups to give reasons for what happened and their use of this strategy was quite similar. Since it is obvious that the offender is guilty, explaining the offense will not ease the offense. This might explain the low frequency of this strategy, because it can only be used in a limited number of situation-specific contexts.

The last strategy is promise of forbearance, which was only used by the SA group and even then with low frequency ($M=.05$). This strategy seems to be one of the most face-threatening strategies. This indicates that the SA group would take this risk in order to strengthen the apologetic act. This reveals that the Saudi females used to employ this strategy in their Saudi culture. The low frequency of the use of this strategy lends support to the findings of El-Khalil's (1998) study which found that few females used the strategy of promise of forbearance.

Overall, the SA and AU groups used similar strategies, although culture clearly has some influence over their choice of apology strategies. This finding is consistent with the findings of some apology studies such as the CCSARP study by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), who found that participants from different groups employed similar strategies and their use was influenced by cultural preferences. Nureddeen's (2008) study also found that Sudanese participants' choice of apology strategies lends support to the culture-specific aspect of language use.

5.3 Strategies with significant differences

The SA group and the AU group differed significantly in their use of some apology strategies namely, expression of regret, request for forgiveness, and expression of self-deficiency. This corroborates the findings of studies that show culture is an important factor in people's use of the speech act of apology (e.g. Sugimoto, 1998). Sugimoto (1998) found that the realization of apology by the Japanese and American participants was influenced by cultural differences in perceptions and use of linguistic behavior.

Significant differences were found in the two groups' use of expression of regret at the level of ($p < .001$). This difference is interpreted as large as Cohen's d shows ($d = 1.28$). This significant difference might be attributed to the frequent use of this IFID by the AU group that exceeded the SA use, and that the word 'sorry' seems to be the most routinized apologetic expression by the AU group.

Significant differences between the SA and AU groups were also found in their use of request for forgiveness at the level of ($p < .001$). This difference is regarded as large as Cohen's d shows ($d = 1.64$). This significant difference might be explained by the more frequent use of this IFID by the SA group, and their greater variety of expressions. The SA group used a range of expressions such as 'forgive me', 'pardon me', 'apologies', and 'excuse me', while there were only few cases in which the AU group employed 'apologize', 'apologies', and 'excuse me'.

Furthermore, the SA and AU groups differed significantly in their use of self-deficiency at the level of ($p < .004$). This difference is considered to be large as Cohen's d shows ($d = 0.95$). This significant difference might be justified by the SA participants' more

frequent use of this sub-strategy and because they also utilized more than one self-deficiency expression in the same response. This significant difference might also be attributed to variation of use in different situations. It was used by the SA group more than the AU group in some situations such as Situations 4 and 5. In other cases, it was not used either by the SA group as in Situation 3, or by the AU group as in Situations 6 and 7. Moreover, it was not employed by either group in Situation 8. It is interesting to note that although their responses were similar, a significant difference has occurred. Furthermore, this might suggest that in Saudi culture, expressing one's self-deficiency is not as difficult as in Australian culture, and hence the SA group used it more than the AU group.

5.4 Features of apology strategies used by SA and AU groups

A number of features have been identified in the Saudi and Australian participants' use of apology strategies. The purpose of the identified features used was an attempt to lessen the level of offense.

The Saudi group employed features such as; using religious expressions which involved using the words 'sister' and 'inshallah', invoking Allah's name, and swearing by God's name. These religious expressions are an integral part of Saudis' everyday conversation. The word sister is commonly used in Saudi society to express sisterhood and solidarity. Moreover, this form of swearing is common in Saudi society, and in these situations would give the hearer the feeling of comfort and certainty that the act would be repaired, as swearing by God's name is considered as sacred and once it is used, it has to be acted upon. The use of such expressions shows the influence of Islamic instruction on their use of apology strategies. This finding is consistent with El-Khalil's (1998) study which reported that Verses from holy Quran were used by the Jordanians to lessen the offense, and

also with the research by Hussein & Hammouri (1998), which found that Jordanians used praising Allah in their apology strategies. Therefore, such findings show that religious orientation influenced participants' use of the speech act of apology.

The SA group also employed features such as frequent use of the word 'ma'alaiish' and endearment expressions which show the influence of culture on their use of apology strategies. Moreover, these features are also employed regularly in Saudis' daily speech, and they are used frequently supporting different speech acts.

Furthermore, the SA use of features such as attributing blame to children, calling children by 'harming' words, and praying for children to get punished for what they did, show that participants are influenced by the practices in their own culture. Also, the occurrence of a feature such as using English expressions, which is commonly used in Saudis' daily speech, shows the influence of English as an international medium of communication on Saudis' everyday discourse.

While the SA group employed a number of features, the AU group employed only one feature, which was the frequent use of the word 'sure'. They used it frequently in their responses and sometimes they utilized it by itself, without any IFIDs, to express their apology. This shows an aspect of the Australian daily practice of the speech act of apology.

5.5 Realization of apology strategies

The results of this study have revealed that the most explicit realization of an apology is the explicit illocutionary force indicating device (IFID). IFID is the first of the formulae in the set of apology strategies. It is considered to be the direct realization of an apology. The IFIDs are the most routinized strategies as they are in the core of the speech act of apology

(Owen, 1983). The overall picture showed that the SA and AU groups seem to use IFIDs in the majority of situations with considerable variation. The SA and AU groups used IFIDs in most of the situations with high frequency (M=6.7 and M=6.75). Expression of regret was the most used sub-strategy by both groups.

The SA and AU groups used different manifestations of the IFIDs. In some cases, they used only one IFID to express apology, and in other cases they used expression of regret with one or two intensifiers. They also used two expressions of regret to perform an apology, in addition to a combination of two IFID devices. The data from some of the participants in both groups indicate that one apology expression was sufficient, whereas other examples from the data indicate that one apology expression was not sufficient and therefore more than one expression of regret or other IFID device was employed.

The two groups also used IFIDs with other apology strategies, most commonly with taking on responsibility and offering of repair, which seems to be viewed as a good combination to strengthen an apology. It appears that the AU and SA groups used IFIDs obligatorily in each act of apology. The most commonly-used IFID was 'I'm sorry'. The AU group considered the use of sorry, with or without an intensifier, to be sufficient, while the SA group considered the use of sorry not sufficient on its own, so they tended to accompany it with other IFIDs, apology strategies or intensifiers in order to strengthen the apology and show sincerity. Moreover, using one or two expressions of regret, with or without an intensifier, was the most common form of apology in the AU data, while using one expression of regret and two IFIDs, with or without an intensifier, was the most common form of apology in the SA data. This indicates that Saudi females consider IFIDs to be effective as apologetic devices, whether intensified or not.

