UNIVERSITI MALAYA

<u>PERAKUAN KEASLIAN PENULISAN</u>

Nama: (No. K.P/Pasport:)

No. Pendaftaran/Matrik:

Nama Ijazah:

Tajuk Kertas Projek/Laporan Penyelidikan/Disertasi/Tesis ("Hasil Kerja ini"):

Bidang Penyelidikan:

Saya dengan sesungguhnya dan sebenarnya mengaku bahawa:

(1)   Saya adalah satu-satunya pengarang/penulis Hasil Kerja ini;
(2)   Hasil Kerja ini adalah asli;
(3)   Apa-apa penggunaan mana-mana hasil kerja yang mengandungi hakcipta telah dilakukan secara urusan yang wajar dan bagi maksud yang dibenarkan dan apa-apa petikan, ekstrak, rujukan atau pengeluaran semula daripada atau kepada mana-mana hasil kerja yang mengandungi hakcipta telah dinyatakan dengan sejelasnya dan secukupnya dan satu pengiktirafan tajuk hasil kerja tersebut dan pengarang/penulisnya telah dilakukan di dalam Hasil Kerja ini;
(4)   Saya tidak mempunyai apa-apa pengetahuan sebenar atau patut semunasabahnya tahu bahawa penghasilan Hasil Kerja ini melanggar suatu hakcipta hasil kerja yang lain;
(5)   Saya dengan ini menyerahkan kesemua dan tiap-tiap hak yang terkandung di dalam hakcipta Hasil Kerja ini kepada Universiti Malaya ("UM") yang seterusnya mula dari sekarang adalah tuan punya kepada hakcipta di dalam Hasil Kerja ini dan apa-apa pengeluaran semula atau penggunaan dalam apa jua bentuk atau dengan apa juga cara sekalipun adalah dilarang tanpa terlebih dahulu mendapat kebenaran bertulis dari UM;
(6)   Saya sedar sepenuhnya sekiranya dalam masa penghasilan Hasil Kerja ini saya telah melanggar suatu hakcipta hasil kerja yang lain sama ada dengan niat atau sebaliknya, saya boleh dikenakan tindakan undang-undang atau apa-apa tindakan lain sebagaimana yang diputuskan oleh UM.

Tandatangan Calon   Tarikh

Diperbuat dan sesungguhnya diakui di hadapan,

Tandatangan Saksi   Tarikh

Nama:
Jawatan:

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: (I.C/Passport No:)

Registration/Matric No:

Name of Degree:

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis ("this Work"):

Field of Study:

  I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

(1)   I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
(2)   This Work is original;
(3)   Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
(4)   I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
(5)   I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya ("UM"), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
(6)   I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate's Signature   Date

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness's Signature   Date

Name:
Designation:

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the apology strategies in English used by 30 Malay undergraduates in Malaysia. It looks into the frequency, combination and sequential position of apology strategies used. The results reveal that the respondents employed different combinations of strategies to apologize. The use of apology strategies varied across six social situations. Most of the responses started with expression of apology (IFID) followed by other strategies. The most common combinations employed are expression of apology and explanation or account, expression of apology and repair and forbearance and expression of apology, acknowledgement of responsibility and minimizing the degree of offense. There is no significant difference in the way both gender apologized as they employed similar strategies in their oral responses. The respondents used two to three strategies the most to apologize. Finally, factors such as age, gender, social distance and severity of the offense play an important role in determining the strategies chosen to apologize.

Keywords: Apology strategies, gender, factors.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan mengenal pasti strategi meminta maaf yang digunakan oleh 30 pelajar sarjana muda di Malaysia. Kajian ini mengkaji kekerapan, kombinasi dan kedudukan strategi meminta maaf yang digunakan. Dapatan menunjukkan responden menggunakan kombinasi strategi yang berlainan untuk meminta maaf. Strategi-strategi yang digunakan berlainan di dalam enam situasi yang diberikan. Kebanyakkan respon yang diberikan bermula dengan expresi maaf diikuti dengan strategi yang lain. Kombinasi strategi yang kerap digunakan adalah expresi maaf dan penjelasan, expresi maaf dan menawarkan pembaikan, expresi maaf, bertanggungjawab dan menawarkan pembaikan. Tiada perbezaan yang ketara dilihat apabila perbandingan gender dibuat. Kedua-dua gender menggunakan strategi yang hampir sama apabila meminta maaf. Mereka menggunakan dua hingga tiga strategi untuk meminta maaf. Faktor-faktor seperti umur, gender, jarak sosial dan tahap serius kesalahan yang dibuat memainkan peranan penting dalam menentukan strategi-strategi yang digunakan untuk meminta maaf.

Kata kunci : Strategi meminta maaf, gender, faktor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, for it is possible to complete this dissertation with His consent. I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Pn. Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor, for her priceless assistance, support and guidance. I would also like to thank my husband, my sons and daughter, my mother and siblings for being there for me, for their patience, support and endless love. Not forgetting my friends who also help me in completing my dissertation. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

APOLOGY STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH

USED BY MALAY UNDERGRADUATES

NOORHAYATI BINTI BAHARUDIN

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN ENGLISH
AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
2016

APOLOGY STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH
USED BY MALAY UNDERGRADUATES

NOORHAYATI BINTI BAHARUDIN

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

KUALA LUMPUR

2016

CHAPTER 1

1.0   INTRODUCTION

"To err is human". This shows that human beings cannot escape from making mistakes in their lives. In other words, it is inevitable for us to make mistakes and therefore we need to apologize to restore harmony. Apologizing does not always mean you are wrong and the other person is right. It just means you value your relationship more than your ego.

Apology is defined as "a speech act addressed to V's face-needs and intended to remedy an offence for which A takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between A and V (where A is the apologist, and V is the victim or person offended" (Holmes, 1989). Apologies are expressive illocutionary acts (Trosborg, 1995), convivial in nature (Leech, 1983) but they can be effective even when they are not sincere (Lazare, 2005) in that they are emotionally satisfying (Nobles, 2008). Bataineh and Bataineh (2008) defined apology strategies as the methods individuals use to perform the speech act of apology.

Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that an apology is primarily and essentially a social act as it is aimed at maintaining good relationship between participants. This shows that an apology is a fundamental speech act which is a part of human communication and it occurs in every culture to maintain good relations between interlocutors. Goffman (1967) referred an apology as a remedy, the essential element in a remedial interchange. Obeng (1999) stated that to avoid a possible confrontation and a ruining of personal and social relations, there is a need for the negotiation of various communicative strategies to remedy the tense situation which may have been created and thereby restore peace and harmony. Trosborg & Shaw (1998) mentioned that apologies are offered to express regret for having offended someone. As such, they imply cost to the speaker and support for the hearer. Apologies typically occur post events to restore harmony when an offense has been

committed. Finally, Juhana (2011) claimed that to express apology is a common occurrence for people to do since in their social interaction they cannot avoid for making mistake.

A number of studies had been done earlier to investigate how people apologize. Some studies are done based on different focuses but most are done to classify the types and the combinations of apology strategies employed by the respondents. Some studies look into the aspect of gender, cultures, and factors that affect the speech act of apologizing. Some studies were carried out to find similarities and differences in the apology strategies used by males and females. Previous studies also focus on the culture, whether there are elements in the specific cultures that affect the way people apologize or to see the similarities and differences in apologizing between cultures. Finally, factors or social variables that affect the way people apologize also was analysed as the secondary part of the previous studies done on apology strategies.

1.1 Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate and categorize the apology strategies used in English as a second language by Malay undergraduates. There are 3 research questions in this study:

1. How do Malay ESL undergraduates apologize?

2. What are the similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies used by male and female undergraduates?

3. What are the factors that influence the different apology strategies used?

This study aims to investigate and categorize the apology strategies used by Malay ESL (English as a second language) undergraduates. The first research question focuses on the patterns and the types of strategies frequently used by the Malay ESL undergraduates and looks at the length and combinations of apology strategies of the responses given. The second research question looks into the similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies used by the male and female participants. Finally, the third research question explores the factors that affect the way the participants apologize.

1.2 Background of the Study

In Malaysia, English is considered as a second language. It is important to have the ability and proficiency to speak in English. Therefore, there is a need to teach the learners to communicate correctly and effectively so that they will be able to apply the knowledge of language forms and functions which include apologizing, requesting, enquiring and complimenting.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study sheds light on the apology strategies used by Malay speakers. It does not only focus on the apology strategies used by Malay undergraduates but also on whether there are gender differences in the types of strategies used. This study also has explored the factors that affect the apology strategies used such as power or social status and social distance. Previous studies were done on Western, Arabic and Indonesian speakers, but none on Malay ESL undergraduates. This is the significance of the study and therefore it fills the existing gap in the literature.

It is important to find out not only how the respondents apologize but also the factors that affect how they apologize. Most previous studies done on apology strategies focused on the frequency of the strategies used and only a few discussed the factors that affect the way people apologize. In this present study, the data on factors was collected in interview sessions and therefore the source of data is more reliable. This data will eventually fill the research gap in this field.

Besides, this study helps to understand the universality of pragmatics and the nature of the different communication styles. It is hoped that this study will give additional information in this field. It offers further contribution to the development of pragmatic research and emphasizes the importance of pragmatic studies in second language acquisition which eventually leads to pedagogy classroom practice. Furthermore, it will bring benefits to the stakeholders to consider including language forms and functions in the secondary and tertiary syllabus. Learners will be able to communicate effectively when they know the language to be used in certain situations. Therefore, indirectly it can help to develop the students' communicative competence and educators can focus on language forms and functions such as apologizing and making requests.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

There are a few limitations in this study. First, the number of respondents is only 30, 15 males and 15 females. This number is considered the minimum and a larger number of participants would definitely give better data or results. Secondly, the instrument used is role-play and not from natural or real life observation. Obeng (1999) claimed that a study of politeness should be ethnographically grounded because it is only within such a broad perspective that we can have a proper understanding of the interactional behaviour and discourse participants. However, role-play is a step closer to naturalistic data compared to the use of DCT (Discourse Completion Task). Thirdly, there are only 6 situations created for the participants to give their response. If there are more situations, the results might vary and therefore would definitely provide variety data.

1.5 The structure of dissertation

There are five chapters in this study. Chapter 2, the review of literature gives introduction to the theoretical background of apology strategies. It includes the definition of apology; the speech act of apologizing, types of apology strategies, apologies and culture, apologies and gender, factors that affect apologies, combinations of apology strategies and the methodological issues in apology studies.

Chapter 3 gives an insight on the research design, subjects of the study, the instrument used and the procedures and coding.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study, which includes the statistics of the responses given by the respondents. The findings are arranged according to the research questions.

Finally in Chapter 5, the summary of the main findings of the study is included.

1.6 Summary

It is hoped that this study will provide pragmatics information on apology strategies and create a better awareness on how do ESL learners apologize, whether they have enough pragmatic knowledge on how to apologize.

CHAPTER 2

2.0 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses previous studies done on apology startegies. It helps the researcher to understand more about the topic. The previous studies are placed under sub-topics such as the definition of apology; forms and functions in apologies, the speech act of apologizing, types of apology strategies, apologies and culture, apologies and gender, factors that affect apologies, combinations of apology strategies and the methodological issues in apology studies.

2.2 Definition of Apology

Many researchers in this field gave various apology definitions. For instance, Fraser (1981) defined an apology as a 'speech-act-set' of strategies and was amplified by Olshtain and Cohen (1983), and Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), as part of the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns). Furthermore, Olshtain & Cohen (1983) mentioned an apology is called for when social norms have been violated, whether the offense is real or perceived. Besides, Owen (1983) identified apologies as a type of ritual action, specifically a type of remedial interchange. Moreover, Olshtain (1989) defined an apology as a speech act which is intended to provide support for the H (hearer) who was actually or potentially malaffected by a violation X. In the decision to carry out the verbal apology, the speaker is willing to humiliate himself or herself to some extent and to admit to fault and responsibility.

Holmes (1990) stated that apologies function as remedy for offences and are aimed at restoring social harmony between people. She further defined apologies as "social acts conveying affective meaning" (p 155). Holmes (1995) again enlightened us that an apology is a speech act addressed to an interaction's face needs with the view to remedy an offense for which the addressor – the apologizer – takes responsibility, and thus restore equilibrium between him and the addressee.

Brown & Levinson (1987) said apologies are politeness devices expressing attention to the hearer's face needs in the context of an offense while Bergman and Kasper (1993) defined an apology as a 'compensatory action to an offense in the doing of which S was casually involved and which is costly to H" (p. 82). Trosborg and Shaw (1998) stated that the act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to 'set things right'.

According to Obeng (1999) there is the need for the negotiation of various communicative strategies to remedy the tense situation which may have been created and thereby restore peace and harmony. In order to remedy tense situations, several politeness devices aimed not only at the preserving face of the person offended as well as that of the apologizer but also aimed at preserving social relations and relations within and between ethnic groups in society.

Juhana (2011) stated that an apology is a speech act used when the behavioral norm is broken. She elaborated that when an action or utterances had resulted that one or more persons perceived themselves as offended, the guilty person(s) needs to apologize. Therefore, the speech act of apologizing aims at maintaining, restoring and enhancing interpersonal relationship.

Lakoff (1973) stated that apologies occur in a range of forms from canonically explicit to ambiguously indirect; the functions served by those forms range from abject abasement for wrongdoing, to conventional greasing of the social wheels, to expression of sympathy, advance mollification for intended bad behavior and formal public displays of currently "appropriate" feeling. In terms of the relation between form and function, apologies are both one-to-many and many-to-one a fact that only makes the analyst's task more daunting and more exciting.

In conclusion, different definitions were made by many different researchers but the main reason for apologizing is to express regret and maintain a relationship. For this study, the definition of 'apology' is taken from Olshtain (1989). An apology is a speech act which is intended to provide support for the H (hearer) who was actually or potentially malaffected by a violation X.

2.3 Apology Strategies

In the early 80s, investigation of apologies began and many researchers introduced different apology strategies. There are many researchers giving different classification of the apology strategies. Some researchers combined the strategies for their research or study. Fraser (1981) created the apology categories based on the intention of the speaker. He came up with nine strategies ranging from the most direct to the less direct. They are 'announcing that you are apologizing, stating one's obligation to apologize, offering to apologize, requesting the hearer accept an apology, expressing regret for the offense, requesting forgiveness, acknowledging responsibility for the offending act, promising forbearance from a similar offending act and offering redress.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983) proposed seven categories but divided them into two groups. The first part when the offender accepts the need to apologize has five categories. They are expression of apology, an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of the responsibility, an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance. The second when the offender does not accept the need to apologize has two strategies. They are a denial of the need to apologize and a denial of responsibility. Only the group part was used in this study. They are an expression of an apology which usually contains the verb apologize, forgive, excuse, pardon or be sorry, an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of responsibility, an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance.

Owen (1983) identified three types of apology. The first incorporates the words apology, apologies or apologize. The second includes 'sorry' and the third consists of phrase 'I'm afraid' followed by a sentence. He also suggested seven strategies for primary remedial moves. They are assert imbalance or show defense, assert that offence has occurred, express attitude towards offense, request restoration of balance, give an account, repair the damage and provide compensation.

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) in their Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) classified five strategies. They are using an IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device), taking responsibility, explanation or account of what happened, offer of repair offending act and promise of forbearance. According to them these strategies can be used alone, by themselves or in any combination or sequence.

Holmes (1990) modified the taxonomy by Olshtain and Cohen (1983). She believed that there is a need to rearrange the strategies so that they would become clearer. Therefore, she came up with four main categories and each category has subcategories. The first is 'an explicit expression of apology, which contains subcategories 'offer apology/IFID, express regret and request forgiveness. The second is explanation or account, an excuse or justification. The third is an acknowledgement, recognize H as entitled to an apology,

express lack of intent and offer of repair or redress. The last category is a promise of forbearance.

Furthermore, Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) created twelve modes of apologizing. They include 'not saying or doing anything, explaining the situation, apologizing ambiguously, apologizing nonverbally, casual saying 'sorry' acting helpless, saying directly 'I'm sorry, offering to do something for the other person, apologizing several times in several ways, writing a letter, leaving or resigning and committing suicide. Their taxonomy is special because they included non-verbal ways to apologize.

Bergmen and Kasper (1993) introduced seven different apology categories. They include IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device), intensified IFID, taking responsibility, giving an account of the reasons, minimizing the effects and severity of the action, offering repair or compensation and verbal redress.

Trosborg's (1987,1995) strategies largely overlap with each other in the same terminology used. They are minimizing the degree of offence either by blaming someone else or by discussing its preconditions, an acknowledgement of responsibility, implicit or explicit explanation or account of what occurred, offer of repair, promise of forbearance and expressing concern. Trosborg (1995) then reduced the strategies to minimizing the degree of offence, acknowledgement of responsibility, explanation or account and expression of apology.

Demeter (2000) in his study 'Pragmatic Study of Apology Strategies in Romanian' suggested another category in apology strategies that is postponing an apology as no apology is given at the moment of speaking at that particular time.

Another taxonomy of apology was attempted by Deutchmann (2003). He introduced three main categories of apology which focus on the function of expression. They are real apologies, formulaic apologies which consist of IFIDs and face-attack apologies which would disarm the hearer.

Different apology strategies were classified by many different researchers. Some of the strategies have the same purpose but were given different names. Olshtain & Cohen (1983) taxonomy was commonly used by the researchers in this field. Their taxonomy has 2 groups; when the offender accepts the need to apologize and when the offender does not accept the need to apologize. Many taxonomies introduced by the researches did not have the second group which the offender does not accept the need to apologize. Some researchers modified the original taxonomy and made changes to suit their data. Holmes (1990) taxonomy has 4 categories and they are clearer as each category has sub-categories. Barnlund & Yoshioka (1990) taxonomy offers 12 modes of apologizing. They introduced a category which the offender does not say or do anything and non-verbal apology. These two categories were not found in other taxonomies. Trosborg (1995) suggested one category which is different from others which is called minimizing the degree of offense by blaming someone else or by discussing its preconditions. Demeter (2000) proposed another category which is postponing an apology as no apology is given. This category was not found in others' taxonomies.

In conclusion, Demeter (2000) stated that there are many different categorizations of apologies. Not all the categories in these taxonomies would work for all cultures. So, when creating the taxonomy for a study, one should choose those categories that are used in the respective culture. Besides, one should be accounted on both explicit and implicit apologies. Finally, categories such as avoiding and postponing apologies should also be part of a taxonomy, as choosing not to apologize or apologize later is also a strategy used when an apology is required.

2.4 Apologies and Culture

There are quite a number of studies done on Western and Asian societies. Studies done on apologies on Asian culture include Ang-Abbey (1991) on Hokkien Chinese, Kim (2008) on Korean and also Wouk (2006) on Indonesian. There are differences in causal reasoning and responsibility assessment when it comes to apologies. Westerners concentrate more on culpability and Easterners on consequences. Whereas an American would look at the person at fault in a certain accident, a Chinese for example, would examine the results of the incident. Yet, both cultures look for ways to save face and, thus end up blaming each other (Gries and Peng, 2002). From this we can see that culture plays an important role in determining the differences in apologizing.

Garcia (1989) found the socio-cultural use of apologies was absolutely central to understanding why there was a difference in NS (Native speakers) and NNS (Non-native speakers) apology. She found that Venezuelan speakers of Spanish had less preference for deference politeness strategies when apologizing to native speakers of English compared to Americans. She believed that American conversational style is considered to be less formal than British one. From the findings, she emphasized that social and cultural rules have significant influence on the choice of apology strategies used to apologize.

Barlund and Yoshioka (1990) have shown that there are some "critical cultural variables that influence the way speakers apologize." The findings of their study show that the Japanese speakers used more direct and extreme apologies, while Americans were more indirect.

Sugimoto (1999) in her study 'A Japan-US Comparison of apology Styles in Japanese Apology Across Discipline American NS of English and Japanese NNS of English compared the participants' responses cross-culturally. She found that there are basic norms of apologizing between cultures. The Japanese students used strategies such as explicit statement of remorse, accounts, description of damage and reparation more than other

strategies. The Japanese students showed that they were more ready to offer and received apologies compared to the American students. Furthermore, she found that the Japanese students used compensation and promise not to repeat offense as their secondary strategies. They also used others like requesting for forgiveness, admitting the responsibility for the offense which shows that they strive more to save face.

Hussein and Hammouri (1998) examined the apology strategies used by American and Jordanian speakers of English. It was found that only Jordanians used strategies such as praising God for what happened, attacking the victim, minimizing the degree of offence, and interjection. Jordanians were also found to use more apology strategies, albeit less direct and more elaborate, which may all be attributed to the influence of culture, patterns of thought, and religious orientation. These results showed that the responses given were influenced by culture and religion.

