

# **THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY IN XITSONGA EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS**

**BY**

**MIHLOTI PENELOPE SOMBHANE**



Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Stellenbosch.

Study leader: Dr M. Dlali

**December 2008**

## DECLARATION

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the owner of the copyright thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

.....  
MP SOMBHANE

.....  
DATE

## **ABSTRACT**

The study explores how Grade 10 learners use the speech act of apology in an educational environment. Apologies are viewed in this study as a kind of remedial work; action taken to change what may be regarded as an offensive act into an acceptable one. Eight different strategies for complaining and twenty-one for apologising are presented with examples to illustrate each. Data was gathered using questionnaires in order to gain insight in the total number of complaint and apology strategies used. Analysis of the answered questionnaires showed that while there are strategies which are commonly used by both male and female learners, some strategies are used mostly by male learners and some mostly by female learners.

## OPSOMMING

Die studie ondersoek hoe graad 10-leerders die spraakhandeling van verskoning vra gebruik in 'n opvoedkundige omgewing. Verskonings word in die studie beskou as 'n soort remediërende werk; 'n aksie wat uitgevoer word om 'n handeling wat aanstoot kan gee, in 'n aanvaarbare handeling te verander. Agt verskillende strategieë om te kla en een-en-twintig om verskoning te vra word aangebied, met voorbeelde wat elkeen te illustreer. Data is versamel deur gebruik te maak van vraelyste om insig in die totale aantal kla- en verskoningstrategieë wat gebruik word, te verkry. Ontleding van die beantwoorde vraelyste het getoon dat alhoewel daar strategieë is wat algemeen deur sowel manlike as vroulike leerders gebruik word, sommige strategieë meer deur manlike leerders en ander meer deur vroulike leerders gebruik word.

## NKOMISO

Dyondzo leyi yi valanga hilaha vadyondzi va ntlawa wa khume va kombelaka ha kona ndzivalelo loko va endla swihoxo eka mbangu wa dyondzo. Eka dyondzo leyi, ku kombela ndzivalelo swi langutiwa ku ri, ntirho wo yo lulamisa maendlele lama nga tirhisiwaka ku cinca leswi nga langutiwaka ku ri maendlelo yo khunguvanyisa ku va maendlele lama amukelekaka. Ku na maqhingha ya nhungu yo kombisa ku vilela ni ya makume-mbirhin'we yo kombela ndzivalelo lama nga nyikiwa ni swikombiso ku hlamusela qhingha rin'wana ni rin'wana. Data yi hlengeletiwile hi ku tirhisa papila ra swivutiso leswi a swi endleriwa ku kuma ntwisiso wa nhlayo ya maqhingha leyi tirhisiweke ku kombisa ku vilela ni ku kombela ndzivalelo. Nhlahluvo wa papila ra swivutiso wu humeserile erivaleni leswaku ku na maqhingha lama tirhisiwaka hi xitalo hi vaxinuna ni vaxisati kasi man'wana ma tirhisiwa ngopfu hi vaxisati kumbe vaxinuna.

## **DEDICATION**

Dedicated to my husband Khongotela Thomas Sombhane.  
My dearest friend whose sweet happiness surrounded and supported me in this  
massive project from beginning to end.

## **NRF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The financial assistance of National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to thank and express my sincere gratitude to the following people for their contribution to this work.

My study leader, Dr. Dlali, for encouragement, support and invaluable guidance through this challenging and enriching learning experience.

Irvin Mathebula, time spent typing my work, and my husband Khongotela time spent proof reading the text.

My sister, Mikateko Ndhambi, for her generosity, love and support.

The principal, staff and grade 10 learners of 2006 at E.P.P Mhinga High School, for allowing me time to conduct my study there.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTER 1

|       |                                 |   |
|-------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1.    | INTRODUCTION .....              | 1 |
| 1.1   | AIM .....                       | 1 |
| 1.2   | RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY .....   | 2 |
| 1.3   | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY ..... | 2 |
| 1.4   | METHODOLOGY .....               | 2 |
| 1.5   | DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES..... | 3 |
| 1.5.1 | Secondary research method ..... | 3 |
| 1.5.2 | Primary research method .....   | 3 |
| 1.6   | SCOPE AND DELIMITATION .....    | 3 |
| 1.7   | ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY ..... | 3 |

### CHAPTER 2: SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY

|       |                         |    |
|-------|-------------------------|----|
| 2.1   | AIM .....               | 5  |
| 2.2   | SPEECH ACTS .....       | 5  |
| 2.2.1 | Trosborg (1995).....    | 5  |
| 2.2.2 | Yule (1996).....        | 9  |
| 2.2.3 | Thomas (1995).....      | 14 |
| 2.2.4 | Austin (1962) .....     | 14 |
| 2.3   | POLITENESS THEORY ..... | 23 |
| 2.3.1 | Trosborg (1995).....    | 23 |
| 2.3.2 | Thomas (1995) .....     | 26 |

### CHAPTER 3: THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 3.1   | AIM .....                                    | 34 |
| 3.2   | THOMAS (1995).....                           | 34 |
| 3.3   | HOLMES (1990).....                           | 36 |
| 3.3.1 | Methodology and the corpus .....             | 39 |
| 3.3.2 | Apology strategies .....                     | 40 |
| 3.3.3 | Syntactic-semantic features of apology ..... | 42 |
| 3.3.4 | Distribution of apology strategies.....      | 44 |
| 3.3.5 | Characteristics of the offence .....         | 44 |

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| 3.3.6 | Relationship between the participants ..... | 47 |
| 3.3.7 | Overall weightiness of the offence.....     | 48 |
| 3.4   | SCHER AND DARLEY (1988).....                | 48 |
| 3.5   | JAWORSKI (1985) .....                       | 52 |
| 3.5.1 | Abstract .....                              | 52 |

#### **CHAPTER 4: APOLOGY STRATEGIES**

|       |                                   |    |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----|
| 4.1   | AIM.....                          | 59 |
| 4.2   | APOLOGY STRATEGIES .....          | 59 |
| 4.2.1 | Trosborg (1995).....              | 59 |
| 4.2.2 | Blum-Kulka et al (1989) .....     | 67 |
| 4.2.3 | Fraser (1979) on apologizing..... | 83 |

#### **CHAPTER 5: APOLOGIES IN XITSONGA**

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| 5.1   | AIM.....  | 87  |
| 5.2   | APOLOGY SITUATIONS .....                        | 87  |
| 5.2.1 | Inconvenience .....                             | 87  |
| 5.2.2 | Space .....                                     | 88  |
| 5.2.3 | Talk.....                                       | 88  |
| 5.2.4 | Time .....                                      | 88  |
| 5.2.5 | Possession .....                                | 88  |
| 5.3   | QUESTIONNAIRE .....                             | 89  |
| 5.3.1 | Copy of the questionnaire.....                  | 89  |
| 5.3.2 | Completion of the questionnaire.....            | 101 |
| 5.4   | ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGIES .....                 | 101 |
| 5.4.1 | Apology situations and apology strategies ..... | 101 |
| 5.4.2 | Apology strategies in sub-situations .....      | 112 |
| 5.4.3 | Individual strategies in major situations ..... | 145 |
| 5.4.4 | Individual strategies.....                      | 154 |

#### **CHAPTER 6: THE EXPRESSION OF OFFENCE IN XITSONGA**

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| 6.1   | THE COMPLAINT STRATEGIES.....                       | 159 |
| 6.2   | COMPLAINT SITUATIONS AND COMPLAINT STRATEGIES ..... | 160 |
| 6.2.1 | The major situations .....                          | 161 |

|                                    |   |            |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| 6.2.2                              | The sub-situation .....                         | 163        |
| 6.3                                | INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES IN MAJOR SITUATIONS ..... | 169        |
| 6.3.1                              | Major situations .....                          | 170        |
| 6.4                                | INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS .....                     | 177        |
| <b>CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION .....</b> |   | <b>180</b> |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>          |   | <b>183</b> |

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 AIM

The aim of this study is to show that apology is a speech act which is frequently used to serve different purposes. A person may apologize because culturally it is a polite ritual to do so and it usually differs from one society to the other. For an example, in other cultures it is an offence to arrive late for a meeting and a person must apologize for that while in some cultures being late means nothing. In apologizing a person acknowledges that he/she has done something wrong.

Leech (1983) in tact maxim by Oshtain state that

Apology is a convivial speech act whose goal coincides with the social goal of maintaining harmony between S (speaker) and H (hearer).

In the study we are going to investigate how the gender of the interlocutor and the type of offence affect the way males and females apologize in an educational context.

We will again investigate which of the strategies are mostly used by both sexes and which strategies have the least number of males or females using them in each an every situation. In other situations there is no significant difference between the use of strategies in these situations between males and females and we are going to investigate why?

This study will also analyze the expression of offence in Xitsonga. Learners express the offence by complaining. A complaint is defined as an expression of “displeasure or annoyance” in response to an action that is seen by the speaker as unfavorable. The study will investigate which complaint strategies are preferred by both females and males, which ones are preferred mostly by males or significant difference between males and females and why?

A further aim of this study is to investigate the impact of the use of apologies in the Xitsonga discourse. In order to reach the desired goal, the focus will mainly be on the following factors:

- Definition of an apology.
- Importance of expressing an apology.
- Problems associated with expressing an apology.

## **1.2 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY**

Although languages are different in some cases, there are apology situations that are peculiar to all languages. Situations such as a direct and indirect apology, explicit explanation are present in almost all languages. Therefore the rationale for this study is to investigate the different ways in which the Xitsonga speaking learners use and interpret an apology and to clarify the issue of ambiguity and confusion that sometimes occurs during the use of an apology.

## **1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The significance of the study lies in the fact that it is aimed at:

- Describing the apology problems encountered by Xitsonga learners.
- Revealing why some people are always indirect when expressing an apology than others.
- The expression of apology in Xitsonga discourse as compared to other cultures.

## **1.4 METHODOLOGY**

This study will make use of the qualitative approach because this type of approach focuses on the phenomena that occur in natural settings (Creswell, 1998:84). Through this type of methodology, the researcher will be able to describe, explore, examine and discover new or little unknown phenomena related to apologies.

## **1.5 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES**

### **1.5.1 Secondary research method**

Through this approach, the researcher will collect data from articles, journals, and books from the library. The researcher values these resources as they contain readily available information on linguistic and cultures.

### **1.5.2 Primary research method**

Through this approach, the researcher will collect first-hand information through questionnaires. Random sampling will be used as well as the following population: grade 11 Xitsonga speaking learners of a local high school, both males and females.

## **1.6 SCOPE AND DELIMITATION**

Even though there will be constant reference to the work already done by other scholars, the researcher's emphasis will be on the expression of apology in Xitsonga.

## **1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

The study is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1, the aim of the study which is already presented, outlined what is going to be done in chapter 5 and chapter 6. Chapter 2, 'speech acts and politeness theory'. This chapter focuses on the power and importance of words. The speaker always have an intention in uttering certain words.

Chapter 3, 'The speech act of apology'. This chapter highlights that apology is used to serve different purposes, ranging from maintaining polite rituals that could vary from one person to the other, the acknowledgement of serious offences. Chapter 4, 'Apology strategies'. This chapter explores the apology strategies which are used by learners in an educational context. It highlight that the restoration of complainable may be performed directly by means of an explicit apology utilizing one of the verbs directly. Chapter 5, 'Apologies in Xitsonga'. This chapter deals with how learners apologise in an educational context.

Questionnaires were completed by learners and analysis to determine which strategies were used was made. Chapter 6, 'Expression of offence'. This chapter

explores the complaint strategies used by learners and the different situations in which they are used. Chapter 7 is the conclusion of the study.

## CHAPTER 2

### SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY

#### 2.1 AIM

The aim of this chapter is to indicate that in general speech acts are acts of communication. There are many things that we can do with words. We can give thanks, make promises, criticize, praise, warn, apologize etc. A speaker always have an intention in uttering a sentence. Where there are disagreements during conversations politeness is demanded to reduce the disagreement, which lies implicitly in the competition between the speaker's desire and what is considered good manners.

#### 2.2 SPEECH ACTS

##### 2.2.1 Trosborg (1995)

###### (a) Communicative functions

The facts and information to be presented by Trosborg are based on “communicative functions.”

When the notion of politeness and theory of politeness brought about by Searle and Austin are put together, they form part of a tool which is used to investigate the way in which communication is used by learners who use foreign languages.

Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) came up with the classification of speech acts. The type of attitude expressed individuates each type of illocutionary act. Searle (1969) and Austin (1962)'s classification of illocutionary acts are mostly behavive and expressive.

###### a.1. A classification of illocutionary acts

Searle (1969) and Austin (1962) have a common understanding, which made them to base their theories in the fact that speaking a language is to engage in a rule-governed form of behavior. Chomsky says that a language is formed by a number of sentences.



Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) think that the language can be taken as speaking going together with a lot of actions. We can classify communicative functions into different classes.

(i) Representatives

Whenever a speaker has a driven thought in doing a representative, he must bear in mind that whatever he says is true. When he wants to say in words what the world look like, he must make sure that “the words match the world.”

(ii) Directives

When directives are to be done, the hearer is made to say something by using actions or saying the words, which indicates to the speaker that he has committed himself to doing something. Directives try by all means to make the “world match the words”. Costs and benefits are differentiated according to the different illocutionary points; e.g. whenever a request is made, it will be to the benefit of both the hearer and the speaker, and this will mean that the hearer has to do something, which will be demanding, to him.

(iii) Commissives

In commissives, the speaker has to sign that he is going to do different things, which need his attention and involvement. Commissives made the “world to words”. In making an offer the speaker shows the willingness or intention to do or to give something to the hearer, the speaker is not sure whether the hearer will accept what he wants to give to him.

(iv) Expressives

This illocutionary act expresses what the speaker has in mind and what he has done before. The speaker has nothing to say about the world nor things to come.

He concentrates on the truth of the matter discussed. In “thanking”, the hearer has done something, which the speaker benefit from it and the speaker shows that he is happy about it. When a complain is being made, the speaker is not happy about

what the hearer has done. Apology shows that the speaker is not happy about what he has done which have a bad turn on the hearer.

(v) Declarations

Specialization in certain fields is required as far as declarations are concerned. A referee can give a red card, a doctor performs surgery etc. It needs someone who is clear as far as language is concerned.

**(b) The composition of speech acts**

b.1 Locutions, Illocutions and Perlocutions

According to Searle (1969) there is no judgment, which can be made visible between the utterance acts, propositional act and the illocutionary act, they depend on one another. Whenever one act is performed obviously the other two are performed too.

Whenever one wants to deliver to the audience something, which will be a warning to them, the speaker has to make sure that the audience understands every word he utters and act on what has been said. An illocutionary act is “happy” if the speaker has to make sure that the listeners understand everything he has said.

When the speaker brings something, which will help the hearer in some way, it is called perlocutionary act. Perlocutionary acts include close and open alarming, persuading, convincing, deterring, misleading, gratefulness, boredom, surprise, shock etc.

Searle (1969) believes that whenever a speaker has a valid reason in uttering certain words that is called illocutionary acts; e.g. praise. When the words said the by speaker have certain effects on the hearer, e.g. warning, that is called perlocutionary acts. A warning can be taken into consideration or ignored, so this acts progress depends on the hearer’s actions.

b.2 Criticism of Searle’s theory of illocutionary acts

Searle’s (1969) theory is criticized because he concentrates on a sentence as an illocutionary act while a sentence is just a small part of a grammar. It is taken that a

speech act refers to a number of sentences, which forms something, which can be delivered to the people through speaking, sentences, which form a page or more.

Searle's implementation of speech acts shows various problems. People who investigated on this acts are not sure as to whether what is said exist. When rules about the speech acts are set it is said to be things that affect all the people, Searle's theory says the opposite of what is said.

Another criticism is the notion conditions are done by all the people, this is not true, each and every culture has its ways of doing things; e.g. other cultures value their traditions and some other cultures have nothing to do with traditions. What Searle says about felicity condition is taken in another way by Reiss (1985). He says that it shows clearly that he concentrates on all the people's ability for seeing things that causes problems and affects the relationship between two people.

Searle (1969) says, "Assertives are made for the purpose of giving information, commissives for the purpose of creating expectations and directives for the purpose of getting others to do things". When he states these things, he does not take into consideration the perlocutionary acts that the hearer does to show what he intends to do, this is evident in directives only.

The notion of perlocutionary act is not clearly developed by Searle and criticism is set on him because of this, criticism is also set on him for not taking into consideration the part taken by the speaker during conversations.

### b.3 Communicative / interactive purpose.

The theory of communicative acts has to make sure that what is said is understood without being put into words. Most of the times those who use language, do make communicative acts so that what they say reach those who must get the message clearly without what has been said being interpreted.

Hordcroft (1978) try to differentiate between communicative and interactive aspects of language. Illocutions is what the speaker says and what the listener understands. Perlocutions are ways in which the words were said in order for the speaker to accept them. If it is expected that the speech act of requesting is being performed,

the communicative act is that the speaker must understand what the request is, whereas the interactive aspect is aimed at the listener accepting the request.

#### b.4 Towards an interactional framework of illocutionary acts

Illocutionary effect has to make sure that the hearer clearly understand what has been said." Illocutionary act "is an act which is performed by the speaker by producing an utterance." Inherent perlocutionary effect" is said to be when the hearer has accepted the speech act, he has done something that shows that he indeed accept the speech act." Consecutive perlocutionary consequences" refer to the reaction of the hearer wherein the hearer has to accept or reject the speech act.

In intended perlocutionary act the speaker may say something with a certain intention in mind, which the hearer can oppose by not doing what is expected of him.

### 2.2.2 Yule (1996)

#### (a) Speech acts and events

When people try to make their feelings to be known, they don't use rules for using words correctly, they do something that makes the hearer to react in a certain way.

(1) "You're fired"

If these words are said by someone in a senior position, the words carry more weight and this can be seen as a very rude remark. This indicates to the hearer that his/her work has come to an end. Actions which are performed via utterances are generally called speech acts.

When a speaker utters something obviously there is something the speaker want to say in saying these words, the hearer can interpret the sentence in another way, which is not what the speaker said. The speaker must try and help the hearer to understand what is being said. This is called the speech act event. The way in which a sentence is being interpreted depends on the nature of the event.

In a very cold day if the speaker says that "this tea is very cold" it might mean that the one who is drinking the tea is complaining. If it is said on a very hot day, after a sip, it

can be seen as a complement. This shows that the hearer can interpret one sentence in many ways.

### **(b) Speech acts**

Whenever a sentence has been said, it always has three basic speech acts. The first is the locutionary act which corresponds to the utterance of a sentence with a particular meaning. The second one is the illocutionary act, which reflects the intended meaning of the speaker in uttering that sentence. The sentence can be said with an intention to praise, warn, criticize etc. The last one is the perlocutionary act which involves the effect that the speaker has on his/her addressees in uttering the sentence. Of the three acts the perlocutionary act is the most commonly used, in every sentence they say the perlocutionary force behind it is different.

- (2) e.g. I'll see you later.  
           I predict that.  
           I promise you that.  
           I warn you that.

When we look at the sentences above, they have different illocutionary forces. They can all be seen as a promise or a warning.

### **(c) I.F.Ds (Illocutionary Force Indicative Device)**

In the sentence, which is uttered, we always have a verb, which indicates to them which illocutionary act has been done. These kinds of verbs are called performative verbs.

When we looked at the example in 2.1.1 above, we can see that the word promise and warn are used as performative verbs and the illocutionary force indicative. Device behind them are very well indicated.

In some sentences the performative verbs are clearly indicated, in some utterances they are not clearly indicated. Sometimes it is easy to see how the speaker feels by the pitch of the voice and it shows the seriousness of the words stated.

### **(d) Felicity Conditions**

There are felicity conditions, which we must consider in order to take events as suitable. There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect, the circumstances and persons has to be appropriate.

In a court of law a judge has certain words that can be said by him like "I sentence you to six months in prison ". No other person has the power and the rights to say these words even if the next person is guilty of murder or rape.

Whenever people talk in everyday's life amongst themselves there are conditions, which govern them in whatever they say. Firstly there is a condition known as the general condition. In this condition care is taken that those who take part understand exactly what is being said and the way in which the words is being said and that they were not claiming that they understand everything that is uttered.

Secondly there is a condition known as content condition. It is understood that in making a promise or warning, it is made for the days to come and the speaker makes the promise as a follow up to what he has promised or warned about.

The third one is the preparatory conditions. When a promise has been made, there are two preparatory conditions, which are taken into consideration. The person who makes the promise has to make sure that the promise is fulfilled and in this way the hearer is going to benefit from it.

The forth is the sincerity condition where the speaker has to fulfill a promise, if a warning has been made the speaker is made to believe that the hearer is not going to repeat his/ her mistakes.

Lastly there is the essential condition. If a speaker makes a promise, he must make sure that the promise is carried forward. If a warning has been made, carry the warning forward even if the result of it is bad.

### **(e) The performative hypothesis**

When a sentence has been uttered, the verbs used don't make statements but perform actions. They belong to a class of utterances called performatives and are

best understood as performing an action. When a person says “I promise “.the person don't make a statement but perform an act, the act of promising. It is concluded that performative verbs are verbs whose utterance involve the performance of an illocutionary act. All these are called the performative hypothesis

### **(f) Speech acts classification**

In “A classification of illocutionary acts” Searle (1976) makes a consistent classification of functions of language usage by dividing illocutionary acts into a limited number of major categories. He takes into consideration that a speaker always has an intention in uttering a sentence. Searle (1976) finds that statements, requests, promises, apologies, criticism, praise, warnings are reducible to five major classes namely representatives, directives, expressives, commissives and declarations.

#### (i) Declarations

These are the things that changes people's lives when they are usually said by people with power and authority, like the priest who has all the power and authority to baptize.

#### (ii) Representative

These are the speech acts, which are performed because of what a person believes in. A person looks at something and says something about it, which is believed by him to be true. A person might say, “The earth is flat”. This is what a person believes in and the fact is, the earth is never flat but round.

#### (iii) Expressives

These are the feelings that people sometimes have and express them out by means of words and actions. Words can be used to express anger, happiness, regret, apology etc.

**(iv) Directives**

These are things, which we do or say to others so that in return they do something. If you borrow something from someone, it is expected of him /her to give the thing to the borrower.

**(V) Commissives**

These are speech acts, which the speakers assign themselves to do something, which they will be forced to do in some days to come. The sentence "I'll be back" shows that something will be done in some days to come.

**(g) Direct and indirect speech acts**

The way in which sentences are performed, indicates clearly whether it is a statement or it is expressing a question or a command. This is shown in the example below:

- (3) a) You wear a sit belt (declarative)  
 b) Do you wear a sit belt? (interrogative)  
 c) Wear a sit belt (imperative)

In the example above, we realize that there is a big relationship between the structural forms and the communicative functions.

Yule (1996:55) stated:

"Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an indirect speech act."

Indirect speeches acts are often used in instances where the speaker doesn't want to humiliate the hearer. So they use politeness for saying the words.

**(h) Speech events**

In preparatory condition it is made clear that the speaker have it in his mind that whatever the speaker says can be carried forward by the hearer. Sending someone



to the shops to buy something means that the hearer has to do something. A content condition focuses on what has to be done in some time to come; the hearer is the one who must do something.

(4) e.g. Can you cook this fish ?

An indirect request comes when the hearer is asked about a condition which must be taken into consideration when they make a request we observe that it is not the same when someone is asked to carry forward something and when there are things to consider when doing something. This conclude that questioning about what to consider is not taken as a request, but the one who is listening to the message take it as request.

When a person must request for something, few sentences must be uttered to request whatever is in the speaker's mind. This is regarded as a speech event.

### **2.2.3. Thomas (1995)**

Thomas (1995) looks at various thinkers /philosophers who say a lot about speech acts. He looks into consideration the speaker and hearer's background attitudes, beliefs and understanding of the context of an utterance and knowledge of the way in which language is used to communicate information. Words communicate information and there in an intention by the speaker on each and every sentence uttered. He looks at what the various thinkers say. A major task for the theory of speech acts is to account for how speakers can succeed in what they do despite the various ways in which linguistic meaning undermines use.

### **2.2.4 Austin (1962)**

Austin is the one who is very much interested in finding more about the speaker's and the hearer's background attitudes, beliefs and understanding of the context of an utterance and knowledge of the way in which languages are used to communicate information. They chose Austin's work because he writes it in a simple and understandable way. There are so many ideas, which represent many issues, which play a big role in pragmatics today. Austin's writing is admirably clear and accessible and it represents a consistent line of thought. Austin was not a linguist at all but a philosopher.

### **2.2.4.1 Ordinary language philosophy**

G.E Moore, according language philosopher and Bertrand Russell a logical positivist philosopher are some of the photospheres who were very much concerned with the relationship between philosophy and language. Their main aim was to present a language which is clear of ambiguity and create a language which is understood by everyone. These philosophers strive to make sure that even people who are not educated are able to communicate effectively.

### **2.2.4.2 Logical positivism and truth conditional semantics.**

Austin (1962) in meaning in interaction by Thomas (1995) stated that:

“Logical positivism is a philosophical system which maintains that the only meaningful statements are those that are analytic or can be tested imperically by logical positivism. Philosophers of language therefore were principally concerned with the properties of sentences which could be evaluated in terms of truth or falsity.”

The above approach was adopted and it is known as truth conditional semantics.

In logical positivism the philosophers argued that if a sentence cannot be read and seen to be true, the sentence was said to be meaningless

(5) e.g. “The king of France is bald”

There was never a king in France, so how can the sentence be true or false? The sentence uttered is completely meaningless.

Austin was also interested in looking at distinctions of different sentences and this was possible by examining how ordinary people do this in everyday language. In ordinary language there are things that are very important to the users of that language, but not all the verbs are able to capture what the speakers are willing to say. Language is said to be used to do things not to say things. Austin came up with the theory of illocutionary acts and perfomative hypothesis because of these facts.

### 2.2.4.3 The performative hypothesis

Austin came up with some facts that most utterances have a truth condition. It is said that they are not statements but action. They perform certain actions hence performative hypothesis.

Austin said that verbs perform some form of action in sentences. Some sentences can make statements that can be judged but some have some truth in them.

(6) e.g. "I drive a white car"

This statement can be true or false. It can be said that your car was never white but is silver. This type of statement is called a performative, which cannot be judged true or false but are best understood as performing an action.

#### (i) Metalinguistic performatives

Metalinguistic performatives are said to be self verifying which means that they contain their own truth condition. They are also said to be self referential, which means that the verb refers to what the speaker of the uttered words is doing and lastly they are non falsifiable which means that they can never be untrue.

It had been noted that all performatives are self verifying; there is a difference between Metalinguistic performatives and the rest. Metalinguistics are observed to be always true and successful.

#### (ii) Ritual performatives

There are certain performatives, which are associated with various rituals or very formal events. Ritual performative are said to be highly culturally dependent there are certain words which are attached to certain people, only a judge can say; "I sentence you to ten years in jail" and this must be said in a specified situation.

##### ii.1 Felicity condition

Austin (1962) states that in felicity condition there must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect and the circumstances and persons must be appropriate. In a given culture there must be a conventional procedure when a

couple gets married. There must be a man and a woman who present themselves before an authorized person (a minister of religion) in an authorized place (a church or a registry office, accompanied by two witnesses. They must go through a specified form of marriage and certain words must be exchanged.

The second felicity condition stated by Austin is that the procedure must be executed correctly and completely. In a marriage ceremony answers to be given to the questions asked by the priest are: "yes, I will" no other alternative answer.

The third felicity condition is that the persons must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions and if consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties had to do it. An example given by Austin is that if a person is mentally unstable at the time of getting married, then the marriage is not legally binding. Another condition is that a marriage must be consummated and if not the marriage is annulled.

## ii. Explicit reference to felicity conditions

Sometimes speakers make references to felicity condition, which allows them to perform a particular act. The speaker of the house of common did have the power to ban those who were out of line.

### (iii) Collaborative performatives

For their success collaborative performatives require the collaboration or particular uptake of another person. For a bet to be successful the other person must accept it. If the other person refuses to bet it is up to him. The bet is to be successfully made when the other person accepts it.

### (iv) Group performatives

Group performatives are either commonly produced by more than one person. If there happened to be people or a group with the same interest, the views of one person carry no weight, and it is only successful when performed on behalf of the entire group.

(v) Overlap of categories

Many ritual performatives are also “collaborative” in nature. The ritual of baptism had been common for years in many cultures. For baptism to be successful there must be people who witness the baptism. Baptism is usually performed in front of more than one person.

(vi) Cross-cultural differences in the use of performatives

There are performatives relating to culturally specific rituals. If a person lives in a culture, which does not have baptism, there will be no performative form “I baptize you” or the verb may exist but cannot be used performatively.

(vii) Collapse of Austin’s performative hypothesis

Austin’s performative hypothesis collapsed for number or rather different sorts of reasons.

- i. There is no formal (grammatical) way of distinguishing performative verbs from other sorts of verbs.
- ii. The presence of performative verb does not guarantee that the specified action is performed.
- iii. There are ways of doing things with words, which do not involve using performative verbs.

(vii) Explicit and implicit performatives

An explicit performative is seen to be a mechanism, which allows the speaker to remove any possibility of misunderstanding the force behind an utterance.

People often avoid using an explicit performative since in many circumstances it seems to imply an unequal power relationship or a particular set of rights on the part of the speaker.

An implicit performative is usually said in such a way that the hearer does not see it as a threat and it also minimize responsibility.

## **(e) Utterances as actions**

### **(j) Locutions, illocutions, Perlocutions**

Utterances not only had sense but also force. Austin distinguished between three types of utterance actions:

- i. Locutions which are the actual words uttered
- ii. Illocutions which are the force or intention behind the words
- iii. Perlocutions, which are the effect of the illocution on the hearer.

### **(ii) Speech acts**

The term speech acts refers to an utterance and the total situation in which the utterance is issued. The same words can be used to perform different speech acts or perform the same speech acts. The focus of the uttered words is on meaning.

## **(f) Approaches to pragmatics**

### **(a) J.R Searle (1969)**

Searle looked at the theory of indirect speech.

#### **(i) Indirect speech act**

Searle says that indirect speech act means getting from what is said to what is meant.

#### **(ii) Searle's condition for speech acts**

Searle says that in uttering certain words, speech acts are performed, acts such as making statements, thanking, giving command, asserting, asking questions and making promises. Searle set out a series of conditions which when properly applied exclude anomalous utterances from the category of promising. Here are Searle's rules for promising:

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Propositional act:     | Speaker(s) predicates future act (A) of speaker(s)                                    |
| Preparatory condition: | S beliefs that doing act A is in the H's (hearer's) best interest and that S can do A |

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Sincerity condition: | Speaker intends to do act A            |
| Essential condition: | S undertakes an obligation to do act A |

### ii.1 Distinguishing speech acts

It is not always possible, using Searle's rules to distinguish among speech acts, which in some sense are related to one another, are by no means interchangeable. Searle himself notes that in order to distinguish order from command it is necessary to introduce some additional preparatory rules.

In the case of other speech acts it is the only final condition which distinguish one speech act from another, totally unrelated ones; for example, congratulate could only be distinguished from compliments by modifying the final condition:

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Propositional act:     | Some events, act etc. E relates to H  |
| Preparatory condition: | E is in H's interest and S believes E is H's interest.  |
| Sincerity condition:   | S is pleased at E   |
| Essential condition:   | Counts as an expression of pleasure at E (congratulate)<br>Counts as a commendation of H (compliment) |

Searle relied on these existing understanding of the speech act verb to describe that speech act verb to this extent has been argued that they are circular.

### ii.2 Plugging the gaps of Searle's rules.

It has been argued that Searle's rules are circular and they fail to distinguish between speech acts and that they cover only paradigm cases of speech acts. It is said that Searle claims to be setting out rules for speech acts but all he is really doing is describing the semantics of speech act verbs.

### ii.3 The speech act of apologizing: a case study

A concrete example is given concerning Searle's speech act of apologizing;

e.g. Pat says to Michael: "I'm sorry I broke your nose."

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Propositional act:     | The speaker (Pat) expresses regret for a past act (breaking Michael's nose) which the speaker herself performed. |
| Preparatory condition: | Pat believes that breaking Michael's nose was not in Michael's best interest.                                    |
| Sincerity condition:   | Pat is sorry she broke Michael's nose.   |
| Essential condition:   | In uttering the words 'I'm sorry I broke your nose', Pat apologizes to Michael.                                  |

The conditions are looked at one at a time to see how they handle the sort of instances of apologizing, which we encounter in everyday life.

