

T.C.
GAZİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**A COMPARISON OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE BETWEEN
TURKISH AND PORTUGUESE EFL LEARNERS VIA SPEECH ACT
SET OF APOLOGIES: A TASK-BASED PERSPECTIVE**

M.A. THESIS

By

Hande ÇETİN

Ankara

2014



**A COMPARISON OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE BETWEEN TURKISH
AND PORTUGUESE EFL LEARNERS VIA SPEECH ACT SET OF
APOLOGIES: A TASK-BASED PERSPECTIVE**

HANDE ÇETİN

M.A. THESIS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

GAZİ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

JULY, 2014

TELİF HAKKI ve TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

Bu tezin tüm hakları saklıdır. Kaynak göstermek koşuluyla tezin teslim tarihinden itibaren tezden fotokopi çekilebilir.

YAZARIN

Adı : Hande
Soyadı : ÇETİN
Bölümü : İngilizce Öğretmenliği
İmza :
Teslim tarihi :

TEZİN

Türkçe adı : Türk ve Portekiz İngilizce'yi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Öğrencilerin Edimbilim Edinçlerinin Özür Söz Edim Grubu Üzerinden Karşılaştırılması : Görev-Temelli Bir Perspektif

İngilizce adı : A Comparison of Pragmatic Competence Between Turkish and Portuguese EFL Learners Via Speech Act Set of Apologies: A Task-Based Perspective

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI

Tez yazma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyduđumu, yararlandıđım tüm kaynakları kaynak gösterme ilkelerine uygun olarak kaynakçada belirttiđimi ve bu bölümler dışındaki tüm ifadelerin şahsıma ait olduđunu beyan ederim.

Yazar Adı Soyadı : Hande ÇETİN

İmza:

APPROVAL

Hande ÇETİN tarafından hazırlanan “A Comparison of Pragmatic Competence Between Turkish and Portuguese EFL Learners Via Speech Act Set of Apologies: A Task-Based Perspective “ adlı tez çalışması aşağıdaki jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Gazi Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenli Anabilim Dalı’nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cemal ÇAKIR

(Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi)

.....

Başkan: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdullah ERTAŞ

(Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi)

.....

Üye: Doç. Dr. Cem BALÇIKANLI

(Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi)

.....

To My Mum and Dad

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While watching the last and the biggest ripples of this study, I need to thank several people who have played crucial roles from the moment when this study was just a little ripple waiting to be thrown into the water till the time when it was possible to see the waves growing.

First and foremost, I want to express my sincere thanks to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Cemal ÇAKIR for his guidance and patience through this challenging process. I feel privileged and honored to work under his supervision.

I also want to thank Prof. Emeritus Andrew D. Cohen and Prof. Emeritus Elite Olshtain for giving me the permission to use their apology instrument which is used as the data collection instrument in this research.

I want to thank Dr. Maria Clara Keating who gave me the opportunity to conduct my research in her class time. I also want to thank all Turkish and Portuguese participants who contributed to this study.

I need to thank my colleagues Instructor Çağlayan Erdönmez and Res. Assist. Ömer Faruk Bozkurt who helped me at different levels of the study, and who were always there for me whenever I needed.

Finally, I want to thank my mother Sevim Çetin, my father Ömer Çetin, and sisters Canan and Nida whose presence have always given me the strength to stand up and move on when I stumbled and who shared every emotion with me throughout the process which makes me feel indebted to them for the rest of my life.

**TÜRK ve PORTEKİZ EFL ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN EDİMBİLİM
EDİNÇLERİNİN ÖZÜR SÖZ EDİM GRUBU ÜZERİNDEN
KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI:GÖREV-TEMELLİ BİR PERSPEKTİF**

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Hande ÇETİN

GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Temmuz 2014

ÖZ

İletişimin fiziki sınırlarının artık olmadığı günümüz dünyasında, kültürel farklılıklar iletişimin ahengini devam ettirmede önem kazanmaktadır. İngilizce ortak dil olarak iletişimin aracı görevini üstlenmektedir ve böylece iletişimsel yetinin bir parçası olan edimbilim edinci İngilizce’yi ana dil olarak kullananlar arasında, İngilizce’yi ana dil olarak kullananlarla ana dili İngilizce olmayanlar arasında ve yerli olmayanların kendi aralarındaki iletişimde önemli bir rol üstlenmektedir. Bu çalışma, ana dili İngilizce olmayanların özür söz eyleminin kullanımındaki kültürel farklılıkları bulmayı ve bulguları bireysellik-toplumsalcılık açısından tartışmayı ve eğer mümkünse, edimbilim edincini görev-temelli edimbilim öğretimi yoluyla geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Bu çalışma Türkiye ve Portekiz olmak üzere karşılaştırmalı olarak yürütülmüştür. Çalışmanın denek grubunu Türkiye, Ankara, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programında 3üncü sınıf öğrencisi olan 11 öğrenci ile Portekiz, Coimbra, Coimbra Üniversitesi, Modern Diller Bölümünde 3üncü sınıf öğrencisi olan 7 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışma hem nitel hem de nicel bir çalışmadır. Çalışmanın modeli Ön-test Son-test Deneysel Modeldir. Veriler sekiz farklı

özür durumunu içeren bir Söylem Tamamlama Testi kullanılarak toplanmıştır ve araştırmacı tarafından her iki denek grubunda da ön-test ve son-test arasında dört haftalık görev-temelli özür söz eylemi üzerine bir edimbilim öğretimi yürütülmüştür. Söylem Tamamlama Testiyle elde edilen veriler analiz edilmiş ve nitel analizin yanı sıra frekans ve yüzdeler olarak sunulmuştur. Karşılaştırma için SPSS programında tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) ve Scheffé Testi uygulanmıştır.

Bulgular bu iki kültür arasında anlamlı farklılıklar olduğunu göstermiştir. Her iki ülke de toplumsalcı kültüre sahip olsa da; bununla birlikte, özür söz eylemi kullanımında bireyselci-toplumsalcı yönelimler açısından farklılık göstermişlerdir. İki grubun ön-test ve son-testlerinin yüzde karşılaştırması da görev-temelli edimbilim öğretiminin edimbilim edinci üzerindeki muhtemel etkilerini sorgulayan diğer araştırma sorumuzu olumlu yönde cevaplamıştır.

Bilim Kodu :

Anahtar Kelimeler :Edimbilim, Kibarlık, Görev-Temelli Öğretim, Özür Söz Eylemi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Bireysellik-Toplumsalcılık

Sayfa Adedi :i-xvii, 150 sayfa

Danışman : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cemal Çakır

**A COMPARISON OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE BETWEEN
TURKISH AND PORTUGUESE EFL LEARNERS VIA SPEECH ACT
SET OF APOLOGIES: A TASK-BASED PERSPECTIVE**

(M.A. Thesis)

Hande ÇETİN

GAZI UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

July 2014

ABSTRACT

In a world where there are no borders for communication, cultural differences gain so much significance in maintaining the harmony of the communication. English as a lingua franca serves as the medium of communication, so pragmatic competence as a part of communicative competence plays a crucial role in the communication between natives, natives and non-natives and also non-natives and non-natives. This study aimed to find out the cultural differences between non-natives in the use of the speech act of apology and discuss them in terms of individualism-collectivism, and tried to find out if it was possible to improve pragmatic competence with the help of task-based pragmatics teaching.

This study was conducted in Turkey and Portugal as comparative research. The subject group was eleven 3rd grade students from Turkey, Ankara, Gazi University, Faculty of Education, English Language Program and seven 3rd grade students from Portugal, Coimbra, Coimbra University, Faculty of Letters, Modern Languages Department. This study was both qualitative and quantitative. The design of the study was Pre-test Post-Test Control Group Experimental Model. The data were collected through a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) which consisted of eight different apologetic

situations, and a four-week task-based pragmatics teaching with a special focus on the speech act of apology was implemented by the researcher in both groups between the pre-test and the post-test. The data gathered with the DCT were analyzed and presented through frequencies and percentages along with the qualitative analysis. For the comparison, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Scheffé Test were applied in SPSS.

The findings of the study indicated some significant culture-specific differences between these two cultures. They both have collectivistic cultures; however, they differed in the use of the speech act of apology in terms of individualistic-collectivistic tendencies. The percentage comparison of the pre-tests and post-tests of these two subject groups answered the other question of the current study positively which inquired the possible effect of the task-based pragmatics teaching on the pragmatics competence.

Science Code :

Key Words :Pragmatics, Politeness, Task-Based Teaching, The Speech Act of Apology, English Language Teaching, Individualism-Collectivism

Page Number :i-xvii, 150 pages

Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Cemal Çakır

LIST OF CONTENTS

INNER COVER.....	i
TELİF HAKKI ve TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU	ii
ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI.....	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ÖZ.....	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
LIST OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background to the Study	1
1.2. Purpose of the Study (Research Questions).....	2
1.3. Importance of the Study	2
1.4. Assumptions.....	3
1.5. Limitations of the Study	3
1.6. Definition of Terms.....	4
CHAPTER 2.....	5
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
2.1. Task-Based Language Teaching	5
2.2. Culture	8

2.3.Pragmatics	9
2.4.Politeness Theory	10
2.5.Speech Acts.....	11
2.6.Speech Act of Apology	12
2.7.Teaching Pragmatics.....	13
2.8.Previous Studies on Pragmatics, Speech Acts and Apology	14
CHAPTER 3.....	22
METHODOLOGY	22
3.1.Design of the Study.....	22
3.2.Subjects.....	22
3.3.Data Collection Instrument.....	23
3.4.Data Collection Procedure	23
3.5.Teaching Implementation Processes.....	24
3.6.Data Analysis.....	29
CHAPTER 4.....	35
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	35
4.1.Presentation.....	35
4.2.Analysis of the Personal Information Part	35
4.2.1.Turkish Subject Group	36
4.2.2.Portuguese Subject Group	40
4.3.Discourse Completion Task Results.....	43
4.3.1.Results of Pre-test of the Turkish Subject Group	45
4.3.2.Results of Post-test of the Turkish Subject Group.....	55
4.3.3.Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of the Turkish Subject Group	64
4.3.4.Results of Pre-test of the Portuguese Subject Group	66
4.3.5.Results of Post-test of the Portuguese Subject Group.....	75
4.3.6.Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of the Portuguese Subject Group.....	84

4.3.7. Comparison of Pre-test of the Turkish Subject Group and Pre-test of the Portuguese Subject Group.....	86
4.3.8. Comparison of Post-test of the Turkish Subject Group and Post-test of the Portuguese Subject Group	89
4.4. Discussions of Discourse Completion Task Results	91
4.4.1. Discussion of Discourse Completion Task Results in Terms of Individualism-Collectivism.....	95
CHAPTER 5	102
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS.....	102
5.1. Summary of the Study	102
5.2. Implications for ELT	104
5.3. Implications for Further Research.....	104
REFERENCES.....	106
APPENDICES.....	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Pre-test of the TSG	32
Table 2: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Post-test of the TSG	32
Table 3: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Pre-test of the PSG	33
Table 4: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Post-test of the PSG.....	34
Table 5: Gender.....	36
Table 6: Age.....	37
Table 7: Language Status.....	37
Table 8: Other Language(s) Known	38
Table 9: Gender.....	40
Table 10: Age.....	41
Table 11: Language Status.....	41
Table 12: Other Language(s) Known	42
Table 13: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	46
Table 14: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	47
Table 15: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	48
Table 16: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	49
Table 17: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	50
Table 18: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	52
Table 19: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	53
Table 20: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Pre-test of the TSG.....	54
Table 21: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Post-test of the TSG	56

Table 22: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Post-test of the TSG	57
Table 23: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Post-test of the TSG	58
Table 24: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Post-test of the TSG	59
Table 25: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Post-test of the TSG	60
Table 26: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Post-test of the TSG	61
Table 27: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Post-test of the TSG	62
Table 28: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Post-test of the TSG	63
Table 29: A Comparison of the Strategy Use Of the TSG in the Pre-test and the Post-test (in percentages)	65
Table 30: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	67
Table 31: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	68
Table 32: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	69
Table 33: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	70
Table 34: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	71
Table 35: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	72
Table 36: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	73
Table 37: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Pre-test of the PSG.....	74

Table 38: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Post-test of the PSG	76
Table 39: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Post-test of the PSG	77
Table 40: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Post-test of the PSG	78
Table 41: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Post-test of the PSG	79
Table 42: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Post-test of the PSG	80
Table 43: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Post-test of the PSG	81
Table 44: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Post-test of the PSG	82
Table 45: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Post-test of the PSG	83
Table 46: A Comparison of the Strategy Use Of the PSG in the Pre-test and the Post-test (in percentages)	85
Table 47: A Comparison of the Strategy Use of the TSG and the PSG in the Pre-tests (in percentages)	87
Table 48: A Comparison of the Strategy Use of the TSG and the PSG in the Post-tests (in percentages)	89
Table 49: Arithmetic means and standard deviations of total number of strategies across eight situations for the TSG	98
Table 50: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test across Eight Situations (the TSG)	98
Table 51: Arithmetic means and standard deviations of total number of strategies across eight situations for the PSG	99
Table 52: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test across Eight Situations (the PSG)	100

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APOL	An expression of an apology
BLAM	Accepting the blame
DCT	Discourse Completion Task/Test
DEFI	Expressing self-deficiency
DESE	Recognizing the other person as deserving apology
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EXPL	An explanation or account of the situation
FORB	A promise of forbearance
FORGI	A request for forgiveness
IC	Individualism-Collectivism
INTE	Expressing lack of intent
OFFE	An offer of apology
PS	Portuguese Subject
PSG	Portuguese Subject Group
REGR	Expression of regret
REPR	An offer of repair
RESP	An acknowledgement of responsibility
TS	Turkish Subject
TSG	Turkish Subject Group

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

It is widely known that along with the other changes, language itself changes too. Although it was enough to translate some sentences in learning a foreign language, namely grammar, during the 1840s, in today's world language learning requires much more than that. With the emergence of the concept of "context", 'pragmatic competence', which means "the ability to perform language functions in a context" (Taguchi, 2008), has gained so much significance in language learning.

In order to be able to "...perform language functions in a context", the issue of teaching and learning pragmatics has become inevitable. Pragmatics is seen as "the study of language in use" (Crystal, 1997; Mey, 2001), and as "topicalizing the incorporation of context factors in discourse" (Levinson, 1983) most of the time. As we can see, with the time, language learning and teaching has gained some other aspects such as context, culture, discourse, pragmatics, and so on, apart from the merely grammar focus. Pragmatics has two main subcategories: sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics (Leech, 1988). These two categories differ in that in sociopragmatics learners need to know and apply the social aspect of pragmatics while in pragmalinguistics, learners need to know and apply the linguistic aspect of pragmatics. To make it clear, for instance, the learner wants to ask for something from an old lady. In this situation firstly, he/she needs to choose which grammar point to use, namely one of the modals, and this refers to the pragmalinguistics because it deals with the linguistic side. After deciding the linguistic feature to use, he/she needs to consider the lady's age, the relationship between them, the status of the lady, and the like and, accordingly, he/she chooses the most relevant way to ask under the conditions of this social context, and at this level he/she reaches the sociopragmatic level. Yet, there emerge some problems. L1 transfer is always active and

has an effect on the learners' developing sociopragmatics, pragmalinguistics, and general L2 knowledge (Roever, 2009). As there is no pragmatic syllabus, and it is not covered in the classrooms most of the time, it is hard to be sociopragmatically competent in the second language without any instruction on pragmatic features and their uses. Yet, pragmatics can be a part of a task-based syllabus because it is a kind of real-world language use, so teaching pragmatics should be integrated into a task-based syllabus (Long and Crooks, 1992, 1993).

This study aimed to find out, using task-based activities, the differences between EFL learners in Turkey and Portugal in conscious uses of 'apologies' as a set of speech acts. This study also aimed to find if there was any, the cultural differences and their effects on learning and using 'apologies' as a set of speech acts. As there is no 'pragmatic syllabus' to apply, it was hoped to find out a way out through this cross-cultural comparison study.

1.2. Purpose of the Study (Research Questions)

In this research, answers for the following research questions were sought:

1. What are the frequencies of semantic formulas of apology used by Turkish and Portuguese learners of English in different situations? Do Turkish and Portuguese EFL students have differences in their uses of semantic formulas of apology?
2. Is there any change in the use of speech act set of apologies by Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners after they are taught task-based pragmatics?
3. Is there a culture effect on Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners' learning and using apology? If there is, what are those cultural effects?

1.3. Importance of the Study

What is desired to be conveyed in communication is not always achieved merely using the words, grammar, and the four skills. What plays a significant role as well in communication is pragmatics, along with them. At this point, teaching and learning pragmatics carries so much significance in communication.

As for the apology, it has a significant role in interpersonal relations apart from its role in communication. While misuse of apology even in the native language may end up with troublesome situations, the appropriate use of apology in a foreign language is even more difficult and the effects of it may be more complicated. In accordance with the results of the study, it was hoped that some suggestions for pragmatics syllabus could be made and pragmatics' awareness for the EFL learners in Turkey and Portugal could be created in this way.

Another significance of this study is that while most of the other studies on this subject are Discourse Completion Task-based and they are aiming to find out the current status of the participants, in this study, besides trying to find out the current status of the two subject groups, four authentic task-based activities are written and it is aimed to improve their pragmatic competence through teaching of task-based pragmatic activities.

1.4. Assumptions

The data collection process of this study was conducted both at Gazi University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Program and at Coimbra University, Faculty of Letters, Modern Languages Program. These two subject groups were assumed to be equal and to represent their sample populations. The data collection instrument which was used in this research was "Apology Instrument" by Cohen and Olshtain (1981), and it was considered to be valid and reliable. It was assumed that the students understood the data collection tool, which was the Apology Instrument, and responded to the discourse completion task honestly. Data collection tool was assumed to be able to collect all kinds of data, namely the four semantic formulas, which was required for the analysis.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

In this study, which is about the pragmatic competence, only the speech act set of apology was studied, and the other speech acts like requests, refusals, and complaints were not covered. As for the subjects, only 11 students from Turkey, Ankara, Gazi

University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Program and 7 students from Portugal, Coimbra, Coimbra University, Faculty of Letters, Modern Languages Program were included in the subject group of the study.

When we review the literature, we see that Cohen and Olshtain (1993) used a DCT on a subject group of 15; Cohen and Olshtain (1981) used a DCT on a subject group of 44; Suzczyńska (1999) worked with a group of 110 participants on her study, whose data collection tool was a DCT; and Wouk (2006) used a DCT on a subject group of 105. However, in this study although a small subject group of 18 participants were used in this study, the current study included teaching of task-based activities unlike the aforesaid studies.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Competence: According to Chomsky (1965), it is “the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language”, and he makes a difference between competence and performance saying that performance is “the actual use of language in concrete situations” (cited in Bachman and Palmer, 1984). It is about the knowledge rather than the ability to use it.

Communicative Competence: There are two components of communicative competence, which are “communicative” and “competence”, and they form the concept of communicative competence with the meaning of having competence to communicate (Bachman and Palmer, 1984).

Pragmatics: How language is used in communication, and the study of meaning in relation to speech situations (Leech, 1989, p.1, p.6).

Pragmatic Competence: The ability to use language appropriately in a social context (Taguchi, 2009, p. 1).

Speech Acts: Doing things with words; perform acts via language. These are the acts which crucially involve the production of the language. It is usual to recognize three basic types: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts (Cruse, 2006).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Task-Based Language Teaching

In order to understand Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), we need to fully comprehend the notion of task, which is proposed as a central unit of planning and teaching in TBLT. This can be problematic because there are various definitions of a task in various fields. But, we need to know what we mean by a task in this context, namely TBLT. As it is defined in a dictionary of applied linguistics by Richards, Platt, and Weber (1986, as cited by Nunan, 1989, pp. 6), a task is,

an activity or action which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language (i.e. as a response). For example, drawing a map while listening to a tape, listening to an instruction and performing a command, may be referred to as tasks. Tasks may or may not involve the production of language. A task usually requires the teacher to specify what will be regarded as successful completion of the task. The use of a variety of different kinds of tasks in language teaching is said to make language teaching more communicative ... since it provides a purpose for a classroom activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

It can be seen that this very first definition of a task mostly deals with its pedagogical side lacking defining real-world tasks (Nunan, 1989). Skehan (1996, as cited by Richards and Rodgers, 2001, pp. 224) brings a communicative perspective to his definition of a task:

Tasks ... are activities which have meaning as their primary focus. Success in tasks is evaluated in terms of achievement of an outcome, and tasks generally bear some resemblance to real-life language use. So, task-based instruction takes a fairly strong view of communicative language teaching.

As it can be seen from the definition above, despite some differences they share a common point which is the emphasis on meaning rather than the linguistic structure. Breen (1987, as cited by Nunan, 1989, pp. 6) also emphasizes the importance of meaning in his definition of a task giving some examples:

... any structured language learning endeavor which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specific working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task. 'Task' is therefore assumed to refer to a range of workplans which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning – from the simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving or simulations and decision making.

As Richards and Rodgers (2001) suggest, the role of tasks in second language acquisition (SLA) has gained significance and support by some researchers of the field who want to develop pedagogical applications of SLA theory (e.g., Long and Crookes 1993), so an interest emerged to use tasks in SLA researches as tools in the mid-1980s. Strategies and cognitive processes used by second language learners have been the focus of these SLA research. This research has put the position of formal grammar instruction in language teaching into question and reevaluation. This research shows that it is not proved that grammar-focused teaching activities have the cognitive learning processes which are employed outside the classroom in the real life situations. Richards and Rodgers (2001, pp. 223) also suggest that “Engaging learners in task work provides a better context for the activation of learning processes than form-focused activities, and hence ultimately provides better opportunities for language learning to take place.” Nunan (1989, pp. 10) defines what a communicative task is by emphasizing these cognitive learning processes in his definition:

... a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right.

Lastly, Richards and Rodgers (2001) accept that there are various different definitions of a task, and suggest that despite these differences “there is a commonsensical understanding that a task is an activity or goal that is carried out using language, such as finding a solution to a puzzle, reading a map and giving directions, making a telephone call, writing a letter, or reading a set of instructions and assembling a toy.” (pp. 224)

The things that form the core of TBLT in every aspect are tasks, but as it is given above, there is no certain definition for it. Yet, Ellis (2009, pp. 223) suggests that a task should meet some criteria:

1. The primary focus should be on ‘meaning’

2. There should be some kind of ‘gap’
3. Learners should largely have to rely on their own resources in order to complete the activity
4. There is a clearly defined outcome other than the use of language

As there is not only one definition for a task, there is not an agreed task type as well. Prabhu (1987) identifies task types as:

1. Information-gap tasks
2. Opinion-gap tasks
3. Reasoning-gap tasks

In this identification of task types, it is seen that they move from one-step transfer to complex cognitive processes. In information-gap activities, learners exchange information to complete the task which is a one-step transfer most of the time. But, in opinion-gap tasks, learners need to express their attitudes, personal preferences, feelings on something to be able to complete the task. Reasoning-gap tasks, on the other hand, is considered to be the most effective because in this type of tasks learners need to get some new information out of the information, which have already been given to them requiring them to infer from it.

