

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Background

Language is the universal medium to express ideas, thoughts, information, messages, emotions, feelings and is regarded to be the most valuable possession of human race. It is common and natural property for the human beings and is called species-specific, species-uniform, universal and unique gift. Language is a system of communication and vehicle used for the sake of communication. All normal children acquire their languages by 5/6 years. It is the most powerful, convenient and permanent means which is extremely complex and highly versatile code for human communication.

Chomsky 1971(as cited in Lyons 2007, p.6) says "Languages are infinitely extendable and modifiable according to changing needs and conditions of the speaker". According to Sapir (1921, p. 8), "Language is primarily human and non-instinctive method to communicate ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols" (as cited in Lyons, 2007, p. 3). According to Richards et al. (1985), "Language is the system of human communication by means of structured arrangement of sounds to form large units" (p.153).

Language is a phenomenon which we use in the society to express our ideas and feelings, by means of which we establish and maintain social relationship. It is special gift to human beings and characterized by uniquely human features. Language differentiates human beings from other non-human beings. Wardhaugh (2001, p.1) defines language "as what the members of a particular society speak." This definition focuses that language is common property only for the human beings who live in a particular society. Animals cannot acquire human language because of its complex structure and their physical inadequacies to acquire human

language. Language is purely human. It is god's special gift to human beings. Language is a very complex human phenomenon and a form of communication which is used for some purposes in a community. It is the most significant aspect of human beings but other animals lack it. Descartes said, 'Thanks to language, man became man' (as cited in Verma and Krishnashwami, 1999, p.3).

### **1.1.1 English: A Brief Introduction**

The world is full of varieties of languages. There are thousands of languages which are equally important so far as their communicative function is concerned. Among them some languages have wider scope, larger popularity and spoken by the large number of people but some languages are spoken in the particular country, society as well as family. The degree of popularity of a language is determined by its area of usage. Among different languages spoken in the world, English is the most widely used, the most highlighted and the most dominant language. It belongs to the group of West-Germanic language family which is the largest language family of the world.

English has occupied an important place in the present world which is highly accepted among other languages. English occupies the top most position in the hierarchy of languages. English is highly developed language spoken in the wider region. It is most widely taught in different countries as a foreign language such as Russia, China, Germany, Nepal, etc. It has rich vocabulary, literature and higher prestige which helps to create international integration among different countries. It is a powerful means to understand and achieve the technology where a vast store of knowledge and technology is explored through the English language. It is an international linguafranca which integrates the whole world. English plays dominant role in different names like international language, auxiliary language, trade language contact language and an international linguafranca. It functions to link its native speakers to nonnative speakers and nonnative speakers to nonnative

speakers. It is main international language of business, sports, advertisement, academic conferences, travel, airport, diplomacy, science and technology, etc. It increases the modernization process because it can be received and understood everywhere. It is called threshold of knowledge and a gateway to the whole body of modern world. The popularity and necessity of English cannot be neglected because it is compulsory to lead the life with the modern era. More than 50 percent textbooks and print media are published in the English language. It has covered different fields and no field is far from the English language. It has wider scope, larger popularity, and higher prestige than other languages spoken in the world and is called international language, global language.

### **1.1.2 The English Language in Nepal**

English is taken as a foreign language in Nepal. It is taught as a compulsory subject from grade one to bachelor level. When we look at the history of English in Nepal, it entered in Nepal in 1910 B.S. when the first Rana Prime Minister Jung Bahadur Rana visited England, returned and opened Darbar high school to teach English to his family members realizing the importance and necessity of the English language. Chandrashamsher opened Tri-Chandra College in 1981 A.D. in the name of his own and king Tribhuvan's name reluctantly. This is called the formal and beginning college of English in Higher Education in Nepal. At that time, literary texts were studied and analyzed and literature was used to be the focus of study in learning language. Secondary language skills (i.e. reading and writing) were given priority. For teaching language, grammar - translated method (GT- Method) was used and the teachers were not trained. After the establishment of democracy in 2007 B.S. different schools were established but modification and reformation occurred in terms of the changing concept of English Education with changing time.

Now, English has been taught and learnt from the beginning of school and it is also taught as an optional subject. It is also taught as a specialization subject to produce qualified and trained teachers and teacher trainers in T.U. under the Faculty of Education. Specially, the NESP (1971 A.D). brought revolutionary change by planning curricula and textbooks. It declared English of 100 marks for each grade from grade four to bachelor level including optional English at secondary and Higher Education level.

English is most important in the academic and social fields. It is essential for academic and communicative purposes in the modern era. The popularity of English is growing rapidly and there is competition between different schools to provide education in English medium. The new generation is interested towards English medium schools. Parents are curious and interested towards the English medium schools to teach their children.

### **1.1.3 Linguistic Scenario of Nepal**

The small and beautiful country, in the lap of Himalayas, 'Nepal' is multilingual, multiracial, multireligious and multicultural. It is fertile land for languages and culture though it is small in size. It is multilingual in the sense that different languages are spoken in different areas from Mechi to Mahakali. According to the population census (2001), there are more than 93 languages spoken in Nepal. Some languages have not been discovered yet and they are still hidden. Different languages spoken in different places do not have written script. "The Ethnologue on the language of the world" edited by Grims (1991), estimates a total of 100 languages are spoken in Nepal, although where it was calculated only in thirty districts. A range of features such as occupation, caste, culture, income, social, ethnic or cultural background, place of residence, etc. usually determine social group. The people from different social groups speak different dialects. The languages and their varieties construct the linguistic scenario.

The languages and their dialects spoken in Nepal are related to four language families named: Indo-Aryan (14 languages), Tibeto-Burman (56 languages), Austro - Asiatic (1 language) and Dravidian (1 language). Nepali is an official language and national language of Nepal which plays a dominant role in the country. It is used for different purposes such as medium of instruction at various levels of education, commerce, mass-media, literature, etc.

According to Dhakal (2064, p. 240), the languages spoken in Nepal can be grouped into the following four language families:

### **1.1.3.1 Indo Aryan Group**

This group includes the following languages:

Nepali	Hindi	Darai
Maithili	Rajbansi	Kumal
Bhojpuri	Bangali	Bote
Tharu	Dunuwari	Chureti
Awadhi	Marwadi	Magahi
Urdu	Majhi	

### **1.1.3.2 Tibeto-Burman Group**

This group includes the following languages:

Tamang	Sherpa	Jirel
Gurung	Thami	Dura
Limbu	Dhimal	Chepeng
Ghale	Thakali	Rai, Kiranti
Magar	Tibbati	

### **1.1.3.3 Dravidian Group**

Dhangadh or Jhangadh is only one language of the Dravidian family which is spoken on the province of Koshi river in the eastern region of Nepal.

#### **1.1.3.4 Austro-Asiatic Group**

'Satar' is the only one language in this family which is spoken in Jhapa district in the eastern part of Nepal. This family has two other branches namely Non-khmer and Munda. The Satar language is also called Santhali language.

#### **1.1.4 Doteli Dialect: A Brief Introduction**

A dialect is a variety of language according to the user. It is a regionally or socially distinctive variety of language identified by a particular set of words and grammatical structures. The variation in the use of a language according to place, time and group of people is called dialect. Dialect is a non-standard variety of language which is determined or realized in terms of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammatical features. It is such a variety of language that tells something about or identifies the speaker or the user of language. The personality of the speaker, his/her geographical origin and the social background are reflected in the dialect that s/he uses. Crystal (2003, p. 136) says, "Dialect is a regionally or socially distinctive variety of language identified by a particular set of words and grammatical structures." Dialects can be classified into two types:

##### **1.1.4.1 Social Dialect (Sociolect)**

Language variation in terms of certain social class is called social dialect or sociolect. For example khas dialect, rana dialect, shah dialect of Nepali in Nepal. According to Verma and Krishnaswamy (1999, p. 5), "dialects based on social stratification are called sociolects, class dialects and caste dialects".

##### **1.1.4.2 Geographical Dialect/Regional Dialect (Geolect)**

Language variation in terms of different regions, places, geography is called geographical dialect. For example - Doteli dialect (in the far-western), Purbeli dialect (in the eastern part of Nepal).

Among different dialects of the Nepali language, Doteli dialect is one which is spoken in the far-western part of Nepal especially in Seti and Mahakali zones. Under Doteli dialect, there are lots of sub-dialects in terms of place, caste, geography. Generally, it is said that Doteli dialect is a common dialect spoken in the far-western part of Nepal. This dialect is closer to the original place of the Nepali language i.e. Karnali zone. It is influenced by the Sinjali and the Parpaschima dialects. Doteli dialect is related to the Kumauni language spoken in the Uttaranchal State of India. According to Chataut (2058, p. 11), "It is supposed to be the oldest form of the Nepali language".

According to the history of Doteli dialect, it was earlier called 'Malla language' in Doti and 'Sinja language' in Sinjapuri and flourished in the Karnali zone. Later, the area of Doti was divided into different zones, districts and the process of pidginization occurred and Doteli dialect lost its originality somehow. According to Dhakal (2064, p. 228), Doteli dialect lies in 'Majhpaschima' and 'Majhpaschima' can be further divided into other three dialects: Dadeldhureli, Dumrakoteli and Nirauli. According to Pantha (2032, p. 11), "mostly Doteli dialect is spoken in far-western region of Nepal".

### **1.1.5 Language Functions**

Language is an inherited capacity which provides enormous advantages to the human beings over other species. Generally, what language does is called language function. It is the purpose for which a piece of language is used. In other words, what we can do through the use of language is called language function. Walter (1993) mentions that function denotes what is done with the language. Language is to transmit the results of one's creative thinking to society and to transmit its knowledge from one generation to another. The fundamental function of language is communication. All human beings share their experiences with the help of language. Language works as a means of communication to the extent that

the experiences including the linguistic experiences of a group of people overlap. Language makes a person a full fledged member of a society. It allows him/her greater possibilities of self-expression. Language provides an individual with a tool for the explanation and analysis of his/her own conceptual process. It gives some kinds of access to the experiences to others which is called language function. Language is used to exchange ideas, feeling, and visions which is called communication. Anything that can be done through language is described as functions. Language functions are often described as categories of behaviour for example, greetings, apologies, requests, offers, complaints, etc. A function refers to the way in which an utterance is used as a means of communication.

