Investigating the Pragmatic Awareness of EFL Students in Using the Speech Act of Apology

Case Study: Master One Students of English at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia- Jijel

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillments of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in

Didactics of Foreign Languages

Submitted by: **Supervised by:**

- Chahinez BOUHANNA   - Meriem BOUSBA

- Rania CHEBBAH

Board of Examiners

- **Chairperson**: Amel BOUKHEDENNA, University of Jijel

- **Supervisor**: Meriem BOUSBA, University of Jijel

- **Examiner**: Meryem KEHAL, University of Jijel

-

2022-2021

I

Declaration

We hereby declare that the dissertation entitled "Investigating the Pragmatic Awareness in Using the Speech Act of Apology by EFL Learners" is our own work and all the resources we have used have been acknowledged by means of references. We also certify that we have not copied or plagiarized the work of other students or researchers partially or fully. In case any material is not documented, we shall be responsible for the consequences.

Signature   Date

Dedication

I proudly dedicate this modest work to my family.

Chahinez

Dedication

I sincerely dedicate this work to:

The dearest people to my heart, my parents, for their unconditional love, encouragement and

sacrifices. Without your support, bringing this work to its end would never been possible.

My treasured sister, Hadil, for her endless love and support.

My encouraging brothers: Souhil, Islem, Mohammed, and Chouaib.

For all My family members and friends who were always been there.

Rania

Acknowledgment

Abstract

Successful learning of EFL entail not only knowledge of its rules, but also appropriate application of these rules and norms of use in real contexts. To express the speech act of apology, as an aspect of language in use, learners need to be aware of the strategies used and the social factors involved in the production of appropriate acts in various communicative situations. The present study had three aims. First, to diagnose M1 students' pragmatic awareness in using the speech act of apology. Second, it attempted to investigate the different strategies used by students to express apologies in different communicative situations. Last, it sought to explore the teachers' practices adopted to raise their students' pragmatic awareness. It was hypothesized that if M1 students have the required pragmatic awareness, they will use various ways and expressions to produce the speech act of apology appropriately. In order to test this hypothesis, two research tools were used; a questionnaire designed for teachers, and a written discourse completion task administered to M1students at the department of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University. The findings revealed that M1 students faced a difficulty in using their pragmatic knowledge to produce appropriate apologies in different contexts. Hence, they lacked awareness of the pragmatic norms of using apology. Data obtained showed that the most frequent strategies used by students were 'the expression of apology' and 'giving explanation'. Teachers, on their part, used task repetition, role-plays and classroom discussion as techniques to raise their learners' pragmatic awareness. Accordingly, it was recommended for teachers to give pragmatics its due share in their teaching curriculum through adopting new strategies for explaining the different norms of English use and raising students' awareness.

Key words: Pragmatic competence, Pragmatic awareness, Speech act of apology.

List of Abbreviation

CCSARP: Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

FL: Foreign Language

IFIDs: Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices

LA: Language Awareness

L2: Second Language

M1: Master One

Q: Questions

S: Situations

T: Topics

WDCT: Written Discourse Completion Task

Table of Content

List of Tables

General Introduction

Background of the Study

Pragmatics as a field of linguistics has attracted numerousresearchers' attention (Crystal, 1999; Kasper and Blum Kulka, 1993; Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983; and Yule, 1996, as cited in Feratha, 2015,p.39). It studies how speakers use language in different contexts. Pragmatic awareness, however, is the conscious knowledge of how the pragmatic normsof language useare applied effectively and appropriately in communicative settings. In order to make a successful communication, learners should be aware of the appropriate use of language and that has been revealed through the numerous studies that tackled the concept of pragmatic awareness.

Schmidt & Richards (1980 as cited in Demeter,2006,p.27) stated that speech acts are the basic units of communication in a given language and are considered as crucially significant elements of the linguistic competence in that language. It is indicated that, as part of our communication, we perform speech acts. Many studies have conducted the different types of speech act more precisely, the speech act of apology.

The case of the English-speaking Hindu Indians from South Africa has been studied in relation to the speech act of apology. Data were collected by Bharuthram (2003, as cited in Demeter, 2006, p.27) using a mixture of approaches, including discourse completion task, surveys and interviews.The data were then analyzed using a coding scheme created for the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). The author wanted to demonstrate how the notion of the face differs from that defined by Brown and Levinson (1987) in the culture of English-speaking Indians from South Africa. Therefore, rather than focusing on their own face while asking for something or apologizing, these speakers are more concerned

with the faces of others. The use of the word "please" in both requests and excuses is one of the illustrations the author used to highlight the value of politeness in their culture.

Similarly, Holmes (1990, as cited in Demeter, 2006, pp.26)carried out another investigation. With the use of a corpus of 183 apologies amassed by students utilizing the ethnographic technique, he provided a thorough explanation of the strategies employed by English speakers from New Zealand. According to the study's findings, there was no difference between situations in which a single strategy was utilized and those in which many strategies were used. Holmes (1990) argued that this is related to the nature of the circumstances, since there were often only single categories for smaller infractions while there were several categories for more serious violations. Additionally, the results demonstrated that an express apology was offered in nearly every case(as cited in Demeter,2006, pp.26-28).

The investigations by Erçetin (1995) and Tunçel(1999, as cited in Ahmet, C. E. B. İ., & Babayiğit,2021, p.905) are two that were conducted in an EFL environment. They looked into how EFL learners apologize and discovered considerable variations that were a result of the participants' cultural backgrounds. Thomas (1983)suggested that second language learners may transfer their first or native language speech act rules into their L2, which may result in "Pragma-linguistics failure" or "Socio-Pragmatic Failure" depending on their perception of the appropriateness of the linguistic conduct. In research involving native Hebrew speakers and Hebrew learners, Olshtain and Olshtain (1993) demonstrated the existence of such an interaction. (as cited in Ahmet, C. E. B. İ., & Babayiğit,2021, p.905).

Another research was coined out by Tunçel (1999) with 129 EFL students at Anadolu University; the findings revealed that there was a significant transfer from the L1 into the L2 in terms of the apologies made. He also made it obvious that when the students replied to the

scenarios in which they had to do the act of apologizing, they translated the Turkish "sociocultural norms" into English (as cited in Ahmet & Babayiğit, 2021, p.905).

The studies discussed show that the researchers compared between the English language and another language. However, the main focus of this study is to explore the pragmatic awareness of M1 students at the Department of English in using the Speech Act of apology. This research attempts to diagnose the strategies used by Master One students to express apologies, and their awareness of the pragmatic and social factors involved in the production of this type of speech acts in different communicative situations.

Statement of the Problem

A successful process of learning a foreign/second language requires both the grammatical knowledge and the pragmatic competence. During their learning experience at the department of English in the past five years, the researchers of this study have noticed that they, along with many other students, fail to appropriately use different types of speech acts, despite having a good command in English grammar and vocabulary. More specifically, they face difficulties in expressing apologies using the appropriate strategies in different communicative contexts. Therefore, this study conducts an investigation of the Master One students' pragmatic awareness in expressing the speech act of apology.

Aims of the Study

The main aim of the study is to investigate the M1 learner's pragmatic awareness of the use of the speech act of apology. It attempts to diagnose the different strategies used by M1 students to express apologies in different communicative situations. It, also, seeks to explore the methods and practices adopted by teachers to raise the students' pragmatic awareness of using the speech act of apology.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

- What are the strategies used by M1students of English to express apology in different communicative situations?

- Do M1students have an awareness of the pragmatic and social factors involved in apology realizations?

- What are the techniques used by teachers to raise the EFL learners' pragmatic awareness in using the speech act of apology?

Research Hypothesis

In order to answer the research questions, it is hypothesized thatif EFL learners have the required pragmatic awareness, they will use different strategies to produce the speech act of apology appropriately in different socialcontexts.

Means of Research

In order to answer the above research questions and verify theinitial stated hypothesis, two research tools are used, a questionnaire and a written discourse completion task (WDCT). The questionnaire was administered to 21 participants out of 60 teachers at the department of English. The aim of using this questionnaire is to investigate the teachers' practices of teaching the pragmatics of English. It is, also, designed to report their views on the students' pragmatic awareness and their competence in using apologies in various communicative contexts. The WDCT was designed to 70 students of M1, at the department of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel, who were selected randomly from a

population of 180 learners. The aim of choosing this research tool is to diagnose students'
pragmatic awareness of the different strategies and social factors involved in use of apologies.

Structure of the Study

The dissertation is divided into two chapters; the first is theoretical and the second is
practical. The first chapter consists of two sections. Section one, entitled Pragmatic
Awareness, discusses the main points related to pragmatic awareness. It includes definitions
of the key terms and the different approaches used in teaching pragmatics. Also, it explains
the areas included in pragmatics teaching, in addition to the techniques employed in raising
the pragmatic awareness of learners. The second section, The Speech Act of Apology, deals
with the definition of the concept of speech act, its main theories, its classification and its
different types. Furthermore, it includes the definition of speech act of apology, its
classification according to different researchers and the strategies used by EFL learners in
expressing apologies. The second chapter, however, presents the description, the
interpretation and the analysis of the collected data using both of the questionnaire and the
discourse completion task.

1   chapter One: Literature Review

1.1   Section One: Pragmatic Awareness

1.1.1   Introduction

Recently, the importance of the field of pragmatics in foreign language teaching and learning drew the attention of researchers to investigate this discipline. The first section of this chapter deals mainly with 'Pragmatic Awareness'. It starts with providing definitions of the key terms, namely pragmatics, competence, and pragmatic competence. The second point is divided into a presentation of the concepts: language awareness and pragmatic awareness, and a comparison between them. The next point is about discussing how pragmatics is taught by presenting the explicit and the implicit approaches that teachers use in the teaching process. Also, the areas of teaching pragmatics are explained. Moreover, techniques for raising the pragmatic awareness of learners and the role of pragmatics in language teaching are presented.

1.1.2   Pragmatic Competence as Part of Communicative Competence

1.1.2.1   Pragmatics

Since its introduction into modern linguistics, pragmatics has been defined in a variety of ways. Some of these definitions were provided by linguists such as Morris (1938), Levinson (1983), Leech (1983), Kasper and Blum Kulka (1993), Yule (1996), and Crystal (1996).

The term pragmatics was coined by Morris (as cited in Feratha, 2015, p.39). He classified semiotics into three categories: semantics, syntactics, and pragmatics, which he defined as "the relationship between signs and interpreters"(p.6-7). Morris (1938) emphasized

the relationship between linguistic forms and their users, i.e., the link between signs of language (linguistic units) and the users' utterance and interpretation of these signs. This means that because no human being is alike, and each one is unique and has his or her own point of view on the world around him or her, his or her choice of sign depends on his or her intention and interpretation when both sending and receiving signs.

Levinson (1983, p.9, as cited in Feratha, 2015, p.40) has written extensively on pragmatics. He assumed that: "Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized or encoded in a language's structure". According to this definition, pragmatics is the study of the relationships that focus on the inference of meaning that is determined by both the structures of language and the context in which those structures are used. It is all about the extra-linguistic features (situational context and shared knowledge) that allow communicative event participants to understand each other's intended meaning.

Yule (1996, as cited in Feratha, 2015, p.41) provided a detailed definition of Pragmatics which covers four aspects with which pragmatics is concerned. According to him, in order to understand what pragmatics is all about, we have to explore its relationship with other areas of linguistics, particularly sociolinguistics. He wrote (1996, pp.3-4):

1. *Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning* which is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)

2. *Pragmatic is the study of contextual meaning;* This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said.

3. *Pragmatic is the study of how more meaning gets communicated than is said*; in other words, it explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning.

4. This perspective then raises the question of what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid. The basic answer is tied to the notion of distance. Closeness, whether it isphysical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said. *Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.*

In other words, pragmatics studies the way the hearer receives the speaker's statements; in addition to how listeners deduce the meaning from what is said to get a full understanding of what is intended by the speaker. Also, pragmatics investigates what is needed to be said at the basis of the relation between both the speaker and the hearer.

Crystal (1997, p.301) perceived pragmatics as "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effect their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication (as cited in , Feratha ,2015,p.39).

In the same line of thoughts, Feratha (2015, p.39) explained that pragmatics is the study of language users' ability to connect and make compatible language and context by surmounting the inconvenience they come across during social conversations and the way their choices oflinguistic forms influence other participants' understanding and interpretation of the intentions in the act of communication.

Leech and Thomas (1983) divided pragmatics into two components: pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics, in order to outline the pertinent terrain for the study of how individuals achieve their goals and attention to interpersonal interactions while using language. Pragma-linguistics deals with the linguistic resources which are available for conveying communicative acts and performing pragmatic functions. Leech (1983, p. 10) defined socio-pragmatics as "the sociological interface of pragmatics, referring to the social views that govern participants' interpretation and performance of communicative activity. It refers to how social context affects the linguistic resources to employ, the interpersonal meanings to convey and the type of action to take in a given situation (as cited in Kasper& Rose, 2001, p.2).