While identifying task types, Ellis (2009) makes two different distinctions. The first task type identification of Ellis is:

1. Unfocused tasks
2. Focused tasks

The main difference lies between these two types of tasks is language use. Unfocused tasks are planned and produced to let the learners practice the language in a general sense, to communicate while focused tasks are designed to give the learners the opportunity to use some specific linguistic features of the language through communication. This doesn't mean that focused tasks are like situational grammar exercises because in focused tasks, the linguistic feature which is planned to be practiced is hidden in the task, but in situational grammar exercises learners are aware of what linguistic feature they are practicing.

Ellis (2009) makes another distinction from the four skills perspective. He identifies the task types as:

1. Input-providing tasks
2. Output-prompting tasks

In the input-providing tasks learners are engaged in the task using their receptive skills of listening and reading while in the output-prompting tasks learners are engaged in the task with their productive skills of writing and speaking. But many tasks are seen to be integrative providing more opportunities to use any of the four skills together and to communicate.

2.2. Culture

Culture is one of the concepts hard to describe. As is stated by Spencer-Oatey (2008), in 1952, Kroeber and Kluckhohn, who are the American anthropologists, examined the concepts and definitions of culture deeply and ended up with a list of 164 different definitions. On the complexity of defining culture, Apte (1994) concedes that although there was so much effort to form an adequate definition for culture, in 1990s still there was not any agreement upon its nature among anthropologists. In our study, we choose as the most appropriate definition of culture the one made by Spencer-Oatey (2008):

Culture is a fuzzy set of basic assumptions and values, orientations to life, beliefs, policies, procedures and behavioral conventions that are shared by a group of people, and that influence (but do not determine) each member's behavior and his/her interpretations of the 'meaning' of other people's behavior.

As the definition shows there are so many variables in the concept of culture. It is obvious that there are crucial boundaries between culture and language teaching because, in a way, culture provides a context for language learning and teaching. As cited by Çetin Koroğlu (2013), this relationship is well explained by The Sapir Whorf Hypothesis such that conceptual contents of languages and cultures are significantly determined by words and their semiotic reflections, and semantic differences and these cultural meanings could be borrowed among languages and exchanged among cultures. "Language influences and

makes up one's thinking and cognition and that relative distinction in a language may not be available in another language" (Sapir, 1985, as cited by Çetin Köroğlu, 2013).

2.3. Pragmatics

Levinson defines pragmatics as the field which studies the linguistic features of a language in terms of how it is used by its users (1983). On the other hand, Crystal (1985) defines pragmatics as the field of study which considers a language from the perspective of users, how they use the language and what they choose to express themselves, and the limitations they come up with when they engage in social interactions, and how other participants are affected during a speech act.

Pragmatics deals with communicative action within the context of socio-culture. Communicative action consists of speech acts - such as requesting, greeting, and so on, and taking part in conversation, using different types of discourse, and maintaining interaction in complex speech events. Speakers perform two things to make utterances: (1) interactional acts and (2) speech acts.

Interactional acts aim to ensure smooth transition between utterances and thus assign the structure of the discourse. Speech acts are the attempts that language learners make in order to carry out specific actions, especially interpersonal functions. Pragmatics is also defined as the field of study which investigates how learners come to acquire various patterns of linguistic action and their use in a second language (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996). The basic assumption of interlanguage pragmatics is that just knowing the corresponding words and phrases in a second language (L2) does not suffice to be proficient in that language. Learners are supposed to choose situationally-appropriate utterances, which means they need to know what to say, when to say, where to say, and how to say it to express themselves in the most effective way.

Pragmatic competence is concerned with a set of internalized rules of how language should be used in ways that are socio-culturally appropriate, with a concern for the other participants in a communicative action (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000). Pragmatics competence includes pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence (Leech,

1983). While pragmalinguistics deals with knowledge of what is available for learners to choose to carry out different pragmatic actions, sociopragmatics deals with the knowledge of how appropriate choices are made in a particular context for specific purposes.

2.4. Politeness Theory

Politeness is not considered to be an innate characteristic of human beings, but rather something that is acquired through socialization process. In this respect, politeness is not considered to be a “natural” phenomenon which can be traced back to the times before mankind existed, but something which have been historically constructed through socio-cultural formations. Though an individual accomplishes the act of behaving politely, this is actually an intrinsic product of social formation since polite acts are socially determined in order to structure social formation. An act should be based upon a standard set of norms in order to be regarded as “polite”. This standard transcends the act itself and is a value which is agreed upon by the participants of an interaction such as the actor, the hearer or any other third party who might be a part of the interaction. Collective values and norms are the basis of this standard and they are acquired by the learners as part of a society from the early days of their lives thorough socialization process.

As cited by Ellis, Werkhofer (1992) regards politeness as the strength of symbolic tool which is created and used in the act of individual speakers, and this tool also shows what kind of behaviors and conduct are just appropriate according to social standards. Fraser (1990) categorizes different views of politeness into four categories: the ‘social norm’ view, the ‘conversational maxim’ view, the ‘face-saving’ view and his own ‘conversational-contract’ view. The ‘social norm’ view relates to the historical understanding of politeness. As cited by Ellis (1994), this view presumes that every society prescribe its own social rules for various cultural contexts. Those explicit rules are generally related to speech style, degrees of formality and so on, and they are not just rules to be found in books but they have been kept in the language itself. The ‘conversational-maxim’ view incorporates a Politeness Principle together with Grice’s Co-operative Principle. Lakoff (1972), Leech (1983) and to a lesser extent Edmondson (1981) mainly share somewhat a similar approach. The ‘face-saving’ view has had most comprehensive

influence as a politeness model and was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978). The ‘conversational-contract’ view was proposed by Fraser and Nolen (1981) and Fraser (1990) and merge with ‘face-saving’ view in many respects. Kasper (1992) states that this view has been the comprehensive perspective on politeness (as cited by Ellis, 1994).

2.5. Speech Acts

Speech Act Theory (SAT) starts in the British tradition as a way of thinking about language. John Austin (1962), a British philosopher, and John Searle (1969), an American philosopher, were the pioneers of this theory. Searle is known as an important defender of SAT not only in the United States, but also all around the world. After some observation, Austin comes up with the idea that people use the language in action, not in isolation. As for an example of it, when people use the language, they don’t just use it, but they carry out some functions like promising, apologizing, requesting, etc. Contrary to the general supposition, Searle (1969) says that linguistic communication as a whole is not about the words or sentences, but about the issuance of them through speech act, and also he sees the speech acts as the actual application of language in actual situations. As a result, the main supposition lying under SAT is that carrying out certain kinds of acts comprises the whole communication. A speech act is an utterance that has a function in communication and this function could be literal or propositional as it is in the example of “where was I when that cell phone rudely interrupted me?”. Apart from these two, they can also have other meanings like functional and illocutionary. Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) say that there are three types of act within speech act theory: a locutionary act which has a propositional meaning, an illocutionary act which is the implementation of a particular function, and a perlocutionary act that is the achieved effect on the addressee. Searle (1975) puts forward that there are direct and indirect speech acts. In a direct speech act, form and function go parallel with each other, but in an indirect speech act, function lies under the form, that is, the illocutionary force of the act. Brown and Levinson (1978) see politeness as a way for each interactant to manage the face and public identity by phrasing remarks. There are universally accepted two face wants which are negative face and positive face. Negative face can be defined as one’s desire to avoid any impedence in his actions by other interactants. Besides, positive face can be defined as one’s desire to create connection and

closeness with other interactants. Positive and/or negative face of the interactant can be threatened by many acts, so these acts can be made less face threatening, that is polite, by Brown and Levinson's (1978) politeness super-strategies.

2.6. Speech Act of Apology

Apologies function as face-threatening acts (FTA) on the speaker rather than the hearer. In its nature of apology, the speaker needs to take responsibility of his/her behavior which is not approved or welcomed by the hearer. Because of its nature, apologies are about the past actions not the future actions. As a part of the Cross-cultural Speech Act Realization, in his study Olshtain (1989) worked on apology strategies in four different languages, that is, Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and German. At the end of this study in which the data were collected by means of a discourse completion task, Olshtain (1989) concludes "...we have a good reason to expect that, given the same social factors, the same contextual factors, and the same level of offence, different languages will realize apologies in very similar ways". Under the light of this conclusion, the act of apologizing can be seen as a pragmatic universal meanwhile the situations that require an apology are not because there are differences in speech communities about what an offense is, what the intensity of the same offence is and the appropriate compensation for this action. How people perceive all these is determined by social factors like status and familiarity. Regarding all these, a non-native speaker needs to know what a specific situation of an apology requires in the target language, which strategies and linguistic features to use and how to make it contextually appropriate.

There is a large body of studies on apologizing patterns of native and non-native speakers that stand as a support for the supposition of an apology speech act set. Olshtain and Cohen (1983) are the first ones to propose this idea, and they justified it through some studies empirically. According to this notion, a finite set of strategies which are associated with the offensive act and are the speaker's attempt to get rid of it by expressing regret and offering compensation or by reducing the intensity of the offense and the responsibility of its addresser can be used to apologize.

2.7. Teaching Pragmatics

Most of the studies conducted so far have focused on the differences in the performance of the same speech act of native speakers and those of L2 learners. However, developmental aspect of learners' pragmatic competence has been overlooked and less attention has been given. Therefore, though much is known about what learners do with L2, still very little is known about how learners come to acquire that knowledge. Studies conducted so far indicate that there major factors play an important role in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. The first factor is learners' linguistic competence. Linguistic competence is necessary for learners to establish native-like discourse. Although learners with limited L2 proficiency can still perform communicatively important speech acts, accomplishing this in native-like ways constitutes a major difficulty for them. The need to perform speech acts like native speakers can be regarded as a motive that encourages continuous linguistic development. The issue that attracts considerable attention is the question of whether the acquisition of linguistic forms and then using them appropriately (Ellis, 1989), or whether learning how to communicate leads to the acquisition of linguistic forms (Hatch, 1978).

The second major factor is the issue of transfer. A large body of research evidence shows that learners transfer 'rules of speaking' from their L1 to their L2. Riley (1989) states that cultural transfer is obvious in communicative interactions in specific situations that learners expect to occur and in how they regulate their discourse according to the types of speech acts they want to perform. However, the role that non-native speakers' L1 and culture play should not be overrated. It is important to treat transfer as a complex process which can be affected by other factors such as learners' stage of development. Kasper and Dahl (1991) point out that it is of high priority to clarify the concept of pragmatic transfer in IL pragmatics research.

The third important factor is the status of the learner. There is lack of equality in communicative actions especially in the ones where non-native speakers are interacting with native interlocutors. The social status of the learner in the native speaker community might be one reason for this. Learners themselves might feel having a lower status just because they are learners.

Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) propose three main pedagogical practices to teach pragmatics to L2 learners:

1. The use of authentic language samples,
2. Input first followed by interpretation and/or production,
3. The introduction of the teaching of pragmatics at early levels.

2.8. Previous Studies on Pragmatics, Speech Acts and Apology

In this part, previous studies on pragmatics, pragmatics awareness- in particular, competence, speech acts, and the speech act of apology are given briefly.

Bardovi-Harlig and Griffin (2005) worked with an ESL classroom consisting of 43 students who had 18 different language backgrounds in order to identify their L2 pragmatic awareness. In their study, they used some video-taped scenarios consisting of some pragmatics deficiencies, and they wanted the students who were participating in this activity to identify these deficiencies and improve them by acting out the scenario themselves. They video-taped the students' role plays and as a result of this study, it was seen that students whose level was high intermediate could recognize and produce the missing speech acts and related semantic formulas like "apology for arriving late or explanations for making requests or for not having completed a class assignment" (pp. 401), but it was concluded that "the specific content or form may be less culturally or linguistically transparent" (pp. 401).

Chang (2011) studied the relationship between pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence by using the speech act of apology. He worked with four groups, each of which consisted of 60 students. He tried to find out which one precedes the other, and with this aim, he collected both perception and production data and examined the differences in the use of apology strategies, content and form in basically four situations but considering the same situation for equal-status, namely the classmates, and the higher-status, the teacher. The findings show that there are no clear boundaries between pragmalinguistic competence and sociolinguistic competence as they are interrelated and interwoven. Another finding of this study is that the perception of the severity level of the offense and the choice of apology strategies are affected by social status.

Neddar (2012) questioned the relationship between interlanguage pragmatics and EFL teaching in his study. He reviewed discourse and moved to interlanguage pragmatics. He supports the idea that communicative language teaching ignores communicate competence, particularly sociopragmatic competence at some points. He concludes that a fully cross-cultural pragmatic approach should be implemented in language teaching.

Cohen and Olshtain (1993) studied the processes involved in the production of speech acts. They worked with a small group of advanced EFL learners consisting of 15 people. They gave the students six speech act situations consisting of two apology situations, two complaint situations, and two request situations, and they asked the students to role play for each situation while they were being videotaped. In this study, they tried to find out students' assessment, planning, and execution of their utterances. As a result of this study, while executing speech act behavior, most of the time students made a general assessment of the utterances which were needed for the situations without planning which vocabulary or grammatical structures to use, and they didn't pay so much attention to grammar or pronunciation. The findings of this study helped to characterize the attendant students in terms of speech production and they came up with three learner styles which are metacognizers who "seem to have a highly developed metacognitive awareness and who use this awareness to the fullest" (pp. 45), avoiders who leave the spaces blanks when they are not sure about appropriateness of what they are going to say, and pragmatists who find alternative solutions which are almost desired ones rather than avoiding the situations like the avoiders.

Cohen and Olshtain (1981) conducted a study with the aim of developing a measure of sociocultural competence, and they chose the speech act of apology for this research. They used a subject group of 44 people, 20 of which were native Hebrew speakers serving as informants in English L2, 12 of which were native Hebrew speakers serving as informants in Hebrew L1, 12 of which were native Americans serving as informants in English L1. They asked the students to respond to eight situations in a DCT, which is used in the current research as well, and to role play their responses. As a result of the study, they suggest that a measure of sociocultural competence can be produced and inappropriate utterances of speech act of apology in L2 can be identified.

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) aimed to identify the cross-cultural speech act realization patterns taking two speech act sets, namely requests and apologies into consideration in

their CCSARP (A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns) Project. The methodological framework of this project was based on that “observed diversity in realization of speech acts in context may stem from at least three different types of variability: (a) intra-cultural, situational variability; (b) cross-cultural variability; (c) individual variability” (pp. 197). This project was conducted in eight languages which were Australian English, American English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian. In order to identify situational variability, this project aimed to “establish native speakers’ patterns of realization with respect to two speech acts relative to different social constraints, in each of the languages studied” (pp. 197). In order to identify cross-cultural variability, they aimed to “establish the similarities and differences in the realization patterns of requests and apologies cross-linguistically, relative to the same social constraints across the languages studied” (pp. 197). As for the last goal of the study, to be able to identify individual, native versus non-native variability, it was aimed to “establish the similarities and differences between native and non-native realization patterns of requests and apologies relative to the same social constraints” (pp. 197). They collected the data both from the natives and the non-natives of each language in this project. As for the subject group, 400 informants attended this study for each language. They used a DCT consisting of eight request situations and eight apology situations to collect the data. As a brief conclusion of this study, it is seen that

...the phenomena captured by the main dimensions are validated by the observed data, and thus might be regarded as potential candidates for universality; on the other hand, the cross-linguistic comparative analysis of the distribution of realization patterns, relative to the same social constraints, reveals rich cross-cultural variability (pp. 210).

Olshtain and Cohen (1990) studied on the complex nature of speech act behavior and dealt with the learning and teaching the speech act of apology in English. The subject group of this study consisted of 18 adult Hebrews learning English. With this study, they tried to answer some questions concerning “choice of semantic formula, appropriate length of realization patterns, use of intensifiers, judgment of appropriacy and students’ preferences for certain teaching techniques” (pp. 51). They gave the attendants a pre-teaching questionnaire and then, they carried out a training session of three lessons, lastly applied the post-teaching questionnaire. The findings of the pre-teaching questionnaire indicated that non-native speakers used merely one strategy rather than explicit apology, but on the other hand native speakers showed a tendency to add an explicit apology to that strategy.

Another finding of pre-teaching showed that non-native speakers produced longer utterances compared to the native speakers' utterances. After the teaching sessions, post-teaching questionnaire findings indicated that students started to produce shorter and more appropriate utterances which were close to native speakers', and they gained confidence in the use of apology strategy.

Suszczynska (1999) is another scholar who conducted a research on the speech act of apology with the aim of highlighting the differences in the apologetic responses in three different languages which were English, Polish, and Hungarian. She carried out a detailed research into apology in terms of strategy choice, sequential arrangement of strategies, the choice of linguistic forms, and the content. She aimed to find out the differences in cultural communicative styles in these three languages and thus figure out their reasons, different cultural values giving way to stylistic differences. To collect the data, she used a DCT consisting of eight different apology situations and asked the subject group consisting of 110 students, 14 of which were American, 20 of which were Hungarian, and 76 of which were Polish, to respond to these eight situations. Findings indicated that in English the dominantly used strategy was expression of regret while in Hungarian it was a refusal strategy, and in Polish it was an offer of apology. She explained the reasoning of this finding, "For an English speaker, an expression of regret is a 'better' way to apologize because, in comparison with other IFIDs, it does not seem to threaten 'distance' between individuals" (pp. 1059). Another finding of the study indicated that there were differences in the strategy order in these three languages. She concluded criticizing politeness theory, "it seems that politeness theory, in its present form, is not enough to explain such differences, since they stem less from universal norms of politeness but more from culture-specific values and attitudes" (pp. 1064).

Christiansen (2003) studied on the relationship between pragmatic ability and proficiency using a subject group of 16 Japanese learners of English. As for the data collection instrument, two different measures of pragmatic ability were formed which were multiple-choice questionnaire and a set of oral role-plays. In order to form a basis for the comparison of the data, eight native speakers of English took these two measures, too. To examine the relationship between pragmatic ability and proficiency, the subjects took the Combined English Language Skills Assessment in a Reading Context (CELSA). As the

result of the research, it was seen that there was not a relationship between proficiency and pragmatic ability, and also the results varied depending on the individuals.

Karsan (2005) studied the speech act of apology. In her study, she collected the data from three different subject groups which were 44 native speakers of Turkish, 24 native speakers of English, and 118 Turkish learners of English. The subject group of Turkish learners of English consisted of students from three different proficiency levels in order to examine if there was any effect of proficiency level on pragmatics transfer. She used a DCT to collect the data. In her study, she aimed to find out the apologizing patterns of Turkish and English and if there was a pragmatic transfer in apology situations by comparing the data collected from three subject groups.

Wouk (2006) studied on apologies in Lombok, Indonesia with the aim of identifying the dominant type of apology term. She indicated that when it was looked at the literature, it was seen that there were three direct apology strategies: which were expression of regret, expression of apology, and request for forgiveness. She used a DCT consisting of six situations to collect the data. As for the subject group of the study, 105 people whose ages ranged from 15 to 50 completed the DCT. The analysis of DCT showed that the mostly preferred strategy by Lombok Indonesians was request for forgiveness, and they didn't tend to use the other two strategies.

Al-Adaileh (2007) studied apologies in terms of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness taking Jordanian Arabic and British English as the components of comparison for his research. He examined the way politeness was conceived by these two different cultures. The results showed that Jordanian apologies were found to be positive politeness strategies contrary to Brown and Levinson's claim for the universality of their theory which says that apologies are negative politeness strategies.

Nureddeen (2008) studied on apologies in Sudanese Arabic. He aimed to find out the type and the extent of apology strategy usage in Sudanese Arabic. He utilized a DCT consisting of ten different situations in terms of strength of social relationship, severity of offense, and social status in order to collect the data. The subject group consisted of 110 college educated Sudanese adults. The findings of the research showed similarity to the previous studies and results supported the suggestion of universality of apology strategies. As a

culture-specific addition to this finding, it was indicated as well that the dominant strategy was explanation in this study.

Kim (2008) conducted a comparative research study on apology in Australian English and South Korean. She had two aims in her research, the first of which was to make a semantic and pragmatic analysis of *mianhada* (corresponding to *sorry*), and the second of which was to investigate South Korean apology speech act strategies. After the analysis, she indicated that *mianhada* differs from *sorry* because it just does not bear expression of regret, but it also conveys the message of accepting the responsibility. As for the other part of the research, she used a DCT consisting of seven situations. She applied the DCT to 44 Korean university students. Findings of the DCT showed that *mianhada* and *joesongshada* were the mostly used expressions in all the apology speech act expressions. The results also indicated that social status, age, social distance are significant in the choice of IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices) in South Korean as it was seen in the example of *joesongshada* which was used in all the situations in DCT only if the speaker was not older than the hearer.

Guan, Park, and Lee (2009) conducted a comparative research study on apology from the perspective of the effects of national culture and the interpersonal relationship types. They used 376 participants in total, 150 of which were undergraduate American students, 100 of which were undergraduate Chinese students, and 126 of which were undergraduate Korean students. The findings of the study showed that the participants from three different cultures showed difference in the perceptions of the offended person's emotional reaction and they also differed in their propensities toward apology use in terms of desire, obligation, intention to apologize, and normative apology use. Another finding revealed that the participants from all these three cultures showed stronger obligation and intention to apologize to an out-group member than to an in-group member, also they did not show any difference in their tendency toward apology use to a friend.

Chang (2010) studied the development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. He used participants from four different grades, which were 3rd grade, 6th grade, 10th grade, and college freshmen, in order to observe the effect of proficiency on the use of the speech act of apology, so he aimed to track the development of pragmatic competence. He used a DCT as the data collection instrument in his study which consisted of eight situations, in four of which the participants addressed an equal status hearer, and in four of which the

participants addressed a higher status hearer. The findings of the study revealed “an acquisition/emergence order of apology strategy as follows” (pp. 418).

Level I: IFID expressing regret

Level II: alerter, admission of fact

Level III: intensifier, concern, minimize, repair

Level IV: explanation, lack of intent, promise of forbearance, IFID requesting forgiveness, acknowledgement, blame (pp. 418).

The results of his study showed that “the developmental patterns of the speech act of apology in L2 resemble the developmental patterns of the L2 request observed by several researchers, in which the L2 learners’ repertoire of apology strategies expands with increasing proficiency” (pp. 422).

Shariati and Chamani (2010) conducted a research on the speech act of apology in Persian in terms of frequency, combination, and sequential position of apology strategies. Unlike the majority, they did not use a DCT to collect the data; instead, they collected the data through an ethnographic method of observation. The data of the research were a corpus of 500 apology exchanges produced by 1250 interlocutors from different genders and ages taking place in a natural environment. They analyzed the data according to the five strategies listed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983). The findings of the study showed that the most commonly used strategy was request for forgiveness and the most commonly used combination was request for forgiveness with acknowledgement of responsibility. They noted that “the same set of apology strategies used in other investigated languages was common in Persian; however, preferences for using these strategies appeared to be culture-specific” (pp. 1689).

Jehabi (2011) studied the choice of apology strategies in Tunisian Arabic. He produced a DCT consisting of ten situations selected randomly out of 25 apology situations listed by students other than the ones who participated in the study. The subject group of the research was 100 university students ranging from the first to the third year who were not studying the subject English. The findings showed that the most commonly appeared responses included a statement of remorse, and the participants used statement of remorse most commonly in three situations, the first of which was a situation where the offended

person was a friend, the second of which was a situation where the culpable person was required to apologize to a older person, and the third of which was a situation where the offended person had the power to affect the culpable person's future. Another finding of this study was that "a noticeable percentage of subjects denied responsibility for the offence and shifted responsibility to other sources using accounts" (pp. 648).

