The Realization of the Apology Speech Act in English by Japanese Speakers:

Cross-Cultural Differences, Pragmatic Transfer, and Pedagogical Implications

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate School of Literary Studies

English

Doshisha Women's College of Liberal Arts

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Literature

---

by

Hitomi ABE

(Adviser: Prof. Kathleen KITAO)

February 2017

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to Doshisha Women's College Professor S. Kathleen Kitao, for invaluable comments and suggestions on my dissertation. All errors that remain are my own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. Introduction

The importance of communicative competence has been recognized as a goal of language teaching and learning in the field of second language acquisition since the notion of communicative competence was introduced by Hymes (1972). He emphasized that the speaker's knowledge of grammar is not enough for appropriate communication in different situations with different interlocutors. Speakers need to acquire both grammatical and sociocultural knowledge of how to use language appropriately. Language learning also requires acquiring pragmatic competence that uses appropriate ways of conveying communicative intent in various situations. Therefore, learners must acquire not only linguistic rules such as phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, but they must also acquire sociocultural rules of language use (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Wolfson, 1989). Although teaching the grammar and vocabulary of a language is not enough, teachers of English as a foreign language often do not know how to teach communicative competence, including pragmatic and cultural competence in the target language.

Studies on interlanguage pragmatics, the study of nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge, have garnered increasing attention (Kasper & Rose, 1999; Eliss, 1994). Rizk (2003) defined pragmatic transfer as "the influence of learners' pragmatic knowledge of language and culture other than the target language on their comprehension, production, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic information" (p. 404). Pragmatic transfer can be either positive, which suggests sociocultural and pragmatic universality among languages, or negative, which shows inappropriate transfer of L1 linguistic norms into L2. Many of the L2 pragmatic transfer studies have shown that despite being linguistically competent in L2 language, learners are likely to transfer L1 pragmatic rules in their L2 production (Blum-Kulka, 1982). Pragmatic failure occurs where speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from the L1 to L2 (Thomas,

1983).

Speech acts are one of the key aspects of linguistic pragmatics. The present study focuses on the speech act of apology. The function of apology is to restore and maintain harmony between a speaker and hearer. People expect to apologize when they think that they have violated social norms (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). Apologies differ cross-linguistically and are realized in different patterns and carry a specific cultural value in each community. Apologizing is not an easy matter in one's first language, and having to do it in a second or foreign language is even more complicated. Along with requests and refusals, apology has been studied extensively in previous pragmatic studies in many different languages in comparison with English: Hebrew (Cohen & Olshtain, 1985), Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Sugimoto, 1995), and Korean (Jung, 2004). The findings of those studies indicate that even advanced level of nonnative speakers of English often lack native-like English pragmatic competence and the need for more study. It is necessary for L2 learners to be properly taught that pragmatic rules of other languages are not always the same as those of their own.

The purpose of the present study is to examine the differences and similarities between Japanese and English concerning the way speakers apologize in these languages. The aim of this study is to investigate the strategies that Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese and native-English speaking Americans use in apologizing in different situations. The study also examines how Japanese junior high and high school English textbooks teach apologies and American English speakers' evaluation of Japanese apologies in English. The usefulness of such a study lies in giving materials developers and teachers information about how apologies are realized in English and the problems that Japanese speakers have in apologizing in English.

This thesis is structured in four chapters.

The purpose of Chapter II: Review of Literature is to introduce the key theoretical concepts that the study is based on and to provide overviews of previous studies that

have been carried out on apologies in different languages. In addition, methodological issues related to cross-cultural pragmatic studies are considered and the research questions the present study attempts to answer are introduced.

Chapter III: Methodology and Results includes explanations of the methodology used in each study and presents the findings of the studies in terms of the overall use of apology strategies in order to answer the research questions. Discussion of situations is an in-depth discussion of the results for each of the ten situations for which the participants in the study had to provide an apology. EFL textbooks used in Japanese junior high school and high school are analyzed. Japanese apologies in English are evaluated by American English speakers. This chapter also describes the procedures and instruments used to collect the data, the participants in the studies, as well as the way the data are analyzed. The discussion will be based both on a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of the data.

Finally, Chapter IV: Conclusions will summarize the most important findings of the study, as well as present the implications of these results to further studies.

2. Review of Literature

2. 1 Communicative Competence

Hymes (1972) first introduced the concept of "communicative competence." He emphasized that the speaker's knowledge of grammar is not sufficient for communicating appropriately in different situations with different interlocutors. Speakers need a good command of both grammar and sociocultural knowledge. He stated, "The engagement of language in social life has a positive, productive aspect. There are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (p. 278). He maintained that language should be described as the appropriate way of speaking as judged by speech community in which the language is used (e.g., what to say under a certain situation; how a person show a deference, gets someone do to something, etc.) The way of speaking can vary substantially from one culture to another, even in the most fundamental manners. Although the learners recognize the foreign form of the target language, they often fail to understand the fact that the foreign form also functions in a foreign way. This way in which the language functions pertain to how the native speakers use the language and what they consider to be appropriate in language use. Brown (1980) also indicated "The culmination of language learning is not simply in the mastery of the forms of language, but the mastery of forms in order to accomplish the communicative functions of language" (p. 189).

Canale and Swain (1980) defined communicative competence, and the concept was further developed in Canale (1983). They identified four kinds of competence underlying the systems of knowledge and skill required for communication:

1) Grammatical competence: the ability to understand the language code features and rules of the language, including vocabulary, word formation, sentence formation, pronunciation, spelling, etc.

2) Sociolinguistic competence: the ability to use language in different sociolinguistic

contexts, depending on contextual factors such as the status of the participants and the purpose of the interaction.

3) Discourse competence: the ability to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text.

4) Strategic competence: the ability to use verbal and non-verbal communication strategies such as paraphrasing and clear reference that are required to deal with communication breakdown or to enhance communicative effectiveness.

This model has dominated the fields of second and foreign language acquisition and language testing for more than decades.

In more recent definitions, Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) proposed a much more comprehensive model of communicative competence, more precisely, the model of communicative language ability. They devoted special attention to the aspect of language use, the way language is used for the purpose of achieving a particular communicative goal in a specific situational context of communication. According to them, many traits of language users such as some general characteristics, their topical knowledge, affective schemata, and language ability influence the communicative language ability. Their focal element is "language knowledge" (See Figure 1). Language knowledge consists of "organizational knowledge" and "pragmatic knowledge." Organizational knowledge includes "grammatical knowledge" (knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, phonology, and graphology) and "textual knowledge" (knowledge of cohesion and rhetorical and conversational organization). Textual knowledge enables comprehension and production of (spoken or written) contexts. Pragmatic knowledge includes "functional knowledge" and "sociolingustic knowledge." Functional knowledge is knowledge of pragmatic conventions for expressing acceptable language functions and for interpreting the procedure of utterances or discourse. Sociolinguistic knowledge is knowledge of sociolinguistic conventions for creating and interpreting language utterances which are appropriate in a

particular context of language use. Compared with the model of Canale and Swain, this model is more organizational description of basic components of communicative competence.

```
LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE
├── ORGANISATIONAL KNOWLEDGE
│   ├── GRAMATICAL KNOWLEDGE
│   │   ├── vocabulary
│   │   ├── syntax
│   │   └── phonology / graphology
│   └── TEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE
│       ├── cohesion
│       ├── rhetorical and conversational organisation
│       └── imaginative functions
└── PRAGMATIC KNOWLEDGE
    ├── FUNKTIONAL KNOWLEDGE
    │   ├── ideational functions
    │   ├── manipulative functions
    │   ├── heuristic functions
    │   └── cultural references and figures of speech
    └── SOCIOLINGUISTIC KNOWLEDGE
        ├── dialects and language varieties
        ├── registers
        └── natural and idiomatic expressions
```

Figure 1. Areas of language knowledge (Source: Bachman & Palmer, 1996, p. 68)

These skills are crucial to smooth communication, but, except for grammatical competence, they have long been neglected in foreign language teaching. It is not easy to acquire these command, but it is necessary to acquire communicative competence to use second language successfully.

6

2. 1. 1 Pragmatic Competence in Second Language Learners

An important aspect of communicative competence is pragmatic competence, which requires knowledge of sociocultural rules. Pragmatic competence involves the ability to comprehend and produce socially appropriate language functions in discourse as well as linguistic or grammatical knowledge (Wolfson, 1989). According to Kasper and Rose (2001), pragmatics has been defined in various ways, reflecting authors' theoretical orientation and audience. Levinson (1983) described pragmatics as the study of language from a functional perspective, that is, it attempts to explain facets of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic causes. Fraser (1983) described pragmatic competence as "the knowledge of how an addressee determines what a speaker is saying and recognizes intended illocutionary force conveyed through subtle attitudes" (p. 30). Rintell (1997) also pointed out that "pragmatics is the study of speech acts," arguing that L2 learner pragmatic ability is reflected in how learners produce utterances in the target language to communicate specific intentions and conversely, how they interpret the intentions which their interlocutor's utterances convey. I find the definition of pragmatics of Crystal (1997) particularly useful. He pointed out that pragmatics is "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (p. 301). It is real-life interactions and requires not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language within a given culture. Kasper and Rose (2001) further explained that pragmatics focus on "the way speakers and writers accomplish goals as social actors who do not need to just get things done but must attend to their interpersonal relationships with other participants at the same time" (p. 2). Researchers have emphasized the importance of research examining the development of pragmatic competence.

Second language learners are required to have the ability to use language and to recognize the intended meaning appropriately in accordance with the sociocultural context. Cohen and Olshtain (1994) mentioned sociocultural ability as "the respondents' skill at selecting speech act strategies that are appropriate given (a) the culture involved, (b) the age and sex of the speaker, (c) their social class and occupation, and (d) their roles and status in the interaction" (p. 145). Later, Cohen (1995) developed the concepts of sociocultural ability and sociolinguistic ability; Sociocultural ability refers to the respondents' skill at selecting appropriate linguistic forms to express the particular strategy used to realize the speech act (e.g., expression of regret in an apology, registration of a grievance in a complaint, specification of the objective of a request, or the refusal of an invitation). Sociolinguistic ability is the speaker's control over the actual language forms used to realize the speech act (e.g., "sorry" vs. "excuse me," "really sorry" vs. "very sorry"), as well as their control over register or formality of the utterance from most intimate to most formal language (p. 23).

Leech (1983) and his colleague Thomas (1983) divided pragmatics into two components: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Leech (1983) claimed that pragmalinguistics is the study of "particular resources which a given language provides for conveying illocutions" (p. 11). It refers to the resources for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meanings. Such resources include pragmatic strategies like directness and indirectness, routines, and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts. Pragmalinguistic competence involves the assessment of the pragmatic force of particular linguistic forms and the ability to use them appropriately. Sociopragmatics is described as the sociological interface of pragmatics, which investigates "the social perceptions underlying participants' interpretation and performance of communicative action" (Leech, 1983, p. 10). Sociopragmatic competence involves the correct social perceptions underlying participants' interaction and performance of communicative

8

action and the ability to use language appropriately according to context. Speech communities differ in their assessment of speaker's and hearer's social distance and social power, their rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition involved in particular communicative acts. Thomas (1983) pointed out that pragmalinguistics consists of linguistic forms and their respective functions, sociopragmatics is very much about proper social behavior.

For ELT, having students acquire pragmatic competence and understanding of socio-cultural norms hold the key to successful communication. It is necessary for students to have the ability to produce the appropriate speech act in specific situations.

2. 1. 2 Pragmatic Transfer and Interlanguage Pragmatics

Language transfer is the influence of a language learner's native language on his/her second or foreign language (Selinker, 1983). Blum-Kulka (1982) and Olshatain (1983) investigated language learners' sociolinguistic transfers and showed that both the choice of speech act as a strategy and the learner's sociocultural rule transferred from L1 to L2. Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) defined "pragmatic transfer" as transfer of first language (L1) sociocultural communicative competence in performing L2 speech acts or any other aspects of L2 conversation, where the speaker is trying to achieve a particular function of language. Pragmatic transfer is the influence of L1 on the production and comprehension of linguistic action in L2. It can be positive and negative. The present study focuses on language transfer from Japanese to English. The Japanese responses in English are compared with responses from native speakers of American English and from Japanese speaking Japanese.

According to Henstock (2003), in the field of second language acquisition, the term interlanguage means a second language learners' produced language that is different from both the target language and his or her native language. Interlanguage pragmatics is the study of non-native speakers' comprehension, production and

acquisition of linguistic action in L2. In other words, it can be defined as the study of non-native speakers' use and acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993).

2. 1. 3 Thomas's Pragmatic Failures

Thomas (1983) defined pragmatic competence as the ability to use language effectively to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context. She also defined misinterpretation of an utterance in a context as pragmatic failure. It is caused by a lack of pragmatic competence, thus it can be defined as "the inability to use language effectively and to understand what is meant by what is said." The concept was further developed later by Einstain and Bodman (1986), as errors caused when non-native speakers do not know what to say, or when they say something inappropriate, as a result of transferring incongruent social rules, values, and belief systems from their native language and cultures.

Thomas (1983) divided pragmatic failure into pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Pragmalinguistic failure is the pragmatic force of the L2 speaker's message is misunderstood or the L2 speaker does not understand the pragmatic force of the L1 speaker's massage. It is the inability to interpret and use the conventional linguistic forms, for example, the English expression, "Can you …?" used as a request rather than a genuine inquiry of one's ability. Sociopragmatic failure is the L2 learner violates pragmatic norms because he/she does not know what can be said to whom in particular situations. Misconceptions of another culture may cause sociopragmatic failure. For example, what kind of question is appropriate depends on native speakers' norms. Such failures may be caused by a fundamental conflict of cultural values.

The difference between pragmalinguistic failures and sociopragmatic failures may not be clear when they were observed. According to Thomas, these two failures have very different causes. Pragmalinguistic failures are caused by a lack of linguistic

knowledge of the specific language, and sociopragmatic failures are caused by misperceptions of a culture. She emphasized that in order to prevent these two types of pragmatic failure, it is essential for language teachers to understand the differences between these two failures and their causes and instill this understanding in their students. Pragmalinguistic failure occurs when speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from L1 to L2 and is caused by mistaken beliefs about the pragmatic force of the utterance. When a speaker tries to perform the right speech but uses the wrong linguistic means, a pragmalinguistic failure occurs. Pragmalinguistic failures can be prevented by teaching when to use particular words, idiomatic phrases, and speech acts of the target language in various contexts/situations. On the other hand, sociopragmatic failures cannot be easily prevented because the cause of sociopragmatic failures may involve each learner's values and beliefs that may conflict with the target culture's values. Sociopragmatic failure stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes linguistic behaviour. A sociopragmatic failure results from when a speaker deviates from appropriate meaning. She claimed that teachers cannot force students to take the target culture's values, but they can gradually increase students' cultural awareness and have them appreciate alternative world views.

One of the aims of the present study is to recognize and help prevent pragmatic failure. By identifying pragmatic transfers and interlanguage, the causes of Japanese speakers' pragmatic failures in the English apology speech act can be determined. I believe that understanding the apology language norms of the two cultures and reducing misconceptions that cause pragmatic failures.

2. 2 The Speech Act of Apology

Speech acts are communicative activities defined with reference to the intentions of speakers and the effects achieved on the listeners. According to Searle (1969), all linguistic communication involves the production of speech acts, such as requesting

something, refusing, offering, apologies, thanking, compliment, complaining. They are different from culture to culture and those differences may result in communication difficulties. This study focuses on the speech act of "apology." According to Olshtain (1983), insulting someone, or physically hurting another person unintentionally, seem to be universally accepted situations which call for an apology, yet different degrees of severity of the action, or different circumstances related to the behavior which results in the need to apologize, might call for different types of apologies and different intensities of such apologies in different cultures.

Goffman (1971) defined apologies as remedial interchanges, remedial work which aims to reestablish social harmony after a real or virtual offense. According to Searle (1979), a person who apologies for doing A expresses regret at having done A. Therefore, the apology act can take place only if the speaker believes that some act A has been performed prior to the time of speaking and that this act A resulted in an infraction which affected another person who is now deserving of apology. Fraser (1981) defined apologies that the offender's expressions of regret for the undesirable effect of the act upon the offended party. Apologies are called for when there is some behavior which has violated social norms (Olshtain 1983). A suitable definition of an apology for this study is Goffman's views of apologies as remedial interchanges. It indicates that an acceptance of responsibility by the speaker, and serve as an implicit self-judgment against the speaker. When an action or utterance (or the lack of either one) has resulted in offense, the offender needs to apologize. The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to "set things right." By apologizing, the person who committed the offence lets the offended person know that he/she is sorry for what he/she has done. Thus apologies provide a remedy for an offence and help restore harmony.

Different researchers have examined apologies in different languages according to different variables. Non-native speakers have to learn what the specific conditions for

apology are in the target community, what the strategies and linguistic means are by which apology can be implemented, and how to make contextually appropriate choices from the apology speech act set.

2. 2. 1 Studies on Non-Native English Speakers' Apologies

The conditions which call for apologies and the actual realizations of the apology speech acts vary from culture to culture (Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper, & Ross, 1995). Various apology speech act studies have been carried out by comparing native speaker's apology performances with those of non-natives.

In a series of studies, Cohen and Olshtain (1981, 1985) and Olshtain and Cohen (1983) compared the use of apologies in Hebrew and English. They categorized the five major apology strategies such as:

1) An expression of an apology: Use of an expression which contains a relevant performative expression (e.g., "I'm sorry," "I apologize," "Excuse me," or "Please, forgive me," "Pardon me.")

2) An explanation or account of the situation used as an indirect act of apology: Explanation or an account of situations which caused the apologizer to commit the offense (e.g., "I have family business," "I'm late for my class.")

3) Acknowledgment of responsibility: Recognition by an apologizer of his or her own fault in causing the offense (e.g., "That's my fault," "I admit that I was wrong.")

4) An offer of repair: Offer made by an apologizer to provide payment for some kind of damage caused by his or her infraction, which can be specific and non-specific (e.g., "I will do extra work over the weekend.")

5) A promise of forbearance: Commitment made by an apologizer not to let the offense happen again (e.g., "It won't happen again.")

Cohen and Olshtain (1981) investigated the ability to use the appropriate sociocultural

rules of the speech act of apology in nonnative speakers of English. They compared 32 Hebrew intermediate-level learners of English and 12 native English speakers in eight situations with role-played testing. The result showed that comparing with native English speakers, Hebrew intermediate-level learners of English occasionally underutilized the main strategies of expressing an apology, acknowledging responsibility, and offering repair. They found that some situations where nonnative English speakers' deviations from the cultural patterns of native English speakers seemed more a result of negative transfer from Hebrew-speaker patterns than a misperception of how to use the formulas in English. In these cases not only did nonnatives use as semantic formula considerably less than native English speakers did, but use of the formula among native Hebrew speakers in Hebrew was low as well. There were also situations where the problem appeared to be more one of grammatical competence than negative transfer from Hebrew-speaker patterns. In such cases, the frequency of use of semantic formulas by native English and Hebrew speakers seemed similar and yet the nonnatives tend to use these formulas less. There were situations in which the nonnative English speakers responded like native English speakers even when Hebrew speakers responded quite differently in Hebrew. They found that foreign language learners did not seem to know the appropriate L2 linguistic forms to convey their intentions and used general formulas instead, thus often saying too little in L2. The nonnative speakers, unlike the native speakers, were also found to avoid intensification and the use of softeners in the foreign language. Cohen and Olshtain (1985) further examined the difference between 84 Hebrew advanced native learners of English and 96 native English speakers in their apology behavior. They used the questionnaire, which included eight apology situations. The findings showed that there were not many differences between the natives and the non-natives with regard to the main strategies for apologizing. Negative transfer from Hebrew-speaker patterns due to a lack of sociocultural awareness and a lack of grammatical competence were no longer prevalent

among the more advanced learners. The native speakers used a well-place interjection or curse and offer of repair sometimes took the place of an expression of apology with an intensifier compared with Hebrew learners of English. It could be seen that natives had a sense of the appropriate comment to use in a given situation as social lubricant to reinforce the apology.

Garcia (1989) compared the politeness strategies used by Americans and Venezuelans in an English language role-play for situation, apologizing to a friend for not having attended his party. Ten female native English speakers and ten female native Spanish speakers participated in that study. Americans and Venezuelans used different apology strategies in English. The results showed that Americans were deferential in their interactions with the offended host whereas Venezuelans were more casual, seeking to maintain a positive friendly face on a more equal basis. As a result of that, Americans were able to establish harmony with the American host, Venezuelans made him feel offended by what he perceived as Spanish's callousness. This study indicated that compared to Venezuelan conversational style, American conversational style has a distinct preference for deference politeness strategies. The Vebezuelan learners' L1-based strategy transfer into L2 apologies led to both disharmony and miscommunication between the hearer (host) and the apologizer.

Yang (2002) examined how Korean EFL learners' apology speech act strategies were transferred from their native language in interlanguage pragmatics perspectives and how they were influenced by sociolinguistic variations such as social status, social distance, severity of offense, and formal or private relationships in posited situations. Participants of 40 Korean learners of English and 20 English native speakers (ENS) responded a given questionnaire with 15 situations. This study showed that most Korean learners of English transferred apology strategies into expressions in English from those of their native language. Korean native speakers (KNS) and Korean learners of English (KLE) were similarly influenced by the four sociolinguistic variations in given

situations requesting participant to respond. On the whole, KLE indicated different strategies from those of ENS and similar strategies with those of KNS in several situations. From the findings, it is evident that KLE transfer their strategies and pragmatic expressions from their native language, affected by the awareness of sociolinguistic variations when they use apology in various situations. Especially, "offer of repair" and "acknowledgment of responsibility" seemed to be transferred from those of their native language. It provided evidence of negative transfer of strategy choice in apology speech acts.

Jung (2004) investigated how advanced Korean learners of English perform L2 apology speech acts, as compared to native English speakers and the possible factors contributing to differences and similarities observed among both groups with two situations of oral role-plays. The result showed that even advanced L2 learners did not necessarily possess adequate sociolinguistic or sociocultural awareness in order to successfully perform the speech act of apology in the target culture. Advanced L2 learners differed from target language speakers in terms of both lexico-grammatical and pragmatic appropriateness. The difference seemed to be due to a variety of factors, including L2 learners' verbosity, transfer of their L1 linguistic and pragmatic knowledge, lack of awareness of appropriate L2 social norms, and lack of appropriate L2 linguistic forms to accomplish the communicative intentions. In reference to frequently used apology strategies, L2 learners used "expression of apology" in much the same way as the native speakers. However, differences were noted between these two groups in terms of their linguistic choices for expressing apologies. Some of the NNs, in particular, used expressions such as "Can you forgive me?" and "Please forgive me, please." (sic) None of the NSs used such expressions. The NNs also used "explanation" strategy as frequently as the NSs did. However, the NNs tended to provide explanations, using significantly more words than the NSs in order to accomplish a similar pragmatic goal. The NNs and NSs used the "acknowledgment of responsibility" less likely. The NNs did

not offer repair as much as the NS, which seems to be due to L1 transfer. The NSs and the NNs showed a similar use of "promise of non-recurrence" strategy. Jung mentioned four factors that influenced L2 learner's apology performances: (1) learner's lack of linguistic proficiency in L2, (2) transfer of their L1 linguistic knowledge, (3) transfer of their L1 pragmatic knowledge, (4) their views on the value of contextual factors when apologizing (e.g., social status and social distance of the participants, and severity of the infraction).

Bataineh and Bataineh (2006) investigated responses from Jordanian non-native speakers of English on a discourse completion task. The study compered male and female use of apology strategies. The findings revealed that male and female respondents used the primary strategies of statement of remorse, accounts, compensation, promise not to repeat offense, and reparation. However, male and female respondents differed in the order of primary strategies they used. It was obvious that female respondents tended to use the statement of remorse more compared to the male respondents. Female respondents tended to assign responsibility to themselves or others more than their male counterparts. The findings further revealed that female respondents used more non-apology strategies than their male counterparts. However, while female concentrated more on brushing off incident as not important and avoiding the discussion or person, male respondents veered more towards offending or blaming victim.