Soliman (2003) did a cross-cultural study to compare the Egyptian and American apology styles. In his study, he found the Egyptians have the tendency to attack the victims who were lower in the status and mention God when they apologized.

Khaled Jebahi (2010) stated that in Tunisia, the offenders invoked God's name that is 'Allah in Arabic' in most of the situations to ask for forgiveness, to offer compensation and to say that the offenses were done unintentionally as it is divinely meant to be. To Muslim, whatever happens is predestined. He concluded that this strategy reflected the concept of predestination in Muslim societies including Tunisian.

Wouk (2006) did a study in Indonesia and found that the Indonesian preferred requests for forgiveness and they did not use other apology terms.

A cross-cultural of different studies was done by Guan et. al. in 2009. This study examined the effects of national culture (US, China and Korea) on apology. The findings showed that the participants from three different cultures had different perceptions of the offended person's emotional reaction and their propensities towards apology use.

Participants from Korea and America showed a greater discrepancy between themselves and their estimate of most people in their own culture.

According to Demeter (2000), the way an apology is both perceived and produced is not so much dependent on the language in which one apologizes, but on the social and cultural norms of the culture in which is spoken.

Bharuthram (2003) explained that the results in his study showed that the speakers in the case of the English Hindu Indians for South Africa used 'please' in apologies and this showed the importance of politeness in their culture.

Mohammad Shariati and Fariba Chamani (2010) in their study showed that preferences for the use of apology strategies varied across language perhaps because of the different socio-cultural values that governed language use in the different cultures.

MaslidaYusof et al. (2011) a study done on Malay subjects stated that it was not the main point whether the apologies made were sincere or not, but what was important was that the respondents realized that they needed to be polite by saying 'sorry' to compensate the offences made.

In conclusion, different cultures may have different ways to maintain relationship and use different apology strategies. But the main objective is to maintain the relationship. Therefore understanding cross-cultural differences in apology can aid individual's communication competence or skills in their interaction with others who come from different cultures.

2.5 Apologies and Gender

Holmes (1993) in her study in New Zealand stated that men and women did not have any significant differences in the way they apologized. In later studies, Holmes (1995) found that apologies between male and female respondents had differences, the most important amongst which were the women used more apologies than men did, women apologized most to hearers of equal power while men apologized to women irrespective of status, and women apologized most to female friends whereas men apologized most to socially distant women. Women also used more apologies for female friends whereas men used more for social distance. Finally, women's apologies are more than men's in space and talk offences. Further, she explained that women and men used different apology strategies since they had different perceptions of when they were appropriate. Women apologized to be polite while men avoided apologies where it was possible. They apologized if the offense was serious.

Tannen (1990) did a study on this issue and found gender differences for three of six message strategies used to provide support, for all seven emotional responses to advice, and for three of seven emotional responses to sympathy. Basow and Rubenfeld (2003) supported this theory by saying that male and female communicated differently. They found that women's speech style was related more to emotional responses to advice and sympathy, but no gender differences were found in the responses given.

Similarly, Bataineh and Bataineh (2006) in their study on Jordanian EFL University students found that the use of the different strategies varied between male and female respondents. They reported that despite similarities in male and female respondents' use of primary apology strategies they differed in the order which they used the strategies. Female respondents opted for non-apology strategies that veered towards avoiding the discussion of offense, male respondents used those which veered towards blaming their male

counterparts. Bataineh & Bataineh (2008) again found that the differences in the use of apology strategies were found to occur not only in cultures but also between the males and females of the same culture.

Juhana (2011) stated that gender manifest behavioral differences constructed within society. A common reason that was given as to why apologies were different is because an apology causes loss of status. One could argue that women apologize more than men because evolutionary pressure has made status more important for men, because men need status to complete for mates. Thus, since status matters relatively less for women, they can apologize more. Nevertheless, results from her study on the use of apologizing speech acts realization by male and female students in Bandung showed no significant differences between males and females of postgraduate students of English education using apologizing strategies. Gender was not a strong factor that influenced the realization of apologizing speech act. Both genders employed many similar categories and there was no highly different tendency between them to express their apologizing speech acts. Both sexes mostly used IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device) + EXP (An explanation of an account) categories in all situations. Both genders used the categories in order to lessen the guilt they felt for the offence so that they mostly used explanation. Secondly, females tended to use EXL! (Exclamation) (expressing surprise). It might happen because females are more expressive than males. Thirdly, both use REPR (An offer of repair/redress) (an offer of repair or compensation for the damage) as they considered a spoken apology was not sufficient to re-establish their social relationship with the hearer. Juhana's study showed that in many situations, both genders used similar apologizing strategies. They employed similar categories in certain situations.

According to Connell (2002), being a man or a woman is not a fixed state. Men and women have different behavior in dealing with things they face. It is because men and women socialized differently. Differences occurred in their conversational strategies including the speech act of apology.

On the other hand, a few studies done show that there is no difference in the way men and women apologize. For instance, Kholisin (2003) in his study on apology strategies used by Javanese indicates that there is no significant difference between males and females Javanese.

Furthermore, Wouk (2006) in the study on Apologizing in Lambok, Indonesia found that there is not so much difference in gender. The differences that occurred showed that males use more solidarity upgrading than the females did.

Finally, Maslida et al. (2011) in her study in University Kebangsaan Malaysia shows that there is no big difference between males and females respondents in the use of apology strategies. Rojo (2005) in her study in Penisular Spanish found that gender and the effects on the use of strategies may not be of high relevance due to the small number of informants. Males seemed to be using a lightly larger number of strategies but the difference does not seem to be significant.

In conclusion, some studies found gender differences on the way apology was made but some studies showed men and women apologized the same and there is no significant difference on the way both sexes apologized as they employed the same primary apology strategies.

2.6 Factors that affect apology strategies used.

There are a few factors that affect the effectiveness of an apology. The factors include familiarity with the victim, formality of the situation, intensity of the offence, place of exchange, age, sex, level of education, and relative authority of the offender and the victim (Soliman, 2003).The factor that has been shown to have the strongest effect on apology realization is the severity of the infraction.

Olshtain (1989) did a comparison of apology in Hebrew, Australian, English, Canadian, French and German. Assessments of contextual factors in different offense contexts suggest that severity of offense of the representative contextual factor in the socio-pragmatic set of apology. Both western and eastern researchers in languages in apology research have addressed the production of apology that is the strategies used to convey the illocutionary act and the contextual factors that influence the choice of the strategies.

Holmes (1990) did a study of the strategies used by New Zealand speakers of English. The results showed that there was equality between the instances where a single strategy was used and the ones that included combinations of strategies. This happened because of the nature of the situations. For more serious offences, several categories of apologies were used. On the other hand, for situations which were not really serious, single categories were mostly used. She further explained that the speakers or respondents selected longer and extended strategies to increase the politeness of their apologies. Intensifiers or boosters were used in their expression of apology. In her study, the politeness of an apology was modified in relation to the weight of the offence. The number of strategies used or the kinds of strategies used were also varied. Two or more strategies may be included in a remedial exchange. She classified a few factors that could affect the strategies used to apologize; the type of offense, seriousness of offense, relationship between the participants or social distance. The relative seriousness or ranking the offense in the relevant culture is a very important factor to be considered when examining the

reasons why native speakers selected particular apology strategies. One important factor why native speakers select particular apology strategies was that of the relative seriousness of the offence in the relevant culture. This is in line with what Cohen and Olshtain (1981) and Trosborg (1987) found. They also mentioned the relative seriousness of the offence as an important factor in the selection of appropriate apology strategies.

Holmes (1990) in her study used a three-point scale to categorize the seriousness of the offense. They were light offense, medium offense, and heavy offense. The results of her study showed that light offences elicited a simple explicit apology. Medium offences involved an explicit apology. They were also accompanied by acknowledgement of responsibility. Finally, more strategies were used for more heavily ranked apologies. A formal apology strategy and double apology were used for more serious offences. The responses were more elaborated for more serious offences which include explanations, acknowledgement of responsibility or an offer of restitution. These kinds of responses were also used to those with more power compared to apologies for offences against power equals or inferiors. The types of offense that she had included are inconvenience/inadequate service, space, talk, time, possessions (including money) and social gaffe.

In Holmes (1993), she reported that several categories in apologies are used in more serious offense compared to the least serious offense where single categories were mostly used. This is due to the fact that factors such as seriousness of the offense, relationship or social distance are the factors that can contribute to the different ways the speakers apologize.

Furthermore, for severity ranking, Brown and Levinson's model also predicts that the severity of the offense would be one of the factors that affect the speech of act of apologizing. There are at least two ways to look at this. The first way is to look for instances in which, all else being equal, severity of offense is greater and this affects apology expression.

Bergmen and Kasper (1993) found that when the speaker was closer to the interlocutor, the offender accepted more responsibility for the offensive act.

Obeng (1999) in his study on Akan paid attention to the nature of the context in which the discourse took place. He took note of such sociolinguistic variables as the formal or informal nature of the context, the status of the interactions (i.e: power and solidarity) and whether they belonged to the same or different social group. His study proved that gender, age and social status had effects in the way Akan apologize. The apologizer, the victims, the place and the way an apology was rendered strongly depended on several sociolinguistic and pragmatic variables. For older or socially superior apologizer, the apology act became face-threatening to the apology recipient. He stated that apology brought the concept of power to the fore because often it was a subordinate who apologized. During the rendering of an apology by a subordinate to a superior, the subordinate status of the apologizer was 'doubled'. He also indicated that if an apologizer was older or socially superior to the apology recipient, then the apology act became face threatening to the apology recipient especially if he or she requested that apology be rendered.

Kim (2008) analyzed Korean and EFL speakers' apology behaviors in term of different social variables with particular attention to pragmatic transfer of first language norms. The findings of his study demonstrated the influence of social factors: social distance, social status, age, gender and severity of offense.

Besides, Kholisin (2003) showed that the setting, situations and speech events were factors or causes that affected the variety of apology strategies used by the Javanese. However, age, whether younger or older and gender, did not affect in the way the respondents apologized.

Alfattah (2010) explained that to investigate the reaction of the hearers to different apology strategies in a specific cultural setting, a prior knowledge of the type of strategies used in apology in that cultural context was required. His study focused on the production of apology strategies, namely the type and extent of apology strategies used. He stated that if the social distance is high, apologizer attempted to use a high degree of politeness. Nevertheless, he found that the respondents of his study did not use intensification and not many combinations of strategies were used.

According to Hunter and Hahn (2011), the power of the participants in an interaction, the social distance between them and the culturally specified ranking of the severity are factors considered to select appropriate strategies. The age of the victim and the apologizer determine the lexical item used. Professional or occupational status played an important role in the form of Korean apologies. When a person of lower professional status spoke, he or she used a different lexical choice to apologize compared to those who were the same level. Korean apologies showed evidence that distance is the relevant factor for lexical selection. Results show that the Korean chose different lexical items when they apologize to their family member and non-family members. The results of the study show that the Korean participants used different items for severe situations. The second way of looking at the relationship between severity and apology expression is to see if one word is perceived stronger than another in the weight that it carries. This is indirect but if one lexical item is stronger than another, it is logical for the stronger one to be used in more severe face threats. Korean participants used 'coysong' instead of 'mian' to apologize to be more polite and to show more respect. In conclusion, based on the evidence, power, distance and severity are all relevant to Korean apologies.

Another study was done by Mohsen Shahrokhi and Jariah Mohd. Jan (2012) on apology strategies used by Persian males. It explored the effect of power, distance and severity of offence on the realizations patterns of apology speech acts to highlight Persian males' linguistic choice. The situations in the DCT (Discourse Completion Test) were varied. The severity of the offence was divided into 2 categories, high and low. The results showed that Persian male speakers used direct way or Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) to apologize. The speakers tended to use humour to minimize the offence made to ease the tense situations when the apologizer was familiar with the victim. Therefore, it can be concluded that dominance and social relation between interlocutors and the severity of offence are not important in the Persian males' choice of apologizing.

In contrast, in a few studies, factors do not play an important role in determining the way the participants apologized. For instance, Harlow (1990) did a study on French learners of English. Social variables such as age, familiarity and relationship between the speakers did not have effect on apologizing.

Nureddeen (2008) in her study on apology strategy in Sudanese Arabic designed or constructed 10 different situations with a few variables such as distance (close, acquaintances and distant), power (equals, high-low, low-high), severity (mild, serious), type of offense (possession, integrity, place, physical, time) and hearer's damaged face (negative, positive). Her results show that the Sudanese Arabic speakers attempted to preserve their positive face by avoiding use of apology strategies such as taking responsibility, intensification and promise of forbearance. Instead, they relied on 'less dangerous strategies like IFID and explanation. She stated that IFID can be interpreted as ritualistic while explanation carries no direct signal of apology. It also found that the respondents of her study apologized more often using IFID sand explanations in situations with less serious offenses.

Cohen et al. (1986) stated that familiarity of interlocutors seemed to have its main influence on the modification strategy of intensifying the expression of apology. The native speakers in their study intensified their apology more to the stranger than to a friend.

Wouk (2006) in her study asked the participants to rate the severity of the offense from 1 to 5. She also had variables in her situations such as lower status-inmates, equal status – familiar, equal status-stranger, higher status- inmate, higher status – familiar and higher status – stranger. Deference strategies were used with higher status addressees unlike solidarity strategies which were used with social intimates. There were some gender differences in the use of upgrading. Females used less solidarity-oriented upgrading than men in some situations. The use of upgrading varied both with nature of the offence and with nature of relationship.

Based on the results from many studies done it can be concluded that factors such as age, familiarity, relationship and severity of offense do affect the way the speakers apologized.

2.7 Combination of apology strategies

One strategy can be combined with other strategies. The results obtained from previous studies done show that the respondents used combinations of apology strategies when they realized that there was a need to apologize. They were also considered to have the proficiency to communicate as they were able to select suitable apology strategies to suit situations given.

In addition, Holmes (1989) claimed that politeness apologies normally include an explicit apology combined with other strategies. She further explained that strategies were combined to constitute remedial exchanges of some complexity. It was also evident that New Zealanders frequently combined an explicit apology with other strategies on occasion. According to her, politer apologies normally include an explicit apology at some point, together with other strategies. The categories are also arranged in increasing order in terms of how heavily ranked they are as politeness strategies. She categorized the responses from the simplest and least heavily weighted strategies to more complex and more heavily weighted apology strategies. Her findings show that combining strategies results in a 'weightier' apology, appropriate for more serious offences. Seventeen different combinations of apology strategies occurred in the data but they were not evenly distributed. No combination occurred more than five times. It was interesting to note that a remedial interchange may involve more than one occurrence of the same apology strategies.

Trosborg (1987) reported that possible combination of the apology strategies is possible because respondents may feel that they need to produce more than one minimum response as a simple apology is considered inadequate. Trosborg then suggested that this may be related to 'the severity of offense'. Another interesting point in her study is the relative flexibility of position that different strategies demonstrate.

Obeng (1999) stated that one of the objectives of his study in Akan discourse is to demonstrate the ways Akan apologize as it involved a combination of two or more apology strategies. He observed that there are combinations of two or more apology strategies known as 'compound apologies'. More than one implicit apology was used to enhance the apology and therefore reinforce the apology made by the speaker. He also stated that the apologies found in the transcripts were analyzed with regard to whether or not they were complex (explicit and implicit) or compound (implicit and implicit). In Akan, an apology may be followed by another apology act, for an example, a brief justification on account of the cause of the offense or an acceptance of blame which is considered as a complex apology structure. The other or second unit reinforced the core or central unit of apology and also acted as a mitigator of the face-threat associated with the core apology. The reason why complex apology was used was that the speaker/apologizer wanted to show that offences were not committed intentionally, or that they were truly sorry for their actions.

Nureddeen (2008) in her study on apology strategy in Sudanese Arabic shows the use of the IFID in final position suggests the significance sequence and patterning of strategies in the realization of apology.

Another study was done by Mohammad Shariati & Fariba Chamani (2010). The research focused on the frequency, combination and sequential position of apology strategies in Persian. The results showed that there were different combinations of apology strategies found in the corpus which includes 66 different combinations of apology strategies. In addition, Blum–Kulka et al. (1989) remarked that after a speaker chooses IFID to apologize, he or she would take on the responsibility for the violation and then followed by the last strategy, offer of repair.

Tuncel (2011) in his study found that most of the Turkish EFL learners realized many different semantic formulas for a single situation and for some situations, lengthy combinations including five different semantic formulas were formulated. The most frequently used combination was IFIDs and acknowledgement of responsibility. Al Fattah (2010) investigated the apology strategies used by Yemeni EFL university students. The findings showed that the subjects of this study used IFIDs especially 'expressions of regret' which was found in every response in the data. According to the subjects, they believed that it is compulsory to have this expression accompanied by other strategies.

Finally, Maslida et. al (2011) conducted a study in Malaysia and the aim was to investigate the pattern and apology strategies used by UKM students based on socio-pragmatic aspects. Most of the responses given by the participants of their study were combinations of strategies. For examples, IFID + explanation or account, IFID + acknowledgement of responsibility and IFID + offer of repair and promise and forbearance. The results shown help us to understand the different communication styles in apology strategies.

In contrast to many of the studies done, Wouk (2006) in her study in Lambok found that the Indonesians there had strong preference for a single type of apology term that was requests for forgiveness and they did no use other apology terms. She further explained that of societies where results more than one type of apology situation have been reported, none showed the same pattern as that found in Lambok Indonesian.

In a nutshell, an apology can consist of a single strategy or a combination of other strategies. Most of the results from the previous studies show combinations of apology strategies. Combinations of apology strategies are frequently used as they are more effective rather than a standalone or single strategy.

2.8 Methodological Issues

Many studies have been done on apology strategies. There are similarities and differences in the research methodology used. DCT (Discourse Completion Test), DCQ (Discourse Completion Questionnaire), role-plays in questionnaire, field observations or note-taking and ethnographic observation are examples of methodology used by researchers. The choice of instruments is based on many factors such as the number of participants, how the strategies are defined and categorized and others. The main concern is whether the instruments are valid and effective. The benefits and drawbacks of different instruments used in collecting data were discussed by Cohen and Olshtain in 1998. According to them, DCT and role-play interviews are the main instruments used for speech act production.

The instrument that is used in most studies of speech act specifically in apology is DCT (Discourse Completion Test). It has been used widely in inter-language pragmatics. Khaled Jebahi (2010) mentioned that DCT is perhaps the most common method of doing research in second language pragmatics especially when investigating speech act as apologies, refusals, invitations and others. Nureddeen (2008) reported that DCT was first used by Blum-Kulka in 1982. According to Mackey & Grass (2005) DCT is a simple pencil and paper task that requires no more than a description of the situation followed by a blank space where the response could be required. Akbar Afghari and Vida Kaviani (2005) explained that the researchers are required to give a brief description of the situation where they have to read each situation give. The participants have to write down their normal language reaction. They also have to imagine that the incidents depicted in the situations are happening to them. The situations are like a questionnaire and the participants have to complete the questionnaire.

The first advantage of using the DCT is that this instrument is more appropriate for studying the many types of strategies in speech act production as it is feasible. Secondly, it can be used for a large number of participants in a short period of time. Large samples can be surveyed more easily thus making statistical analysis more feasible. Alfattah (2010) supported this point by saying that this type of questionnaire enables the researcher to reach large numbers of respondents and statically control the variables and analyze the data accordingly.

However, there are also disadvantages of using DCT. First, the DCT does not reflect accurately the speech that occurs in natural conditions. Many feel that DCT may not be an accurate representation of what the speaker would say in naturally occurring situations. Yuan (2001) stated that research on the methods used in pragmatics and speech act studies pin pointed the limitations of the DCT compared to naturally occurring data. DCT responses were found to be shorter, simpler, less face-attentive and less emotional. Nureddeen (2008) further explained that another drawback of the DCT is that the respondents can be affected by the order of the situations on the DCT, being influenced by previous situation(s) or response(s). She found that in a study where the DCT was used, the possible drawbacks of the ordering of the situations can be limited by using different copies of the DCT with different ordering. Another concern according to Demeter (2000) is that the subjects may use portions of the written situation in their responses. In addition, the respondents may be forced to perform an apology in predetermined situations which perhaps, in real life interactions they may decide to opt out. Besides, the situations are dissimilar to what happens in real interaction. If the subjects could not picture themselves in the respective situations, they would just merely speculate on what they do and they eventually might act differently (Demeter, 2000). Furthermore, results are stereotypical rather than actual and responses generally shorter. Therefore, to overcome the drawbacks,

the situations designed or constructed must be very authentic so that the subject would picture themselves in the respective situations. (Demeter, 2000).

