

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING  
UNIVERSITY OF DANANG**

**PHAM THI THU THAO**

**A STUDY OF PRE-SEQUENCES  
IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE APOLOGY**

**Field: THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
Code: 60.22.15**

**M.A. THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
(A SUMMARY)**

**Supervisor: LE TAN THI, Ph.D.**

**DANANG, 2011**

**The study has been completed at College of  
Foreign Languages, University of Danang**

**Supervisor: Le Tan Thi, Ph.D.**

**Examiner 1: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Phan Van Hoa**

**Examiner 2: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tran Van Phuoc**

The thesis will be defended at the Examination  
Council for the M.A. theses, University of Danang.

Time:

Venue: University of Danang

*The original of this thesis is accessible for the  
purpose of reference at:*

- Library of the College of Foreign Languages,  
University of Danang.
- The Information Resources Center, University of  
Danang.

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. RATIONALE

There is some jewellery which is very simple but extremely precious and increases charms and elegance for those who always wear. It's *apology*. The mysterious strength of an honest apology is relief and small joy from life. Apology exists in civilised society. In public, although someone touches the other by chance, apology is burst out naturally. Obviously, apology is offered when speakers feel really faulty. Apology here always goes with a regretful mood and expecting to be forgiven more than a usual action of civilization. Sometimes, apology which is made at the right place and time can erase so much revenge, suffering and so on. The force of apology turns out to be stronger than thank you.

However, not all the apologies which we make are always accepted for many reasons. Therefore, when making apologies, most speakers, especially Vietnamese people and English people may often use pre-sequences as a polite strategy as well as a safe strategy to survey if their apologies can be accepted.

It has not been doubted that different cultures often have different conventions. Actually, many failures have been occurred. Actually, many failures have been occurred in intracultural and cross-cultural linguistic communication. The failures are often vaguely diagnosed as impolite behavior on the part of the other person. One of the strategies which can minimize this unexpected result is using pre-sequences as hedges. In order to have an insight

into the problem, I decide to choose *A Study of Pre-sequences in English and Vietnamese Apology* as the topic of my M.A thesis.

### **1.2.1. Aims of the Study**

This research paper aims at helping the learners of Vietnamese and English acquire some knowledge of pre-sequences in apologies (PAs) in English and Vietnamese and use them more effectively in daily communication.

### **1.2.2. Objectives of the Study**

- Point out the most typical structures of PAs used in English and Vietnamese.
- Analyze the pragmatic features of PAs in terms of strategies involving politeness.
- Contrast the syntactic and pragmatic features of PAs in English and Vietnamese to find out the similarities and differences between the two languages.
- Suggest some implications of the findings for teaching and learning English as a foreign language.

### **1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What are the typical structures of PAs in English and Vietnamese?
2. What are the pragmatic features of PAs in English and Vietnamese?
3. What are the similarities and differences between the syntactic and pragmatic features of PAs in English and Vietnamese?

### **1.4. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The study will be able to provide useful knowledge to enable better use of PAs in cross-cultural communication in English and

Vietnamese. The findings of the study can be the potential source for the teaching and learning of speech acts in general and PAs in English and Vietnamese in particular as foreign languages.

### **1.5. THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

For the limitation of time and knowledge, this research is carried out by analyzing the syntactic and pragmatic features of PAs in English and Vietnamese. The data are collected from films.

Within the scope of the study, response of apologies, apologies as well as non-verbal aspects such as facial expressions, tones and body language are not included.

### **1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

The study is organized into five chapters as follows.

**Chapter 1:** *Introduction.*

**Chapter 2:** *Literature Review and Theoretical Background.*

**Chapter 3:** *Methodology and Procedures of the Study.*

**Chapter 4:** *Findings and Discussions.*

**Chapter 5:** *Conclusions.*

## **CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

### **2.1. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Schegloff [21, p.55-62] in “*Pre-sequences and Indirection*” states that pre-sequences are sequences produced to be specifically preliminary to determine actions, projecting their occurrence, contingent on the response to the pre-sequence initiator.

Cutting [9, p.31-39] in “*Pragmatics and Discourse*” discusses and points out the purposes of using pre-sequences.

Moreover, Yule [27, p.133] in “*Pragmatics*” discusses in detail pre-sequences as pre-invitations, pre-requests, and pre-announcements.

