2013

Cross Cultural Pragmatics: A Study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey

Mehmet Aydin
Minnesota State University - Mankato

Cross cultural Pragmatics: A study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers,

American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey

By

Mehmet Aydin

A Thesis Submitted for the Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In

Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

May 2013

Title: Cross cultural Pragmatics: A study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish

speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of

English in Turkey

(Mehmet Aydin)

This thesis has been examined and approved by the following members of the
thesis committee.

_____

Dr. Nancy Drescher, Advisor

_____

Jessica Schomberg. Second Reader

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Tables

Abstract

The study aims to identify and compare apology strategies used in Turkish, American English, and advanced non-native speakers of English in Turkey. In order to identify and compare the norms of apologizing in Turkish, English, and non-native English speakers in Turkey, apologies given to the same situations from these three different groups of participants were analyzed. The results from the Native Speakers of Turkish (NST) and Native Speakers of English (NSE) groups were used to identify the norms of apologies in these languages. Then, NNSE participants' responses were compared to the norms to be able to identify transfers from L1 to L2. Data were collected via a discourse completion test (DCT) from 29 native speakers of English, 30 native speakers of Turkish, and 15 nonnative speakers of English in Turkey. The DCT was administered in Turkish for the NST participants and in English for the NNSE and NSE participants. Results of the study revealed that advanced nonnative speakers showed similarities in their apologies in terms of general strategies, although in their modification of strategies they showed usage of L1 forms.

Key Words: pragmatics, apologies, cross-cultural, Turkish pragmatics, apology speech acts.

Chapter I: Introduction

Language, as the main way of communication among humans, holds a crucial role on understanding and expressing the world around us and beyond. Because of this crucial importance of language in the social life of humans, it has been investigated from different dimensions such as structure, sound processes, and cultural aspects. The main aspect of language investigated by the current paper is the cultural aspect and variations of language, which can be referred to as pragmatics. Cutting (2008) describes pragmatics as a field of linguistics which examines the language and language variations according to the contexts in which they are used. One of the most prominent contexts of the language is the cultural environment in which the language is used. La Castro (2012) states that actions such as asking someone to close the door or ordering coffee at a coffee shop are closely related to the social environment. The way people use the language changes from one culture to another, and not knowing these cultural norms might affect the effectiveness of communication. First of all, to be able to analyze cultural norms and understandings, language function should be identified. Speech act theory was developed to identify the aim of the language used and the underlying meaning (Cutting, 2008). In speech act theory, one could identify the language use and its purpose, such as an apology, request, or refusal. The theory allows researchers to investigate the language use in a deeper manner. Speech act theory will be explained in more detail in the following chapters of the current paper.

The fact of the cultural differences in language use has caused researchers and teachers to question teaching methodology and language competency because grammatical, syntactic, and semantic competence alone cannot be enough to

communicate efficiently. Pragmatic competence, which refers to the ability to communicate efficiently in the context of the language use, came into the attention of the scholars and teachers. The importance of pragmatic competence can be explained within a language situation; for example in Japan saying, "I am sorry" might be enough of an apology in many situations, whereas in other cultures such as that of Jordan, an explanation for the offense might be required (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2008). Reaching the competence in the structure of a language might not mean that communication can be utilized efficiently. To be able to reach a better communicative or pragmatic competence, understanding the target culture and language use in that culture plays a crucial role. Second language learning (SLL) also includes comparing and contrasting the L1 and L2 pragmatics. Thus, researchers have been trying to analyze and compare different language and cultures and how learners acquire pragmatics. Although, cross-cultural pragmatics have been studied vigorously, it seems that there is a need for further research, particularly in the area of examining Turkish pragmatics and English learners in Turkey. Since the main goal of language teaching is leaning towards communicative competence, the importance of understanding the differences between Turkish and English and also the performances of Turkish learners is crucial. Due to the unique cultural fabric of Turkey and the Turkish language, it can be deceiving to make assumptions based on another culture's pragmatic norms. For better achievement in teaching language practices, analyzing Turkish pragmatic norms can play a crucial role in terms of the development of pragmatic competence of English learners in Turkey.

The current study aims to bring light to the differences in pragmatics of Turkish language and American English in order to provide a better chance to instruct students

and help them improve their pragmatic skills. The current study specifically investigates how apologies differ in Turkish and American English, and also how English learners in Turkey use apologies in English. First the study aims to create a comparison between Turkish and English apologies so that the pragmatic norms of each language can be identified and compared. Second, it is important to understand if learners of English in Turkey use American English apology strategies because misuse of pragmatic norms might cause communication problems. Given the importance of English as a lingua franca and the fact that it is the prominent foreign language taught in Turkey, it is crucial to identify the differences in pragmatics of these two languages to be able to reach better language instruction. The current study aims to find answers the following questions:

1) What are the differences in apology strategies between Turkish and English?

2) What pragmatic norms do advanced level EFL students use in their apologies? Are there transfers from L1 to L2?

The second chapter provides a review of literature that compares and contrasts other studies in the field of apology speech acts so that the understanding of the topic can be improved. Chapter III provides the methodology used to elicit data for the study and provides valuable information about the participants, instrument, procedures, and the analysis framework. Chapter IV presents the results of the data collection and discusses the findings in order to answer the research questions. Chapter V summarizes the results and provides a general overview of the results by including a discussion of the findings and interpretations that can be derived from the results. Chapter VI offers a conclusion to the study by including limitations of the study, suggestions for further research and teaching implications.

Chapter II: Review of Literature

In every culture, people have their unique ways of conveying meaning through language; it is important to understand the variations in communication patterns and meanings related to the context to be able to learn and teach a language. One area of linguistics, pragmatics, examines these variations. To be able to communicate and function effectively in the target language context, a learner should be able to understand the pragmatics of the target language, otherwise the communication might not be conducted efficiently. Thus. pragmatic competence is an important aspect of language learning and second language acquisition.

Given the importance of pragmatic competence, it is crucial to understand the pragmatics of both the native language and the target language. When specific pragmatic features are better understood, both teachers and learners can benefit from this knowledge. To improve the understanding and usage of language, many researchers have investigated different areas of pragmatics. Among these areas, speech acts have been investigated vigorously. First defined by Austin (1962), Speech Act Theory aims to explain the language as a series of actions. In this theory, speech acts are categorized into five main domains according to how listeners and speakers are affected by the communication (Celce - Murcia & Olshtain, 2007). These categories include assertives, directives, commisives, expressives, and declarations.

 Apologies, under the category of expressives in Speech Act Theory, have been one of the main foci in the field of pragmatics because of their importance in human communication as an act of face-saving and politeness. To be able to reach a clearer understanding of apologies, researchers have approached the matter in different ways.

One of the most crucial approaches is to classify apology strategies, such as in Cohen & Olshtain (1983) where they created a classification of universally occurring apology speech acts. These classifications are generally referred to as taxonomies or coding schemes and are used by many other researchers. Researchers have used these classifications to further examine apology patterns in languages and provide more consistency across studies.

Because of its importance as a second or foreign language, English is one of the most widely studied languages. One of the cornerstone studies in the area of apology use, focusing only on English, was conducted by Holmes (1990). Researchers have since aimed to investigate different languages and comparisons of apology strategies in different languages by using similar taxonomies created by early scholars. For example Jordanian Arabic speakers have been compared to British English speakers (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2008), Persian speakers to British English speakers (Chamani & Zareipur, 2010) and Setswana to English speakers (Kasanga & Lwanga-Lumu, 2007). These studies have aimed to find out what kinds of apology strategies are used in different languages and how they differ from each other in different contexts by comparing the native speakers' choices of apology strategies.

In addition to comparing apology use in different languages, researchers have also worked to better understand pragmatic competence or teaching of languages by investigating language learners' usage of apology strategies and suggesting possible teaching implications (Beckwith & Dweaele, 2008; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein, 1986; Dalmau & Gotor, 2007; Kondo, 1997; Shardakova, 2005; Trosborg, 1987).   The cornerstone project in the field of second language

pragmatics, A Cross-cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCASRP), was conducted by Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984). The study set a benchmark for the cross-cultural pragmatics research with the amount of languages investigated and the methodology used for the project. Another study conducted by Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein (1986) investigated Hebrew native speakers' apologies in English as L2, and Trosborg (1987) Dutch native speakers' apologies in English as L2. Also, there are different studies focusing on the same language from different dimensions (Kondo, 1997; Beckwith & Dweaele, 2008). Beckwith & Dweaele (2008), have investigated native English speakers' apologies in comparison with those learning Japanese, and Kondo (1997) studied the apologies of Japanese native speakers in English as L2 More recently Dalmau & Gotor (2007) looked at Catalan native speakers' apologies in English as L2, Shardakova (2005) English natives speakers' apologies in Russian as L2. The studies mentioned above are discussed in depth in the following sections of this chapter.

