



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijsc.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

Pragmatics of Expressing Apology in English and Tatar Languages

Gulyusa Kurbangalievna Ismagilova^{1a}, Dilyara Shamilevna Shakirova^{2a}, Olesya Viktorovna Zabavnova^{3b}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received October 2020
Received in Revised form January 2021
Accepted January 2021
Available online February 2021

KEYWORDS:

Pragmalinguistics
Sociolinguistics
Pragmatics
Speech act
Discourse

Abstract

The article reveals that the speech act of apology is carried out with the help of typical models of remorse transmission, indicating the emotional tone of guilt recognition. The object of the current study is the motivational aspect of sincere apology and the variability of its verbalization in the English and Tatar communicative culture. The analysis of the use of the speech act of apology reveals the fact that the functioning of apologies in different linguistic and cultural communities is influenced by cultural characteristics, as well as the rules and norms of communicative interaction. The scientific novelty of the work lies in the fact that the study of a specific type of speech act is done for the first time with the simultaneous involvement of several extra-linguistic parameters. The materials of the article can be useful for teachers in the University practice of teaching English, Tatar, and linguists learning speech genres.

© 2021 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ Associate Professor, Email: gulyusa.ismagilov@yahoo.com (Corresponding Author)
Tel: +8-927-4723362

² Associate Professor, Email: shakirova_ds@mail.ru

³ PhD Candidate, Email: ovzabavnova@gmail.com

^a Kazan Federal University, Russia

^b University of Applied Sciences Fulda, Germany

1. Introduction

While classical speech action theory has realized (or seems to have) apologized for prototypes, which is a practical act of apologizing and expressing remorse, a major contribution of recent research to apologetic pragmatism has not been based on introspection. Rather, based on extracted or natural data, an apology is a culturally sensitive set of speech practice (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983) of semantic formulas or strategies that occur regularly in apology. The answers relate to the successful performance of this speech. The object of this article is the ways of expression, types, and contexts of the functioning of apologies in English and Tatar languages. The apology is included in the active fund of speech activity. It is an essential component of speech etiquette in various forms of its manifestation, an indicator of the communicative politeness of a person and the behavioral culture of a people, along with a way of expressing acquaintance, farewell, greeting, and address (Bender & Lascarides, 2019; Brown & Levinson, 1978; Goffman, 1971). An apology functions as a speech formula, a pragmatic cliché that can be learned to use in inappropriate contexts. Fixing the comparison of means of expression of apologies of all types in the corresponding social contexts shows that English is characterized by a large variety of label means and Tatar-less (Owen, 2019). However, the global conclusion is that the English language has a significantly developed fatalistic (ritual-label) apology, which is widely represented not only in the office but also in informal situations (Qari, 2019). In contrast, for the Tatar language, the area of fatalistic apology is significantly less indicative, and in informal situations, it is relatively rare. Apology in the English language also is quite common, although less representative in comparison with the Tatar language. Linguistic pragmatics studies the conditions of using language by communicants in the acts of speech communication. Specifically, these conditions include the communicative goals of the interlocutors, the time and place of the speech act, the level of knowledge of the participants, their social status, psychological and biological characteristics, rules, and conventions of speech behavior adopted in a particular society (Ohtsubo et al., 2012).

Based on the above, it should be emphasized that the pragmatic significance of the act of apology is fully manifested in the process of verbal communication. Apology, as a word and one of the speech acts and as the name of one of the speech etiquette strategies, has long been in the field of view of scientists, being studied in comparative terms (Tufanova, 2018). Apologies in the English linguistic culture is spoken mechanically because undesirable actions are also committed involuntarily. They even apologize for the reservation in the speech while using the apology as an introductory word. Thus, it is clear that the British apologize often and very expressively, figuratively. The British apologize even when there is no apparent reason to apologize (Gabidullina, Akhatova, Karimova, Glukhova, & Zakirov, 2018; Ganiev, 2000).

The communicative conditions necessary for the successful implementation of the speech act of apology in discourse are considered. The speech act of apology occupies a stable position in linguistic pragmatics, and its existence is not in doubt. Situations of apology, except for the extraordinary, are not evident, but they occupy an important place in the English and Tatar cultures (Kabanov, Khairutdinova, & Bulanova, 2020; Shardakova, 2005). Their analysis provides the key to understanding the fundamental values and specifics of the spirituality of native speakers. In everyday life, we often have to apologize for any wrong actions or behavior. In English, we can apologize for the well-known phrase *I'm sorry*. However, to expand your vocabulary, you need to know other options for this phrase. Depending on the situation, you can use different phrases that have varying degrees of regret. Other expressions are suitable to ask for forgiveness in informal communication. In the expressions below, the degree of regret is also high: I deeply regret (very profound); *I'm ever so sorry*; *I hope you can forgive me*; *I hope I can be forgiven*.