Istfic and Kampusu (2009) investigated the use of apologies with 20 participants in intermediate level, 20 participants in advanced level of Turkish EFL learners and 5 native speakers of English. The data were gathered by a Discourse Completion Test which included eight apology situations to find out whether there are similarities and differences in those groups and whether Turkish EFL learners approach native speaker norms. The results revealed that in some situations, advanced level participants approached native speaker norms more than the participants in intermediate group in the use of apologies. However, both group of Turkish EFL learners used apologies more

17

than native English speakers. Their L1 had an influence on their use of apologies, especially intermediate level participants transferred native Turkish speaker norms into English such as blaming the other person.

Alfattah (2010) examined apology strategies of Yemeni EFL university students. The data were collected by a written questionnaire including four situations representing different social contexts. The findings of the study showed that the participants used most frequently "expressions of regret" in all situations. Participants tended to believe that apologies should consist of the expression as a compulsory component by any one of the other strategies. An acknowledgement of responsibility was the most common strategy that followed expressions of regret in the study. It was offered as an apology when the speaker recognized his/her responsibility for the offense. According to Alfattah, taking on responsibility is the most explicit most direct and strongest apology strategy. The participants of the study used most frequently two strategies; expressions of regret plus taking on responsibility with intensification and the use of intensified expressions of regret or the use of expressions of regret separately. The intensifications with other strategies were more frequent in the data. The study indicated that the participants tended to choose expressions of regret in all situations but in a considerable variation.

Todey (2011) investigated the apology strategies used by native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English by coding responses from the eight situations on the discourse completion task. Participants were 57 native speakers of English, 38 were male and 19 were female and 28 non-native speakers of English, 16 were male and 12 were female participated in this study. They were all undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory English course. The study showed that apologies between native and non-native speakers of English were not dramatically different. She pointed out that while use of an expression of apology was most common for all the eight situations and between the four gender groups, the general trend was that as a

situation became more severe, subjects chose to use other strategies (such as acknowledgement of responsibility and explanation/accounts). She also found that while there was a general trend for more apology strategies when the severity was raised, there was not a strong correlation between severity and the number of apology strategies employed.

These studies on apology strategies are mostly a comparison between two languages or cultures, and comparison between native speakers and non-native speakers. As shown by these studies, native and non-native speakers of English use different apology strategies. However, these classification of apology strategies have limited semantic formulas, so narrow categorizations are needed in order to achieve a deeper understanding of apologies in English. Native English speakers use intensifiers more frequently than non-native English speakers and use appropriate comment effectively after the apology to keep good relationship with interlocutors. Non-native English speakers show pragmatic transfer in apologies. Nevertheless, more specific examples are needed to explain the pragmatic features of these two groups. A more detailed description of both the similarities and difference of apology strategies which native English speakers and non-native English speakers use under different circumstances should provide insight into the causes of pragmatic failure. For a deep understanding of pragmatic transfer into L2 apologies, it is necessary to examine what factors influence transfer of L1 sociocultural knowledge to L2 contexts when performing the speech act of apologies.

2. 2. 2 Comparison of Apologies between Japanese and Native Speakers of English

Apology conversation in English and Japanese has been analyzed by several researchers. Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) investigated American and Japanese differences in apology. They conducted interview study and questionnaire study. Both 40 Japanese and American university students, half were male and half female,

participated in the interview study to identify the culturally relevant variables that might influence apologies. The participants were asked to describe a recent incident in which someone had apologized to them, and one in which they had apologized someone else. The results showed that the Japanese exchanged apologies most frequently with their closest friends and acquaintances, less often with superiors, rarely with family members or strangers. American also exchanged apologies most often with their closest friends, next with family members, equally with acquaintances and superiors, rarely with strangers. The results further revealed that while the Japanese apologized most often for failure, incompetence, or mismanagement of time, Americans apologized most often for poor manners, next for incompetence or failure, and least often for not meeting a deadline. They identified four types of situations that equally require apology in American and Japanese cultures: (a) mismanagement of time, (b) failure to complete an assignment, (c) incompetent completion of an assignment, and (d) a breach of social norms. The Japanese felt the relationship remained the "same" or got "worse" after an apology, while fewer Americans felt it remained the "same" and many felt it got "better" as a result of the apology. Apparently apologies are a communicative tactic that mainly repairs or restores an endangered relationship among Japanese but one that often improves a relationship among Americans. Based on the interview study, they carried out the questionnaire test in twelve critical situations. Participants of the study were 120 Japanese and 120 Americans. The study showed that both Americans and Japanese prefer to apologize directly in varying degrees. However, Americans more often offered an explanation of the situation to justify their offensive acts. On the other hand, Japanese preferred do something for the other person. Analysis of variance revealed no significant difference in forms of apology chosen by males or females in either Japan or America. The degree of similarity was striking in both cultures although it was slightly greater in the American participants. The study also revealed that while Japanese relied on fewer forms of apology, Americans opted for a somewhat wider range of apologetic

acts. In addition, Japanese employed a wider variety of apologies in adapting to the status of partners while Americans tended to rely on the same narrow repertoire of apologies regardless of the status of their companions.

Kumagai (1993) compared apology speech acts in Japanese and American English. The study showed that Americans used the emotional expressions (e.g., "Oh!") and address forms (e.g., "Tom") more than Japanese. On the other hand, Japanese used acknowledged the responsibility (e.g., "I was at fault") and commented (e.g., "Are you all right") more than Americans. Japanese tended to use more speech turns and fewer strategies per turn than Americans. Americans significantly increased the number of strategies with the seriousness of the offense, in contrast to the Japanese. Japanese people tended to emphasize restoring relationship and Americans emphasize solving the problem.

Sugimoto (1995) found several cultural similarities and differences between Americans and Japanese in the use of apology. She compared Americans and Japanese perceptions of, and reaction to, situations that potentially require apology. Two hundred Americans and 181 Japanese college students completed a questionnaire in which each was asked to: (a) rate the victim's and the offender's initial reactions to the situation, (b) produce a message indicating what the offender would say in response to the situation, and (c) rate the victim's feelings after the message was delivered. Both Americans and Japanese commonly used four strategies: (a) statement of remorse (e.g., "I'm sorry."), (b) explanation, (c) description of damage, and (d) reparation. Japanese generated messages with more segments than did Americans in their apology. Americans included explanation more than Japanese. Japanese preferred to use strategies such as remediation, a promise not to repeat the offense, a statement of remorse and a request for forgiveness than Americans. She measured the victim's reactions both before and after apology was offered, as well as when no apology was offered. The results showed that both Japanese and Americans felt less upset when apology was given and more

21

upset when no apology was offered. The study showed that there were basic norms of apologizing between cultures, however there were differences between type of strategy employed by the speaker and the frequency to which strategies were used.

Sugimoto (1997) also compared styles of apology of 200 American (79 male and 121 female) and 181 Japanese (82 male and 99 female) college students. She conducted questionnaire included 12 situations. The study revealed that the four most frequently used categories were: (a) statement of remorse, (b) accounts, (c) description of damage, and (d) reparation both Americans and Japanese. Although the frequency of using each category differed across cultures, the results seemed to indicate that similar basic norms of apology exist in the two cultures. However cultural differences also seemed to exist. Japanese used more elaborate types of remorse statements. They tended to repeat words (e.g., "Sorry, sorry, I'm very sorry") whereas American respondents used intensifiers (e.g., "I'm terribly sorry") when magnifying their apology message. Beyond the frequent use of the account category in general, Americans and Japanese showed different patterns of using individual strategies. Americans were more likely than Japanese to: (a) explicitly state that the offender had no control over the situation, and (b) to attribute the offense to forgetfulness. On the other hand, Japanese employed two individual accounts strategies more often than did Americans: (a) attributing the offense to uncontrollable forces and (b) explicitly asserting that they had no intention to wrong the victim. She claimed that Japanese participants were not always indirect: they explicitly asserted the lack of intention more often than did Americans. Alternately, Americans were not always direct, either: they implicitly suggested the lack of intention by attributing the offense to forgetfulness. Although the trend was observed only in a few situations, unlike Americans, Japanese participants described the negative side of damage. Americans stressed positive side of the situation. In addition, Japanese used both elaborated and unelaborated types of promises significantly more than Americans did. Japanese not only made vague promises, but also produced direct and

straightforward promises. Japanese also showed more open in their request of forgiveness and stated their desire to maintain their relationship with the victim. In general, more Japanese responses included remediation strategies than did American responses: (a) Japanese used direct offers of remediation more often, and (b) Americans used remediation inquires and conditional offers more frequently.

Japanese and English speakers have different apology conversation patterns. Saying directly "I'm sorry" was the most popular form of apology in both Japanese and Americans. In the American apologies, explaining the situation was the second most common choice, while doing something for the other person was the second most popular strategy used in the Japanese apologies. Overall, the more severe the offense, the more types of strategies are included in apology messages. While both Americans and Japanese adjust their apologies to the severity of offense, they seem to differ in their preferred forms for different levels of severity. In general, Japanese offenders employed a wider variety of apology strategies in adapting to the type of their relationship with the victims while American offenders tended to rely on the same narrow repertoire of apologies regardless of the nature of their relationship to the victims.

2. 2. 3 Comparison of Apologies in English between Japanese and Native Speakers of
       English

There are a limited number of studies compared with apologies in English between Japanese and native speakers of English. Nakano. Miyasaka, and Yamazaki (2000) analyzed Japanese EFL learners' speech functions of discourse completion tasks. They compared Japanese learners' strategies of apologies with strategies obtained by native speakers of English, which was extracted from Aijmer (1996). The study showed that the Japanese learners used quite limited types of expressions, i.e., "I'm sorry" and "Excuse me." They also found that Japanese learners seldom used intensifiers (e.g., terribly, very, awfully, etc.) Their results revealed two features. First, many learners

confused I'm sorry" and "excuse me." They used the apologizing expression "I'm sorry" even in the situation in which "excuse me" seems to be proper, and vice versa. They considered that it might be caused by the negative transfer from Japanese. It would be influenced by "sumimasen" in Japanese. According to them, that phrase is used for both the opening of conversation and apologizing, therefore, the learner might use this expression in both cases. Secondly, some learners suddenly explained their own things or situations without using any apology expressions. They also compared Japanese learners' expressions with expressions found in 12 English textbooks used in junior and senior high schools in Japan. They focused on "sorry," "pardon," "excuse," and "apologize." Expression using the word "apologize" was not found in all the three data (JHS textbooks, HS textbooks, and DCT). While the textbooks included expressions with the word "pardon," the DCT data had no such expression. They conclude that the Japanese learners failed to acquire that expression.

Matsumura (2011) investigated the features of 425 university-level Japanese EFL learners' speech act realization strategies, with a focus on the interaction between their understanding of native English speakers' realization strategies and their preference for a native/non-native realization strategy in a specific situation. He used a multiple choice preference questionnaire and a multiple choice knowledge test. The findings showed that participants did not know the native realization strategy in all of the apology situations. The most frequently observed interaction type in apology was unintentional convergence, that is, those who did not know native realization strategies but whose preference happened to converge with that of native speakers. This suggested that a number of Japanese EFL students misunderstood what strategies native English speakers would use when apologizing. In these circumstances, a misunderstanding and miscommunication would likely happen between native English speakers and native Japanese speakers when apologizing in English.

Those studies show that Japanese EFL learners' lack of accurate knowledge about

native English speakers' preference strategies of apologies. For the appropriate apology in a given social context, it is crucial to understand and use intensifiers properly. They also show that Japanese EFL learners' apology expressions are influenced by Japanese sociocultural norms.

From an educational view point, ELT need to have Japanese EFL students acquire a deeper understanding of native English speakers' realization apology strategies. Apology contains an element of exploring a positive relationship between the speaker and the hearer. It could be thought of as a good-relationship construction process.

2. 3 Teaching Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatics in second language classroom is essential because learners can perceive and understand the use of language appropriately and they can be equipped with the knowledge of a variety of language choices employed based on the situation and the hearer through instruction (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996, 2001). Kasper and Rose (2001) suggested three areas that need to be expanded to a great extent: (1) classroom-based interlanguage pragmatics research, to examine the opportunities for developing pragmatics that are offered in language classrooms; (2) interlanguage pragmatics research, to gain insight into whether pragmatic ability develops in classroom setting without explicit instruction; and (3) classroom research, to focus on the effects that various approaches to instruction have on pragmatic development. They argued that effects of instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development, especially in the L2 classroom, have been explored far less. Some studies compared effectiveness of instructional techniques, such as implicit, explicit, deductive, or inductive approaches.

Suh (2009) did the study to investigate the effect of metapragmatic instruction by combination explicit teaching, activities for raising awareness, and guided practice to teach how to make request. The participants included 12 intermediate-advanced ESL Somalis and Mexicans. A pre-test post-test design used in the study. A Written

Discourse Completion Task and a course evaluation open-ended questions with 15-item were utilized as the data collection instruments. The findings suggested that the explicit instruction had some positive impacts on participants' responses in making request in post-test compared to pre-test. The participants demonstrated that they knew how to vary request politeness and indicated that they would use the mitigators they practiced in class.

While deductive and inductive methods were often used in grammar teaching and learning, Rose and Ng (2001) argued that they could be applied to other areas of language teaching and learning such as pragmatics. Deductive and inductive approaches are two opposite teaching concepts. Decco (1996) divided the deductive and inductive methods into five modalities in detail according to the different application in different teaching contexts.

Modality A—Actual deduction.

> The detailed and clear grammatical rules are presented, and students had to apply these rules in exercise.

Modality B—Conscious induction as guided discovery.

> Students read examples of the target grammatical structures, and teachers lead them to induce rules via asking questions.

Modality C—Induction leading to an explicit "summary of behavior."

> Students should practice the grammatical structures intensively, and then the teacher would give detailed summary of the rules.

Modality D—Subconscious induction on structured material.

> The organized materials would be given to students, and then they would do the intensive practices to receive the rules.

Modality E—Subconscious induction on unstructured material.

> Students would practice the target grammatical structures to get the

rules. (p. 96)

The modalities relevant to this study (Rose & Ng, 2001) were Decoo's modalities A and B. Modality A was actual deduction, and students were given explicitly grammatical rule explanation and applied these rules on the examples and exercises. Modality B was conscious induction as guided discovery. Students needed to read a lot of given examples, and teachers would guide them to find out rules by themselves through asking them questions.

Rose and Ng (2001) investigated the differential effects of instruction for inductive and deductive approaches to the teaching of compliments and compliment responses in a foreign language context. In their study, the two treatment groups and the control group of undergraduate students participated. These groups completed all three of the data collection instruments: a self-assessment questionnaire (SAQ), a written production questionnaire (PQ), and a metapragmatic questionnaire (MAQ). In addition to these groups, baseline data for both English and Cantonese was also collected. All three questionnaires incorporated the same eighteen compliment scenarios. The results from PQ offered some evidence that instruction was effective, "instruction in pragmatics can make a difference in a foreign language context" (p. 168). However, they also found that there was no effect for instruction on learner confidence or meta-pragmatic assessment of appropriate compliment responses, based on a comparison of the experimental and control groups in their study. Their findings indicated an improvement in the utilization of compliment formulas by learners instructed with both approaches, while only the deductive group approximated US group in the use of response strategies. They concluded that inductive and deductive instruction might both assist in pragmalinguistic improvement, although only the deductive approach may lead to sociopragmatic development. It could be argued that the inductive instruction actually had a negative impact on sociopragmatic development, perhaps by raising difficult issues without proving unambiguous solutions. They

27

claimed, in a foreign language context it may be necessary to provide explicitly the kind of information necessary for learners to develop sociopragmatic proficiency in the target language.

Ishihara (2011) reported the immediate and delayed effects of classroom instruction on the speech act of giving and responding to compliments for intermediate learners in a second language context in the U.S. The findings indicated that the instruction probably facilitated learners' improvement not only in terms of performance, but also awareness of giving and responding to compliments. One year after instruction, some of the skills and strategies were marginally used and might have been largely forgotten. However, the learners appeared to have maintained central skills and strategies such as: giving compliments on appropriate topics, utilizing syntactically native-like compliments, using downgrading and commenting on history response strategies, and developing conversation utilizing compliments. Although learners improved in pragmatic ability with either approach, the explicit instruction generally appeared to be more effective than the implicit approach (Kasper, 1997).

Tan and Farashaiyan (2012) investigated the effect of explicit instruction of formulaic politeness strategies among Malaysian undergraduates in making request. The 60 participants divided into two groups of intervention and control groups. The data were cumulated through three tests, open ended completion test, a listening test and an acceptability judgment test. Treatment or experimental group received explicit instruction with structured and problem-solving and input tasks. The comparison was made between the performance of treatment group and that of control in terms of the pre-test and post-test. The results displayed that the treatment group learned during the pre-test to the post-test and it confirmed the effect of instruction on students' performance. This showed that explicit form-based instruction was successful for learners to comprehend and produce the English politeness strategies effectively in making request.

28

Based on the findings, Tan and Farashaiyan concluded such tests were greatly dependent on working memory and the learners must effectively and rapidly reply to the stimuli. In the deductive intervention, the learners explicitly faced the information, while in the inductive intervention they should do the discovery of the rules from the examples. The learners could not strongly form the explicit knowledge in the deductive intervention whereas in the inductive intervention the participants did. Additionally, the participants using the inductive approach succeeded in handling and storing information about the pragmatic features in their working memory. Therefore, the inductive instruction was effective regarding the structured input tasks or problem-solving tasks. This suggested that it encouraged learners to take responsibility for their language learning, with the teacher in the role of a facilitator.

Bardovi-Harlig (1996) examined twenty ESL textbooks which contained dialogues. She concluded that "most textbooks do not cover the teaching of pragmatics, while those that do fail to present pragmatically accurate models to learners" (p. 26). In addition, she later stated that "in general, textbooks cannot be counted on as a reliable source of pragmatic input for classroom language learners" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001, p. 25). Her studies were in line with other studies which indicated language textbooks: (1) include little information on L2 pragmatics, (2) lack explicit discussions of conversational norms and practices, and (3) contain inauthentic language samples that are based on introspection rather than genuine language use (Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Wong, 2001).

The results of these studies showed that even advanced learners of English did not have pragmatic awareness of speech acts in the absence of any effective classroom instruction and material. More research needs to be done to shed light on the kind of instructional measures of learning or teaching in L2 classroom. Learners need to recognize the social function of different speech acts and the significance of different degrees of indirectness. Helping students to understand and improve appropriate

language use in L2 pragmatics is pedagogically necessarily.

2. 3. 1 Teaching the Speech Act

Use of language is closely and uniquely associated with the culture and rules of speaking vary across cultures. For teachers, how to teach them effectively in second language classrooms is challenging. There are some difficulties. Woodfield (2004) showed three issues about teaching speech acts. Many language classes remain conducting lessons by display question; the teacher initiates exchanges with a question, the student responds and the teacher gives feedback to the student. Students may learn how these acts are done within this context, and in this way are socialized to classroom culture. However, they may not be so well prepared to do things with language outside the classroom. For students, the classroom may be the only available setting where they can try out what using the foreign language feels like, and how much more or less comfortable they are with various aspects of L2 pragmatics.

Second, teaching speech acts is to correct the impression of them that students may have received from English textbooks. Textbooks containing conversations or dialogues do not present pragmatically accurate models to learners. Bouton (1996) found that 80% of invitations in one ESL textbook used a form of invitation which appeared only 26% of the time in a published corpus on native speaker invitations. They were unambiguous invitations, which were direct and to the point and always mentioned a definite time, place, or activity. Suezawa and Abe (2012) found that refusals in requests were rarely used in the conversational sentences of Japanese junior high school English textbooks. In addition, they had a small repertoire of refusal patterns. "Regret + negative willingness + excuse" and "Regret + reason" were commonly used in those textbooks. "Positive opinions," which American native English speakers prefer to use, were never found. The models of speech acts in such textbooks do not always accurately reflect how people actually speak. In using samples of actual speech as

models or in creating models based on the descriptions of speech acts given in pragmatics literature, teachers have the opportunity to help their students "say it like it is" (Woodfield, 2004, p. 28).

Third, teaching speech acts is to prevent negative pragmatic transfer. Researchers have found that sometimes students rely on what they do in their native language when they perform speech acts in a second language. Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) investigated refusals in the English of Americans and Japanese. Their findings showed that Japanese refusals started with expressions of regret followed by an excuse, such as "I'm sorry I am busy." On the other hand, American refusals started with a positive opinion, such as "I'd really like to help you but…," and then regret and excuse in that order. Japanese excuses were often less specific than those of Americans. Whereas Americans favored an "airtight" excuse, such as "I have to meet Mr. Brown at 6:00 PM." However, Japanese used excuses that were extremely vague: for example, "I'm busy" or "I have a plan." They found three examples of pragmatic transfer with Japanese speakers of English: less use of specific statements to make excuse, more use of statements of principle such as "I never yield to temptation," and more use of statements of philosophy like "Things with shapes eventually break." It is worthwhile to teach how the target language is used appropriately.

Fourth, teaching sociopragmatic knowledge of the target speech act is one of the essential elements to let students gain effective communication skills. Thomas (1983, pp. 96-97) mentioned the importance of pragmatic failure by comparing it with grammatical errors:

Grammatical errors may be irritating and impede communication, but at least, as a rule, they are apparent in the surface structure, so that H [the hearer] is aware that an error has occurred. Once alerted to the fact that S [the speaker] is not fully grammatically competent, native speakers seem to have little difficulty in making

allowances for it. Pragmatic failure, on the other hand, is rarely recognized as such by non-linguists. If a non-native speaker appears to speak fluently (i.e., is grammatically competent), a native speaker is likely to attribute his/her apparent impoliteness or unfriendliness, not to any linguistic deficiency, but to boorishness or ill-will. While grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a person.

Several studies (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Bouton, 1996; Kasper, 1997) have shown that learners of high grammatical proficiency will not necessarily possess comparable pragmatic competence. Even advanced learners may use language inappropriately and show differences from target language pragmatic norms.

2. 3. 2 Teaching the Apology Speech Act to EFL Learners

Pragmatics, or language use in its context, is one of the most complex and challenging areas for teachers to teach in a language classroom. As Olshtain and Cohen (1991) stressed, it is necessary for teachers to have their students become aware of sociocultural and sociolinguistic differences that might exist between the students' first language and the target language. The students with such awareness can understand why unintended miscommunication occurs. From a pedagogical perspective, ELTs need to have their students raise their level of awareness of the pragmatic failure and have them get ready for it with the strategies suited to the situations. In this sense, it is meaningful to teach the apology speech act to Japanese students of English.

Todey (2011) mentioned that understanding how native speakers use apologies in their L1 in comparison to how non-native speakers use apologies in their L2 can help identify not only social and cultural differences, but also how to better teach apologies in English to non-native speakers. English language teachers need to decide what apology strategies they teach. For teaching speech acts, it is vital to clarify which

32

strategies to use, when and how to modify these strategies in a given situation. Speech act studies can provide information about situations in which particular apology strategies are regarded as appropriate by the target language speakers. Proper analysis of the use of apologies by non-native speakers of English can also provide ELTs and material developers with an understanding of why non-native speakers might find a typical apology in English confusing, insufficient, or too much.

The correct use of apologies holds great importance for meaningful and clear communication. An unsuccessful apology can lead to communication breakdown, misunderstanding, and frustration for interlocutors. Additionally, an improper use of any of the apology strategies can lead to confusion and even further damage, requiring additional remedial action from the speaker. Learning how to apologize appropriately in the target culture is important in order to become communicatively competent and maintain harmonious human relationships in a target culture. Without varying language use according to the target culture's sociocultural norms and the situation, a second language speaker could totally fail to communicate one's intention. Successful communication and appropriate use of second language will hopefully promote cross-cultural understanding and appreciation. The detailed description of apologies realized by the native English speakers of America and the Japanese learners of English in this study can allow us to identify the areas for instruction for these particular Japanese learners of English (i.e., incorporating research findings into classroom teaching).