When people communicate with each other they express at least one function of language. Communicative function means the task of language that the speaker desires to acquire from the hearer through either verbal response or non-verbal response. A single language function can be expressed through more than one grammatical structure. Language function is associated with various related terms like speech act theory, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, linguistics, etc. Language is used as an instrument of social interaction and used to communicate with each other in the social environment. Communicative function refers to the ways in which a language is used in community. It refers to exchanging ideas, feelings, information, etc. between two or more than two persons. Language functions are the purposes for which people speak or write. We can do everything using language. When we switch the radio or television on, for example, our purpose is to be amused or entertained or to find something out. In the same way, we only speak or write with a purpose in mind: to help someone to see our point of view, perhaps or to ask their advice or to reach agreement with them. We call these purposes the functions of language. Every language has such functions but different languages express these functions in different ways.



Van Ek and Alexander (1980) presented six main categories of language function which are Socializing, Getting Things Done, Expressing Moral and Emotional Attitude, Expressing Modal Attitude, Expressing Intellectual Attitude and Seeking Factual Information. Requesting and Apologizing fall under the 'Getting Things Done' and 'Socializing' functions respectively.

### **1.1.5.1 Socializing**

Human is a social being who uses language to communicate with each other. Language is a vehicle to share ideas, feelings, thoughts, emotions between different persons. Socializing is a process of being socialized in a society (among different persons). Among the different functions of language, socializing refers to the way of communicative relationship between or among persons. Socializing includes the functions such as - Greeting, Taking Leave/Farewell, Welcoming, Addressing/Vocatives, Introducing, Congratulating, Expressing Good wishes, Thanking, Attracting Attention, Asking to Repeat, Apologizing, Expressing Excuse, Expressing Praise/Credit, Expressing Complements, Expressing Condolence, Expressing Sympathy, Extending an Invitation, Proposing a Toast, Using Conversation/ Discourse fillers, etc.

### **Apology**

An apology is a speech act which expresses that one is sorry for having done something wrong, for causing pain, trouble, etc. It is an expression used by a speaker against some offence committed by him/her most probably unknowingly. It is a way of regret for doing wrong, being impolite or hurting somebody's feeling. Everybody should know the ways of expressing apology. Otherwise, s/he is considered as a rude or impolite person in society. Apology brings a balance of relationship between the speaker and listener as a remedial task.

Leech (1983) says that apologies express regret for some offence committed by a speaker against a hearer and there is no implication that speaker has benefited from offence. According to Austin (1962, p. 282), "It is a piece of utterance serving a behavitive function of language"(as cited in Lynes, 2007, p. ).

An apology is a remedial task for wrong done by the speaker and to establish good relationship between a speaker and hearer. Apology makes the language more courteous and plays an integral role to establish social relation and plays vital role to develop communicative competence on the part of the learners.

An apology makes conversation more effective. It is necessary in different situations to communicate effectively and regarded as an indispensable factor for communication. When we do something wrong, we can save ourselves by apologizing before someone complains to us. In this case it may be even more essential to 'break it gently'. It means apology is essential to break the wrong done by the speaker.

An apology is the marker of politeness which is used as a remedial task for doing wrong. The use of politeness terms such as apologies make the conversation effective. We cannot imagine any effective conversation without using politeness terms such as thanking, regretting, apologizing, offering, congratulating, which are called the essentials of conversation.

A speaker should know the appropriate use of politeness terms for the effective conversation. The proper use of apologies, creates flavour in the conversation removing all the mistakes.

Fraser (1981, p.263) states several strategies that can be used alone or in combination to form an apology. He says that direct strategies mention the apology as an issue while indirect strategies do not explicitly mention the apology as an issue. Apology plays a vital role of remedy for an offence and restore

equilibrium or harmony between the speaker and listener. In the same way, in Doteli dialect, somebody apologizes for committing mistake or for doing wrong. For example:

I'm sorry. I could not come on time. (English)

Mu tyamami aaun naisakyama maph diyê. (Doteli)

Apology can also be divided into three types:

Apology : That statement which expresses that one is sorry for having done something wrong, for causing pain, trouble, etc. for example:

Sorry, I could not see. (English)

Maph diya muile nai dheke. (Doteli)

Apology + Repairment : It refers to a statement that follows the apology. For example:

I'm sorry. I'll buy another for you. (English)

Maph diya. Mu tamarilai arkho kinidiulo. (Doteli)

Repairment: It refers to those responses which are not apologies in form but functions as apologies indirectly. For example:

Okay, I'll buy another for you. (English)

Pakh, tamarilai mu arkho kinidiulo. (Doteli)

### **1.1.5.2 Getting Things Done**

The function of language 'Getting Things Done' includes different functions like - Requesting, Asking, Ordering, Telling, Directing, Instructing, Encouraging/ Discouraging, Persuading, Urging, Prohibiting, Threatening/Warning/Cautioning, Making Plans/Proposal/Reason, Making Appointment, Making Bookings, etc.

## **Request**

Request is a kind of language act which is done in the relation to other people. It is a kind of language function which is a marker of politeness. When we ask someone to do something, we make a request. Request symbolizes the civilization and culture of the society.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (OALD) (1996, p.996) defines request as "an act of politely asking for something." Fraser (1975, p. 13) mentions that "request is a property associated with an utterance in which, according to the hearer, the speaker has neither exceeded any rights nor failed to fulfill any obligations". Request refers to the statement that expresses politeness explicitly.

Language is used among participants who use it. It should be appropriate according to the context. A good language user should have the ability to use the language which is pragmatically correct as well as contextually appropriate. Though request refers to asking politely, it differs from language to language and depends on the social situations, social classes of the people. Request is an essential factor to make a good relationship between speaker and hearer and society's protocol. It depends on the cultural and linguistic convention of that language community as well as the age, sex, social class, personal relationship and particular situation.

Request refers to politeness and it states from higher to lower rank. The application of language depends on the social norms, rules and cultural phenomena which differ from society to society. It is a tactful way of getting people to do things. For example, 'open the door, please'. There is a variety of ways of making a request. The choice of a form of request depends upon the relationship between the addresser and addressee involved in a discourse. Different request expressions depend on how difficult, unpleasant or urgent the task is.

As request is an act of asking others politely or not politely to do something, it is also a marker of politeness which largely depends on the cultural and linguistic conventions of that language community. The degree of politeness depends upon the formality of expression. In the more formal situation the expressions are more polite than in an informal situation. For example, a husband in Nepalese society uses nonhonourable pronouns like 'Ta' and 'Timi' to address his wife but gets honourable pronouns like 'Tapai', 'Hajur' from wife, which is the same situation in Doteli dialect where husband uses, 'Tu' for wife but wife uses 'Tam', 'Hajur' for husband. But in the English language there is not pronominal distinction for husband and wife but common pronoun 'you' is used. Politeness also depends upon the closeness between the speaker and listener. The person who is familiar is addressed less politely whereas the person who is not familiar is addressed more politely. The proper use of language expresses the appropriate behaviour between the interlocutors. It brings cordial relationship if the speaker is most polite to the addressee. For the proper use of politeness the speaker should know how to talk with whom, when, where and in what manner and it is used on the basis of situations.

In Doteli dialect, 'form of request' is the matter of respect and it has first, second and third person pronoun system as English and Nepali languages do. Doteli speakers show their request to their seniors by using respected verbs. Request is shown according to power, economic status, caste, age, sex, village, city, etc., which are called determiners of request. The pronoun 'Tu' is used for juniors, 'Tam', 'Hajur' are used to address seniors and to express high honorificness. Politeness is expressed according to the pronouns they use to address their seniors. For example :

Open the door, please. (English)

Dwar ugadi dina. (Doteli).

Request can be divided into the following three types:

Direct Request : That statement which expresses politeness explicitly is called direct request. For example:

Please come to me, today. (English)

Mera wa aaya jeloj jas manneithe. (Doteli)

Indirect Request: That statement which does not express politeness explicitly but expresses politeness implicitly is called indirect request. For example:

I fell sorry to tell you to search my mobile. (English)

E! Dai, mero mobile khojidina. (Doteli)

Non -Request : That statement which does not express politeness explicitly or implicitly is called non-request. For example:

Has anybody seen my mobile ? (English)

Kannei mero mobile dhekya ? (Doteli)

## **1.2 Review of the Related Literature**

Many research works have been carried out to compare various aspects between English and other languages like Nepali, Gurung, Bantawa Rai, Doteli, Newari, Maithili, etc. There are some research works on comparative study of apology and request between English and some other languages but no any research has been carried out on apology and request systems of English and Doteli in the department. Some of the researches that are somehow related to the present study area are as follows:

Pandey (1997) carried out a research on "A Comparative Study of Apologies Between English and Nepali." The objectives of his study were to enlist different forms of apologies in English and Nepali, to compare apologies in English and Nepali and to provide suggestions for teaching learning of apologies. In his study, he concluded that the English native speakers were more apologetic than the

Nepali native speakers and women were more apologetic than their male counterparts in English and Nepali. Similarly, another research entitled 'Request forms in the English and Nepali Language: A Comparative Study' was done by Chapagain (2002). The objectives of her research were - to enlist different forms of request used by the English native speakers and the Nepali native speakers, to compare request of the English and Nepali native speakers based on sociopragmatic approach. She found that the English native speakers were more polite than the Nepali native speakers in making requests.

Likewise, Tembe (2001) carried out a research on "A Comparative Study of Apologies Between English and Limbu" The objectives of his study were to enlist the different forms of apologies in English and Limbu, to compare and contrast Limbu apologies with those of English and to suggest some pedagogical implications. He found that the native speakers of English were more apologetic than the native speakers of Limbu. Similarly, Paneru (2007) carried out a research entitled "A Comparative Study of English and Doteli Kinship Terms." He concluded that Doteli dialect had many terms to symbolize different kinds of kinship relations but English has fewer. So, Doteli dialect is richer than English in terms of Kinship terms.