A limited numbers of studies have been done relating to apology strategies in Turkish. Most recently, though, Tuncel (2011) investigated the apology strategies used by prep-school students and senior year college students in comparison with native English speakers. Tuncel (2011) aimed to find out the progress of pragmatic competence of the students throughout their college education, especially for English language teaching majors. Another study was done by İstifçi (2009) to investigate apology strategies engaged by intermediate and advanced English learners in comparison to native speakers of English. The study investigated the pragmatic competence performed by two different proficiency groups in comparison to Turkish and English norms. These two studies are the only studies that have been found by the researcher of the current paper that aim to

investigate Turkish and English pragmatics. Even though the studies provide valuable information about apologies in Turkish, English, and EFL students in Turkey, they do not seem enough to draw conclusions about the topic.

Apology Speech Acts

Speech Act Theory aims to explain language exchange in terms of the effects on listeners and speakers. Austin (1962) first suggested speech act theory by claiming that constatives and performatives are the two main acts of speech. Constatives are statements that can be judged in terms of truth. Constatives in that sense are statements that do not cause actions. On the other hand, performatives are statements that can be evaluated in terms of felicity, or in terms of their actions. These two types of acts of speech are the basis of the language classification that led to a deeper analysis of the language. Searle (1969) had a systematic approach and classified speech acts under five main categories: assertives, directives, commisives, expressives, and declarations. The explanation below in Table 1.0 was adopted from Verschueren (1999).

Table 1.0 Speech Acts (Verschuren, 1999)

Speech Act	Definition	Example
Assertives	Expressing a belief, committing the speaker to truth of what is asserted. E.g. statements	We watched a movie yesterday.
Directives	Expressing a wish, making an attempt to get to hearer to do something.	Bring me some hot water.

	E.g. requests	
Commisives	Expressing an intention, commitment for the speaker to engage in a future action. E.g. promises, offers	I promise, I will complete the work by tomorrow.
Expressives	Expressing a variety of psychological states. E.g. apologies	I am sorry for my disrespectful behavior.
Declarations	Bring about a change via words. E.g. baptizing, declaring war, abdicating	Hereby I pronounce you husband and wife.

Under the category of expressives, apology speech acts hold an important place in human communication as a face saving act of speech. Thus it is crucial for people to understand what an apology is and how it functions. An act of apology can be considered a remedial act of speech, which means that the speaker is trying to save his or her face because of an action. Cohen & Olshtain (1983) explains apologies as a speech act occurring between two participants in which one of the participants expects or perceives oneself deserving a compensation or explanation because of an offense committed by the other. In that situation, one participant has a choice to apologize or deny the responsibility or the severity of the action. Thus, an apology in that sense plays a role as a politeness strategy. Apology speech strategies are classified by the seminal work of

Cohen & Olshtain (1983), which has been mainly used by other researchers as formulaic expressions which are also can be referred as direct apologies, or indirect apologies which include an explanation or account, acknowledgement of responsibility, offer of repair, promise of forbearance. The apologies might be modified by using a combination of apology strategies together or with intensifiers such as adverbs to intensify the apology, or they might be modified to decrease the responsibility of the offender.

Direct Apologies

According to Cohen & Olshtain (1983), an expression of apology mostly includes explicit illocutionary force indicating devices (IFID), which are utterances or formulaic expressions which convey the meaning of apology or regret. These formulaic expressions include performative verbs such as " be sorry," "apologize," or "excuse." Since this type of apology includes direct utterances of regret and apology, they are considered to be direct apologies. In the case of English, data have shown that direct apologies are the most widely used apology strategies of all. Holmes (1990) mentions apology strategies used in New Zealand English, by using an ethnographic study in which she composed a corpus based on ethnographic methodology by collecting data based on naturally occurring conversations and apology exchanges with the help of college students. Completing the study, she found out that almost exactly half of the apologies included an expression of apology, especially expressing regret for an action.

Indirect apologies

Apologies do not always include a performative verb or an IFID. A variety of verbs or statements can be used to convey the meaning of a speech act (Searle, 1976). In the case of apologies, indirect apologies can be provided in different manners. Cohen &

Olshtain (1983) categorized the indirect apologies in the following ways: providing an explanation, an acknowledgement of responsibility, an offer of repair, a promise of forbearance. Providing an explanation for an action could be a strategy for apologizing in an indirect manner. In the case of a formula, the offender of the action uses an explanation for the offence. For example, to apologize for being late for the class, a student could provide an explanation by stating that the tire of his or her car exploded on the way. This particular apology strategy could be acceptable or not according to the contextual factors; culture, severity of action, age, gender, the particular situation, and other various factors.. Holmes (1990) states that providing an explanation for the action was the second dominant apology strategy used in New Zealand English, and the most used indirect apology strategy.

Another indirect way to convey an apology is "acknowledgment of responsibility" which includes acceptance of the fault or responsibility by the speaker. The speaker can use different sub-sets to convey the meaning of responsibility or even deny the responsibility. These subsets can be listed as follows: accepting the blame, e.g. "It is my fault," expressing self-deficiency, e.g. "I was confused," recognizing the other person's deserving of an apology, e.g. " You are right!" and expressing lack of intent, "I didn't mean to" (Cohen & Olshtain, 1983).

In other situations, speakers could offer to repair the damage caused by his or her action. In a given context, repairing might include repairing or replacing the damaged good by the offender, or repairing the inconvenience caused by the action. For example, in the case of an apology that the offender breaks the other's computer, the suggested

apology might be, "I will buy you a new one." This type of action might require an action or not according to the response of the listener.

A promise of forbearance is another type of indirect strategy, which includes future action or promise that the action will not happen again. This certain type of indirect apology strategy is situation dependent and does not hold a majority part as a strategy to apologize.

Modification of Apology Strategies

In some cases, the person who apologizes can intensify the apology by using different strategies. Also the speaker can use intensifiers such as adverbs to modify mostly the IFIDs produced by the speaker. For example the speaker could say, " I am very sorry." or "I am deeply sorry." instead of just saying, "I am sorry." Also the speaker can reduce the intensity of apology by rejecting the responsibility, minimizing the responsibility or minimizing the offense. In some cases the speaker might not apologize at all, which itself is an important part of the apology speech acts. Trosborg (1987) found out in her research on the apology strategies in Danish and English that Danish natives used non-apologies in the role-plays while they were speaking English. Interestingly non-native speakers of English used non-apologies more than both native Danish or English speakers. Speakers used different strategies while they were conducting non-apologies. The strategies are as follows: explicit denial of responsibility, implicit denial of responsibility, providing justification for the act, blaming a third party, and blaming the complainer (Trosborg, 1987).

Apology Strategies in Different Languages

Mostly based on the universal apology strategies and classifications researchers have been conducting, research studies have tried to identify the differences in apology strategies in many languages (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2008; Chamani & Zareipur, 2010; Kasanga & Lwanga-Lumu, 2007). Many researchers have focused on comparing English with other languages because of the fact that English is the primary language, which is taught as a second or foreign language in the world. This section analyzes different languages, comparing them to English in order to draw some hypotheses about what can be the differences between Turkish and English.

Bataineh & Bataineh (2008) analyzed apology strategies used by American English speakers and Jordanian Arabic speakers. They also looked at differences between gender in the two different cultures and languages. The participants consisted of 100 American and 100 Jordanian speakers. They were asked to describe situations where they think an apology was expected. Then researchers chose 15 most frequent situations and applied them as a questionnaire. Data from the study revealed that there are differences such as, Jordanian speakers are more manifesting than American speakers, which means that Jordanian Arabic speakers used a combination of many strategies at the same time. Also, the data shows that American female and male difference is much less than Jordanian male and female differences.

Chamani & Zareipur (2010) investigated the differences in apology strategies between British English and Persian by analyzing data collected from naturally-reoccurring situations from two different corpora. Data for the British apologies were taken from Deutschmann (2003), based on spoken data from British National Corpus

(BNC). Data for the Persian apologies were from a corpus consisting of 500 apology exchanges gathered by an author and three assistants by completing tasks including information about the context of the apologies and the exact words in the conversations. Results suggested that both participants used similar strategies. However, British speakers used only one IFID in many situations while Persians used an explicit apology accompanying other strategies. Both of the studies show that there are differences in the two languages compared to English in terms of manifestation of apologies. Since the cultures are similar to the Turkish culture, there could be similarities in Turkish apology strategies. According to the two studies, Persian and Arabic native speakers of both these languages were more manifesting in their apologies. They preferred to use more combinations of strategies rather than choosing only one strategy as American and British English speakers frequently did. It might also be expected that Turkish speakers might use more strategy combinations than American English speakers.

