



Gender Differences in the Usage of Apology : A Case Study of Native Speakers of English in Jordan's Private Schools

اختلافات الذكور والإناث في استعمال الاعتذار : دراسة حالة للناطقين باللغة الانجليزية في المدارس الخاصة الأردنية

Prepared by

Saffanah Mahdy Abu Darwish

Supervisor

Professor Zakaria Abu Hamdia

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Degree of Master of Arts in English Language and Literature.

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Middle East University

August 2014

Authorization Statement

I, Saffanah Mahdy Abu Darwish, authorize Middle East University to supply Hard and electronic copies of my thesis to libraries, establishments, bodies, and institutions concerned with research and scientific studies upon request, according to university regulations.

Name: Saffanah Mahdy Abu Darwish

Signature:



Date: 9th-8-2014

Thesis Committee Decision

This thesis "Gender Differences in the Usage of Apology; A case Study of Native Speakers of English in Jordan's Private Schools" was discussed and certified on August, 11th, 2014.

Thesis committee:

Prof. Zakaria Abu Hamdia

Prof. Sabbar Al-Saddoun

Dr. Nahed Ghazoul

Signature



.....
.....
.....

Table of contents

	content	Page
	Authorization Statement	II
	Examination committee decision	III
	Table Of Countents	IV
	List Of Tables	VII
	List Of Appendixes	X
	Acknowledgements	XII
	Abstract	XIII
	ملخص الرسالة	XIV
Chapter One	Introduction	
1.0	Background of the study	1
1.1	Statements of the problem	2
1.2	Objectives of the study	2
1.3	Questions of the study	2
1.4	Significance of the study	3
1.5	Limitations	3
1.6	Definitions of significance terms	3
Chapter Two	Literture review	
2.0	Introduction	5
2.1	Theoritical literature	5
2.1.1	Defintions of speech acts	6
2.1.2	Types of speech acts	7

2.1.3	Apology definitions	10
2.1.4	Apology strategies	13
2.1.5	Speech acts and politeness	18
2.1.6	Gender and apology	21
2.2	Empirical studies	23
Chapter three	Method and procedures	29
3.0	Introduction	29
3.1	Population and sample of the study	29
3.2	Methodology	30
3.2.1	Instruments of the study	30
-	The students questionnaire	
3.2.2	Validity of the instrument	31
3.2.3	Reliability of the instrument	31
3.3	Design of the study	31
3.4	Procedures of the study	32
Chapter four	Results of the study	34
4.0	Introduction	34
4.1	Analysis of the results	34
Chapter five	Discussions , conclusions and recommendation	75
5.0	Introduction	75
5.1	Discussion of the findings of question one	75
5.2	Discussion of the findings of question two	78
5.3	Discussions of the results of the questions	80
5.4	Conclusion	81

5.5	Recommendations	82
	References	84
	Appendices	90

List of tables

Table number	Table title	Page
Table 1	Male respondents – situation one	35
Table 2	Female respondents – situation one	35
Table 3	Male and female respondents- situation one	38
Table 4	Male respondents- situation two	38
Table 5	Female respondents- situation two	39
Table 6	Male and female respondents- situation two	39
Table 7	Male respondents- situation three	41
Table 8	Female respondents – situation three	42
Table 9	Male and female respondents – situation three	42
Table 10	Male respondents – situation four	44
Table 11	Female respondents- situation four	45
Table 12	Male and female respondents –situation four	45
Table 13	Male respondents – situation five	47
Table 14	Female respondents – situation five	47
Table 15	Male and female respondents- situation five	48
Table 16	Male respondents – situation six	49
Table 17	Female respondents- situation six	50
Table 18	Male and female respondents- situation six	51
Table 19	Male respondents – situation seven	52
Table 20	Female respondents – situation seven	53
Table 21	Male and female	54

	respondents – situation seven	
Table 22	Male respondents – situation eight	55
Table 23	Female respondents – situation eight	56
Table 24	Male and female respondents- situation eight	57
Table 25	Male respondents – situation nine	58
Table 26	Female respondents – situation nine	59
Table 27	Male and female respondents- situation nine	60
Table 28	Male respondents- situation ten	61
Table 29	Female respondents – situation ten	62
Table 30	Male and female respondents – situation ten	62
Table 31	Male respondents – situation eleven	64
Table 32	Female respondents – situation eleven	65
Table 33	Male and female respondents – situation eleven	65
Table 34	Male respondents – situation twelve	67
Table 35	Female respondents- situation twelve	68
Table 36	Male and female respondents- situation twelve	68
Table 37	Male respondents – situation thirteen	69
Table 38	Female respondents – situation thirteen	70
Table 39	Male and female respondents – situation thirteen	70
Table 40	Male respondents- situation fourteen	71
Table 41	Female respondents – situation fourteen	72
Table 42	Male and female respondents – situation fourteen	73
Table 43	Male and female	74

	respondents – situation fifteen	
Table 44	Strategies used by the male respondents in the fourteen strategies	75
Table 45	Strategies used by the female respondents in the fourteen strategies	77
Table 46	Differences between the strategies used by the male and female respondents	79

List of appendixes

Appendix	Title	Page Number
A	Panel of Experts and Validation Committee of the Questionnaire Form.	86
B	Questionnaire of the Study	87-88

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, for their
endless love, support and encouragement

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise and thanks are due to Allah, the Almighty, for supporting me in completing this work. Without His support, grace and mercy, I would not have finished my thesis.

First and foremost, I have to thank my parents for their love and support throughout my life. Thank you both for giving me strength to reach for the stars and chase my dreams.

My sister, brothers, deserve my wholehearted thanks as well. Special thanks to my fiancé Ali for his support and encouragement. To my lovely friend, Lina Al-kurdi, thank you for your understanding and encouragement in my many, many moments of crisis. Your friendship makes my life a wonderful experience.

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Prof. Zakaria, for his guidance and support throughout this study, and especially for his confidence in me.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the act of apologizing used by male and female students in order to find out whether there are similarities and differences between them. The data were gathered by a questionnaire consisting of 15 questions. The respondents of the study were English native-speaking students from some private schools in Amman, Jordan. The sample consists of sixty students (30 male and 30 female). The study revealed that there are differences and similarities between the two groups. The study also revealed that in general, there were significant differences between males and females respondents in using apology strategies. Gender is a strong factor that influences the use of the speech act of apology. It was proven by the facts that both genders employed many different strategies. Six strategies such as "apology+ commanding the offended", "polite request", "apology +polite request", "polite reaction", "denying responsibility" and "smiling" were used specifically by the male respondents. On the other hand, female respondents used five strategies such as "intensifier+ apology", "offering repair", "hiding the truth", "not facing the problem", and "blaming the offended". The results also showed that male respondents use more explicit apology than their female counterparts.

Keywords: apology, apology strategy, gender

ملخص الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة لبحث استراتيجيات الاعتذار المستخدمة من قبل الطلبة الذكور والإناث لإيجاد إن كان هناك اوجه اختلاف او تشابه في استخدام الاعتذار بين الذكور والإناث . تم جمع البيانات من خلال استبيان يتألف من 15 موقف ,وزع الاستبيان على ثلاث مدارس خاصة اردنية في عمان. تتألف عينة الدراسة من 60 طالب وطالبة (30 ذكور و 30 إناث) من الناطقين بالانجليزية . كشفت نتائج الدراسة ان هنالك اوجه اختلاف وتشابه في استخدام استراتيجيات الاعتذار بين المجموعتين. و بينت الدراسة ايضا ان هنالك اختلافات واضحة بين الذكور والإناث في استخدام استراتيجيات الاعتذار.

توضح الدراسة أن الجنسين استخدموا استراتيجيات مختلفة , حيث استخدم الذكور بشكل خاص ست استراتيجيات اعتذار لم تستخدم من قبل الاناث بينما استخدمت الاناث خمس استراتيجيات اخرى لم تستخدم من قبل الذكور. اضافة الى ذلك بينت النتائج ان الذكور استخدموا استراتيجية الاعتذار الصريح بشكل اكبر من الاناث. ولهذا تعتبر الدارسة الجنس عاملا قويا يؤثر على استخدام الاعتذار.

Chapter One

Introduction

This chapter presents the rationale for the study, the statement of the problem of the research, the objectives and questions which are to be answered. The importance of the study as well as its limitations is later parts of this chapter. In addition, important terms used in the analysis of the data conclude the chapter.

1.0 Background of the study

In the past 30 years, ample research has been devoted to the description of various speech acts and the role of gender on the varied use of apology strategies. That is to say, apologies are one of the speech acts in socio-pragmatic studies.

This study investigates the potential differences between apology strategies used by English-speaking male and female students in some private high schools in Amman, Jordan. This study tries to assess the role that gender plays in producing differences.

Most theories of Gender in Language explain that there are differences between male and female in daily life communication. These differences are caused by social norms and cultural context. Social norms and cultural context influence both male and female in choosing different communication strategies. This study aims at finding out whether male and female use different apology strategies.

1.1 Statement of the problem

It is expected that the use of apology strategies will be different between male and female students. Such differences are related to social norms and cultural contexts that affect gender. However, while a lot of studies have been conducted to understand apology strategies in different contexts, few have been conducted to investigate that in Arabic-speaking context, and specifically in high schools. Therefore it is important to investigate this area of speech act of apology used by English native-speaking students in Amman, Jordan.

1.2 Objectives of the study

This study aims to:

1. find out the apology strategies used by native-English speaking males and females high school students, and
2. clarify the potential differences in the use of apology strategies between male and female respondents.

1.3 Research questions

This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the apology strategies used by native-English speaking males and females high school students?
2. What are the potential differences in the use of apology strategies between male and female respondents?

1.4 Significance of the study

This study might be significant because it presents its findings within the framework of the much debated two-culture theory, which introduces gender as an indicator of difference. Its findings will be related to the existing body of research in terms of concurrence or variance.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in time and place. The sample of the study consists of high school native-speakers of English in some private schools in Amman, Jordan. The sample of this study consists of sixty students (30 male and 30 female). The sample has been chosen from these schools: first, Jordan International School (J.I.S), second, The Islamic Educational College (I.E.C), and third, The National Orthodox School. The researcher has chosen these three schools because these schools are the accept researchers to choose the sample from their students. It should be emphasized that this study focuses only on the speech act of apology by the speaker.

1.6 Definition of Significant Terms

Some technical terms that are often used throughout this study are defined as follows:

Speech act is an action performed via utterances. (Yule 1996, p.47), although it is defined operationally as an utterance that serves a function in communication such as apology, request, or greeting.

Apology: Theoretically, Holmes (1990) gives the definition of an apology as a speech act addressed to the person face-needs of the offended person and intended to remedy an offence for which the apologizer takes responsibility. Thus it restores equilibrium between the apologizer and the person offended (p.156). However, operationally, an apology is the speech used when norms of behavior are broken.

Apology strategies :Theoretically, there are seven strategies for primary remedial moves: “assert imbalance or show deference,” “assert that an offence has occurred,” “express attitude towards offence,” “ request restoration of balance,” “give an account,” “repair the damage,” and “provide compensation” (Owen, 1983, p. 169)

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

2.0 Introduction

This chapter is comprised of the theoretical background of the study as well as some related empirical studies about the speech act of apology and apology strategies. The first section of this chapter includes the definitions of speech acts and also shows and clarifies where apologies are in the classification of speech acts. The second section deals with the definitions of apology and the different categories of apology strategies. The third section discusses the theory of politeness in relation to apology. The fourth chapter will present the relation of gender and apology. The final section presents and discusses some empirical studies related to apology and apology strategies linked to the gender theory. At the end of this chapter the researcher will summarize what has been done in this chapter, and will mention what will be done in later chapters.