At a global level, the responses of the SA and AU groups in most of the situations displayed a systematic use of IFIDs with one or two apology strategies; namely taking on responsibility, offer of repair, and concern for the hearer, with or without intensifiers. What seems interesting in both groups is that in most of the responses, wherever the expression of regret was employed, it was always intensified. For example, the SA group mostly intensified their offers of apology and requests for forgiveness, and they used an expression of regret mostly at the beginning of their responses to ensure the sincerity of the apology.

‘All taking on responsibility’ was found to be the most commonly-used strategy, after the IFIDs, in both the SA and AU data. This strategy was used when the offender acknowledged responsibility for the committed offense. This strategy is considered to be universal, as claimed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983). Indeed, the findings of the current study give support to this claim. In the present study, this formula consists of six sub-strategies; explicit self-blame, lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency, expression of embarrassment, admission of fact and refusal to acknowledge guilt, which also contains two sub-strategies (pretend to be offended and blame the hearer). Taking on responsibility is considered to be the most explicit and strongest apology strategy. Both groups of native speakers used this strategy with high frequency in most of the situations. ‘All taking on responsibility’ was used relatively more often by the SA group (M=5.5) than the AU group (M=4.7).

Explicit self-blame was utilized by the AU group (M=.4) slightly more than the SA group (M=.15). It is worth noting here that in the AU group’s use of explicit self-blame, they employed self-dispraise expressions such as *clumsy*, *clutz* and *stupid*, while such expressions were not used by the SA group. This humbling of one-self, used to intensify the apology,

might signify a cultural influence. The SA group did not use such expressions, as in Saudi culture it is not easy to humble oneself in front of other people, while it seems a normal act in the AU culture. Moreover, the SA group preferred self-deficiency, although self-deficiency is considered as embarrassing. This indicates that SA group would perform an apology in public in order to ease the offended and it would be explained more as cultural attitude. Lack of intent was used to assure good will to the offended. The AU group preferred lack of intent which might indicate a culture-based preference in choice of apology strategies. However, both groups' responses in this strategy seemed to be similar, which suggests universality of this strategy. For expression of embarrassment, while the AU group used direct and relatively short utterances, the SA group used some supporting tools, such as attributing responsibility to children, swearing and long utterances to intensify their apology. These differences in realization of this sub-strategy can be explained by the fact that the two groups come from different cultural backgrounds.

In addition, admission of fact but not responsibility was similarly used by both groups and their responses were also similar. This indicates that both groups preferred not to explicitly admit responsibility, thus avoiding face damage. An example of this can be seen in *'I didn't know how to contact you'* which occurred in Situation 3, 'forgetting an appointment', as the professor admitted that he did not know how to contact the student, but still did not take responsibility for the offense. Also, severity of offense in some situations, such as Situation 2 'spilling a glass of juice', and Situation 3 'forgetting an appointment', might influence their choice of the 'all taking on responsibility' option. In SA culture, it sometimes seems difficult for a person to admit responsibility explicitly, and this clarifies why they prefer admitting to a fact rather than being willing to take responsibility. The use of this strategy is consistent with the finding of El-Khalil (1998), who reported that Jordanians

opted frequently for giving excuses such as 'I could not come because I got unexpected company' in order to justify the offense, which is similar to statements used by the SA and AU groups such as ('I had to attend an urgent meeting' = "كان عندي اجتماع طارئ"). Such utterances are considered to be admission of facts but not responsibility in this study. The strategy of 'refusal to acknowledge guilt' was realized comparably by both groups, as they used it more as a self-defense tool. 'Pretending to be offended' and 'blaming the hearer' were only employed by the SA group, which indicates cultural preferences. The SA group realized 'pretending to be offended' more as a blaming device to shift responsibility to the offended person. This might also show a cultural attitude in use of this apologetic device. Also, 'blaming the hearer' occurred only in the SA data. The SA group realized it in two ways, one through sarcasm and the other through offering advice. This realization might characterize some aspects of Saudi society in performing the speech act of apology.

It appears that the SA group tended to assign responsibility to themselves more than the AU group did, probably because the SA group wanted to clarify the situation more and convince the offended of the sincerity of their apology.

With 'respect to explanation or account', the SA and AU groups used it as an attempt to avoid making an explicit apology, which seems to be an influential cultural aspect of both groups.

For 'concern for the hearer', the SA and AU groups used it explicitly. This indicates that there are similarities between the two cultures in terms of using this strategy. In addition, it has been observed that the SA group employed some tools and features within their apologies in order to intensify their apology and to lessen the threatening act such as: humour,

swearing and intensive phrases. The SA group seems particularly concerned about getting the victim's satisfaction, which is an important part of Saudi human behavior.

With respect to 'offers of repair', the SA group varied from the AU group in terms of this realization. The AU group tended to use short utterances, whereas the SA group used long utterances, and in some cases the SA group insisted on compensation and offered repair more than once. Also, the SA group used some features such as endearment expressions and swearing to placate the offended and to show sincere offerings of repair. However, although some of the AU group used long sentences and offers of replacement, this was still less than the SA group. This reflects Saudi and Australian females' cultural norms of use in the speech act of apology.

In 'promise for forbearance', the use of some religious phrases to ease the impact of the offense by the SA group has been observed. This is an obvious result of the influence of the Saudis' religious instruction.

To conclude, the above observed similarities and differences between the SA and AU groups in their realization of apology strategies reflect specific aspects of each group's culture and give a picture of both groups' use of the speech act of apology. This extends our understanding of the use of some pragmatic tools by Saudi and Australian females and thus enriches the body of research into cross-cultural pragmatics.

5.6 Implications

The findings of the current research suggest a number of possible implications for the study of cross-cultural pragmatics. First, this research suggests that certain features of speech acts might be important for understanding the way people from different cultures use speech

acts. The findings of this study show that the SA and AU groups employed some features within their use of apology strategies that gave a picture of the use of apology in both cultures. Second, the findings suggest the value of comparing apology strategies used by participants from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds to attain intended outcomes, since some strategies were realized differently. Third, using DCT as a data collection method offers the researcher rich data that allow for having a deeper view of use of apology by Saudi and Australian females, thus supporting a similar claim by Cummings (2006). Finally, as Kasper and Schmidt (1996, p. 160) have stated: "pragmatic knowledge should be teachable". This may mean that in the design of future cross-cultural teaching material, apology norms of Saudi and Australian cultures could be valuable pedagogical considerations, so this would lead to better cross-cultural communication.

