

THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY IN TSHIVENDA EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

BY

AVHATAKALI JONATHAN MAKHADO



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

Study leader: Prof. J.A. du Plessis

MARCH 2002

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this assignment is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

A.J. MAKHADO

DATE

SUMMARY

An apology in Tshivenda is offered when an individual has violated a social norm or want to restore any form of a complainable. When it is given, it serves as a remedial work, designed to smooth over any social disruption that was caused. Sometimes a person who is suppose to apologize may find reasons to minimize the degree of the offence. If the offence in question is big, a verbal apology may be insufficient to restore the damaged relationship.

Male and female learners commit a lot of offences towards each other at school and they are obliged to apologize for such offences. In the process of apologizing, they are faced with a wide choice of strategies to choose from.

In most cases, male learners have a tendency of giving an explanation to their offences. They do not always seek for a direct apology. In the acceptance of their offences, they opt for longer strategies to apologize. Males seem to be either proud or shy to ask for an apology from females. Female learners on the other hand, do not want to use longer strategies to apologize, but they ask for forgiveness immediately.

It is not all the males who do not want to apologize directly to females, but there are others who apologize directly. They are the ones who take females as their equals and they also want to maintain a good relationship with them. The same applies with females, a minimal number of them use longer strategies to apologize. They do not use direct strategies.

There are other strategies also useful in Tshivenda male and female learners, but their use is not so popular. Strategies like explicit acceptance of the blame and expression of self-deficiency are considered the least of other ones.

An apology is usually influenced by the way the complainant shows his or her dissatisfaction. Male and female learners also differ with the way they complain. They use complaint strategies differently. Both male and female learners use direct accusation and indirect accusation extensively. But the difference comes by the fact that females are longer with their complaints than males. Females show their annoyance by involving more complaint strategies. Males do not take long to complain, they involve only a few strategies.

OPSOMMING

'n Verskoning in Tshivenda word aangebied in geval waar 'n individu 'n sosiale reel oortree het. Wanneer dit aangebied word, dien dit as 'n remedie ontwerp om die sosiale onderbreking wat ontstaan het reg te stel. Soms sal die persoon wat veronderstel is om 'n verskoning aan te bied redes vind om die graad van die sosiale oortreding te probeer verminder. In geval waar die oortreding as baie groot beskou word waar 'n mondelingse verskoning nie genoegsaam wees om die verhouding weer te herstel nie.

Manne en vrou skoliere behaan heelwat sosiale oortreding teenoor mekaar by die skool en is oorplig om verskoning aan te bied vir sulke oortredings. Tydens die proses van verskoning aangebied word die skoliere gekonfronteer met verskeie opsies om van te kies.

Manlike skoliere het die manier om verkonings en verduidelikings te gee vir hulle oortredings. Hulle sal nie 'n direkte apologie aangebied nie. Indien hulle aanvaar dat hulle verkeerd was, sal hul die opsie om hulle verduidelikings te gee as strategie gebruik. Manspersone bly te trots en skaam te wees om 'n apologie te vra van dames. Dames weer vra makliker en direk om verskoning.

Hierdie beginstel van om verskoning vra geld nie ten opsigte van alle skoliere nie. Sommiges sal direk apologie aangebied. Ander aanvaar vroulike skoliere as hul gelykes en probeer om 'n gesonde verhouding te handhaf. Dieselfde beginsel geld tot vroulike skoliere van hulle sal lang verduidelikings aangebied as 'n strategie deur om verskoning te vra: Hulle vra nie direk om verskoning nie.

Daar is ook ander strategieë in gebruiklike in Tshivenda deur manlik sowel as vroulike skoliere, maar is nie populêr in gebruik nie. Strategieë soos die duidelike aanvaarding van skuld en die uitdrukking van selfbeskuldiging word beskou as die minste gebruiklike opsie.

'n Verskoning word beïnvloed deur die manier waarop die klaer sy of haar misnoe wys of uitspreek. Manlike sowel as vroulike leerders versoek ook in metodiek hoe hulle kla. Hulle maak gebruik van 'n kla strategie wat verskillend is van mekaar. Beide geslagte maak gebruik van direk sowel as indirek beskuldigings. Die verskil egter is by vroulike klaers aangesien hul klagte langer duur as hul manlike ewe nie. Vroulike klaers wys hul woede of ongelukkigheid deur meer klagte strategie te betree. Mans daarom teen neem nie lang om te kla nie en behels net a paar strategieë.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the first place, I wish to express my cordial thanks to my supervisor, Prof. J.A du Plessis, without whose expert supervision this study would not have been a reality. To him I say: Keep it up!

Secondly, my heartfelt thanks go to Prof. M. Visser, Dr. Dlali and the rest of the staff of the Department of African Languages from the University of Stellenbosch who helped me with this work.

In the third place, I am most grateful to the following people without whose support, my research would have not succeeded: My sister Mrs M Makhavhu and her husband, Mr I.W. Mukwevho and his wife, Mrs J. Sibadela and all the other people who know they really contributed to this work.

Fourthly, my warmest thanks go to my family; my wife Aletta, two sons, Londani and Mulisa who encouraged me to finish the work when I looked tired.

Lastly, I do not want to forget God who blessed me with the brain of coming up with this work. To Him I say: I will always be with you.

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	AIM OF THE RESEARCH.....	1
1.2	ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY.....	1
2.	SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS.....	4
2.1	SPEECH ACTS.....	4
2.1.1	JENNY THOMAS.....	4
2.1.1.1	TYPES OF PERFORMATIVES.....	8
2.1.1.2	DISTINGUISHING SPEECH ACTS.....	16
2.1.1.3	THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGIZING: a case study.....	18
2.1.1.4	THE SPEECH ACT OF WARNING: a case study.....	21
2.1.1.5	RULES VERSUS PRINCIPLES.....	23
2.1.2	GEORGE YULE.....	25
2.1.2.1	ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE INDICATING DEVICE.....	26
2.1.2.2	FELICITY CONDITION.....	27
2.1.2.3	THE PERFORMATIVE HYPOTHESIS.....	28
2.1.2.4	SPEECH ACT CLASSIFICATION.....	30
2.1.2.5	DIRECT AND INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS.....	31
2.1.2.6	SPEECH EVENTS.....	31
2.2	THEORIES OF POLITENESS.....	32
2.2.1	DELIMITING THE CONCEPT OF POLITENESS.....	32
2.2.2	POLITENESS EXPLAINED IN TERMS OF PRINCIPLES AND MAXIMS.....	39
2.2.3	PROBLEMS WITH LEECH'S APPROACH.....	43
2.2.4	POLITENESS AND THE MANAGEMENT OF FACE.....	44
3.	THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY.....	51
3.1	THE APOLOGY.....	51
3.1.1	SCHER AND DARLEY (1997).....	51
3.1.2	HOLMES (1990).....	58
3.1.2.1	APOLOGIES AND FACE.....	60
3.1.2.2	METHODOLOGY AND CORPUS.....	64
3.1.2.3	APOLOGY STRATEGIES ACCORDING TO HOLMES.....	66
3.1.2.4	SYNTACTIC-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF APOLOGIES.....	69
3.1.2.5	DISTRIBUTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES.....	73
3.1.2.6	CHARACTERISTICS OF OFFENCE.....	73
3.1.2.7	SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENCE.....	77
3.1.2.8	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS.....	78
3.1.2.9	OVERALL WEIGHTINESS OF THE OFFENCE.....	79
3.1.3	JAWORSKI.....	80
3.1.3.1	SOME METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	82

3.1.3.2	APOLOGIES IN POLITENESS THEORY.....	84
3.1.3.3	SOME POLISH DATA: UNPROTOTYPICAL APOLOGIES...	86
4.	APOLOGY STRATEGIES.....	96
4.1	TROSBORG.....	96
4.1.1	STRATEGIC DISARMERS.....	109
4.1.2	INTERNAL MODIFICATION.....	112
4.2	CCSARP.....	114
4.2.1	APOLOGIES.....	115
5.	APOLOGIES IN TSHIVENDA.....	125
5.1	AIM.....	125
5.2	APOLOGY SITUATIONS.....	125
5.3	QUESTIONNAIRE.....	127
5.3.1	COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	154
5.4	ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGIES.....	155
5.4.1	APOLOGY SITUATIONS AND APOLOGY STRATEGIES....	155
5.4.2	APOLOGY STRATEGIES IN SUBSITUATIONS.....	171
5.4.3	INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES IN MAJOR SITUATIONS.....	232
5.4.4	INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES.....	245
6.	THE EXPRESSION OF THE OFFENCE IN TSHIVENDA.....	252
6.1	THE COMPLAINT STRATEGY.....	252
6.2	SITUATIONS AND COMPLAINT STRATEGIES.....	254
6.2.1	THE MAJOR SITUATIONS.....	255
6.2.2	THE SUBSITUATIONS.....	258
6.3	INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE IN MAJOR SITUATIONS.....	267
6.4	INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS.....	279
7.	CONCLUSION.....	283
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	287

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIM OF THE RESEARCH

It is always believed that apology is offered for any committed undesirable behaviour in order to lessen the degree of the offence. Sometimes the different offences committed need different apology strategies. It is not surprising to see other offences being addressed by the strategy of an offer of repair. Males and females are believed to address their offences differently.

The aim of this research is to investigate how apologies may be expressed in Tshivenda, specifically in situations between male and female learners. At the end of this research, it will be clear to know how male and female learners differ to apologize to different situations. Strategies which are frequented by each of the two groups are going to be clear.

1.2. ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 2 of this study deals with the speech acts and politeness as postulated by Jenny Thomas and George Yule. These two authors

based their arguments on pragmatics. This is where Thomas tries to explain the concept of 'speech act' with reference to other pragmaticists. The speech acts of order or command, request and warning were dealt with extensively. George Yule concentrated on the three acts namely; locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts, which are deduced from the action performed by producing an utterance.

Chapter 3 will be showing how Scher and Darley explain the speech act of apology. In this chapter Scher and Darley also explain how the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) was useful to the explanation of the speech act of apology.

Holmes also explains the speech act of apology as function-centred. He argues that apology is not given without a reason or function. It is here in this chapter where apology strategies and different type of offences are discussed by Holmes. It is in this chapter where Jaworski talks about variation in the degree of directness of apologies. He also tries to examine the need to apologize, the form of apology and apology's acceptance.

Chapter 4 deals with the different apology strategies as postulated by Trosborg. Apart from the apology strategies, there are some Tshivenda examples based on such strategies.

Chapter 5 deals with apology situations in Tshivenda. By using a questionnaire which was completed by learners, analysis of all the situations was successful. In order to obtain an analysis of offences, five major situations, namely; inconvenience, space, talk, time and forgetting, were used.

Chapter 6 includes the expression of the offences in Tshivenda. There is also an illustration of complaint strategies. Other things which are included are the situations in Tshivenda with their complaint strategies.

Chapter 7 is the last one, and it carries the summary of what have been found in chapters 5 and 6.

CHAPTER 2

SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS

2.1. SPEECH ACTS

2.1.1. THOMAS (1995)

Austin brought into existence interest in pragmatics. Thomas wonders why Austin's idea on language was taken up with great eagerness within linguistics whereas the work of others with similar opinion with him didn't make any impact. But the following four factors try to explain why Austin's work was taken seriously: the publication of his collection after his death in 1962 which is called 'How to do things with words' reduces the frustration within linguistics with the limitations of truth conditional semantics, Austin's writing is admirably clear and easily reached, his work represents a consistent line of thought and it also indicates future issues which are of major importance in pragmatics today.

Austin was not a linguist but a philosopher who worked at Oxford University between 1940 and 1950. Austin, his pupil H.P. Grice and a group of philosophers with similar views with him from

Oxford University, and other areas were known as ordinary language philosophers.

Austin gave a series of lectures at Oxford University and Harvard University from 1950 to 1954 and 1955 respectively. Such lectures tried to set out his ideas on language. His lectures were brought together in the form of a book after his death in 1960 by J. O. Urmson. The lectures were based on Austin's own lecture notes and recordings of his own lectures. Austin developed and changed his position better considerably as the series of lectures went on.

Austin and his group were trying to react against Oxford based philosophers like G. E. Moore and Bertrand Russell who were concerned with the relationship between philosophy and language. Moore was interested in the language of common sense, and on the other hand, Russell and others believed that everyday language is somehow insufficient. They believed that such a language is full of unclear things, impressions and contradictions. Russell and his group had the aim of removing the impurities from the language such as perceived imperfections and illogicalities and create an ideal language.

It is because of the above ideas that Austin and his group observed that ordinary people manage to communicate extremely effectively

and without problems. They then tried to understand how it is that people manage with language as well as they do and that is why they avoided to remove imperfections from it.

Logical positivism is a philosophical system which believes in maintaining that only meaningful statements are those that are analytic or can be tested relying on observations. Logical positivist philosophers of language are concerned with the properties of sentences which can be evaluated in terms of truth or falsity. This approach is included in truth conditional semantics within linguistics.

The doctrine of logical positivism is that a sentence is meaningless unless it can at least be verified. There are sentences that cannot be judged to be true or false, and such sentences become meaningless. Other sentences in relation to the underlying proposition are seen to be false and others are irregular.

Austin was interested in the way ordinary people use language in everyday life. He thought that ordinary language cannot be violated. He was motivated by philosophers of distinction. He believed that one good way of identifying which distinctions are important or relevant is to examine how ordinary people do this in everyday language. But it does not mean that all the distinctions a society wishes to make in the domain of getting the hearer to do

something, are captured by different verbs available in given language.

Austin was also motivated to involve language used by ordinary people by his belief that there is a lot more to a language than the meaning of its words or phrases. He believes that our use of language is aimed at performing actions and not just to make statements. This led him to the theory of illocutionary acts. He started to explore his ideas by the performative hypothesis so as to come with the theory which examines what kinds of things we do when we speak, how we do them and how our acts may become successful or not.

The examination of the performative hypothesis is important because it shows how Austin's views developed, it illustrates how and who came into being and that performatives are part of subsets of illocutionary verbs.