### Propositional act

Does the act have to have been performed by the speaker? In many cultures apologies may be done on behalf of someone else: for someone close to you or for whom you have responsibility (spouse, children, pets, the family car), for an institution with which you are associated (e.g. the company or college for which you work). People sometimes apologize for things over which they have no control whatsoever.

The speaker can apologize for a past, present and future act. Sometimes the speaker has to apologize to express regret formally or explicitly.

### Preparatory condition

Does the speaker have to believe that the act was to the hearer's disadvantage? The hearer apologize for something which she /he has done, while privately thinking that would be better off not doing what he /she apologizes for.

### Sincerity condition

People frequently say they apologize for their wrong doings while deep inside they are not.



### Essential condition

To show that you apologize there are certain words which must be uttered to show that you apologize.

#### ii.4 Over generality of rules

Austin discusses certain examples of speech acts, which Searle's rules cannot cope with. There are examples, which his rules will not eliminate.

Example: If Margaret Thatcher win on Thursday I warn you not to be ordinary, I warn you not to be young, I warn you not to fall ill and I warn you not to grow old.

The example above was said by Neil Kinnock (the then leader of the British labor party) as a warning shortly before the British general elections in 1983. Austin observes all Searle's conditions for warning.

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Propositional act:     | Future event or state E  |
| Preparatory condition: | H has reason to believe E will occur and not in H's interest.              |
| Sincerity condition:   | S believes E is not in H's best interest.                                  |
| Essential condition:   | Counts as an undertaking to the effect that E is not in H's best interest. |

Searle achieved the odd distinction of producing sets of conditions, which are simultaneously over-specific and over general.

#### ii.5 The speech act of warning: a case study

Searle does not point out that (in English) there are at least two different types of warning, with different grammatical forms and different conditions. Type 1 warnings relate to situations where you can do nothing to avoid the event itself, although it is sometimes possible, as in the case of flood, hurricane or other severe weather warnings.

Other type 1 warnings include events such as delivering some sort of medical prognosis or political prognostication, there is nothing that can be done except to steel yourself for the unpleasant event.

Type 2 warnings are designed to prevent the unpleasant event altogether.

e.g. ...told him to go immediately to wherever it was his boy lived and warn him that if he didn't stop the police would be informed

**(g) Searle's formal approach to the categorization of speech acts.**

When speech act of apologizing is discussed, the reasons for categorizing a particular locution as performing one speech act rather than another are complex. When examples are given in each of which one participant fails to tell the whole truth, a consideration must be made as to whether or not the key speech act would be classified as lying and on what basis such a judgment would be made.

Coleman and Kay (1981) shows that people's reason for classifying something as a lie or not a lie are extremely complex. Not only formal considerations are taken into account but also functional, Psychological and effective factors, sometimes classification of speech acts are influenced by considerations which are culturally – specific or which relates to the speaker's goal in speaking in a particular way.

## **2.3 POLITENESS THEORY**

### **2.3.1 Trosborg (1995)**

**(a) Theories of verbal politeness. Anna Trosborg**

Trosborg (1995) states that “politeness is a pragmatic mechanism” (ef. Weydt 1983), in which a variety of structures (including non-verbal and prosodic features) work together according to the speaker's intention of achieving smooth communication.

Looking at what Trosborg is saying politeness is developed in order to reduce friction in personal interaction. Politeness has been of concern to a number of linguists, and principles of politeness have been presented notably by Lakoff (1973, 1975), Brown-Levinson (1978, 1987) and Leech (1983). Leech came out with a politeness principle with six maxims (the maxim of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy). He felt it is necessary to set up his principle of politeness to account for language usage in which the maxim of Grice's(1975) cooperative principle is flouted for reasons of social interaction.

Both Grice's(1975) and Leech's(1977) theories have been criticized for neglecting certain types of verbal interaction. Not all communication is optimally cooperative (for example, cross examinations in court and political interviews). Uncooperativeness, as well as lack of politeness must be accounted for.

(i) The notion of face

Brown-Levinson (1978, 1987) based their claims on “face” and rationality and they present their theory of linguistic politeness according to two major categories of “positive politeness” and “negative politeness”. In English the term “losing face” refers to being embarrassed or humiliated, it acknowledges politeness as a ritual and maintaining “face” in interaction is the central element in commonly accepted notions of politeness. Brown-Levinson treated the aspects of “face” as basic wants.

Brown-Levinson distinguishes between positive and negative face:

“Negative face: the want of every “competent adult member” that his actions be unimpeded by others”

“Positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others”

Face is said to be emotionally determined and can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction. When threatened, people are expected to defend their face and it is highly likely that they can in turn threaten other people's faces. Therefore, it will in general be to the mutual interest of the participants to maintain each other's face.

In using negative politeness strategies, such as minimizing, weakening and avoiding, the speaker addressee's personal territory and personal freedom of action can be acknowledged. The self image of the addressee can be validated appropriately when intensifying strategies are used by the speaker to show recognition and appropriate validation. In this instance positive politeness was used.

When we look at what different linguists have said, politeness can be defined as a desire to protect self image. It is also conceived as a polarity system attending to the addressee's positive or negative phase.

(ii) Criticism of Brown-Levinson's theory

Trosborg (1995) states that “the notion of face is claimed to be universal, but it is subject to cultural specification and elaboration in any particular society.” Trosborg criticized Brown-Levinson's theory.

Brown-Levinson's theory has been criticized for being unable to avoid an ethnocentric bias towards Western languages and western perspective. It has been pointed out that the notion of face is much more complicated and culture dependant than claimed by Brown-Levinson. It also failed to give a proper account of formal linguistic forms such as honorifics, which is amongst the major means of expressing linguistic politeness in some languages.

(iii) Politeness and illocutionary functions

Leech (1983) classified illocutionary functions according to the notion of politeness. He classified them according to four types: The competitive, the convivial, the collaborative and the conflictive functions.

The competitive type of functions involves acts in which illocutionary goal competes with the social goal. E.g. ordering, asking, demanding, and begging.

Disagreements do happen and politeness is demanded to reduce the disagreement which lies implicitly in the competition between the speaker's desire and what is considered “good manners”. If a person said something which is not polite, positive politeness is demanded to make the situation less severe.

The convivial class of functions involves acts in which the illocutionary goal coincided with the social goal e.g. offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, and congratulating. These acts take a form of positive politeness and when they are used they are always polite. If someone is being congratulated, the speaker adheres to the listener's positive face.

The collaborative function involves acts where the illocutionary goal is indifferent to the social goal e.g. asserting, reporting, announcing, and instructing. These acts are considered neutral with regard to politeness. Politeness is never considered in this act.

Conflictive functions refer to acts in which the illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal .e.g. threatening, accusing, and reprimanding. These acts are designed to cause offence and they are said to be impolite.

(iv) Temporal And personal deixis

Politeness is defined in terms of the parties' rights and obligations based on the relationship between people which are negotiated in a conversation contract between speaker and hearer who must adjust and readjust to suit the new purpose to the ongoing perception of those rights and obligations.

Temporal and personal deixis is seen as a crucial point. There is a suggestion by Rauh that shifting from the deictic centre of orientation may account for varying pragmatic effect such as expression of degrees of politeness. The greater the distance from the deictic centre, be it temporal or personal dimensions, the greater the degree of politeness and the lesser the degree of illocutionary force. It can be concluded that all languages must be seen as operating within politeness parameters.

### **2.3.2 Thomas (1995)**

(a) Delimiting the concept of politeness

There has been a tremendous confusing as far as the word politeness is concerned. Under the heading politeness, peoples have discussed five separate, though related, sense of phenomena:

- Politeness as a real world goal.
- Deference
- Register
- Politeness as a surface level phenomenon
- Politeness as an illocutionary phenomenon

(i) Politeness as real-world goal.

Politeness as real world goal had been interpreted as a genuine desire to be pleasant to others or as the underlying motivation for an individual's linguistic

behavior. As people who know our languages very well we have access only to what the speaker says and how their hearers react, If what the speaker had said is rude, we shall observe it through the hearer's reaction.

(ii) Deference versus politeness

Deference is also connected with politeness. It refers to the respect we show to other people by virtue of their higher status, greater age etc. Politeness is seen as a more general matter of showing consideration to others. Social behavior can be used to show both deference and politeness. Deference can be shown by standing up when a person with superior power enter the room. Politeness can be shown by holding a door open to allow someone else to pass through.

(ii) Register

The term register refers to systematic variation in relation to social context or the way in which the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation. More formal language use is required in certain situations as well as certain social relationships.

Register has little to do with politeness and little connection with pragmatics, since there is no choice about whether to use formal language in formal situations. Register is seen as a social linguistic phenomenon, which generally occurs in a particular situation.

(iv) Politeness as an utterance level phenomenon

Politeness focused on utterance level realization in Walter's (1979) is defined in his interest of utterance level phenomenon, it investigate how much politeness could be squeezed out of speech act strategies alone, and investigate the perception of politeness by native and non-native speaker's of English and Spanish, he used a standard lexical context in order to establish a hierarchy of politeness, he instructed his informants that they must ignore context as much as possible

If two people had to decide on something and the other one says, you choose. This utterance can be seen as a directive but on the other hand it can normally be seen as

perfectly polite. It is said to be polite because it is costly to the speaker or beneficial to the hearer.

Trosborg (1995) stated that “In this section we have seen that we cannot assess politeness readily out of context, it is not the linguistic form alone which renders the speech act of polite or impolite, but the linguistic form+the context of utterance+the relationship between the speaker and the hearer

(v) Politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon

Linguists focused on politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon. They interpreted politeness as a strategy employed by a speaker so that a variety of goals can be achieved, goals such as promoting or maintaining harmonious relations. They include the strategic use of conventional politeness strategies and a range of other strategies, including many forms of conventional and non-conventional indirectness.

**(b) Politeness explained in terms of principles and maxims**

Leech (1980 [1977]) sees politeness as crucial in explaining why people are often indirect in conveying what they mean and as rescuing the cooperative principle in the sense that politeness is satisfactory explain by exceptions to and apparent deviations from the cooperative principle. Two concepts are introduced for discussion: ambivalent and pragmatic principles.

(i) Ambivalent and politeness

When utterances which are ambivalent are employed, it is possible to convey messages which the hearer is liable to find disagreeable without causing undue offence:

e.g. Notice in the junior common room, Queens college, Cambridge: The newspapers are for all students, not the privileged few who arrive first.

The pragmatic force in the above example is ambivalent and it is left to the readers to decide what the precise message is and whether it applies to anyone of them. They did have mixed feelings about what is written on the notice.

(ii) Pragmatic principles.

Leech introduced the politeness principle as follows:

Minimize (all things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs.

Maximize (all things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs.

There is a good deal of evidence that people respond consciously to considerations of politeness, they often mark the fact that they cannot or do /not intend to observe politeness norms. Sometimes people communicate impolite thoughts or feelings indirectly. A number of maxims related to the pragmatic principles are discussed.

ii.1 The tact maxim

The tact maxim states that expression of beliefs, which imply cost to others, should be minimized; the expression of beliefs, which imply benefit to others, should be minimized. Minimizers can be used to reduce the implied cost to the hearer. Another aspect of tact maxim is that of mitigating the effect of a request by offering optionality. The third component of tact maxim is cost /benefits scale. If something is perceived as being to the hearer's benefit, it can be expressed politely without employing indirectness.

ii.2 The generosity maxim

The generosity maxim states that the expression of benefit to self should be minimized; the expression of cost to self should be maximized. This maxim refers to an utterance which shows generosity though sometimes indirectly stated.

ii.3 The approbation maxim

The approbation maxim states that the expression of belief which expresses dispraise of others should be minimized; the expression of beliefs which express approval of others should be minimized. It is preferred to praise others if they have done something good and to remain silent if there is nothing good to say. People do utter positive statements to show approval or dispraise indirectly if they do not approve of what is expressed.



#### ii.4 The modesty maxim

The modesty maxim states that the expression of praise of self should be minimized; the expression of dispraise of self should be minimized. This maxim concentrates a lot on the notion of self. There are those people who compliment and praise themselves without praising others.

#### ii.5 The agreement maxim

The agreement maxim states that the expression of disagreement between self and others should be minimized; expression of agreement between self and others should be minimized.

The usual warning apply concerning the need to take account of the relationship between speaker and hearer and of the nature of the interaction in which they are involved. It is observed that they are much more direct in expressing their agreement than disagreement.

#### ii.6 The Pollyanna principle

There are things that the Pollyanna principle needs people to do. They put the best possible gloss on what people have to say. This refers to the use of minimizers such as a bit, but this is a strategy which was already adequately dealt with under the heading of reducing the size of imposition. Other aspects simple relate to relexicalization replacing an unpleasant term with supposedly less unpleasant one.

#### (iii) Problems with Leech's approach

The problem with Leech's approach is that there appears to be no motivated way of restricting the number of maxims. This made the theory at best inelegant at worst virtually unfalsifiable

### **(c) Politeness and management of face**

The concept of face was proposed by Coffman (1967) to strengthen the influential theory which is proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978) (1987).

Goffman (1967) defined face as

...the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in term of approved social attributes albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for himself.

Within politeness theory “face” is best understood as every individual’s feeling of self-worth or self-image, through interaction with others. This image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others. Face has two aspects, positive and negative. If a person has a desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others then a positive face is reflected. An individual’s negative face is reflected in the desire not to be impeded or put upon, to have the freedom to act as one chooses.

### **(i) Face threatening acts**

According to Brown and Levison, certain illocutionary acts are the reason why another person’s face is damaged or threatened. Such acts are known as “face-threatening acts. If a person is insulted, obviously the hearer positive face will be damaged if disapproval is expressed for something that the hearer hold dear. If the speaker agrees to have done something bad then the speaker’s positive face is damage.

#### **i.1 Super strategies for performing face-threatening acts**

Four possibilities have been identified if the speaker decides to use the FTA. Three sets of on-record super strategies, perform the FTA on-record without redressive action, perform the FTA on record using positive politeness. Perform the FTA on record using negative politeness and one set of off-record strategies. FTA may be avoided altogether if the speaker feels threatened.

#### **i.2 Performing an FTA without any redress (bald-on-record)**

An individual may be constrained by certain external factors to speak directly in certain in occasions.

Teaching a person to drive is an occasion which focuses on the propositional content of the message and pays little attention to the interpersonal aspect of what is said.

### i.3 Performing an FTA with redress (positive politeness)

Within Brown and Levinson's theory, when words are spoken, positive politeness is always employed. A number of Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies are illustrated. It is observed that there are close parallels in Lee's politeness principles "seek agreement", avoid disagreement, be optimistic, and give sympathy

### i.4 Performing an FTA with redress (negative politeness.)

Negative politeness is oriented towards a hearer's negative face which appeals to the hearer's desire not be impeded or put upon, to be left free to act as they choose. In negative politeness deference in idea is always observed.

### i.5 Performing an FTA using off record politeness

Off-record politeness may be performed by giving hints, use metaphor, be ambiguous or vague, be incomplete or use ellipsis which is one of the most frequently encountered off-record politeness strategies.

### i.6 Do not perform FTA

There are times when something appears to be potentially so face-threatening that it is best not to say anything that is why they do not perform strategy is seen to be self-explanatory. There are times when the speaker decides not to say a thing and wish to let the matter drop.

## (ii) Criticism of Brown and Levinson

According to Brown and Levinson the face of either the speaker or the hearer is threatened. Apology threatens the speaker's face in an obvious way, but it is also seen as a considerable embarrassment to the hearer. Brown and Levinson claim that positive and negative politeness is mutually exclusive. But in practice it is observed that single utterance can be oriented to both positive and negative face simultaneously.

(iii) Politeness viewed as conversational contract

According to Fraser (1990), people are constrained in interaction by what is called Conversation contract. When people speak they understand each other and it is this understanding which people bring to an interaction of the norms obtained within that interaction and of their rights and obligations within it. People employ the degree of politeness required by the event or situation in which they find themselves.

## (iv) Politeness measured along pragmatic scales.

Spencer Oatey (1992) argues that the way Brown-Levinson (1987)(1978) and Leech's theory of politeness are formulated, they are formulated in such a way that they are open for criticism on the ground that they are culturally based. She proposes sets of dimensions which she suggests that all the research on politeness can be summarized in terms of them. Individuals will select a point on the scale according to their cultural values and the situations within which they operate. The scales referred to by Spencer are needed for consideration, and need to be valued and there is need for relational identity.

(v) Conclusion

Politeness is defined by most people as a pragmatic /communicative phenomenon within pragmatic and not to equate it with any moral psychological disposition towards being nice to one's interlocutor.

Outside pragmatics it is misinterpreted with tiresome frequency. Pragmatics is accused of viewing the world as a place where everyone is nice and kind to everyone else.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY

#### 3.1. AIM

The aim of this chapter is to highlight that apology is a frequently used speech act which serves different purposes ranging from maintaining polite rituals that could vary from one person to the other, to acknowledgement of serious offences.

#### 3.2 THOMAS (1995)

The speech act of apologizing: a case study.

- Propositional act: S expresses regret for past act A of S
- Preparatory condition: S believes that A was not in H's best interest.
- Sincerity condition: speaker regrets act A.
- Essential condition: counts as an apology for act A.

Let us look at the concrete example: Pat say to Michael: "I'm sorry I broke your nose and see how it might work out.

- Propositional act: The speaker performed a past act (breaking Michel's nose) and he expresses regret for it.
- Preparatory condition: Pat broke Michael's nose and she believes that it was not in Michael's best interest.
- Sincerity condition: Pat is sorry she broke Michael's nose.
- Essential condition: Pat apologizes to Michael in uttering the words "I'm sorry I broke your nose".

The examples given could cope very well with Searl's rules of apologizing. There are instances of apologizing which we come across in everyday life, we are going to take the conditions one at a time and see how they handle these sort of instances.

**(a) Propositional act**

The Propositional act poses a question of whether the act have to have been performed by the speaker, in many cultures it is possible to apologize on behalf of someone or something else: For someone close to you or people or things you have responsibility e.g. spouse, children, pets or the family car, for an institution you are associated with. There are things, which people have no control over them, which they are bound to apologize, like the behavior of people who belong to the same country as themselves.

Does the act have to be a past act? Can a person apologize for what is busy happening? "I am sorry about the noise" or things that are still to come, 'I am sorry but I shall have to report you". Someone's head is going to be chopped off and the executioner seeks forgiveness, can we describe this as an apology?

Does the speaker have to express regret formally /explicitly? The answer is that there are circumstances. If a student is late for a seminar, when she says "the buses are on strike", this could count as an apology if the hearer chooses to accept it as such. Words do have the potential to act as an apology when the people concerned chooses to take them as such.

**(b) Preparatory condition**

Does the speaker have to believe that the act was /is /will be to the hearer's disadvantage? The speaker can sometimes think that the hearer will be better off without eating something and decide to apologize for the wrong doing though he did not mean it, e.g. knocking to the floor the hearer's full fat double chocolate cheese cake with whipped cream.

**(c) Sincerity condition**

Sometimes people frequently say they are sorry when they are not. Does this mean that they have not apologized?

#### **(d) Essential condition**

The sine qua non of apologizing is actually saying or writing that you are sorry. The question is whether it is essential to utter certain words in order to apologize. Sometimes an apology can come in a form of actions, cleaning the house, send a bouquet of flowers; go around in sack cloth and ashes for forty days? Without explaining too much, we rapidly see that such constitutive rules for apologizing fail to capture what we recognize as perfectly ordinary, instances of apologizing. In order to cope with the list of eventualities mentioned so far, the rules would have to start off like this:

Propositional act: the speaker expresses or implies or in some other way indicates regret for a past, present or future act performed by the speaker or someone or something for which the speaker has responsibility or could be seen to have responsibility (but perhaps has no responsibility whatsoever)

Preparatory condition: the speaker may or may not believe that the act was, is or will be against H's best interest ..... and so on.

The speech act of apologizing operates in everyday life, when we attempt to expand Searle's rules concerning these acts, the conditions become hopelessly complex, vague and unworkable. It is immensely appealing to produce formal rules for the way in which speech acts operate, unfortunately the rules only work in very restricted circumstances. They are general in their specification and exclude perfectly normal instances of speech acts that they fail to eliminate anomalous use.

### **3.3 HOLMES(1990)**

#### **Apologies in New Zealand English**

##### **(a) Abstract**

Holmes (1990) states that "apologies are defined as primarily social acts conveying affective meaning"

Holmes described the syntactic, semantic and sociolinguistic features of apologies based on a corpus of 183 apologies. In this New Zealand corpus an account is

provided of the kinds of social relationship and the range of offences which elicited apologies.

Apologies are politeness strategies; an attempt is made to relate the relative “weightiness” of the offence to features of the apology strategies used to remedy it. Friends may sometimes offend each other and the functions of linear apologies between them may be more complex than a simple linear model suggests.

### **(b) Defining apology**

The central function of apology is to restore social equilibrium or harmony and to provide remedy for an offence committed. This is given more weight by Holmes (1990) when she says “an apology is a speech act addressed to B’s face-needs and intended to remedy an offence for which A takes responsibility and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B (where A is the apologizer and B is the person offended)”

The functions of apology can be achieved in an infinite number of ways on the offence addressed and this makes it difficult to specify the content of an apology in a helpful manner. Oshtain and Cohen (1983) proposed that their goal be the description of the maximal potential set of semantic formulas for each act, speech act set consist of the major semantic formulas any of which could suffice as an ‘emic’ minimal element to represent the particular speech act.

The approach advocated by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) and Fraser (1981), namely, to specify not the formulae but the felicity condition under which a particular utterance would count as a speech act. Owen (1983) concluded that the results are circular because there is no independent way of establishing felicity conditions.

Utterances which qualify as apologies can be identified using: function-centered definition. The elements of the definition imply the following minimal felicity conditions.

- a) An act has occurred
- b) A believes the act has offended B
- c) A takes some responsibility for the act.



When we look at the circumstances above it is likely that what A says will be interpreted as an apology.

It is possible and useful to categorize the range of strategies which were used in a corpus of apologies collected from native speakers of English, though it is not possible to specify a complete speech act set for apology.

An apology will typically address an offence performed by the apologizer.

e.g. [A bumps into B who is standing still]

A sorry

B that's ok

A child, friend or spouse may make an offence which makes a father/ husband (person responsible for their well being) apologizes on their behalf. A father (A) may apologize on behalf of his child who has spilled some juice on B's carpet. The father takes responsibility for the offence rather than the offender.

### **(c) Apologies and face**

Goffman (1967) says "Apologies, like compliments are primarily aimed at maintaining or supporting the addressee's and in some cases the apologizer's face."

The offences which have damaged the addressee's face in some respect can be regarded as negative face. And apologies are generally aimed at face redress associated with FTAs (Face-threatening acts). Even if the addressee's face have been damaged, accompanying elements may address the victim's or the speakers positive face need. In maintaining the participant's face, transgressions to positive or negative face wants may be addressed.

Negative face is redressed by apologies when the offence has ignored Bs "want that his actions be unimpeded by others.

Positive face wants is addressed by apologies when the transgression offends B's need that his or her "wants be desirable to at least some others." Loss of positive face incurred by the speaker may simultaneously be addressed by apologies. Where there is an inclusion of an explanation in the remedial exchange, the speaker's

positive face needs are generally taken into account. Sometimes apologies may be in some circumstances be associated with deliberate offenses e.g.intentional attacks on the addressee's face, attacks like insults and accusations. The face attacker herself can apologize for the (FAA). Apologies can express other functions too. Functions like utterances which express regret, functions of conveying bad news and apologizing for it. Norrick (1978) pointed out that in addition to convincing the speaker's regret, apologies often serve such social functions as "to evince good manner, to assuage the addressee's wrath or simply to get off the hook and be on one's way."

### **3.3.1 Methodology and the corpus**

Elicited instances were used in most of the research on apologies. They were usually based on suggested role plays of some kind, written or spoken

Another method used was the ethnographic approach, this method need a collection of spontaneous speech in natural settings. The method was said to be time consuming because there is no guarantee that one will collect sufficient examples of relevant speech act.

The methodology which was seen as ideal would involve "a two-pronged approach", combining aspects of both ethnographic observation and elicited responses, by exploring the spontaneous utterances of a range of respondents in the same natural context. A wide range of situations must be observed to obtain some idea of the range of contexts, in which apologies occur, the type of offences which are fruitful in contexts in which apologies occur. the type of offences and the kind of social factors which appear to be related to different types of apology. Apologies and apology responses collected with the assistance of New Zealand students who selected the task have a corpus consisting of 183 remedial interchanges. The method used for data collection was the ethnographic method. The students were not that satisfied with the method, it was difficult for them to collect examples of apologies than instances of compliments.

### 3.3.2 Apology strategies

Following Osthtain and Cohen's (1983) framework, four basic categories were used. With a number of subcategories where necessary

- A. An explicit expression of apology
  - offer apology e.g "I apologize"
  - express regret e.g. "I'm sorry"
  - request forgiveness e.g "forgive me"
  
- B. An explanation or account, an excuse or justification.
  - e.g. I wasn't expecting it to be you.
  
- C. An acknowledgement of responsibility
  - Accept blame, e.g. "It was my fault"
  - Express self-deficiency, e.g "I was confused"
  - Recognize H as entitled to an apology e.g "you deserve an apology".
  - Express lack of intent, e.g. "I didn't mean to".
  - Offer repair / redress, "We'll replace it for you".
  
- D. A promise of forbearance
  - e.g. "I promise it won't happen again".

When we look at the example above, we note that the strategies are not mutually exclusive they may co-occur. When used in an appropriate context any one strategy alone may counts as an apology. When a person says "I apologize" like in category A the instance is a direct speech act functioning as an apology, those in categories B, C and D are indirect apologies because they occur alone without an explicit apology form. There has been some debate over whether the less direct speech acts are more polite than more direct ones. At some point politer apologies normally include an explicit apology together with another strategy. The categories A-D are arranged in increasing order in terms of how heavily ranked they are as politeness strategies.

The simplest and least heavily weighted strategies are apologies in category A and those in C and D are more complex and more heavily weighted apology strategies.

The strategies native speaker's use and how they are combined is very important to consider. In combining these strategies there are two factors, which deserve attention. First the number of strategies which co-occur are worth comment, and second, it is interesting to note the co-occurrences patterns which characterized the data. Seventeen different combinations of apology strategy occur in the data. Sometimes a remedial interchange may involve more than one occurrence of the same apology strategy.

e.g. [A has drifted off in B's class.]

A: I am feeling a little muddled at the moment and I think it's my fault, maybe I wasn't listening, but what was field independence.

The example above have two instances of the speaker expressing self-deficiency and one accepting the blame, all of which are (strategies acknowledging responsibility). Different strategies demonstrate relative flexibility of position. strategy A and C may occur in any position. B does not occur in place 4, and D never occurs in initial position or in place C. This is explained using the table below.

### POSITION

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | A | A | A |
| B | B | B | - |
| C | C | C | C |
| - | D | - | D |

Key: A = an explicit expression of apology, B = an explanation or account, C =an acknowledgement of responsibility, D = a promise of forbearance.

It is concluded that in the small number of written apologies in the corpus, there was always an explicit apology strategy at some point. The only cases where there are no explicit apologies are conversations between intimates, where the intonation very clearly signals the function of the utterance as an apology

### 3.3.3 Syntactic-semantic features of apology

TABLE 1

| Patten  | United Kingdom<br>number % |      | New Zealand<br>Number % |      |
|---|----------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| Variant of apologize or apology /ies<br><br>Verb; e.g. I must<br>We ought to apologize<br>Would like to | 3                          | 3.6  | 6                       | 3.8  |
| Noun; e.g. I have an apology to make (accept my) apologies  | 1                          | 1.2  | 8                       | 4.6  |
| I'm afraid  | 7                          | 8.4  | 5                       | 2.9  |
| Pattern with sorry  |                            |      |                         |      |
| (intensifier) sorry   | 20                         | 24.1 | 66                      | 37.9 |
| I'm /am (intense) sorry   | 21                         | 25.3 | 36                      | 20.7 |
| I'm (intense) sorry to /if /for up /(that)s   | 22                         | 26.5 | 24                      | 13.8 |
| (I'm) (intense) sorry about that /it  | 9                          | 10.8 | 12                      | 6.9  |
| Other patterns  |                            |      |                         |      |
| Excuse me /us   | -                          |      | 9                       | 5.2  |
| Pardon (me) I beg your pardon   | -                          |      | 4                       | 2.3  |
| Forgive me  | -                          |      | 3                       | 1.7  |
| We regret that S  | -                          |      | 1                       | 0.6  |

Where an apology is explicitly expressed it is possible to classify its form. Owen (1983) provided a very detailed description of the forms identified in her British corpus and compared it with the New Zealand corpus in table 1. Holme (1990) discuss and exemplify each category.

Variant of Apologize or Apology / ies

Variants in which the explicit performative formulas are used are very rare. Holme (1990) only found two instances in her spoken corpus two instances in written form which were formal. In New Zealand data too, these forms in more formal interaction or writing.

I'M AFRAID as an apology

An interesting account of how I'm afraid may serve to express an apology was provided by Owen (1983). She argued that when followed by a full complement sentence, the primary function of the utterance is to inform though the "I'm afraid" clearly expresses regret and thus "some remedial effect may be achieved. In New Zealand corpus I'm afraid functioning as an apology was not used constantly, only 4 were used in speech and one in writing that is 2.9 percent of the syntactic patterns used to express the apology explicitly.

#### Variant of sorry

Sorry is the most frequent form used as an explicit apology. Owen (1983) provided the following descriptive rule for variants in her data involving the word sorry.

|                           |            |
|---------------------------|------------|
| I'm ([intensifier]) sorry | (that) S   |
|                           | to VP      |
|                           | if S       |
| I am                      | about that |

There are predominance of a few identifiable patterns in the New Zealand data. Some form of sorry accounts for more than 75 percent of the data.

#### Other patterns

In the New Zealand data four other patterns were identified as ways of expressing an apology explicitly. The four ways are:

- Excuse me /us
- Pardon (me) /I beg your pardon
- Forgive me
- We regret that

The latter two occurs only as written forms and apart from one instance of excuse me, the first two patterns occur as speech forms. The speech forms tend to be apologies for socially frowned on behavior or for actions which inconvenience addressees. In table 1 the formulae involved draw on a very narrow range of lexical items less than 10 in total: apology, apologize, be afraid that, excuse, forgive, sorry, regret and only 79 percent included some form of sorry on all the apologies collected.

### 3.3.4 Distribution of apology strategies

Holmes (1990) says: “Apology function as remedies for offences and are aimed at restoring social harmony between people. The crucial nonlinguistic elements involves are thus the seriousness of the offense and the relationship between the participants”.

An informal exploration was offered by Holmes (1990). There are two ways in which it seems that apologizers modify the politeness of an apology in relation to the weight of the offense: they may vary the number of strategies used in any interaction, and they may vary the kinds of strategies used. A speaker may include two or more strategies in a remedial exchange and she may select higher rather than lower ranked apology strategies to increase the politeness of the apology.

### 3.3.5 Characteristics of the offense

The ranking or seriousness of the different offenses were considered as a crucial factor in the context in which they occurred.

#### (a) Type of offense

There is no formal existing classification of types of offense. In the New Zealand data, space, inconvenience, talk, time, possessions and social gaffe proved workable and appeared to account for all of the instances.

**TABLE 2: TYPE OF OFFENCE**

|                                   | Number | %    |
|-----------------------------------|--------|------|
| Inconvenience /inadequate service | 72     | 39.3 |
| Space                             | 30     | 16.4 |
| Talk                              | 30     | 16.4 |
| Possessions (including money)     | 26     | 14.2 |
| Social gaffe                      | 20     | 10.9 |
| Total                             | 183    | 100  |

#### (i) Inconvenience

When we look at table 2 a large proportion of apologies in the corpus (39.3%) can be described as relating to actions which have inconvenienced the addressee in some way. Inconvenience includes examples where the apologizer had not performed

adequately in a particular context or had provided inadequate service and so had convenience the addressee.

e.g. [B promised to help A with his /her project but he didn't come]

A: I waited for you the whole day yesterday and you didn't come.