5.7 Limitations and suggestions for further research

The inevitable small scope of this study has led to some limitations. First and foremost, given that the participants were all university students and staff members, the ability to generalize across the populations may be restricted. In an effort to combat this limitation, future research should include participants of different social groups. However, the results provide insights into the way these groups of NSs realize the speech act of apology and the kind of apology strategies employed by them. Also, this study was restricted to female participants, so it is recommended that future research includes male participants to make it possible to observe any gender effects. In addition, due to the limitations of the DCT, (short responses and problems eliciting real-life performance), more authentic data and reliable results may be obtained if naturally occurring data is collected. In addition, the social variables of power and imposition were controlled in this research but were not the focus of

the study due to its small scale. Further research should investigate these variables, and other variables as well, such as age. Finally, the findings of this study suggest that to have a more comprehensive picture of the use of apology in Australian and Saudi contexts, further research on apology made by both Saudis and Australians in a broad range of settings is necessary.

In future research, I plan to involve more groups of Saudi Arabic and Australian females in different contexts. Also, another similar study of Australian Arabic learners would be valuable.

5.8 Conclusion

This study investigated the speech act of apology made by Saudi female native speakers of Arabic and Australian female native speakers of English. It examined the apology strategies used, similarities and differences in terms of apology strategies, features that characterized the SA and AU groups' use of apology strategies and realization of apology strategies.

This study found that there were some similarities as well as significant differences between the Saudi and Australian females in terms of their use of apology strategies, which can be attributed to the influence of culture. The SA and AU groups employed five similar strategies, which were used more by the SA group. These were: Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs), explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer and offer of repair. Also, differences were found between the two groups concerning their use of apology strategies. Although there were some marginal variations amongst the two groups in terms of the apology strategies used, some strategies were only utilized by the SA group.

Also, this study found that a number of features were utilized by the SA and AU groups in their use of apology strategies. The number of features employed by the SA group exceeded that of the AU group. Identification of such features distinguishes the SA and AU cultures. In addition, the use of these features by the SA group reflects some aspects of their religion and cultural tradition and provides valuable insights into the Saudi daily practice of apology. In addition, this study showed that the SA and AU groups realized apology strategies sometimes similarly and other times differently, which suggests that the SA and AU cultures seem to have some different and some common aspects in the way they realize apology strategies in their everyday discourse.

A key finding of the study was that there was significant variation in the use of some apology strategies within both the SA and AU groups, thus indicating that significant differences potentially occur even among participants from the same gender and cultural background.

It is hoped that this study has made a useful contribution to the field of cross-cultural pragmatics by investigating the speech act of apology made by Saudi Arabic females and Australian English females. This is an area that has received little investigation in the literature, and which for that reason might provide unique insights into differences and similarities between (and within) Saudi Arabic and Australian English female groups in terms of cultural as well as linguistic behavior.

References

- Al-Zumor, A. W. Q. G. (2011). Apologies in Arabic and English: An inter-language and cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University-Languages and Translation*, 23(1), 19-28.
- American Psychological, A. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University Students. (2010). *Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(3), 223.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- BARDOVI-HARLIG, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do Language Learners Recognize Pragmatic Violations? Pragmatic Versus Grammatical Awareness in Instructed L2 Learning*. *Tesol Quarterly*, 32(2), 233-259.
- Bataineh, R. F. (2006). Apology strategies of Jordanian EFL university students. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(11), 1901-1927.
- Bataineh, R. F. (2008). A cross-cultural comparison of apologies by native speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4), 792-821.
- Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. *Interlanguage pragmatics*, 82107.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1980). *Learning to Say What You Mean in a Second Language; a Study of the Speech Act Performance of Learners of Hebrew as a Second Language*.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 31): Ablex Pub.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns(CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.

- Boon, S. D., & Sulsky, L. M. (1997). Attributions of blame and forgiveness in romantic relationships: A policy-capturing study. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality; Journal of Social Behavior & Personality.*
- Boxer, D. (1993). *Complaining and commiserating*: Lang.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4): Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, S., & Attardo, S. (2005). *Understanding language structure, interaction, and variation: an introduction to applied linguistics and sociolinguistics for nonspecialists*: University of Michigan Press/ESL.
- Cohen, A. (1995). Investigating the production of speech act sets. *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language*, 21-44.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). DEVELOPING A MEASURE OF SOCIOCULTURAL COMPETENCE: THE CASE OF APOLOGY. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 113.
- Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of Requests and Apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of Study Abroad and Strategy-Building Intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 189-212.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(1), 155.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*: Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Cummings, L. M. B. M. C. (2006). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language*, 11, 65.
- Dictionary, M. W. (2003). Merriam-Webster, Incorporated. *Online version available at: www.mw.com.*

- El-Khalil, H. (1998). Variation in apology strategies among friends and acquaintances in Jordanian Arabic. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Irbid, Jordan: Yarmouk University.*
- Fraser, B. (1981). On apologizing. *Conversational routine*, 259-271.
- Garcia, C. (2009). Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(1), 3-20.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public; microstudies of the public order*: New York, Basic Books [1971].
- Goffman, E., & Best, J. (2005). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied linguistics*, 24(1), 90-121.
- Hartford, B., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2004). *Interlanguage pragmatics: exploring institutional talk*: Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Hatch, E. M. (1992). *Discourse and language education / Evelyn Hatch*: Cambridge [England] ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in society*, 19(2), 155-199.
- Holmes, J. (1995). Sex differences and apologies: One aspect of communicative competence. *Readings on second language acquisition*, 362-385.
- Hussein, R. F., & Hammouri, M. T. (1998). Strategies of apology in Jordanian Arabic And American English. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*(49), 37-50.
- Jebahi, K. (2011). Tunisian university students' choice of apology strategies in a discourse completion task. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 648-662.

- Johnston, B., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1998). Effect of rejoinders in production questionnaires. *Applied linguistics*, 19(2), 157-182.
- Jordà, M. P. S. (2003). Metapragmatic awareness and pragmatic production of third language learners of English: A focus on request acts realizations. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 43-68.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second language research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*, 316341.
- Kasper, G. (2008). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* London Continuum.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 13(02), 215-247.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 52, 1.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18(02), 149-169.
- Kim, H. (2008). The semantic and pragmatic analysis of South Korean and Australian English apologetic speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 257-278.
- Kondo, S. (1997). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English: Longitudinal study on interlanguage apologies. *Sophia linguistica*, 41, 265-284.
- Kwon, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 23(4), 339-364.

- Limmaneeprasert, O. (1993). The acquisition of pragmatic and metapragmatic knowledge by L2 learners of Thai. *Unpublished MA thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa.*
- Lipson, M. (1994). Apologizing in Italian and English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 32(1), 19-39.
- Lukasik, V. J. (2000). Predictors of the willingness to use forgiveness as a coping strategy in adolescent friendships.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*, 115-132.
- Márquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies* (Vol. 83): John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Strategy Use in Egyptian Arabic and American English Refusals. *Applied linguistics*, 23(2), 163-189.
- Nurani, L. M. (2009). Methodological issue in pragmatic research: is discourse completion test a reliable data collection instrument. *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, 5(9), 667-678.
- Nureddeen, F. A. (2008). Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 279-306.
- Olshtain, E. (1983). Socio-cultural competence and language transfer. In L. S. Susan M. Gass (Ed.), *Language transfer in language learning*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*, 155-173.

- Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. . (1985). Degree of approximation: Non-native reactions to native speech act behavior. In S. M. G. a. C. G (Ed.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, 18-35.
- Owen, M. (1983). *Apologies and remedial interchanges*: Mouton The Hague.
- Reineke, I. (1969). *Language and Dialect in Hawaii*: Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Rintell, E. M., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*, 248-272.
- Rizk, S. (1997). Apology in English among Arab nonnative speakers of English. *Journal of the Faculty of Education (Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt)*, 3, 1-27.
- Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 22(1), 27-67.
- Salkind, N. J. (2009). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics: EXCEL 2007 Edition*: Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. *General linguistics*, 9(2), 67-92.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209-232.
- Soliman, A. (2003). *Apology in American English and Egyptian Arabic*. Paper presented at the TESOL 3rd Annual Graduate Student Forum, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.
- Sugimoto, N. (1998). Norms of apology depicted in US American and Japanese literature on manners and etiquette. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(3), 251-276.
- Sugimoto, N. (1999). *Japanese apology across disciplines*: Nova Science Publishers.

- Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: Men and women in conversation. *New York: Morrow.*
- Tran, G. Q. (2004). Revisioning methodologies in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics. *English. Edu: Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4(1), 25-49.*
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11(2), 147-167.*
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies* (Vol. 7): De Gruyter Mouton.
- Vollmer, H. J., & Olshtain, E. (1989). The language of apologies in German. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies, 197-220.*
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). A semantic metalanguage for a cross-cultural comparison of speech acts and speech genres. *Language in Society, 14, 491-514.*
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics*: Mouton de Gruyter Berlin.
- Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies, 174-96.*
- Y o u n g, F. R. (1998). Hauptseminar: Cross-cultural Pragmatics.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: DCT Situations and Questionnaire

Discourse Completion Test (DCT) Questionnaire
--

(English Version)

Dear participant,

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire which contains situations in which you might find yourself.

I would appreciate it if you could complete this questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you for your help and co-operation.

First, please fill in the following form about yourself:

Name:

Age: (18-23) (24-28) (28-32) (32 & over)

Nationality:

Have you ever visited any English speaking country?

.....

Have you ever visited any country where English is used as a second language?

.....

Have you ever studied in a private language institute? Or studied abroad?

.....

Please read the following short descriptions of situations in which you may find yourself. Think of what you might say in response. Write your response in the space provided. Put yourself in the given situations and respond accordingly (as if you were in a real situation):

Situation 1:

It is 9:30 in the morning and you are a teaching assistant at a university and you are in a meeting now with a number of professors in addition to the head of your department. Dr Karen, whom you don't know well, made a comment that you respond to but she had not actually finished talking and you unintentionally interrupt her. She says angrily: "I wasn't done. Please don't interrupt me." What would you say?

.....

Situation 2:

You are a teacher at a school and you are at the principal's office to get some papers signed. The secretary , whom you never talked to, tells you that the principal isn't available at the moment, so you leave the paper on the secretary's desk but knock over her glass of orange juice, which spills all over her skirt. She says: "Oh, my goodness!" What would you say?

.....

Situation 3:

You are a lecturer at a university and you have an appointment with one of students today, who, although you do not know her, asked you to revise a paper she is going to present at a conference. You miss the appointment because you had to attend an urgent meeting, and a day later the student comes to your office. What would you say to her?

.....

Situation 4:

You are a second-year college student and you forgot to bring the medical statement as an excuse for skipping two classes when you were sick. This is the first time you skipped classes. Your professor is Dr Conroy, a lecturer at the Faculty of Education. She is a nice person and she is teaching you for the first time. You have a meeting with her to discuss the issue. You are in her office now. What would you say?

.....

Situation 5:

You are a first-year college student and you are late for class. You are running to class and on your way, you step on another student’s foot in the corridor. You don’t know this student. She says angrily “Hey, watch out!” What would you say?

.....

Situation 6:

You are a first-year college student and live in college dormitory. You are watching a movie in your room when you hear a knock at your door. It is a student like you, who has just moved in and is living in the room next to you. She says: “Would you mind lowering your TV volume? I’m trying to study for the exam tomorrow and I can’t concentrate.” What would you say?

.....

Situation 7:

You are a mother and you have two kids. Your husband’s friend invites you to his new house for the first time. You are sitting now in the guest room with some other guests. All the children are playing around the house, and suddenly your younger son breaks an expensive vase. The host’s wife comes to see what is happening and says “Oh, no, this was a gift from my sister.” What would you say?

.....

Situation 8:

You are a student and have been studying with your friend in the library for three hours and discussing a project you are doing together for a term paper. A lot of other students are in the library and they are studying as well. The librarian comes to you and tells you to quiet down in an angry tone of voice. What would you say?

.....

Discourse Completion Test (DCT) Questionnaire
 (Arabic Version)

(استبيان)

عزيزتي المشاركة:

الرجاء تعبئة الاستبيان التالي والذي هو عبارته عن عدة مواقف قد تواجهينها في حياتك اليومية. يسعدني لو تقومى بأداء الاستبيان في وقت قصير وارساله. وشكرا لتعاونك ومشاركتك الطيبه.

أولا : قومي بتعبئة المعلومات التالية:

الاسم

العمر: (18-23) (24-28) (28-32) (32 فما فوق)

الحال الدراسي: (طالبه) (خريجه)

- هل قمتي بزياره أي دولة تتحدث الانجليزية؟

- هل قمتي بزيارة أي دولة يتحدثون فيها الانجليزية كلغة ثانية؟

- هل درستي مسبقا في أي مؤسسه أو معهد لغه خاص؟ أ و درستي بالخارج؟

- هذا الاستبيان مكون من ثمان مواقف حياتيه.

الرجاء قومي الان بقراءة تفاصيل المواقف التالية والتي قد تواجهك في حياتك اليومية. فكري فيما قد تقولينه في حال تعرضتي لمثل هذه المواقف. اكتبني ردك في الخانة المخصصة لذلك. ضعي نفسك في هذه المواقف وكأنها تحدث لك في الحقيقه الان وبناء عليه قومي بكتابة ردك.