In his informal book called 'How to do things with words', Austin's first thing was to show that some utterances have no truth conditions. He said that such utterances are not statements or questions but actions. Austin went further by including performative verbs. According to him, performative verbs bring to syntactically different sentences. Sentences with performative

verbs do not make statements. They cannot be judged to be true or false. They are best understood as performing an action. One way of testing for a performative verb is to see whether you can meaningfully insert the adverb 'hereby' between subject and verb.

2.1.1.1. TYPES OF PERFORMATIVES

a. Metalinguistic performatives.

In this type of a performative, the verb refers to what the speaker of the utterance is doing. This performative contains its own truth condition and is always true. Each and every language has its own finite set of metalinguistic performances.

There are sentences which have truth conditions and others are always to be true whereas others become true after some proof.

Metalinguistic performatives are again always felicitous or successful. They do not appear to depend on any external conditions for their success.

b. Ritual performatives.

This type of a performative is not always successful. In this case, Austin found that performatives can go wrong. The performative may fail or become unsuccessful if the felicity conditions are not

observed. According to Thomas, felicity conditions apply particularly to the performatives associated with various rituals or very formal events. Ritual performatives are highly culturally dependant. Such rituals can only be appropriate or successful if they are uttered by a specified person in a specified situation.

Felicity condition.

According to Austin, in felicity there must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect, and ; the circumstances and persons must be appropriate. Felicity conditions expect the procedure to be carried out correctly and completely. Most of the times persons carrying out procedures must have the requisite thoughts; feelings and intentions and if consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties must do it.

Explicit reference to felicity conditions.

There are times when speakers make a detailed reference to their reason for speaking in a particular way. Most of the time speakers refer to the felicity conditions which allow them to perform a particular act. Example: Two people are getting married. The priest announces, ‘with the power vested in me, I now pronounce you two husband and wife.’

c. Collaborative performances

When some performatives do not have felicity conditions by saying that a specified person must utter the words in particular circumstances, their success is not guaranteed, they require the collaboration or a particular uptake of another person for their success.

d. Group performatives.

They are performatives which are commonly produced by more than one person. e.g. a report from a certain committee. The performative becomes successful when performed on behalf of the entire committee. The views of one member of the committee carry no weight and it becomes successful when performed by the group.

e. Overlap categories.

Overlap category occurs because not all categories are neat and self-contained. It means that many ritual performatives are also collaborative in nature. Some collaborative performatives also fall within the category of ritual performatives.

f. Cross-cultural differences in the use of performatives.

Cross cultural difference in the range and the use of performatives is noticeable in each of the categories. The difference is mostly noticeable in performatives relating to culturally specific rituals.

g. Collapse of Austin's performative hypothesis.

Austin performative hypothesis enables people to use the language to do some actions; which are capable of changing the world despite to show that people use the language to make statements about the world. According to Thomas, the effect of the language can be very small or can suddenly change the world. Austin's belief that only performative verbs could be used to perform action was unable to be defended, and that is why his performative hypothesis collapsed due to the following reasons: one cannot grammatically distinguish performative verbs from other verbs; even if there is performative verb, it does not mean that the specified action is performed; and there are ways of doing things which do not involve using performative verbs.

h. Explicit and implicit performatives.

An explicit performative allows the speaker to remove any possible chance of misunderstanding the speaker's intention of uttering the words. Austin indicates that there are no valid differences between explicit and implicit performatives. He, however, shows that implicit performative is used in different ways. The difference between the two concepts is seen as lying in the stylistic movement where there has been a change in position of words in a statement.

i. Utterances as actions.

In this aspect, Austin looks at the difference between the truth-conditional aspect of what a statement is and the action it performs, between the meaning of the speaker's words and their illocutionary force.

Locution, illocution, perlocution.

Locution is the actual word uttered, illocution is what the speaker wants to say with his or her words and perlocution is how the words of the speaker can be interpreted by the hearer and this can be different from what the speaker was intending to say.

Speech acts.

This word is used by Austin as referring to an utterance and the total situation in which the utterance is used. Today the word 'speech act' refers to the same meaning as illocutionary act, illocutionary force, pragmatic force or force. It, therefore, means that different words can be used to perform the same speech act because some words can be used to perform different speech acts.

John Searle was also another student of Austin at Oxford. Searle, as a philosopher, wrote a book called 'Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language' which distinguishes between propositional

content and illocutionary force. Searle also proposed a detailed classification of the major categories of speech acts, where he pointed out the necessity of taking into account the analysis of a speech act and the social institution within which it was produced.

Thomas is concerned with Searle's theory of indirect speech act and his attempt to establish a set of rules for speech act. Thomas argues that Searle's search for rules leads us into a narrow lane as his attempt raises important issues for pragmatic theory.

Indirect speech act:

According to Searle, an indirect speech act is one performed by means of another.

Example: This notice is displayed in the changing rooms at the swimming pool at the University of Warwick:

Would users please refrain from spitting.

In Searle's theory, the example is a directive (Don't spit) performed by means of an interrogative. Thomas agrees that all speech acts, except for explicit performatives, are indirect to some certain extent; and are performed by means of another speech act. Searle's account on how to calculate the meaning of indirect

speech acts is so similar to Grice's method for getting from 'what is said' to 'what is meant.'

Searle's conditions for speech acts:

In his attempt to explain how a speech act works, Searle tried to establish a set of series of conditions which properly applied, should exclude unusual utterances from any category. Thomas comes with this utterance:

I promise I'll come over there and hit you if
you don't shut up!

According to Thomas the statement above is problematic because the action it performs is not the one specified by the speech act verb (promise) instead it is a threat, but he agrees that the statement is also an utterance which contains a performative verb and also performs an action. It is due to this problem that Searle set out rules so that they may exclude anything that deviates from normal utterances from the category of promising:

Propositional act: Speaker (S) predicates a future act (A) of
speaker (S).

Preparatory conditions: S believes that doing act (A) is in H'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.

Thomas again comes with another example from Francis to Helen:

‘I’ll cook you a curry for dinner tonight.’

He postulates the following:

Propositional act: The speaker (Francis) says something about a future act (cooking a curry tonight) which the speaker himself will perform.

Preparatory condition: Francis believes that cooking a curry for Helen is to Helen’s benefit. (Something which Helen will enjoy)

Sincerity condition: Francis truly intends to make a curry for Helen.

Essential condition: In uttering the words ‘I’ll cook you a curry’ Francis undertakes an obligation to make a curry for Helen.

It is for the above practice that Thomas insists why ‘I promise I’ll come over there and hit you if you don’t shut up’ is not suitable.

He further says that the issues Searle raised in relation to

promising are of general application and it must be possible to establish rules of this nature for every speech. Searle also offered requesting, asserting, questioning, thanking, advising, warning, greeting and congratulations as examples of rules for speech acts. However, Thomas proposes four interrelated sets of problems that come from Searle's work:

- the distinction between one speech act to another is not always clear.
- Searle's rules are full of gaps which make them a hopelessly complex collection if they can be published.
- the conditions specified by Searle may exclude perfectly normal instances of a speech act but permit irregular cases.
- Searle's rules do not take into account that the same speech act verb may cover a range of slightly different phenomena and some speech acts overlap.

2.1.1.2. DISTINGUISHING SPEECH ACTS

According to Thomas it is not always possible, by using Searle's rules, to differentiate between speech acts which are by no means interchangeable. He used 'ask,' 'request,' 'order,' 'command' and 'suggest' which all typically involve an attempt by the speaker (S) to bring about an action (A) on the part of the hearer (H).

Thomas insists that an order or command can be distinguished from a request by introducing some additional preparatory rules. In a command, the speaker is always in a position of authority over hearer. In both the speaker and the hearer the authority relationship infects the essential conditions because the utterance counts as an attempt to get the hearer to do action in virtue of the authority of speaker over hearer. This additional preparatory rule applies to many other speech acts, an understanding of the nature of the power relationships obtained between speaker and hearer in order to interpret the illocutionary force of many utterances.

Thomas goes further by saying that many of Searle's set of conditions could apply to any number of speech acts, and it is difficult to see what additional preparatory conditions could be introduced to distinguish request unproblematically from demand.

The last problem, according to Thomas, is that when we look at the essential condition, we often find that Searle was relying on the existing understanding of the meaning of the speech act verb to describe speech act verb and to this extent it has been argued that many of Searle's rules are circular.

Plugging the gaps in Searle's rules.

Thomas puts forward that Searle's rules are circular even though he, himself, disputed this fact. Thomas argues that Searle's rules failed to distinguish between speech acts and that they covered only paradigm cases of speech acts. According to Thomas, although Searle claimed to have set out rules for speech acts, all he was really doing was to describe the semantics of speech act verbs. Nevertheless, Thomas tries to see as to whether it is possible to extend Searle's conditions to cover at least some of the hardly noticeable speech acts. Below is how Thomas tries to establish a set of Searlean conditions for a slightly more complicated example.

2.1.1.3. **THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGIZING: a case study**

Propositional act: S expresses 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.

A more concrete example:

Pat says to Michael, 'I'm sorry I broke your nose.'

Propositional act: The speaker (Pat) expresses a regret for 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 apologized to Michael.

Below is an explanation of each of the conditions:

Propositional act.

As far as Thomas is concerned, in many cultures it is possible to apologize on behalf of someone or something else. It is usual to hear people apologizing for things over which they have no control whatsoever, such as the behaviour of their compatriots. Thomas also gives an example from Britain where you would hear people apologizing to overseas visitors for the weather.

He also proposes that it possible to apologize for the past act, future act and present act, but such apology must be expressed formally or clearly, bearing in mind that some words have the potential to act as an apology.

Preparatory condition.

The speaker has to believe that the act is of the hearer's advantage. You can even apologize for things you did deliberately.

Sincerity condition.

Thomas argues that it is good to say sorry when you feel you really are. It is bad to say sorry when you are not.

Essential condition .

It is better to apologize when the conditions are conducive or allow you to. Thomas advises that it is absolutely essential to utter certain words in order to apologize.

Thomas postulates that Searle's rules have conditions which become hopelessly complex, vague and unworkable. Producing formal rules for the way in which speech acts operate is extremely appealing, unfortunately the rules only work in very restricted circumstances. They exclude perfectly normal instances of speech acts and are so general in their specification that they fail to eliminate speech irregularly used.

Overgenerality of rules.

Here, Thomas indicates that there are totally irregular utterances which Searle's rules will not eliminate.

He indicates that these words: saying, commanding, ordering, requesting, asking and inviting, overlap and can also act as warning.

2.1.1.4. **THE SPEECH ACT OF WARNING: a case study.**

Thomas argues that Searle did not mention the two types of warning. He proposes the first one as warning that relates to situation where you can do nothing to avoid the event itself, although it is sometimes possible, and it takes the form of declarative.

Example: The speaker was Denis Healey, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Labour Government:

‘I warn you there is going to be howls of anguish from the 80,000 people who are rich enough to pay over 75% on the last slice of their income.’

Another type of warning is that which is designed to prevent the unpleasant event together. It usually appears in the form of a negative imperative. It differs from the first one because it is actually within the power of those warned to avoid future event.

Thomas explains further to indicate that sometimes recipients of warning become unsure whether he received the first or second type of warning.

Example: The following story was related by J.M. Barrie, author of *Peter Pan*, concerning one of his words, Jack-Llewelyn-Davies, and a friend:

When stuffing himself with cakes at tea, Sylvia had warned him, 'You'll be sick tomorrow.' 'I'll be sick tonight.' replied Jack cheerily.

Searle's formal approach to the categorization of speech acts.

In this approach, words that are uttered can be categorized. But there are certain contexts in which we do not expect the truth to be told. Again, there are some culturally-specific situations in which the whole truth is not expected.

It is then that Thomas argues that there are functional, psychological and effective factors that determine classes of speech act. Sometimes the way in which we classify a speech act may be influenced by considerations which are culturally-specific or which relate to the speaker's goal in speaking in a particular way.

According to Thomas, Searle's rules are capable of coping only with the most typical or central instances of a speech act and fail to distinguish adequately between one speech act and another.

2.1.1.5. RULES VERSUS PRINCIPLES

As far as Thomas is concerned, speech act may be described in terms of rules. He postulates that pragmatics seeks different sorts of generalization from those made within grammar. Grammar is governed by rules, pragmatics is constrained by principles. Here are five basic differences between rules and principles:

i. Rules are all or nothing, principles are more or less.

Rules require either yes or no in their applications. You cannot apply the rule partially. You can speak extremely clearly or not at all clearly.

ii. Rules are exclusive, principles can co-occur

Thomas argues that rules are exclusive because invoking one rule makes it impossible for another. When nouns are replaced by pronouns the grammar of English requires that 'he' and 'she' are used to replace nouns referring to a male and a female person

respectively. If you choose the wrong pronoun, you have violated the rule.

In pragmatics, according to Thomas, you can invoke two or more principles simultaneously. You can observe both the maxims of Manner and Quality; and this can be done when maxims clash.

Example: A is a waiter in a pretentious, but second rate restaurant. B is a gourmet, who runs his own restaurant:

A: Did you enjoy the lamb, Sir?

B: It was very interesting.

iii. Rules are constitutive, principles are regulative.

Thomas postulates that grammar is there so as to have an aim of devising rules which have no counter-examples. He says the rules are said to have failed if a sufficiently powerful counter example is found, and such rules must be reformulated. He argues that in pragmatics we speak of probabilities, where we cannot say with absolute certainty what something means or what effect an utterance will have. What is actually done best, is to state with more or less certainty what is probably the case.

iv. Rules are conventional, principles are motivated.

Thomas takes rules as arbitrary. He says they are things that are argued and agreed upon. Sometimes rules do not follow a logical pattern. Pragmatic principles are said to be motivated. If people find that they are more likely to achieve their aim if they speak politely, clearly and to the point, they will do so. If, on the other hand, they find that their goals are best served by being rude, ambiguous and evasive, then they will be just that.