2. 4 Data Collection Methods in Pragmatics Research

This section discusses the data collection methods available for investigating apologies. The advantages and disadvantages of each data collection method are discussed in relation to the present study. A number of data collection methods have been used to analyze speech acts. Several methods have been used to extensively

studied speech acts produced by both native and non-native language speakers. The methods discussed here include discourse completion task (DCT), role-play, observation of naturally occurring speech, spoken corpora, and how to combine their results through triangulation. The present study used DCT to increase the validity.

2. 4. 1 Discourse Completion Test

The most commonly used data elicitation method in pragmatics research has been Discourse Completion Test (DCT). It consists of "scripted dialogs that represent socially differentiated situations. Each dialog is preceded by a short description of the situation, specifying the setting, and the social distance between the participants and their status relative to each other, followed by an incomplete dialog" (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989, pp. 13-14). On the DCT, a situation is described to participants, who are then asked to write down what they would say if they were actually in such a situation. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) suggested that the DCT met the need of cross-linguistic research to control social variables for comparison; it allows the researcher to collect large amounts of data in short periods of time, classification of the most frequent stereotypical strategies employed to perform a particular speech act, and control over sociolinguistic variables (setting, age, gender, social status and power). Since all participants are given the same scenarios and fill out the same written form, data tends to be more consistent and reliable as a result. It has proven most fertile and been used widely in variety of cross-cultural speech act studies (Blum-Kulka, et al., 1989; House, 1988; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987).

However, it is also well known that conversations in real situations often include more elaboration. Written questionnaires do not permit the researcher to gather pragmatic features commonly found in oral discourse such as distribution of turns, and other features that may have pragmatic import such as hesitation, repetition, reformulation, mitigation, and non-verbal signals (stress, pitch, silence, laughter, or

facial expressions) (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Kasper, 2000). Participants usually had more time to respond in writing in comparison to oral responses (Wolfson, Marmor, & Jones, 1989; Cohen, 1995). Turnbull (2001) pointed out the three factors that might limit the usefulness of DCT methodology: writing differs in important ways from speaking, the applicability of the DCT is that participants typically give their own contribution to talk without the input of the other with whom they are talking, and the extent to which people's intuitions about talk map accurately into their actual talk.

An oral discourse completion test (oral DCT) was also developed to examine participants' ability to produce routines. Oral DCT requires the participants read or listen to situational descriptions and produced speech acts what they would say in that situation. Yuan (2001) compared Kunming Chinese responses to compliments in written DCTs, oral DCTs, field notes and recorded conversations. The study found that the oral DCT generates a significantly larger number of natural speech features than the written DCT.

On the other hand, Rintell and Mitchell (1989) compared requests and apologies elicited by written and oral versions of the same DCT, which were given to low advanced learners of English and to native English speakers. The results showed little difference in data elicited from oral versus written versions of the DCT. They claimed that both elicitation methods provide data that are similar to spoken language rather than written language.

Beebe and Cummings (1996) investigated differences between natural speech act data and written questionnaire data. They found that although the responses elicited through DCTs failed to reflect the amount of negotiation and depth of emotion in actual talk, DCTs were powerful in gathering a large amount of data, on a wide range of difficult-to-observe speech behaviors, in a short period of time and systematically. They also showed that data elicited with this instrument were consistent with naturally occurring data, at least in the main patterns and formulas. It helps to capture the

canonical shape of speech acts.

2. 4. 2 Role-plays

Role-plays elicit spoken data in which at least two interlocutors are engaged in social interactions. They are sometimes employed to collect more natural data than DCT. Role-plays can be of two types: closed and open (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). In the closed role-play, the participant responds to a role-play situation without a reply from an interlocutor. Open role-plays, on the other hand, specify the actors' roles, but the course and outcome of the conversation are not predetermined. During a role-play interaction, participants are instructed to read a situational description and respond orally as they would in a real situation.

The major advantage of role-play is that they allow researchers to observe how speech acts are carried out and how an utterance of a speaker determines the response of the interlocutor. That is, role-play includes the negotiation process. Moreover, it allows researchers to control various social variables such as social distance, social power, gender, and age. Trosborg (1995), Houck and Gass (1996), and Cohen and Olshtain (1993) used open role-play to study speech acts made by non-native speakers. They rationalized role-play as the best available method with the largest degree of control. Open role-play can provide a wider range of speech act production strategies and linguistic features compared with other methods like DCT. Unlike natural data, role-plays can elicit high frequencies of the pragmatic feature under investigation in comparable situations. However, transcribing recorded data is very difficult to do and code precisely and is also time consuming. Most studies using role-play do not have a statistically sufficient number of participants due to the difficulty of transcribing recorded data. It does not lend itself to the collection of a large amount of data from different places that the other methods (such as DCT) offer. Therefore, a high inter-rater reliability is very hard to achieve with this method (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). In addition,

participants recognize that this is a role-play, not a real conversation, and that they are subjects of a study, so this influences the results of role-play data, and it may differs from real situation. Furthermore, there are no significant differences in results when comparing the two method of DCT and role-play (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

Kodama (1996) examined two methods for collecting refusals: oral role-play and DCT using Japanese and American participants. One of her findings is that most Japanese participants preferred DCT over role-play. The majority of the American participants preferred role-play, though possibly because they were able to use visual cues in their interactions. According to Kodama, Japanese preferred DCT because they had time to think and could control the situation. This suggests that Japanese were either not comfortable using cues provided in role-play, or the role-play cues were insufficient. Consequently, role-plays may not be the best available method if used alone without any other data collection instruments.

2. 4. 3 Natural Conversations

The focus of natural data is not often analysis of a particular speech act, but rather, the observation of a communicative event in which multiple speech acts co-occur. One advantage of ethnographic method is that spontaneous data are collected in naturally occurring contexts. Wolfson (1981, 1983) and Wolfson et al. (1989) have argued for ethnographic data method, observation of authentic speech, for the study of naturally occurring speech act. Natural observation is an effective method for studying speech acts within a specific culture because it has no artificial control over the participants or the context (Cohen and Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain and Blum-Kulka, 1985; Kasper and Dahl, 1991; Troscorg, 1995; Houck and Gass, 1996). It is, however, extremely time consuming and almost impossible (Cohen and Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain and Blum-Kulka, 1985; Cohen, 1996). Natural data are very hard to come by, as speech act events occur unpredictably. Beebe and Cummings were able to collect natural data in a

controlled situation, but their studies were limited to a single situation and small numbers of participants.

Some limitations for gathering naturally occurring data for cross-cultural research purposes are well known in the literature on pragmatics and have been pointed out by many authors, such as Beebe and Cummings (1996), Cohen (1998), and Kasper and Dahl (1991). One disadvantage of natural data is that it seems almost impossible to control for a variety of sociolinguistic variables such as gender, age, educational level, ethnic group, and social class. In addition, the pragmatic feature in question (e.g., politeness, mitigation, indirectness) cannot be captured with relatively high frequencies and in comparable situations. Another difficulty when doing contrastive work across languages using authentic data alone is that it is difficult to obtain similar utterances in two or more languages; thus, the researcher is almost obligated to contrive situations for the purpose of comparison. Consequently, if the researcher's goal is to examine the realization patterns (frequency, distribution, and content) of pragmatic strategies used by native speakers of two different cultures under similar circumstances and using the same speech act, ethnographic data may not be an option.

As Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) stated, authentic ethnographic data is necessary to determine various contextual variables in natural speech acts. However, merely observing authentic conversation normally does not allow a researcher to control variables. This means naturally occurring data can determine variables but not easily test variables and establish statistical significance due to the limited number of variable data in natural settings. In order to generalize the study results, the study needs a large number of participants and many controlled variables. In addition, due to the limited number of American native English speakers available and accessible at the time of the study, it is not possible to collect sufficient data from these participants through natural observation.

2. 4. 4 Spoken Corpora

Another method of gathering speech act data is spoken corpora. A corpus can consist of written text, transcribed speech or multimedia like audio/video clips; it can also be distributed using various media (e.g. disks, CD, DVD, tape) or online. Appropriate software enables researchers to investigate many linguistic features such as (1) the frequency with which every word in the corpus occurs, (2) words that are unusually (in)frequent when compared with a reference corpus, (3) all occurrences of a particular word, (4) recurring larger structures (clusters, phrases), (5) grammatical frames, (6) collocations, (7) occurrences of parts of speech and their combinations, to mention a few (Bednarek, 2010, p. 68).

Biber, Conrad and Reppen (1998, p. 4) also listed the essential characteristics of corpus-based linguistics:

• It is empirical, analysing the actual patterns of use in natural texts;

• It utilises a large and principled collection of natural texts, known as a "corpus", as the basis for analysis;

• It makes extensive use of computers for analysis, using both automatic and interactive techniques;

• It depends on both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques.

A corpus-based pragmatics must provide the means to specify what the speech acts actually performed in ordinary conversation are, and what differentiated linguistic properties they show. A large, appropriately compiled corpus makes it possible to analyze everyday conversations used in real situations and can provide extensive data.

Fahey (2005) analyzed and compared the speech act of apologizing drawn from two soap operas. According to her, some of the advantages of using data drawn forms soap operas are the following: soap operas are accessible and quality of sound and recording is often good. In soap operas the context is made explicit for the researcher because they are designed to be observed and ratified by an observer (i.e. audience).

Among the disadvantages of using soap operas as a source of data are the following: they are artificially scripted, and an observer needs to watch several episodes to gain contextual information (e.g. knowledge of the characters' personalities, their relationships and roles). However, soap operas present apologies, and other speech acts, which have been carefully crafted in order to appear as spontaneous speech, allowing at the same time the observation of pragmatic elements of a particular culture. They present scripted conversation as real conversation and the significance of the dialogues is entirely dependent on context. The actors perform the dialogues and try to reproduce the spontaneity of real speech, and most times viewers of soap operas perceive the language used as casual conversation. It could be argued that the soap opera dialogues cannot represent casual spoken language because they are not spontaneous. Nevertheless, the level of engagement of the audiences with a particular soap opera seems to demonstrate that they are perceived as representative of real dialogues. Moreover, soap operas are geographically situated and their linguistic and pragmatic differences allow their audiences to recognize them as their own.

Aijmer (1996) investigated conversational routines in English including thanking, apologies, requests and offers based on empirical investigation of the data from the London-Lund Corpus of spoken English (LLC). The LLC consists of 87 texts with a variety of topics and settings including face-to-face conversation, telephone conversation, public speeches, news broadcasts, interviews, etc. She emphasized that the number of spoken corpora available to researchers is limited compared to written corpora.

Several corpora have focused on Japanese learners of English, and there is a Japanese spoken corpus, but it is difficult to use a corpus to explore the variables that influence apology strategies using corpus methods. Therefore, corpus methods are not suitable for the investigation of pragmatic characteristics of apologies of Japanese English speakers in various contexts.

2. 4. 5 Triangulation

Combining different methods enhances speech act studies by increasing its validity. According to Cohen (1996), each data collection technique has its own advantages and disadvantages. The principle of triangulation is that using multiple data collection methods overcomes the disadvantages of any single method. Its effectiveness is strongly supported by many researchers including, Kasper and Dahl (1991), Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985), and Cohen (1996).

Several studies on speech acts have successfully used multiple data collection methods. Robinson (1992) and Olshtain (1983) combined DCT with retrospective interviews demonstrated the need for triangulation in this area of research.

Robinson (1992) investigated the validity of verbal reports in interlanguage pragmatics using 12 female Japanese students divided into two proficiency groups. She used concurrent verbal reports from a think-aloud session and retrospective interviews in addition to DCT in her research. These two methods helped disclose the cognitive process of language learners as they produced refusals in American English. She designed the verbal report procedures to elicit information about the language learners' intentions, cognition, and planning of their utterances. She also used questions aimed at identifying their pragmatic knowledge. By using the introspective data collected, she was able to obtain information about the learners' interlanguage pragmatics, and their strategies of language processing which are not observed by DCT responses alone.

Olshtain (1983) investigated how speech acts vary with the context and language spoken. She combined role-play and follow-up questions to examine apologies made by native speakers of Hebrew speaking Hebrew, English speakers speaking Hebrew, Russian speakers speaking Russian. By comparing apology norms across the three languages, Olshtain found that language learners used their native social rules rather than the rules of the target culture. This could explain why native Hebrew speakers

using English are often considered ostensibly rude by Americans. Olshtain presented different perceptions of apologies dependent on the language and found evidence for negative language transfer from the role play data and participants' retrospective reports. Role-play alone would not have adequately produced such results without learners' perception of the speech act.

As mentioned above, a combination of methods has been employed to overcome the limitation of methodology used in the study.

2. 4. 6 The Present Study

Turnbull (2001) concluded, "the choice of pragmatic elicitation technique depends on the nature of phenomenon of interest and the level of analysis" (p. 49). I chose to use the DCT because (1) the conditions for data collection could be controlled, (2) a large number of participants could easily take the questionnaire, (3) the data analysis tends to be more consistent and reliable because all participants are presented with the same scenarios and respond in written form, and (4) the results could be easily compared with the results of other research. This study mainly used quantitative analysis considering pragmatic features of Japanese EFL learners and comparison between Japanese speakers and English speakers with different situational context of apologies. The data from the DCT is not able to provide the features of authentic discourse, but it can clarify students' language usage based on their pragmatic competence through quantitative comparative analysis. In addition, analysis of the EFL text books and an evaluation questionnaire to follow up and combine with the DCT were also conducted to increase the validity of the findings of the DCT. These three studies reveal the apology strategies used by American native English speakers and Japanese EFL learners, the present situation of teaching apologies in EFL classes in Japan, and apology expressions preferred by native speakers of English which EFL learners need to acquire.

2. 4. 7 Hypothesis

This study tests the following hypotheses:

1) Japanese EFL students don't have knowledge about native English speakers' preferred/dispreferred apology strategies.

2) Japanese speakers' apologies in English will exhibit pragmatic transfer in content of semantic formulas and combinations.

2. 4. 8 Research Questions

This study addresses the following research questions:

1) What apology strategies are frequently used by Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese, and by Americans in English?

2) What are Japanese EFL students taught about apologies in English in junior high and high school? How are they taught it?

3) How do American English speakers evaluate Japanese apologies in English?

3. Methods and Results

3. 1 Study 1: Discourse Completion Test

3. 1. 1 Overview

This study used a Discourse Completion Test to investigate Japanese speakers' apologies in English and in Japanese and American native English speakers' apologies to examine similarities and differences in (1) combinations and frequency of semantic formulas, (2) the severity of offense, and (3) the apology strategies according to each situation.

3. 1. 2. Data Collection

The data was collected through the Discourse Completion Test (DCT). In a DCT, scenarios that call for specific speech acts are presented to participants in written form. Participants respond in writing what they think they would actually say under the situations described in the scenarios.

To obtain naturalistic data, Wolfson et al. (1989) argued that it is not reasonable to always assume that written responses are representative of spoken ones. Furthermore, they argued that short, decontextualized written segments are not comparable to authentic, longer routines (p. 182).

However, DCT is a still very commonly used method in the field, given that the values of the DCT are considered to be greater than the possible disadvantage. Other data gathering models, role-play, for example, do not result in comparable data as DCT does.

I used DCT because it enables the collection of a large amount of data which reduces bias. In addition, because all participants are presented with the same scenarios and respond in written form, data analysis tends to be more consistent and reliable.

3. 1. 2. 1 Participants

Participants of this study were Doshisha Women's College students, 76 of which took the English version and 62 of which took the Japanese version. They were all first

year students majoring in English, and their level of English proficiency was, on average, intermediate. They were currently studying English courses and in addition, they have just finished high school English. They filled out the English version of questionnaire first. One week later, they answered the DCT in Japanese. Since some participants were absent from the classes, participants who filled out the Japanese version fewer than those who filled out the English version.

Participants of native English speakers in this study were 45 Americans. There were 15 students of Japanese Studies Program (JSP) at Doshisha Women's College (age 18-23), 8 ALT teachers at a junior high school in Kyoto (age 20s–early 30s), and 22 university students in the United States (age 19-22). Their age were from 18 to early 30s. This study focused on American English because it is most commonly used for English education in Japan.

Participants were all female. A previous study showed that there were not many gender differences, although female participants tended to use more apology strategies than male participants did (Schumann & Ross, 2010).

3. 1. 2. 2 Measures / Procedures

In this study, ten apology situations of the DCT were used as a research instrument. The DCT was carefully designed in stages. Situations used to elicit apologies greatly influence people's reactions, and thus need to be carefully selected for inclusion. According to Sugimoto (1997), it is important in apology studies to not only balance the types of offenses presented but also use situations that are well grounded in the participants' daily experience. First, I carried out a questionnaire survey to investigate situations when people apologize to their friends. Participants were asked an open question: When have you apologized to a close friend? Second, I chose 13 most common situations from the results of the survey and then carried out a questionnaire again to get categorized those situations were severe or not-severe. Participants chose

45

the level of severity using 5-point scale with 1 meaning the least severe, and 5 meaning the most severe, in each situation. Severity of damage should be controlled and balanced because too insignificant damage may only elicit perfunctory apologies while too severe damage may lack realism to the participants. In terms of the severity of offense for the apologies, it has been in alternated in the situations are severe or not severe. It has been considered that damaging a friend's camera is a severe offense while bumping into a friend as a light or not severe offense. Finally, based on the results, I made the DCT consist of 10 apology situations. The situations involved five large (#1, #3, #5, #7, and #9) and five small (#2, #4, #6, #8, and #10) apologies, based on the severity of offense for the apologies (see Table 1). I ranked them in order of severity, which set #1 as most severe, #3 as the second most severe, #5 as the third most severe, #7 as the fourth most severe, and #9 as the fifth most severe. The lowest severity of offense was set to #10, the second lowest severity of offense was set to #8, the third lowest severity offense was set to #6, the fourth lowest severity of offense was set to #4, and the fifth lowest severity of offense was set to #2.

Table 1. Classification of Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

Stimulus Type, Size, and Situation

DCT item	Size	Situation
#1	Large	Speaker damaged a friend's camera
#2	Small	Speaker commented on a friend's new hairstyle
#3	Large	Speaker missed half of the movie
#4	Small	Speaker was late for an appointment
#5	Large	Speaker forgot to bring a friend's notebook
#6	Small	Speaker forgot to return a friend's CD
#7	Large	Speaker spilled orange juice on a friend's clothe
#8	Small	A friend covered speaker's shift
#9	Large	Speaker spilled coffee on a friend's magazine
#10	Small	Speaker bumped into a friend

In all situations, it was specified that apologies were directed to a close friend of equal status. Social distance was taken to represent the degree of familiarity between the

interlocutors. This study limited for apologies to close friends because the previous study by Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) showed that Japanese tended to apologize to people who were equal status most frequently. In addition, Demeter (2006) showed that the great variety of strategies used to apologize mostly interactions between friends.

The DCT questionnaire for this study was pilot-tested to make sure that the instrument is effective in terms that the instructions and the situations in a questionnaire were clear and, imaginable. The pilot-test was conducted with four participants and they were relatively close to the profile of the target population. They were asked to make comments on the clarity of the situations and to give comments about the process of completing the questionnaire. Based on the feedback from the participants, some minor changes were made to the questionnaire. Some of the participants gave hypothetical answers that would either describe or explain what they would do instead of saying the apologies themselves, the instructions of the questionnaire needed some changes in order to make it clearer to the participants what they had to do. The final version was then distributed to the participants. However, some participants still misunderstood the instructions and descriptions of some situations. Those were eliminated from the data.

On the DCT of English version for Japanese participants, the instructions, the explanation of each situation, and the response were written in English (see Appendix A). In the Japanese version of DCT, all were written in Japanese (see Appendix B). The length of the questionnaire was limited to ten situations for fear that participants would tire by the last questions. At the end of each questionnaire, participants were asked about their experiences of studying abroad, opportunities of communication with native English speakers outside of regular courses, and latest TOEIC score. This information was gathered for an analysis of that will not be reported in this paper.

3. 1. 3 Data Analysis

After collecting the DCT questionnaires, the responses on the DCT were

categorized using Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification system along with additional strategies discovered and labeled by this present study. They proposed seven categories and divided it into two parts. The first part contains five main categories of apologies in cases where the offender feels the need to apologize, namely an expression of apology, an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of responsibility, an offer of repair, and a promise of forbearance. Each of these categories has several sub-categories in order to make a further delimitation of strategies. The second part contains two strategies for the case when the speaker does not feel the need to apologize. These are a denial of the need to apologize and denial of responsibility. I would include other categories to analyze the data in detail (see Appendix C). I coded combinations of semantic formulas and frequency of semantic formulas. Next, the degree of use of apology expressions were calculated. How many times each group used expressions of apology and intensified expressions of apology was calculated. Then data were also analyzed according to the use of apology strategies.

In order to answer the research questions set for this study, the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

3. 1. 3. 1 Quantitative Analysis

A quantitative analysis in this study was the analysis of what kind of strategies speakers use most frequently when apologizing. The data were analyzed based on the percentage of their frequency of usage. In contrast to most of the previous research studies that focused on speech act production, the present analysis is an attempt at not only finding the frequency of different types of apologies in Japanese EFL learners, but also at the different ways these types combine when apologizing in situations with a various sociolinguistic factors. Apologies can be performed by any of the strategies below, or any combination or sequence there of (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). Consequently, apology strategies gathered by this study were analyzed using

a modified version because of the need to create new categories in order to reflect the specificity of the data. Intensified expression of apology, statement of the situation, acknowledgement of responsibility, suggesting a repair, statement of alternative, suggestion for avoiding the situation and verbal avoidance were added in the apology strategies. Also, adjuncts to apologies and other were added for this study. The apology categories are shown in Appendix C.

3. 1. 3. 2 Qualitative Analysis

The actual utterances of Japanese English speakers and American English speakers for each type of apology strategies in each situation were compared qualitatively. A qualitative analysis allowed for a more in depth look at the different strategies that speakers of Japanese and Americans use in order to apologize in different situations. Aspects such as patterns of responses, the types of lexical items or constructions used for the different categories of apologies as well as the relationship between the strategies used and the circumstances of each situation were looked at. In addition, some of the more unique, less common or unexpected responses were also analyzed. A qualitative analysis is essential for the proper understanding of the different choices that the Japanese speakers and Americans made in each situation, as a mere interpretation of the frequencies for each category and strategy is not enough. According to Demeter (2006), only a qualitative analysis would be able to account for the use of indirect speech acts, when an apology, even though it belongs to a certain category, performs a different function. It is exactly this kind of use that is important for learners of a foreign language to learn, since they require cultural and pragmatic competence to perform in a foreign language. Attacking the complainer during an apology, for example, as a humorous way to lessen the one's burden is something that would not be possible in all cultures or in all situations.

3. 1. 4 Results

In order to answer the research questions, the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. After finishing the coding, data were analyzed according to the patterns and frequency of semantic formulas, the use of apology strategies according to the severity of offense, and the strategies for apologizing in each situation.

3. 1. 4. 1 Apologies in English

3. 1. 4. 1. 1 Strategies Used in Apologies in English

In order to see apology strategies in detail, I compared to the frequency of semantic formulas used by Japanese group and American group, the number of semantic formula was counted.