Kasanga & Lwanga-Lumu (2007) investigated apology strategies in Setswana, nativized varieties of English, and native English by using videotaped role-plays and a DCT for Setswana and two nativized varieties of English one variety is spoken by white South Africans as a first language, and the other is spoken by Black South Africans as a second language. For the Native English out of South Africa part, Olshatin's (1991) study on Australian English was used. The Two hundred Setswana speakers, who were bilingual English speakers, were included in the Setswana part of the study. DCT results were used for the quantitative part of the study. Also, videotaped role-plays completed with eight participants for the qualitative part of the study. Results focusing on especially IFID and responsibility, suggested that there are differences between Setswana, nativized

English, and native English. Setswana speakers applied more repair and responsibility in their apologies then native English speakers. The interesting finding is that even if some participants use English as a formal or native language, cultural differences could cause pragmatic variances. As all the research reports, there have been differences in apology strategies used in different languages. It can be inferred from the fact that languages differ in apology strategies in language learning that teachers should be aware of the differences to be able to ignore miscommunication caused by pragmatic competence.

Nonnative Speakers' Use of Apologies

Pragmatic competence is a very important part of human communication. Lack of the pragmatic skills might result in miscommunication and misunderstanding between people. In that sense, it is important to improve students' pragmatic competence. Since apologies vary in languages, it is important for language learners and language instructors to know if the language learners transfer their apology strategies or not and what kind of elements affect the development of pragmatic competence in language learning.

To be able to understand this phenomenon in language acquisition, researchers have been investigating learners' apology strategies (Beckwith & Dweaele, 2008; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein, 1986; Cohen & Shively, 2007; Dalmau & Gotor, 2007; Kondo, 1997; Shardakova, 2005). These studies mainly focused on two different factors that affect the development of pragmatic competence: proficiency and exposure to language and culture. One of the most important projects in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics is the Cross Cultural Speech Acts Realization Project (CCSARP), which focused on many languages in various contexts. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) reported on the CCSARP, which was being conducted by many

researchers on different languages (Australian English by Eija Ventola, American English by Nessa Wolfson and Ellen Rintel, British English by Jenny Thomas, Canadian French by Elda Weizman, Danish by Claus Faerch and Gabriele Kasper, German by Juliane House-Edmondson and Helmut Vollmer, Hebrew by Shoshana Blum-Kulka and Elite Olshtain, and Russian by Jenny Thomas) by using the same methodology from native and non-native speakers of these languages to investigate speech acts of apology and requests. The instrument used was a discourse completion task (DCT), which included various contexts and situations. Participants for the projects included 400 college students in their second or third years of study in any subject but linguistics. The groups were set up to be homogenous for gender and native language. Half of the participants were native speakers and the other half were nonnative speakers of the studied language. The article does not suggest many explicit results about the different languages; it instead provides considerations in the research and a general notion of conclusions. The conclusion suggests that dimensions of apologies and requests might be universal but distribution of the strategies might vary among cultures. The article gives a framework of one of the corner stone projects in the filed of cross-cultural speech acts, by providing in depth explanation on the procedures, participants and analysis. But, it lacks explicit data or conclusions about the topic. Also, the article summarizes all the information without providing specific examples or data. In the summary of the results, one interesting finding stated was the fact that cultures close to each other, such as German and English, did not show as many differences in terms of apologies. The study also showed the great difficulty of analyzing the speech acts through languages, and how

the results can be interpreted. The method of analysis in the study continues to be used by many researchers.

Non-native Apologies Across Proficiency Levels

One element which can have a great deal of affect on the development of pragmatic competence is the proficiency level of EFL/ESL students. With the improvement of the language skills ,it is expected that the pragmatic competence can improve too.

Olshtain & Rosenstein (1986) conducted research to define the differences in apology strategies used by native speakers and advanced level nonnative speakers of English using the classifications of severity of actions and distance between interlocutors. To gather the data, researchers applied two different versions of a questionnaire, which includes various situations in terms of degree of offense and formality, to 180 respondents, which includes 96 native speakers of American English and 84 advanced learners of English who have Hebrew as their native language. Results suggested that there were not many differences between native English speakers and nonnative English speakers' use of strategies, though in the modifications of apologies there are certain differences. Nonnative speakers applied more intensification in their apologies than native speakers. The research mainly shows that advanced level learners apply similar apology strategies with native speakers though there are certain differences in the strategies of modifying apologies.

Dalmau and Gotor (2007) conducted a study on apology strategies used by Catalan learners of English in their L2; specifically, they focused on the frequency of IFIDs. They investigated students who are classified in three different proficiency levels

by using a DCT. They also included two control groups who were native speakers of Catalan and native speakers of English. Results revealed that Catalan native speakers employed more IFIDs than British speakers. Also, upper-intermediate proficiency-level learners employed IFIDs close to their native language, though advanced and intermediate level learners employed fewer IFIDs than native speakers of English?. Researchers claimed that lack of enough knowledge and the insufficient? proficiency level of intermediate and advanced learners prevented them from expressing them freely in their L2. The research studies mentioned, all focused on proficiency and claimed that with proficiency improvement in L2, pragmatic competence also increases. In the case of the current study, pragmatic competence of Turkish advanced level English learners will be investigated and parallelism to the former research will be discussed.

Non-native Apologies and Exposure to the Target Culture

Another element in language learning and pragmatic competence is exposure to language and how pragmatic competence is affected by the exposure. The focus is important due to the fact that living in a target language context is an important element in language learning. Kondo (1997) conducted research to investigate the change in the apology strategies used by Japanese learners of English who learned the language in the target language context with a natural learning environment. To gather the data, the researcher applied a DCT, which consisted of 9 situations familiar to both Japanese and American students, and 45 learners of English completed the DCT before and after they lived in the United States. The participants included 48 Japanese speakers, 45 Japanese learners of English who went to the United States as exchange students and stayed there for a year, and 40 American speakers of English. Results of the study revealed that all

four groups of participants dominantly used IFIDs or a combination of strategies that included IFIDS. Also, the researcher claims that Japanese learners transferred their native language pragmatics more before they spent a year in the Unites States. Moreover, results revealed that exposure to language and culture changed the students understanding of situations, such as the severity of the action and distance between communicators.

The study conducted by Shardakova (2005) aimed to describe patterns American learners of Russian and native speakers of Russian use as apology strategies in relation to L2 proficiency and exposure to target language. A total of 131 participants consisted of 41 Russian native speakers, 90 American learners of Russian, also ## American learners of Russian categorized according to their proficiency level and in-country experience. Participants were given a 21-item Dialogue Completion Questionnaire including various domain samples. The study demonstrated that Native Russian speakers and American learners have access to the same strategies; however, there are differences in how they use the strategies. More interestingly, the study showed that L2 proficiency and exposure to the target culture has a distinctive effect on improving pragmatic competence, especially exposure to target language affected pragmatic skills even in lower proficiency levels.

Shively and Cohen (2007) conducted research to investigate how study abroad with a strategy-building intervention affects the acquisition of pragmatics in terms of requests and apologies. To be able to collect the data, they used 86 American university students who were assigned to either a French or Spanish speaking country. Students were randomly selected: 42 for experimental and 44 for control groups. Researchers used a pretest and posttest to collect the data. Students also? completed the Speech Act

Measure of Language Gain test and 4 other instruments in 4 hour personal sessions in Minnesota before they left, and they completed the same instruments online and at the end of the semester of the study abroad. Results revealed that both the control and experimental groups showed improvement in pragmatic competence in requests and apologies. The group, though, who stayed in the target culture did not show a significant difference from the group who studied in US as might have been expected?. Researchers suggested that since the time of the stay in the target culture was limited, the group who stayed in the US and the group who studied abroad did not show significant difference in terms of their pragmatic competence. Both studies showed that exposure to language and culture in the target language context improves pragmatic competence in the target language. But in an EFL context exposure to actual culture is limited to the classroom activities and material so exposure is limited in the EFL context.

Comparison of Turkish and English Pragmatics and English Learners' Choices

As can be inferred from the studies discussed in the current chapter, apologies across languages show immense differences. Although studies on other languages can provide useful information about pragmatics and culture, it is faulty to make a direct assumption about Turkish based on the studies about other languages. Turkish, in terms of apologies, remains a language not studied broadly and vigorously enough to provide consistent and useful data for language researchers, teachers, or learners. Two main studies have been conducted, however, about Turkish pragmatics. One was done by Tuncel (2011), who investigated the apology strategies used by prep-school students and senior year college students in comparison with native English speakers, and the other was done by İstifçi (2009) to investigate apology strategies employed by intermediate and

advanced English learners in comparison to Native speakers' of English. Tuncel (2011) aimed to investigate apology speech acts used by intermediate and advanced English learners in an EFL setting in Turkey and if the students applied Turkish pragmatic norms or native English pragmatic norms to their English speech via DCT based methodology. The study investigated 20 intermediate and 20 advanced level EFL learners at a Turkish college. The native English apology data were collected from 5 native speakers who stayed in Turkey two or more years when the study was conducted. The Turkish data for the comparison was taken from the results of a doctoral dissertation completed by Tunçel (1999). İstifçi (2009) reports that strategies used by advanced speakers reached the English norms whereas the effect of L1 in intermediate level learners were much more prominent. As an example, intermediate learners used blaming as a way to reject the apology, while the strategy was not detected in native English data. It is also suggested that in some cases, both levels of learners used some formulas which were not seen in either Turkish or English norms. The phenomenon can be interpreted as the fact that learners developed their own interlanguage during the learning process. The study done by İstifçi (2009), though, provides very important data on the Turkish students' choices of apologies and differences between intermediate and advanced learners, suffers from some limitations. First of all, the fact that the native English data was collected from only 5 participants who were teachers living in Turkey for an expanded time period raises the concern that the native English speaking participants might have been affected by Turkish pragmatics; as Shardakova, (2005) states, the long-term stay in a country has a great effect on developing the pragmatics of the culture. Also, the fact that native English norms were only created according to five participants could limit the reliability of the