Şahin (2011) conducted a research with three subject groups which were native speakers of American English, Turkish, and Turkish learners of English whose proficiency level was advanced level. In her study, she aimed to find out which refusal strategies they used communicating with equals and if there was any pragmatic transfer from their native language. As for the data collection instrument, a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) whose situations were formed out of a TV Serial was used on the three different subject groups. And the data was analyzed manually and PASW was used afterwards for the descriptive statistics. As for the result of this research, Şahin claimed that refusals and rapport management orientations were both culture and situation specific when refusal was used between equal status interlocutors. She also claimed that refusals and rapport management orientations showed difference cross-culturally and intra-culturally.

Hirama (2011) studied the pragmatic transfer taking the apologetic expressions as her starting point. It is said that Japanese people overuse 'I'm sorry' and, she tried to find out if there was an effect of L1 transfer on this situation. For that reason, she used three subject groups which were Japanese people who lived in Japan and spoke English less than a year, Japanese people who lived in Montreal and spoke English more than a year, and a group of native speakers of English. The results of this study showed that the first group used 'I'm sorry' more frequently than the other two. It was concluded that the longer time they spoke English the less frequently they used 'I'm sorry'.

As can be seen in the subsection before this one, there are so many studies on pragmatics, pragmatics transfer, different speech act as it is a promising subject area in the discipline. Yet, there are not many studies comparing two countries whose native language is not English because mostly, the researchers examine the relationship between English and a language other than English. In my research, I aim to find out if there is a similarity in apology norms of these non-native speakers of English and whether a task-based pragmatics teaching would promote pragmatics competence.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Design of the Study

This research is both qualitative and quantitative. The main difference between qualitative and quantitative research is the issue of using numerical data. This difference is well explained by Hue, as follows:

Quantitative research is essentially about explaining phenomena and identifying trends and patterns by collecting and analyzing data numerically, whereas qualitative research is an umbrella term that covers a variety of approaches that focus on the meaning of the phenomenon being investigated and do not involve numerical data (Hua, 2011, pp. 392).

The design of the study is Pre-test Post-test Experimental Model, which is a sub-category of Experimental Models.

3.2. Subjects

In this research for the study group, two groups of 3rd grade students studying English Language Teaching were chosen. The first group and the second group were randomly selected in this study. There are 18 participants in the sampling group of this study. The first group of this research consists of eleven 3rd grade students from Turkey, Ankara, Gazi University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Program and the second group of this research consists of seven 3rd grade students from Portugal, Coimbra, Coimbra University, Faculty of Letters, Modern Languages Department.

3.3. Data Collection Instrument

For the design of data collection instrument, the literature was reviewed and it was seen that Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs) were mostly used as instruments to collect speech act data. As Hua (2011, pp. 401) explains:

A discourse completion task elicits discourse data from participants by asking them to note down what they would say or how they would react in a given situation. This technique is very often used in comparing how the same speech act is realized in different contexts.

In this research, a questionnaire was formed consisting of 2 parts in parallel with the research questions. The first part of the questionnaire consists of the questions about the students' gender, age, native language and the other languages known and to what level. The second part of the questionnaire is a DCT which was formed and used by Cohen and Olshtain (1981). The DCT, which is called 'Apology Instrument' was used by Cohen and Olshtain (1981) in their study. To use this instrument, a permission request was made and the e-mails regarding the permission to use it were given in the Appendices part. Apology Instrument consists of 8 different situations and the students were asked to respond to these 8 brief situations. They were asked to imagine that they were the one in the situation and write down what they would have said in each situation.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The data which were used in this study were collected through 2-section data collection instrument. The first part of the instrument is personal information section which consists of questions about gender, age, native language, and the other languages known and to what level. The second part of the instrument was Apology Instrument by Olshtain and Cohen, consisting of 8 brief situations. The data collection procedure was started with the Turkish EFL learners who were the 3rd graders in English Language Teaching Program (ELTP), Faculty of Education, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey. The pre-test was implemented with the 3rd grade students from Gazi University. They were asked to respond to 8 situations in Apology Instrument after filling the personal information part in the instrument. Then they received a task-based pragmatics teaching for 4 weeks, 1 hour each

week. The lesson plans for the 4-week-teaching are given in the Appendices part. After the teaching, they were given the same data collection instrument as the post-test. The same procedure was followed with the Portuguese EFL learners who were 3rd graders in Modern Languages Department, Faculty of Letters, Coimbra University, Coimbra, Portugal. At the end of the procedure, the data gathered from the two subject groups were analyzed with Content Analysis Technique. As Weber explains, “Content analysis is a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text” (1990, pp. 9). He also notes that:

A central idea in content analysis is that the many words of the text are classified into much fewer content categories. Each category may consist of one, several, or many words. Words, phrases, or other units of text classified in the same category are presumed to have similar meanings. Depending on the purposes of the investigator, this similarity may be based on the precise meaning of the words, or may be based on words sharing similar connotations (1990, pp. 12).

First, the analysis of personal information section was made for the Turkish subject group (TSG) with the aim of gaining more information about the subject group, then the Portuguese subject group (PSG). Second, the data gathered with pre-test and post-test from the Turkish subject group were compared and analyzed to see if there was any meaningful difference between them as a result of the 4-week-teaching. Third, the data gathered with pre-test and post-test from the Portuguese subject group were compared and analyzed to see if there was any meaningful difference between them as a result of the 4-week-teaching. Fourth, the data gathered with pre-test in the two subject groups were compared to each other to see the difference between two subject groups before 4-week pragmatics teaching. Finally, the data gathered with post-test in the two subject groups were compared to each other to see the difference between two subject groups after 4-week pragmatics teaching.

3.5. Teaching Implementation Processes

After reviewing the literature, it was seen that the activities that are strongly recommended to teach pragmatics were found to be the Task-based ones. In parallel with this, four task-based activities were written by the researcher. While designing and planning the activities,

an approach from basic to complex was adopted. The main aim of teaching pragmatics with a special focus on the speech act of apology through these activities was to create some awareness about the nature of apologies, and to find out the differences between the two subject groups, and to minimize these differences in the process of teaching. Since the emergence of English as lingua franca, this has become more of an issue because English is a medium for communication between interactants from different countries and cultures. Under the light of the information of culture having effects, like L1 negative and/or positive transfer, on the pragmatic use of language, diminishing these cultural differences on the use of apology gives the opportunity to diminish the miscommunication and misunderstandings as well.

Teaching implementation processes started with the TSG right after the pre-test implementation in the last month of the Fall Semester of the 2013-2014 Academic Year at Gazi University. As described in the Subjects section, the TSG was composed of 11 third graders who were studying English Language Teaching at the time of teaching. The teaching process took 30 minutes of class time each week and lasted for four weeks. The teaching was held by the researcher, and during the activities the instructor of the course was not present in the class. With the completion of teaching task-based activities, the students were asked to complete the post-test. The same process was followed for the PSG. The implementation process was given a start at the beginning of the Spring Semester of the 2013-2014 Academic Year at Coimbra University with seven 3rd grade students who were studying at the Modern Languages Department at the time of teaching. The only difference about the teaching process in TSG and the PSG was that the PSG instructor of the course was present in the class during the teaching process for all four activities and the pre-test, post-test completion processes. The design, planning and the implementation of the activities were the same for the TSG and the PSG. As for the role of the teacher in all these four activities, the teacher explained and introduced the activities, the aim of the activities, and their procedures, and guided and monitored them during the activities.

The first activity was designed with the aim of raising awareness about different levels of offense, and introducing different apology strategies differently. The activity time was 30 minutes and planned as a reasoning-gap activity which was explained in the literature review subsection

For this activity, six mini dialogues were written on cards and given out to the students who were asked to work in pairs beforehand. Each pair got one card to work on together. The pairs were asked to read the mini dialogues on their cards and to imagine a situation which would require such an apology and such a response to that apology. The main goal was to lead the students to think about the level of offense and create a situation accordingly. Of these six mini dialogs, two of them required a situation of low-level of offense, two of them showed medium-level of offense, and the other two were pointing out a situation of high-level of offense. These dialogs can be found in the Appendices section.

Each pair discussed the mini dialogues on their cards as a pair, and then stated their situation which they thought would be the most appropriate for the apologetic utterance and the response to it on their cards in front of the class. Group discussion was triggered after each pair's statement. The students discussed the level of appropriateness of their friends' situations according to the dialog given. Three levels of offense were introduced to the students during the discussion. Some significant differences appeared between the TSG and the PSG in terms of their perceptions about the levels of offense during discussions. For instance, the TSG had the tendency to regard the dialogs with the medium-level of offense as high-level of offense. On the contrary, the rendition of the PSG differed as they tended to regard the situations with medium-level of offense as low-level of offense. After the discussions, with a sum up of the levels of offense the first activity was completed.

The main aim of the second-week activity was to create awareness about the semantic formulas of the speech act of apology. A secondary goal of this activity was to identify the cultural effects on the interpretation of the semantic formulas and to diminish these differences. This activity was both information-gap and reasoning-gap activity taking 30 minutes of the class time.

The semantic formulas of the speech act of apology which was listed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983) were written on a big colored carton beforehand and tacked on the board by the researcher. The native example utterances for each strategy were written on strips of carton as well. The students were introduced the list of semantic formulas and they were asked to come to the board and write an example sentence to one of the strategies next to it. After the completion of this, each student was given a strip of carton with a native utterance on it and asked to tack it next to the strategy which they thought would correspond to. After the completion of matching, a group discussion was started on the

appropriateness of the matching, in accordance both with the native pattern and the semantic formulas. Through discussion, the students gained an insight into the speaker meaning besides the sentence meaning. After the completion of the activity, both the TSG and the PSG expressed that they had not thought about the conveyed message, like acknowledging the responsibility, or expressing regret, or requesting for forgiveness, while apologizing both in their L1 and their L2, so they found the activity quite useful, practical, and interesting.

The third activity which was taking 30 minutes of class time aimed to improve the students' competence to implement apology strategies appropriately and to be able to reflect on the others' responses. This activity was both an opinion-gap and reasoning-gap activity.

Students were asked to form pairs for the activity. Each pair was given four cards on which different apology requiring situations were written. Pairs were asked to respond to these situations in turns. The situations can be found in the Appendices section.

For instance, one of the pairs responded the Situation 1, and the other pair wrote a response to the Situation 2. After they completed responding to the situations, they changed their cards, and scored their partner's response according this scale:

1= acceptable

2= more or less acceptable

3= not acceptable

After the scoring, a whole group discussion was started. The students read their partners' responses and stated how they scored his/her partner's utterance and explained why they scored so to the class and the owner of the response explained why he/she chose to apologize that way, and the group discussion followed after. When the discussion on each pair's responding/scoring was completed, the second turn started with the Situation 3 and the Situation 4 following the same procedure. This activity gave the opportunity to compare the scorings of the TSG and the PSG. As a surprising result, in the TSG pairs scored their partner's response mostly "more or less acceptable"; however, in the PSG besides scoring "more or less acceptable", they mostly scored their partner's response as "acceptable". It was observed that there were two reasons to explain this situation, one of

which was that the TSG was not feeling confident in the use of appropriate apology strategy, so they scored “more or less acceptable” because the situation threatened their negative face and they avoided the situation. The second reason which was related to the first one was that the TSG avoided giving sincere apologies in order not to be judged by their partners; hence, they gave monotype responses in some situations. After the discussion, the activity was completed.

The last activity was designed in accordance with the goal of relating apology and showing its importance in a real life apology situation. By using an information-gap activity, it was aimed to create some curiosity and to provide the students with an opportunity to elicit the situation by using their former knowledge, so the activity turned out to be a reasoning activity which took the 30 minutes of the class time.

A dialog taken from the movie “Never Back Down” was written on the board, and the students were asked to guess the situation underlying this utterance.

A: I lied, the first class. I had every intention of fighting outside the gym.

B: Is this your apology?

The discussion in terms of the relationship type, status, level of offense, and the reasoning of the interactants was held as a whole group discussion. Towards the end of the discussion, a snapshot from the movie was presented and the discussion continued on the snapshot a little bit more. Then the video of this scene was provided, so the situation was made clear. On the basis of the video, the students were engaged in another kind of discussion, this time about the rights and wrongs of the apology used, then they explained how they would apologize at the same situation. A summary discussion of all the four activities, in terms of content, such as the effects and significance of the levels of offense, strategy choices, status differences, relationship types, age on the speech act of apology was done.

3.6. Data Analysis

In parallel with the research questions, the data analysis was done qualitatively and quantitatively. The first research question which is, “What are the frequencies of semantic formulas of apology used by Turkish and Portuguese learners of English in different situations? Do Turkish and Portuguese EFL students have differences in their uses of semantic formulas of apology?”, the answers of the students given to the apology instrument was analyzed with Content Analysis Technique and presented through tables. For the second research question, which seeks to find if there is any change in the use of speech act set of apologies by Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners after they are taught task-based pragmatics, a 4-week teaching was carried out and the data gathered from the pre-test of Turkish subject group were compared to the data gathered from their post-test. Also, the data gathered from the pre-test of Portuguese subject group were compared to the data gathered from their post-test through percentages using tables. In order to find an answer to the other research question, which is “Is there a culture effect on Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners’ learning and using apology? If there is, what are those cultural effects? “, the answers given to the second part of the questionnaire, which is a DCT were analyzed with Content Analysis Technique, which is one of the Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques and the data of post-test of Turkish subject group were compared with the data of post-test of Portuguese subject group.

In the data analysis process, the responses which were given by the participant students to the eight apology situations in the DCT were analyzed according to the semantic formulas of the apology speech act set. First, it was planned to use the strategies where the offender needs to apologize. There are five main formulas and seven sub-formulas in this category. The list is given below with example utterances as Olshtain and Cohen (1983) listed these formulas:

1. An expression of an apology
 - a. An expression of regret, e.g., “I’m sorry.”
 - b. An offer of apology, e.g., “I apologize.”
 - c. A request for forgiveness, e.g., “Excuse me.” “Please forgive me.” “Pardon me.”
2. An explanation or account of the situation

3. An acknowledgement of responsibility
 - a. Accepting the blame, e.g., “It is my fault.”
 - b. Expressing self-deficiency, e.g., “I was confused.” “I wasn’t thinking.” “I didn’t see you.”
 - c. Recognizing the person as deserving apology, e.g., “You are right.”
 - d. Expressing lack of intent, e.g., “I didn’t mean to.”
4. An offer of repair, e.g., “I’ll pay for the broken vase.” “I’ll help you get up.”
5. A promise of forbearance, e.g., “It won’t happen again.”

Then, in the coding process it was seen that the students did not feel the need to apologize in some situations, so the other formulas where the offender does not feel the need to apologize, does not take the responsibility, or rejects it were added to the coding system. These formulas consist of two main formulas and two sub-formulas as listed and given example utterances by Olshtain and Cohen (1983),

1. A denial of the need to apologize, e.g., “There was no need for you to get insulted.”
2. A denial of responsibility
 - a. Not accepting the blame, e.g., “It wasn’t my fault.”
 - b. Blaming the other participant for bringing the offense upon him/herself, e.g., “It’s your own fault.”

These coding categories were used to analyze and code the students’ responses to the DCT. Two independent coders, one of which was the researcher of this study coded all the responses according to these formulas. As for the intercoder reliability, the agreement between these coders’ rendition was examined according to a formula by Miles and Huberman (1994):

$$\text{Reliability} = \frac{\text{number of agreements}}{\text{total number of agreements} + \text{disagreements}}$$

As Miles and Huberman (1994) state,

Each coder will have preferences and each vision is usually legitimate, especially for inferential codes. Clarifying these differences is also useful; each analyst tends to be more ecumenical during later coding for having assimilated a colleague's rival vision of data that initially looked codable in only one way. ... something closer to 80% than was the case for between-coder agreements (pp. 64).

A brief training session on semantic formulas of the apology speech act set was carried out with the second coder, and the coding system was explained, so the second coder was fully informed before the coding process. The formula given above was implemented to the results of these two coding. 39 disagreements (the ones whose agreement percent was under 70%) were detected after the intercoder reliability study. At these problematic points, the views of a third and a fourth coder were taken and they compromised on them. Then, the formula was implemented to the coding results for the second time. The agreement between coders was found to be over 75% in all the cases. The final results of the intercoder reliability study are given in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4 in percentage terms.

The semantic formulas of the apology speech act set are coded and used as codes rather than the full forms, and the explanation of coding is given below,

1. An expression of an apology (APOL)
 - a. An expression of regret (REGR)
 - b. An offer of apology (OFFE)
 - c. A request for forgiveness (FORGI)
2. An explanation or account of the situation (EXPL)
3. An acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP)
 - a. Accepting the blame (BLAM)
 - b. Expressing self-deficiency (DEFI)
 - c. Recognizing the person as deserving apology (DESE)
 - d. Expressing lack of intent (INTE)
4. An offer of repair (REPR)
5. A promise of forbearance (FORB)

Table 1: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Pre-test of the TSG

Semantic Formulas	Situation 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
REGR	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
OFFE	100	-	-	-	100	-	-	-
FORGI	-	-	100	-	100	100	100	100
EXPL	-	100	100	100	-	-	-	-
BLAM	-	100	100	-	85	100	-	-
DEFI	-	100	100	100	100	100	100	-
DESE	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-
INTE	100	-	-	-	-	100	100	100
REPR	-	100	100	100	80	100	-	-
FORB	-	100	100	100	-	-	-	-

Table 1 gives the results of intercoder reliability study on the Pre-test responses of the Turkish subject group to eight situations in the DCT. Four disagreements were detected between the coders' rendition in this section. After the views of other coders were taken, a full agreement was reached on coding. In Situation 2, the percent of agreements on two strategies which were EXPL and DEFI were 66% and 16% respectively, and 100% agreement was reached for both of them. In Situation 3, the agreement on the semantic formula of DEFI was 22%, and it turned to 100% agreement. In Situation 4, there was no agreement (0%) on DEFI, and 100% agreement was reached after the revision.

Table 2: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Post-test of the TSG

Semantic Formulas	Situation 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
REGR	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
OFFE	100	-	-	-	-	100	-	-
FORGI	-	100	100	-	-	-	100	100
EXPL	75	100	100	83	-	-	-	100
BLAM	100	100	-	100	100	100	100	-
DEFI	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	-
DESE	-	-	-	100	100	-	-	-
INTE	100	-	-	-	100	100	100	100
REPR	-	100	100	87	100	87	100	-
FORB	-	100	100	100	-	-	-	-

Table 2 presents the results of intercoder reliability study on the Post-test responses of the Turkish subject group to eight apologetic situations in the DCT. Five disagreements were found between the coding of first and the second coders. After the revision of third and the fourth coders on these disagreements, in Situation 1, the agreement percentages of EXPL and INTE turned to 75%, and 100% from 0%, and 70% respectively. In Situation 2, the agreement on BLAM turned to 100% from 50% and there was a total disagreement on INTE (0%), depending on the tendency of all the coders, it was concluded that this semantic formula was not used, so it was omitted. In Situation 8, the agreement on the semantic formula of EXPL was 0%, and it turned out to be a full agreement.

Table 3: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Pre-test of the PSG

Semantic Formulas	Situation 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
REGR	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
OFFE	100	100	-	-	100	100	-	-
FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EXPL	80	100	100	100	-	-	-	100
BLAM	-	100	100	-	100	-	-	-
DEFI	-	-	100	-	100	100	100	100
DESE	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-
INTE	100	-	-	100	-	100	100	100
REPR	-	100	75	100	83	100	-	100
FORB	-	100	-	100	-	-	-	-

Table 3 gives the results of intercoder reliability study on the Pre-test responses of the Portuguese subject group to eight situations in the DCT. Fifteen disagreements which were below 70% were detected and improved according to the tendency of all the coders in these problematic points. In Situation 1, the semantic formula of FORGI and REPR were omitted, and EXPL turned to 80% from 40%. In Situation 2, the semantic formulas INTE and DEFI were omitted, and OFFE, REPR, and FORB all turned to 100% agreement from 50%, 66%, and 66% respectively. In Situation 3, the agreement on EXPL turned to a full agreement from 50%. In Situation 4, 66% agreement on EXPL turned to 100%. In Situation 5, the agreement percent on DEFI turned to 100% from 66%, and INTE was

omitted. In Situation 8, three disagreements which were on EXPL, DEFI, and INTE all turned to 100% agreement from 0%, 66%, 50% respectively.

Table 4: Intercoder Reliability Results of the Post-test of the PSG

Semantic Formulas	Situation 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
REGR	100	100	87	100	100	100	100	87
OFFE	100	100	-	-	-	100	100	-
FORGI	-	100	100	-	-	-	-	-
EXPL	100	100	100	100	-	-	100	100
BLAM	-	100	100	100	75	100	-	-
DEFI	-	100	-	-	75	100	100	100
DESE	100	-	-	100	-	-	-	-
INTE	100	-	-	-	100	-	100	-
REPR	-	100	100	77	100	100	100	100
FORB	-	100	100	100	-	-	-	-

Table 4 presents the results of intercoder reliability study on the Post-test responses on Portuguese subject group to eight apologetic situations in the DCT. Fifteen disagreements were found between the coding of the first and the second coder, and improved depending on the tendency of all the four coders. In Situation 1, the agreement percent on EXPL and DESE both turned to 100% from 37% and 0% respectively. In Situation 2, the semantic formula INTE was omitted, and OFFE and BLAM both turned to a full agreement from 50% and 33% respectively. In Situation 3, OFFE was omitted, and the disagreement on BLAM and FORB both turned to a full agreement from 33% and 66% respectively. In Situation 4, it was decided to omit the semantic formula of DEFI. In Situation 6, a full disagreement on the semantic formula of BLAM and DEFI both turned to a full agreement. In Situation 7, the 0% agreement on the semantic formula EXPL turned to 100% agreement. In Situation 8, the agreement percentages on EXPL and DEFI both turned to 100% from 0% and 66% respectively, and INTE was omitted.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Presentation

In this chapter, the analysis of the research is provided. As the questionnaire which is used in the study has two sections consisting of personal information section and a DCT, this chapter begins with the results of personal information section in order to get a better understanding of the two subject groups. The analysis of Turkish subject group are given first, then the analysis of Portuguese subject group are presented through tables in the analysis of the personal information part.

In the second part of this chapter, the results of DCT are presented through in-depth analysis. In order to find an answer to the second research question, firstly the data gathered from the pre-test of Turkish subject group were analyzed with content analysis technique and presented with example responses given to DCT by participants. Then, the data collected from the post-test of the same subject group were analyzed and presented with example statements. The comparison of the results of this subject group's pre-test and post-test followed. The same process was applied to the Portuguese subject group while presenting the results beginning with the results of pre-test, then the post-test, lastly the comparison of these two. In order to find an answer to the third and the fourth research questions, this chapter continues with the comparison of pre-tests and then the post-tests of the two subject groups.

4.2. Analysis of the Personal Information Part

In this section, results are compiled under separate titles depending on which subject group they belong to. The results of Turkish subject group are presented first, then the results of Portuguese subject group are given. In order to gain a better understanding about the nature of the subject groups, the results of the personal information part were analyzed. As

both of the subject groups are small groups, the results are presented through percentages, but mostly in frequencies through tables.