Previous studies done using DCT include studies on Persian, Jawa, Turkish, Arabic, South Korean, Malay, Iranian, Tunisian, English, Jordanian and many more. Bataineh & Bataineh (2006) stated that DCT raises the issue of task effect. A number of studies have reported task-induced inter-language variation on empirical research findings. Hinkel (1997) reported that Chinese learners of English favoured less direct advice on the DCT then they did on multiple-choice questionnaires whereas Rintell & Mitchel (1989) reported that their respondents provided shorter responses to the DCT than oral role-plays in English request and apologies.

Another instrument which is similar to DCT is DCQ (Discourse Completion Questionnaire). This instrument is similar to DCT but it was given a different name. Abdul Wahed Qasem (2011) did a study on Arabic and English using DCQ. He stated that the advantage of using DCQ is that the respondents feel free to express themselves without any kind of intervention by the researcher. It was noticed that the subjects feel embarrassed when they did the role-play.

The second instrument used in this field is a role-play. Role-play interviews produce a wider range of speech act production strategies than DCTs do (Sasaki 1998) as well as considerably longer responses (Rintell & Mitchell, 1989). It produces different responses on the part of the subject. Role-plays seem a better choice when interaction between speaker and hearer are also important. Studies done using this instrument include Trosborg (1987) who used role-plays to compare the apologies of native speaker of English with the native speakers of Danish. Another study which used role-play as the instrument is on Spanish by Rojo (2005). On the other hand, role-plays can sometimes results in unnatural behavior on the part of the subject (Jung, 2004). Cohen and Olshtain (1998) claimed that role-play forces the subject to take a role-play they would not consume in real life, or they

may not be good actors, then it elicits an unnatural behavior. Not all role-plays are the same. Besides, they are more difficult to transcribe and code. Furthermore, they offer less control of the variables involved in the study (Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

Only a few researchers used ethnographic observations. Mohammad Shariati and Fariba Chamani (2010) study's on Persian and Akan used natural interactions. Obeng (1999) stated that a study of politeness should be ethnographically grounded because it is only within such a broad perspective that people can have proper understanding of the interactional behavior of the discourse participants. Moreover, ethnographic data gives a fuller picture of natural communication that includes gesture, tone and others. This point is also supported by Nureddeen (2008). She stated that more reliable results could be obtained in natural environment. Furthermore, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) affirmed that ethnographic observations seem to be more representative of the language used natural settings and although it is time consuming and difficult, it may give insight on how people apologize in natural communication. Bataineh & Bataineh (2008) support this, claiming that it would be interesting to examine whether the findings would hold true if the data was collected orally using among others, observations, role-play or dialogue completion. Wolfson et. al (1989) declared that an ideal way for data collection for the study of speech acts is based on both systematic observation and elicitation procedures and analysis.

Mohammad Shariati and Fariba Chamani (2010) did a study using written ethnographic observation. They pointed out that it is more desirable if the data were tape-recorded because in this way prosodic features of sound are available but it is difficult and time-consuming. This point is supported by Abdul Wahed Qasem (2011) saying that collecting data based on naturally occurring situations is a very time consuming task. Holmes (1990) used ethnographic method in her study in New Zealand. She assigned New Zealand students to collect the apology responses. Based on the findings, she reported that the data suffered inevitably from limitations. She stated that it is much more difficult to

collect examples of apologies than instances of compliments. She further explained that small short examples are not easily noticed or salient in conversation and more elaborate apologies are comparatively infrequent. Thus, the data cannot provide more than broad guidelines on the relative frequency of different types of apology. However, it provided a useful source of information on the range of apology strategies and the syntactic-semantic forms used to express them by New Zealand adults.

In conclusion, each method or instrument used had its pros and cons thus there is no perfect one that can be used in the study of speech act specifically referring to studies on apologies. The instrument for this study is role-play. Role-play was chosen because it is more natural as spontaneous responses could be collected orally and recorded. Interactive responses could also be provided and it is one step closer to real life situation. Another instrument can be used to complement the other method is interview. This method is also used in this study. Using the DCT does not relate how the participants perceived context-external factors such as differences in power, social distance, perception of seriousness and type of social contract. So, all these factors can be obtained through interviews. Interviews can address other variables such as gender, age, education, status of the offenders to find out their potential effects in the use of an apology. Therefore, the most suitable one will be actually determined by the researchers to suit with the objective of their research.

2.9 Summary

Many studies done on apology strategies focus on different areas. Some concentrate on the strategies used, cultures and gender. All the studies provide ample information for the researcher to have a better understanding not only on the types of strategies but also the issues in methodology.

CHAPTER 3

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter gives an insight of the research design, theoretical framework, subjects of the study, the instrument used, the procedures and coding.

3.2 Research Design

Qualitative analysis and a simple frequency count were conducted on the different types of apology strategies used. To answer the first and second research questions, qualitative analysis was selected as to analyze frequency of the type of strategies that the speakers used most often when they apologized. To answer the third research question and in order to analyse the factors that influence the way the apologies were made in certain situations, a qualitative analysis is needed so that more information and explanations could be included in the findings. The data gathered was analyzed in depth according to length of responses, patterns of responses, the types of lexical items or constructions used for the different categories of apologies were looked into. In addition, more unique, less common or unexpected responses were also analyzed. Furthermore, the frequencies of each category were also interpreted in detail. Therefore, by having both methods, the data could be merged; integrated and compared side-by-side in the discussion and the study could be explored in depth.

3.3 Subjects

The subjects of this study were 30 Malay undergraduates in an institution of higher learning in Malaysia. 15 Malay male and 15 Malay female learners aged between 21 to 23 years old were selected. The subjects were all degree students from the Faculty of Engineering, from Universiti Teknologi Petronas in Perak. They were taking different courses, namely Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Petroleum Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Electrical & Electronics Engineering and Petroleum GeoScience. All of them were in their third year. Besides, all of them took an English Test in Universiti Teknologi Petronas which resembles MUET (Malaysian University English Test) in their foundation year. 90% of them got an A for this test. English Language was in taught in their first and second year. In the first year, they learned Academic Writing while in the second year, Professional Communication Skills was taught. However, they used their mother tongue; that is the Malay Language fully. They only used the English Language when they communicate with their lecturers and their friends who were not Malays. The subjects were selected using probability sampling or representative sampling. Probability samples were selected in such a way as to be representative of the population. They provide the most valid or credible results because they reflect the characteristics of the population from which they are selected. For this study, the probability samples are the undergraduates.

3.4 Instruments

Role-play is used as the main instrument of this study. This type of instrument is chosen because it is more natural as it is more spontaneous as responses were collected orally and recorded. In addition, the responses were produced interactively. Role play has the potential to resemble real-life situation and therefore the data obtained can be regarded as resembling real-life use. In addition, spoken role-play is preferred over written to ensure participants did not know in advance what they were going to be asked to perform and they are not able to plan their responses and producing reliable data as well (Rojo, 2005). Moreover, she stated that role-play allows the researchers to focus on the language he or she is interested in examining and therefore it is time-saving in terms of collection. Six social situations were constructed for the role-play and the six social situations were designed to fit real-life situations which the respondents might come across in their daily lives. This is important as the respondents can really relate it to them well. All the situations were between a lecturer and the undergraduates which could happen in campus. Therefore, the variables could be controlled. Besides, the situations were designed to be different in the size of imposition so that the participants could rank them after the interview sessions were conducted. The situations are as follows:

Table 3.1 **:** Description of the Situations

Situations	Descriptions	Dialogues
Situation 1 : Obstructing the way	You are talking to your friend and suddenly your lecturer tells you that you are blocking his/her way. What would you say?	Lecturer : Excuse me, you are blocking the way.
Situation 2 : Being absent from class	You are frequently absent from class. What would you say?	Lecturer : I checked the attendance and found out that you have been frequently absent from class.
Situation 3 : Losing a book	You borrowed a book from your lecturer and you lost it. What would you say?	Lecturer : Can I have my book back? I need it.
Situation 4 : Being late for class	Your class starts at 8.00 a.m but you are late for 30 minutes. What would you say to your lecturer?	Lecturer : You are late for your class.
Situation 5 : Unable to hand in assignment on time	Your lecturer asked you to hand in your assignment on time but you fail to complete it. What would you say?	Lecturer : Where is your assignment? You know that the deadline is today.
Situation 6 : Cheating in a test	You are caught cheating in a test by your lecturer. What would you say?	Lecturer : You cheated in the test. What do you have to say to this?

A pilot study was conducted to check the validity of the 6 situations. The participants or respondents had to role-play how they would apologize in the 6 situations. The researcher acted as the lecturer and the role-play sessions were recorded.

The second instrument that was used is interview. The interview conducted provides relevant information from the interviewees to complement the data gathered from the role-play. The respondents also would be able to provide more information for the study. Interview questions were formulated to support and to justify the qualitative findings. The interview questions are:

1. Why did you choose to apologize in the way you did?

2. Would you react differently if the situations were different?

The interview sessions were done in 30 sessions with one interviewee per session. After the participants had done the role-play, they were interviewed about the choices of strategies used.

3.5 Theoretical Framework

This study adopted analytical framework by Olshtain and Cohen (1983) on categories of apology strategies.

Table 3.2 **:** Olshtain and Cohen (1983)'s Theoretical Framework

Olshtain and Cohen (1983)	
Strategies	Examples

1. An expression of apology Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFIDs)
 	
  a. An expression of regret
  b. An offer of apology
  c. A request for forgiveness
	
	I'm sorry.
	I apologize.
	Forgive me.

2. An explanation or account of the situation
  a. Explicit
  b. Implicit
	
	The bus was late.
	The traffic is always so heavy.

3. An acknowledgement of responsibility
 	
  a. Accepting the blame
  b. Expressing self-deficiency
  c. Recognizing the other person as deserving apology
  d. Expressing lack of intent
	
	It was my fault.
	I was confused.
	You are right.
	
	I didn't mean to.

4. An offer of repair	I'll help you get up.
5. A promise of forbearance	It won't happen again.
6. A denial of the need to apologize	There was no need for you to get insulted.

7. A denial of responsibility
  a. Not accepting the blame
  b. Blaming the other participant
	
	It wasn't my fault.
	It's your own fault.

Table 3.3 : Modification of Olshtain& Cohen (1983) For The Study

Olshtain and Cohen (1983)	
Strategies	Examples

1. An expression of apology Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFIDs)
 	
   a. An expression of regret
   b. An offer of apology
   c. A request for forgiveness
	
	I'm sorry.
	I apologize.
	Forgive me.

2. An explanation or account of the situation
   a. Explicit
   b. Implicit
	
	The bus was late.
	The traffic is always so heavy.

3. An acknowledgement of responsibility
 	
   a. Accepting the blame
   b. Expressing self-deficiency
   c. Recognizing the other person as deserving apology
   d. Expressing lack of intent
	
	It was my fault.
	I was confused.
	You are right.
	
	I didn't mean to.

4. Repair and Forbearance
   a. An offer of repair
   b. A promise of forbearance
	
	I'll help you get up.
	It won't happen again.

5. A denial of responsibility
   a. Not accepting the blame
   b. Blaming the other participant
	
	It wasn't my fault.
	It's your own fault.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983) proposed five categories if the offender accepts the responsibility for the offence committed. The first strategy is an expression of apology, also known as Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFIDs). The second strategy is an explanation or account of the situation. Both explicit and implicit explanations were included in this strategy. The third strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility. The other last two strategies are an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance. On the other hand, if the offender rejects the need to apologize, he or she may not react at all and if there is a verbal reaction, it is divided into two other categories. The first is a denial of the need to apologize. The second category is a denial of responsibility which includes not accepting the blame and blaming the other participant.

This study follows Olshtain and Cohen (1983) framework closely but modification was made to make it clearer. Therefore, 5 strategies were   selected. They are expression of apology or IFIDs, explanation or account of the situation and acknowledgement of responsibility. The fourth strategy is repair and forbearance. This strategy is the combination of Olshtain and Cohen's offer of repair and a promise of forbearance. These two strategies are combined as they serve the same purpose that is to tone down or downgrade the offense made. The fifth strategy is a denial of responsibility which includes not accepting the blame and blaming the other participant.

3.6 Procedures

Firstly, 6 social situations were constructed. Secondly, a pilot test was conducted on 5 volunteers from Universiti Teknologi Petronas to check the ambiguity of the situations and the time needed by the participants to do the role-play. As there was no ambiguity, therefore all the 6 situations were workable and could be used for this study.

Before the role-play and interview sessions were conducted, a letter was sent to the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering asking for approval. After the request was granted, one student was assigned as assistant to help the researcher to get the respondents, to arrange a schedule and to book the venue for the role-play and interview sessions. The role-play and interview sessions were conducted in a students' meeting room, a room for the students to have their meetings and discussions. The purpose of the study and how the sessions would be carried out were explained to the respondents. Then, they were asked to read and sign the consent form provided. They also had to fill in a background questionnaire to obtain their personal information such as age, gender, educational background and others. Next, the situations were read to the respondents. The researcher acted as a constant person (Rojo, 2005) being the hearer, receiving the responses from all the participants. The researcher initiated the role-play and the respondents had to give their responses to what the researcher said. The responses were given orally. The role-play sessions were recorded. After all situations were done, the recorded role-play sessions were played to the respondents and then the interview sessions were carried out. The interview sessions were conducted to find out about their apology strategies to get a better understanding and to answer the third research question: What are the factors that influence the different apology used?

Below are the set of questions given:

1. Why did you choose to apologize in the way you did?

2. Would you react differently if the situations were different?

Each session took about 30 minutes including the interview session. The shortest role-play was 02:04 while the longest role-play was 03:31 minutes. Next, after each role-pay session was done, each respondent was given a questionnaire (Appendix C) and they were asked to rank the 6 situations according to the severity of offense.

The recorded responses were transcribed. The data then was analyzed and categorized according to the modified model of the set of apology strategies proposed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983).

The collected data in this study was coded on the basis of the coding scheme developed by Blum-Kulka (1984) Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) with some modification in this study. According to the CCARP coding scheme, the unit of analysis is the utterance or sequences of utterances produced by the respondents. Using modification of Olshtain and Cohen (1983), each strategy in the model of the study was given a code. The codes are illustrated in the following table:

Table 3.4 : Codes for the strategies used

	Codes	Strategies
1.	A	Expression of apology or IFIDs
2.	B	Explanation or account of the situation
3.	C	Acknowledge responsibility
4.	D	Repair and Forbearance
5.	E	A denial of responsibility
6.	F	Others (requesting, interjection, invoking God's name and pleading)

Identification of the strategies was done by categorizing the responses based on the descriptions of each category to answer the first research question: How do Malay ESL undergraduates apologize? Then, comparisons between male and female responses were made to answer the second research question: What are the similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies used by male and females undergraduates? Finally, all data were analysed again and presented in tables, figures and deep explanations.

Besides the coding scheme and categorization of the data, each of the respondents was also given a code. The males were coded as M1 (Male 1) until M15 (Male 15) whereas for the females, they were coded as F1 (Female 1) until F15 (Female 15).

Finally, a few terms are used to explain the data in this study. The first term is 'patterns of apology strategies'. This term refers to the different patterns found in the 6 situations. The second term used is 'combinations of strategies' which refer to the combinations of a few strategies in the responses given by the participants. For instance, a combination of strategies A (expression of apology) and B (explanation or account) in a response. Finally, the term 'instances' refer to the occurrences of each strategy in a response. It refers to how many times a strategy occurs in a response or all the responses given by the respondents. For example, there are three instances of strategy A (expression

of apology) in a response of ABAA. Drawing upon Holmes (1990) study, responses in this study were split according to different strategies as the strategies were not mutually exclusive; they may co-occur in a response. Examples are shown below:

a. AA = "Sorry Sir (A). I'm sorry Sir (A)".

b. CCC = "I haven't finished my assignment (C). That's my bad (C). I didn't mean to (C) ".

c. ACDD = "Sorry Madam (A). I have lost your book (C) and I will replace with another

one (D) or I will pay the price (D)".

d. ACDDDA = "I'm sorry (A). I kind of misplace your book (C) so is there anything I can

do to replace your book (D) or maybe I can replace your book with some

money (D) or I can find the same book that I lost (D). I'm sorry (A)".

3.7 Pilot Test

A pilot test was conducted in November 2013 at Universiti Teknologi Petronas in Sri Iskandar, Perak. The purpose of the pilot test was to check the validity of the six situations constructed and the time needed for the role-play sessions. The subjects of the pilot test were five Malay undergraduates, three females and two males aged 21 years old. All the volunteers were in their third year. The purpose of the study and how the role-play sessions would be conducted were explained to the respondents. The participants were called one by one in a common room. It is a room available for the students to study and to have their discussion. The six situations were read to each respondent. Each of the participants gave their responses in different role-play sessions. Each role-play was recorded and it took about 15 minutes. After that the recorded responses were transcribed. The data then was analyzed and categorized according to the modified version of Olshtain and Cohen (1983) set of apology strategies. Only four strategies were selected as they suit the responses given by the respondents. The four strategies selected are Expression of apology (IFID) Explanation or account, Acknowledgement of responsibility, Repair and Forbearance (combination of an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance).

3.8 Preliminary Results of Pilot Study

Table 3.5 : Codes for apology strategies and examples.

Apology strategies	Codes	Examples
1. Expression of apology (IFID)	A	1. I'm so sorry. (Situation 5) 2. Sorry. (Situation 4) 3. Please forgive me. (Situation 6)
2. Explanation or account	B	1. I was not feeling well. (Situation 2) 2. I didn't hear the alarm this morning. (Situation 4) 3. I have lost my pendrive last week and had to redo the assignment. (Situation 6)
3. Acknowledgement of Responsibility	C	1. Actually, I lost your book. (Situation 3) 3. My mistake. (Situation 2) 4. I'm ashamed of my action. (Situation 6)
4. Repair and Forbearance	D	1. I promise to attend all the classes after this. (Situation 2) 2. I promise not to cheat again next time. (Situation 6) 3. I'll buy a new one or either pay for the loss. (Situation3)

The table below shows the strategies used by the respondents in Situation 1.

Table 3.6 : Situation 1 : Obstructing the way

Strategies	No. of Males	No. of Females	Examples of responses
A	2	2	I'm sorry.
AC		1	Sorry, I didn't realize it
Total	2	3	

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account;

C=acknowledgement of responsibility; D=repair and forbearance)

Only two strategies A and AC were used. Four out of five respondents used only IFIDs (expression of apology) to apologize. For examples, "Sorry', "I'm sorry Madam" and "I'm sorry". One female respondent employed two strategies AC. The response given was "Sorry (A), I did not realize it" (C). The responses given in this situation are the shortest compared to the other situations.

Table 3.7 shows the strategies employed by the respondents in Situation 2.

Table 3.7 :Situation 2 : Being absent from class

Strategies	No. of Males	No. of Females	Examples of responses
AB	1		I'm sorry. I was sick.
ABD		1	I'm sorry. I have problems managing my time recently. I promise to attend all the classes after this
AD	1		I'm really sorry. I will try to improve in the future
CB		1	My mistake. I was not feeling well.
DBA		1	I promise to attend all the classes. I have problems with my car recently. I am sorry
Total	2	3	

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account; C=acknowledgement of

responsibility; D= repair and forbearance)

All the respondents used different combinations of apology strategies. Male respondents used only two apology strategies, AB and AD while two female respondents used two apology strategies, ABD and DBA. The responses given are "I'm sorry (A). I have problems managing my time recently (B). I promise to attend all the classes after this (D)" and "I promise to attend all the classes (D). I have problems with my car recently (B). I am sorry (A)". From the responses given, female respondents gave longer responses compared to males.

Table 3.8 demonstrates the responses given by the respondents in Situation 3.

Table 3.8 : Situation 3 : Losing a book

Strategies	No. of Males	No. of Females	Examples of responses
ACD	1		I'm sorry Sir. But lost the book. I'm searching a replacement for the book.
ACDD		1	I'm sorry. I think I have lost it. I'll buy a new one or either pay for the loss
CBDA		1	Actually I lost the book. I've searched for it but I couldn't find it. I will buy a new one for you. I'm sorry
CD	1		I have lost it. I'll pay for the loss.
CDD		1	I have to admit it. The book is lost. But don't worry, I will find it or else I will buy you a new book.
Total	2	3	

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account; C=acknowledgement of responsibility; D= repair and forbearance)

In this situation, all the respondents also employed different combination of apology strategies. The data reveals that female respondents employed longer responses which consists maximum of four strategies, ACDD and CBDA. The responses given are " I'm sorry (A). I think I have lost it (C). I'll buy a new one (D) or either pay for the loss (D)" and "Actually I lost the book (C). I've searched for it but I couldn't find it (B). I will buy a new one for you (D). I'm sorry (A)".