2.1 Theoretical Literature

Previous works on gender differences in the use of apology have focused primarily on the observed differences between males and females. This notion can be seen in recent popular literature which discusses gender differences, such as John Grey's *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* or Deborah Tannen's *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. These books explore the idea that women value emotional bonding and common life experiences more than men do, and

they examine, among other issues, how these gendered perspectives influence communication techniques and strategies between men and women. A few studies focused on the speech act of apology in English language (English dialects) like (Holmes, 1989, 1990; Tannen 1994 ; Mattson Bean and Johnstone 1994 ; and Bataineh and Bataineh 2005).

However, before discussing the findings and interpretations of these studies, it is necessary to present an overview of the concept of speech acts and the different types of speech acts, as well as the speech act of apology that is the focus of the present study. In addition, it presents the concept of politeness and apology, and the relation of gender to apology.

2.1.1. Definitions of speech acts

"Speech acts" are acts of communication. To communicate means to express a certain behavior, and the type of speech act being performed matches to the type of behavior being expressed. According to Searle (1969) "talking is performing acts according to rules. (p.22).

John Searle (1969) and John Austin (1975) are the pioneers of the speech act theory, which includes the way people apologize, promise, request and perform other linguistic acts. The concept of speech acts was first defined by Austin (1962) in the first edition of the book *How to do things with words* .Austin did not use the term

speech act but " performative sentence" or " performative utterance", which indicated that " the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action" (p.6).

The term itself was first used by Searle (1969) stating that "talking is performing acts according to rules" (p. 22), and that "speech acts ... are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication" (p.16). Schmidt and Richards (1980) state that speech acts are all the acts we perform through speaking, all the things we do when we speak and the interpretation and negotiation of speech acts are dependent on the context (p.129).

Geis (1995), for instance, proposes what he calls a "dynamic speech act theory" (p.9), which needs to be a combined part of conversation theory. Instead of viewing speech acts as uttering words or sentences, he defines them as multi-turn interactions that perform requests, invitation, apologies, and other such actions.

2.1.2 Types of speech acts

The varied definitions of the speech acts proposed by the scholars lead to various categorizations of the types of speech acts. This section will provide the various types of speech acts, and identify which of them is related, in our case, to apology.

Austin (1975) first classifies speech acts into five categories:

- 1-“verdictives,” which represent acts that give a verdict,
- 2- “exercitives,” which express power on the hearer,
- 3-“commissives,” which commit the speaker to doing something,
- 4-“behabitives,” which express different social behaviors such as apologizing, congratulating, and the like, and
- 5- “expositives,” which are conversation or argument related, such as “I assume” or “I concede” (p. 151).

Parker and Riley (1994:14) state that a speech act has two facets:

- 1- An locutionary act which is defined as the act of saying something, or, the speaker's use of different linguistic units to express a proposition.
- 2- An illocutionary acts are those acts the speaker does when he utters a sentence, like apology, command and request.

Communicative approaches to speech act theory mostly categorize speech acts according to what they communicate to the hearer. Thus, Searle (1979:12-20) proposed five types of speech acts, namely:

- 1- representatives/assertives (present the way things are),
- 2- directives (instruct somebody to do something),
- 3- commissives (when one commits oneself),
- 4- expressives (express feelings and attitudes), and
- 5- declarations (that bring about changes with the use of utterances)

Searle (1979) says that a certain illocutionary act can be “performed indirectly by way of performing another” (p. 31). Searle calls this type of illocutionary act an indirect speech act, as opposed to a direct speech act. While in the case of a direct speech act the content of the utterance is the same as the intention of the speaker, in indirect speech act content and intention are different.

Speech act consists of three separate acts: an act of saying something, an act of doing something, and an act of affecting something. Mirroring this, Leech (1983) used Austin's (1962,1975) kinds of speech acts: Locutionary act, Illocutionary act, and Perlocutionary act (Leech, 1983:199).

Locutionary act is the act of simply uttering a sentence from a language; it is a description of what the speaker says (Leech, 1983: 199). Illocutionary act is the act in which the speaker intends to do something by producing an utterance. Illocutionary acts would include stating, promising, thanking, congratulating, apologizing, threatening, predicting, ordering, and requesting.

Perlocutionary act is the act done by the hearer affected by what the speaker has said. Perlocutionary acts would include effects such as: get the hearer to think about, bring the hearer to learn that, get the hearer to do, persuading, embarrassing, intimidating, boring, irritating, or inspiring the hearer (Leech 1983:199).

2.1.3 Apology definitions

Just as in the case of speech acts that have various definitions, apology has been defined in different ways. As there are different types of speech acts, there are different types or strategies of apologies, as well. The following section is an overview of the most important and common definitions of apology as well as the different strategies of apology.

As a type of speech act, apology is the topic of many studies that aim at explaining what it is. They also examine how apologies can be classified in different ways (e.g. by syntactic structure, topic, goals, addressee, etc) and how apologies are performed and perceived in English.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983) hold that apologizing as a speech act is usually called for when some behavior has caused a violation of the social norms. Olshtain and Cohen (1983), while describing the apology speech act set, assume that apologizing is a two-party act, in the sense that there are two participants: one perceiving himself as deserving an apology, and the other perceived as responsible for causing the infraction (p.21). This process entails that there is a circle of interaction between the recipient and the apologizer.

Leech (1983) views apologies as an attempt to redress an imbalance between the speaker and the addressee created by the fact that the speaker committed an insult against the addressee. According to him, it is not enough to apologize; the apology needs to be successful in order for the hearer to forgive the speaker, and thus reestablish the balance (pp.104-105).

Owen (1983) limits the concept of apology. According to him apologies are remedial moves that follow what he calls a "priming move" on the part of the person who expects the apology, which is a move that triggers the apology. He restricts the use of the term apology to only those utterances that actually contain the explicit phrases "I'm sorry" or "I apologize" and variants of these. Such a definition would exclude from the start any indirect ways of apologizing. Owen's definition would apply only to explicit apologies (pp, 62-63).

In the case of apologies, Owen (1983: 63) believes that the use of this act is restricted in English to the utterances that involve the following:

- 1- Apology, apologies, or apologize,
- 2- Sorry,
- 3- I'm afraid + sentence pro-form.

Owen suggests that the use of these key words renders the move remedial, just as the use of 'thank' comprises thanking. The first type, Owen asserts, is of rare use since it has a restricted range in spoken English, figuring mostly in more formal situations or in the opening of lectures. Apologies of this type are one-party

conversation in the sense that forms of speech by the addressee are not expected to occur. According to Owen, the second type - which incorporates the use of 'sorry' - is said to be the most popular way of performing a primary remedial move in English. Unlike the use of 'apologize' and 'sorry', which appear to have full remedial function, 'I'm afraid' is used to partially convey the same function. This use is distinct from the use of "I'm afraid" to express a speaker's mental condition of fear (p.63).

Brown & Levinson (1987) see an apology as a negative politeness strategy. Apologies are assumed to redress face-threatening acts (FTA) to the speaker's positive face; the speaker indicates regret doing the threatening act. Consequently, this will incur a face loss to some degree on the part of the speaker. On defining apologies, Brown & Levinson (1987) state that apologies are used to communicate regret or reluctance to do an FTA (p. 187-188).

According to Holmes (1995) Apologies are:

Hearer-oriented face-supportive acts.... Apologies have been seen as negative politeness strategies aimed at remedying the effects of an offence or a face-threatening act and restoring social harmony and equilibrium (p184).

However, because apologies are not the only convivial acts, Trosborg (1995) states that apology is designed to repair damage in social interaction. She also adds that:

It coincides with social goal of maintaining harmony between speaker and hearer. This act is face-saving for the hearer and functions to diminish friction in interaction. For these reasons, it might be anticipated that speakers would not hesitate to issue apologies. However, as apologies are issued at the cost of the speaker, who often has to humiliate him /herself, these acts are face-threatening to the speaker.... (P-146)

Apologies fall within the expressive speech acts, where the speaker tries to indicate his own attitude. In order for an apology to have an effect, it should reflect real and honest feelings. As Gooder and Jacobs (2000) state:

The proper apology acknowledges the fact of wrong doing, accepts ultimate responsibility, expresses sincere sorrow and regret, and promises not to repeat the offense. Some of the features of the proper apology are the admission of trespass, the expression of regret, and promise of a future in which injury will not recur (P.273-241).

In addition, Marquez-Reiter (2000) identifies an apology as a compensatory action for an offense committed by the speaker which has affected the hearer (p.44).

2.1.4 Apology strategies

The variety of definitions of apologies leads to the variety in classifications of apology strategies. There are a number of researchers who have developed systems for classifying apology strategies in different ways.

According to Fraser (1981:263), as cited in Batianeh, R (2006), an apology is viewed as convincing; the offender has to use a combination of two or more of the following nine strategies:

1. Announcing that an apology is forthcoming through clauses like (I (hereby) apologize);
2. Stating the offender's obligation to apologize with words like (I must apologize);
3. Offering to apologize to show the sincerity of the act with sentences like (Do you want me to apologize?);
4. Requesting the acceptance of the given apology with clauses like (please accept my apology for);
5. Expressing regret for the offense through the use of intensifiers like (truly, terribly, very and so);
6. Requesting forgiveness for the offense;
7. Acknowledging responsibility for the offending act;
8. Promising forbearance from a similar offending act with sentences like (I promise you that will never happen again); and
9. Offering redress to show that the offender really regrets the offense with offers like (please let me pay for the damage I have done).

Olshtain and Cohen (1983:22) provide the classification of apology strategies into five main categories which can be summarized as follows:

1. Expression of apology: the use of an expression which contains a relevant performative verb, i.e. “sorry,” “I apologize,” “Excuse me,” or “Please forgive me,” “Pardon me.” That is to say; using the performative verbs (apologize, excuse, forgive, and pardon).
2. Acknowledgement of responsibility: the recognition by an apologizer of his or her own fault in causing the offense, i.e. “That’s my fault,” “I admit that I was wrong.”
3. Explanation: the explanation or account of situations which caused the apologizer to commit the offense, i.e. “I have family business,” “I’m late for my class.”
4. Offer of Repair: the offer made by an apologizer to provide some kind of payment for damage caused by his or her infraction, which can be specific or non-specific, i.e. “I will do extra work over the weekend.’, and
5. Promise of non-recurrence: the commitment made by an apologizer not to let the offense happen again, i.e. “It won’t happen again.”

Owen (1983) classifies apologies by the type of utterance they incorporate. Thus, he identifies three types of apologies: one that incorporates “apology,” “apologies,” or “apologize;” one that combines “sorry;” and finally, the one that is created by the phrase “I’m afraid” followed by a sentence. Owen incorporates apologies in the broader context of primary remedial moves. Thus, there are seven strategies for primary remedial moves: “assert imbalance or show deference,” “assert that an offence has occurred,” “express attitude towards offence,” “request restoration of balance,” “give an account,” “repair the damage,” and “provide compensation” (p.169)

Trosborg (1987: 150-152) suggests that the offender decides which apology strategy to use from the following:

1. Minimizing the degree of offense through: Discussing the preconditions of the offense, and blaming another person for the offense;
2. Acknowledgement of responsibility for which he lists the following six types depending on the degree the offender accepts the blame:
Implicit acknowledgement; explicit acknowledgement; expression of the lack of intent; expression of self-deficiency; expression of embarrassment; and explicit acceptance of the blame;
3. Explanation or account which is done either implicitly or explicitly by the offender to mitigate his responsibility.
4. Offer of repair which is carried out in two ways:
 - A. Literal offer in which the offender states he will pay for the damage, or
 - B. Compensation which might balance the offence;
5. Promise of forbearance where the offender promises never to repeat the offense, and
6. Expressing concern for the offended person to calm him.