data. The other study, which was completed by Tunçel (2011), investigates the apology strategies employed by Prep-school learners and senior students who studied at the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department at Anadolu University in comparison to Native Turkish and English speakers. A DCT was used as a means of data collection. The DCT was completed by 50 native English speakers from Britain and the United States of America, 68 prep-school students who were going to continue their education in the ELT department at Anadolu University, and 61 senior students in the ELT department at the same school. The study revealed that Turkish speakers transferred their L1 to their L2 very frequently. Especially in one specific situation, which includes someone insulting the other, Turkish speakers preferred not to apologize by suggesting that if the hearer was not to blame he or she should not take the blame. But in the case of native English speaker data, the formula included IFIDs very frequently. Tunçel (2011) also suggests that especially learners in advanced levels used some formulas that do not fit in Turkish or English norms. The finding suggests that learners construct interlanguage forms as they develop language skills. Both of the studies provide very valuable data on Turkish apology speech acts and how it may differ from English norms. Findings from both studies show that it is important to understand the pragmatics of each culture to be able to reach a better teaching practice.

Conclusion

The research done in the field of apology speech acts has revealed a crucial understanding of how speech acts might differ among languages and cultures, and in terms of teaching and learning languages, how crucial it is for one to understand and realize the pragmatic norms of a culture and reach pragmatic competence to be able to

communicate efficiently at an advanced level. Realizing the importance of understanding the differences in languages, it can be claimed that more research is required to reveal the mechanics of pragmatics in each language to provide valuable information for the teachers, learners, and the researchers in the field. Specifically looking at the case of Turkish, although some research has been done, there is still a need for further research to be able to reach a more consistent and complex understanding of Turkish and English pragmatics, and specifically how learners of English use the apologies.

Chapter III: Methodology

Chapter III will explain the methodology of the study by providing in-depth information about participants, the instrument, procedures, and the process of the data collection and analysis. Each component of the chapter will provide the rationale behind the choices which were made during the process as well as about the participants, the instrument, and the procedure.

Participants

The current study includes 74 participants including 29 native speakers of English (NSEs), 30 monolingual Turkish speakers (NSTs), and 15 Turks who are non-native speakers of English (NNSEs). As a convenience of sample native English speakers, 32 college students studying at an American university were recruited to join the study. Two of the students were taken out of the study because they were bilinguals and one of the students did not respond to the survey questions. Thus participants of NSE group went down to 29. The ages of the NSE participants ranged between 18- 24. The students were recruited from the freshmen students attending composition classes at the university. There were 10 males and 19 females in the study. The monolingual Turkish speakers were recruited from college students who attended a college in Turkey, and their ages are between 18 and 26. Their majors vary from business to engineering. None of the participants were from majors related to language studies in order to prevent language intervention. Even if the students had formal English classes during middle school and high school education, their English proficiency level was either beginner or intermediate. The participant number was 38 at the beginning but 8 participants were excluded from the study due the their education level, English proficiency and inadequate responses to

the survey. There were 12 males and 18 females in the study. For the non-native speakers'
section of the study, Turkish students from different colleges were recruited. Participants
include students from Middle East Technical University (METU), Bosporus University,
and Bilkent University. All the participants were advanced level, proficient English
speakers. They have taken a year of intensive English and their proficiency was
determined as high by the test and the instructors. Eight of the participants were females
and 7 of the participants were males. Their ages varied between 18 and 26.

  The participants were recruited from the colleges for the reasons of convenience
and reliability of the responses. Since the DCT was designed as an online instrument, it
required the individuals to be computer literate and familiar with academic tasks and
surveys. The most appropriate group that met these criteria was the college students
group. Also in the NNSE sampling, it was preferable to use college students because in
the case of Turkey, recruiting proficient English speakers especially EFL learners would
be challenging outside the college context. Also it is suggested that college context
describes the best sociological sampling and reflection, due to the vibrant social life, and
being the future generation which will define the sociocultural context. Also, by limiting
the context to college students, age consistency was easy to maintain.

  Each group in the study was recruited for different purposes. The NSE group and
the NST group were recruited to set norms for comparison of the differences in apologies
between Turkish and English. The NNSE group was recruited to investigate the
intervention of English or Turkish in their English usage. The NNSE groups' results were
compared to NNS and NNT groups to be able to understand the transfers and other
phenomena occurring during apologies.

Materials and Methods

The current study used a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) which was applied via an online survey program called Survey Monkey. The DCT used in the study was a modified version of the DCT used by Beckwith & Deweale (2008). The DCT was modified to be able to address the pragmatic issues and also cultural situations. The main reason for preferring DCT as the tool for data collection is the practicality of the instrument since it allows for collecting great amounts of data in a short amount of time. Also, it has been suggested that the responses reflect parallelism with other data collection methods such as role-plays and ethnographic methods. Cohen (1996a) criticizes the DCT as an instrument because of its inability to collect authentic responses. On the other hand, DCTs were praised by Kasper & Dahl (1999) for the ability to collect crucial information about the participants' backgrounds, which can play a vital role in the results. For the current study, benefits of the DCT were considered as vital for the research, thus the DCT is preferred as the data collection method.

The DCT was translated into Turkish for the monolingual Turkish speakers. The translation was modified according to pragmatic norms, while the English version used American norms. The modifications will be described further in the description of the instruments. The translations were assessed and edited by two Turkish professors who are professionals in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).
The DCT includes eight scenarios, all of which require an apology as a response although the DCT does not force the participants to apologize, because absence of apology is also an area of the research. Each scenario is an offense committed to somebody else.

Scenarios include differences in power relationships: equal, higher, lower. Also, offenses vary in terms of their severity.

There were slight modifications to the original DCT obtained from Beckwith & Deweale (2008) in order to accommodate for the participants' cultural understanding and the familiarity with the situations. For example, in situation one, "The student showed up and asked for the essay," a comment was added to be able to increase the understanding that it was a face-to-face situation. In the second situation, "You went to a meeting with the professor and the professor asked for the book," a sentence was added to the original so that an apology could be highly probable. In the case of situation three, the extent of the tardiness and the student being in the café waiting was added to the context so that requirement of an apology could be likely. Also, in situation five, the duration of being late was added to increase the probability of an apology. Situation six was, "Imagine you drove a car into someone else's car in the parking lot. What do you say to the owner of the car?" in the original script, but having a car in Turkey, especially for college students, is not a very likely situation, so that the item was replaced with "Imagine you were in a bus and you bumped into another passenger and broke his computer. What would you say to the passenger?" The modifications were made to be able to reach a better understanding of the context and appropriateness for the participants. It was hoped to reach a more realistic context by modifying the situations and the questions. Eventually, these eight situations include context, characters that might exemplify various groups of situations and social contexts to provide a comprehensive study of apology strategies.

DCT Administration

The DCT for the current study was created and distributed electronically. The electronic copies were distributed by Minnesota State University, Mankato research services via the Survey Monkey online survey system. The cooperation with the institutional research and electronic services contributed to minimizing the concerns about the anonymity of the participants. The NSE group of participants were recruited at Minnesota State University, Mankato with the help of TAs and professors of the English department. To eliminate the risks of ineligible participants, the DCT included a background information section. The NST and NNSE groups were recruited by the faculty members from different colleges and acquaintances from different universities in Turkey. All three groups of participants were given the DCT with a background information section at the beginning. The professors, other than the researcher, were not given the results of the actual participants to ensure the anonymity.

Data Analysis

The data analysis of the current study is based on the classification of apologies suggested by Cohen et al. (1983). The raw data were analyzed and classified according to the semantic formulas included in the each response. The classifications are as follows:

A. Five apology strategies:

   a. direct apology (IFIDs): "sorry," "excuse," "forgive," etc.

   b. explanation: nonspecific (There has been a lot going on in my life), and specific (I could not catch the bus.)

   c. responsibility: implicit (I was sure I did it right.), lack of intent (I did not mean to.), self deficiency (How could I be so blind.), and self-blame (It is my fault.)

d. repair: unspecified (How can I fix that?), and specified (Let me buy a new computer for you.)

e. promise of forbearance: such as, "It won't happen again."

B. Combination or absence of apology strategies:

a. combination of the strategies

b. absence of the strategies

C. Modification of apology strategies:

a. intensity of apology: "really," "very," "terribly," etc.

b. minimizing responsibility: "I told you not to do that."

c. denial of responsibility: denial of fault (It is not my fault.), and blaming the hearer (It is your fault.)

d. emotionals: interjection (Oh, ooops), invocation (God!), or curse (Damn)

e. minimizing the offense: (No harm done.).

f. comments: about self, about others, and about the situation.