“*Linguistics for Non-Linguists*” by Parker, et al [16] constructs a theory of pragmatics. This theory gives us concepts as implicature and conversational maxims, speech acts, a classification of illocutionary acts, etc developed by such linguists as Grice, Austin, Searle.

Đỗ Hữu Châu in “*Đại Cương Ngôn Ngữ Học*” [2] has created a new approach to pragmatics for Vietnamese linguists.

Nguyễn Đức Dân [3] in “*Ngữ Dụng Học*” also focuses pre-sequences and considers them as conversational openings.

Nguyễn Thiện Giáp [4] in “*Dụng Học Việt Ngữ*” mentions pragmatics such as context and meaning, conversation theory, politeness, cooperative principle and conversational implicature and so forth. Especially, he also mentions pre-sequences.

Nguyễn Thị Kim Cúc” [15] Huỳnh Thị Kim Thúy [12] and Ngô Thị Bích Hà [14] have offered intensive empirical studies of various speech acts.

## **2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

### **2.2.1. Syntactic Features**

Syntax is the study of how words combined to form sentences and the rules governing the formation of sentence. It is more involved in the internal organization of a sentence.

Syntactic structure is the arrangement of words and morphemes into larger units. Each unit consists of one or more units of the rank below it. Thus, a sentence consists of one or more clauses, a clause consists of one or more word groups, a group

consists of one or more words and a word consists of one or more morpheme.

There are some different clause types: declarative (positive and negative), interrogative, imperative and exclamative.

### **2.2.2. Speech Act Theory**

According to Yule [27, p.47], “*Actions performed via utterances are generally called speech act*”. Furthermore, he introduced three acts performed simultaneously by producing an utterance: locutionary act, illocutionary act, perlocutionary act.

Briefly, Yule [27, p.49] states that, of these of speech acts, the most distinctive one is illocutionary force: “*Indeed, the term speech act is generally interpreted quite narrowly to mean only the illocutionary force of an utterance*”.

#### **2.2.2.1. Speech Act Classification**

According to Searle [19], speech acts are categorized into five groups: *representative, directive, commissive, expressive, declarative*.

#### **2.2.2.2. Felicity Conditions**

Basing on the theory of felicity conditions of Austin [5], Searle [19, p.57-61] points out four conditions that a speech act must need: *preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, essential conditions, propositional content conditions*. Moreover, according to Austin [5], the meaning of a speech act is not in what it can be true or false but it is in felicity conditions. These conditions also include subjective and objective ones.

#### **2.2.2.3. Mood**

According to Graham Lock [13, p.177-180], the two functions subject and finite are crucial to the structural identification

of mood in English, and he classified it into four types. They are declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamative. Declarative, interrogative, and imperative mood can be combined with positive or negative *polarity*. For negative polarity, the negative particle *not* (or *n't*) directly follows the finite. Where there is no other auxiliary, the auxiliary *do* again functions as finite.

### **2.2.3. Conversational Theory**

#### **2.2.3.1. The Concepts of Conversation**

- *Conversation is the language communication between people and people.* [8, p.105]

- *Conversation is the means by which we draw near to one another with sympathy and pleasure; it is the basis of our social activity.* [24, p.550]

- *Conversation is a friendly, natural talk in which people exchange information, ideas and emotions to one another.* [7, p.612]

#### **2.2.3.2. Conversational Structure**

##### **a. Turn and Turn-taking**

Richards.J.C [17] in “*The Language Teaching Matrix*” assumes that “*a turn is seen everything one speaker says before another speaker begins to speak*”.

According to Yule [27, p.78], he states that a turn may be very short or long. Long turns might be required for the S to explain an opinion, describe something or tell a story.

According to Wardhaugh [26, p.56] a conversation can have two turns, the usual sequence is *ab* where *a* and *b* are the parties of the conversation. The observation of turn-taking system is that speaker-change always occurs, and a person does not continue

talking indefinitely; instead one person stops talking and another begins.

### ***b. Adjacency Pair and Sequence***

According to Sacks [18] and Schegloff [22], adjacency pair is the smallest unit in conversation. That is a sequence of two adjacent utterances produced by a different S and related to each other in such a way that they form a pair type. The adjacency pair part always consists of a first part and second part. The utterance of the first part immediately creates an expectation of the utterance of a second part of the same pair. However, not all first parts receive their second parts immediately.