1.1.2.2 Competence

The term competence is considered a crucial concept in linguistics and Applied Linguistics. Chomsky, in his influential work "Aspects of the Theory of Syntax" (1965), made distinction between competence which is the monolingual speaker-listener's knowledge of language and performance which is the actual use of language in real situations. Brown (2005) described this term as follows:

> The term competence has been used, beginning with Chomsky's
> original formulation of the concept. Inspired by the Saussure an
> concepts of langue and parole, Chomsky puts forward
> competence and performance. He linked competence to an
> "idealized" speaker-hearer who doesn't display such
> performance variables as memory limitations, distraction, shifts
> of attention and interest, errors and hesitation phenomena such

as repeats, false starts, pause, omissions and additions (p.31).

Hymes (1972, as cited in Bagarić & Mihaljević Djigunović, 2007, p.95) was one of the first scholars to use the term "communicative competence." The introduction of communicative competence by Hymes (1972) acknowledged that teaching and learning languages entails far more than focusing on grammatical or lexical systems. He (1972) defined communicative competence as the ability to use grammatical competence in a variety of communicative situations, in addition to inherent grammatical competence. In other words, it is the listener's and the speaker's acquired knowledge that helps in achieving effective communication. As a result, Hymes (1972, 1974) incorporated the sociolinguistic viewpoint into Chomsky's linguistic view of competence. According to Hymes (1972), the ability to speak competently entails not only grammatical knowledge of a language, but also knowing what and how to say something in any situation.

As a result, researchers have shown a strong interest in the discipline of pragmatic competence in recent decades. However, teaching pragmatic competence is now widely accepted as an essential component of language learning and teaching (as cited in Bagarić & Mihaljević Djigunović,2007, p.95).

1.1.2.3 Pragmatic Competence

According to Kecskes (2014, as cited in Alzeebaree &Yavuz, 2017), pragmatic competence is the ability to communicate effectively in a social setting. It is an important aspect of communicative competence. It requires knowledge of pragma-linguistics, or how to produce speech acts such as apology, complaint, and so on in a specific context, as well as knowledge ofsocio-pragmatics, or how to use such speech acts in appropriate situations. The interaction of pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic elements is significant in intercultural

communication, where participants typically have more exposure to pragma-linguistics than socio-pragmatics, especially if target language acquisition occurs in the classroom. This assumes that L2 learners frequently have stronger pragma-linguistics skills than socio-pragmatics skills.

1.1.3 Language Awareness Vs Pragmatic Awareness

1.1.3.1 Language Awareness

In the late 1950s, the idea of awareness was introduced. According to Mastas (2001), helping the students to deal with language-related challenges through language teaching rather than mastering the target language only, gained the attention and interest of several researchers.

Language awareness (LA henceforth) which has been widely advocated in recent years is one of these general issues. Carter (2003, as cited in Farahian & Rezaee, 2015, p.19) explained that "language awareness refers to the development in learners of an enhanced consciousness of and sensitivity to the forms and functions of language" (p.64). In the same vein, Fairclough (1992) stated that LA is "conscious attention to properties of language and language use as an element of language education (p. 2). Another definition was provided by Verity (2003, p.103) in which he assumed that LA is an area of applied linguistics, according to which it explores the knowledge of native speakers "to bring it to the surface, to make it aware, and to make it tools that may be used by learners."(as cited in Farahian & Rezaee, 2015, pp.19-21)

1.1.3.2 Pragmatic Awareness

Pragmatic Awareness is considered an important aspect in the success of language learning. Nouichi (2015, as cited in Sapoetra, 2019) defined pragmatic awareness as

"conscious, thoughtful, and obvious knowledge about the pragmatic rules and conventions that direct the appropriate use of language in various communicative situations". This means that people from different cultures communicate in different ways and strategies. Moreover, it isthe recognition or knowledge of how language is used to encode social meaning through conscious reflection on the relationships between the factors involved in pragmatic comprehension and production.

1.1.4 Teaching Pragmatics in EFL Context

1.1.4.1 Approaches of Teaching Pragmatics in EFL

According to Eslami-Rasekh, (as cited in Castillo& Eduardo 2009, p.32) "the responsibility of teaching the pragmatic aspect of the language use falls on teachers" (p.310). Teachers are considered to be an effective source for learners. Therefore, teachers use explicit and implicit of approaches in teaching to help raising the pragmatic awareness of learners.

1.1.4.1.1 Implicit Approach

According to Schmidt (1993, as cited in Taghizadeh, 2017, p.204), implicit teaching is non-conscious generalization from instances. Schmidt (1993) contended that the general phenomena of implicit learning is well-established in the psychological literature and is considered as a natural by-product of attention to structured input (Hartman, Knopman, &Nissen, 1989; Reber,1989, as cited in Taghizadeh, 2017). Schmidt (1993) added, "There is a growing consensus in psychology that the mechanisms of implicit learning probably involve the strengthening and weakening of connections between nodes in complex networks as a result of experience, rather than the unconscious induction of rules abstracted from data."(p. 26). Brown (2007, as cited in Taghizadeh, 2017, p.204) also referred to implicit learning as "learning without conscious attention awareness" (p. 291).This process entails exposing

learners to varied input and having them deduce underlying content, rules, and, in the case of speech acts, their proper production and usage during communication events. The fundamental concept is that learners' participation in these many communication events will stimulate critical assessments of the process of verbal interactions, particularly the usage of speech acts, and that the results will be implemented by the learners in their own language behavior. Role play is one approach of implicitly instructing in the classroom for speech act development that is also highly suggested by researchers such as Liu and Ding (2009) and Atieh et al. (2014). According to these researchers, this exercise helps L2 students' transition from learners to active users of the language (as cited in Taghizadeh, 2017, p.204).

1.1.4.1.2 **Explicit Approach**

Schmidt (1993) pointed out that explicit learning, also known as "conscious problem solving"(p.27), relies on a variety of mechanisms, including attempts to form mental representations, searching memory for related knowledge, and forming and testing hypotheses. Explicit instruction involves formalized content in which the main tenets of a subject are divided into discrete units and learners are guided through these units. In pragmatics, explicit instruction would entail instruction in the many diverse aspects of pragmatic competence – theoretical and applied language studies.

Both implicit and explicit learning have benefits. When it comes to learning fuzzy patterns based on perceptual similarities and detecting non-salient covariance between variables, implicit learning appears to be superior, whereas explicit learning appears to be superior when a domain contains rules based on logical relationships rather than perceptual similarities (Mathews et al., 1989, as cited in Taghizadeh, 2017, pp.204-205).

1.1.4.2 Areas of Teaching Pragmatics

1.1.4.2.1 Deixis

Cutting, (2008, as cited in Borer,2018, p.24) defined deixis as the analyzes of how language is used in connection to time, location, and speaker's utterance. Although they do not always refer to something specific, deictic phrases may point to the object they are referring to nearly literally, as when we say, That over there. Expressions with a spatial deictic vocabulary include here and there. Words like now, then, and later are used in time deixis, also known as temporal deictic expressions. We, you, and them are among the pronouns used in personal deixis. Deictic expressions are context dependent because without contextual knowledge the expressions would have limited meaning. 'She is there now' is an example of a deictic expression that would be confusing without appropriate contexts.

1.1.4.2.2 Presupposition

Presupposition is a pragmatic term that refers to the relationship between two sentences in which the truth or falsity of one is a necessary condition for the truth or falsity of the other. It is a language technique used to persuade someone to take a different position in communication and interaction (meaning negotiation). Levinson (1996, pp. 131-132) defined presuppositions as presumptions or inferences made when using different linguistic structures that refer to various devices or deductions associated with the extra linguistic context. Yule (1996, as cited in Feratha,2015, p.55) emphasized this clearly:

> Speakers continually design their linguistic messages on the basis of assumptions about what their hearers already know […]. What a speaker assumes is true or is known by the hearer can be described as a presupposition (pp. 131-132).

A presupposition is something that a speaker believes to be true or that the listener is aware of.

1.1.4.2.3 Entailment

Entailment is a logical relationship between two propositions in which the truth of one strongly suggests the truth of the other. Entailment is defined by Crystal (1998, p. 136) as "a relationship between two sentences in which the truth of the second sentence necessarily follows from the truth of the first", for example, "I can see a dog" entails "I can see an animal." One cannot simultaneously assert the first and deny the second. Any true inference derived from a true proposition is defined as entailment. Entailments, as defined by Levinson, are "background assumptions against which an action, theory, expression, or utterance makes sense or is rational" (1983, p. 168). In other words, an entailment is the relationship between two sentences in which the truth of one requires the truth of the other (as cited in Feratha,2015, p.55-56).

1.1.4.2.4 Speech Acts

Speech acts are communicative activities defined with reference to the intentions of speakers and the effects achieved on the listeners. Philosophers such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969, as cited in Rasekh & Mardani, 2010, p.97) have properly identified and classified the different types of the speech acts. (This element will be discussed in details in the second section of this chapter).

1.1.4.3 Techniques for Raising the Pragmatic Awareness

To raise the pragmatic awareness of learners, teachers use different techniques in the process. The most commonly used techniques are: classroom discussion, role plays and task repetition. These techniques will be explicitly explained below.

1.1.4.3.1 Classroom Discussion

According to Cashin (2011), a "conversation" could be thought of as an activity that involves the written or spoken presentation of several points of view in a particular scenario. Additionally, Brookfield and Preskill (2005, p. 6) defined it as "an alternately serious and lighthearted endeavor by a group of two or more to discuss perspectives and engage in reciprocal criticism". Individuals can encounter circumstances where they actively engage in social discussions. Silverthorn (2006) stated that when students learn how to organize their thoughts and then communicate them successfully in class debates, critical thinking skills are developed (as cited in Abdulbaki et al., 2018, p.119).

1.1.4.3.2 Role Plays

Davis (1993, p.159) define drole-playing as a sort of web-based learning that allows students to apply what they are learning or have learned in a supervised context. There are two different types of role-playing games. The first are closed or divergent role plays. The students must do an oral answer that lasts one turn. It particularly relates to what will happen. The second type of role-play is called an opened role-play, or convergent role-play. It is not specific enough. It was focused on what the pupil will do, Tompkins (1998). According to Joyce & Weil (2009), role-playing presents a real example of human behavior. The learners may use it to study their feelings, identify their attitudes, beliefs, and views, grow in their capacity for problem-solving, and explore the subject matter in a variety of ways (as cited in Fattah, 2018,).

1.1.4.3.3 Task Repetition

Ellis(2009) defined a "task" as a meaning-focused educational activity where students must employ both language and nonlinguistic resources to attain a communicative end.

Bygate and Samuda (2005, p 43) said that task repetition involves assigning language learners the same or significantly changed tasks to do repeatedly throughout time. For Ellis (2005), the first time a task is performed, it is considered practice for subsequent times (or a pre-task activity before subsequent times) when the task is repeated (as cited in Ahmadian, 2012, p.380).

1.1.4.4   The Role of Pragmatics in Language Teaching

According to Stalnaker (1972), pragmatics is "the study of linguistic actions and the circumstances in which they are performed"(p. 383). It looks at how language users may change their utterances to the appropriate contexts. The purpose of pragmatics teaching is to increase students' self-assurance in their ability to select the appropriate words to employ in a variety of social circumstances. In the study and teaching of second languages, pragmatics comprises speech acts, conversational structure, conversational implicature and sociolinguistic features of language usage, including choice of address forms.

Teaching pragmatics is encouraged by Bardovi-Harlig (1996) since observing language learners demonstrated that there is a proven demand for it and that pragmatics training may be effective. Therefore, we need pragmatics to grasp how language is used in a certain context and to be able to utilize it effectively (as cited in Deda, 2013, p.68).

1.1.5   Conclusion

To sum up, the above section highlighted the main concepts related to pragmatic awareness. The term pragmatics was defined by various linguists, each scholar made his specific definition. In addition to the difference between two components of pragmatics, pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics. Also, the difference between competence and performance was explained. The concepts of communicative competence and pragmatic

competence were tackled. The second title entails definitions of language awareness and pragmatic awareness. The next point discussed the explicit and the implicit approaches used in teaching pragmatics, and followed by the areas involved in the process. The areas are: deixis, presupposition, entailments and speech act. Furthermore, in raising the pragmatic awareness, teachers use some techniques like classroom discussion, role plays and task repetition which found it useful for students. The role of pragmatics in language teaching is considered as the last title in the pragmatic awareness section.

1.2   Section Two: The Speech Act of Apology

1.2.1   Introduction

The second section of the theoretical chapter deals with the speech act theory that was developed by John Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). The section comprises three main points. The first element presents the definition of the term 'Speech Act' and identification of the development of Austin's theory along with Searle's contribution, as well as the classification and types of the speech act provided by Austin. The second point explores the relationship between the concept of politeness and Speech Acts. The last section, however, encompasses the definition of the Speech Act of apology in addition to its classification, and the strategies suggested by Olshtain& Cohen (1983), Holms (1990) and Fraser (1981) in expressing apologies.

1.2.2   The Speech Act

1.2.2.1   What is a Speech Act?

The term 'Speech Act' has been defined by various researchers. Austin (1962) defined speech acts as actions that refer to the activity done through produced utterances. For Yule

(1996), speech acts are a study of how speakers and listeners utilize language. In a similar vein, Birner (2013) adds that saying anything implies doing something (as cited inHidayat, 2016, p.3).In other words, speech acts refer to expressions used by the speaker with the intent to communicate in daily conversations like apologizing, requesting or complaining with an appropriate use of language. With the growing interest in the idea of 'Speech Acts', researchers started investigating this area, among them was the British philosopher John Austin (1962). He was the first to propose the speech act theory, which was later expanded by the American philosopher John Searle (1969).