The table below shows the responses given by the respondents in situation 4.

Table 3.9 :Situation 4 : Being late for class

Strategies	No. of Males	No. of Females	Examples of responses
AB	1	1	Sorry, I didn't hear the alarm this morning. I'm sorry Sir, I woke up late
ABD		1	Sorry Sir, I have problems with my car. I'll try not to be late again next time
AC	1		Sorry. I am late today.
BAD		1	I woke up late today. I'm sorry Madam. I'll make sure it won't happen again.
Total	2	3	

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account; C=acknowledgement

of responsibility; D= repair and forbearance)

The respondents used four combinations of apology strategies in this situation. The longest responses given consist of three strategies, ABD and BAD employed by two female respondents. The most frequently used of strategy in this situation is AB employed by one male and one female respondent. The responses give are "Sorry (A) , I didn't hear the alarm this morning (B)" and "I'm sorry Sir (A), I woke up late (B)".

The table below shows the responses given by the respondents in situation 5.

Table 3.10 :Situation 5 : Unable to hand in assignment on time

Strategies	No. of Males	No. of Females	Examples of responses
ACBB		1	I'm sorry Madam. I know the dateline is today but I have lost my pendrive last week and had to redo the assignment
ACD		1	I'm so sorry. I couldn't finish it. I promise I will send it to you tomorrow.
ADD		1	I'm sorry Madam. I almost finish it. I'll submit it before tomorrow.
B	1		The pendrive corrupted
D	1		I almost finish it
Total	2	3	

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account;

C=acknowledgement of responsibility; D= repair and forbearance)

For situation 5, the respondents used combinations of five different strategies as shown in the table above. The longest response was given by a female respondent. She used four strategies, ACBB. The response given was "I'm sorry Madam (A). I know the dateline is today (C) but I have lost my pendrive last week (B) and had to redo the assignment (B)". The shortest responses were given by 2 male respondents, they employed strategy B and D. the responses given are "The pendrive corrupted (B)" and "I almost finish it (D)".

The table below shows the responses given by the respondents in situation 6.

Table 3.11 : Situation 6 : Cheating in a test

Strategies	No. of Males	No. of Females	Examples of responses
ABAD		1	I'm really sorry. I'm desperate. Please forgive me. I'll not do it again
AC	1		I'm very sorry. I am ashamed of my action.
AD		1	I'm really sorry. I promise not to cheat again next time.
CB	1		I have to do it because I don't have enough time to study.
DA		1	I promise not to do this again. I'm sorry.
Total	2	3	

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account;

C=acknowledgement of responsibility; D= repair and forbearance)

In this situation, all of them used different sets of strategies. The longest response was given by a female respondent. She used the four different strategies in her response, ABAD. The response given was "I'm really sorry (A). I'm desperate (B). Please forgive me (A). I'll not do it again (D)". The rest of the respondents used only two strategies in this situation.

The table below shows the combinations of strategies used in 6 situations.

Table 3.12 : Combinations of Apology Strategies in 6 Situations.

Strategies	Males	Females	Total
	No	No	No
A	2	2	4
AB	2	1	3
ABAD		1	1
ABD		2	2
AC	2	1	3
ACBB		1	1
ACD	1	1	2
ACDD		1	1
AD	1	1	2
ADD		1	1
B	1		1
BAD		1	1
CB	1	1	2
CBDA		1	1
CD	1		1
CDD		1	1
D	1		1
DA		1	1
DBA		1	1
Total	12	18	30

(A=IFIDs/expression of apology; B=Explanation or account;

C=acknowledgement of responsibility; D=repair and forbearance)

Altogether the respondents used 19 sets of strategies. 24 of the responses given by the participants consist of different strategies. The most commonly used strategy is A (IFIDs). 2 males and 2 female respondents used this strategy in Situation 1. This is followed by the combinations of strategies AB (IFIDs + explanation or account) and AC (IFIDs + acknowledgement of responsibility) employed by 3 respondents. It is also clear that 10 out of 19 sets of responses given started with A (IFIDs) and followed by other

strategies. The shortest responses are B (explanation or account) and D (repair and forbearance), both given by 2 male respondents.

The overall results also show that female respondents give longer responses compared to the males. They used minimum of two strategies (AB, AC, AD, CB and DA) and the other responses include combinations of 3 to 4 apology strategies (ABD, ACD, ADD, BAD, CDD, ABAD, ACBB, ACDD and CBDA). The male respondents, on the other hand employed shorter responses mainly using 2 strategies (AB, AC CD and CB) and maximum of 3 strategies (ACD).

In conclusion, these results show the answers to the first research question: How do Malay ESL undergraduates apologize? All the participants in this pilot test responded well as the responses given suit the framework chosen for this study. This shows that all the 6 situations are workable and can be used for the research.

3.9 Summary

The theoretical framework and qualitative method selected are suitable to answer all the research questions. The instrument and coding help the researcher to identify the data obtained from the interview sessions conducted and therefore increase the validity of information presented in this study.

CHAPTER 4

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study which include the statistics of the oral responses of the respondents. The findings are arranged into a few sub-topics according to the research questions of this study. There are three parts. Analysis was done on the set of apology strategies which refers to the patterns of the responses given by the respondents, gender differences and similarities in the way the respondents apologized and the reasons for the apology strategies used when the respondents apologized.

4.2 Results of Analysis

To answer the research questions of this study, the data collected were analyzed qualitatively. The analysis was done according to the situations. Each situation was discussed based on the responses of the respondents. To meet the research questions, the analysis of the data was divided into three parts. The first part of the analysis answers the first research question that is 'How do Malay ESL undergraduate apologize?' It explores the patterns of the responses used by the respondents. The second part of the analysis answers the second research question that is 'What are the similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies used by male and female undergraduates?' Finally, the last part of the analysis answers the third or the last research question; 'What are the factors that influence the different apology used?' Each response given is coded as follows:

Table 4.1 : Descriptions of the codes

Codes	Descriptions
A	expression of apology (an offer of apology, a request for forgiveness, expression of regret)
B	explanation or account (explanation or account of the situation /giving justification)
C	acknowledgement of responsibility; (implicit acknowledgment , explicit acknowledgement, expression of lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency, expression of embarrassment, explicit acceptance of the blame)
D	repair and forbearance (an offer of repair, a promise of forbearance)
E	denial of responsibility (not accepting the blame, blaming the other participant)
F	others (requesting, interjection, invoking God's name, pleading)

4.3 Patterns of Apology Strategies

This section discusses the patterns of apology strategies employed by all the participants. The responses were analysed and categorised according to the research questions and placed under six situations.

Situation 1 is about obstructing the way. In this situation, the respondent was talking to his or her friend and then suddenly a lecturer told him or her that he or she was obstructing him or her. Table 4.2 shows the responses given by the participants in Situation 1.

Table 4.2 : Situation 1 : Obstructing the way.

No.	Strategies	No of Participants	%
1	A	4	13.33
2	AA	1	3.33
3	AAD	1	3.33
4	AC	2	6.67
5	ACA	1	3.33
6	ACD	2	6.67
7	AD	9	30.00
8	FA	5	16.67
9	FABBAD	1	3.33
10	FAC	1	3.33
11	FAD	3	10.00
	TOTAL	30	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D =offer and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

Altogether, there are only 11 patterns of apology strategies and it is the least compared to the responses given in the other 5 situations. This is due to the fact that many apology strategies would not be necessary for this situation. The use of Strategy A (expression of apology) would be sufficient for this offense. In all responses, the expression of apology (A) is the most as there are 34 instances in all the responses given. Some variations of expression of apology given by the participants are "Sorry Sir", "I am sorry Sir". In contrast, the longest response given for this situation is combination of 6 strategies, FABBAD (others + expression of apology + explanation or account + explanation or account + expression of apology + repair and forbearance). Another interesting result is 10 respondents used Strategy F (others) in this situation when they started their responses by using interjection 'Oh'. This interjection is employed because the participants were surprised or shocked as they were in the middle of a conversation with their friend when the lecturer told them that they were obstructing her way. They were not aware that they were actually obstructing someone. It is also seen that Strategy E (denial of responsibility) is not used at all in this situation. All of the participants accepted the responsibility of the offense made.

Other than that, the most common response given by the participants is AD (expression of apology + repair and forbearance). 30% of the participants opted for this combination. A few examples of the responses given for this combination are:

Table 4.2.1 : AD Responses

Lecturer : Excuse me, you are blocking the way.		
Participant (M1)	Sorry teacher.	I will change my position now.
Participant (M9)	I am sorry Sir.	I will change my place.
Participant (F2)	I'm sorry Sir.	You may walk here.
Strategies	(A)	(D)

The second most frequently used combination of strategies is FA (others + expression of apology). 16.67% of the participants responded using these strategies. Some examples to show this combination are shown in table 4.2.2 :

Table 4.2.2 : FA Responses

Lecturer : Excuse me, you are blocking the way.		
Participant (M7)	Oh!	Sorry Miss.
Participant (M11)	Oh!	I am sorry
Participant (F12)	Oh!	I am sorry Madam.
Strategies	(F)	(A)

The third most frequently used is A (expression of apology). 13.33% of the participants gave this short response. Table 4.2.3 shows the responses given:

Table 4.2.3 : A Responses

Lecturer : Excuse me, you are blocking the way.	
Participant (M3)	Sorry Sir.
Participant (M5)	I am sorry Sir.
Participant (M6)	I'm sorry Madam.
Strategy	(A)

Situation 2 is about being absent from class. In this situation, the respondent was frequently absent from class. Table 4.3 shows the responses given by the respondents in Situation 2.

Table 4.3 : Situation 2 : Being absent from class

No.	Strategies	No. of Participants	%
1	AAB	1	3.33
2	AB	9	30.00
3	ABAB	1	3.33
4	ABBC	1	3.33
5	ABBD	1	3.33
6	ABD	3	10.00
7	AC	3	10.00
8	ACD	1	3.33
9	AEB	1	3.33
10	BAD	1	3.33
11	BB	2	6.67
12	BC	2	6.67
13	BDDB	1	3.33
14	CBD	1	3.33
15	EE	1	3.33
16	FACBD	1	3.33
	TOTAL	30	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D =repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others

16 patterns of apology strategies were used and 21 responses started with Strategy A (expression of apology) followed by the other strategies. The strategy that they used the most in all the responses given is Strategy B (explanation or account), as there are 30 instances in all the respondents responses. It is expected as the nature of the situation requires a justification. This is followed by Strategy A (expression of apology) with 25 instances. Some realizations of Strategy B (explanation or account) given by the participants are that they have family problems, health problems and other commitment such as meetings and competitions. The shortest responses given consisted of two apology strategies. They were AB (expression of apology + explanation or account), AC

(expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility), BB (explanation or account + explanation or account), BC (explanation or account + acknowledgement of responsibility) and EE (denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility). On the other hand, the longest response given was the combination of FACBD (Others + expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + explanation or account + repair and forbearance). The participant (F3) tried hard to make up for the offense made by combining 5 different apology strategies in her response. Only one response was given for denial of responsibility (EE).

From the results, 30% of the respondents used the combination of AB (expression of apology + explanation or account). This is the most frequent pattern used by them as they need to justify why the offense was made. Some examples are:

Table 4.3.1 : AB Responses

Lecturer : I checked the attendance and found out that you are frequently absent from class.		
Participant (F4)	I am sorry Sir.	I have problems with my family.
Participant (M2)	I'm sorry Sir.	I have been in hospital this month.
Participant (M11)	Actually I am sorry for that	because I am usually overslept.
Strategies	(A)	(B)

The second most common response given by the respondents was ABD (expression of apology + explanation or account + repair and forbearance) and AC (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility). 10% of the respondents used ABD and another 10% used AC. The examples are:

Table 4.3.2 : ABD Responses

Lecturer : I checked the attendance and found out that you are frequently absent from class.			
Participant (M3)	I am sorry Sir.	Lately I have events that I have to attend.	So, here I give my exemption letter to you.
Participant (M8)	I am sorry Sir.	I absent due to some reasons and I cannot give you a proper official letters regarding that	so I will make sure after this I will come to your class
Participant (F1)	I'm sorry	because actually I have meeting with the club of 'Rakan Masjid'	but then I promised I will not do it again.
Strategies	(A)	(B)	(D)

Table 4.3.3 : AC Responses

Lecturer : I checked the attendance and found out that you are frequently absent from class.		
Participant (M5)	I am sorry Sir.	It is my fault.
Participant (M7)	I am sorry	for being absent for too long.
Participant (M15)	Sorry Sir	for not attending your class.
	(A)	(C)

The third most frequent response used by the respondents is BB (explanation or account + explanation or account) and BC (explanation or account + acknowledgment of responsibility). 2 respondents used combination of BB and another 2 used combination of BC in their responses. The examples for these responses are :

Table 4.3.4 : BB Responses

Lecturer : I checked the attendance and found out that you are frequently absent from class.		
Participant (F6)	Actually Sir, I am not purposely absent from your class.	I have my own reason because I sick.
Participant (F14)	I'm not feeling well.	I mean I'm having some kind of morning sickness.
Strategies	(B)	(B)

Table 4.3.5 : BC Responses

Lecturer : I checked the attendance and found out that you are frequently absent from class.		
Participant (M4)	Actually I have some problems with my family	so that I have to be away from the classes.
Participant (M5)	I have some reasons	for being absent from the class
Strategies	(B)	(C)

Situation 3 is about losing a book. The respondent borrowed a book from the lecturer and he or she lost it. Table 4.4 shows the frequency of the apology strategies used.

Table 4.4 : Situation 3 : Losing a book

No.	Strategies	No. of Participants	%
1	AACD	1	3.33
2	AACDD	1	3.33
3	AC	3	10.00
4	ACD	6	20.00
5	ACDA	2	6.67
6	ACDD	3	10.00
7	ACDDDA	1	3.33
8	AD	1	3.33
9	ADC	1	3.33
10	CBD	1	3.33
11	CCA	1	3.33
12	CD	3	10.00
13	CDD	1	3.33
14	D	1	3.33
15	DC	1	3.33
16	DD	1	3.33
17	FACD	1	3.33
18	FD	1	3.33
	TOTAL	30	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility:
F = others)

Overall, the participants used 18 patterns of apology strategies in their responses. 19 responses given started with Strategy A (expression of apology) followed by other strategies. Furthermore, Strategy D (repair and forbearance) is used the most in all the responses given with 34 instances followed by Strategy C with 27 instances and Strategy A with 26 instances. The participants employed Strategy D (repair and forbearance) the most. Some realizations of the responses given for this strategy are offering to replace or buy a new book, offering money to compensate and trying to find the book. The strategy that the participants did not use at all for this situation is Strategy E (denial of responsibility). The

shortest response given for this situation is one stand alone strategy that is strategy D while the longest response consists of 6 apology strategies ACDDDA (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance + repair and forbearance + repair and forbearance + expression of apology). The participant (M10) really felt that there is a need to compensate the offense made so that there is co-occurrence of strategy D (repair and forbearance) in the response given. The use of strategy F (others) at the beginning of the responses given occurred in 2 responses. For instance, FACD (others + expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance) and FD (others + repair and forbearance). The responses given for this strategy are "Oh" and "Oh my God".

The most frequent pattern used by the participants is ACD (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance). 20% of the participants employed this combination of strategies. The examples to show this are:

Table 4.4.1 : ACD Responses

Lecturer : Can I have my book back? I need it.			
Participant (M2)	I am sorry for that because	I lost it	so I will pay for that.
Participant (F13)	Sorry Madam.	I have lost your book.	I will buy a new one, the same book to you.
Participant (F14)	I'm sorry Sir.	I accidentally lost your book.	May I know the price of the book so that I can buy a new one for you.
Strategies	(A)	(C)	(D)

The second most frequent pattern used for this situation was the combinations of AC (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility) and CD (acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance) with 10% each. The examples for these two patterns are as follows:

Table 4.4.2 : AC Responses

Lecturer : Can I have my book back? I need it.		
Participant (F5)	I am really sorry.	I lost your book.
Participant (M3)	I'm very sorry	because I have missing you book.
Participant (M5)	Sorry Madam.	I have lost your book.
Strategies	(A)	(C)

Table 4.4.3 : CD Responses

Lecturer : Can I have my book back? I need it.		
Participant (F12)	Actually I have lost you book.	So I am going to replace it.
Participant (M7)	Frankly speaking, your book has been lost in my care,	so is there any way for me to replace or compensate it?
	(C)	(D)

The table below shows the results of Situation 4. Situation 4 is about being late for class. The respondent was late for 30 minutes.

Table 4.5 : Situation 4 : Being late for class

No.	Strategies	No. of Participants	%
1	A	1	3.33
2	AB	13	43.33
3	ABA	1	3.33
4	ABAD	1	3.33
5	ABF	1	3.33
6	AC	1	3.33
7	ACB	3	10.00
8	ACBB	1	3.33
9	ACBD	1	3.33
10	ACD	1	3.33
11	AD	2	6.67
12	AFD	1	3.33
13	BBA	2	6.67
14	BC	1	3.33
	TOTAL	30	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The participants used an overall of 14 patterns of apology strategies in this situation. Most of the responses given started with Strategy A (expression of apology). There are 27 responses started with Strategy A. It is also the most common strategy used in this situation with 31 instances followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) with 27 instances. Most of the reasons given by the participants for this situation are oversleeping and waking up late. Others include helping a friend, having a stomach ache in the morning, traffic jam and having other important or urgent matters to be settled first. The shortest response used in this situation is A (expression of apology) whereas the longest response consists of 5 strategies, ABBAD (expression of apology + explanation or account + explanation or account + expression of apology + repair and forbearance). Strategy F was given in 2 responses, ABF (expression of apology + explanation or account + others) and AFD

(expression of apology + others + minimizing the degree of offense). The responses given

for strategy F are "Can I attend you lecture today" and "In Sha Allah". From the result we

can also notice that the participants did not use strategy E (denial of responsibility) at all.

The most frequently used pattern was AB (expression of apology + explanation or

account). 43% of the participants employed this combination of strategies in their

responses. Below are of the examples for this type of response:

Table 4.5.1 : AB Responses

Lecturer : You are late for your class.		
Participant (M1)	I am sorry Sir.	I overslept.
Participant (M3)	I'm very sorry Sir	because I have another matter.
Participant (F11)	Sorry Sir	because this morning I woke up late so I took time to take a bath.
Strategies	(A)	(B)

The second most frequent set used are ACB (expression of apology +

acknowledgement of responsibility + explanation or account). The examples are as follows:

Table 4.5.2 : ACB Responses

Lecturer : You are late for your class.			
Participant (F10)	Sir, I am sorry.	I know that I am late for 30 minutes	But there were something happen before.
Participant (F5)	Sorry Doctor,	I came late to your class	because of some reasons.
Participant (F9)	I'm sorry Sir	because I am late.	I have another thing to be settled first because it is important and urgent to be settled.
Strategies	(A)	(C)	(B)

Table 4.6 shows the results of Situation 5. In this situation, the respondent was unable to hand in their assignment on time.

Table 4.6 : Situation 5 : Unable to hand in assignment on time

No.	Strategies	No. of Participants	%
1	A	2	6.67
2	AB	2	6.67
3	ABB	1	3.33
4	ACD	1	3.33
5	ACFD	1	3.33
6	AD	1	3.33
7	ADCB	1	3.33
8	AFD	1	3.33
9	BBAD	1	3.33
10	BD	1	3.33
11	C	1	3.33
12	CA	1	3.33
13	CAC	1	3.33
14	CB	1	3.33
15	CBBD	1	3.33
16	CBCD	1	3.33
17	CBD	2	6.67
18	CCC	1	3.33
19	CD	2	6.67
20	D	1	3.33
21	ED	1	3.33
22	FACF	1	3.33
23	FBBC	1	3.33
24	FBBD	1	3.33
25	FCA	1	3.33
26	FCB	1	3.33
	TOTAL	30	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The results show that the participants employed 26 patterns of responses in this situation. The most common strategy used in all the responses was Strategy C (acknowledgment of responsibility) with 22 instances in the responses given. This is followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) with 19 instances of occurrences in all the responses given. Some realizations of Strategy C included admitting that they are unable to finish their assignment, expression of lack of intent and expression of self-deficiency. For Strategy B (explanation or account), the responses were 'a little bit more to complete the assignment', 'problems with managing their time', 'laptop broke down', 'busy with other activities', 'the assignment was hard to complete' and 'did not really know how to do the assignment'. The shortest responses given were single strategies (A, C, and D). On the other hand, the longest responses employed consisted of 4 strategies. The use of Strategy F (others) was also employed deliberately in this situation. The examples of this strategy include "Yes, I know", "Can I have extra time", Today is the deadline?" and "In Sha Allah". There is only one response given that has Strategy E (denial of responsibility) where the response given was that the assignment was with another friend as they were doing it in a group.