The present research is basically different from the above mentioned researches because nobody has done the research on the comparative study between request and apology of the English and Doteli. So, it is a new venture in itself.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- i. To enlist different forms of requests and apologies in English and Doteli.
- ii. To compare requests and apologies in English and Doteli.
- iii. To point out some pedagogical implications based on the findings of the study.

#### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

This study has multifold significance in terms of different aspects. It will be significant for the teachers to teach Doteli dialect as well as English language on the basis of their request and apology functions. The students, textbook writers, curriculum and syllabus designers, methodologists, lexicographers and those who are directly or indirectly involved in teaching and learning English as a foreign language will be benefitted. It will be fruitful for nonnative speakers of Doteli as well as English. It will be milestone for teaching and evaluating the performance of the learners. This study will play an important role for the upliftment of different languages which are not developed and have been losing their originality. It will have a vital role to develop communicative competence on the part of learners, for the efficient conversation. It will be significant to play an integral role to establish or reinforce social relations, beneficial to the learners to grasp the cross-cultural pragmatic competence and to help in incorporating important factors of communicative competence in making different policies.

#### **1.5 Definitions of the Specific Terms**

**Requests :** They refer to the statements that express politeness explicitly.

**Responses:** They refer to all the answers of the questions in which polite terms are used.

**Indirect Requests:** They deal with those responses which are not in the form of politeness but express request to some extent.

**Non-Requests:** All the other responses except direct and indirect requests. They are impolite responses which do not express requests explicitly or implicitly.



**Apology :** It refers to the statement of request (for doing wrong, being impolite, hurting somebody's feeling). In other words it refers to a statement expressing that one is sorry for having done something wrong, for causing pain, trouble, etc.

**Non-apologetic responses :** This term refers to those responses that do not consist the use of apologies. This is a term to show or to say that one is not sorry for some fault or wrong.

**Literate :** This term refers to those Doteli and English informants who have got their academic qualification to read and write.

**Educated:** This term refers to those Doteli and English informants who have got academic qualification of SLC level or above.

**Illiterate:** This term refers to those informants who have not got formal education and who are unable to read and write.

**Sociopragmatic:** In this study, this term refers to the form and function of language in the given social setting.

**Repairment:** This term refers to those responses which are not apologies in form but function as apologies indirectly, e.g. okay, I will buy another one. This term is interchangeably used with remedy.

**Apology and Repairment :** This term refers to statement that follows the apology, e.g. I'm sorry, I will buy another book for you. Here, this underlined part is repairment.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter incorporates the description of the sources of data, population of the study, sampling procedure, tools and process of data collection. It also describes the limitations of the study.

#### **2.1 Sources of Data**

The researcher used both sources of data i.e. primary and secondary to conduct this study.

##### **2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data**

The native speakers of Doteli dialect who lived in Doti especially Bhumi Rajmandu VDC and the native speakers of the English language who were in the different places of Kathmandu especially British council, Orbit Institute, Garden Hotel Thamel, Luthreen World Federation, were the primary sources of data.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources**

The secondary sources of data for this study were different books e.g. Van Ek (1980), Matreyek (1985), Jones (1987), Lyons (2006), dictionaries, e.g. Chataut (2058 B.S.), Richards et al. (1999), Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary (OALD) (1996), Journals e.g. Dewatabi (2060 B.S), English Language Teaching (ELT) (2005), Magazines like Guguldi (2064 B.S.), etc.

#### **2.2 Sample of the Study**

There were 80 native speakers of Doteli and English. Among them 40 respondents were the English native speakers found in different places of Kathmandu and 40 respondents were the Doteli native speakers found in Bhumi Rajmandu VDC, Doti.

### 2.3 Sampling Procedure

To carryout this research, the researcher selected two districts, i.e. Doti and Kathmandu. He selected a Particular VDC from Doti named Bhumi Rajmandu for the data collection of Doteli and different places of Kathmandu like British Council, Hotel Garden, Orbit Institute, Luthereen World Federation for the data collection of the English language.

The researcher used judgemental non random sampling for the selection of the on sample. Out of 80 informants selected non randomly, there were 40 native speakers of Doteli. Likewise, there were the equal number of English informants. Out of 40 Doteli informants, 20 were males and 20 were females. Similarly, there were 20 males and 20 females respondents of the English language. They are shown in the following table:

**Table 1**

**The Selected Informants from English and Doteli for Data Collection**

S.N.	Native Language	Sex		Total No. of Respondents
		Male	Female	
1	English	20	20	40
2	Doteli	20	20	40

While collecting data from native speakers of the English language, both American and British English speakers were contacted. The distribution of population among native speakers of English is as follows:

**Table 2**

**Total Selected Informants from English for English Data**

Native Language	British	American	Total no. of Respondents
English	20	20	40

## **2.4 Tools for Data Collection**

Questionnaire was the tool for data collection. The researcher prepared two sets of questionnaire for the native speakers of Doteli and English.

## **2.5 Process of Data Collection**

The researcher prepared two sets of questionnaire in both English and Doteli involving different situations related to the request and apology. The Doteli native speakers were allowed to respond to in Doteli and the English native speakers were allowed to respond in English language. The researcher visited Bhumi Rajmandu VDC in Doti and different wards for data collection for Doteli and different places in Kathmandu for the English language. He contacted the sample population of both English and Doteli and provided the questionnaires having similar situations. At last, those questionnaires were collected and analyzed using simple statistical tools: average and percentage.

## **2.6 Limitations of the Study**

This study had the following limitations:

- i. This study was confined to 40 native speakers of English and equal number of Doteli speakers.
- ii. This study was limited only to request and apology functions of language.
- iii. This study was limited to Bhumi Rajmandu VDC, Doti and some places of Kathmandu.
- iv. Only the educated and literate native speakers were informants.
- v. The study was based on Matreyek's (1983), Communicating in English: Examples and models.

**CHAPTER THREE**  
**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of data. All the responses of the English and Doteli native speakers on requests were tabulated on the basis of direct request, indirect request and non-request. Similarly, the responses of the English and Doteli native speakers on apology were tabulated on the basis of apology, apology and reparation and reparation. The responses of the English and Doteli native speakers were analyzed, compared and contrasted in the given situations. The division is made on the basis of the relationship of the respondents themselves in their interaction and carried out under the relationship between friends, strangers, students, teachers, doctors, shopkeepers, landladies, guests, brothers and neighbours.

**3.1 List of Request and Apology Forms used by the English and Doteli Native Speakers to Address Different People.**

The English and Doteli native speakers used different forms of request and apology to address different people. It can be shown as follows:

**3.1.1 List of Total Request Forms Used by the English Native Speakers**

Out of 800 responses in English, the following forms of request were used by the English native speakers.

**Table 3**  
**List of Total Request Forms Used by the English Native Speakers**

<b>DR by ENSs</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
Could you /I	61	7.62
Could you please	35	4.37
Can you please	45	5.62
Please .....	140	17.5
May I .....	50	6.25
Excuse me	52	6.5

Would you mind if I could	76	9.5
I would be pleased	8	1
Can you/I .....	25	3.12
I wonder if you	2	0.25
..., will you	3	0.37
Excuse me, can you /I .....	5	0.62
Excuse me, I'd like to .....	4	0.5
would you please .....	17	2.12
I would be grateful .....	20	2.25
Excuse me could you .....	6	0.75
Excuse me may I .....	2	0.25
I beg your pardon	2	0.25
.... Please	2	0.25
<b>IdR by ENSs</b>	F	%
Is it ok, if I/You	39	4.87
Is it alright if I	2	0.25
Do you mind if I	21	2.62
I feel sorry to .....	6	0.75
It is possible to .....	16	2
I want to you inform.....	7	0.87
I'll not forget	8	1
I want to promise	7	0.87
Isn't it ok, if I .....	1	0.12
Hey why don't you .....	4	0.5

Out of 800 responses, only 555 responses were direct request, 111 were indirect request responses. Among 555 direct request responses different forms were used and they got their percentage on the basis of their frequency. The percentage of each forms of direct request and indirect request is based on their total number of frequency. Among different forms used by the English native speakers, the form 'please' related to direct request was more frequent.

### **3.1.2 List of Total Request Forms Used by Doteli Native Speakers**

The total request forms used by Doteli native speakers can be shown as follows:

**Table 4**  
**List of Total Request Forms used by Doteli Native Speakers**

DR by DNSs	F	%
Kripaya	71	8.87
Kripaya sir	7	0.87
Khusi huneithe	57	7.12
Jeloi jas manneithe	49	6.12
Kailain bisaddeithe	36	4.5
IdR by DNSs	F	%
Kemu tamaro	28	3.5
Ketamu mulai...	24	3
... aridine hauki ?	15	1.87
... hunnaki ?	5	0.62
Huneithyo	5	0.62
O hajur	13	1.62
E Dai	10	1.25
E bui	9	1.12
Tamlai thulo dharma huneithyo	13	1.62
... laijai dellaki ?	7	0.87
Kailain bisaddehu	9	1.12
Jana dihalya	3	0.37
Ke mu jan sakulo, sir ?	5	0.62
Janakhelidiyai	2	0.25
Keyo naikheli naihunu ?	2	0.25
Niko huneithyo	7	0.87
Dhekallaki ?	11	1.37
Sakalla ?	17	2.12
Dukh aridinupadyo	14	1.75
Jeloi sahayog huneithyo	4	0.5
Ketu chhadda sakallai ?	7	0.87
Addadine hau ?	5	0.62
Niko huneithyo	3	0.37
Jana aridiya	5	0.62

Out of 800 responses by the Doteli native speakers, different 220 responses (27.5%) were direct and 213 responses (26.62%) were indirect. Among different forms, the form 'Kripaya' related to direct request was most frequent.

