



The Use of Apologies` Strategies in Pashto and English Languages from the Perspective of Politeness

Dr. Mian Shah Bacha, Head, Department of English, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Sheringal, Dir Upper KPK, Pakistan.Email: bachamsb@gmail.com. Contact No: 324986701

Dr.Rabia Rustum, Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University, Islamabad, Abbottabad

Abstract- This research is aimed at how apologies strategies are expressed in Pashto and English. A questionnaire of open role play scenarios of requesting and apologising was used to collect data from Pashto language respondents and data collected by Reiter were compared with the Pashto language. The questionnaire was adapted from Reiter's study (2000) and translated into Pashto for respondents who spoke that language. The questionnaire consisted of 24 role play scenarios (12 requests and 12 apologies), and each set of the questionnaire took 45 to 50 minutes to complete. Peshawar University, University of Malakand, Islamia College University, Peshawar, Swat University, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Sheringal, and a Pos University each had ten students. The methodological framework of Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) was used. The data on apology strategies in both linguistic cultures hold up Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper's claims (1989). In both British English and Pashto, the use of IFID and the "expression of responsibilities strategies" occurred in varying degrees, but the use of other semantic and sub-formulaic terms did not. The findings of the apology strategies also indicate that they were implemented in various ways in British English and Pashto, with the British respondents expressing a clear preference for the lexical expression "I am sorry." Adverbs like dreadfully, awfully, really, very, really, and terribly were used to emphasize the strength of this lexical type. In an Anglo-Saxon dominated milieu, such amplified ways for the expression of apology strategies occurred as a convention for conflict avoidance, which was perceived to be a redressal for the addressee's negative face. The Pashto respondents, on the other hand, used non-intensified ways for expressing regret, but they also used IFID intensified in some of the strategies. Bakhana Gwarama (forgive me), Mazrat Koma (I regret/ apologise), Khafa Nashai (never mind), Afsos Koma (I am sorry), Mata Der Afsos De (I am extremely sorry), and Mafi Gwarama were among the expressions the Pashto respondents chose (I seek forgiveness). When the offence was going to be serious, these types of apologies occurred in both formal and informal contexts. The findings also indicate that British respondents used more intense apology expressions. The Pashto respondents did not use such intense forms of apology speech, implying that the negative face of the addressee was not needed. Furthermore, the findings indicate that the severity, seriousness, and nature of the offences influenced the strategies used in both linguistic cultures' role play situations.

Keywords: apologies, politeness, requests, avoidance, redressal

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

John Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969) have contributed much towards the concept of speech acts. They have discussed the importance of the speech acts within the human communication. They state that mere words are not enough for a successful human communication, there are also some pragmatic factors that ensure a meaningful interaction among humans. The human speech is expressed by some direct and indirect speech acts, but indirect speech acts are more complex than the direct speech acts. There are always some linguistic cues and markers for understanding these speech acts. The branch of linguistics which deals with such linguistic cues, markers and other socio-pragmatic factors is called pragmatics.

In Pragmatics, a context and co-context play a very important role in the human speech. There are even some socio-pragmatic factors which are used for the speaker-intended meaning. In pragmatics, even things that semantics ignore are discussed. Thus, the importance of pragmatics as a separate branch of linguistics has increased. Human speech in all its pragmatic manifestation is discussed in pragmatics. The concepts of implicature, Conversational Cooperative Principles by Paul Grice (1975) and the Concept of Politeness by Brown & Levinson (1978) have greatly contributed to the field of pragmatics.

In pragmatics, the speech Acts and its particular strategies are also pragmalinguistically dealt. Pragmatics has also a link with sociolinguistics and thus a pragma-socio- linguistic relations involve the strategies of direct and indirect expressions. Even the formulaic expressions and linguistic forms and their social components such as social power, distance and an effective language use are also kept in view for the use of these direct and indirect speech acts (Leech, 1983).