4.2.1. Turkish Subject Group

Turkish subject group consisted of 11 participants in total. When we look at the subject group in terms of gender, it is seen that eight of them were female and three of them were male. Looking at the percentages, it is clearly seen that the majority of Turkish subject group was female (72.7 %).

Table 5: Gender

Gender	Number	Percentage
Female	8	72.7 %
Male	3	27.3 %
<i>Total</i>	11	100 %

In the Table 6, when we look at the ages of the participants in this subject group, we see that they are mostly in the age group of 18-21 and one in the age group of 22-25. The ages of the participants range from 20 to 22. The age of the youngest of the group was 20 and the oldest was 22, giving an average age of 20,7.

Table 6: Age

Age	Number
18-21	10
22-25	1
26-30	-
Over 30	-
<i>Total</i>	11

Table 7 presents the analysis of participants' language status in terms of being either monolingual or bilingual. It is seen that all of the participants in this subject group are monolingual which makes this subject group different from Portuguese subject group in this sense.

Table 7: Language Status

Language Status	Language Name(s) (Number of Students)
Monolingual	Turkish (11)
	Total: 11
Bilingual	
	Total: -
	General Total: 11

Table 8 gives the results of languages known other than the native languages of the participants and their proficiency levels. All the participants are coded like TS1 (Turkish Subject 1), TS2, and this coding is used in the in-depth analysis. TS1 says that he/she knows B2 level of English and A1 level of German. TS2 writes that he/she knows English

at B2 level and Russian without informing us about its proficiency level. TS3 knows only one more language other than his/her native language (English at B2 level). TS4, TS7, and TS8 know the same two languages which are English and German whose proficiency levels are B2 and A1 respectively. TS5 says that he/she knows English at B2 level. TS6, TS9, TS10, and TS11 say that they all know the same two languages at the same proficiency level which are English and French whose proficiency levels are B2 and A1 respectively. It is seen that the participants in this subject group know mostly two languages with the average of 1.8 languages. Mostly known languages are German (four of the participants) and French (four of the participants) apart from English. Additionally, it can be seen that they all know these two languages at the basic level which is A1.

Table 8: Other Language(s) Known

Subjects /	Language(s)	Levels				Total Number of Language(s)
		A1	A 2	B 1	B2	
TS 1	English				✓	2
	Spanish					
	German	✓				
	French					
	Russian					
	Portuguese					
TS 2	English				✓	2
	Spanish					
	German					
	French					
	Russian	✓				
	Portuguese					
TS 3	English				✓	1
	Spanish					
	German					
	French					
	Russian					
	Portuguese					
TS 4	English				✓	2
	Spanish					
	German	✓				
	French					
	Russian					
	Portuguese					
TS 5	English				✓	1

	Spanish		
	German		
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
TS 6	English	✓	2
	Spanish		
	German		
	French	✓	
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
TS 7	English	✓	2
	Spanish		
	German	✓	
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
TS 8	English	✓	2
	Spanish		
	German	✓	
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
TS 9	English	✓	2
	Spanish		
	German		
	French	✓	
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
TS 10	English	✓	2
	Spanish		
	German		
	French	✓	
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
TS 11	English	✓	2
	Spanish		
	German		
	French	✓	
	Russian		
	Portuguese		

4.2.2. Portuguese Subject Group

There were 7 participants in the Portuguese subject group in total. When we look at the Table 9 which analyses the subject group in terms of gender, we see that five of them were female and two of them were male. When we examine the percentages, it is clearly seen that the majority of Portuguese subject group was female (71.4 %). When we compare the percentages of Turkish subject group and Portuguese subject group, which are 72.7 and 71.4 percent female dominated respectively, we can say that the groups are alike in terms of gender distribution.

Table 9: Gender

Gender	Number	Percentage
Female	5	71.4 %
Male	2	28.6 %
<i>Total</i>	7	100 %

In the Table 10, we see the age distribution of the participants in this subject group. When we look at the numbers, we see that they are mostly in the age group of 22-25 and one in the age group of over 30. The ages of the participants range from 22 to 38. The age of the youngest of the group was 22 and the oldest was 38, giving an average age of 25.4. When we compare the age average of TSG and PSG, which are 20.7 and 25.4 respectively, it can be noticed that these two groups differ in terms of age average which is higher in PSG.

Table 10: Age

Age	Number
18-21	-
22-25	6
26-30	-
Over 30	1
Total	7

Table 11 gives the results of the analysis of participants' language status in terms of being either monolingual or bilingual. Contrary to TSG whose participants are all monolingual, it is seen there are six monolinguals, five of whose native language is Portuguese and one is German, and there is one participant who is bilingual in Portuguese and English. When we compare PSG with TSG in terms of both being monolingual and being bilingual, these two groups differ them both from each other. Most of the participants are monolingual in PSG like the ones in TSG, but there is a little variety in the native languages in PSG because there is one participant whose native language is German in PSG while all the participants' native language is Turkish in TSG. Additionally, while there is no bilingual participant in TSG, there is one participant in PSG who is bilingual in Portuguese and English.

Table 11: Language Status

Language Status	Language Name(s) (Number of Students)
Monolingual	Portuguese (5) German (1) Total: 6
Bilingual	Portuguese, English (1) Total: 1
General Total: 7	

Table 12 gives the results of languages known by Portuguese participants other than their native languages and their proficiency levels at these languages. All the participants are coded like PS1 (Portuguese Subject 1), PS2, and so on, and this coding is used in the in-depth analysis. PS1 says that he/she knows B2 level of English and Spanish and B1 level of German. PS2 who is bilingual writes that he/she knows Spanish, German, and French without noting down their proficiency levels. PS3 knows three languages which are English (C2 level), Spanish (A2 level), and French (B2 level). PS4 says that he/she knows English at C1 level and Spanish at B2 level of proficiency. Like PS4, PS5 knows two languages which are English and Portuguese both of whose proficiency level is C1. PS6 says that he/she knows English at B2 level and Spanish at the same level. PS7 writes down that he/she knows English and Spanish without giving any information about their proficiency levels. According to the results, it can be seen that the participants in this subject group know mostly two or three languages with the average of 2.4 languages. When we compare the results of languages known in TSG and in PSG, which are average 1.8 and 2.4 languages respectively, we see that the average of the languages known is higher in PSG. Additionally, there is another difference in these two subject groups in terms of the proficiency levels of the languages known because while the participants in TSG know the languages, other than English, at the basic level, the participants in PSG know the languages, other than English, at higher levels of proficiency like B1, B2, or C1. Mostly known languages by the participants in PSG are Spanish (six of the participants), French (two of the participants), and German (two of the participants) apart from English.

Table 12: Other Language(s) Known

Subjects / Language(s)	Levels				Total Number of Language(s)
	A1	A 2	B 1	B2	
PS 1	English			✓	3
	Spanish			✓	
	German		✓		
	French				
	Russian				
	Portuguese				
PS 2	English				3
	Spanish ✓				
	German ✓				
	French ✓				

	Russian		
	Portuguese		
PS 3	English	✓(C2)	3
	Spanish	✓	
	German		
	French	✓	
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
PS 4	English	✓(C1)	2
	Spanish	✓	
	German		
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
PS 5	English	✓(C1)	2
	Spanish		
	German		
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese	✓(C1)	
PS 6	English	✓	2
	Spanish	✓	
	German		
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese		
PS 7	English✓		2
	Spanish✓		
	German		
	French		
	Russian		
	Portuguese		

4.3. Discourse Completion Task Results

In this section, the results of the DCT gathered from the pre-tests and the post-tests of TSG and PSG are presented through frequencies and percentages. As there were eight situations in the DCT, the responses of the participants to the situations in the DCT were analyzed in a situation-based manner and the results were presented in a situation-based manner as well. In each subsection, the utterances of the participants which were taken from the DCT

without any interference in terms of grammar, spelling, or any other mistakes were given as examples with the intention to illustrate the results. The aforesaid list of semantic formulas by Olshtain and Cohen (1983), which consisted of five main formulas and seven sub-formulas were used while coding the utterances of the participants. In addition to that, two semantic formulas which are preferred when the culpable person denies the responsibility, or rejects to apologize, or does not feel the need for an apology were used in the analysis, and presented separately from the main five strategies. The descriptions and the codes of the semantic formulas of the apology speech act set are given below with example native utterances:

1. An expression of an apology (APOL)
 - a. An expression of regret (REGR), e.g., “I’m sorry.”
 - b. An offer of apology (OFFE), e.g., “I apologize.”
 - c. A request for forgiveness (FORGI), e.g., “Excuse me.” “Please forgive me.”
“Pardon me.”
2. An explanation or account of the situation (EXPL)
3. An acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP)
 - a. Accepting the blame (BLAM), e.g., “It is my fault.”
 - b. Expressing self-deficiency (DEFI), e.g., “I was confused.” “I wasn’t thinking.” “I didn’t see you.”
 - c. Recognizing the person as deserving apology (DESE), e.g., “You are right.”
 - d. Expressing lack of intent (INTE), e.g., “I didn’t mean to.”
4. An offer of repair (REPR), e.g., “I’ll pay for the broken vase.” “I’ll help you get up.”
5. A promise of forbearance (FORB), e.g., “It won’t happen again.”

1. A denial of the need to apologize, e.g., “There was no need for you to get insulted.”

2. A denial of responsibility
 - a. Not accepting the blame, e.g., “It wasn’t my fault.”
 - b. Blaming the other participant for bringing the offense upon him/herself, e.g., “It’s your own fault.”

4.3.1. Results of Pre-test of the Turkish Subject Group

There were eleven participants in the TSG, and their responses to the situations in the DCT in pre-test were examined in order to find out their current status in terms of their choices of semantic formulas, and the results are presented through frequencies and percentages for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the frequencies and percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas –APOL and RESP- were included. The total frequencies and the percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- can be seen in the tables.

Table 13 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in situation 1.

Situation 1: You’re at a meeting and you say something that one of the participants interprets as a personal insult to him/her.

S/he: “I feel that your last remark was directed at me and I take offense.”

Table 13: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 1	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S			
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	8	%44
	REGR	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	7	%39
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%5
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												10	%56
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	10	%56
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	0	18	%100

Table 13 demonstrates that three semantic formulas were used by the TSG in Situation 1, and the most frequent strategy (56%) is expressing lack of intent (INTE) which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility. An expression of an apology (APOL) follows it which consists of 44% of all the strategies used in Situation 1. The sub-formulas of APOL which are expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) comprise this 44% with the use of 39% and %5 respectively.

Table 14 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 2.

Situation 2: You completely forget a crucial meeting at the office with your boss. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting. Your boss gets on the line and asks:

Boss: “What happened to you?”

Table 14: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 2	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10		
	(APOL)											11	%40
	REGR	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	11	%40
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	8	%29
	(RESP)											3	%10
	BLAM	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%3
	DEFI	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	%7
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	%7
	(FORB)	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	4	%14
Total		3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	28	%100

As Table 14 illustrates, six semantic formulas were used by the TSG in Situation 2, and the most frequent strategy (40%) is expression of regret (REGR) which is a sub-formula of an expression of apology (APOL). An explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) follows it with the use of 29%. The third most frequent semantic formula is a promise of forbearance (FORBE) with 14%. And the least frequent strategies are found to be an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) (10%) which is comprised of 3% use of BLAM and 7% use of DEFI, and an offer of repair with use of 7% of all the strategies used by TSG in Situation 2.

Table 15 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 3.

Situation 3: You forget a get-together with a friend. You call him to apologize. This is already the second time you've forgotten such a meeting. Your friend asks over the phone:

Friend: "What happened?"

Table 15: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 3	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)												11	%37
	REGR	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	1	10	%34
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%3
	(EXPL)	1	1	1	1	2	1	-	2	1	2	-	12	%40
	(RESP)												4	%13
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%3
	DEFI	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	3	%10
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	%7
	(FORB)	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%3
Total		2	1	2	4	3	3	2	4	3	4	2	30	%100

Table 15 shows that six semantic formulas were used by the TSG in Situation 3, and the most frequent strategies are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) (40%) and an expression of an apology (APOL) (37%) which is comprised of REGR (34%) and FORGI (3%). An acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) follows them with 13% which is comprised of BLAM (3%) and DEFI (10%). The least frequent used strategies in all these six strategies are an offer of repair (REPR) and a promise of forbearance (FORBE) with the use of 7% and 3% respectively.

Table 16 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 4.

Situation 4: You call from work to find out how things are at home and your kid reminds you that you forgot to take him shopping, as you had promised. And this is the second time that this has happened. Your kid says over the phone:

Kid: “Oh, you forgot again and you promised!”

Table 16: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 4	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)												7	%32
	REGR	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	7	%32
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	3	%14
	(RESP)												1	%4
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%4
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	8	%36
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	3	%14
Total		0	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	22	%100

Table 16 demonstrates that five semantic formulas were used by the TSG in Situation 4. The most commonly used strategies by the Turkish participants in this item of DCT are an offer of repair (REPR) (36%) and expression of regret (REGR) (32%) which is a sub-formula of an expression of apology (APOL). They are followed by an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and a promise of forbearance (FORBE) with the same

percentage (14%) of usage. The least frequent used semantic formula in this item is expressing self deficiency (DEFI) with 4% which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP).

Table 17 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 5.

Situation 5:Backing out of a parking place, you run into the side of another car. It was clearly your fault. You dent in the side doors slightly. The driver gets out and comes over to you angrily.

Driver: “Can’t you look where you’re going? See what you’ve done?”

Table 17: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 5	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)												9	%31
	REGR	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	7	%25
	OFFE	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%3
	FORGI	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%3
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												14	%51
	BLAM	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	7	%25
	DEFI	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	%18
	DESE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	%8
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	5	%18
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	28	%100

As it can be seen in Table 17, seven semantic formulas were used by the TSG in Situation 5. The most commonly used strategy by the Turkish participants in this item of DCT is an

acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with the percentage of 51% in all the strategies used in this situation which is made up of accepting the blame (BLAM), expressing self-deficiency (DEFI), and recognizing the other person as deserving apology (DESE) which comprise 51% with the use of 25%, 18%, and 8% respectively. The second most frequent semantic formula is an expression of an apology (APOL) with the use of 31% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) (25%), an offer of repair (OFFE) (3%), and a request for forgiveness (FORGI) (3%). The least frequent used main semantic formula in this item of DCT is an offer of repair (REPR) with the use of 18% in all the formulas used in this situation by TSG.

Table 18 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 6.

Situation 6: You accidentally bump into a well-dressed elderly lady at an elegant department store, causing her to spill her packages all over the floor. You hurt her leg, too. It's clearly your fault and you want to apologize profusely.

She: "Ow! My goodness!"

Table 18: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 6	Semantic Formula	Frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S			
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	16	%62
	REGR	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	9	%35
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	7	%27
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												4	%15
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	DEFI	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	%7
	(REPR)	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	6	%23
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	26	%100

Table 18 shows that six semantic formulas were used by the TSG in Situation 6. The most frequent strategy used by the Turkish participants in this item of DCT is an expression of apology (APOL) by far percentage of 62% which consists of REGR and FORGI with the percentage of 35% and 27% respectively. The second most commonly used semantic formula is REPR with 23% use of all the strategies used in this item. The least frequent semantic formula is RESP with the use of 15% which is comprised of BLAM, DEFI, and INTE whose percentages are 4%, 4%, and 7% respectively.

Table 19 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 7.

Situation 7: You bump into a well-dressed elderly lady at a department store, shaking her up a bit. It's your fault, and you want to apologize.

She: "Hey, look out!"

Table 19: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 7	Semantic Formula	Frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S			
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	%81
	REGR	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	9	%56
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	4	%25
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												3	%19
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%6
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	%13
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	16	%100

As it is clear in Table 19, four semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 7. The most frequent semantic formula used by the Turkish participants in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with a percentage of 81%, in which REGR and FORGI have the percentages of 56% and 25% respectively. The second most commonly used semantic formula is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 19% use of all the strategies used in this item which is comprised of DEFI and INTE whose percentages are 6% and 13% respectively.

Table 20 presents pre-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 8.

Situation 8: You bump into an elderly lady at a department store. You hardly could have avoided doing so because she was blocking the way. Still, you feel that some kind of apology is in order.

She: "Oh, my!"

Table 20: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Pre-test of the TSG

Situa. 8	Semantic Formula	Frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S			
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	11	%92
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	8	%67
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	3	%25
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												1	%8
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	%8
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	12	%100

As it is seen in Table 20, three semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 8. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with a percentage of 92% which is realized by two sub-formulas: REGR and FORGI with the percentage of 67% and 25% respectively. The second most commonly used semantic formula is expressing lack of intent (INTE) with 8% use of all the strategies used in this item which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP).

In addition to the situations where the culpable person acknowledges his fault and delivers an apology using one or more of the ten aforesaid semantic formulas, in the analysis some situations where the culpable person denies the responsibility, or rejects to apologize, or does not feel the need for an apology were detected. They used the two denial strategies and some other ways to avoid an apology. Here are these situations,

TS1 preferred to use a kind of ‘white lie’ to escape from the situation and to avoid an apology in Situation 4.

TS1: No baby. I didn’t forget it. I’m on my way and I’m coming to home.

TS4 avoided the responsibility and used the strategy of ‘blaming the other participant for bringing the offense upon him/herself’ in Situation 1.

TS4: I didn’t intend so, **you understood me wrong.**

TS6 used off-record politeness and denied the responsibility in that way in Situation 8.

TS6: Pardon me. **I cannot pass.**

TS9 used avoidance of responsibility in two different situations which were Situation 1 and 5. In Situation 1, TS9 used the denial strategy of ‘blaming the other participant for bringing the offense upon him/herself’ and in Situation 5, used the denial strategy of ‘a denial of the need to apologize’.

TS9: Sorry. **You understood me wrongly.** I didn’t mean it so. Accept my apologies. (Situation 1)

TS9: Sorry. I couldn’t see. **Such a thing can be always.** We can solve this problem together. (Situation 5)

TS11 escaped from the situation with avoidance of an apology using the strategy of ‘not accepting the blame’ in Situation 1.

TS11: **I know what I say.**

4.3.2. Results of Post-test of the Turkish Subject Group

There were eleven participants in the TSG, and their responses to the situations in the DCT in post-test were examined in terms of their choices of semantic formulas, and the results are presented through frequencies and percentages for each situation in the DCT. The main

formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the frequencies and percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas – APOL and RESP- were included. The total frequencies and the percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- can be seen in the tables.

Table 21 presents post-test results of the TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 1.

Table 21: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 1	Semantic Formula	Frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			9	%43
	REGR	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	%38
	OFFE	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%5
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	%19
	(RESP)												8	%38
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%5
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	7	%33
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	21	%100

Table 21 above shows that five semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 1. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 43% which is comprised of REGR and OFFE with the percentage of 38% and 5% respectively. The second most commonly used semantic formula is an

acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 38% which is comprised of BLAM and INTE whose percentages are 5% and 33% respectively. The least frequent semantic formula is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with the use of 19% of all the strategies used in this item.

Table 22 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 2.

Table 22: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 2	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)												13	%45
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	12	%41
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	(EXPL)	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	%10
	(RESP)												2	%7
	BLAM	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	%7
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	%10
	(FORB)	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	8	%28
Total		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	29	%100

As shown in Table 22, six semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 2. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 45% which is comprised of REGR and FORGI with the percentage of 41% and 4% respectively. The second most commonly used semantic formula is a promise of forbearance (FORB) with 28%. The third most commonly used semantic formulas are an

explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and an offer of repair (REPR) with the same percentage which is 10%. And the least frequent semantic formula is accepting the blame (BLAM) with 7% which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility.

Table 23 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 3.

Table 23: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 3	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)												11	%46
	REGR	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	9	%38
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	%8
	(EXPL)	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	5	%21
	(RESP)												-	-
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	6	%25
	(FORB)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	%8
Total		3	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	3	2	24	%100

As can be seen from Table 23, five semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 3. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 46% which is comprised of REGR and FORGI with the percentage of 38% and 8% respectively. The second most commonly used semantic formula is an offer of repair (REPR) with 25%, and the third most frequent strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 21% use of all the strategies used in this item. The

least frequent strategy is a promise of forbearance (FORB) with 8%. It is seen that none of the sub-formulas of an acknowledgement of responsibility were used in this item of DCT in the post-test by the TSG.

Table 24 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 4.

Table 24: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 4	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			8	%29
	REGR	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	8	%29
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	%18
	(RESP)												2	%6
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%3
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%3
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	8	%29
	(FORB)	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	5	%18
Total		4	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	3	3	28	%100

As we can see in Table 24, six semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 4. The most frequent semantic formulas in this item of DCT are an expression of an apology (APOL) and an offer of repair (REPR) with the same percentage of 29%. Expression of regret (REGR) which is a sub-formula of APOL comprises this 29%. The second most commonly used strategies are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and a promise of forbearance (FORB) with the same percentage of 18%. The least

frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 6% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and recognizing the other person as deserving apology (DESE) whose percentages are 3% separately.

Table 25 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 5.

Table 25: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 5	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			10	%37
	REGR	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	%37
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												8	%30
	BLAM	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	5	%18
	DEFI	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%4
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	(REPR)	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	9	%33
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	27	%100

As it is seen in Table 25, six semantic formulas whose percentages are so close to each other were used by the TSG in Situation 5. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is expression of regret (REGR) with 37% which is a sub-formula of an expression of apology (APOL). The second most commonly used strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 33% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT. The third most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 30% which is comprised of

accepting the blame (BLAM) whose percentage is 18% and expressing self-deficiency (DEFI), recognizing the other person as deserving apology (DESE), and expressing lack of intent (INTE) that all have the same percentage of 4%.

Table 26 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 6.

Table 26: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 6	Semantic Formula	frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			11	%46
	REGR	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	%42
	OFFE	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												5	%20
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	%8
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	%8
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	%4
	(REPR)	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	8	%34
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		1	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	24	%100

As it is apparent in Table 26, six semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 6. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of apology (APOL) with 46% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 42% and 4% respectively. The second most commonly used strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 34% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT. The third most frequent strategy is an

acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 20% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) whose percentages are the same (8%) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentage is 4%. It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used by the TSG in this item of DCT.

Table 27 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 7.

Table 27: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 7	Semantic Formula	Frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S	T S			TS 10
	(APOL)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			11	%72
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	9	%59
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	%13
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)												3	%21
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%7
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%7
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	%7
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%7
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	15	%100

As it can be seen clearly in Table 27, six semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 7. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of apology (APOL) with by far percentage of 72% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and a request for forgiveness (FORGI) whose percentages are 59% and 13%

respectively. The second most commonly used strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 21% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM), expressing self-deficiency (DEFI), and expressing lack of intent (INTE) which all have the equal percentage of 7%. The least frequent strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 7%. It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used by the TSG in this item of DCT.

Table 28 presents post-test results of TSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 8.