Adapted from Cohen et. al (1986).

The coding of the apologies was done for each group and each situation. the percentage of occurrence of a strategy was calculated according to number of participants used the stategy. Some of the content such as modification of strategies, non-apologies or unusual occurrence of a strategy was further investigated and exemplified to be able to understand the nature of the apologies better.

Conclusion

Chapter III discussed the methodology behind the current study. In the Chapter III, crucial components of the methodology, such as participants, instruments, and procedures,

were explained. The current chapter was designed to provide guidance for the reader to be able to understand how results are reached via the data collection process and the rationale behind the choices, which were made for data collection. It is hoped that the methodology will make the results and other components of the study clearer for the readers.

Chapter IV Results

Chapter IV of the study provides the results composed from the collected data.

Results are presented according to each situation. NSE and NST groups are compared,

then the NNSE group's results are compared to the findings. The main strategies used by

each group are provided in the tables and more detailed explanations are discussed for

each situation. First of all, the main strategies used in the DCT are discussed. The raw

number of participants who used a strategy and the overall percentage of the usage of a

strategy are given in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1 Overall usage of strategies

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	19	63%	28	97%	12	80%
Explanation	7	23%	7	23%	4	27%
Repair	10	33%	16	55%	5	33%
Responsibility	3	10%	6	21%	2	13%
Forbearance	3	10%	2	7%	2	13%

As can be seen in Table 4.1, the most used strategy by all three groups is the

IFIDs. On average 63% of the NST, 97% of the NSE, and 80% of the NNSE groups used

the strategy in their apologies. The big difference between NST and NSE participants is

obvious in Table 4. It can be suggested that Turkish native speakers are more indirect

than American English speakers in their apologies. Also, there was a very distinctive

difference in the choice of the performative phrase chosen by these groups. American

English speakers mostly preferred, " I am sorry," or "sorry" as an expression of apology, while Turkish speaker used, "kusura bakma" which can be translated pragmatically as "excuse my mistake." The phrase "kusura bakma" is not an exact equivalent of "I am sorry", because there is some usage of "Üzgünüm" which can be an exact equivelant, though the expression "kusura bakma" can be considered as an alternative IFID. Another difference in the usage of IFIDs was the place they were used. The NSE group strictly used IFID expressions in the beginning of the apology, while the NST group equally used the IFIDs in the beginning or at the end of the apology chunks. The data in Table 4.1 shows that the NNSE group reached a usage frequency of IFIDs closer to both NSEs and NSTs, that is, about half way in between. It might be expected that the NNSE group would have a similar usage with the NSE group; since the NNSEs are advanced level English learners, it seems like they are still in a place where they create their own interlanguage. It can be said that the NNSE participants are leaning towards a native like usage of IFIDs since their prominent IFID expression choice was "I am sorry" as native speakers. Usage of explanation for the offense was approximately equal in all three groups of participants (NST: 23%, NSE: 23%, NNSE: 27%). In terms of offering a repair for the offense, the NSE group showed a higher frequency with 55%, while the NST and the NSSE groups showed the same amount with 33% . This similar frequency might be interpreted as the transfer from L1 to L2. Also, NSE participants used the strategy of taking the responsibility more than other groups (NSE: 21%, NST: 10%, and NNSE 13%). Also, in terms of responsibility, NSE and NST groups showed some differences. In the NSE group, the most preferred choice of responsibility was lack of intent. They generally used the expression "I did not mean to," while the NST group used more self-

blame by saying "benim hatam," which means "It is my fault." Nonnative speakers of English seemed to ignore the usage of taking responsibility in most cases. But, in rare cases, they used the strategy similar to their native language Turkish.

In terms of the combination of strategies, NSEs and NSTs showed a very different pattern. For example, most of the time NSE participants chose to use IFID+EXP or IFID+REP, whereas NST speakers used EXP+IFID in some cases. The usage of IFIDs at the end of the combination seemed very specific to the Turkish monolingual participants, because the NNSE group did not show that pattern. Moreover, Turkish speakers in almost 30% of the apologies used indirect apologies without an IFID while NSE participants strictly used IFIDs in almost all situations. Also, there were rare cases of non-apologies, especially in NST data. It seemed like when the relationship with the hearer is closer, such as a friend, Turkish speakers showed some non-apologies. For example in situation 1, one of the participants said "beni bilirsin hep geç kalırım, takma bunlara" which can be translated as "you know me I am always late, get over it." The NSE participants did not show non-apologies, but in situation 8, one of the participants used denial of responsibility by saying, "I am sorry but the bus is shaking." It seems like, in the case of Turkish, it is acceptable not to apologize for an offense if the offended side is a close friend or if the offended party is not responsible. But, in American culture, it can be said that even when there are external factors causing the offense, an apology is seen as appropriate. Even though in some situations in the American context an apology might not be as necessary.

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

In situation 1, there is a high-low power relationship between the communicators. The person who is apologizing is the professor so the higher power in the situation is the offender. In Turkish culture, power relationships are considered very strict, such that it might be considered in this situation that the professor does not need to offer an explicit apology for the offense. In American culture where the power relationship is more flexible, the apologies can differ. The offense can be considered as not severe.

TABLE 4.2 Main Strategies for Situation 1: forgetting to return the essay

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	N	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	9	30%	29	100%	9	60%
Explanation	6	20%	6	21%	3	20%
Repair	13	43%	24	83%	9	60%
Responsibility	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
Forbearance	0	%0	0	0%	0	0%

In the first situation, there is a distinctive difference in the main apology strategies used between NSTs and NSEs. As can be seen in the table 4.2 above, NST speakers used 30% IFIDs while all of the NSE group employed IFIDs. The most preferred expressive for IFIDs by the NSE participants was "Sorry," or "I am sorry," whereas Turkish monolinguals used, "Kusura bakma" which means "excuse me" as an expressive. The

usage of explanation (EXP) as a strategy is very similar in both groups (20% for NSTs and 21% for NSEs). Although the percentage of participants using explanations was similar in these two groups, the choice of explanation was very different. NSE participants preferred specific explanations such as "my wife was sick" or "I had to give grades on exams," while Turkish participants preferred non-specific explanations for the offense by mostly stating that they were busy. Another obvious difference between the NST and NSE groups was in the usage of offering a repair (REP) for the offense. Only 43% of the NST group applied the strategy while 83% of the NSE group offered a repair for the offence. Taking responsibility (RESP) and promise of forbearance (FORB) as apology strategies did not seem preferred by either group. Although, in the NST group, there were 2 cases that participants used taking responsibility as a strategy in a form of self-blame. According to the findings so it can be inferred that American-English speakers preferred direct apologies more than Turkish speakers, also Americans seemed more eager to offer a repair for the offense than Turkish. Also, in the detailed analysis it was found that both of the groups preferred combinations of strategies. Both groups mostly employed the combination of IFID+REP or IFID+EXP. Although the sequencing of the strategies varied greatly between NSE and NST groups. Turkish participants preferred EXP+IFID while Americas used IFID+EXP. It might be because in Turkish the main meaning is generally provided at the end of a sentence or a paragraph. In the case of EFL students in Turkey NNSEs in other words, there were different patterns. For example, in situation 1, the NNSE group used 60% IFIDs,, which is in between the NSE and NST groups. It can be inferred that the NNSEs were similar to NSEs, but still had the effects of L1 on their L2. In terms of explanation, the two languages were very similar

and the similarity also appeared in the NNSE group. Also, the NNSE group used 60%

repairs, which again stayed in between the NSTs and NSEs. Over all, it seemed like the

NNST group had a usage of apologies not very similar to either native speaker group, but

created their own interlanguage. The results mainly show that Turkish respondents did

not use IFIDs as much as American respondents and that Turkish participants preferred

indirect strategies more than IFIDs in some cases.

Situation 2: Imagine you are a student. You borrowed a book from one of your

professors but you forgot to return it on time. You went to a meeting with the professor

and the professor asked for the book. What would you say to the professor?

Situation 2 includes a different power relationship than situation one because in

situation two the offender has the lower power status. The offense is still not the very

severe, though in Turkish culture power relationship can be more distinctive than in

American culture.

TABLE 4.3 Situation 2: Forgetting to return the book.