2. Theoretical Framework

Various authors have researched various topics related to this article. Stein et al. (2012) state that, in Tatar linguistics, the monographic expressions of speech are not specifically

studied, but in the well-known theoretical works on grammar and word-formation of Zakiev, Sukhorukov, Melnichenko, Sobenin, Ivanova, and Orekhov (2016), the linguistic features of the speech expressions are noted. Aydarova and Aminova (2016) believe that the study's connection is determined by the fact that an ethnoculturological study of the Tatar and Turkish peoples' communicative behavior enables us to reassess the ethnos' communicative culture in the modern context and reveal typical and distinctive features of the communicative culture of the Tatar and Turkish peoples. The investigation of communicative behavior based on paroemias explains the ordinary rules of communicative behavior of an ethnic society, which is more prosperous, more distinct, and more precise than various modern primary theories of effective communication. The study of Galiullina, Kadirova, Khadieva, Kuzmina, and Kajumova (2018) revealed that the Tatar language possesses around twenty ancient cosmonyms of Turkic origin. With the development of computer technologies, the necessity of observing the celestial bodies with the purpose of determining the route and weather is no longer of relevance; this made the names of stars and constellations vanish from the Tatar language. Teaching astronomy in schools par excellence in Russian from the mid-20th century and the development of Russian-Tatar bilingualism with an overpoise to Russian was instrumental to the loss of originally Turkic appellations of stars. In Goody (1978), the development of modern Tatar poetry in Bashkortostan and takes into account critical reviews. It also reveals the peculiarities of the poetic world. The novelty of the research is in identifying key tendencies in the development of modern Tatar poetry in Bashkortostan through systematizing scientific and critical materials. The introduction involves the study of Tatar literature, including the poetry of Bashkortostan in a socio-cultural perspective, the peculiarities of Tatar poets' identification either as a part of Tatar or Bashkir literature, the historical background of this division, and the influence of this process on their works. The author focuses on the theoretical understanding of the stylistic features of the

works, specifying the differences between the term's style, individual style, and regional peculiarities of style. The work is carried out on the basis of the classification adopted in the literature. The researcher reveals the features of the world picture, artistic representation of the modern world in literary works, characteristics of the poets' way of thinking, and unique features of their aesthetic positions (Holmes, 1990). Holmes (1990) used students to record apologies using an approach advocated by Hymes (1964; 1968). Students were asked to note down 'The next 20 apologies they heard 'as soon and as accurately as possible' and 'without selection or censorship' (Holmes, 1990). Contextual details were also recorded.

3. Methodology

The present study is an intricate use of methods adopted in pragmatics, the semantics of comparative linguistics. The main method of research is the interlingual comparison. The paper also uses the methods of system-activity approach to the analysis of language on the basis of the theory of speech acts, component, functional, semantic, and contextual analysis of language units, the method of synchronous description of structural and semantic features of speech act. For the analysis of dictionary definitions, quotes from the literature of English and Tatar languages are used. There is a method of one-stage and two-stage transformation as a particular method, which allows you to restore the real structure of the speech act.

The problem of polite speech behavior attracts the attention of many specialists, the subject of which is the communicative process. Recently, in the works of both foreign (Braun, 1993; Fox, 2004) and Russian scientists, a lot of attention is paid to the study of communicative formulas of apologies, polite behavior, and etiquette. In these works, the category of politeness is considered on the material of different languages from the cognitive, socio-cultural, and tender aspects.

In Tatar linguistics, the monographic expressions of speech are not specifically studied, but in the well-known theoretical works on grammar and word-formation of Zakiev et al. (2016), the linguistic features of the speech

expressions are noted. The study of the expression of apology in the modern Tatar language is reflected in the works of Gabidullina et al. (2018).