When we refer to human beings we are almost always obliged to use gender specific pronouns. It is not normally grammatically possible to use any pronouns other than him/ he/ his when referring to male human beings or to use any pronoun other than she/ her/ hers when referring to female human beings. All these illustrate motivation, principles.

2.1.2. GEORGE YULE

George Yule proposes three related acts that can be deduced from the action performed by producing an utterance. The first one is called a locutionary act. This is an action due to producing any meaningful linguistic expression. This type of an act cannot be produced by a person who has a difficulty in forming the sounds and words to create meaningful utterances in a language.

The second act is called illocutionary act. This is the purpose of an utterance by the speaker. Yule argues that we engage ourselves everytime in utterances with some kind of function in minds. This type of an act is performed through the communicative force of an utterance. The illocutionary act is generally known as the illocutionary force of the utterance.

The third one is called perlocutionary act. This one comes into existence as a results of creating an utterance with a function aimed at having an effect to the listener. The speaker depends on the circumstances that the hearer can recognize the effect he or she intended by an utterance, and this is called the perlocutionary effect. It, therefore, means that the speech act is the illocutionary force of an utterance.

2.1.2.1. ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE INDICATING DEVICE (IFID).

This is an expression which shows where there is a narrow opening for a verb that clearly names the illocutionary act as performative verbs. Yule insists that speakers do not always perform their speech acts so clearly, but they sometimes describe the speech act being performed.

But there are times when there is no performative verb mentioned in an utterance. There are other IFID's which can be identified and they are: word order, stress and intonation. The illocutionary force can also be indicated by a lowered voice quality for a warning or threat, but the utterance also has to be produced under certain conforming conditions to count as having the intended illocutionary force.

2.1.2.2. FELICITY CONDITION

They are expected circumstances for the performance of a speech act to be recognized as intended. Yule pursues the idea that the performance becomes infelicitous if the speaker is not a specific person in a special context.

Example: It is inappropriate for a priest to sentence a criminal to prison.

The following are preconditions that we find in everyday contexts among ordinary people:

General conditions occur when the participants can understand the language being used and they do not play-act or become non-

sensical. Context condition for a promise and a warning is that the content of the utterance must be about a future event. A promise's further content condition requires that the future event will be a future event of the speaker. The preparatory conditions for a promise are importantly different from those for a warning. The preparatory conditions for a warning are that, it is not clear that the hearer knows the event will occur, and the speaker thinks that the event will occur, and the event will not have beneficial effect. Sincerity conditions for promise is that the speaker really intends to carry out the future action and, for a warning, the speaker really believes that the future event will not have a beneficial effect.

The last condition is called the essential condition and it covers that by the act of uttering a promise, intends to create an obligation to carry out the action as promised. With a warning, the utterance changes the state from non-informing of a bad future event to informing. In order for speech act to be appropriately performed, the essential condition combines with a specification of what must be in the utterance content, the context, and the speaker's intention.

2.1.2.3. THE PERFORMATIVE HYPOTHESIS

It occurs when it is assumed that underlying every utterance there is a clause containing a performative verb which makes the illocutionary force clear.

The basic format of the underlying clause is that the subject must be first person singular followed by the adverb 'hereby' indicating that the utterance is counting as an action by being uttered. There can also be a performative verb in the present tense and an indirect object in second person singular.

There are times when speakers do not include the adverb 'hereby' and they refer to such as explicit performatives or primary performatives.

It is important to make the above analysis because it makes clear just what elements are involved in the production and interpretation of utterances. Again, it shows that some adverbs or adverbial clauses naturally attach to the explicit performative clause rather than the implicit version.

The problem with the performative hypothesis is that it is difficult to know exactly what the performative verb might be for some utterances. Another problem with this analysis is that it is not known as to how many performative verbs are there in any

language and that makes it difficult to identify explicit performatives.

2.1.2.4. **SPEECH ACT CLASSIFICATION.**

There are five types of general functions performed by speech acts; namely: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives and commissives.

Declarations as a speech act have the power to change the world through their utterances. Here, the speaker has the special institutional role in a specific context in order to perform it appropriately.

Representatives indicate what the speaker believes to be right or wrong. Representatives include statements of facts, assertions, conclusions and descriptions.

Expressives state the feelings of the speaker. They include psychological states and statements of pain, pleasures, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. Sometimes expressives can be caused by what the speaker or hearer does, but they are much concerned with the experience of the speaker.

Directives are employed by speakers when they use someone else to do something. They express the needs or wants of the speaker. They include commands, orders, requests and suggestions. They may be positive or negative. The speaker tends to make the world fit his or her words through the hearer.

Commissives are used by speakers when they want to commit themselves to some future action. They include promises, threats, refusals and pledges.

2.1.2.5. DIRECT AND INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS.

Direct speech act occurs when there is direct relationship between a structure and a function; and on the other hand, an indirect speech act occurs when there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function. Yule says that a declarative used to make a statement is a direct speech act, but a declarative used to make a request is an indirect speech act.

2.1.2.6. SPEECH EVENTS.

They are activities in which participants interact through language in some conventional way to arrive at some results. Speech events may also include an obvious central speech act but it also has

utterances leading up to and consequently reacting to that central action. It is, as Yule argues, a social situation involving participants who necessarily have a social relationship of some kind, and who, on a specific occasion, may have particular goals.

2.2. THEORIES OF POLITENESS.

Politeness theory is also taken as a sub-discipline of pragmatics. According to Thomas, people are using the same terms in very different ways and are operating with different definitions of politeness and are talking at cross-purposes.

2.2.1. DELIMITING THE CONCEPT OF POLITENESS.

In order to try to end the confusion with the term ‘politeness,’ Thomas comes with five separate sets of phenomena:

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

a. Politeness as a real-world goal.

As far as Thomas is concerned, the aspect of politeness as a real-world goal does not have any place in pragmatics because we have no access to speaker's real motivation for speaking as they do, and discussions as to whether one group of people is politer than another are ultimately futile. The only thing that we, as linguists, can have access to, is what speakers say and to how their hearers react.

b. Difference versus politeness.

Thomas argues that difference refers to the respect we show to other person by virtue of their higher status, greater age, etc. On the other hand he takes politeness as a more general matter of showing consideration to others. There is also a relationship between difference and politeness. Both the two, difference and politeness, can be shown clearly through general social behaviour and by linguistic means.

Thomas postulates that difference is built into the grammar of language like Korean and Japanese. He claims that it is also found in a much reduced form in the grammar of languages like French, German and Russian wherein there is a choice of second person pronoun. In the present English, difference is used in address forms like doctor, professor, etc and the use of the honorifics such as sir or madam.

As far as it is concerned, the choice of the honorific or plain form of the copula is not a matter of individual choice, but it is an obligatory choice among variants. It helps to reflect the speaker's sense of place or role in given situation according to social conventions.

Thomas argues further by saying that difference has a little to do with pragmatics because the speaker has no choice as to whether to use the deferent form or not, unless the speaker deliberately wishes to disobey the behavioural norms of a given society.

Example: The speaker was the Academy Sergeant Major (one of the few ranks of non-commissioned officer normally addressed as 'Sir') He was talking to a newly arrived group of officer cadets:

'You will address me as 'Sir' at all times and I will also address you as 'Sir'. The difference is that you will mean it!'

The example above shows an obligatory form of difference and as such it is of no significance pragmatically because it is only when

there is a choice by challenging the current norms, that the use of deferent or non-deferent forms become of interest to the pragmaticist.

According to Thomas, the use of a deferent form does not in and of itself convey any respect. Usually the speaker manages to express extreme disrespect while using conventional forms of deference. Sometimes the speaker exploits the address system, using an inappropriately elaborate and deferential form of address. Here is an example of a man addressing his wife in order to imply that she is behaving in an unnecessary pretentious way:

The speaker and his wife have driven a long way and are both very hungry. However, the wife keeps refusing to stop at the diners they pass, because she thinks it looks too down-market:

“What was the matter with the ‘Elite Diner,’ milady?”

In conclusion, Thomas shows that it is possible to be differential without being polite:

Example: Brian Wilson, Labour M.P. for Cunninghame North, was addressing Nicholas Soames,

Conservative M.P. for Crawley, during the 'poll Tax' debate in 1988:

BW: Does the honourable member for Crowley wish to intervene?

NS: No.

BW: The last time I saw a mouth like that it had a hook in it.

As far as the example above is concerned, the speaker uses an elaborate deference form, while at the same time impolitely implying that Mr Soames looked like a trout.

c. Register

Thomas points out that 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. Register has little to do with politeness and has a little connection with pragmatics, because there is no real choice about whether or not to use formal language in formal situations. Register is primarily a socio-linguistic phenomenon which says that a description of the linguistic forms generally occur in a particular situation.

Thomas even insists that a choice of register has little to do with the strategic use of language and it only becomes of interest to the pragmaticist if a speaker deliberately uses unexpected forms in order to change the situation.

d. Politeness as an utterance level phenomenon.

Politeness focusses on utterance realization to investigate how much politeness could be squeezed out of speech act strategies alone and to investigate the perception of politeness by native and non-native speakers of English and Spanish. In a studies done, it was found that members of a particular community showed a very high level of agreement as to which linguistic forms were most polite, and in general, it was found that the more grammatically complex the strategy, the more highly it was rated for politeness.

There are two issues which arise from the studies which was done. The first one is listing the linguistic forms which can be used to perform a speech act in a given language is not pragmatics. Thomas argues that it only becomes pragmatics when we look at how a particular form in a particular language is used strategically in order to achieve the speaker's goal. The second issue is as soon as we put a speech act in context, we can see that there is no necessary connection between the linguistic form and the

perceived politeness of a speech act. The reasons for this being: the speech act is costly to the speaker or beneficial to the hearer.

Example: A married couple is trying to decide on a restaurant. The husband says: “You choose.”

This is a direct imperative, but it would normally be seen as perfectly polite.

The second reason is that on the face of it, forms of request are much more polite than the more normal.

Example: The wife says to the husband: “Will you be kind enough to tell me what time it is?”
(and later)
“If you’ll be kind enough to speed up a little.”

The third reason to be unsafe to equate surface linguistic form with politeness is that some speech acts seem almost inherently impolite.

Example: i. I’m afraid I must ask you to leave.
ii. Go away!
iii. Bugger off!

It becomes difficult for the hearer to censure any statement which is rude. Thomas argues that whether the utterance of (i) above is more motivated by consideration for hearer.

e. Politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon.

Brown and Levinson take politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon. They interpret politeness as a strategy, used by a speaker to achieve a variety of goals, such as promoting or maintaining harmonious relations. They say these strategies may include the strategic use of the conventional politeness strategies discussed in (d) above, but also includes other strategies.

2.2.2. POLITENESS EXPLAINED IN TERMS OF PRINCIPLES AND MAXIMS.

Politeness is also regarded as crucial in explaining why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean and rescuing the Cooperative Principle because politeness can explain exceptions to and apparent deviations from the CP.

a. Ambivalence and politeness.

An ambivalent utterance is the one which has more than one potential pragmatic force. Thomas argues that by employing an

utterance which is ambivalent, it is possible to convey messages which the hearer is liable to find disagreeable without causing undue offence.

Example: Notice in the junior Common Room, Queens College, Cambridge:

These newspapers are for all students, not the privileged few who arrive first.

The pragmatic force from this example is left to the readers to decide what the precise force of the message is and whether or not it applies to them.

b. Pragmatic Principles.

The Politeness Principles (PP) runs as follow: Minimize the expression of impolite beliefs; maximize the expression of polite beliefs. Thomas thinks that the Politeness Principle rescues by explaining why speakers do not always observe the Gricean maxims. In his discussion, Thomas also includes the expression of impolite beliefs which is what a person is thinking or implying and that it is perfectly clear that the speakers have impolite thoughts or feelings which are conveyed indirectly. Below are different maxims as postulated by Leach:

i. The tact maxim.

This maxim states that ‘minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to others; maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to others.’ This maxim relates to the aspect of the size of the imposition.

Example: Just pop upstairs and

Hang on a second!

I’ve got a bit of a problem.

Another aspect is that of mitigating the effect of a request by offering optionality. This aspect resembles rules of politeness. Tact maxim has another aspect of the cost or benefit scale. It says that if something is perceived as being to the hearer’s benefit, X can be expressed politely without employing indirectness.

ii. The Generosity maxim.

Leech’s Generosity maxim states that minimize the expression of benefit to self maximize the expression of cost to self. This maxim helps to explain why it is not a problem to say: ‘You must come and have dinner with us;’ while the proposition that we will come and have dinner with you requires to be expressed indirectly.

It is further explained that languages or cultures vary in the degree to which you are expected to apply this maxim. Though Leech emphasized the fact that there is no suggestion that members of one culture are more generous than members of another; she points out that some cultures attach much more importance to the Generosity maxim than do others.

iii. The Approbation maxim

This maxim states that ‘minimize the expression of beliefs which expresses dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which expresses approval of others.’

iv. The Modesty maxim.

This maxim states that ‘minimize the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of dispraise of self.’ Leech here, argues that the operation of this maxim may lead someone to reject a compliment which had been paid to him.

v. The Agreement maxim.

This maxim states that ‘minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.’ This maxim considers the relationship between the speaker and hearer and of the nature of interaction in which they are involved. Leech claims that people usually avoid

disagreement but they are more direct in expressing their agreement.

vi. The Pollyanna Principle.

According to Thomas, Pollyanna was the eponymous heroine of Eleanor H. Porter's novel. The Pollyanna Principle encourages the use of a minimizer such as 'a bit' and simply has other aspects which relate to relexicalization, replacing an unpleasant term with a supposedly less unpleasant one.

Example: The speaker had just 'lost' two hours work on the word-processor:

'Ah well, I'll probably write it better second time around.'

2.2.3. PROBLEMS WITH LEECH'S APPROACH.

According to Thomas, this approach appears to be a motivated way of restricting the number of maxims. But Thomas insists that the approach was good to make specific cross-cultural comparisons and to explain cross-cultural differences in the perception of politeness and the use of politeness strategies. Thomas further argues that Leech could have overcome the unrefined series of her approach, if she had seen her maxims as a series of socio-

psychological constraints influencing, to a greater or lesser degree, the choices made within the pragmatic parameters.