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	12	40%	24	83%	14	93%
Explanation	15	50%	10	34%	5	33%
Repair	16	53%	22	76%	9	60%
Responsibility	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Forbearance	0	%0	1	3%	0	0%

In situation 2 as in situation 1, the NSE group employed many more IFIDs than the NST group (NSE 83% and NST 40%). It appears that Turkish participants used more explanation than Americans while they were apologizing (NST 50%, NSE 34%). In terms of usage of repair for the offense in each group, the NSTs used 53% and the NSEs used 76%. Only one participant in the NSE group used promise of forbearance as a strategy of apology. The combination of apologies showed some difference in the two languages. American participants used IFID+EXP or IFID+REP while Turkish speakers preferred to use IFIDs after EXP or REP. In situation 2 intensifiers also varied between NST and NSE groups. NSE participants used intensifiers such as "so sorry" or "very sorry," but no intensifiers could be found in the responses of the NST participants. In situation 2, non-native speakers showed a similar pattern to the NSE group. They used 93% IFIDs, 33% explanation and 60% repair. It seemed like in terms of combinations of apology strategies, the NNSE group followed the same formula with the NSE group and used IFID+REP or IFID+EXP, except in rare cases. Also in terms of the repair for the offense, NSE and NST participants offered different types of repairs. For example, most of the NSE participants stated that they would return the book right away or a day later, while Turkish monolinguals asked for a way to repair the offense, even if they already agreed to bring the book back as soon as possible. According to the data, it can be concluded that advanced non-native speakers employed similar strategies with the NSEs in most cases. Another difference was in the usage of intensifiers. In the Turkish data, there was no usage of an intensifier whereas both NSE and NNSE groups applied intensifiers in their apologies.

Situation 3: Imagine you are the manager of a café. Today you have an interview with a student who wants to a job in the café. However you are half an hour late for the interview because of a meeting. The student is waiting for you in the café. What would you say to the student?

In situation 3, the relationship between the offender and the participant of the apology is not actually settled yet, although the offender is the potential employer, so the offender can be considered as the higher power. The severity of the action might differ culturally. In American culture, punctuality is very important whereas in Turkish culture being late can be acceptable in most cases.

TABLE 4.4 Situation 3: being late for the interview

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	N	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	25	83%	29	100%	11	73%
Explanation	23	77%	25	86%	12	80%
Repair	3	10%	7	24%	0	0%
Responsibility	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%
Forbearance	0	%0	1	3%	0	0%

In situation 3, usage of IFIDs is very high. In the NSE group, all of the participants in the group used IFIDs as a part of their apologies. As in other situations, the preference for expressives were different. NSEs chose "I am sorry" while Turkish monolinguals used "Özür Dilerim" which can be translated as "I apologize." Second, the most used strategy by the NSE group is explanation with 86% frequency. The NST group shows a similar

pattern by using IFIDs 83% of the time along with explanation and explanation 77% of the time. Explanations for the offense differed in the two native speakers groups as well. Turkish participants preferred nonspecific explanations while American participants were specific about their explanations. In terms of offering a repair for the offense, American participants more than doubled the Turkish participants. 24% of the NSEs used REP while only 10% of the NSTs offered any repair for the offense. The repair offer was mostly on continuing the interview right away to fix the situation. Interestingly, one of the repairs offered by a Turkish participant was to hire the person. Also, one of the NSEs used a promise of forbearance. In situation 3, the NNSE group showed some distinctive differences from the other two groups. NNSEs used fewer IFIDs than either of the others (73%). Additionally, 80% of NNSE participants used explanation, which is close to both the NSEs and NSTs. Also two of the participants used self-blame as taking responsibility. Also, it was very interesting to see that two of the NST participants did not see an apology as necessary in the situation. One of the non-apologies was "Sabırlı olmak iyidir" which means "it is good to be patient." The participant apparently stated that for the job it is necessary to be patient. It appears that the NNSE group showed a distinctive interlanguage by applying strategies that did not occur in the native speaker groups. Situation 4: Imagine you are a waiter in an expensive restaurant. A customer ordered beef but you brought chicken instead. The customer mentions the mistake you made. What would you say to the customer?

Situation 4 brings up a customer-waiter relationship. In this case, the offender has a lower power status than the costumer.

TABLE 4.5 Situation 4: bringing the wrong order

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	N	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	24	80%	29	100%	12	80%
Explanation	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
Repair	26	87%	29	100%	8	53%
Responsibility	2	7%	5	17%	3	20%
Forbearance	4	14%	0	0%	4	27%

In situation 4, the difference in the usage of IFIDs seems distinctive. All of the American

participants used an IFID in their apologies while 80% of the Turkish participant used

IFIDs. Also, 10% of the NSTs used explanation in their apologies while none of the

NSEs preferred explanations as a form of apology. Also, there was a high frequency of

usage to offer repair in both of the native speaker groups. All of the NSEs used offer of

repair and 87% of the NSTs used this strategy. The biggest difference between these

groups was with regard to usage of promise of forbearance. 4 of the Turkish participants

preferred the strategy while none of the Americans used this strategy. In situation 4, 80%

of the NNSEs used IFIDs which is at the same rate as NST. It seems that the NNSEs

transferred L1 strategies to L2. , but it is hard to reach a solid conclusion because of the

differences occurring in other situations. On the other hand, there is a big difference in

the usage of repair for the offense between the non-native speakers and the native

speakers. 87% of the NSTs and 100% of the NSEs used and offer of repair while only

53% of the NNSEs preferred this strategy. It seems that NNSEs got closer to the native

speakers in terms of accepting the responsibility, in most cases accepting the blame by

stating "it is my fault." Interestingly, NNSEs used promise of forbearance as a strategy

like the NSTs while NSEs did not use this strategy at all. It can be said that there was a

transfer from L1 to L2. Also, usage of intensifiers differed greatly among the three

groups. 73% of the NSE participants used an intensifier to upgrade their apologies. The

intensifiers mostly included adverbs "terribly," "really," and "so." But in the Turkish data,

there was only one case which included an intensifier. NNSE participants used

intensifiers as well, but it was not as prominent as NSE participants. Overall, some

transfer of L1 to L2 can be observed in situation 4; though, more prominently, it can be

concluded that non-native speakers employed some kind of interlanguage that carries the

qualities different than the native speakers' usage of English and Turkish.

Situation 5: Imagine 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?

Situation 5 offers an equal power relationship between communicators. Also there is a

close relationship between the offender and the offended. The situation offers a very

interesting setting because friend relationships can be very distinctively different among

cultures.

TABLE 4.6 Situation 5: being late for the pair work

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IFID	14	46%	29	100%	10	67%
Explanation	10	33%	10	34%	4	27%
Repair	1	3%	18	62%	1	7%

Responsibility	6	20%	1	3%	2	14%
Forbearance	6	20%	1	3%	5	33%

In terms of IFIDs, there is a very big gap between the Turkish speakers and

English speakers. Only 46% of the Turkish participants used IFIDs, while all of the

English speakers applied this strategy in their apologies. Also, NSE participants mostly

applied more combinations of strategies than the NSTs. IFID+EXP and IFID+REP were

the most frequent combinations of strategies used by the NSE participants, while in most

cases Turkish monolinguals found only one strategy enough for the situation. On the

other hand, usage of Explanation for the offense showed a very similar frequency in the

both native speaker groups. Ten participants from the each group used explanation as an

apology strategy, which reflects 33% of the Turkish participants and 34% of the

American participants. A distinctive difference occurred in the usage of offer of repair as

an apology. Only 3% of the Turkish participants preferred this strategy while 62% of the

American participants employed the strategy. Also, 20% of the Turkish speakers

employed a promise of forbearance while only one participant from the NSE group

preferred this strategy. There were two cases of non-apologies used by the Turkish

monolinguals. It seemed like the Turkish participants, based on the friendship with the

offended, did not see an apology as necessary. The similar case could be seen in the

usage of intensifiers 47% of NSE participants supported their IFIDs with an intensifier

while none of the NST participants used intensifiers. In Situation 5, the NNSE group

showed very interesting characteristics in terms of their apology strategies. With regard

to IFIDs, the NNSE groups reached 67%, which can be considered in between the native

speakers frequency of IFIDs. But, in offering a repair, only one of the participants preferred the strategy like in the NST group, while 62% of the NSE group used the strategy. It can be said that in terms of offering a repair, the NNSE group employed a very similar pattern with their native language. Also, the NSSE group showed a very similar pattern by taking the responsibility and promise of the forbearance to the NST group (RESP: NNSE = 14%, NST = 20%; FORB: NNSE = 33%, NST = 20%). Moreover, NNSE participants showed a similar pattern with NSTs in terms of combination of the apologies. It seems that in situation 5, friendship affected their L2 usage and they moved towards more L1 standards. It might be concluded that in situation 5, there was more L1 to L2 transfer than other situations. The reason for the phenomenon might be because of the relationship of the communicators as being friends.

Situation 6: Imagine you were in a bus and you bumped into another passenger and broke his computer. What would you say to the passenger?

Situation 6 includes a severe offense in which the action causes physical damage to the other person's property. Power relationship is not stated since the offended person is a stranger.