Olshtain and Cohen's 1983 taxonomy was also revised by Holmes (1990), who believes that it is necessary to remodel these strategies in order to make them clearer. Thus, she divides apologies into four main categories, each category having subcategories. The first one is "an explicit expression of apology" and contains the subcategories:

- a. “offer apology/IFID (illocutionary force indicating device)”
- b. “express regret,”
- c. “request forgiveness.”

The second main category is represented by “an explanation or account, an excuse or justification.”

The largest group, “an acknowledgment of responsibility,” contains:

“accept blame,” “express self-deficiency,” “recognize H (hearer) as entitled to an apology,” “express lack of intent,” and “offer repair/redress.”

Finally, the last category is “a promise of forbearance” (p.167). One can notice that “acknowledgment of responsibility” is exclusively proposed by Holmes.

Trosborg (1995) classifies apology strategies as follow:

- "1.Expression of apology: a. expression of regret, b. offer of apology, and c. request for forgiveness.
- 2. Remedial support: a. expressing concern for hearer, b. promise of forbearance, c. offer of repair" (pp. 381-383). Trosborg also presents another strategy in which the speaker refuses to take responsibility; this strategy is 0 strategy or "opting out" strategy (p. - 383).

Aijmer (1996) differentiates thirteen apology strategies as follow:

A. Explicit emotional:

- 1. Explicitly apologizing, 2.Expressing regret.

B. Explicit non-emotional:

1. Offering apology,
2. Acknowledging a debt of apology,
3. Demanding forgiveness,
4. Explicitly requesting the hearer's forgiveness.

C. Implicit Emotional:

1. Giving an explanation, 2 Expressing emotions.

D. Implicit non-emotional:

1. Self-denigration or self-approach.
2. Minimizing responsibility.
3. Acknowledging responsibility for the offended act
4. Promising for forbearance from similar offending act.
5. Offending redress.

2.1.5 Speech Acts and Politeness

The speech act theory is also closely related to the concept of politeness. Early studies on politeness claim that this concept is universal (Lakoff, 1973; Brown & Levinson, 1987). According to Lakoff (1973) there are three main rules of politeness, namely “don’t impose,” “give options,” and “make [the hearer] feel good – be friendly” (p. 298). Lakoff (1990) defines politeness as a set of "interpersonal relations" (p. 34) aimed at making communication smooth through keeping the possibility of conflict and confrontation which are innate in human communication, to the minimum.

Watts (2003:39) characterizes politeness as follows:

1. Politeness is the natural attribute of a 'good' character.
2. Politeness is the ability to please others through one's external actions.
3. Politeness is the ideal union between the character of an individual and his external actions.

Brown and Levinson politeness theory (1987) is the most common approach. Brown and Levinson regard politeness as a universal phenomenon found in every culture; such a claim is evidenced by their observation of similarities in the linguistic strategies employed by speakers of different languages i.e. different cultures. They propose that an individual's face motivates strategies of politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) define face as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (p. 61). They distinguish between negative face and positive face. Positive face is the desire to be liked and appreciated by others. Negative face is the desire not to be imposed upon, disturbed. Brown & Levinson consider that face is "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction." (P.61).

Consequently, individuals often prioritize three wants, the want to communicate the content of a face-threatening act, the want to be efficient, and the want to maintain the hearer's face. These three wants create five strategic choices for the speaker (Brown & Levinson, 1987:60):

- (1) on the record, without redressive action, baldly (smallest estimated risk of face loss);

- (2) speak on record with redressive action, in the form of positive politeness;
- (3) speak on record with redressive action, in the form of negative politeness;
- (4) speak off the record;
- (5) don't do the FTA (do not speak at all).

However, what counts as polite behavior (including values and norms attached to such behavior) is culture specific and language-specific (Gu, 1990). According to Gu (1990), for the Chinese “politeness exercises its normative function in constraining individual speech acts as well as the sequence of talk exchanges” (p. 242). As is the case for any specific society, politeness theory differs from one culture to another. The findings of Al-Adaileh, B (2006) pointed to the fact that the social variables play a significant role in the performance of the speech act of apology. In the study, the two cultures (English and Jordanian) exhibited differences as to which combination of these variables determines the choice and frequency of apologies. It also demonstrated that the key motive behind the act of apologizing in British English is the seriousness of offence in connection with the recognition of the social power of the addressee. Conversely, the interaction between the seriousness of the offence and social distance seems to be the main motivation behind this speech act in Jordanian Arabic.

To sum up this section, the concept of politeness is also closely related to the speech act theory and to apology. Although the concept of politeness differs from one culture to another, it carries the notion of keeping the relations between people on good terms.

2.1.6. Gender and apology

In sociolinguistic studies, gender is associated with social constructs that are influenced by socio-cultural conditions. By biological gender, people are labeled male and female. By social gender, people are classified by their roles in a community. Norms in a society also determine what can and what cannot be done by men and women, such as the type of job, roles in the family and environment, how to dress, and how to speak (in our case, how both men and women use language to apologize to the same gender and ,also, to each other).

The literature that deals with the gender effects on language reveals two contradictory views. The first point of view claims that men and women speak different languages due to the fact that they are members of different cultures (Maltz and Borker 1982;Tannen 1990; Gray 1992). However, the other theory claims that men and women behave in different ways because this approach puts men as the ones who control and dominate a conversation. Women then become the ones who are dominated (subordinate).

Furthermore, Maltz and Borker (1982) and Tannen (1990) present the "difference" approach which is based on the theory of cultural differences proposed by. Central to this approach is the claim that men and women come from two different subcultures. The differences of these two subcultures lead to the differences of communicative competence of men and women. In fact, this approach does not concentrate on the imbalance of power distribution of men and women, but more on differences in internal norms of men and women at the time of interaction.

As proponents of the different-culture theory, Maltz & Borker (1982) state that men and women have different cultural assumptions about talk and friendly conversation. They argue that whereas girls talk to establish and maintain relationships of closeness; boys perceive talk as a tool for conveying information and getting things accomplished. They further explain that adults possess different rules for running a friendly conversation when starting to interact socially and publicly with each other (p.202-203).

A big supporter of this approach is Deborah Tannen. She believes the difference starts in childhood, where parents use more words about feelings to girls and use more verbs to boys. Males and females belong to different sub-cultures and therefore speak differently. Tannen (1990; 1994; 1995), elaborating on the different-culture approach, claims that men's and women's methods of communication are very different. She (1990) perceives conversation between men and women to be "a cross-cultural communication" as they belong to different linguistic communities (p.18).

Tannen (1990) claims that there are gender differences in ways of speaking, and we need to understand them in order to avoid unnecessarily blaming "others or ourselves -- or the relationship -- for the otherwise mystifying and damaging effects of our contrasting conversational styles" (p.17). Tannen takes a sociolinguistic approach to these gender differences since she states that "because boys and girls grow up in what are essentially different cultures...talk between women and men is cross-cultural communication" (p. 18).

Tannen's term "rapport-talk" means that women use language for intimacy. Girls are socialized as children to believe that "talk is the glue that holds relationships together" (p. 85), so that as adults conversations for women are "negotiations for closeness in which people try to seek and give confirmation and support, and to reach consensus" (p. 25). Conversation is for community; the woman is an individual in a network of connections.

Some studies tested gender differences in using apologies in English, some studies show that there are differences while, on the other hand, other studies failed to present any differences. These studies will be presented in the following section of the empirical studies. Also, some studies about language and gender will also be presented in the next section.

2.2 Empirical Studies

As a type of speech act, the apology has also been the object of numerous studies that attempted to find out how this particular speech act is performed and how speakers in a language community use it in various social contexts. Review of previous research studies on the apology speech act in the present study are presented specifically within English language.

There are a few studies that looked exclusively at how native English speakers apologize, these studies try to show whether there are differences or similarities in using apology strategies by males and females. Other studies contrast the use of apology in English and other languages. Also, some studies that focused on language and gender are presented in this section.

In the early studies of language and gender, some (socio-) linguists believed that men would take dominant roles within conversation. Lakoff and Zimmerman and West looked at these issues. Lakoff (1975) looked at the features that reflected women as inferior in social status. This is known as the deficit model. She looked at the use of linguistic features such as tag questions. She said that their use showed uncertainty and the use of polite terms, showed women's inferior status.

The example of important research on language and gender from the perspective of men domination of women is a study Zimmerman and West (1975). The authors studied the interruption in the conversation. Zimmerman and West examined daily conversations in public places like coffee shops, stores, and university buildings. The result of their research shows the inequality between men and women in conversation. Men use the mechanisms of power and control while interacting with women. Men also use the tactics of interruption to limit women in expressing themselves in a conversation.

Supporting the same-culture (The Dominance theory) view MacGeorge, Graves, Feng, Gillihan, and Burleson (2004) argue that more similarities than differences in women's and men's behaviors are observed. These researchers believe that although women and men possess different skills with respect to the use of language, they should not be regarded as members of different communication cultures (p.171)

Previous works on gender differences of the use of apology have focused primarily on the observed differences between males and females. For example, from the field of social psychology, investigating apologetic behaviors during court cases, Rothman & Gandoss (1982) found that women apologize and express remorse more than men. From the same field, in the study by Gonzales, Pederson, Manning & Wetter (1990), arguably found that women apologize more than men. Gonzales et al., investigating the effects of sex, status and consequence severity on the accounting strategies produced by 99 American students, found that female students produced more explicit apologies than their male counterparts. On average, women proffered over 80% more of such explicit apologies than did men.

Holmes's study (1989) focused on a range of strategies used by New Zealanders with consideration of various social factors as well as the distributional patterns for women and men. She, for instance, found that, in 183 remedial exchanges in the corpus with the total number of 295 occurrences of apology strategies and based on gender, both women and men largely use the same strategies, women tended to use apologies more than men, women apologized to other women more than to men, and men apologized to women more than to men. Added to that, women gave 74.5 percent

of all the apologies recorded and received 73.3 percent of them. Holmes, also added (p.198), apologies to males are much less frequent than apologies to females (26.7 percent vs. 73.3 percent).

The outcomes from Mattson Bean & Johnstone's (1994) investigation of the use of the apology form during telephone interviews also pointed to the existence of gender differences with reference to apologizing. In their study, however, it was the male interviewers who favored the form and used it more than twice as often as their female counterparts. Female respondents were addressees for roughly the same number of apology forms as were male respondents (3.6 for females, 3.1 for males), and female interviewers received nearly the same number as male interviewers (0.7 for females, 0.8 for males). But males, interviewers and respondents alike, uttered more apology forms than did females. In addition, the differences are minute in case of respondents (male respondents uttered 0.8 apology forms per survey and female respondents 0.7) but striking in the case of interviewers, the male interviewers employed an average of 5.6 apology forms per survey to the female interviewers 2.3.

Bataineh, R. and, Bataineh, R. (2005) aims at investigating potential gender effects in American university students' use of apologies within the framework of the two-culture theory. The researchers used a questionnaire. The findings revealed that male and female respondents used the primary apology strategies of statement of remorse, accounts, compensation, and reparation. These strategies accounted for 74% of the strategies used by the male respondents and 80.4% of those used by their female counterparts. Female respondents used slightly fewer non-apology strategies

than their male counterparts (1.8% vs.3%). Male respondents opted for not apologizing (i.e. saying nothing) much more than their female counterparts (compare 46.6% to 33%).

Contrary to what has been mentioned above, other studies show that gender differences have no significant effect on apologetic behaviors, forms or functions. In earlier studies Linnell, Porter, Stone, and Cohen (1992) used the verbal discourse completion situations designed by Cohen and Olshtain (1981) in assessing oral apologies among twenty native and twenty non-native speakers of English. No significant differences were found between the two groups in six of the eight situations which included situations such as forgetting a meeting with a boss, forgetting a meeting with a friend and bumping into an elderly lady in a department store.