B: I'm sorry, something came up and I forgot to tell you.

(ii) Space

Gofman (1971) provided a detailed discussion of the range of infringements on another's personal space which may occasion apologies. The examples he gave included walking too close to or in front of another person, bumping into them, and taking their seats or desk space. The offender usually apologizes to signal her wish to protect herself against being perceived negatively.

e.g. [A bump into B along a busy pavement and knocks a parcel out of her arms]

A: sorry Miss, I was in a hurry.

B: you should watch where you're going.

I'm sorry is the pattern which is always used and it goes together with the correlation of a space offense with a simple explicit apology strategy.

(iii) Talk

Talk involves some instructions on the addressee's talk or talking turn or another infringement of the rule for polite talk. The most frequent examples relate to interruption but others include verbal insults, the introduction of an inappropriate topic, slip of a tongue, not hearing someone, and offences such as talking too loud or too long.

e.g. [woman to fellow student in tutorial discussion]

A: I'm sorry I didn't mean to stop you

An interruption can be interpreted as implying that what the addressee is saying is not worth attention and therefore as a threat to positive face, alternatively, it can be seen as impending the addressee's freedom to talk and thus as a threat to negative face.



(iv) Time

Here, people don't take into account the value of another person's time. They sometimes waste other people's time. Where the apologizer has kept the addressee waiting or has arrived late for an appointment, the infringement involves an imposition of the addressee's time.

e.g. [B is phoning her friend A]

B: where were you last night? I thought you said you'd meet me at 7:45 outside Chevy's

A: oh no! What a nong! I'm really sorry I thought you meant tonight. Oh boy, I hope you are not too cheesed off with me.

"What a nong" is an insult that was used to strengthen the apology. Most apologies combine an explicit apology usually in the form of sorry with the explanation of the account. Western cultures are very conscious with time and offenses for wasting another's time generally demanded some explanation.

(v) Possessions

This category of offense involves some damage or loss to the addressee's possessions. Including money. The offenses which are involved are such as bumping into someone's car, spilling something on their clothes, damaging their pen, breaking their washing machine, failing to pay a bill on time or losing a book.

e.g. [Two friends in the library]

A: you know that pen you lent me, I'm afraid I've lost it. If you like I'll buy you another one.

B: oh don't worry. If it turns up throw it in my way but if it doesn't don't worry.

Apologies for possession offences usually include explicit acknowledgement of responsibility which takes the form of an offer of repair or restitutions in most every case.

(vi) Social gaffe

A social gaffe is when the apologizer has broken a social etiquette rule relating to socially frowned on behavior, such as burping or speaking while eating.

e.g. [A belch while they are busy eating at the dinner table].

A: Excuse me.

**(b) Seriousness of offence**

A three-point scale was used to categorize the seriousness of the offense:

- (1) Light offense for example, bumped into someone, forgot to return a book to the library on time.
- (2) Medium offense: For example, kept someone waiting and made them late for a film, broke someone's stapler.
- (3) Heavy offenses: For example' Knocked someone over and hurt them, made someone miss an important engagement

**3.3.6 Relationship between the participants**

**(a) Social distance**

The corpus includes apologies between participants who differ widely In terms of how well they know each other or the degree of social distance that characterize the relationship. Three categories were used to classify the data: I-very close friends or intimates, for example spouses, partners, family members, F-friends or colleagues, S-distant acquaintances or strangers.

Using Brown and Levinson model, one would expect that the more heavily ranked strategies would be used to the most distant addressees and the simplest strategy to those least distant. As far as social distance is concerned intimacy evidently permits shortcuts.

## **(b) Power**

The relative status of the participants is taken into consideration. Power is classified into three categories: U-apology was made to person with more power, E-apology was made to a person with equal power, D-was made to a person with less power.

### **3.3.7 Overall weightiness of the offence**

The data in this corpus allowed a correction a correction of apology strategies with offence weight by combining the effects of the seriousness of the offence, the relative power of the participants and their relative social distance. It has been supported that weightier offences elicit more complex apologies.

Holmes (1990) supported Brown and Levinson's model by examining the strategies used in apologies between maximally distant interlocutors of different status when the less powerful person has committed an offense of medium seriousness or a lighter offense. There is clear evidence that the less weighty the offense, the more likely a single simple explicit apology will be used. Sometimes an apology between friends elicits a more elaborated apology.

## **3.4 SCHER AND DARLEY (1988)**

When an individual has violated a social norm, he must apologize. Apologies serve as remedial work, designed to smooth over or remedy any social disruption that was caused by norm violation.

There are five strategies that form the apology speech act.

- 1) An illocutionary force indicating device, such as "I'm sorry", "I apologize", or "excuse me"
- 2) An explanation of the account of the cause which brought about violation
- 3) An expression of the speaker's responsibility for the offence
- 4) An offer of repair
- 5) Promise of forbearance

If a person has done something wrong, he must apologize. The amount of blame and punishment assigned to the person who broke the rules, differs when the person

apologizes versus no apology is given. Apologies reduce the sanctioning of applied to the transgressor by reducing negative evaluations of the identity of the transgressor. They may also affect sanctioning by reducing the anger the victim feels after the transgression.

Different forms of apology brings differing effects “excuse /me”, “I’m sorry” or “I feel bad about this” have differing effect on the person receiving it.

In social discourse there are two functions served by apologies. On the other hand apology shows that the speaker is aware of the social requirement to apologize in certain situations. Apology also communicates important information about the psychological state of the speaker.

There are strategies which were identified which convey information that is a required part of an apology. For an apology to be successful the speaker must acknowledge responsibility for having committed some offending act, and he /she must express regret about the offense. Apology usually conveys an information of regret or remorse.

Remorse makes people to change their negative personality, judgment and other reactions from the transgressor.

A promise of forbearance increases the effectiveness of an apology by promising the hearer that the offense will never happen again. An offer of repair, the transgressor offer to make the bad situation right. An explanation or account is not part of apology. The perception of the speaker’s identity should be improved by each apology strategy, the sanctioning applied by the speaker should also be reduced, increase the regret attributed to the speaker and increase perceptions of the appropriateness of the apology.

## **(a) METHOD**

### **(i) Overview**

The presence or absence of strategies, promise of forbearance, expression of responsibility and offer of repair were manipulated within-subject factors in a split-plot design.

(ii) Subject and procedure

There were volunteers who volunteered to serve the subjects and they were from psychology and anthropology classes at the state University of New York. Thirty-two students volunteered (72% female, median age = 22 years). Subjects were given prepared packets during the experimental sessions. They were instructed to read the story of Ralph. They were also asked to put themselves in the place of the main character and imagine how that person would feel.

In the instructions that followed the subjects were informed that the aim of the experiment was to see with “how the different ways people react to their own behavior can effect the way those people are seen by others. The subjects were asked to deal with the content of the story and they were asked to respond to certain questions. After their judgment they observed that each of the eight apologies followed, along with the independent measures.

(iii) Independent variables

The presence or absence of the four apology strategies were operationalized with the statement shown in table 1.

**Table 1: Operationalization of apology components and definitions for strength ratings**

**(Ralph story)**

|                           |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Remorse /IFID             | “I’m sorry I didn’t call you the other day with information”   | An action of remorse or sadness about one’s actions.                         |
| Responsibility expression | I know what I did was wrong                                    | An acknowledgment that some rule or norm of social conduct has been violated |
| Promise of forbearance    | I promise something like will never happen again               | A promise to keep one’s word in the future                                   |
| Offer repair              | If there is any way I can make it up to you please let me know | An offer to make recompense for one’s actions                                |

IFID = illocutionary force indicating device

An apology was constantly present in all the components within each apology. The IFID always came first, followed by responsibility expression, promise of forbearance and repair.

(v) Dependant variables

The subjects were asked to assess Ralph's situation and see if Ralph's response to the situation was appropriate and apologetic. Will they blame Ralph for his actions and how much will they condemn him for what he has done. Subjects were asked how reliable a friend Ralph was and how conscientious he was.

**(b) Results**

The four apology strategies examined in this study each affected reactions to the apologies and the transgressor. Not all the components contributed to the appropriateness and effectiveness of the apology, but also that each component seemed to have roughly the same importance, all else being equal.

(i) Trend analysis

Trend analysis was done by including subject as a factor in the analysis. There were strong linear components in the relationships between the number of apology components and the dependant variables.

(ii) Interaction effects

To find the effect of the interaction various explicit apology components must be examined. Higher numbers indicates that the apology was more appropriate that the transgressor was to be blamed and condemned more, and that the transgressor was more apologetic.

**(c) DISCUSSION**

The judgment that people make about the transgressor have clear independent effects on the strategies people use to realize the speech acts of apologizing. The addition of each strategy seems to have had an additive effect of judgments of how appropriate the utterance of the transgressor was and how much the transgression was blamed and sanctioned for the transgression and on judgments relate to the

identity of the transgressor. The current study shows that there is a correspondence between the things people say when they apologize and the effects of those apologies.

### **3.5 JAWORSKI (1985)**

#### **APOLOGIES AND NON-APOLOGIES**

##### **3.5.1 Abstract**

Brown and Levinson's (1987 [1978]) politeness theories are taken into consideration when the study of apology variation in Polish is presented. The main emphasis is on example, which shows that speech acts are "Fuzzy categories and range from the most to the least prototypical. The discussion an presentation is called 'apology negotiation'. Politeness theory serves as a descriptive and analytic framework. The words which are usually used are speech acts, apologies, politeness, methodology and polish.

##### **(a) Introduction**

Most pragmatic researchers have researched about apologies. The data used in this paper comes from a small corpus of real life apologies collected with the help of sociolinguistic students in Poznan, Poland in 1990. Joworsky says "I shall concentrate on certain theoretical and methodological aspects of studying apologies (in Polish) and speech acts, i.e. on the question of how to approach non-formulaic unprototypical examples of apologies in the corpus and to show how politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1987) can be used for their study".

Several unprototypical examples of apologies were examined. These examples of speech acts studied vary, and partly depend on the data collection method. As far as requests are concerned, they were listed from the most to the least direct. They range from utterances with verbs in the imperative mood (leave me alone, clean up the mess) to 'mild hints' (I am a nun in response to a persistent hassler)

Variations in degree of directness with respect to apologies have been mentioned in a few studies. Joworsky's interest lies with the different types of variations observable in the realization of speech acts, i.e. the degree to which a given utterance or

exchange is perceived as an apology or as a non-apology. The main aim of this paper is to examine situations in which two or more interactants negotiate the need to apologize, the form of an apology and its acceptance.

Other researchers have commented on non- apologies which have entered their corpus.

Trosborg has found that these non-apology strategies were used more often by her non-native English speakers than both by native English and native Danish speakers. According to her this can be attributed to two interlocking factors: the aversiveness of having to take the blame coupled with inadequacy to give explanations.

### **(b) Some methodological consideration**

The method which was used focuses on ethnographically collected direct compliments, i.e. utterances which unambiguously can be defined as compliments. A circular conclusion was made that (a) compliments are high formulaic speech acts, (b) the formulation of (a) is based on the examination of a corpus of largely formulaic (direct, unambiguous, etc) compliments.

Another method used was data collection by means of a questionnaire. Before devising their questionnaire administered to native and non-native speakers of English, the author first observed the usage of expressions containing words like thanks, grateful and appreciates.

This questionnaire was referred to as 'discourse completion test'.

### **(c) Variation and discreteness in apologies**

This paper discusses the problem of how native speakers of one language (here Polish) vary with respect to their notions of when it is appropriate to apologize and what happens when two interactants disagree on this issue, i.e. this study looks at the functional variation in the realization of apology and at the dynamic aspects of the negotiation of situations by participants.

Holmes (1989) has shown that in New Zealand English men and women use different strategies for apologizing to members of their own and the opposite sex, to



strangers, intimate friends and distant acquaintances. Fraser (1981) discusses formal variation in apology realization with reference to the formality of the situation. For example, in case of more serious offenses and in more formal settings, apologies tend to be longer and elaborate. For people who are intimate the apologies are more implicit, for example, apologies between husband and wife are frequently expressed by such forms as “oops”, “no good”, there is no expression of regret and the act in question is not even mentioned.

Fraser lists the following nine strategies for apologies.

- Strategy 1:           Announcing that you are apologizing  
                          ‘I (hereby apologize for...’
- Strategy 2:           stating one’s obligation to apologize  
                          ‘I must apologize for...’
- Strategy 3:           Offering to apologize  
                          ‘I (hereby) offer my apology for...’
- Strategy 4:           Requesting the hearer to accept an apology  
                          ‘I would appreciate it if you accept my apology for...’
- Strategy 5:           Expressing regret for the offense  
                          ‘I’m (truly /very /so /terribly sorry for...’
- Strategy 6:           Requesting forgiveness for the offense  
                          Please excuse me for...’
- Strategy 7:           Acknowledging responsibility for the offending act  
                          ‘That was my fault’
- Strategy 8:           Promising forbearance from a similar offending act  
                          ‘I promise you that that will not happen again’
- Strategy 9:           Offering redress  
                          ‘Please let me pay for the damage I’ve done’.

**(d) Data collection for this study.**

Fraser’s definition was adopted as a useful starting point in data collection. The data collectors included in their corpora examples of speech acts with different degree of expressed regret and assumed responsibility, which resulted in collecting examples of a whole range of apologies from the most to the least prototypical.

**(e) Apologies in politeness theory.**

For Brown and Levinson apologies are seen as face threatening acts which are damaging to the speakers positive face. It does happen that apologies belong to negative politeness strategies in performing acts threatening to the hearer. Deferential and non-linguistic behavior are other forms of negative politeness. More than one apology strategies can be used for an apology for a face-threatening act.

These are the list of apology strategies as excerpted from Brown and Levison's work (1987; 187-190) and it is treated as open ended.

1. *Admit the impingement.* Speakers simply admit that he is impinging on H's face with expression like ;  
"I'm sure you must be very busy, but ..."
2. *Indicate reluctance.* S can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on H with the use of hedges like :  
'I normally wouldn't ask you this, but... '
3. *Give overwhelming reason.* S can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the FTA thereby implying that normally he wouldn't dream of infringing upon H's negative face :  
"I can think of nobody else who could ..."
4. *Beg forgiveness.* S may beg H's forgiveness or at least ask for "acquittal" – that is, that H should cancel the dept implicit in the FTA :  
"I'm sorry to bother you"

An apology can be performed indirectly, or "off record: off-record apologies usual take the form of an overstatement for example:

I tried to call you a hundred times, but there was never any answer (Brown and Levinson, 1987:219)

Social distance , relative power and absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture are taken into consideration when assessing the weightiness of a face

threatening act as this will also be a crucial element in a speaker's decision whether to apologize or not.

(f) **Apology negotiation**

Many speakers will try by all means to achieve a successful apology. A person who does not apologize for an offence he / she committed she / he will be labeled as a bad person that is why a person will try by all means to negotiate for forgiveness. The negotiation of an a apology between the offender and the victim may involve several turns in which consequent manipulation of the power, social distance and ranking takes place. In apology negotiation the offender's main goal is the minimization of his / her positive face threat.

(g) **Some Polish data. Unprototypical apology**

The form of apologies collected from Polish are not always formulaic, that they often involve negotiation at the relative status and power relationship of the participants, and the assignment of the degree of imposition associated with the offending act in question. The following is an example of prototypical apology.

1. F1 bumb into F2 on crowded tram  
F2 'oh, excuse me "  
F2 'oh, never mind

The example below is an example of a less prototypical apology or negotiated apology with notably longer exchanges between participants.

2. Mother (M) and daughter (D) (age 5): the daughter is trying to reach an electric switch at the staircase (tries to be helpful) but during the process stomps on the mother's bag.  
M: Majusia, you're treading on my bag  
D: Why did you leave it here?  
M: Ok, just move it

In the example above the daughter avoids an apology by renegotiating the power dimension, blaming her mother for placing the bag in the wrong place.

3. At a stop during a train journey F1 (aged 25) leaves her seat in the compartment for a few minutes to get a drink on the platform. F2 (aged 60) takes her seat when she is gone, F1 comes back  
 F2: "I'm only [going] to Oborniki, you're a young lady, you can stand".

The old lady came with an apology strategy which was viewed as an attempt to manipulate social distance. She called the woman a young lady, which is seen as a compliment. She also expresses optimism about the outcome of the situation: "You can stand".

4. In a busy street M (c. 60) bumps heavily into F (c. 25). She turns her head and looks at him waiting for an apology.  
 M : "you should apologize to me. You're walking on the wrong side of the pavement.

M is manipulative and supports that with a claim that the woman was on the wrong side of the pavement. Here the power arrangement is reversed.

5. M walks into F's bags scattered on a shop floor. It is her fault (she should not have left her bags there).  
 M. "oh fuck!"

The example above is ambiguous. The use of the words "oh fuck!" may indicate either shifting the blame from himself to the woman, or he tries to sign his misfortune, and thus win the woman's sympathy and forgiveness for walking into her belongings.

6. M1 and M2 (room mates, both over 20) had argument about M1's failure to keep earlier promise. After a quarrel M2 goes out for a walk. When he comes back M1 produce a bottle of wine originally saved for an upcoming party.  
 M1: "united we stand, divided we fall".  
 M1 clearly manipulates distance between himself and M2 by using positive politeness strategy by giving M2 a gift (a bottle of wine)
7. M and F (both 23) share an apartment and, consequently, a refrigerator. M comes home and find out his meal has disappeared from the fridge.  
 M: "Damn it, who's eaten my cutlet? "  
 F: well, I'm afraid it was me. I'm sorry, I didn't know.

These two shares an apartment, there is no way that F didn't know it was M1's cutlet. F starts with a fairly formulaic and predictable apology but gives a false reason for committing the offending act.

(h) **Conclusion.**

Jaworski (1985) says that in this paper he has suggested that an empirically based study of speech acts cannot ignore variation in their realization with regard to both form and function. With regard to the functional variation in situations calling for apologies he proposed a dynamic view of interaction involving negotiation of apology. Applying politeness theory of the study to discursive negotiations has an added advantage of being successfully used in cross-linguistic research.

## CHAPTER 4

### APOLOGY STRATEGIES

#### 4.1 AIM

The aim of this chapter is to look at apology strategies of learners in Xitsonga education context. The speaker apologise because he accepts the need to apologise and assume the cost to do so and not making a necessary apology may occasion more serious face loss in the long run.

#### 4.2 APOLOGY STRATEGIES

##### 4.2.1 Trosborg (1995)

##### (a) The speech act of apology.

Trosborg (1995) says “Apologies are expressive illocutionary acts which can be differentiated from complaints, which are also expressive act, by being convivial in nature”. According to Trosborg, apology can be used to express regret for something that the speaker has done wrong.

Violation of social norms calls for an apology whether the offence is real or potential. There are certain effects that apologies have, for example, the effects of the paying off a dept, thus compensating the victim for the harm done by the offence. In every apology situation there are two participants: the apologizer and the recipient of the apology.

If someone do something which offend another person, and for which he / she must apologize. Apologies are usually done to set things that went wrong or right. They are done to remedy an unpleasant situation.

##### (i) The apology as a remedial act.

Owen (1983:22) says,” remedial interchanges are taken to comprise those acts concerned specifically with repairing damage to face, where face-preservation itself becomes the object of the conversation for time, however short”. According to Owen apologies and remedial acts must be done when an offense has been committed.

(ii) The apology as a face-saving act

Apologies are usually offered to express regret for having offended someone. The speaker must apologize which imply cost to him /her and support for the hearer. Apologies usually occur to restore harmony when an offense has been committed and this usually involves an element of face-saving. If a person has been hurt, inconvenienced, or violated in some way or other, his /her face must be restored and an apology is called for. If someone has committed an offense, he /she must make it clear to the offended person that he /she is sorry for what he /she has done.

In this respect, the apology involves a threat to the speaker but it is possible for the “offender” to save face by justifying or explaining the reasons for his /her failure.

**(b) Felicity conditions**

Searle (1969)'s rules of illocutionary act did not include the act of apologizing. Owen (1982:117-122) has constructed the set of rules for the use of appropriate illocutionary force indicating device (IFID) as follows:

## Preparatory

- Rule (1): The act A specified in the propositional content is an offence against the addressee H.
- Rule (2): H would have preferred S's not doing A and S believes H would have preferred S's not doing A too.
- Rule (3): A does not benefit H and S believes A does benefit H.
- Sincerity rule: S regrets (is sorry for) having done A
- Essential rule: Counts as an expression of regret by S for having done A

With regard to the preparatory rule, Owen emphasizes the necessity of having a rule that indicates that one does not apologize for acts that are not (interpretable as) offenses. Norrick (1978:280) described the social functions of apologies as follows:

- Admitting responsibility for a state which affected someone in an adverse way (thereby implicating contribution)
- Asking to be forgiven
- Showing good manners
- Assuaging the addressee's wrath

- Getting off the hook

According to Norrick in an apology more is at stake than expressing regret “a speaker usually apologizes, expresses regret, to some end” and apologies are made in the hope of being forgiven or in the hope that the addressee will dismiss the matter.

### **(c) Apology strategies**

The restoration of complainable may be performed directly by means of an explicit apology utilizing one of the verbs directly signaling apology (apologize, be sorry, excuse etc) or it can be done indirectly by taking on responsibility or giving. Sometimes the potential apologizer may choose to deny responsibility; these strategies are categorized under cat.0, as they do not meet the criteria for apologies.

#### (i) Opting out cat.0

Complainee does not take on responsibility

Blunt refusals and evasive responses can be other forms of denying responsibility.

In denying responsibility the complainable has occurred or he /she denies that he /she can be held responsible either by justifying his /her behavior or by blaming someone else or attacking the complainer.

#### (ii) Evasive strategies – cat. I

##### 1. Minimizing the degree of offence

The complainee does not deny responsibility instead, he /she seeks to minimize the degree of offence, either by arguing that the offence is of minor importance. The following three sub-strategies apply:

- 1.1 Minimizing e.g. oh what does that matter, that’s nothing
- 1.2 Querying preconditions: e.g. well, everybody does that, what is love then? (in response to the complainable ‘you don’t love me’)
- 1.3 Blaming someone else: the offense committed by the complainee can be partly excused by an offense committed by a third party.



### (iii) Indirect apologies

#### iii.1 Acknowledgment of responsibility – cat. II

A person may choose to apologize implicitly or explicitly and with varying degrees of self-blame. This is supported by the categories outlined below:

- 2.1 Implicit acknowledgment: e.g. I can see your point perhaps I shouldn't have done it.
- 2.2 Explicit acknowledgment: e.g. I'll admit I forgot to do it.
- 2.3 Expression of lack of intent: e.g. I didn't mean to.
- 2.4 Expression of self-deficiency: e.g. I was confused you know I am bad at...
- 2.5 Expression of embarrassment: e.g. I feel so bad about it.
- 2.6 Explicit acceptance of blame: e.g. it was entirely my fault, you're right to blame me.

#### iii.2 Explanation or account- cat. III

A complainees may try and make her guilt less severe by giving an explanation or account of the situation. Indirect apologies are sometimes used for various kinds of mitigating circumstances; they may be put forward on their own or in addition to a direct expression of apology. There is a distinction between an implicit and an explicit explanation or account:

- 3.1 Implicit explanation: e.g. such things are bound to happen, you know.
- 3.2 Explicit explanation: e.g. sorry I'm late, but my car broke down.

When we look at 3.1 and 3.2 the speaker acknowledges responsibility. In an explanation or account, a complainees admits that something wrong has been done and comes with an excuse for his /her behavior which lessens the blame.

### **(d) Direct apologies**

#### d.1 Expression of apology-cat. IV

An apologizer has a choice to express his /her apology explicitly. Apology can be expressed using a small number of verbs like apologize and sorry. First person singular subject is often used as the explicit performative e.g. 'I apologize'. This

sentence is also in the present indicative active 'I apologize' can also be equally expressed by the utterance 'I am sorry'.

According to Searle (1969), the IFID for the act of apologizing is also taken to be the verb apologize, rather than expressions involving the word sorry. Expression of regret, requests for forgiveness and so on is regarded as indirect and historical evidence warns us against setting apologies as illocutionary act. The following examples exemplify the semantic content of an expression of regret, an offer of apology or a request for forgiveness:

- 4.1 Expression of regret: e.g. sorry about that
- 4.2 Offer of apology: e.g. I apologize for the inconvenience involved.
- 4.3 Request for forgiveness: e.g. Excuse me, please, forgive me, pardon me
  - 1) Please forgive me, I'm terribly sorry about what I said
  - 2) Excuse me, I'm sorry for interrupting you but I need your help
  - 3) Pardon me, I didn't hear what you said

#### **(e) Remedial support**

Owen (1983) says: "apologies occur frequently as social routines which may. If the sincerity rule is that the speaker feels regret for a committed act, many of the apologies made in everyday conversation must be classed as "insincere" in the strict sense of the word". Verbal expression of concern or promises with regard to future behavior and remedy of the offense can be offered as an additional support.

##### e.1 Expressing concern for hearer

In order to make peace or calm the complainer, the complainees may express concern for his /her well-being or his /her condition.

##### e.2 Promise of forbearance

The speaker takes responsibility of what he /she has done wrong by expressing regret by apologizing. To show that the speaker is indeed apologizing he /she is expected to behave in a consistent fashion and never to repeat the offence which was committed. The speaker may also promise to improve his /her behavior in a number of ways. The performative verb is usually used in this regard.

### e.3 Offer of repair

An apologizer may offer repair for the damage which resulted from his /her insincere acts. It does sometimes happen that it is not possible to repair the damage that has been done, in this instance the apologizer may offer some kind of “compensatory” action or “tribute” to the complainer.

Repair: e.g. I’ll pay for the cleaning

Compensation: e.g. you can borrow my dress instead

### (f) **Strategic disarmers**

Where a serious offense has been committed, the complainer may be very angry. The apologizer may try to soften the complainer’s feelings by using a “strategic disarmer”. This strategy is intended to calm the complainer’s feelings, e.g.

This is most embarrassing for me, I really never meant to park in your drive way.

The apologizer uses strategic disarmers with the hope that the complainer will accept the apology. Strategic disarmers, as part of the communicative act of apologizing differ from apologies which function as disarmers preceding other speech acts.

#### (i) Apologies as strategic disarmers

Strategic disarmers can be used typically as softeners preparing for requests, complaints and refusals, e.g.

- 1) Sorry to trouble you, but isn’t that your car parked right in front of the garage (before a request)
- 2) Excuse me, could I just get past, please? (before “territory-invasion”)
- 3) I’m terribly sorry but you seem to have taken my suitcase by mistake. (before a complaint)
- 4) I’m sorry but I’m afraid there are no more seats left for the late show (before a refusals)

We usually apologize for something that we have already done but it is also possible to apologize for future offence like the examples of the types of apology described

above. This can be justified on the grounds that it is possible for the speaker to apologize for something he /she is in course of doing, or has not yet done, provided that both speaker and hearer have good grounds to believe that it will be done.

### **(g) Internal modification**

Trosborg (1995) focused on internal modifiers which serve to mitigate the circumstances under which an offense was committed and which, consequently, lessen the blame that can be attached to the complaine. In the case of an attack, these elements play down the guilt that can be attached to the apologizer. She was also concerned with markers that serve the purpose of remediation, either by means of intensification of apology, excuse, etc or simply as verbal devices to restore harmony.

There are categories of internal modifiers which are subjected to analysis, this include down graders (minimizing the guilt) as well as upgraders (maximizing the apology). The following eight categories of internal modifiers referred to as “modality markers” are distinguished.

Categories 1 – 4 minimize the complainable and hence play down the blame that can be attached to the complaine. These strategies usually save the apologizer’s face by making him /her appear less guilty. Category 5 maximizes the apology, excuses me etc, and thus upgrades the impact of the apology on the receiver, while category 6 emphasizes the apologizer’s belief in the complainers positive attitude with regard to the proposition. Categories 7 – 8 function at the interpersonal level of discourse to restore harmony between two interlocutors:

- 1) Down toners: Adverbial sentence modifiers, such as just, simply, etc and adverbials expressing tentativeness e.g. perhaps, may be, possibly (I just left for five minutes)
- 2) Understaters: perhaps that under-represent the state of affairs denoted in the complainable, e.g. a little bit, a second, not very much etc (I went out for second only)
- 3) Hedges: adverbials by means of which the complaine avoids a precise propositional specification, e.g. kind of, sort of, somehow, etc. (somehow, it all happened very quickly, I kind of didn’t notice before it was too late)

- 4) Subjectivizers: modifiers that characterize the proposition as the speaker's personal opinion, or indicate his attitude towards the proposition, e.g. I think, I suppose, I'm afraid, in my opinion etc.
- 5) Intensifiers: adverbials intensifying part of proposition, e.g. intensifying lack of intention, an expression of regret or embarrassment. (I'm terribly sorry, I really didn't mean any harm)
- 6) Commitment upgraders: sentence modifiers expressing a special commitment towards the proposition. (I was sure /certain /positive that you wouldn't mind... /that would forgive me)
- 7) Cajolers: Gambits functioning at the interspersions level of discouraging with the function of restoring harmony between two interlocutors  
E.g you know, you see, I mean, etc.
- 8) Appealers: Discourse elements (including tags) intended to elicit a response from the complainer, appealing to his/ her understanding, etc  
E.g. okay, right, don't you think.

#### **(h) Discussion**

Cohen-olshtain (1981) says: "The strategies described above as apology strategies (cat. 1-1v with the outlined sub-strategies and the strategies) outlined as "remedial support" have been outlined as constituting the set of strategies representing the speech act of apologizing".

If a speaker doesn't take responsibility for the offence he/she has committed, it do not count as an apology but just as a minimizer of the degree of offence and this can hardly count as apologies. Acknowledgement of responsibility only indirectly serves as an apology and the status of explanation is debatable.

In the CCSARP framework, an explanation can count as an apology yet, according to native speaker reactions obtained by Wolski – Marmor – Jones (1989), reason were not acknowledged as apologies. In giving a reason no offence was acknowledged for which reason the response did not count as an apology.

According to Owen (1983) there is "no clear boundary between utterances which are apologies and those which are not", and "even accounts may on occasion get described as apologies".

Responses to apologies are not part of this investigation, but they typically involve acts of acceptance, minimizing and expressing forgiveness.

- 1) Oh, that's all rights
- 2) It wasn't your fault
- 3) Yeah, I see, I quite understand
- 4) I forgive you

#### **4.2.2 Blum-Kulka et al (1989)**

##### **(a) Apologies across languages Olshtain E**

###### **(i) Introduction**

In 1985 in the cabinet crisis in Israel, Sharon a member of the cabinet made certain statements at a public meeting which presented criticism of the government and of Pere's leadership. Prime Minister Peres and his party perceived Sharon's statements to the public as intolerable criticism and as a series of personal insults towards Peres. As such, the statement became the violation for which an apology was in order.

At first, the industry minister had no intention to apologize for what he had said, but the prime minister and his party members presented him with a document specifying the six points (made in his public address) which were considered by them as serious offences and which therefore deserved a suitable apology. The industry minister sent a first version of an apology which said "if things that I have said were interpreted as personal insults then I apologize, however, I have not changed my mind on the issues". This apology was not accepted because it was only "half an apology".

He then prepared a second version in which he agreed to clarify his position on the six points and the version was rejected. In his final version he said, "I support the government and of course I apologize for having used such strong terms in my speech". His final version was accepted. Three versions were necessary before the apology was accepted.

(ii) The speech act of apologizing

An apology is basically a speech act which is intended to provide support for the H (hearer) who was actually or potentially malaffected by violation X. When the speaker takes a decision to make an apology, the speaker is willing to humiliate himself /herself to some extent and to admit to fault and responsibility for X. In Brown and Levinson's (1978) terms, the act of apologizing is face-saving for the hearer and face-threatening for the speaker. According to Leech (1983) "tact maxim", apology is a convivial speech act whose goal coincides with the social goal of maintaining harmony between speaker and hearer. In the example given above it seems clear that, at first, the industry minister attempted to avoid cost to himself by trying to evade an explicit apology, while the minister demanded full benefit of the apology since he felt that he had been injured by X. because of its political nature the apology has to be done in public and the complainees has to publish an acceptance of the apology before the conflict was settled.