### 3.1.3 List of Total Apology Forms Used by the English Native Speakers

The total apology forms used by the English native speakers can be shown as follows:

**Table 5**  
**List of Total Apology Responses Used by the English Native Speakers**

Apologies	F	%
Sorry	142	17.75
I'm sorry	95	11.87
I'm really sorry	44	5.5
I'm very sorry	45	5.62
I'm so sorry	44	5.5
Oh ! ...	42	5.25
Oh ! I'm sorry	26	3.25
Oh! I'm so sorry	1	0.12
Oh ! terribly sorry	7	0.87
I apologize	11	1.37
Pardon me	23	2.87
Excuse me	46	5.75
Oh my god !	2	0.25
I'm afraid	23	2.87
I'm extremely sorry	22	1.62
Oh ! I'm very sorry	22	2.75
I'm very very sorry	2	0.25
Oh ! sorry	23	2.87
Please so sorry	6	0.75
I beg your pardon	5	0.62

Out of 800 responses by the English native speakers, different 631 responses (78.87%) were apologies which are tabulated with their frequency and percentage. Among them, the form 'sorry' was more frequent.



### 3.1.4 List of Total Apology Forms Used by the Doteli Native Speakers

The total Apology forms used by the Doteli native speakers can be shown as follows:

**Table 6**  
**List of Total Apology Forms Used by the Doteli Native Speakers**

Apologies	F	%
Maph arya/paun/diya	116	14.5
Oho galti bhai/aryo	59	7.37
Hatteri barbad bhyo	16	2
Sorry	19	2.37
Dukh lagyo	8	1
Bigade	17	2.12
Dukh janamanya	16	2
Maphi maudochhu	19	2.37
Janarisaya	19	2.37
Gali janadiya	11	1.37
Asaji janamanya	6	0.75
Chhema diya	10	1.25
Laj lagei chha	8	1
Galti bhai sir	6	0.75
Oho maph paun	20	2.5
Ehe bekar bhyo	3	0.37
Kyaru hajur	11	1.37
Context - specific apologies	F	%
Oho ! .....	38	4.75
Hattari .....	22	2.75
Kyadda	6	0.75
Hat	11	1.37
Ei	2	0.25
E he !	10	1.25

This table shows that, out of 800 responses by the Doteli native speakers, 453 responses were apologetic. Among them, the form 'maph aryal diya/paun' was more frequent.

### 3.2 Comparison of Request and Apology Between the English and Doteli

The comparison between the English and Doteli on request and apology functions is done on the basis of different forms used for different persons in different situations which can be shown as follows:

#### 3.2.1 Total Forms of Request and Apology used by the English and Doteli Native Speakers for Different Persons

The total number of request and apology forms used by the English and Doteli native speakers to address different persons can be shown as:

**Table 7**  
**Total Forms for Different Persons**

S.N.	Native Language	Language Function											
		Request						Apology					
		DR		IdR		Non-R		AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	English	555	69.4	111	13.87	134	16.75	338	42.2	293	36.62	55	6.87
2	Doteli	220	27.5	213	26.62	367	45.87	254	31.75	199	24.87	114	14.25

The above table shows that the English native speakers were more polite and apologetic than the Doteli native speakers. Out of 800 responses, 69.4 percent of the responses in the English and 27.5 percent of the responses in Doteli were direct requests. Similarly, 42.25 percent of the English and 31.75 percent of the Doteli responses were apologetic. English native speakers found to be more apologetic and they repaired the situations more than the Doteli native speakers.

The Doteli native speakers used more non-apologetic responses than their English counterparts. It shows that the Doteli native speakers seem less polite than the English native speakers while responding to the situations. It was found that the Doteli native speakers expressed their apologies from their tone, facial expressions and other different tactics. The respondents used different polite terms in different

situations. Some examples from the English and Doteli native speakers are as follows:

In English-

1. Please, open the door. (S.no. 7)

In Doteli-

2. Mulai aaj manai ruppe diya jeloj jas manneithe. (S. no. 13)  
(I would be grateful if you lend me some money, today.)

The researcher found that 26.62 and 13.87 percent of the responses were indirect request in Doteli and English respectively. In these responses polite terms were not used but the forms of sentence expressed request indirectly. For example:

In English-

3. I would be pleased if you won't again. (S. no. 16)

In Doteli-

4. E. Baini katibajyo ho? (S.no.3)  
(Sister, what time is it now?)

The other responses are categorized under non requests. Among all the responses 16.75 and 45.87 percent of the responses were non - request responses in English and Doteli respectively. For instance:

In English-

5. Fool guy ! don't play cards again. (s.no. 17)

In Doteli-

- 6 E, budi bato kaniuho bhanni ? (S.no.3)  
(Sister, where is the way?)

These responses were not polite to respond to the situation. This shows that the number of non-requests in Doteli is greater than that in English. The Doteli native speakers were found less polite than the English native speakers while responding

to the situations. The Doteli native speakers were polite but they were less polite than the English native speakers in the percentage comparing with each other.

### 3.2.1.1 Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Friends

The frequency and percentage of the request and apology forms used by the English and the Doteli native speakers for their friends can be shown as follows:

**Table 8**  
**Total Request and Apology Forms to Address to Friends**

NLSs	S.No.	Request						S.No.	Apology					
		DR		IdR		Non-R			AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	1, 4, 8, 10, 11	156	78	16	8.0	28	14	3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 18	106	33.15	153	47.81	24	7.5
Doteli	1, 4, 8, 10, 11	-	-	75	37.5	125	62.5	3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 18	85	26.56	80	25	31	9.68

In the discourse between friends, the English native speakers used more direct forms of request. Out of 200 responses, 78 were direct requests, 8 percent were indirect and 14 percent of them were non-requests. But in the case of the Doteli native speakers, no direct requests were found. They did not use any direct request while addressing friends. They were found very informal to their friends. For example:

In English-

1. Please come to me today (S.no.1)

There were some expressions where the respondents showed a very close intimacy with their friends. These types of responses were used by the Doteli and English Native speakers.

In English-

2. Friend ! Lend me some money. (S.no. 8)

In Doteli-

3. Ram, aaj manai ruppe dihal. (S.no. 8)  
(Ram, lend me some rupees today.)

These responses were not found to be polite, so such expressions were categorized under non-requests. Out of all the responses, 14 percent of the English and 62.5 percent of the Doteli responses were in non - request forms.

The Doteli native speakers used more indirect requests than their English counterparts. Out of 200 responses, 8 and 37.5 percent of the responses were found indirect in English and Doteli respectively. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

4. Is it ok, if you cook today. I'm feeling headache. (S.no. 4)

In Doteli-

5. Sita mulai jeli tis lagei chaa. (S.no. 10)  
(Sita, I'm very thirsty.)

The numbers of polite terms in English were far more greater than those used by the Doteli native speakers. It was found that the Doteli native speakers were not polite with their friends. The situation is important for the politeness in any language. Intimacy has less politeness.

In the context of apologizing to a friend mostly apology followed by repairment was used in English but less in Doteli. Out of 320 responses, 47.81 percent of the responses were apology followed by repairment in English whereas 25 percent of the responses were of such type in Doteli. Similarly, the percentage of apology and repairment were 33.15 percent and 7.5 percent in English and 26.56 percent and 9.68 percent in Doteli. From these percentages, we know that the use of apology and apology followed by repairment in English is greater than that in Doteli but the percentage of repairment in Doteli is greater than that in English. Some examples are as follows:

1. I'm sorry, I lost it. I'll buy another for you. (S.no. 3)
2. Oh Sorry, don't mind. I'll give you mine. (S.no. 3)

Similarly, the responses apology followed repairment found in Doteli situations are as follows:

3. Maph gar yaar kitab haraigai, aaba arko kinidiulo han. (S.no. 3)  
(Sorry, the book is lost. I'll by another.)
4. Chhema ara, mu tolai, apani kitab deiulo. (S.no. 3)  
(Sorry, I'll give you mine.)

There are some other expressions used by both the English and Doteli native speakers expressing only apologies. For example:

In English-

5. Oh! I'm sorry, I lost your book. (S.no. 3)

In Doteli-

6. Kitab haraigai mapha de. (S. no. 3)  
(Sorry, the book is lost.)

The English native speakers used more apologetic and apology followed by repairment expressions than the Doteli native speakers but the Doteli native speakers used more repairment responses than the English native speakers. For example:

In English-

7. I'm busy today, perhaps next time. (S.no. 5)

In Doteli-

8. E ! taso bhaya tero kitab kinidiulo yaar. (S.no. 3)  
(I'll buy your book.)

The term 'yaar' in Doteli is used to show the intimacy between friends. It is used to show the friend-friend relationship which refers intimacy.

### 3.2.1.2 Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Strangers

The total frequency and percentage of request and apology forms used by the Doteli and English native speakers for the strangers can be shown as follows:

**Table 9**  
**Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Strangers**

NLSs	S. No.	Request						S.No.	Apology					
		DR		IdR		Non-R			AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	3,5,6,9,19	153	76.5	17	8.5	30	15	1,2,6,9,10,15,20	158	56.42	89	31.78	8	2.85
Doteli	3, 5, 6, 9, 19	49	24.5	32	16	119	59.5	1,2,6,9, 10, 15,20	115	41.07	87	31.07	29	10.35

Out of 200 responses, 153 (76.5%) were direct in English whereas 49 (24.5%) were direct in Doteli. The number of direct requests in English is greater than in Doteli. Some examples of direct request are as follows:

In English-

1. Would you mind directing the way to Panga ? (s.no. 3)

In Doteli-

2. O hajur tamara khuttaki salam chha. Mero mobail khojiddina (S.no. 6)  
(Please, help me to findout my mobile.)

The Doteli native speakers used more indirect forms of request compared to the English native speakers. The indirect request responses used by the Doteli and English native speakers was found to be 32 percent and 17 percent respectively. For example:

In English-

3. I feel sorry to tell you to search my mobile. (S.no. 5)

In Doteli-

4. E ! Baina Panga jane bato koho bhanna ? (S.no.3)

(Hello, sister, which is the way to Panga ?)

The Doteli native speakers responded using non-request in many situations. They used 59.5 percent non-request responses but the English native speakers used 15 percent of such responses only. Some non-request responses used by the English and Doteli native speakers are as follows:

In English-

5. Has anyone seen my mobile ? (S.no. 5)

In Doteli-

6. Mero mobail khojidina. (S.no.5)  
(Search about my mobile.)

The Doteli native speakers used a very few terms of requests compared to the English native speakers. In conclusion, it was found that the English native speakers were more polite than the Doteli native speakers to respond to the strangers.