Table 28: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Post-test of the TSG

Situa. 8	Semantic Formula	Frequencies										Total Freq.	%	
		T S 1	T S 2	T S 3	T S 4	T S 5	T S 6	T S 7	T S 8	T S 9	TS 10			TS 11
	(APOL)											10	%67	
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	9	%60
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%7
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	4	%26
	(RESP)												1	%7
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%7
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	15	%100

Table 28 shows, four semantic formulas in total were used by the TSG in Situation 8. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of apology (APOL) with by far percentage of 67% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and a

request for forgiveness (FORGI) whose percentages are 60% and 7% respectively. The second most commonly used strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 26% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT. The least frequent strategy is expressing lack of intent (INTE) with 7%. It is seen that the semantic formulas of an offer of repair (REPR) and a promise of forbearance (FORB) were not used by the TSG in this item of DCT.

In addition to the situations where the culpable person acknowledges his fault and delivers an apology using one or more of the ten aforesaid semantic formulas, in the analysis some situations where the culpable person denies the responsibility, or rejects to apologize, or does not feel the need for an apology were detected. They used the two denial strategies and some other ways to avoid an apology. When compared to their pre-test responses, it is seen that they used less denial strategies in the post-test. Here are these situations,

TS2 used a denial strategy which was ‘a denial of the need to apologize’ in Situation 1.

TS2: I didn’t mean it, **so you shouldn’t.**

TS4 avoided an apology using the strategy of ‘blaming the other participant for bringing the offense upon him/herself’ in Situation 1.

TS4: I didn’t mean so. **You are wrong.**

TS8 escaped from the apologetic situation using the denial strategy of ‘a denial of the need to apologize’ in Situation 4.

TS8: **No, I didn’t forget it.** I will come late so I think that we can go tomorrow.

4.3.3. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of the Turkish Subject Group

There were eleven participants in the TSG, and their responses to the situations in the DCT in the pre-test and the post-test were examined in terms of their choices of semantic formulas, and the results are presented comparatively in percentage terms for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the percentages, the main formulas which do

not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas –APOL and RESP- were included. The total percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- which are formed of their sub-formulas’ percentages can be seen in the table. While calculating the number of strategies used in each situation, the same principle was adopted. In other words, if the main formula had sub-formulas, sub-formulas were counted; however, if the main formula did not have any sub-formulas, the main formula was counted.

Table 29: A Comparison of the Strategy Use Of the TSG in the Pre-test and the Post-test (in percentages)

Semantic Formulas	Pre-test % / Post-test %							
	Situa. 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
(APOL)	44/43	40/45	37/46	32/29	31/37	62/46	81/72	92/67
REGR	39/38	40/41	34/38	32/29	25/37	35/42	56/59	67/60
OFFE	5/5	-/-	-/-	-/-	3/-	-/4	-/-	-/-
FORGI	-/-	-/4	3/8	-/-	3/-	27/-	25/13	25/7
(EXPL)	-/19	29/10	40/21	14/18	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/26
(RESP)	56/38	10/7	13/-	4/6	51/30	15/20	19/21	8/7
BLAM	-/5	3/7	3/-	-/3	25/18	4/8	-/7	-/-
DEFI	-/-	7/-	10/-	4/-	18/4	4/8	6/7	-/-
DESE	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/3	8/4	-/-	-/-	-/-
INTE	56/33	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/4	7/4	13/7	8/7
(REPR)	-/-	7/10	7/25	36/29	18/33	23/34	-/7	-/-
(FORB)	-/-	14/28	3/8	14/18	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-

As compared in Table 29, while the variety of the semantic formulas used by TSG in pre-test was limited to three semantic formulas in Situation 1, in the post-test it is seen that they used five different semantic formulas. In Situation 2, while the variety of semantic formulas used remained the same, the distribution of them showed difference. In the post-test, they used more promise of forbearance, and less explanation or account of the situation. In addition to that, unlike the pre-test, they started to use semantic formula of a request for forgiveness, and did not use the semantic formula of expressing self-deficiency. In Situation 3, while they used seven different semantic formulas in the pre-test, they used only five strategies in the post-test. For the same situation, in the post-test they used more strategies of an expression of an apology, and an offer of repair, and less of an explanation

or account of the situation. In Situation 4, the variety of semantic formulas turned to six from five. Unlike the pre-test, they started to use the semantic formulas of accepting the blame and recognizing the other person as deserving apology, and did not use the strategy of expressing self-deficiency. In the post-test, they used more a promise of forbearance and an explanation or account of the situation, and less an offer of repair and expression of regret. In Situation 5, while they used seven semantic formulas in the pre-test, they used six formulas in the post-test.

Unlike the pre-test, they used expressing lack of intent and did not use the strategies an offer of apology and a request for forgiveness. They used more expression of regret and an offer of repair and less an acknowledgement of responsibility in the post-test. In Situation 6, the variety of the semantic formulas used in the pre-test and post-test stayed the same but the distribution of them showed difference. Unlike the pre-test, they used an offer of apology and did not use a request for forgiveness. While they used more of acknowledgement of responsibility and offer of repair in the post-test, they used less of expression of an apology in the post-test again. In Situation 7, the strategies used varied, and rose to six from four. Unlike the pre-test, they used the strategies of accepting the blame and an offer of repair. In addition to that, they used more an acknowledgement of responsibility and less of expression of an apology in the post-test. In the last situation of DCT, while the number of semantic formulas used in pre-test was three, it was four in the post-test. Unlike the pre-test, they used the semantic formula of an explanation or account of the situation. Lastly, they used less the formula of an expression of an apology in the post-test in Situation 8.

4.3.4. Results of Pre-test of the Portuguese Subject Group

There were seven participants in the PSG, and their responses to the situations in the DCT in pre-test were examined in order to find out their current status in terms of their choices of semantic formulas, and the results are presented through frequencies and in percentage terms for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the frequencies and

percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas –APOL and RESP- were included. The total frequencies and the percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- can be seen in the tables.

Table 30 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 1.

Table 30: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Pre-test of the PSG

		Frequencies								
Situa. 1	Semantic Formula	PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7	Total Freq.	%
	(APOL)								8	%44
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	-	2	7	%39
	OFFE	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%5
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	5	%28
	(RESP)								5	%28
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	5	%28
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	3	3	3	2	0	4	18	%100

Table 30 above shows, four semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 1. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of apology (APOL) with 44% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 39% and 5% respectively. The second most commonly used strategies sharing the same percentage of 28% are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP). It is seen that the semantic

formulas of an offer of repair (REPR) and a promise of forbearance (FORB) were not used by the PSG in this item of DCT.

Table 31 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 2.

Table 31: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 2	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								8	%44
	REGR	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	6	%33
	OFFE	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	%11
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	4	%22
	(RESP)								1	%6
	BLAM	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%6
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	%11
	(FORB)	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	%17
Total		2	3	3	3	1	3	3	18	%100

Table 31 illustrates that six semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 2. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of apology (APOL) with 44% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 33% and 11% respectively. The second most commonly used strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 22% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT. The third most frequent strategy is a promise of forbearance (FORB) with 17%. It is followed by an offer of repair (REPR) with 11%. The least frequent semantic formula is accepting the blame (BLAM) with 6% which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP).

Table 32 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 3.

Table 32: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 3	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								7	%33
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	%33
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	4	%19
	(RESP)								2	%10
	BLAM	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%5
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%5
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	1	1	1	3	-	1	8	%38
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	2	3	3	5	2	4	21	%100

As it is clear in Table 32, five semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 3. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an offer of repair (REPR) with 38%. The second most commonly used strategy is expression of regret (REGR) with 33% which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL). The third most frequent strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 19% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT by the PSG. The least frequent semantic formula is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 10% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) which both have the same percentage of 5%. It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used in this item of DCT by PSG.

Table 33 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 4.

Table 33: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 4	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								5	%25
	REGR	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	5	%25
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	3	%15
	(RESP)								3	%15
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	%10
	INTE	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%5
	(REPR)	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	6	%30
	(FORB)	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	%15
Total		2	4	3	3	3	2	3	20	%100

We can see in Table 33, six semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 4. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an offer of repair (REPR) with 30%. The second most commonly used strategy is expression of regret (REGR) with 25% which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL). The other strategies which were used in this item of DCT have the same percentage of 15% which are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL), a promise of forbearance (FORB), and an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) which is comprised of recognizing the other person as deserving apology (DESE) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentages are 10% and 5% respectively.

Table 34 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 5.

Table 34: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 5	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								9	%45
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	8	%40
	OFFE	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%5
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)								5	%25
	BLAM	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	%10
	DEFI	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	%15
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	6	%30
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	4	3	3	2	1	4	20	%100

Table 34 shows, five semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 5. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 45% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 40% and 5% respectively. The second most commonly used strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 30% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT. The third most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 25% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) whose percentages are 10% and 15% respectively. It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used in this item of DCT by PSG.

Table 35 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 6.

Table 35: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 6	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								8	%40
	REGR	-	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	%35
	OFFE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%5
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)								3	%15
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	%10
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%5
	(REPR)	-	1	2	3	1	1	1	9	%45
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	3	3	4	4	2	2	20	%100

The table above shows that five semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 6. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an offer of repair (REPR) with 45% use of all the strategies used. The second most commonly used strategy is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 40% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 35% and 5% respectively. The least frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 15% which is comprised of expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentages are 10% and 5% respectively. It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used in this item of DCT by PSG.

Table 36 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 7.

Table 36: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 7	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								10	%84
	REGR	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	10	%84
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)								2	%16
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%8
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%8
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	1	3	2	1	1	2	12	%100

As shown in the table above, three semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 7. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is expression of regret (REGR) with by far percentage of 84% which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL). The second most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 16% which is comprised of expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) both of which have the same percentage of 8%. It is seen that the semantic formulas of an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL), an offer of repair (REPR), and a promise of forbearance (FORB) were not used in this item of DCT by PSG.

Table 37 presents pre-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 8.

Table 37: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Pre-test of the PSG

Situa. 8	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								8	%57
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	8	%57
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%7
	(RESP)								4	%29
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	%22
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%7
	(REPR)	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	%7
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		2	1	2	3	1	2	3	14	%100

As it is seen in Table 37, five semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 8. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is expression of regret (REGR) with 57% which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL). The second most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 29% which is comprised of expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentages are 22% and 7% respectively. The other two formulas which have the same percentage of 7% are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and an offer of repair (REPR). It is seen that the semantic formula of an offer of repair was not used in this item of DCT by PSG.

In addition to the situations where the culpable person acknowledges his fault and delivers an apology using one or more of the ten aforesaid semantic formulas, in the analysis some situations where the culpable person denies the responsibility, or rejects to apologize, or doesn't feel the need for an apology were detected. They used the two denial strategies and some other ways to avoid an apology. Here are these situations,

PS5 used a different way of avoidance and chose to delay the apology in Situation 2.

PS5: I am really sorry. I am on my way now. **If you still have some minutes, I would like to talk to you in person.**

PS6 used the denial strategies of ‘a denial of the need to apologize’ and ‘not accepting the blame’ in Situation 1, also she tried to make the offended person forget her own fault by talking in Situation 5.

PS6: Excuse me. Can you tell me why? (Situation 1)

PS6: I’m sorry, **but you don’t have to talk like that. Let’s have a conversation.** (Situation 5)

PS7 used a different strategy, and tried to foreground the minor problem to the background major problem in Situation 5.

PS7: I am sorry. I am so sorry. I didn’t see you. **There is no need to talk like that.** Everything can be fixed.

4.3.5. Results of Post-test of the Portuguese Subject Group

There were seven participants in the PSG, and their responses to the situations in the DCT in post-test were examined in terms of their choices of semantic formulas, and the results are presented through frequencies and in percentage terms for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the frequencies and percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas –APOL and RESP- were included. The total frequencies and the percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- can be seen in the tables.

Table 38 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 1.

Table 38: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 1 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 1	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								8	%35
	REGR	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	6	%26
	OFFE	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	%9
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	8	%35
	(RESP)								7	%30
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
	INTE	1	-	1	1	-	1	2	6	%26
	(REPR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		4	3	3	3	3	2	5	23	%100

As shown in Table 38, five semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 1. The most frequent semantic formulas in this item of DCT both of which have the same percentage of 35% are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and an expression of an apology (APOL) which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 26% and 9% respectively. The second most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 30% which is comprised of recognizing the other person as deserving apology (DESE) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentages are 4% and 26% respectively. It is seen that the semantic formulas of an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance (FORB) were not used in this item of DCT by PSG.

Table 39 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 2.

Table 39: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 2 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 2	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								9	%35
	REGR	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	5	%19
	OFFE	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	%12
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%4
	(EXPL)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	%26
	(RESP)								4	%16
	BLAM	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	3	%12
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%4
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	5	%19
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%4
Total		3	3	3	2	7	2	6	26	%100

As can be seen in the table above, eight semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 2. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 35% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR), an offer of apology (OFFE), and a request for forgiveness (FORGI) whose percentages are 19%, 12%, and 4% respectively. The second most frequent strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 26% use of all the strategies used in this item of DCT by PSG. The third most frequent strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 19%. The other frequently used strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 16% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) whose percentages are 12% and 4% respectively. The least frequent semantic formula is a promise of forbearance (FORB) with 4% use of all the strategies used in this item by PSG.

Table 40 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 3.

Table 40: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 3 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 3	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								9	%35
	REGR	2	1	-	1	2	-	2	8	%31
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%4
	(EXPL)	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	5	%19
	(RESP)								2	%7
	BLAM	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	%7
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	-	1	1	2	1	1	7	%27
	(FORB)	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	%12
Total		5	2	2	4	6	3	4	26	%100

As it is seen in Table 40, six semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 3. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 35% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and a request for forgiveness (FORGI) whose percentages are 31% and 4% respectively. The second most frequent strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 27%. The third most frequent strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 19%. The other frequently used strategy is a promise of forbearance (FORB) with 12% use of all the strategies used in this item by PSG. The least frequent semantic formula is accepting the blame (BLAM) with 7% which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP).

Table 41 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 4.

Table 41: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 4 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 4	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								6	%23
	REGR	1	1	-	1	2	1	-	6	%23
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	4	%15
	(RESP)								6	%23
	BLAM	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	5	%19
	DEFI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DESE	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%4
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	2	1	1	2	1	-	2	9	%35
	(FORB)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%4
Total		5	4	3	3	5	2	4	26	%100

As Table 41 illustrates, six semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 4. The most frequent semantic formula in this item of DCT is an offer of repair (REPR) with 35%. The second most frequent strategies both of which have the percentage of 23% are expression of regret (REGR) which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL) and an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and recognizing the other person as deserving apology (DESE) whose percentages are 19% and 4% respectively. The other frequently used strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 15% use of all the strategies used in this item by PSG. The least frequent semantic formula is a promise of forbearance (FORB) with 4%.

Table 42 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 5.

Table 42: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 5 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 5	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								8	%35
	REGR	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8	%35
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)								8	%34
	BLAM	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	4	%17
	DEFI	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	3	%13
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%4
	(REPR)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	%31
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	3	4	4	4	2	3	23	%100

As seen in Table 42, five semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 5. The percentages of the most frequent semantic formulas used in this item of DCT are so close to each other. The most frequent semantic formula is expression of regret (REGR) with 35% which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL). The second most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 34% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM), expressing self-deficiency (DEFI), and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentages are 17%, 13%, and 4% respectively. The other frequently used strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 31%. It is seen that the semantic formulas of an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and a promise of forbearance (FORB) were not used by PSG in this item of DCT.

Table 43 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 6.

Table 43: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 6 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 6	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								11	%48
	REGR	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	10	%44
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	%4
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(RESP)								3	%13
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%4
	DEFI	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	%9
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	-	1	3	2	1	1	9	%39
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	2	2	4	6	2	4	23	%100

Table 43 shows that four semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 6. The most frequently used semantic formula is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 48% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 44% and 4% respectively. The second most frequent strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 39% use of all the strategies used in this item by PSG. The least frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 13% which is comprised of accepting the blame (BLAM) and expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) whose percentages are 4% and 9% respectively. It is seen that the semantic formulas of an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and a promise of forbearance (FORB) were not used by PSG in this item of DCT.

Table 44 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 7.

Table 44: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 7 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 7	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								7	%47
	REGR	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	6	%40
	OFFE	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	%7
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	%7
	(RESP)								5	%33
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	3	%20
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	%13
	(REPR)	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	%13
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	15	%100

As it is seen in Table 44, six semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 7. The most frequently used semantic formula is an expression of an apology (APOL) with 47% which is comprised of expression of regret (REGR) and an offer of apology (OFFE) whose percentages are 40% and 7% respectively. The second most frequent strategy is an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP) with 33% which is comprised of expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) and expressing lack of intent (INTE) whose percentages are 20% and 13% respectively. The third most frequent strategy is an offer of repair (REPR) with 13%. The least frequent strategy is an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) with 7% use of all the strategies used by PSG in this item. It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used by PSG in this item of DCT.

Table 45 presents post-test results of PSG in terms of the frequencies and the percentages of the use of semantic formulas in Situation 8.

Table 45: Frequencies and Percentages of the use of Semantic Formulas in Situation 8 in the Post-test of the PSG

Situa. 8	Semantic Formula	Frequencies							Total Freq.	%
		PS 1	PS 2	PS 3	PS 4	PS 5	PS 6	PS 7		
	(APOL)								7	%59
	REGR	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	%59
	OFFE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FORGI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(EXPL)	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	%8
	(RESP)								3	%25
	BLAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFI	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	%25
	DESE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(REPR)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	%8
	(FORB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3	1	1	2	1	2	2	12	%100

Table 45 presents that four semantic formulas in total were used by the PSG in Situation 8. The most frequently used semantic formula is expression of regret (REGR) with 59% which is a sub-formula of an expression of an apology (APOL). The second most frequent strategy is expressing self-deficiency (DEFI) with 25% which is a sub-formula of an acknowledgement of responsibility (RESP). The other two semantic formulas used in this item both of which have the same percentage of 8% are an explanation or account of the situation (EXPL) and an offer of repair (REPR). It is seen that the semantic formula of a promise of forbearance (FORB) was not used by PSG in this item of DCT.

In addition to the situations where the culpable person acknowledges his fault and delivers an apology using one or more of the ten aforesaid semantic formulas, in the analysis some situations where the culpable person denies the responsibility, or rejects to apologize, or doesn't feel the need for an apology were detected. They used the two denial strategies and some other ways to avoid an apology. When we compare these situations to their pre-

testresponses, it is seen they used less denial strategies in the post-test. Here are these situations,

PS6 used the denial strategy of ‘a denial of the need to apologize’ in Situation 1.

PS6: I am really sorry. I didn’t mean to offend you. **Can you explain me where or how did I offend you?**

PS7 used another strategy to avoid the situation, tried to change the subject, and tried to foreground the minor problem to the background major problem in Situation 5.

PS7: I know what I’ve done, thank you very much. **There is no need to talk and react like that, there are much worse things in this world and besides, it’s just a car.** I pay for the damage, there’s no need to worry about it. And I didn’t say before but... I’m sorry for all this, I truly am.

4.3.6. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of the Portuguese Subject Group

There were seven participants in the PSG, and their responses to the situations in the DCT in the pre-test and the post-test were examined in terms of their choices of semantic formulas, and the results are presented comparatively in percentage terms for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas –APOL and RESP- were included. The total percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- which are formed of their sub-formulas’ percentages can be seen in the table. While calculating the number of strategies used in each situation, the same principle was adopted. In other words, if the main formula had sub-formulas, sub-formulas were counted; however, if the main formula did not have any sub-formulas, the main formula was counted.

Table 46: A Comparison of the Strategy Use Of the PSG in the Pre-test and the Post-test (in percentages)

Semantic Formulas	Pre-test % / Post-test %							
	Situa. 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
(APOL)	44/35	44/35	33/35	25/23	45/35	40/48	84/47	57/59
REGR	39/26	33/19	33/31	25/23	40/35	35/44	84/40	57/59
OFFE	5/9	11/12	-/-	-/-	5/-	5/4	-/7	-/-
FORGI	-/-	-/4	-/4	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-
(EXPL)	28/35	22/26	19/19	15/15	-/-	-/-	-/7	7/8
(RESP)	28/30	6/16	10/7	15/23	25/34	15/13	16/33	29/25
BLAM	-/-	6/12	5/7	-/19	10/17	-/4	-/-	-/-
DEFI	-/-	-/4	5/-	-/-	15/13	10/9	8/20	22/25
DESE	-/4	-/-	-/-	10/4	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-
INTE	28/26	-/-	-/-	5/-	-/4	5/-	8/13	7/-
(REPR)	-/-	11/19	38/27	30/35	30/31	45/39	-/13	7/8
(FORB)	-/-	17/4	-/12	15/4	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-

As compared in Table 46, in Situation 1 PSG used more varied semantic formulas in the post-test. Unlike the pre-test, they used the strategy of recognizing the other person as deserving apology. They more often used an explanation or account of the situation and an acknowledgement of responsibility, and less of expression of an apology in the post-test. In Situation 2, the variety of the semantic formulas used turned into eight from six in the post-test. Unlike the pre-test, PSG used the strategies of expressing self-deficiency and a request for forgiveness in the post-test. They started to use more an offer of repair, an acknowledgement of responsibility, and an explanation or account of the situation, and less a promise of forbearance and an expression of an apology in the post-test. In Situation 3, while they used five different semantic formulas in the pre-test, they used six different semantic formulas in the post-test. Unlike the pre-test, they used the strategies of a request for forgiveness and a promise of forbearance and didn't use the strategy of expressing self-deficiency in the post-test. They used more an expression of an apology and less an acknowledgement of responsibility and an offer of repair after the task-based teaching.

In Situations 4, 5 and 6, the variety of the semantic formulas stayed the same, but their distribution showed difference in the post-test. In Situation 4, unlike the pre-test, they used the strategy of accepting the blame, and didn't use the strategy of expressing lack of intent in the post-test. They used more of an acknowledgement of responsibility, an offer of

repair, and less of an expression of an apology and a promise of forbearance in the post-test. In Situation 5, unlike the pre-test, they used the strategy of expressing lack of intent, and didn't use the strategy of an offer of apology in the post-test. While they used more an acknowledgement of responsibility, they used less an expression of an apology in the post-test. In Situation 6, they used the semantic formula of accepting the blame and didn't use the formula of expressing lack of intent in the post-test unlike the pre-test. While they used more an expression of an apology, they used less an acknowledgement of responsibility and an offer of repair in the post-test. In Situation 7, while the number of semantic formulas used in the pre-test was just three, in the post-test it varied and turned into six different semantic formulas. Unlike the pre-test, they used the strategies of an offer of apology, an explanation or account of the situation, and an offer of repair in the post-test. While they used more an acknowledgement of responsibility, they used less an expression of an apology in the post-test. In Situation 8 which is the last item of the DCT, PSG used less varied semantic formulas in the post-test. Unlike the pre-test, they didn't use the strategy of expressing lack of intent in the post-test. While they used more an offer of repair, an explanation or account of the situation, and an expression of an apology, they used less an acknowledgement of responsibility in the post-test.

4.3.7. Comparison of Pre-test of the Turkish Subject Group and Pre-test of the Portuguese Subject Group

There were eleven participants in the TSG and seven participants in the PSG. Their responses to the situations in the DCT in their pre-tests were examined in terms of their choices of semantic formulas with the aim of comparing them in terms of their current status and the results are presented comparatively in percentage terms for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas – APOL and RESP- were included. The total percentages of these two main formulas –

APOL and RESP- which are formed of their sub-formulas' percentages can be seen in the table. While calculating the number of strategies used in each situation, the same principle was adopted. In other words, if the main formula had sub-formulas, sub-formulas were counted; however, if the main formula did not have any sub-formulas, the main formula was counted.