4. Results

The relevance of the investigated problem is caused by the need for further analysis of the apology based on the study of literature on the problem of the theory of speech acts, the theory of communication. This article is focused on revealing the features of the speech act of apology in pragmalinguistics. Such concepts as pragmatics and speech situations of apologies in English and Tatar languages are analyzed. The leading approaches to the research of this problem are component, functional, semantic, the method of synchronous description of structural and semantic features of speech act. The article deals with the communicative and pragmatic context of the speech act of apology, the reason for which is the awareness of the violation of moral and ethical norms.

Apologizing and showing remorse for wrongs committed against others is the only way an individual with integrity should act. An apology is a way to accept responsibility for one's mistakes, and thus reduce guilt and forgive oneself. It allows individuals to move on and grow; it can repair relationships that have been moribund for years. Apologizing sincerely is a skill that every individual, especially managers and leaders, should develop. Apologies can help businesses save huge amounts of money in legal bills and can help a firm enhance and/or restore its image, as well as resulting in greater mental and even physical health for individuals. The cost of an apology is small, a loss of a bit of pride. The benefit, however, is great: it provides an individual, a leader, an organization, and even an entire country with the ability to purify and renew itself. Showing remorse for misdeeds is not a sign of cowardice or weakness. On the contrary, sincere remorse is a sign of courage and moral strength (Friedman, 2006).

Apologies for mistakes and misunderstandings typically include corrective actions following threats to positive facial needs. An apology for these crimes is an example of B & L's positive etiquette strategy of 'claiming common ground; seek agreement, avoid disagreement'. Most of

the crimes apologized to in this group were relatively trivial, and minor differences due to mistakes and misunderstandings were quickly resolved as the interlocutors realized that they were speaking for different purposes. An apology for these crimes often marks the actual moment of understanding a mistake or misunderstood understanding, and IFIDs are often combined with surprising inferences (oh, oh! Or yes!). Conversations aimed at exchanging information (usually in the context of a 'text ruler') often resulted in many such apologies. He wanted to be an information provider (for example, a teacher) who made a mistake and apologized after pointing it out. In the case of foreign languages, out of 263 language signs, 173 are administrative signs, and 90 are ergonyms. A major change took place after the fall of the USSR. In 1992, Tatarstan passed a law on the official languages of the Republic of Tatarstan, making the official status of Tatar equal to the Russian language in Tatarstan's new constitution. These policy changes led to the growth of Tatar secondary schools and the creation of compulsory Tatar language classes for all students in grades 1 to 11 in Tatarstan. In 2007, Moscow and Tatarstan signed a power-sharing agreement that would allow Tatarstan to make joint decisions with Moscow on economic, cultural, and other regional policies. However, the agreement expired on July 24, 2017. At the end of 2017, the two announced that Tatar education would be reduced, although both expressed different measurements. Tatar President, Rustam Minikhanov, said that Tatar language classes remained compulsory but reduced from six to two hours a week, but Tatarstan Attorney General Ildus Nafikov said that Tatarstan was open for two hours a week on a voluntary form with the written consent of the parents.

The scope of comparative studies has now expanded considerably. The purpose of the study in these areas is to compare speech acts in the native and target languages. The linguistic means used for the implementation of a particular communicative act vary not only in different languages but also within the framework of one linguistic culture: different linguistic means can be used for the implementation of the same speech act. Thus, in the English language, for the implementation of communicative actions, these formulas are

used: *Sorry / Excuse me / Pardon / No offense / Forgive me / I beg your pardon*. In addition, such structures with *apology / apologies / apologize / regret et. cet.* Form lots of expressions: *I owe you an apology / Please accept my apologies / I do apologize for ... / Do not be angry with me... / I regret / my bad / my mistake... / That was totally on me ...* (Bikmullina & Zamaletdinov, 2020)

For example, «*Lord Arthur smiled and shook his head. –Mr. Ferguson, –said Poirot. –You are a very impertinent young man.*

–You must excuse me. I like attacking established institutions.

–You never dine with me now. I thought you must have some curious romance on hand.

–I beg your pardon, but we either lunch or sup together every day, and I have been to the opera with you several times, –said Dorian, opening his blue eyes in wonder (Wei-Hong, Eslami, & Burlaw, 2015; Wilde, 2003).

In the English linguistic culture, the studied forms cannot be considered as synonyms since they cannot replace each other, and each of them has its own communicative use. However, the universal form is (*I am*) *sorry*. It is used for apology, sympathy, empathy, request to repeat. The form of *Excuse me* is used to creating a communicative contact, interrupt a conversation, display dissatisfaction when asked to skip. The use of forms *Pardon (me) / I beg your pardon* is becoming less common in modern English. They are used only when there is a request to repeat and sudden denial of something. The most limited forms of use are *I apologize* and *forgive me*. They are considered official forms (Oboko, 2020).