The five strategies which make up the speech act set of apology (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983) consist of two which are general and three which are situations specific. The general strategies are: the IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device) which contains the formulaic, routinized forms of apology and the expression of the speaker's responsibility, which relates to the S's willingness to admit fault. Potentially, the IFID and/or the expression of S's responsibility could realize an apologies situations the IFID contains the explicit, performative verbs which express apology. The other three strategies, the explanation, the offer of repair, and the promise of forbearance, are situation-specific and will semantically reflect the content of the situation.

External modification can take the form of added concern for the hearer which intensifies the apology or a statement, minimizing either offence or the harm it may have caused, thus downgrading the apology. If, for instance, after insulting someone, we say something like: "I am sorry, but you really shouldn't get insulted by such remarks". We have downgrading the apology and raise the question whether an apology was even necessary. Sharon had downgraded his early apologies by querying the seriousness of the violation (minimizing the offence) and by demanding similar apologies addressed to him.

In studying apologies, a major research question relates to the factors which affects S's decision to choose anyone realization of the act over the others in the potential set of such realizations. Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) suggest the notion socio-pragmatic set in order to encompass the social and contextual factors which might affect S's choice. The social factors includes parameters such as social power (status), social distance, sex and age. The contextual factors include situational features which carry pragmatic significance since they affect realization choices.

There is good reason to believe that the social factors work in the similar way across speech acts in any particular culture or sub culture.

### (iii) The study

Focus is made on the similarities and differences of the realization of the patterns of apologies cross – linguistically, relative to the same social and pragmatic constraints. Seven apology situations presented in the disclosure-completion questionnaire were analyzed in four different languages: Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and Germany.

A number of hypotheses underlie the study presented here:

1. The two general apology strategies, IFID and expression of responsibility, will materialize, to varying degrees in all situations and in all languages.
2. Languages make use of full range of apology strategies, yet the distribution of specific strategies varies across situations.
3. Preferences of IFID's and expression of responsibility are related to social distance, social power and severity of offence.
4. Apology intensification is related to social distance, social power, and severity of offence.
5. Languages differ significantly in strategy preferences according to situations.

An analysis of apologies in Hebrew was discussed. One hundred and seventy-three respondents answered the discourse completion questionnaire in Hebrew. The situations were presented to comparable group of 30 native speakers (not included in the group respondents) who evaluated each of the factors on a scale.



1. Social distance on scale of 1 to 3 (1 = strangers, 2 = acquaintances, 3 = friends)
2. Social power on scale of 1 to 3 (1 = lower than H, 2 = S and H are equals, 3 = S higher than H)
3. Severity of offence on scale of 1 to 2 (1 = low, 2 = high)
4. Obligation of the S to apologize on a scale of 1 to 2 (1 = low, 2 = high)

In table 1 severity and obligation follow almost exactly the same pattern. As a result, perceived severity of offence as the representative contextual factor in the socio-pragmatic set of the apology was chosen.

From table 2 two general strategies, the IFID and the expression of responsibility, appear in all situations, confirming hypothesis 1 (for Hebrew). There are, however, considerable variations in the level preference according to situations.

While for situation 6 (the personnel director who is late for an appointment with an applicant) 81% of the candidates found IFID a suitable strategy, for situation 2 (a university professor who has not corrected a student's paper) only 38% chose to use an IFID. The expression of IFID stipulates the S's recognition that some norm has been violated and that the H deserves to be placated.

The second column in table 2 specifies the use of the expression of responsibility. 96% of the respondents selected such expression for situation 2 (a student forgot to return a book to the professor), only 32% chose it in situation 8 (an error in the main course served by the waiter in a restaurant). There is variety in the usage of expression of responsibility, while, in the case of the student who forgot the book, it is clearly her responsibility and she is expected to recognize that, in the case of the waiter an admission to having made such an error might cost him the job.

None of the seven situations which were presented in CCSARP questionnaire in Hebrew elicited a promise of forbearance. Internal modification which adds strength to the apology occurred in the Hebrew data in situation 4 (a student forgot to return a book to the professor) 40% and only around 20% in situation 8 (waiter), 10 (meetings).

Minimization of the offence, which downgrades the apology, occurred in situations 8 (waiter), 10 (meeting), 12 (driver) and 14 (insult).

### iii.1 Social factors and strategy selection

The findings with respect to social distance in Hebrew did not indicate significant statistical relations with any of the strategies or modifications in apology. Hebrew speakers tend to prefer IFIDs with strangers rather than with closer friends or acquaintances, e.g.

1. ANI MICTAER AL HAIXUR  
I'm sorry for (being) late...
2. ANI MITNACEL AL HAIXUR  
I apologize for (being) late...

### iii.2 Social factors and apology modification

Intensification rises with lower status. The lower the status of the apologizer in comparison to the apologizee, the more intensification he /she will choose to use for situation 4, in which a student apologizes to her professor, the collected data indicate the highest level of intensification as the examples show:

3. ANI MEOD MICTAERET  
I am very sorry...
4. ANI NORA MICTAERET  
I'm terribly sorry...

Intensification rises with higher severity of offence. This indicates that the higher the perceived severity of offence, the more likely the Hebrew speaker is to intensify the expression of apology. Situation 12 (Driver) A drivers in a parking lot backs up into the hearer's car.

E.g. 5. ANI MAMASH MICTAER

I'm truly sorry

6. BE' EMET SLXA ...

Really forgiveness...

From the data presented above we can see how the social and contextual factors, included in the social-pragmatic set, relate to the speaker's, choice of strategies and modifications to these strategies. These relations differ from culture to culture. The following responses from Australian English for situation 4 (Book) are examples of IFID usage:

7. I am very sorry, I forgot to bring it.
8. I am so sorry but I forgot to bring it with me.

We established earlier that in Hebrew the use of IFID is related to social distance. We don't have similar information about the relation which holds between socio-pragmatic factors and the choice of strategy in other three languages seem to exhibit preferences for IFID selection in accordance with situational factors.

The use of the situation of responsibility for the four languages (English, French, German and Hebrew) was presented in the data. Similarities are greater among them than similarities in the preferences for IFID's; all four languages have a very high level of preference for expression of responsibility (95-96 %). Similarly situation 2 (seminar paper) and 6 (Manager) show high agreement, with high preference for the use of this strategy in all four languages.

When a speaker chooses to use an IFID in order to realize the speech act of apology, he /she implicitly takes on responsibility for the violation, especially if the speaker's perspective is expressed, e.g., "I'm sorry or "I apologizer" or "Forgive me". It is noted that the contextual features of a situation play a significant role in the choice of strategies, especially in the choice of expression of responsibility.

#### **(iv) Conclusion**

From the four languages investigated they show surprising similarities in IFID and expression of responsibility preferences across seven situations. Looking at the findings, the strength of the speech act set as a unit of apology analysis at the universal level has proved to be very useful. The findings of this study seem to reinforce the notion that, at a global level of analysis, we can identify universal manifestations of strategy selection.

In other words, we have good reason to expect that, given the same social factors, the same contextual features, and the same level of offence, the different languages will realize apologies in very similar ways.

**(b) Studying Requests and Apologies. Rintel and Mitchell.**

(i) Introduction

Each and every culture has its own ways of communicating. These differences in language use sometimes cause misunderstandings and offences. The cross cultural speech act Realization Project was formed to provide a way in which the linguistic realizations of speech acts of requesting and apologizing could be compared across languages and cultures and examined within a given language, and to look at the production of these speech acts by learners of a number of languages. There are some possibilities which come to mind when we think of factors that influence interlanguage strategies, and they are:

- the strategies taught explicitly in language classes
- the variety of strategies observed in the target of language environment.
- native language strategies and, native culture estimations of the requirements of a given social situation.
- some aspects of the language development process independent of L1 knowledge of L2 input.

The CCSARP project collect data using the completion of written questionnaire, to get the linguistic strategies available to speaker's to perform requests and apologies. This method is best at eliciting data and effectively controls the contextual variables important to this study. This method has been effective for the comparison of strategies from different languages, and for the comparison of strategies used by the native speaker and learners of the same language. The only problem is that the subject is bound to write in the space provided even if he / she have more things to write down. Writing is perceived as a more formal activity than speaking and the subject thus choose to write more formal language on the questionnaire.

(ii) Method

## b.1 Data Elicitation.

In the case of data elicitation, the original American version of the CCSARP completion test was modified. The line of dialogue that comes immediately after the blank line for the subject's response was eliminated. The situation was changed as in the following:

Original question:

Jack missed a class the day before, and would like to borrow Judith's notes

Jack: .....

Judith: sure, but let me have them back before class next week.

Revised question:

Jack, a student, was sick and missed one of the classes of the course he is enrolled in. He would like to borrow another student's notes

The other student's name is Judith. Imagine you are Jack. What do you say to get Judith to lend you her notes for the class you missed?

When we look at the example given above subjects are not asked to respond as they would in a given situation, but as they believe the character supplied in the situation would. Subjects are asked to take a variety of roles. A space about 3 1/3 inches long is left for the written response on the page.

## b.2. Subjects.

The study was carried out in two parts. Firstly, data was collected from learners who were doing English as a second language only. There were university students at a low advanced level and their native languages varied. There were thirty-four non-native speaker's who participated in the study . Sixteen responded to the written questionnaire and 18 participated in the role play.

For the second part data was collected from native English speaking subjects. Thirty-seven native speakers participated in the study. Written data was collected from 23 of these subjects and oral data from 14. They were all undergraduates. 13 more

learners participated in the written data and three more learners participated in the oral role plays, bringing the number of learners in the study to 29 in the written group, and 21 in the oral one.

### b.3 Data analysis.

In first part of the study, responses were analyzed in such a way as to look at their internal sequential organization. A new coding scheme was used rather than using the CCSARP scheme. In so doing, note of conversational opening was made, address terms, statements before the head acts, the linguistic form of the head act, the presence of “please”, and statements after the head act. These statements include justifications, excuses, explanations, offers to make good, to repay favors and the like. The length of the responses was also noted.

In the second part of the study the CCSARP coding scheme was adopted. All responses from all the subjects were coded according to the CCSARP format. This included a recording of the original non-native data. There was an additions of two categories. The length of each response was also noted. The number was indicated when more than one head act appeared in a response.

## (iii) Results

### iii.1 Length.

When data was collected from non-native speakers, the oral responses were longer than the written ones. The length differences never changed over all situations. The oral apologies were an average 12.7 words longer than the written ones, and the oral requests were 14.4 words longer. Requests and apologies are longer because they contain more and longer “supportive moves” as well as hesitations and recyclings.

Length does not distinguish the oral form from written utterances in the native speaker data. Both long and short utterances were found in each group.

### iii.2 Range of linguistic strategies to Request.

A range of requesting strategies were found in both written and oral data collected from non-native and native speakers. When particular situation seems to elicit a

somewhat narrower range of forms, the reduced variability is reflected in oral data as well as written, and in both native and non-native groups of subjects. Taking an example of a situation in which an individual asks her room mate to clean up the mess he left in the kitchen, the responses varied across the scales of politeness and directness, from threats to polite hints to conventional polite requests.

It is noted that, although there is enormous in the head acts chosen for this situation in each group, the forms seem to fall all along defence continuum from the highly deferential “would yous” and “could yous” and offers to clean the kitchen together, to less deferential imperatives “you have tos” and even threats.

The request forms were distributed as categorized by the CCSARP coding scheme for each of the five situations. In the three of request situations, ride, borrow note, and lecturer, the similarity of request strategy type between oral and written data is extremely clear.

### iii.3 Strategies to Apologize

Using the CCSARP coding scheme substantiated the conclusion drawn from our earlier analysis of non-native written and oral data. In apologies, the head act are extremely uniform, with the reutilized “I’m (very, really) sorry” appearing in the majority of cases. “ I’m sorry “, across all apology situations is 68 % in non-native written data, 64,2 % in the non-native oral data, 66,8 % in the native written data and 67,5 % in the native oral data. In two situations, significant differences do emerge between the written and oral modalities of the non-native speakers only.

### (iv) Discussion.

This research was carried in order to compare the requests and apologies collected by means of the CCSARP discourse completion test to parallel data collected in oral role plays. The methodology used to elicit the pragmatic data from both native speakers and learners of English was described, and result were given with respect to the length of utterance and the range of strategies to request and apologize

#### iv.1 Length of utterance

The length of responses between oral and written data collected from nonnative subject was considerably different. Overall responses were on average, 12, 9 words longer than written responses. In contrast, there was only a minimal length difference between oral and written data collected from native speakers. In this case, oral responses were, on average, 1, 85 % words longer than the written responses. Amongst the non-native speakers the length difference between oral and written responses was consistent.

However, the length difference observed between written and oral responses in our non-native data was not replicated in the native speaker data. Requests are said to be having longer supportive moves as well as hesitations and restatements.

#### iv.2 Strategies to requests.

The CCSARP coding method provides a way to organize the broad range of strategies into more specific categories. In three of the request situations, four great similarities in the distribution of type of strategy in the oral and written data from both native speakers and non-native speakers were found.

The request strategy types (1-9), represent decreasing level of directness, with 01, the imperative form, the most direct and 09, mild hint, the least direct. The scale also represents increasing level of politeness. In situations where the requester asks, not for a favor, but that an obligation be fulfilled, direct language seems appropriate. Social interaction involved in the face-to-face role play apparently motivates the subjects to use less-direct, and therefore more-polite, language, even though, when presented with the hypothetical situation on paper, other subjects indicate the more direct language is appropriate.

#### iv.3 Strategies to Apologize.

Few differences were observed between oral and written data in the strategies chosen by subject to apologize. Apologies are usually done on a daily basis when offences have been committed, and, even when differences do emerge, it would be difficult to interpret patterns in the use of "I'm sorry" as opposed to "excuse me".



These phrases simply do not carry the pragmatic differences perceived in, for example “would you mind moving your car” and “move your car”.

When we look at these examples the subject express responsibility for the offending act. And these responsibilities are either implicit or explicit.

## **(v) Conclusions**

The investigation of oral language as a written data collection instrument was found to be skeptical by many researchers. Though there were known distinction between spoken and written language, language elicited in this study was seen to be similar whether collected in written or oral form. In both methods subjects are given certain situations which they are expected to role play. In both situations presentation of spoken language will be elicited.

The response was affected by two ways of data elicitation. First; the non-native oral data was far longer than the data elicited in the discourse in frequency of use of direct request strategy forms between oral and written data, for both native speakers and non-native, in two situations.

The results show that the differences that are there between the two methodologies are not apparent. In the comparison made in this study, in one case the differences emerged as interactions between method and variable (learner) in one case, and between method and situational variable (obligation vs. favor) in another case.

C The CCSARP coding manual.

### **(a) Constructing a discourse completion test.**

A discourse completion test was used to elicit data in CCSARP. When people communicate, speech acts are being performed, the test were designed to elicit the realization of specific speech acts, in each item a brief description of what was going on is given and a dialogue of the situation written down and from which one has been omitted. It was the duty of the respondents to fill in the missing turn and this called for the providing of the speech act aimed at. There are things which must be taken into consideration of such tests, like:

1. Contextualization of speech act to be elicited.
2. Manipulation of external and internal contextual features.
3. Cultural transpositions.

(i) Contextualization of the speech Act.

Before a dialogue takes place, the relationship between the two participants is clearly defined and the setting in which they are. The context for the realization of the speech act is provided. The type of speech act to be elicited determines the nature of the description, such that, in the case of request, for example such that, in the case of request, for example it will contain the need for request, and in the case of an apology, the specification of the offence committed. Two people are involved in the dialogue, A and B. If the dialogue concerns apology, the first move (A's) is used to contextually signal left blank for B's reaction, and the third turn specifies A's reaction. In both cases the dialogue serves to complete the interaction and to contextually delimit the speech act aimed at

#### EXAMPLE:

1. promise of reward: A reward may be promised on fulfillment of the request and this might increase the likelihood of the learner's compliance with the speaker's request.  
"Could you give me a lift home? I'll pitch in on some gas"
2. Imposition minimizer. The speaker tries to reduce the imposition place on the hearer by his request  
"Would you give me a lift, but only if you're going my way".
3. Aggravating supportive moves:
4. Insult. The speaker uses insult to increase the impositive force of his or her request.  
"You've always been a dirty pig, so clean up!"
5. Threat. The speaker uses threats to threaten the hearer with potential consequences if there is non-compliance to his / her request.  
"Move that car if you don't want a ticket!"

6. Moralizing. In order to lend additional credence to his or her request, a speaker invokes general moral maxims.

“If one share a flat one should be prepared to pull one’s weight in cleaning it, so get on with the washing up!”

(ii) Mode

In the category of mode, an attempt is made to take irony and related phenomena into account. There are two values obtained on this dimension of analysis.

ii.1 Neutral

“Excuse me, could you give me a lift home? ”

ii.2 Marked

“Could I humbly beg to scrounge a lift home?”

ii.3 Type of modal.

In many languages modal verbs feature significantly in requestive behavior in many languages. Modals are syntactic class of verb forms. In English, **will** and **would** are classified as modal verbs.

(iii) Apologies

iii.1 Segmentation

Any one or combination of the following strategies can perform apologies:

- . Illocutionary force Indicating Device (IFID)
- . Taking on Responsibility
- . Explanation or Account
- . Offer of Repair
- . Promise of Forbearance.

In the following example, all five strategies are used in the sequence given above:

Example

## IFID RESPONSIBILITY EXPLANATION

I'm sorry I missed the bus, there was traffic jam.

## REPAIR FORBEARANCE

Let's make another appointment. I'll make sure I'm here on time

### 4.2.1.3 Coding categories

#### c Alerters

##### 1. Illocutionary force indicating (IFIDs)

The speaker's apology is made explicit in a formulaic, reutilized expression. Expressions like sorry, excuse me, I apologize, Forgive me, Pardon me, I apologize, I'm afraid are usually noticed.

##### 2. Intensifiers of the apology

#### **(b) IFID internal:**

- (i) Intensifying adverbials of apology are I'm very /terribly /so /really /awfully sorry.
- (ii) Emotional expressions of apology are oh /oh no /oh Lord /God.
- (iii) Expressions marked for register  
"I do apologize"
- (iv) Double intensifier or repetition of intensifying and adverbial. "I'm really dreadfully sorry /I'm very, very sorry"
- (v) Please  
"Please forgive me"
- (vi) Other: concern for the hearer  
"I hope I didn't upset you"

#### **(c) Taking on responsibility**

- (i) Explicit self-blame. The speaker explicitly admits that he /she is guilty. "my mistake"
- (ii) Lack of intent. The speaker explicitly states that he /she had not intended to hurt the hearer through his/her offence. "I didn't mean to upset you"

- (iii) Justify hearer. The speaker tells the hearer that he /she fully understand the latter's reaction to the offence inflicted upon him/her. "you're right to be angry"
- (iv) Admission of facts but not responsibility. The speaker admits the guilt but denies taking responsibility. "I haven't read it, I missed the bus"
- (v) Refusal to acknowledge guilt. The speaker completely rejects responsibility of the offence.

Denial of responsibility

"It was not my fault"

Blame the hearer

"It is your own fault"

Pretend to be offended.

"I'm the one to be offended!"

- (d) **Explanation or account.** The speaker gives an explanation for the violation at hand. "The traffic was terrible, that is why I was late"
- (e) **Offer of repair.** The speaker offer to repair the damage that he /she has caused. "I'll pay for the damage/ I'll go and enquire in the kitchen"
- (f) **Promise of forbearance.** The speaker promises that he /she will not violate the norms again. "this won't happen again"

(g) **Distracting from the offence (downgrading).**

Query precondition. The speaker attempts to throw doubt on the modalities of a previous arrangement which he /she broke. "Are you sure you were supposed to meet at 10"

Acts innocently

"Am I late?"

Future /task-orientated remark

"Let's go to work then"

Humor. It is used as a strategy to pacify the hearer. "If you think that's a mistake, you ought to see our fried chicken!" (Spoken by a waiter after a wrong dish)

Appeaser. Appeasers are not directly connected with the speaker's offence. "I'll buy you a cup of coffee". (Spoken after a speaker had kept hearer waiting for him)

#### **4.2.3 Fraser (1979) on apologizing.**

##### **(a) Abstract**

Fraser (1979) says: "apologies are viewed in this paper as one type of remedial work, action taking to change what might be seen as an offensive act into an acceptable one".

In our day to day encounters, we intend to offend each other by violating certain social norms: e.g. belching at a dinner table. Sometimes offences occur because we fail to fulfill a personal expectation held the offended individual. If for example a husband forgot his wife's birthday, the husband may realize that he has offended his wife and try to remedy the situation. Goffman (1971) says this about remedial work.

"...to change the meaning that otherwise might be given to an act, transforming what could be seen as offensive into what can be seen acceptable. This change seems to be accomplished, in our western society at least, by striking in some way at the moral responsibility otherwise imputed to the offender"

According to Goffman remediation is accomplished by three main devices: accounts, requests and apologies.

The offender sometimes transfers the responsibility of the offence to another part or source. It includes strategies for providing accounts that the acts didn't really occur and usually push the blame to something else like drunkenness or passion.

Requests include instances in which a potential offender is asking license of potentially offended person to engage himself or herself in what is seen as a violation of his rights. The request in such a case is indicating that he is fully aware of the potentially offensiveness of the proposed action, but is beginning sufferance, thereby exposing himself to rejection.

For an example, saying “excuse me” before passing someone. This means that the request is being made in advance.

In apology the offender is working after the offensive action, similar to an account though unlike a request, but with the added features not shared by an account that the offender is expressing regret for the undesirable effect of the act upon the offended party.

### **(b) An apology**

Austin (1962) says that an apology is incontestably a type of illocutionary act, a type of speech act that could be performed by invoking the appropriate formula under the appropriate circumstances.

Apologies can be analyzed into two different spheres: what we customarily believe to be true about the speaker who is apologizing, what must be true in order for an apology to be made. When a person apologizes, there are four things that are assumed to be true. First, it is assumed that the speaker believes that some act, A, has been performed prior to the time of speaking. Second, an assumption is made that the speaker believes that the act personally offended the hearer. Thirdly, an assumption is made that the speaker believes he was partly responsible for the offence. Finally an assumption is made that the speaker feels regret for the act committed which offended the hearers, if a person says “I apologize” for stepping on your toe, but “I’m not sorry” this type of an apology is inappropriate.

An apology may be performed just in case two basic conditions are met. First the speaker acknowledges responsibility for having performed some act, and secondly, the speaker conveys regret for the offence which comes about as a result of the commission of act. In apologizing two things are done: take responsibility for an offensive act, and express regret for the offence committed. In such an example, the use of “excuse me” can be seen as an apology; on the other hand it might be used as a request. Excuse me can be used as an apology or as an expression of regret on the part of the speaker.

### **(c) Strategies of apologizing**

The following are examples of how does one go about making an apology. The examples are written in terms of specification of the strategy.

Strategy 1: Announcing that you are apologizing “I (hereby) apologize for...”

Strategy 2: Stating one’s obligation to apologize “I must apologize for...”

Strategy 3: Offering to apologize “I hereby offer my apology for...”

Strategy 4: Requesting the hearer accept an apology “Please accept my apology for...”

Strategy 5: Expressing regret for the offence “I’m truly sorry for...”

Strategy 6: Requesting forgiveness for the offence “Forgive me for...”

Strategy 7: Acknowledging responsibility for offending act “That’s was my fault...”

Strategy 8: Promising forbearance from a similar offending act “I promise you that that will never happen again”

Strategy 9: Offering redress “Please let me pay for the damage I have done”

The first four strategies are direct; they all perform an act of apologizing the other three counts as announcing that the speaker is apologizing.

The next five strategies are much more indirect than the first four, the speaker does say that apology is the issue. In strategy five, the speaker is expressing regret. In strategy 6 and 7 the speaker is acknowledging responsibility for the offending act. When looking at strategy 8 the speaker expresses neither responsibility for having performed the act nor regret for the act committed. The last strategy the speaker offers to redeem the damage that he /she has done.

### **(d) Factors influencing the choice of the apologizing strategy**

1. The nature of the infraction: was it a social or a personal norm that was offended



2. The severity of the infraction. How severe is the offence regarding the range of social violations.
3. The situation in which the infraction occurred. Was it formally, like interrupting the president while speaking, or intimate, stepping on the spouse's toes in the shower?
4. Familiarity between the interactants, familiarity ranges from two people who have never encountered one another previously to those who share the same home.
5. The sex of the apologizer. Do men or women apologize more? Women were not found to be offering more apologies than men. In the situation recorded both men and women would sometimes apologize.

## CHAPTER 5

### APOLOGIES IN XITSONGA

#### 5.1 AIM

The aim of this chapter is to investigate how the Vatsonga people apologize in an educational context. To get a thorough outlook on this, three questions will be answered.

- Which are the apology strategies used by the students?
- Which are the apology situations used?
- Do apology differ according to the offence committed?

#### 5.2 APOLOGY SITUATIONS

We have five major apology situations. These are the situations which proved workable and appeared to account to all of the instances in the data:

Inconvenience, space, talk, time and possessions. I've also observed that all the situations are applicable to learners in grade 10. Each major situation have its sub situations.

##### 5.2.1 Inconvenience

Inconvenience can be described as relating to actions which have inconvenienced the addressee in some way. This includes instances where the apologizer had not performed adequately in a particular context or had provided inadequate service and so had inconvenienced the addressee.

There are four sub sections which are very relevant to grade 10 learners i.e. wrong information, inadequate services, forgetting to convey the message and forgetting your responsibility. These sub situations proved to be very common amongst the learners and they either acknowledge responsibility or denied responsibility and attacked the complainer.

### **5.2.2 Space**

Space involves infringements on another's personal space which are occasionally apologies. Examples include walking too close or in front of another person, bumping into them, and taking their seat or desk space. These offences sometimes threaten the addressee's negative face by impeding her freedom of movement. There are four sub situations which are commonly used by learners at school i.e. accident which occur when you bump into someone, seat, queue and obstructing someone's way.

### **5.2.3 Talk**

The offence involves some kind of intrusion on the addressee's talking or talking turn or another infringement of the rules for polite talk.

The most frequent examples which were also used by learners relate to an interruption, but others include verbal insults, the introduction of an inappropriate topic, a slip of the tongue, not hearing someone, and offences such as talking too loud or too long. The examples given are the sub situations of talk, four of them were used when collecting data i.e. insult, phone, noise and inappropriate service.

### **5.2.4 Time**

This situation involves one person wasting another person's time or in some way not taking appropriate account of the value of another's time. Where the apologizer has kept the addressee waiting, or has forgotten or arrived late for an appointment, the infringement involves an imposition on the addressee's time. Negative face is threatened by impeding the addressee's freedom of action in most cases. The sub situations all involve offences related to time i.e. forgetting, handing of an assignment, late arrival, late transport.

### **5.2.5 Possession**

The fifth situation involved some damage or loss to the addressee's possessions, including money. Offences in this category involve damage or removal of something which belonged to the addressee, or they directly cost the addressee money.

Offenses such as bumping into someone’s car, spilling something on their clothes, damaging their pen, breaking their washing machine, failing to pay bill on time, or losing a book all come into this category. The sub situations which were used by the learners are; money, clothes, class notes and pen.

**5.3 QUESTIONNAIRE**

**5.3.1 Copy of the questionnaire**

**1. KU KU HUMESA EKA MATIRHELO  
INCONVINIENCE**

**1.1. Mahungu mo ka ma nga ri wona  
Wrong information**

Munghana wa wena u ku byela leswaku nkarhi wo tsala xikambelwana exikolweni iRavumune. Loko u fika exikolweni hi Ravumune, u kuma leswaku munghana wa wewa u ku fikisele mahungu mo ka ma nga ri wona, xikambelwana xi tsariwile khale hi Musumbunuku.

*Your friend told you that the time for the test at school is on Thursday. When you arrived at school on Thursday, you found that your friend has given you wrong information and the test has already been written on Monday.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso  
Offence**

**U vilela eka munghana wa wena hi ta mahungu lama mo ka ma nga ri wona.  
You complain to your friend about this wrong information.**

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa  
Apology**

**Munghana wa wena u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a ku khunguvanyisile  
Your friend apologizes for this offence**

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

**1.2. Ntirho wo ka wu nga hetisekangi  
Inadequate service**

Munghana wa wena u ku tshembise leswaku u ta ta hi Ravunthlanu a ta ku pfuna hi projeke leyi u nga ku yi endleni. Ravunthlanu ri fike ri thlela ri hundza munghana wa wena a nga vonakangi.

*Your friend has promised you that he will come and help you with the project you are busy with on Friday. Friday came and passed but he didn't come.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**U vilela eka munghana wa wena ku va a nga ku pfunangi.**  
***You complain to your friend for not helping you***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
***Apology***

**Munghana wa wena u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a ku khunguvanyisile.**  
***Your friend apologizes for this offence.***

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

**1.3. Ku rivala ku hundzisa mahungu**  
***Forgetting to convey the message.***

**A wu vabya leswi swi nga endla leswaku u tsandzeka ku ya exikolweni. U nyikile munghana wa wena mahungu ya ku vabya ka wena leswaku a ta kota ku byela mudyondzisi. A nga kalanga a n'wi byela mudyondzisi leswi nga endla leswaku u hundziwa hi xikambelwana.**

***You were sick that you couldn't go to school. You had given the message of illness to your friend so that he could tell the class teacher about this. He never told the class teacher and you even missed a test.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**U vilela eka munghana wa wena ku va a nga byelangi mudyondzisi.**  
***You complain to your friend for not telling the teacher.***

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

**1.4. Ku rivala vutihlamuleri**  
***Forgetting your responsibility***

**Hi wena mulanguteri wa kamara yo dyondzela naswona hi wena u pfalaka mafasitere no khiya rivanti loko xikolo xi huma. U khiya rivanti u nga pfalangi mafasitere. Khamba ri nghena hi fasitere ri teka ntirho wa mavoko wa un'wana kwala kamareni, mudyondzisi a nga si nyika timakisi leswi nga endla leswaku n'wana loyi a fanele ku endla ntirho wun'wana.**

*You are the class monitor and you are responsible for closing the windows and locking the door after school. You locked the door without closing the windows. A thief got through the window and stole another learner's piece of art work which was not yet assessed, which made the educator to tell the learner to redo the work.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**U vilela eka mulanguteri wa kamara ro dyondzela ku va a rivele vutihlamuleri bya yena.**

*You complain to the class monitor for forgetting his responsibility.*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa.**  
**Apology**

**Mulanguteri wa kamara yo dyondzela u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a ku khunguvanyisile.**

*The class monitor apologizes for this offence.*

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

**2. NDHAWU**  
**SPACE**

**2.1. Nghozi**  
**Accident**

**A wu ri ku tsutsumeni leswaku u ta nghena hi nkarhi ekamareni ro dyondzela hikuva nsimbhi se a yi bile. Swi nga languteriwanga u tlumbane na wun'wana mudyondzi loyi anga wela ehansi a tivavisa.**

*You were running so that you could get into class as the bell had already rung. Unfortunately you bumped into another learner who fell down and hurt her/himself.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**Mudyondzi wa vilela ku va a wile a tivavisa**

*The learner complains of falling and getting hurt.*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

**U kombela ku khomeriwa eka ku khunguvanyisa loku.**  
***You apologize for such an offence***

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

**2.2. Xitshamo**  
**Seat**

**Xitshamo xa wena xi biwe hi mumu kutani u twa u nga tshamiseki kahle eka xona. U teka goza ro teka desika ra un'wana mudyondzi loyi a nga ri kona ekamareni ro dyonzela hi nkarhi walowo. Sweswi u vuyile.**

***Your seat was struck by the sun and you couldn't feel comfortable on it. You decide to take another learner's desk that was not in the class by then. Now he is back.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**Mudyondzi u vilela hi ku tekiwa ka desika ra yena.**  
***The learner complains for his/her desk being taken.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

**U kombela ku khomeriwa eka xikhunguvanyiso lexi nga endliwa.**  
***You apologize for the offence committed.***

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

**2.3. Ku fola layini**  
**Queue**

**A wu jahile ku ri nkarhi wo wisa naswona a wu lava ku xava xinkwa. U nghene endzeni ka vhengele u xava xinkwa. U nghena endzeni ka vhengele u xava xinkwa u nga swi vonangi leswaku a ku ri na un'wana modyondzi emahlweni ka wena.**

***You were in a hurry, it was break time and you wanted to buy bread. You got to the shop and bought the bread without having seen that there was another learner in front of you.***

**Xikhungavanyiso**  
**Offence**

**Mudyondzi u komba ku vilela ku va a tluriwile elayinini.**  
***The learner complains for being jumped in a queue.***

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
*Apology*

**U kombela ku khomeriwa eka ku khunguvanyisa loku.**  
*You apologize for upsetting him/her.*

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

**2.4. Ku sivela**  
***Obstruct***

**U vitaniwile ehofisini ya nhloko ya xikolo. Mudyondzi un'wana u famba hi ku nonoka endleleni yo famba ka yona a ku sivela ndlelani yo famba ka yona kutani a wu koti ku hundza.**  
*You have been called to the principal's office. Another learner is walking slowly along the corridor obstructing your way.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
***Offence***

**U hundzisa xivilelo ku va u siveriwa ndlela.**  
*You complain for being obstructed*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
***Apology***

**Mudyondzi u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a ku sivele ndlela.**  
*The learner apologizes for obstructing your way.*

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

**3. KU VULAVULA**  
***TALK***

**3.1. Ndzhukano**  
***Insult***

**Vadyondzi a va ri na nhlengeletano ya ntlawa wa vona va vulavula hi swirhalanganyo swa vona. Exikarhi ka mbulavurisano mudyondzi un'we u hlamule un'wana hi ndlela leyi a nga twa ku ri ndzhukano.**



*Learners were having a class meeting where they were discussing their problems. In the midst of the discussion, one learner answered the other in a way he felt was an insult.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**Mudyondzi u vilela hi ndlela leyi a nga hlamuriwa hi yona enhlengeletanini.**  
***The learner complains about the way he was insulted in meeting.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

**Mudyondzi loun'wana a kombela ku khomeriwa eka ndzhukano wo tano**  
***The other learner apologizes for such an insult.***

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

**3.2. Rinqingho**  
**Phone**

**A wu vulavula na munghana wa wena eka rinqingho ra mani na mani na swona a mi ri ku hambaneni hi miehleketo. Leswiswi endlile leswaku mi vulavula nkarhi wo leha leswi swi endleke leswaku vadyondzi van'wana lava a va lava ku tirhisa rinqingho va vilela.**

***You were speaking to your friend on the public telephone and you were having a disagreement. The disagreement with your friend prolonged the time spent talking on the phone. This has raised a concerned from the other students who were waiting to use the phone.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**Mudyondzi loyi a ri kusuhi na wena u vilela hi ku tirhisa ka wena riqingho ra mani na mani nkarhi wo leha.**

***A learner who was next to you in the line complains about your use of a public phone for a long time.***

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

**Ku kombela ku rivaleriwa**  
**Apology**

**U kombela ku rivaleriwa ku va u teke nkarhi wo leha.**  
***You apologise for taking such a long time.***

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

**3.3. Huwa/Pongo**  
**Noise**

A wu ri e ku hlayeni na van'wana u nga timangi rinqingho ra wena ra le nyongeni. Loko wa ha ri eku hlayeni rinqingho ri rila u boheka ku ri hlamula u hetelela u bela van'wana huwa.