Table 2. Frequency of Categories in Apologies by Japanese and Americans in English

Coding categories	Japanese		Americans	
	n	%	n	%
Expression of apology	396	57.8	141	32.1
Intensified expression of apology	180	26.3	157	35.8
Explanation	79	11.5	89	20.3
Statement of the situation	224	32.7	105	23.9
Implicit acknowledgment	6	0.9	3	0.7
Explicit acknowledgment	8	1.2	7	1.6
Expression of reluctance	6	0.9	2	0.5
Expression of lack of intent	16	2.3	30	6.8
Expression of self-deficiency	6	0.9	9	2.1

Expression of embarrassment	2	0.3	9	2.1
Non-specific offer of repair	9	1.3	20	4.6
Specific offer of repair	293	42.8	188	42.8
Suggesting a repair	6	0.9	17	3.9
Statement of alternative (1)	0	0	0	0
Statement of alternative (2)	20	2.9	11	2.5
Promise of Non-recurrence	18	2.6	4	0.9
Suggestion for avoiding the situation	0	0	0	0
Topic switch	3	0.4	1	0.2
Joke	0	0	2	0.1
Finding a silver lining	1	0.1	0	0
Laugh	1	0.1	3	0.7
Denial of responsibility	1	0.1	0	0
Minimizing offense	0	0	5	1.1
Minimizing responsibility	1	0.1	0	0
Minimizing blame	0	0	2	0.5
Emotionals	30	4.4	44	10
Gratitude	58	8.5	40	9.1
Wishing the best after apologizing	0	0	0	0
Concern for the interlocutor	60	8.8	12	2.7
Understanding	0	0	5	1.1
Feedback	18	2.6	4	0.9
Adjunct to the offer of repair	33	4.8	7	1.6
Utterances related to apology	58	8.5	45	10.3

Utterances not related to apology	2	0.3	0	0
Performing of repair	13	1.9	23	5.2

The most frequently used category was expression of apology, which was used in 57.8% in Japanese responses. On the other hand, Americans used intensified expression of apology most frequently, which was 35.8%. If I add the 26.3% of the apologies that contained an intensified expression of apology, 84.1% of Japanese responses contained explicit expression of apology. Those of Americans contained 67.9% of explicit expression of apology. These findings are consistent with other previous studies, which found that an explicit expression of apology was present in the most of the combinations or that apologies given were direct (Bergman & Kasper 1993, Barnlund & Yoshioka 1990). This suggests that Japanese and American speakers feel the need to be explicit when they do not want to risk the hearer not interpreting their response as an apology. However, American participants less used explicit expressions than Japanese participants. They used other categories and expressed apology as indirectly.

Japanese and Americans used specific offer of repair same frequency. Both group showed high proportion of that strategy. This differed from the results of a previous study (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990). In their study, explaining the situation was the second most common choice in American apology, while doing something for the other person was the second most popular strategy used in Japanese apology. The result of this study can be accounted for in that they are close friends, so they would definitely have a chance to see each other again. The closer the relationship is, the more likely is the speaker is to produce an offer of repair in order to maintain their relationships (Thijittang, 2010). Participants may give an explicit apology and follow it up with an offer to make up for it. Japanese used statement of the situation more often than Americans. On the other hand, Americans used explanation more frequently than Japanese. Japanese tended to state the situation as it is. Americans in the study felt that

they needed to explain the reason why they had to apologize to their friends.

Although they didn't use it frequently, both American English speakers and Japanese English speakers used the acknowledgment of responsibility strategy. However, the native English speakers used this strategy with a relatively high frequency, especially, explicit acknowledgment, expression of lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency, and expression of embarrassment. It seems that Japanese learners of English had difficulty in readily producing a variety of sub-strategies in L2, despite the relative and semantic simplicity of these sub-strategies.

The general quantitative results of this study show that overall the American speakers in the study used a greater variety of strategies with more frequency than Japanese.

3. 1. 4. 1. 2 Most Frequently Observed Apology Patterns

Coded as semantic formulas, the responses were compared to discover the general pattern for each situation in each language group. The most frequent patterns of semantic formulas for each language group in each situation are listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Most Frequently Observed Apology Patterns in English

Situations	Japanese	Americans
#1 (High)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=12.2%)	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair (90% specific; 10% non-specific) (freq.=22.2%)
#2 (Low)	other (freq.=52.6%)	other (freq.=25.6%)

#3 (High)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=10.3%)	intensified apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair (33.3% specific; 66.7% non-specific) (freq.=7%) expression of apology ; offer of repair (66.7% specific; 33.3% non-specific) (freq.=7%)
#4 (Low)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=30.7%)	expression of apology + explanation (freq.=16.3%)
#5 (High)	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=19.7%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=20%)
#6 (Low)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=13.5%)	expression of apology + explanation (freq.=13.3%)
#7 (High)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=20%)	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=20%)
#8 (Low)	gratitude (freq.=23.6%)	gratitude + offer of repair (78.9% specific; 21.1% non-specific) (freq.=46.3)
#9 (High)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific)	offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=15.6%)

	(freq.=29.3%)	
#10 (Low)	expression of apology + concern (freq.=22.7%)	expression of apology + performing of repair (freq.=26.7%)

Out of the 760 apologies given to the ten situations by the 76 Japanese participants, 685 were valid, and 75 instances had missing values, as the participants did not provide an apology for that particular situation. Specifically, only 38 participants could understand the description of the situation correctly in #2. This number was spread across 276 different apology patterns in total, whether containing standalone categories or combinations of these. Out of the 450 apology given to the ten situations by the 45 American participants, 439 were valid as well. This number was spread across 244 different patterns of apologizing in total, whether containing standalone categories or combinations of these. Americans used a greater variety of combinations of semantic formulas than Japanese in spite of the lower number of participants, so as a result, frequency were generally lower except for #1 and #8. The results showed that American participants used combinations of two categories except for #2 and #9. Japanese participants used stand-alone categories in #2, #8. It is clear from these findings that participants overwhelmingly preferred to use more than one category when apologizing, and there were many different combinations used.

3. 1. 4. 1. 3 Apology Strategies Interacting with Severity of Offense

Severity of offense is one of the factors influencing the use of speech acts of apology. It directly affects the victim's attitude toward the offender. The severity of offense in the present study was classified with two categories: severe and not-severe.

Table 4. Frequency of Apology Strategies Interacting with a Severity of Offense of Japanese in English and Americans

Coding categories	Japanese		Americans	
	n	%	n	%
Expression of apology	208	24.1	64	11.4
Intensified expression of apology	126	14.6	116	20.4
Explanation	11	1.3	18	3.2
Statement of the situation	126	14.6	61	10.9
Implicit acknowledgment	1	0.1	2	0.4
Explicit acknowledgment	3	0.3	5	0.9
Expression of reluctance	5	0.6	2	0.4
Expression of lack of intent	13	1.5	20	3.6
Expression of self-deficiency	2	0.2	5	0.9
Expression of embarrassment	2	0.2	7	1.2
Non-specific offer of repair	8	0.9	8	1.4
Specific offer of repair	235	27.3	158	28.1
Suggesting a repair	6	0.7	17	3.9
Statement of alternative (2)	19	2.2	11	2.5
Promise of Non-recurrence	7	0.8	0	0
Finding a silver lining	1	0.1	0	0
Laugh	1	0.1	2	0.4
Denial of responsibility	1	0.1	0	0
Minimizing offense	0	0	5	0.9
Minimizing blame	0	0	1	0.2
Emotionals	18	2.1	37	6.6

Gratitude	1	0.1	1	0.2
Concern for the interlocutor	22	2.6	4	0.7
Understanding	0	0	4	0.7
Feedback	1	0.1	0	0
Adjunct to the offer of repair	29	3.4	7	1.2
Utterances related to apology	15	1.7	10	1.8
Performing of repair	1	0.1	0	0
Total	862	100	562	100

The more severe the offense, the more types of strategies are included in apologies as well as other studies (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Holmes, 1990; Mir, 1992; Shlenker & Darby, 1981). Moreover, while both Americans and Japanese adjust their apologies to the severity of offense, they seem to differ in their preferred forms for different levels of severity in line with the study of Barnlund & Yoshioka (1990). As previous studies (Mir, 1992; Schlenker & Darby, 1981) mentioned, both Japanese and Americans are more likely to use intensified expressions of apology (e. g., "I'm so sorry," compared to "I'm sorry") when responding to situations involving a more severe offense in this study. Sugimoto (1995) pointed out that the degree of intensification is greater among Japanese than among Americans. However, in contrast to her study, the results of this study showed that the degree of intensification is greater among Americans than among Japanese. The results indicated that Japanese participants most frequently used expression of apology than intensifications. On the other hand, American participants most often used intensified expression of apology to the situations of severe. Japanese speakers also intended to deliver feelings of regret to the interlocutor but they sometimes could not choose an appropriate intensifier due to the lack of pragmatic competence. They most often used "so" as intensifiers, then they used "really" and "very." The results had only a few expressions of "terribly" and "truly."

Some participants used "awfully" and one used "so deeply." Expressions of "terribly," "awfully," and "so deeply" never found in American responses. Some used intensifiers after expression of apology, such as "I'm sorry, very much," "I'm sorry, too much," and "I'm so sorry, really." This can be both lack of English proficiency and pragmatic failure results from L1. In addition, 38 responses of Japanese included repeated expressions of apology, some apologized three times. There were also repetition of using intensifiers like "I'm very very sorry" and "I'm really really sorry." Additionally, nine participants used expressions to ask for friends' forgiveness, such as "Please forgive me," "Will you forgive me?" and "Could you forgive me?" Furthermore, three participants used "I beg your pardon?" instead of "I'm sorry." None of the American participants used such expression.

American participants more frequently used intensified expression of apologies for severe apology situations. Fourteen responses included repeated expressions of apologies and some used it three time. They also most frequently used "so" as intensifiers, then followed "really" and "very" as well as Japanese. However, differences were noted between the native and non-native apologies, in terms of the linguistic items chosen for expressing apologies. Except for "I'm really really sorry," six responses included "I'm so so sorry." None of the Japanese participants used this expression. In addition, in terms of intensifiers, some American participants used "seriously," which was never found in Japanese responses. Only three responses involved "Please forgive me," even though explicit expression of apology with a request for forgiveness was frequent in Japanese responses

American participants more often used the explanation strategy than Japanese participants did. In contrast, Japanese participants more often used the statement of the situation strategy than American participants did. This may possibly due to a transfer of L1 Japanese strategy use. Another explanation for the different approach to offering an apology in Japan and in America may lie in the nature of both countries' society and

they differ in their manner of coping with social situations. According to Bolstad (2000), Americans may be feel uncomfortable with an apology offered without an explanation.

The American native English speakers and the Japanese learners of English showed a similar use of the offer of repair strategy. There were typical specific offers in common with both language groups. In #1, both participants offered to pay for the damage. In regard to #3, the most typical offer was treating the friend to something. Most participants offered to return home to get a friend's notebook in #5. Offers frequently used in #7 were paying for the cleaning. In #9, both group of participants offered to buy the same magazine. Those typical offers led to the result with similar frequency. In terms of the strategy of non-specific offer of repair, American participants more frequently used it on the whole and one instance of the expression was "How can I make it this?"

Table 5. Frequency of Apology Strategies Interacting with a Not-Severe Offense of
       Japanese in English and Americans

Coding categories	Japanese		Americans	
	n	%	n	%
Expression of apology	197	30.6	118	24
Intensified expression of apology	45	7	26	5.3
Explanation	67	10.4	75	15.2
Statement of the situation	98	15.2	44	8.9
Implicit acknowledgment	5	0.8	1	0.2
Explicit acknowledgment	5	0.8	5	1
Expression of reluctance	1	0.2	0	0
Expression of lack of intent	3	0.5	10	2
Expression of self-deficiency	4	0.6	7	1.4

Expression of embarrassment	0	0	2	0.4
Non-specific offer of repair	1	0.2	11	2.2
Specific offer of repair	57	8.9	48	9.8
Suggesting a repair	0	0	2	0.4
Statement of alternative (2)	1	0.2	0	0
Promise of Non-recurrence	10	1.6	4	0.8
Topic switch	3	0.5	1	0.2
Joke	0	0	2	0.4
Laugh	0	0	1	0.2
Minimizing responsibility	1	0.2	0	0
Minimizing blame	0	0	1	0.2
Emotionals	12	1.9	20	4.1
Gratitude	18	2.8	39	7.9
Concern for the interlocutor	38	5.9	9	1.8
Understanding	0	0	1	0.2
Feedback	17	2.6	4	0.8
Adjunct to the offer of repair	4	0.6	0	0
Utterances related to apology	43	6.7	37	7.5
Utterances not related to apo.3logy	2	0.3	0	0
Performing of repair	12	1.9	23	4.7
Total	644	100	492	99.8

As shown in Table 5, both Japanese and American English speakers used intensified expression of apology much less than severe situations. Compared to severe situations, participants of both group used less variations and less number of apology strategies. It is clear that severity of offense influence the choice of apology strategies.

American responses involved the strategy of explanation with a little higher frequency than those of Japanese. The results showed that there was a tendency to provide an explanation in #4. Expressions such as "I overslept" and "The train was late" were common in both language groups. This situation might be relatively common situation and most participants probably have a similar experience.

In terms of offer of repair strategy, both Japanese and Americans had similar frequency. Typical specific offer of repair were provided in #8 and #10. In #8, they offered covering a friend's shift someday. Most of them offered picking a friend's book up in #10. Similar to situations of severe, American participants more frequently used non-specific offer of repair than Japanese participants. Only one participant of Japanese used this strategy. This may be due to the fact that Japanese learners of English might have lacked L2 linguistic knowledge to use this particular strategy and Japanese sociolinguistic rules do not use this strategy as frequently as the native English speakers (Jung, 2004).

3. 1. 4. 1. 4 Discussion of Situations

It is necessary to have a more in-depth look at the relationship between the different categories and the situations in which they appear. Therefore, this part will discuss each of the ten situations for which the participants of the study had to provide apologies. This part will combine a quantitative analysis of the types of apologies used with a qualitative discussion of some of the most important aspects of the apologies provided by the participants. The responses made by Japanese EFL speakers are presented as they are without any grammatical corrections.

Situation 1: Damaging a Friend's Digital Camera

The first situation in the questionnaire required an apology for damaging a close

friend's digital camera.

Table 6. Combinations of Categories for Situation 1

#1 (High)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese 36 patterns	expression of apology + offer of repair	9	12.2
	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	8	10.8
	expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	7	9.5
Americans 20 patterns	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	10	22.2
	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair	8	17.8
	expression of apology + offer of repair	5	11.1

The typical apology that Japanese participants provided this situation contained as

an expression of apology and an offer of repair as in the example below:

I'm sorry. I'll buy new one for you.

In regard to the strategy of specific offer of repair, Japanese participants frequently used

62

"fix" and "buy new one" and American participants as well. Others used terms such as "recompense" and "compensate," but these two words never found in responses of Americans. This seems to be associated with lack of L2 vocabulary knowledge, the ability to select appropriate words. Only one participant mentioned that she already bought new one.

In this situation, Japanese used various expressions to describe expression of apology, which were rarely used in other situations. Those were: "I can't express how sorry I am," "I can't find any words to apologize you," and "I don't know how sorry I am." It is clear that this is very severe situation, so participants tried to express their desire to apologize and offered their sincere apologies. However, American English speakers didn't use these kinds of expressions even though Japanese English speakers preferred to use. This may be due to the fact that Japanese participants applied to L1 socio-cultural strategies and transfer them to verbal performance in L2. In addition, these expressions in English were less appropriate for severity level of this situation. The Japanese learners of English seemed not to be able to use expressions appropriate to the L2 interactional context. Furthermore, Japanese used the strategy of expression of reluctance, such as "I'm afraid but…," and "It's hard to say…," which were never found in other situations, so this must be related to the severity of offense.

The most typical apology combinations which American participants used were intensified expression of apology, statement of the situation, and offer of repair. The example was following:

Okay, so, I'm really sorry, but I dropped your camera and I don't think it works anymore. But I can totally buy you a new one or something.

Responses of American English speakers tended to longer than those of Japanese English speakers, and it provided concrete and simple statement of the situation as a

63

whole. As mentioned above, Americans offered paying the damage as specific offer of repair. There was a response which used specific offer of repair and non-specific offer of repair together.

I'm so sorry. I am willing to pay you for the damage. I want to make it up to you somehow.

This is very severe situation, so some participants added how they would be like to their responses such as panic, frantically try to fix it, cry out in horror, and profusely apologize, or soooooo sorry. Americans were more likely to use the acknowledgement of responsibility to state their heartfelt apologies. I will provide two examples that uses those strategies:

I'm truly sorry for damaging your digital camera. I did not mean to damage it, I accidentally dropped it. Please forgive me.

Hey, I am so sorry! I accidentally dropped your camera after taking a picture and I tried and can't get it work. I feel so bad about it, and I will definitely replace it!

In addition, there were expression of reluctance, such as "I hate to tell you this" or "I have something to tell you" similar to some Japanese responses. However, the choice and use of expressions were very different from those of Japanese. Japanese EFL learners need to acquire indirect strategies to express certain apology messages.

Situation 2: Commenting a Friend's New Hairstyle

In this situation, the speaker comments about a friend's new hair style that looked much better before.

Table 7. Combinations of Categories for Situation 2

#2 (Low)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese	utterances related to apology	20	52.6
14 patterns	explanation	6	15.8
Americans	utterances related to apology	11	25.6
18 patterns	explanation + utterances related to apology	7	16.3
	explanation	5	11.6

Unfortunately, many Japanese participants misunderstood the setting of this situation, so validity of answer was very small. The most typical responses were following:

But, I think it's good to try various hair style.

But, your hair color is better than before.

Most responses, which included utterances related to apology, encouraged their

friends. Many participants misunderstood the description of this situation in converse, so their responses were:

I don't mean you looked bad before, of course I liked it.

Your former hairstyle was also good. But, I like your present style more.

As well as Japanese responses, Americans most often used the strategy of utterances related to apology in this situation. However, their responses were longer and had more repertoire than those of Japanese. The examples were following:

But I did like your haircut before, I just mean that this is even better. Your hair is so cute!

Hey! But your hair will grow out so it will be ok! It really doesn't look that bad.

I'm sorry. I didn't mean to hurt your feelings, you still look beautiful I'm just not used to the change yet, but just let it grow on me!

Some Americans used an expression of "grow on," but it was never found in responses of Japanese. This suggests that Japanese EFL learners need to know expressions that are preferred by native English speakers in accordance with L2 sociocultural norms. Six participants of Americans wrote that "I wouldn't say that" even though they answered. There should be room for improvement in this situation.

Situation 3: Missing Half of the Movie

In this situation, the speaker forgot to go to the movie with a friend and they already missed the half of the movie.

Table 8. Combinations of Categories for Situation 3

#3 (High)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese 42 patterns	expression of apology + statement of the situation	7	10.3
	expression of apology + statement of the situation + statement of alternative (2)	6	8.8
	expression of apology + statement of alternative (2)	5	7.4
Americans 36 patterns	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	3	7
	expression of apology + offer of repair	3	7
	statement of alternative (2)	2	4.7
	explanation + expression of apology	2	4.7
	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair	2	4.7

There was a great variety of apology patterns used in this situation, so each frequency was very low. Japanese participants most often used expression of apology and statement of the situation. The example of most frequently used response was following:

I'm sorry. I'm late.

This is kind of typical expression as conversational routine both in Japanese and in English for Japanese participants. In this situation, many Japanese English speakers tended to use statement of alternative. They suggested their friends that seeing the movie another time or another day. The example of such responses was following:

I'm sorry. I'm late. Would you like to see another movie?

In terms of specific offer of repair, some participants proposed to treat their friends to lunch as well as American participants. This seems daily conversation both for Japanese and Americans. Some Japanese participants used the strategy of promise of non-recurrence in this situation. They said, such as "I won't be late anymore," and "Next time, I will never be late."

On the other hand, Americans used expression of apology and statement of the situation and offer of repair most frequently. The results suggest the fact that American speakers who participated in this study also varied many different ways of apologizing in the case of this situation, which would mean that the choice of strategies is more related to the specific individual apologizes rather than to cultural characteristics. The example of the most frequent pattern was following:

I am so sorry I forgot. Do you have time to go to lunch so we can talk and catch up?

Participant who answered this also wrote, "Being late giving me anxiety, so I would probably be a mess emotionally." This implies the possibility that collecting data from

the more naturalistic method would provide more variety of results. Buying a friend's lunch or dinner were common features for specific offer of repair. This response included statement of alternative and offer of repair together.

I'm so sorry! I totally lost track of time! Look, how about we catch the later showing. It'll be my treat cause I made you wait so long.

Others used expressions of self-deficiency.

I can't believe I must've thought that movie started later, I'm so scatterbrained.

Let's go out for coffee and dessert after the movie. My treat.

American speakers also used more often and more effective acknowledgment of responsibility than Japanese speakers to mitigate a victim's anger and aggression in this situation. In addition, many American participants used explanation such as, "lost track of time" and "got distracted by something." Those kinds of expressions were never found in Japanese responses. It is obvious that Japanese EFL leaners need to acquire the expressions that native English speakers preferred to use in their daily conversation, and it is one of the elements of smooth communication. This situation seemed confusing, so one subject wrote, "I'd text her since she'd be in a movie and tell her sorry I was, then I'd ask if she wants me to go in the theater or not." This respond showed room for improvement of the description of this situation.

Situation 4: Being Late for an Appointment to Meet with a Friend

The speaker forgot about the meeting with a friend and the speaker was 30 minutes late in this situation.

Table 9. Combinations of Categories for Situation 4

#4 (Low)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese 28 patterns	expression of apology + statement of the situation	23	30.7
	expression of apology + explanation	8	10.7
	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation	5	6.7
Americans 30 patterns	expression of apology + explanation	7	16.3
	expression of apology + statement of the situation	4	9.3
	intensified expression of apology + explanation + offer of repair	2	4.7
	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + explanation	2	4.7
	intensified expression of apology + explanation	2	4.7

As well as #3, many Japanese speakers of English used typical expressions in this situation, which were:

I'm sorry to have kept you waiting.

I'm sorry I'm late.

Those are very useful expressions in this kind of situation. Others used the strategy of explanation and their responses also included very common expressions. Explanations which were given in this situation were similar to those of American English speakers. The following were examples of explanations:

I'm so sorry. When I woke up, it's time to go out.

I'm sorry. The traffic was busy.

Other kinds of rare strategies which found in this situation was implicit acknowledgement and the example was:

I'm really sorry, my bus was late so I'm here now. I should called you about time before.

Some used promise of non-recurrence in this situation similar to #3. The following was an example:

I'm sorry to have kept you waiting. I will be careful next time.

Using such as those two strategies seems to suggest that the speaker attempts to show the interlocutor that they are willing to keep normal and healthy relationships.

On the other hand, the most typical combination of American participants used was expression of apology and explanation. The example was following:

I'm sorry. I'm running late today.

Including this answer, there were some expressions of explanation which were never found in Japanese responses. Those were: "I got caught up," "I got held up," "I lost track of time," and "This morning was super crazy." This shows that idioms are important aspect of language proficiency and may be the important factor in learning native speakers preferred use of them. Furthermore, there was one response which used indirect explanation.

Ahhh…I hate traffic, I'm so sorry I'm late.

There were other responses including statement of the situation, expression of self-deficiency, and expression of embarrassment. I will provide two examples. Those contained in typical wordings and none of Japanese EFL learners used them.

Sorry. I'm running so late. I'm the worst friend ever. How can I make it up to you?

I'm sorry I was late, that was inconsiderate of me.

Additionally, as mentioned before, "How can I make it up to you?" was common expression as non-specific offer of repair in American responses. Japanese participants didn't use this expression.

Situation 5: Forgetting to Bring a Friend's Notebook

The speaker forgot to bring a friend's notebook and the friend needs the notebook to study for tomorrow's exam.

Table 10. Combinations of Categories for Situation 5

#5 (High)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese 18 patterns	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair	15	19.7
	expression of apology + offer of repair	13	17.1
	specific offer of repair	10	13.2
Americans 27 patterns	expression of apology + offer of repair	9	20
	offer of repair	6	13.3
	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair	4	8.9

In this situation, the Japanese most typical patterns of apology was intensified expression of apology and specific offer of repair. In contrast to other situations, intensifiers used more frequently than simple expression of apology even though it was a very little difference. The example was following:

I will go back home and bring it. I'm so sorry.