الموقف الأول:

انتي معيده بالجامعه والان الساعه 9:30 صباحا والان انتي في اجتماع مع عدد من الدكتاتره بالاضافه لرئيسه قسمك. دكتوراه (ساره) اللي ما تعرفينها جيدا قامت بالتعليق وانتي قاطعنيها بدون قصد وقمتي بالرد عليها وهي ما بعد تنهي كلامها. فهي قالت لك وهي معصبه "ما بعد انتهي، لو سمحتي لا تقاطعيني. فمادا ستقولين الان للدكتوراه ساره؟

الموقف الثاني:

انتي مدرسه بالمدرسه والان في مكتب المديره لتوقيع بعض الاوراق. السكرتيره اللي أبدا ما تكلمتي معها مسبقا، خبرتك بأنوالمديره غير موجوده حاليا فأنتي تركتي الاوراق على مكتب السكرتيره. فاهتز كاس عصير البرتقال للسكرتيره وانسكب على تنورتها كلها. فقالت السكرتيره "اوه، يا ربي". فمادا ستقولين للسكرتيره الان؟

الموقف الثالث:

انتي محاضره بالجامعه وعندك موعد مع احدى الطالبات، اللي بالرغم من انك ما تعرفينها، طلبت منك مراجعة ورقة عمل راح تقدمها في مؤتمر. إنتي راح عليك الموعد لأنو كان عندك اجتماع طارئ كان لازم تحضرينه. بعدها بيوم الطالبه حضرت لمكتبك. ماذا ستقولين للطالبه الان؟

الموقف الرابع:

إنتي طالبة كليه في السنه الثانيه و نسيتي احضار العذر الطبي لتقديمه بدل تخلفك عن محاضرتين لما كنتي مريضه، وهذي أول مره تتخلفين فيها عن المحاضرات. دكتوراه الماده تبعك (دكتوراه سميه) محاضره في كلية التربيه وهي انسانه لطيفه و اول مره تدرسك فيها. عندك اجتماع معها لمناقشه الموضوع. انتي في مكتبها الان. ماذا ستقولين للدكتوراه سميه الان؟

الموقف الخامس:

إنتي طالبة في العام الاول بالكليهومتاخره على الكلاس تبعك. فأنتي تجرین على أساس تلحقي على الكلاس وفي طريقك بالممر تدوسي على قدم طالبه انتي ما بتعرفينها. الطالبه تقولك: "هي، انتي انتبهي". ماذا ستقولين للطالبه الان؟

الموقف السادس:

إنتي طالبة سنه أولى بالكليه وتعيشين بسكن الكلية وتشاهدين فيلم في غرفتك وتسمعين حد يطرق بابك. اللي عند الباب طالبه مثلك انتقلت للسكن حديثا و تسكن بالغرفه اللي بجنبك. فهي تقولك " ممكن تخفضي على صوت التلفزيون العالي لاني أحاول أدرس لاختبار بكره و مو قادره أركز".

ماذا ستقولين للطالبيه الان ؟

الموقف السابع: إنتي أم وعندك طفلين وصديق زوجك وجه لكم دعوه لبيته الجديد لأول مره. انتي الان جالساه في غرفة الضيوف مع بقية المدعويين وكل الاطفال يلعبون حول البيت. فجأه ولدك الصغير يكسر فازه غاليه. صاحبة البيت(زوجة صاحب الدعوه) تحضر وتشوف وش اللي صاير, وتقول: " اوه، لا، هذي كانت هديه من أختي." ماذا ستقولين لصاحبة البيت الان ؟

الموقف الثامن: انتي طالبيه ومكتتي في المكتبه تدرسين مع صديقتك لمدة ثلاث ساعات وتناقشون على مشروع تعملونه لورقة عمل الترم. كثير من الطالبات في المكتبه يدرسون مثلكم . مسؤلة المكتبه تحضر لعندكم وتطلب منكم تخفضو اصواتكم بنبرة عصبية. ماذا ستقولين لمسؤلة المكتبه الان ؟

Appendix 2: Plain language statement

(English Version)
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT
Apologies by Saudi and Australian females



You are invited to participate in the above research project, which is being conducted by THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE DrCarstenRoever (supervisor) and MsShatha Al Ali (student) of the School of Languages and Linguistics at The University of Melbourne. This project will form part of MsShatha's Master's thesis, and has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee.

We would ask you to complete an eight-item questionnaire. With your permission, the questionnaire would be kept with us. We estimate that the time commitment required of you would not exceed 15 minutes.

We intend to protect your anonymity and the confidentiality of your responses to the fullest possible extent, within the limits of the law. The data will be kept securely and then will be destroyed after finishing the project.

Please be advised that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Should you wish to withdraw at any stage, or to withdraw any unprocessed data you have supplied, you are free to do so without prejudice. The researchers are not involved in the ethics application process.

If you would like to participate, please indicate that you have read and understood this information by signing the accompanying consent form and returning it in the envelope provided.

Should you require any further information, or have any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact either of the researchers; DrCarstenRoever: +61 3 8344 4919 , MsShatha: 0422429546 . Should you have any concerns about the conduct of the project, you are welcome to contact the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne, on ph: 8344 2073, or fax: 9347 6739.

HREC 1237585.1 Version 1. 26-03-2012

(Arabic Version)

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT

Apologies by Saudi and Australian females

(الاعتذارات بواسطة النساء السعوديات والاستراليات)



عزيزتي، أنتي مدعوه للمشاركة في المشروع البحثي المذكور أعلاه والذي يعد من قبل الدكتور كارستن روفر (مشرف) و الأنسه شذى العلي (طالبة) في قسم اللغات واللغويات في جامعة ملبورن. هذا المشروع هو جزء من بحث الماجستير للأنسه شذى، والذي تمت الموافقه عليه من قبل لجنة أخلاقيات البحوث الانسانيه.

نحن نطلب منك في مشاركتك بهذا المشروع البحثي أن تقومي بتعبئة الاستبيان المكون من ثمان فقرات والباحثين سوف يحتفظون بالاستبيان بعد اكمالك له. الوقت المقدر الذي تستطيعين فيه انجاز الاستبيان لا يتعدى ثلاثين دقيقة. نحن نعمل على الحفاظ على سرية معلوماتك المعطاه لأكبر درجه ممكنه والمعلومات سوف تحفظ في مكان آمن ومن ثم تتلف بعد إنتهاء المشروع. إن مشاركتك في هذه الدراسه هي من محظ ارادتك ولك الحريهالتامه في الانسحاب في أي مرحله. اذا ترغبين بالمشاركه الرجاء التأكيد بأنك أتممت قراءة وفهم هذه المعلومات التي تم ذكرها بتوقيعك على نموذج (التفويض) المرفق ومن ثم إعادته إلينا.