2.2.4. POLITENESS AND THE MANAGEMENT OF FACE.

Thomas insists central to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness is the concept of face. Thomas takes face as individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image; but this image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others. Face has a positive and a negative aspect. An individual's positive face is reflected in his or her desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others. An individual's negative face is reflected in the desire not to be put upon, to have the freedom to act as one chooses.

a. Face-threatening acts (FTA's)

According to Thomas, these are certain illocutionary acts which are liable to damage or threaten another person's face. An illocutionary act has the potential to damage the hearer's positive face or hearer's negative face and the illocutionary act may potentially damage the speaker's own positive face or speaker's own negative face.

Thomas suggests that in order to reduce the possibility of damage to hearer's face or speaker's own face, he or she may adopt certain strategies. The choice of a strategy is made on the basis of the speaker's assessment of the size of the face-threatening act. The speaker can calculate the size of the face-threatening act on the basis of the parameters of power, distance and rating the imposition. When the above are combined, they determine the overall weightness of the face-threatening act which in turn influences the strategy used.

i. Superstrategies for performing face-threatening acts.

According to Thomas, the first decision to be made is whether to perform the face-threatening act or not. If the speaker decides to perform them, there are four possibilities; three sets of on-record superstrategies and one set of off-record strategies. On-record superstrategies include performing the FTA on-record using positive politeness and performing the FTA on-record using negative politeness. If the speaker decides that the degree of face threat is too great, he or she may decide to avoid the FTA altogether.

ii. Performing an FTA without any redress.

Thomas postulates that sometimes external factors constrain an individual to speak very directly; for example: when there is an

emergency of some sorts or where there is some form of channel limitation. The speaker is likely to focus on the propositional content of the message and pays little attention to the interpersonal aspect of what is said during emergencies or in highly task-oriented situations such as teaching someone to drive.

Example: The speaker knows that a bomb has been planted in the stands at his racecourse. He thinks his young nephew is hiding in the stands:

.....Toby, get off the stands. The stands are not safe Toby: for Christ's sake do what I say. This is not a game. Come on, you little bugger..... for once in your life, be told.

If the mother decides that the overall weightiness of the FTA is very small, the request may be made bald on record.

Thomas, furthermore, argues that sometimes no attempt is made to mitigate the FTA, with no regard of the rating of the imposition when the power differential is great. It is then that powerful participants will often employ directness.

iii. Performing an FTA with redress (positive politeness).

Thomas insists that when you want to speak to someone you may orient yourself towards that individual's positive face and empty politeness.

Example: Male first- year student calling to female first- year student (whom he didn't know) in their college bar during 'freshers' week:

"Hey, blonde, what are you studying, then?
French or Italian? Join the club!"

The young man, argues Thomas, used positive politeness strategies.

iv. Performing an FTA with redress (negative politeness).

Again Thomas, postulates that negative politeness is oriented towards a hearer's negative face, which appeals to the hearer's desire not to be put upon to be left free to act as they choose. It manifests itself in the use of conventional politeness markers, difference markers and minimizing imposition.

Example: This is an extract from a note that was sent to me by an academic from another university. She was visiting Lancaster for a conference and we had

arranged to meet on Friday, but unfortunately I forgot our appointment:

Dear Jenny Thomas

I'm sorry I missed you today. I wanted to discuss with you.....

I know it is a terrible imposition, but if you had any time, Sat.p.m. we could perhaps meet at Lancaster for a coffee? I'd very grateful.

Best wishes,

The speaker here has employed negative politeness. He becomes conventional indirect by saying we could because he wanted to.

v. Performing an FTA using off-record politeness.

Thomas points out that these are strategies for performing off-record politeness. Such strategies include giving hints, using metaphors, being ambiguous or vague.

Example: One student to another: This isn't a crème egg I can see you are eating, is it?

vi. Do not perform FTA.

As far as Thomas is concerned, this appears to be self-explanatory. There are times when something is potentially so face threatening that you don't say it. But Tonaka terms this as opting out choice (OOC). She says there are times when the speaker decides to say nothing or genuinely wishes to let the matter be dropped, and when an individual decides to say nothing but still wishes to achieve the effect which the speech act would have achieved had it been uttered.

Another solution is where there is a strong expectation that something will be said, that saying nothing is in itself a massive FTA.

b. Criticism of Brown and Levinson.

Thomas postulates that the description of the FTA implies that an act is threatening to the face of either the speaker or the hearer, in fact many acts can be seen to threaten the face of both the speaker and the hearer simultaneously. But apology threatens the speaker's face and can be the source of considerable embarrassment to the hearer.

A single utterance can be oriented to both positive and negative face simultaneously but Brown and Levinson claim that positive and negative politeness are mutually exclusive.

This model appears to predict that the greater the degree of face-threatening, the greater will be the degree of indirectness. But many counter-examples were found.

Brown and Levinson also argue that some speech acts are inherently face-threatening. But it has been concluded that some utterances pose no threat at all. It has also been agreed that saying anything at all is potentially face-threatening.

CHAPTER 3

THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY.

3.1. THE APOLOGY

3.1.1. SCHER AND DARLEY (1997).

Scher and Darley take apology as common utterance. They postulate that apologies are nearly offered when an individual has violated a social norm. That is why they say, when apology is given, it serves as a remedial work, designed to smooth over any social disruption that was caused by the norm violation. Goffman, on the other hand, says apology is a gesture through which an individual splits himself into two parts, the part that is guilty of an offence and the part that separates itself from the delict and affirms a belief in the offended rule. He proposes that in this way, an apology deflects the moral implications of transgression from the perceived identity of the transgressor.

Scher and Darley make it known that a substantial body of research has appeared in the past few years which explores both the things people say when they apologize and the effectiveness of apologies in remediating the negative effects of transgressions. But

these researchers have not looked at the differing effects of the different things people actually say when they apologize.

According to Scher and Darley, the Cross-Cultural Speech Acts Realization Project (CCSARP) carried out the most extensive analysis of the content of apologies. They say this project has proposed five strategies that form the apology speech act set, the strategies that can be used to apologize. They mention these five strategies as an illocutionary force indicating device (IFID); an explanation or account of the cause which brought about the violation, an expression of the speaker's responsibility for the offence, an offer of repair and a promise of forbearance. The data that has been collected by the CCSARP shows that these strategies are used frequently in apologies in a variety of languages and across a variety of cultures.

Scher and Darley (1997: 128) claim that research on the effectiveness of apologies has examined how judgements made about a transgressor, and the amount of blame and punishment assigned to transgressors, differ when a transgressor apologizes and when no apology is given. They argue that apology reduces sanctioning applied to transgressors by reducing negative evaluations of the identity of the transgressor. Apologies may also

affect sanctioning by reducing the anger victims feel after the transgression.

According to Scher and Darley it is unclear at this point to say whether or not apologies reduce blame because apologies include an expression of responsibility or admission of blame; which might actually increase blame. But on the other hand, they argue that because apologies serve to reaffirm the speaker's compliance with the moral rules of society, the admission of responsibility may not necessarily affect the more moralistic judgements of blame. Based on some observations, Darby and Schlenker (1982) say apologies have been shown to reduce blame judgements.

Scher and Darley argue that there has been only limited examination of differing effects of different forms of apologies. They claim that these apologies do not allow independent analysis of the effects of the different messages.

As far as Scher and Sarley are concerned, there are good reasons to believe that each of the apology strategies identified by the CCSARP should have important independent effects on the reactions to apologizers. They argue that there are two functions served by apologies in social discourse. They say an apology is an illocutionary act, which serves to show that the speaker is aware of

the social requirement to apologize in certain situations, which the CCSARP seems to have viewed apologies in this light. They go further by saying that an apology also works by communicating important information about the psychological state of the speaker.

There are two of the apology strategies identified by the CCSARP which convey information that is a required part of apology. The speaker must acknowledge the responsibility for having committed some offending acts, and he or she must express regret about the offence in order for apology to be carried out; hence Darby and Schlenker define apologies as admissions of blameworthiness and regret for an undesirable event.

Scher and Darley argue that the admission of responsibility for the transgression is a necessary feature of an apology. It conveys to the listener that the speaker is aware of the social norms that have been violated; and therefore conveys that the speaker will be able to avoid the offence in future interactions. The admission of responsibility, as they further postulate, performs the function of splitting the self in preparation for the expression of regret or remorse that will serve as an indication of the separation of the good, innocent self from the guilty self.

Scher and Darley take remorse or regret as primary information intended to be conveyed by an apology. They say the idealistic apology typically consists of an expression of feeling. An apology without an expression of remorse (e.g. I apologize) seems to be perfunctory or formal, indicating the illocutionary force of apology, without conveying information about the emotional state of the transgressors.

The absence of remorse can seriously affect the broader effectiveness of the apology. Negative emotion following a transgression is a sign that the outcome was distressful and surprising for the transgressors. It has been shown that displays of embarrassment after an unsubtle act reduce the likelihood that observers will attribute an unsubtle disposition to actors. Remorse serves to deflect negative personality judgements and other reactions from the transgressors.

A promise of forbearance, as Scher and Darley postulate, increases the effectiveness of an apology by assuming hearers that the speaker will not repeat his or her transgression. It is important for social interactants to feel that the transgressor is aware of the violated rule and will strive to follow the rule henceforth, if the function of an apology is to remedy the social breach and bring the transgressor back into the fold.

An offer of repair has a straightforward connection to the remedial function of an apology. It is an offer to try to make the situation right, to repair things so that it is as if the transgression did not take place. An offer can have a symbolic function, serving as a form of self-punishment of the guilty self.

Scher and Darley deny that an explanation or account, which is often given together with an apology, is an apology. But they say the offering of external circumstances that reduce the offence, forms part of an excuse and this is another form of remedial work that seeks to reduce the responsibility of the transgressor for the transgression. Again, they argue that while the reduction of responsibility included may improve judgements made about the speaker and his or her relationship to the transgression, it does so through mechanisms that are different from apologies.

Scher and Darley propose that apology strategies should each provide important information about the speaker and have an independent effect on judgements made about a speaker and about apology. They further say that each apology strategy should improve perceptions of the speaker's identity, reduce the sanction applied to the speaker, increase remorse or regret attributed to the

speaker, and increase perceptions of the appropriateness of the apology.

A research on the presence or absence of the few apologies was done. The subjects were informed that the experiment they underwent, was concerned with how the different ways of people react to their own behaviour can affect the way those people are seen by others. The research shows that the apology components all significantly contributed to the prediction of each dependent variable, except the expression of remorse that failed to predict the subject ratings.

The warning to this research is that the operationalization of the apology strategies may not have been equally powerful in operationalizing the manner of the apology strategy. Another problem arises from the use of a mixed experimental design, where the effects of variables manipulated as between subject variables have less statistical power than variable manipulated within subjects.

It was also found that responsibility expression and repair offer have interacting effects. Apart from that, there is a three way interaction between responsibility expression, repair offer and forbearance promise.

3.1.2. HOLMES

Holmes (1990) argues that remedial interchange highlight the central function of apology which is to provide a remedy for an offence and restore social equilibrium or harmony. It is for this reason that he postulates that apology is a speech act addressed to B's face-needs and intended to remedy an offence to which A takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B, where A is the apologizer and B is the person offended.

He further says that it is not easy to say exactly what the content of an apology is in any helpful manner because this function may be achieved in an infinite number of ways depending on the offence addressed. But Olshtain and Cohen (1983) proposed that it is possible to specify all the potential types of sentences and utterances that together create a set of parameter for a particular speech act. They say that the description of each act is their goal.

Austin and Searle (1962 and 1969 respectively) on the other hand specify the felicity conditions under which a particular utterance would count as an instance of a particular speech act. This approach was motivated by Fraser (1981) and Owen (1983). Owen even says that there is no independent way of establishing felicity

conditions. She argues that one has recourse to the felicity conditions, which are established by reference to the form of those utterances that are identified as apology, in order to classify an utterance as an apology.

Apologies have been identified as utterances that are function-centred. The following minimal felicity conditions have elements of this definition:

- an act has occurred.
- A believes the act has offended B.
- A takes some responsibility for the act.

From these, A is likely to be interpreted as apologized but the way he can put his utterances cannot be predicted.

Holmes further postulates that even though it is not possible to specify a complete speech act set for apology, it is both possible and useful for descriptive purpose to categorize the range of strategies which were used in a corpus of apologies.

The first one is that apology will typically address an offence performed by the apologizer:

Example: (A bumps into B, who is standing still).

A: Sorry.

B: That's OK.

Secondly, an apology will be made on behalf of someone for whom the apologizer feels responsible, such as a child, a spouse, a friend, or a member of the same group as the person apologizing:

Example: (A's child spills her drink on B's carpet).

A: Oh look I'm terribly sorry. I'll clean it up.

Have you got a cloth?

B: Don't worry. I'll do it. It wasn't very much.

This example is showing that the person to whom an offence has been done, takes responsibility thereof rather than the offender.

3.1.2.1. APOLOGIES AND FACE.

The main aim of apologies is to maintain or support the addressee's and sometimes the apologizer's face. As Holmes says, apologies are generally aimed at face redress associated with face-threatening acts or offences that have damaged the addressee's face in some respect. Apologies can be regarded as negative politeness strategies. Though apology is taken as a negative politeness strategy, it also addresses the victim's or the speaker's

positive face needs. The elements of this negative strategy also address transgressions to positive or negative face wants.

The good thing about apologies is that they redress negative face when the offence has ignored B's want that his actions be unimpeded by others. Another thing about apologies is that they address positive face wants when the transgression offends B's need that his or her 'wants' be desirable to at least some others. They also redress damage to the victim's positive face:

Example: (Introducing B to C, A has used Mr. instead of Dr. for B).

A: OH I am sorry- it's Dr. Hall not Mr. Forgive Me.