Furthermore, Márquez Reiter (2000) explores politeness phenomena in British English as compared to that in Uruguayan Spanish. The researcher analyzed apologies in terms of the differences and similarities in same and cross-gender interactions, Reiter points out that the major differences in the linguistic behavior of males and females are no more than differences between languages. She also stated that:"Notwithstanding, both, British and Uruguayan females employed more apologies than their male counterparts" (p.168)

In the same rank, Wouk (2006) found that the gender of the apologizer did not affect apology responses in any consistent way. Although, some gender differences were observed in use of upgrading, with males significantly more upgrading overall

than did females. The ratio of male to female in using upgrading was 1.41. In another situation the ratio was 1.64.

In the light of what has been presented, this study aims to see whether there are any gender differences in the use of apology strategies in particular by English native-speaking males and females students in Jordan private schools.

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology adopted in this study and gives information about the population, the sample and the instrument. It also describes the validity and reliability of the instrument. Finally, it describes data collection procedures and gives information about the research design and statistical analysis.

3.1 Population and Sample of the Study

The population of this study includes native-speakers of English in private schools in Amman, Jordan. This is related to a field problem. It was impossible to collect data from schools of Arabic-speaking students (see 1.5) for different administrative reasons. Therefore, data was collected from only English-speaking students. The population resembles a sample of 60 students from some private schools in Amman was selected to respond to the questionnaire. The sample members were divided equally thirty male students and thirty female students.

3.2 Methodology

The methodology used in this study is descriptive and analytic, and the corpus obtained from the subjects is described and analyzed. The researcher attempts to find out the apology strategies used by English native-speaking students. The aim of this

study is to find whether, gender affects the use of apology by English native-speaking students in some private schools in Amman.

3.2.1 Instrument of the Study

To accomplish the objective set for this study, the researcher designed a questionnaire and delivered it by hand to the subjects of the study in the various private schools.

3.2.1.1 The Students' Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see appendix B) is the main instrument used by the researcher to collect the data. The questionnaire consists of 14 situations to which the respondents are asked to answer. It also consists of one yes or no question. Some of the questionnaires' items are originally extracted from instrument used in previous studies such as Hussein, R. & Hammouri, M. (1998). Some items were modified and others were added to be relevant to native English speakers in private schools in Amman, Jordan. The first part of the questionnaire required obtaining the demographic data of the subjects: gender, age, level of education, and nationality.

The second part of the questionnaire consists of situations that probe how the respondents would apologize in those situations. The questionnaire was presented to the respondents in English. Useful guidance and help was given through the whole process. Sixty copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the students enrolled in

three private schools in Amman, Jordan. In administering this questionnaire, the researcher used the delivery and collection method.

3.2.2. Validity of the Instrument

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher sent the questionnaire to a panel of experts who are professors of English (see appendix A). They were asked to examine the face and content validity of the designed questions. They were asked to review the phrasing, suitability, thoroughness, and ease of use of the questionnaire. The professors gave the researcher comments and suggestions on the content of the questionnaire form. Some comments and suggestions resulted in the modifications of the questionnaire items. (See appendix B).

3.2.3. Reliability of the Questionnaire

The researcher used a test-retest device to measure the reliability of the instrument. Ten students who were excluded from the main sample were selected to respond to the items of the questionnaire. A week later, it was administered again for the second time and the results showed consistency in the answers.

3.3 Design of the Study and Statistical Analysis

This study employed a mixed method approach. A quantitative and qualitative approach using the open questionnaire was administered to students to gather data from a convenience sample of 60 participants (30 males and 30 females) from private

schools in Amman, Jordan. The questionnaire sought how native English-speaking students apologize, and whether there are any gender differences in the way male and female respondents apologize.

The collected data were recorded, analyzed and interpreted; the researcher placed the answers in tables with percentages of students' responses and attitudes. Then these tables were numbered and given titles. The analyses covered three areas: the strategies used by male and female students to apologize, the main differences between male and female respondents in apology strategies, and the main reasons behind the differences.

The researcher depended on simple arithmetical procedures such as frequencies and percentages in analyzing and interpreting the data. Furthermore, each table was followed by a commentary that highlighted significant aspects of the findings that drew the readers' attention to important issues.

3.4 Procedures of the Study

1. After choosing the topic of the study, the researcher read a number of previous studies related to the speech act of apology and apology strategies, and gender differences in using apology strategies.
2. The researcher identified the population and selected the samples on which the instruments were applied.

3. The researcher then put up the questions of the current study depending on previous studies, and thus the dimensions of the study were established. Then a questionnaire was designed.
4. Validity and reliability of the designed questionnaire were verified.
5. Letter of permission was obtained from the Middle East University to facilitate the research and to administer the questionnaire.
6. The questionnaire was distributed and collected by the researcher in the second semester during May, 2014. A cover letter, which explained the purpose of the study and the official approval to carry out this study, was sent to the respondents.
7. After that the raw data taken from the questionnaire were recorded, analyzed and interpreted; the researcher recorded the questionnaire returns by using a summary sheet recording the questions one by one.
8. The results were presented by using simple tables each of which had a title and a number, and each table was followed by a commentary highlighting items of interest.
9. The researcher analyzed the results by using simple arithmetical procedures such as frequencies, percentages.
10. Finally, the researcher interpreted the information to find out whether the results agree or disagree with previous studies in the review of literature.
11. The main conclusions that could be drawn from the findings were presented briefly and simply.
12. The researcher presented recommendations and suggestions for future studies.
13. The list of references was written in alphabetical order using the APA.

Chapter Four

Results of the study

4.0 Introduction

In order to answer the research questions set forth in this study, the data collected with the help of the survey were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The present chapter will present the overall categories of the apologies given by the respondents. This is necessary to find out the most frequently used categories, as well as the kind of combinations the respondents preferred to use when apologizing.

4.1 Data Analysis

The responses from the respondents were calculated and their frequencies were taken in order to make a comparison between male and female respondents. The analysis of situations in which the distribution of the strategies is presented in a table for each situation as follows:

The first situation "You are running quickly upstairs. There is a woman sitting on the stairs. You cannot avoid her. So you step on her foot. If this situation were real, what would you say?"

Table (1) shows the strategies used by male respondents in this situation.

Male respondents – situation 1		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit Apology	I am so sorry	16
No-apology	Nothing	2
Apology + providing justification	I am sorry, but I am in a rush	7
Apology + commanding the offended	Why are you sitting here? Move away	2
Polite request	Would you please not sitting here	1
Apology + Polite request	Sorry , please let me pass	2

As the table shows the male respondents tried to be explicit in the way they apologize by using expressions of apologizing such as 'I apologize', 'I am so sorry'. On the other hand, only two respondents would not apologize in the same situation.

The other strategies used in this situation were combination of strategies like using 'apology + providing justification', 'apology + polite request, 'apology + commanded the offended'.

Table (2) shows the apology strategies used by female respondents in situation one.

Situation one- female respondents		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit Apology	Sorry	16
	I apologize	
Intensifier + apology	I am really sorry	8
	I am so sorry	
Blaming the offended	Why are you sitting here!	6

As this table shows the female respondents used only three apology strategies for situation one. They used the 'explicit apology' strategies such as I apologize, sorry. "Explicit apology + intensifier" such as I am so sorry, I am really sorry. The third apology strategy was "blaming the offended (or the victim)".

The following table presents a comparison between the strategies used by the male and female respondents in situation one:

Situation1	Male		Female	
Strategies	Frequencies	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit apology	16	53.28	16	53.28
No-apology	2	6.6	–	–
Apology+ Justification	7	23.31	–	–
Apology +criticizing the offended	2	6.66	–	–
Polite request	1	3.33	–	–
Apology + polite request	2	6.66	–	–
Blaming the offended	–	–	6	19.98
Intensifier +apology	–	–	8	26.64

As the table shows, the female respondents used three strategies (the explicit apology, blaming the offended and intensified apology). On the other hand, the male respondents used six strategies for the same situation.

The only similarity between the two groups was that they both used the "explicit apology" in equal percentage about 53.28%. This portion shows that both parties tried to be polite and also apologize explicitly. The differences were clear in that about 19.98% of the female respondents used blaming the offended (or the victim), in a way they wanted to avoid apology. In such cases, this will show that the female respondents were not polite in comparison with the male respondents. It was clear that about 6.66% of the male respondents criticized the offended but in a polite way using an apology. The second strategy that presented the male respondents more polite than the female ones was the strategy of "apology+ providing justification". This strategy was not used by the female respondents.

The last strategy used by the male respondents was the "non-apology strategies", which was used by two respondents (about 6.66%). "Polite request" was used only by the male respondents; it was used by one male respondent. It was clear from the findings of the first situation that the only similarity between the male and female respondents was the use of the explicit apology. On the other hand, the male respondents used more strategies in the first situation more than their female counterparts.

Situation two: “While you are at your best friend's home, you ask him to show you his favorite vase. When you hold it, it falls down from your hand and smashes. If this situation were real, what would you say?”

Table (4) illustrates the strategies used by the male respondents for situation two.

Male respondents- situation two		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am very sorry	13
Offering Solution	I will buy a new one I will try to fix it	2
Apology + Offering solution	I am so sorry , I will buy a new one	11
Apology + Justification	Sorry but I do not know how it fell	2
Impolite response	Hhahahaha , this is revenge for that time you broke my phone	1
Providing Justification	OMG, I did not mean that to happen.	1

The table shows that 13 male respondents use the explicit apology strategy in this situation. They also use two combined apology strategies such as apology + offering solution which was used by eleven respondents, and only two respondents use apology + providing justifications strategy. Two other strategies were used such as offering solutions which was used by two respondents, and providing justification which was used by one respondent. The last strategy was used by one respondent which is the impolite response.

Table (5) presents the strategies used by the female respondents in situation two.

Female respondents – situation two		
Category	Example	Frequency
Offer of solution	Oh, I will try to fix it. I will buy a new one for you.	16
Explicit apology	I am sorry. OMG , Sorry	6
No-apology	Nothing	8

This table shows that only three strategies were used by the female respondents in situation two. The main strategy was "offering solution" which was used by 16 female respondents. The second strategy which was used by six respondents was the "explicit apology". The third one was the "non-apology strategy" which was used by eight female respondents.

Table (6) presents a comparison between the strategies used by the male and female respondents to show the similarities and differences between the respondents.

Situation 2 Strategies	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit apology	13	43.29	6	19.98
No –apology	–	–	8	26.64
Offer solution	2	6.66	16	53.28
Apology+ offer solution	11	36.63	–	–

Apology+ Justification	2	6.66	–	–
Impolite response	1	3.33	–	–
Justification Providing	1	3.33	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

As it is clear in this table, the male respondents used six strategies, whereas the female used only three strategies. The similarity between the respondents is the use of the "explicit apology strategy". But the percentage is 43.29% of the male respondents used this strategy while only 19.98% of the female respondents used it.

Also the female respondents tried "offering a solution and fixing the problem" as a way of apologizing. About 53.28% of the females used this strategy, while 6.66% of the male respondents used it. The only strategy that was used by female respondents is the non-apology strategy. This strategy was used with average 26.64% by the female respondents.

The male respondents, on the other hand, used four strategies that were not used by the female respondents. These strategies include "apology + offering solution" which was used by 63.63% of the total respondents. The second strategy was "apology+ providing justification" which was used by only two respondents (about 6.66%). The next strategy was "providing justification" without apologizing; this strategy was used by one respondent. The last strategy that was used only by the male respondents is "the impolite response" which was used only by one male respondent.