II. POLITENESS AND ITS DIFFERENT PROSPECTS

Robin Lakoff (1975) defines politeness “to be a way or medium which is used to reduce friction in personal interaction”. Leech (1980, p. 19) finds the term politeness to be a “strategic conflict avoidance which can be measured in terms of the degree of an effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation”. Brown & Levinson (1987) define the term politeness to be a complex system for softening face threats. Arndt and Janny (1993) termed politeness to be an interpersonal supportiveness.

Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki and Ogino (1986) find the term politeness to be a kind of constraint on human interaction”. Ide (1988) terms politeness to be a kind of language which is associated to smooth communication, but Sifianou (1989) finds the term politeness to be a set of social values which the interactants find useful for the satisfaction of their mutually shared expectation.

Watts (2003) links the concept of politeness to that of impoliteness. The concepts of politeness highlighted by Lakoff (1973, 1975), Brown & Levinson (1978, 1987), Fraser and Nolen (1981) and Leech (1981) are almost the same but with a friction of difference.

The concepts of the Western scholars are mostly specific to the western cultures but in the oriental cultures the concept of politeness is different.

Finally, the term politeness may refer to some communication strategies which are used and intended to maintain the mutual face and to achieve smoothness in communication for taking into account the human relationship. Politeness also makes opportunity in behavior but this appropriate behavior may vary from culture to culture and from situation to situation.

Keeping in view the previous studies regarding the linguistic politeness and its conceptualization. it has got two important aspects volition or strategic politeness and discernment or social indexing –volition by Hill (1986), Ide (1989) or strategic politeness by (Lakoff (1973, 1975), Brown & Levinson (1978, 1987), Fraser and Nolen (1981), and Leech (1983) and discernment by Hill (1986), Ide (1989) or the social indexing by Ervin-Tripp (1990). The difference between the volition and discernment is that volition is based on the speaker’s willingness and upon his own choice whereas discernment requires one to conform himself or herself to the given social norms. Volition has got to deal with the linguistic performance regarding some action for the achievement of some communicative goal while discernment has nothing to do with the communicative goal which the speaker intends to achieve but it does require one to represent some social warrants. In case of volition, the speaker has a wide range of possibilities to choose an accurate and precise linguistic form for the social interaction. Discernment and the social importance of the addressee determine the automatic and compulsory linguistic forms in accordance to the social norms and conventions.

Brown & Levinson (1987) have also suggested a scale to measure the degree of politeness in certain specific social context. The speaker’s face, then, assured in accordance to three universal independent and culturally sensitive social variables. These independent and culturally social variables are the social distance (D), the variable of power (P) and the variable of the imposition ranking (R) and each of these variables is specifically intrinsic to a particular act in a particular situation. The variables of D, P, and R are added values through which the amount of face work is known and understood.

If the variables D, P and R are minimally considered, then, the request to the hearer to open the door will be:

(1) Please, open the window

On the contrary, if the maximization of D, P and R are meant, then the above mentioned expression would be changed to the following:

(2) It is too warm, don’t you feel? Would you mind opening the window, please?

To avoid or make a maximum use of such face threatening acts or activities, there are various strategies which are available in their interaction to choose from.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The coding scheme of apologies by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) was used for this research study. The constituents of the coding scheme of Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) are the following:

- Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)
- Responsibility Taking
- Explanation for some fault or mistake
- Offer or Repair/Restitution
- Promise of Forbearance

These constituents are explained in the following:

IFIDs are the routinely used expressions wherein the function of apology becomes obvious in certain expressions, e.g., sorry (*Maafi gwaram*), regretful (*maazrat khwa*) etc.

Similarly, there are some expressions in Pashto language like, *بخښنه غواړم،خفه نه شی،معافی غواړم،معزرت او افسوس* (I seek an apology, never mind, excuse me, I am extremely apologetic) etc.

The second formula of this scheme is the responsibility taking wherein the speaker takes the responsibility for having done some offence or mistake and this formula has got further sub-categories.

- Explicit Self-blame: In this sub-formula, the speaker takes responsibility directly for having done some mistake or fault, e.g., My mistake, etc.

- Lack of Intent:

In the second formula of taking responsibility, the speaker says that fault or mistake done by the speaker was not deliberate, but unintentional, e.g., It was an accident, I did not really think so.