In the context of apologizing to a stranger, the English native speakers were more apologetic. Out of 280 responses, 56.42 percent in English and 41.07 in Doteli were apologetic. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

1. Sorry, I could not see. (S. no. 1)

In Doteli-

2. Maph diya hajur muile nai dheke. (S.no. 1)  
(Sorry, I couldn't see.)

In the context of one apologizing to a stranger, 31.78 and 31.07 apologies followed by repairment were used by the English and Doteli native speakers respectively. Some examples of apology followed by repairment are as follows:



In English-

3. Sorry, I'm busy today. I'll try next day. (S.no. 5)

In Doteli-

4. Maph diya. Aaj meri naihuni. Arkha din jaula. (S.no. 5)  
(Sorry, I can't go today. I'll go next day.)

Some other responses were also found in this context which explicitly do not express apologies called repairment. Among them, 2.85 percent and 10.35 percent of the responses were used by the English native speakers and the Doteli native speakers respectively. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

5. I don't know. I am new for here. (S.no. 2)

In Doteli-

6. Mulai tha naithin. Kasai arkha soda. (S.no. 2)  
(I don't know, ask other.)

The English native speakers used more apologetic responses than the Doteli native speakers. But the Doteli native speakers repaired responses more than the English native speakers.

### 3.2.1.3 Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Neighbours

The total frequency and percentage of request and apology forms used by the English and Doteli native speakers to address neighbours are as follows:

**Table 10**

**Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Neighbours**

NLSs	S.No.	Request						S.No.	Apology					
		DR		IdR		Non-R			AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	13, 20	50	62.5	15	18.75	15	18.75	19	14	35	17	42.5	4	10
Doteli	13, 20	24	30	29	36.25	27	33.75	19	13	32.5	11	27.5	5	12.5

This table shows that the number of direct requests in English is greater than that of Doteli. Out of 80 responses, the English native speakers used 62.5 percent direct requests but the Doteli native speakers used 30 percent of such requests. Some examples of direct request from English and Doteli are given below:

In English-

1. Please help me to fill out my form. (S. no. 13)

In Doteli-

2. Kripaya hajur aaj pharam bhaddalai manai ruppe dihal. (S.no. 13)  
(Please, Lend me some rupees to fillout the form today.)

Out of all responses, 18.75 percent indirect request responses were used by the English native speakers and 36.25 percent by the Doteli native speakers. The Doteli native speakers used more indirect forms of request than their English counterparts. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

3. I'll never forget if you help to take my father in the hospital. (S.no. 20)

In Doteli-

4. Mera balai aspatal laijaidellaki ? Mata yakalai naisautebhyaya. (S.no. 20)  
(Take my father to the hospital I can't alone.)

Non -request expressions were 18.75 percent in English and 33.75 percent in Doteli. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

5. Help me to fillout my form. (s.no. 13)

In Doteli-

6. Mero faram bhaddalai sahayog aridiya. (S.no. 13)  
(Help me to fill out my form.)

The English native speakers used more direct request responses than Doteli for the neighbours. They were very polite compared to Doteli speakers. The Doteli native speakers used more indirect forms of request than the English native speakers. The greater number of responses were found in direct forms of requests by ENSs whereas indirect forms of requests by DNSs to address their neighbours.

The above mentioned table shows the number of apology used by the English native speakers is greater than the number of apology expressed by the Doteli native speakers. Out of 40 responses, 35 percent of the responses used by the English native speakers and 32.5 percent apologetic responses were used by the Doteli native speakers were apologetic. Some examples of apologies are as follows:

In English-

1. Oh ! bad news. Sorry for the loss. (S.no. 19)

In Doteli-

2. Maph diya hajur bigadi halyo. (S.no. 19)  
(Sorry, for loss.)

The English native speakers used 42.5 percent and the Doteli native speakers used 27.5 percent responses related to apology followed by repairment. The English native speakers used greater number of apology followed by repairment than the Doteli native speakers. For example:

In English-

3. I'm sorry. I'll replace it. (S.no. 19)

In Doteli-

4. Maph ara hajur. Mu arko leidiulo. (S.no. 19)  
(Sorry, I'll replace it.)

The number of only repairment was greater in Doteli than in English. The English native speakers used 10 percent such repairment responses whereas Doteli native speakers used 12.5 percent responses. Some examples of repairment are as follows:

In English-

5. I'll pay for your loss. (S.no. 19)

In Doteli-

6. Mu tamro tiridiulo. (S.no. 19)  
(I'll pay yours.)

It was concluded that the English native speakers used more apologetic responses than the Doteli native speakers while addressing their neighbours. But the Doteli native speakers used a greater number of repaired responses than the English native speakers.

### 3.2.1.4 Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Teachers

The total request and apology forms used by the English and Doteli native speakers to address their teachers can be shown as follows:

**Table 11**

**Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Teachers**

NLSs	S.No.	Request						S.No.	Apology					
		DR		IdR		Non-R			AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	11	27	67.5	3	7.5	10	25	4	20	50	13	32.5	4	10
Doteli	11	15	37.5	8	20	17	42.5	4	15	37.5	5	12.5	11	27.5

The above table shows that the English native speakers were more polite to their teachers compared to their Doteli counterparts. Out of 40 responses, 67.5 percent were direct request in English but 37.5 percent were direct in Doteli. Some such responses are as follows:

In English-

1. May I go out sir ? (S.no. 11)

In Doteli-

2. Kripaya sir mu datpin bhullige baira jaun ? (S.no. 11)  
(I forgot my pen. Please can I go out ?)

The Doteli native speakers used more indirect forms of request than their English counterparts. Out of 40 responses, 7.5 percent in English and 20.0 percent in Doteli were categorized under indirect requests, respectively. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

3. I forgot my pen. Is it ok, if I go out to buy another. (S.no. 11)

In Doteli-

4. Datpin kinna baira Jana paiyalo, sir ? (S.no. 11)  
(Can I go out to buy a pen, Sir ?)

Besides, 25 and 42.5 percent were non-requests in English and Doteli respectively. So the Doteli native speakers were less polite than the English native speakers. Some examples of non-request are as follows:

In English-

4. I have to buy a pen sir. (S.no. 11)

In Doteli-

5. Sir ma baira janchhu. (S.no. 11)  
(Sir, I go out.)

It was found that the English native speakers were more apologetic to their teachers than the Doteli native speakers. Out of 40 responses, 50 percent of the responses were expressed in the form of apology in English whereas 37.5 percent in Doteli. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

1. Sorry, it's an emergency. (S.no. 4)

In Doteli-

2. Maph diya sir, akkaibar hanya. (S.no. 4)  
(Sorry sir, just a moment.)

The English native speakers used more forms of apology followed by repairment than their Doteli counterparts. The English native speakers used 32.5 percent and The Doteli native speakers used 12.5 percent apology followed by repairment.

Consider the following examples:

In English-

3. I'm sorry. I'll switch off next day. (S.no. 11)

In Doteli-

4. Maph paun sir. Ababata ta banna addehu. (S.no. 11)  
(Sorry sir. I'll switch off next day.)

The English native speakers used 10 percent of the responses to repair the situations but the Doteli native speakers used 27.5 percent of the responses without expressing apologies directly. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

5. Who is he ? (S.no. 4)

In Doteli-

6. Aila ko holo bhanna ? (S.no. 4)  
(Who is calling now ?)

The English native speakers used more apologetic responses than the doteli native speakers. But the Doteli native speakers used more repairment compared to the English native speakers.

### **3.2.1.5 Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Brothers**

The frequency and percentage of the request and apologetic responses used by the English and Doteli native speakers to address their brothers can be shown as follows:

**Table 12**

**Total Request and Apology Forms to Address Brothers**

NLSs	S.No.	Request						S.No.	Apology					
		DR		IdR		Non-R			AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	17	11	27.5	8	20	21	52.5	12	4	10	18	45	8	20
Doteli	17	-	-	11	27.5	29	72.5	12	2	5	4	10	14	35

This table shows that the English native speakers were more polite than the Doteli native speakers while addressing brothers. They used 27.5 percent direct request responses but Doteli speakers did not use the direct request at all. For example:

In English-

1. Please don't play card again. (S.no. 17)

The Doteli native speakers used more indirect requests than their English counterparts. Out of 40 responses, 20 percent of the responses were indirect request in English but 27.5 percent of the responses were so in Doteli. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

2. Is it Ok, if you don't play cards again? (S.no. 17)

In Doteli-

3. Ke tu tas khellu chhada sakallai ? (s.no.17)

(Can you leave to play cards ?)

Besides, 52.5 percent and 72.5 percent non-request responses were used in English and Doteli respectively. The Doteli native speakers were less polite than the English native speakers. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

5. Don't play cards again. It is bad habit. (S.no. 17)

In Doteli-

6. Aba bata tas jana khelei han. (S.no. 17)  
(Don't play cards again.)

It was found that the Doteli native speakers did not use any direct request for their brothers but the English native speakers used 27.5 percent direct request responses. It was found that an elder brother in Doteli did not use any polite responses for his younger brothers.

The English native speakers were more apologetic to their brothers than the Doteli native speakers. Out of 40 responses, 10 percent of the responses were expressed in the form of apology in English but 5 percent were such in Doteli. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

1. Sorry, I forgot. (S.no. 12)

In Doteli-

2. Galti bhai muta bhullige bhai kyaddai. (S.no. 12)  
(Sorry bro, I forgot.)

Out of 40 responses, 45 percent of the responses used by the English native speakers were in apology followed by repairment but only 10 percent of the Doteli responses were of such type. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

3. Sorry, I forgot. I'll buy here. (S.no. 12)

In Doteli-

4. Maph ara bhai muta bhullige aba yain kinidiulo. (S.no. 12)  
(Sorry bro, I forgot. I'll buy here.)

The Doteli native speakers used large number of repairment responses than their the English counterparts. They used 35 percent repairment responses. Where as



English native speakers used only 20 percent responses. Two examples are as follows:

In English-

5. Don't worry, I forgot. (S.no. 12)

In Doteli-

6. Mu bhullige yain kinidiulo hain ? (S.no. 12)  
(I forgot. I'll buy here.)

The English native speakers used more apologetic responses than the Doteli native speakers. But the use of repairment was greater in Doteli than in English. The Doteli native speakers used some context-specific apologies like (ehe, oho, hattamarau, hat) etc. But the English native speakers did not use.