TABLE 4.7 Situation 6: breaking someone's laptop

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	22	73%	29	100%	12	80%
Explanation	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%
Repair	18	60%	18	62%	13	87%
Responsibility	3	10%	11	38%	2	13%

Forbearance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

In the 6th situation, the frequency of IFID usage is very high in both native speaker groups. 73% of the NST group used an IFID as a mean of apology and 100% of the NSE used IFIDs. Also, the usage of offering a repair for the offense seems very similar in both native speaker groups too (NST: 60%, NSE: 62%). Although the amount of the strategy is similar, the type of the offer differed between these two groups. NST participants generally offered to replace the laptop or pay the damage, while NSE participants offered a partial help to the offended. For example, seven of the NSE participants stated that they could help the person with the laptop, while Turkish participants offered to pay for the fixing. The only distinctive difference in terms of apology strategies in these groups appears in the usage of taking the responsibility for the offense. While 38% of the American participants used the strategy, only 10% of the Turkish participants employed taking the responsibility and apologizing strategy. In the case of non-native speakers of English, the data revealed very interesting findings. First of all, the NNSE group stayed in between the native speakers group in terms of usage of the IFIDs. Interestingly, offer of repair showed the highest frequency by 87%, which is higher than both NSE and NST. The offer of repair used by the NSSE group was very similar to NST group which is a full repair or replacement of the laptop. Also, one of the NSSE participants used explanation for the offense, which was not preferred by either of the native speaker groups. It can be inferred that, because of the severity of the offense usage of IFIDs were higher in the NSE group. Also, it can be claimed that there was L1 to L2 transfer in the type of repaired offered by NNNSE participants. It might be because

of the severity of the action, NNSE participant might have thought it was necessary to be more explicit in their apologies.

Situation 7: Imagine you are working for a company. You offended a colleague during a meeting. After the meeting the colleague you offended made a comment about the incident to you by stating that he was offended by your comment. What would you say to your colleague?

Situation 7 brings up a more professional setting and an equal power relationship. The severity of offense can be culturally different. Since American culture is more work oriented and Turkish culture is more person oriented, it can be hard to define the severity of action in the same way.

TABLE 4.8 Situation 7: offending a colleague

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n: 15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	18	60%	28	97%	10	67%
Explanation	1	3%	1	3%	4	27%
Repair	6	20%	6	21%	3	20%
Responsibility	8	27%	22	76%	7	47%
Forbearance	10	33%	10	34%	3	20%

In general, apology strategies used in situation 7 seems very diverse. Both native speaker groups used all of the strategies. As can be seen in the table 4.8, IFID usage shows considerable difference between NST and NSE groups (NST: 60%, NSE: 97). It is very interesting that the expressive choices changed in NSE group dramatically. Almost

half of the expressives used by NSE participants were ,"I apologize" or "my apologies" in situation 8, while in other situations, "I am sorry" was far more used as an IFID. Offer of repair was preferred in a very similar amount by both of the native speaker groups (NST: 20%, NSE: 21%). But the type of repair was different in both groups, American participants offered a repair by offering a promise to make things better, while Turkish participants offered something else for the offense such as a meal or a drink. In terms of taking responsibility for the offense, the NSE group showed a very high frequency by 76%, while only 27% of the NST group used the strategy. Also, promise of forbearance was used in a similar amount by NST and NSE participants (NST: 33%, NSE: 34%). In the case of nonnative speakers choices in situation 7, they showed similar patterns to the NST participants in terms of usage of IFIDs. 60% of the NST group and 67% of the NNSE group used IFIDs. Distinctively, the NNSE group employed higher frequency of explanation than any of the native speakers groups. Also, usage of responsibility seemed to be different than the native speakers; while responsibility was used by 27% of the NSTs and 76% of the NSEs, it was used by 47% of the NNSEs. A similar difference between native speakers and nonnatives also appeared in the usage of promise of forbearance. Even if the native speaker groups employed this strategy in similar frequencies (NST: 33%, NSE: 34%), the NNSE group did not prefer the strategy as much as NSEs and NSTs (NNSE: 20%).

Situation 8: Imagine you are travelling on a bus. You put your bag in the rack, but it fell down and hit another passenger. What would you say to the passenger?

The setting of situation 8 is very similar to the setting of situation 6, but the severity of offense is lower than situation 6. The power relationship of the interlocutors is not specific since they are strangers to each other.

TABLE 4.9 Situation 8: falling bag

Apologies Strategies	NST n: 30		NSE n: 29		NNSE n:15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
IFID	27	90%	29	100%	15	100%
Explanation	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%
Repair	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%
Responsibility	7	23%	12	41%	4	27%
Forbearance	1	3%	2	7%	0	0%

In situation 8, apologies are mostly expressed with IFID's. 90% of the NSTs and 100% of the NSEs used IFIDs as an expression of apology. It seemed that 60% of the Turkish monolinguals found an IFID enough of an apology and did not use other strategies or combinations. Also, 47% of the NSE group used an intensifier while none of the NST participants used intensifiers. The second most used apology strategy was taking responsibility for the action. It was used more frequently by NSE participants than NSTs (NSE: 41%, NST: 23%). Also, promise of forbearance was used by both groups less frequently. Only 3% of the NSTs and 7% of the NSEs preferred this strategy. In situation 8, the NNSE group showed a similar pattern to the NST participants. Since the usage of IFIDs was very similar in both native speaker groups, the usage of IFID was also similar in the NNSE group by 100%. Also, in terms of using responsibility, the NNSE group

showed a similar pattern with the NST participants by NST 23% and NNSE 27%. Also, the NNSE group was similar to NST in terms of using intensifiers, only one participant from this group employed an intensifier. It could be claimed that in situation 8, transfer from L1 to L2 can be prominent.

In conclusion, it can be claimed that apologies in Turkish and American English differ in many aspects. The difference also has an effect on the nonnative speakers of English in Turkey. In general, even when the advanced learners can reach a native like proficiency in terms of pragmatics, they still carry the effects of L1, especially in the subcategories of apology strategies.

Chapter V Discussion

The current chapter discusses the results from the data collected. The discussion covers the main differences presented by native speakers of Turkish, native speakers of American English, and non-native speakers of English in Turkey. The discussion also presents the relationship between the L1 and L2 in terms of pragmatics.

One of the most prominent differences between native Turkish speakers and native American English speakers was the usage of IFIDs as an apology strategy. As show in Table 4.1, the frequency of usage of IFIDs was considerably higher in NSE data with 97%, while it was only 67% in the NST data. The overwhelming usage of IFIDs by the NSE group were the expressions "I am sorry" and "sorry," while Turkish monolinguals preferred other expressions such as "Özür dilerim" which means "I apologize," and "Kusura bakma," which can be translated as "Excuse me," in addition to "I am sorry." In terms of NNSE participants, it can be said that they had a close frequency of IFID usage to the NSE participants with 80%, and their choice of IFID was "I am sorry" which can be claimed as a more native-like way of apologizing. Although they reached a close proximity to the native speakers in this respect, they seemed to lack the usage of intensifiers since NSE participants used intensifiers in situations 4 and 5 overwhelmingly since the usage of intensifiers were rare in the NNSE data. It can be concluded from the results on IFID usage and intensifiers that Turkish speakers are less direct in their apologies than the Americans. Also, it was revealed that Americans use intensifiers in their apologies while Turkish speakers do not see them as necessary. In the case of development of EFL students in Turkey, it appeared that advanced learners have reached an in-between proficiency in terms of general strategies in most cases, though in

the subcategories, L1 pragmatics interrupted their speech overwhelmingly. For example, in terms of offer of repair, NNSE participants made offers like NST speakers. In situation 6, the phenomenon was very obvious. While NSE participants preferred to use partial repair for the offer while helping with repairing the computer whereas NNSE participant generally offered a full repair or replacement of the laptop like NST respondents. The data revealed that the usage of subcategories were similar to L1. Thus it can be claimed that even advanced learners in Turkish EFL setting have not reached a native like pragmatic competence in their L2 usage. Another very interesting finding in the research was the sequencing of the apology strategies used. NSE participants strictly followed a formula of combinations such as IFID+EXP or IFID+REP in which IFIDs are strictly used at the beginning of an apology chunk, but in the case of NSTs, the sequencing of apology strategies were more flexible and structures such as EXP+IFID or REP+IFID appeared frequently. The Turkish way of the sequencing in which IFID is at the end of the sentence in some occasions, was not observed in the NNSE group. It can be claimed that since in Turkish, the meaning is generally given at the end of a sentence or a paragraph, the structure occurs somehow frequently. It can also be claimed that advanced level English Learners adopted the American norms of apology sequences, since it was observed that in their apologies NNSE participants preferred to use IFIDs at the beginning of the sentences.

Another interesting finding was the difference of power relationships and apologies. Especially in situation 5 where the interlocutors are friends it appeared that apologies drastically changed among cultures. Also nonnative apologies showed a different pattern. In situation 5, all of the NSE participants used an IFID and mostly

intensified their apologies with adverbs such as "really" or "so," but NST participants preferred less IFIDs. Moreover, it was observed that the use of IFID by the nonnative speakers dropped, too. Also, NST and NNSE participants used only one strategy in most cases, while NSE participants used combinations of strategies such as IFID+EXP or IFID+REP. Moreover, there were two cases that Turkish monolinguals did not apologize. It can be inferred from the results that Turkish participants are less apologetic when the offended person is a close friend. It can be because of the close friendship and strong personal relationship or the community based nature of the Turkish language. In the case of NNSE participants, it appeared that they performed close to Turkish norm in situation 5. It can be because of the fact that when the apology accepter is a friend, less attention is paid to the apology. Thus, the norms the apologizer uses gets closer to the native language forms.