Table 47: A Comparison of the Strategy Use of the TSG and the PSG in the Pre-tests (in percentages)

Semantic Formulas	Pre-test of TSG% / Pre-test of PSG %							
	Situa. 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
(APOL)	44/44	40/44	37/33	32/25	31/45	62/40	81/84	92/57
REGR	39/39	40/33	34/33	32/25	25/40	35/35	56/84	67/57
OFFE	5/5	-/11	-/-	-/-	3/5	-/5	-/-	-/-
FORGI	-/-	-/-	3/-	-/-	3/-	27/-	25/-	25/-
(EXPL)	-/28	29/22	40/19	14/15	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/7
(RESP)	56/28	10/6	13/10	4/15	51/25	15/15	19/16	8/29
BLAM	-/-	3/6	3/5	-/-	25/10	4/-	-/-	-/-
DEFI	-/-	7/-	10/5	4/-	18/15	4/10	6/8	-/22
DESE	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/10	8/-	-/-	-/-	-/-
INTE	56/28	-/-	-/-	-/5	-/-	7/5	13/8	8/7
(REPR)	-/-	7/11	7/38	36/30	18/30	23/45	-/-	-/7
(FORB)	-/-	14/17	3/-	14/15	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-

Table 47 shows that the TSG and the PSG showed difference in terms of the variety of the semantic formulas used in each item of the DCT, and their distributions. In Situation 1, while the TSG used three different semantic formulas, the PSG used one more semantic formula which was an explanation or account of the situation, so used four semantic formulas in total. Additionally, the PSG used less of acknowledgement of responsibility than the TSG did. In Situation 2, the variety of the semantic formulas used was the same for the TSG and the PSG. Unlike the TSG, the PSG used the semantic formula of an offer of apology, and did not use the strategy of expressing self-deficiency. The PSG used more a promise of forbearance, an expression of an apology, an offer of repair, and less an explanation or account of the situation and an acknowledgement of responsibility than the TSG did. In Situation 3, while the number of semantic formulas used was seven for the

TSG, it was five for the PSG. Unlike the TSG, the PSG did not use the strategies of a request for forgiveness and a promise of forbearance. Additionally, the PSG used more an offer of repair, and less an expression of an apology, an explanation or account of the situation, and an acknowledgement of responsibility than the TSG did.

In Situation 4, the TSG used five different strategies, but the PSG used six different strategies. Unlike the TSG, the PSG used the strategies of recognizing the other person as deserving apology and expressing lack of intent, and did not use the strategy of expressing self-deficiency. While the TSG used more an expression of an apology, an offer of repair, the PSG used more an acknowledgement of responsibility. In Situation 5, while the PSG used five different strategies, the TSG used two more strategies which were a request for forgiveness and recognizing the other person as deserving apology, and used seven different strategies in total. The PSG used more an expression of an apology, an offer of repair, and less an acknowledgement of responsibility than the TSG did. In Situation 6, the variety of the semantic formulas used was less in PSG (5) than the TSG (6). Unlike the TSG, the PSG used the strategy of an offer of apology, and didn't use the strategies of a request for forgiveness and accepting the blame. Additionally, the PSG used less an expression of apology, and more an offer of repair than the TSG did. In Situation 7, the TSG used one more strategy which was a request for forgiveness than the PSG. The PSG used more an expression of an apology and less an acknowledgement of responsibility than the TSG did. In Situation 8, while the TSG used three different semantic formulas, the PSG used five different semantic formulas in total. Unlike the TSG, the PSG used the strategies of an explanation or account of the situation, expressing self-deficiency, an offer of repair, and didn't use the strategy of a request for forgiveness. In addition to that, the PSG used more an acknowledgement of responsibility, and less an expression of an apology than the TSG did in their pre-tests.

4.3.8. Comparison of Post-test of the Turkish Subject Group and Post-test of the Portuguese Subject Group

There were eleven participants in the TSG and seven participants in the PSG. Their responses to the situations in the DCT in their post-tests were examined in terms of their choices of semantic formulas with the aim of comparing them in terms of their status after the task-based activities and the results are presented comparatively in percentage terms for each situation in the DCT. The main formulas are given in brackets which are APOL, EXPL, RESP, REPR, and FORB. While calculating the percentages, the main formulas which do not have sub-formulas –EXPL, REPR, and FORB- and the sub-formulas of the two main formulas –APOL and RESP- were included. The total percentages of these two main formulas –APOL and RESP- which are formed of their sub-formulas’ percentages can be seen in the table. While calculating the number of strategies used in each situation, the same principle was adopted. In other words, if the main formula had sub-formulas, sub-formulas were counted; however, if the main formula did not have any sub-formulas, the main formula was counted.

Table 48: A Comparison of the Strategy Use of the TSG and the PSG in the Post-tests (in percentages)

Semantic Formulas	Post-test of TSG% / Post-test of PSG %							
	Situa. 1	Situa. 2	Situa. 3	Situa. 4	Situa. 5	Situa. 6	Situa. 7	Situa. 8
(APOL)	43/35	45/35	46/35	29/23	37/35	46/48	72/47	67/59
REGR	38/26	41/19	38/31	29/23	37/35	42/44	59/40	60/59
OFFE	5/9	-/12	-/-	-/-	-/-	4/4	-/7	-/-
FORGI	-/-	4/4	8/4	-/-	-/-	-/-	13/-	7/-
(EXPL)	19/35	10/26	21/19	18/15	-/-	-/-	-/7	26/8
(RESP)	38/30	7/16	-/7	6/23	30/34	20/13	21/33	7/25
BLAM	5/-	7/12	-/7	3/19	18/17	8/4	7/-	-/-
DEFI	-/-	-/4	-/-	-/-	4/13	8/9	7/20	-/25
DESE	-/4	-/-	-/-	³ / ₄	4/-	-/-	-/-	-/-
INTE	33/26	-/-	-/-	-/-	4/4	4/-	7/13	7/-
(REPR)	-/-	10/19	25/27	29/35	33/31	34/39	7/13	-/8
(FORB)	-/-	28/4	8/12	18/4	-/-	-/-	-/-	-/-

The comparison in Table 48 shows that the analysis of the comparison of the post-tests of the TSG and the PSG revealed that they showed difference in terms of the variety of the semantic formulas used and their distributions. In Situation 1, although the number of the semantic formulas used by the TSG and the PSG was the same (5), they differed in their selection of formulas. Unlike the TSG, the PSG used the strategy of recognizing the other person as deserving apology, and did not use the strategy of accepting the blame. Additionally, they differed in terms of frequencies of some strategies. For instance, the PSG used more an explanation or account of the situation, and less an expression of an apology and an acknowledgement of responsibility. In Situation 2, while the TSG used six different semantic formulas, the PSG used two more different semantic formulas which were an offer of apology and expressing self-deficiency, so used eight different semantic formulas. While the PSG used more an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of responsibility, and an offer of repair, they used less an expression of an apology and a promise of forbearance than the TSG did. In Situation 3, while the number of semantic formulas used by TSG was five, it was six with an additional semantic formula which was accepting the blame by the PSG. The PSG used more an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance and less an expression of an apology and an explanation or account of the situation than the TSG.

In Situation 4, the number of the semantic formulas used by the TSG and the PSG was the same, and their selection of semantic formulas was the same as well. The only difference was seen in the frequencies of some semantic formulas. For instance, the PSG used more an acknowledgement of responsibility and an offer of repair, and less an expression of an apology, an explanation or account of the situation, and a promise of forbearance than the TSG did. In Situation 5, while the PSG used five different semantic formulas, the TSG used one more semantic formula which was recognizing the other person as deserving apology. The PSG used more an acknowledgement of responsibility, and less an expression of an apology and an offer of repair than the TSG did. In Situation 6, while the TSG used six different semantic formulas, the PSG used five different semantic formulas. The TSG used the strategy of expressing lack of intent in addition to the five semantic formulas which were the same with the PSG. The PSG used more an offer of repair, and less an expression of an apology and an acknowledgement of responsibility than the TSG did. In Situation 7, the number of semantic formulas used by the TSG and the PSG was the same, but their selection of semantic formulas differed. For instance, unlike the TSG, the

PSG used the strategies of an offer of apology and an explanation or account of the situation, and did not use the strategies of a request for forgiveness and accepting the blame. Additionally, the PSG used more an acknowledgement of responsibility and an offer of repair and less an expression of an apology than the TSG did. In Situation 8, the number of semantic formulas used by the TSG and the PSG was the same (4), but they differed in their selection of semantic formulas. For instance, unlike the TSG, the PSG used the strategies of an offer of repair and expressing self-deficiency, and did not use the strategies of a request for forgiveness and expressing lack of intent. Additionally, the PSG used more an acknowledgement of responsibility, and less an expression of an apology and an explanation or account of the situation.

4.4. Discussions of Discourse Completion Task Results

With the aim of identifying the differences and similarities between the TSG and the PSG in terms of the use of apologies, the analysis of the individual responses to the DCT in the pre-test and post-test in terms of their selection of semantic formulas and their frequencies was done. Under light of the results of this study, it is concluded that the TSG and the PSG showed similarities most of the time, but also displayed some culture-specific features.

If we start with the general look, it can give a better understanding of the nature of the findings. When we look at the percentages of strategy selection across eight situations, it is noticed a difference between the TSG and the PSG in terms of their order. For the TSG in the pre-test, from the most frequent to the least frequent, the order of the percentages of strategy selection across eight situations was APOL, RESP, REPR, EXPL, and FORB. When we look at the PSG, we see the order of APOL, REPR, RESP, EXPL, and FORB in the pre-test. What makes the difference here is that the order of REPR and RESP change in these two subject groups. This situation can be culture-specific. The Turkish subject group tended to use more acknowledgement of responsibility through mostly expressing lack of intent after an expression of an apology. But the PSG tended to offer of repair more frequently than an acknowledgement of responsibility after an expression of an apology. As it can be seen in their example utterances,

TS: I'm sorry but **I don't want to blame you.**

TS: I am so sorry. **I didn't want to do this.** I hope that you are okay.

TS: Sorry madam. **I couldn't do it consciously.**

TS: Excuse me, I am very sorry. **I did it accidentally.**

PS: I'm so sorry, **I promise I will try to do it when I get home.**

PS: I'm sorry, I'm really tired and didn't sleep well last night. **I'll meet you later today.**

PS: I'm so sorry. **We should go to the hospital and check if you got injured.**

PS: Oh, I'm so so sorry, **let me help you! What can I do for you? Shall I take you to the hospital? Let me pick all your packages!**

As Olshtain and Cohen (1983) stated that "In English it seems that the first sub-formula, an expression of regret, is most common" (pp. 22), the findings of the current study show similarity with their statement both in the post-tests and the pre-tests of the TSG and the PSG because when we look at the pre-test and post-test results of the TSG and the PSG, the most frequently used semantic formula is APOL, and the most frequently used sub-formula of it is REGR in all these four cases.

TS: **I'm so sorry**, madam. I know it is my fault. Do you need any help?

TS:**I'm terribly sorry.** It was completely my fault. I will pay for the damage.

PS:**I am so sorry.** Are you OK? Can I do something for you?

PS:**I'm so sorry.** I completely forgot! I know this is the second time I forget this but I've been very busy lately. Ah... Can we meet another day? **Sorry again.**

When we look at the distribution of the sub-formulas of APOL, we see that in the pre-test and the post-test of the TSG the order of them was the same and it is like –from the most frequent to the least frequent- REGR, FORGI, OFFE. But, the order of the sub-formulas in the pre-test of the PSG was like -from the most frequent to the least frequent- REGR, OFFE, and they didn't use the sub-formula of FORGI. In their post-test, they used the strategy of FORGI, and the order was like -from the most frequent to the least frequent- REGR, OFFE, FORGI. We can conclude that the TSG tended to express their apologies most frequently by requesting for forgiveness after REGR while the PSG tended to express their apologies most frequently by offering an apology after REGR. This difference may be the result of native-language transfer.

TS: Please forgive me. I am completely absent-minded.

TS: Oh! I'm sorry, madam! I should hurry up. **Please, forgive me!**

PS: **I apologize**, I didn't see you there, are you OK?

PS: I hear and understand why you may have taken offense, but what I said was not directed towards you or any other persons. **I apologize for my poor choice of wording.**

When we examine the frequency order of the sub-formulas of RESP in the pre-test for both of the groups, we see that the order of them for the TSG was –from most frequent to the least frequent- INTE, DEFI, BLAM, DESE. For the PSG, it was like -from most frequent to the least frequent- DEFI, INTE, BLAM, DESE. We can conclude that the TSG acknowledged their responsibility of the faulty action mostly by expressing their lack of intent while the PSG acknowledged their responsibility mostly by expressing their self-deficiency. These two sub-formulas are indirect strategies. They chose an indirect strategy but they differed in the selection of the way of acknowledgement. This situation can be culture-specific.

When we look at the percentages of strategy selection across eight situations in the post-test results, we see a change in the order of frequency of the semantic formulas used by the TSG and the PSG. Surprisingly, after the teaching activities, the order of the semantic formulas -from the most frequent to the least frequent- turned out to be APOL, REPR, RESP, EXPL, FORB for the TSG. And for the PSG, the order of semantic formulas changed in this way -from the most frequent to the least frequent- APOL, RESP, REPR, EXPL, FORB. But in the PSG, the percentages of the RESP and REPR in the post-test across eight situations were so close to each other. So we can say that the order of the semantic formulas used by the PSG stayed almost the same as it was in the pre-test, but the TSG started to use the strategy of REPR more frequently than they did in the pre-test.

If we compare the post-test results of the TSG and the PSG with the acquisition/emergence order of apology strategy stated by Chang (2010), which is

Level I: IFID expressing regret

Level II: alerter, admission of fact

Level III: intensifier, concern, minimize, repair

Level IV: explanation, lack of intent, promise of forbearance, IFID requesting forgiveness, acknowledgement, blame (pp. 418).

We can say that both of the subject groups of the current study are between the Level III and Level IV.

Lastly, we can say that the TSG and the PSG showed mostly similarities, but also differences in terms of their selection of semantic formulas, frequencies of these formulas. As discussed above, and illustrated in the data analysis part, these differences can be situation-specific, culture-specific, or L1 transfer into L2 apology competence, but mostly they showed similarities according to the analysis of the responses given to DCT.

4.4.1. Discussion of Discourse Completion Task Results in Terms of Individualism-Collectivism

In this section, it was aimed to shed light on the research results, and to bring some explanation to them in a culture-based manner through discussion. As Guan, Park, and Lee (2009) stated that the commonly used dimensions in cross-cultural research are individualism and collectivism, these two dimensions formed the basis for the cross-cultural discussions for the current research. Hui and Triandis (1986) defined the collectivism and compared individualism to collectivism as;

concern by a person about the effects of actions or decisions on others, sharing of material benefits, sharing of nonmaterial resources, willingness of the person to accept the opinions and views of others, concern about self-presentation and loss of face, belief in the correspondence of own outcomes with the outcomes of others, and feeling of involvement in and contribution to the lives of others. Individualists show less concern, sharing, and so on than collectivists.

Uskul, Hynie, and Lalonde (2004) stated that “the cultural differences attributed to the individualism-collectivism dimension are accounted for, or mediated by, individual differences along the dimension of independent-dependent self-construals” (pp. 175). In individualistic cultures, people show the tendency to be independent; however, in collectivistic cultures, people tend to be more dependent.

Matsumoto, Yoo, and Fontaine (2008) suggested that many ways exist to understand culture and one fundamental way to examine the content of culture is through values. They stated that there are four attributes to define the dimension of Individualism-Collectivism (IC) (Triandis, 1995, as in Matsumoto et al., 2008);

Self, goals, relationship, and determinants of behavior. On the one hand, individualistic cultures foster the development of independent construals of self (Markus and Kitayama, 1991), favor personal goals over in-group goals (Yamaguchi, 1994), encourage rationality and interpersonal exchange (Kim, Triandis, Kağıtçıbaşı, Choi, and Yoon, 1994), and place more importance on attitudes as relatively important determinants of behavior. On the other hand, collectivistic cultures foster interdependent selves and in-group goals, encourage relatedness and communal relationships, and place relatively more importance on norms as determinants of behavior (as in Matsumoto et al., 2008, pp. 59).

If we extend the term of norms which plays a crucial role in collectivistic cultures, we can say that “norms provide guidelines for thinking, feeling, and doing in specific situational contexts that are accepted and expected by a group” (Matsumoto et al., 2008, pp. 58). As Guan et al. (2009) stated that “the distinction between an in-group member and an out-group member is one of the key characteristics of IC” (pp. 33), we see that the term of group has a significant role in the distinctions in terms of IC. We see that in-groups are defined by Triandis (1988) as “groups of people about whose welfare one is concerned, with whom one is willing to cooperate without demanding equitable returns, and separation from whom leads to discomfort or even pain” (pp.75). For collectivist cultures, the answer to the question of including whom in the in-group may vary, but in many collectivist cultures, family members and friends are accepted as in-group members; however, out-group members are formed out of the strangers “whose welfare is not of much concern to an individual, or opponents whose welfare can even conflict with that of in-group members” (Guan et al., 2009, pp. 33). When we consider the importance of in-group or out-group membership, we see that it is less important in the individualistic cultures, and there is no significant distinction between in-group and out-group. Guan et al. explained the situation in other words, “individualists would behave more consistently across situations involving in-group or out-group members than would collectivists” (Guan et al., 2009, pp. 34). They also related this to the apology where the current discussion was based on;

Thus, in cultures where people separate in-group and out-group members to a greater degree, greater emphasis may be placed on maintaining harmonious relationships with in-group members than with out-group members. In such cultures, communication constructs such as apology that function to smooth predicaments and restore relationships may be more likely to be valued and employed for in-group members (pp. 34).

Contrary to the majority who support the distinction of IC, there are some researchers who criticize this and suggest that IC does not have to be an appositional construct; however, they can co-exist in any culture (Özdikmenli-Demir and Sayıl, 2009).

Under the light of this review, when we consider the two cultures which were on the focus of the current study, we see that both Turkey and Portugal have collectivistic cultures (Hofstede, 1980). However, depending on the abovesaid statement of Özdikmenli-Demir and Sayıl (2009), although they are both collectivistic cultures, they are not necessarily identical regarding collectivistic tendencies and many other aspects of communication.

Besides this, both Turkey and Portugal over the past twenty years have been experiencing transformations in every aspect of social life. Carpenter and Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (2005) explains the reason of this change in Turkey, “because of free market economy and trends toward liberalization after the 1980s, Turkey has been undergoing a very rapid social change” (pp. 298). The reasons of the changes in Portugal can be explained with the fact that social structures were formed as before and after the Salazar regime (Brettell, 2001), so along with these changes their tendencies may have changed as well.

Under the light of these, we compared the two cultural groups in terms of IC, and in-group and out-group apologetic tendencies. As it was known that Turkey and Portugal have a collectivistic culture, they were expected to value and employ the apology more likely for in-group members rather than the out-group members. Additionally, it was expected that the two cultures both had similar tendencies toward apology use.

To avoid the probable effects of task-based teaching on the participants’ tendencies toward apology, the pre-test results were taken into consideration rather than the post-test results, and each group’s pre-test results were analyzed within itself in a situation-based manner. Our criterion was that the more apology strategies they used, the more they valued the situation and the apology required in that situation, so we looked at the total frequencies for each situation.

When we look at the situations in the DCT, we see that two of them were the ones where the offender was expected to apologize to an in-group member, and the rest including an out-group member as the offended person.

Situation 1: out-group member (colleague)

Situation 2: out-group member (boss)

Situation 3: in-group member (friend)

Situation 4: in-group member (family member)

Situation 5: out-group member (stranger)

Situation 6: out-group member (an old lady)

Situation 7: out-group member (an old lady)

Situation 8: out-group member (an old lady)

In order to find out the significant differences across these eight situations within groups, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and scheffé test were applied in SPSS to the total strategies used in each situation in the pre-test for the two subject groups separately.

Table 49: Arithmetic means and standard deviations of total number of strategies across eight situations for the TSG

Situations	N	X	S. D.
1	10	1.80	.63
2	11	2.55	.52
3	11	2.73	1.01
4	10	2.20	.63
5	11	2.55	.69
6	11	2.36	.92
7	11	1.45	.69
8	11	1.09	.30
Total	86	2.09	.88

Table 49 presents the results of the TSG in terms of the strategy use for Situation 1 (X=1.80), Situation 2 (X=2.22), Situation 3 (X=2.73), Situation 4 (X=2.20), Situation 5 (X=2.55), Situation 6 (X=2.36), Situation 7 (X=1.45), and Situation 8 (X=1.09).

Table 50: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test across Eight Situations (the TSG)

	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	26.238	7	3.748	7.493	.000
Within Groups	39.018	78	.500		
Total	65.256	85			

Table 50 indicates that significant differences between eight situations in the DCT in the pre-test of the TSG were found [$F(7-78)=7.493, p<.05$]. In order to find out the reason of this significant difference, Sheffé test was applied. According to this analysis, it was found that the total number of strategies used in Situation 2 ($X=2.22$) was significantly higher than the total number of strategies used in Situation 8 ($X=1.09$); the total number of strategies used in Situation 3 ($X=2.73$) was significantly higher than the total number of strategies used in Situation 7 ($X=1.45$) and Situation 8 ($X=1.09$); the total number of strategies used in Situation 5 ($X=2.55$) was significantly higher than the total number of strategies used in Situation 8 ($X=1.09$); the total number of strategies used in Situation 6 ($X=2.36$) was significantly higher than the total number of strategies used in Situation 8 ($X=1.09$).

In order to find out the significant differences across these eight situations in the PSG, the same process of analyses were followed with the pre-test results.

Table 51: Arithmetic means and standard deviations of total number of strategies across eight situations for the PSG

Situations	N	X	S. D.
1	6	3.00	.63
2	7	2.57	.79
3	7	3.00	1.15
4	7	2.86	.69
5	7	2.86	1.07
6	7	2.86	.90
7	7	1.71	.76
8	7	2.00	.82
Total	55	2.60	.93

In Table 51, the strategies used were calculated for Situation 1 ($X=3.00$), Situation 2 ($X=2.57$), Situation 3 ($X=3.00$), Situation 4 ($X=2.86$), Situation 5 ($X=2.86$), Situation 6 ($X=2.86$), Situation 7 ($X=1.17$), and Situation 8 ($X=2.00$).

Table 52: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test across Eight Situations (the PSG)

	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	11.486	7	1.641	2.159	.055
Within Groups	35.714	47	.760		
Total	47.200	54			

As a result of this analysis, a significant difference was not found across eight situations in the DCT for the pre-test results of the PSG [$F(7-47)=2.159, p<.05$].

The results were surprising because they were not corresponding to the presumptions. In the results of the PSG, there were not any significant differences across eight situations; however, in the results of the TSG, we encountered with some significant differences. The participants in the PSG treated each situation equally regardless of in-group and out-group factor which indicated individualistic tendencies for the PSG.