1.2.2.2   Main Theories of Speech Acts

1.2.2.2.1   Austin's Speech Act Theory

The British philosopher Austin (1965) was concerned with the structure of utterances in terms of meaning, use, and action. He established his theory of speech acts in a series of lectures that were later released as a book entitled *'How to Do Things with Words'* (1962), in which he suggested a three-tiered classification of speech acts: locution, illocution, and perlocution.

First, locutionary act is an act that has a semantic meaning, which means stating something semantically meaningful or forming a phrase**.** For Austin(1965), any utterance with a prepositional meaning is considered as a locutionary act. Second, an illocutionary act is an act of doing something through language, such as requesting, denying, warning, or complaining. Finally, a perlocutionary act is what we do through saying something, such as convincing, persuading, discouraging, or deceiving. Austin (1962) focused on the function of these taxonomies, demonstrating that a speech act created by a speaker has consequences on the hearer (as cited in Tagushi, 2019, pp.17-18).

According to Austin (1962), the successful execution of an illocutionary act requires three conditions. To start with, securing the hearer's uptake. In order to establish this security, the speaker has to make sure that the hearer understands his utterance. The second condition is causing a change in the given situation. Since illocutionary acts deal with actions rather than words, these actions result in changing the sequence of events. Inviting a response from the hearer is the last condition. According to Austin (1962), illocutionary acts require a reaction or a response from the hearer. This response can be expressed verbally and nonverbally through using body language like gestures and intonation. These conditions show that speech act theory mainly focuses on individual utterances more than the discourse itself. It establishes a basis for analyzing a speech act as a collaborative act between the speaker and the hearer. For example, when the speaker invites or gives a compliment, he must be clear enough so that the hearer reacts appropriately (as cited in Tagushi, 2019, p.18).

1.2.2.2.2 Searle's Theory of Speech Act

The American philosopher Searle (1969) was inspired by Austin's theory and extended it in his work, which he called "Speech Acts" (1969). Searle (1969) focused on the intentional and conventional aspects of illocutionary acts of the speaker. He went on to suggest a set of felicity characteristics that must be satisfied before an utterance can be regarded as a successful speech act. Felicity conditions are composed of propositional, preparation, sincerity, and essential criteria. Each of which highlights a distinct quality of a speech. The first condition refers to the ability of the speaker to understand the language used and not just acting. The second condition is preparation which refers to the ability of the speaker to perform a successful act under the necessary authority and the circumstances. The condition of sincerity refers to the idea that the speaker must commit to the speech act

seriously and sincerely. The last condition is essential criteria; it is where the speaker aims at making his statements to be acted by the hearer (as cited in Tagushi 2019, p.18)

1.2.2.3 Classification of Speech Acts

The Speech Act Theory was expanded by both Austin (1965) and Searle (1976). The former made his classification of the illocutionary acts, while the latter criticized his work and developed other categories.

Austin (1965) established five divisions described as Verdicts, Exercitives, Commissives, Behabitives, and Expositives.

> (1) Verdictives, which express verdicts or evaluations given by judges. Verbs such as, p. to condemn, to absolve, to judge, to estimate, to appraise.
>
> (2) Exercitives, which express the exercising of powers and rights. It includes verbs like to vote, to appoint, to excommunicate, to order, to warn.
>
> (3) Commissives, which express commitments or undertakings. Verbs belonging to this category include: to promise, to guarantee, to contract, to commit.
>
> (4) Behabitives, which have to do with social behavior or reaction to it. This category includes verbs such as to thank, to refuse, to apologize, and to complain.
>
> (5) Expositives, which are used to explain or clarify reasons, arguments and communications. Verbs belonging to this category include to reply, to argue, to concede, and to

assume. (1962, pp. 150-163, as cited in Feratha,2015,

p.77)

On his part, Searle (1976) established five classifications of speech acts. Representatives are claims that have truth value and bind the speaker to the stated proposition, for instance asserting, claiming, and reporting. The second category is directives which requires the speaker to make an attempt to persuade the listener to do something; if the speaker says something, the hearer will make an action at the basis to what he utters as in requesting or giving commands. Commitments are the third category, they are explained as imposing the speaker to do a future action; when the speaker expresses his words, and he needs to perform an action according to what he said. For expressives, they are words that express the speaker's feelings or describing his psychological states like apologizing or praising. The last classification is declarations, which are spoken actions that modify the present situation; the speaker should have the right to make these changes. For instance, when a priest makes a marriage official, this means that he changes the situation of two people from single to married (as cited in Tagushi,2019, p.18).

1.2.2.4 Types of Speech Acts

John Austin in his work *"How to Do Things with Words"* (1965) distinguished three types of speech acts: The locutionary act, the illocutionary act and the perlocutionary act.

1.2.2.4.1 The Locutionary Act

Locutionary acts, according to Austin, is when the speaker does a statement referring to certain meaning using specific words and following the grammatical rules of the language. He (1965) classified the locutionary act in the category of constatives, i.e., sentences that say something. The philosopher pointed out that the acts of stating or asserting something are

referred to as canonical constatives. The example of the locutionary act can be seen in the following sentences:

1. It's so cold in this house.

2. The couch is heavy.

The two sentences represent the actual condition. The first sentence refers to turning on the fireplace and the second sentence refers to the weight of the couch.

1.2.2.4.2   The Illocutionary Act

Austin's (1965) primary innovation is the concept of 'Illocutionary Acts', where the speaker does things with words. He states that illocutionary acts are done through performative sentences, which refers to sentences that do something rather than describing something while speaking. According to him such sentences are, by definition, not performatives, as in the above-mentioned examples:

1. It's so cold in this house.

 2. The couch is heavy.

They indicate that the first sentence is uttered by someone while turning on the fireplace and the second sentence is done by someone while lifting up the couch.

1.2.2.4.3   The Perlocutionary Act

The perlocutionary act is the effect of speaking on the hearer's feelings or thoughts, whether intended or not. To illustrate with reference to the same examples:

1. It is so cold in this house.

 2. The couch is heavy.

These examples explain that the first sentence shows a request to turn on the fireplace and the second sentence shows a request to lift up the couch (as cited in Horn & Warn, 2006, p.55)

1.2.2.5 Speech Acts and Politeness

The idea of politeness is strongly tied to speech act theory. According to early researches on politeness, this idea is ubiquitous. According to Lakoff (1973, p 298), there are three fundamental rules of politeness, which are "don't intrude," "offer alternatives," and "make [the hearer] feel good-be nice". According to Brown and Levinson (1987)**,**all members of a society maintain a specific picture of themselves, which they refer to as their "face." They identify two kinds of faces: "negative faces" and "positive faces». While the first is characterized as a desire for no one to obstruct one's actions, the second suggests that individuals expect their requirements to be attractive to others as well. Furthermore, politeness is influenced by both cultural and environmental factors.

The emphasis of Brown and Levinson's (1987 as cited in Amraoui, 2019, p.11) politeness theory is on the connections between linguistic characteristics and socio-cultural situations. The study included speakers of three languages: English, which is spoken in Great Britain; Tamil, a dialect spoken in the Tamilnadu area of India; and Tzetlal, which is spoken in Chiapas, Mexico. The hypothesis was developed by the researchers in order to analyze the universal principles of politeness. They observed that across the three languages, individuals occasionally express themselves clearly and immediately, but other times they talk more gently to avoid confrontation or to avoid action from other members of the speech community.

Staab (1983) pointed that speech actions are used to denote language functions that are intended to either avert a threat to the speaker's or hearer's face – for example, being

courteous when seeking something – or to recover, or save face. Lubecka (2000) stated that apologies are both face threatening and face saving because apologizing implies admitting that the speaker has done something wrong. It is, also, face saving because, if accepted, the apology is intended to alleviate the speaker's offense. Leech (1983) stated that speech actions bring another issue in terms of politeness. Certain speech acts, such as orders or instructions, appear to be impolite by nature, whilst others, such as offers or invitations, appear to be courteous by nature. According to Leech (1983), we must differentiate between positive politeness, which improves politeness in naturally polite speech actions, and negative politeness, which decreases impoliteness in essentially impolite speech acts. He also claimed that one must consider the relative nature of politeness, which is dependent on the culture of other speakers.

Moreover, the desire to be polite influences the sort of speech act performed. To be more kind, one can choose an indirect rather than a direct speaking behavior (Leech, 1983). According to Leech, this is defined as the meta-linguistic use of politeness in speech activities. As a result, the relationship between politeness and speech acts is similar to the relationship between direct and indirect speech acts. It's difficult to categorize verbal behavior as polite or disagreeable and use these labels as guidance. The environment in which a speech act is delivered determines whether it delivers polite or disagreeable meaning (as cited in Demeter,2006, pp.12-15).

1.2.3   The Speech Act of Apology

Apology as a type of speech acts gained a crucial importance among researchers. The expression apology had been defined by various scholars like Holms (1995), Blum-kulka and Kasper(1993). Moreover, scholars found out that learners use different strategies in

expressing the speech act of apology, these strategies are classified by linguists like Fraser (1981), Holms (1990), and Olshtain &Cohen (1983).

1.2.3.1   Definition of Apology

The term "apology" is derived from the Greek word "apologeomai," which means "to justify or defend oneself" or "defense." An apology, according to Holmes (1995), is an act that is directed to a person who feels offended, where the apologizer admits his/her mistake and seeks to make up the offence. Olshtain and Cohen (1983) considered apologies to be a social event since they are undertaken when social standards are broken. According to Blum-Kulka and Kasper (1993), speech actions differ in the amount to which conventionalized verbal forms are employed; certain speech acts, such as apologizing and praising, use more conventionalized linguistic forms than others (as cited in Thijittang,2010, pp.30-31).

Thijittang, (2010, p.31) stated that linguists classify the apology act according to various criteria. Divisions are primarily based on external factors such as the situation or the object of regret. Sometimes the speaker explicitly apologizes to the other person for his/her offence. Other times, a speaker regrets and explains the reason of the mishap and offers to pay for the loss.

1.2.3.2   Classification of Apology

Apologies are classified according to Austin (1962, as cited in Feratha, 2015, p.89) as 'Behabitives', which he defined as "a sort of performative concerned roughly with reactions to conduct and behavior toward others and aimed to display attitudes and emotions"(p.83).In expressing apology, the speaker performs a locutionary act by saying: 'I apologize' (explicit performative) or 'I'm sorry' while apologizing (primary performative); a perlocutionary act in which s/he pacifies the hearer and an illocutionary act in which s/he apologizes (who accepts

the apology and forgives). Meanwhile, Searle classified the act of apologies as an expressive type, describing a psychological condition.

1.2.3.3   Apology Strategies

The variety of definitions provided by scholars like Fraser (1981), Holms (1990), and Olshtain &Cohen (1983) made each researcher to explain the apology strategies in different ways.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983, as cited in Thijittang,2010, p.32) divided apology tactics into five broad groups, which can be characterized as follows:

1. Expression of apology; use of an expression which contains a relevant

   performative verb, i.e. "I'm sorry," "I apologize," "Excuse me," or

   "Please forgive me," "Pardon me."

2. Acknowledgement of responsibility; recognition by an apologizer

   of his or her own fault in causing the offense, i.e. "That's my

   fault," "I admit that I was wrong."

3. Explanation; explanation or account of situations which caused the

   apologizer to commit the offense, i.e. "I have family business,"

   "I'm late for my class."

4. 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 nonspecific, i.e. "I will do extra work over the

   weekend.'

5. Promise of non-recurrence; committed made by an apologizer not

   to let the offense happen again, i.e. "It won't happen again**."**

For Holms (1990), four categories with sub-categories were identified. The strategies are likely the same of Olshtain and Cohen (1983). However, Holms (1990) divided the strategy of explicit expression of apology into three subcategories: an offer of apology/ IFIDs (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices, refers to the variety of apology verbs), as when saying: 'I apologize' or 'please accept my apologies'; an expression of regret, such as: 'I'm sorry' or 'I'm afraid'; a request for forgiveness, as in 'excuse me' or 'forgive me'**.** The second strategy is explanation or account, for example: The traffic was horrendous.

The acknowledgment of responsibility strategy was classified, by Holms (1990), as follows: accepting the blame, for instance: 'it is my fault' or 'silly me'; expressing self-deficiency, like: 'I was confused' or 'I forgot'; recognizing the other person as deserving apology, as in: 'you're right', expressing lack of intent, such as'I didn't mean to break it'; *offering repair/ redress e.g. I'll get a new one for you,* while promise of forbearance is considered as the last category, for instance: I promise it won't happen again(as cited in Thijittang,2010, p.35).