Situation three “Your sister invites you to her room to show you her expensive clock she has just got for her birthday. When she hands it to you, it falls down and smashes. If this situation were real, what would you say?”

Table (7) shows the strategies used by the male respondents in situation three.

Male respondents –situation three		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Sorry	11
No-apology	Nothing	2
Offering Solution	Take mine I will pay for it I will buy you a new one	7
Apology+ offering Solution	So sorry, I will buy you a new beautiful one	7
Apology + Providing justification	Sorry , I was not carry it tight	2
Other responses	It was not worth much anyway.	1

As table (7) shows that the most used strategy was the "explicit apology". Strategies like "offering solution" and "apology+ offering solution" were used in equal portion. Seven respondents used these two strategies. Another strategy used in situation three was the "non-apology strategy". This strategy was used by two male respondents. The last two strategies used by the male respondents were "apology+ providing justification" which was used by one respondent, and "other responses" which was used by one male respondent.

Table (8) presents the strategies used by the female respondents in situation three.

Female respondents – situation three		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Sorry	5
	I apologize	
Offer of repair	I will buy you a new one	14
No-apology	Nothing	11

As it is clear in table (8), the female respondents used three strategies. The most used strategy was "offering repair" which was used by 14 female respondents. The second most used strategy is "the non-apology" strategy which was used by eleven female respondents. The last strategy that was used in this situation is the 'explicit apology' which was used by five respondents.

The following table sets a comparison between strategies used by the male and female respondents in situation three.

Table (9) presents a comparison between the male and female respondents in situation three.

Situation 3	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit Apology	11	36.63	5	16.65

Offer of repair	–	–	14	46.62
No-apology	2	6.66	11	36.63
Offer solution	7	23.31	–	–
Apology+ offer solution	7	32.31	–	–
Apology+ Justification	2	6.66	–	–
Opting out responsibility	1	3.33	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

The table shows that two strategies were used by both the male and female respondents; these two strategies were "the explicit apology" and "the non-apology strategy". However, the portions of the usage of these two strategies differ by the male or the female respondents; 36.63% of the male respondents used the explicit apology while 16.65 % of the female respondents used it.

The only strategy that was used by the female respondents was the offer of repair; about 36.63% of the female respondents used this strategy. The male respondents used four strategies, these strategies were "offer solution", "apology+ offer solution", "apology + providing justification" and "opting out responsibility".

Situation four: “While your brother is studying, you switch on the radio causing a loud noise. Your brother hates being disturbed while studying. If this situation were real, what would you say?”

Table (10) shows the strategies used by the male respondents in situation four.

Male respondents – situation four		
Category	Example	Frequency
No-apology	Nothing	4
Apology	Sorry So sorry Sorry and laughing	5
Polite solution	Ok , I'll turn it off	12
Impolite solution	Go find another place to study	4
Apology + solution	Sorry, I'll turn it off	5

This table shows that the most used strategy by the male respondents was "the polite solution" which was used by 12 respondents. Two strategies which were used equally by five respondents for each strategy were "the explicit apology" and "apology+ offering solution". The last two strategies were "impolite solution" and "the non-apology strategy"; both were used by four respondents for each strategy.

Table (11) presents the strategies that are used by the female respondents in situation four.

Female 4		
Category	Example	Frequency
No-apology	Nothing	2
Apology + Offering solution	I am sorry, I will leave the room	10
Explicit apology	I am sorry; it was not on a purpose.	6
Impolite solution	Go find another place to study.	8
Polite Solution	I will turn it off. I will turn down the volume.	4

As the table shows the most used strategy was "apology+ offering solution" which was used by 10 respondents. The next most used strategy was "impolite solution" which was used by eight respondents. Other strategies were "the explicit apology" which was used by six respondents and the "polite solution" which was used by four respondents. The last strategy was the "non-apology" strategy which was used by two female respondents.

Table (12) sets a comparison between the male and female strategies used in situation four, to show the differences and similarities between the two groups.

Situation 4	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit apology	5	16.65	6	19.98
No apology	4	13.32	2	6.66
Apology +offer solution	5	16.65	14	46.64
Impolite solutions	4	13.32	8	26.64
Polite solutions	12	39.96	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

As the table shows both male and female respondents used four similar strategies. However, these strategies were used in different portions. The first strategy used by 46.64% of the female respondents was "apology + offering solution". However, this strategy was used by 16.65% of the male respondents. The second strategy is "an impolite solution" which was used by 26.64% of the female respondents, while only 13.32% of male respondents used it.

The third strategy used by both groups was the explicit apology which was used by 19.98% of the female respondents, and 16.65% of the male respondents. The last strategy used by the two groups was the non apology strategy which was used by 6.66% of the female respondents while 13.32% of the male respondents used this strategy. The only strategy which was used by 39.96% of the male respondents was the polite solution.

Situation five: " Your father asked you to wash his car, but you forgot. Now he is angry. If this situation were real, what would you say?"

Table (13) shows the strategies used by the male respondents in situation five.

Male respondents – situation five		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Please, forgive me Sorry Sorry forgive me	4
No-apology	nothing	1
Apology + offer solutions	Sorry, I will wash it now	7
Offer solution	I will wash it later	11
Apology + providing justification	Sorry, I was studying	7

The table shows that the most used strategy was "offering solution" which was used by 11 respondents. Two strategies were used equally by the seven male respondents; these strategies were "apology + offer solution" and "apology+ providing justification". In situation five, four male respondents used the "explicit apology strategy". The last strategy used in this situation was the non-apology strategy which was used by one respondent.

Table (14) presents the strategies used by the female respondents in situation five.

Female respondents- situation five		
Category	Example	Frequency
Apology + offering solution	I am sorry, I will wash it now.	17
Explicit apology	Sorry dad	3
Impolite response	Go wash it yourself I would not do it , I am a girl. Ask my brother to do it.	4
Offer solution	I will wash it later.	4
Apology + promise of non-recurrence	Sorry dad, I promise not to forget this thing again.	1
Providing Justification	Dad I have exams these days.	1

This table shows that the most used strategy was "apology+ offering solution" which was used by 17 respondents. Two strategies were used equally: "impolite response" and "offering solution" which were used by four respondents for each strategy. Also two strategies were used equally by one respondent for each strategy. These strategies were "apology+ promise of non-recurrence" and "providing justification". The last strategy is the "explicit strategy" which was used by three female respondents.

Table (15) presents a comparison between the strategies used by the male and female respondents in situation five.

Situation 5	Male		Female	
Strategies	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit apology	4	13.32	3	9.99
No –apology	1	3.33	–	–
Apology + Offer solution	7	23.31	17	56.61
Impolite responses	–	–	4	13.32
Offer solution	1	3.33	4	13.32
Apology + promise of non-recurrence	–	–	1	3.33
Justification + solution	–	–	1	3.33
Apology + Justification	7	23.31	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

It is clear from the table that both groups used three similar strategies which were the "explicit apology", "apology+ offer solution", and "offer solution". About 13.32% of the male respondents used the explicit apology while only 9.99% of the female respondents used this strategy. About 56.61% of the female respondents use "apology+ offer solution" while only 23.31% of the male respondents use this strategy. The last strategy that was used by the two groups was "offering solution" which was used by 13.32% by the female respondents while only 3.33% of the male respondents used this strategy.

Two strategies were used only by the male respondents. These strategies were "the non-apology" strategies and "apology+ providing justification". The female respondents, on the other hand, used three strategies that were used only by the female respondents. These three strategies were "impolite responses", "providing justification+ offering solution" and "apology+ promise of non-recurrence".

Situation six: "The night before your friend has an important speech to make at a conference at the school, you deleted by mistake your friend's speech from the computer. You now tell this to your friend. If this situation were real, what would you say?"

Table (16) shows the strategies used by the male respondents in situation six.

Male respondents- situation six		
Category	Example	Frequency
Offering solution	I will write a new one	7

No-apology	Nothing	4
Apology + solution	Sorry , I'll write a new one	7
Apology	Oh, I am sorry	6
Apology +providing Justification	Sorry, it was by mistake	4
Ignoring the problem	Ignoring it, unless he comes and asks about it.	1
Apology + blaming somebody or something else	Sorry, you should have made a back up copy. Sorry, but there is a virus on your device.	1

This table shows that the male respondents used seven strategies in situation six. Two most used strategies were "offering solution" and "apology+ offering solution". These two strategies were used by seven male respondents for each strategy. The next most used strategy, which was used by six respondents, was the "explicit apology". The "non-apology strategy" and "apology+ providing justification", both, were used by four respondents for each strategy. Strategies like "ignoring the problem" and "apology + blaming somebody or something else" were used by one respondent for each strategy.

Table (17) will presents the strategies used by the female respondents in situation six.

Female respondents – situation six.		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am so sorry.	2
Apology+ offering help	I am sorry, I will help you rewrite a new good one	21
Offering help	I will write a new one .	6
Hiding the truth	I will not tell her	1

The female respondents used only four strategies. The most used strategy was "apology + offering help". This strategy was used by 21 respondents. The second strategy which was used by six respondents was "offering help". 'Explicit apology' was used by two respondents. The last strategy was "hiding the truth" which was used by one respondent.

Table (18) presents a comparison between the male and female respondents in situation six.

Situation 6 Strategies	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit Apology	6	19.98	2	6.66
Apology + offering solution	7	23.31	21	69.93
Impolite response	–	–	2	6.66
Offer help	7	23.31	4	13.32
Hide the truth (ignoring the problem)	1	3.33	1	3.33
No- apology	4	13.32	–	–
Apology + Justification	4	13.32	–	–
Apology + blaming somebody or something else	1	3.33	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

The table shows that both male and female respondents used four similar strategies. These strategies were "explicit apology", "apology+ offer solution", "offering help" and "hiding the truth". However, these strategies were used in different portions. The most used strategy was "apology+ offering solution" which was used by 69.93% by the female respondents, while this strategy was used by

23.31% male respondents. The explicit apology was used by 19.98% by the male respondents while only 6.66% of the female respondents used it.

"Offering help" was used by 23.31% of the male respondents while only 13.32% of the female respondents used it. "Hiding the truth" which was used by one single respondent from the two groups. Only one strategy was used by the female respondents. This strategy was "impolite response" which was used by 6.66% of the female respondents. The male respondents used three strategies. These strategies were "the non-apology strategy", "apology+ providing justification" and "blaming something or somebody else".

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

Table (19) presents the strategies used by the male respondents in situation seven.

Male respondents-situation seven		
Category	Example	Frequency
Apology	OMG , so sorry	15
No-apology	Nothing	4
Apology +Providing Justification	I am sorry, my bag is heavy	7
Polite reaction	Feeling shy	1
Apology + offering help	So sorry , I will carry my bag	2
Denying the responsibility	Oops , it is not my fault	1

The table shows that 15 respondents used the "explicit apology" strategy. The second most used strategy was "apology+ providing justification" which was used by seven male respondents. Another strategy was "the non-apology strategy" which was used by four respondents. Two respondents used "apology+ offering help". "Polite reaction" and "denying responsibility" were used by one respondent for each strategy.

Table (20) presents the strategies that are used by the female respondents for situation seven.

Female respondents- situation seven		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Sorry. Deeply sorry.	10
Apology + offering help	Sorry, are you okay? Sorry, I will help you.	12
Blaming somebody or something else.	Ops, It is the driver fault. These racks are unstable.	3
Ignoring the problem	Nothing, I would act like I did not notice.	1
Apology + providing justification	Sorry, it was by accident.	3
No-apology	Nothing	1

As the table shows that the most used strategy was "apology + offering help", this strategy was used by 12 female respondents. Ten respondents used the "explicit apology". Two strategies were used equally by three respondents for each one: "blaming something or somebody else" and "apology + providing justification" were used by three respondents for each strategy. Two strategies were also used equally by

one respondent for each strategy. These two strategies were "the non-apology strategy" and "ignoring the problem".