(B smiles in an embarrassed way to address C).

B: Nice to meet you.

As far as Holmes is concerned, another function of apologies is to address the loss of positive face incurred by the speaker. The speaker's positive face needs are taken seriously, where a remedial exchange includes an explanation:

Example: (A is phoning B to warn her of potential inconvenience).

A: I'm sorry, but I'm going to be late for work.

The buses aren't off strike yet and with it being a wet Friday, it'll probably be a while until my taxi arrives.

B: Uh- huh as long as you're here by six, cos I'm going then.

From this example, there is an awareness of potential offence to the victim's negative face, and apology tries to redress the speaker's positive face loss by pointing reasons why the anticipated offence may be difficult to avoid.

Apologies may in some circumstances be associated with deliberate offences. Face attack act (FAA) was introduced by Peddy Austin (1988) and is used for the face-threatening acts which involve intentional attacks on the addressee's face, such as insults and accusations:

Example: (A's child, C, has insulted her playmate, B, who is a guest at A's house).

C: Go away you're mean and I hate you.

A: Sally! It's alright Brigid, she doesn't mean it.

B: (No visible response, carries on playing).

The face attacker can apologize for herself for the face attack act. The face attacker must split the self into a blameworthy part and a part that stands back and sympathizes with the blame giving:

Example: (A, reneging on an earlier agreement, tells B's family that she cannot now put them up. B can reasonably feel insulted and discounted. Apology comes some time later):

A: Look I'm terrible sorry for what happened. I Was in an impossible position. I just couldn't Please everyone.

B: That's OK. I understand though I must admit I felt pretty hurt at the time.

Apologies can express other function, too. They may be bivalent or plurivalent speech acts that express more than one illocutionary or pragmatic force. Holmes argues that utterances that express regret for an offence may also serve as an admission from where the addressee learns of the offence. A single utterance simultaneously performs the function of conveying bad news and apologizing for it:

Example: (In trying to undo a bottle for B, A breaks the

cap):

A: Oh dear, I'm afraid I've broken it.

B: Never mind, at least it's open now.

Again we have this utterance which serves as an apology and simultaneously provides an explanation or excuse for the offence:

Example: (A has started to eat before B, the family's guest,
Has served herself to all the food available):

A: I'm just so hungry I can't wait any longer.

B: Don't worry, go ahead.

Apologies also serve as social functions as to exhibit good manners, to soothe the addressee's wrath or simply to get off the hook and be on one's way.

3.1.2.2. METHODOLOGY AND CORPUS.

Elicited instances are used in most of the researches on apologies. These apologies are very valuable in providing data on the forms that the native and non-native speakers know and the range of

apology strategies respondents consider they would use a particular situation. This approach is also useful to examine data based on actual usage in naturally occurring contexts. The data that could serve as a valuable check on the authenticity of elicited data.

The other approach is that of an ethnographic. Cohen and Olshtain point out that this approach is time consuming. When using it, there is no guarantee that one will collect sufficient examples of the relevant speech act.

There is also a two-pronged approach that combines the aspect of both ethnographic observation and elicited responses by exploring the spontaneous utterances of a range of respondents in the same natural context. As preliminary step, it holds sense to observe in as wide a range of situations as possible to obtain some idea of the range of contexts in which apologies occur, the type of offences that are fruitful in eliciting them and the kinds of social factors which appear to be related to different types of apologies.

The last approach used is the remedial interchanges namely, apologies and apology responses. This data collection method is used very successfully by researchers. It is a good approach because it provides a useful source of information on the range of apology strategies and the syntactic-semantic forms used to

express them. The problems with this data collection method are that it cannot provide more than broad guidelines on the relative frequency of different types of apology and that, it relies on a written transcription after the completion of the exchange.

3.1.2.3. APOLOGY STRATEGIES

There are classification systems for apology strategies that were developed from an interest in teaching second language learners.

According to Holmes, four broad, categories were used, with a number of sub-categories where necessary:

- A. An explicit expression of apology.
 - i. Offer apology, e.g. 'I apologize.'
 - ii. Express regret, e.g. 'I'm sorry.'
 - iii. Request forgiveness, e.g. 'excuse me' or 'forgive me'

- B. An acknowledgement of responsibility.
 - i. Accept blame, e.g. 'it was my fault.'
 - ii. Express self-deficiency, e.g. I was confused.'
 - iii. Recognize hearer as entitled to an apology, e.g. 'You're right.'

- C. An explanation or account, an excuse or justification, e.g. 'I wasn't expecting it to be you.'
- D. A promise of forbearance, e.g. 'I promise it won't happen again.'

Holmes also finds that the strategies are not mutually exclusive, in other words, they may occur together:

Example: (A and B are flatmates. B has asked A to put out her washing and he has forgotten):

B: Thanks for putting my clothes out Gerry.

A: Oops! That's right. I forgot. I'm sorry. Next time I'll remember.

It should also be noted that any one strategy alone may count as an apology in the appropriate context.

Holmes argues that direct speech acts also function as apologies. When these direct speech acts occur alone without a clear form, they become indirect apologies. These indirect apologies have their function of making an excuse or taking responsibility for some undesirable action or making a promise.

Another strategy is that of the less direct speech acts which are more polite than more direct ones. Here Holmes postulates that politer apologies include a clear apology at some point, together with another strategy. These politer apologies are also arranged in an increasing order in terms of how heavily ranked they are as politeness strategies. Direct speech act apologies are the simplest and least heavily weighted strategies but those without a clear form are more complex and more heavily weighted.

Expressing regret is another strategy which is the most frequent apology strategy selected. It is good because it accounts for almost half of all the strategies in the data, provides an account or excuse, and combines more with other strategies. Holmes even tries to explain how strategies combine. In that explanation, he shows that there are two factors which deserve attention for the possibility of combination of strategies. These factors are: the number of strategies which occur together and the noting of the co-occurrence patterns which characterized the data. These combinations occur using the four broad basic categories and there is also an information on different patterns found in the data. Sixteen different combinations of apology strategies occur in the data but they cannot be distributed evenly.

Again, the remedial interchange may also involve more than one occurrence of the same apology strategy:

Example: (A has drifted off in B's class):

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

Holmes also says that there are strategies that show the relative flexibility of position. Such strategies may occur in any position.

Holmes finally says that there are apologies that are always explicit. The only cases where there is no explicit apology are; conversations between intimates, and where the intonation very clearly signals the function of the utterance as an apology.

3.1.2.4. SYNTACTIC-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF APOLOGY

Holmes points out that when apology is clearly expressed, it is possible to classify its form. He postulates that it is obligatory to utter a variant for any wrongdoing. Below is a list of such variants:

a. Variant of apologies or apology and apologies.

As far as Owen is concerned, it is relatively rare to find variants using very clear performative formula. She referred to some very few instances which she find as occurring in a kind of monologue, such as a lecture or a formal notice, reflecting the fact that the relationship between the participants is rather distant and formal. Sometimes you may find that participants do not know each other.

Example: (Waitress to a customer in restaurant):

A: Please accept our apologies sir. We'll replace
it for you.

There are cases when apologies occur not only in formal notices, but also between those who know each other but who are not close friends:

Examples: i. (Letter from one colleague to another):

Dear Dave

First apologies for taking so long to get back to
you with the reading you requested.

ii. Letter from the writer to the editor whom he

knows):

Dear Jean

My apology for the slightly belated arrival of this paper.

b. I'm afraid as an apology.

Owen argues 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 effects may be achieved. She even suggests that the primary function is remedial, since the pro-form presupposes the addressee's knowledge of the offence:

Example: (A walks in without the parcel he was supposed to collect on his way home from school):

B: You didn't forget it, did you?

A: I'm afraid, I did. I'll collect it tomorrow, I promise.

c. Variant of sorry.

Again, Owen provides the following descriptive rule, for variants in her data involving the word 'sorry' which is clearly the most frequent form used as an explicit apology:

Example: I'm	(that) S
(intensifier) sorry	to VP
I am	if S
	about that

(Postcard from A to B, a colleague and friend):

Dear Lorry

Sorry to put you in the embarrassment position of having to ask if you owe me money. You do not.

d. Other patterns.

Apology can be expressed explicitly by the terms excuse me, pardon me, forgive me, we regret, and others.

Example: (A is a waitress who has served B the wrong drink):

A: I beg your pardon. I thought you said 'wine and soda.'

B: Never mind. I'll have it anyway.

3.1.2.5. DISTRIBUTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES

The context in which different apology strategies occur influence the distributions of such strategies. Holmes, thus, comes with two ways in which it seems that apologizers modify the politeness of an apology in relation to the weight of an offence, and that is, they may vary the kinds of strategies used.

3.1.2.6. CHARACTERISTICS OF OFFENCE

The categorization of different types of offences is important because it provides information for comparison in different communities and cultures. So, here Holmes considers the crucial factor of the relative seriousness or ranking of different offences in the contexts in which they occurred.

3.1.2.6.1. Types of offence

Holmes argues that there is no formal existing classification of types of offence. But with the use of categories like inconvenience, space, talk, time, possession and social gaffe, distinction becomes clear.

	Number	%
Inconvenience/ inadequate service.	72	39.3
Space	30	16.4
Talk	30	16.4
Time	26	14.2
Possessions	20	10.9
Social Gaffe	5	2.7
TOTAL	183	100

a. Inconvenience.

In a research done by Holmes, it was found that a large proportion of the apologies can be described as relating to actions which have inconvenienced the addressee in some way:

Example: (B has requested that a docket be stapled to a bank card slip. A, the shop assistant, has been unable to find a stapler):

A: I'll just have to cellotape it on. I'm sorry.

B: That's fine.

The above example shows that the offence sometimes implies a lack of respect for the addressee's positive face needs.

b. Space.

According to Goffman (1971) infringement on another's personal space occasion apologies. These may include, walking too close to or in front of another person, bumping into them, and taking their seat or desk space. Goffman further argues that these offences sometimes threaten the addressee's negative face by impeding her freedom movement:

Example: (A bumps 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 have watched where you are
Going.

c. Talk.

This is an offence that involves some kind of intrusion on the addressee's talk or talking turn or another infringement of rules for polite talk:

Example: (A is apologizing to her daughter for a big

argument in which she and her husband are involved):

A: I'm sorry this happened when you were here.

B: It doesn't matter.

d. Time.

It is also an offence to waste another person's time or not taking appropriate account of the value of another's time. Holmes argues that the infringement involves an imposition on the addressee's time where the apologizer has kept the addressee waiting, or has forgotten or arrived late for an appointment:

Example: (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're not too cheesed off with me.

e. Possession.

This is an offence which involves some damage or loss to the addressee's possessions, including money. This type of an offence

involves damage to or removal of something which belongs to the addressee, or directly cost the addressee money:

Example: (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 my way but if it doesn't, don't worry.

f. Social gaffe.

This is an offence which occurs when the apologizer breaks a social rule relating to socially frowned on behaviour like burping or speaking while eating:

Example; (A, talking to B on the phone, has just had a Coughing bout):

A: Excuse me coughing.

3.1.2.7. **SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENCE**

Holmes insists that a three-point scale was used to categorise the seriousness of the offence:

- i. light offence, like bumping into someone.
- ii. medium offence, like keeping someone waiting and made them late for a film.
- iii. heavy offence, like knocking someone over and hurt them.

In the research, Holmes argues that there were majority of light offences evaluated. Holmes further indicates that majority of light offences elicited a simple explicit apology, whereas medium offences were much more likely than light offences to involve an explanation and an explicit apology. Medium offences were also accompanied by an acknowledgement of responsibility than was typical of the data as a whole. Heavy offences were much less likely than others to be respondent to with just a simple apology.

3.1.2.8. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS

According to Brown and Levinson, an increase in the social distance between participants results in a more heavily weighted face threatening act. They even come up with a categorization of dimensions in order to interpret the correlations of choice of apology strategies with these aspects of the context in which the relevant offence occurred.

- a. Social distance.

To explain this well, Holmes uses other collection of apologies between participants who differ widely in terms of how well they know each other, or the degree of social distance that characterizes the relationship. The three categories which were used to classify data are very close friends or intimates like spouse, partners, family members, friends and colleagues and distant acquaintances or strangers.

b. Power.

Holmes points out that it is often difficult to determine the relative power relations in an interaction. One of the important factors to help here is the relative status of the participants. Apart from the above, Brown and Levinson used three categories, namely, apology was made to a person with more power, apology was made to a person of equal power and, apology was made to a person with less power. The majority of the apologies occurred between equals.

3.1.2.9. OVERALL WEIGTINESS OF THE OFFENCE

Holmes now points out that the effect of a combination of the various non-linguistic factors analysed on the choice of apology strategies can be considered. It can be considered by combining the effects of the seriousness of the offence, the relative power of the

participants and their relative social distance. According to Holmes, a serious offence elicits more elaborated apology strategies and that a powerful victim receives more elaborated strategies than an equal or less powerful one.

Another way of determining the effect is by using some support for the hypothesis that weightier offences tend to elicit more complex apologies.

It can also be determined by examining the strategies used in apologies between maximally distant interlocutors of different status when the less powerful person has committed an offence of medium seriousness or a lighter offence. The less weighty the offence, the more likely a single explicit apology will be used. And, again, an offence between friends sometimes appears to elicit a more elaborated apology.

3.1.3. JAWORSKI

Jaworski suggests that as one looks at the earlier studies of apologies, and the other speech acts, it is clear that the degree to which unbiased examples of the speech acts in question are studied, partly depends on the date collection.

With respect to apology, Jaworski insists that variation in the degree of directness of apologies have been maintained in a few studies. His interest lies with a different type of variation observable in the realization of this speech act. It is the degree to which a given utterance or exchanged is perceived as an apology or as a non-apology. Jaworski tries to examine situations in which two or more interactants negotiate the need to apologize, the form of an apology, and its acceptance. This studies focusses on the situations where the person perceived as responsible for the offence act does not perceive him or herself as such, and decides to deny it verbally. Jaworski indicates further that even Trosborg (1987) found that her subjects did not always accept responsibility for the offensive act in question and that is why she came up with the following non-apology situations:

- i. Explicit denial of responsibility.
- ii. Implicit denial of responsibility.
- iii. Providing justification for the act.
- iv. Blaming a third party.
- v. Blaming the complainer.