An insertion sequence is one adjacent pair within another. It is one of the strategies for delaying in response. Delay in response symbolically marks potential unavailability of the immediate expected answer. Delay represents distance between what is expected and what is provided. In order to see how delay is locally interpreted, we need some analytic terms for what is expected within certain types of adjacent pairs.

### ***2.2.3.3. Conversational Principles***

#### ***Conversation Principle: Cooperation***

In considering the suitability of participants' moves in conversation, Grice, H.P [11, p.45] in "*Logic and Conversation*" formulates a broad general principle, the cooperative principle: "*Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged*".

The principle can be described by four following categories which are called "maxims". They can be characterized in modified

form below: *maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, maxim of manner.*

#### **2.2.4. Politeness Theory**

The theory of Brown and Levinson [6] on politeness is one of the most influential research papers on language and politeness. It focuses mainly on the concept of “face” to explain the motivation for politeness behavior.

##### **2.2.4.1. The Notion of Face**

The theory on the face work of Brown and Levinson [6, p.66] points out that “*Face is something that is emotionally invested and that can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interactions.*” According to their theory, there are two kinds of face:

**a. Positive Face:** The need to be connected.

**b. Negative Face:** The need to be independent.

##### **2.2.4.2. Negative and Positive Politeness**

Brown and Levinson [6] also divide polite behaviour into positive politeness and negative politeness.

**a. Positive Politeness** involves strategies employed by a S to show appreciation on the other’s actions or needs.

**b. Negative Politeness** addresses the H’s negative face, that is to say a sense of personal autonomy.

##### **2.2.4.3. Politeness Strategies**

According to Brown and Levinson’s model of politeness, on any occasion when he decides to make a FTA, the S first of all has a choice between bald on record, positive and negative politeness and off-record.

1. Bald on- record (without redressive action, baldly):

Do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most often utilized by speakers who closely know their audience. With the bald on record, there is a direct possibility that the audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy.

2. Positive politeness strategies satisfy the H's positive face in some respect.

3. Negative politeness strategies satisfy the H's negative face to some degree.

4. Off-record strategies can satisfy the H's negative face to a degree greater than that afforded by negative-politeness strategy. In this way, the S can avoid the responsibility for his action that on-record strategies entail.

#### **2.2.4.4. Politeness and Indirectness**

#### **2.2.4.5. Face Threatening Act (FTA)**

Brown and Levinson [6, p.68] divide FTAs into four groups:

1. *Acts Threatening the H's Negative Face*
2. *Acts Threatening the H's Positive Face*
3. *Acts Threatening the S's Negative Face*
4. *Acts Threatening the S's Positive Face.*

#### **2.2.5. Pre-sequences, Apology and PAs**

##### **2.2.5.1. Pre-sequences**

Pre-sequences means certain utterances come before the other utterances which is in the beginning of a conversation or certain utterances belong to the opening sequence of a conversation [Mey, 1983, p.221].

##### **2.2.5.2. Definition of Apology**

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary [25, p.62] defines apology as follows: "*a regretful acknowledgement of an offence or failure*".

Ex:     *We owe you an apology.*  
          *My apologies for the delay.*

### 2.2.5.3. PAs

On the basis of the definitions of Apology and Pre-sequences above, PAs can be defined as follows: “A PA is an utterance before an apology to check if an apology can be accepted”. Let us consider the following examples to understand more about PAs.

Agent: ***I’ll look in the basket if you don’t mind.***(Pre-apology)

Peter: Be my guest. (Go ahead)

Agent: Thank you very much, **sorry about this.**(Apologize)[161]

Fran: ***Can I say something?*** (Pre-apology )

Steve: Sure. What do you mean? (Go ahead)

Fran: **I’m sorry.** (Apologize)[200]

As we can see, the PAs in examples above are performed with different structures expressing the S’ intention of surveying the H’s attitude for the polite purpose. This is a matter of subtlety in communication especially in apologizing.

In Vietnamese, Nguyễn Đức Dân [3, p.92] gives the definition of pre-sequences in the book entitled: “*Ngữ Dụng Học*”. He assumes that pre-sequences are a way of expressing a survey or making a comfortable atmosphere before coming to the first part of the conversation.