There was no result for the most commonly used patterns of strategies for this situation. However, 4 sets were used more than the others. A (expression of apology), AB (expression of apology + explanation or account), CBD (acknowledgement of responsibility + explanation or account + repair and forbearance) and CD acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance) each employed by 6.67% of the participants. The examples for each pattern are as follows:

Table 4.6.1 : A Responses

Lecturer : Where is your assignment? You know that the deadline is today.	
Participant (M8)	Yes Sir, I am sorry.
Participant (F5)	Sorry.
Strategy	(A)

Table 4.6.2 : AB Responses

Lecturer : Where is your assignment? You know that the deadline is today.		
Participant (M4)	Sorry Sir	because my laptop broke down.
Participant (M1)	Sorry teacher,	I have done my assignment but I couldn't submit it on time.
Strategies	(A)	(B)

Table 4.6.3 : CBD Responses

Lecturer : Where is your assignment? You know that the deadline is today.			
Participant (M12)	I know that the dateline is today	but I have other works to do Sir	but I will complete it by today before 12 am tonight.
Participant (M3)	I cannot pass it on time.	I have only just a little bit more to complete	but I will pass it later.
Strategies	(C)	(B)	(D)

Table 4.6.4 : Responses of CD

Lecturer : Where is your assignment? You know that the deadline is today.		
Participant (M5)	I didn't manage to do it on time.	I will pass it.
Participant (M6)	Actually I don't finish my assignment yet	so I'll pass up to you tomorrow.
Strategies	(C)	(D)

Table 4.7 shows the results of Situation 6. Situation 6 is about cheating in a test.

Table 4.7 : Situation 6 : Cheating in a test

No.	Strategies	No. of Participants	%
1	A	2	6.67
2	AB	3	10.00
3	ABB	2	6.67
4	AC	1	3.33
5	ACBBAD	1	3.33
6	ACC	1	3.33
7	ACD	2	6.67
8	ACDF	1	3.33
9	AD	2	6.67
10	ADBB	1	3.33
11	AEE	1	3.33
12	AEEEBEB	1	3.33
13	B	1	3.33
14	BC	1	3.33
15	CB	3	10.00
16	CCDA	1	3.33
17	CD	1	3.33
18	EE	2	6.67
19	EEB	1	3.33
20	F	1	3.33
21	FABC	1	3.33
	TOTAL	30	100

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others

The results show that a total of 21 patterns of strategies were used by the participants. The most common strategy used in this situation was Strategy A (expression of apology) with 21 instances followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) with 20 instances in all the responses given. The examples of realizations of Strategy B are that the participant did not study or had not finished studying before the exam and therefore they were not prepared well for the test. Other than that, some participants said they did not know how to answer the questions. Another fact was that the participants employed 12 instances of Strategy E (denial of responsibility) in 4 patterns given. The short responses

employed for this situation consisted of one strategy that is Strategy A or B alone without a

secondary strategy. On the other hand, the longest response given was the combination of 7

strategies, AEEEBEB (expression of apology + denial of responsibility + denial of

responsibility + denial of responsibility + explanation or account + denial of responsibility

+ explanation or account). There were 4 sets of strategies that had Strategy E (denial of

responsibility. One of the responses given show they did not cheat but they were just

looking around to get ideas. Another interesting point for this situation is that 3 participants

employed Strategy F (others) in their responses. The examples of this strategy include "I

have nothing to say", "Can I have one more chance to have a test" and "Please don't send

me to the dean or so on".

10% of the participants used pattern AB (expression of apology + explanation or

account) and another 10% used CB (acknowledgement of responsibility explanation or

account). The examples for the responses are :

Table 4.7.1 : AB Responses

Lecturer : You cheated in the test. What do you have to say to this?		
Participant (F5)	I am sorry	because I haven't finished my study before coming to your test.
Participant (F12)	Sorry Sir.	I do not know how to do the question.
Participant (M4)	I'm sorry teacher	because yesterday I didn't study at all.
Strategies	(A)	(B)

Table 4.4.2 : CB Responses

Lecturer : You cheated in the test. What do you have to say to this?		
Participant (M11)	I have to do it	because I don't have time to study on this subject.
Participant (M5)	I admit that I cheated.	Actually I didn't study last night so I'm desperate.
Participant (M13)	Yes Sir, I admit	Because I'm lack of study and revision in this subject.
	(C)	(B)

In conclusion, this section discusses the patterns and combinations of apology strategies employed by all 30 participants in 6 situations. It shows that different combinations of apology strategies were employed by the respondents. The length of the responses also varied. The most frequently used pattern is AB (expression of apology + explanation or account) with 27 responses out of 180 responses. This is followed by AD (expression of apology + repair and forbearance) with 15 responses.

4.4 Position in which strategies occur

Table 4.8 : Distribution of positions where the strategies occur.

Position / Strategy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
A	115	22	8	4	2	1	0	152
B	13	55	20	8	1	0	1	98
C	23	49	11	4	0	0	0	87
D	4	30	37	15	3	2	0	91
E	5	7	2	1	0	1	0	16
F	20	2	2	2	0	0	0	26

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The table above shows the position in which the strategies occur. Strategy A (IFIDs) occurred 115 times in the first position in the responses given. The word "sorry" and "I apologize" are the first strategy the respondents used when they apologized. 14 out of 30 respondents mentioned that it is a must to apologize first before giving any explanations or justifications on the offences made. Strategy B (explanation or account) occurred mostly in the second and third position with 55 instances. This strategy was usually used after strategy A. Explanations and justifications are given after they said "Sorry". In the interview sessions, the respondents said that an apology was needed because the offender feels bad for what he or she had done and it was necessary to apologize to someone who has better position than them. The respondents stated that the way they apologize comes naturally or spontaneous that is to say 'sorry' and give reasons to justify the offense made by them. Furthermore, they mentioned that it is common to say 'sorry' and give explanations and reasons. 14 of them said that 'sorry' is the first thing that needs to be said. Moreover, to apologize means that the offender has to say 'sorry' as it is the most common word used. It is also common way to apologize by saying 'sorry' because it the way they were taught and raised. Saying 'sorry' is important if you make a mistake because 'sorry' is a word to show that you are regret for the offence made. By including the

word 'sorry' in their responses, the offender also shows good manners. Besides, by saying 'sorry', it shows that the respondent admits the mistake that he or she has made. These reasons would explain why there are 152 instances of Strategy A (expression of apology) followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) with 98 instances.

Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) is frequently used in the second position with 48 instances. This strategy is also used after the respondents apologized. Strategy D (repair and forbearance) occurs mostly in the third position of the responses with 37 instances while Strategy E (denial of responsibility) occurs mostly in the second position with 7 instances.

4.5 Number of strategies in 6 situations.

Table 4.9 : Distribution of strategies used and their positions.

Situation / No. of Strategies Used	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 strategy	4	0	1	1	4	4
2 strategies	17	18	10	17	9	13
3 strategies	8	7	10	9	9	7
4 strategies	0	4	7	3	8	4
5 strategies	0	1	1	0	0	0
6 strategies	1	0	1	0	0	1
7 strategies	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**30**	**30**	**30**	**30**	**30**	**30**

Table 4.9 shows the distribution of strategies used and their position in all 6 situations. In situation 1, the respondents used combinations of 2 strategies the most with 17 responses to apologize. This is followed by combinations of 3 strategies with 8 responses. 4 responses consist of only 1 strategy and there is 1 response which consists of 6 strategies. In situation 2, 18 responses are combinations of 2 strategies and the second combinations frequently used consist of 3 strategies with 7 responses. The longest response is combinations of 5 strategies. In situation 3, the combinations used the most are combinations of 2 and 3 strategies with 10 responses respectively. The longest response is combinations of 6 strategies. In situation 4, combinations of 2 strategies were used the most with 17 responses. This is followed by combinations of 3 strategies with 9 responses. The longest response consists of 4 strategies. In situation 5, the most frequently used responses consist of 2 to 3 strategies. The longest response consists of 4 strategies. Finally in situation 6, the respondents employed combinations of 2 strategies the most in their responses. The longest response is combinations of 7 strategies. In conclusion, the respondents used 2 strategies the most to apologize in situations 1,2, 4 and 6,. For situation 3 and 4, they used 2 to 3 strategies the most to apologize.

4.6 Number Of Instances Of The Strategies Used In 6 Situations

Table 4.10 :. Instances Of Strategies in Responses in 6 Situations

Situation / Strategy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
A	34	25	26	31	15	21	152
B	2	30	1	26	19	20	98
C	6	9	27	8	22	15	87
D	16	10	34	6	16	9	91
E	0	3	0	0	1	12	16
F	10	1	2	2	8	3	26

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; D = denial of responsibility: F = others)

Table 4.10 shows the number of instances of strategies in the sets of responses in all 6 situations. For Situation 1 (Obstructing the way), the most frequently used strategy is Strategy A (expression of apology) with 34 instances. This strategy appears mostly at the beginning of the responses given by the respondents. The second frequently used strategy is Strategy D (repair and forbearance) with 16 instances. It can be concluded that when the respondents realized that they were obstructing the way they immediately employed Strategy A (expression of apology) that is "Sorry". Then they minimized the offense by using strategy D (repair and forbearance) by giving way to the lecturer.

For Situation 2 (Being absent from class), Strategy B (explanation or account) is the most frequently used by the respondents with 30 instances followed by Strategy A (expression of apology) with 25 instances. This shows that the respondents gave reasons why they were absent and apologized by saying "Sorry".

Strategy D (repair and forbearance) is used deliberately in Situation 3 (Losing a book) as there are 34 instances. The respondents offered buying a new book or replacing the lost book. The second most frequently used is Strategy C (acknowledgement of

responsibility) with 27 instances. They respondents used "Sorry" and admitted that they were responsible for the missing book.

For Situation 4 (Being late for class), Strategy A (expression of apology)) is the most frequently used by the respondents with 31 instances. They expressed their apology by saying "Sorry" and then gave reasons for being late by employing Strategy B (explanation or account) with 26 instances.

Strategy C (acknowledgment of responsibility) is the most frequently used in Situation 5 (Unable to hand in assignment on time) with 22 instances. The respondents admitted that they were late and gave reasons for being late by employing Strategy B (explanation or account) with 19 instances.

For Situation 6 (Cheating in a test), Strategy A (expression of apology) is the most frequently used with 21 instances followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) with 20 instances. The respondents employed the verb "Sorry" to apologize and gave reason why they cheated in the test.

Overall, for all the 6 situations, Strategy A (expression of apology) is deliberately used by the respondents. There are 152 instances in their sets of responses. This shows that the verb "sorry" is commonly used when it comes to apologizing. The second and third are Strategy B (explanation or account) with 98 instances and Strategy D (repair and forbearance) with 91 instances.

In conclusion, the respondents employed different combinations of strategies in their responses. The way they apologized varied across situations. The results show that they used 2 to 3 strategies the most in most of the responses given. Combination of AB was the most frequently used with 27 sets followed by combinations of AD and ACD with 15 sets and 10 sets each.

4.7 Similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies based on gender.

This section discusses similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies employed by the male and female participants. The responses were categorized and placed under six situations.

Situation 1 is about obstructing the way. In this situation, the respondent was talking to his or her friend and then suddenly a lecturer told him or her that he or she was obstructing him or her.

Table 4.11 : Situation 1 : Obstructing the way

No.	Strategies	Males		Females	
		No	%	No	%
1	A	4	26.67	0	0.00
2	AA	1	6.67	0	0.00
3	AAD	1	6.67	0	0.00
4	AC	1	6.67	1	6.67
5	ACA	0	0.00	1	6.67
6	ACD	1	6.67	1	6.67
7	AD	3	20.00	6	40.00
8	FA	2	13.33	3	20.00
9	FABBAD	0	0.00	1	6.67
10	FAC	0	0.00	1	6.67
11	FAD	2	13.33	1	6.67
	TOTAL	15	100.00	15	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The table above reveals that the most common category used by the males that is expression of apology (A) with 26.67%. Some examples of the responses given are "Sorry Sir", "Sorry Miss" and Sorry Madam". This shows that 4 male respondents did not tend to elaborate much in the responses given. On the other hand, 40% of the female respondents used the combination of expression of apology and repair and forbearance (AD). For

examples, "Sorry teacher, I will change my position now", I'm sorry Sir, you can take the way now", and "Sorry Sir, you may use this way". Males' responses range from 1 to 3 strategies while the females' responses have the combination of 2 to 6 strategies. 7 males and 10 females used 2 strategies for this situation.

For the patterns of strategies used, both males and females employed 8 responses. One female respondent (F3) used combinations of 6 strategies FABBAD. The response given was "Oh!, I'm so sorry. I thought I didn't block anyone. I thought you were not behind me. Erm…but I am so sorry. Er…you can just go right now". The expression of apology that is "sorry" is mentioned in all the responses given in Situation 1. Besides, "sorry" is used the most by both genders.

For individual apology used most frequently by both genders in this situation is Strategy A (expression of apology) with 17 instances each. Strategy D (repair and forbearance) is the second most frequently used by males and females, with 7 and 9 instances respectively.

Table 4.12 shows the apology strategies used in Situation 2. Situation 2 is about being absent from class. In this situation, the respondent was frequently absent from class.

Table 4.12 : Situation 2 : Being absent from class

No.	Strategies	Males		Females	
		No	%	No	%
1	AAB	0	0.00	1	6.67
2	AB	4	26.67	5	33.33
3	ABAB	1	6.67	0	0.00
4	ABBC	0	0.00	1	6.67
5	ABBD	0	0.00	1	6.67
6	ABD	2	13.33	1	6.67
7	AC	3	20.00	0	0.00
8	ACD	0	0.00	1	6.67
9	AEB	1	6.67	0	0.00
10	BAD	1	6.67	0	0.00
11	BB	0	0.00	2	13.33
12	BC	2	13.33	0	0.00
13	BDDB	1	6.67	0	0.00
14	CBD	0	0.00	1	6.67
15	EE	0	0.00	1	6.67
16	FACBD	0	0.00	1	6.67
	TOTAL	15	100.00	15	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The results show that both male and female respondents employed the combination of expression of apology and explanation or account (AB) the most with 26.67% and 33.33% respectively. Some examples are "I'm sorry for that because I'm usually overslept", "I'm sorry Sir, I have been in the hospital this month", "I'm really sorry Sir because I have too many urgent problems in my current situation", "I'm sorry Sir, Er…er… I have problems with my family" and "Ar… sorry Madam. I have er… another commitment".

The longest combination of strategies is FACBD (others + expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + explanation or account + repair and forbearance) employed by one female respondent (F3). The response given is "Oh, I'm so sorry Sir. The reason behind why always absent in the class because I've been doing a competition with the supervisor but maybe I can just ask him give you a letter regarding the matter so it is official". On the other hand the shortest combinations consist of two strategies employed by 9 males and 8 females. They are AB (expression of apology + explanation or account), AC (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility), BB (explanation or account + explanation or account), BC (explanation or account + acknowledgement of responsibility) and EE (denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility). There is no single strategy or standalone response used by both males and females in this situation. This shows that "Sorry" alone is not enough as they need to justify the reason why they were frequently absent. This situation requires the participants to justify or give explanation on the offense made. Explanation or account (B) is used the most in all the responses given by both genders. There are 14 instances used by males and 16 instances used by female respondents. Only one male respondent (M1) denied the responsibility. He used the combinations of AEB (expression of apology + denial of responsibility + explanation or account) responses are "Sorry teacher, but I think I come to the class. Maybe I mistake the attendance". The second respondent who employed strategies EE (denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility) is a female (F15). The response given was "Maybe there was a mistake because I come to your class and only one day I didn't come". All together, the male respondents use 8 patterns of strategies while the female respondents used 10 patterns. This shows that female respondents used more combinations of strategies than male respondents for this situation.

For individual apology used most frequently by males in this situation is Strategy B (explanation or account) with 14 instances. The reasons given for being absent are oversleeping and having other commitment. On the other hand, female employed 16 instances of this strategy. The reasons given are having family problems, having other commitment and were sick. Strategy A (expression of apology) is the second most frequently used by males and females, with 13 and 12 instances respectively.

Situation 3 is about losing a book. The respondent borrowed a book from the lecturer and he or she lost it. The table below shows the frequency of the apology strategies used.

Table 4.13 : Situation 3 : Losing a book

No.	Strategies	Males		Females	
		No	%	No	%
1	AACD	1	6.67	0	0.00
2	AACDD	1	6.67	0	0.00
3	AC	2	13.33	1	6.67
4	ACD	3	20.00	3	20.00
5	ACDA	0	0.00	2	13.33
6	ACDD	1	6.67	2	13.33
7	ACDDDA	1	6.67	0	0.00
8	AD	0	0.00	1	6.67
9	ADC	1	6.67	0	0.00
10	CBD	0	0.00	1	6.67
11	CCA	0	0.00	1	6.67
12	CD	2	13.33	1	6.67
13	CDD	1	6.67	0	0.00
14	D	0	0.00	1	6.67
15	DC	1	6.67	0	0.00
16	DD	0	0.00	1	6.67
17	FACD	0	0.00	1	6.67
18	FD	1	6.67	0	0.00
	TOTAL	15	100.00	15	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The most frequent strategy used by both male and female respondents is ACD (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance). The number of respondents who opted for this strategy is 6, 3 males and 3 females. Some examples of the responses include "I'm sorry Sir, I lost it. Should I pay you for the book?", "Forgive me Sir, I have lost the book, May I give…er… may I replace another book?", and "I'm sorry for that because I lost it. I will…er…. pay for that".

The longest combination of apology strategies used in this situation is ACDDDA (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance + repair and forbearance + repair and forbearance + expression of apology). This combination is employed by one male respondent (M10). The response given is "I'm really sorry but I kind of misplace your book. So is there anything I can do to replace back your book or maybe I can replace your book with some money or I can find the same book that I lost. But first of all, I am sorry". In contrast, the shortest combination is D (repair and forbearance) given by one female respondent (F2). They only used one strategy assuming that the lecturer would understand that the book was lost. The responses given are "I will check and give it to you back" and "Sir, can you give me the time, I can buy it for you". Overall, male respondents used 11 patterns of strategies while the female respondents used 10. 10 male respondents used A (expression of apology) first and combine it with other strategies compared to the female respondents. Two responses started with strategy F (Others) employed by one male and one female. The responses given for this strategy are "Oh my God. I'm sorry. I lost it. Should I pay for the book?" (FACD) and "Oh!, I will check and give it to you back" (FD).

For individual apology used most frequently by males and females in this situation is Strategy D (repair and forbearance) with 18 and 16 instances respectively. Both gender offered repair by offering to pay, buy or replace the missing book. Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) is the second most frequently used by males with 14 instances. The second most frequently used strategies for females are Strategy A (expression of apology) and Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) with 13 instances each.

Table 4.14 shows the results of Situation 4. Situation 4 is about being late for class. The respondent was 30 minutes late.

Table 4.14 : Situation 4 : Being late for class

No.	Strategies	Males		Females	
		No	%	No	%
1	A	0	0	1	6.67
2	AB	9	60.00	4	26.67
3	ABA	1	6.67	0	0.00
4	ABAD	0	0.00	1	6.67
5	ABF	0	0.00	1	6.67
6	AC	1	6.67	0	0.00
7	ACB	1	6.67	2	13.33
8	ACBB	0	0.00	1	6.67
9	ACBD	0	0.00	1	6.67
10	ACD	0	0.00	1	6.67
11	AD	0	0.00	2	13.33
12	AFD	1	6.67	0	0.00
13	BBA	1	6.67	1	6.67
14	BC	1	6.67	0	0.00
	TOTAL	15	100.00	15	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The results show that both male and female respondents chose the combination of AB (expression of apology and explanation or account) with 60% and 26.67 % respectively. Some examples of the responses are "Sorry teacher, I overslept", "I'm very sorry Sir, because I have another matter", and "I'm sorry sir, I woke up late". 10 of the explanations given were that they overslept.

The longest combinations of strategies are ABAD, ACBB and ACBD. These responses were given by 3 female respondents. On the other hand, the shortest response is A (expression of apology) alone given by only one female respondent (F4). Based on the interview given, she said that she would feel embarrassed if there were many other students

in the class and that was why she only gave a short response. This shows that the place where the offense made, the atmosphere and the surrounding play important role in determining the length of the responses given. Male respondents used 7 patterns of strategies while female respondents used 10.