Overall, the data revealed that Turkish participants are more indirect in their apologies than the Americans. Also, the relationship between the offender and the offended has a high effect on the way of apologizing. Even if the advanced learners get closer to the target cultural norms, they are still affected by the native culture. Istifci (2009) also suggests that advanced learners have the ability to act in the target language norms to some extend. One of the most important findings the current study revealed can be the fact that intensifiers of the apologies are generally not applied by the nonnative speakers, even if the NNSE participants able to apply target cultural norms in terms of general strategies.

Conclusion

It appears that in the past, the greatest importance has been given to the form of the language in ESL/EFL settings. Currently, though as the communicative approach has become more valued and widely accepted in language teaching settings, the focus has shifted towards the improvement of communicative competence, which includes pragmatic competence of the learners. Thus, focus on pragmatics and speech acts have been in rising demand. To be able to teach better, it is necessary to understand the cultural differences and pragmatic patterns of the languages so that teachers can target this specific area of teaching. The current study analyzes the differences between Turkish and American English, and also looks at the apology speech acts performed by nonnative speakers of English in Turkey in order to provide a deeper understanding of the issues occurring in the language use. It is clear that L1 and L2 interact to a great extend in language learning. The data collected for the research suggests important finding in terms of this interaction. The specific issue of advanced learners and the differences between Turkish and English are explored so that the instructors can target these areas to reach a better pragmatic competence in their classrooms. It is hoped that the teachers who are interested in the pragmatic approach to language teaching can benefit from the findings.

As almost every study in the field of language and pragmatics, the current study suffers from limitations. First of all, while practical, the choice of data collection method as DCT has shortcomings such as, since it is a written response, the responses might be somehow different from natural responses. Also, situations require participants to put themselves in scenarios that they might not be familiar with. The other limitation of the study is the participant demography. The number of participants for each group was

expected to be balanced, but during the recruitment process the balance could not be reached. The imbalance might cause issues of comparison and inaccuracy. Despite the limitations of the study, it can be stated that the results might benefit the society to a great extend in understanding the apology speech acts.

The study stays limited to certain aspect of apologies and cross-cultural pragmatics. Further research studying the phenomenon in a deeper level can be very beneficial for a better understanding. Also, variables such as social class, gender, and diversity can be other potential research areas for the further studies. Also, each semantic formula can be studied individually and learners' performances can be investigated in a longer period.

References

Bataineh, F. R. & Bataineh, F. R. (2008). A cross-cultural comparison of apologies by native speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 40,792-821.

Beckwith, S. & Dewaele, J. (2008). The development of apologies in the Japanese L2 of adult English native speakers. *Birkbeck Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 3,1-29.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Request and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 3, 196-213.*

Chamani, F. & Zareipur, P. (2010) A cross cultural study of apologies in British English and Persian. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics, 36,* 133-153.

Cohen, A., Olshtain, E. & Rosenstein, D. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: what remains to be learned? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 62,* 51-74.

Cohen, A. & Olshtain, E. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition (18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cohen, A. & Shively, L. R. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 190-212.

Cohen A. D. (1996a). Speech Acts. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* pp. (383-400). Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dalmau, M. S. & Gotor, H. C. (2007). From "Sorry very much" to "I am ever so sorry:"

Acquisitional patterns in L2 apologies by Catalan learners of English.

Intercultural Pragmatics, 4, 287-315.

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

İstifçi, İ. (2009). The use of apologies by EFL learners. *English Language Teaching.* 2,

(3), 15-25.

Kasanga, L. A. & Lwanga-Lumu, J. (2007). Cross-cultural linguistic realization of

politeness: A study of apologies in English and Setswana. *Journal of Politeness

Research*, 3, 65-92.

Kasper, G. & Dahl, M. (1991). Research Methods in Intercultural Pragmatics. USA:

University of Hawaii Press.

Kondo, S. (1997). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of

English; longitudinal study on interlanguage apologies. *Sophia Linguistica, 41*,

265-284.

Meier, A. J. (1998). Apologies: What do we know? *International Journal of Applied

Linguistics,* 8, 215-

Olshtain, E. (1991). Apologies across languages. *Papers in Applied Linguistics,* 20-30.

Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of

Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2,

423-451.

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

11, 147-167.

Tuncel, R. (2011). Apologizing and speech act realizations of Turkish EFL Learners. International Conference on Management, Economics and Social Sciences.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Appendix A

DCT English version

The current survey aims to investigate apology strategies in Turkish and English. There are situations given below which possibly require apologies. You do not have to provide an apology if you feel like it is not appropriate. Please read the situations carefully and try to provide as closest respond as possible to your natural spoken respond to the situation. The first part requires you to provide some personal information. If you feel uncomfortable, you are not obliged to provide information. All responses will be kept anonymous.

Age: Gender: Native Language:

The level of English (if not a native speaker):

English Learning background (if not a native speaker)

Education: Current Class:

Situation 1

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

Situation 2

Imagine you are a student. You borrowed a book from one of your professors but you forgot to return it on time. You went to a meeting with the professor and the professor asked for the book. What would you say to the professor?

Situation 3

Imagine you are the manager of a café. Today you have an interview with a student who wants to a job in the café. However you are half an hour late for the interview because of a meeting. The student is waiting for you in the café. What would you say to the student?

Situation 4

Imagine 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?

Situation 5

Imagine 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?

Situation 6

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

Situation 7

Imagine you are working for a company. You offended a colleague during a meeting. After the meeting the colleague you offended made a comment about the incident to you by stating that he was offended by your comment. What would you say to your colleague?

Situation 8

Imagine you are travelling on a bus. You put your bag in the rack, but it fell down and hit another passenger. What would you say to the passenger?

Appendix B

DCT Turkish version

Bu anket Türkçe ve İngilizcedeki özür dileme tekniklerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Aşağıda büyük ihtimalle özür gerektiren durumlar verilmiştir. Eğer uygun olmadığını düşünüyorsanız özür dilemeniz gerekli değildir. Lütfen durumları dikkatlice okuyup doğal olarak vereceğiniz cevaba en yakın cevabı yazmaya çalışınız. Eğer cevap vermek istemiyorsanız vermek zorunda değilsiniz. Bütün cevaplar ve bilgiler anonim olarak tutulcaktır.

Yaşınız:　　　　　　Cinsiyetiniz:　　　　　　Ana diliniz:

İngilizce seviyeniz:

İngilizce öğrenim geçmişiniz:

Eğitim durumunuz:　　　　　　　　Şu anki sınıfınız:

1. Durum

   Üniversitede profesör olduğunuzu düşünün. Bir öğrencinizin ödevini bugün geri vereceğinize söz verdiniz fakat henüz okumayı bitirmediniz. Öğrenciniz size geldi ve ödevini sordu. Öğrencinize ne derdiniz?

2. Durum

   Üniversitede öğrenci olduğunuzu düşünün. Bir hocanızdan bir kitap ödünç aldınız fakat zamanında geri vermeyi unuttunuz. Hocanızla görüşmeye gittiniz ve hocanız kitabı sordu. Hocanıza ne derdiniz?

3. Durum

Bir kafede yönetici olduğunuzu düşünün. Bir öğrenci iş görüşmesine geliyor fakat siz başka bir toplantı nedeniyle yarım saat geç kaldınız. Bu öğrenci sizi kafede bekliyor. Bu öğrenciye ne söylerdiniz?

4. Durum

Çok pahalı bir restoranda garson olduğunuzu düşünün. Bir müşteriniz size biftek sipariş etmesine rağmen siz yanlışlıkla tavuk getirdiniz. Müşteriniz size yaptığınız hatadan bahsediyor. Bu müşterinize ne söylerdiniz?

5. Durum

Sürekli geç kalan bir öğrenci olduğunuzu düşünün. Bugün birlikte ödev yaptığınız bir arkadaşınızla olan toplantınıza geç kaldınız. Arkadaşınız iki saattir sizi bekliyordu. Bu arkadaşınıza ne söylerdiniz?

6. Durum

Otobüste olduğunuzu düşünün. Bir yolcuya çarptınız ve bilgisayarı düşüp kırıldı. Bu yolcuya ne söylerdiniz?

7. Durum

Bir şirkette çalıştığınızı düşünün. Bir toplantı sırasında iş arkadaşlarınızdan birini gücendirdiniz. Toplantıdan sonra bu arkadaşınız size gelip olayla ilgili konuştu ve kırıldığını belirtti. İş arkadaşınıza ne söylerdiniz?

8. Durum

Bir otobüs yolculuğunda olduğunuzu düşünün. Çantanızı üst bölmeye koydunuz fakat düştü bir yolcuya çarptı. Bu yolcuya ne söylerdiniz?