According to Fraser (1981, p.263), apologies are divided into nine possible strategies:

1. Announcing that apology is forthcoming through clauses like I (hereby)apologize…;

2. Stating the offender's obligation to apology with words like I must apologize

3. Offering to apologize to show the sincerity of the act with sentences like Do you want me to apologize?

4. Requesting the acceptance of the given apology with clauses like Please accept my apology for…;

5. Expressing regret for the offense through the use of intensifiers like truly, terribly, very and so;

6. Requesting forgiveness for the offense.

7. Acknowledging responsibility for the act;

8. Promising forbearance from a similar offending act with sentences like I promise you that will never happen again.; and

9. Offering redress to show that the offender really regrets the offense with offers like Please let me pay for the damage I have done. (as cited inThijittang,2010, p.33)

In addition to the different classifications of the apology strategies proposed by the previous researchers, there are some paralinguistic features used in expressing the act of apology. According to Crystal (1975, p.162), paralinguistic is a study related to paralanguage which is defined as the link between the non-linguistic forms of communication behavior and the verbal linguistic study such as grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. The study of language's non-formal features, such as phonology, syntax, grammar, and so on, is known as paralinguistic. Paralinguistic characteristics can be divided into two groups: vocal and body paralinguistic features. Vocal paralinguistic characteristics are related to how we speak. We have the ability to talk softly or loudly, which are qualities of loudness. Our vocals can sound breathy, which is a technique some singers could employ. We have the ability to alter our speech tone as well. A high tone may signify anxiety, an inquiry, or even fury in some people. In some people, a low tone conveys uncertainty or authority. These characteristics all express purpose and are affected by the environment. While, the body features are the physical characteristics to convey message like facial expressions. There are several types of information that are shared when laughing, or lifting the eyebrows. Another way to communicate is by biting one's lips, clenching one's teeth gestures. What these activities

29

signify is influenced by the cultural setting as well (as cited in paralinguistic language features, 2015).

1.2.4 Conclusion

To conclude, the section above discussed the speech Act of Apology. The first point introduced the definition of the speech act; in addition to Austin's theory (1962) and its development made by Searle's (1969). Austin (1962) identified the three types and the classification of the speech act. In a similar vein, Searle (1969) made his own classification. The next point dealt with the relationship of politeness theory to the speech act of apology. Furthermore, the last point included the strategies used in expressing apologies by Olshtain & Cohen (1983), Holms (1990), and Fraser (1981) in expressing apology.

2   Two: Field work

2.1   Introduction

This study is designed to investigate students' pragmatic awareness concerning the use of the speech act of apology. In this study, two different tools are used to test the research hypothesis; a written discourse completion task which is designed for Master one students, and a questionnaire that is administered to teachers of the department of English at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia -Jijel-. This chapter presents a detailed analysis and interpretation of the collected data, as well as a discussion and synthesis of the findings. The results gathered are used to answer the questions posed and to verify the validity of the hypothesis proposed.

2.2   Population and Sampling

The questionnaire was administrated to 21participants out of 60 teachers working at the department of English, at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel. The teachers were selected randomly without any criterion, due to the fact that this research deals with the teachers' view of students' pragmatic awareness of using the speech act of apology and the different methods used by teachers to teach and raise student's pragmatic awareness.

The WDCT was administered to 70 Master one students out of the total population 180 students of the department of English at the university of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia. The students were selected randomly to answer a set of activities that aim at evaluating both of their knowledge and awareness in using the different strategies of expressing the speech act of apology. However, the selection of Master one students aims at evaluating their ability to use the pragmatic knowledge they have perceived throughout the past four years at the university of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

As was mentioned previously, a questionnaire has been used as a research instrument to gather quantitative data from the participants in order either to confirm or to reject the research hypothesis. Questionnaires are mostly used by researchers since they help in gathering information in a short period of time from a large population. The reason behind using a questionnaire rather than other tools like interviews and diaries is that questionnaire seems more adequate for gathering data. In other words, it takes less efforts and less time. Besides, it is relatively easy to analyze and to interpret its data. Thus, sufficient information is likely to be collected in short periods of time. The teachers' questionnaire, at hand, aimed at investigating the teachers' attitudes towards teaching both pragmatics and the speech act of apology, in addition to their views on students' use of the different strategies of apology.

WDCT is the most commonly used data collection tool in the field of pragmatics. This instrument was used by many researchers over the years in order to assess EFL learners' pragmatic competence and pragmatic awareness in producing the different kinds of speech act. It consists of a set of role-play situation that help collecting a large amount of information in a short period of time. Kwon (2004) (as cited in Taghidadeh, 2017, p 112) stated that DCT is a controlled elicitation data method as it allows participants to vary their response because the situations are developed with status embedded in the situations. On the other hand, the current instrument is used to assess Master one students' pragmatic knowledge and examine their ability to perform the speech act of apology, also to evaluate their pragmatic awareness in using appropriate structures in the given situation.

2.4 The Teachers' Questionnaire

2.4.1 Description and Administration of the Teacher's Questionnaire

The questionnaire was distributed to 21 teachers who were available and willing to participate in this research regardless of the modules they are teaching. The questionnaire is composed of 18 questions. It consists of four main sections: background information, teaching pragmatics, teaching the speech act of apology and further suggestions. The types of questions used are a mixture of closed questions that require the teachers to answer by 'Yes' or 'No' or choose from a number of choices, and open-ended questions where they are requested to give alternative answers when necessary.

The first section provided background information about the participants (Q1-Q3). Teachers were asked to specify the degree they hold where four options were proposed: License, Master, Magister and Doctorate. Also, they were asked to provide the number of years of teaching English with the modules they usually teach. These questions were asked for the description of the sample.

Section Two is entitled 'Teaching Pragmatics' (Q4-Q9). This section involved six main questions concerning teaching pragmatics. Q4 was set to explore the teachers' perceptions of their students' level of using language for communication. Q5 and Q6 were asked to indicate the teachers' point of view concerning EFL learners' need for instruction to use language appropriately for communication, and whether they incorporate English pragmatic elements in their teaching and provide a justification if they don't (Q7). Whereas, questions 8 and 9 were set to investigate the method and approaches used by teachers to teach language use and the different areas of English pragmatics they usually teach.

Section Three, 'Teaching the Speech Act of Apology' (Q10-Q18), maintained eight questions regarding the teaching of the speech act of apology. Questions 11 and 12 were posed to evaluate the students' level of using different English speech acts and to identify the most commonly used ones; while questions 13 and 14 were designed to indicate the most commonly used apology strategies by the students and whether they are aware of them or not. The last four questions were about the different techniques used by teachers to raise their student's pragmatic awareness, whether teachers include the concept of culture while teaching apology and their point of view concerning giving the teaching of English pragmatics its due share in the present curriculum. The last section was designed for teachers to add any comments or suggestions regarding the teaching of the speech act of apology.

2.4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of the Results of the Teacher's Questionnaire

Section One: Background Information

Q1: What degree do you hold?

Table2-1Teachers' Degree of English

Degree	Subjects	Percentage (%)
License	0	0%
Master	7	33.33%
Magister	6	28.57%
Doctorate	8	38.10%
Total	21	100%

The first question was designed to know the teachers' degree of English. As shown in the table above, 38,10% of the teachers held the Doctorate degree which was the highest percentage, while 33.33% of them held the Master degree. However, the least percentage 28.57% represented teachers with a Magister degree. These results clarified that the majority of teachers at the English Department were highly qualified.

Q2: How long have you been teaching English?

Table 2-2Teachers' Experience of Teaching English

Years	Subjects	Percentage (%)
1-7	7	33.33%
8-15	9	42.86%
+16	5	23.81%
Total	21	100%

Teachers in this question were required to mention the number of years they have been teaching English. As shown in the table above, nine teachers had an experience from eight to fifteen years, seven teachers' experience was between one to seven years, while five teachers have been teaching English for more than sixteen years. The results of this question indicated that the teachers involved in this study had enough experience to assess students' level in using language appropriately in different contexts.

Q3: Which modules do you usually teach?

Table 2-3 Modules Taught by Teachers

Modules	Subjects	Percentage (%)
O.E.	6	28.57%
W.E.	6	28.57%
D.A.	2	9.52%
Grammar	3	14.29%
Others	4	19.05%
Total	21	100%

In the third question, teachers were asked to mention the modules they usually teach in English. The results above stated that the most frequent modules that were mentioned were Oral Expression (O.E.) and Written Expression (W.E.) with 28.57% of the whole sample, followed by Grammar with 14.29%, and finally the least frequent module was Discourse Analysis (D.A.) with 9.52%; However, 19.05% was divided between different other modules such as Phonetics, Research Methodology, , Linguistics, Didactics, Literature, ESP, SHS, and Translation.

Section Two: Teaching Pragmatics

Q4: How do you see student's level in using language for communication?

Table 2-4Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Student's Competence in Using Language for Communication

Level	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Excellent	0	0%
Good	6	28.57%
Average	11	52.38%
Not Bad	3	14.29%
Very Bad	1	4.76%
Total	21	100%

Teachers in this item were required to rate their students' level concerning the use of language in communication from "Excellent" to "Very Bad". It is noted that 52.38% of respondents considered their student's level in using language for communication as "Average", 28.57% said they are "Good", 14.29% of them claimed that they are "Not Bad". However, only one teacher 4.76% considered the student's level as "Very Bad». These results stated that EFL learners face no difficulty in using the knowledge they learnt appropriately in communication.

Q5: Do you think that EFL learners need instruction to use language appropriately for communication?

Table 2-5Teachers' Views on Learners' Need for Instruction to Use Language Appropriately for Communication

Answers	Subject	Percentage (%)
Yes	19	90.48%
No	1	4.76%
Total	21	100%

This question was designed to know the teachers' point of view concerning the students' need for instruction in order to use language appropriately in communication. The results noted that 90.48% of teachers agreed that learners need instruction to use language appropriately, while one teacher 4.76% said that learners do not need any instruction to successfully use appropriate language in communication. The results of this question strengthen teachers' perception concerning the students' ability to use the learnt knowledge in everyday communication.

Q6: Do you include English pragmatic elements in your teaching?

Table 2-6Teachers' Incorporation of Pragmatics in their Teaching

Answers	Subject	Percentage (%)
Yes	16	76.19%
No	4	19.05%
No answer	1	4.76%
Total	21	100%

This question has two parts. The first part was designed to know whether teachers of the English Department include any English pragmatic elements in their teaching or not. As shown in the table above sixteen teachers (76.79%) claimed that that they include English pragmatic elements in their teaching. 19.05% of the sample reported that they never include any English pragmatic element in their teaching. Yet one teacher gave no answer.

- if no why?

This part of question was intended to examine the teachers' reasons behind not including pragmatic elements in their teaching. According to the data collected, two main reasons were noticed. The first was the lack of time, the other one was concerned with the field of study where some teachers claimed that teaching pragmatics does not belong to their field of experience. These results indicated that teachers at the English department see that teaching pragmatics to EFL students is important but many factors prevent them from giving it its due share.

Q8: How do you teach language in use?

Table 2-7Methods Used in Teaching Language in Use

Teaching Methods	Subject	Percentage (%)
Implicitly	10	47.62%
Explicitly	6	28.57%
Both	4	19.05%
Not Answered	1	4.76%
Total	21	100%

The current question explored the different methods used in teaching language in use. As presented in the table above, 47.62% of teachers taught language in use implicitly. While 28.57% of them taught it explicitly. However, 19.05% of the participants claimed of using both methods in their teaching, yet one teacher did not answer this question. The answers of this question showed the teachers' lack of knowledge of pragmatics which leads them to use implicit methods to incorporate pragmatics in their teaching instead of using explicit methods that might reveal their weaknesses in the field of pragmatic.

Q9: Which areas of English pragmatics do you incorporate?

Table 2-8Main Areas of Pragmatics that are Taught

Areas of Pragmatics	Subject	Percentage (%)
Presupposition	7	33.33%
Entailment	7	33.33%
Speech Act	19	90.46%
Deixis	4	19.05%
Others	3	14.29%

Along with the table above, speech act had the highest percentage (90.46%) as the most teachable area of pragmatics, followed by presupposition and entailment with equal percentage (33.33%) while 19.05% went for teaching deixis; However, 14.29% was divided to other areas of pragmatics such as meaning and context, managing references in discourse and learning the use of conversational implicatures. The results of this question clearly demonstrated teachers' familiarity with the area of speech acts, unlike the other concepts such as entailment, presupposition and deixis in which the teachers showed some difficulties even in understanding these concepts.

Section Three: Teaching the Speech Act of Apology

Q10: How do you rate your students' level of using different English Speech Acts?

Table 2-9Teachers' Perception of their Students' Level of Using English Speech Acts

Student's Level	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Excellent	0	0%
Good	5	23.81%
Average	11	52.38%
Weak	5	23.81%
Extremely Weak	0	0%
Total	21	100%

In response to this question, teachers were asked to rate the students' level of using the different speech acts from "Excellent" to "Extremely Weak". The results stated that 52.38% of the teachers considered the students' level as "Average" while the rest of the population was divided between the level "Good" and "Weak" with 23.81%. The obtained results in this question stated that despite the students' ability in applying the acquired knowledge to produce successful communication especially when using speech acts (Q4 & Q10), according to teachers' view students still need instruction to communicate appropriately

Q11: Which kind of Speech Acts do your students usually use?