- Express Embarrassment:

In this sub-formula, an exquisite embarrassment is shown by the speaker at the time of the speech, e.g., I feel dreadful about this matter, how awful..., etc.

- Admit Facts:

In this sub-formula taking responsibility, the speaker neither openly refuses his involvement in any offence nor accepts openly the responsibility for doing such an act, e.g., I still have your car but I have not driven it. -Refusal to accept the fault:

The third semantic formula is the explanation for some fault. The speaker comes out with an apology for having done some mistake or fault. He comes with a lot of reasons to justify that offense, e.g. Sorry, I am really sorry, I am late, a tire of my car got a flat on my way to the office.

In the fourth semantic formula, the offer of restitution is made where the speaker presents some compensation for having done damage, e.g., I just got your computer smashed by mistake, but I will get you a new one, do not worry.

The last and fifth formula is the promise of forbearance wherein the speaker takes full responsibility for having done some mistake and the speaker ensures the hearer that such mistake would not happen again in the future, e.g., I promise it won't happen again.

Even in the Pashto language, same promise of forbearance is also used as it is said

یره چی بخښنه غواړم بیا به داسی نه کیږی،

Translation: I am extremely sorry for it, it won't happen again.

The strategies will be discussed in detail in the next chapter of results and discussions and any ambiguity regarding these strategies will be clarified.

The Use of Apology Strategies

The apology and its sub-strategies were used in the role play situations of both the linguistic cultures of British English and Pashto language. The form and function of apologies both in British English and Pashto language are discussed in this research.

Moreover, the explanatory variables and parameters of the apologies are also discussed. The data on apology strategies also came along with the request data as the respondents of both languages were supposed to perform role plays of both requests as well as apologies. In apology, basically the face needs of the addressee are aimed which means to address the negative face of the addressee but on the other hand, it also has to address the positive face needs of the speaker. In apology, an intention is shown to offer a remedy for an offense for which a speaker has taken a responsibility. So it is quite natural that a good number of apologies are offered for an offense which has been committed.

Aijmer (1996) finds apology strategies to be somewhere amid thirteen but her own study does not support the notion of thirteen strategies. For this study, the taxonomy of Olshtain and Cohen (1981) has been used and their taxonomy deals with five main strategies. The strategies of apology are an explicit expression of apology, an explanation of the violation, an expression of the responsibility, an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance with some sub-strategies which are eleven in all.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data of apologies and their occurrence across Pashto and English languages are given in the following tables and their discussion ensues.

Table 1 : Apology Patterns Data in both British English and Pashto Language (1-12) Role Play Situations

Situation	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12	
Strategy	B	PL	B	PL	B	PL	B	P	B	P	B	P	B	P	B	P	B	P	B	P	B	P	BE	P
IFID	1	1	3	2	3	2	5	4	1	0	2	1	6	3	1	0	1	1	6	2	2	1	1	0

IFID	8	5	1	6	1	7	1	2	1	3	9	3	0	0	4	2	1	8	9	3	9	5	11	6					
Intensified			2		1				4								1												
Taking																													
Responsibility																													
Explicit																													
self-blame	0	2	0	1	1		2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0				
Lack of intent	2	1	2	2	2		1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	2	0	2	5	2				
Expression of embarrassment	1	2	6	4	1		1	0	2	6	3	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	3	2	6	0	3	6	3				
Admission of facts	1	7	1	1	4		2	1	7	5	2	1	4	7	7	3	9	6	1	4	6	0	9	9	6	1	5	9	
Refusal to acknowledge guilt	0	2	0	0	0		1	1	2	0	1	4	2	0	0	3	2	0	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	0			
Explanation	7	9	0	2	11		4	2	1	0	1	8	4	1	2	7	2	2	9	2	0	6	1	0	6	9	4		
Offer of repair	8	5	11	6	3		2	0	3	1	3	6	1	4	6	7	3	1	1	1	3	6	0	2	2	3	1	4	7
Promise of forbearance	0	1	0	0	0		1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0		
Distancing from offence	1	1	1	0	1		2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	0	0			
No of apologies	1	1	15	1	15		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	5	5		5			5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 1 shows an overall comparative analysis of the apology strategies in the Pashto and the British English. In IFID and IFID intensified strategies, the respondents of the British English were more consistent than the respondents of the Pashto language. In 'explicit self-blame' a sub strategy of the responsibility taking, the respondents of the Pashto language were comparatively better than the British respondents. The 'lack of intent strategy' was used almost similarly by the respondents of both the languages. The