Trosborg also says that these non-apology strategies can be attributed to two interlocking factors: the awareness of having to take the blame and inadequacy to give explanation.

Holmes rejects Trosborg's view but comes with his own proposition of the functional definition of an apology as 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. This definition implies the occurrence of the following circumstances:

- an act has occurred
- A believes the act has offended B, and
- A takes some responsibility for the act.

Jaworski argues that it is impossible to establish the exact form of apologies on the basis of Holmes' proposal. But he postulates that when minimal felicity conditions are fulfilled and if A says something in such circumstances, his or her utterance is likely to be interpreted as an apology. Therefore, it is possible to predict the function of A's utterance in each circumstances above but not its form. Holmes stands firm and indicates that, as for A, he may choose not to apologize at all.

3.1.3.1. SOME METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Herbert looks at direct compliments as utterance which can clearly be defined as compliments. It is in this definition that Jaworski argues that Herbert ignores variation and runs the risk of arriving at a circular conclusion, because compliments are highly formulaic speech acts and their formation is based on the examination of a body of writings of a largely formulaic compliments. Below is a procedure of how CCSARP and others define units and their analysis:

The unit of analysis for both requests and apologies in the discourse completion test is the utterance or sequence of utterances supplied by the informant in completing the test item, provided it realizes the speech act under study.

Jaworski interprets the following from the procedure above: the body of writing on requests or apologies to be studied consists of the subject response to a number of stimuli, provided that these responses conform to the researcher's expectations of what constitutes requests and apologies. He is trying to define requests as requests and apologies as apologies and they can be recognized clearly.

There was also an opportunity for the adjustment and betterment of the data in the CCSARP project. Jaworski advocates the view that

a study of apologies and requests should involve situation capable of the most frequent elicitation of these speech act types.

3.1.3.2. APOLOGIES IN POLITENESS THEORY

Brown and Levinson (1978 and 1987) take apologies as face threatening acts (FTA's) which damage the speaker's (S's) positive face. Acts of this type include: acting stupid, confessions, self-contradictions, falling down, and may more. They further argue that apologies belong to negative politeness strategies in performing acts which are threats to the hearer's (H's) face. These negative politeness strategies include deferential linguistic or non-linguistic behaviour, hedging the illocutionary force of the act, impersonalization of utterances in order to distance the speaker and hearer from an act.

In their politeness theory, Brown and Levinson further indicate that apology is also face-threatening act on record using one of the several strategies to apologize. Below is a list of such strategies as stipulated by Brown and Levinson:

i. Admit the impingement

The speaker simply admits that he is impinging on hearer's face.

Example: I know this is a bore, but we must go.

ii. Indicate reluctance.

The speaker attempts to show that he is reluctant to impinge on hearer with the use of hedge.

Example: I hope you don't mind me saying this but it is true.

iii. Give overwhelming reasons.

The speaker claims that he has compelling reasons for doing the face-threatening act to imply that normally he wouldn't dream of infringing upon hearer's negative face.

Example: I cannot think of anybody else who could help me do this.

iv. Beg forgiveness.

The speaker may beg hearer's forgiveness, or at least ask for the hearer to cancel the debt implicit in the face-threatening act.

Example: I am sorry to bother you.

It is further argued that an apology, like any other speech act, can be performed indirectly or off-record. An overstatement is a good example of any possible off-record.

Example: I went there several times but I couldn't see anybody.

Because of the fact that apology is used to remedy a face-threatening act, Brown and Levinson manage to arrive at their circulation of the weightiness of a face-threatening act. They, therefore, suggest these three factors:

- a. social distance
- b. relative power
- c. absolute ranking of imposition in the particular culture.

3.1.3.3. SOME POLISH DATA: UNPROTOTYPICAL APOLOGIES.

Jaworski states that the form of apologies is not always in a sort of a formulae. They often involve negotiation of a 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 are Polish examples of prototypical apologies:

- a. F1 bumps into F2 on a crowded tram:

F1: Oj, przepraszam.

(Oh, excuse me).

F2: Ah, nic nie szkodzi.

(Oh, never mind).

- b. Two students talk to each other several hours after a mild quarrel:

F1: Przepraszam, że się tak zachowałam. Jestem trochę

(I'm sorry that I did that. I am a little

zdeenerwowana tym egzaminem.

upset by this exam).

- c. Receiving change in a shop:

Customer (F): Jeszcze dziesięć złotych.

(Ten zlotys more).

Saleswoman : Ah przepraszam, te nowe dwudziestki.

(Oh, I'm sorry. It's these new twenties)

- d. Examples which involve less prototypical or negotiated apologies are also there:

- i. Mother (M) and daughter (D) aged 5: the daughter is trying to search for an electric switch at the staircase (tries to be helpful) but in the process stomps on the mother's bag.

M: Majusiu, podepczesz mi ta torbe.

(Majusiu, you're treading on my bag).

D: To czemu ja tutaj postawilas?

(Why did you leave it here?)

M: [sighs] No dobrze, przenies ja.

(OK, just move it).

In the above example, the daughter avoids an apology by negotiating the power dimension, blaming her mother for placing the bag in the wrong place. But, nevertheless, the daughter also offers her remedial act by silently removing the bag.

- ii. At the 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 (c.60) takes her seat when she is gone. F1 comes back.

F2: Ja tylko do Obornik. Piniusia mloda to postoi.

(I'm only going to Obornik. You're a young lady. You can stand).

As far as Jaworski is concerned, the offender redefines the degree of imposition involved in the offending act by insisting that she is going to travel a short distance. She also uses two positive politeness strategies to justify her offending act which are: the lady is still young and that she can stand.

iii. 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: To pani powinna mnie przeprosic! Idzie pani zla stroma
(You should apologize to me. You're walking on the
chodnika.
wrong side of the pavement).

M reverses the power arrangement which was suggested non-verbally by F. M wants F to apologize because he claims that the woman was on the wrong side of the pavement, and he is trying to tell her to walk on the right side of the pavement.

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

M: Uz, kurwa!
(Oh fuck!)

M's response is not clear. It is not clear whether M is trying to shift the blame for tripping over the woman's bags from himself onto the woman, which is a justified thing for him to do, or to try to signal his uncluefulness to her in order to win the woman's sympathy and forgiveness for walking into her belongings.

- v. M1 and M2 (roommates, both over 25) had an argument about M1's failure to keep an earlier promise. After the quarrel M2 goes out for a walk. When he comes back, M1 produces a bottle of wine originally saved for an upcoming party.

M1: Zgodą baduje, niezgodą rujnuje.

(United we stand, divided we fall).

M1 clearly manipulates distance between himself and M2 by using positive politeness strategies which include: to give a gift of wine, and the use of a formulae which clearly calls for solidarity

- vi. M (c.50), a customer in a self-service restaurant complains to the saleswoman (c.40) about his soup.

M: Ta zupa jest nie do jedzenia. Jak wam nie wstyd

(This soup is inedible. How can you be not ashamed

podawac takie rzeczy?

of serving things like that?)

F: A co pan myśli? Sprobowalby pan harowac za takie
(And what do you think sir? You should try and slave
pieniadze w tych warunkach!
here in such conditions for such lousy wages).

The saleswoman avoids an apology by trying to win the customer's sympathy claiming that working in a terrible place and for low wages is enough for a punishment for serving bad dishes to customers.

vii. M and F (both 23) share an apartment and, consequently, a refrigerator. M comes home and finds out that his meal has disappeared from the fridge.

M: Cholera, kto wcial mojego kotleta?

(Damn it! Who's eaten my cutlet?)

F: Hmm, obawiam sie, ze to ja. Przepraszam, nie

(Well, I'm afraid it was me. I'm sorry. I didn't

wiedzialam.

know).

M: Drobazg. Kotlety sa bardzo niezdowe.

(It's nothing. Cutlets are very bad for you).

F: Nie zlosc sie. Skad mialam wiedziec, ze to twój?

(Don't be angry. How could I know it was yours?)

M: No, falk. Zapomnialem mu przyczepic moja

(Yes, I forgot to attach my card to
wizytowke!
it).

F: Wiesz co, chyba jest jeszcze cos w zamrazalniku.
(You know, I think there is something in the freezer.
Poczekaj chwile, to ci cos' przyrzadze.
Wait a little and I'll prepare it for you).

M: No dobrze. Jezeli przedtem nie umra z glodu.
(Well, OK, if I don't starve to death first).

The example above started by a fairly formulaic and predictable apology from F. But this was not the case because F tried to save herself by giving a false reason for committing the offending act. She said that she didn't know that it was hers because M didn't attach a card to it. Finally, F offered M a remedial action by preparing something to eat.

viii. M1, M2 and M3: Polish student, all aged over 20, during a temporary stay in the USA; roommates. It is late afternoon. M1 comes back having spent the previous night out. M2 and M3, who have been worrying about M1, are having dinner:

M1: Czesc panowie! Co u was?

(Hello gentleman! What's new with you?)

M2: To raczej co u ciebie? Gdzie byless?

(Or, rather, what's new with you? Where have you been?)

M1: Aaa... Wiesz, namowili mnie na partyjke, no I

(Well, you know, they talked me into a game of cards Skonczyliśmy o czwartej. A potem na osma do pracy.. and we finished at four (a.m). and then, off to work at eight).

M2: A nie przyszedł ci do głowy, żeby chociaż zadzwonić?

(And didn't it cross your mind to give us a call?)

M1: Stary, dzwoniłem chyba pięć razy, ale nikt nie odbierał!

(I called at least five times, old man, but nobody answered).

M3: Niemożliwe, wszyscy byliśmy w domu od dziewiątej.

(Impossible, we were all at home from nine).

M2: Wiesz, bo my tutaj-

(You see, we here-)

M1: (Interrupts) Nie no, przepraszam. Ale sami wiecie-

(Well, I'm sorry, but you know-)

M2: (Gets very angry) Nie Jasiu, żadne 'wiecie'!

(No Jas, no 'you know'! We are living here together and Mieszkamy razem I chyba obowiązują nas pewne we've got some rules to follow. Specially as we're zasady. Zwłaszcza, że nie jesteśmy u siebie. Teraz

not at home. Now put yourself in one of our
postaw sie w naszej sytuacji-
situation-)

M1: (Interrupts again) No, ale nie rob z tego tragedii!
(But don't turn this into a tragedy!)

M2: Nie przerywaj mi dobrze? Faktem jest, ze postpile
(Don't interrupt me OK? The fact is that you acted like
glupio. Uwazam, ze jesli nie mogles nas zawiadomia, to
a fool. I think that if you were not able to get in touch
powinienes po prostu przyjechac I nie byloby sprawy. A
with us you should have simply come back and nothing
jak teraz wygladasz?
would be the matter. And now, how do you look like?)

M1: Teraz to juz przesadzarz! A w ogole przestan mnie
(Now you're exaggerating. And anyway, stop treating
tjak jakiegos gówniarza. Powiedzialem, ze
me like some piece of turd. I said I was sorry, that I felt
przepraszam, ze jest mi glupio, ale nie zachowuj sie jak
stupid, but don't act like a hysterical mother. Do you
rozhisteryzowana mamuska. Mam cie pocalowac w
want me to kiss you on your
reke czy co?
hand?)

M3: Daj spokoj. Chodzi tylko o to, ze nikt wie wiedzial gdzie

(Stop it now. It's only that nobody knew where you were
jestes i co robisz.
and what you were doing).

M1: Dlatego was przepraszam. Wiecej sie to nie
(That's why I'm sorry. It won't happen again, OK).
Powtorzy, OK?

M3: OK, nie ma sprawy.
(OK, no problem).

The example shows M1 opening an exchange with a formulaic greetings. M2 and M3 show M1 that there has been an increased distance between them. They even put M1 under obligation of providing an apology for his late arrival. But M1 does not see any reason for apologizing because he was with friends and they were playing a game. M2 and M3 insisted that M1 apologize and at the end he restores the equilibrium between them. Finally he apologizes and M3 accepts his apology.

CHAPTER 4

APOLOGY STRATEGIES

4.1. TROSBORG.

The restoration of a complainable may be performed directly by means of a clear apology using one of the verbs directly signalling apology or it can be done indirectly by taking on responsibility or giving explanations. A person who is suppose to apologize may find reasons to minimize the degree of the offence. If the offence in question is big, a verbal apology may be insufficient to restore the damaged relationship.

Remedial strategies can take the form of verbal recompensations or in more severe cases in which verbal remediation is insufficient, strategies attempting a remedy of the complainable may be required. An offer of repair is often required in cases in which a verbal apology is felt to be insufficient to restore social harmony. A promise of forbearance relates to future behaviour, and the strategy of expressing concern for the hearer serves as an additional attempt to soothe the complainer. These strategies are presented below in order of increasing acceptance of the

complainable and with an increase in the potential ability to satisfy the complainer:

1. Opting out-Cat.0

Complainee does not take on responsibility. This category does not meet the criteria for apologies.

A denial of responsibility can take on various forms, from blunt refusals to evasive responses. The complainee either denies that the complainable has occurred and he or she denies that he or she can be held responsible, either by justifying his or her behaviour or by blaming someone else and attacking the complainer.

The five categories can be described as follow:

0.1. Explicit denial of responsibility.

The complainee clearly denies that an offence has occurred or that he or she is in anyway responsible for it.

Example:i. A thi divhi tshithu nga hazwo, ndi a ni
(I know nothing about it, I can assure
fulufhedzisa.
you).

- ii. Ni a zwi divha zwauri ndi nga si vhuye nda ita
(You know that I would never do a thing like
zwithu zwi no nga hezwo.
that).

0.2. Implicit denial of responsibility.

The complainees avoids responsibility by either ignoring a complaint, by talking about something else or by other ways.