The results of the TSG proved that the participants in this group valued the Situation 3 the most where they apologized to a friend. This was also partially surprising because what was expected from a collectivist culture was to value the family member over a friend. Both cultural groups did not value the situation where the offended was a family member contrary to the collectivistic culture tendencies; however, the TSG valued the other situation where the offended was an in-group member (a friend) the most indicating that the TSG displayed more collectivist tendencies than the PSG. As it is known that the individuals from individualist cultures do not make the distinction between in-group and out-group, it can be concluded that the PSG displayed more individualistic traits than collectivist ones. This may be caused by the fact that both individualist and collectivist tendencies can exist within a culture. However, this situation may be subject-group-specific because the participants in the PSG were the university students at Coimbra University which was a significant university for the number of exchange students. The participants may have influenced by the exchange students coming from the other Western countries, and naturally adopted individualist tendencies through interaction.

While there was none in the PSG, we encountered significant differences in four situations in the results of the TSG. This may indicate that the treatment of the participants in the TSG for the situations were different in terms of in-group and out-group manner, therefore, unlike the PSG, the TSG showed individualist traits by making that distinction. If we discuss the other significant differences in the TSG, the participants valued the apology more when they needed to apologize to a higher status interactant than the apology when they apologize to a stranger (equal-level). Additionally, the TSG showed more concern when they caused a physical damage or injury, and an apology was expected than the situations where the level of offense was not at a physical level. Surprisingly, status difference, group membership, and the level of offense did not make any significant change in the apologetic treatment of the PSG across eight situations in the DCT.

To sum up, although they both have a collectivistic culture, the two subject groups showed differences at their treatment of the apologetic situations. While the TSG displayed relatively parallel traits to collectivist culture, the PSG tended to treat the apologetic situations in an individualistic manner.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Summary of the Study

This study aimed to make a comparison of pragmatic competence between Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners with the focus on the speech act of apologies and also to find out if task-based teaching on the speech act of apology helps the learners to gain or improve this competence. For this aim, the design of the current study was formed as pre-test / post-test experimental model. The subject group of the study consisted of the TSG comprised of 11 TSG EFL learners, and the 7 PSG EFL learners. The proficiency level of the participants was B2-C1. As the data collection tool, a DCT taken from Cohen and Olshtain (1981) was used both in the pre-tests and the post-tests of these two subject groups. The current research started with the TSG. The pre-test was implemented with the TSG before the teaching session. After the pre-test implementation, the teaching session started with the activities which were task-based activities written by the researcher taking 30 minutes of class time each. The teaching session lasted for four weeks, one activity each week. Through these four task-based activities, it was aimed to introduce the semantic formulas of the speech act of apology, the severity level of the offense, the use of intensifications and emotional, so to help the students to choose appropriate strategies needed for the situations by giving them the chance to practice and discuss the example apologetic situations in the class. After the teaching session, post-test was implemented with the TSG in order to find out if there was any effect of the task-based teaching on their selection of strategies, frequencies, and pragmatic competence. The same process was followed with the PSG.

The participants' responses were coded by two independent coders according to the semantic formulas of the speech act of apology listed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983). An intercoder reliability study was conducted on these two codings. The analysis was made in accordance with the research questions of the study.

For the first research question, “What are the frequencies of semantic formulas of apology used by Turkish and Portuguese learners of English in different situations? Do Turkish and Portuguese EFL students have differences in their uses of semantic formulas of apology?”, the pre-test results of these two subject groups were analyzed in a situation-based manner and presented through frequencies and percentages. The comparison of the percentages was presented through tables. It was found that the two subject groups differed in the number of strategies used, their strategy selections and their distributions in each item of the DCT. In Situation 1, while the most frequently used strategy was RESP in the TSG, it was APOL in the PSG. In Situation 6, while the most commonly used strategy was APOL by the TSG, it was REPR by the PSG. These differences were thought to be culture-specific. Detailed analysis was given in the discourse completion task results part.

For the second research question, “Is there any change in the use of speech act set of apologies by Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners after they are taught task-based pragmatics?”, the pre-test results were compared to the post-test results of these two subject groups separately. As a result of this comparison, it was seen that the variety of the semantic formulas, their selection of the appropriate strategies, the distribution of the semantic formulas, and the use of intensifiers were slightly improved in both subject groups and this can be concluded as the effect of the task-based teaching.

For the last research question, “Is there a culture effect on Turkish and Portuguese EFL learners’ learning and using apology? If there is, what are those cultural effects?”, in the situation-based analysis, differences between TSG and PSG were detected both in the pre-test and the post-test in terms of selection of semantic formulas, their frequencies, being more or less indirect, the sequencing of the semantic formulas, use of intensifiers and emotional, and their treatment of the situations in the DCT. Although these differences are not so clear in the quantitative analysis, they can be distinguished easily through qualitative examination.

5.2.Implications for ELT

As the communication grows, it brings more requirements with itself within this process. The focus of language teaching and learning has shifted from grammatical competence to communicative competence which brings socio-pragmatic competence into a significant point in today's world. The current study is a small step to gain some insights into this world.

Apologies play a significant role in the relationships because it has the effect to remedy, or vice versa with a pragmatic failure. While it has such a vital role in the relationships, and it has a multi-faceted structure like culture, status, relationship type, and so on, it needs to be taught not just in theory but also in practice.

This study was conducted with EFL learners with the aim of highlighting the significance of pragmatics teaching in practice. This study was conducted as a comparative study between the TSG and the PSG in order to find out and show not just the similarities but also the differences to draw attention to the cultural differences, or L1 transfers because although it was agreed that the speech act of apology is universal, there are still cultural differences- although they are not so significant- and they can affect the communication in a negative way if they are not realized. So, it carries so much significance to acquire this competence through task-based authentic activities for EFL learners which are the future English language teachers.

5.3.Implications for Further Research

This study was conducted on the speech act of apology with two non-native subject groups of EFL learners using a DCT to collect the data and the semantic formulas listed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983) were used to analyze the data, and a task-based teaching was implemented for four weeks.

Further studies can be conducted with different subject groups having different proficiency levels in order to figure out the effect of L2 proficiency on pragmatic

competence. Or it can be conducted with some other variables on focus. For instance, the data can be analyzed according to the other sets of apology strategies, like Fraser's (1981), or Trosborg's (1987-1995).

The teaching session of the current study was limited to four task-based activities each of which took 30 minutes. The further study can be carried with more activities to get a better and more concrete conclusion about the effect of teaching the speech act of apology on the pragmatic competence.

This study was conducted with a subject group of 18 participants. The further research can be carried out with a bigger size of subject group in order to get more generalizability.

The current study compared two non-native subject groups coming from different cultures which were the TSG and the PSG. There is no study conducted on the apology strategies of Turkish or Portuguese. A further study on the apology strategies of Turkish and/or Portuguese can shed light on the nature of the apologies of these cultures.

REFERENCES

- Akıncı Akkurt, P. (2007). *Şikayetler Yolu ile İngilizce Edimbilimsel Farkındalıklarının Ölçülmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Kültürlerarası Edimbilimsel Bir Bakışaçısı*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Al-Adaileh, B. A. M. (2007). *The speech act of apology: a linguistic exploration of politeness orientation in British and Jordanian culture*. (Published PhD thesis). University of Leeds, Leeds.
- Apte, M. (1994). Language in sociocultural context. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 4*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1984). Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency assessment: Research and application. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Some comments on the terminology of language testing* (pp. 34-43). Multilingual Matters.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and Language Teaching: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograp, 3*.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Introduction to teaching pragmatics. *English Teaching Forum*, 41.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, 33, 401-415.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 3, 196-213.
- Brettel, C. B. (2001). Portugal. In Ember, M., & Ember, C. R. (Eds.) *Countries and Their Cultures*, Vol. 3 (pp. 1801-1813). Macmillan Reference, USA.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). 'Universals of Language Use: Politeness Phenomena' in Rod Ellis, 1994.
- Carpenter, S., & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2005). Importance and Descriptiveness of Self-Aspects: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 39, 3, 293-321.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, Y. (2010). 'I no say you say is boring': the development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. *Language Sciences*, 32, 408-424.

- Chang, Y. (2011). Interlanguage pragmatic development: the relation between pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. *Language Sciences*, 33, 786-798.
- Christiansen, Y. (2003). *Pragmatic ability and proficiency in Japanese learners of English*. (Published master's thesis). Department of Integrated Studies in Education McGill University, Montreal.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of socio-cultural competence: the case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31, 1, 113-134.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The Production of Speech Acts by EFL Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 1, 33-56.
- Cole, P., & Morgan, J. (eds.) (1975). *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburg University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *The English Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Çetin Köroğlu, Z. (2013). *Language Instructors' Perspectives on Textbook Content in terms of Intercultural Communicative Competence: Gazi University Case*. Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara.

Delen, B. (2010). *Ders Kitaplarının Söz Edim Gruplarının Kullanımı ve Öğretimi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi*.(Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Ellis, R. (1989). Classroom learning Styles and Their Effect on Second language Acquisition: A Study of Two Learners.*System, 17*.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings.*International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19, 3*, pp. 223.

Fraser, B. (1981). On apologizing. In Coulmas, F. (Ed.), *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Pre-patterned Speech* (pp. 259-271). Mouton, The Hague.

Guan, X., Park, H. S., & Lee, H. E. (2008). Cross-cultural differences in apology.*International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33*, 32-45.

Hatch, E. (1978). *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

- Hirama, K. (2011). *Crosslinguistic influence on pragmatics: The case of apologies by Japanese-first-language learners of English*. (Published master's thesis). Department of Integrated Studies in Education McGill University, Montreal.
- Hofstede, G. H. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hua, Z. (2011). Conclusion: Studying language and intercultural communication: methodological considerations. In Hua, Z. (Ed.), *The Language and Intercultural Communication Reader* (pp. 389-407). Routledge.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-Collectivism: A Study of Cross-Cultural Researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 2, 225-248.
- Jehabi, K. (2011). Tunisian university students' choice of apology strategies in a discourse completion task. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 648-662.
- Karsan, N. (2005). *A comparative study of apology speech act in Turkish and English in Turkey*. (Published master's thesis). The Institute of Social Sciences of Erciyes University, Kayseri.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 215-247.
- Kim, H. (2008). The semantic and pragmatic analysis of South Korean and Australian English apologetic speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 257-278.

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

Leech, G. (1989). *The Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M., & Crooks, G. (1992). Three Approaches to Task-based Syllabus Design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26.

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., & Fontaine, J. (2008). Mapping Expressive Differences Around the World: The Relationship between Emotional Display Rules and Individualism Versus Collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39, 1, 55-74.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Boston & Oxford: Blackwell.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. (2nd edition). SAGE Publication.

Neddar, B. A. (2012). Short notes on discourse, interlanguage pragmatics and EFL teaching: where do we stand? *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5687-5692.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library, 6-10.

Nureddeen, F. A. (2008). Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 279-306.

Olshain, E., and Cohen, A. (1983). 'Apology: A Speech Act Set'. In Wolfson and E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley MA: Newbury House.

Olshain, E., and Cohen, A. (1990). The Learning of Complex Speech Act Behaviour. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7, 2, 45-65.

Özdikmenli-Demir, G., & Sayil, M. (2009). Individualism-collectivism and conceptualizations of interpersonal relationships among Turkish Children and their mothers. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26,4, 371-387.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. *Cambridge Language Teaching Library*, 223-224.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1975). *Indirect Speech Acts* in Cole and Morgan (eds.), 1975.

- Shariati, M., and Chamani, F. (2010). Apology strategies in Persian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1689-1699.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Suszczyńska, M. (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: Different languages, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1053-1065.
- Şahin, S. (2011). *American English, Turkish and Interlanguage refusals: A cross-cultural communication and interlanguage pragmatics study*. (Published master's thesis). The Graduate school of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Taguchi, N. (2008). Cognition, language contact, and the development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, 58, 34.
- Taguchi, N. (2009). Pragmatic competence. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence in Japanese as a second language: An introduction* (pp. 1-19). Mouton Series of Pragmatics.
- Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism v. Individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In Verma, G. K., & Bagley, C. (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes and cognition* (pp. 60-95). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 147-167.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.

Uskul, A. K., Hynie, M., & Lalonde, R. N. (2004). Interdependence as a Mediator between Culture and Interpersonal Closeness for Euro-Canadians and Turks. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 2, 174-191.

Weber, R. P. (1990). Basic Content Analysis. *Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*, 49 (pp. 9-14). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Wouk, F. (2006). The language of apologizing in Lombok, Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 1457-1486.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Section I: Background Questions

1. Your gender? Female Male
2. Your age?
3. What is your native language?
4. How many languages do you know? And their levels?
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
5. How long have you been learning English as a foreign language?
.....

Section II:

Apology Instrument

Instructions: You will be asked to read eight brief situations calling for an apology. In each case, the person who you owe the apology to will speak first. Respond as much as possible as you would in an actual situation.

1. You're at a meeting and you say something that one of the participants interprets as a personal insult to him/her.

S/he: "I feel that your last remark was directed at me and I take offense."

You: ...

2. You completely forget a crucial meeting at the office with your boss. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting. Your boss gets on the line and asks:

Boss: "What happened to you?"

You: ...

3. You forget a get-together with a friend. You call him to apologize. This is already the second time you've forgotten such a meeting. Your friend asks over the phone:

Friend: "What happened?"

You: ...

4. You call from work to find out how things are at home and your kid reminds you that you forgot to take him shopping, as you had promised. And this is the second time that this has happened. Your kid says over the phone:

Kid: "Oh, you forgot again and you promised!"

You: ...

5. Backing out of a parking place, you run into the side of another car. It was clearly your fault. You dent in the side doors slightly. The driver gets out and comes over to you angrily.

Driver: "Can't you look where you're going? See what you've done?"

You: ...

6. You accidentally bump into a well-dressed elderly lady at an elegant department store, causing her to spill her packages all over the floor. You hurt her leg, too. It's clearly your fault and you want to apologize profusely.

She: "Ow! My goodness!"

You: ...

7. You bump into a well-dressed elderly lady at a department store, shaking her up a bit. It's your fault, and you want to apologize.

She: "Hey, look out!"

You: ...

8. You bump into an elderly lady at a department store. You hardly could have avoided doing so because she was blocking the way. Still, you feel that some kind of apology is in order.

She: "Oh, my!"

You: ...

Appendix 2: Teaching Activities

Activity 1 (30 min.)

Aim of the activity: This activity aims to create awareness about different levels of offense and different apology strategies. Students are expected to identify the level of offense considering the situation and match it to the apology strategy being used.

Procedure of the activity:

1. Students work in pairs first, then the group discussion follows.
2. Pairs are given a piece of paper on which an apologetic expression and a response to it are written.
3. Pairs are expected to create a situation for the apologetic expression and the response. The aim of this part is to check if the students deduce the level of offense and get the correct situation for it.
4. Then they are asked to perform their situation in front of the others.
5. The rest of the students ask the pair the reason of their choice.
6. At the end of the activity relevant strategies are explicitly introduced to the students.

Situation 1

A: I'm so sorry.

B: It's OK.

Situation 2

A: Oh, sorry.

B: Oh! Sorry.

Situation 3

A: Oh, I'm terribly sorry. Let me get that for you.

B: Thanks. That's OK.

Situation 4

A: Oh, I'm so sorry. Let me help you.

B: Thanks.

Situation 5

A: Oh! I'm so very sorry. Are you OK?

B: Yeah, I think so, but I'm not sure about these

Situation 6

A: Oh my gosh! I'm so sorry. Are you all right?

B: Yeah, thanks.

Activity 2 (30 min.)

Aim of the activity: This activity aims to create awareness about the semantic formulas of apology. It also tries to get the previous knowledge of apologetic expressions from the learners and match them with the native patterns of apologetic expressions by finding the appropriate strategy.

Procedure of the activity:

1. Students are given on the board the table below with the example part missing.

The Speech Act Set for Apologies

Strategy	Example
1. An expression of an apology	
a) Expression of regret	I'm sorry.
b) An offer of apology	I apologize.
c) A request for forgiveness	Excuse me.
2. An explanation or account of the situation	The bus was late.
3. An acknowledgement responsibility	
a) Accepting the blame	It's my fault.
b) Expressing self-deficiency	I wasn't thinking.
c) Recognizing the other person as deserving apology	You are right.
d) Expressing lack of intent	I didn't mean to.
4. An offer of repair	I'll pay for the broken vase.
5. A promise of forbearance	It won't happen again.

(taken from Olshtain and Cohen, 1983)

2. Each student is given a piece of paper on which one of these strategies is written.
3. Students are asked to produce an example for the strategy written on their papers.
4. Students come to the board one by one and write their sentences next to the strategy.
5. A group discussion follows this procedure about the appropriateness of the sentences with the strategies.
6. Then students are given the missing example part of the table. Each student is given a sentence written on a card and asked to stick it next to the appropriate strategy.
7. When this procedure is completed, students see their sentences on one side and the native patterns on the other side, so they are asked to discuss the appropriateness of their choices.

Activity 3 (30 min.)

Aim of the activity: This activity aims to implement apology strategies and to be able to reflect on the others' responses. In this way, some awareness about apology and apology strategy use is aimed to be achieved.

Procedure of the activity:

1. Students work in pairs in this activity.
2. Each pair is given a card on which a situation is written.
3. First, one of the pair responds to the Situation 1, then gives the card to his/her partner to score his/her response using the scale below.

1= acceptable

2= more or less acceptable

3= not acceptable

4. After each turn, group discussion takes place reflecting on the scoring.
5. The other one of the pair writes a response to the Situation 2 and gives the card to his/her partner to score it.
6. By changing the roles, responder-scorer, pairs continue to respond and score until the Situation 4 is completed.
7. When the activity is over, a group discussion is made on the appropriateness of the responses and the scoring.

Situation 1: A close friend of yours invited you to his/her birthday party. You forgot the date of the party, so you couldn't attend it. You see your friend a few days later, and you say:

You: ...

Situation 2: You have missed an important meeting at work due to the heavy traffic. You see your boss after the meeting is over, and you say:

You: ...

Situation 3: you promised that you would help your sister with her exam, but at the same day, you arranged a date with a friend, and totally forgot your sister. The other day you see your sister sad and realize what you have done, and say:

You: ...

Situation 4: You borrowed your friend's car, and accidentally broke its window.

You meet your friend to give the car back, and you say:

You: ...

Activity 4 (30 min.)

Aim of the activity: This activity aims to relate apology and to show its importance providing a real life apology situation. By using an information-gap activity, it is aimed to create some curiosity and to provide the students an opportunity where they can elicit the situation by using former knowledge in a reasoning-gap activity.

Procedure of the activity:

1. Group work is preferred in this activity.
2. A dialogue from the movie “Never Back Down” is written on the board.

“A: I lied, the first class. I had every intention of fighting outside the gym.
B: Is this your apology?”
3. Students are asked to guess the situation lying under this dialogue.
4. Students are asked to guess the relationship, the status of these two people.
5. The snapshot of this scene is shown to the students and they continue eliciting with the help of the characters.
6. After these discussions, the video of this scene is provided to the students. They compare the real situation with their own guesses.
7. As for the last activity, the students are asked to imagine that they are the one who apologizes in this situation and they give their apologetic responses.

Appendix 3: Scripts of Students' Responses to DCT

Turkish Subject Group

Pre-Test Responses

TS1

Situation 1: I'm sorry but I don't want to blame you.

Situation 2: I know I should inform you, but I have very important meeting. So I'm sorry.

Situation 3: I'm complicated very much these days so I completely forgot the meeting. I'm so sorry.

Situation 4: No baby. I didn't forget it. I'm on way and I'm coming to home.

Situation 5: I'm so sorry. You are right and it is completely my fault.

Situation 6: Oh! I'm sorry, madam! I should hurry up. Please, forgive me!

Situation 7: If I hurt you, I'm sorry.

Situation 8: You are welcome, madam. I'm sorry.

TS2

Situation 1: I'm sorry because I did not mean it.

Situation 2: Nothing. I just again forget and I am really sorry about that. I'll come as soon as possible.

Situation 3: My honey, there was something. I had to cope with urgently. That's why I am late.

Situation 4: Next time, I'll repair this. If you wish after work we can go out for shopping.

Situation 5: Firstly, please don't shout at me. Ok. It is my fault and my mind was full of stuff, so I did wrongly.

Situation 6: Ohh. I'm sorry. I did not see you, lady. Are you ok?

Situation 7: Pardon me.

Situation 8: Sorry for that, but you were on my way.

TS3

Situation 1: I am so sorry. I didn't mean it.

Situation 2: I don't know. How did I forget it? It will never happen again.

Situation 3: I'm sorry. I am so busy these days.

Situation 4: I'm sorry my dear. We will go shopping as soon as possible, okey.

Situation 5: I'm sorry. I couldn't realize it. I will make up it urgently.

Situation 6: Forgive me madam! Is there anything I can do for you?

Situation 7: Sorry, madam.

Situation 8: Sorry.

TS4

Situation 1: I didn't intend so, you understood me wrong.

Situation 2: I am really sorry. I completely forgot about the meeting. I can compensate for it.

Situation 3: I am really sorry, I completely forgot about the meeting because my mind is very confused in these days. I won't repeat it again.

Situation 4: Oh, honey. As you know I had a lot of work to do. But, I can go shopping with you two times to compensate it.

Situation 5: Oh, pardon me, sir. I am absent-minded. I really apologize.

Situation 6: Oh, madam, pardon me, I am really sorry. Please forgive me. I may help you. And if you have problem with your leg, I may take you to the hospital.

Situation 7: Pardon me. I am really sorry. Did I hurt you?

Situation 8: Sorry, madam.

TS5

Situation 1: I'm sorry for I make you feel like that. There is actually no intention to direct anyone.

Situation 2: I'm really sorry. Nowadays, I've been experiencing lots of bad things.

Situation 3: I'm really sorry. There are some unexpected things to be dealt with and I totally forgot.

Situation 4: I'm sorry. Let's be prepared and I'm coming there!

Situation 5: I'm sorry I didn't see. I will afford all your damages.

Situation 6: I'm really sorry for that. Can you forgive me?

Situation 7: I'm sorry.

Situation 8: I'm sorry, but you need to look at where you stand.

TS6

Situation 1: No, I didn't mean so.

Situation 2: I'm sorry. My mother is ill and I couldn't come. It won't be again.

Situation 3: I'm sorry my dearie. I forgot our meeting. If you are available tonight, we can meet.

Situation 4: Oh. I'm so sorry my little one. Let's get ready and come and we are going to do shopping.

Situation 5: I'm sorry. Yes it's my fault. Now I'm going to park another place.

Situation 6: I'm sorry madam. Are you okey? I'm going to help you. Don't trouble yourself.

Situation 7: Oh! I'm sorry.

Situation 8: Pardon me. I cannot pass.

TS7

Situation 1: I'm sorry. I didn't mean it.

Situation 2: I'm terribly sorry, sir! I regret forgetting this meeting.

Situation 3: Please forgive me. I am completely absent-minded.

Situation 4: I am so sorry. I was so busy. We will do something else together whenever you want.

Situation 5: I'm terribly sorry. I'm ready to pay for the damage that I caused.

Situation 6: I'm sorry, madam! It was completely my fault.

Situation 7: I'm sorry, madam! I was a bit unconscious.

Situation 8: I'm sorry, madam!

TS8

Situation 1: I am sorry but I didn't direct at you.

Situation 2: I have a really problem. I forget my plans easily. I am so sorry.