In the Tatar language, the expression *gafu it, gafu itegez, gafu kylygys, kicher, kicheregez, kicheregezche, teube* are used. In the Tatar language, lexical means of apology in its structure are of several types: 1) simple, 2) complex (expressed in complex verbs), 3) phraseological units. The most active from the simple terms are *gafu, tauba* (borrowing from Arabic), *kicher, yarlyka, onityjk, achulanma, upkalama* (originally Turkic). Some Arab-Persian borrowings are used when the apology, take the suffixes of the Tatar

language: *ranzh(ema), bakhil(le), bakhil(lashik)* Gabidullina et al. (2018).

The Arab-Persian borrowings often perform the main role (*gafu, tauba, marhamat, shafkat, gaep*) (Bidaoui, 2017). If the main component is synonymous with the word "apology", then the auxiliary verb is used in a positive form (*gafu it, tauba kyl*), and in the case when the main component is the opposite of a given word, the auxiliary verb is used in the negative form (*baddoga kylma, gaep itma*). The English apologies used in the situation of minor guilt are *sorry, I am sorry*, have the Tatar equivalent of *gafu it, gafu itegez*.

The English request for forgiveness, used in the situation of serious misconduct/sin *sorry, I am sorry*, in Tatar translation differentiates 1) a request for forgiveness – *kicher, kicheregez*, 2) enhanced request for forgiveness – *kicheregez* and 3) a request for forgiveness in a religious context – *tauba*. The expressions of apology in the modern Tatar language are divided into high (*gafu kyl, gafu it, kicher, bakhil bul, bakhillek soryjm, gaepka borma(giz)*), medium (*gaep itma, ranzhema, onityjk*) styles. *Gafu itarses inde, kyzdyrganda kyza torgan gadatem bar, Ikebez da kyzdyk bez berga eshlise keshelar, gafu iteshik. Sez mine, min sezne*. You will forgive when the passionate is in the habit. We are both fiery, and we will work together, let's forget each other; *Gafu ita kur inde... – Gafu, gafu!* Please forgive me, – Excuse me, excuse me.

The apology also depends on the communicative and pragmatic attitudes of the speaker: the one who wants to restore relations will rather apologize. For example, "*I'm very sorry, but you remember I was – I was angry with you before Mr. Torpenhow went away?*" (Fitzgerald, 2009, p. 210); *Gafu it inde, akylym. Kemda bulmyj torgan hal*. I am sorry, my darling. Things happen. In the Tatar language, to enhance the impact on the interlocutor in the apology, the word *zinkhar ochen* is often used.

5. Discussion

An apology may be defined as the act of declaring one's regret, remorse, or sorrow for having insulted, failed, injured, harmed, or wronged another (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy IEP). A definition quite interested

in the function suggests that an apology is a speech act addressed to B's face – needs and intended to remedy an offense for which A. takes responsibility (Holmes, 1990).

Apologies are also "speech acts" that are hard to identify, define or categorize, a difficulty that arises directly out of the functions they perform (Lakoff, 2001) and the forms they take. In function, they range from self-abasement for wrongdoing to the formal display of appropriate feeling. In form, they range from explicit apologies to the most ambiguous ones. Apologies matter theoretically because they are rich in forms and functions. They also involve intricate presuppositions and/or assertions. Their attraction is that they either blur things or explicitly state them. Moreover, their theoretical richness as unique human activities shows in the categories they take, in other words, register, genre, and key, etc. Practically, apologies matter because, as speech acts, they are felicitous from the speaker's perspective and soothing for the addressee. Apologies are needed on both individual and social levels. On an individual level, they appease the listener. On a social level, they smooth things and bring harmony to the parties involved. Talking about apologies ushers us to an operative linguistic discipline nowadays, namely Pragmatics. Horn's (1988) definition of this discipline is quite helpful. According to him, pragmatics is the study of the purpose for which sentences are used, of the real-world conditions under which a sentence may be appropriately used as an utterance. In a relevant sense, apologies are thematically enticing and practically significant as pragmatic 'speech acts'. Apologies postulate a daunting task by virtue of their fluidity and of the intricate relations between their forms and functions, and, in a deeper linguistic sense, the relations between language and its context of utterance.