### 3.2.1.6 Total Request Responses Used to Address Shopkeepers and Doctors

The frequency and percentage of the request responses used by the English and Doteli native speakers for the shopkeepers and doctors can be shown as follows:

**Table 13**

**Total Request Forms to Address Shopkeepers and Doctors**

NLSs	S.No	Request					
		DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	2,15 (Shop.)	60	75	15	18.75	5	6.25
	12, 14 (Dr.)	63	78.75	15	18.75	2	2.5
Doteli	2,15 (Shop.)	55	68.75	10	12.5	15	18.75
	12, 14 (Dr.)	55	68.75	20	25	5	6.25

Out of 80 responses, 75 and 68.75 percent of the responses were direct in English and Doteli respectively. Similarly, 18.75 percent of the responses in English and 12.5 percent of the responses in Doteli were indirect. Similarly, 6.25 and 8.75 percent of the responses were non-request in English and Doteli. The English

native speakers used 78.75 percent direct responses, 18.75 percent indirect responses and 2.5 percent non-request responses for the doctors but the Doteli native speakers used 68.75 percent direct request responses, 25 percent indirect request responses and 6.25 percent non-request responses. It is concluded that the English native speakers use more direct request responses than the Doteli native speakers but the Doteli native speakers use more indirect request responses and non-request responses. Some examples are as follows:

In English -

1. Excuse me, Have you got new shoes ? (S.no. 2)

In Doteli-

2. Kripaya mulai juta dhekauna sauji. (S.no.2)

The Doteli and English native speakers used more indirect request responses to address the shopkeeper and doctor. Some examples are as follows:

In English

3. Is it ok, if you show me a pair of shoes. (S.no.2)

In Doteli-

4. Sauji ekjor juta dhekallaki ? (S.no.2).

Beside, the number of non-request forms in Doteli was greater than in English. It was found that the Doteli native speakers used a large number of non-request responses than the English native. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

5. Let's see a pair of shoes. (S.no. 2)

In Doteli-

6. Ekjor juta dhekauna. (S.no. 2)

### 3.2.1.7 Total Request Forms to Address Fathers

The total request forms used by the English and Doteli native speakers for their fathers can be show as follows:

**Table 14**  
**Total Request Forms to Address Fathers**

NLSs	S.No	Request					
		DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	7	20	50	15	37.5	5	12.5
Doteli	7	15	37.5	15	37.5	10	25

Out of 40 responses, the English native speakers used 50 percent direct request responses, 37.5 percent indirect request responses and 12.5 percent non-request responses to address their fathers. But the Doteli native speakers used 37.5 percent direct request responses, 37.5 percent indirect request responses and 25 percent non-request responses to address their fathers. It was found that Doteli native speakers used equal number of indirect request but more non-request responses than their English counterparts but they used less direct request responses than the English native speakers. Some examples of direct request responses by the English and Doteli native speakers are as follows:

In English-

1. Dad, can you open the door, please ? (S.no. 7)

In Doteli-

2. Ba mera hat galligya dwar ugadidiya khusi huneithe. (S.no. 7)

Some examples of indirect request are as follows:

In English-

3. Is it possible to me to take if you open the door. (S.no. 7)

In Doteli-

4. Dwar ugadidiya mulai saji huneithyo. (S.no. 7)

Similarly, some examples from non-request are:

In English-

5. Dad open the door, quickly. (S.no. 7)

In Doteli-

6. O ba dwar ugadda. (S.no. 7)

### 3.2.1.8 Total Request Forms to Address Students

The frequency and percentage of the request forms used by the English and Doteli native speakers for their students can be shown as follows:

**Table 15**

**Total Request Forms to Address Students**

NLSs	S.No	Request					
		DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	16	15	37.5	7	17.5	18	45
Doteli	16	7	17.5	13	32.5	20	50

Out of 40 responses, the English native speakers used 37.5 percent direct request responses, 17.5 percent indirect request responses and 45 percent non-request responses but the Doteli native speakers used 17.5 percent direct request responses, 32.5 percent indirect request responses and 50 percent non-request responses. English native speakers used more direct request responses than the Doteli native speakers but the Doteli native speakers used more indirect request responses and non-request responses than English native speakers.

Different forms like kripaya, khusihuneithe, jeloj jas manneithe, kailain bisaddeithe, etc. were used for direct request by Doteli native speakers. They also

used different non-request responses using different forms like dhekallaki, sakallaki, Dukh aridinupadyo, sahayog huneithyo, etc.

### 3.2.1.9 Total Apology Forms to Address Landladies and Guests

The total apology forms used by the English and Doteli native speakers to address landladies and guests can be shown as follows:

**Table 16**  
**Total Apology Forms to Address Landladies and Guests**

NLSs	S.No	Apology					
		AP		AP+Rep		Rep	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	16 (Landlady)	10	25	9	22.5	4	10
	17 (Guest)	12	30	8	20	3	7.5
Doteli	16 (Landlady)	10	25	6	15	9	22.5
	17 (Guest)	12	30	8	20	15	37.5

The above table shows that situation no. 16 and 17 were related to landladies and guests. Out of 40 responses, the English native speakers used 25 percent purely apologetic responses, 22.5 percent apology followed by repairment and 10 percent repairment responses. Similarly, out of 40 responses, the Doteli native speakers used 25 percent apology responses, 15 percent apology followed by repairment responses and 22.5 percent repairment responses. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

1. Sorry, I forgot. (S.no. 16)
2. Sorry, It won't happen again. (AP + Rep) (S.no. 16)
3. I'll pay tomorrow. (S.no. 16)

In Doteli-

4. Maph diya manai matha bhyo. (S.no. 16)  
(Sorry, it's abit late.)

5. Oho ! galti bhai. Ababata tyampara dihallo. (S.no. 16)  
(Oh ! sorry. I'll pay in time.)
6. Bhol Porukhi diulo. (S.no. 16)  
(I'll pay tomorrow or the next day.)

The English native speakers used 30 percent purely apologetic responses, 20 percent apology followed by repairment responses and 7.5 percent repairment responses to address guests. But the Doteli native speakers used the equal number of apology responses and apology followed by repairment response to the English native speakers (i.e. 30 percent and 20 percent respectively) but they used more number of repairment responses. Some examples are as follows:

In English-

1. Sorry, It's my tuition time. (S.no. 17)
2. I'm sorry today. I'll come to you tomorrow. (S.no. 17)
3. I'll meet you on Saturday. (S.no 17)

In Doteli-

4. Sari mero padde bagat bhayo mu janchhu. (S.no. 17)  
(Sorry, It's time to read, I go.)
5. Galti bhai, Muile aaj naiaaunehu bhanyabhe hunthyo, aba bhol bhetula hanya ? (S.no. 17)  
(Sorry, I should have told him not to come, I'll meet you tomorrow.)
6. Aba bhol bhetula. (S.no. 17)  
(We'll meet tomorrow.)

In conclusion, it was found that the English native speakers were less polite than the Doteli native speakers while apologizing to landladies and guests.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 Summary**

The main purpose of this study was to enlist, compare and contrast request and apology forms used by the English and the Doteli native speakers. For this purpose, the researcher prepared a set of questionnaire in English and Doteli, consisting of 40 items. Then the questionnaires were distributed to 20 British and 20 American informants in different places of Kathmandu to collect their responses. The questionnaires for Doteli native speakers were distributed to different informants who were permanent inhabitants of Bhumi Rajmandu VDC, Doti. The researcher used purposive non random sampling while collecting data. All the respondents were educated and literate including both male and female. After collecting the data, the analysis and interpretation was done by using a simple statistical tool of percentage. The data were analyzed and interpreted first, in terms of relationship between friends, strangers, teachers, neighbors, shopkeepers, students, brothers, fathers, guests, landladies. The data related to request function were analyzed and interpreted in terms of relationship between friends, strangers, teachers, brothers, fathers, students, neighbors, shopkeepers but the data related to apology function were analyzed and interpreted in terms of relationship between friends, strangers, teachers, brothers, guests and landladies. At last, in terms of the data collected on the basis of request and apology function of language, the forms to address different people used by native English speakers and Doteli speakers were compared.

#### **4.2 Findings**

The following major findings have been deduced from the study:

1. Out of 800 responses, the English native speakers used 69.4 percent direct request, 13.87 percent indirect request and 16.75 percent non request responses.

2. Out of all the responses used by the English native speakers the form 'please' was more frequent.
3. Out of 800 responses, the Doteli native speakers used 27.5 percent direct request, 26.62 percent indirect request and 45.87 percent non request responses.
4. Out of all the responses used by the Doteli native speakers, the form 'kripaya' was more frequent.
5. Out of 800 responses, the English native speakers used 78.87 percent total apologetic responses.
6. Out of all responses used by the English native speakers, the form 'sorry' was more frequent.
7. Out of 800 responses, the Doteli native speakers used 56.62 percent total apologetic responses.
8. Out of all responses used by the Doteli native speakers, the form 'maph arya paun/diya' was more frequent.
9. In the relationship between friends, the English native speakers were more polite. No direct request was found from Doteli interlocutors.
10. Out of all the responses, 80.96 percent of the English native speakers and 51.56 percent of the Doteli native speakers used apologetic responses in the relationship with friends.
11. Out of all the responses, the English speakers used 85 percent request responses and the Doteli native speakers used 40.5 percent request in the relationship with strangers.
12. The English native speakers used 88.2 percent apologetic responses but the Doteli native speakers used 72.14 percent responses in the relationship with strangers.
13. The English native speakers used 81.25 percent request responses for neighbors but the Doteli native speakers used 66.25 percent request responses. So, English native speakers were found more polite than the Doteli native speakers to address their neighbours.