73

Additionally, there was a characteristic strategy which was found in Japanese responses in this situation. They tended to use adjunct to the offer of repair such as "Please stay here," and "Wait a moment" after they told that they would go get their friends' notebook. The following were examples, which included the strategy of adjunct to the offer of repair:

Sorry!! I'll go back to my house and bring it, so wait a moment. I'll be right back.

I will go back to my home and bring it to you as soon as I can. So can you wait a minute?

American participants, on the other, used expression of apology and specific offer of repair most frequently.

I'm sorry I will bring it right now.

The data showed that typical specific offer for this situation was to go get a friend's notebook, which was common in both responses of Japanese and Americans. Furthermore, many of their responses were characteristically associated with expressions to ensure speakers to do it immediately in this situation, such as "right now," "as soon as possible," and "as soon as I can."

It is worth noting that some American showed understanding to a close friend, but none of Japanese participants used this kind of strategy. The examples were following:

I fully understand how you feel but I didn't mean to make you angry. I accidentally forgot it. I'm sorry.

I'm seriously so sorry! I will bring it to you as soon as possible. I know you have a

test tomorrow so you really need it.

I can understand that you angry. It was honestly just a mistake. I'll drop it off at

your house tonight.

These responses with understanding can help to mitigate friends' anger, frustration, and

help them calm down. It would also help to create a good atmosphere to prevent them

getting worse. There was another response included the strategy of minimizing offense.

I'll go back home and get it after class is over, okay? You'll still get a chance to

study.

The results shows that these expressions seem very effective for L2 learners to be aware

of the strategies native English speakers of Americans use and why they employ them.

Situation 6: Forgetting to Return a Friend's CD

The speaker promised to return a friend's CD within a couple of days, but kept it

for a month in this situation.

Table 11. Combinations of Categories for Situation 6

#6 (Low)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese	expression of apology + statement of the situation	10	13.5
38 patterns	expression of apology + statement of the situation +	8	10.8

	feedback		
	explanation + expression of apology	6	8.1
Americans 30 patterns	expression of apology + explanation	4	8.9
	expression of apology + statement of the situation + explanation	3	6.7
	expression of apology + statement of the situation	3	6.7

The result showed that there was a great variety of apology patterns used in this situation. The most typical combinations of Japanese apologies was expression of apology and statement of the situation. Below is an example of the most often used combination:

I'm sorry I've kept it so long.

Japanese English speakers used this combination the most frequently just as with #3 and #4. In the sixth situation, one of the characteristics was using the strategy of feedback. One of the aspects of the results presented in Table 10 showed that feedback is the key strategy that Japanese students use to reduce any possible negative effects and to handle this kind of situation. Apologies with the category feedback as in the examples below:

Thank you for lending your CD to me for almost a month. It was very nice.

I'm sorry for keeping this CD so long time. Anyway, thank you. It was very good.

I'm sorry to be late. I am really pleased with it, so I listened to this CD again and again.

I'm very sorry. This CD was very good so I listened to it many times.

The strategies of gratitude and explanation were also used. Japanese participants who used explanations responded such as "This CD was so good, and I wanted to listen it again and again."

On the other hand, the typical response of American participants in this situation was expression of apology and explanation.

Sorry! I thought about how I needed to give it back to you but I just kept forgetting.

I'm sorry! I totally forgot! I had it out but I just kept leaving it behind.

With regard to the second most frequent patterns, expression of apology, explanation and statement of the situation were used. The example was below:

I'm sorry! I totally forgot! I had it out but I just kept leaving it behind.

Differently from Japanese participants, Americans often described the explanation that they forgot about the CD. In addition, Americans used concern and utterances related to apology in this situation. They were rarely found in Japanese responses. Those examples were:

Wow, I'm sorry. I still have this. Hope you didn't miss it too much! Here you go!

I hope you don't mind I had it for so long.

Sorry I kept forgetting to return this to you! I hope it wasn't an inconvenience!

I forgot I had this. Here you go!

The results seem to indicate that the strategy of concern for the interlocutor can play a part in reducing a friend's anger indirectly and help maintain their relationship. It should be similar to the strategy of Japanese feedback. In regard to other characteristics, Americans used "here you go" as expression of handing a friend's CD back. Additionally, one participant used minimizing blame:

Why didn't you remind me to give it back?

This response implied the relationship was relaxed and familiar.

Situation 7: Spilling Orange Juice on a Friend's Clothing

In this situation, the speaker accidentally bumped into a friend and spilled orange juice on a friend's clothing.

Table 12. Combinations of Categories for Situation 7

#7 (High)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese	expression of apology + offer of repair	15	20
31 patterns	intensified apology + offer of repair	8	10.7
	intensified apology	4	5.3
	intensified apology + concern	4	5.3
Americans	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair	9	20
21 patterns	emotional + intensified expression of apology + offer	9	20

| | of repair | | |
| | expression of apology + offer of repair | 6 | 13.3 |

The most typical patterns of Japanese participants used was expression of apology and specific offer of repair. Below was the example of that pattern:

I'm sorry! I have tissue. Please wipe your clothing. I will send your clothing to the laundry.

In comparison with other situations, Japanese EFL learners used intensified expression of apology more often. They seemed to think that this situation was very severe one. One used "I beg your pardon" in this situation, and it indicated the lack of L2 proficiency. The result made it clear that they tended to use longer utterances and more different words when they responded this situation. In addition, some of both Japanese participants and American participants used two kinds of specific offer of repair in this situation, such as paying for the cleaning and cleaning it up.

J: I'm so sorry. Let's go my house and I lend you my cloth. I'll pay for cleaning.

A: Oh my gosh! I'm soo sorry! Here let me get some towels so we can cleaned it up! Can I get you a new shirt from your dorm? I'm seriously so sorry, totally my bad.

However, none of Japanese used expression of "clean up." They used "wash" and "wipe" in the same sense of "clean up." The results indicated the lack of acquisition of appropriate word usage which were native English speakers preferred to use. Japanese participants could not choose the correct word to express the meaning. As showing the

above example, Japanese responses were observed characteristically in tend to contain two kinds of specific offer of repair in one response in this situation. In contrast to American speakers, Japanese speakers also often used the strategy of concern for the interlocutor in this situation. The examples were following:

I'm sorry. (wiping her clothing with the towel) Are you okay?

I'm so sorry! Are you OK?

Omg! I am sooo sorry! Are you alright? I didn't mean it. Please forgive me!!

The Japanese participants seemed to transfer pragmatic knowledge in matching to what they would say to the L1 context of this situation. They might show that how can be considerate and kind to the interlocutor in this kind of situation in Japan. In addition, there was one instance which included finding a silver lining and denial of responsibility only in this situation. They were never found in responses of Americans.
.

Oh my gosh! Are you okay? I'm so sorry, but you smells good! HAHAHA.

Oh, I'm so sorry. But it's not my fault.

These were worth mentioning as the participants used unique expressions, which might be hard to believe. However, even though the participants may or may not have intended, each apology could turn out to be a humorous one according to their relationships with interlocutors.

American participants most frequently used intensified expression of apology and specific offer of repair in this situation.

I'm so sorry! Let me help you get cleaned up.

Responses of Americans also contained emotionals much frequently than those of Japanese in this situation.

Oh goodness, I'm so sorry! That was totally my fault. Let me help you clean it up!

Oh my goodness. I am so sorry! Let me see if we can find something else for you to wear if it doesn't clean out.

Oh my god!! I'm so sorry!! Here let's grab some napkins and let's go to the bathroom and clean you up, I'm so sorry.

Emotional expression seemed to demonstrate their feelings about what they done. Considering the severity of the situation, it also makes apology strengthen. One could also consider the cultural basis of emotions. There was a response which contained the strategy of minimizing the offense with emotionals, which was never found in Japanese responses.

CRAP! I'm so sorry. At least it wasn't coffee.

This may be turned out to be effective and smooth communication between close friends in a humorous way.

Situation 8: Covering a Speaker's Shift

A friend covered the speaker's shift of part time job in this situation.

Table 13. Combinations of Categories for Situation 8

#8 (Low)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese	gratitude	13	23.6
14 patterns	expression of apology + offer of repair	9	16.4
	gratitude + offer of repair	9	16.4
Americans	gratitude + offer of repair	19	46.3
15 patterns	gratitude	5	12.2
	expression of apology + statement of the situation + gratitude	3	7.3

In this situation, both Japanese participants and American participants more frequently used gratitude than expression of apology. The typical expression for

Japanese was gratitude as a standalone category. The example was:

Thank you for working for me.

They offered to take friends' position when they are urgent as specific offer of repair.

I'm sorry and thank you for your kindness. I'll replace you when you are urgent.

Thank you for working for me. Next time I'll work for you.

Americans also used similar responses those of Japanese in this situation. Some Americans used non-specific offers of repair, which Japanese never used.

Thank you so much or taking my shift. Let me know if I can do the same for you.

Thank you so much for taking my shift! I really appreciate it! If I can ever do the same for you please let me know.

Thank you so much for covering my shift. Let me know if I can ever do something for you.

In terms of the strategy of statement of the situation, they used these kinds of expressions:

I'm sorry for the short notice, but thanks so much for covering my shift.

Thank you so much! I'm sorry if I disrupted your day.

I'm sorry that you had to cover for me at the last minute. I'll bring you a treat

tomorrow and I will happily take any of your shift.

Interestingly, there were a variety of expressions to express their gratitude in American

responses in this situation. The examples were following:

You're a life-saver!

You are the best, the absolute best.

Those were the strategy of gratitude, not direct expressions of apology, but it is worth

noting that native English speakers used these expressions as apology strategies.

Furthermore, there was one unique response to express emotions:

I hate when I have emergencies to handle they are so stressful!

In contrast to other expressions of emotions, this demonstrated the speaker's feeling

indirectly and suggestively.

Situation 9: Spilling a Coffee on a Friend's Magazine

In this situation, the speaker spilled a coffee on a friend's magazine.

Table 14. Combinations of Categories for Situation 9

#9 (High)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%

Japanese 22 patterns	expression of apology + offer of repair	22	29.3
	expression of apology + statement of the situation	19	25.3
	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	6	8
Americans 27 patterns	offer of repair	7	15.6
	expression of apology + offer of repair	6	13.3
	expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	3	6.7
	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair	3	6.7

The typical expression of Japanese participants used in this situation was expression of apology and offer of repair. The second most frequent one was the combination of expression of apology and statement of the situation. The third most frequent combination was intensified expression of apology, statement of the situation and offer of repair as can be seen in Table 12. These examples were below:

I'm sorry. I'll buy a new one.

I'm sorry, but I spilled coffee on your magazine. I'll get a new one for you.

In this situation, I could see the variations of specific offer of repair in Japanese responses. Some participants already completed specific offer of repair by buying new one. Interestingly, some of them wrote that they return a new one without saying that. One of them responded returning new one without saying spilled a coffee and "This is very interesting magazine, isn't it?" The results of these responses might be related to the severity of this situation and it seemed easy to repair. In addition, some participants

used adjunct of offer of repair in this situation. The examples were:

I'm sorry. I spilled coffee on the magazine, so I'll get the same magazine, so could you wait for several days?

I'm so sorry for spelling coffee on it. I'll buy new one and I give you it. So, could you wait?

American participants most often used standalone expression of specific offer of repair in this situation. The example was:

Can I buy you a new copy?

They offered to buy a new copy as well as those of Japanese participants.

I'm sorry. Can I replace it?

In contrast to offer of repair by Japanese participants, five American participants expressed the offer as a question as illustrated in the above examples. None of Japanese participants used this pattern. In addition, the strategy of suggesting a repair was used by five American participants, such as "Do you want me to buy you a new one?" Only one Japanese participant used this strategy.

Some Americans used expression of lack of intent more frequently than Japanese did, even though the number was small.

I'm sorry. I didn't mean to. I'll buy you a new one!

I am so sorry. It was an accident, I will get you another copy just tell me where you got it from.

Ahh, I'm so sorry! But I accidently got some coffee on your magazine. It's a bit ruffled but you can still read it. I'm really sorry that happened.

These expressions can help to mitigate a friend's anger and help a friend accept an apology from the speaker. There is one more aspect that makes the apologies to this situation interesting and unique. Even though this is not typical, there were a few apologies that included minimizing offense in that. Here are such examples:

Sorry about the coffee. You can still read it fine.

Those pages weren't very interesting.

These might get accepted as apologies based on relationship with the speaker and the friend.

Situation 10: Bumping into a Friend

The speaker bumped into a friend in the library and the books she was carrying fell onto the floor.

Table 15. Combinations of Categories for Situation 10

#10 (Low)	Combinations	Frequency	
		n	%
Japanese	expression of apology + concern	17	22.7

33 patterns	expression of apology	9	12
	expression of apology + offer of repair	7	9.3
Americans 20 patterns	expression of apology + performing of repair	12	26.7
	expression of apology + offer of repair	8	17.8
	emotional + expression of apology	3	6.7
	emotional + expression of apology + offer of repair	3	6.7

The results of this situation was very interesting. Japanese participants used a combination of expression of apology and concern for the interlocutor most frequently. On the other hand, American participants used a combination of expression of apology and performing of repair most frequently.

J: Sorry. Are you and books OK?

A: (Pick them up). Sorry, girl.

Many Japanese speakers of English used concern for the interlocutor as well as #7. Those results suggest that when bumping into a friend, it is one of the most important thing for Japanese to make sure a friend is OK. The Second most typical expressions were expression of apology for Japanese and expression of apology and specific offer of repair for Americans.

J: I'm sorry!

A: I'm sorry, let me get your books.

Sorry; let me help you get those.

With regards to specific offer of repair, Japanese participants used "I'll pick up for you" or "I carry the books" and then some participants used "Here you are" as adjuncts to offer of repair. Some participants used unique responses, which added to utterances not related to apology, such as:

Oh, sorry. Anyway long time no see.

Oops! Are you Okay? I pick them up and you stay there. What kind of books do you like to read?

On the other hand, American participants more frequently used the strategies of emotionals and offer of repair than Japanese. The following were examples:

Woops! Sorry about that!

Oops! My bad! Here, let me get those for you.

Some American English speakers also contained explanation in their apologies. This was also found in some Japanese responses, but their expressions were different. Americans typically used these two expressions, such as "I'm so clumsy" and "I was not looking where I was going." None of Japanese used these expressions, they typically used these expressions instead, such as "I was careless" and 'I'm not careful." Most Japanese responses which used explanation contained one of two words, "careless" and "careful." None of American responses included them. This shows that it is necessary for Japanese EFL learners to acquire L2 strategic and linguistic knowledge.

3. 1. 4. 2 Japanese Speakers' Apologies in English and in Japanese

3. 1. 4. 2. 1 Frequency of Apology Semantic Formulas

In order to see apology strategies in detail, I compared to the frequency of semantic formulas used by Japanese language group and English language group, the number of semantic formulas was counted.

Table 16. Frequency of Categories in Apologies by Japanese in English in Japanese

Coding categories	English		Japanese	
	n	%	n	%
Expression of apology	396	57.8	316	53.6
Intensified expression of apology	180	26.3	151	25.6
Explanation	79	11.5	51	8.6
Statement of the situation	224	32.7	129	21.9
Implicit acknowledgment	6	0.9	0	0
Explicit acknowledgment	8	1.2	1	0.2
Expression of reluctance	6	0.9	0	0
Expression of lack of intent	16	2.3	6	1
Expression of self-deficiency	6	0.9	0	0
Expression of embarrassment	2	0.3	1	0.2
Non-specific offer of repair	9	1.3	15	2.5
Specific offer of repair	293	42.8	248	42
Suggesting a repair	6	0.9	2	0.3
Statement of alternative (1)	0	0	0	0
Statement of alternative (2)	20	2.9	30	5
Promise of Non-recurrence	18	2.6	5	0.8

Suggestion for avoiding the situation	0	0	0	0
Topic switch	3	0.4	0	0
Joke	0	0	3	0.5
Finding a silver lining	1	0.1	0	0
Laugh	1	0.1	2	0.3
Denial of responsibility	1	0.1	0	0
Minimizing offense	0	0	2	0.3
Minimizing responsibility	1	0.1	0	0
Minimizing blame	0	0	0	0.5
Emotionals	30	4.4	20	3.4
Gratitude	58	8.5	36	6.1
Wishing the best after apologizing	0	0	0	0
Concern for the interlocutor	60	8.8	54	9.2
Understanding	0	0	0	0
Feedback	18	2.6	8	1.4
Adjunct to the offer of repair	33	4.8	28	4.7
Utterances related to apology	58	8.5	62	10.5
Utterances not related to apology	2	0.3	0	0
Performing of repair	13	1.9	22	3.7

As shown in Table 16, there were 1192 formulas used in the Japanese language group apologies. The greatest number identified as expression of apology, specific offer of repair, and intensified expression of apology. Expression of apology accounted for 316 or 53.6% of the total number of formulas used. Specific offer of repair was the second most popular formula and was used 248 times, accounting for 42% of the

formulas. Formulas coded as intensified expression of apology accounted 151 or 25.6% of the total.

English language group used 1548 semantic formulas. The most common formulas used by the English language group were expression of apology, specific offer of repair, and statement of the situation. The third most frequently used semantic formulas were different from Japanese group. Formula used 386 or 56.4% coded as expression of apology. Specific offer of repair was the second most common formula with 293 or 42.8%. Statement of the situation were used in 224 or 32.7% of the apologies.

Based on the results in Table 16, the following general similarities and differences were observed among two groups. The two groups mainly displayed four expressions in the different order, but fifth most frequently used semantic formulas were different.

3. 1. 4. 2. 2 Most Frequent Observed Apology Patterns Used by Japanese Speakers in English and in Japanese

Coded as semantic formula, the responses were compared to discover the general pattern for each situation in each language group. The most frequent patterns of apologies for each language group in each situation are listed in Table17.

Table 17. Most Frequently Observed Apology Patterns by Japanese in English and in Japanese

Situations	English	Japanese
#1 (High)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=12.2%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=18%)
#2 (Low)	utterances related to apology	utterances related to apology

	(freq.=52.6%)	(freq.=59%)
#3 (High)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=10.3%)	expression of apology + statement of alternative (freq.=22%)
#4 (Low)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=30.7%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=18.3%)
#5 (High)	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=19.7%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100 % specific) (freq.=30.5%)
#6 (Low)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=13.5%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (freq.=24.6%)
#7 (High)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=20%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (88.8% specific; 11.1% non-specific) (freq.=14.8%)
#8 (Low)	gratitude (freq.=23.6%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (57.1% specific; 42.9% non-specific) (freq.=15.2%)
#9 (High)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=29.3%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (100% specific) (freq.=27.9%)
#10 (Low)	expression of apology + concern (freq.=22.7%)	expression of apology + concern (freq.=44.3%)

English group used 276 combinations of semantic formulas. In contrast, Japanese group used only 174 combinations in total. The English language group used a greater variety of combinations of semantic formulas than the Japanese language group. The number of combinations differed widely, but both Japanese and English groups used same apology pattern most frequently except for #5 and #7. With regard to #5, although English group most frequently used intensified expression of apology, both groups used direct apology expression. In other words, there was not much difference between the two groups in terms of frequently observed patterns. It indicates that Japanese speakers tend to use same expression of apology in spite of language difference.

Table 18. Frequently Observed Apology Strategies

	English	Japanese
1	expression of apology	expression of apology
2	specific offer of repair	specific offer of repair
3	intensified expression of apology	statement of the situation
4	statement of the situation	intensified expression of apology
5	Explanation	utterances related to the apology

Other expressions were rare, but the English group tended to use acknowledgment of responsibility more than Japanese group. The Japanese group never used implicit acknowledgment, expression of reluctance, and expression of

self-deficiency. Japanese might be more sensitive to refer difficulty to an interlocutor in English than in Japanese. Three of Japanese group used joke, which was never found in English group. It would be easier to tell a joke about something in native language in a humorous way to avoid serious harm. These tendencies might also suggest that language differences between Japanese and English play some role in changes made in expression. Both groups used concern with similar frequency. Especially, in situations 7 and 10, their apologies included to emphasize their feelings of anxiety, such as "Are you okay?" Six responses of English group repeated like "Did that hurt? Are you okay?" in #10 in spite of the not severe situation.

3. 1. 4. 2. 3 Preference for Direct Apology Expressions

With regard to use of direct apology strategies, formulas classified as direct were expression of apology and intensified expression of apology. Japanese language group used direct expressions 451 cases (14.9%). English language group used direct expressions 341 cases (16.8%). This revealed that both group used direct strategies with similar frequency. Table 19 shows the overall results of frequently used direct expressions in each situation.

Table 19. Frequency of Direct Expression of Apology by Japanese in English and in Japanese

Situation	Category	Lang.=English		Lang.=Japanese	
		n	%	n	%
#1	expression of apology	26	35.1	30	49.2
	intensified	48	64.9	29	47.5
	total	74	100	59	96.7
#2	expression of apology	6	15.8	5	8.2

	intensified	1	2.6	0	0
	total	7	18.4	5	8.2
#3	expression of apology	40	58.8	25	42.4
	intensified	26	38.2	32	54.2
	total	66	97.1	57	97.6
#4	expression of apology	53	70.7	45	75
	intensified	22	29.3	13	21.7
	total	75	100	58	96.7
#5	expression of apology	40	52.6	22	37.3
	intensified	19	25	18	30.5
	total	59	77.6	40	67.8
#6	expression of apology	53	71.6	46	75.4
	intensified	11	14.9	10	16.4
		64	86.5	56	91.8
#7	expression of apology	37	49.3	29	47.5
	intensified	34	45.3	28	45.9
	total	71	94.7	57	93.4
#8	expression of apology	26	47.3	23	50
	intensified	4	7.3	9	19.6
	total	30	54.5	32	69.6
#9	expression of apology	46	61.3	35	57.4
	intensified	18	24	9	14.8
	total	64	85.3	44	72.1
#10	expression of apology	60	80	56	91.8
	intensified	7	9.3	3	4.9
	total	67	89.3	59	96.7

To observe the degrees in the use of the direct apology strategies preferred by the two groups, I examined the frequency in each situation. English language group preferred more direct apology strategies in situation 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9. The results indicated that Japanese EFL learners tended to use more direct expression of apology in English than in Japanese, but the perception of their frequency difference was small. The presence of Japanese expression of apologies in English and in Japanese seemed to be associated with sociocultural context of native language use. Both language group used expression of apology more frequently than intensified expression of apology except for one situation in each group regardless of the severity of offense. Intensified expression of apology was most frequently found in #1 in English language group. In contrast, Japanese language group most frequently used intensified expression of apology in #4.

Overall, the data showed that both group used explicit expression of apology strategies similar frequency. Therefore, this finding indicated a transfer of L1 directness of apology strategies into English. The presence of expression of apologies showed an association between Japanese with apologies in English and in Japanese.

3. 1. 4. 2. 4 Frequency of Offer of Repair by Japanese in English and in Japanese

Data were also analyzed according to the specific offer of repair for apologies. Analyzing the offer of repair was important because they were given to make up for the situation to require apology. It is possible to find the evidence of pragmatic transfer not only by analyzing the numbers of offer of repair in the apologies, but also the content and specificity of the offers.

To analyze the offers, all of the offers for a specific situation were classified as either specific (e.g., "I'll buy new one") or non-specific (e.g., "I'll do something to make it up"). In addition, specific offer of repair sub-categorized according to the responses.