Situation 3: I am so sorry. Last days, I have a lot of things to do so I forgot the meeting. I am really sorry.

Situation 4: I am so sorry. I promise that this will not be again.

Situation 5: I am sorry. I am aware of my fault.

Situation 6: I am so sorry. I didn't want to do this. I hope that you are okay.

Situation 7: Pardon me.

Situation 8: Sorry!

TS9

Situation 1: Sorry. You understood me wrongly. I didn't mean it so. Accept my apologies.

Situation 2: Sorry boss. I have forgotten the meeting totally. I know it happened second time, but I promise that it will not happen again.

Situation 3: Oh guys. Nowadays I'm confused. I have forgotten our meeting totally. I'm really sorry.

Situation 4: I know baby. I'm really sorry. I couldn't remember it. I promise that it will not happen again. Trust me.

Situation 5: Sorry. I couldn't see. Such a thing can be always. We can solve this problem together.

Situation 6: Oh madam. I'm very sorry. Are you okay? I hope that you're well. If you're not well, I can pick up you a hospital.

Situation 7: Sorry madam. I couldn't do it consciously.

Situation 8: Excuse me. May I pass?

TS10

Situation 1: I didn't mean to insult you.

Situation 2: Sorry, I forgot the meeting, it won't be again.

Situation 3: Sorry, I was busy and I forgot the get-together. I will make up this another time.

Situation 4: Oh, sweetie, I am very sorry but I am very busy these days I will take you shopping as soon as possible.

Situation 5: You are right, it was my fault but you can be more sincere.

Situation 6: Excuse me, I am very sorry. I did accidentally.

Situation 7: Excuse me, I am very sorry. I did it accidentally.

Situation 8: Oh, I am sorry. It wasn't on purpose.

TS11

Situation 1: I know what I say.

Situation 2: I fell asleep boss, I'm sorry.

Situation 3: I'm so sorry. This is my fault.

Situation 4: Oh, I won't be it again.

Situation 5: Oh, my God! This is my bad fault!

Situation 6: Forgive me. Let's go to a clinic. I will pick them.

Situation 7: I'm sorry.

Situation 8: Pardon.

Post-test Responses

TS1

Situation 1: I am sorry but it was not directed at you. Please, don't take offense.

Situation 2: I am terribly sorry. I am aware of my fault. I don't know how I will fix this situation but I will do my best.

Situation 3: I am so sorry. I had a really big problem. I promise that it won't be again.

Situation 4: Honey, I am terribly sorry. You are right but I was so busy. I will compensate this, don't worry.

Situation 5: I am so sorry. It was my fault.

Situation 6: Oh! I am really sorry. I hope you are okay.

Situation 7: I am sorry.

Situation 8: Sorry about it.

TS2

Situation 1: I didn't mean it, so you should not.

Situation 2: I am sorry sir, I forgot, but next time I'll be there on time.

Situation 3: I am sorry, I know this is a second time, but I'll repair the situation.

Situation 4: Baby, I'm sorry, but when I come to home, I'll take you to go to playground.

Situation 5: Ok, that is my fault but please be careful about your attitude. I'll take my car back now.

Situation 6: I terribly sorry lady. Can I help you?

Situation 7: I'm sorry.

Situation 8: I feel sorry.

TS3

Situation 1: I apologize for it. I never meant this.

Situation 2: I know this is not acceptable but I am very sorry. It would be never again.

Situation 3: I am a bit busy these days and I forget everything. Forgive me. I will be careful for the next time.

Situation 4: Oh, my child. I won't do it again. We will go shopping as soon as possible. I promise you.

Situation 5: Sorry, madam. I can park another place if you want. I didn't see you.

Situation 6: Oh, madam. I don't know how to say my apology. What can I do for you. Let me help you.

Situation 7: Oh, so sorry. Is there any problem?

Situation 8: sorry madam. Can I pass through?

TS4

Situation 1: I didn't mean so. You are wrong.

Situation 2: I am terribly sorry, sir. I forgot the meeting completely. I can do anything to compensate for it. It will never happen again.

Situation 3: Sorry, honey. I forgot the meeting. What about going out tonight to compensate it?

Situation 4: My dear, I am so busy. It won't repeat itself. What about going out tomorrow to compensate it?

Situation 5: Oh, I am terribly sorry, sir. I can pay its cost.

Situation 6: Oh, I am sorry madam. Are you OK? Let me help you.

Situation 7: I am sorry, madam.

Situation 8: Sorry, madam.

TS5

Situation 1: I'm sorry. I didn't mean it.

Situation 2: I'm really sorry. I'm having very bad times recently. This won't happen again.

Situation 3: I'm sorry. I had a very important date. Please forgive me.

Situation 4: Oh, I'm sorry. I had a really important meeting. I promise this won't happen again.

Situation 5: I'm really sorry and I will compensate for your damage.

Situation 6: I'm really sorry. It's my fault.

Situation 7: I'm sorry.

Situation 8: I'm sorry for that but can you stop blocking the way?

TS6

Situation 1: I'm sorry. My intention was not to take offense you.

Situation 2: I'm so sorry sir. Excuse me, please. I have forgotten such a meeting. But, it won't be again.

Situation 3: I'm so sorry, honey. I I have forgotten our meeting. What about meeting later?

Situation 4: Oh, I'm terribly sorry, dearie. Ok. I will cancel everything. Let's go.

Situation 5: I'm sorry. I didn't run into intentionally.

Situation 6: Oh my God. I'm so sorry madam. I'll help you.

Situation 7: Pardon me.

Situation 8: It is not my fault. You are blocking the way. What could I do? Now, if you let me, I want to pass from there!

TS7

Situation 1: I'm terribly sorry. I didn't want to hurt you.

Situation 2: I'm terribly sorry, sir! I am sorry to have forgotten the meeting. How can I compensate it?

Situation 3: I'm sorry, darling! I forgot about it completely.

Situation 4: I am so sorry. I know that I promised to take you shopping but I forgot. I will never forget again.

Situation 5: I'm terribly sorry. It was completely my fault. I will pay for the damage.

Situation 6: I'm so sorry, sir! I didn't realize you.

Situation 7: I'm sorry, sir! I was a bit absent-minded.

Situation 8: I'm so sorry, sir! I didn't want to hurt you.

TS8

Situation 1: It is my fault. I am sorry about that.

Situation 2: I'm so sorry. It will never be again.

Situation 3: I'm sorry but I have had an important meeting at the office.

Situation 4: No, I didn't forget it. I will come late so I think that we can go tomorrow.

Situation 5: You are right. I am so sorry. I will do my best for your car.

Situation 6: I'm sorry.

Situation 7: Sorry, madam!

Situation 8: It's not important. I'm sorry.

TS9

Situation 1: Sorry. I didn't mean so.

Situation 2: I'm very sorry. I've forgotten totally it.

Situation 3: I promise that it will not happen again.

Situation 4: I know baby. I'm very sorry. Trust me, it won't happen again.

Situation 5: I'm so sorry. I'll pay for it.

Situation 6: I am really sorry. It's my fault. I'll pay for it.

Situation 7: Pardon.

Situation 8: Excuse me. Can I pass?

TS10

Situation 1: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to insult you.

Situation 2: I am so sorry, sir. I was so busy, it won't be again.

Situation 3: I'm sorry. I am so busy nowadays, I forgot it, but I will make up for this.

Situation 4: Sorry honey. You know I have a lot of works to do. I will take you shopping at first chance.

Situation 5: I am so sorry, it was my fault, I will pay its cost.

Situation 6: I'm so sorry. It was an accident. Let me help you.

Situation 7: Oh, I'm so sorry. It was an accident. Are you okay?

Situation 8: I'm sorry, but you are blocking the way and I couldn't pass.

TS11

Situation 1: I'm so sorry. It is not about you. I didn't mean to insult to you.

Situation 2: I'm really terribly sorry. I completely forgot the meeting. I know it is not the first time but it will be the last, I promise.

Situation 3: I'm terribly sorry. I forgot it. If you have no plan tomorrow afternoon, can we meet? I'll be there this time.

Situation 4: I'm so sorry, honey. I was so busy that I forgot it. But I will take you shopping another day, I promise.

Situation 5: I'm really, terribly sorry. I know it's my fault. I'll pay its cost.

Situation 6: I'm so sorry, madam. I didn't see you. Let me carry your packages.

Situation 7: I'm so sorry, madam. I know it is my fault. Do you need any help?

Situation 8: I'm really sorry. But I couldn't pass.

Portuguese Subject Group

Pre-test Responses

PS1

Situation 1: I am sorry, that was not my intention. What I wanted to say was...

Situation 2: Sorry I couldn't attend the meeting. I know that is the second time it happens. I'll try to work on it.

Situation 3: Sorry, I forgot to meet you, I will try to be on time next time.

Situation 4: I'm so sorry, I promise I will try to do it when I get home.

Situation 5: Sorry, I saw it but I couldn't avoid. Please let's see what we can do to solve this problem.

Situation 6: Please take my apologies, I didn't meant to bump into you, Are you ok?

Situation 7: Oh sorry! Really sorry.

Situation 8: Sorry! I couldn't avoid it. Did I hurt you?

PS2

Situation 1: I'm sorry Mr./Mrs., that wasn't my intent, I apologize.

Situation 2: I know what you're thinking "This is the second time" but I've been having some trouble at home. I know I shouldn't mix the two, and I am completely and utterly sorry.

Situation 3: Hey, listen sorry I wasn't able to show up last night but you're going to love this ...

Situation 4: Yes! You're right, I know. I didn't mean to forget, I've just been so busy. How about when I get home we go shopping and then for some ice cream.

Situation 5: I'm so sorry, I wasn't paying attention. We should probably exchange information. This was all my fault!

Situation 6: Oh my God! I didn't see you, are you ok? I'm so sorry. Can I get you any help.

Situation 7: Sorry.

Situation 8: Sorry.

PS3

Situation 1: I am sorry, my intention was not to insult you. I was just trying to give a general example.

Situation 2: I'm sorry, I totally forgot about the meeting, since I had a lot of work and preparing to do today. I will be there as soon as possible.

Situation 3: I'm sorry, I'm really tired and didn't sleep well last night. I'll meet you later today.

Situation 4: I'm sorry son, I'm very busy but I promise I will take you shopping this week-end.

Situation 5: It's my fault, I'm sorry. Let's call my insurance company and we'll take care of this.

Situation 6: Sorry madame, are you OK? Let me help you with that, and I will take you to the hospital so they take care of your leg.

Situation 7: Ups, sorry. Are you OK? I wasn't looking where I was going. Sorry if I startled you.

Situation 8: I'm so sorry. We should go to the hospital and check if you got injured.

PS4

Situation 1: I'm so sorry! That wasn't, at all, my intention. Please let me rephrase what I meant.

Situation 2: Hello Sir, I apologize for missing the meeting again, I was so focused taking care of some paperwork that I completely forgot. I promise that won't happen again!

Situation 3: Hi! Sorry, my bad! I completely forgot we were supposed to meet today! Can we reschedule our meeting?

Situation 4: Oh, I'm so, so sorry honey! This is the last time I fail you, I promise! We can go shopping tomorrow and I'll buy you a present to make it up to you!!

Situation 5: I apologize for this, let me have your contacts so that I can pay for all the damages. And I'm sorry once again.

Situation 6: Oh, I'm so so sorry, let me help you! What can I do for you? Shall I take you to the hospital? Let me pick all your packages!

Situation 7: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to disturb you!

Situation 8: Sorry, it wasn't my intention to hurt you, but you were blocking the way!

PS5

Situation 1: Not by any means! I am sorry that apparently I wasn't being clear enough. What I really meant is that ...

Situation 2: I am really sorry. I am on my way now. If you still have some minutes, I would like to talk to you in person.

Situation 3: I'm really sorry. I simply totally forgot our date! There was so much going on in the last few weeks and I had a lot of stuff to manage. Can I invite you over to my place tomorrow? I would like to cook dinner for us. Wine is on me, of course!

Situation 4: I am so sorry. It won't happen again. Instead, we'll go shopping on Saturday and afterwards we'll see that new film at the cinema, okay?

Situation 5: I am really, really sorry. That's the first time something like this happens to me. Can we deal with this without calling the police? Of course my insurance will pay for it.

Situation 6: Oh my God, I'm so sorry. I didn't see you coming! Let me help you with that, please! Did I hurt you? I'm really sorry.

Situation 7: I'm sorry! Are you okay?

Situation 8: Sorry.

PS6

Situation 1: Excuse me. Can you tell me why?

Situation 2: apologize, but I really forgot the meeting. I promise that it won't happen again. I'm really sorry!

Situation 3: Jesus! How can I explain you? Yeah... Ok... I forgot... again! I'm terribly sorry!

Situation 4: Yes, dear! You are right, but mummy forgot so I won't promise anything again. Wait just a minute because I'm arriving.

Situation 5: I'm sorry, but you don't have to talk like that. Let's have a conversation.

Situation 6: I'm really, really sorry! How can I help you?

Situation 7: I'm sorry!

Situation 8: I'm sorry! I couldn't avoid it.

PS7

Situation 1: Aw, I'm so sorry. I didn't mean to... I'm sorry. Don't misunderstand me, please.

Situation 2: I'm sorry. Ah ... I have a problem with the car and you know the traffic is at rush time. It won't happen again.

Situation 3: Aw, I'm sorry. I completely forget it. You know me. You know I forget things. Can we meet another day?

Situation 4: I'm sorry honey but things got complicated at work. I promise you that when I take you shopping I give you that thing you've been asking for for long time ago.

Situation 5: I am sorry. I am so sorry. I didn't see you. There's no need to talk like that. Everything can be fixed.

Situation 6: Ow. I am so sorry. Are you alright? Are you OK? Allow me to ... catch the packages for you.

Situation 7: I am sorry. I am so sorry. Are you alright?

Situation 8: Ow, I am sorry but I couldn't avoid it! Are you alright? Sorry again.

Post-test Responses

PS1

Situation 1: Sorry, I wasn't my intention to hurt your feelings not even directed to you. This was my opinion although it can not be taken as right on something you should attach with.

Situation 2: I'm sorry boss. I know that's the second time I miss a meeting. But I have been working a lot plus that I have been facing some problems with my personal life. Please let me know if possible what I've missed and I'll set up things and whatever you need me, just say.

Situation 3: Oh sorry, I'm really sorry, I hope you are ok. I know that I did it once, but that's something which I have to work on I promise you I won't do it anymore, and I would like to invite you to go out I'll pay all.

Situation 4: Sorry kid. I know I promised you, that's my fault. I won't do it again. Is there something you want? I'll take you out more times.

Situation 5: Please did you get hurt? I'm so sorry, that's my fault, can I do something to repair any damage?

Situation 6: Ow! Sorry, please are you ok? Do you need to call ambulance? I am so sorry to not see you. If you need anything please tell me, I'll take it to you.

Situation 7: Sorry lady, It wasn't my intention. Can I help you in anything?

Situation 8: Sorry, I couldn't avoid it, anyway are you ok? Can I help you.

PS2

Situation 1: I hear and understand why you may have taken offense, but what I said was not directed towards you or any other persons. I apologize for my poor choice of wording.

Situation 2: Firstly, I would like to convey how deeply sorry I am for having missed the meeting. I realize it is my second time, and there is no excuse, but I had a flat, and the tow truck took an hour to arrive.

Situation 3: Hey, listen, something came up. Sorry I couldn't call you sooner. Rain check?

Situation 4: I know I forgot again Jr., but as soon as I get home we'll go, it's just been hectic. Sorry.

Situation 5: I wasn't paying attention, I'm so, so very sorry. Let's exchange information.

Situation 6: I'm very sorry ma'am. I'm such a clutz. Are you alright?

Situation 7: I apologize, I didn't see you there, are you OK?

Situation 8: Sorry!

PS3

Situation 1: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to offend you. I was just giving an example.

Situation 2: Well I'll be honest. I know it is not the first time this happens, but I forgot about the meeting. I'll start working on it and have it on your desk by this afternoon.

Situation 3: I totally forgot I was suppose to meet you, but I was so tired I fell asleep. Do you mind coming over?

Situation 4: Listen now, I know I promised but I'm really busy right now. I'll make it up to you this weekend.

Situation 5: I'm really sorry, I didn't see you there, my bad. I'll pay for the repairs, don't worry.

Situation 6: Oh my goodness, I'm awfully sorry. Are you okay? Did you get hurt? The best I can do is to take you to the hospital.

Situation 7: I'm really sorry ma'am, didn't see where I was going, are you ok?

Situation 8: I'm so sorry I bumped into you. Are you okay?

PS4

Situation 1: I'm sorry if you didn't get what I meant! It wasn't, at all, my intention to insult you! This was a misunderstanding.

Situation 2: Hello Sir! I apologize for not being in the meeting again, but I had a family problem, and all this situation led me to forget that I was supposed to attend the meeting.

Situation 3: Hi! I'm sorry! I was studying for my exam and I completely forgot we were supposed to go out! Let me make it up to you! I promise I won't fail again.

Situation 4: Oh sweetie I am so so sorry! Let me make it up to you! We'll go to the shopping tomorrow and I'll buy you a very special present!

Situation 5: I'm sorry! I should've been more careful! Please let me take care of the situation and I'll pay for all the damages! And I'm sorry again for the inconvenience.

Situation 6: Oh my God! I'm so so sorry! Let me help you! Let me grab all your packages! Is your leg ok? Do you want me to take you to the hospital to see if everything's OK?

Situation 7: Oh, I'm sorry, it wasn't my intention to hurt you! Are you OK?

Situation 8: I'm sorry, but you were in my way!

PS5

Situation 1: I'm sorry for having provoked that impression, but you really got me wrong here. What I was trying to say was...

Situation 2: Hello. I'm so sorry I forgot our meeting. To be honest, I don't even know what to say because it's already the second time. All the moment, I'm having a lot of stress and I'm not quite myself. Please don't think that this will happen all the time now. I'm really sorry. When can I meet you to make it up in person? I could be at your office in like 10 mins, for example?

Situation 3: I am so sorry! I had such a long day at work and when I got home, my sister called, she's having problems with her boyfriend. Like this, I just totally forgot our date.

I'm really, really sorry. I hope you can forgive me once more? I wanna make it up again, so are you still free tomorrow night? Wine and dinner is on me, of course!

Situation 4: I'm really sorry, darling. I promised you something and couldn't keep it, that shouldn't happen, you're right! But on Saturday we'll go shopping the whole day and you can have ice cream and pizza, ok? That'll be fun! But I'm still really sorry.

Situation 5: I'm sorry! Didn't see that coming... But please, don't be that mad, it was clearly not my intention to do that! Of course my insurance will pay for the damage, so let's just exchange our numbers.

Situation 6: I am so very sorry! Please, let me help you get up! I don't know how that could happen, I should've seen you there. Does your leg hurt? Do you think I should bring you to a doctor? I'm so, so sorry!

Situation 7: I'm really sorry. I was in such a hurry. Are you okay?

Situation 8: I'm sorry!

PS6

Situation 1: I am really sorry. I didn't mean to offend you. Can you explain me where or how did I offend you?

Situation 2: Sir, I'm calling to apologize. I would like to do it in presence but, as you can observe, I'm not yet at the office due to a problem that I can justify...

Situation 3: OK! Maybe it's better you change me for another friend. But if you still like me we can arrange another get-together... I'll prove to you that you have a lot of courage...

Situation 4: My dear baby... I'm sorry but I didn't have enough money to take you shopping... so I had to work a little more...

Situation 5: I am really sorry. I'll pay everything.

Situation 6: Oh! I'm really sorry! Can I help you? Are you hurt?

Situation 7: Sorry! I didn't see you...

Situation 8: Sorry! I didn't see you...

PS7

Situation 1: I am sorry, I didn't mean to offend you. Don't misinterpret me I really didn't mean what you think I did. Maybe I didn't use the correct words... I apologize once again.

Situation 2: I beg your pardon? What time is it? I got stuck with the last project... I lost the notion of time. I'm so sorry. I can make extra work if you like to compensate it. Could you tell me the main points of the meeting to start work on it, please?

Situation 3: I'm so sorry. I completely forgot! I know this is the second time I forget this but I've been very busy lately. Ah... Can we meet another day? Sorry again.

Situation 4: I know I promised, honey but something happened here and now I have extra work. I promise I'll compensate it. I buy you those t-shirts you've been asking for for a long time, what you say?

Situation 5: I know what I've done, thank you very much. There is no need to talk and react like that, there are much worse things in this world and besides, it's just a car. I pay for the damage, there's no need to worry about it. And I didn't say it before but... I'm sorry for all this, I truly am.

Situation 6: Ow! I am so sorry! Are you ok, madam? Let me help you pick up those for you, will you? I am so sorry, I really am. Would you accept my apology?

Situation 7: I am so sorry. Are you OK? Can I do something for you?

Situation 8: I am sorry. I really am. Are you alright? Sorry madam I couldn't avoid it really.

Appendix 4: Permissions

10/01/2014

GOP E-Posta :: Re: permission request

Konu **Re: permission request**
Gönderen Andrew Cohen <adcohen@umn.edu>
Alınan <hande.cetin@gop.edu.tr>
Tarih 04.10.2013 17:14



Yes. I am happy to give you permission to use the Apology instrument you are referring to.

Best, Andrew Cohen

Andrew D. Cohen
Prof. Emeritus, U. of Minnesota
1555 Lakeside Drive, #182, Oakland, CA 94612.
Tel.: 510-250-9205 (home), 612-747-4700 (cell)
adcohen@umn.edu / <https://z.umn.edu/adcohen>

On Fri, Oct 4, 2013 at 5:50 AM, <hande.cetin@gop.edu.tr> wrote:

Dear Professor,

I'm working as a research assistant at Gazi University, Turkey, under the frames of English Language Teaching Program. My thesis is designed around pragmatics awareness taking 'apology' as its basis. I'm writing to you in reference to your Apology Instrument. I would like to use it as my data collection tool. I wonder if you could give me the permission to use it.

Best regards,

Hande Çetin

Research Assistant
Educational Sciences Institute
Gazi University, Turkey

10/01/2014

GOP E-Posta : Re: permission request

Konu **Re: permission request**
Gönderen Elite and Zeev Olshtain <elitezeev@yahoo.com>
Alınan hande.cetin@gop.edu.tr <hande.cetin@gop.edu.tr>
Tarih 05.10.2013 10:44



Dear Hande Cetin,

I would be pleased to allow you to use the apology instrument. Please keep me posted on your results. I wish you success in your work.

Elite Olshtain

Elite and Zeev Olshtain
5, Ha Lamed Hey St.
Jerusalem, 93661
Israel
Tel: 972-2-5639326
Fax: 972-2-5636840

From: "hande.cetin@gop.edu.tr" <hande.cetin@gop.edu.tr>
To: elitezeev@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, October 4, 2013 3:25 PM
Subject: permission request

Dear Professor,

I'm working as a research assistant at Gazi University, Turkey, under the frames of English Language Teaching Program. My thesis is designed around pragmatics awareness taking 'apology' as its basis. I'm writing to you in reference to your Apology Instrument. I would like to use it as my data collection tool. I wonder if you could give me the permission to use it.

Best regards,

Hande Çetin

Research Assistant
Educational Sciences Institute
Gazi University, Turkey



GAZİ GELECEKTİR..