Example: A person is being asked why he came late and he answers:

Matshelo mvula i do na.
(Tomorrow it will rain).

0.3. Justification.

The complainees provides arguments in which he or she seeks to persuade the complainer that no blame can be attached to him or her. Either the complainable has not occurred at all, or it can be fully justified.

Example: Ho vha hu si na zwe nda vha ndi tshi nga ita.

(There was nothing I could do).

0.4. Blaming someone else.

The complainees seeks to evade responsibility by blaming someone else. He or she may blame the third party or even the complainer him or herself.

Example: Zwo itiswa nga mme anga.

(It is because of my mother).

0.5. Attacking the complainer.

If the complainer lacks an adequate defence for his or her own behaviour, he or she may choose to attack the complainer instead.

Example: The man has arrived home late and the wife is complaining:

Ndo lenga u vhuya ngauri no vha no ndina.

(I came back late because you had troubled me).

2. Evasive strategies-cat. 1

1. Minimizing the degree of offence.

This strategy is closely related to the strategies in which the complainees fails to take on responsibility. The difference lies in the fact that the complainees does not deny responsibility. Instead he or she seeks to minimize the degree of offence or by querying the preconditions on which the complainant is grounded or the complainees may be partly responsible.

1.1. Minimizing:

Example: Oh, izwo zwi dina mini, a si tshithu, nahone a si
(Oh, what does that matter, that's nothing, what
vhufhelo ha shango.
about it, it's not the end of the world).

1.2. Querying preconditions:

Example: Ee, munwe na munwe u a ita hezwo, nahone
(Well, everybody does that; What is love then?
lufuno ndi mini? (Ndi phindulo kha mbilaelo ya
(in response to the complainable You do not
uri a ni mpfuni).
love me).

1.3. Blaming someone else:

The offence committed by the complainee can be partly excused by an offence committed by a third party:

Strategy 1.3 is distinguishable from 0.3 on the grounds that in 1.3 the complainee admits responsibility.

Example: Ndi zwone ndo khakha, hone na nwana o tou zwi
(I agree that I did wrong, but it is also because of
itisa.
the child).

3. Indirect apologies.

3.1. Acknowledgement of responsibility- cat. II

When a complainee chooses to take on responsibility, he or she can do so implicitly or explicitly and with varying degrees of self-blame. The sub-categories outlined below are all hearer-supportive and self-demeaning, and they are ordered with respect to the degree of recognition with which the complainee accepts the blame:

2.1. Implicit acknowledgement:

Example: Zwine na khou amba ndi a zwi pfesesa, khanwe
(I can see your point, perhaps I shouldn't have
ndo vha ndo tea ndi so ngo zwi ita.
done it).

2.2. Explicit acknowledgement :

Example: Ndi khou tenda ndo tou hangwa u zwi ita.
(I'll admit I forgot to do it).

2.3. Expression of lack of intent:

Example: Ndo vha ndi songo diimisela u ita nga u ralo.
(I didn't mean to).

2.4. Expression of self-deficiency:

Example: Ndo vha ndo dada, ni a zwi divha a thi koni u
(I was confused, you know I am bad at
langa mbiti dzanga.
controlling my temper).

2.5. Expression of embarrassment:

Example: Ndi pfa zwi tshi ntshonisa.
(I feel bad about it).

2.6. Explicit acceptance of the blame:

Example: Ndi nga nthani hanga; ni tea u mmbona mulandu.
(It was entirely my fault; You're right to blame me).

3.2. Explanation or account- cat. III.

A complaineé may try to mitigate his or her guilt by giving an explanation or account of the situation. Various kinds of mitigating circumstances serve as indirect apologies and may be put forward on their own or in addition to a direct expression of apology. A distinction between an implicit and an explicit explanation or account.

3.1. Implicit explanation.

Example: Zwithu zwo raloho zwi a tea u itea, ni a divha.
(Such things are bound to happen, you know).

3.3. Explicit explanation.

Example: Pfarelo ndo lenga, goloï yanga yo vha yo
(Sorry I'm late, but my car broke
tshinyala.
down.).

Strategies 3.1 and 3.2 differ from strategy 0.2 with respect to the speaker's acknowledgement of responsibility. In an explanation or account, a complaineé admits that what he or she has done was undesirable, but he or she tries to lessen the blame which can be attached to him or her by referring to mitigation circumstances that may excuse his or her behaviour. An explanation or account serves as an excuse for a committed offence, whereas in a justification the complaineé does not acknowledge that an offence has occurred.

4. Direct apologies.

a. Expression of apology- cat. IV.

An apologizer may choose to express his or her apology explicitly. A small number of verbs apply and the expression is a routine formulae generally accepted to express apology. Austin points to

the expression 'I apologize' in the present indicative active, with a first person singular subject as the explicit performative for the act of apologizing. This function can also be achieved by the utterance 'I am sorry,' which in Austin's perception is the inexplicit or indirect form of the act of apologizing.

4.1. Expression of regret: e.g. Ndi a disola. (I am sorry).

Example: i. Ndi khou disola u sokou ni dzudza.

(I'm sorry to keep you waiting).

ii. Ndi a disola kha hezwila.

(Sorry about that).

iii. Ndi a disola u dzhia tshifhinga uri ndi kone u

(I'm sorry to have been so long in getting in

kwamana na inwi.

touch with you).

4.2. Offer of apology, e.g. Ndi a farelwa (I apologize).

Example: i. Ndi fhanu nga u swikisa pfarelo ya uri ndo

(I hereby apologizing for misplacing your

xedza bugu yanu.

book).

ii. Ndi humbela uri vha tangedze pfarelo yanga

(Please accept my sincere apology for not

ya u sa da mushumoni.

coming to work).

iii. Mushumisani na nne u tama u swikiselwa

(My client would like to extend his apology to

khumbelo ya pfarelo kha vhukhaki ho iteaho.

you for the inconvenience involved).

4.3. Request for forgiveness.e.g. Ndi humbela pfarelo (Please, forgive me).

Example: i. Ndi khou humbela u farelwa, ndi khou disola

(Please, forgive me. I'm terribly sorry for not

nga maanda u sa da hanga mulovha.

coming yesterday).

ii. Mpfareleni, ndi khou di sola u ni khakhisa,

(Excuse me, I'm sorry for interrupting, but we

fhedzi ri khou tea u tuwa.

had to go).

- iii. Kha vha nkhangwele, a tho ngo pfa zwe vha
(Pardon me, I did not hear what you
amba.
said).

5. Remedial support.

Owen (1983:119) argues that apologies occur frequently as social routines that may not meet the demands expressed in the sincerity conditions. 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. As a consequence, a distinction has been made between heartfelt apologies and routine ones.

5.1. Expressing concern for hearer- strategy 5.

In order to soothe the anger of a complainer, the complaineer may express concern for his or her well being, condition, etc:

Example: A tho ngo kona u da, mulenzhe wanga wo
(I couldn't come, my leg is
vhisala.

hurt).

5.2. Promise of forbearance- strategy 6.

When apologizing, the speaker takes responsibility by expressing regret, and he or she will be expected to behave in a consistent fashion and not immediately to repeat the act for which he or she has just apologized. Apologies, therefore, seem to relate not only to the past but also to future acts. They take on a commissive aspect that can be made explicit in a promise of forbearance.

With respect to future behaviour, an apologizer can promise either never to perform the offence in question again, or to improve his or her behaviour in a number of ways. Such responses are often signalled by the performative verb promise:

Example: A zwi tsha do dovha zwa itea ndi a fulufhedzisa.

(It won't happen again, I promise).

5.3. Offer of repair- strategy 7.

An apologizer may offer to repair the damage which has resulted from his or her infraction. Repair may be offered in its literal sense or as an offer to pay for the damage. In situations where actual

repair is not possible, the apologizer may offer some kind of compensatory action as tribute to the complainer:

Example

Repair : Ndi do badelela u i lugisa.
(I'll pay for the machanic).

Compensation: Vha nga di vha vha tshi khou shumisa goloi
(You can borrow my car
yanga.
instead).

4.1.1. STRATEGIC DISARMERS

The apologizer may try to soften the complainer's feelings with strategic disarmers in order to change the attitudinal tone of an interaction. Strategic disarmer is aimed at placating the complainer:

Example: Hezwi ndi zwone zwithu zwi no khou
(This is the most embarrassing for me.
ntshonisesa. Ndo vha ndi songo diimisela u mu
I really never meant to beat
rwa.

him).

This strategy functions as a preparator to pave the way for the acceptance of the apology and occurs in interactions in which the apology occurs as a responsive move and in situations in which an apology is the initial head-act. Strategic disarmers differ from apologies that function as disarmer preceding other speech acts:

a. Apologies as strategic disarmers.

Apologies may function as strategic disarmers as preparators for other acts, typical as softeners preparing for requests, complaints, refusals, etc:

Examples: i. Kha vha mparele u vha dina, hone ila a si

(Sorry to trouble you, but isn't that your car
goloji yavho yo imiswaho phanda ha garatshi?
parked in front of the garage?)

ii. Pfarelo, ndi nga fhira-vho?

(Excuse me, could I just get past, please?)

iii. Vha mparele nga maanda, hone-ha vha tou

(I'm terribly sorry but you seem to have taken

nga vho dzhia suthukheisi yanga nga phoswo.
my suitcase by mistake).

- iv. Mpfareleni, hone-ha ndi khou ofha uri a hu
(I'm sorry, but I'm afraid there are no more
tshe na madzulo a baisikopo ya madekwana.
seats for the late show).

It is normal that apologies relate to past acts, since we cannot apologize for something we have not yet done. But, just as it is possible to thank somebody in advance, it is also possible to apologize for future offence. Apologies that occur before the offence and that involve the types of apologies described above, can be justified on the ground that it is possible for the speaker to apologize for something that he or she is in the course of doing, or has not yet done, provided that both speaker and the hearer have good reasons to believe that it will be done.

4.1.2. INTERNAL MODIFICATION

This serves to mitigate the circumstances under which an offence was committed, and which, consequently lessen the blame that can be attached to the complaine:

a. Downtoners.

Adverbial sentence modifiers, such as ; just, simply, etc and adverbials expressing tentativeness like perhaps, maybe possibly, etc:

Example: Ndo tou tuwa lwa mithethe mitanu fhedzi.
(I just left for five minutes).

b. Understaters.

Phrases that under- represent the state of affairs denoted in the complainable, e.g a little bit, a second, not very much, etc.

Example: A thongo mu rwesa.
(I didn't beat him very much).

c. Hedges.

Adverbials by means of which the complainee avoids a precise propositional specification, e.g kind of, sort of, somehow, etc:

Example: Ndo mu tuwisa ngauri o vha a nga inwe ndila.
(I let her go because she was somehow).

d. Subjectivizers.

They are modifiers that characterize the proposition as the speaker's personal opinion, or indicates his or her attitude towards the proposition, e.g. I think, I suppose, I'm afraid, in my opinion, etc:

Example: Ndi humbula uri zwi nga si tsha dovha zwa itea.
(I think it will never happen again).

e. Intensifiers.

Adverbials intensifying part of the proposition, e.g. intensifying a lack of intention, an expression of regret or embarrassment:

Example: Ndi khou di sola nga maanda, ndo vha ndi songo
(I'm terribly sorry, I really didn't mean to hurt
humbula u ni vhaisa.
you).

f. Commitment upgraders.

Sentence modifiers expressing a special commitment towards the proposition:

Example: Ndo vha ndi na vhutanzi uri ni do mpfarela.
(I was sure that you would forgive me).

g. Cajolers.

Gambits functioning at the interpersonal level of discourse with the function of restoring harmony between the two interlocutors:

Example: Ndo balelwa ni a divha.

(I couldn't you know).

h. Appealers.

Discourse elements intended to elicit a response from the complainer, appealing to his or her understanding, etc:

Example: A thi tsha do dovha, thiri?

(I won't do it again, okay?)

4.2. THE CCSARP.

This is the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project which was formed to provide a way in which the linguistic realizations of the 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.

When studying the speech acts performed by language learners, a number of different research questions like; what is the relationship between those produced by learners, those produced by native speakers of the target language. The CCSARP employs a discourse of completion test, much like a written questionnaire, to get at the linguistic strategies available to speakers to perform requests and apologies.

4.2.1. APOLOGIES.

Apologies can be performed by any of the following strategies, or any combination or sequence thereof:

a. Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID).

They are formulaic expressions that follow a certain sequence in which the speaker's apology is made clearly:

Example: i. Pfarelo ndi songo fara tshifhinga.

(Sorry, I did not keep time).

ii. Mpfareleni u sa da nga tshifhinga.

(Excuse me for not coming on time).

iii. Ndi humbela pfarelo kha u da hanga u lenga.

(I apologize for coming late).

iv. Pfarelo u sa da hanga nga tshifhinga.

(Forgive me for not coming on time).

v. Kha vha nkhangwele u da hanga u lenga.

(Pardon me for coming late).

vi. Ndi a disola u da hanga u lenga.

(I regret that I come late).

vii. Ndi khou tshuwa ndo lenga.

(I'm afraid, I am late).

Intensifiers of the apology. IFID internal:

i. Intensifying adverbials

Example: Ndi khou pfa ndi tshi khou disola nga maanda

(I am terribly sorry that I didn't buy what you

ndi songo renga zwe na nndaedza.

told me).

ii. Emotional expressions/ exclamations.

Example: Mudzimu a so khole.
(God, it is not deliberate).

iii. Expressions marked for register.

Example: Ndi humbela pfarelo uri a thi nga di matshelo.
(I do apologize that I won't come tomorrow).

iv. Please.

Example: Ndi khou tou humbela, kha vha mpfarele u sa da
(Please, forgive me for not coming to school
hanga tshikoloni mulovha.
yesterday).

v. Others:

Concern for the hearer.

The speaker takes a very clear knowledge of the hearer's feelings, which he or she may have offended:

Example: Ndi a fulufhela a tho ngo vha sinyusa u sa
(I hope I didn't upset you for preparing

tavhanya ndo vha itela zwiliwa.
your food late).

b. Taking on responsibility.