Table 20. Frequency of Offer of Repair by Japanese in English and in Japanese

Situations	Offer of repair	English		Japanese	
		n	%	n	%
#1	specific	46	92	44	95.7
	non-specific	4	8	2	4.3
	total	50	100	46	100
#2	specific	0	0	0	0
	non-specific	0	0	0	0
	total	0	0	0	0
#3	specific	14	87.5	15	83.3
	non-specific	2	12.5	3	16.7
	total	16	100	18	100
#4	specific	9	90	12	92.3
	non-specific	1	10	1	7.7
	total	10	100	13	100
#5	specific	62	98.4	52	98.1
	non-specific	1	1.6	1	1.9
	total	63	100	53	100
#6	specific	9	100	7	100
	non-specific	0	0	0	0
	total	9	100	7	100
#7	specific	45	97.8	32	97
	non-specific	1	2.2	1	3
	total	46	100	33	100
#8	specific	25	100	28	80
	non-specific	0	0	7	20

	total	25	100	35	100
#9	specific	69	100	54	100
	non-specific	0	0	0	0
	total	0	100	54	100
#10	Specific	14	100	4	100
	non-specific	0	0	0	0
	total	14	100	0	100

As shown in Table 20, Japanese language group used specific offer of repair more frequently in #1 and #4 than English language group. On the other hand, English language group used specific offer of repair more frequently in #3, 5, and 7. Both group used only specific offer of repair in other situations. Except for #8, there was not much difference between Japanese and English. This showed that their use of English were strongly influenced by their native language and they transferred L1 pragmatic rules to the L2 speech act performance. The example of a specific offer that both groups frequently used was variations of "I'll cover your shift when you have urgent business" in #8. Seven out of thirty-five responses used non-specific offer of repair in Japanese group. The example of Japanese non-specific offer of repair would express "Let me know if I can ever do something for you" in English. None of English group used non-specific offer of repair in this situation. This may due to the fact that the Japanese learners of English might have lacked L2 linguistic knowledge to express this offer in English.

The most noticeable finding was the similarity in the offers given by Japanese language group and English language group. Both groups frequently provided same kinds of specific offers for apologies. Japanese group offered to buy new one in #9 as specific offer of repair as well as English group did. Moreover, 14 participants already completed offer of repair and 3 participants bought new one without saying that as well

as English group. As shown in Table 20, the frequency of the use of non-specific offer was also similar.

There were no significant differences between both language groups. Participants used much the same expressions of offer of repair in English and in Japanese. This result indicated that the Japanese convention of offering a repair appeared to transfer into the English of Japanese speakers. This revealed that English used by the Japanese can be affected by L1 language.

3. 1. 4. 3 Japanese Speakers' Apologies in English and in Japanese and American Speakers' Apologies in English

3. 1. 4. 3. 1 Most Frequent Observed Apology Patterns Used by Native Speakers of American English and by Japanese Speakers in English and in Japanese

In Table 21, apologies by native speakers of Japanese in Japanese, native speakers of American English in English, and Japanese EFL learners in English are compared in terms of the most frequent combination of apology strategies used in each situation.

Table 21. Most Frequently Observed Apology Patterns by Americans (NEs) and by Japanese in Japanese (NJs) and in English (EFL)

Situ.	NEs	NJs	EFL
#1	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair (22.2%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (18%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (12.2%)
#2	utterances related to	utterances related to	utterances related to

	apology (25.6%)	apology (59%)	apology (52.6%)
#3	intensified expression of apology + statement of the situation + offer of repair (7%) expression of apology + offer of repair (7%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (18.3%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (10.3%)
#4	expression of apology + explanation (16.35)	expression of apology + statement of alternative (22%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (30.7%)
#5	expression of apology + offer of repair (20%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (30.5%)	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair (19.7%)
#6	expression of apology + explanation (13.3%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (24.6%)	expression of apology + statement of the situation (13.5%)
#7	intensified expression of apology + offer of repair (20%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (14.8%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (20%)
#8	gratitude + offer of repair (46.3%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (15.2%)	gratitude (23.6%)
#9	offer of repair (15.6%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (27.9%)	expression of apology + offer of repair (29.3%)
#10	expression of apology + performing of repair (26.7%)	expression of apology + concern (44.3%)	expression of apology + concern (22.7%)

*The percentages in brackets show the percentage of participants in a given group.

101

NEs usually began their apologies with intensified expression of apology, such as "I'm so sorry" followed by statement of the situation or offer of repair for severe situations, except for #5 and #9. Unlike NEs, NJs began their apology with expression of apology, such as "I'm sorry" or "Sorry," except for #2 in spite of the severity of offense. Comparing the three groups, it was found that the EFL group employed similar strategies to the NJs, except for #5 and #8. When apologizing something to a close friend, both NJs and EFL often began their apologies with direct expression of apology strategies. Unlike the NEs, NJs never used intensified expression of apology as the most frequent apology pattern in any situation. On the other hand, EFL began with their apologies with intensified expression of apology in #5, but in that situation, NEs didn't began their apologies with expression of apology without intensifiers.

Some evidence of pragmatic transfer in Japanese EFL apologies was found. Both groups shared certain patterns of apology 8 out of 10 situations. It was observed that when the Japanese EFL learners used direct apology expression strategies, they used them with offer of repair or statement of the situation, except for #10. Similarly, NJs used direct expression of apologies with offer of repair or statement of the situation, except for #4 and #10.

3. 1. 4. 3. 2 Most Frequently Observed Apology Strategies Used by Native Speakers of American English and by Japanese Speakers in English and in Japanese

Table 22 shows five most frequently used semantic formulas in each group. The following general similarities and differences were observed among three groups.

Table 22. Five Most Frequently Observed Semantic Formulas by NEs, NJs, and EFL

	NEs	NJs	EFL
1	specific offer of repair	expression of apology	expression of apology

	(42.8%)	(53.6%)	(57.8%)
2	intensified expression of apology (35.8%)	specific offer of repair (42%)	specific offer of repair (42.8%)
3	expression of apology (32.1%)	intensified expression of apology (25.6%)	statement of the situation (32.7%)
4	statement of the situation (23.9%)	statement of the situation (21.9%)	intensified expression of apology (26.3%)
5	explanation (20.3%)	utterances related to the apology (10.5%)	explanation (11.5%)

*The percentages in brackets show the percentage of participants in a given group.

The most frequently used category was expression of apology both NJs and EFL, which was used very similar frequency. NJs and EFL used specific offer of repair second most frequently, and those frequency were also much the same. The order was different, but NJs and EFL used intensified expression of apology with almost same frequency. On the other hand, Americans used specific offer of repair most frequently, which was 42.8%. If I took expression of apology and intensified expression of apology together, most observed strategy was explicit expression of apology in three groups.

NEs and EFL mainly used the same five semantic formulas, but the order and frequency were very different. The results revealed that despite the fact that both groups used similar apology categories, cross cultural differences were obvious.

These results support the idea that pragmatic transfer exists in the choice of selecting apology strategies and content of semantic formulas. L1 pragmatic norms of EFL learners was transferred to L2. It is clear that L2 learners must be aware of L2 sociocultural constraints on speech acts in order to be pragmatically competent.

3. 1. 4. 4 Summary

This study investigated the similarities and the differences of apology strategies used by Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese, and by Americans in English. The results showed what were the most frequently used categories in each situation, as well as what kind of combinations the participants used in their strategies to apologize. Different ways of realizing these categories were also discussed.

Japanese English speakers used the most formulaic expressions, for example, "sorry" or "I'm sorry." One of the reason may be that Japanese EFL learners heard the routine from "I'm sorry" or "Sorry" frequently from EFL textbooks or media such as movies, dramas. American English speakers more frequently used intensified expression of apology than the formal expression of apology. Japanese EFL learners need to understand that a very severe offense will require intensifiers and they should be appropriate for the situation. In addition, American participants more frequently used acknowledgment of responsibility as indirect expression of apologies than Japanese participant did. It is obvious that acquiring such apology strategies helps Japanese English learners to smooth communication in English.

The seriousness of the offense was related to the choice of apology strategies for Japanese and Americans. The more severe the offense was, the more types of categories used in combinations of apology. The use of the explicit expression of apology and intensified expression of apology were more observed as well. The frequency of intensified expression of apologies was higher than in other situations of not severe.

In addition to the perceived severity of the offense, another factor that influenced the choice of strategies was whether the offense produced consequences beyond the interaction in the situation or not. In breaking a friend's digital camera, where there was material damage involved as well as #7 and #9, and forgetting a friend's notebook, where the consequences involved the inability to study for the exam the next day, the strategy of offer of repair was the most often used category. Therefore, the speakers considered that they needed to offer a way to make up for such consequences in order to

maintain their relationships.

Finally, there seems to be pragmatic transfer from Japanese into English. Especially, the Japanese tendency to use the strategy of expression of apology, concern for the interlocutor, and offer of repair may indicate transfer of sociocultural norms when communicating in a second language. Results demonstrated that overall the two groups shared most of the strategies of offer of repair and that pragmatic transfer existed in the choice and content of apology strategies. It is necessary for Japanese EFL learners to acquire the linguistic and pragmatic knowledge to make appropriate apologies in English.

3. 2 Study 2: The Use of Apologies in Japanese Junior High and High School English Textbooks

3. 2. 1 Overview

The purpose of this study is to investigate how junior high school and high school English textbooks teach making apologies in English to Japanese speakers. This study sheds light on the present situation of teaching pragmatics in classroom settings: how English textbooks cover the teaching of apology speech act. EFL textbooks used in junior high school and high school in Japan that have been approved by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology were investigated. This study consisted of two analysis: apologies found in the textbooks and combination of apology strategies.

3. 2. 2 Materials

In Japan, textbooks in elementary and secondary schools must be either authorized by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology or published under the copyright of Japanese School Education Law. The 36 textbooks, 18

textbooks each for junior high school and high school, used in this analysis are shown in Appendix D and E.

The eighteen English textbooks for junior high school used in this study covered all the English courses offered in junior high schools. I examined six series of EFL textbooks; *COLUMBUS 21*, *NEW CROWN*, *NEW HORIZON*, *ONE WORLD*, *SUNSHINE*, and *TOTAL ENGLISH*, developed for junior high school students (from first year through third year). All of them have been approved by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology and are used at junior high schools in Japan. Most textbooks employ devised stories using their own characters to introduce the functions of language, vocabulary and grammatical structures.

There are seven subjects in high school English classes: Basic English Communication, English Communication I, II, and III, English Conversation, and English Expression I and II. Eighteen English textbooks were chosen from Basic English Communication, English Communication I, and English Conversation. I chose them because English Communication I is a requirement for high school English, so students definitely take this course in high school. English Communication is a course that covers all four English language skills; listening, speaking, reading, and writing in a comprehensive way. Basic English Communication aims for a smooth connection between junior high school English and high school English. English Conversation especially aims to improve the ability of interactive communication with a focus on listening and speaking. This course focuses on developing students' communication skills, which are deeply related to appropriate language use, so I also chose textbooks from this course. I examined: *Joyful English* (Basic English Communication), *All Abroad!*, *Prominence*, *English Now*, *Discovery*, *Vista, Crown*, *My Way*, *New One World*, *On Air, Compass*, *Genius*, *Element*, and *Landmark* (English Communication I), *Hello there!*, *Select*, *Sailing*, and *My Passport* (English Conversation). They are all used in high schools in Kyoto.

106

All of those textbooks employ a topic-based approach, the contents of which are organized by language-use situations and functions of language described in *The Course of Study* by the Ministry of Education published under the 2008 versions, which describes three types of language-use situation: situations where fixed expressions are often used (i.e., greetings, self-introductions, talking on the phone, shopping, asking and giving directions, traveling, and having meals), situations that are likely to occur in students' lives (i.e., home life, learning and activities at school, and local events), and situations that find out information through various means (i.e., reading books, newspapers, and magazines, and watching TVs and movies). The functions of language are classified into five: facilitating communication (i.e., addressing, giving nods, asking for repetition, and repeating), expressing emotions (i.e., expressing gratitude, complaining, praising, and apologizing), transmitting information (i.e., explaining, reporting, presenting, and describing), expressing opinions and intentions (i.e., offering promising, giving opinions, agreeing, disagreeing, and accepting), and encouraging the behavior of another person (i.e., asking, inviting, permitting, giving advice, giving orders, and holding attention).

3. 2. 3 Procedures

English textbooks used in junior high school and high school were analyzed by counting the numbers of apologies found in conversational sentences. In my study, I counted apologies found in both main contents of each Unit (including main conversational sentences, dialogues and main reading paragraphs) and book notes (including additional exercises and additional readings) of the textbooks. I separated them into two parts because book notes might not be taught in the class. Apologies were found by using key words: apologize, excuse, forgive, pardon, and sorry, which were categorized as expressions of apologies by Cohen and Olshtain (1981).

To analyze the data, each grade level of the junior high school text books and the

107

use of apologies were compared. With regard to high school text books, in the nature of the curriculum, they were analyzed according to the subject.

This study carried out the following investigations: (1) apologies found in 36 textbooks were identified and counted and (2) apologies were categorized according to strategies.

3. 2. 4 Results and Discussion

3. 2. 4. 1 Apologies Used in Japanese Junior High School English Textbooks

In order to determine the textbook apology tendencies in detail, the expressions of apologies: apologize, excuse, forgive, pardon, and sorry were counted. They were often used in some particular situations such as "opening a conversation," and "asking to say something again." This study did not include these situations into the numbers to limit the analysis of the speech act of apology.

Table 23 shows the frequency of apologies used in main conversational sentences and book notes of the junior high school textbooks.

Table 23. Numbers of Apologies Used in Japanese Junior High School English Textbooks

Target Age of the Textbooks	Apologies Used in Main Conversational Sentences	Apologiess Used in Conversational Sentences in Book Notes	Total
	n	n	n
First Year of Junior High school	9	13	22

Second Year of Junior High school	9	21	30
Third Year of Junior High school	8	21	29
Total	26	55	81

Comparison of the number of apologies indicated that apologies were used more frequently in book notes (55) than in the main conversational sentences (26). Book notes had more than doubled. As Suezawa and Abe (2012) pointed out, since English teachers in Japan usually teach from the main conversational sentences or main reading paragraphs, it is quite possible that English teachers and students do not even open or use the pages of book notes when teaching or studying in English textbooks, where the other types of apologies are found. This suggests that students may not acquire sufficient pragmatic knowledge through English textbooks.

3. 2. 4. 2 Apologies Used in Japanese High School English Textbooks

Table 24 shows the frequency of apologies used in main conversational sentences and book notes of the high school textbooks.

Table 24. Numbers of Apologies Used in Japanese High School English Textbooks

Target class of the textbooks	Apologies Used in Main Conversational Sentences	Apologies Used in Conversational Sentences in Book Notes	Total
	n	n	n

Basic English Communication	1	0	1
English Communication I	14	12	26
English Conversation	9	11	20
Total	24	23	47

There were almost the same number of apologies in main conversational sentences (24) and book notes of the textbooks (23). As for Basic English Communication, there was only one apology in the textbook. In addition, five of thirteen textbooks of English Communication I had no apology expressions. All English Conversation textbooks taught apologies in English, but the amount was not enough. The range of apology speech acts among most of the textbooks was quite limited. This implies that high school English textbooks don't provide learners with sufficient information on developing pragmatic competence.

3. 2. 4. 3 Strategies Used in Apologies in Junior High School Textbooks

The combination of apology strategies in conversational sentences of the textbooks was examined. Table 25 demonstrates the combined numbers of apologies found in both main conversational sentences and in book notes.

Table 25. Types of Apology Strategies in Junior High School English Textbooks

Target age of the Textbooks	Expression of apology n	Emotional + expression of apology n	Expression of apology + explanation n	Emotional + expression of apology + explanation n	Expression of apology + statement of the situation n	Emotional + expression of apology+ statement of the situation n	Others n

First year	7	2	6	0	2	1	4
Second year	0	2	9	2	6	0	11
Third year	8	1	8	0	8	0	4
Total	15	5	23	2	16	1	19

The results showed that "Expression of apology + explanation" was one of the most typical combination of apology strategies in the textbooks, such as "I'm sorry I'm busy tomorrow." and "I'm sorry. I have other plans." Those apology strategies mainly used in the situation of refusals to invitations and offers. Additionally, there were three textbooks which introduced the way of saying "no," people usually apologize and explain, such as, "Sorry, I can't and tell the excuse," or "I'm sorry and tell the excuse." Introducing students to the speaking way of native English speakers associated with a particular speech act in a certain context, how they usually apologize in English, is pragmatically helpful and would increase pragmatic awareness.

Regarding "Expression of apology + statement of the situation," the textbooks often introduced useful expressions in school life, such as "I'm sorry I'm late" and "I'm sorry I broke the window." Most textbooks taught "sorry" and "I'm sorry" as "Expression of apology" except one textbook. That textbook contained "apologize" as "Expression of apology," and "pardon" as expression to get attention and to ask to say something again. Furthermore, only one type of intensifiers used in two third-year textbooks, such as "Oh, I'm really sorry" and "I'm really sorry…." This may relate to Japanese EFL learners' lack of knowledge about appropriate use of intensifiers. Although Americans used intensifiers when emphasizing their apologies, Japanese tended to repeat words, such as "sorry" (Sugimoto, 1997).

With regard to strategy of "Others," "Expression of apology + I can't" and "Expression of apology + I can't + explanation" were most frequently found through all grades. There was only one sentence using "Self-reluctance" in the second-year textbook, "Sorry, I'm afraid I don't know." In addition, only one expression of "Lack of intention" was contained in the third-year textbook, "I'm sorry I didn't mean to upset

you." A "Repair apology" found in the third-year textbook. The speaker used this to repair not introducing herself previously when answering the phone, "Sorry. This is Kumi."

The results revealed that Japanese learners learned quite limited variation of apology expressions in junior high school English textbooks. As shown in this study and Suezawa and Abe (2012), English textbooks need to include more expression of apologies which reflect on native English speakers' manner of speaking. This findings indicated that most textbooks used in English classes provide typical pattern of apology strategies and not sufficient pragmatic aspects of explanation and that may cause lack of students' pragmatic knowledge.

The apology strategies used by Japanese participants of the DCT were limited compared to American native English speakers. I could say that Japanese learners learn quite limited variation of apology expressions in junior high school English textbooks, and it was reflected in the result of the DCT.

3. 2. 4. 4 Strategies Used in Apologies in High School Textbooks

The combination of apology strategies in conversational sentences of the textbooks was examined. Table 26 demonstrates the combined numbers of apologies found in both main conversational sentences and in book notes.

Table 26. Types of Apology Strategies in High School English Textbooks

Target class of the textbooks	Expression of apology n	Emotional + expression of apology n	Expression of apology + explanation	Emotional + expression of apology + explanation n	Expression of apology + statement of the situation n	Others

			n			
Basic English Communication	0	0	0	0	0	1
English Communication I	2	0	10	1	8	5
English Conversation	6	0	4	0	9	1
Total	8	0	14	1	17	7

The results of this study showed that "Expression of apology + statement of the situation" was one of the most typical strategies that was used in the high school English textbooks in apologies. The following were some examples: "I'm sorry I don't have homework" as an expression in the classroom situation and "Sorry, I'll be 10 minutes late" and "Sorry, I'm late" as expressions used in daily conversations. In the DCT, Japanese participants frequently used this kind of expressions. Japanese learners learned these expressions as set patterns in high school English textbooks. This is one possibility to narrow their use of apology strategies in English. The association of speech act functions to particular forms limits the range of language students have available to perform a certain speech act. Part of the challenge in acquiring target language pragmatic competence is learning to choose from a variety of forms which perform similar functions and then choosing appropriately (Vellenga, 2004).

With respect to "Expression of apology + explanation," they were used for the situation of refusals to invitations and offers, was similar to junior high school English textbooks. Those were: "Sorry, but I have to go to a club meeting" and "Sorry, I'm busy. I'm going shopping with my mother on that day." In contrast to junior high school textbooks, these expressions offered more specific explanation. In high school textbooks, this combination was also used for the situation of apology for the delay: "I'm sorry. I overslept" and "Sorry. The train was late." These kinds of explanation frequently found in the results of the DCT. They were daily situations which everyone could experience and students could learn those were common expressions from high school textbooks.

In regard to "Expression of apology," five of eight expressions were "sorry." Two

of the textbooks of English Communication I and one of English Conversation textbooks used "apologize," such as "I've got to apologize for not finishing the work in time." Two of the other textbooks of English Communication I also used "forgive," such as "Please forgive me for saying such a thing to you." Only one textbook of English Conversation taught "excuse me" as an expression of apology. Other textbooks dealt with "excuse me" and "pardon" as expressions to get attention and to ask to say something again similar to junior high school textbooks. The previous study found that students had difficulty in using "sorry" and "excuse me" according to the situation (Nakano, Miyasaka, and Yamasaki, 2000). In some cases, the focus on speech acts in textbooks may actually be pragmatically inappropriate for students. Teachers need to recognize that EFL textbooks don't include sufficient pragmatic information to raise students' pragmatic awareness, and it would be useful to provide opportunities to improve teaching and learning pragmatics in the EFL class. The use of appropriate language in different contexts should be addressed more particularly in EFL textbooks. It should help students have a certain level of awareness about the target language norms so that they can make appropriate choices for language use. In addition, there were no intensifiers in the high school English textbooks. Sugimoto's study (1997) showed that Japanese rarely used intensifiers in comparison with Americans when making apologies. The results of the DCT also showed that some Japanese participants used intensifiers incorrectly. This is one possibility because they have never been taught the effective way of using intensifiers from the high school textbooks.

Moreover, "Expression of apology + I can't" was found as "Others." There was just one sentence using "Expression of lack of intent," such as "I'm sorry, but I accidentally broke your glasses." The data revealed that EFL textbooks included only a few variation of apology expressions and they were not sufficiently reflect native speakers' use of language. The limitations of apology strategies and pragmatic information which students can learn from English textbooks can lead to pragmatic

failure.

The results indicated that the apology strategies used in Japanese high school English textbooks were also limited as with the case of junior high school English textbooks. The results were in line with the study of Bardovi-Harlig (2001) which showed that language textbooks include little information on L2 pragmatics. Unfortunately, the results of this study revealed that EFL textbooks still include only a small portion of appropriate pragmatic information to improve EFL learners' pragmatic competence.

3. 2. 5 Summary

The analysis yielded only very general findings. However, the general results showed that there was limited information about apology strategies in Japanese junior high school and high school English textbooks.

More apologies were found in the book notes than in the main conversational sentences of the junior high school English textbooks. The numbers of apologies found in the main conversational sentences and book notes of the high school English textbooks were almost the same. It is quite possible that English teachers and students do not use the pages of book notes when teaching or studying in English textbooks. I also have to admit the possibility that English teachers use additional handouts or materials in their English classes. However, teachers seldom bring in outside materials related to pragmatics, and thus, learning pragmatics from textbooks is highly unlikely (Vellenga, 2004).

With respect to apology strategies, there were limited variation of apology strategy in both junior high school and high school English textbooks. "Expression of apology + explanation," "Expression of apology + statement of the situation," and "Expression apology" were commonly used. These set patterns may influence to students' knowledge of apologies in English. The responses of the DCT from Japanese

participants included a small repertoire of apology patterns in comparison with those of Americans. This tendency may arise from an influence of the textbooks widely used in junior and high schools.

The results of this study indicate the need for the Japanese junior high school and high school English textbooks to include more apology expressions in the conversational sentences. Most textbooks encourage students to practice English conversation in pairs. Especially, one of the textbooks of English Conversation in high school include role play in addition to pair work. They should motivate students to learn English and express something in English. More variety of apology expressions which reflect manner of native English speaking help students to get knowledge of apology speech act in English. To communicate effectively, second language learners must acquire the sociocultural strategies used by native speakers of a target language as well as their vocabulary.

3. 3 Study 3: Native-English Speaking Americans' Evaluation of Japanese Apologies in English

3. 3. 1 Overview

The evaluation questionnaire was the final instrument for this study. This questionnaire investigated how Americans regard apologies with their sociocultural norms and how they evaluate Japanese apologies in English. Apology may be a universal speech act, but its realization and intensification vary according to cultural norms. It is very important to American sociocultural norms to apologize appropriately in communicating with Americans in English.