For individual apology used most frequently by males and females in this situation is Strategy A (expression of apology) with 15 and 16 instances respectively. Strategy B (explanation or account) is the second most frequently used by both genders, with 14 instances for males and 12 instances for females. Most of the reasons given by them are oversleeping and having other important matters to be settled first.

Table 4.15 shows the results of Situation 5. In this situation, the respondent was unable to hand in his or her assignment on time.

Table 4.15 : Situation 5 : Unable to hand in assignment on time

No.	Strategies	Males		Females	
		No	%	No	%
1	A	1	6.67	1	6.67
2	AB	2	13.33	0	0.00
3	ABB	0	0.00	1	6.67
4	ACD	1	6.67	0	0.00
5	ACFD	1	6.67	0	0.00
6	AD	0	0.00	1	6.67
7	ADCB	0	0.00	1	6.67
8	AFD	0	0.00	1	6.67
9	BBAD	1	6.67	0	0.00
10	BD	1	6.67	0	0.00
11	C	0	0.00	1	6.67
12	CA	0	0.00	1	6.67
13	CAC	0	0.00	1	6.67
14	CB	1	6.67	0	0.00
15	CBBD	1	6.67	0	0.00
16	CBCD	0	0.00	1	6.67
17	CBD	2	13.33	0	0.00
18	CCC	0	0.00	1	6.67
19	CD	2	13.33	0	0.00
20	D	1	6.67	0	0.00
21	ED	1	6.67	0	0.00
22	FACF	0	0.00	1	6.67
23	FBBC	0	0.00	1	6.67
24	FBBD	0	0.00	1	6.67
25	FCA	0	0.00	1	6.67
26	FCB	0	0.00	1	6.67
	TOTAL	15	100.00	15	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

The results show that both male and female respondents used combinations of two and three strategies; AB, AD, CA, CD, ACD and CBD. 13.33% of the male respondents chose the combinations AB, CD and CBD. 2 female respondents employed two combinations of strategies; AD and CA in their responses. For an example, "I didn't manage to do it on time. I will pass it" (CD). Only male respondent (M13) denied the responsibility, "My assignment actually is with my friend because we are doing in group so perhaps I will call him now" (ED). Both genders used many different combinations of apology strategies in this situation. The longest combinations consist of four strategies. They are ACFD, BBAD, CBBD employed by 3 males and CBCD, FACF, FBBC and FBBD employed by 4 females. In contrast, the shortest strategies are Strategy A, C and D used by 2 males and 2 females. 5 responses started with Strategy F (others). All these responses were employed by female respondents. The realizations given for this strategy included "Yes, I know" to show that they were aware of the dateline of the submission of their assignment and "Can I submit it tomorrow" and others. One male respondent (M9) employed Strategy F (others) in the middle of his response; "Please forgive me Sir. I am er…not done it yet. In Sha Allah, later, or as soon as possible I will try to submit it to you" (ACFD). In Sha Allah is used to show that he would submit it as soon as possible with Allah's permission. Overall, the female respondents used 15 patterns of strategies whereas the male respondents used only 12.

For individual apology used most frequently by males in this situation is Strategy D (repair and forbearance) with 11 instances and the second is Strategy B (explanation or account) with 10 instances. The male respondents said that they would try to submit the assignment as soon as possible. They also explained that they had other commitment such as co-curricular activities which cause them not having time to complete the assignment given. On the other hand, female participants employed Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) the most for individual apology used with 12 instances. 9 respondents

admitted that they could not finish the assignment given. Strategy A (expression of apology) and Strategy B (explanation or account) are the second most frequently used by females with 9 instances each. They explained that they did not have enough time to finish the assignment given and they were unable to understand the requirement of the assignment given.

Table 4.16 shows the results of Situation 6. Situation 6 is about cheating in a test.

Table 4.16 : Situation 6 : Cheating in a test

No.	Strategies	Males		Females	
		No	%	No	%
1	A	0	0.00	2	13.33
2	AB	1	6.67	2	13.33
3	ABB	0	0.00	2	13.33
4	AC	1	6.67	0	0.00
5	ACBBAD	1	6.67	0	0.00
6	ACC	1	6.67	0	0.00
7	ACD	1	6.67	1	6.67
8	ACDF	0	0.00	1	6.67
9	AD	1	6.67	1	6.67
10	ADBB	1	6.67	0	0.00
11	AEE	0	0.00	1	6.67
12	AEEEBEB	0	0.00	1	6.67
13	B	0	0.00	1	6.67
14	BC	0	0.00	1	6.67
15	CB	3	20.00	0	0.00
16	CCDA	1	6.67	0	0.00
17	CD	1	6.67	0	0.00
18	EE	2	13.33	0	0.00
19	EEB	0	0.00	1	6.67
20	F	1	6.67	0	0.00
21	FABC	0	0.00	1	6.67
	TOTAL	15	100.00	15	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F =   others)

The highest percentage of strategy used by the males respondents is CB (acknowledgement of responsibility and explanation) with 20.00% while for the female respondents, there are 4; A, AB, and ABB with 13.33% each. The longest combination of strategies is AEEEBEB (expression of apology + denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility + explanation or account + denial of responsibility + explanation or account) which was employed by a female respondent. The response is "I'm really sorry Sir, it's just I'm not cheated but maybe it is the way you look at things but I seriously didn't look at his or her paper. I just…em...I am thinking about the answer but I seriously didn't look at the answer. It is just me trying to remember what's the thing I have been studied last night". The shortest response is given by 4 respondents. Two female respondents (F4 and F9) gave single strategy (Strategy A) by just saying "My apology" and "I am sorry Sir". One male respondent (M7) used F (Others) that is "I have nothing to say" and one female respondent (F15) also only used one strategy that is strategy B (explanation or account) in her response. The response that she gave was "I don't study last night". When asked during the interview why the response given was short, the respondents explained that they were too embarrassed with the offense made so that they could not say anything else. They also mentioned that they were too afraid to even give any explanation. The overall patterns of strategies used by male and female respondents are 12. However, only 80 instances of strategies were used in the responses given and it is the second highest of all the 6 situations. Five respondents, three females and two males denied the responsibility. The responses given by the female respondents were "Sorry, because I didn't think I cheated in the exam. Er..maybe…aa..I need the prove to prove that I cheated" (AEE), "No, I am not cheating in exam. I didn't ask any questions, any answers but I'm just asking her about what time is it now"(EEB) and "Is it Sir because I think you have false accusation"(EE) was given by a male respondent.

For individual apology used most frequently by males in this situation is Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) with 11 instances. 5 of them admitted that they cheated in the test. The second is Strategy A (expression of apology). Females on the other hand, employed 12 instances of Strategy A (expression of apology) and B (explanation or account) with 12 instances. They explained that they cheated because did not know how to answer the questions.

Table 4.17 shows the patterns of apology strategies in all 6 situations.

Table 4.17 : Patterns of apology strategies in all 6 situations

No.	Strategies	Males		Females		All	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1	A	5	5.56	4	4.44	9	5.00
2	AA	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
3	AAB	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
4	AACD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
5	AACDD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
6	AAD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
7	AB	16	17.78	11	12.22	27	15.00
8	ABA	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
9	ABAB	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
10	ABAD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
11	ABB	0	0.00	3	3.33	3	1.67
12	ABBC	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
13	ABBD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
14	ABD	2	2.22	1	1.11	3	1.67
15	ABF	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
16	AC	8	8.89	2	2.22	10	5.56
17	ACA	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
18	ACB	1	1.11	2	2.22	3	1.67
19	ACBB	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
20	ACBBAD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
21	ACBD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
22	ACC	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
23	ACD	6	6.67	7	7.78	13	7.22
24	ACDA	0	0.00	2	2.22	2	1.11
25	ACDD	1	1.11	2	2.22	3	1.67
26	ACDDDA	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
27	ACDF	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
28	ACFD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
29	AD	4	4.44	11	12.22	15	8.33
30	ADBB	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
31	ADC	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
32	ADCB	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
33	AEB	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
34	AEE	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
35	AEEEBEB	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
36	AFD	1	1.11	1	1.11	2	1.11
37	B	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
38	BAD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
39	BB	0	0.00	2	2.22	2	1.11
40	BBA	1	1.11	1	1.11	2	1.11

41	BBAD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
42	BC	3	3.33	1	1.11	4	2.22
43	BD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
44	BDDB	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
45	C	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
46	CA	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
47	CAC	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
48	CB	4	4.44	0	0.00	4	2.22
49	CBBD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
50	CBCD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
51	CBD	2	2.22	2	2.22	4	2.22
52	CCA	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
53	CCC	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
54	CCDA	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
55	CD	5	5.56	1	1.11	6	3.33
56	CDD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
57	D	1	1.11	1	1.11	2	1.11
58	DC	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
59	DD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
60	ED	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
61	EE	2	2.22	1	1.11	3	1.67
62	EEB	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
63	F	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
64	FA	2	2.22	3	3.33	5	2.78
65	FABBAD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
66	FABC	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
67	FAC	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
68	FACBD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
69	FACD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
70	FACF	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
71	FAD	2	2.22	1	1.11	3	1.67
72	FBBC	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
73	FBBD	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
74	FCA	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
75	FCB	0	0.00	1	1.11	1	0.56
76	FD	1	1.11	0	0.00	1	0.56
	TOTAL	90	100.00	90	100.00	180	100.00

(A = expression of apology; B = explanation or account; C = acknowledgement of responsibility; D = repair and forbearance; E = denial of responsibility: F = others)

Altogether, there are 76 patterns of apology strategies employed by all the respondents. The use of strategies varies across situations. The overall picture indicates that the most common strategy used by the male respondents is AB (expression of apology + explanation) with the highest percentage 17.78%. On the other hand, female respondents employed the combination of AD (expression of apology + repair and forbearance) and AB (expression of apology + explanation) the most with 12.22% each. Furthermore, the longest combination is AEEEBEB with 7 strategies employed by a female respondent. Second longest consist combinations of 7 strategies; ACBBAD and ACDDDA employed by 2 males. The shortest are A, B, C and D used by both genders. Moreover, most of the responses given started with IFIDs. There are 36 patterns of responses started by IFIDs (A) and followed by other strategies. This is followed by acknowledgement of responsibility (C) with 12 instances.

Overall, for all the 6 situations, the respondents used 152 times or instances of Strategy A (expression of apology), 100 instances of Strategy B (explanation or account), 85 instances of Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility), 91 instances of Strategy D (repair and forbearance), 16 instances of Strategy E (denial of responsibility) and 26 instances of Strategy F (others) in the sets of apology strategies (Table 4.10).

Table 4.18 shows the distributions of instances employed by males and females.

Table 4.18 : Distributions of instances employed by males and females

Strategies	Instances		
	Males	Females	Total
A	73	79	152
B	46	52	98
C	43	44	87
D	48	43	91
E	6	10	16
F	8	18	26
Total	224	246	470

All together, the respondents used 470 instances of apology strategies ranging from strategy A to strategy F. Males employed 224 instances whereas females employed 246 instances.

For individual apology that is most frequently used, both males and females employed Strategy A (expression of apology) with 73 instances and 79 instances respectively. The second strategy most frequently used by males is Strategy D (repair and forbearance) with 48 instances. On the other hand, females employed Strategy B (explanation or account) as the second strategy most frequently used with 52 instances. Males employed Strategy B (explanation or account) as the third strategy most frequently used with 46 instances whereas for females, Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) with 44 instances.

In conclusion, there are 470 instances of strategies in all the responses given by the respondents. The respondents used a variety of apology strategies in their responses.

4.8 Factors that influence the apology strategies used

This section discusses the factors that influence the way the respondents apologize. There are a few factors that influenced their apologetic responses.

Table 4.19 shows the factors that influenced the apology strategies used.

Table 4.19: Factors that influenced the apology strategies used

No.	Factors	No. of Participants
1.	Severity of offense	30
2.	Gender	20
3.	Age	13
4.	Power or position of the hearer	11
5.	Social distance or closeness	9
6.	Respondent's and hearer's mood	6
7.	Frequency of offense made	6
8.	Personality of the hearer	6
9.	Time	4
10.	Setting or place where the offense was made	2

There are a few factors that influenced the apology strategies used by the respondents to apologize. All participants stated that severity of offense is a factor taken into consideration when they wanted to apologize. This is followed by other factors such as gender, age, power of the hearer, social distance. The least factors mentioned by the participants are time and setting or place where the offense was made.

Table 4.20 shows the ranking of the situations based on the severity of offense.

Table 4.20: Ranking of the situations based on the severity of offense

Rank	Situation 1						Situation 2						Situation 3						Situation 4						Situation 5						Situation 6					
	Males		Females		Total		Males		Females		Total		Males		Females		Total		Males		Females		Total		Males		Females		Total		Males		Females		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1 (the most serious)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.7	1	3.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	100	14	9.33	29	96.7
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	26.7	4	26.7	8	26.7	6	40	7	46.7	13	43.3	1	6.7	0	0	1	3.3	4	26.7	1	6.67	5	16.7	0	0	1	6.7	1	3.3
3	0	0	1	6.7	1	3.3	3	20.0	3	20.0	6	20.0	4	26.7	2	13.3	6	20	3	20.0	2	13.3	5	16.7	4	26.7	8	53.3	12	40.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	20.0	0	0	3	10.0	5	33.3	5	33.3	10	33.3	1	6.67	1	6.7	2	6.67	4	26.7	5	33.3	9	30.0	3	20.0	5	33.3	8	26.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	1	6.7	1	3.3	2	13.3	2	13.3	4	13.3	4	26.7	4	26.7	8	26.7	6	40.0	8	53.3	14	46.7	3	20.0	0	0	3	10.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 (the least serious)	12	80.0	13	86.6	25	83.4	1	6.67	1	6.67	2	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.7	0	0	1	3.3	1	6.7	1	6.67	2	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	100	15	100	30	100	15	100	15	100	30	100	15	100	15	100	30	100	15	100	15	100	30	100	15	100	15	100	30	100	15	100	15	100	30	100

The first factor is the size of imposition or the severity of the offense of all the six situations given. The respondents were asked to rank the situation based on the severity of the offense. Data was tabulated in Table 4.20. Data was compared horizontally. The highest percentage of each row was chosen as the ranking of severity of offense.

Table 4.21 shows the overall ranking of the situations based on the severity of offense.

Table 4.21 : Overall ranking of the situations based on the severity of offense

Ranks	Situations
1	6 (Cheating in a test)
2	3 (Losing a book)
3	5 (Unable to hand in assignment on time)
4	2 (Being absent from class)
5	4 (Being late for class)
6	1 (Obstructing the way)

Table 4.21 shows the overall ranks for severity of offense. This table is the summary of severity of offense ranked by the respondents in all 6 situations (Appendix D). Rank 1 is considered the most serious offense followed by the others. 29 out of 30 male and female respondents ranked Situation 6 that is cheating in test as the most serious because the impact or the effect of this offence is greater compared to the other situations. They might be expelled from the university. Overall, there were 21 patterns of apology strategies used in this situation (Table 4.7) and it was the second highest. However, from the analysis made, some of the respondents gave short responses for this situation although it is ranked as the most serious offence. This is due to the fact that some of them felt that the offence made was too embarrassing and they could not say anything else except 'sorry'. Some participants felt that they should not elaborate much because it would make things worse.

The second most serious offense is Situation 3 that is losing a book. 13 of the respondents stated that this situation is the second serious because it involves material possession and trust. They felt that they were responsible for the book they borrowed. The nature of this situation requires the respondents to make up for the offense made. Therefore, this is proved true when 21 of them used D (repair and forbearance) in their responses to minimize the effects and severity of the action. They tried to make up the offense made by offering compensation where they either offered to buy a new book or offered money to replace it. The respondents assumed that when they made the offer, the hearer (the lecturer) would forgive them because he or she would be able to get the replacement of the lost book. This shows that the respondents thought that Strategy D (repair and forbearance) would be the effective to restore harmony as it can be settled by offering compensation. All together, the respondents used 18 patterns of strategies (Table 4.4) ranging from strategy A to Strategy F. The most frequently used strategy is repair and forbearance (D) with 34 instances.

Next, Situation 5 (unable to hand in assignment on time) was ranked as the third most serious offense because 12 out of 30 respondents think that this offense would affect their assignment marks and eventually would affect their final marks for that subject. Overall 26 patterns of strategies (Table 4.6) were used in this situation. It has the highest use for number of strategies in all 6 situations. Many strategies were used because the respondents felt that it would affect their overall marks as the assignment carried out some weightage of the final marks. The final result therefore would affect their future. More strategies were used to apologize in this situation and it suggests that the participants considered it a more serious threat that they had to face. Thus, the apology requires them to elaborate more. The most frequent strategy used is acknowledgement of responsibility (C)

where there are 20 instances in all the responses given. The respondents felt that they needed to express self-deficiency and they accepted the blame for not sending their assignment on time. They realized their mistake and they had to admit it. The second highest use of strategy is Strategy B (explanation or account) with 19 instances. This is proved when the respondents mentioned that they need to give explanations after they admitted the mistake that they made.

The other 3 situations were considered less serious. Situation 2 (being absent from class) was ranked as the fourth serious offense. Overall, 16 patterns of all strategies were used in this situation (Table 4.3). In conclusion, it is very clear that the nature of this situation requires the respondents to justify the offense made by giving reasons or the circumstances that may excuse their behaviour. This is proved when Strategy B (explanation or account) was used the highest with 30 instances. The respondents stated that their attendance is also important as it would indirectly affect their examination results.

Situation 4 (being late for class) was ranked the second least serious. The situation was considered very common among university students. They said that although they were late, they came to class so the degree of offense was less by that. Therefore the respondents thought that this situation was not really serious compared to the others. There are only 14 patterns of strategies used in this situation (Table 4.5). The most frequently strategy is expression of apology or IFID (Strategy A) with 31 instances while the second strategy frequently used is explanation or account (Strategy B) with 27 instances. The nature of this situation is more or less very similar to situation 2 where both situations require the respondents to give explanation and justification.

Finally the least serious ranked by the respondents is Situation 1 (obstructing the way). 25 of 30 respondents considered this situation as the least serious because it was not their intention to obstruct the way. In other words, it was not done unintentionally. They did not realize that they were obstructing the way and therefore it was not considered serious. They also mentioned that this situation was very common. Overall, the responses given in this situation were rather short and the strategies used are the least compared to other situations. In the interview sessions many of them said that for this situation, they assumed that the lecturer was in hurry or he or she was going somewhere so he or she did not have much time to actually listen to any further explanation. Therefore the respondents tried to make it short just by saying "sorry" due to time constraint. This is due to the fact that the use of many apology strategies would not be necessary for this situation. The use of Strategy A (expression of apology) would be sufficient for this offense. Moreover, 11 patterns of strategies (Table 4.2) range from A to F are used for this situation and it is the least number of strategies used compared to the other 5 situations. This shows that this situation does not need any further elaborations as it is just a quick "meeting" and it is considered less face threatening than the other situations.

Another interesting fact is that 9 responses given start with interjection "Oh", followed by other strategies in Situation 1. This happens because the respondents were shocked and surprised as they did not realize that they were obstructing the way. The other responses started with "sorry" followed by other strategies. The participants mentioned in the interview that it was very common to say "sorry" first for the offense made. In conclusion, this situation does not require the participants to elaborate much.

It is seen that the severity of the offense was one of the important factors that determine the way the respondents apologize. Furthermore, the respondents stated that for more serious offenses, they needed to give more combinations of apology strategies. Besides, they had to really construct proper and formal sentences. Moreover, if the offense committed was serious, explanations were really considered important and the explanations given would be lengthy. In contrast, some of the respondents said that they regretted and felt ashamed of the offense made to the extent that they could not say anything else besides 'sorry'. This statement applied in Situation 6 that is cheating in a test where some of the responses given were short. This means that if the offense made is too serious as it makes the offender feels too ashamed or embarrassed, the response given would be as short as 'Sorry'.

The types of the offense would actually determine the length of the respondents' responses. They stated that reasons need to be given only if they are solid. The explanations given would also depend on the situations. It is to show respect, a formality by giving explanations and reason and promise not to repeat it again. 9 respondents also thought that the hearer would expect some explanations and therefore they did not just say sorry without any explanation. 'Sorry' alone is not enough. 5 respondents said that when they felt guilty making a mistake and that they had done a mistake; there is a need to promise not to do it or repeat the offense again. If it was the respondent's fault, he or she needed to give a reason why he or she committed the offense and ask for forgiveness. By doing so, the relationship between the offender and the hearer would be affected. 4 respondents stressed that an offender must admit the mistake done before giving reasons for the wrong doing. Another respondent (M10) said that giving explanations and reasons could actually indirectly means 'sorry'. Some people do not take apology or 'sorry' only. In order to

satisfy the hearer, the apologizer needs to give reasons just to show that they are responsible for the offense. Some of the responses given are short because they can be simply understood by the hearer. Some responses are long because they need further details which are required for the hearer to understand. In conclusion, these reasons justify why the types of the offense would actually determine the length of the respondents' responses.