“*Có những lời nói được dùng trong một lúc nào đó để người khác cảm nhận được sẽ có một hoặc một chuỗi những lời nói tiếp theo. Lời nói đó là mở thoại*”

“*Mở thoại chỉ là lời thăm dò, tạo không khí thuận lợi khi bước vào cuộc thoại*”.....

According to Nguyễn Thiện Giáp [4, p.87], pre-sequences are called “*những lời wóm trước*”. He states that “*Mở đầu cuộc thoại thường có chức năng gây chú ý để đối phương cảm thấy sẽ có một*

hoặc một chuỗi lời tiếp theo; những câu có tính chất thăm dò đối phương về chủ thể, về quan hệ, về cách thức giao tiếp. Như vậy, những lời chào, những lời hô gọi, những lời thưa gửi, làm quen...là những lời mở đầu”.

“Lời ước trước là những lời được dùng để hình dung khả năng hành động nào đó”. The following exchanges contain PAs

Giang: **Dạ em nghe điện thoại một lát nha anh!**(*Ước thử*)

Khanh: Có gì quan trọng không em? (*Tiến triển*)

Giang: **Xin lỗi anh.** (*Xin lỗi*) [236]

Anh Hai:**Thu, có Ba Má ở nhà không?** (*Ước thử*)

Thu: Kiểm tui hay kiểm Ba Má? (*Tiến triển*)

Anh Hai:**Tôi qua đây để xin lỗi Thu.** (*Xin lỗi*) [240]

### 2.2.6. Pragmatics

According to Yule [27, p.3-4], pragmatics is defined as follows:

- *Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.*
- *Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.*
- *Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said.*
- *Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.*

These are the four areas that pragmatics is concerned with.

Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

#### 3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

This is a qualitative and quantitative study executed with a contrastive and analysis.

#### 3.2. DATA COLLECTION

The data in English are taken from most kinds of films except for cartoon and musical films such as *Titanic* by James Cameron, *The Reader* by David Kross, *Buried* by Rodrigo Cortes, *I Now Pronounce You Chuck and Lorry* and *Raging Bull* by Martin Scorsese, *All About Steve* by Phil Trail, *Deception* by Marcel Langenegger, etc.

The data in Vietnamese come from a variety of films except for cartoon, musical and horror films, especially popular films on television such as *Cổng Mặt Trời* by Nguyễn Dương, *Cuộc Gọi Lúc Không Giờ* by Nguyễn Danh Dũng, *Chuyện Tình Mùa Thu* by Trương Dũng, *Sóng Tình* by Xuân Cường, *Những Khoảnh Trời Riêng* by Đỗ Mai Nhật Tuấn, *Ngôi Nhà Hạnh Phúc and Đẹp Từng Centimet* by Vũ Ngọc Đăng, *Tha Thứ Cho Anh* by Phạm Nhuệ Giang, etc.

#### 3.3. DATA ANALYSIS

From nearly 600 samples picked out from both languages, we tried to choose the most interesting, noticeable ones with care to illustrate a number of important points under our investigation. All these samples are typed carefully with more than 80 pages so that we can select and copy them easily if necessary.

The data are grouped into categories depending on the syntactic and pragmatic features that PAs perform for later analysis.

The samples collected were described qualitatively in terms of syntactic and pragmatic features in English and Vietnamese.

The frequency of structures used for PAs was totalized basing on the quantitative method.

The syntactic and pragmatic features of PAs were then summarized in some tables.

The contrastive method was applied to analyze the similarities and differences in the syntactic and pragmatic features of PAs in the two languages.

Some generalizations and implications were drawn out after the data analysis.

### **3.4. PROCEDURES**

The following steps are detailed procedures to be taken:

(i) Collecting data

The sampling is made with the searching for PAs of a wide range of linguistic structures in English and Vietnamese. They are picked out from most of the films.

(ii) Classifying PAs

This is done in terms of syntactic and pragmatic features.

(iii) Describing and comparing PAs in English with those in Vietnamese.

(iv) Finding and discussing

(v) Suggesting some implications for English teaching and learning.