Table 2-10Kinds of Speech Acts Used by Students

Types of Speech Act	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Suggestions	10	47.62%
Requests	15	71.49%
Apologies	13	61.91%
Compliments	5	23.81%
Others	5	23.81%

The question was set to explore which kinds of speech acts are usually used by students. The results mentioned that 71.49% represented the use of requests. 47.62% went for the use of suggestions, 61.91% for the use of apologies and 23.81% represented the use of compliments. However, another 23.81% was divided between different kinds of speech acts such as: offers, invitations, warnings, reprimands, refusals and the expressive speech act. Regarding the results of this question the reason behind the use of one kind of speech acts over another might be the lack of knowledge about some of them or the students lack of awareness in using different strategies to express a certain speech act.

Q12: Are they knowledgeable of the different structures and appropriate use of apology?

Table 2-11Student's Awareness of the Different Structures and Appropriate Use of Apology

Answers	Subject	Percentage (%)
Yes	5	23.81%
No	16	76.19%
Total	21	100%

This question was designed to know the teachers' point of view concerning the students' awareness of the different structures and appropriate use of apology. The results of this question showed that the majority of students (76.19%) were not knowledgeable while 23.81% claimed that EFL students were aware of the different structures. The obtained results in this question confirmed the previous questions' assumption concerning the lack of students' knowledge about the different structures and appropriate use of apology.

Q13: What are the most commonly used apology strategies (structure) by the students?

Table 2-12The Most Commonly Used Apology Strategies by the Students

Strategies	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Expression of Apology	18	85.71%
Acknowledgment of Responsibility	8	38.10%
Offer of Repair	2	9.52%
A Request for Forgiveness	12	57.14%
A Promise of Forbearance	5	23.81%

Teachers in this question were requested to mention the most commonly used apology strategies by students. As noted in the table above, the highest percentage went for the use of "Expression of apology" strategy with 85.71%, the second one went for the use of "a request for forgiveness" with 57.14%, next a use of acknowledgment of responsibility with 38.10%, then the use of "a promise of forbearance" strategy with 23.81%. Finally, the least commonly used apology strategy by students according to teachers was "offering a repair" with 9.52%. Like the previous question the results of this question confirmed again the lack of students' knowledge about the various ways of apologizing.

Q14: When using the speech act of apology, do you refer to or speak about culture?

Table 2-13Teachers' Reference to Culture

Answers	Subject	Percentage (%)
Yes	11	52.38%
No	8	38.10%
Not Answered	2	9.52%
Total	21	100%

This question was designed to know whether teachers make any reference to culture when using the speech act of apology or not. The results showed that 52.38% of teachers tookthe concept of culture into consideration during the process of teaching, while 38.10% of them claimed that they do not. However, 9.52% did not provide and answer. This reveals teachers' awareness of the cross-cultural differences in using speech acts.

Q15: What are the techniques or the strategies that you usually use in raising the student's pragmatic awareness?

Table 2-14Techniques Used in Raising the Student's Pragmatic Awareness

Strategies	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Classroom Discussion	18	85.71%
Role Play	8	38.10%
Task Repetition	2	9.52%
Others	1	4.76%

This question was intended to specify the different techniques used by teachers in order to raise the student's pragmatic awareness. The statistics showed that the least used technique was "Task Repetition" with 9.52%. Eight participants represented by 38.10% claimed that they use "Role Plays". The mostly used technique among the questioned teacher was "Classroom Discussion" with 85.71%, meanwhile one teacher added another technique which was presenting native speakers' videos.

Q16: Do you think that the teaching of English pragmatics, in general, and the different types of speech acts, in particular, got their due share in the present curriculum?

Table 2-15The Reasons of not Incorporating English Pragmatics in the Present Curriculum

Answers	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Yes	4	19.05%
No	17	80.95%
Total	21	100%

According to their experience in teaching, participants in this question were asked to say whether the teaching of language in use, in general, and the different types of speech act, in particular, got their due share in the present curriculum or not. 80.95% of the answers were 'yes', they did while 19.05% said that they did not get their due share. Despite that most teachers are not specialized in pragmatics; they are aware of its importance for students to develop their communicative skills and the need to be incorporated in the present curriculum.

- If no, is it because

    a) The lack of teacher's knowledge

    b) The lack of time devoted

  c) The lack of materials

  d) Other reason

Table 2-16The Reasons Teaching Pragmatics in the Present Curriculum

Answers	Subjects	Percentage (%)
A	6	28.57%
B	12	57.14%
C	5	23.81%
Other reasons	2	9.52%

This second part of the question was set to identify the main reasons for why the teaching of language in use did not get its due share in the present curriculum. Most of the participants agreed that the main reason was the lack of time devoted with 57.14%, 28.57% said because of the lack teacher's knowledge while 23.81% claimed that it's because of the lack of materials.

Section Four: Further Suggestions

This section was mainly devoted to seek teachers' further suggestions regarding the teaching of the speech act of apology. Most of teachers agreed on the need for devoting more extra-time and energy to teach the speech act of apology, especially in Oral Expression module. In addition, some other teachers suggested to take into consideration the aspect of culture (English culture) and use appropriate materials that can help in better understanding of the different strategies of expressing apology in various cultures, such as exposing the students to native speakers' videos. As a final suggestion, teachers opted for including the module of pragmatics in the curriculum to teach its different components and aspects explicitly to students in order to raise their awareness.

2.5 The students' WDCT

2.5.1 Description and Administration of the Students' WDCT

The WDCT contains four main activities. The three first activities consisted of four situations, each of which took the form of role-plays resembling real life situations. Participants in the first activity were asked to read the situations which offer two different ways of apology, circle the appropriate answer and then explain their choice. The second activity required the students to say whether the provided apology is appropriate or not and explain their answer. These two activities aimed at testing the students' pragmatic knowledge. Situations in activity three required an apology, so that, students were asked to imagine the situation and complete the dialogue as an evaluation to their ability to perform their previously acquired knowledge. However, in the fourth activity students were provided with four different topics in which they were required to choose two topics and write a short conversation where they express apology, then identify and explain the apology they used. This activity combines between the students' knowledge and their ability to use it appropriately in different contexts.

The selection and construction of situations took into consideration the three main social variables which are social distance, social power and severity of offence. First, the social and contextual features of the communicative acts, i.e., internal contextual features (absolute ranking of imposition of the speech act); Absolute ranking of the imposition is described by Hudson as "the potential imposition of carrying out the speech act, in terms of the expenditure of goods and /or services by the hearer, or the obligation of the speaker to perform the act" (2001, p. 284). Second, the relative power of the speaker over the hearer "the degree to which the speaker can impose his or her will on the hearer due to a higher rank within an organization, professional status, or the hearer's need to have a particular duty or job

performed" (Hudson, 1995, p.4). Finally, the social distance of the speaker and the hearer which is the degree to which people are willing to accept and associate with those having different social status. Consequently, The DCT collected data were examined through determining the main social variables that the participants should take into account when performing the appropriate speech acts (requests/apologies).

2.5.2   Analysis and Interpretation of the WDCT

After collecting the DCT questionnaire, the responses on the DCT were categorized using Olshtain and Cohen's (1983as cited in Thijittang, 2010, p.32) apology classification. They suggested five strategies of apologies when the offender feels the need to apologize. The classifications are as follows:

1. Expression of apology; example: "I'm sorry," "I apologize," "Excuse me," or "Please forgive me," "Pardon me."

2. Acknowledgement of responsibility; e.g. "That's my fault," "I admit that I was wrong."

3. Explanation; explanation or account of situations, e.g. "I have family business," "I'm late for my class."

4. Offer of Repair; e.g. "I will do extra work over the weekend.'

5. Promise of non-recurrence; e.g. "It won't happen again."

The coding of the apologies was done for each situation. The percentage of the appropriateness of the strategy used was calculated according to the social variables and Olshtain and Cohen's (1983) classification of the speech act of apology.

Activity one:

In the first activity students were provided with four situations that offer two different ways of apology. The question was to circle the appropriate answer (A or B) and explain their choice.

Situation One:

You stepped slightly on the foot of a woman while you are trying to sit down, but it was impossible for you to avoid doing this, as the woman had extended her legs too far towards the front sit. Still, you felt the need to apologize.

Woman: Ah, Be careful!

You: A) Sorry, but you should not have extended your legs so far.

       B) I deeply regret having hurt you.

Explain: …………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-17Analysis of Situation One (Act.1) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S1	H=S	+SD	Low

H=S: equal social status

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-18Students' Responses to Situation One (Act. 1)

Situation 1	Subjects	Percentage %
A	32	45.71%
B	35	50%
No answer	3	4.29 %
Explained	66	94.29%
Not explained	4	5.71%
Total	70	100 %

As shown in the above table (Table 2. 18), both of the speaker (S) and the hearer (H) have equal social power with a high social distance and a low severity of offence. This relationship between the speaker (S) and the hearer(H) requires a serious and formal apology from the apologizer (S).

The second table (Table 2. 19) states that 50% of participants have chosen to express regret as a form of apology. While 45.71% of the participants have chosen the first structure in which they express their apology with an explanation where they declared that it is not their fault. This expression seemed to be less formal compared to social distance variable since the high social distance between the speaker and the hearer the more serious and formal is the apology. The rest of participants 4.29% gave no answer to this situation. However, according to the second part of the answers, although students have explained their choice of the appropriate answer, they showed no awareness to the importance of social variable in selecting the appropriate strategy of apology they provided their explanation regarding the issue of politeness.

Situation Two:

You and your friend did a role-play for a speaking test in an English class. The conversation was not smooth because you did not prepare well. Your friend was upset. What would you say to your friend after the test?

You: A) Sorry I should have prepared well.

B) I had too much pressure this week that's why I could not prepare well.

Explain: …………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-19Analysis of Situation two (Act.1) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S2	H=S	SD=SD	High

H=S: equal social status

SD=SD: equal social distance

Table 2-20Students' Responses to Situation Two (Act. 1)

Situation 2	Subjects	Percentage %
A	40	57.14 %
B	30	42.86 %
Explained	66	94.29%
Not explained	4	5.71%
Total	70	100 %

Regarding the second situation, the analysis showed that both of interlocutors ('S' and 'H') have both equal social power and social distance with a high severity of offence, which means that the offended person gives no importance to any kind of apology the apologizer used. However, the need for an apology is still needed.

Students' responses on this situation were approximately equal. 40% of the students have chosen option (A) where an expression of apology 'sorry' is used along with an acknowledgement of responsibility 'I should have prepared well'. While the rest 30% of them have selected the second option (B), which contained a combination of an expression of apology 'sorry' and an explanation or account of situation 'I had too much pressure this week that's why I couldn't prepare well. Regarding the section of explaining their choice, students showed their willingness to take the responsibility of committing a mistake rather than denying responsibility and giving excuses always as a form of showing politeness regardless their awareness of the factor of social variables.

Situation Three:

You had to discuss some of your problems with your teacher but due to a traffic jam, you came 45 minutes late. What would you say to your supervisor when you see him/ her?

Your teacher: you are 45 minutes late.

You: A) Sorry I'm late. The traffic was very heavy.

B) I realize that I was wrong, please forgive me. It won't happen again.

Explain: ………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-21Analysis of Situation Three (Act.1) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S3	H>S	+SD	High

H>S: hearer being more powerful than the speaker

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-22Students' Responses to Situation Three (Act. 1)

Situation 3	Subjects	Percentage %
A	51	72.86%
B	19	27.14%
Explained	63	90%
Not explained	7	10%
Total	70	100 %

In the current situation, the hearer (H) is said to have higher social power over the speaker (S). The analysis also showed that there is a high social distance between the teacher (H) and the student (S), with a high severity of offense. The results obtained from this analysis indicated the need for using a serious and an effective apology. This apology might include an expression of apology, admitting the offence, and an acknowledgment of responsibility, rather than providing explanations; taking into consideration the teacher's (H) social power and the social distance between the interlocutors.

However, the resulted responses of the students mentioned that the majority of them 72.86% have chosen option (A) that includes an expression of apology 'sorry', admitting the offence 'I'm late' and an explanation or account of situation 'the traffic was very heavy'. While the rest of participants 27.14% have selected option (B) which is a combination of apology strategies: expression of apology 'please forgive me', admitting the mistake 'I realize that I was wrong' and a promise of forbearance 'It won't happen again'. Along with the section of explaining their answers, students showed no awareness of social power and social distance variables and their importance in deciding on what apology strategy or combination of strategies to use with different people

Situation Four:

You have promised you younger brother to take him to the park on Sunday. But on Sunday evening, some of your friends came to meet you and you couldn't go with him. You also forgot to do so. What would you say to him?

You: A) Sorry I could not cancel that meeting.

B) I'm sorry about forgetting our appointment. I promise that I will try to make it better next time.

Explain: …………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-23 Analysis of Situation Four (Act.1) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S4	H<S	-SD	Low

H<S: hearer being less powerful than the speaker

-SD: low social distance

Table 2-24Students' Responses to Situation Four (Act. 1)

Situation 4	Subjects	Percentage %
A	17	24.29%
B	53	75.71%
Explained	62	88.57%
Not explained	8	11.42%
Total	70	100 %

The analysis of the last situation in the first activity stated that the speaker (S) have a high social power over the hearer (H), his younger brother; however, a low social distance and a low severity of offence are noticed. This combination of variables recommend a less seriousness in expressing apology.