Besides, they would also look at negative effects of the situation or the offense made. If the effect was very bad, for example losing a book, they would be more polite because it dealt with property. Therefore they had to be responsible. If the offense was committed intentionally, they would admit it and bear the consequences. For critical situation or offense, they would say 'sorry' plus some explanations, give a lot of details and show some gestures like nodding their head to show that they were really sorry for what they have done wrong. Some said that for more serious offenses, they must quickly say 'sorry' to apologize and listen to the hearer response and try to discuss it with the hearer to solve the situation. 4 respondents mentioned that an oral apology sometimes was not enough. They needed to have a written apology such as giving a formal letter or sending an e-mail so that there was black and white to show that they were really serious about their apology. On the other hand, if the situation or offense was not so serious, the respondents stated that there was no need to justify or elaborate much and therefore the responses given would be shorter. It was proved when they ranked Situation 1 as the least serious offense. Besides, some of the male respondents said that they would try to make jokes or add some humors to ease the intensity and to tone down the degree of offense. Sometimes, they would just smile.

In addition, the way they apologize depended on whether the situation or offense made was done intentionally or unintentionally. If it was something that they could control but they did not manage it, for example being unable to hand in assignment on time, they would give a longer explanation whereas if it was uncontrollable or done unintentionally the responses given would be shorter. If the situation had occurred before, the respondents would know what to say therefore the responses would be longer.

To sum up, severity of offense determined the length and the choice of strategies employed by the respondents.

There are other factors that determine the way they apologize besides the severity of offense found in the interview sessions conducted. The second factor that could affect the way they apologize is the gender of the hearer. 13 out of 30 respondents stated that gender could determine their responses. 3 male respondents said that if the hearer was a female, not much response would be given because they felt shy. "I feel shy when I apologize to a woman so usually I don't say much" (M4). 2 male respondents stated that if the hearer was a male, their responses would be straight forward but if it was a female, they needed to really be selective with the language used and explain more to be clear. In contrast, if the hearer was a male, there was no need for them to explain more because according to them, males are simple. For women on the other hand, he would give longer explanation because they needed to understand the situation so that they would not misunderstand it. "It's easy to apologize to a man, just tell them straight but to a woman I would really have to think the words to use to apologize because women are complicated" (M13). Another male respondent (M9) stated that he would use a different tone if the hearer was a female. His further elaborated that his voice would be softer. Furthermore, another male respondent (M11) said that he was more comfortable with men so he would confess his mistake more

easily than to a female hearer. When he apologized to a woman, he had to be selective with the words chosen and the explanation given would not be too detailed. He also said that the response would be different and more formal. As for the female respondents, they would respond more if the hearer was a female as they felt comfortable and therefore would share more and elaborate the details. They would give shorter and responses if the hearer was a male because they felt insecure. Moreover, another female respondent (F10) said that she felt guiltier if the hearer was a female because women were more sensitive. Therefore the way that she would apologize would be like coaxing the hearer. In contrast, 4 male and 4 female respondents did not regard gender of the hearer as a factor. They mentioned that they would react the same regardless the gender. "I don't apologize differently to a male or female. I think they are the same, give them the same respect" (M2). They explained that they would respond the same where they would ask for forgiveness and give explanations. Furthermore, they have the same amount of respect for both genders.

Another factor that determines the way the respondents apologize is age. A female respondent (F2) said that if the hearer was old, she would use a softer tone and the word 'sorry' was a must. But if the hearer was young, she would not really use the word 'sorry' and maybe just give an explanation. Besides, many of the respondents also mentioned that they would be more polite to older hearers. "The word 'sorry' is a must when I need to apologize especially to the elders. The tone also would be softer to show that I respect them" (M7). The respondents reported that most older or senior lecturers in UTP are conservative. Therefore if they made any offense, they really had to apologize and explain more to compensate for the mistake or offense made. A male respondent (M1) said "many lecturers here are old so when they don't simply accept 'sorry'. That's why we need to explain'. The respondents also mentioned that it was culturally right to respect the elders. If

the hearer was around 20 or 30, they assumed that they would be able to understand them better and therefore, they felt more relaxed and would be less formal. But to those who were in their 40's and 50's, the respondents would apologize just like the way they apologized to their parents. For older lecturers, they would be more polite and yield or concede, not make any jokes because they were afraid of being considered rude. " I would repeat 'sorry' a few times and be more polite if I have to apologize to senior lecturers" (F5). Furthermore, some stated that they would use some gestures and body language to apologize, for example, nodding their heads or bending their bodies a bit when they apologize. Moreover, they had to admit that they were wrong and apologize. One important point mentioned by some of the respondents was that an offender must not protest or be defensive to older hearers. Besides, an offender must also use a softer tone and use more apology expressions. However, to some of the respondents, the young lecturers tended to be "emotional" whereas the older lecturers are more "experienced" and calm. Therefore, to them, the older lecturers were more willing to listen compared to the young ones. A respondent (F10) said "Young lecturers are easy to get angry but the old lecturers were calmer so they will listen to the explanation patiently".

The next factor that determines the way the respondents apologize was power or the position of the hearer. If the hearer has higher post, the respondents tend to use more formal language. Furthermore, they would not only apologize orally. They need to send a written apology such as email or letter to support the oral apology. "Sometimes we need to send a formal letter or e-mail to apologize rather than just give the apology orally" (M3).

Another factor taken into account is social distance or closeness. If the hearer was close to the respondents, they (M7, M11, F15) would be very honest by explaining more to make the hearer understand. They would apologize sincerely and say more to make up. If the offender had a closer relationship with the hearer, he or she felt free to confess and some respondents stated that they would try very hard not to hurt the hearer much. " I feel more comfortable to apologize if that person is close to me. I would just say whatever I want" (F15). Furthermore, the tone also would be different. If the hearer knew the respondent's family and the offense was serious, the respondent would avoid meeting him or her after apologizing because they felt ashamed of their action. Besides, some said that they would make jokes to ease the severity if the hearer was close to them. "I would include jokes when I apologize to the person close to me. This will make the situation less serious" (M7). On the other hand, if there was a gap between them, they would not explain much and not in detail, because they found it difficult to express themselves to apologize to those who are not close to them. In addition, if the respondent does not like the hearer, he or she would just say 'sorry' without further elaborations.

The respondent's and hearer's emotion or mood at that particular time was also another factor to be taken into account. The respondents stated that if the mood of the hearer is not good at that time, they would keep quiet or not explain much because it would make the situation worse. The reactions of the hearer were also important. If the hearer was really angry, the respondents would only give short responses because no matter what justifications or explanation they gave, the hearer would think that they were giving excuses. Two extracts from the interview to show this are "I won't dare to say a lot if the lecturer is very angry because I think an angry person will not want to listen to what I said" (F3) and "Better don't make the angry person become angrier by giving long explanation"

(M8). On the other hand, if the hearer was not really angry, then more explanations would be given. The mood of the apologizer is also a factor that determines the way he or she apologizes. If he or she is not in a good mood, then it would definitely affect the way he or she apologizes by giving a shorter response. When the mood of the respondent is not good, less elaboration would be given to the hearer. A respondent said "Usually if I'm not in a good mood I will not say much" (F7). To add to this, if the respondents feel really guilty, they would explain more because they want to tell the truth and not give excuses.

Another factor was the frequency of the offense committed was also a factor. A few respondents stated that if it was the first time they committed the offense, they did not really have to explain but if it is the second or third time, they would explain more because they are afraid that the consequences would be greater. "It would be very serious if I make the same mistake for the second or third time. I surely will explain more" (F9).

The personality of the hearer also affects the way the respondents apologize. The respondents stated that if the hearer was approachable, easy-going and friendly, they would straightaway give more explanation as they felt comfortable communicating with him or her. Besides, if the hearer was strict, the respondents would give shorter responses and they would explain only if they were asked to. "I don't feel really stressful when I apologize to the young lecturers because they are friendly and it is easy to apologize to them" (F10).

Time is another factor that should be taken into consideration. If the hearer is in a rush, for an example in Situation 1 (obstructing the way), the respondents (M2, M6, F8) would give shorter responses. If the time was limited for them to explain, they would just give a quick response because the hearer was rushing so the respondent assumed that he or she did not want to hear much. "Usually I just say 'sorry'. I don't say much if it is only a short meeting, like in the first situation" (M2).

Finally, setting or the place where the offender had to apologize is also a factor. Female respondents stated that if they had to apologize in a crowd, the responses given would be shorter as they felt embarrassed. They preferred to apologize 'one-to-one' with the hearer so that they would be able to explain more and the length of the responses would be longer. "It would be embarrassing to apologize in a crowd. I definitely won't say much as I know everybody would be looking and judging" (F4). In a crowd, the responses would not be detailed because the respondents wanted to protect their dignity and their voice would be soft as they felt embarrassed because many people were watching. One female participant (F4) gave a short response using only 1 strategy (A) in situation 4 (being late for class).

To sum up, there are many other factors that determine the way the respondents apologize besides severity of the offense. Factors such as gender, age, power, social distance and others should be analyzed and taken into account.

4.9 Summary

Based on the analysis presented in this chapter, it is clear that most of the oral responses given are combinations of a few apology strategies. The respondents employed two to three apology strategies and most responses started with an expression of apology (IFID). Males and females respondents show similarities in the way they apologize. It is found that size of imposition does affect the way the respondents apologized as well as other factors such as gender, age, position and social distance.

CHAPTER 5

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will generally discuss the findings of the research. All the results presented in Chapter 4 will be discussed according to the research questions. There are three parts based on the three research questions: How do Malay ESL undergraduate apologize?', 'What are the similarities and differences in the types of apology strategies used by male and female undergraduates?' and 'What are the factors that influence the different apology used?'. This chapter also helps the researcher to check the data obtained with the literature review presented in Chapter 2.

5.2 Patterns of apology strategies.

This section answers the first research question : How do Malay ESL undergraduates apologize? The participants used a variety of apology strategies in their responses in all the 6 social situations given. Overall, there are 76 different patterns of apology strategies employed by all the participants in the 6 situations. The use of apology strategies varied across situations. The findings reveal that the most common pattern used by the participants is AB (expression of apology + explanation or account). A total number of 27 responses which accounted for 15% of all the responses given are the combinations of Strategy A and B. This is due to the fact that when an offense is made, the offender should

apologize by saying 'sorry' first followed by giving justification of the situation. This will allow the participants or offenders to give reasons for the offence they made. This pattern could be seen in Situation 2 (being absent for class) the most with 9 respondents, followed by Situation 4 (being late for class) with 13 respondents.

The second most commonly used pattern is the combination of AD (expression of apology + repair and forbearance) with 15 responses of apology strategies which accounted for 8.33% of all the responses given. This result shows that after the respondents expressed that they were sorry for the offense made, they needed to tone down or lessen the impact or the effects of the offense by offering a repair to compensate the damage made or giving a promise that it would not happen again. This kind of pattern can be seen in Situation 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 with 9,1,2,1,2 occurences respectively. This is similar to the findings found by Sugimoto (1997) in her study. She found that Japanese students used compensation and promise not to repeat offence as their secondary strategies.

The third most frequently used pattern is ACD (expression of apology + acknowledgement of responsibility + repair and forbearance). There are 13 sets of apology strategies with 7.22% of all the responses given by the participants. This combination of apology strategies can be seen in all 6 situations. The participants used Startegy A (expression of apology) first by saying 'sorry', followed by Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility). They either accepted the blame , expressed self-defieciency or expressed lack of intent. These two strategies were followed by Strategy D where the speakers made an effort to minimize the degree of offense made. They either offered a repair to compensate the damage or a promise.

Moreover, it was also noticed that most of the respondents gave their responses using Strategy A (expression of apology) first followed by the other apology strategies in all 6 situations. There are 115 out of 180 the responses start with 'sorry'. This shows that the participants considered Strategy A as an important strategy and that they had to use it first when they committ to any offense. To them it is more polite to say 'sorry' first to show that they are guilty to the offense made. These findings support Maslida Yusof et al. (2011) study. The respondents realized that they needed to be polite by saying 'sorry' to compensate the offences made. This further supported by Alfattah (2010). Alfattah who found that IFIDs, expecially expression of regret were found in all the responses in the data. He said the respondents believed that it is compulsory to have this expression accompanied by other strategies.

In addition, the respondents employed 83 responses with combinations of 2 strategies and 51 responses are combinations of 3 strategies. They used 2 to 3 combinations of apology strategies per response. Some examples are :   AB, AD, ACD, AC and others. These results are in line with the research done earlier by Bergman and Kasper (1993), Rojo (2005), Marquez-Reiter (2000), Mohammad Shariati & Fariba Chamani (2010, and Mohsen Shahrokhi and Jariah Mohd. Jan (2012). The responses in their findings are combinations of 2 to 3 strategies.

On top of that, the shortest responses given are single strategy or standalone strategy. There are 9 responses for Strategy A, 1 response for strategy B, C and F. The percentage of single strategy responses is 6.67%. For strategy F (others) the response given is 'I have nothing to say'. In contrast, the longest pattern of apology strategies given by the participant consists of 7 strategies per response, AEEEBEB (expression of apology + denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility + explanation or

account + denial of responsibility + explanation or account) and the second longest responses consist of 6 strategies is ACBBAD (expression of apology + acknowledgement of resppnsibility + explanation or account + explanation or accoune + expression of apology + offer and forbearance) and ACDDDA (expression of apology + acknowlegement of responsibility + offer and forbearance + offer and forbearance + offer and forbearance) which has the combinations of 6 strategies. These findings support what Tuncel (2011) found in his study that most of the Turkey EFL learners had the tendency to realize many different semantic formulas for a single situation and for some situations, they formulated lengthy combinations including five different semantic formulas.

Overall, the findings of this present study are in line with other previous studies done in this field. For examples, studies done by Holmes (1993), Obeng (1999). They found that there are different combinations of strategies used to enhance and reinforce the apology made.

In conlusion, 168 out of 180 responses given are combinations of different apology strategies as they are considered more effective when it comes to apologizing. The participants gave the responses in such a way that would satisfy the hearer.

Other than looking at the frequently used apology strategies, this study also examines the positions of the apology strategies used in their responses. The findings show that Strategy A (expression of apology) occur the most in the first position with 115 instances. It is followed by Strategy C with 23 instances. In contrast, Nureddeen (2008) in her study on apology strategy in Sudanese Arabic shows the use of the IFID in final position. This suggests the significance sequence and patterning of strategies in the realization of apology.

For the second position, the participants opted for Strategy B (explanation or account) with 55 instances followed by Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) with 49 instances. Moreover, Strategy D (repair and forbearance) occurs the most in the third position of the responses given with 37 instances followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) with 20 instances. For the fourth position of the responses, the most commonly used apology strategy is Strategy D (repair and forbearance) with 15 instances. This part is also discussed by Holmes (1999). She also revealed this interesting point that is the positions of the strategies in her study. The results of her study showed that strategy A (an explicit apology) and Strategy C (acknowledgement of responsibility) occured in any position. Strategy B (explanation or account) did not occur in the 4th position and Strategy D (promise of forbearance) did not occur at the initial or first position of the responses.

To sum up, it is obvious that Strategy A (expression of apology) is commonly used in the first position followed by Strategy B (explanation or account) for the second positions and Strategy D (repair and forbearance) for the third position of the responses given by the participants.

Strategy F (Others) has a few sub categories. The sub categories under this strategy are requesting, interjection, invoking God's name and pleading. Most responses given by the respondents under this strategy are interjections. Juhana (2011) found in her study that 14 female respondents used this strategies which means the interjection "Oh" to express surprise. She stated that this happened because females are more expressive than males. In this present study, 7 females and 5 males used this kind of expression because they were shocked and they did not realize the offense made. Wouk (2006) mentioned about the frequency of interjections available. She also noted that interjections are not found in situations that lack an element of surprise or realization, since most of the situations where

interjections are relatively common do involve an element of surprise, it is possible that in addition to status, surprise is also a relevant factor in these results. This is similar to the present results that are found in Situation 1(obstructing the way). It contains an element of suddenness or surprise which explains why there are interjection 'oh' in the findings. The participants were surprised or shocked when they were told that they were obstructing the way. They were in the middle of a conversation with their friend and therefore did not realize that they were obstructing the lecturer.

Other than that, two responses given by one male respondent included *Insha Allah* which means with God (Allah)'s permission. These phrase is used in Situation 4 (being late for class) and Situation 5 (unable to hand in assignment on time). The male respondent (M9) used it as the second last strategy before Strategy D (repair and forbearance). This phrase was appropriate to be used before a promise is made as Muslims depend on Allah (God)'s willing to fulfill their promise. This kind of result can also be found in the study done by Hussein and Hammouri (1998), Soliman (2003) and Jebahi (2010). Their findings show that strategy of praising God for what happened was employed by the respondents. This shows that the responses given are influenced by religion and culture. The offenders invoked God's name that is 'Allah in Arabic' in most of the situations to ask for forgiveness, to offer compensation and to say that the offenses were done unintentionally as it was divinely meant to be. This is due to the fact that they believed whatever happened and whatever that would happen is destined by Allah.

Finally, another interesting result was that there were responses that had Strategy E (Denial of responsibility). This strategy was introduced and discussed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983). But there is not much evidence of this type of strategy in previous studies. In this study, 4 male and female respondents used this strategy in their responses. They denied

their responsibility for the offenses made. This strategy can be seen in Situation 6 (cheating in a test), 2 (being frequently absent from class) and 5 (unable to hand in assingment on time).

5.3 Gender differences and similariries in apology strategies

This study also looks at the similarities and differences in the way male and female Malay ESL undergraduates apologize. The overall results show that both male and females respondents more or less employed the same strategies in their responses. There were no significant differences in the ways they apologize. Overall they used 2 to 3 strategies to apologize in the reponses given. For combinations of 2 strategies, male respondents employed 49 responses and the female respondents employed 34 responses. For combinations of 3 strategies, male respondents employed 22 responses while the female responses employed 29 responses. The combinations employed by both genders are more or less the same. They gave responses like AB (expression of apology + explanation or account), ACD (expression of apology + acknowledgemtent of responsibility + repair and forbearance), A (expression of apology) and FA (others + expression of apology). This is similar to what Kholisin (2001), Rojo (2005) Wouk (2006) Maslida et al. (2011), and Juhana (2011) found in their studies. It is proved that there is not much differences in gender as both sexes employed many similar apology strategies.

However, slight diffences were noticed and will be discusssed here. First, the most frequently patterns used by the male and female respondents. The male respondents employed combinations of AB (16 responses), AC (8 responses) and ACD (6 responses). On the other hand, the female respondents employed the combinations of AB (11

responses), AD (11 responses) and ACD (7 responses). The results show that both gender used 2 to 3 strategies the most in their responses.

Secondly, the shortest responses which consist only one apology strategy were used by both male and female respondents. For males, there were only 2, Strategy A (5 responses) and Strategy F (1 response). In contrast, females tend to use more standalone or single apology strategy. They are Strategy A (4 responses), 1 response each for Strategy B, C and D. The longest response which consists of 7 apology strategies was employed by a female respondent ; AEEEBEB (expression of apology + denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility + denial of responsibility + explanation or account + denial of responsibility + explanation or account) followed by the combinations of 6 strategies employed by 2 male participants; ACBBAD (expression of apology + acknowledgement of resppnsibility + explanation or account + explanation or accoune + expression of apology + repair and forbearance) and ACDDDA (expression of apology + acknowlegement of responsibility + repair and forbearance + repair and forbearance + repair and forbearance + expression of apology). Besides, in this study, males participants employed 42 patterns of apology strategies whereas the females respondents employed 51 patterns of apology strategies for all the situations given (Table 4.17).

The results discovered in this present study show that there are similarities but some slight differences in the way both genders apologize. The study done by Bataineh & Bataineh (2006) proved that although there were similarities in both genders' responses they differed in the order of the primary startegies which they used. The findings from studies done by Holmes (1993) and Rojo (2005) also showed men and women do not have any significant differences in the way they apologized.

This is in contrast with other studies done based on apologies in gender which found that there are differences in the apologies made by males and females. Tannen (1990) found that men and female communicate differently and there are significant gender differences in the way both genders apolgized.