In discussing the importance of apology in the Tatar language, it should be noted that the difference between foreign languages and the Tatar language, as we can see, is not very significant. However, bearing in mind that the Tatar language is official for the city of Kazan, and foreign languages such as English, Italian, French are not, the absence of a difference is striking. In 1926, the policy of the USSR forced the Tatars to shift from the Arabic

script used since 920 AD to the Latin script. The late 1930s indicated a gradual shift to the Russianization of the nation (a process of forced or voluntary assimilation into Russian culture), including another shift to the Cyrillic script. This Russification and state control over Tatar-language publications led to a reduction in Tatar-language programs/schools from 95% in 1931–1932 to 8% in the 1980s. The Tatar language gradually fell into the group of minority languages definitely endangered.

In English communication, in case of disturbance of personal space, both participants apologize, and in Tatar, only the one who disrupted it. The British apologize even when there is no exact reason to apologize. The speech act of apology in one culture is not the same in another socio-cultural context, although in many linguistic cultures, the choice of discursive apology strategies may be similar. In the same social circumstances, with the same contextual conditions, and with the same level of damage, apologies in different languages may be expressed similarly.

In the Tatar language, along with the recognition of guilt, there are cases when explaining the situation, the communicant takes the blame, as it were, justifies himself, explaining all external circumstances, for example, *Gafu it inde, akyllym. Bula torgan hal.* I am sorry, my darling. It happens to everyone.' The communicant admits his guilt and explains his misbehavior, but at the same time justifies himself. Using the method of apology, English-speaking communicants really admit guilt, Tatar communicants find an excuse, explain the situation as being beyond their control. An apology for an average and serious act or an apology, in essence, is usually accompanied by an emotion of shame and some actions. For example, *Gafu it sins mine, apaem, kicher min akhmakny, uskanem.* Forgive me, my sweet, excuse me, my being a fool man, my dear. "–Harry, Harry, it's terrible. Sibyl Vane is dead. –I'm so sorry for it all, Dorian, –said Lord Henry as he entered. –But you must not think too much about it" (Wilde, 2003). As we can see from the examples, the repetition of apology formulas gives to the expression of apology greater expressiveness. Apologies in the English linguistic culture is pronounced automatically

since unwanted actions are also committed involuntarily. Apologize even for the disclaimer in the speech, while the apology acts as an introductory word. It is important to note that the British apologize often and more expressive than the Tatars.

Thus, there are different interpretations of the cases in the compared communicative cultures when an apology should be made: if the Russians apologize when there is a reason for an apology, the British do it much more often and even in those situations with no apparent reason. These differences can be summarized as follows: the British apologize often and more expressive than the Tatars; English speech formulas of apology, compared with Tatar, are, to a greater extent, lost their meaning; their primary pragmatic value lies in maintaining harmony between interlocutors.

In a public apology situation, the pragmatic components play a significant role. It is essential who apologizes, in what context, and in the presence of which audience, the apology text itself is also essential. Apologies made officially should be accepted at the official level. Based on the above, it should be noted that the pragmatic meaning of the apology is fully manifested in the communicative mode. We also made a similar attempt. In the English and Tatar cultures, there may be a discrepancy between the situations of apologies, which provokes a different attitude to these situations on the part of representatives of the two cultures. The study showed that the composition of misconduct and misconduct, entailing an apology, is a necessary but insufficient condition for verbal execution of an apology. Naturally, the form of expressing an apology in an official situation should differ from the verbal execution of an apology in an informal situation. Indeed, an apology can occur in a formal setting, at work, in public places, making the apology random. It can occur between people of the same social status or at different levels of the social ladder.

Moreover, it can be expressed in an informal atmosphere, wherein a person who apologizes may be relatives or close friends. This premise, intuitively recognized by many researchers, should be considered when describing the means of expressing an apology when establishing their socially determined specificity. Simultaneously, social contexts should be

taken into account vertically, starting with a fatal apology and ending with a non-fatal apology.