### **3.5. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### **4.1. THE SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF PAs IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE**

##### **4.1.1. The Syntactic Representation of PAs in English**

Basing on observing, describing and analyzing 299 samples of PAs in English from the cited sources, we can find out a variety of kinds of PAs such as PAs as a word, a phrase, a sentence, and a series of sentences. In addition, we can find PAs as a sentence in many structures: declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamative structures. Among these structures, PAs as a word with 20 cases accounting for 6.7%, PAs as a phrase with 10 cases occupying 3.34%, PAs as a series of sentences with 21 cases (7.02%) and PAs as a sentence with 248 cases (82.94%). Among 248 cases of PAs as a sentence, declarative structures are the most typical in English with 190 cases accounting for 76.61%. Next, the second position is imperative with 30 cases occupying 12.1%; interrogative comes at the third with 27 cases and 10.89% and the last position is exclamative with 1 case (0.40 %). It depends on the content and form of apologies that the S can choose an appropriate structure so as to get the most effective apologies.

##### ***4.1.1.1. PAs as a Word***

##### ***4.1.1.2. PAs as a Phrase***

##### ***4.1.1.3. PAs as a Sentence***

###### **a. Declaratives**

###### ***a.1. Affirmative statements***

###### ***a.2. Negative statements***

**b. Imperatives**

*b.1. Affirmative Imperatives*

*b.2. Negative Imperatives*

**c. Interrogatives**

*c.1. Yes/ No Questions*

*c.2. Declarative Questions*

*c.3. Wh- questions*

*c.4. Tag questions*

**d. Exclamatives**

*4.1.1.4. PAs as a Series of Sentences.*

**4.1.2. The Syntactic Representation of PAs in Vietnamese**

Like English, after observing, describing and analyzing the data including 293 samples of PAs from the cited sources, we can find out a variety of structures such as PAs as a word, a sentence and a series of sentences. Among these structures, the result shows that PAs as a word with 6 cases accounting 2.05%, PAs as a phrase with 1 case (0.34%), PAs as a sentence with 247 cases (84.30%) and PAs as a series of sentences with 39 cases occupying 13.31%. There are plenty structures in PAs as a sentence such as interrogatives, declaratives, imperatives and exclamatives. Among these structures, we can find that declaratives with 147 cases accounting for 59.51%; interrogatives with 54 cases accounting for 21.86%; imperatives with 24 cases (9.72%) and exclamatives with 22 cases (8.91%).

*4.1.2.1. PAs as a Word*

*4.1.2.2. PAs as a Phrase*

*4.1.2.3. PAs as a Sentence*

**a. Declaratives**

a.1. *Affirmative statements*

a.2. *Negative statements*

**b. Interrogatives**

b.1. *Questions ending with modal particles*

b.2. *Questions containing interrogative adjuncts*

b.3. *Questions containing interrogative pronouns*

b.4. *Declarative questions*

**c. Imperatives**

c.1. *Affirmative imperatives*

c.2. *Negative imperatives*

**d. Exclamatives**

**4.1.2.4. PAs as a Series of Sentences**

**4.1.3. Similarities and differences of Syntactic Representation of PAs in English and Vietnamese.**

**Table 4.3: Summary of relative frequency (%) of syntactic representation of PAs in English and Vietnamese.**

Structures of PAs	English Language		Vietnamese Language	
	N	%	N	%
1. A sentence	248	82.94	247	84.3
2. A series of sentences	21	7.02	39	13.31
3. A word	20	6.7	6	2.05
4. A phrase	10	3.34	1	0.34
<b>Total</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Types of PAs</b>				
1. Declaratives	190	76.61	147	59.51
2. Interrogatives	27	10.89	54	21.86

3. Imperatives		30	12.1	24	9.72
4. Exclamatives		1	0.4	22	8.91
<b>Total</b>		<b>248</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100</b>
1. Declaratives	1. Affirmative statements	129	67.9	123	83.67
	2. Negative statements	61	32.1	24	16.33
<b>Total</b>		<b>190</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100</b>
2. Interrogatives	1. Yes/ no questions	14	51.85	11	20.37
	2. Declarative questions	8	29.63	1	1.85
	3. Wh-questions	4	14.82	4	7.41
	4. Tag questions	1	3.7	38	70.37
<b>Total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>
3. Imperatives	1. Affirmative	22	73.33	11	45.83
	2. Negative	8	26.67	13	54.17
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>
4. Exclamatives		<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100</b>