Answers on this situation mentioned that 75.71% of the participants opted for option (B) 'I'm sorry about forgetting our appointment. I promise that I will try to make it better next time', while 24.29% of the students opted for option (A) in which the combination of strategies used is: expression of apology 'sorry' in addition to and explanation of the situation 'I could not cancel that meeting'. According to their choice of appropriate answers and their given explanations, students perceived the apology in terms of politeness regardless of the high or the low social power and social distance of the hearer.

Activity two:

In the second activity, students were required to say whether the provided apology in the given situations is appropriate or not then explain their answers.

Situation One:

James did not have time to change before going to the wedding of his best friend, and therefore he is wearing sports clothes.

James: I apologize for having come to your wedding wearing sports clothes, but I have just returned from a trip and I did not have time to stop by home and change.

(Appropriate/ Not appropriate)

Explain: …………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-25Analysis of Situation One (Act.2) According to Social Variables

Situations	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S1	S=H	-SD	Low

S=H: equal social power

-SD: low social distance

Table 2-26Students' Responses to Situation One (Act. 2)

Situation 1	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	37	52.86%
Not appropriate	28	40%
No answer	5	7.14 %
Explained	60	85.71%
Not explained	10	14.29%
Total	70	100 %

The speaker (S) and the hearer (H) in this situation have the same social power, but since they are best friends, they tend to have a low social distance with a low severity of offence. In this case, the hearer does not necessary require a formal or a serious apology and all structures can be appropriate in this situation.

However, the results in the second table (Table 2.31) showed that 52.86% of the participants considered the provided apology in the situation as "Appropriate", 40% as "Not Appropriate", while 7.14% of the students gave no answer. Concerning the answers' justifications, the table above showed that 14.29% of the participants did not provide a justification, while 85.71% of them have justified their answers, but only three participants showed some awareness in taking the social distance of the interlocutors into consideration when they mentioned the following justifications: 'he is my best-friend he is going to understand', 'it's ok since they are best-friends' and 'generally we use informal English when we speak with close friends'.

Situation Two:

Jhon lied to his best friend saying that he could not go with him to a game because he had a job in a different town. On fact, he wanted to spend the evening with his family. However, his friend finds out.

Jhon: I'm sorry… I … I told you I was in Tulsa because I wanted to spend the night with my family … Yeah … I feel so bad. Is there … is there anything I can do to make it up to you? (Appropriate/ Not appropriate)

Explain: ………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-27Analysis of Situation Two (Act.2) According to Social Variables

Situations	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S2	S=H	SD=SD	High

S=H: equal social power

SD=SD: equal social distance

Table 2-28Students' Responses to Situation Two (Act. 2)

Situation 1	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	30	42.86%
Not appropriate	38	54.29%
No answer	2	2.86 %
Explained	56	80%
Not explained	14	20%
Total	70	100 %

Regarding the second situation, the analysis showed that the interlocutors are so close to each other (best-friend) so they have equal social power and social distance; However, the severity of offence is said to be high. The apologizer in this case is required to provide an acceptable apology that may include a justification just to clear things for the offended person.

In analyzing the student's answers, the table above stated that 42.86% of the students considered the provided apology as 'appropriate', 54.29% as 'not appropriate', while the rest 2.86% left a blank answer. The 80% of the students who have explained their answers have referred to the aspect of politeness claiming that the apologizer have admitted his mistake and tried his best to explain the situation for his best friend, However, very few students

mentioned the relationship between the apologizer and the offended person saying that in such relations the language used is always appropriate.

Situation Three:

The night before her friend has an important speech to make at a conference, Sara delates by mistake her friend's speech from the computer.

Sara: Forgive me I'll stay up late and write another one as well as I can, or I'll help you if you accept that? (Appropriate/ Not appropriate)

Explain: …………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-29Analysis of Situation Three (Act.2) According to Social Variables

Situations	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S3	S=H	+SD	High

S=H: equal social power

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-30Students' Responses to Situation Three (Act. 2)

Situation 1	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	62	88.57%
Not appropriate	5	7.14%
No answer	3	2.49 %
Explained	55	78.57%
Not explained	15	21.43%
Total	70	100 %

The analysis of the above table indicated that the interlocutors in this situation are also friends i.e., have equal social power. But with high social distance and a high severity of offense. In this situation, according to the social factors, the speaker needs to provide and apology that may include an expression of apology plus an offer of repair.

The second table represents the analysis of the students' responses. It showed that '62' of them said that the provided apology is appropriate, five students said it is not where the last three participants did not answer the question. Concerning their justification, '55' students justified their answers by the need to take responsibility and committing making the mistake without making any reference to the difference in social distance between the speaker and the hearer; However, the rest of the students '15' did not provide any justification for their answers. This analysis clearly states that EFL students do not have a pragmatic awareness about the use of strategies to express apology.

Situations Four:

Sam is a friend of the groom's mother and he missed the wedding ceremony. He now meets the groom at the reception after the wedding ceremony.

Sam: I apologize for not having arrived on time, but my car broke down.

(Appropriate/ Not appropriate)

Explain: …………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-31 Analysis of Situation Four (Act.2) According to Social Variables

Situations	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S4	S=H	+SD	Low

S=H: equal social power

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-32Students' Responses to Situation Four (Act. 2)

Situation 1	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	44	62.86%
Not appropriate	18	25.71%
No answer	8	11.43 %
Explained	48	68.57%
Not explained	22	31.43
Total	70	100 %

As shown in the above table (Table 31.), both of the speaker (S) and the hearer (H) have equal social power with a high social distance and a low severity of offence. This relationship between the speaker (S) and the hearer(H) requires a serious and formal apology from the apologizer (S).

The second table (Table 32) stated that 44 Master students regarded the provided apology as appropriate, 18 as not appropriate and the rest 8 students left it blank. Regarding the explanation, 22 students gave no justification, while 48 of the students explained their choices by referring to politeness and taking responsibility of committing a mistake.

Activity Three:

Master one students, in this activity, were required to imagine themselves in the given situations and finish the incomplete dialogue with the most appropriate apology.

Situation One:

You are a professor. You promised to return a student's essay today, but you haven't finished reading it yet. The student showed up and asked for his essay. What would you say to him?

You: …………………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-33Analysis of Situation One (Act.3) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S1	S>H	SD=SD	High

S>H: speaker being more powerful than hearer

SD=SD: equalsocial distance

Table 2-34Students' Responses to Situation One (Act. 3)

Situation 1	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	28	40%
Not appropriate	28	40%
No answer	14	20%
Total	70	100 %

In the current situation, the speaker (S) is said to have higher social power over the hearer (H), the analysis also showed that there is a high social distance between the professor (S) and the student (H), with a high severity of offense. The results obtained from this analysis indicated the need for less serious expression of apology since the apologizer is more power over the offended person (student).

The above table stated that 40% of the students provided an appropriate apology, the same percentage (40%) provided an inappropriate apology; However, the rest of students gave no answers.

Situation Two: You are a waiter in an expensive restaurant. A costumer ordered beef but you brought chicken instead. The costumer mentioned the mistake you made. What would you say to the costumer?

You: ………………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-35Analysis of Situation Two (Act.3) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S2	S<H	+SD	High

S<H: speaker being more powerful than hearer

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-36Students' Responses to Situation Two (Act. 3)

Situation 2	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	50	71.43%
Not appropriate	11	15.71%
No answer	9	12.86%
Total	70	100 %

Regarding the second situation, the analysis showed that both of interlocutors ('S' and 'H') have both equal social power and social distance with a high severity of offence, which

means that the offended person gives no importance to any kind of apology the apologizer used. However, the need for an apology is still needed.

The analysis of the students' responses revealed that 71.43% of the answers were appropriate, 15.71% were in appropriate, while 9 participants did not provide an answer.

Situation Three: You are a student who is often late. Today you are late for a meeting with a friend you are working on an essay with. Your friend has been waiting for you for a long two hours. What would you say to your friend?

You: ……………………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-37Analysis of Situation Two (Act.3) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S3	S=H	SD=SD	Low

S=H: equal social power

SD=SD: equal social distance

Table 2-38Students' Responses to Situation Three (Act. 3)

Situation 3	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	23	32.86%
Not appropriate	28	54.29%
No answer	9	12.86%
Total	70	100 %

Regarding the third situation, the analysis showed that the interlocutors are close to each other (friends) so they have equal social power and social distance. However, the

severity of offence is said to be low. The apologizer in this case is required to provide an acceptable apology regardless of the strategies to be included.

The above table (2. 38.) showed that 23 of the answers were appropriate, 28 were not appropriate. However, 9 papers were left blank.

Situation Four:

You were in a bus and you bumped into another passenger and broke his computer. What would you say to the passenger?

You: …………………………………………………………………………...

Table 2-39Analysis of Situation Four (Act.3) According to Social Variables

Situation	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
S2	S=H	+SD	Low

S=H: equal social power

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-40Students' Responses to situation four (Act. 3)

Situation 2	Subjects	Percentage %
Appropriate	53	75.71%
Not appropriate	8	11.43%
No answer	11	15.71%
Total	70	100 %

Activity Four: In this activity students were provided with four different topics considering social variables. The instruction was to choose tow of the topics and write a short conversation where they express an apology, then to identify and explain the apology strategy used. After collecting the WDCT papers, we found that 29 students did not answer activity four.

a) Arriving late to an appointment (with your teacher)

Table 2-41Analysis of the First Topic (Act.4) According to Social Variables

Topic	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
T1	S<H	+SD	High

S<H: speaker being less powerful than hearer

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-42Students' Responses to the First Topic (Act. 4)

Topic 1	Subjects	Percentage %
Answered strategy	18	90%
Not answered strategy	2	10%
Explained	20	100%
Not explained	0	0%
Total	20	100 %

Regarding the first topic, the analysis showed that both of interlocutors ('S' and 'H') have both equal social power and social distance with a high severity of offence, which means that the offended person gives no importance to any kind of apology the apologizer used. However, the need for an apology is still needed.

The number of students who selected this topic was 20 students. According to the data collected, 18 students who have chosen the first topic answered the strategy question while 2 students did not provide an answer.11 students mentioned 4 different strategies namely, explaining the situation, admitting mistake, expressing regret and promising. However, all the participants who have explained their answers referred to politeness and taking responsibility without any reference to the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

b) Calling someone after 10 p.m. (wrong number)

Table 2-43Analysis of the Second Topic (Act.4) According to Social Variables

Topic	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
T2	S<H	+SD	High

S<H: speaker being less powerful than hearer

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-44 Students' Responses to the Second Topic (Act. 4)

Topic 2	Subjects	Percentage %
Answered strategy	22	91.67%
Not answered strategy	2	8.33%
Explained	21	87.5%
Not explained	3	12.5%
Total	24	100 %

According to the data showed in (Table2.48), the hearer in topic two is said to have more power over the speaker. The table also indicated a high social distance and a high severity of offense.

This topic was chosen by 24 students. The results in the above table stated that 22 students completed the strategy question, while two of them did not. Among the 22, students 19 students have successfully named types of apologies "giving explanation" such as in 'sorry, I wanted to call a friend' and "expression of apology' such as the expression 'I'm sorry I dialed the wrong number'. However, not all the strategies went accordingly with the expressed apology. The rest two students did not provide an answer. Concerning the justification, all the 21 students who completed this question did not succeed in to mention the expected explanation.

c) Breaking something, which does not belong to you (a classmate)

Table 2-45 Analysis of the Third Topic (Act.4) According to Social Variables

Topic	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
T3	S>H	-SD	Low

S>H: speaker being more powerful than hearer

+SD: high social distance

Table 2-46 Students' Responses to the Third Topic (Act. 4)

Topic 3	Subjects	Percentage %
Answered strategy	14	73.68%
Not answered strategy	5	26.32%
Explained	14	73.68%
Not explained	5	26.32%
Total	19	100 %

The analysis of this topic stated that the speaker (S) have a high social power over the hearer (H),while a low social distance and a low severity of offence were noticed. This combination of variables recommend a less seriousness in expressing apology.

Nineteen students have chosen this topic. Meanwhile, four apology strategies were highlighted by the twelve participants, 'an expression of apology', 'an expression of regret', 'an explanation of situation' and 'an offer of repair'. Those participants justified their answers in terms of politeness. However, the rest number of participants did not answer these two questions.

d) Losing your friend's copybook

Table 2-47Analysis of the Fourth Topic (Act.4) According to Social Variables

Topic	Social Power	Social Distance	Severity of Offense
T4	S=H	SD=SD	Low

S=H: equal social power

SD=SD: equal social distance

Table 2-48Students' Responses to the Fourth Topic (Act. 4)

Topic 4	Subjects	Percentage %
Answered strategy	16	88.89%
Not answered strategy	2	11.11%
Explained	16	88.89%
Not explained	2	11.11%
Total	18	100 %

Regarding the third situation, the analysis showed that the interlocutors are close to each other (friends) so they have equal social power and social distance. However, the

severity of offence is said to be low. The apologizer in this case is required to provide an acceptable apology regardless of the strategies to be included.