respondents of the British English were more prominent in the expression of embarrassment strategy in A 2, A 5 and A 12. However, the respondents of the Pashto language used this strategy a bit higher in A 2, A 5, A 9, A 11 and A 12. The respondents of the British English were exclusively better in the strategy of the admission of facts. They used it in high terms in A 1, A 4, A 6, A 8, A 9, A 11 and A 12 respectively. The strategy of 'refusal to acknowledge the guilt' was almost the same in both the languages. Respondents of both the languages were comparatively better on the use of the 'explanation strategy'. The British respondents used it higher in A 3, A 7 and in A 10 but while the respondents of the Pashto language made a higher use of this strategy in A 1, A 7, A 10 and in A 11 respectively. The respondents of the British English were again better on the use of the offer of repair strategy and they used it more in A 2, A 5, A 6, A 9 and A 12. The strategy of 'promise of forbearance' and 'distraction from offence' was comparatively low in both the linguistic cultures.

Table 2: Comparison of Apology Strategies in the Role Play Situations in the British English and in the Pashto Language (Part-1, S 1-3)

Situation Strategy	1				2				3			
	BE	BE%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%
IFID	1	7%	1	7%	3	20%	2	13%	3	20%	2	13%
IFID Intensified	8	53%	5	33%	12	80%	6	40%	11	73%	7	47%
Explicit self-blame	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	2	13%
Lake of intent	2	13%	1	7%	2	13%	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%
Expression of embossment	1	7%	2	13%	6	40%	4	27%	1	7%	1	7%
Admission of facts	13	87%	7	47%	1	7%	1	7%	4	27%	2	13%
Refusal to acknowledge guilt	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%
Explanation	7	47%	9	60%	0	0%	2	13%	11	73%	4	27%
Offer of repair	8	53%	5	33%	11	73%	6	40%	3	20%	2	13%
Promise of forbearance	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%
Distracting from offence	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%
No of apologies												

Table 3: Comparison of Apology Strategies in the Role Play Situations in British English and Pashto Language (Part-2, S 4 -6)

Situation Strategy	4				5				6			
	BL	BL%	PL	PL%	BL	BL%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%
IFID	5	33%	4	27%	1	7%	0	0%	2	13%	1	7%
IFID Intensified	1	7%	2	13%	14	93%	3	20%	9	60%	3	20%
Explicit self-blame	1	7%	2	13%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%
Lake of intent	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%
Expression of embossment	0	0%	2	13%	6	40%	3	20%	1	7%	1	7%
Admission of facts	13	87%	7	47%	5	33%	2	13%	14	93%	7	47%
Refusal to acknowledge guilt	1	7%	2	13%	0	0%	1	7%	4	27%	2	13%
Explanation	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	8	53%	4	27%
Offer of repair	0	0%	3	20%	13	87%	6	40%	14	93%	6	40%
Promise of forbearance	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Distracting from offence	0	0%	2	13%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%
No of apologies												

Table 4: Comparison of Apology Strategies in the Role Play Situations in British English and Pashto Language (Part-3, S 7 -9)

Situation	7				8				9			
	BE	BE%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%
IFID	6	40%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%
IFIDI	0	0%	0	0%	4	27%	2	13%	11	73%	8	53%
ESB	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	3	20%	0	0%	3	20%
LOI	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	2	13%
EOE	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	4	27%	3	20%
AOF	7	47%	3	20%	9	60%	6	40%	14	93%	6	40%
RAG	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	2	13%	0	0%	3	20%
EXPLN	12	80%	7	47%	2	13%	2	13%	9	60%	2	13%
OOR	7	47%	3	20%	1	7%	1	7%	13	87%	6	40%
POB	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DFO	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%