## **4.2. THE PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF PAs IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE**

### **4.2.1. The Pragmatic Representation of PAs in English**

#### ***4.2.1.1. Explaining***

#### ***4.2.1.2. Notifying***

#### ***4.2.1.3. Demanding***

#### ***4.2.1.4. Expressing feeling***

#### ***4.2.1.5. Drawing the H's attention***

#### ***4.2.1.6. Blaming oneself for the mistake.***

#### ***4.2.1.7. Commenting***

#### ***4.2.1.8. Expressing wishes***

#### ***4.2.1.9. Judging and checking judgement***

#### ***4.2.1.10. Surveying***

#### ***4.2.1.11. Warning***

*4.2.1.12. Promising*

*4.2.1.13. Confirming*

*4.2.1.14. Suggesting*

*4.2.1.15. Introducing*

*4.2.1.16. Soothing*

*4.2.1.17. Reminding an experience*

**4.2.2. The Pragmatic Representation of PAs in Vietnamese**

*4.2.2.1. Expressing feeling*

*4.2.2.2. Explaining*

*4.2.2.3. Notifying*

*4.2.2.4. Drawing the H's attention*

*4.2.2.5. Surveying*

*4.2.2.6. Expressing wishes*

*4.2.2.7. Judging and checking judgement*

*4.2.2.8. Persuading*

*4.2.1.9. Demanding*

*4.2.1.10. Soothing*

*4.2.1.11. Blaming oneself for the mistake*

*4.2.1.12. Promising*

*4.2.1.13. Begging*

*4.2.1.14. Confirming*

*4.2.1.15. Advising*

*4.2.1.16. Commenting*

*4.2.1.17. Suggesting*

*4.2.1.18. Introducing*

*4.2.1.19. Making conditions*

**4.2.3. Similarities and differences of Pragmatic Representation of PAs in English and Vietnamese**

**Table 4.6: Summary of relative frequency (%) of pragmatic representation of PAs in English and Vietnamese**

Types of features	English language		Vietnamese language	
	Number	Frequency (%)	Number	Frequency (%)
1. Explaining	61	20.40	44	15.02
2. Notifying	56	18.73	39	13.31
3. Demanding	29	9.70	9	3.07
4. Expressing feeling	27	9.03	49	16.72
5. Drawing the H's attention	19	6.35	24	8.19
6. Blaming oneself for the mistake	18	6.02	9	3.07
7. Commenting	18	6.02	7	2.39
8. Expressing wishes	10	3.34	17	5.80
9. Confirming	9	3.01	12	4.09
10. Judging and checking judgement	9	3.01	17	5.80
11. Surveying	8	2.67	24	8.19
12. Warning	8	2.67	0	0
13. Suggesting	8	2.67	2	0.68
14. Soothing	6	2.01	12	4.09
15. Promising	6	2.01	5	1.71
16. Introducing	6	2.01	1	0.34
17. Reminding an	1	0.33	0	0

experience				
18. Begging	0	0	6	2.05
19. Making conditions	0	0	1	0.34
20. Persuading	0	0	10	3.41
21. Advising	0	0	5	1.71
Total	<b>299</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>100</b>

### 4.3. THE APOLOGIES FOLLOWING PAs IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

*Table 4.7. The apologies following PAs in English and Vietnamese*

In English	In Vietnamese
Apologize	Xin lỗi
Pardon	Tha lỗi/ xin tha lỗi
Excuse	Tha thứ/ xin tha thứ
Forgive	Thông cảm bỏ qua

## CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1. SUMMARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

As presented in the third chapter, the thesis involves the qualitative and quantitative study of the syntactic and pragmatic features of PAs in English and Vietnamese.

So as to perform the study effectively, we have read a variety of theoretical material related to speech acts and other issues

concerning the research. After that, we designed an outline to specify the steps of the study.

With regard to the data collection, we relied mostly on the document review which consists of samples taken from English and Vietnamese films.

After collecting the data, we classified them into categories suitable to each part that I have designed in the outline and then we described, analyzed and made a contrasting analysis to clarify the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese in the way of performing PAs. The problems under investigation have resulted in the findings which are summarized in the following section.