Table (21) sets a comparison between the strategies used by the male and female respondents for situation seven.

Situation 7 Strategies	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit Apology	15	49.95	10	33.3
No-apology	4	13.32	1	3.33
Apology + offering help	2	6.66	12	39.96
Apology + Justification	7	23.31	3	9.99
Blaming someone or something else	–	–	3	9.99
Ignoring the problem	–	–	1	3.33
Polite reaction	1	3.33	–	–
Denying the responsibility	1	3.33	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

It is clear from the table that both male and female respondents used four similar strategies. These strategies were "explicit apology", "non-apology strategy", "apology+ offering help" and "apology+ providing justification". The portion of using explicit apology by male respondents is 49.95%, while only 33.3% of the female respondents used this strategy.

About 13.32% of the male respondents used the "no-apology strategy" while only 3.33% of the female respondents used this strategy. Strategy of "apology + offering help" was used by 39.96% of the female respondents while 6.66% of the male respondents used this strategy. Another strategy was "apology+ providing justification" which was used by 23.31% by the male respondent while only 9.99% of the female respondents used this strategy.

Two strategies were used only by the female respondents. These strategies were "blaming something or somebody else" and "ignoring the problem". On the other side, two strategies were used by the male respondents. These two strategies were "polite reaction" and "denying responsibility".

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

Table (22) shows the strategies used by the male respondents for situation eight.

Male respondents- situation eight		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am sorry I apologize	9
No-apology	I do not apologize Nothing	3
Apology+ providing justification	I am sorry I was at the hospital my brother broke his leg	11

Apology + offering solution	Sorry, I will do extra effort to make to up to you	4
Offering solution	Ok I will do it on my own	1
Avoid a problem to be happened	I will call him before hand and tell him that I will be late	1
Providing justification	I will tell him the reason which made me late so much	1

The table shows that seven strategies were used by the male respondents in situation eight. Eleven respondents used "apology + providing justification". The second most used strategy was the "explicit apology" which was used by nine respondents.

Strategy such as "apology + offering solution" was used by four respondents, while three respondents used the non-apology strategy. The last three strategies, which were used equally by one respondent for each strategy, were "offering solution", "providing justification" and "avoid the problem to happen".

Table (23) presents the strategies used by the female respondents for situation eight.

Female respondents –situation eight.		
Category	Example	Frequency
Apology + Providing justification	Sorry, but I got busy with something important	7
Explicit apology	Excuse me. Sorry.	13
No-apology	Nothing	3
Providing justification	It was an accident in the road.	1
Offering solution	I will make extra effort	4
Apology + blaming the Offended.	Sorry, but you know that I am always late.	2

The female respondents used six strategies for this situation. The most used strategy was the "explicit apology" which was used by 13 respondents. "Apology + providing justification" was used by 7 respondents. The other four strategies are the "non-apology" strategy which was used by 3 respondents. One respondent used "providing justification", "offering solution" was used by four respondents; and the last strategy was "apology+ blaming the offended" which was used by two respondents.

Table (24) presents a comparison between the male and female respondents for situation eight.

Situation 8	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Apology	9	29.97	13	43.29
No-apology	3	9.99	3	9.99
Apology + justification	11	36.63	7	23.31
Apology + offering solution	4	13.32	–	–
Avoid to make a problem	1	3.33	–	–
Giving justification	1	3.33	1	3.33
Offering solution	1	3.33	4	13.32
Blaming the offended	–	–	2	6.66
Total	30	100	30	100

This table shows that five similar strategies were used by both male and female respondents. These strategies were "explicit apology", "non-apology", and "apology+ providing justification", "providing justification" and "offering solution". "The explicit apology" was used by 43.29% female respondents while only 29.97% of male respondents used it. "Apology + providing justification" was used by 36.63% of male respondents while 23.31% of the female respondents used this strategy. Two strategies were used in equal portion. For instance the "non-apology" strategy and "giving justification" were used by one respondent for each group. Two strategies were used only by the male respondents. These strategies were "apology+ offering solution" and "avoid making a problem". One strategy was used only by the female respondents. This strategy was "laming the offended" which was used by two female respondents.

Situation nine: "While you were sitting with your father and his guests, you interrupted him a lot. When the guests left, your father blamed you a lot. If this situation were real, how would you apologize?"

Table (25) presents the strategies that are used by the male respondents for situation nine.

Male respondents – situation nine		
Category	Example	Frequency
No-apology	Nothing	7
Explicit Apology	So sorry Sorry dad	7
Apology +promise of non-	Sorry dad I will not do it again	4

recurrence		
Promise of non-recurrence	This is the last time doing this	2
Other responses	Oh, but I had lots to say	1
Apology+ Justifications	I apologize dad, but I was excited	9

For situation nine, the male respondents used six strategies. The most used strategy was 'Apology + providing justification' which was used by nine respondents. Another two strategies, which were used by seven respondents for each strategy, were the "explicit apology" and "the non-apology strategy". "Apology + promise of non-recurrence" was used by four respondents. The last two strategies were "promise of non-recurrence" which was used by two respondents and "other responses" which was used by one respondent.

Table (26) presents the strategies used by the female respondents for situation nine.

Female respondents- situation nine.		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am very sorry	7
Apology+ providing justification	Sorry, I get excited and had lots to say.	7
No-apology	I would not apologize	1
Apology+ Promise of non-recurrence	I would not do it again, Sorry	12
Promise of non- recurrence	Ok, I will not open my mouth again	3

The female respondents, as the table shows, used five strategies for situation nine. The most used strategy was apology+ promise of non-recurrence which was used by twelve respondents. Two strategies were used equally. These strategies are "the explicit apology" and "apology + providing justification". Both strategies were used by seven respondents for each strategy. Three female respondents used "promise of non-recurrence". Only one respondent used "the non- apology" strategy.

Table (27) presents a comparison between the strategies used by the male and female respondents.

Situation 9	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
No-apology	7	23.31	1	3.33
Explicit apology	7	23.31	7	23.31
Apology +Promise of non-recurrence	4	13.32	12	39.96
Promise of non-recurrence	2	6.66	3	9.99
Other responses	1	3.33	–	–
Apology +giving justification	9	29.97	7	23.31
Total	30	100	30	100

Both groups, male and female respondents, used one similar strategy with equal portion. This strategy was the "explicit apology" which was used by seven respondents for each group. Also both groups used four similar strategies, but with

different portions. For instance, 23.31% of the male respondents used the "non-apology strategy" while only 3.33% of the female respondents used it. Another strategy was "apology + promise of non-recurrence" which was used by 39.96% of the female while only 13.32% of the male respondents used it. About 9.99% of the female respondents used "promise of non-recurrence" while only 6.66% of the male respondents used this strategy. The last strategy that was used by both groups was "apology+ providing justification" which was used by 29.97% of the male respondents and 23.31% of the female respondents used it.

Situation ten: “You borrowed a CD from your classmate and did not return it. How would you apologize?”

Table (28) presents the strategies use by the male respondents for situation ten.

Male respondents – situation ten		
Category	Example	Frequency
No-apology	Nothing	2
Explicit apology	I am sorry	4
Offering solution	I will buy you a new one	10
Apology + providing justification	I am sorry , it has been crashed.	1
Apology + offering solution	I am so sorry , you can take mine	13

As the table shows, the most used strategy was "apology + offering solution", this strategy was used by 13 respondents. The second most used strategy was "offering

solution" which was used by 10 respondents. The rest three strategies were "the non-apology strategy", "the explicit apology" and "apology+ providing justification".

Table (29) presents the strategies used by the female respondents for situation ten.

Female respondents – situation ten		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am very sorry	1
Apology + promise to return it.	Sorry, I will give it back to you tomorrow.	22
No- apology	No apology	1
Offering solution	I will buy a new one	6

As for situation ten, the female respondents, as it is clear in the table, used four strategies. The most used strategy was "apology + promise of non-recurrence" which was used by 22 respondents. The strategy of "offering solution" was used by 6 female respondents. Two strategies which were used equally, one respondent for each strategy, were "the non-apology strategy" and "the explicit apology".

Table (30) will set a comparison between the strategies which are used by the male and female respondents.

Situation 10	Male		Female	
Strategies	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage

Explicit apology	4	13.32	1	3.33
No-apology	2	6.66	1	3.33
Offer solution	10	33.3	6	19.98
Apology + Offer justification	1	3.33	–	–
Apology + offer solution	13	43.29	22	73.26
Total	30	100	30	100

As it is clear from the table of both groups, the male and female respondents, used four similar strategies but with different portions. "The explicit apology" was used by 3.33% of the female respondents and 13.32% of the male respondents. Also "the non-apology strategy" was used by 6.66% of the male respondents while only 3.33% of the female respondents used this strategy. "Offering solution" was used by 33.3% of the male respondents while 19.98% of the female respondents used it. The last mutual strategy was "Apology +offering solution" which was used by 73.26% of the female respondents and 43.29% of the males used it. One strategy was used only by the male respondents is "apology + providing justification" which was used only one respondent.

Situation eleven: "Your teacher lent you a story that you asked for, and you lost it. If this situation were real, how would you apologize?"

Table (31) presents the strategies that are used by the male respondents for situation eleven.

Male respondents –situation eleven		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	So sorry	11
No-apology	Nothing	1
Apology+ offering solution	Sorry sir, I will buy you a new story	13
Apology+ blaming somebody or something else	My little brother tore it apart. I am sorry	1
Offer solution	I will buy a new copy.	3
Polite reaction	Feeling shy and ashamed	1

It is obvious from the table that the most used strategy was "apology +offering solution" which was used by 13 respondents. The second most used strategy for this situation, which was used by 11 respondents, was "the explicit apology". Three respondents used "offering solution". The last three strategies were "the non-apology strategy", "apology + blaming somebody else" and "feeling shy". These last three strategies were used by one respondent for each strategy.

Table (32) presents the strategies used by the female respondents for situation eleven.

Female respondents – situation eleven		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Sorry again	6
Apology + offering solution	Sorry, I will get a new copy for you.	15
Offering solution	I will buy a new copy.	8
Promise of non-recurrence	I will not lost anything else again.	1

Female respondents used only four strategies for situation eleven. The strategy which was used most was "apology + offering solution". This strategy was used by 15 female respondents. Eight respondents used "offering solution without apologizing", and six respondents used "the explicit apology". The last strategy which was used by one respondent is "promise of non-recurrence".

Table (33) presents a comparison between the strategies that are used by the male and female respondents for situation eleven.

Situation 11	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit apology	11	36.63	6	19.98
No-apology	1	3.33	–	–
Apology +offering solution	13	34.29	15	49.95

Apology+ blaming Somebody or Something else	1	3.33	–	–
Offering solution	3	9.99	8	26.64
Polite reaction	1	3.33	–	–
Promise of non-recurrence	–	–	1	3.33
Total	30	100	30	100

The table shows that three strategies were used by the two groups but with different portions for each group. These strategies were "the explicit apology", "apology+ offering solution" and "offering solution". The explicit apology was most used by the male respondents with the average 63.63% while only 19.98% of the female used this strategy. The second mutual strategy was "apology + offering solution" which was used by 49.95% of the females and 34.29% of the male respondents. About 26.64% of the female respondents used "offering solution" while only 9.99% of the male respondents used it. Three strategies were used only by the male respondents. These strategies were the "non-apology strategy", "apology+ blaming something or somebody else" and "polite reaction". One female respondent used "promise of non-recurrence".