*You were studying with others and your cellular phone was not switched off. While you were studying, your phone rang and you had to answer it and you ended up making noise to the other learners.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

Mudyondzi wun'wana wa vilela ku va u hlamula rinqingho va ri e ku hlayeni.  
*One learner is complaining to you for answering the phone while they were studying.*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

U kombela ku khomeriwa ku va u rivele ku tima rinqingho ra wena.  
*You apologized for forgetting to switch off your phone.*

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

**3.4. Nhloko-mhaka yo ka yi nga tshamisekangi**  
**Inappropriate topic**

Eka ntlawa wo burisana, u sungula nhlokomhaka leyi yige vamanana lava kurisaka vana va ri voxo a va lulamangi.

*In a group discussion, you raised a topic that single mothers are bad.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

Mudyondzi loyi a kurisiwaka hi manana wa yena a ri swakwe wa vilela leswaku nhlokomhaka leyi a yi tshamisekanga

*A learner who is being raised by a single mother complains that the topic is inappropriate.*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apologies**

**U kombela ku khomeriwa ku va u n'wi khunguvanyisile.**  
***You apologize for offending him/her.***

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

**4. NKARHI**  
**TIME**

**4.1. Ku rivala**  
***Forgetting***

**U twanane na munghana wa wena leswaku mi ta hlangana ekhefina hi awara ya ntlhanu na nhlekanhi. Hikwalaho ka ku tala ka ntirho wa siku, swi endle leswaku u rivala leswaku mi twanane ku hlangana. Munghana wa wena u ku yimerile a kala a lan'wa a famba.**

***You have agreed to meet your schoolmate at the café at 17H00. Because of the pressure you had that day, you totally forgot about the appointment. Your friend had to wait for you until he/she angrily went away.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**Munghana wa wena u kombisa ku vilela leswaku a wu vonakangi.**  
***Your friend complains that you did not turn up.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

**U kombela ku khomeriwa eka munghana wa wena ku va u nga xiximangi ntwanano.**

***You apologized to your friend for not honoring the appointment.***

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

**4.2. Ku heleketa asayimente**  
***Handing of an assignment***

**U kumekile u khomekile hi swin'wana kutani u kombela munghana wa wena ku ku heleketela asayimente e ka mudyondzisi. Munghana wa wena u fikile a hlwerile kutani a ya dyondza a nga rhanganga hi ku heleketa asayimente. U yi heleketile ninhlekanhi leswi-endleke leswaku mudyondzisi a tshembisa ku susa timaraka ku va yi nga tisiwangi hi nkarhi.**

**You asked your friend to submit the assignment to your teacher early in the morning because you had other commitments. Your friend arrived late at school and she/he decided to attend his/her class first. He/she submitted your assignment late in the afternoon and the teacher promised to deduct some marks for the late submission.**

**Xikhunguvanyiso  
Offence**

**U yisa xivilelo eka munghana wa wena ku va a nga yisangi asayimente ya wena hi nkarhi.**

***You complain to your friend for submitting your assignment late.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa  
Apology**

**Munghana wa wena a kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a ku khunguvanyisile.  
*Your friend apologized for an offence.***

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

**4.3. Ku ka u nga fiki hi nkarhi  
*Late arrival.***

**U twanane na munghana wa wena leswaku mi ta hlangana erivaleni ra mintlangu hi awara ya nharhu ni nhlekanhi. U boheka ku tshika leswi a wu ri ku swi endleni leswaku u ta fika hi nkarhi. Munghana wa wena a nga vonakangi hi awara ya nharhu, u te a ta fika hi awara ya mune.**

***You had agreed to meet with your friend at 15H00 at the sports ground. You were forced to leave something that you were doing so that you could be punctual. At 15H00 your friend did not turn up and she/he finally came at 16H00.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso  
Offence**

**U hundzisa xivilelo eka munghana wa wena ku va a nga fikangi hi nkarhi.  
*You complain to your friend for being late.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa  
Apology**

**Munghana wa wena u kombela ku khomeriwa ku ka a nga fikangi hi nkarhi.  
Your friend apologize for being late.**

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

**4.4. Xifambo xi nga fiki hi nkarhi  
Late transport**

**U tshembise munghana wa wena ku hundza u n’wi teka hi xikanyakanya loko mi ya exikolweni nimixo. U famba hi ndlela yin’wana u ya n’wi tsundzuka u ri ekule. U vuya u ta n’wi teka mi fika mi hlwerile hi awara hinkwayo.**

***You promised your friend to collect him/her with your bicycle when going to school in the morning. You take another route to school and forget about your friend. When you finally remembers, you came back to collect him/her only to arrive at school an hour late.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso  
Offence**

**Munghana wa wena wa vilela leswaku u endlile leswaku mi nga fiki hi nkarhi exikolweni.**

***Your friend complains that you made her/him to arrive late at school.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa  
Apology**

**U kombela ku khomeriwa eka munghana wa wena ku ka u nga fikangi hi nkarhi  
You apologize to your friend for being late**

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

**5. VUN’WINYI  
POSSESSION**

**5.1. Mali  
Money**

**Munghana wa wena u lombile R5-00 leswaku a ta xava swakudya hi nkarhi wo wisa. U tshembise ku vuyisa mali leyi vhiki ri nga si hela. Sweswi ku hidzile n’hweti a nga se vuyisa mali ya wena.**

***Your friend came to borrow R5-00 from you so that he/she could buy something to eat during break time. You gave him/her and she/he promised to pay back before the end of the week. It is now a month and she/he has not yet paid back the money.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**U le ku vileleni eka munghana wa wena ku va a nga hakelangali mali ya wena.**  
***You are complaining to your friend for not paying back the money.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

**Munghana wa wena u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a tsandzekile ku vuyisa mali ya wena.**  
***Your friend apologizes for being unable to pay back the money.***

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

**5.2. Swiambalo**  
**Clothes**

**Mi le ku dyeni ka swakudya hi nkarhi wo wisa eholweni yo dyela, un'wana wa vadyondzi loko a suka eku tekeni ka swakudya u rhetile a wela ehenhla ka wena a ku chela buruku/rhoko hi swakudya**  
***It was break and you were eating food in the dinning hall. One of the learners on his/her way from taking food slipped and his/her plate fell on you and spilled the food on your trouser.***

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
**Offence**

**U vilela eka mudyondzi leswaku buruku ya wena yi cheriwile hi swakudya.**  
***You are complaining to the learner that the food spilled on your trousers.***

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
**Apology**

**Mudyondzi loyi a kombela ku khomeriwa.**  
***The learner apologizes***

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

**5.3. Tinotsi ta le tlilasini**  
***Class notes***

Mudyondzi a xwile exikolweni siku leri hundzeke. U lombile tinotsi ta wena leswaku a ya kopa a tshembisa ku tivuyisa siku leri landzelaka kambe a nga tivuyisangi.

*One learner was not at school the previous day. He/she borrowed your note book so that he/she could copy them and promised to bring them back the following day but she couldn't.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
***Offence***

Wa vilela eka mudyondzi ku va a tsandzekile ku vuyisa tinotsi ta wena.  
*You are complaining to the learner for failing to bring the notes back.*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
***Apology***

Mudyondzi u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a tsandzekile ku vuyisa tinotsi  
*The learner apologizes for failing to bring back the notes.*

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

**5.4. Xitsalo**  
***Pen***

U lombile munghana wa wena xitsalo, u tshembisile ku ku vuyisela xona kambe u xi vuyisile xi tshovekile.

*You borrowed your friend a pen who promised to bring it back however the pen was broken when it was brought back.*

**Xikhunguvanyiso**  
***Apology***

U vilela e ka munghana wa wena leswaku u tshovile xitsalo xa wena.  
*You complain to your friend for breaking your pen.*

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

**Ku kombela ku khomeriwa**  
***Apology***

Munghana wa wena u kombela ku khomeriwa ku va a tshovile xitsalo xa wena.  
*Your friend apologizes for breaking your pen.*

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

### 5.3.2 Completion of the questionnaire

Grade 10 learners of E.P.P. Mhinga high school completed the questionnaire. Two learners were expected to complete one questionnaire, one as a complainant and the other as the one who must apologize for the offence committed.

If the complainant was a boy the apologizer had to be a boy. 80 learners completed the questionnaire, 40 boys and 40 girls. There were a lot of spoiled questionnaires and only 50 were in good condition. 26 boys and 24 girls completed the questionnaire accurately.

## 5.4 ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGIES

### 5.4.1 Apology situations and apology strategies

#### **TASK1: TOTAL NUMBER OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES**

Table 1

**TOTAL NUMBER: 1003**

|                                      | No. | %    | Male<br>No. | %    | Female<br>No. | %    |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|-------------|------|---------------|------|
| <b>1. INCONVINIENCE</b>              | 199 | 19.8 | 106         | 19.4 | 93            | 20.4 |
| 1.1 Wrong information                | 52  | 26.1 | 28          | 26.4 | 24            | 25.8 |
| 1.2 Inadequate services              | 50  | 25.1 | 26          | 24.5 | 24            | 25.8 |
| 1.3 Forgetting to convey the message | 50  | 25.1 | 26          | 24.5 | 24            | 25.8 |
| 1.4 Forgetting your responsibility   | 47  | 23.1 | 26          | 24.5 | 21            | 22.6 |
| <b>2. SPACE</b>                      | 206 | 20.5 | 114         | 20.9 | 92            | 20.1 |
| 2.1 Accident                         | 54  | 26.2 | 30          | 26.3 | 24            | 26.1 |
| 2.2 Seat                             | 49  | 23.8 | 28          | 24.6 | 21            | 22.8 |
| 2.3 Queue                            | 52  | 25.2 | 28          | 24.6 | 24            | 26.1 |
| 2.4 Obstruct                         | 51  | 24.8 | 28          | 24.6 | 24            | 26.1 |
| <b>3. TALK</b>                       | 195 | 19.4 | 103         | 18.9 | 92            | 20.1 |
| 3.1 Insult                           | 47  | 24.1 | 25          | 24.3 | 22            | 23.9 |
| 3.2 Phone                            | 50  | 24.6 | 26          | 25.2 | 24            | 26.1 |
| 3.3 Noise                            | 48  | 24.6 | 26          | 25.2 | 22            | 23.9 |
| 3.4 Inappropriate service            | 50  | 24.6 | 26          | 25.2 | 24            | 26.1 |
| <b>4. TIME</b>                       | 202 | 20.1 | 112         | 20.5 | 90            | 19.7 |
| 4.1 Forgetting                       | 48  | 23.8 | 26          | 23.2 | 22            | 24.4 |
| 4.2 Handing of an assignment         | 50  | 24.8 | 26          | 23.2 | 24            | 26.7 |
| 4.3 Late arrival                     | 48  | 23.8 | 26          | 23.2 | 24            | 22.2 |



|                      |          |      |         |      |         |      |
|----------------------|----------|------|---------|------|---------|------|
| 4.4 Late transport   | 56       | 27.7 | 32      | 28.6 | 24      | 26.7 |
| <b>5. POSSESSION</b> | 201      | 20.0 | 111     | 20.3 | 90      | 19.7 |
| 5.1 Money            | 50       | 24.9 | 30      | 27.0 | 20      | 22.2 |
| 5.2 Clothes          | 52       | 25.9 | 28      | 25.2 | 24      | 26.7 |
| 5.3 Class notes      | 50       | 24.9 | 27      | 24.3 | 23      | 25.6 |
| 5.4 Pen              | 49       | 24.4 | 26      | 23.4 | 23      | 25.6 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>         | A = 1003 |      | B = 546 | 54.4 | C = 457 | 45.6 |

In table 1 above. Various apology situations have been listed in a verbal order from situation 1 to situation 5. These situations refer to those which have been listed in the questionnaire. The numbers which appear next to these situations in a horizontal order reflect the total number of apology strategies which have been used in each situation as well as in each sub situation. E.g. situation 1 (Inconvenience) a total number of 199 strategies have been used i.e. 19,7% of the total number of strategies of these 199 strategies, 106(19,4%) have been used by males and 93(20,4%) by females.

#### 5.4.1.1 The major situations

|    | Situation     | Total | Male | Female |
|----|---------------|-------|------|--------|
| 1. | Inconvenience | 19.8  | 19.4 | 20.4   |
| 2. | Space         | 20.5  | 20.9 | 20.1   |
| 3. | Talk          | 19.4  | 18.9 | 20.1   |
| 4. | Time          | 20.1  | 20.5 | 19.7   |
| 5. | Possession    | 20.0  | 20.3 | 19.7   |

According to the table above, the apology strategies which have been used in each situation may be classified as follows:

#### A. Total number of strategies in each situation

Situation: 2, 4, 5: 20.5, 20.1, 20.0

Situation: 1, 3: 19.8, 19.4

In situations 2, 4 and 5 the learners used longer apologies with more strategies when they apologized because there were usually attacks which occurred after a direct apology, several explanations of lack of intent, an expression of self deficiency and an expression of embarrassment. This contributed to the use of more strategies.

The least strategies were used in situations 1 and 3 because no long explanations were necessary, it was just acknowledgement of responsibility for wrongdoing.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

The situation in which males used the most strategies, i.e. the longest apology may be grouped as follows:

Situation 2, 4, 5: 20.9, 20.5, 20.3

Situation 1: 19.4

Situation 3: 18.9

### **Females**

The most frequent situations in order

Situation 1, 2, 3: 20.4, 20.1, 20.1

Situation 4, 5: 19.7, 19.7

- (a) With both males and females, the most strategies have been used in situation 2. Usually apologies related to space offences elicited just a simple apology form, very few offences warranted an explanation as well, that is why this situation was used most by both males and females.
- (b) Situations 4 and 5 has the least number of strategies with females but the most number of strategies with males. Apparently offences for wasting another's time generally demanded some explanation, the same goes to offences in some damage or loss to the addressee's possessions, including money. The most strategies were used by males because males were more inclined to give explanations while females asked for more forgiveness.
- (c) Situation 3 has the least number of strategies with males. The reason for this is because males are usually not rude like females, that is why the offences bended most often to elicit simple explicit apologies.

## **C. Strategies between males and females in each major situation.**

The number of strategies, which have been used by males and females according to table 2, do not differ very much in each major situation.

Situation 1: 19.4, 20.4 = 1%

Situation 2: 20.9, 20.1 = 0.8%

Situation 3: 18.9, 20.1 = 1.2%

Situation 4: 20.5, 19.4 = 1.1%

Situation 5: 20.3, 19.7 = 0.6%

In all of the situations listed above there is no significant difference between the use of strategies in these situations between males and females.

#### **5.4.1.2 The sub situations**

##### **5.4.1.2.1 Inconvenience**

|     | Sub situation                    | Total | Male | Female |
|-----|----------------------------------|-------|------|--------|
| 1.1 | Wrong information                | 26.1  | 26.4 | 25.8   |
| 1.2 | Inadequate service               | 25.1  | 24.5 | 25.8   |
| 1.3 | Forgetting to convey the message | 25.1  | 24.5 | 25.8   |
| 1.4 | Forgetting your responsibility   | 23.6  | 24.5 | 22.6   |

#### **A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation**

Group 1: 1.1 (26.1)

Group 2: 1.2, 1.3 (25.1, 25.1)

Group 3: 1.4 (23.6)

In sub situation 1.1, longer apology strategies were used because the offence referred to social behaviour and impoliteness. The apologizer had to explain why he/she conveyed wrong information. Sub situations 1.2 and 1.3 has the second most strategies because the apologizer could not provide the correct change of required information, so the substantial proportion do attract just a simple explicit apology. Situation 1.4 has the least strategies used because there was nothing more to be said for forgetting one's responsibility than to say sorry.

#### **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

##### **Males**

Group 1: 1.1 (26.4)

Group 2: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 (24.5, 24.5, 24.5)

##### **Females**

Group 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 (25.8, 25.8, 25.8)

### Group 2: 1.4 (22.6)

1. With both males and females the most strategies have been used in sub-situation 1.1 because inconvenience by giving wrong information needs an apology and an explanation.
2. Sub-situations 1.2 and 1.3 has the most strategies used with the females but the least with the males. The reason was that females gave a lot of explanation than the males, males just gave a simple apology.
3. Situation 1.4 has the least strategies from both males and females, it is because both males and females accounted for the occurrence and no explanation was needed.

#### a. strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.

The number of strategies which have been used by males and females in each sub-situation do not differ much except in sub-situation 1.4.

Sub-situation 1.1: 26.4, 25.8 = 0.6%

Sub-situation 1.2: 24.5, 25.8 = 1.3%

Sub-situation 1.3: 24.5, 25.8 = 1.3%

Sub-situation 1.4: 24.5, 22.6 = 1.9%

In three of the sub-situations listed above there is no significant difference between the use of strategies between males and females. There is a significant difference in strategies used in sub-situation 1.4. The reason because males gave a lot of explanation for the offence committed.

#### 5.4.1.2.2 Space

|     | Sub-situation | Total | Male | Female |
|-----|---------------|-------|------|--------|
| 2.1 | Accident      | 20.5  | 20.9 | 20.1   |
| 2.2 | Seat          | 23.8  | 24.6 | 22.8   |
| 2.3 | Queue         | 25.2  | 24.6 | 26.1   |
| 2.4 | Obstruct      | 24.8  | 24.6 | 25     |

#### A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation

Group 1: 2.3, 2.4 (25.2, 24.8)

Group 2: 2.2 (23.8)

Group 3: 2.1 (20.5)

In sub-situations 2.3 and 2.4 longer apology strategies were used because walking in front of another person or jumping them in a queue is a serious offence which warranted an explanation. Sub-situation 2.2 has the second most strategies because taking another person's seat needed an explanation. Situation 2.1 has the least strategies used because bumping into someone elicited just a simple apology.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females.**

### **Males**

Group 1: 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 (24.6, 24.6, 24.6)

Group 2: 2.1 (20.9)

### **Females**

Group 1: 2.3, 2.4, (26.1, 25)

Group 2: 2.2 (22.8)

Group 3: 2.1 (20.1)

- (a) With both males and females, the most strategies have been used in sub-situations 2.3 and 2.4 because offences related to queue and obstruction need a thorough explanation.
- (b) Males also used the most strategies in sub-situation 2.2 because males usually give an explanation for the offence they committed.
- (c) Females used the second most strategies in 2.2 because they also gave an explanation for the offence they committed.
- (d) Both males and females used the least strategies in sub-sections. This is because they both felt not to make long explanations but to say a simple sorry.

## **C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.**

The number of strategies, which have been used by males and females in each sub-situation, do not differ much.

Sub-situation 2.1 : 20.9, 20.1 = 0.8%

Sub-situation 2.2 : 24.6, 22.8 = 1.8%

Sub-situation 2.3 : 24.6, 26.1 = 1.5%

Sub-situation 2.4 : 24.6, 25 = 0.4%

There is no significant difference between the strategies used by both males and females. This is because both males and females elaborated the apology with an inclusion of an explanation.

#### 5.4.1.2.3 Talk

|     | Sub-situation         | Total | Males | Females |
|-----|-----------------------|-------|-------|---------|
| 3.1 | Insult                | 24.1  | 24.3  | 23.9    |
| 3.2 | Phone                 | 25.6  | 25.2  | 26.1    |
| 3.3 | Noise                 | 24.6  | 25.2  | 23.9    |
| 3.4 | Inappropriate service | 24.6  | 25.2  | 26.1    |

#### A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation.

Group 1 : 3.2 (25.6)

Group 2 : 3.3, 3.4, 3.1 (24.6, 24.6, 24.1)

In sub-situation 3.2, longer apology strategies were used because a person had to explain or justify why he/she had to be so long in a public phone. For sub-situations 3.3, 3.4 and 3.1, fewer strategies were used because talk offences do not appear to elicit a typical pattern of apology strategy.

#### B. Total number of strategies between males and females.

##### Males

Group 1: 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 (25.2, 25.2, 25.2)

Group 2: 3.1, 3.3 (24.3)

##### Females

Group 1: 3.2, 3.4 (26.1, 26.1)

Group 2: 3.1, 3.3 (23.9, 23.9)

- (a) With both males and females the most strategies were used in sub-situation 3.2 and 3.4. Males and females because they both see this as serious offences, which the apologizer has to give an explicit explanation for the offense.
- (b) Males has the most strategies used in 3.3 because naturally males don't like noise, if they do make noise there is a serious reason to which they will give an explanation.
- (c) Both males and females has the least strategies used in sub-situation.

3.1. The reason is because both males and females might take an insult as a slip of a tongue, which needs a simple apology.

(d) Females has the least of all the strategies used in sub-situation 3.3 because naturally females are talkative though not all, they don't see it as an offence and to them a simple sorry is enough

### **C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.**

The number of strategies, which have been used by males and females in each sub-situation, do not differ much.

Sub-situation 3.1: 24.3, 23.9 = 0.4%

Sub-situation 3.2: 25.2, 26.1 = 0.9%

Sub-situation 3.3: 25.2, 23.9 = 1.3%

Sub-situation 3.4: 25.2, 26.1 = 0.9%

There is no significant difference between the strategies used by both males and females. This is because in both males and females, when an account or excuse forms part of the apology, it will often address the most obvious interpretation in a particular context.

#### **5.4.1.2.4 Time**

|     | Sub-situation            | Total | Males | Females |
|-----|--------------------------|-------|-------|---------|
| 4.1 | Forgetting               | 23.8  | 23.2  | 24.4    |
| 4.2 | Handing of an assignment | 24.8  | 23.2  | 26.7    |
| 4.3 | Late arrival             | 24.8  | 25    | 22.2    |
| 4.4 | Late transport           | 27.7  | 28.6  | 26.7    |

#### **A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation.**

Group 1: 4.4 (27.7)

Group 2: 4.2, 4.3 (24.8, 24.8)

Group 3: 4.1 (23.8)

In sub-situation 4.4, longer apology strategies were used because wasting another person's time or is some way not taking appropriate account of the value of another's time is an offense which generally demand some explanation waiting for transport for a long time need an explanation why the transport was late, that is why longer

apology strategies were used. Sub-situations 4.2 and 4.3 has the second longer apology strategies used. The reasons are more or less the same as the ones stated. The least strategies were used in sub-situation 4.1. No long apology strategies were used, just an apology followed by an account.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

Group 1: 4.4 (28.6)

Group 2: 4.3 (25)

Group 3: 4.1, 4.2 (23.2, 23.2)

### **Females**

Group 1: 4.2, 4.4 (26.7, 26.7)

Group 2: 4.1 (24.4)

Group 3: 4.3 (22.2)

4. With both males and females the most strategies were used in sub-situation 4.4. This is because both females and males have reasons for the offence committed.
5. Females also has the most strategies used in sub-situation 4.2, the reasons are the same as above.
6. Males used sub-situation 4.3 and females 4.1 as the second with most strategies used. Males gave a lot of explanation for their late arrival while females explained for them not conveying information on time
7. Males used the least strategies in 4.2 and 4.1 because they were more inclined to say a simple sorry.
8. Females used the least strategies in sub-situation 4.3. The reasons are the same as the ones stated above.

## **C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation**

Sub-situation 4.1: 23.2, 24.4 = 1.2%

Sub-situation 4.2: 23.2, 26.7 = 3.5%

Sub-situation 4.3: 25, 22.2 = 2.8%

Sub-situation 4.4: 28.6, 26.7 = 1.9%



In sub-situations 4.1 and 4.4, there is no significant difference in the number of strategies, which have been used by males and females. In sub-situations 4.2 and 4.3, there is a significant difference in the number of strategies, which have been used by males and females. The reason is because males are more inclined than females do.

#### 5.4.1.2.5 Possession

Table

|     | Sub-situation | Total | Male | Female |
|-----|---------------|-------|------|--------|
| 5.1 | Money         | 24.9  | 27.0 | 22.2   |
| 5.2 | Clothes       | 25.9  | 25.2 | 26.7   |
| 5.3 | Class notes   | 24.9  | 24.3 | 25.6   |
| 5.4 | Pen           | 24.9  | 23.4 | 25.6   |

#### A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation

Group 1: 5.2 (25.9)

Group 2: 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 (24.9, 24.9, 24.4)

In situation 5.2 the learners used longer apologies with more strategies because sub-situation relating to clothes are heavy offences. The apology must be more elaborated and must include an explanation, an acknowledgement of responsibility and sometimes even an offer of repair, that's why more strategies have been used. There is no significant difference between group one and group two because in situations where possession is concerned, remedial exchange directly addressed this implication.

#### B. Total number of strategies between males and females

##### Males

Group 1: 5.1 (27.0)

Group 2: 5.2, 5.3 (25.6, 24.3)

Group 3: 5.4 (23.4)

##### Females

Group 1: 5.2 (26.7)

Group 2: 5.3, 5.4 (25.6, 25.6)

Group 3: 5.1 (22.2)

- (a) With males 5.1 has the most strategies used while with females 5.2 has the most strategies used. The reasons are because 5.1 has to do with money and males don't like to be seen as croaks, they try by all means to come with an explicit explanation and offer of repair as far as clothes are concerned.
- (b) With both males and females 5.3 has the second most strategies used; the reasons are more or less the same as the ones stated above.
- (c) For males 5.4 has the least strategies used while with females 5.1 has the least strategies used, this is because with males, breaking a pen is a minor offence which needs a simple sorry while this is the same with females regarding money.

### **C. Strategies between males and females in sub-situations**

Sub-situation 5.1: 27.0, 22.2 = 4.8%

Sub-situation 5.2: 25.2, 26.7 = 1.5%

Sub-situation 5.3: 24.3, 25.6 = 1.3%

Sub-situation 5.4: 23.4, 25.6 = 2.2%

In sub-situations 5.2 and 5.3 there is no significant difference in the number of strategies, which have been used by males and females. In sub-situation 5.1 there is a significant difference, males used the most strategies because they are more likely to give explanations to their wrong doings. There is also a significant difference in sub-situation 5.4 with the females using the most strategies, the reasons are the same as the ones given above.

## 5.4.2 Apology strategies in sub-situations

### 5.4.2.1 Inconvenience

#### 5.4.2.1.1 Wrong information

**Table 2**

|              |           |      | <b>Male</b> |             | <b>Female</b> |             |
|--------------|-----------|------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
|              | No.       | %    | No.         | %           | No.           | %           |
| 0.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.3          | 7         | 13.5 | 1           | 3.6         | 6             | 25          |
| 0.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.5          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.6          | 6         | 11.5 | 6           | 21.4        | -             | -           |
| 3.1          | 4         | 7.7  | 3           | 10.7        | 1             | 4.2         |
| 3.2          | 7         | 13.5 | 2           | 7.1         | 5             | 20.8        |
| 4.1          | 3         | 5.8  | -           | -           | 3             | 12.5        |
| 4.2          | 3         | 5.8  | 1           | 3.6         | 2             | 8.3         |
| 4.3          | 10        | 19.2 | 8           | 28.6        | 2             | 8.3         |
| 5            | 4         | 7.7  | 2           | 7.1         | 2             | 8.3         |
| 6            | 8         | 15.4 | 5           | 17.9        | 3             | 12.5        |
| 7            | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>52</b> |      | <b>28</b>   | <b>53.8</b> | <b>24</b>     | <b>46.2</b> |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

According to the table above, it is clear that some strategies have been extensively used, especially those that are directly connected to giving of an apology.

The following classification can be made with reference to the number of strategies used in each specific category:

##### Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation 13.5%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 19.2 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 15.4%

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 13.5%

## Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 7.7%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 7.7%

## Group 3

Strategy 4.1 and 4.2 have a limited number of strategies used i.e. 5.8% for each of them. There are a number of strategies which have been used at all e.g. 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1 etc.

Groups 1 and 2 have been frequently used because they all make the complaine to accept the apology.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 2.6, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 3.1, 3.2, 5

Group 3: 0.3, 4.2

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 0.3, 4.3

Group 2: 4.1, 4.2, 3.2, 5

Group 3: 3.1

Others: Negligent

- (a) With both males and females, 4.3 which is request for forgiveness have been used frequently because both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (b) Females also have the most strategies used in 0.3 (justification). Sometimes females justify what led to their wrong doings
- (c) Males also have the most strategies used in 2.6 and 6 (Explicit acceptance of blame, promise of forbearance). Males are more inclined to promise not to do something wrong again and the do accept if they have done something wrong.
- (d) With both males and females 3.2 and 5 (explicit explanation, expressing concern for hearer) have the second most strategies used. Both males and females tend to come with excuses for a committed offence by trying to explain why it happened like that and explain concern for his/her condition.

- (e) Males have the second most strategies used in 3.1 while with the female it was the least used. Males are good at explaining for their wrong doings while females just request for forgiveness.
- (f) Males have the least strategies used in 0.3 and 4.2 (Justification, offer of apology). Males are more inclined to give explanations than to ask for forgiveness.
- (g) The other strategies were never used by both males and females

#### 5.4.2.1.2 Inadequate service

**Table 3**

|       |     |    | <b>Male</b> |      | <b>Female</b> |      |
|-------|-----|----|-------------|------|---------------|------|
|       | No. | %  | No.         | %    | No.           | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.3   | 2   | 4  | -           | -    | 2             | 8.3  |
| 0.4   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.3   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.4   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.5   | 4   | 8  | -           | -    | 4             | 16.7 |
| 2.6   | 4   | 8  | 3           | 11.5 | 1             | 4.2  |
| 3.1   | 4   | 8  | 3           | 11.5 | 1             | 4.2  |
| 3.2   | 13  | 26 | 7           | 26.9 | 6             | 25   |
| 4.1   | 4   | 8  | 2           | 7.7  | 2             | 8.3  |
| 4.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 4.3   | 10  | 20 | 5           | 19.2 | 5             | 20.8 |
| 5     | 2   | 4  | 2           | 7.7  | -             | -    |
| 6     | 7   | 14 | 4           | 15.4 | 3             | 12.5 |
| 7     | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| TOTAL | 50  |    | 26          | 52   | 24            | 48   |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 26%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 20%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 14%

## Group 2

Strategy 2.5: Expression of embarrassment: 8%

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 8%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 8%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 8%

## Group 3

The other strategies have a very limited number of strategies used with 0.3 and 5 having 4%. The other strategies have not been used at all.