Table 5: Comparison of Apology Strategies in the Role Play Situations in British English and Pashto Language (Part-4, S 10 -12)

Situation	10				11				12			
	BE	BE%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%	BE	BE%	PL	PL%
IFID	6	40%	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%
IFIDI	9	60%	3	20%	9	60%	5	33%	11	73%	6	40%
ESB	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%
LOI	5	33%	2	13%	0	0%	2	13%	5	33%	2	13%
EOE	2	13%	6	40%	0	0%	3	20%	6	40%	3	20%
AOF	0	0%	9	60%	9	60%	6	40%	15	100%	9	60%
RAG	1	7%	2	13%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%
EXPLN	0	0%	6	40%	10	67%	6	40%	9	60%	4	27%
OOR	0	0%	2	13%	2	13%	3	20%	14	93%	7	47%
POB	0	0%	2	13%	3	20%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%
DFO	0	0%	2	13%	5	33%	6	40%	0	0%	0	0%

Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 show the percentage of the apology strategies in the role play situations in both the British English and in the Pashto language. The data given in the tables depict that the open and explicit expression of apology i.e., IFID and IFIDI intensified and the taking responsibility strategies were used in both the languages.

The use of both IFID and IFIDI intensified was made by the British respondents in almost all the role play situations. The Pashto respondents also made use of these strategies but less than the British respondents. Some of the situations wherein some kind of damage was done to the addressee belongings in the British English. The incidence of IFIDI intensified was noted 80% in apology role play situation 5 (damage to the car), 93% in apology of 9 (damaging the carpet), 73% in the apology role play situation 12 (smashing the laptop), and 60% in apology 6 (crashing the car).

The data of the tables show that IFID was not used by the British respondents in a role play situation 7 (cancelling holidays) and even the same strategy of IFIDI was hardly used in role play 4. The non use of IFIDI strategies in the role plays of apology 7 and apology 4 may be of less offense but in role play 7 the offense seemed to be a serious one because to cancel some one's holiday is really a serious one. The cancelling of holidays seemed to be on his/her company's behalf, therefore, it was not considered to redress the

addressee's face. However, the Pashto respondents used IFID 27% in the role play 4 but ignored it in the 7 role plays of apology. As far as the taking responsibilities part of the apology strategy is concerned, the sub-strategy admission of fact was used in all the role play situations in both the languages except in role play 2 (ruining the trousers) and in the role play of apology 10 (stepping on some one's toes). In the role play 2, the physical act of the speaker (addressor) caused some damage to the hearer's clothing (spilling coffee or ruining the trousers) and in role play 10, the hearer was disturbed by stepping on his/her toes. In such situations, the admission of fact would have been useless until the hearer (addressee) saw the damage.

The Role of Situational Factors and Variables in Determining the Apology Strategies

The situational factors and variables had a role in determining the strategies of apology. Such situational, explanatory parameters and variables were used as per the social distance, social power and as per the severity of the situation.

These factors varied in all the 12 role play situations of apology, but the severity of an offence was not ignored. It was even attempted to measure the relative seriousness of the offence in both the linguistic cultures. Such a measure of the seriousness of offence in view of its all social factors was important for the independent evaluation of the over weighting of the FTA.

In simple words, the data of the strategies and their sub strategies show that the seriousness of the offences did have an importance in all the role play situations of both the linguistic cultures.

The data show that the British respondents were more apologetic than the Pashto respondents and even the nature of the severity of an offence made the respondents of both languages to apologize in the role play situations. The social status and social power of the interlocutors were also to play a role as per the seriousness of an offence in the role play situation.

The following discussion makes the results of the data clear:

- If the social power of the addressor (Speaker) is less than the addressee (Hearer) then, the addressor is bound to apologize more than the apology of a non -serious situation. Such an instance was noted in A 6 (car accident) in comparison to A 1 (book returning).
- Even if the addressor (Speaker) has more social power than the addressee (Hearer) and the committed offence is of a serious nature, so in such a situation, the addressor is supposed to offer an apology for the offence. Despite of his/her high social power, the instance of such an apology was noted in A 7 (cancelling holidays) where the speaker had more social power than the hearer.
- If the hearer and the speaker are of equal social status and the offence is a serious one, yet the speaker has to apologize despite of the close relationship between the speaker and hearer. Such an instance of apologizing was noted in A 5 (spilling oil on the seat) and in A 9 (smearing carpet). Thus, an apology is made due to the severity of an offence.