Situation twelve: "At a restaurant, you are carrying your meal to your table. When you are walking between tables, you stumble, and your soup spills over an elderly lady's blouse. That's clearly your fault. How would you apologize to her for the accident?"

Table (34) shows the strategies used by the male respondents for situation twelve.

Male respondents – situation twelve		
Category	Example	Frequency
No-apology	Nothing	4
Explicit apology	Oh, I am sorry I apologize	7
Apology+ offering solution	Sorry , take this blouse Sorry, I will take you home	6
Apology+ offering help	Sorry, I will help you to clean it up	7
Offering help	I will clean the blouse	4
Apology+ Providing justification	I am sorry , but there was no place to pass .	2

As the table shows, the male respondents used six strategies for situation twelve. Two strategies were used equally, seven respondents for each strategy. These two strategies were "the explicit apology" and "apology +offering help". Also two strategies were used equally by four respondents were "offering help" and "the non-apology strategy". The last two strategies were "apology+ offering" solution which was used by six respondents; and "apology + providing justification" which was used only by two respondents.

Table (35) presents the strategies which are used by the female respondents for situation twelve.

Female respondents- situation twelve		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am deeply sorry	2
Apology + offering solution	I am so sorry, let me get some tissues	22
Offering solution	I would get napkins	5
Not facing the problem	I would run away	1

It is obvious from the table that only four strategies were used for situation twelve by the female respondents. "Apology + offering solution" was the most used strategy which was used by twenty two respondents. Another strategy which was used by five female respondents was "offering solution". The last two strategies were the "explicit apology" which was used by two respondents; and "not facing the problem" which was used by one respondent.

Table (36) presents a comparison between the strategies that are used by the male and female respondents for situation twelve

Situation 12 Strategies	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
No-apology	4	13.32	–	–
Explicit apology	7	23.31	2	6.66
Apology +offering	6	19.98	22	73.26
Apology +offering help	7	23.31	–	–
Offering help	4	13.32	–	–
Apology+ offering justification	2	6.66	–	–
Offering solution	–	–	5	16.65
Not-facing the problem	–	–	1	3.33
Total	30	100	30	100

As the table shows, two strategies were used by both groups. These two strategies were "the explicit apology" and "apology+ offering solution". The strategy of "apology + offering solution" was used by 73.26% of female respondents while only 19.98% of the male respondents used it. "The explicit apology" was used by 23.31% of the male respondents while only 6.66% of the female respondents used it. Four strategies were used only by the male respondents. These strategies were "the non-apology strategy", "apology+ offering help", "offering help" and "apology+ providing justification". On the other hand, two strategies were used by the female respondents. These strategies were offering solution and not facing the problem.

Situation thirteen: "Rushing to get to class on time, you enter the elevator, and step on someone's foot that you know as one of the teachers at the school. How would you apologize?."

Table (37) presents the strategies which are used by the male respondents for situation thirteen.

Male respondents –situation thirteen		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	I am sorry I apologize	22
Providing justification	I was late to class and I did not see you	1
Apology+ Providing Justification	Sorry, I was in a rush Sorry, I am late for the class	6
No-apology	Nothing	1

It is clear from the table that four strategies were used by the male respondents for situation thirteen. The most used strategy was the "explicit apology" which was used by twenty two respondents. Other two strategies were used by one respondent from each group. These two strategies were "providing justification" and the "non-apology strategy". The last strategy was "apology+ providing justification". This strategy was used by six male respondents.

Table (38) presents the strategies that are used by the female respondents for situation thirteen.

Female respondents- situation thirteen		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Ops I am very sorry	16
Apology + providing justification	Sorry. I am late for the class	13
No-apology	I would be too much in a hurry to apologize.	1

The female respondents used three strategies. The most used strategy was "the explicit apology" which was used by 16 respondents. The second strategy, which was "apology + providing justification", was used by 13 respondents. The last strategy was the "non-apology strategy" which was used by one female respondent.

Table (39) sets a comparison between the strategies which is used by the male and female respondents for situation thirteen.

Situation 13 Strategies	male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Explicit apology	22	73.26	16	53.28
No-apology	1	3.33	1	3.33
Apology + Giving	6	19.98	13	43.29

Justification				
Giving justification	1	3.33	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

The table shows that there were three strategies used by both groups. The most used strategy by the male respondents was "the explicit strategy" which was used by 73.26% while the same strategy was used by 53.28% of the female respondents. The second strategy was "apology + giving justification" which was used by 43.29% of the female respondents while only 19.98% of the male respondents used it. One strategy was used equally by one respondent for each group. This strategy was "the non-apology strategy". Only one strategy used by the male respondents. This strategy was "giving justification".

Situation fourteen: "In the school, you stepped on one student's foot in a crowded elevator. What would you say to? "

Table (40) presents the strategies used by the male respondents for situation fourteen.

Male respondents – situation fourteen		
Category	Example	Frequency
No-apology	Nothing	3
Explicit apology	I am sorry	16
Apology+ Providing justification	Sorry, it is crowded here	7
Providing justification	I have not seen you	2
Blaming something or somebody else	It is not my fault. It is the elevator crowded	1
Smiling	Just smile	1

For situation fourteen, the male respondents used six strategies. "Explicit apology" was used by 16 respondents. Another strategy which was used by 7 respondents is "apology+ providing justification". "The non-apology strategy" was used by 3 respondents. Only two respondents used the strategy of "providing justification". Two strategies were used equally by one respondent for each group.

Table (41) presents the strategies used by the female respondents for situation fourteen.

Female respondents – situation fourteen		
Category	Example	Frequency
Explicit apology	Oh, please my apology	22
Apology + providing justification	Sorry, but I am very late	5
No-apology	No- apology	3

The female respondents used three strategies only. The most used strategy was the explicit strategy which was used by 22 respondents. The second strategy was "apology + providing justification" which was used by 5 respondents. The last strategy which was used by 3 respondents was "the non-apology strategy".

Table (42) presents a comparison between the strategies used by the male and female respondents for situation fourteen.

Situation 14 Strategies	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
No-apology	3	9.99	3	9.99
Apology	16	53.28	22	73.26
Apology +Giving Justification	7	23.31	5	16.65
Giving Justification	2	6.66	—	—
Blaming somebody or something else	1	3.33	—	—
Smiling	1	3.33	—	—
Total	30	100	30	100

As the table shows, one strategy was used by the male and female respondents. This strategy was "the non-apology strategy" which was used by 9.99% for each group. Two strategies were used by both groups. These strategies were "the explicit apology" which was used by 73.26% of the female respondents while 53.28% of the male respondents used it. The second strategy was "apology + providing justification" which was used by 23.31% of the male respondents and about 16.65% of the female respondents. Three strategies were used by the male respondents. These strategies were "providing justification", "blaming somebody or something else" and "smiling".

Situation fifteen: "Would you apologize if the person you insult is from another gender?"

Table (43) presents a comparison to show whether male or female respondents would apologize or not to another gender.

Situation 15	Male		Female	
Strategies	Frequency	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Yes , I would apologize	23	76.59	22	73.26
No , I would not	3	9.99	3	9.99
It Depends	2	6.66	4	13.32
May be	2	6.66	–	–
Total	30	100	30	100

The table shows that 73.26% of the female respondents would apologize, and 76.59% of the male respondents would also apologize, however, 9.99% of both gender groups would not apologize. 13.32% of the female respondents mentioned that their apology depends on the situation. Male respondents, on the other hand, said that their apology depends on the offended, if he or she deserves the apology or not.

4.2 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the findings and results for the questions of the questionnaire. The results present similarities and differences in using apology strategies by the male and female respondents. The analysis of the data presented in this section and the answers of the research questions will be presented in chapter five.

Chapter Five

Discussions, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a brief summary and a short discussion of the findings of the two research questions. It also attempts to explain and interpret the results in light of the reviewed literature. The chapter concludes with recommendations and suggestions for future research.

5.1 Discussion of the Findings of Question One:

Q1: What are the apology strategies used by native-English speaking males and females high school students?

The following tables will present the strategies used by the male and female respondents.

Table (44) presents the strategies used by the male respondents for the fourteen situations.

	Strategies used by male respondents	Number of situations	Total
1.	Explicit apology	14	146
2.	No-apology	13	38
3.	Apology +providing justification	12	65
4.	Apology+ commanding the offended	1	2
5.	Polite request	1	1
6.	Apology+ polite request	1	2
7.	Offering solution	7	41
8.	Apology +offering solution	9	73
9.	Providing justification	4	5
10.	Other responses	2	2
11.	Polite solution	1	12
12.	Impolite solution	1	4
13.	Ignoring the problem	1	1
14.	Apology + blaming somebody or something else	2	2
15.	Polite reaction	2	2
16.	Apology+ offering help	9	9
17.	Denying responsibility	1	1
18.	Avoiding the problem	1	1
19.	Apology + promise of non-recurrence	1	4
20.	Offering help	1	4
21.	Smiling	1	1
22.	Impolite response	1	1
23.	Promise of non recurrence	1	2
24.	Blaming somebody or something else	1	1

The table shows that 24 strategies were used by the male respondents for fourteen situations. The table shows that the most used strategy by the male respondents is the explicit apology which was used in the fourteen situations. The next most used strategies are "apology +offering solution" which was repeated 74 times in nine situations , "apology +providing justification" which was used 65 times in 12 situations, "offering solution" which was used 41 times in 7 situations, and "the no-apology strategy" which was used by 38 times in 13 situations. "Polite solution"

strategy was used 12 times in one situation. "Apology+ offering" help was used 9 times in 9 situations. "Providing justification" was used in 4 situations and was repeated 5 times. "Impolite solutions", "apology + promise of non-recurrence" and "offering help" were used 4 times in one situation.

Some strategies were used twice in one situation. These strategies were "promise of non-recurrence", "apology + commanding the offended" and "apology + polite request". Other strategies were used twice in two situations. These situations were "polite reaction", "apology+ blaming somebody or something else". Finally six strategies were used one time in one situation. These strategies were "polite request", "ignoring the problem", "avoiding the problem", "smiling", "impolite response" and "blaming somebody or something else".

Table (45) presents the strategies used by the female respondents in the fourteen strategies.

	Strategies used by female respondents	Number of situations	total
1.	Explicit apology	14	115
2.	Blaming the offended	1	6
3.	Intensifier +apology	1	8
4.	Offering solution	6	43
5.	No-apology	9	31
6.	Offering repair	1	14
7.	Apology +offering solution	4	64
8.	Impolite solution	1	8
9.	Polite solution	1	4
10	Impolite response	1	4
11.	Apology+ promise of non-recurrence	2	13
12.	Providing justification	2	2
13.	Apology+ offering help	2	33
14.	Offering help	1	6
15.	Hiding the truth	1	1

16.	Blaming somebody or something else	1	3
17.	Ignoring the problem	1	1
18.	Apology+ providing justification	5	35
19.	Apology +blaming the offended	1	2
20.	Promise of non-recurrence	2	4
21.	Apology+ promise of return it	1	22
22.	Not facing the problem	1	1

The female respondents used 22 strategies to respond for fourteen situations in this study. The most used strategy was "the explicit apology" which was used 115 times in fourteen situations. The next most used strategies were "apology + offering solution" which was used 64 times in 4 situations, "offering solution" which was used 43 times in 6 situations, "apology + providing justification" which was used 35 times in 5 situations, "apology + offering help" which was used 33 times in two situations, and "no-apology" which was used 31 times in 9 situations.

Strategy like "offering repair" was used 14 times in one situation. "Apology + promise of non-recurrence" was repeated 13 times in two situations. "Apology + promise to return it" was used 22 times in one situation. "Promise of non-recurrence" was used 4 times in two situations. Some strategies were used from 3-8 times in one situation, these strategies were "blaming the offended", "intensifier+ apology" , "impolite solution", "polite solution", "impolite response", "offering help", "blaming somebody or something else". Strategy such as "providing justification" was used twice in two situations. Finally, three strategies were used one time in one situation. These strategies were "hiding the truth", "ignoring the problem", and "not facing the problem".