Group one and two have been frequently used because all of them shows that the person is truly sorry.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 2.6, 3.1, 4.1, 5

Others: Negligence

Females: Group 1: 3.2, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 2.6, 3.1, 4.1

Others: Negligence

- (a) Both males and females have the most strategies used in 3.2, 4.3 and 6 (explicit explanation, request for forgiveness and promise of forbearance). This is because both males and females are inclined to use these strategies.
- (b) Both males and females have the second most used strategies in 2.6, 3.1 and 4.1, reasons are the same as the ones listed above.
- (c) Both males and females never used the other strategies.

### 5.4.2.1.3 Forgetting to convey the message

**Table 4**

|       |     |    | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------|-----|----|------|------|--------|------|
|       | No. | %  | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.3   | 4   | 8  | 4    | 15.4 | -      | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.2   | 6   | 12 | 2    | 7.7  | 4      | 16.7 |
| 2.3   | 4   | 8  | 4    | 15.4 | -      | -    |
| 2.4   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.5   | --+ | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.6   | 17  | 34 | 9    | 34.6 | 8      | 33.3 |
| 3.1   | 6   | 12 | 1    | 3.8  | 5      | 20.8 |
| 3.2   | 2   | 4  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.3  |
| 4.1   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 4.2   | 3   | 6  | 1    | 3.8  | 2      | 8.3  |
| 4.3   | 4   | 8  | 3    | 11.5 | 1      | 4.2  |
| 5     | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 6     | 2   | 4  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.3  |
| 7     | 2   | 4  | 2    | 7.7  | -      | -    |
| TOTAL | 50  |    | 26   | 52   | 24     | 48   |

#### A. Total number of strategies

##### Group 1

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 12%

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 34%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 12%

##### Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 8%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 8%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 6%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 8%

##### Group 3

The other strategies have a limited number used with 4% (3.2, 6 and 7) to strategies which have not been used at all e.g. 0.1, 0.2, 1.2, 1.3 etc

Group one and two have been frequently used because when someone forgot to convey a message, they acknowledge and accept the blame and try to justify their lack of intent.

### **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 0.3, 2.3, 2.6, 4.3

Group 2: 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, 7

Females: Group 1: 2.2, 2.6, 3.1

Group 2: 3.2, 4.2, 4.3, 6

- (a) Both males and females have the most strategies used in 2.6 (explicit acceptance of blame) because both males and females are inclined to accept that they have done something wrong.
- (b) Males have the most used strategies in 0.3, 2.3 and 4.3 (justification, expression of lack of intent and request for forgiveness. This is like this because they are more inclined to do so.
- (c) Females have the most strategies used in 2.2 and 3.1 (Explicit acknowledgement and implicit explanation, the reasons are the same as the ones listed above.
- (d) Females use 6 (promise of forbearance) as the second used strategy while males use 7 (offer of repair). Females take responsibility while males offer to repair the damage.
- (e) Both males and females also used 4.2 offer of apology as the second used strategy because it is directly connected to giving an apology.
- (f) The other strategies were never used at all.



#### 5.4.2.1.4. Forgetting your responsibility

**Table 5**

|       | No. | %    | No. | %    | No. | %    |
|-------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|
| 0.1   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 0.2   | 8   | 17.0 | 7   | 26.9 | 1   | 4.7  |
| 0.3   | 3   | 6.4  | 1   | 3.8  | 2   | 9.5  |
| 0.4   | 6   | 12.8 | 3   | 11.5 | 3   | 14.3 |
| 1.1   | 2   | 4.3  | 2   | 7.7  | -   | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.1   | 2   | 4.3  | -   | -    | 2   | 9.5  |
| 2.2   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.3   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.4   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.6   | 8   | 14.9 | 3   | 11.5 | 4   | 19.0 |
| 3.1   | 4   | 8.5  | 4   | 15.4 | -   | -    |
| 3.2   | 5   | 10.6 | 2   | 7.7  | 3   | 14.3 |
| 4.1   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 4.2   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 4.3   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 5     | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 6     | 2   | 4.3  | 2   | 7.7  | -   | -    |
| 7     | 8   | 17.0 | 2   | 7.7  | 6   | 28.6 |
| TOTAL | 47  |      | 26  | 55.3 | 21  | 44.7 |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

##### Group 1

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility

Strategy 0.4: Blaming someone else

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation

Strategy 7: Offer of repair

##### Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation

### Group 3

The other strategies have a limited number used with 4.3 in strategies 1.1, 2.1 and 6 to strategies, which have not been used at all

Group one and two have been frequently used because when people forgot their responsibility they sometimes shift the to someone else and deny the responsibility, but sometimes they accept the blame but give an explanation and offer to repair the damage.

### **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 0.2, 0.4, 2.6, 3.1

Group 2: 0.3, 1.1, 3.2, 6.7

Others: Negligence

Females: Group 1: 0.3, 0.4, 2.6, 3.2, 7

Group 2: 0.2

Others: Negligence

- (a) Both males and females have the most strategies used in 0.4 and 2.6 (blaming someone else and Explicit acceptance of blame), it is because both males and females are more likely to blame others or accept the blame.
- (b) Males have the most used strategies in 0.2 and 3.1 (implicit denial of responsibility and implicit explanation) Males are more inclined to give explanation for whatever they have done wrong. Females have the most strategies used in 0.3, 3.2 and 7 (justification, explicit explanation and offer of repair. Females are more inclined to do so.
- (c) Females have the least strategies used in 0.2 (implicit denial of responsibility). With females it is rear that they can deny responsibility when they have forgot to do their job.
- (d) With the males the least used strategies are 0.3, 1.1, 3.2, 6 and 7 (Justification, minimizing, explicit explanation, promise of forbearance and offer of repair). There is no clear cut of the reason why it is like this.
- (e) The other strategies were not used at all.

## 5.4.2.2 Space

### 5.4.2.2.1 Accident

**Table 6**

|              |           |      | <b>Male</b> |             | <b>Female</b> |             |
|--------------|-----------|------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
|              | No.       | %    | No.         | %           | No.           | %           |
| 0.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.2          | 10        | 18.5 | 7           | 23.3        | 3             | 12.5        |
| 0.3          | 8         | 14.8 | 5           | 16.7        | 3             | 12.5        |
| 0.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.3          | 4         | 7.4  | -           | -           | 4             | 16.7        |
| 2.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.5          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.6          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 3.1          | 4         | 7.4  | 4           | 13.3        | -             | -           |
| 3.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 4.1          | 2         | 3.7  | -           | -           | 2             | 8.3         |
| 4.2          | 5         | 9.3  | 5           | 16.7        | -             | -           |
| 4.3          | 9         | 16.7 | 4           | 13.3        | 5             | 20.8        |
| 5            | 8         | 14.8 | 3           | 10          | 5             | 20.8        |
| 6            | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 7            | 4         | 7.4  | 2           | 6.7         | 2             | 8.3         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>54</b> |      | <b>30</b>   | <b>55.6</b> | <b>24</b>     | <b>44.4</b> |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

According to table 6, it is clear that some strategies have been extensively used. The following classification can be made with reference to the number of strategies used in each specific category.

##### Group 1

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility: 18.5%

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 14.8%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 16.7%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 14.8%

##### Group 2

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 7.4%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 7.4%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 9.3%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 7.4%

### Group 3

Strategy 4.1 has a limited number of strategies used with 3.7%. There are a number of strategies, which have not been used at all, e.g. strategy 0.4, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 6 etc.

Group A and group B have been frequently used because offences related to space usually elicited just a simple apology and the more serious ones also warranted an explanation as well.

### **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 0.2, 0.3, 3.1, 4.3, 5

Group 2: 7

Others: Negligence

Females: Group 1: 0.2, 0.3, 2.3, 4.3, 5

Group 2: 4.1, 7

Others: Negligence

- (a) Both males and females have the most strategies used in 0.2 (Implicit denial of responsibility) 0.3 (Justification), 4.3 (Request for forgiveness) and 5 (Expressing concern for hearer). Both males and females have the most strategies used because with offences related to space they are both inclined to apologise though sometimes they do deny responsibility.
- (b) Males also have the most strategies used in 3.1 (Implicit explanation) while female have the most used in 2.3 (Expression of lack of intent). Apology goes together with some explanations, showing lack of intent, the first usually done by the males and the second by the females.
- (c) Both males and females have the second most strategies used in strategy 7 (offer of repair). Both males and females are inclined to do so.
- (d) Females have the second most strategy used in 4.1 (Expression of regret)
- (e) The other strategies never used at all.

### 5.4.2.2.2 Seat

**Table 7**

|       |     |      | <b>Male</b> |      | <b>Female</b> |      |
|-------|-----|------|-------------|------|---------------|------|
|       | No. | %    | No.         | %    | No.           | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.3   | 4   | 8.2  | -           | -    | 4             | 19.0 |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.3   | 3   | 6.1  | 3           | 10.7 | -             | -    |
| 2.4   | 4   | 8.2  | 4           | 14.3 | -             | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.6   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 3.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 3.2   | 9   | 18.4 | 5           | 17.9 | 4             | 19.0 |
| 4.1   | 7   | 14.3 | 5           | 17.9 | 2             | 9.5  |
| 4.2   | 13  | 26.5 | 7           | 25   | 6             | 28.6 |
| 4.3   | 2   | 4.1  | -           | -    | 2             | 9.5  |
| 5     | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 6     | 7   | 14.3 | 4           | 14.3 | 3             | 14.3 |
| 7     | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| TOTAL | 49  |      | 28          | 57.1 | 21            | 42.9 |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

##### Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 18.4%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 14.3%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 26.5%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 14.3%

##### Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent

Strategy 2.4: Expression of self-deficiency

##### Group 3

Strategy 4.3 has a limited number of strategies used with 4.1%. The other strategies were not used at all e.g. 0.1, 0.2, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.5 etc

Group one and group two have been frequently used because they are directly related to apology.

### B. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 4.1, 4.2

Group 2: 2.3, 2.4, 6

Others: Negligence

Females: Group 1: 3.2, 4.1, 4.2

Group 2: 2.3, 2.4, 6

Others: Negligence

(a) Females used the same strategies as the most strategies used in group one and group two, i.e. 3.2 (explicit explanation), 4.1 (expression of regret) 4.2 (offer of apology), 2.3 (expression of lack of intent), 2.4 (expression of self deficiency) and 6 (promise of forbearance). The reason is because they are all directly related to apology.

(b) The other strategies were never used at all, e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1 etc.

#### 5.4.2.2.3 Queue

**Table 8**

|       |     |      | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------|-----|------|------|------|--------|------|
|       | No. | %    | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 0.1   | 4   | 7.7  | 4    | 14.3 | -      | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.3   | 3   | 5.8  | 3    | 10.7 | -      | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.2   | 3   | 5.8  | 3    | 10.7 | -      | -    |
| 2.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.4   | 1   | 1.9  | 1    | 3.6  | -      | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.6   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 3.1   | 6   | 11.5 | 2    | 7.1  | 4      | 16.7 |
| 3.2   | 5   | 9.6  | 3    | 10.7 | 2      | 8.3  |
| 4.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 4.2   | 3   | 5.8  | -    | -    | 3      | 12.5 |
| 4.3   | 12  | 23.1 | 7    | 25   | 5      | 20.8 |
| 5     | 8   | 15.4 | 3    | 1.7  | 5      | 20.8 |
| 6     | 7   | 13.5 | 2    | 7.1  | 5      | 20.8 |
| 7     | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| TOTAL | 52  |      | 28   | 53.8 | 24     | 46.2 |

## A. Total number of strategies

### Group 1

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 11.5%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 23.1%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 15.4%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 13.5%

### Group 2

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility: 7.7%

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 5.8%

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 5.8%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 9.6%

### Group 3

Strategy 2.4 has a limited number of strategies used with 1.9%. There are a number of strategies which have not been used at all, e.g. 1.3, 2.1, 2.5 etc

Group one and two have been frequently used because an offence related to queue threaten the addressee's negative face by impeding her/his freedom of movement and apology is necessary.

## B. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 0.1, 0.3, 2.2, 3.2, 4.3, 5

Group 2: 2.4, 3.1, 6

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.1, 4.3, 5 and 6

Group 2: 3.2, 4.2

Others: Negligent

(a) Both males and females have the most strategies used in strategy 4.3 (Request for forgiveness) and 5 (Expressing concern for hearer), the reason is because both males and females are inclined to do so.

(b) Males have the most strategies used in strategy 0.1 (explicit denial of responsibility), 0.3 (Justification), 2.2 (explicit explanation). The main reason is because they are more inclined to do so.

- (c) Females have the most strategies used in 3.1 (implicit explanation) and 6 (promise of forbearance), females are also more inclined to do so.
- (d) Males have the second most strategies used in 2.4 (expression of self-deficiency) 3.1 (implicit explanation) and 6 (promise of forbearance), the reasons are the same as the ones given above.
- (e) Females have the second most strategies used in 3.2 (explicit explanation) and 4.2 (offer of apology), the reasons are the same as the ones give above.
- (f) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.2.4 Obstruct

**Table 9**

|       |     |      | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------|-----|------|------|------|--------|------|
|       | No. | %    | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 0.1   | 8   | 15.7 | 4    | 14.3 | 4      | 17.4 |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.2   | 2   | 3.9  | 2    | 7.1  | -      | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.3   | 2   | 3.9  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.7  |
| 2.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.6   | 4   | 7.8  | -    | -    | 4      | 17.4 |
| 3.1   | 6   | 11.8 | 4    | 14.3 | 2      | 8.7  |
| 3.2   | 8   | 15.7 | 5    | 17.9 | 3      | 13.0 |
| 4.1   | 2   | 3.9  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.7  |
| 4.2   | 4   | 7.8  | 2    | 7.1  | 2      | 8.7  |
| 4.3   | 7   | 13.7 | 6    | 21.4 | 1      | 4.3  |
| 5     | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 6     | 8   | 15.7 | 5    | 17.9 | 3      | 13.0 |
| 7     | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| TOTAL | 51  |      | 28   | 54.9 | 23     | 45.1 |

#### A. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility: 15.7%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 11.8%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 15.7%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 13.7%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 15.7%



## Group 2

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of the blame: 7.8%

Strategy 4.2: offer of apology: 7.8%

Strategy 1.2 (Querying precondition), 2.3 (expressing of lack of intent) and 4.1 (Expression of regret) each has a limited number of strategies used with 3.9% each. The other strategies have never been used at all.

Group 1 and 2 have been frequently used because they are all directly related to apology. The other strategies have not been used at all.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 0.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.3 and 6

Group 2: 1.2, 4.2

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 0.1, 2.6, 3.2, and 6

Group 2: 2.3, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3

Others: Negligent

- (a) Both males and females have the most strategies in strategy 3.2 (explicit explanation) and 6 (promise of forbearance). They are both inclined to do so.
- (b) Males have the frequently most used strategies in strategy 0.1 (explicit denial of responsibility), 3.1 (implicit explanation) and 4.3 (Request for forgiveness). Males sometimes shift the blame to someone else.
- (c) Females have the most strategies used in strategy 2.6 (Explicit acceptance of the blame), females are mostly inclined to do so.
- (d) Other strategies were averagely used and some strategies were never used at all.

### 5.4.2.3 Talk

#### 5.4.2.3.1 Insult

**Table 10**

|       |     |      | <b>Male</b> |      | <b>Female</b> |      |
|-------|-----|------|-------------|------|---------------|------|
|       | No. | %    | No.         | %    | No.           | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.3   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.3   | 11  | 23.4 | 6           | 24   | 5             | 22.7 |
| 2.4   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.6   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 3.1   | 5   | 10.6 | 3           | 12   | 2             | 9.0  |
| 3.2   | 4   | 8.5  | 2           | 8    | 2             | 9.0  |
| 4.1   | 10  | 21.3 | 4           | 16   | 6             | 27.3 |
| 4.2   | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 4.3   | 10  | 21.3 | 6           | 24   | 4             | 18.2 |
| 5     | 5   | 10.6 | 4           | 16   | 1             | 4.5  |
| 6     | 2   | 4.3  | -           | -    | 2             | 9.0  |
| 7     | -   | -    | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| TOTAL | 47  |      | 25          | 53.2 | 22            | 46.8 |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

According to table 10 it is clear that some strategies have been extensively used. The following classification can be made with reference to the number of strategies used in each specific category.

##### Group 1

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 23.4%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 21.3%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 21.3%

##### Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 10.6%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 8.5%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 10.6%

### Group 3

Strategy 6 (promise of forbearance) has a limited number of strategies used with 4.3%. There are a number of strategies, which have not been used at all.

Group 1 and group 2 have been frequently used because offences related to talk often elicit simple explicit apologies and others involve explanation or justification.

### B. The number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 2.3, 4.1, 4.3, 5

Group 2: 3.1

Others: Negligence

Females: Group 1: 2.3, 4.1, 4.3

Group 2: 3.1, 3.2, 5 & 6

Others: Negligence

- (a) Both males and females have the most frequently used strategies in strategy 2.3 (expression of lack of intent), 4.1 (expression of regret) and 4.3 (Request for forgiveness) because they are all inclined to apologise.
- (b) Males also have the most frequently used strategy in strategy 5 (expressing concern for hearer), the reasons are the same as the ones listed above.
- (c) Females have the second most frequently used strategies with strategy 3.1 (explicit explanation), 5 (expressing concern for hearer) and 6 (promise of forbearance), all the strategies are directly related to apology.
- (d) There are some strategies, which were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.3.2 Phone

**Table 11**

|     |     |    | <b>Male</b> |      | <b>Female</b> |     |
|-----|-----|----|-------------|------|---------------|-----|
|     | No. | %  | No.         | %    | No.           | %   |
| 0.1 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 0.2 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 0.3 | 5   | 10 | 3           | 11.5 | 2             | 8.3 |
| 0.4 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 1.1 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 1.2 | 4   | 8  | 2           | 7.7  | 2             | 8.3 |
| 1.3 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 2.1 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 2.2 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 2.3 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |
| 2.4 | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -   |

|       |    |    |    |      |    |      |
|-------|----|----|----|------|----|------|
| 2.5   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.6   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 3.1   | 4  | 8  | 2  | 7.7  | 2  | 8.3  |
| 3.2   | 12 | 24 | 7  | 26.9 | 5  | 20.8 |
| 4.1   | 8  | -  | 5  | 19.2 | 3  | 12.5 |
| 4.2   | 7  | 14 | 3  | 11.5 | 4  | 16.7 |
| 4.3   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 5     | 5  | 10 | 2  | 7.7  | 3  | 12.5 |
| 6     | 5  | 10 | 2  | 7.7  | 3  | 12.5 |
| 7     | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| TOTAL | 50 |    | 26 | 52   | 24 | 48   |

### A. Total number of strategies used

Group 1

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 10%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 24%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 14%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 10%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 10%

Group 2

Strategy 1.2: Querying preconditions: 8%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 8%

Group 3

The other strategies were never used at all e.g. 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 1.3 etc

Group 1 and 2 have been frequently used because after taking a very long time on the phone the speaker would tend to justify his/her behaviour and offer an apology.

### B. The number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 0.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2

Group 2: 1.2, 3.1, 5 and 6

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.2, 4.1, 4.2,

Group 2: 0.3, 1.2, 3.1

Others: Negligent

- (a) Both males and females have the most frequently used strategies in strategies 3.2 (explicit explanation), 4.1 (expression of regret) and 4.2 (offer of apology) the reason is because they are all directly related to apology and both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (b) Females also have the most strategies used in strategy 5 (expressing concern for hearer) and strategy 6 (promise of forbearance), the reasons are the same as the ones listed above.
- (c) Males have the most frequently used strategy in strategy 0.3 because they sometimes justify their actions.
- (d) Both males and females have the second used strategies in strategy 1.2 (querying preconditions) and 3.1 (implicit explanation), the reasons are because both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (e) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.3.3 Noise

**Table 12**

|              |           |      | <b>Male</b> |             | <b>Female</b> |             |
|--------------|-----------|------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
|              | No.       | %    | No.         | %           | No.           | %           |
| 0.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.2          | 3         | 6.3  | 3           | 11.5        | -             | -           |
| 0.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.2          | 7         | 14.6 | 4           | 15.3        | 3             | 13.6        |
| 2.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.5          | 3         | 6.3  | -           | -           | 3             | 13.6        |
| 2.6          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 3.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 3.2          | 8         | 16.7 | 5           | 19.2        | 3             | 13.6        |
| 4.1          | 2         | 4.2  | -           | -           | 2             | 9.1         |
| 4.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 4.3          | 9         | 18.8 | 4           | 15.3        | 5             | 22.7        |
| 5            | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 6            | 13        | 27.1 | 7           | 26.9        | 6             | 22.7        |
| 7            | 3         | 6.3  | 3           | 11.5        | -             | -           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>47</b> |      | <b>26</b>   | <b>54.2</b> | <b>22</b>     | <b>45.8</b> |

## A. Total number of strategies used

Group 1

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 14.6%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 16.7%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 18.6%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 27.1%

Group 2

Strategy 2.5: Expression of embarrassment: 6.3%

Strategy 7: offer of repair: 6.3%

Group 3

Strategy 4.1 has a limited number of strategies used with only 4.2%, the other strategies were never used at all.

## B. The number of strategies between males and females

Males group 1: 2.2, 3.2, 4.3 and 6

Group 2: 0.2, 7

Others: negligent

Females: Group 1: 2.2, 3.2, 4.3 and 6

Group 2: 4.1

Others: Negligent

- (a) Both male and females used the same most frequently used strategies, i.e. 2.2 (explicit acknowledgement), 3.2 (explicit explanation), 4.3 (request for forgiveness) and 6 (promise of forbearance). They both used the same strategies because both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (b) Males have the second frequently used strategy in strategy 0.2 (Implicit denial of responsibility) and 7 (offer of repair) males sometimes deny responsibility for the offences committed because males are inclined to give explanations.
- (c) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.3.4 Inappropriate service

**Table 13**

|       |     |    | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------|-----|----|------|------|--------|------|
|       | No. | %  | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.3   | 4   | 8  | 2    | 7.7  | 2      | 8.3  |
| 0.4   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.1   | 4   | 8  | 2    | 7.7  | 2      | 8.3  |
| 1.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.3   | 16  | 32 | 10   | 38.5 | 6      | 25   |
| 2.4   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.6   | 2   | 4  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.3  |
| 3.1   | 2   | 4  | 2    | 7.7  | -      | -    |
| 3.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 4.1   | 8   | 16 | 5    | 19.2 | 3      | 12.5 |
| 4.2   | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 4.3   | 12  | 24 | 5    | 19.2 | 7      | 29.2 |
| 5     | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 6     | 2   | 4  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.3  |
| 7     | -   | -  | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| TOTAL | 50  |    | 26   | 52   | 24     | 48   |

#### A. Total number of strategies used

##### Group 1

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 32%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 16%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 24%

##### Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 8%

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 8%

##### Group 3

Strategies 2.6, 3.1 and 6 have a limited number of strategies used with 4% each; the other strategies were never used at all. Group one and two have been frequently used because they are all directly related to the apology.

## B. The number of strategies between males and females

Males:group 1: 2.3, 4.1, 4.3

Group 2: 0.3, 1.1, 3.1

Others: Negligence

Females: Group 1: 2.3, 4.1, 4.3

Group 2: 0.3,1.1, 3.1

Others: Negligence

(a) Both males and females have the most and the second most frequently used strategies, which are the same. The most frequently used are: 2.3 (expression of lack of intent), 4.1 ((expression of regret) and 4.3 (request for forgiveness). The second most frequently used strategies are: 0.3(Justification), 1.1 (explicit denial of responsibility) and 3.1 (implicit explanation). They used the same strategies because they are all inclined to ask for forgiveness.

(b) The other strategies were never used at all.

### 5.4.2.4 Time

#### 5.4.2.4.1 Forgetting

**Table 14**

|       | No. | %    | No. | %    | No. | %    |
|-------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|
| 0.1   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 0.3   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.2   | 2   | 4.7  | -   | -    | 2   | 9.1  |
| 2.3   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.4   | 1   | 2.1  | -   | -    | 1   | 4.5  |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 2.6   | 10  | 20.8 | 8   | 30.8 | 2   | 9.1  |
| 3.1   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 3.2   | 9   | 18.8 | 5   | 19.2 | 4   | 18.2 |
| 4.1   | 8   | 16.7 | 2   | 7.7  | 6   | 27.3 |
| 4.2   | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| 4.3   | 10  | 20.8 | 5   | 19.2 | 5   | 22.7 |
| 5     | 2   | 4.2  | 2   | 7.7  | -   | -    |
| 6     | 6   | 12.5 | 4   | 15.4 | 2   | 9.1  |
| 7     | -   | -    | -   | -    | -   | -    |
| TOTAL | 48  |      | 26  | 54.4 | 22  | 45.8 |



According to table 14 it is clear that some strategies have been extensively used. The following classification can be made with reference to the number of strategies used in each specific category.

Total number of strategies used

Group 1

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 20.8%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 18.8%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 20.8%

Group 2

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 16.7%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 12.5%

Group 3

Some strategies have a limited number ranging from 4.7% (strategy 2.2) to 2.1% (strategy 2.4) while some strategies have never been used at all.

Group one and two have been frequently used because offences related to time usually needs an explanation and people are inclined to give an explanation for the offense committed.

#### **A. The number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 2.6, 3.2, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 4.1, 5

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.2, 4.1, 4.3

Group 2: 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, and 6

Others: Negligent

(a) Both males and females have the most frequently used strategy, which is strategy 3.2 (explicit explanation), this is because both males and females are inclined to give an explanation.

- (b) Males have the most frequently used strategies which are strategies 2.6(explicit acceptance of blame), 4.3 (request for forgiveness) and 6 (promise of forbearance) males are more likely inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (c) Females have the most frequently used strategies, which are strategies 4.1 (expression of regret) and 4.3 (request for forgiveness), the reasons are the same as the ones listed above.
- (c) The other strategies used by males and females were used because they are directly related to apology.
- (d) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.4.2 Handing of an assignment

**Table 15**

|       |     |    | <b>Male</b> |      | <b>Female</b> |      |
|-------|-----|----|-------------|------|---------------|------|
|       | No. | %  | No.         | %    | No.           | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 0.3   | 11  | 22 | 6           | 23.1 | 5             | 20.8 |
| 0.4   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.1   | 2   | 4  | 2           | 7.7  | -             | -    |
| 2.2   | 3   | 6  | -           | -    | 3             | 12.5 |
| 2.3   | 5   | 10 | 3           | 11.5 | 2             | 8.3  |
| 2.4   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 2.6   | 3   | 6  | 3           | 11.5 | -             | -    |
| 3.1   | 2   | 4  | -           | -    | 2             | 8.3  |
| 3.2   | 4   | 8  | 2           | 7.7  | 2             | 8.3  |
| 4.1   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 4.2   | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| 4.3   | 9   | 18 | 7           | 26.9 | 2             | 8.3  |
| 5     | 10  | 20 | 2           | 7.7  | 8             | 33.3 |
| 6     | 1   | 2  | 1           | 3.8  | -             | -    |
| 7     | -   | -  | -           | -    | -             | -    |
| TOTAL | 50  |    | 26          | 52   | 24            | 48   |

#### **A. Total number of strategies used**

Group 1

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 22%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 18%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 20%

Group 2

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 10%

Group 3

Some strategies have a limited ranging from 4% (strategy 2.1) to 1% (strategy 6)

Group one and two have been frequently used because they are all directly related to apology and asking for forgiveness.

### **B. The number of strategies between males and females**

Males            Group 1: 0.3, 2.3, 2.2, 5  
                       Group 2: 2.1, 3.2, 5 and 6  
                       Others: negligent

Females:        Group 1: 0.3, 2.2, 5  
                       Group 2: 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.3  
                       Others: Negligent

- (a) Males have the most frequently used strategies in strategy 0.3 (Justification), 2.3 (expression of lack of intent), 2.6 (explicit acceptance of blame) and 4.3 (request for forgiveness) males are sometimes inclined to ask for forgiveness and they do justify whatever they have done.
- (b) Females have the most frequently used strategies in strategy 0.3 (justification) 2.2 (explicit acknowledgement) and 5 (expressing concern for hearer), the reasons are the same as the ones stated above.
- (c) Group two in both males and females have been used because they are directly related to apology.
- (d) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### **5.4.2.4.3 Late arrival**

**Table 16**

|     |     |   | <b>Male</b> |   | <b>Female</b> |   |
|-----|-----|---|-------------|---|---------------|---|
|     | No. | % | No.         | % | No.           | % |
| 0.1 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 0.2 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 0.3 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 0.4 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 1.1 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 1.2 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 1.3 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 2.1 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |

|       |    |      |    |      |    |      |
|-------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| 2.2   | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.3   | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.4   | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.5   | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.6   | 4  | 8.3  | 4  | 14.3 | -  | -    |
| 3.1   | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 3.2   | 5  | 10.4 | -  | -    | 5  | 25   |
| 4.1   | 16 | 33.3 | 8  | 28.6 | 8  | 40   |
| 4.2   | 3  | 6.3  | -  | -    | 3  | 15   |
| 4.3   | 2  | 4.2  | 2  | 7.1  | -  | -    |
| 5     | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 6     | 18 | 37.5 | 14 | 50   | 4  | 20   |
| 7     | -  | -    | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| TOTAL | 48 |      | 28 | 58.3 | 20 | 41.7 |

### A. Total number of strategies used

Group 1

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 33.3%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 37.5%

Group 2

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 8.3%

Strategy 4.2: offer of apology: 6.3%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 10.4%

Group 3

Strategy 4.3 has a limited number of strategies used with 4.2%. The other strategies were never used at all.

Groups one and two have been frequently used because offences related to time are a bit serious and people are inclined to give explanations and ask for forgiveness.

### B. The number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 4.1, 6

Group 2: 2.6, 4.3

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.1, 4.1, 6

Group 2: 4.2

Others: Negligent

- (a) Both males and females have the most frequently used strategies in strategy 4.1(expression of regret) and strategy 6(promise of forbearance). The reason is because both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness by showing that they regret what they have done and promise to make things right.
- (b) Strategy 3.1 (implicit explanation) was also a most frequently used strategy by the females; females are inclined to make excuses.
- (c) Males also have strategy 2.6 (explicit acceptance of blame) and 4.3 (request for forgiveness) as the second most used strategies. Males are inclined to ask for forgiveness, that is why strategies 2.6 and 4.3 were frequently used.
- (d) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.4.4 Late transport

**Table 17**

|              |           |      | <b>Male</b> |             | <b>Female</b> |             |
|--------------|-----------|------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
|              | No.       | %    | No.         | %           | No.           | %           |
| 0.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 0.3          | 6         | 10.7 | 1           | 3.1         | 5             | 20.8        |
| 0.4          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 1.3          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.2          | 2         | 9.6  | -           | -           | 2             | 8.3         |
| 2.3          | 3         | 5.4  | 3           | 9.4         | -             | -           |
| 2.4          | 2         | 3.6  | -           | -           | 2             | 8.3         |
| 2.5          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 2.6          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 3.1          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 3.2          | 10        | 17.9 | 8           | 25          | 2             | 8.3         |
| 4.1          | 13        | 29.2 | 6           | 18.8        | 7             | 29.2        |
| 4.2          | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 4.3          | 12        | 21.4 | 6           | 18.8        | 6             | 25          |
| 5            | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| 6            | 8         | 14.3 | 8           | 25          | -             | -           |
| 7            | -         | -    | -           | -           | -             | -           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>56</b> |      | <b>32</b>   | <b>57.1</b> | <b>24</b>     | <b>42.9</b> |

#### **A. Total number of strategies used**

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 17.9%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 29.2%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 21.4%

Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 10.7%

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 9.6%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 14.3%

Group 3

Some strategies have a limited number ranging from 5.4% (strategy 2.3) to 3.6% (strategy 2.4). There are a number of strategies, which were never used at all.