في حالة الرغبه في القيام بأي استفسارات إضافيه الرجاء عدم التردد في التواصل مع الباحثين: د.كارستن روفر: +61 3 8344 4919 , الأنسه شذى: 0422429546. وإذا لديك أي مخاوف بالنسبه للدراسة فأنتي مرحب بك للتواصل مع المسئول المنفذ, اخلاقيات البحوث الانسانيه, جامعة ملبورن, على هاتف رقم: 8344 2073 أو فاكس:

9347 6739

HREC 1237585.1 Version 1. 26-03-2012

Appendix 3: Consent form

School of Languages and Applied Linguistics/Faculty of Arts

Consent form for persons participating in a research project PROJECT TITLE:Apologies by Saudi and Australian Females	
Name of participant:	
Name of investigators: Ms Shatha Al Ali/ Dr Carsten Rover	
1.	I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written plain language statement to keep.
2.	I understand that after I sign and return this consent form it will be retained by the researcher.
3.	I understand that my participation will involve answering a questionnaire and I agree that the researcher may use the results as described in the plain language statement.
4.	I acknowledge that: (a) the possible effects of participating in answering a questionnaire have been explained to my satisfaction; (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data I have provided; (c) the project is for the purpose of research; (d) I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements; (e) my name will be referred to by a pseudonym in any publications arising from the research; (f) I have been informed that a copy of the research findings will be forwarded to me, should I agree to this.
Participant signature: (you can just type your name)	Date:
HREC 1237585.1	

Appendix 4: Pilot questionnaire

(English Version)

Discourse Completion Test (DCT)/ Pilot Questionnaire

Dear participant,

First, please fill in the following form about yourself

Name:-----

Age: (18-23) (24-28) (28-32) (32 & over)

Nationality:-----

Have you ever visited any English speaking country?

.....

Have you ever visited any country where English is used as a second language?

.....

Have you ever studied in a private language institute? Or studied abroad?

.....

I would appreciate it if you could complete this questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you for your help and co-operation.

You are kindly requested to evaluate the following situations by rating the items. Each item includes three options (1,2 or 3), which mean:

1-very little, hardly any

2-some, a medium amount

3-a lot, very large

Situation 1:

It is 9:30 in the morning and you are a teaching assistant at a university and you are in a meeting with a number of professors in addition to the head of your department now. Dr Smith, whom you don't know well, made a comment that you respond to but he had not actually finished talking and you unintentionally interrupt him. He says angrily: "I wasn't done. Please don't interrupt me."

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing

2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship

3 – very familiar, close relationship

2-Degree of Power that Dr Smith has over you:

1-very little power

2-strong power

3-very strong power

3-Degree of offense of the action here(interrupting a professor in a meeting) is:

1-mild offense

2-serious offense

3-very serious offense

Situation 2:

You are a teacher at a school and you are at the principal's office to get some papers signed. The secretary, Rose, tells you that the principal isn't available at the moment, so you leave the paper on the secretary's desk but knock over her glass of orange juice and split her orange and it spills all over her skirt. She says: "Oh, my goodness!"

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing

2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship

<p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a teacher) have over the secretary (Rose):</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(spilling a glass of juice) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p> <p>Situation 3:</p> <p>You are a lecturer at a university and you have an appointment with one of your students, Karen, today, to revise a paper she is going to present at a conference. You miss the appointment because you had to attend an urgent meeting, and a day later the student comes to your office.</p> <p>1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :</p> <p>1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing</p> <p>2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship</p> <p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a lecturer) have over the student:</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(late for an appointment) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p> <p>Situation 4:</p> <p>You are a second-year college student and you didn't submit your term paper on the due date because you couldn't find enough material for your research area. This is the first time you missed a due date. Your professor is Dr Conroy, a lecturer at the Faculty of Education. She is a strict professor and she is teaching you for the first time. You have a meeting with her a few days after the paper is due. You are in her office now.</p> <p>1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :</p> <p>1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing</p> <p>2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship</p> <p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a student) have over your professor (DrConory):</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(late for submitting a term paper) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p> <p>Situation 5:</p> <p>You are a first-year college student and you are late for class. You are running to class and on your way, you step on another student's foot in the corridor. You don't know this student. She says angrily "Hey, watch out!".</p> <p>1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :</p> <p>1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing</p> <p>2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship</p> <p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a student) have over the other student:</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(stepping on a student's foot) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p>

Situation 6:

You are a first-year college student and live in college dormitory. You are watching a movie in your room when you hear a knock at your door. It is Sarah, a student like you, who is living in the room next to you. Sarah says: "Would you mind lowering your TV volume? I'm trying to study for the exam tomorrow and I can't concentrate."

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

- 1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing
- 2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship
- 3 – very familiar, close relationship

2-Degree of Power that you (a student) have over the other student (Sara):

- 1-very little power
- 2-strong power
- 3-very strong power

3-Degree of offense of the action here(disturbing a student who is studying for an exam) is:

- 1-mild offense
- 2-serious offense
- 3-very serious offense

Situation 7:

You are working in a bank and you have an important meeting with your boss at 9:10 in the morning to talk about a new strategy for the bank. You forget about the meeting while you are having your breakfast. An hour later, your boss calls and says: "What happened this morning? I thought we had a meeting?"

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

- 1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing
- 2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship
- 3 – very familiar, close relationship

2-Degree of Power that your boss has over you (an employee):

- 1-very little power
- 2-strong power
- 3-very strong power

3-Degree of offense of the action here(forgetting a meeting with your boss) is:

- 1-mild offense
- 2-serious offense
- 3-very serious offense

Situation 8:

You are a mother and you have two kids. Your husband's friend invites you to his new house for the first time. You are sitting now in the guest room with some other guests. All the children are playing around the house, and suddenly your younger son breaks an expensive vase. The host's wife, Nora, comes to see what is happening and says "Oh, no, this was a gift from my sister."

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

- 1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing
- 2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship
- 3 – very familiar, close relationship

2-Degree of Power that you (a guest) have over the host (Nora):

- 1-very little power
- 2-strong power
- 3-very strong power

3-Degree of offense of the action here(breaking an expensive vase) is:

- 1-mild offense
- 2-serious offense
- 3-very serious offense

Situation 9:

You borrowed \$1000 from your friend a year ago, and you didn't return the money on time because you couldn't afford it and cannot return it now. Your friend comes to visit you and asks for her money as she really needs it to fulfill obligations of her own.