## **5.2. BRIEF RE-STATEMENT OF THE FINDINGS**

(1) Syntactically, PAs are analyzed with a variety of different structures such as: a word, a phrase, a sentence and a series of sentences and divided into a lot of types for each structure. For example, there are several types of PAs as a sentence such as interrogatives, declaratives, imperatives and exclamatives. In the two languages, it can be seen that the position of appearance of syntactic representation is similar.

With regard to structural forms, *declarative questions* in both English and Vietnamese have the form of statement produced in a rising intonation. However, the syntax of *tag questions* in English is clearer than that of *questions ending with modal particles* in Vietnamese. Moreover, the forms of PAs as *yes/no questions* in English and as *questions containing interrogative adjuncts* in Vietnamese are identified differently. Another point is that PAs as

*wh- questions* in English have the forms different to *questions containing interrogative pronouns* in Vietnamese.

Mood in English is grammatically formed by the order of the subject and the finite. But in Vietnamese, mood is lexically recognized by typical markers, particularly by typical words or modal particles.

PAs in both languages also contain modifying acts as *pre-modifying* and *post-modifying*. Naming and polite expressions can exist in the all forms of construction.

PAs are most frequently represented by sentences and declarative sentences in English and Vietnamese.

PAs which contain one more turn or PAs and an official apology at the same turn exist in both English and Vietnamese.

(2) Pragmatically, the study focuses on classifying and analyzing the features of PAs in both languages such as: *surveying, notifying, confirming, introducing, explaining, drawing the H's attention, promising, judging and checking judgement, expressing wishes, commenting, expressing feeling, demanding, blaming oneself for the mistake, suggesting, soothing, warning, reminding an experience, begging, making conditions, persuading and advising.*

PAs are pragmatically represented by explaining and notifying in high frequency in both languages.

PAs in English has two features less than those in Vietnamese \_17 features in English and 19 ones in Vietnamese for example. Besides sharing 15 features, the PAs in both languages also have some features which exist in this language do not appear in the other one.

In terms of the frequency of occurrence of pragmatic representation of PAs in English and Vietnamese, it can be seen that *promising feature* in both languages is nearly equal with 6 cases (2.01%) in English and 5 cases (1.71%) in Vietnamese. However, there are also some differences.

Another point is that the position of appearance of pragmatic representation in English and Vietnamese is quite different.

Furthermore, most of the features above in English and Vietnamese are identified in the same structures, but they still have some differences.

Finally, the perception of politeness and formality in relation to personal relationship between interlocutors in communication with PAs in English and Vietnamese are almost the same.

### **5.3. IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING ENGLISH**

#### **5.3.1. Implications for the Learners**

The learners must place themselves on the communication process with others in English to obtain the competence in it. Whatever linguistic forms and features of PAs are learned. Moreover, learners should know the purpose when they use PAs. At last, learners should know using PAs in daily communication is considered as a polite strategy so as to avoid shocking the H as well as avoiding threatening the H's face.

#### **5.3.2. Implications for the Teachers**

Firstly, teachers should create more opportunities for the learners to practise PAs in conversations. Secondly, teachers should stimulate learners to practise speaking as much as possible. Last but not least, teachers should help learners know how to use PAs

effectively by suggesting some structures as well as features used for PAs and help them to select some specific ones for certain situations.

#### **5.4. LIMITATIONS**

The research has been carried out with our great effort. However, it certainly cannot avoid some weakness due to the researcher's limitation of time, knowledge, materials and other objective factors.

The corpus was built with limited samples of PAs in English and Vietnamese from films. We could not conduct a fieldwork with authentic samples of PAs used in everyday conversations. Thus, it is far from a complete list of PAs covering the need of expressing degree of the Ss' attitude or emotion.

The study has just addressed the issues of PAs in terms of syntactic and pragmatic features in English and Vietnamese. Other elements such as voice, intonation, tone playing an important role in producing PAs are not completely considered.

Finally, using PAs in both languages is affected by social factors such as age, social positions, power, sex, profession, education, income and so on, but they are not mentioned in this study.

#### **5.5. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

If the future research is conducted in this direction, the following aspects will be taken more consideration and investigation:

- Cultural aspects of PAs in English and Vietnamese.
- The responses of PAs in English and Vietnamese.