3. 3. 2 Data Collection

The questionnaire used a structured format (see Appendix F). Question items were written based on the purposes of the study and were related to situations in the DCT. The question items were then grouped. The question form of this study consisted of three major sections. The first part, Part A, asked about the participants' knowledge about apologies. The four topics contained open-ended questions related to apology, for example, "Do you think apology is important? Why?" was in significance of apology topic. The second part, Part B, was divided into four topics asking about Japanese apologies in English with their answers of the DCT. The last part asked about participants' background information, such as year of age, gender, nationality, and years of studying about Japan. The data obtained from this part provided background information about the participants.

3. 3. 3 Participants

Participants of this study were 7 American native English speakers. They were students of Japanese Studies Program (JSP) at Doshisha Women's College (age 20-22).

3. 3. 4 Procedures

The questions of this study construction procedures were as follows. First, four situations from the DCT were chosen based on Japanese participants' responses. Those were categorized as severe apology situations. Then, a draft of the questions in English was written and they were grouped into topics based on the purpose of the study. Next, the questions were eliminated and edited according to suggestions from the research supervisor. After the questions were constructed, one native English-speaking teacher teaching in Doshisha Women's College was invited to do the questionnaire as a pilot. The ambiguous wordings were corrected and questions were clarified in order to get participants to understand questions clearly. Finally, the questions were used to do the participants.

Participants were 7 American JSP students. In the first part of the questionnaire, participants were asked about significance of apology. They were asked to answer open-ended questions. In the second part, they evaluated apologies generated by Japanese participants in English. At last, they were asked about their background information, such as year of studying about Japan. This questionnaire took approximately 30 minutes.

3. 3. 5 Data Analysis

3. 3. 5. 1 Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis of this study allowed for a more in depth look at strategies that Japanese learners of English should acquire in order to apologize appropriately in situations with different sociolinguistic variation and also provide native English speakers' opinions about the significance of apology and apologies in English used by Japanese EFL learners. In this study, the qualitative data consisted of text documents obtained from open-ended questions.

3. 3. 6 Background Information of Participants of Evaluation Questionnaire

Table 27. Background Information of Participants of Evaluation Questionnaire

JSP students	Japanese learning experience
A1	About three and a half years
A2	2 years
A3	I have taken classes only and have studied year and a half.
A4	3 months in Japan, 2 years of college study, hobby / interest since 4 years old (14 years)
A5	Approximate two and a half years
A6	Informally for about 2 years, formally for a year and a half now. I've studies Japan through class and websites on line.
A7	Formally 2 years. Reading books, manga, language guides, watching anime, dramas, movies, etc.

 A: JSP students in this study

Seven JSP students participated in this study. They were all female American students to take Japan Studies Program in Doshisha Women's College. They were coded as A1 to A7. They all studied Japanese more than a year and had an interest in Japan.

3. 3. 7 Significance of Apology

The JSP students' views about the significance of apology were investigated to see social function of apology speech act.

3. 3. 7. 1 Importance of Apology

The questionnaire revealed that all of JSP students had the same opinion

regarding importance of apology. They agreed that apology is important. It helps maintaining good relation and harmony between a speaker and a hearer and minimizes the seriousness of the violation. Also, apology is a social manner and people apologize with the similar purpose that is to express regret for the offense, acknowledge responsibility for the offense or offer of repair (see A4, A5 and A6 for example).

"Yes. Apologies are a way in which we can show courtesy to one another. Courtesy and understanding are very important."

<div align="right">(A4, excerpt Part A. 1)</div>

"Of course. It helps keep peoples' relationships stable."

<div align="right">(A5, excerpt Part A. 1)</div>

"Yes, because I don't want anyone to feel upset because of something I said or did."

<div align="right">(A6, excerpt Part A. 1)</div>

Participants' responses showed that apologies help keep peoples' relationship good. As many scholars agree that apologies are of importance in that they imply the speaker's guilt and making apology is recognized as universal phenomenon. Lakoff (2000) also pointed out, "apology, more than most speech acts, places psychological burden both on its maker and, less seriously, on its recipient" (p. 201). Therefore, it can be said that apology is an important speech act in human communication. The questionnaire results from this study support the idea of the importance of apology as the findings reveal JSP students agree that apology is important. They also value an apology in maintaining harmony and redressing offenses.

"Yes, because it is respectful and helps the person to know that what you did is your fault and you are taking full responsibility for it. But saying it too much weakens the apology."

<div align="right">(A1, excerpt Part A. 1)</div>

"Yes! If you're wrong but refuse to apologize to someone, it's rude and could possibly ruin your relationship with that person (if it happens often)."

<div align="right">(A7, excerpt Part A. 7)</div>

The response of A1 has important information about apology. Saying "sorry" too much weakens the apology. It suggested the appropriateness of the apology. In the DCT, some Japanese participants used "Expression of apology" and "Intensity of apology" many times in one response. It is necessary to understand giving an appropriate apology in the target language. A7 mentioned not apologizing possibly break a relationship with a person depending on the occurrence frequency.

3. 3. 8 Apology Strategies

In terms of apology strategies, two topics were used to ask JSP students with the aim of finding out about apology strategies. These included: using different apology patterns to match a hearer's social distance, and using different apology patterns according to situation which is severe or not-severe.

3. 3. 8. 1 Using Different Apology Patterns to Math a Hearer's Social Distance

The JSP students' views about using different apology patterns to match a hearer's social distance were indicated as being considered in relation to close, neutral or distant relationships. Four out of seven JSP students agreed that different relationship types have an effect on the apologies they produce (see A4, A5, and A6 for example).

"Yes, to a degree. I take into account the person I am talking to."

<div align="right">(A4, excerpt Part A. 2)</div>

"Of course. It's just the way I learned to do it."

<div align="right">(A5, excerpt Part A. 2)</div>

"Yes, out of respect I will apologize more formally to people I don't know or people who have a higher status than me."

<div align="right">(A6, excerpt Part A. 2)</div>

Another opinion is the following.

"I think so. Because you feel more comfortable with different people. Also, the things you apologize are different."

<div align="right">(A7, excerpt Part A. 2)</div>

Brown and Levinson (1987) indicated that an increase in social distance (among strangers) requires the presence of respect through apologies and the decrease in social distance has a tendency not to entail the production of apologies. However, it is worth noting that though different social distance affects the choice of patterns of apology, it is clear that other factors are often what ultimately determine the way someone apologizes. A very severe offense may need a formal apology even between close friends.

On the other hand, three participants didn't agree this question. They almost answered that they were just really sorry for any mistake they made, no matter who they were interacting with. One of them answered that she apologizes the same way to her family as to her friends. It could be in line with the study of Barnlund and Yoshioka

(1990). They showed that Japanese tended to apologize to people who were equal status most frequently. Americans tended to rely on the same narrow repertoire of apologies regardless of the status of their companions. There is room for further investigation.

3. 3. 8. 2 Using Different Apology Patterns according to which is Severe or Not-severe

The JSP students' view about using different apology patterns according to whether the offence was severe reveals that use of apology patterns differ according to the severity of offense. The more severe the offense, the more possible an expression of apology will be accompanied by other apology strategies such as statement of the situation or offer of repair (see A2, A3, and A4 for example).

"Yes, because if you shorten your apologies to a quick 'sorry,' the person will not take you seriously, likewise a strong apology for a simple mistake makes you annoying."

(A2, excerpt Part A. 2)

"Yes. If it is something very bad that may hurt the person, then I will carefully and critically apologize."

(A3, excerpt Part A. 3)

"Yes, I feel that the worse the offense was, the more I need to apologize to repair the situation."

(A6 excerpt Part A. 3)

Two of them explained in concrete terms (see A1 and A7).
"When I bumped into someone: I'm sorry. – It's fine.
 When I broke something, I would get panics: I'm sorry. How can I fix this?"

"Of course. If I stepped on your toe and immediately began apologizing non-stop – that's weird. Similarly, if you're late for a meeting at work and just say, 'Sorry!' – that's not good enough, and also rude."

It is clear that the questionnaire data is in line with the DCT data in which the Americans and Japanese tended to use a simple strategy and less combination of apology strategies for non-severe offenses. On the contrary, they preferred using a more complex and great range of apology patterns for severe offenses. Evidence from this questionnaire data and the DCT data leads to the conclusion that the severity of offense is one of the important factors in guiding the speaker's choice of an appropriate apology strategy.

3. 3. 9 Apologies in Japan

To explore perception about apologies' role in Japan, participants were asked to about that. One of seven didn't answer this question. Their answers were following (see A1, A4, A5, and A7 for example).

"To show you didn't mean to make a mistake and maintain trust you'll do better next time?"

"Apologies play an important role in maintaining relationships in Japan. As everyone has a position relate to another person, and apologies help to enforce the social structure, which is very important in Japan."

"It keeps everyone happy."

"It's part of the culture. Everyone apologies for everything – it makes society polite and considerate in Japan."

Their answers showed that they recognize that apologies play an important role in Japanese society. It helps to maintain good relationships. Another participant answered about "sumimasen" and "gomennasai."

"'Sumimasen' and 'gomennasai' are both very useful words and can help to differentiate between the severity of apologies."

It seems that two apologizing expressions, gomennasai and sumimasen are easy to be confused. I could find some Japanese participants of the DCT used the "excuse me" and "I beg your pardon" in the situation in which "I'm sorry" seemed to be appropriate. The confusion might be caused by negative transfer from Japanese. As this answer pointed out, in Japanese, we use phrase, "sumimasen" for both the opening of conversation and apology. It is likely that the Japanese apology expression "sumimasen" closely links to the English expression "I'm sorry" for the Japanese learners.

"I'm not very sure. It seems to me Japanese people don't really do things that will inconvenience or need an apology either."

This answer would suggest that Japanese sociocultural norms were different from her own cultural norms. When communicating with people from other cultures, it might lead to misunderstanding. The results of this question reminded that it is very important to understand target culture's sociocultural norms.

3. 3. 10 Evaluation of Japanese Apologies in English

To see native English speakers' judge about Japanese apologies in English, I chose 4 situations and characteristic responses from the DCT of Japanese in English. The JSP students evaluated 4 responses involved talking with a close friend who was a Japanese non-native speaker of English. The evaluation consisted of a 5-point scale ranging from not sufficient to too much. Three were set to appropriate. I approached quantitative data by calculating the means and ranges for rating appropriateness. The purpose of this analysis is to understand aspects of how Americans evaluate apologies in English by Japanese speakers and to obtain a general picture of the appropriate level of Japanese apologies in English. The means and the ranges were calculated (see Table 28).

Table 28. Means and Ranges of American Judgment of the Appropriate Level of Japanese Apologies in English

Item	Mean	Range
1	2.71	3
2	3.43	2
3	3.86	3
4	2.57	1

The purpose of examining individual apology responses is to investigate what Americans considered the appropriate level of apology to be. In Table 28, the means showed that three out of four apology responses (1, 2, and 4) were judged as appropriate apology, as they were close to "3." Response 3 was rated as toward too much. To capture the judgments more precisely, how the difference shows between the two extreme values, distribution ranges were analyzed. This revealed participants had fairly consistent ratings in judgments of response 2 and 4 of appropriateness of apology responses. Considered together, the means and the ranges indicate that Americans considered Japanese apology responses 3 as too much than would be appropriate and they considered 2, and 4 as especially appropriate. The mean of 3 indicated that it was considered appropriate, but the range indicated that participants' individual ratings varied. These observations are helpful to explore characteristics of apology responses and features of judgments to individual differences.

3. 3. 10. 1 Situation: Damaging a Friend's Digital Camera

A close friend broke your digital camera and it no longer works in this situation.

Close friend: "I'm sorry. I'll fix it."

Four out of seven students evaluated this response was appropriate. They chose appropriate because at least she is going to get it fixed, and understood it was an accident. Two of seven students chose not sufficient; 1 and 2. They would like it to be stronger because cameras are expensive, and her apology for damaging something of theirs was too casual. The appropriate answer for them was the following; "I'm so sorry! I'll fix it or buy you a new one! I'm sorry!" Only one student evaluated this answer scale 4, closer to too much. She felt, "I wouldn't make my friend go so far as to fix it. But the offer adds to the sincerely of the apology." In this situation, specific offer

127

of repair and sincere apology seem to be necessary.

3. 3. 10. 2 Situation: Forgot to Return Your Notebook

In this situation, a close friend forgot to bring your note book. You need that for an exam tomorrow.

Close friend: I'm so sorry. I'll go back home and get your notebook. I'll be back in ten minutes. Can you wait here?

Five out of seven participants evaluated this answer appropriate. They chose appropriate because she's fixing the problem so they would no longer be angry. In addition, one person commented, "I'm a little upset, but I'm too nice a person especially to close friends. I can wait a few more minutes if they do it." This comment suggested that maintaining relationships with close friends were important. Each of the rest of participants chose 4 and 5. They evaluated this closer to too much. The person who chose 5 commented, "Very happy that she is willing do to this for me since she saw that it meant so much." Furthermore, two participants added that they would go with her to her home instead of waiting.

3. 3. 10. 3 Situation: Spills on Orange Juice

The setup of this situation is that a close friend accidentally bumps into you and the entire glass of orange juice spills on your clothing.

Close friend: I'm sorry. I'll wash your clothes.

As for this response, three of seven participants judged too much more than 5. They felt too much because she apologized and that was enough. It was obviously an

128

accident, so there is no need for that. For them, the appropriate answer like "I'm so sorry" or "I'm so sorry. Let's go try to rinse it out and I have an extra top you can borrow." They felt it was an accident, so "I'm sorry" was enough. The result of the DCTs, both American participants and Japanese participants frequently used specific offer of repair in this situation. The difference between the results of the DCTs and this study raised interesting possibility. Two participants judged this as appropriate. On the other hand, only one participant judged this as not sufficient, 2. She commented, "Washing it is no good – you have to wait for the rest of the day." According to her, the appropriate answer was following; "I'm so sorry! I should have been more careful. Are you okay?" In addition to this response, she wrote, if possible, it would be good for the friend to offer to help you clean it up or get you spare clothes."

3. 3. 10. 4 Situation: Forgot to Meet at a Movie Theater

A close friend forgot to meet you at a movie theater and you have already missed half of the movie in this situation.

Close friend: I'm so sorry. Would you like to see another movie?

Four participants evaluated this appropriate and their comments were like; "It would depend on their reason for being late. Also which movie," "I'll go with her to see a movie, it's okay if we missed the other movie," and "Unless I was busy afterwards I would immediately agree. If I did have other plans we could reschedule." On the other hand, three participants chose 2, which was not sufficient. They answered that they would be very upset especially if they really wanted to see this particular movie. For them, appropriate answers were following; "Can we watch the next showing? I will buy the snacks. I'm sorry," and "I'm so sorry. (Reason as to why you were so late) We can't watch the movie, but maybe we can go do something else? I'm really sorry." As two

129

participants pointed out, the reason for being late is important in this situation.

Over half American participants chose 3 and the others chose 2, so they were relatively satisfied with Japanese apologies in English. However, participants who chose 2, which were toward not sufficient were more common than other situations. This results were in line with the findings from the DCT. The results of the DCT showed that only a few American participants used the strategy of statement of alternative differently from Japanese participants. Japanese EFL learners need to understand that expression of apology and statement of alternative are appropriate, but they are not enough. It seems better to include the strategy such as explanation or offer of repair to make the apology native English speakers' preferred one.

These findings of JSP students' evaluations here would seem to provide good evidence for teaching pragmatic competence as one of the important aspects for English teachers. Marquez Reiter (2000) pointed out that students' attention will have to be drawn to the role of social distance, social power, severity of offense in apologizing not only in the target language but in their own. They also have to be given as many opportunities as possible to practice their communicative competence in the language classroom. Kasper (1997) also mentioned that the challenge for foreign or second language teaching is whether students will have learning opportunities in a way that they can benefit in the development of pragmatic competence in the target language.

Therefore, the view of improving language learners' communicative competence by comparing similarities and differences of apologies presented above provides an alternative way for EFL teaching, especially teaching English in non-English speaking countries such as Japan. Language learners need to be provided opportunities to examine and develop strategies for apologizing of the target language and compare and contrast them to their own L1 strategies.

3. 3. 11 Summary

This study presented the results of questionnaire data analysis. The questionnaire data reflects the JSP students' view in details on importance of apology, apology strategies, and evaluation of Japanese apologies in English. The findings could enrich as well as confirm the findings from the DCTs analysis.

In this study, the JSP students viewed English apology and Japanese apology as social speech acts which serve a function in communication. Apology is important for JSP students. They valued apologies in maintaining harmony and the repair of offenses.

For the two sociolinguistic variables; social distance and severity of offense, the findings from the questionnaire data supported the findings from previous studies and the DCT data. When apologizing, participants were sensitive to the hearer's social status. They tended to agree that different relationship types have an effect on the apologies they produce. In addition, participants used different apology patterns in relation to severity of offense; the more severe the offense, the more possible expression of apology will be accompanied by other apology strategies such as statement of the situation and offer of repair. From these results, it can be said that the choice of strategies of Americans is determined by social variation such as social distance and also type of offense.

For Japanese apology strategies in English, JSP students evaluated them appropriate on the whole. However, some were judged as too much, and others were judged as not sufficient. This results indicates that Japanese EFL learners need to understand clearly in selecting apology strategies appropriately for different contexts. Comparing the similarities and differences of Japanese apology in English and English apology can improve their communication skill in English. That will lead a better understanding of how to apologize appropriately in a target language culture.

4. Conclusion

4. 1 Study 1

The aim of this study was to investigate the types of categories that Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese and American speakers use in situations that require apologies among close friends, as well as how these categories combine to form apology strategies. Some of the findings were similar to previous studies, while other findings were different from them.

Research Question 1, focusing on frequently used apology strategies by Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese and by Americans in English, was examined using the DCT. The findings showed that the most often used strategies were direct expression of apologies. This was consistent with Barnlund and Yoshioka's (1990) findings on speakers of Japanese and of American English. However, in contrast to previous studies, Americans used intensified expression of apology more frequently than Japanese speakers of English. Japanese speakers tended to use expressions of requesting forgiveness much more frequently than Americans. This result was similar to the study of Jung (2004), which examined apologies by Korean EFL learners. This expression should not have been necessary, considering the equal status of those involved in the apology speech act. EFL learners seemed not to be able to use expressions appropriate to the L2 interactional context. In addition, the categories "feedback," and "concern to the interlocutor" had higher frequency than those of American participants. American speakers were more likely to use the strategy of explanation than Japanese speakers.

Japanese used the strategy of statement of the situation than explanation. American participants preferred to use the strategy of acknowledgement of responsibility. The preference for such categories suggests the fact that indirect expression of apologies are important for the American speakers in the survey. The findings suggested that Japanese EFL learners have problems in performing apology speech act in sociopragmatically appropriate. Sociopragmatic knowledge, which was defined by Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983), is necessary to perform appropriate apology which is contextually proper under various social variables. Acquiring sociopragmatic knowledge, which must reflect the functional use of language in communicative situations, can enhance positive transfer.

The preference for combinations with categories demonstrated the differences between Japanese participants and American participants. In so far as the combination of basic categories was concerned, the findings showed that an overwhelming majority of the apologies were combinations rather than standalone categories in both groups. However, Americans used a wide variety of combinations for apology strategies. The total number of Japanese responses (685) included 276 patterns of apology combinations, (40%). On the other hand, the total number of American responses (439) included 244 patterns of apology combinations, (56%). The more severe the offense it was, the more combinations preferred to be used in common with both groups. As mentioned in previous studies, the findings of this study showed that the severity of offense was deeply related to the choice and use of apology strategies.

In addition, both Japanese participants and American participants responded similarly using offer of repair in the case of the situations in which the speakers considered that they needed to offer a way to make up for. In those situations, both Japanese and Americans provided similar specific offer, such as paying for the damage.

Hypothesis 1, focusing on Japanese EFL students' knowledge about native English speakers' preference of apology strategies, was examined through the DCT.

Japanese EFL learners preferred to use more formulaic expression of apologies than American participants. More frequent use of requesting forgiveness and less use of explanation than those of Americans were also observed. The results thus supported Hypothesis 1.

This study also compared the apology strategies by Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese to find transfer from Japanese into English. The tendency especially appeared to use of the strategy of expression of apology, offer of repair, and concern for the interlocutor. The findings showed that expressions which Japanese participants used for specific offer of repair and concern for the interlocutor in Japanese and in English were very similar. It was obvious that Japanese EFL learners' choice of apology strategies in English were influenced by their L1. Hypothesis 2 about pragmatic transfer in apologies made by Japanese was supported.

4. 2 Study 2

The second study tried to answer Research Question 2, what apology strategies were taught in Japanese junior high school and high school with EFL textbooks. Apologies were found in the main conversational sentences more than in the book notes of the junior high school English textbooks. Almost the same number of apologies were found in the main conversational sentences and book notes of the high school English textbooks.

Both of them had a small repertoire of apology patterns, and patterns such as "Expression of apology + explanation," "Expression of apology + statement of the situation," and "Expression of apology" were in common. These routine-like patterns may be influential to students' knowledge about apologies in English. The responses of the DCT from Japanese participants in English had a small repertoire of apology patterns in comparison with those of Americans. In terms of expression of apology, the use of intensifiers were rarely taught in Japanese EFL textbooks. The results of the DCT

showed that American participants used intensified expression of apology more frequently than Japanese participants depending on the severity of the offense. In addition, Japanese participants tended to lack of the knowledge of indirect expression of apologies along with the situations for its appropriate use. This tendency may arise from an influence of the textbooks widely used in junior and high schools. It will be useful for making an effective apology to expand students' knowledge about the use of strategies and patterns for apologies in English.

4. 3 Study 3

This study presented the results of qualitative data analysis. The results were related to Research Question 3. The qualitative data reflected American English speakers' views in details on significance of apology, apology strategies, and Japanese apologies in English.

Apology was also important for American English speakers. They valued an apology in maintaining harmony and redressing offenses.

For the two sociolinguistic variables; social distance and severity of offense, the findings from the qualitative data supported the findings from the DCT data. Most of them agreed that different relationship types have an effect on the apologies they produce. They varied apology strategies to match with the relationship, such as distant, neutral, and close. In addition, participants used different apology patterns in relation to severity of offense: The more severe the offense was, the more possible explicit expression of apology would be accompanied by other indirect strategies such as acknowledgement of responsibility or offer of repair. From these results, it can be said that the choice of apology strategies of American English speakers is determined by social variation such as social distance and also type of offense.

With regard to apology strategies in English used by Japanese EFL learners were generally evaluated as appropriate by American participants. However, according to the situations, some participants evaluated that as not sufficient, and others evaluated that as

too much. It is clear that using only direct expression of apology is sometimes not enough to express the feeling of apology. In short, this study also confirmed Hypothesis 1. Understanding and selecting indirect apology strategies appropriately along with direct expressions of apology for different contexts in English are very important for EFL learners.

Comparing the similarities and differences of Japanese apology in English and American English apology can improve Japanese EFL learners' communication skill in English. They will have a better understanding of how to apologize appropriately through a contrastive study of apologies in Japan and America.

4. 4 Pedagogical Implications

Apology is a speech act that has potential to cause problems for English as a foreign language learners. Pedagogical implications are discussed in terms of raising sociolinguistic and pragmatic awareness of Japanese EFL learners to better understanding of the sociopragmatic aspects of speech acts of apology in English, and to assist teachers in enhancing pragmatic teaching in the language classroom and developing teaching materials.