14. The English native speakers used 77.5 percent apologetic responses for neighbours against the Doteli native speakers who used 60 percent only.
15. The English native speakers used 75 percent request responses but the Doteli native speakers used 57.5 percent responses to address their teachers. So, the English native speakers were found more polite than the Doteli native speakers to address their teachers.
16. The English native speakers used 82.5 percent apologetic responses and the Doteli native speakers used 50 percent apologetic responses with their teachers. The English native speakers found more apologetic than the Doteli native speakers to address their teachers.
17. Out of all the responses, the English and Doteli native speakers used 47.5 and 27.5 percent request responses respectively with their brothers. So the English native speakers were more polite than the Doteli native speakers to address their brothers.
18. The English native speakers used 65 percent apologetic responses against the Doteli native speakers who used 15 percent only. So, the English native speakers were more apologetic responses than the Doteli native speakers with their brothers.
19. The English native speakers used 93.75 percent request responses and the Doteli native speakers used 81.25 percent to address shopkeepers. So the English native speakers were found more polite than their Doteli counterparts.
20. English native speakers used 97.5 percent and the Doteli native speakers used 93.75 percent of request responses to address doctors. So the English native speakers were found more polite than the Doteli native speakers in the interaction to the doctors.
21. The English native speakers were found more polite in the relationship with the doctors whereas the Doteli native speakers were found less polite.
22. Doteli native speakers were found less polite than the English native speakers in the interaction between fathers. Out of all the responses, 87.5

percent request responses were used by the English native speakers and 75 percent by the Doteli native speakers.

23. The English native speakers used 55 percent request responses to address their students but the Doteli native speakers used only 20 percent only. So, the English native speakers were found more polite than the Doteli to address their students.
24. The English native speakers used 50 percent apologetic responses to address guests but the Doteli native speakers used 50 percent only. So, it was found that the Doteli native speakers were as polite as the English native speakers to address with their guests.
25. The English native speakers found less apologetic than their Doteli counterparts in the case of interaction between landladies. The Doteli native speakers used 37.5 percent non-apologetic responses where as English native speakers used 42.5 percent non-apologetic responses.
26. The English native speakers were more apologetic and polite than their Doteli counterparts.
27. The Doteli native speakers used English forms like 'please' for request and 'sorry' for apology because they were educated and literate. So, it was found that educated and literate Doteli native speakers use English forms like 'sorry', 'please', etc.
28. It was found that the English native speakers used more apologetic terms than the Doteli native speakers but the Doteli native speakers used some context- specific apologies which explicitly always do not express apologies.

### **4.3 Recommendations**

The researcher, on the basis of the findings has attempted to forward some suggestions for teaching 'requests' and 'apologies' which would be beneficial for teachers, students, and learners of English and Doteli as second languages/ dialect. Some ideas for teaching 'request' and 'apology' are mentioned below:

1. The Doteli native speakers who want to learn the English language should be taught to be more polite in English to request others.
2. The Doteli native speakers who want to learn the English language should be informed that the English native speakers use the term 'please' more frequently to be polite.
3. The Doteli native speakers should be taught to be more polite in the English language to apologize others.
4. The Doteli native speakers should be informed that the English native speakers use the term 'sorry' more frequently to be apologized.
5. The English native speakers who want to learn Doteli should be informed that the Doteli native speakers are less polite than the English native speakers to request others.
6. The English native speakers also should be informed that the Doteli native speakers are less polite than the English native speakers to apologize others.

## Appendix I

### I. Total Request Forms in English

S.N.	Forms of Request	Frequency of Occurrence
1.	a. Could you come	5
	b. Please come to....	8
	c. Would you mind	6
	d. Can you please	4
	e. I would be grateful	2
	f. Will you	2
	g. Do you mind if	4
	h. Could you please	4
2.	a. Can you help	5
	b. Please could you	4
	c. Please help	7
	d. Could you help	2
	e. Excuse me would you mind	2
	f. Is it ok if you	5
	g. May I ...	3
	h. would you mind	4
	i. Could you please	3
	j. Please can I .....	3
3.	a. Excused me	7
	b. Could you	4
	c. Please help ...	4
	d. I feel sorry to tell	3
	e. Would you mind	5
	f. would you please	4
	g. Can you .....	4
	h. I would like to	4
4.	a. Could you	5
	b. Please	8
	c. I would be pleased	2
	d. Will you	3
	e. Do you mind if	4
	f. Could you please	4
	g. ... please	2
	h. would you mind	5
	i. Can you please	4
5.	a. please help	4
	b. Excuse me	6
	c. I would be grateful	3
	d. Would you mind	7

	e	Would you please	5
	f	May I .....	5
	g	I want you to inform	3
6.	a.	Could you tell	4
	b	.. Please	3
	c	Excuse me	6
	d	Would you mind	5
	e	I want you to inform	4
	f	Can you .....	4
	g	Please tell ...	4
	h	May I .....	4
7.	a.	Could you	5
	b	Would you mind	3
	c	Would you open	2
	d	... please	3
	e	please	3
	f	Excuse me	1
	g	Could you please	3
	h	I'll not forget	3
	i	I wan't to inform	4
	j	Do you mind if I	5
	k	Is it ok. If you	3
8.	a.	Would you mind	7
	b	May I ...	4
	c	Could you	5
	d	I would be pleased	2
	e	Will you ...	2
	f	Do you mind	3
	g	Could you please	4
	h.	Please	8
9.	a.	Excuse me	6
	b	I would be pleased	2
	c	Can you .....	4
	d	May I.....	5
	e	Would you mind	5
	f	I want you to promise	3
	g	Could you help	4
	h.	Please ....	7
10.	a.	May I ...	4
	b	Could you please	4
	c	Could you .....	5
	d	Excuse me could you	4

	e	Please	10
	f	Can you please	3
	g	Can you /I .....	3
	h	Isn't o.k., If I	1
11.	a.	May I .....	8
	b.	Excuse me, may I .....	2
	c.	I beg you pardon	2
	d.	Can I /You	5
	e.	Please	10
	f.	Hey, why don't you	4
12.	a.	Could you	4
	b.	Excuse me, may I	5
	c.	I beg you pardon	3
	d.	May I .....	6
	e.	Can I .....	2
	f.	Please	7
	g.	Is it ok, if you	5
	h.	Do you mind if	3
	I.	I want to promise	3
13.	a.	Could you please	4
	b.	... could you ?	2
	c.	can you .....	2
	d.	I will not forget	5
	e.	Is it possible to	2
	f.	I wonder if you ...	6
	g.	Please ...	1
	h.	Would you mind	6
	i.	I/We would be grateful	5
	j.	I feel sorry	1
14.	a.	Please	7
	b.	Will you .....	4
	c.	Please would you	4
	d.	Would you mind	6
	e.	I would be grateful	4
	f.	Can you .....	3
	g.	Excuse me	5
	h.	I want to promise	2
	i.	May I .....	2
	j.	Is it ok if I	2
	k.	... please	1
15.	a.	Please promise	2
	b.	Could you please	5

	c	Could you help	4
	d	Would you mind	8
	e	I would be grateful	3
	f	Can you .....	5
	g	Is, it ok, If you	6
	h.	Is, it possible	4
16.	a.	Please	9
	b	Would you mind	2
	c	Excuse me ... please,	4
	d	I want to inform you	4
	e	Do you mind if .....	3
17.	a.	Please	4
	b	I would be grateful	1
	c	Can you please	2
	d	Is it ok, if you	5
	e	Is it possible	3
	f	I would be pleased	2
	g	Would you mind .....	2
18.	a.	May I .....	10
	b	Excuse me can I /You	5
	c	Would you mind	2
	d	Can you please	2
	e	Please	4
	f	Could you please	3
	g	Do you mind	1
	h	Is it ok, if I	2
	i	I would be grateful	1
19.	a.	May I	5
	b	I want you to promise	4
	c	Excuse me, could you	2
	d	Would you please	4
	e	Excuse me	6
	f	Please ...	5
	g	Would you mind	5
20.	a.	Would you mind	6
	b	I would be grateful	4
	c	Please	7
	d	I will not forget if	3
	e	I feel sorry	2
	f	could you please	3
	g	I wonder if you	1
	h	Can you .....	3

i Is it alright to

2



**ii. Total Request Forms in Doteli**

S.N.	Forms of Request	Frequency of Occurrence
1.	a. ke mu tamaro	10
	b ke tamu mulai	6
	c huneithyo	1
2.	a. kripaya	11
	b dekalaki ?	10
	c sakalla ?	4
	d dukh aridinupadyo	4
	e jeloj jas manneithe	6
3.	a. kailain bisaddeithe	3
	b kripaya	1
	c kailain bisaddeithe	4
	d e baini	9
	e e hajur	3
4.	a. ke tamu mulai	4
	b aridine hauki ?	10
	c huneithyo	1
5.	a. e hajur	3
	b kripaya	3
	c khusi huneithe	4
	d e dai	5
	e jeloj jas manneithe	3
6.	a. e hajur	7
	b kripaya	2
	c jeloj jas manneithe	3
	d niko manneithe	3
7.	a. jeloj jas manneithe	8
	b niko manneithe	6
	c dukh aridinupadyo	3
	d kripaya	7
	e sakalla ?	6
8.	a. ke tamu mulai	4
	b hunnaki ?	5
	c huneithyo	1
	d aridine hau ?	5
9.	a. kailain bisaddeithe	6
	b kripaya	3
	c niko manneithe	3
10.	a. huneithyo	2
	b ke mutamaro	8
11.	a. sir, kripaya	7

	b	kripaya	5
	c	khusi huneithe	3
	d	ke mu jan sakulo sir ?	5
	e	jan dihal	3
12.	a.	jeloi jas manneithe	8
	b	kailain bisaddeithe	7
	c	dukh aridinupadyo	5
	d	kripaya	7
	e	sakalla ?	8
13.	a.	jeloi jas manneithe	6
	b	kripaya	6
	c	hajurlai dharma huneithyo	5
	d	khusi huneithe	4
	e	hajur ! dukh dinchhu	4
	f	laijai dellaki ?	2
14.	a.	sakolla ?	4
	b	sahayog huneithyo	3
	c	kripaya	6
	d	khusi huneithe	5
	e	niko manneithe	7
	f	jeloi jasmanneithe	5
15.	a.	khusi huneithe	6
	b	kripaya	15
	c	jeloi jas manneithe	13
	d	mulai sahayog huneithyo	1
	e	kailain bisaddeithe	6
16.	a.	sakallai ?	5
	b	niko huneithyoki ?	3
	c	khusi huneithe	7
	d	jan aridiyai	5
17.	a.	ke tu chhadda sakallai ?	7
	b	jan kheldiyai	2
	c	ke yo nai ari nainunu ?	2
18.	a.	addadine hau ?	5
	b	ke mu tamro	10
	c	niko huneithyo	3
19.	a.	e dai	5
	b	kipaya	4
	c	huneithyo	3
	d	niko manneithe	3
	e	khusi huneithe	4
20.	a.	hajurlai dharma huneithyo	8

b	kailainai bisaddeithe	5
c	hajur ! dukh aridinupadyo	5
d	jeloi jas manneithe	3
e	lajjai dellaki ?	5