5.2. Discussions of the findings of Question two

Q2. What are the potential differences in the use of apology strategies between male and female respondents?

Table (46) presents the potential differences between the strategies used by the male and female respondents.

strategies used by male respondents	Total	Strategies used by female respondents	Total
Explicit apology	146	Explicit apology	115
No-apology	38	No-apology	31
Apology+ commanding the offended	2	Intensifier +apology	8
Polite request	1	Offering repair	14
Apology + polite request	2	Hiding the truth	1
Polite reaction	2	Not facing the problem	1
Denying responsibility	1	Blaming the offended	6
Smiling	1		

It is clear from the table that male respondents used more explicit apology than their female counterparts. However, the "no-apology strategy" was used somehow equally between the two groups. Seven strategies were used only by the male respondents. These strategies were: "apology + commanding the offended", "polite request", "apology + polite request", "polite request", "denying responsibility" and "smiling". On the other hand, the female respondents used other five strategies. These strategies were "intensifier + apology", "offering repair", "hiding the truth", "not facing the problem", "and blaming the offended".

In comparing these strategies, we can notice that the male respondents use explicit apology more than their female counterparts. Comparing the strategies in tables (45)

and (46), we also notice that the male respondents use combinations of strategies to apologize and fix their mistakes. Whereas the female respondents try to fix the mistake in different strategies without apologizing in most situations.

In responding to question 15 in the questionnaire, as the table (44) shows that both groups equally indicate that they would apologize to the opposite gender (23 male respondents and 22 female respondents). Also, both groups equally indicate that they would not apologize to the opposite gender (9.99% of both groups).

5.3 Discussions of the results of the questions

The results of our study show that there are gender differences in using apology strategies by native-English speaking students. These results are consistent with the studies of (Tannen 1990,1994,1995) ; Maltz and Borker 1982; Mattson Beans and Johnstone 1994).These studies found that there are differences in using apology strategies between male and female.

In contrast, findings of this study are not consistent with other studies like (Rothman and Gandossy 1982 ; Holmes 1989 ; Gonzales , Pederson, Manning, & Wetter (1990).These studies found that women apologize more than men, women use strategies to apologize more than men. Also, Gonzales et al. found that women used more explicit apologies than their male counterparts. In our study we found the opposite; that male respondents used explicit apologies more than their female counterparts.

Other studies found that gender did not affect the use of apology strategies between male and female respondents. These studies are (Linnell, Porter, Stone, and Cohen (1992) ; Reiter (2000); Bataineh & Bataineh (2005); Wouk (2006)). These studies contrast the findings of our study which present clear differences in the strategies and the frequencies of using the strategies.

As we it obvious from the answers of the research questions, the male respondents used twenty four strategies in responding to the fourteen situations. The female respondents, on the other hand, used twenty two strategies for the fourteen situations. The main conclusions will be presented in the following section.

5.4 Conclusion

Based on the data, the study comes to the following conclusions:

1. Male respondents produce more explicit apology than their female counterparts.
2. Both groups roughly use the strategy of no-apology (43 times by the female and 38 times by the male respondents).
3. Male respondents use combinations of strategies such as (apology + commanding the offended; apology + polite request). Whereas, there are no mutual combined strategies between male and female respondents.

4. Male respondents use particularly four strategies like polite request, polite reaction, denying responsibility and smiling. On the other hand, the female respondents use particularly five different strategies such as (intensifier + apology, offering repair, hiding the truth, not facing the problem, and blaming the offended).
5. Many similar combination of strategies were produced by the female and male respondents like (apology + offering solution, apology + promise of non-recurrence, apology+ offering help, and apology + providing justification).
6. Female respondents produce strategies without any expression of apology like offering help, ignoring the problem, promise of non-recurrence, offering solution, offering repair, impolite solution, polite solution, impolite response, and providing justification).
7. Male respondents also produce strategies without combining it with an expression of apology like (polite request, offering solution, providing justification, other responses, polite solution, impolite solution, ignoring the problem, polite reaction, denying responsibility, avoiding the problem, offering help, smiling, impolite response, promise of non-recurrence, and blaming somebody or something else).

5.5 Recommendations

On the basis of the results of this study, the researcher suggests the following recommendations:

1. Comparing and contrasting the apology strategies used by the participants from different age groups of the same culture to see whether or not they all used the same

strategies and determining the differences between the strategies used by different groups.

2. Comparing and contrasting the apology strategies used by participants from same-sex groups to see whether or not they all used the same strategies and determining the differences between the strategies used by these groups.

3. Examining apology using oral responses which will bring into focus supra segmental factors like tone.

4. Comparing other types of speech acts that might cause misunderstanding or present the speaker as impolite like requesting.

5.6 Conclusion and summary of the study

This study tries to examine the apology strategies used by the male and female respondents in some private schools in Amman, Jordan with the aim of examining the impact of gender on the use of apology strategies and frequency. The findings of the data analysis reveal that there are similarities in using apology strategies between male and female students. However, male students tend to use more apology strategies in most situations than female. Thus, it can be said that this area of research should be investigated in more depth. It is suggested that a future study could be conducted to investigate the differences in using apology strategies between by English native-speaking students, and Arabic native-speaking students in Arabic-speaking context.

References:

- Aijmer, K. (1996). *Conversational Routines in English: Convention and Creativity*. London : Longman.
- Al-Adaileh, B. (2006). The speech act of apology: A linguistic exploration of politeness Orientation in British and Jordanian culture. Phd thesis, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Bataineh , R. & Bataineh , R . (2005). *American university students' apology strategies: An intercultural analysis of the effect of gender*. (on-line), available : <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr9/bataineh.htm>
- Bataineh, R. (2008). A cross-cultural study of the speech act of apology in American English and Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4), 792-821
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cohen, A. D. & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of socio-cultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 113-134.
- Fraser, B. (1981). On apologizing. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp.259-271). New York: Mouton.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14 (2), 219-236.
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from mars, women are from venus*. New York : Harper Collins.
- Geis, M. L. (1995). *Speech acts and conversational interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gonzales, M. H., Pederson, J. H., Manning, D. J., and Wetter, D. W. (1990). Pardon my gaffe: effects of sex, status, and consequence severity on accounts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 58 (4), 610-621.
- Gooder, H and Jacobs , J.M. (2000). On the border of the unsayable: The apology in postcolonizing Australia. *Interventions : International Journal of postcolonial studies*, 2 (2), 229-247.

- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14 (2), 10-17.
- Hussein, R., & Hammouri, M. (1998). Strategies of apology in Jordanian Arabic and American English. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 49 , 37-50.
- Holmes, J. (1989). Sex differences and apologies: one aspect of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics* ,10 (2),194-213.
- (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society*, 19 (2): 155-199
- (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London : Longman.
- Lakoff , R. (1973). Logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's. In papers from the Ninth Regional meeting of the Chicago linguistic society, 292-305.
- (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper and Row.
- (1990). *Talking Power. The Politics of Language in Our Lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Linnell, J., Porter, F. L., Stone, H., & Chen Wan-Lai. (1992). Can you apologize me?

An investigation of speech act performance among non-native speakers of English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 8(2), 33-53.

MacGeorge, E. L, Graves, A. R., Feng, B., Gillihan, S. J., and Burleson, B. R. (2004).

The myth of gender cultures: Similarities outweigh differences in men's and women's provision of and responses to supportive communication. *Sex Roles*, 50 (3-4), 143-175.

Maltz, D. N. and Borker, R. A. (1982). *A cultural approach to male-female*

miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and Social Identity*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.(pp.202-203)

Márquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A*

contrastive study of requests and apologies. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mattson, B. J., and Johnstone, B. (1994). Workplace reasons for saying you're sorry:

Discourse task management and apology in telephone interviews. *Discourse Processes*, 17(1) , 59-81.

Olshain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). *Apology: A speech act set*. In Wolfson.N & Judd.

E (Eds),*Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olshain, E. (1989). *Apologies across languages*. In Blum-Kulka, S., House, J and

Kasper, G.(1989). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood:

N. J. Albex.

Owen, M. (1983). *Apologies and remedial interchanges: A study of language use in social interaction*. New York: Mouton.

Parker, F. & Riley, K. (1994). *Linguistics for non-linguists*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rothman, M. L. and Gandossy, R. P. (1982). Sad tales: The accounts of white-collar defendants and the decision to sanction. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 25 (4), 449-73.

Schmidt, R. W. and Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 1,2, 129-158.

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

Searle, J.R. (1976). *The Classification of Illocutionary Acts*. *Language in Society*, 5 (1). 1- 24.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: William Morrow.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men at Work , Language, Sex and Power*. London: Virago Press.

Tannen, D. (1995). *Gender and discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics* ,11(2), 147-167.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and Apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wee, L. (2004). Extreme communicative acts' and the boosting of illocutionary force. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(12) , 2161-2178.

Wouk, F . (2006). The language of apologizing in Lombok, Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics* ,38 (9), 1457–1486.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zimmerman, D & West , C. (1975). Sex roles , interruptions and silences in conversation. In Thorne , B and Henley , N (eds). *Language and sex. Difference and dominance (pp105-129)*. Rowley ,Mass : Newbury House.

Appendix A

Area of Specialization	Place of Work	Position	Name
Linguistics / English Pragmatics	Al-Hussein bin Talal University	Associate Professor	Bilal Al.Adialeh
Linguistics -Syntax	Al-Hussein bin Talal University	Associate Professor	Ahmed Al- saidat
Linguistics	Al-Hussein bin Talal University	English teacher	Wasan Beldawi

APPENDIX B

This questionnaire seeks to test the way native English speakers apologize. The data collected will be used to study the differences and similarities concerning apology strategies among native speakers of English language in Jordan.

Sex

Age

Nationality

Level of Education

Please read the following situations. After each situation write what you would actually say, do not tell anyone about what you would say.

1. You are running quickly upstairs. There is a woman sitting on the stairs. You cannot avoid her. So you step on her foot. If this situation were real, what would you say?

2. While you are at your best friend's home, you ask him to show you his favorite vase. When you hold it, it falls down from your hand and smashes. If this situation were real, what would you say?

3. Your sister invites you to her room to show you her expensive clock she has just got for her birthday. When she hands it to you, it falls down and smashes. If this situation were real, what would you say?

4. While your brother is studying , you switch on the radio causing a loud noise. Your brother hates being disturbed while studying. If this situation were real, what would you say?

5. Your father asked you to wash his car, but you forgot. Now he is angry. If this situation were real, what would you say?

6. The night before your friend has an important speech to make at a conference at the school, you deleted by mistake your friend's speech from the computer. You now tell this to your friend. If this situation were real , what would you say ?

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

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

9. While you were sitting with your father and his guests, you interrupted him a lot. When the guests left, your father blamed you a lot. If this situation were real, how would you apologize?
10. You borrowed a CD from your classmate and did not return it. How would you apologize?
11. Your teacher lent you a story that you asked for, and you lost it. If this situation were real, how would you apologize?
12. At a restaurant, you are carrying your meal to your table. When you are walking between tables, you stumble, and your soup spills over an elderly lady's blouse. That's clearly your fault. How would you apologize to her for the accident?
13. Rushing to get to class on time, you enter the elevator, and step on someone's foot that you know as one of the teachers at the school. How would you apologize?
14. In the school, you stepped on one student's foot in a crowded elevator. What would you say to?
15. Would you apologize if the person you insult is from another gender?

THANK YOU FOR COOPERATION