## **B. The number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 4.1, 4.3, and 6

Group 2: 0.3, 2.3

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.1, 4.3, 0.3

Group 2: 2.2, 2.4, 3.2

Others: Negligent

- (a) Both males and females have the most frequently used strategies in strategy 4.1 (expression of regret) and 4.3 (request for forgiveness), the reason is because both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (b) The other remaining strategies used by both males and females are directly related to apology that is why they were frequently used, e.g. strategy 0.3 (justification), 3.2 (explicit explanation), 6 (promise of forbearance), 2.4 (expression of self-deficiency)
- (c) The other strategies were never used at all.

### **5.4.2.5 Possession**

#### **5.4.2.5.1 Money**

**Table 18**

|     |     |   | <b>Male</b> |   | <b>Female</b> |   |
|-----|-----|---|-------------|---|---------------|---|
|     | No. | % | No.         | % | No.           | % |
| 0.1 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 0.2 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 0.3 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |
| 0.4 | -   | - | -           | - | -             | - |

|       |    |    |    |      |    |    |
|-------|----|----|----|------|----|----|
| 1.1   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 1.2   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 1.3   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 2.1   | 4  | 8  | 2  | 6.7  | 2  | 10 |
| 2.2   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 2.3   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 2.4   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 2.5   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 2.6   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 3.1   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 3.2   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 4.1   | 22 | 44 | 14 | 46.7 | 8  | 40 |
| 4.2   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 4.3   | 3  | 6  | 2  | 6.7  | 1  | 5  |
| 5     | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| 6     | 21 | 42 | 12 | 40   | 9  | 45 |
| 7     | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -  |
| TOTAL | 50 |    | 30 | 60   | 20 | 40 |

### **A. Total number of strategies**

According to the table above, it is clear that some strategies have been extensively used, especially those that are directly connected to giving an apology.

The following classification can be made with reference to the number of strategies used in each specific category.

#### Group 1

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance

#### Group 2

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness

#### Group 3

The other strategies were never used at all. group 1 and 2 were used because the strategies used are all directly related to apology.

### **B. The number of strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 4.1, 6

Group 2: 2.1, 4.3

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.1, 6

Group 2: 2.1, 4.3

Others: Negligent

(a) Both males and female frequently used the same strategies. Strategy 4.1 (expression of regret), strategy 6 (promise of forbearance), strategy 2.1 (implicit acknowledgement) and strategy 4.3 (request of forgiveness). Both males and females are inclined to regret their wrong doings and ask for forgiveness.

#### 5.4.2.5.2 Clothes

**Table 19**

|       |     |      | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------|-----|------|------|------|--------|------|
|       | No. | %    | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.3   | 3   | 5.6  | 3    | 10.7 | -      | -    |
| 2.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.6   | 2   | 3.8  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.3  |
| 3.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 3.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 4.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 4.2   | 9   | 17.3 | 4    | 14.3 | 5      | 20.8 |
| 4.3   | 7   | 13.5 | 3    | 10.7 | 4      | 16.7 |
| 5     | 5   | 9.6  | 4    | 14.3 | 1      | 4.2  |
| 6     | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 7     | 26  | 50   | 14   | 50   | 12     | 50   |
| TOTAL | 52  |      | 28   | 53.8 | 24     | 46.2 |

#### A. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 4.2: offer of apology: 17.3%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 13.5%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 50%



Group 2

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 9.6%

Group 3

Some strategies have a limited number ranging from 5.6% (strategy 2.3) to 3.8% (strategy 2.6). Some strategies were never used at all.

Group 1 and 2 were frequently used because they are all directly related to asking for forgiveness and apologizing.

### **B. The number of strategies between males and females.**

Males: Group 1: 4.2, 5 and 7

Group 2: 2.3, 4.3

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.2, 4.3 and 7

Group 2: 2.6, 5

Others: Negligent

(a) Both males and females have frequently used strategy 4.2 (offer of apology) and 7 (offer of repair). The reason is because both male and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness and repair the damage caused.

(b) The other strategies used by both males and females are directly related to asking for forgiveness e.g. 4.3 (request for forgiveness), 2.6 (explicit acceptance of blame)

(c) The other strategies were never used at all.

#### **5.4.2.5.3 Class notes**

**Table 20**

|     |     |   | <b>Male</b> |     | <b>Female</b> |   |
|-----|-----|---|-------------|-----|---------------|---|
|     | No. | % | No.         | %   | No.           | % |
| 0.1 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 0.2 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 0.3 | 2   | 4 | 2           | 7.4 | -             | - |
| 0.4 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 1.1 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 1.2 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 1.3 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 2.1 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |
| 2.2 | -   | - | -           | -   | -             | - |

|       |    |    |    |      |    |      |
|-------|----|----|----|------|----|------|
| 2.3   | 2  | 4  | -  | -    | 2  | 8.7  |
| 2.4   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.5   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 2.6   | 12 | 24 | 5  | 18.5 | 7  | 30.4 |
| 3.1   | 4  | 8  | 2  | 7.4  | 2  | 8.7  |
| 3.2   | 6  | 12 | 4  | 14.8 | 2  | 8.7  |
| 4.1   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 4.2   | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 4.3   | 9  | 18 | 6  | 22.2 | 3  | 13   |
| 5     | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| 6     | 15 | 30 | 8  | 29.7 | 7  | 30.4 |
| 7     | -  | -  | -  | -    | -  | -    |
| TOTAL | 50 |    | 27 | 54   | 23 | 46   |

### A. Total number of strategies

#### Group 1

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 24%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 18%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 30%

#### Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation

#### Group 3

Strategies 0.3 and 2.3 have a limited number of strategies used with 4% each. The other strategies were never used at all.

Group one and two were frequently used because they are all directly related to apology.

### B. The number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 2.6, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 0.3, 3.1, 3.2

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 2.6, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 3.1, 3.2

Others: Negligent

Both males and females used the same strategies in group 1 and 2 because when it comes to possessions both males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness (4.3), Promise of forbearance (6) and give an explanation for their offenses (3.2)

(a) Other strategies were never used at all.

#### 5.4.2.5.4 Pen

**Table 21**

|       |     |      | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------|-----|------|------|------|--------|------|
|       | No. | %    | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 0.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 0.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 1.3   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.2   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.3   | 2   | 4.1  | -    | -    | 2      | 8.7  |
| 2.4   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.5   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 2.6   | 3   | 6.1  | 3    | 11.5 | -      | -    |
| 3.1   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 3.2   | 5   | 10.2 | 2    | 7.7  | 3      | 13   |
| 4.1   | 1   | 2    | -    | -    | 1      | 4.3  |
| 4.2   | 9   | 18.4 | 5    | 19.2 | 4      | 17.4 |
| 4.3   | 7   | 14.3 | 3    | 11.5 | 4      | 17.4 |
| 5     | 6   | 12.2 | 4    | 15.4 | 2      | 8.7  |
| 6     | -   | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| 7     | 16  | 32.7 | 9    | 34.6 | 7      | 30.4 |
| TOTAL | 49  |      | 26   | 53.1 | 23     | 46.9 |

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 4.2: offer of apology: 18.4%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 14.3%

Strategy 7: offer of repair: 32.7%

Group 2

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 6.1%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 10.2

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 12.2%

### Group 3

Some strategies have a limited number ranging from 4.1% (strategy 2.1) to 2% ((strategy 4.1). other strategies were never used at all.

Groups one and two have been frequently used because they are all directly related to apology.

### B. Number of strategies between males and females

- (a) Both males and females frequently used strategy 7 (offer of repair). The reason is because both males and females do offer to repair the damage, which resulted from their infraction.
- (b) Males also have strategy 4.2 (offer of apology) and 5 (expressing concern for hearer) as the most frequently used strategies because males are more inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (c) Females also have strategy 4.2 (offer of apology) and 4.3 (request for forgiveness). The reasons are the same as the ones stated above.
- (d) Other strategies were never used at all.

### 5.4.3 Individual strategies in major situations

**Table 22**

| MAJOR SITUATIONS        |       |      | MALE |      | FEMALE |      |
|-------------------------|-------|------|------|------|--------|------|
|                         | TOTAL | %    | NO.  | %    | NO.    | %    |
| <b>1. INCONVINIENCE</b> |       |      |      |      |        |      |
| Strategy 0.2            | 8     | 4.0  | 7    | 6.6  | 1      | 1.1  |
| Strategy 0.3            | 16    | 8.0  | 6    | 5.7  | 10     | 10.8 |
| Strategy 0.4            | 6     | 3.0  | 3    | 2.8  | 3      | 3.2  |
| Strategy 1.1            | 2     | 1.0  | 2    | 1.9  | -      | -    |
| Strategy 2.1            | 2     | 1.0  | -    | -    | 2      | 2.2  |
| Strategy 2.2            | 6     | 3.0  | 2    | 1.9  | 4      | 4.3  |
| Strategy 2.3            | 4     | 2.0  | 4    | 3.8  | -      | -    |
| Strategy 2.5            | 4     | 2.0  | -    | -    | 4      | 4.3  |
| Strategy 2.6            | 34    | 17.1 | 21   | 19.8 | 13     | 13.9 |
| Strategy 3.1            | 18    | 9.0  | 11   | 10.4 | 7      | 7.5  |
| Strategy 3.2            | 27    | 13.6 | 11   | 10.4 | 16     | 17.2 |
| Strategy 4.1            | 7     | 3.5  | 2    | 1.9  | 5      | 5.4  |
| Strategy 4.2            | 6     | 3.0  | 2    | 1.9  | 4      | 4.3  |
| Strategy 4.3            | 24    | 12.1 | 16   | 15.1 | 8      | 8.6  |
| Strategy 5              | 6     | 3.0  | 4    | 3.8  | 2      | 2.2  |
| Strategy 6              | 19    | 9.5  | 11   | 10.4 | 8      | 8.6  |
| Strategy 7              | 10    | 5.0  | 4    | 3.8  | 6      | 6.5  |
| TOTAL                   | 199   |      | 106  |      | 93     |      |
|                         |       |      |      |      |        |      |
| <b>2. SPACE</b>         |       |      |      |      |        |      |
| Strategy 0.1            | 12    | 5.9  | 8    | 7.1  | 4      | 4.3  |

|                      |     |      |     |      |    |      |
|----------------------|-----|------|-----|------|----|------|
| Strategy 0.2         | 10  | 4.9  | 7   | 6.3  | 3  | 3.3  |
| Strategy 0.3         | 15  | 7.4  | 8   | 7.1  | 7  | 7.6  |
| Strategy 1.2         | 2   | 0.9  | 2   | 1.8  | -  | -    |
| Strategy 2.3         | 8   | 3.9  | 2   | 1.8  | 6  | 6.5  |
| Strategy 2.4         | 5   | 2.5  | 5   | 4.5  | -  | -    |
| Strategy 2.6         | 4   | 1.9  | -   | -    | 4  | 4.3  |
| Strategy 3.1         | 16  | 7.8  | 10  | 8.9  | 6  | 6.5  |
| Strategy 3.2         | 22  | 10.8 | 13  | 11.6 | 9  | 9.8  |
| Strategy 4.1         | 11  | 5.4  | 5   | 4.5  | 6  | 6.5  |
| Strategy 4.2         | 25  | 12.3 | 14  | 12.5 | 11 | 11.9 |
| Strategy 4.3         | 30  | 14.7 | 17  | 15.2 | 13 | 14.1 |
| Strategy 5           | 18  | 8.8  | 8   | 7.1  | 10 | 10.9 |
| Strategy 6           | 22  | 10.8 | 11  | 9.8  | 11 | 11.9 |
| Strategy 7           | 4   | 1.9  | 2   | 1.8  | 2  | 2.2  |
| TOTAL                | 204 |      | 112 |      | 92 |      |
| <b>3. TALK</b>       |     |      |     |      |    |      |
| Strategy 0.2         | 3   | 1.5  | 3   | 2.9  | -  | -    |
| Strategy 0.3         | 9   | 4.6  | 5   | 4.9  | 4  | 4.3  |
| Strategy 1.1         | 4   | 2.1  | 2   | 1.9  | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 1.2         | 4   | 2.1  | 2   | 1.9  | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 2.2         | 7   | 3.6  | 4   | 3.9  | 3  | 3.2  |
| Strategy 2.3         | 17  | 8.7  | 10  | 9.8  | 7  | 7.5  |
| Strategy 2.5         | 3   | 1.5  | -   | -    | 3  | 3.2  |
| Strategy 2.6         | 2   | 1.0  | -   | -    | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 3.1         | 11  | 5.6  | 7   | 6.9  | 4  | 4.3  |
| Strategy 3.2         | 24  | 12.3 | 14  | 13.7 | 10 | 10.8 |
| Strategy 4.1         | 28  | 14.4 | 14  | 13.7 | 14 | 15.1 |
| Strategy 4.2         | 17  | 8.7  | 8   | 7.8  | 9  | 9.7  |
| Strategy 4.3         | 31  | 15.9 | 15  | 14.7 | 16 | 17.2 |
| 5                    | 10  | 5.1  | 6   | 5.9  | 4  | 4.3  |
| 6                    | 22  | 11.3 | 9   | 8.8  | 13 | 13.9 |
| 7                    | 3   | 1.5  | 3   | 2.9  | -  | -    |
| TOTAL                | 195 |      | 102 |      | 93 |      |
| <b>4. TIME</b>       |     |      |     |      |    |      |
| Strategy 0.3         | 17  | 8.3  | 7   | 6.1  | 10 | 10.9 |
| Strategy 2.1         | 6   | 2.9  | 4   | 3.5  | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 2.2         | 7   | 3.4  | -   | -    | 7  | 7.6  |
| Strategy 2.3         | 8   | 3.9  | 6   | 5.3  | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 2.4         | 3   | 1.5  | -   | -    | 3  | 3.2  |
| Strategy 2.6         | 17  | 8.3  | 15  | 13.1 | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 3.1         | 2   | 0.9  | -   | -    | 2  | 2.2  |
| Strategy 3.2         | 28  | 13.6 | 15  | 13.1 | 13 | 14.1 |
| Strategy 4.1         | 37  | 18   | 16  | 14   | 21 | 22.8 |
| Strategy 4.2         | 3   | 1.5  | -   | -    | 3  | 3.3  |
| Strategy 4.3         | 33  | 16   | 20  | 17.5 | 13 | 14.1 |
| Strategy 5           | 12  | 5.8  | 4   | 3.5  | 8  | 8.7  |
| Strategy 6           | 33  | 16   | 27  | 23.7 | 6  | 6.5  |
| TOTAL                | 206 |      | 114 |      | 92 |      |
| <b>5. POSSESSION</b> |     |      |     |      |    |      |
| Strategy 0.3         | 2   | 0.9  | 2   | 1.7  | -  | -    |
| Strategy 2.1         | 4   | 1.9  | 2   | 1.7  | 2  | 2.1  |
| Strategy 2.3         | 7   | 3.3  | 3   | 2.6  | 4  | 4.2  |
| Strategy 2.6         | 13  | 6.1  | 5   | 4.3  | 8  | 8.4  |
| Strategy 3.1         | 4   | 1.9  | 2   | 1.7  | 2  | 2.1  |
| Strategy 3.2         | 12  | 5.7  | 7   | 6    | 5  | 5.3  |

|              |     |      |     |      |    |      |
|--------------|-----|------|-----|------|----|------|
| Strategy 4.1 | 22  | 10.4 | 14  | 12   | 8  | 8.4  |
| Strategy 4.2 | 18  | 8.5  | 9   | 7.7  | 9  | 9.5  |
| Strategy 4.3 | 26  | 12.3 | 14  | 12   | 12 | 12.6 |
| Strategy 5   | 11  | 5.2  | 8   | 6.8  | 3  | 3.2  |
| Strategy 6   | 36  | 17   | 20  | 17.1 | 16 | 16.8 |
| Strategy 7   | 57  | 26.9 | 31  | 26.5 | 26 | 27.4 |
| TOTAL        | 212 |      | 117 |      | 95 |      |

### 5.4.3.1 Major situations

#### 5.4.3.1.1 Inconvenience

##### A. Total number of strategies

###### Group 1

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 17.1%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 13.6%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 12.1%

###### Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 8%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation 9%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 9.5%

###### Group 3

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility: 4%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair

###### Group 4

Strategy 0.4: Blaming someone else: 3%

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 3%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 3%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 3%

###### Group 5

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 1%

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 1%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 2%

Strategy 2.5: expression of embarrassment: 2%

- (a) Group one and two have the most frequently used strategies because they are directly related to apology and people are inclined to ask for forgiveness when they have inconvenienced someone.
- (b) Groups three and four have the second most frequently used strategies because they are also slightly related to apology.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 2.6, 4.3

Group 2: 3.1, 3.2, 6

Group 3: 0.2, 0.3

Group 4: 2.3, 5, 7

Group 5: 0.4, 1.1, 2, 2.2

Females: Group 1: 2.6, 3.2

Group 2: 0.3, 6, 4.3

Group 3: 3.1, 7

Group 4: 2.2, 2.5, 4.2

Group 5: 0.2, 2.1, 5

- (a) Looking at the groupings above, both males and females have frequently used strategies with strategy 2.6 (Explicit acceptance of blame). They both accept the blame for the inconvenience caused.
- (b) There is no relationship in the other groups between the males and females because males are more inclined to give an explanation while females apologize.

### **5.4.3.1.2 Space**

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 4.2: offer of apology: 12.3%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 14.7%

Group 2

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 10.8%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 10.8%

### Group 3

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 7.4%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 7.8%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 8.8%

### Group 4

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility: 5.9%

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility: 4.9%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 5.4%

### Group 5

Strategy 1.2: Querying precondition: 0.9%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 3.9%

Strategy 2.4: Expression of self-deficiency: 2.5%

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 1.9%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 1.9%

(a) Groups one and two have been frequently used because people are inclined to give an explanation for their offences and ask for forgiveness.

(b) Group three also has more strategies used because people always justify why an offence was committed and ask for forgiveness.

(c) Groups four and five were moderately used.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 4.2, 4.3

Group 2: 3.1, 6

Group 3: 0.1, 0.3, 5, 0.2

Group 4: 2.4, 4.1

Group 5: 1.2, 2.3, 2.4

Females: Group 1: 4.2, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 3.2, 3.1, 4.1

Group 3: 0.3, 2.3, 3.1, 4.1

Group 4: 0.1, 2.6

Group 5: 0.2, 7



- (a) Both males and females have the most frequently used strategies used in group 1 and 2 and they have a number of the same strategies used; i.e. 3.1 (Implicit explanation), 3.2 (Explicit explanation), 4.2 (offer of apology), 4.3 (request for forgiveness) and 6 (promise of forbearance). These strategies were used because these strategies are culturally needed for apologizing.
- (b) For the males and females 0.3(Justification) was frequently used, the reason is because both males and females are inclined to justify their actions.
- (c) The other groupings have a limited number of strategies used because they are not directly related to space offences.

#### **5.4.3.1.3 Talk**

##### **A. Total number of strategies**

###### Group 1

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 14.4%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 15.5%

###### Group 2

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 12.3%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 11.3%

###### Group 3

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 8.7%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 8.7%

###### Group 4

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 4.6%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 5.6%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 5.1%

###### Group 5

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility: 1.5%

Strategy 1.1: minimizing: 2.1%

Strategy 1.2: Querying preconditions: 3.6%

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 3.6%

Strategy 2.5: Expression of embarrassment: 1.5%

Strategy 2.6: Promise: 1%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 1.5%

- (a) Group one, two and three have been frequently used because offenses related to talk tend most often to elicit, explicit, apology, explanation and most of all to ask for forgiveness.
- (b) A limited number of strategies were used in group 4 and 5 because talk do not appear to elicit typical patterns of apology strategy.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 4.1, 4.3

Group 2: 2.3, 6, 4.2

Group 3: 3.1, 5

Group 4: 0.3, 2.2

Group 5: 0.2, 1.1, 1.2, 7

Females: Group 1: 4.1, 4.3, 6

Group 2: 3.2, 4.2

Group 3: 2.3

Group 4: 0.3, 3.1, 5

Group 5: 1.1, 1.2, 2.6

- (a) Both males and females used strategy 3.2 (explicit explanation), 2.3 (expression of lack of intent), 4.1 (expression of regret), 4.2 (offer of apology) and 6 (promise of forbearance) in groups one and two as the most frequently used strategies. The reason is because both males and females are inclined to apologize and regret their wrong doings.
- (b) Group four and five have the same strategies, which were the same least used strategies; i.e. 0.3 (Justification), 1.1 (minimizing), 1.2 (Querying conditions). It is rare for both males and females to justify talk offenses.

### **5.4.31.4 Time**

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 13.6%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 16%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 16%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 18%

Group 2

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 8.3%

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 8.3%

Group 3

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 5.8%

Group 4

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 2.9%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 3.9%

Group 5

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 2.9%

Strategy 2.4: Expression of self-deficiency: 1.5%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 1.5%

(a) Groups one and two have more number of strategies, which were used because in offenses related to time, involve combination of strategies. They generally demand an explanation, justification and asking for forgiveness.

(b) The other groups have a limited number of strategies used because they are not commonly used in offenses related to time.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

Males: Group 1: 4.3, 6, 4.1

Group 2: 2.6, 3.2

Group 3: 2.3

Group 4: 2.1, 5

Group 5: Insignificant

Females: Group 1: 3.2, 4.3

Group 2: 0.3, 5

Group 3: 6, 2.2

Group 4: 2.4, 4.2

Group 5: 2.1, 2.3

- (a) Males have the most number of strategies used in group one and two. The strategies used are 4.3 (request for forgiveness), 4.1 (expression of regret), 2.6 (explicit acceptance of blame), 3.2 (explicit explanation) and 6 (promise of forbearance). These strategies were frequently used because males are inclined to ask for forgiveness.
- (b) Females also have their own frequently used strategies in group one and two. 0.3 (justification) and 5 (Expressing concern for hearer). The reasons are the same as the ones stated in a because 4.3 and 3.2 were also frequently used by the males.
- (c) For the males strategy 2.2 (implicit acknowledgement), 2.4 (expression of self-deficiency), 3.1 (implicit explanation) and 4.2 (offer of apology) were never used at all.

#### **5.4.3.1.5 Possession**

##### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 12.3%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 26.9%

Group 2

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 10.4%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 8.5%

Group 3

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of the blame: 6.1%

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 5.7%

Group 4

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 3.3%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 5.2%

Group 5

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 0.9%

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 1.9%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 1.9%

- (a) There is no significant difference in the number of strategies used in group one, two and three because they are all related to possession that is why they have been frequently used. They have been used because possession offences include an explicit acknowledgement of responsibility by asking for forgiveness, express regret, give an explicit explanation and offer repair.
- (b) Group 4 and 5 have a limited number of strategies used.

### B. Strategies between males and females

Males:       Group 1: 6, 7  
                   Group 2: 4.2, 4.3  
                   Group 3: 3.2, 5  
                   Group 4: 2.6, 2.3  
                   Group 5: 0.3, 2.1, 3.1

Females:     Group 1: 6, 7  
                   Group 2: 4.2, 4.3  
                   Group 3: 2.6, 4.1  
                   Group 4: 2.3, 3.2  
                   Group 5: 2.1, 3.1, 5

Looking at the strategies between males and females, the same strategies were used from the most frequently used to the least. The reason is because all males and females are inclined to ask for forgiveness and offer repair.

#### 5.4.4 Individual strategies

**Table 23**

|     |     |     | Male |     | Female |     |
|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|--------|-----|
|     | No. | %   | No.  | %   | No.    | %   |
| 0.1 | 20  | 2   | 15   | 2.7 | 5      | 1.1 |
| 0.2 | 21  | 2   | 17   | 3.1 | 4      | 0.8 |
| 0.3 | 59  | 5.8 | 28   | 5.1 | 31     | 6.7 |
| 0.4 | 6   | 0.6 | 3    | 0.5 | 3      | 0.6 |
| 1.1 | 6   | 0.6 | 4    | 0.7 | 2      | 0.4 |
| 1.2 | 6   | 0.6 | 4    | 0.7 | 2      | 0.4 |
| 1.3 | -   | -   | -    | -   | -      | -   |
| 2.1 | 6   | 0.6 | 2    | 0.4 | 4      | 0.8 |
| 2.2 | 20  | 2   | 6    | 1.1 | 14     | 3   |
| 2.3 | 44  | 4.3 | 25   | 4.5 | 19     | 4.1 |

|       |      |      |     |      |     |      |
|-------|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|
| 2.4   | 8    | 0.8  | 5   | 0.9  | 3   | 0.6  |
| 2.5   | 7    | 0.7  | -   | -    | 7   | 1.5  |
| 2.6   | 70   | 6.9  | 41  | 7.4  | 29  | 6.3  |
| 3.1   | 51   | 5    | 30  | 5.4  | 21  | 4.5  |
| 3.2   | 113  | 11.1 | 60  | 10.8 | 53  | 11.4 |
| 4.1   | 105  | 10.3 | 51  | 9.2  | 54  | 11.6 |
| 4.4   | 69   | 6.8  | 33  | 6    | 36  | 7.8  |
| 4.3   | 144  | 14.4 | 82  | 14.8 | 62  | 13.4 |
| 5     | 57   | 5.6  | 30  | 5.4  | 27  | 5.8  |
| 6     | 132  | 13   | 78  | 14.1 | 54  | 11.6 |
| 7     | 74   | 7.3  | 40  | 7.2  | 34  | 7.3  |
| TOTAL | 1018 |      | 554 |      | 464 |      |

According to the table above, the individual strategies can be grouped from the highest to the lowest frequency according to the total number of times each individual strategy has been used.

#### 5.4.4.1 Total number of strategies

##### Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 11.1%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 14.4%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 13%

##### Group 2

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 6.9%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 10.3%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 7.3%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 6.8%

##### Group 3

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 5.8%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 5%

Strategy 5: Expressing concern for hearer: 5.6

##### Group 4

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility: 2%

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 2%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 4.3%

#### Group 5

Strategy 0.4: Blaming someone else: 0.6%

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 0.6%

Strategy 1.2: Querying preconditions: 0.6%

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 0.6%

Strategy 2.4: Expression of self-deficiency: 0.8%

Strategy 2.5: Expression of embarrassment: 0.7%

#### Group 6

Other: Negligent

- (a) When we look at the groupings, group 1 and group 2 have the most frequently used number of strategies, this is because people are more inclined to use them when apologizing.
- (b) Groups 3 and 4 also have a number of strategies used because sometimes people have to justify their wrong doings by explaining what made them committed the offense.
- (c) Group 5 has a limited number of strategies used with group 6 having some strategies, which were never used at all.

#### **5.4.4.2 Strategies between males and females**

##### Males

##### Group1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 14.8%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 14.1%

##### Group 2

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 10.8%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 9.2%

##### Group 3

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 7.4%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 7.2%

## Group 4

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 5.1%

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 5.4%

Strategy 5: Expression of concern for hearer: 5.4%

## Group 5

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility: 3.1%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 4.5%

## Group 6

Strategy 0.4: Blaming someone else: 0.5%

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 0.7%

Strategy 1.2: Querying preconditions: 0.7%

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 0.4%

Strategy 2.4: Expression of self-deficiency: 0.9%

## Females

## Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 11.4%

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 11.6%

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 13.4%

Strategy 6: Expressing concern for hearer: 11.6%

## Group 2

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 7.8%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 7.3%

## Group 3

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 6.7%

Strategy 2.6: Explicit acceptance of blame: 6.3%

## Group 4

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 4.5%

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 4.1%



#### Group 5

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 3%

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility: 1.1%

#### Group 6

Strategy 0.2: Implicit denial of responsibility: 0.8%

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 0.6%

Strategy 1.2: Querying preconditions: 0.4%

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 0.8%

Strategy 2.4: Expression of self-deficiency: 0.6%

- (a) Males are more inclined to give explanations than females. Males used 10.8% while females used 4.5%
- (b) Request for forgiveness was more frequently used by both males and females because they are both inclined to ask for forgiveness. Males used 14.8% while females used 13.4%
- (c) When we look at the other groupings between male and females, there is no significant difference, they take all apologies seriously and offer repair where necessary

## CHAPTER 6

### THE EXPRESSION OF OFFENCE IN XITSONGA

#### 6.1 THE COMPLAINT STRATEGIES

Trosborg suggested eight different types of complaint strategies

##### Strategy 1: Hint

Trosborg takes a hint as a complaint strategy which does not say what exactly the problem is. Though a hint is not clear about the problem, an offence can be deduced from that talk.

##### Strategy 2: Annoyance

The complainant who is angry about a certain behaviour uses this strategy. The complainant shows his or her anger by saying something, which is sometimes not good to the complainees.

##### Strategy 3: Ill consequences

The complainant complains by revealing the consequences as a result of the complainees. He or she may indicate that he /she was hurt because of the actions or behaviour of the complainees.

##### Strategy 4: Indirect accusation

The complainant may try to accuse the complainees for his /her behaviour indirectly. The complainant does not say directly what offended him or her. He or she can just indicate that he or she is not satisfied about the action.

##### Strategy 5: Direct accusation

This is the direct opposite of strategy 4. The complainant does not go about the bush, but he or she accuses the complainees directly. The complainees will know where he or she went wrong.

##### Strategy 6: Modified blame

This is a strategy that puts a blame to something that took place. It always indicates the blame but it also gives an alternative to the behaviour that offended.

### Strategy 7: Explicit blame to behaviour

This is a clear blame that is directed to the behaviour that caused a complaint. It does not blame the person but the actions contributed to an offensive act.

### Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person

In this strategy, the blame is directly put to the person who caused an offensive act. It differed from the previous one because this one does not dwell on the behaviour.

## 6.2 Complaint situations and complaint strategies

### Total number of strategies

**Table 1**

|                                      | No.  | %    | MALE |      | FEMALE |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|
|                                      |      |      | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| <b>1. INCONVENIENCE</b>              | 216  | 20.6 | 118  | 21.2 | 98     | 20   |
| 1.1 Wrong information                | 54   | 25   | 30   | 25.4 | 24     | 24.5 |
| 1.2 Inadequate service               | 50   | 23.1 | 26   | 22.0 | 24     | 24.5 |
| 1.3 Forgetting to convey the message | 54   | 25   | 30   | 25.4 | 24     | 24.5 |
| 1.4 Forgetting your responsibility   | 58   | 26.9 | 32   | 27.1 | 26     | 26.5 |
| <b>2. SPACE</b>                      | 212  | 20.2 | 111  | 19.9 | 101    | 20.6 |
| 2.1 Accident                         | 55   | 25.9 | 29   | 26.1 | 26     | 25.7 |
| 2.2 Seat                             | 57   | 26.9 | 30   | 27.0 | 27     | 26.7 |
| 2.3 Queue                            | 50   | 23.6 | 26   | 23.4 | 24     | 23.8 |
| 2.4 Obstruct                         | 50   | 23.6 | 26   | 23.4 | 24     | 23.8 |
| <b>3. TALK</b>                       | 207  | 19.8 | 110  | 19.7 | 97     | 19.8 |
| 3.1 Insult                           | 54   | 26.1 | 30   | 27.3 | 24     | 24.7 |
| 3.2 Phone                            | 53   | 25.6 | 28   | 25.5 | 25     | 25.8 |
| 3.3 Noise                            | 50   | 24.2 | 26   | 23.6 | 24     | 24.7 |
| 3.4 Inappropriate service            | 50   | 24.2 | 26   | 23.6 | 24     | 24.7 |
| <b>4. TIME</b>                       | 209  | 19.9 | 111  | 19.9 | 98     | 20   |
| 4.1 Forgetting                       | 52   | 24.9 | 27   | 24.3 | 25     | 25.5 |
| 4.2 Handing of an assignment         | 53   | 25.4 | 28   | 25.2 | 25     | 25.5 |
| 4.3 Late arrival                     | 54   | 25.8 | 30   | 27.0 | 24     | 24.5 |
| 4.4 Late transport                   | 50   | 23.9 | 26   | 23.4 | 24     | 24.5 |
| <b>5. POSSESSION</b>                 | 204  | 19.5 | 107  | 19.2 | 97     | 19.8 |
| 5.1 Money                            | 50   | 24.5 | 26   | 24.3 | 24     | 24.7 |
| 5.2 Clothes                          | 50   | 24.5 | 26   | 24.3 | 24     | 24.7 |
| 5.3 Class notes                      | 52   | 25.5 | 27   | 25.2 | 25     | 25.8 |
| 5.4 Pen                              | 52   | 25.5 | 28   | 26.2 | 24     | 24.7 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                         | 1048 |      | 557  |      | 491    |      |

In table 24 above, various complain solutions have been listed in a vertical order from situation 1 to situation 5. these situations refer to those which have been listed in the questionnaire. The numbers which appear next to these situations in horizontal order reflect the number of complaint strategies which have been used in each situation as well as in each sub-situation; e.g. situation 1 (Inconvenience), a total number of 216 strategies have been used, i.e. 20.6% of the total number of strategies of these 216 strategies, 118 (21.2%) have been used by males and 98 (20%) have been used by females.