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

- 1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing
- 2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship

<p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a friend) have over your friend:</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(did not return the borrowed money on time) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p> <p>Situation</p> <p>You are a third-year college student and need extra tutoring in Math. You meet with a tutor, Ms Lee, to have Math classes every Monday at 6:00 pm. Ms Lee is a punctual person and is never late for an appointment. This Monday you attend a graduation party of a friend's of yours, and forget about the meeting. While you are at the party, Ms Lee calls you to know the reason for your absence and tells you that she has been waiting for you for two hours.</p> <p>1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :</p> <p>1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing</p> <p>2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship</p> <p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a student) have over your tutor:</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(late for an appointment) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p> <p>Situation 11:</p> <p>You are a student at secondary school and you missed the science class last week because of flu. You borrowed your friend's book to complete your homework and forgot to bring it back, and the exam is the next day. You cannot return it back today because your home is too far from school, and time wouldn't help you friend to study either. During a break, your friend comes to you to ask for her book.</p> <p>1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :</p> <p>1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing</p> <p>2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship</p> <p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a friend) have over your friend:</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(forgot to bring back a friend's book and the exam is the next day) is:</p> <p>1-mild offense</p> <p>2-serious offense</p> <p>3-very serious offense</p> <p>Situation 12:</p> <p>You are a student and have been studying with your friend in the library for three hours and discussing a project you are doing together for a term paper. A lot of other students are in the library and they are studying as well. The librarian comes to you and tells you to quiet down in an angry tone of voice.</p> <p>1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :</p> <p>1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing</p> <p>2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship</p> <p>3 – very familiar, close relationship</p> <p>2-Degree of Power that you (a student) have over the librarian:</p> <p>1-very little power</p> <p>2-strong power</p> <p>3-very strong power</p> <p>3-Degree of offense of the action here(disturbing students studying in the library) is:</p>	10:
---	-----

- 1-mild offense
- 2-serious offense
- 3-very serious offense

Situation 13:

You are a student and have been studying with your friend in the library for three hours and discussing a project you are doing together for a term paper. A lot of other students are in the library and they are studying as well. One of the students comes to you and tells you to quiet down in an angry tone of voice.

1-Degree of familiarity between the people in the situation :

- 1 – very unfamiliar, don't know each other at all or only in passing
- 2 – somewhat familiar, know each other but do not have a close relationship
- 3 – very familiar, close relationship

2-Degree of Power that you (a student) have over the other student:

- 1-very little power
- 2-strong power
- 3-very strong power

3-Degree of offense of the action here(disturbing students studying in the library) is:

- 1-mild offense
- 2-serious offense
- 3-very serious offense

(Arabic Version)

استبيان

عزيزتي المشاركة:

أولا : قومي بتعبئة المعلومات التالية:

الاسم:-----
العمر: (18-23) (24-28) (28-32) (32 فما فوق)

يسعدني لو تقومي بتعبئة الاستبيان في وقت قصير وارساله.
وشكرا لتعاونك ومشاركتك الطيبة..

الرجاء تقييم المواقف الحياتية التالية باختيار التقييم المناسب لكل فقره. كل فقرة تتضمن ثلاث خيارات (1,2,3) وهذا يعني:

- (1) ضعيف جدا, تقريبا معدوم الدرجة
- (2) القليل, متوسط الدرجة
- (3) الكثير, درجة كبيره

الموقف الأول:

انتي معيده بالجامعه والان الساعه 9:30 صباحا والان انتي في اجتماع مع عدد من الدكاترة بالاضافة لرئيس قسمك. احدى الدكاترة المتواجدين (دكتور محمد) اللي ما تعرفينه جيدا قام بالتعليق وانت قاطعتيه بدون قصد وقمتي بالرد عليه وهو ما بعد ينهي كلامه. فهو قالك وهو معصب"ما بعد انتهي، لو سمحتي لا تقاطعيني".

1-درجة المعرفة (العلاقة) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين, لا تربطهم أي علاقة ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره
- 2-متعارفين وبيبينهم علاقة لحد ما, يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقة قويه
- 3-متعارفين جدا, بينهم علاقة قويه

2-درجة السلطة (القوه) التي يملكها (الدكتور محمد) عليك:

- 1-سلطة ضئيله جدا
- 2-سلطه قويه
- 3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (مقاطعة حديث دكتور في اجتماع):

1-أهانة عادية(خفيفه)

2-أهانة قوية

3-أهانة قوية جدا

الموقف الثاني:

إنني مدرسة بالمدرسة والان في مكتب المديره لتوقيع بعض الأوراق. السكرتيره "روز" خبرتكم بأنوالمديره غير موجوده حاليا فأنتي تركنتي الأوراق على مكتب السكرتيره فقام اهتز كاس عصير البرتقال للسكرتيره وانسكب على تنورتها كلها. فقالت السكرتيره"اوه، يا ربي".

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين. لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره
- 2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقته لحد ما. يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه
- 3-متعارفين جدا. بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها انتي كمدرسه على (السكرتيره):

1--سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الاهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (سكب كاس عصير البرتقال على تنورة سكرتيره):

1-أهانة عادية(خفيفه)

2-أهانة قوية

3-أهانة قوية جدا

الموقف الثالث:

انتي محاضره بالجامعه وعندك موعد مع احدى طالباتك(فاطمه) لمراجعة ورقة عمل راح تقدمها في مؤتمر. إنني راح عليك الموعد لأنو كان عندك اجتماع طارئ كان لازم تحضرينه. بعدها بيوم الطالبه حضرت لمكتبك.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين. لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره
- 2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقته لحد ما. يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه
- 3-متعارفين جدا. بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها انتي كمحاضره على طالباتك (فاطمه):

1--سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الاهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (إخلاف موعد مع طالبه):

1-أهانة عادية(خفيفه)

2-أهانة قوية

3-أهانة قوية جدا

الموقف الرابع:

أنتي طالبة كليته في السنه الثانيه وما قدمتي ورقة عمل الترم في الموعد المحدد لأنك ما قدرتي تحصيلين على مصادر كافيه لمجالك البحثي، وهذي أول مره تتخلفين فيها عن الموعد المحدد. دكتوراه الماده تبعك(دكتوراه سمييه) محاضره في كلية التربيه هي انسانه شديده و اول مره تدرسك فيها. عندك اجتماع معها بعد كم يوم من الموعد المحدد لتسليم ورقة العمل. انتي في مكتبها الان.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين. لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره
- 2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقته لحد ما. يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه
- 3-متعارفين جدا. بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها انتي كطالبه على (الدكتوراه سمييه):

1--سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (عدم تقديم ورقة عمل الترم في الوقت المحدد):

1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-اهانه قويه

3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف الخامس:

انتي طالبه في العام الاول بالكليه ومتاخره على الكلاس تبعك. فانتى تجربين على أساس تلحقي على الكلاس وفي طريقك بالممر تدوسي على قدم طالبه انتى ما بتعرفينها. الطالبه تقولك: "هي، انتى انتبهى".

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

1-غير متعارفين. لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابداء أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقته لحد ما، يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه

3-متعارفين جدا، بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها كطالبه على (طالبه اخرى):

1-سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (الاطاءه على قدم طالبه):

1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-اهانه قويه

3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف السادس:

إنتي طالبة سنه أولى بالكليه وتعيشين بسكن الكلية وتشاهدين فيلم في غرفتك وتسمعين حد يطرق بابك. اللي عند الباب(ساره) طالبه مثلك تسكن بالعرفه اللي بجنبك. ساره تقولك "ممكن تخفضي على صوت تلفزيونك العالي لاني أحاول أن أدرس لاختبار بكره و مو قادره أركز".