The first implication is the need for raising Japanese EFL students' awareness and understanding of differences of sociolinguistic variables between their native language culture and that of the target language. The findings of the present study showed the norms of Japanese were often transferred into English when Japanese EFL learners produced an interlanguage apology. Japanese EFL learners are often unaware of the mismatch between their interlanguage pragmatics and the L2 pragmatics. For example, Japanese EFL learners used expressions such as "Excuse me," and "I beg your pardon" in order to make it appropriately as in "I'm sorry." Another example is that some students used intensifiers where they are not correct place as in "I'm sorry, very much." In addition, the responses of Japanese EFL learners sounds very formal for the

situations when a speaker communicate with a close friend. Promoting Japanese EFL students' awareness and understanding in both L1 and L2 cultures by giving an overview of the sociolinguistic patterns behind the apology speech act would help them communicate more successfully in the target language. Therefore, comparing the similarities and differences in apologies of L1 and L2 may be one pedagogical way to raise learners' linguistics and pragmatics awareness in EFL learning.

The second implication is concerning English as a foreign language teaching regarding EFL teaching materials. EFL teachers should be aware that Japanese EFL textbooks in junior high school and high school do not involve enough apology strategies. The results of the study 2 was in line with a previous study of N. Yang (2000). Since the textbooks dealing with English as a foreign language show simplification of vocabulary and situations in apology act, it is strongly recommended that language teaching materials be designed to reflect the native English speakers' way of speaking and thinking in real life situations. Furthermore, exercises in textbooks should be based on samples of authentic materials or specially written conversations which show the conversational routines and strategies used in the realization of an apology act. They should not focus simply on one semantic formula as in "sorry," "I'm sorry" or "I'm very sorry." The findings of the present study confirmed the importance of teaching pragmatic competence, and specifically teaching apology strategies in the language classroom. Japanese EFL learners who are surrounded by their native language and culture and rarely have the opportunity to use L2 outside of the classroom, need to be given as many opportunities as possible to practice their communicative competence in the language classroom.

4. 5 Suggestions for Further Research

In the nature of studying speech acts, it is difficult to make strong statements. We can look at what native English speakers tend to do and compare it with what Japanese

137

learners of English tends to do based on the findings, but it is difficult to draw conclusions that are absolutely firm.

This study analyzed and compared in order to find the similarities and differences of apology strategies between Japanese English speakers and American English speakers. The findings of the study yielded some meaningful results, however the present study also has some limitations.

First, the questionnaire method was used to investigate the apology strategies of Japanese EFL learners and Americans. However, one should acknowledge that eliciting data from a DCT questionnaire does not provide information of like tone and pitch, which are important factors in determining the effectiveness of an apology. Since this study focused on only the production of apology by the speaker, it would be interesting to see whether or not the victim accepts the apology and what the victim's response is to the apology. Therefore, examining apology strategies using more naturalistic data would be suggested for future study. That nature would allow for some focus on oral features which relates to apologizing.

Second, other social variables like gender, age, and seniority to explore how different factors affect the use of apology strategies would be useful in future study. Participants of this study were all female and this led to the decision to include only female. Including male participants in the study, which would open up the possibility to analyzing apologies across gender. Another possible direction could be the broadening of the age range, social distance, and social status of the participants, which would lead to a better understanding of how social factors influence the choice of apology strategies.

Third, participants' level of English proficiency was not considered in this study. From the perspective of English proficiency, it would be interesting to see the result of different levels of English proficiency effect on the apologies in English of Japanese EFL learners.

Fourth, the evaluations of Japanese apologies in English by American participants were limited to four apology situations in this study. Japanese apologies in English were also limited to just one example in each situation. It would be interesting to see the result of other situations and other expressions of Japanese apologies in English.

Fifth, this study focused on only American English. It would be interesting to compare apology strategies with other English-speaking countries.

Finally, in terms of the pedagogical aspects, it would be necessarily to explore effective approaches to teach pragmatics in a foreign language classroom. Therefore, exploring and developing appropriate approaches to explicit or implicit teaching of pragmatics needs further investigation in order to help language learners acquire and develop their pragmatics knowledge sufficiently.

Even though the findings of this study also have limitations, there are some important implications that can be drawn from them. The most important thing is that, knowing what strategies native speakers of English use to apologize is important in order to raise awareness among the Japanese EFL learners regarding the differences and similarities in apology strategies used in Japanese and in English. If teachers are aware of the native English speakers' preferred apology patterns, they can teach which type of strategy is more appropriate for certain types of situations. The findings of this study contribute to the knowledge of apologies produced by Japanese and Americans, which is crucial in order to obtain a better understanding of apology speech act varies across languages and cultures.

References

Aijmer, K. (1996). *Conversational routines in English: Conversation and creativity*. London: Longman.

Alfattah, M. H. A. (2010). Apology strategies of Yemeni EFL university students, *MJAL, 2*(3), 223-249.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barnlund, D. C., & Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*(2), 193-206.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, Vol. 7 (pp. 21-39). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bataineh, R. F., & Bataineh, R. F. (2006). Apology strategies of Jordanian EFL university students. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*, 1901-1927.

Bednarek, M. (2010). Corpus linguistics and systemic functional linguistics: Interpersonal meaning, identity and bonding in popular culture. In M. Bedanarek & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *New discourse on language: Functional perspectives on multimodality, identity, and affiliation* (pp. 237-266). London and New York: Continuum.

Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (1996). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 65-86). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Original version 1985).

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Anderson, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-94). New York: Newbury House.

Bergman, M. L, & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apologizing. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 82-107). New York: Oxford University Press.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blum–Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 3*, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Request and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns. *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 196-212.

Bolstad, M. (2000). Learning from Japan: The case for increased use of apology in mediation. *Cleveland State Law Review, 48*, 545.

Bouton, L. F. (1996). Pragmatics and language learning. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, Vol. 7 (pp. 1-20). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, *49*(1), 44-58.

Brown, J. D. (1980). Relative merits of four methods for scoring cloze tests. *Modern Language Journal*, *64*, 311-317.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language testing and teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 89-112.

Cohen, A. D. (1995). Investing the production of speech acts. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 21-43). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In S. Mckay & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383-420). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* Harlow: Longman.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence. The case of apology. *Language Learning, 31*(1), 113-134.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1985). Comparing apologies across languages. In K. R.

Jankowsky (Ed.), *Scientific and humanistic dimensions of language* (pp. 175-184). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 33-56.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1994). Researching the production of speech acts. In E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp. 143-156). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Decoo, W. (1996). The induction-deduction opposition: Ambiguities and complexities of the didactic reality. *IRAL, 34*, 95-118.

Demeter, G. (2006). *A pragmatic study of apology strategies in Romanian.* Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. W. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 167-185.

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

Fahey, M. P. (2005). Speech acts as intercultural danger zones. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, *8*. Retrieved from http://immi.se/intercultural/nr8/palma.htm

Fraser, B. (1981). On apologizing. In F. Coulmas (Ed.). *Conversation routine: Exploration in standardize communication situations and pre-patterned speech* (pp. 259-273). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fraser, B. (1983). The domain of pragmatics. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 29-59). New York: Longman.

Garcia, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingua, 8*(1), 3-20.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order.* New York: Basic Books.

Henstock, M. (2003). *Refusals: A language and cultural barrier between Americans and Japanese.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

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

Houck, N. & Gass, S. M. (1996). Non-native refusal: A methodological perspective. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 45-64). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

House, J. (1988). "Oh excuse me please…": Apologizing in a foreign language. In B. Kettermann, P. Bierbaumer, & A. Karpf (Eds.), *English as a second language* (pp. 303-327). Tubingen: Narr.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Ishihara, N. (2011). Formal instruction on the speech act of giving and responding to compliments. *Proceedings of the 7th conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics,* 62-78. Retrieved on June 10, 2011, from http://www. Instruction on compliments.

Istfic, I., & Kampusu, Y. (2009). The use of apologies by EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 2*(3), 15-25.

Jung, E. H. S. (2004). Interlanguage pragmatics: Apology speech acts. In C. L. Moder & A. Martinovic-Zic (Eds.), *Discourse across languages and cultures* (pp. 99-116). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved August 20, 2004, from http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 316-341). London and New York: Continuum.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 215-247.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 19*, 81-104.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose., & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kumagai, T. (1993). Remedial interactions as face-management: The case of Japanese and Americans. In S. Y. T. Matsuda, M. Sakurai and A. Baba (Eds.), *In honor of Tokuichiro Matsuda: Papers contributed on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday* (pp: 278-300). Tokyo: Iwasaki Linguistic Circle.

Kodama, N. (1996). *Refusals in Japanese: Oral and written alternatives elicited by discourse completion task and role play.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, School of Education.

Lakoff, T. R. (2000). *The Language War.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

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

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

Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1995). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 155-187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Márquez Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matsumura, S. (2011). Factors that matter in choosing an L2 speech act realization strategy. *Shakaigakubu-kiyo, Ryukoku Daigaku, 13*, 245-254.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2008). Curriculum Guidance. Available from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/index.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2013). *Catalog of Textbooks Used for Junior High School in 2014* [Data file]. Available from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/kyoukasho/mokuroku/25/1333777.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2013). *Catalog of Textbooks Used for High School in 2014* [Data file]. Available from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/kyoukasho/mokuroku/25/1333777.htm

Mir, M. (1992). Do we all apologize the same?--An empirical study on the act of apologizing by Spanish speakers learning English. *Pragmatics and language learning, 3*, 1-19.

Nakano, M., Miyasaka, N., & Yamazaki, T. (2000). A study of EFL discourse using corpora: An analysis of discourse completion tasks. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 273-297.

Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. M. Gass & L., Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 232-249). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olshtain, E. and Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Crosscultural pragmatics and the testing of communicative competence. *Language Testing*, *2*(1), 16-30.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign*

language (pp. 154-165). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Rintell, E. (1997). Getting your speech act together: The pragmatic ability of second language Learners. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 17*, 96-106.

Rintell, E. and Mitchell, C. (1989). Studying request and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 248-272). Norwood, N. J: Ablex.

Rizk, S. (2003). Why say "NO!" when you refuse? *TESOL Arabia 2002 conference proceedings, 7*, 401-431.

Robinson, M. A. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (pp. 27-82). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Rose, K. R., & Ng, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. R. Rose & G, Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schlenker, B. R., & Darby, B. W. (1981). The use of apologies in social predicaments. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*, 271–278.

Schumann, K., & Ross, M. (2010). Why Women Apologize More Than Men Gender Differences in Thresholds for Perceiving Offensive Behavior. *Psychological Science, 21*(11), 1649-1655.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selinker, L. (1983). *Language transfer.* In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), Language transfer in language learning (pp. 33-68). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Suezawa, A., & Abe, H. (2012). The use of refusals in Japanese junior high school English textbooks. *Shiga Tanki Daigaku Kenkyu-kiyo, 38*, 89-100.

Sugimoto, N. (1995). *A Japan-U.S. comparison of apology styles.* Unpublished doctoral

dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois.

Sugimoto, N. (1997). A Japan–U.S. comparison of apology styles. *Communication Research, 24*(4), 349–370.

Suh, J. S. (2009). Reading concepts in cooperative work by EFL college students. *English Teaching, 64*(2), 151-171.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8*, 131-155.

Tan, K. H., & Farashaiyan, A. (2012). The effectiveness of teaching formulaic politeness strategies in making request to undergraduates in an ESL classroom. *Asian Social Science, 8*(15), 189-196.

Thijittang, S. (2010). *A Study of pragmatic strategies of English of Thai university students: Apology speech acts*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Tasmania.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91-110.

Todey, E. (2011). *Apology strategies as used by native & non-native speakers of English.* Iowa: Iowa State University.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Request, complaint, and apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Turnbell, W. (2001). An appraisal of pragmatic elicitation techniques for the social psychological study of talk: The case of request refusals. *Pragmatics, 11*(1), 31-61.

Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ, 8*(2), 25-38.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*(2), 117-124.

Wolfson, N. (1983). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 82-95). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N. (1989). The social dynamics of native and nonnative variation in complimenting behavior. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 219-236). New York and London: Plenum Press.

Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wong, J. (2001). "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 40*, 37–60.

Woodfield, H. (2004). *Requests in English: A study of ESL and native speaker responses to written discourse completion tasks.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bristol, UK.

Yang, N. (2000). Teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: A cross-cultural comparison. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 5*, 39-52.

Yang, T. K. (2002). A Study of Korean EFL Learners' Apology Speech Acts: Strategy and Pragmatic Transfer Influenced by Sociolinguistic Variations. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 225-43.

Yuan, Y. (2001). An inquiry into empirical pragmatics data-gathering methods: Written DCTs, oral DCTs, field notes, and natural conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *33*(2), 271-292.

Appendices

Appendix A

Discourse Completion Test

Instruction: Please read each of the following situations. In each situation, you are talking with a **<u>close friend</u>**. After each situation, you will be asked to write a response in the blank after "you." Please write down the exact words you would say. Try to write down the words you would use in the actual conversation.

1. You borrowed a digital camera from your friend, and you dropped it and seriously damaged it so that it no longer works.

You:

2. Your friend changed her hairstyle. When you were talking with her, you said, "You looked much better before." She looks disappointed.

You:

3. You forgot to meet your friend at a movie theater. Your friend called you, and you are now arriving at the theater. You have already missed half of the movie.

You:

4. You promised to meet your friend at the station at 10:00 a.m., but you were 30 minutes late.

You:

5. You promised to return your friend's notebook today. However you forget to bring it. Your friend needs that notebook because there is an exam tomorrow. Your friend is angry at your forgetting to bring it.

You:

6. You promised to return a borrowed CD to your friend within a couple of days.

   However, you kept it for almost a month, and you are now returning it.

   You:

7. You are holding a glass of orange juice in a cafeteria. You accidentally bump into a

   friend. The entire glass spills on your friend, soaking her clothing.

   You:

8. You have a part-time job at a restaurant and your friend also works there. One day,

   you had some urgent business and your friend had to work in your place.

   You:

9. You borrowed a newly published magazine from your friend and spilled coffee on it.

   It's got big stains on several pages.

   You:

10. At the library, you accidentally bump into a friend. Two of the books she is carrying

   fall onto the floor.

You:

I would like some information about your background in order to help me in the study I am doing. I will keep this information confidential.

1. Age:

2. Sex:

3. Nationality

4. Occupation

Thank you very much for answering my questionnaire.

Appendix B

Discourse Completion Test

以下の 10 の状況をよく読んで、実際の会話を思い浮かべて返答を書いてください。どの状況でもあなたは **親友** と話しています。なお返答は **日本語** で書いてください。

1. あなたは親友から借りたデジタルカメラを落として壊してしまい、動かなくなってしまいました。

   あなた：

2. 親友が髪型を変えました。彼女と話している時に、あなたは「前の髪型の方が良かった」

と言いました。彼女はがっかりしているようです。

あなた：

3. あなたは親友と映画館で待ち合わせをしていたのを忘れていました。親友から電話があり、あなたは今到着するところです。すでに映画は半分終わってしまっています。

あなた：

4. あなたは 10 時半に駅で親友と会う約束をしていましたが、30 分遅刻しました。

あなた：

5. あなたは今日親友に借りたノートを返す約束をしていましたが、持ってくるのを忘れました。明日テストなので親友はノートが必要です。親友はあなたが持ってくるのを忘れたことを怒っています。

あなた：

6. あなたは親友に借りた CD を 2〜3 日以内に返す約束をしていましたが、ほぼ 1 ヶ月借りたままでちょうど今返すところです。

あなた：

7. あなたはカフェテリアで手にコップに入ったオレンジジュースを持っています。うっかりして親友にぶつかってしまい、オレンジジュースがすべて親友にかかって、彼女の服がずぶぬれになってしまいました。

あなた：

8. あなたは親友と同じレストランでアルバイトをしています。ある日急用が入って、あなたの親友があなたの代わりに働かなくてはならなくなりました。

あなた：

9. あなたは親友から最新号の雑誌を借りて、その上にコーヒーをこぼしてしまいました。数ページにわたって大きなシミができてしまいました。

あなた：

10. あなたは図書館でうっかり親友にぶつかってしまいました。彼女が手に持っていた２冊の本が床に落ちました。

あなた：

職業：　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　年齢：

性別：

英語圏への留学経験はありますか？　　　はい　・　いいえ

「はい」と答えた方に質問です。どこの国でどのくらいの期間滞在しましたか？

ご協力ありがとうございました

Appendix C

Apology strategies

-Expression of apology: Use of an expression which contains a relevant performative
verb. e.g., "I'm sorry"; "I apologize"; "Excuse me"; "Forgive me"; "Pardon me."

-Intensified expression of apology: Use of an expression of apology with intensity of
apology: "really," "very," "so," "terribly," "awfully," "truly," "please"; combinations
and repetitions.

e. g., "I'm so sorry."

-Explanation: An explanation or an account of situations which caused the apologizer to
commit the offense

-Statement of the situation: A description of the situation that led to the need for apology.
e.g., "I dropped your camera and broke it."

-Acknowledgment of responsibility: A recognition by the apologizer of his or her fault in causing the offense. This semantic formula can be subcategorized into:

    1. Implicit acknowledgment

        e.g., "I should have called you before."

    2. Explicit acknowledgment

        e.g., "It completely slipped my mind."

    3. Expression of reluctance

        e.g., "I hesitate to say this, but it is true."

    4. Expression of lack of intent

        e.g., "I didn't mean to."

    5. Expression of self-deficiency

        e.g., "You know I am bad at remembering things."

    6. Expression of embarrassment

        e.g., "I feel so bad about it."

-Offer of repair: An offer made by the apologizer to provide payment for some kind of damage caused by his or her infraction, which can be specific and non-specific.

    1. Non-specific offer of repair

        e.g., "I'll see what I can do."

    2. Specific offer of repair

        e.g., "I will do extra work over the weekend."

-Suggesting a repair: Suggesting something that the interlocutor rather than the apologizer could do. e.g., "Do you want to come with me?"

-Statement of alternative

    1. I can do X instead of Y

        e.g., "I'd rather…"

    2. Why don't we X instead of Y

        e.g., "Let's do…instead"

-Promise of Non-recurrence: A commitment made by the apologizer not to have the offense happen again.   e.g., "It won't happen again."

-Suggestion for avoiding the situation: A suggestion to avoid the problem in the future. e.g., "Let's put it in writing next time."

-Verbal avoidance

    1. Topic switch

    2. Joke

    3. Finding a silver lining: Referring to something good that came out of the apologizer's mistake. e.g., "You have a lead on a new job."

    4. Laugh

Adjuncts to apologies

1. Denial of apology: e.g., "It' not my fault."

2. Minimizing offense: e.g., "It's O.K. No harm done."

3. Minimizing responsibility: e.g., "Didn't you say we would meet at 10:30?"

4. Minimizing blame: e.g., "You should have called me sooner."

3. Emotionals: "Oh!" "Oops!" "God!"

4. Gratitude: e.g., "Thank you.", "I appreciate it."

5. Wishing the best after apologizing: e.g., "I hope you enjoy yourselves."

159

6. Concern for the interlocutor: e. g., "Are you okay?", "Have you been waiting long?"

7. Feedback: e.g., "This book was interesting."

8. Adjunct to the offer of repair: e.g., "Please wait." "Just a moment."

Other

1. utterances related to apology: e.g., "Believe me." "What's wrong?"

2. utterances not related to apology: e.g., "Let's go."

3. Performing of repair: e.g., (Pick them up.)

Appendix D

Japanese Junior High School English Textbooks

Textbooks	Author	Publisher	Published Year	Published Place
COLUMBUS 21 English Course 1~3	Tōgo, Katsuaki et al.	Mitsumura Tosho Publishing CO., Ltd.	2011	Tokyo
NEW CROWN English Series 1~3 New Edition	Takahashi, Sadao et al.	Sanseido Publishing CO., Ltd.	2006, 2011	Tokyo
NEW HORIZON English Course	Kasashima, Jyunichi et al.	Tokyo Shoseki Publishing CO.,	2011	Tokyo

		Ltd.		
ONE WORLD English Course 1~3	Matumoto,Shigeru et al.	Kyoiku Shuppan CO., Ltd.	2011	Tokyo
SUNSHINE English Course 1~3	Aoki, Shoroku et al.	Kairyudo Publishing CO., Ltd.	2006, 2011	Tokyo
TOTAL ENGLISH New Edition 1~3	Horiguchi, Syunichi et al.	Gakko Tosho CO., Ltd.	2011	Tokyo

Appendix E

Japanese High School English Textbooks

Textbooks	Author	Publisher	Published Year	Published Place
JOYFUL English	Takiguchi, Masaru et al.	Sanyusha Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
All Abroard!	Kiyota, Yoichi et al.	Tokyo Shoseki Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
PROMINANCE	Tanabe, Masami	Tokyo Shoseki	2013	Tokyo

	et al.	Publishing CO., Ltd.		
ENGLISH NOW	Matsubayashi, Yoshiko et al.	Kairyudo Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
Discovery	Namai, Kenichi et al.	Kairyudo Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
VISTA	Kaneko, Tomoko et al.	Sanseido CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
CROWN	Shinozaki, Minoru et al.	Sanseido CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
MY WAY	Morizumi, Mamoru et al.	Sanseido CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
New ONE WORLD	Ito, Harumi et al.	Kyoiku-Shuppan Co., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
On Air	Yashiro, Kyoko et al.	Kaitakusha Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
Compass	Okada, Keiko et al.	Taishukan Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
Genius	Muranoi, Hitoshi et al.	Taishukan Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
ELEMENT	Ushiro, Yuji	Keirinkan	2013	Tokyo

	et al.	CO., Ltd.		
LANDMARK	Takeuchi, Osamu et al.	Keirinkan CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
Hello there!	Sakai, Shien et al.	Tokyo Shoseki Publishing CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
SELECT	Kitade, Ryo et al.	Sanseido CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
Sailing	Yashima, Tomoko et al.	Keirinkan CO., Ltd.	2013	Tokyo
My Passport	Kuramochi, Saburo et al.	Bun-eido Publishing CO, Ltd.	2013	Tokyo

Appendix F

Part A: Apology Speech Act

   1. Do you think apologies are important? Why?

   2. Do you vary apology patterns to match your relationship with the hearer, for example, close, neutral, or distant? Why?

3. Do you use different apology patterns according to the severity of the offense? Why?

4. What role apologies play in maintaining relationships in Japan?

Part B

Instruction: Please read the following 4 situations.　In each situation, you are talking with a close friend who is a Japanese non-native speaker of English.　Try to imagine an actual conversation and answer the question that follows about your close friend's responses.

1. You lent a digital camera for your friend, and she dropped it and seriously damaged it so that it no longer works.

    Close friend: I'm sorry. I'll fix it.

    How appropriate is the level of apology in this response?

                                appropriate

    not sufficient   1   2   3   4   5   too much

    How would you feel about this response?

If you think this apology is not appropriate, write an appropriate apology.

2. Your friend promised to return your notebook today. However she forgets to bring it. You need that notebook for an exam tomorrow. You are angry at your friend for forgetting to bring it.

    Close friend: I'm so sorry. I'll go back home and get your notebook. I'll be back in ten minutes. Can you wait here?

    How appropriate is the level of apology in this response?

    appropriate

    not sufficient   1   2   3   4   5   too polite

    How would you feel about this response?

    If you think this apology is not appropriate, write an appropriate apology.

3. You are holding a glass of orange juice in the cafeteria. Your friend accidentally bumps into you. The entire glass spills on you, soaking your clothing.

Close friend: I'm sorry. I'll wash your clothes.

How appropriate is the level of apology in this response?

                         appropriate

not sufficient   1   2   3   4   5   too much

How would you feel about this response?

If you think this apology is not appropriate, write an appropriate apology.

4. Your friend forgot to meet you at a movie theater. You called her, and she is now arriving at the theater. You have already missed half of the movie.

   Close friend: I'm so sorry. Would you like to see another movie?

   How appropriate is the level of apology in this response?

                            appropriate

   not sufficient   1   2   3   4   5   too polite

   How would you feel about this response?

   If you think this apology is not appropriate, write an appropriate apology.

I would like some information about your background in order to help me in the study I am doing. I will keep this information confidential.

1. Age:

2. Sex:

3. Nationality

4. How long have you been studying about Japan, formally or informally? How have you studied about Japan, e.g., reading books on your own or taking a class?

5. If you would be willing to answer more question about your responses, please write down your e-mail address.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.