### 6.2.1. The major situations

|   | <b>Situation</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|---|------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1 | Inconvenience    | 20.6         | 21.2        | 20            |
| 2 | Space            | 2.2          | 19.9        | 20.6          |
| 3 | Talk             | 19.9         | 19.7        | 19.8          |
| 4 | Time             | 19.9         | 19.9        | 20            |
| 5 | Possession       | 19.5         | 19.2        | 19.8          |

According to the table above, the complaint strategies, which have been used, can be classified as follows:

#### A. Total number of strategies in each situation

Situation 1.2: 20.6, 20.2

Situation 3.4, 5: 19.9, 19.9, 19.5

In situation 1 and 2 the learners used longer complaint strategies when they complained longer strategies were used because complaint related to incontinence sometimes comes in a form of an argument and a number of sentences will be uttered. There is no significant difference in the number of strategies used in the first two situations and the remaining three.

#### B. Total number of strategies between males and females

##### Males

The situation in which males used the most strategies may be grouped as follows:

Situations 1: 21.2

Situation 2, 3, 4, 5: 19.9, 19.7, 19.9, 19.2

## Females

The most frequent situations in order

Situation 1, 2, 4: 20, 20.6, 20

Situation 3,5: 19.8, 19.8

- (a) With both males and females the most strategies have been used in situations 1 because inconvenience is not taken well by all people, they complain using longer sentences when they have been inconvenienced.
- (b) Females also have the most strategies used in situation 2 and 4 which is space and time. This is because females tend to prefer overlap as far as time and space is concerned.
- (c) Both males and females have the least strategies used in situation 3 and 5. Talk and possessions are taken as something which is straight forward and to the point, you don't have to use long sentences when complaining.

### C. Strategies between males and females in each situation

The number of strategies, which have been used between males and females, do not differ much in each major situation.

Situation 1: 21.2, 20 = 1.2%

Situation 2: 19.9, 20.6 = 0.7%

Situation 3: 19.7, 19.8 = 0.1%

Situation 4: 19.9, 20 = 0.1%

Situation 5: 19.2, 19.8 = 0.6%

In all the situations listed above there is no significant difference between the use of these strategies in these situations between males and females.

## 6.2.2. The sub-situation

### 6.2.2.1. Inconvenience

|     | <b>Sub-situation</b>             | <b>Total</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|-----|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1.1 | Wrong information                | 2.5          | 25.4        | 24.5          |
| 1.2 | Inadequate service               | 23.1         | 22.0        | 24.5          |
| 1.3 | Forgetting to convey the message | 25           | 25.4        | 24.5          |
| 1.4 | Forgetting your responsibility   | 26.9         | 27.1        | 26.5          |

#### A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation

Group1: 1.4, (26.9)

Group 2: 1.1, 1.3 (25, 25)

Group 3: 1.2 (23.1)

In group one, sub-situation 1.4 have longer complaint strategies which were used. The reason is because complaints related to forgetting your responsibility is an inconvenience which the complainees will say as lot of things for the inconvenience caused. There is no significant difference between group 1 and 2. situation 1.2 have the least number of strategies used because complaints related to inadequate service are more likely to be conveyed through direct accusations.

#### B. Total number of strategies between males and females

##### Males

Group 1: 1.4 (26.9)

Group 2: 1.1, 1.3 (25, 25)

Group 3: 1.2 (23.1)

##### Females

Group 1: 1.4 (26.5)

Group 2: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 (24.5, 24.5, 24.5)

(a) With both males and females sub-situation 1.4 have the most number of strategies used because with complaints related to forgetting your responsibilities, both males and females are more inclined to show annoyance. The complainees

may sometimes say things that may start an argument, that is why there are more strategies used.

- (b) There is no significant difference in the number of strategies used in group two and the same sub-situation were used.

### **C. Strategies between males and females in the sub-situation**

The number of strategies used by males and females in each sub-situation do not differ much except in sub-situation 2.1.

Sub-situation 1.1: 25.4, 24.5 = 0.9%

Sub-situation 1.2: 22.0, 24.5 = 2.5%

Sub-situation 1.3: 25.4, 24.5 = 0.9%

Sub-situation 1.4: 27.1, 26.5 = 0.6%

In three of the sub-situations listed above there is no significant difference between the use of strategies between males and females. There is a difference in strategies used in sub-situation 1.2. The reason is because females are more inclined to show annoyance while males use direct accusations.

#### **6.2.2.2. Space**

|     | <b>Sub-situation</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|-----|----------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| 2.1 | Accident             | 25.9         | 26.1        | 25.7          |
| 2.2 | Seat                 | 26.9         | 27.0        | 26.7          |
| 2.3 | Queue                | 23.6         | 23.4        | 23.8          |
| 2.4 | Obstruct             | 23.6         | 23.4        | 23.8          |

#### **A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation**

Group1: 2.1, 2.2 (25.9, 26.9)

Group 2: 2.3, 2.4 (23.6, 23.6)

In sub-situations 2.1 and 2.2 longer complaint strategies were used because people are more likely to get annoyed in complaints related to accidents and taking other people's seats. Usually the complainant is angry that is why longer complaint strategies have been used. There is a difference between group 1 and 2 sub-situations 2.3 and 2.4's complaints are direct.

## B. Total number of strategies between males and females

### Males

Group1: 2.1, 2.2, (26.1, 27.0)

Group2: 2.3, 2.4 (23.4, 23.4)

### Female

Group 1: 2.1, 2.2 (25.7, 26.7)

Group 2: 2.3, 2.4 (23.8, 23.8)

- (a) With both males and females the most strategies have been used in situations 2.1 and 2.2. the reason is because both males and females are inclined to display annoyance.
- (b) Both males and females have the second most used strategies with sub-situations 2.3 and 2.4. the reasons are the same as the ones stated above.

## C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.

Sub-situation 2.1: 26.1, 25.7 = 0.4%

Sub-situation 2.2: 27.0, 26.7 = 0.3%

Sub-situation 2.3: 23.4, 23.8 = 0.4%

Sub-situation 2.4: 23.4, 23.8 = 0.4%

There is no significant difference in strategies used between males and females in these sub-situations.

### 6.2.2.3. Talk

|     | Sub-situation         | Total | Male | Female |
|-----|-----------------------|-------|------|--------|
| 3.1 | Insult                | 26.1  | 27.3 | 24.7   |
| 3.2 | Phone                 | 25.6  | 25.5 | 25.8   |
| 3.3 | Noise                 | 24.2  | 23.6 | 24.7   |
| 3.4 | Inappropriate service | 24.2  | 23.6 | 24.7   |

## A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation

Group 1: 3.1, 3.2 (26.1, 25.6)

Group 2: 3.3, 3.4 (24.2, 24.2)



In sub-situations 3.1 and 3.2 longer complaint strategies were used because insult and talking a long time on the phone annoy people. They will complain while angry, accuse, blame and intimidate where necessary. That is why longer complaint strategies were used. There is no significant difference with those used in group 2 and the reasons are the same as the ones stated above.

## **B. Total number of strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

Group1: 3.1, 3.2 (27.3, 25.5)

Group 2: 3.3, 3.4 (23.6, 23.6)

### **Females**

Group 1: 3.2 (25.8)

Group 2: 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 (24.7, 24.7, 24.7)

- (a) With both males and females sub-situation 3.2 have the most number of complaint strategies used. The reason is because both males and females becomes annoyed easily when someone use a public phone for a long time.
- (b) Males also have the most complaint strategies used in situation 3.1 (insult). The reasons are the same as the ones stated above.
- (c) Females used strategy 3.1 (insult) as the second most used strategy because females tend to prefer overlap.
- (d) The other remaining sub-situations were used by both males and females as the second most used strategies

## **C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.**

Sub-situation 3.1: 27.3, 24.7 = 2.6%

Sub-situation 3.2: 25.5, 25.8 = 0.3%

Sub-situation 3.3: 23.6, 24.7 = 1.1%

Sub-situation 3.4: 23.6, 24.7 = 1.1%

There is no significant difference in the use of strategies used between males and females in this sub-situation except with sub-situation 3.1. Males are more inclined to react to insult than females do.

#### 6.2.2.4. Time

|     | <b>Sub-situation</b>     | <b>Total</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| 4.1 | Forgetting               | 24.9         | 24.3        | 25.5          |
| 4.2 | Handing of an assignment | 25.4         | 25.2        | 25.5          |
| 4.3 | Late arrival             | 23.9         | 23.4        | 24.5          |
| 4.4 | Late transport           | 23.9         | 23.4        | 24.5          |

#### A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation

Group 1: 4.1, 4.2 (24.9, 25.4)

Group 2: 4.3, 4.4 (23.9, 23.9)

There is no significant difference between the number of strategies used in group 1 and in group 2. In both groups longer complaint strategies were used because the complainant complains as the result of the complaine and accuse the complaine directly. This resulted in longer complaint strategies being used.

#### B. Total number of strategies between males and females

##### Males

Group1: 4.1, 4.2, (24.3, 25.3)

Group 2: 4.3, 4.4 (23.9, 23.9)

##### Females

Group 1: 4.1, 4.2 (25.5, 25.3)

Group 2: 4.3, 4.4 (24.5, 24.5)

Both males and females used the same sub-situations with the most used strategies. There is no significant difference between the number of strategies used in group 1 and 2 for both males and females. Both males and females place high value on time. Longer complaint strategies were used by both males and females because they both get annoyed very easily.

### C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.

Situation 4.1: 24.3, 25.5 = 1.2%

Situation 4.2: 25.2, 25.5 = 0.3%

Situation 4.3: 23.4, 24.5 = 1.1%

Situation 4.4: 23.4, 24.5 = 1.1%

There is no significant difference between the number of strategies used between males and females in this sub-situation.

#### 6.2.2.5. Possession

|     | <b>Sub-situation</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|-----|----------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| 5.1 | Money                | 24.5         | 24.3        | 24.7          |
| 5.2 | Clothes              | 24.5         | 24.3        | 24.7          |
| 5.3 | Class notes          | 25.5         | 25.2        | 25.8          |
| 5.4 | Pen                  | 25.5         | 26.2        | 24.7          |

#### A. Total number of strategies in this sub-situation

Group 1: 5.3, 5.4 (25.5, 25.5)

Group 2: 5.1, 5.2 (24.5, 24.5)

There is no significant difference between group 1 and 2. In both groups longer complaint strategies were used because damage or loss to the complainant's possessions including money elicited longer complaint strategies because the complainant was angry about a certain behaviour.

#### B. Total number of strategies between males and females

##### Males

Group 1: 5.3, 5.4 (25.2, 26.2)

Group 2: 5.1, 5.2 (24.3, 24.3)

##### Females

Group 1: 5.3 (25.8)

Group 2: 5.2, 5.4 (24.7, 24.7, 24.7)

- (a) Both males and females have the most used complaint strategies in strategy 5.3 (class notes). The reason is because both males and females get annoyed very easily when someone is irresponsible and reliable.
- (b) Males also have the most used strategies in strategy 5.4. The reasons are the same as the ones given above.
- (c) There is no significant different between the number of strategies between males and females in the remaining sub-situations.

### C. Strategies between males and females in this sub-situation.

Sub-situation 5.1: 24.3, 24.7: 0.4%

Sub-situation 5.2: 24.3, 24.7: 0.4%

Sub-situation 5.3: 25.2, 25.8: 0.6%

Sub-situation 5.4: 26.2, 24.7: 1.5%

There is no significant difference between the strategies used between males and females in this sub-situation.

### 6.3. Individual strategies in major situations

**Table 2**

|                         | Total | %    | Male |      | Female |      |
|-------------------------|-------|------|------|------|--------|------|
|                         |       |      | No   | %    | No.    | %    |
| <b>1. INCONVENIENCE</b> | 216   |      | 118  |      | 98     |      |
| Strategy 1              | -     | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| Strategy 2              | 46    | 21.3 | 24   | 20.3 | 22     | 22.4 |
| Strategy 3              | 57    | 26.4 | 35   | 29.7 | 22     | 22.4 |
| Strategy 4              | 19    | 8.8  | 9    | 7.6  | 10     | 10.2 |
| Strategy 5              | 25    | 11.6 | 13   | 11.0 | 12     | 12.2 |
| Strategy 6              | 18    | 8.3  | 11   | 9.3  | 7      | 7.1  |
| Strategy 7              | 27    | 12.5 | 15   | 12.7 | 12     | 12.2 |
| Strategy 8              | 24    | 11.1 | 11   | 9.3  | 13     | 13.3 |
| <b>2. SPACE</b>         | 212   |      | 111  |      | 101    |      |
| Strategy 1              | 13    | 6.1  | 5    | 4.5  | 8      | 7.9  |
| Strategy 2              | 53    | 25   | 28   | 25.2 | 25     | 24.6 |
| Strategy 3              | 30    | 14.2 | 15   | 13.5 | 15     | 14.9 |
| Strategy 4              | 21    | 9.9  | 8    | 7.2  | 13     | 12.9 |
| Strategy 5              | 50    | 23.6 | 30   | 27.0 | 20     | 19.8 |
| Strategy 6              | 30    | 14.2 | 15   | 13.5 | 15     | 14.9 |
| Strategy 7              | 15    | 7.1  | 10   | 9.0  | 5      | 5    |
| Strategy 8              | -     | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| <b>3. TALK</b>          | 207   |      | 110  |      | 97     |      |
| Strategy 1              | -     | -    | -    | -    | -      | -    |
| Strategy 2              | 68    | 32.9 | 38   | 34.5 | 30     | 30.9 |

|                      |     |      |     |      |    |      |
|----------------------|-----|------|-----|------|----|------|
| Strategy 3           | 16  | 7.7  | 5   | 4.5  | 11 | 11.3 |
| Strategy 4           | 18  | 8.7  | 10  | 9.1  | 8  | 8.2  |
| Strategy 5           | 25  | 12.1 | 15  | 13.6 | 10 | 10.3 |
| Strategy 6           | 30  | 14.5 | 15  | 13.6 | 15 | 15.5 |
| Strategy 7           | 22  | 10.6 | 12  | 10.9 | 10 | 10.3 |
| Strategy 8           | 28  | 19.5 | 15  | 13.6 | 13 | 19.4 |
| <b>4. TIME</b>       | 209 |      | 111 |      | 98 |      |
| Strategy 1           | 9   | 4.3  | 3   | 2.7  | 6  | 6.1  |
| Strategy 2           | 45  | 21.5 | 25  | 22.5 | 20 | 20.4 |
| Strategy 3           | 52  | 24.9 | 28  | 25.2 | 24 | 24.5 |
| Strategy 4           | 24  | 11.5 | 12  | 10.8 | 12 | 12.2 |
| Strategy 5           | 33  | 15.8 | 18  | 16.2 | 15 | 15.3 |
| Strategy 6           | 13  | 6.2  | 8   | 7.2  | 5  | 5.1  |
| Strategy 7           | 15  | 7.2  | 7   | 6.3  | 8  | 8.1  |
| Strategy 8           | 18  | 8.6  | 10  | 9.0  | 8  | 8.1  |
| <b>5. POSSESSION</b> | 204 |      | 107 |      | 97 |      |
| Strategy 1           | 7   | 3.4  | 2   | 1.9  | 5  | 5.1  |
| Strategy 2           | 34  | 16.7 | 20  | 18.7 | 14 | 14.4 |
| Strategy 3           | 13  | 6.4  | 8   | 7.5  | 5  | 5.2  |
| Strategy 4           | 9   | 4.4  | 2   | 1.9  | 7  | 7.2  |
| Strategy 5           | 41  | 20.0 | 2.2 | 20.6 | 19 | 19.6 |
| Strategy 6           | 63  | 30.9 | 35  | 32.7 | 28 | 28.9 |
| Strategy 7           | 17  | 8.3  | 10  | 9.3  | 7  | 7.2  |
| Strategy 8           | 20  | 9.8  | 8   | 7.5  | 12 | 12.4 |

### 6.3.1. Major situations

#### 6.3.1.1. Inconvenience

##### A. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 21.3%

Strategy 3: Consequences: 26.4%

Group2

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 12.5%

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 11.6%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 11.1%

Group 3

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 8.8%

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 8.3%

Group 4

Others: Insignificant

- (a) Group 1 have the most number of strategies of complaint strategies used. Most strategies have been used because when people have been inconvenienced, they are annoyed and inconvenience goes together with consequences. If an act has occurred, there will be consequences that go with it.
- (b) Group 2 have the second most used strategies because in issues related to blame people are inclined to blame or accuse.
- (c) Group 3 have the least number of strategies used with group 4 having strategies which were never used at all.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

**Males:**

- Group 1: 2.3 (20.3, 29.7)
- Group 2: 5.7 (11.0, 12.7)
- Group 3: 4, 6, 8 (7.6, 9.3, 9.3)
- Group 4: Others insignificant

**Females:**

- Group 1: 2.3 (22.4, 22.4)
- Group 2: 5, 8.7 (2.2, 13.3, 12.2)
- Group 3: 4, 6 (10.2, 7.1, 1)
- Group 4: Others insignificant

- (a) When we look at the groupings, both males and females are in favour of strategy 2 and 3, they are the most frequently used strategies by both males and females. Both males and females get angry when they are inconvenienced and they do reveal the consequences as the results of the complaine.
  - (b) Both males and females are inclined to accuse directly, that is why they both have strategy 5 as the second most used strategy.
  - (c) Strategy 1 was never used by both males and females

### **6.3.1.2. Space**

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 25%

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 23.6%

### Group 2

Strategy 3: Consequences: 14.2%

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 14.2%

### Group 3

Strategy 1: Hint: 6.1%

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 9.9%

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 7.1%

### Group 4

Others: Insignificant

- (a) Group one have the most number of complaint strategies which have been used. People get annoyed but they sometimes accuse directly more specially with offenses related to space.
- (b) Group two have the second most number of complaint strategies used. Strategy 3 (consequences) and strategy 6 (modified blame) were used because people are inclined to remedy situations which are unfavourable.
- (c) Group three have the least number of strategies used with group 4 having strategies which were never used at all.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

Group 1: 2, 5 (25.2, 27.0)

Group 2: 6, 3 (13.6, 13.5)

Group 3: 1, 4, 7 (4.5, 7.2, 9.0)

Group 4: others: Insignificant

### **Females**

Group 1: 2, 5 (24.6, 19.8)

Group 2: 4, 6, 3 (12.9, 14.9, 14.9)

Group 3: 1, 7 (7.9, 5)

Group 4: Others: Insignificant

- (a) Both males and females used strategy 2 (annoyance) and strategy 5 (direct accusation) frequently than the other strategies. Both males and females get annoyed very easily.

- (b) The second used strategy by both males and females is strategy 6 (modified blame) and strategy 3 (consequences). Both males and females know that blame goes together with consequences.
- (c) Strategy 1 (Hint) and strategy 7 (explicit blame on behaviour) was the least used strategies by both males and females.
- (d) Strategy 8 was never used at all.

### **6.3.1.3. Talk**

#### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 32.9%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 19.5%

Group 2

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 12.1%

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 14.5%

Group 3

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 8.7%

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 10.6%

Strategy 3: Consequences: 7.7%

Group 4

Others: Insignificant

- (a) Strategy 2 and 8 have long apology strategies which have been used. When a person insult or stay long on a public phone, an argument may come up which results in longer complaint strategies being used. Blaming a person need more words to complain that is why longer complaint strategies were used.
- (b) Strategy 5 and 6 have the second most used strategies used, the reasons are because accusing someone need a lot of words because an argument may start, that is why longer complaint strategies were used.
- (c) Group 4 have the least number of strategies used with strategy 1 (hint) which was never used at all.



## **A. Strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

Group 1: 2 (32.9)

Group 2: 5, 6, 8 (12.1, 14.5, 19.5)

Group 3: 3.4, 7 (7.7, 8.7, 10.6)

Group 4: Insignificant

### **Females**

Group 1: 2, 8 (3.9, 19.4)

Group 2: 3, 6 (11.3, 15.5)

Group 3: 4, 5, 7 (8.2, 10.3, 10.3)

Group 4: Insignificant

- (a) Both males and females have the most strategies used in strategy 2 (annoyance) because both males and females are inclined to show anger by saying so many things.
- (b) Strategy 8 (explicit blame on person) was also the most used with the female. It is the nature of females to swear and blame the person directly.
- (c) Males have the least number of strategies used in strategy 3 (consequences) while females have the least in strategy 5 (direct accusation). Males are more inclined to reveal consequences in a direct manner while females also accuse directly, that is why short complaint strategies were used.
- (d) Strategy 1 (hint) was never used at all.

#### **6.3.1.4. Time**

### **A. Total number of strategies**

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 21.5%

Strategy 3: Consequences: 24.9%

Group 2

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 11.5%

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 15.3%

### Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 7.2%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 8.6%

### Group 4

Strategy 1: Hint: 4.3%

Strategy 6: modified blame: 6.2%

- (a) Group 1 have the most frequently used strategies. All the other three major situations, i.e. Inconvenience, space and talk have strategies 2 (annoyance) and 3 (consequences) as the most used strategies and the reasons are the same.
- (b) Group two have the second most strategies used. Accusations, whether direct or indirect need a lot of talking that is why longer complaint strategies were used.
- (c) There is no significant difference between total number of strategies in group 3 and 4.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

Group 1: 2.3: (22.5, 25.2)

Group 2: 4.5: (10.8, 16.2)

Group 3: 7.8: (7.2, 6.3)

Group 4: 1.6: (5.3, 2.7)

### **Females**

Group 1: 2.3 (20.4, 24.5)

Group 2: 4.5 (12.2, 15.3)

Group 3: 7.8 (8.1, 8.1)

Group 4: 1.6: (6.1, 5.1)

- (a) When we look at groups 1 and 4, both males and females have used the same strategies from the most to the least. Group 1, strategies 2 (annoyance) and 3 (consequences) were the most frequently used. The second most frequently used strategies were strategies 4 (indirect accusation) and 5 (direct accusation). The least used strategies were group 3 and 4 with strategies 7 (explicit blame on behaviour), 8 (explicit blame on person), 1 (hint) and 6 (modified blame).
- (b) The groupings are the same for the males and females because both males and females react the same to complaints related to time.

### 6.3.1.5. Possession

#### A. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 20.0%

Strategy 6: modified blame: 30.9%

Group 2

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 16.7%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 9.8%

Group 3

Strategy 3: Consequences: 6.4%

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 8.3%

Group 4

Strategy 1: Hint: 3.4%

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 4.4%

- (a) Group one have the most number of strategies used. Direct accusation and modified blame were used. People are more inclined to use these strategies when their possessions have been damaged. They complain using longer complaint strategies.
- (b) Unlike the other four major situations, annoyance is not the most favoured when it comes to possession.
- (c) Group 3 and 4 have the least number of strategies used. With possession the complaints are usually direct and to the point.

#### B. Strategies between males and females

##### Males

Group 1: 5.6 (20.6, 32.7)

Group 2: 2.7 (18.7, 9.3)

Group 3: 3.8 (7.5, 7.5)

Group 4: 1.4 (1.9, 1.9)

## Females

Group 1: 5.6 (19.6, 28.9)

Group 2: 2.8 (14.4, 12.4)

Group 3: 4.7 (7.2, 7.2)

Group 4: 1.4 (5.1, 5.2)

- (a) Looking at the groupings between the males and females above. Both males and females used the same strategies from group one to group four except in group in group three. The reason is because males are direct talkers while females like to swear and accuse.
- (b) Males have the least strategies used in strategy 4 (indirect accusation) while females have the least strategies used in strategy 3 (consequences). Males are inclined to accuse directly.

## 6.4. Individual complaints.

**Table 2**

|                                | TOTAL |      | MALE |      | FEMALE |      |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|--------|------|
|                                | No.   | %    | No.  | %    | No.    | %    |
| 1. Hint                        | 29    | 2.8  | 10   | 1.8  | 19     | 3.9  |
| 2. Annoyance                   | 246   | 23.5 | 135  | 24.2 | 111    | 22.6 |
| 3. Consequences                | 168   | 16.0 | 91   | 16.3 | 77     | 15.7 |
| 4. Indirect accusation         | 91    | 8.7  | 41   | 7.4  | 50     | 10.2 |
| 5. Direct accusation           | 174   | 16.6 | 98   | 17.6 | 76     | 15.5 |
| 6. Modified blame              | 154   | 14.7 | 84   | 15.1 | 70     | 14.3 |
| 7. Explicit blame on behaviour | 96    | 9.2  | 54   | 9.7  | 42     | 8.6  |
| 8. Explicit blame on person    | 90    | 8.6  | 44   | 7.9  | 46     | 9.4  |
| TOTAL                          | 1048  |      | 557  |      | 491    |      |

According to the table above, the individual strategies can be grouped from the highest to the lowest frequency according to the total number of times each individual strategy have been used.

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 23.5%

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 16.6%

Group 2

Strategy 3: Consequences: 16.0%

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 14.7%

Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 9.2%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 8.6%

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 8.7%

Group 4

Strategy 1: Hint: 2.8%

- (a) Group one is the most favoured as far as complaints strategies are concerned. Annoyance is the most frequently used of all the strategies because once a person complains, it means that person is upset that is why a lot of strategies have been used.
- (b) Direct accusation also plays a main role in complaint strategies because some complaints are very direct, the complainant does not beat around the bush but she /he accuses the complainees directly.
- (c) Group 3 have a limited number of strategies used. It is rare to find the complainant blaming the person or the behaviour
- (d) Strategy 1(hint) is the least used strategy, people hate beating around the bush, they complain directly.

## **B. Strategies between males and females**

### **Males**

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 24.2%

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 17.6%

Group 2

Strategy 3: Consequences: 16.3%

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 15.1%

Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 9.7%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 8%

#### Group 4

Strategy 1: Hints: 1.8%

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 7.4%

#### **Females**

##### Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 22.6%

Strategy 3: Consequences: 15.7%

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 15.5%

##### Group 2

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 10.2%

Strategy 6: modified blame: 14.3%

##### Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame on behaviour: 8.6%

Strategy 8: Explicit blame on person: 9.4%

##### Group 4

Strategy 1: Hint: 3.9%

- (a) Both males and females used longer complaint strategies in strategies 3 (consequences), 2 (annoyance), 6 (modified blame) and 5 (direct accusation) which are found in group one and two. The reason is because both males and females are inclined to put a blame to something that took place, accuse directly, get angry about certain behaviours and reveal consequences because of the complaine.
- (b) Both males and females have a limited number of strategies used for strategy 7 (explicit blame on behaviour) and strategy 8 (explicit blame on person). A limited number of strategies were used because both males and females dislike blaming but accuse directly.
- (c) Strategy 1 (hint) was the least used by both males and females like stating what the problem is, they don't beat around the bush.

## CHAPTER 7

### CONCLUSION

The study investigated the production and situation of complaint by Xitsonga speaking learners in order to discover what complaint strategies are preferred for these learners and why. The findings then suggest that both males and females get annoyed very easily.

In the data collected, explicit explanation, acceptance of blame and request for forgiveness is the most favoured apology strategies while on the other hand, annoyance and direct accusation is the most favoured complaint strategies. The analysis also shows that there is a slight difference between males and females as far as an expression of apology is concerned; males are more inclined to give explanations while females ask more for forgiveness.

In chapter 5, it is evident that the situation of possession involves a lot of number of strategies than the other situations. Learners know that it is good to apologize for the things that belong to others. males do not want to involve many strategies to clear off their offences as females do.

In all the major situations, strategies of request for forgiveness and explicit explanation are used extensively. They always alternate for the first position in group 1 in all the situations. This means that in a quest for an apology, learners opt for either a request for forgiveness or explicit explanation.

In the situations of inconvenience and space, both male and female learners use the strategies of request for forgiveness and explicit explanation. But the two strategies, request for forgiveness and explicit explanation, are also used in other explanations.

In talk situation, explicit explanation and request for forgiveness are used but with supplement of others. Males and females in talk situation also use the strategy of an expression of lack of intent. This strategy helps them to lessen the degree of their offence. Males also employ the strategy of minimizing the offence. They know that if they do not minimize their offence, females may get angry.

In a time situation, both male and female learners use explicit explanation to explain clearly why they are punctual. Both of them also rely on the implicit explanation. But females also ask for forgiveness when they are not punctual. Instead of a direct apology, males use the strategy of minimizing. This strategy is used to please females.

Explicit explanation is also useful to both male and female learners in a possession situation. Like in all situations, this strategy is important to clear the circumstances that led to an offence. But females also want to make sure that for every offence they commit, they ask for a direct apology.

Some of the offences are committed unintentionally. Learners do not always have intentions of offending with their actions. Others want to use implicit explanation in order to avoid an explanation of their offences.

Other strategies are also used in Xitsonga situations, but not the way explicit explanation and request for forgiveness are used. But the use of strategies like opting out, blaming someone else, implicit acknowledgement, expression of self deficiency, expression of embarrassment, explicit acceptance of blame and expressing concern for hearer is minimal in Xitsonga.

Males are more inclined to give explanations while females ask for more forgiveness. This means that male learners are proud or shy to apologize to females.

Chapter 6 shows that male and female learners are direct with their complaint strategies. But not all of them are direct, others also use indirect strategies. Those who do not want to accuse their complainers use annoyance strategy. Annoyance is used to threaten complainers by showing anger. Other strategies which are sometimes used are explicit blame to behaviour, ill consequences and explicit blame to a person.

Females are more indirect than males. Females are always afraid of males and this makes them to be indirect to males. But females are also strong to the extent that they can also be direct. The directness that females show is higher than that of males. Those who are direct always want to be fair with their dissatisfaction.



Both male and female learners are annoyed by the offences they experience, but females become more annoyed than males. This is because males always want to provoke females. Again, females have more consequences because males offend them to an extent that they lose something, get hurt, or even fail to do something.

Males use more strategy of explicit blame to behaviour than females but females use more strategy of blame to a person than males. Females are using this strategy more because most of the actions which are done by males toward females are aimed at offending them.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin J, (1962), **How to do Things with Words**. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Blum-Kulka S, House J, Kasper G (1989) **Cross-cultural pragmatics. Request and apologies**. Norwood. New Jersey: Ablex
- Brown P & Levinson S.C (1987) **Politeness: Some universals in language usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Fraser B **On apologizing** Coulmas Fled, (1979) Conversational routine. Mouton
- George Yule. **Pragmatics** (1996) Oxford university press. Longman London and New York
- Goffman E (1967) **Interaction Ritual** Essay on the face to face behaviour. New York
- Grice H.P. (1975) **Logic and conversation** New York
- Holmes J (1990). **Apologies in New Zealand English** Cambridge university press
- Jaworski (1990) **Apologies and non-apologies** Walter de Gruyter
- Leech S.C. (1983) **Pragmatics**. Cambridge university press
- Norrick (1978) Expressive illocutionary acts. **Journal of pragmatics** 2: 277 – 99
- Oshtain E & Cohen A.D. (1983) **Apology** Newbury house publishers
- Oshtain E (1989) **Apologies across languages**. In Blum-Kulka S, J House, G Kasper and R Freedle. **Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and apologies**. Norwood N.J.: Ablex
- Rintell & Mitchell: **Studying Requests and apologies**. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Scher & Darley (1997), **How effective are things people say to apologize** Plenum Publishing Corporation
- Searle J (1969) **Speech acts: An essay in philosophy of language**. Cambridge university press

Thomas J (1995) **Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to pragmatics**. Longman  
London and New York

Trosborg A (1995) Interlanguage **Pragmatics: Requests, complaints and  
apologies** Mouton de Gruyter

Walters (1981) Variation in the requesting behaviour of bilingual children.  
**International Journal of sociology of language** 27: 77-92