The last topic was chosen by 18 students. The analysis of the students' responses revealed that 88.89% of the students mentioned and explained a couple of strategies mainly an expression of apology, an expression of regret, giving explanation and promising. The rest of participants 11.11% did not provide neither a name of strategy nor an explanation.

The overall analysis of the students answers in the previous four activities can be summarized as follows:

Table 2-49The Overall Analysis of Activity One

	Appropriate answers	Not appropriate answers	Not answered	Not explained
S1	45.71%	50%	4.29%	5.71%
S2	42.86%	57.14%	0	5.71
S3	27.14%	72.86%	0	10%
S4	24.29%	75.71%	0	11.42

In the first activity the majority of the students provided answers to all the situations and explained them. However, their answers were not appropriate regarding when regarding the social variables mentioned in the above table (Table2. 49), especially in situations three and four. Also, students tended to fail and choosing the most appropriate apology strategy in different situations, and in defining the factors that control the appropriateness of the structures in which most of their explanations regarded the aspect of politeness. To sum up this first activity did not show neither pragmatic knowledge nor pragmatic awareness among Master one students.

Table 2-50The Overall Analysis of Activity Two

	Appropriate answers	Not appropriate answers	Not answered	Not explained
S1	52.86%	40%	7.14%	14.29%
S2	42.86%	54%	2.86%	20%
S3	88.57%	7.14%	2.29%	21.43%
S4	62.86%	25.71%	11.43%	31.43%

In the second activity, the number of students who did not provide an answer or an explanation increased in most situations. The students' performance in this activity was slightly better than in activity one, and this can be noticed from their answers. The students showed their ability to decide whether the provided apology is appropriate or not. Despite, their lack of awareness in explaining their choice, most of them referred to aspect of politeness. However, many other students skipped the part of justifying their answers which means that they might have selected their answers randomly.

Table 2-51The Overall Analysis of Activity Three

	Appropriate answers	Not appropriate answers	Not answered
S1	40%	40%	20%
S2	71.43%	15.71%	12.86%
S3	32.86%	54.29%	12.86%
S4	75.71%	11.43%	15.71%

Activity three showed a better students' performance in producing their own structures of apology compared to other activities, regardless of their knowledge about the social factors or any other factors that determine the appropriate structure to be used. They provided appropriate apologies in most situations. However, many other students did not answer all the situations.

Table 2-52Sum of the Students' Performance in Activity Four

	Answered strategy	Not answered strategy	Explained	Not explained
T1	20%	10%	100%	0%
T2	91.67%	8.33%	87.5%	12.5%
T3	73.68%	26.32%	73.68%	26.32%
T4	88.89%	11.11%	88.89%	11.11%

Concerning the last activity, 29 students did not answer the whole of it; while the rest of the students' provided answers except for some who skipped the part of justifying their use of apology strategies. The results of this activities showed that Master one students at the department of English have some knowledge about the different strategies of the speech act of apology and have the ability to perform different combinations of structures. However, they still have a lack of awareness regarding taking into consideration the different social factors that take control over the use of appropriate apology structures.

2.6   The Overall Analysis

The analysis of the teachers' questionnaire revealed that the majority of the English teachers are highly qualified to evaluate students' knowledge and ability to use language

appropriately in different contexts, since most of the participants hold a Doctorate degree. This qualification also appeared when a large number of participants has been teaching English for more than eight years. In addition to that, the various modules taught by teachers give another advantage for them to observe the students' pragmatic awareness in different contexts. However, answers obtained from questions four and five showed that despite the average level of EFL students in using language for communication they still need assistance and guidance in order to communicate effectively.

Concerning teaching pragmatics, the resulted answers clearly demonstrated the efforts done by teachers of different modules to include the use of different areas of pragmatics in their teaching, especially speech acts. Teachers also worked on raising the students' pragmatic awareness using both implicit and explicit methods depending on the context. Teachers assumed that among the different kinds of speech act used by EFL learners, apologies are the most commonly used, still learners are not knowledgeable of its structures and their use in appropriate context. This result can be clearly confirmed when teachers claimed the use of "expression of apology" strategy by students in most situations, which means that they have no awareness of the appropriate strategies that must be used in different situations.

Furthermore, teachers' responses in question fourteen revealed that most of participants include the aspect of culture when teaching the speech act of apology. In other words, learners are supposed to be aware of the appropriate structures to be used in given situations within the culture they are exposed to.

In raising the pragmatic awareness of EFL students, most teachers agreed on the use classroom discussions, role plays and task repetition. However, the majority of them considered the technique of classroom discussions as the most effective one where both

teachers and students exchange and practice their knowledge. Role plays, as well, give students a good opportunity to practice the learnt structures.

Additionally, teaching pragmatics, in general, and speech act of apology, in particular, according to the participant teachers did not get their due share in the present curriculum. The reasons selected by the participants showed that the curriculum adopted in the English Department gives less importance for teaching pragmatics and the speech act of apology due to the time provided and the lack of knowledge and materials.

The overall results collected from both the teachers' questionnaire and the students' WDCT go in a line of each other. The results collected from the teachers' questionnaire stated that Master one learners have a difficulty in using their pragmatic knowledge in appropriate contexts which is demonstrated in their use of appropriate strategies in expressing apologies. In fact, students still need further instructions from their teachers in order to communicate appropriately. Moreover, both of the results confirmed the students' use of limited apology strategies in different situations. Thus, to answer the first question stated in the general introduction about the strategies used by Master one students, data obtained revealed that among the most frequent strategies mentioned by both teachers and students are "the expression of apology" and "giving explanation". Second, the results of the WDCT, on the other hand, showed no awareness, from the part of the students, concerning the different strategies that can be used to express apologies, and the different social factors inherent in the choice of appropriate strategies in different communicative situations, as well, the only factors that is taken into account is politeness. Third, the teachers' questionnaire answered the last research question about the techniques used by teachers to raise EFL learners' pragmatic awareness in using the speech act of apology, the results stated that the mostly used techniques are task repetition, classroom discussions and role plays. Finally, the results revealed the presence of teachers' awareness of the cross-cultural differences in using speech

act of apology. The results of this study confirmed the research hypothesis. Because of the lack of pragmatic awareness EFL learners fail in using different ways and expressions to produce the speech act of apology appropriately in different contexts of situation

General Conclusion

The current study investigated the pragmatic awareness in using the speech act of apology by Master one learners at the department of English, at Mohammed Seddik Ben yahia University. The aim of the study was to investigate the Master One learners' pragmatic awareness of the use of the speech act of apology. Specifically, it attempted to diagnose the different strategies used by Master One students to express apologies in different communicative situations. It, also, tried to explore the methods and practices adopted by teachers to raise the students' pragmatic awareness. To achieve the objectives of this work, two research tools were used. The questionnaire was administered to 21 teachers, whereas the written discourse completion test was designed for 70 Master one students.

The research study was made up of two chapters. The first chapter was divided into two sections which discussed the literature review. Section one covered pragmatic awareness. It included the definition of the key terms like pragmatics, pragmatic awareness, approaches and the areas of teaching pragmatics. The section, also, presented the most effectively techniques that are used by teachers to help raising learner's pragmatic awareness. Moreover, the section two dealt with the speech act of apology. It introduced the definition of the speech act and the main theories related to it. Additionally, the act of apology was defined, along with a presentation of the classification and the strategies used in expressing the speech act of apology by different scholars. Furthermore, the second chapter consisted a description of the questionnaire and the written discourse completion task with an analysis and interpretation of the results obtained from both tools. The limitations of the study are then mentioned with some pedagogical recommendations.

The findings of the study showed that Master one students face difficulties in using their pragmatic knowledge in appropriate contexts to achieve successful communication

illustrated in the use of appropriate strategies in expressing apology. It also revealed that students still need extra guidance and instruction from their teachers. In addition, the results showed a lack of the students' pragmatic awareness regarding the different strategies to be used to express the speech act of apology, and the different social factors inherent in choosing the appropriate strategies in different contexts. The most commonly used strategies among the students were expression of apology and giving an explanation and the only social factor that is taken into consideration is politeness. Finally, the findings emphasized three techniques that are used by teachers in order to raise their learners' pragmatic awareness namely, task repetition, classroom discussions and role plays. The findings of this study showed that Master one students find difficulties in choosing the appropriate strategies to express apology in different contexts. Thus, the hypothesis stated in the general introduction is confirmed. In other words, students' lack of pragmatic awareness leads to their inability to produce appropriate apologies in different communicative situations.

Limitations of the study

The study encountered some difficulties. Some of which are:

➢ The results of the current study cannot be generalized to all Master one students.

➢ The absence of natural and spontaneous interaction between the interlocutors in WDCT made the results obtained difficult to analyze and too reliable.

➢ Due to the nature of the topic discussed in the dissertation, the participant teachers avoided and hesitated to complete the questionnaire.

Pedagogical Recommendations

In the light of the findings of the present study, the following recommendations are suggested:

- ➢ Due to its importance for achieving successful communication, teachers should develop their knowledge of the pragmatics of English regardless of their specialties.

- ➢ Teachers should give pragmatics its due share in their teaching curriculum through adopting new strategies to explain the different norms of English use which, in return, helps to raise their students' awareness.

- ➢ EFL learners need to be more knowledgeable about the different strategies of expressing the speech act of apology through the extensive practice in role plays or real-life discussion with their peers.

- ➢ EFL learners should take into consideration the different social factors that control the use of appropriate apology strategies by interacting with English language speakers.

List of References

Abdulbaki, K., Suhaimi, M., Alsaqqaf, A., & Jawad, W. (2018). The Use of the Discussion

Method at University: Enhancement of Teaching and Learning. *International*

Journal of HigherEducation, *7*(6), 118-128.Retrieved from

https://www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/ijhe .

Abdulghani, C.A.B., & Abdulahi, M.A.(2021). The meaning and scope of pragmatics.

International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 5(5), 102-

105.

Ahmadian, M. J. (2012). Task repetition in ELT. *ELT journal*, *66*(3), 380-382. Retrieved from

https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs020.

Ahmet, C. E. B. İ., & Babayiğit, M. V. (2021). A Cross-cultural study of the speech act of

apology by Turkish and Kurdish speakers of English and the native speakers of

English. *Şarkiyat*, *13*(2), 902-916. Retrieved from

https://doi.org/10.26791/sarkiat.937046

Alzeebaree, Y., & Yavuz, M. A. (2017). Realization of the speech acts of request and apology

by Middle Eastern EFL learners. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and*

Technology Education, *13*(11), 7313-7327.

Amraoui, R. (2019). A Study about the used of politeness strategies in refusal speech acts in

relation to gender as an influential factor ,the case of third year students of

English.(p.11).(Master's Dissertation, MKU of Biskra)

Bagarić, V., & Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2007). Defining communicative competence.

METODIKA*: časopis za teoriju i praksu metodika u predškolskom odgoju,*

školskoj i visokoškolskoj izobrazbi, *8*(14), 84-93.

Borer, B. (2018). Teaching and learning pragmatics and speech acts: An instructional

pragmatics curriculum development project for EFL learners.

Castillo, R. E. E., & Eduardo, R. (2009). *The role of pragmatics in second language*

teaching.(p.32). (Doctoral dissertation, SIT Graduate Institute). Retrieved from

https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1479&context=ipp_collection

Deda, N. (2013). The role of Pragmatics in English language teaching. Pragmatic competence.

Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, *2*(4), 68. Retrieved from

https://www.richtmann.org/journal/index.php/ajis/article/view/106

Demeter, G. (2006). *A pragmatic study of apology strategies in Romanian (pp.12-15).*(

Master's Degree, Oklahoma State University).

Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Mardani, M. (2010). Investigating the effects of teaching apology

speech act, with a focus on intensifying strategies, on pragmatic development

of EFL learners: The Iranian context. *The International Journal of Language*

Society and Culture, *30*(1), 96-103. Retrieved from

https://aaref.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/30-8.pdf

Farahian, M., & Rezaee, M. (2015). Language awareness in EFL context: An overview.

International Journal of Language, Literature and Culture, *2*(2), 19-21. Retrieved

from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277076010_Language_Awareness_in_EFL_Context

_An_Overview .

Fattah, S. (2018). Role-play as an independent learning technique in developing semantic &

pragmatic competence. *Annals of Language and Literature*, *2*(1), 27-32.

Feratha, M. (2015). *Developing pragmatic awareness and communicative competence of*

Third year students of English, University of Constantine1.(pp.39-89) (Doctoral

dissertation, جامعة الإخوة منتوري قسنطينة).

Hidayat, A. (2016). Speech acts: Force behind words. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris*

Bahasa Inggris, *9*(1), 1-12. Retrieved from

https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/60843-EN-speech-acts-force-behind-

words.pdf

Horn, L., & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics (p.55).* Blackwell

Publishing Ltd.

Paralinguistic language features. (2015). Retrieved from

https://educationalresearchtechniques.com/2015/05/12/paralinguistic-language-

features/

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. (p.2).Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Sapoetra, J. (2019, April). Cross-Cultural Studies and Pragmatic Awareness. In *WoMELA-GG*

2019: The 1st Workshop on Multimedia Education, Learning, Assessment and its

Implementation in Game and Gamification in conjunction with COMDEV 2018,

Medan Indonesia, 26th January 2019, WOMELA-GG (p. 303). European Alliance for

Innovation. Retrieved from https://eudl.eu/pdf/10.4108/eai.26-1-2019.2282940

Taghizadeh, R. (2017). *Pragmatic competence in the target language: A study of Iranian*

Learners of English. (pp.204-205). University of Salford (United Kingdom).