References

- Aydarova, A., & Aminova, A. (2016). The negative evaluative component within the semantic structure of behaviour verbs in Russian, English and Tatar languages. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(3), 150-153.
- Bender, E. M., & Lascarides, A. (2019). Linguistic fundamentals for natural language processing ii: 100 Essentials from semantics and pragmatics. *Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies*, 12(3), 1-268.
- Bidaoui, A. (2017). Revisiting the Arabic diglossic situation and highlighting the socio-cultural factors shaping language use in light of Auer's (2005) model. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 2(5), 60-72.
- Bikmullina, E. R., & Zamaletdinov, R. R. (2020). Linguocultural analysis of the most common greetings in the Russian, Tatar and Chinese languages. *Languages of Slavic Culture*, 2(2), 520-534.
- Braun, F. (1993). Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice. *Linguistics*, 31(4), 770-772.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 156-311). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, A., & Suchet, D. (1937). *Death on the Nile*. New York, NY: Berkley Books.
- Christie, A. & Massey, D. (1997). *Hercule Poirot and the labours of Hercules: The flock of Geryon*. London, England: DH Audio Publisher.
- Fitzgerald, F. S. (2009). *The Great Gatsby*. Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press.
- Fox, K. (2004). *Watching the English: The hidden rules of English behavior*. London, United Kingdom: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Friedman, H. H. (2006). The power of remorse and apology. *Journal of College & Character, City University of New York*, 6(2), 10-22.

- Gabidullina, F., Akhatova, Z., Karimova, I., Glukhova, O., & Zakirov, R. (2018). Ethical discussions in the national literature as a form of moral education of the students. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(2), 295-305.
- Galiullina, G., Kadirova, E., Khadieva, G., Kuzmina, K., & Kajumova, Z. (2018). Language of family communication in the modern Tatar-Russian bilingual society. *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, 2(2), 267-279.
- Ganiev, F. A. (2000). *Tatar language: Problems and research*. Kazan, Russia: Tatar Book Publishing.
- Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order. Harmondsworth, Penguin. *Communication Research*, 9(3), 6-18.
- Goody, E. N. (1978). *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society*, 19(2), 12-25.
- Horn, L. R. (1988). Pragmatic theory. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*, 2(1), 113-145.
- Hymes, D. (1964). Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist*, 66(2), 1-34.
- Hymes, D. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, 2(1), 99-138.
- Kabanov, P., Khairutdinova, L., & Bulanova, L. (2020). Criminological characteristics of migrant crimes: Russian and foreign practices. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9(2), 16-25.
- Lakoff, R. T. (2001). Nine ways of looking at apologies: The necessity for interdisciplinary theory and method in discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 45-109). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Mclaughun, M. L., Cody, M. J., & O'Hair, H. D. (1983). The management of failure events: Some contextual determinants of accounting behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 9(3), 208-224.
- Oboko, U. G. (2020). Language as a didactic tool and vehicle of cultural preservation: A pragma-sociolinguistic study of selected Igbo proverbs. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 8(2), 121-136.
- Ohtsubo, Y., Watanabe, E., Kim, J., Kulas, J. T., Muluk, H., Nazar, G., ... & Zhang, J. (2012). Are costly apologies universally perceived as being sincere? A test of the costly apology-perceived sincerity relationship in seven countries. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, 10(4), 187-204.
- Olshstein, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech-act set. In W. Nessa & J. Elliot (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and acquisition*, Rowley (pp. 101-149). London, England: Newbury House Publisher.
- Owen, M. (2019). *Apologies and remedial interchanges: A study of language use in social interaction*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Qari, I. (2019). The gender of the addressee as a factor in the selection of apology strategies: The case of Saudi and British. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 7(1), 83-95.
- Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(4), 423-451.
- Stein, M., Federspiel, A., Koenig, T., Wirth, M., Strik, W., Wiest, R., ... & Dierks, T. (2012). Structural plasticity in the language system related to increased second language proficiency. *Cortex*, 48(4), 458-465.
- Tufanova, Y. (2018). Peculiarities of interlocutors' verbal communicative behavior in apology situation. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 50, 1230-1242.
- Verboon, P., & Van Dijke, M. (2012). The effect of perceived deterrence on compliance with authorities: The moderating influence of procedural justice. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 1(5), 151-161.
- Wei-Hong, S., Eslami, Z., & Burlbaw, L. M. (2015). Investigating non-native English-speaking graduate students' pragmatic development in requestive

- emails. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 3(1), 1-15.
- Wilde, O. (2003). *The picture of Dorian gray*. New York, NY: Dover Publications Incorporated.
- Zakiev, E. R., Sukhorukov, V. N., Melnichenko, A. A., Sobenin, I. A., Ivanova, E. A., & Orekhov, A. N. (2016). Lipid composition of circulating multiple-modified low-density lipoprotein. *Lipids in Health and Disease*, 15(1), 134-152.