Another important point is that female participants used Strategy F (others) first. For instance, there were 14 responses of Strategy F whereas for males, there were only 4 responses that started with Strategy F.

In a nutshell, there were slight differences in the way both genders apologized but overall, most of the responses given were combinations of 2 to 3 apology strategies and the type of strategies used were also similar.

5.4 Factors that influence the type of apology strategies used

Finally, this study also highlights the factors that affect the way the participants apologized. The results revealed that 29 out of 30 participants, regardless of gender, ranked Situation 6 as the most serious offense followed by Situation 3, 5, 2, 4 and 1 (Table 4.20). More strategies of apology were combined for serious offenses such as in Situations 5 and 6. The participants explained that the seriousness or severity of the offense is based on the impact or the consequences of the offense. If the effects of the offense were greater than the others, it was considered more serious. Many patterns of apology strategies were used for Situation 6, 3 and 5 (Table 4.7, 4.4, 4.6). This is similar to the findings found by Gries and Peng (2002). They found that the Asians concentrate on consequences and would examine

the results of the incident. The severity of the offense greatly affects the way the participants apologize as they used a few strategies in their responses.

This result is also similar to what Holmes (1990) found in her study that more strategies were used for more heavily ranked offense. The speakers elaborated much more for more serious offenses. Moreover, the speakers used formal apology strategies and double apologies such as AB (expression of apology + explanation or account) in serious offenses. This fact can be seen in the findings in this study as there were also double apologies or co-occurance of the same strategy in a response especially the repetitions of strategy A (expression of apology). For examples, in responses of AA, AAB, AACD, AACDD, AAD, ACDA, ACDDDA and ABA. Strategy A is repeated twice in each response given as to show that the speakers were really sorry for the offense made.

On the other hand, Situation 1 (obtsructing the way) is the least serious with only 11 patterns of apology strategies employed by the participants. This shows that only a few combinations of strategies were employed by the participants in this situation compared to the others. The responses given mostly combinations of 2 to 3 apology strategies.They did not elaborate much as the offense was not serious and they did not realize that they were obstructing the way. Therefore, one or two strategies would be enough for the apology made. This result is similar to what Obeng(1999) and Nureddeen (2008) found in their studies. Their results show that for certain situations which are not severe, variety of apology strategies would not be necessary and normally the usage of IFIDs would be sufficient. The respondents of their studies apologized more often using IFID and explanations in situations with less serious offenses. Furthermore, they stated that an apology must be minimized if it is known that the offender was unaware of his actions.

In conclusion, there is a general trend that the more severe a situation is, the more apology strategies are used. It is very clear that severity of the offense is one of the major factors that can affect the way the participants apologize.

Other than severity of offense, it was found from the findings that other factors such as the effects of the offense made. The nature of the situation itself a factor, whether it is something that the respondents can control or not. Besides, age, mood, power, gender, personality and social distance of the hearer can greatly affect the way the participants apologized.

First, the hearer is also considered as an important factor that determine how the participants apologize. The gender of the hearer can affect the partcipants's reactions and responses. If the hearer was a male, the apology made would be straight forward and direct. Therefore the responses would not be lenghty. If the hearer was female, more explanations and longer responses would be given as the participants felt that women were more complex and therefore it explains why such elaborated responses are needed.

Next, the participants also would apologize differently according to the age of the hearer. For older hearers, they would apologize more politely, more formally and the tone of their voice also would be soft. Another important fact was that the word 'sorry' was compulsary or a must when it came to apologizing to older hearers to show respect and therefore more effort would be made to restore harmony with them. In contrast, they felt more comfortable with younger hearers as there was no big gap and the apology made would be simple and some sense of humor would be added to ease the offense made.

Familiarity with the hearer or social distance was also another factor. The findings of this study show that if the participants were close to and familiar with the hearer, they would explain and elaborate on their apology more. This was because they felt comfortable apologizing to them as they could be more expressive. Moreover, they would sincerely apologize as they did not want to hurt those who were close to them. If the hearer were friendly and approachable, the apology made would be lengthy. This result is in line with what Bergmen and Kasper (1993), Cohen et al. (1986) and Mohsen Shahrokhi and Jariah Mohd. Jan (2012) found in their studies. They stated that familiarity of interlocutors seemed to have its main influence on the modification strategy of intensifying the expression of apology. Their results show that social distance that is the familiarity with the hearer affects the way they apologize.

Other than that, the power of the hearer also affected the way the partcipants in this study apologized. To those hearers who had power or a high or important post, an oral apology alone would not be enough. It must come together with a written apology. The participants also would elaborate more when they apologize. Similarly, Holmes (1990) also mentioned that elaborated responses are given to those who are considered having more power compared to those who have equal power or the inferiors. Obeng (1999) stated that nature of the context in which the discourse takes place is important, whether the nature of the context is formal or informal, whether both offender and the hearer are in the same or different social group.

On top of that, the nature of the situation itself is a factor. This refers to whether the offense is controllable or uncontrollable, the setting and atmospehere when the situation happens, the frequency of the offense made; whether it is the first or the second time it happens. The results from Holmes (1990) study show that explanations are most likely to

accompany inconvenience offences and time offenses. This is similar to the findings of this present study in Situation 5 (unable to hand in assignment on time) with 19 instances and Situation 4 (being late for class) with 26 instances. In contrast, an apology strategy involving repair and forbearance and more specifically an offer of redress is more likely with a possession offense which is line with the findings in this study for Situation 3 (losing a book) with 34 instances. Finally, space offences and social gaffes on the other hand, are most commonly satisfied by a simple explicit apology (A).

Other minor factors that affect the way the participants apologize include the respondents' emotions, whether they were in a good or bad mood at the time the offence was made. If their mood was good at that time, they would elaborate more. If not short responses would be given.

Next, the frequency of the offense made was also taken into account. It means that if it was the first time the participants commit to the offense, they would not elaborate much but if the offense had occurred again, longer apology responses would be given.

The setting which refers to the place and the atmosphere when they need to apologize was also a factor as they would apologize differently in public or in a room, with only the offender and the hearer. All these factors are not discussed in any of the other studies done in this field.

The findings in this study contrast with Harlow (1990). In Harlow's findings, social variables such as age, familiarity and relationship did not affect the apologizing speech of act.

To sum up, this present study found that factors such as severity of the offense, age, power, social distance,the nature of the situations and gender play an important role in influencing the way the participants apologized. Other studies that show the same variables are done by Obeng (1999) on Akan and Kim (2008). Hunter and Hahn (2011), Kholisin (2003) also proved that factors such as power, social distance and severity are factors considered in order to select appropriate apologies. However, factors such as age and gender do not affect the way the respondents apologized. Many studies found these factors to have an impact on the choice of apology strategies but from where the data obtained is not stated clearly. On the other hand, data on factors that affect the way the speakers apologize was obtained through interview sessions.

5.5 Summary

A few significant results from the analysis was also highlighted in this chapter. Overall, from the analysis done, it is clear that the speakers were able to express their apologies in ESL. It also shows that participants have the ability to use appropriate language in term of apology startegies for the situations given to them. The overall results show that most of the responses given by the respondents were the combinations of a few apology strategies. The most commonly used strategies to apologize are expression of apology or IFID (A) with 152 instances, explanation or account (B) with 98 and promise and forbearance (D) with 91 instances. It is common to say sorry and give justifications on the offense made. Furthermore, most of the responses given start with expression of apology (IFID) as it is considered the most important strategy or it is a 'must' to be used

when they want to apologize. It is then followed by other apology strategies as to complement the primary strategy (IFID). In other words, the findings show preferences on combinations of a few strategies compared to standalone or single strategy when it comes to apologizing. These findings are consistent with previous findings on Akan (Obeng, 1999), Spanish (Rojo, 2005), Turkish (Mohammad Shariati and Fariba Chamani, 2010) and Persian (Mohsen Shahrokhi and Jariah Mohd. Jan, 2012).

It is also found that there was no significant difference in the way male and female respondents apologized. The results showed that both genders used almost the same combinations of apology strategies to apologize. This finding is in line with a few studies done by Kholisin (2001), Maslida et. al (2011) and Juhana (2011). Finally, from the interviews, it was found that there were a few factors that affected the way the respondents apologized. The factors include age and gender of the hearer, social distance, and severity

of the offense. All these factors were taken into consideration when the respondents want to employ certain apology strategies. Some of the factors were also discussed in the study done on Korean by Hunter & Hahn (2011) and Holmes (1990).

Finally, it is hoped that this study will shed light on the apology strategies in English used by Malay undergraduates in Malaysia.

5.6 Recommendations for future research

There a few suggestions for future studies. First, data could be obtained through observations. The observation could be made in any occasion or in daily life activities and could be recorded to provide a more natural data. Secondly, the number of participants could be increased because a larger scope would definitely provide better data. Finally, a comparative study between cultural groups such as Malays, Chinese and Indians could be done to investigate the similarities and differences in the choices of apology strategies used.

REFERENCES

Abdul Wahed Qasem Ghaleb Al-Zumor. (2011). Apologies in Arabic and English : An Inter-language and Cross-cultural Study. *Journal of King Saud University*, 23, 19-28. doi:10.1016/j.jksult.2010.02.001

Akbar Afghari & Vida Kaviani. (2005). Apology Sppech Act realization patterns in Persioan. IJAL, Vol.8, No 2, Sept 2005. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from http://www.sid.ir/En/VEWSSID/J_pdf/87620050201.pdf

Alfattah, Mohammed Hasan. (2010). Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University Students. *MJAL*, 3, 223-249. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from http://www.mjal.org/Journal/appology.pdf

Ang-Abbey, Lucila, (1991). Transfer behaviour of Hokkien Chinese speakers in apologizing. Borneo Research Bulletin 23, 14-35.

Atieh Farashaiyan & Seyed Yasin Yazdi Amirkhiz. (2011). Analysis of Apology Strategies: The Case of Iranian EFL and Malaysian ESL University Students. *English Language Teaching*, 4, 214-224. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from http://www.ccsenet.org/elt

Barlund, D.C., Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies : Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14(2), 193-206. doi: 10.1177/009365097024004002

Basow & Rubenfeld. (2001). Troubles Talk. *Sex Roles*, 48, 183-187.

   Retrieved November 21, 2013, from, http://link.springer.com/article/

   10.1023/A%3A1022411623948#page-1

Bataineh, R. F., & Bataineh R. F. (2006). Apology strategies of Jordanian

   EFL university students. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 1901-1927.

   doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.11.004

Bataineh, R. F., & Bataineh R.F. (2008). A Cross-cultural Comparison of

   Apologies by Native Speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic.

   Journal of Pragmatics, 40, 792-821. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2008.01.003

Bergmen, M.L, & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and Performance in native and non-native

   apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp 82-

   107). New York : Oxford University Press.

Bharuthram,S. (2003). Politeness phenomena in the Hindu sector of the South African

   Indian English Speaking community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1523-1544.

Blum-Kulka. S & Olshtain E. (1984) Request and Apologies: Across-Cultural Study

   of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). Retrieved October 23, 2010, from

   http://www.genlingnw.ru/study/Soclinv/files/smrp/CSARP%20Blum-Kulka.pdf

Blum-Kulka, S., House and Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural*

   pragmatics: Requests and apologies, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness* : *Some universals in language usage*. New

York : Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A.D and Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural

competence : The case of apology. *Language Learning* 31(1): 113-134.

Cohen, A.D., et.al (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: what remains to be learnt?

International Journal of the Sociology of Language. Volume 1986, Issue

62, Pages 51–74, ISSN (Online) 1613-3668, ISSN (Print) 0165-

2516. doi: 10.1515/ijsl.1986.62.51

Cohen, A.D., and Olshtain, E. (1998). Researching the production of second-language

speech acts. In E.E. Tarone,S.M. grass & A.D. Cohen (Eds), *Research methodology*

in second-language acquisition (pp. 143-156). Hillsdale, new Jersey : Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, A.D., (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts : *Studies in Second*

Language Acquisition. 18. 253-267.

Connell, R.W.(2002).*Gender*. Cambridge, Polity Press; Malden, Blackwell Publishing.

Cutting, J. (2008) *Pragmatics And Discourse, A Resource Book For Students*. (2ⁿᵈ ed.).

New York: Routledge.

Demeter, G. (2000). A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian. North

   University, Baia Mare, Romania. Retrieved November 21, 2013, from

   http://digital.library.okstate.edu/etd/umi-okstate-1727.pdf

Deutchmann, M. (2003). *Apologizing in British English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,

   Umea Universiteit, Unmea.

Fraser (1981). *On Apologizing*. In Coulmas, Florian (Ed.), Conversational routine :

   Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech

   The Hague. Mouton. (259-271)

Garcia, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: Politeness Strategies used by native and

   non-native speakers. *Multilingual*. 8(1), 3-20.

Goffman, Edwig, (1967). *International Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*.

   New York: Double day Anchor Books.

Gries, P. H., & Peng, K. (2002). Culture Clash? Apologies East and West. *Journal

   of Contemporary China,* 11, 173-178.

Guan, et.al. (2009). Cross-Cultural Differences

   in Apology. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 32-45.

   doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.10.001

Harlow, L.L (1990). Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *The Modern Language Journal* 74 (3), 328-351. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from JSTOR. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1990.tb01070.x

Hinkel, E. (1997). Appropriateness of advice : DCT and multiple choice data. *Applied Linguistics* 18, 1-26.

Holmes, J. (1989). Women's and men's apologies : Reflectors of cultural values. *Applied Linguistics,* 10(2), 194-213.

Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand. *Language in Society*, 19 (2). 155-199.

Holmes, J. (1993). New Zealand women are good to talk to : An analysis of politeness strategies in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20 (2), 91-116. Retrieved October 23, from ScienceDirect. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(93)90078-4

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*, London: Longman

Hunter, H & Hahn, J. W. (2011). What Korean Apologies Require of Politeness Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1303-1317. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.028

Hussein, Riyad. F, Hammouri, Mamoun T,. (1998). *Strategies of Apologies in Jordanian Arabicand American English*. Grazer Linguistische Studien 49, 37-51.

Juhana. (2011). The Use of Apologizing Speech Acts Realization by Male and Female

      Students. *Ragam Jurnal Perkembangan Humaniora*, 1, 1-10. Retrieved October 23,

      2010, from

      http://www.polines.ac.id/ragam/index_files/jurnalragam/paper_1%20apr_2011.pdf

Jung, E-H.S. (2004). Inter language pragmatics. Apology speech acts. In C.L Morder & A.

      Martinovic. Zic (EDS.), Discourse across languages and cultures (pp. 99-116).

      Philadelphia : John Benjamins.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). *Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics* (Report

      Descriptive). Mahoa: Hawaii University, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum

      Center.

Khaled Jebahi (2010) Tunisian University Students' Choice of Apology Strategies in a

      Discourse Completion Task. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 3274-3289.

      doi:1016/j.pragma.2010.09.008

Kholisin. (2003). Strategi Permintaan Maaf dalam Bahasa Indonesia di kalangan Penutur

      Bahasa Jawa di Wilayah Kota Malang. Forum Penelitian Th. 15, No. 1, Jun 2003,

      him. 12-27.

Kim, H. (2008). The Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis of South Korean and

      Australian English Apologetic Speech Acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 257-278.

      doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2007.11.003

Lakoff, Robin T. (1973). "*The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's.*" In Paper

from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago linguistic Society (pp. 292-305).

Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lazare, A. (2005). *On Apologizing*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman

Mackey, A., Grass, S. (2005). *Second language Research: Methodology and Design*;

Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.

Marquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay : a contrastive

study of request and apologies*. Amsterdam: Philadelhia.

Maslida Yusof, et.al. (2011). Ooops... Maaf : Politeness Strategies and The Redemption of

Offence. *Jurnal Melayu*, 8, 27-50. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from

http://journalarticle.ukm.my/3474/1/bil%25208%2520-%2520topik%25202.pdf

Mohammad Shariati, Fariba Chamani. (2010). Apology Strategies in Persian.

Journal of Pragmatics, 42, 1689-1699. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.10.007

Mohsen Shahrokhi & Jariah Mohd. Jan. (2012). The Realization of Apology Strategies

Among. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 692-700.

doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.183

Nobles, Melissa, (2008). *The Politics of Official Apologies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nureddeen, F. A. (2008). Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Apology Strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 279-306. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2007.11.001

Obeng, S. G. (1999). Apologies in Akan Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 709-734. Retrieved November 21, 2013 from http://ezproxy.um.edu.my:2095/science/article/pii/S0378216698000897

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A.D. (1983). Apology : A speech-act set. In N. Wolfson & E.Judd (EDs.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition* (pp.18-35). Rowley. Ma ; Newbury House.

Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper, eds; cross-cultural pragmatics : Requests and apologies, 155-173, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Owen, M. (1983). *Apologies and Remedial Interchanges*. Berlin: Mouton.

Patton, M.Q. (2001) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Rintell, E, M. and Mitchell,C,J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies : An

inquiry into method, In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper, eds., Cross

cultural pragmatics : Requests and apologies, 248-272. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rojo, L. (2005). "Tequeríacomentar un problemilla…" The Speech Act of Apologies

in Peninsular Spanish: A pilot study. *Hipertexto*, 1, 63-80. Retrieved October 23,

2010, from http://www.utpa.edu/dept/modlang/hipertexto/docs/Hiper1Rojo.pdf

Sasaki. M (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts : A comparison of

questionnaires and role plays. Journal of Pragmatics, 30(4), 457-484.

doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00013-7

Seiji, T. (2011). A Cross-Cultural Examination Of The Effects Of Apology And

Perspective Taking On Forgiveness. *Journal of Language and Social

Psychology*, 20, 144-166.

Soliman, Abdulmeneim, (2003). *Apology in American English and Egyptian Arabic*. In:

Paper Presented at TESOL 3rd Annual Graduate Student Forum, Baltimore, MD.

Sugimoto, N. (1999). A Japanese U.S. Comparison of apology styles. In N. Sugimoto

(Edu), *Japansese apology across discipline* (pp. 79-104). Commack, N.Y. Nova

Science Publisher.

Suszcynnska, M. (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian :

Different language, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics*,31, 1053-1065.

Retrieved October 23, 2010, from

http://ezproxy.um.edu.my:2095/science/article/pii/S0378216699000478

Tannen, D. (1990). *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. New York: Oxford University

Press.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology Strategies in Native/Non-native. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11,

147-167. doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(87)90193

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: request, complaints and apologies*. Berlin:

Mounton de Gruyter.

Trosborg, A. & Shaw, P. (1998). "Sorry, does not pay my bills". The Handling of

Complaints in Everyday Interaction and Cross-Cultural Business Interaction.

Hermes Journal of Linguistics, 21, 67-94. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from

https://pure.au.dk/portal/files/9969/H21_04.pdf

Tuncel. R (2011). Apologizing and Speech Act Realization of Turkish EFL learners.

International Conference on management Economics and Social Sciences

(ICMESS' 2011) Bangkok Dec, 2011. Retrieved October 23, 2010, from

http://psrcentre.org/images/extraimages/1211799.pdf

Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts

across cultures. In S. Blum-KUlka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), Cross-cultural

Pragmatics : Requests and Apologies (pp. 174-196). Norwood, New Jersey : Ablex.

Wouk, F. (2006) The Language of Apologizing in Lambok, Indonesia. *Journal of*

Pragmatics, 38, 1457-1486. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.09.011

Yuan, Y. (2001). An inquiry into empirical programme data-gathering methods : written

DCTs oral DCTs, field notes, and natural conversations, Journal of Pragmatics,

Vol. 33, pp. 271-292

CONSENT FORM

I volunteer to participate in a research conducted by Noorhayati binti Baharudin from University Malaya. In understand that the research is designed to gather information about academic work of faculty on campus. I will be one of approximately 30 people selected for the role-play and interview session for this research.

1. My participation in this project is voluntary. The information of the research has been explained to me.

2. I give permission for my role-play and interview sessions to be recorded.

3. I understand that the researcher will not identify me by name in any reports using information obtained from this role-play and interview, and my confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions.

Respondent's signature:

_____   _____   _____

Name of participant   Signature   Date

Researcher's signature

_____   _____   _____

Name of researcher   Signature   Date

Personal Information

1. Name : _____

2. Age : _____

3. Sex : _____

4. Course : _____

5. Year : _____

6. MUET result : Band _____

7. Hometown : _____

Rank the situations below according to the severity of offense or size of imposition.
(the most serious offense to the least serious)

No.	Situations	Ranking
1.	Obstructing the way	
2.	Being absent from class	
3.	Losing a book	
4.	Being late for class	
5.	Unable to hand in assignment on time	
6.	Cheating in a test	