Taguchi, ²N. (Ed.). (2019).*The Routeldge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and*

Pragmatics (pp.17-18*)*.New York: Routledge.

Thijittang, S. (2010). *A Study of pragmatic strategies of English of Thai university students:*

Apology speech acts (pp. 31-35) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tasmania)

Appendices

Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teachers,

We humbly request you to spare some of your precious time to help us in completing data by filling up the following questionnaire. This questionnaire is a part of a research work about students' pragmatic awareness of using the speech act of apology.

 Please use a tick (√) to choose the options you think appropriate or provide your own answers when needed.

   May I thank you in advance for your collaboration.

Pragmatics is

   The study of natural language understanding, and specifically the study of how context influences the interpretation of meanings. It is a subfield of linguistics.

Part one: Background Information

1. What degree do you hold?

      a) License ☐

      b) Master ☐

      c) Magister ☐

      d) Doctorate ☐

2. How long have you been teaching English?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………….

3. Which modules do you usually teach?

   …………………………………………………………………………………..

Part Two: Teaching Pragmatics

4. How do you see your student's level in using language for communication?

   a) Excellent ☐

   b) Good ☐

   c) Average ☐

   d) Not bad ☐

   e) Very bad ☐

5. Do you think that EFL learners need instruction to use language appropriately for communication?

   Yes   No   ☐   ☐

6. Do you incorporate or include English pragmatics elements in your teaching?

   Yes ☐   No ☐

7. If no, why?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………

8. How do you teach English language use?

   Implicitly ☐

   Explicitly ☐

   Both ☐

9. Which areas of English pragmatics do you incorporate?

   a) Presupposition (the relationship between two sentences in which the truth or   ☐

      falsity of one is a necessary condition for the truth or falsity of the other)

b) Entailment (a logical relationship between two propositions in which the truth of one strongly suggests the truth of the other) ☐

c) Speech act ☐

d) Deixis (how language is used in connection to time, location and speaker's utterance) ☐

e) Others ……………………………………………………………………………

Part Three: Teaching the Speech Act of Apology

10. How do you rate your students' level of using different English speech acts?

    a) Excellent ☐

    b) Good ☐

    c) Average ☐

    d) Weak ☐

    e) Extremely weak ☐

11. Which kind of speech act do your students usually use?

    a) Suggestions ☐

    b) Requests ☐

    c) Apologies ☐

    d) Compliments ☐

    e) Others…………………………………………………………………………

12. Are they knowledgeable of the different structures and appropriate use of apology?

Yes ☐   No ☐

13. What are the most commonly used apology strategies (structures) by the students?

    e) Expression of apology ☐

    f) Acknowledgement of responsibility ☐

    g) Offer of Repair ☐

    ☐

h) A request for forgiveness

i) A promise of forbearance [ ]

14. When using the speech act of apology do you refer to or speak about culture?

Yes [ ]   No [ ]

15. What are the techniques or the strategies that you usually use in raising the student's pragmatic awareness?

a) Classroom discussions [ ]

b) Role-plays [ ]

c) Task Repetition [ ]

16. Do you think that the teaching of English pragmatics, in general, and the different types of speech acts, in particular, got their due share in the present curriculum?

Yes [ ]   No [ ]

-If no, is it because

a) The lack of teacher's knowledge [ ]

b) The lack of time devoted [ ]

c) The lack of materials [ ]

d) Other reasons……………………………………………………………..

Section Four: Further Suggestions

Please, add any further comment or suggestion regarding the teaching of the speech act of apology

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………

……

The Written Discourse Completion Test

Dear students,

We would be so grateful if you complete this small test about the way, you express apology. Please follow the instructions in each of the following activities.

Thank you in advance.

Activity 1: The following situations offer two different ways of apology. **Circle** the appropriate answer (A or B) and **explain** your choice:

Situation One: You stepped slightly on the foot of a woman while you are trying to sit down, but it was impossible for you to avoid doing this, as the woman had extended her legs too far towards the front sit. Still, you felt the need to apologize.

Woman: Ah, Be careful!

You: A) Sorry, but you should not have extended your legs so far.

B) I deeply regret having hurt you.

Explain: ……………………………………………………………………………………………

Situation Two: You and your friend did a role-play for a speaking test in an English class. The conversation was not smooth because you didn't prepare well. *Your friend was upset. What would you say to your friend after the test?*

You   A) sorry I should have prepared well.

B) Sorry I had too much pressure this week that's why I could not prepare well.

Explain: ……………………………………………………………………………………

Situation Three: You had to discuss some of your problems with your teacher but due to a traffic jam, you came 45 minutes late. What would you say to your supervisor when you see him/her?

> *Your teacher: You are 45 minutes late.*

> *You: A) Sorry! I am late. The traffic was very heavy.*

> *B) I realize that I was wrong, please forgive me. It won't happen again.*

Explain: ……………………………………………………………………………………

Situation Four: You have promised your younger brother to take him to the park on Sunday. But on Sunday evening, some of your friends came to meet you and you couldn't go with him. You also forgot to do so. What would you say to him?

> *You: A) Sorry I could not cancel that meeting*

> *B) I'm sorry about forgetting our appointment. I promise that I will try to make it better next time.*

Explain: ……………………………………………………………………………………

Activity 2: As an English language speaker, please <u>say</u> whether the provided apology in the following situations <u>is appropriate or not</u> and <u>explain</u> why.

Situation One: James did not have time to change before going to the wedding of his best friend, and therefore he is wearing sports clothes.

> *James: I apologize for having come to your wedding wearing sports clothes, but I have just returned from a trip and I did not have time to stop by home and change.*

(Appropriate/ Not Appropriate)

Explain: **……………………………………………………………………………………..**

Situation Two: Jhon lied to his best friend saying that he could not go with him to a game because he had to be at his job in a different town. In fact, he wanted to spend the evening with his family. However, his friend finds out.

> *Jhon: I'm sorry… I… I told you I was in Tulsa because I wanted to spend the night with my family… Yeah… I feel so bad. Is there… is there anything I can do to make it up to you?"*

(Appropriate/ Not Appropriate)

Explain: **…………………………………………………………………………………**

Situation Three: The night before her friend has an important speech to make at a conference, Sara deletes by mistake her friend's speech from the computer. She now tells this to her friend.

> *Sara: 'Forgive me, I'll stay up late and write another one as well as I can, or I'll help you if you accept that?*

(Appropriate/ Not Appropriate)

Explain: **…………………………………………………………………………………**

Situation Four: Sam is a friend of the groom's mother and he missed the wedding ceremony. He now meets the groom at the reception after the wedding ceremony.

> *Sam: 'I apologize for not having arrived on time, but my car broke down.'*

(Appropriate/ Not Appropriate)

Explain: **…………………………………………………………………………………**

Activity 3: Each of the following situations requires an apology. As a speaker of English language, what would you say if you were the person involved?

Situation 1: You are a professor. You promised to return a student's essay today but you haven't finished reading it yet. The student showed up and asked for his essay. What would you say to him?

You: ………………………………………………………………………………

Situation 2: You are a waiter in an expensive restaurant. A costumer ordered beef but you brought chicken instead. The costumer mentions the mistake you made. What would you say to the costumer**?**

You: ………………………………………………………………………………

Situation3: You are a student who is often late. Today you are late for a meeting with a friend you are working on an essay with. Your friend has been waiting for you for two hours. What would you say to your friend?

You: ………………………………………………………………………………

Situation 4: You were in a bus and you bumped into another passenger and broke his computer. What would you say to the passenger?

You: ………………………………………………………………………………

Activity 4: Choose **<u>TWO</u>** of the topics below to write a short conversation where you express an apology, then identify and explain the apology strategy used.

       a) Arriving late to an appointment (with your teacher)

       b) Calling someone after 10 p.m. (wrong number)

       c) Breaking something, which does not belong to you (a classmate)

d) Losing your friend's copybook (a close friend)

Situation One: **...**

You: …………………………………………………………………………..

Strategy Used: ………………………………………………………………….

Explanation: …………………………………………………………………

Situation Two: ....

You: …………………………………………………………………………..

Strategy Used: ………………………………………………………………….

Explanation: …………………………………………………………………

Résumé

Un apprentissage réussi de l'EFL implique non seulement la connaissance de ses règles, mais également l'application appropriée de ces règles et normes d'utilisation dans des contextes réels. Pour exprimer l'acte de parole d'excuse, en tant qu'aspect du langage en usage, les apprenants doivent être conscients des stratégies utilisées et des facteurs sociaux impliqués dans la production d'actes appropriés dans diverses situations de communication. La présente étude a trois objectifs. Premièrement, diagnostiquer la conscience pragmatique des étudiants de M1 dans l'utilisation de l'acte de parole d'excuse. Deuxièmement, il tente d'étudier les différentes stratégies utilisées par les élèves pour s'excuser dans différentes situations de communication. Enfin, il cherche à explorer les pratiques des enseignants adoptées pour éveiller la conscience pragmatique de leurs élèves. Il est supposé que si les étudiants de M1 ont la conscience pragmatique requise, ils utiliseront différentes manières et expressions pour produire l'acte de parole d'excuse de manière appropriée. Afin de tester cette hypothèse, deux outils de recherche sont utilisés ; un questionnaire destiné aux enseignants et une tâche de complétion de discours écrit administrée aux étudiants de M1 du département d'anglais de l'Université Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia. Les résultats révèlent que les étudiants de M1 rencontrent des difficultés à utiliser leurs connaissances pragmatiques pour produire des excuses appropriées dans différents contextes. Par conséquent, ils ne sont pas conscients des normes pragmatiques de l'utilisation des excuses. Les données obtenues montrent que les stratégies les plus fréquemment utilisées par les élèves sont « l'expression d'excuses » et « l'explication ». Les enseignants, pour leur part, ont utilisé la répétition de tâches, les jeux de rôle et la discussion en classe comme techniques pour éveiller la conscience pragmatique de

leurs apprenants. En conséquence, il est recommandé aux enseignants de donner à la pragmatique sa place dans leur programme d'enseignement en adoptant de nouvelles stratégies pour expliquer les différentes normes d'utilisation de l'anglais et en sensibilisant les étudiants.

Mots clés : Compétence pragmatique, Conscience pragmatique, Acte de parole d'excuses.

ملخص

لا يتطلب التعلم الناجح للغة الانجليزية كلغة اجنبية معرفة قواعدها فحسب، بل يشمل ايضا الاخذ بعين الاعتبار استعمال وتطبيق هذه القواعد بطريقة تتلاءم مع سياق الكلام والمعنى المراد ابلاغه للمستمع. للتعبير عن الاعتذار كنوع من انواع التواصل في اللغة، على المتعلم ان يكون على دراية بمختلف الاساليب، الاستراتيجيات وكذلك المعايير التي تساعد على استعمال الطرق المناسبة لإنجاح عملية التواصل في مختلف المواقف. هذه الدراسة تحمل في طياتها ثلاثة اهداف. اولا، معرفة مدى وعي طلبة السنة اولى ماستر لغة انجليزية بتقنية الاعتذار. ثانيا، دراسة مختلف الاستراتيجيات التي يستخدمها الطلبة للتعبير عن اعتذارهم في مختلف المواقف. اخيرا، تسعى الى دراسة الاستراتيجيات المتبعة من طرف الاساتذة من اجل رفع الوعي البراغماتي لدى الطلبة. الفرضية المقترحة في هذه الدراسة هي انه إذا كان لدى طلبة السنة اولى ماستر الوعي العلمي المطلوب فسيستخدمون اساليب واستراتيجيات مختلفة للتعبير عن اعتذارهم بطريقة ملائمة في مختلف المواقف. من اجل اختبار هذه الفرضية تم اعتماد اداتين للبحث. استبيان للأساتذة واختبار مكتوب لطلبة السنة اولى ماستر في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة محمد الصديق بن يحي. كشفت النتائج أن طلاب السنة اولى ماستر يواجهون صعوبات في استخدام مخزونهم المعرفي من اجل التعبير عن اعتذارهم بطرق مناسبة في سياقات مختلفة. لذلك، فهم غير مدركين للمعايير البراغماتية لاستخدام الاعتذارات. تظهر البيانات التي تم الحصول عليها أن الاستراتيجيات الأكثر استخدامًا من قبل الطلاب هي "التعبير عن الاعتذار" و "التوضيح". من ناحية أخرى، استخدم المعلمون تكرار المهام ولعب الأدوار واسلوب المناقشة داخل القسم كتقنيات لرفع الوعي العملي لدى المتعلمين. وفقًا لذلك، يوصى بأن يعطي المعلمون البراغماتية مكانها في برنامجهم التدريسي من خلال تبني استراتيجيات جديدة لشرح المعايير المختلفة لاستخدام اللغة الإنجليزية وزيادة الوعي بين الطلاب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الكفاءة البراغماتية، الوعي البراغماتي، فعل الكلام الاعتذاري.