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

1-غير متعارفين. لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابداء أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقته لحد ما، يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه

3-متعارفين جدا، بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها كطالبه على طالبه اخرى (ساره) :

1-سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (ازعاج طالبه تحاول الدراسه لاختبار بالغد):

1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-اهانه قويه

3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف السابع:

أنتي تشتغلين في بنك و عندك موعد مهم مع مديرتك الساعه 9:10 صباحا لمناقشه استراتيجيه جديدة في البنك. انتى تنسين الموعد وانتى تتناولين فطورك. بعد ساعه مديرتك تتصل عليك وتقولك: "وش اللي صار هالصباح؟ اعتقد كان عندنا اجتماع؟".

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

1-غير متعارفين. لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابداء أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقته لحد ما، يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه

3-متعارفين جدا، بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكها مديرتك عليك (كموظفه):

1-سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (نسيان اجتماع مع مديرتك):

1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-اهانه قويه

3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف الثامن:

إنتي أم وعندك طفلين وصديق زوجك وجه لكم دعوه للحضور لبيته الجديد لأول مره. انتي الان جالسه في غرفة الضيوف مع بقية المدعوين وكل الاطفال يلعبون حول البيت. فجأه ولدك الصغير يكسر فازه عاليه الثمن. صاحبة البيت(زوجة صاحب الدعوه (نوره)) تحضر وتشوف وش اللي صاير, وتقول: " اوه، لا، هذي كانت هديه من أختي."

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

1-غير متعارفين, لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبيّنهم علاقته لحد ما, يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه

3-متعارفين جدا, بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها انتي (كضيفه) على المضيفه (نورا):

1--سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (كسر فازه عاليه الثمن):

1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-اهانه قويه

3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف التاسع:

اقترضتي 1000 دولار من صاحبك من سنه وما رجعتي لها المبلغ في الوقت المحدد لانوماقدرتي توفيرينه وما تقدري ترجعيه الان. صديقتك تحضر تزورك وتطلب منك المبلغ لانها محتاجته لتقضي بعض الاحتياجات الخاصه فيها.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

1-غير متعارفين, لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبيّنهم علاقته لحد ما, يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه

3-متعارفين جدا, بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها (كصديقه) على صديقتك:

1--سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (عدم اعاده المال المقترض في الوقت المحدد):

1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-اهانه قويه

3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف العاشر:

انتي طالبة كليه بالسنهالثالثه وتحتاجين دروس خصوصيه في ماده الرياضيات وانتي تحضرين عند الأتسه منيره لتأخذي دروس بالرياضيات كل يوم اثنتين الساعة 6:00 بالمساء. الأتسه منيره دقيقه في مواعيدها وما تتأخر على أي موعد. هذا الاثنتين انتي تحضرين حفلة تخرج صديقتك وتنسين الموعد. وانتيبالحفله الأتسه منيره تتصل عليك لتعرف سبب تغيبك وتقولك انها كانت تنتظرك لمدة ساعتين.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

1-غير متعارفين, لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابدأ أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبيّنهم علاقته لحد ما, يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه

3-متعارفين جدا, بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها (كطالبه) على مدرستك للمواد الخاصيه:

- 1-سلطه ضئيله جدا
- 2-سلطه قويه
- 3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (نسيان موعد):

- 1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)
- 2-اهانه قويه
- 3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف الحادي عشر:

انتي طالبه بالثانوييه،ماحضرتي كلاس العلوم الاسبوع الماضي بسبب الانفلونزا. استعرتي كتاب صديقتك لتكملي واجباتك ونسييتي ترجعين الكتاب لها واختبار الماده بكره. ما تقدرين ترجعين لها الكتاب اليوم لانو بيتك بعيد من المدرسه والوقت مار اح يسعف صديقتك للمذاكره. خلال الفسحه صديقتك تحضر عندك لتطلب كتابها.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين، لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابداء أو فقط في لقاءات عابره
- 2-متعارفين وبيّنهم علاقته لحد ما، يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه
- 3-متعارفين جدا، بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها (كصديقه) على صديقتك:

- 1-سلطه ضئيله جدا
- 2-سلطه قويه
- 3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (نسيان احضار كتاب صديقه والاختبار في اليوم التالي):

- 1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)
- 2-اهانه قويه
- 3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف الثاني عشر:

انتي طالبه ومكتتي في المكتبه تدرسين مع صديقتك لمدة ثلاث ساعات وتتناقشون على مشروع تعملونه لورقه عمل الترم. كثير من الطالبات في المكتبه يدرسون مثلكم. مسئوله المكتبه تحضر لعندكم وتطلب منكم تخفضو اصواتكم بنبره عصبية.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين، لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابداء أو فقط في لقاءات عابره
- 2-متعارفين وبيّنهم علاقته لحد ما، يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقته قويه
- 3-متعارفين جدا، بينهم علاقته قويه

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها (كطالبه) على مسئوله المكتبه:

- 1-سلطه ضئيله جدا
- 2-سلطه قويه
- 3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (التسبب في ازعاج طالبات يدرسون في المكتبه):

- 1-اهانه عاديه(خفيفه)
- 2-اهانه قويه
- 3-اهانه قويه جدا

الموقف الثالث عشر:

انتي طالبه ومكتتي في المكتبه تدرسين مع صديقتك لمدة ثلاث ساعات وتتناقشون على مشروع تعملونه لورقه عمل الترم. كثير من الطالبات في المكتبه يدرسون مثلكم. احدى الطالبات تحضر لعندكم وتطلب منكم تخفضو اصواتكم بنبره عصبية.

1-درجة المعرفه (العلاقه) بين الاشخاص في هذا الموقف:

- 1-غير متعارفين، لا تربطهم أي علاقته ولا يعرفون بعض ابداء أو فقط في لقاءات عابره

2-متعارفين وبينهم علاقة لحد ما, يعرفون بعض لكن ليس بينهم علاقة قوية
3-متعارفين جدا, بينهم علاقة قوية

2-درجة السلطه (القوه) التي تملكينها انتي (كطالبه) على الطالبه الاخرى:

1--سلطه ضئيله جدا

2-سلطه قويه

3-سلطه قويه جدا

3-درجة الالهانه (الإساءه) في هذا الموقف (التسبب في ازعاج طالبات يدرسون في المكتبه):

1-الهانه عاديه(خفيفه)

2-الهانه قويه

3-الهانه قويه جدا