The results of the data appear to be in contrast to Fraser (1981) and Holmes (1990). They stated that the less social distance was proportional to the decreased apology strategy. The social distance and the lesser social power appeared to contribute more towards the performance of apologies. Such performance was noticed in A 4 (forgetting a map) and in A 8 (typing letters). Apart from the social distance and social power, the severity of an offence also forces the use of apologies among the interlocutors, despite of their equal social status and intimate friendship. Such apologies were noticed in A 9 where the interlocutors were intimately related.

The data show that the strategies of apologies were noticed in the role plays of both languages and thus, the close and intimate nature of social intimacy became secondary. Thus, it appears that the linguistic behaviour of the speakers of both the languages does not conform to the Brown & Levinson's model of politeness. As per the model of Brown & Levinson (1987), apologies are sensitive to increase in social distance and to the severity of an offence, but in the present study, it was shown that the apologies occurred due to the severity of an offence and social power.

V. CONCLUSION

The data of the apology strategies in both the linguistic cultures confirm the claim of Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989). The use of IFID and the 'expression of the responsibility strategies' appeared in varying degrees in both the British English and in the Pashto language but the use of other semantic and sub-formulaic strategies were just context dependent.

The results of the apology strategies further show that they were realized in different forms in the British English and in the Pashto language but the British respondents had shown their preference conspicuously towards the lexical phrase, 'I am sorry'. The intensity of this lexical form was realized by the use of adverbs like dreadfully, awfully, extremely, really, so and terribly. Such intensified forms for the expression of an apology strategies happened as a convention in Anglo-Saxon influenced milieu for a conflict avoidance which was considered to be a redressal for the addressee's negative face. On the other hand, the Pashto

respondents made the use of the non-intensified forms for the expression of apology but they used IFID intensified also in some of the strategies. They went for expression like *Bakhana Gwarama* (forgive me), *Mazrat Koma* (I regret/ I apologize), *Khafa Nashai* (never mind), *Afsos Koma* (I am sorry), *Mata Der Afsos De* (I am extremely sorry) and *Mafi Gwarama* (I seek forgiveness). These forms of apology appeared both in the formal as well as in informal context when the offence was going to be a serious one. The results further show that the British respondents used intensified nature of apology expressions. The Pashto respondents did not use such intensified forms of apology expression which means that a need for the redressal addressee's negative face was found

Moreover, the data analysis further shows that the respondents of both the languages found the admission of facts to be a preferred way of responsibility strategy and the sub formulaic strategies helped a lot for the expression of this responsibility strategy. Even the acceptance of involvement was made for an offence, but it was not an overt acceptance, but was rather a way of abstaining from the responsibility of an offence.

Furthermore, the results show that the severity, seriousness and the nature of the offences influenced the strategies in the role play situations of both the linguistic cultures.

REFERENCES

1. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood: N. J. Ablex
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*, 56–310. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
4. Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1972). Pronouns of power and solidarity. In P. Gigliogli, *Language and social context*, 252–282. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
5. Ehlich, K. (1992). *On the historicity of politeness*. In R. Watts, S. Ide, and K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*, 71– 107. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International journal of the sociology of the language*, 27: 93–109.
7. Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10: 347–371.
8. Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's". *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292–305. Chicago: *Chicago Linguistic Society*.
9. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: *Harper and Row*.
10. Leech, G. N. (1980). *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: *John Benjamins*.
11. Reiter's. (2000). book, "Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies
12. Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece. A cross-cultural perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
13. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to Pragmatics*. London: *Longman*.
14. Watts, R., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K. (1992). Introduction. In Watts, R., Ide, S. and Ehlich, K. (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*, 1– 17. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.