## Appendix II

### I. Total Apology Forms in English

S.No.	Forms of Apology	Frequency of Occurrences
1.	a Sorry	4
	b I'm sorry	5
	c I'm so sorry	1
	d Oh ! I'm sorry	12
	e I'm very sorry	8
	f Oh !	6
	g I'm really sorry	4
2.	a I'm so sorry	3
	b I'm sorry	5
	c Sorry	4
	d Oh !	7
	e I'm afraid	5
	f Pardon me	5
	g I'm really sorry	3
3.	a I'm extremely sorry	1
	b I'm really sorry	7
	c Sorry	7
	d I'm sorry	5
	e I'm very sorry	6
	f I'm so sorry	2
	g Excuses me	2
	h Please so sorry	4
4.	a Excuse me	5
	b I'm so sorry	3
	c Sorry, sir	14
	d I'm sorry	3
	e I'm really sorry	3
	f Oh ! I'm sorry	4
	g Oh ! I'm so sorry	1
5.	a Sorry	8
	b I'm extremely sorry	1
	c I'm sorry	4
	d I beg your pardon	2
	e I'm so sorry	2
	f I'm terribly sorry	7
	g I apologize	1

	h	I'm afraid	3
6.	a	Sorry	4
	b	I'm so sorry	2
	c	I'm extremely sorry	3
	d	Oh ! so sorry	2
	e	Oh ! sorry	7
	f	I'm sorry	5
	g	Excuse me	8
7.	a	I'm extremely sorry	2
	b	Excuse me	2
	c	Oh! I'm sorry	6
	d	Sorry	7
	e	I'm so sorry	2
	f	I'm sorry	7
	g	oh ! ..	7
8.	a	I'm so sorry	2
	b	I'm Sorry	5
	c	Sorry	5
	d	Please, so sorry	2
	e	Oh ! .....	4
	f	Oh ! I'm sorry	9
9.	a	Oh ! Sorry	7
	b	I'm so sorry	3
	c	I'm sorry	4
	d	Sorry	6
	e	Oh ! I'm sorry	10
	f	I'm afraid	5
	g	Oh ! ..	3
10.	a	Sorry	6
	b	Excuse me	8
	c	I apologize	4
	d	I'm sorry	4
	e	I'm afraid	5
	f	Pardon me	4
11.	a	I'm so sorry	1
	b	Sorry	7
	c	I'm very sorry	8
	d	I'm really sorry	7
	e	I'm sorry	9

	f	I'm extremely sorry	3
	g	Excuse me	1
12.	a	I'm sorry	4
	b	I'm very sorry	2
	c	Oh ! my god	2
	d	Sorry	10
	e	I'm really sorry	1
	f	Oh ! .....	3
13.	a	I'm so sorry	2
	b	Sorry	8
	c	I'm sorry	5
	d	I'm very sorry	6
	e	I'm extremely sorry	2
	f	Oh ! .....	8
	g	Oh! I'm sorry	3
14.	a	I'm so sorry	4
	b	I'm sorry	8
	c	Sorry	10
	d	Excuse me	4
	e	I apologize	2
	f	pardon me	3
15.	a	Excuse me	8
	b	Sorry	4
	c	I'm so sorry	7
	d	Oh ! ...	4
	e	I'm extremely sorry	6
	f	Pardon me	4
	g	I apologize	2
16.	a	I'm extremely sorry	4
	b	I'm sorry	5
	c	Sorry	6
	d	Oh ! sorry	1
	e	Oh ! I'm very sorry	1
	f	I apologize	2
17.	a	Will you excuse me	2
	b	Sorry	6
	c	Excuse me	3
	d	I'm extremely sorry	3
	e	I'm sorry	5

	f	Oh ! .....	1
18.	a	I beg your pardon	3
	b	Pardon me	5
	c	Sorry	8
	d	I'm so sorry	4
	e	I'm sorry	7
	f	Excuse me	2
	g	I'm really sorry	7
19.	a	I'm so sorry	6
	b	I'm extremely sorry	4
	c	I'm very sorry	2
	d	I'm really sorry	5
	e	Sorry	9
	f	Oh ! I'm sorry	3
	g	I'm very very sorry	2
20.	a	I'm sorry	4
	b	Sorry	5
	c	I'm very sorry	10
	d	Oh ! sorry	9
	e	I'm so sorry	3
	f	I'm afraid	5
	g	I'm really sorry	4

## II. Total Apology Forms in Doteli

S.N.	Forms of Apology	Frequency of Occurrences
1.	a. maph aarya	5
	b. oho ! ...	2
	c. oho ! maph paun	7
	d. sorry	3
	e. janrisaya	6
	f. dukh janamanya	5
2.	a. maph paun	6
	b. oho !....	6
	c. oho ! maph paun	7
	d. e he !	3
	e. hatteri	5
3.	a. maphde	4
	b. hatteri barbad bhyo	4
	c. sorry yaar	1
	d. janrisaya	4
	e. oho ! galti bhai	12
4.	a. maph diya sir	11
	b. sorry sir	6
	c. galti bhai, sir	3
5.	a. maph paun	6
	b. oho ! .....	9
	c. janrisa	6
	d. kyaru yaar	2
6.	a. maph paun	5
	b. sorry	5
	c. oho ! galti bhai	8
	d. maphi maudochhu	5
	e. bigade	6
	f. hatteri	3
7.	a. maph paun	3
	b. oho ! galtibhai	14
	c. oho ! .....	8
	d. hatteri	3
8.	a. sorry	4
	b. maph de	7
	c. janrisa	5
9.	a. maph paun	5



	b oho ! .....	4
	c asaji janmanya	2
	d hat !	4
	e gali jandiya	5
	f oho ! galtibhai	8
10.	a. maph paun	6
	b e he !	5
	c kydda	6
	d hat !	3
	e sorry	4
	f hatteri	3
11.	a. dukh lagyo	3
	b maphde	5
	c kyaru yaar	4
	d barbad bhyo	9
12.	a. maph de bhai	1
	b oho ! galti bhai	2
	c ehe ! bekar bhyo	3
13.	a. hatteri	8
	b hat !	3
	c sorry	1
	d maph de	5
14.	a. dukh lagyo	5
	b maph paun	6
	c jan risa	3
	d e !	2
15.	a. janrisa	9
	b asaji janmanya	4
	c maph paun	5
	d maphi maudochhu	5
	e dukh janmanya	5
16.	a. marh diya	2
	b oho ! galtibhai	5
	c bigade	4
	d oho ! galtibhai	5
17.	a. hat !	2
	b oho !	2
	c e he !	2
	d maph de /paun	14

18.	a.	sorry	1
	b.	ehe !	7
	c.	maph paun	8
	d.	barbad bhyo	3
19.	a.	maph paun	6
	b.	galti aryo	3
	c.	maphi maudochhu	3
	d.	janrisya	4
	e.	bigadyo	2
	f.	dukh janmanya	1
	h.	kyaru hajur	2
	i.	gali jandiya	3
20.	a.	gali jandiya	3
	b.	oho ! maph paun	6
	c.	oho ! galti bhai	7
	d.	bigade	5
	e.	maphi maudochhu	6
	f.	dukl janmanya	5

## REFERENCES

- Allen, J.P. B. and S. Pit Corder (1973). *Reading for applied linguistics*. Vol. 1. London: OUP.
- Bhandari, B.M. and T. Gyawali (2001). *Communicative English*. Kathmandu: Ashis Pustak Bhandar.
- Blundell, J. et al. (1982). *Functions in English*. New York: OUP.
- Chapagain, G. (2002). *Request forms of English and Nepali*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu. T.U.
- Chataut, R. D. (2058). *Dotyali vrihat sabdakosh*. Kathmandu: Velu Vishwa Pratisthan.
- Dhakal, S.P. (2064). *Samanya ra prayogic bhasabigyan*. Subhakamana Prakashan: Tahachal.
- Fraser, B. (1980). On apologizing, In F. Columas (ed.). *Conversation Routines*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Guguldi, (2064). *Dotyali monthly sahitik patrika*. Kanchanpur: Jagadamba Chhapakhana.
- Jones, L. (1987). *Functions of language*. London : CUP.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*: London: Sage Publication.
- Lyons, J. (2005). *Language and linguistics*. New York : CUP.
- Lyons, J. (2007). *Language and linguistics*. New York: CUP.
- Lyons, J. (2006). *Language and linguistics*. United Kingdom: CUP.

- Matreyek, W. (1983). *Communicating in English examples and modes I fucntions*.  
New York: Pergamon Press.
- Panday, G.P. (1997). *A comparative study of apologies between English and Nepali*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis: Kathamndu. T.U.
- Paneru, G.R. (2007). *A comparative study of English and Doteli kinship terms*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu.
- Richard, J. C. and et al. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*.  
London: Longman.
- Sharma, L.P. (2004). *A study on the proficiency in the communicative functions and their exponents*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis: Kathmandu. T.U.
- Tembe, H.R. (2007). *A comparative study of apologies between English and Limbu*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis: Kathmandu. T.U.
- Van EK and Alexander (1980). *Threshold level*. London: Council for Europe.
- Verma, S.K. and N. Krishnaswamy (1999). *Modern linguistics and introduction*  
New York: OUP.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2001). *Introduction of sociolinguistics*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Pantha, D.K. (2032). *Doteli Lokshahitya*. BhudiPuran Prakashan: Kathmandu.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: CUP.