The speaker tries to soothe the hearer by choosing to express responsibility for the offence which created the need to apologize:

i. Explicit self blame.

The speaker clearly acknowledges the fact that he or she has been at fault.

Example: Mulandu ndi u sa ni vhudza hu tshe na
(My mistake is not to tell you in
tshifhinga.
advance).

ii. Lack of intent.

The speaker clearly states that he or she had not intended to hurt the hearer through his or her offence:

Example: Ndo vha ndi songo humbula uri zwi do ni vhaisa
(I didn't mean to upset you by going away
zwa u sokou tuwa ndi songo ni vhudza.
without telling).

iii. Justify hearer.

The speaker communicates to his or her hearer that he or she fully understands the latter's reactions to the offence inflicted upon him or her:

Example: No tea uri ni sinyuwe nga zwe nda ni itela.

(You are right to be angry by what I did to you).

iv. Expression of embarrassment.

Example: Ndi pfa zwi tshi ntshonisa vhukuma zwe nda ita.

(I feel awful about what I did).

v. Admission of facts but not of responsibility.

The speaker does not deny his or her involvement in the offensive act but abstains from openly accepting responsibility:

Example: A tho ngo i vhala.

(I haven't read it).

Ndo i sia ngauri ndo siiwa nga bisi.

(I left it because I missed the bus).

Ndo mbo di hangwa nga hazwo.

(I forgot about it).

A tho ngo vhuya nda wana tshifhinga tsha u i

(I haven't had time to mark it

koreka.

yet).

vi. Refusal to acknowledge guilt.

The speaker completely rejects responsibility for the offence, in one or more of the following ways:

Denial of responsibility.

Example: A si nne ndo zwi itisaho.

(It wasn't my fault).

Blame the hearer.

Example: Ndi mulandu wanu wa u sa vala vothi.

(It's your fault of not closing the door).

Pretend to be offended.

Example: Ndi nne ndo khakhelwaho.

(I am the one offended).

c. Explanation or account.

It covers any external mitigating circumstances offered by the speaker. It gives objective reasons for the violation at hand:

Example: i. Vhuendi ho vha ho vhifhesa.

(The traffic was terrible).

ii. Nwana o vha a tshi khou lwala.

(The child was sick).

From the above examples, it is clear that the speaker is trying to take responsibility.

d. Offer of repair.

If the damage or inconvenience which affected the hearer can be compensated for, the speaker may choose to offer repair; this offer must be directly related to the offence perpetrated. This category provides a repair for a repairable:

Example: i. Ndi do lifha tshinyalelo.

(I'll pay for the damage).

ii. Ndi do ya nda vhudzisa tshitangani.

(I'll go and enquire in the kitchen).

e. Promise of forbearance.

Whenever the speaker's sense of guilt is strong enough, he or she may feel the need to promise that the offensive act will never occur again:

Example: Hezwi a zwi tsha do dovha zwa itea.

(This won't happen again).

f. Distracting from the offence. (Downgrading).

Blum-Kulka argues that tactical moves by which the speaker tries to divert the hearer's attention from his or her own responsibility for the offence include the following:

i. Query precondition.

The speaker attempts to throw doubts on the modalities of a previous arrangement which he or she broke:

Example: Ndi zwone zwauro ro vha ro tea ro tangana nga

(Are you sure we were supposed to have met at

10?

10?)

ii. Act innocently/ Pretend not to notice the offence.

Example: Ndo lenga?

(Am I late?)

iii. Future/ task-orientated remark.

The speaker tries to make light of his or her offence by diverting the hearer's attention from the past to the future.

Example: Zwenezwo, kha ri dzhene mushumoni!

(Let's get to work then).

iv. Humour.

This is used as a strategy to pacify the hearer:

Example: Arali vha tshi vhona uri ndo tou khakha, a si

(If you think that's a mistake, you are wrong,

zwone, ndi khou toda u vha sumbedza khuhu

you ought to see our fried

dzashu dzo bikwaho.

chicken).

v. Appeaser.

This type of compensatory is not directly connected with the speaker's offence:

Example: Ndi do ni rengela khaphu ya tie.

(I'll buy you a cup of tea).

CHAPTER 5

APOLOGIES IN TSHIVENDA.

5.1 AIM

This chapter is going to focus on the five apology situations. There is going to be a questionnaire which will be completed in order to determine the different apology strategies. An analysis of these strategies will be done to see the situation with the most number of strategies. Total number of strategies in each situation and the total number of strategies between males and females will be determined. The chapter will also include individual strategies in major situations and individual strategies.

5.2 APOLOGY SITUATIONS

The five situations which will be involved are inconvenience, space, talk, time and possession. These five situations are used because they appear to account for all the instances in a school situations. Inconvenience is related to actions which have inconvenienced the addressee in some way. Its subsituations are wrong information, inadequate service and forgetting the message.

In a space situation, there is a range of infringements on another's personal space which may occasion apologies. Its subsections are accident, seat and queue. In a talk situation, the offence involves some kind of intrusion on the addressee's or talking turn or another infringement of rules for polite talk. The subsituations for a talk situation include insult, phone and noise.

Another situation is that of 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. The subsituations of time are forgetting, handling of an assignment and late arrival.

The last situation is possession. It involves some damage or loss to the addressee's possession. Its subsituations are money, clothes and class notes.

It has also been considered that the situations above are applicable to learners of all the higher grades in every school.

5.3. QUESTIONNAIRE

1. INCONVENIENCE

1.1. Wrong information

Khonani yanu o ni vhudza uri divha la u nwala thesite ndi Lavhuna tshikoloni. Musi ni tshi swika tshikoloni ni khou wana uri khonani yanu ho ngo ni fha mafhungo one ngauri thesite yo nwalwa nga Musumbuluwo.

Your friend told you that the time of 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 that the test has already been written on Monday.

Vhukhaki.

Ni khou vhilaela kha khonani yanu malugana na mafhungo e a ni vhudza a si one.

Offence

You complain to your friend about this wrong information.

Pfarelo.

Khonani yanu u humbela pfarelo nga hazwo.

Apology.

Your friend apologizes for this offence.

1.2. Inadequate service

Khonani yanu o ni fulufhedzisa uri u do da u ni thusa nga phurodzheke ine na khou ita nga Lavhutanu. Lavhutanu lo da la fhira a songo vhonala.

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

Vhukhakhi.

Ni khou vhilaela kha khonani yanu nga u sa da a ni thusa.

Offence.

You complain to your friend for not helping you.

Pfarelo.

Khonani yanu u a humbela pfarelo nga zwenezwo

Apology

Your friend apologizes for this offence.

1.3. Forgetting to convey the message.

No vha ni tshi khou lwala lune a no ngo kona u ya tshikoloni. No laedza khonani yanu uri a swikise mulaedza, fhedzi ho ngo swikisa kha mudededzi wanu. No fhedza no pfukwa nga thesite ya lenelo duvha.

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 your class teacher about this. He never told the teacher and you even missed the test

Vhukhaxhi.

Ni khou vhilaela kha khonani yanu u sa ya hawe a vhudza mudededzi na zwa uri no fhirwa nga thesite.

Offence.

You complain to your friend for not telling the teacher and that you even missed the test.

Pfarelo.

Khonani yanu u hambela pfarelo kha vhukhakhi honoho.

Apology.

Your friend apologizes for such an offence.

2. SPACE.

2.1. Accident.

No vha ni tshi khou gidimela u dzhena kilasini ngauri tsimbi yo vha yo no lila. Ni tshi khou gidima no do thulana na munwe a mbo di wa a vhaaisala.

You were running so that you could get into the class as the bell had already rang. Unfortunately you bumped into another learner who fell down and hurt him/herself.

Vhukhaxhi.

Mutshudeni u khou vhilaela nga ha u thulwa a wa a vhaaisala.

Offence.

The learner complains of falling and getting hurt.

Pfarelo.

Ni khou humbela pfarelo kha vhukhaxhi honoho.

Apology.

You apologize for such an offence.

2.2. Seat.

Hune na dzula hone ho dzhena duvha zwino ni khou pfa ni songo dzula zwavhudi. No do dzhia vhudzulo ha munwe we a vha a siho nga tshifhinga tshenetsho. Zwino o vhuya.

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

Vhukhaki.

Mutshudeni u khou vhilaela malugana na u dzhielwa vhudzulo hawe.

Offense.

The learner complains for his/her taken desk.

Pfarelo.

Ni hambela pfarelo kha vhukhaki honoho.

Apology.

You apologize for the offence committed.

2.3. Queue.

No vha no dzhaya lwe ni tshi khou toda u renga vhurotho nga bureiki. No mbo di renga ni songo zwi limuwa uri hu na munwe mutshudeni a re phanda hanu kha laini.

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

Vhukhaki.

Mutshudeni u khou vhilaela nga ha u mu fhirela kha laini.

Offence.

The learner complains about being jumped in a queue.

Pfarelo.

Ni khou hambela pfarelo kha vhukhaxhi honoho.

Apology.

You apologize for such an offence.

3. TALK.

3.1. Insult.

Matshudeni o vha o fara mutangano wa kilasi vha tshi khou amba nga zwinwe zwe zwa vha zwi sa khou tshimbila zwavhudi. Zwenezwo vhe kati, munwe a mbo di fhindula munwe, we zwi si mu fare zwavhudi. Mutangano wo fhela.

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

Vhukhakhi

Mutshudeni u khou vhilahela nga ha u sa fhinduliwa hawe zwavhudi mutanganoni.

Offence

The learner complains about the way he was insulted in the meeting.

Pfarelo.

Mutshudeni u khou humbela pfarelo ya u sa fhindula zwavhudi munwe mutanganoni.

3.2. Phone

No vha ni tshi khou amba na khonani yanu lwe no vha ni sa khou pfana kha founu. U sa pfana ha vheiwe zwo ita uri ni dzhiese tshifhinga ni tshi kha di amba lwe zwi si fare vhanwe vha re lainini vho no khou toda u founa.

You were speaking to your friend on the public phone and you were having a disagreement. Your disagreement with your friend prolonged the time in the phone such that other learners who wanted to use it get worried.

Vhukhakhi.

Mutshudeni we a vha a tshi khou tevhelela u khou vhilaela nga ha u shumisa hanu founu tshifhinga tshilapfu.

Offence.

A learner who was next on the line complains about your use of a public phone for a long time.

Pfarelo.

Ni khou humbela pfarelo kha vhukhaxhi ha u shumisa founu tshifhinga tshilapfu.

Apology.

You are apologizing for the offence of using a public phone for a long time.

3.3. Noise.

No vha ni tshi khou vhalala na manwe matshudeni no hangwa u vala founu yanu. Zwenezwo ni kati ya mbo di lila lwe na mbo di i fhindula zwa sia zwi tshi khou itela vhanwe phosho.

You were studying with others and you had your cellular phone not switched off. While you were reading your phone rang and you had to answer it but you ended up making noise to others.

Vhukhakhi.

Munwe mutshudeni u khou vhilaela nga ha u amba hanu nga founu vhanwe vha tshi khou vhala nthani ha u i dzima.

Offence.

One learner is complaining about your answering to the phone while others are studying in a way that you disturb them.

Pfarelo.

Ni khou humbela pfarelo ya u hangwa u dzima founu musi ni tshi khou todou vhala.

Apology.

You apologize for the offence of forgetting to switch off your phone and ultimately responding to it while others are studying.

4. TIME.

4.1. Forgetting.

No langana na khonani yanu ane na dzhena nae tshikolo uri ni tangane khefini nga iri ya vhutanu madekwana. No do fhedza no hangwa nga hazwo nga nthani ha mishumo ye na vha ni na yo. Khonani yanu o da nga tshifhinga tshone a vhona ni sa di a tuwa.

You agreed to meet your schoolmate at the café at 05:00 p.m .
Because of the pressure you had on that day, you totally forgot

about the appointment. Your friend had to wait for you until he/she angrily went away.

Vhukhaxhi.

Khonano yanu u khou vhilaela nga ha u sokou mu dzudza khefina na fhedza ni si de.

Offence.

Your friend complains about the way you just let him/her in the café and you didn't turn up.

Pfarelo.

Inwi ni khou humbela pfarelo kha khonani yanu ya mulandu wa u hangwa hanu zwe na langana nae.

Apology.

You apologize to your friend for an offence of forgetting that you had an appointment and he/she had to stay that long waiting for you.

4.2. Handling of an assignment.

No hambela khonani yanu uri a ni isele asainimenthe kha mudededzi wanu nga matsheleloni sa vhunga inwi no farekanea ni si nga si kone u ya tshikoloni. Khonani yanu o swika o lenga trshikoloni lwe a thoma u ya u funziwa. O fhedza o isa mushumo wanu nga masiari lune na mudededzi u ri u do tusa maraga nga nthani ha zwenezwo.

You asked your friend to submit the assignment to your teacher early in the morning because you had other commitment . Your

friend arrived late to school and he/she 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 late submission.

Vhukhaki.

Ni khou vhilaela kha khonani yanu nge a lenga u isa mushumo wanu lwe zwa ita uri mudededzi a bwise maraga.

Offence.

You complain to your friend for submitting your assignment late that the teacher even deducted some marks for late submission.

Pfarelo.

Khonani yanu u khou humbela pfarelo kha vhukhaki ha u leng u isa mushumo wanu nga matsheloni.

Apology.

Your friend apologizes for an offence of submitting your assignment late.

4.3. Late arrival

No vha no langana na khonani yanu uri ni tangane mudavhini wa bola nga awara ya vhuraru masiari. No kombetshedzea u litsha zwe na vha ni tshi khou ita uri ni fare tshifhinga. Nga awara ya vhuraru khonani yanu a si vhonele lwe a sala a tshi swika nga awara ya vhuna.

You had agreed to meet with your friend at 03:00 p.m at the sports-ground. You were forced to leave something that you were doing

so that you could be punctual. At 03:00 p.m your friend didn't turn up and he/she finally came at 04:00p.m.

Vhukhakhi.

Ni khou vhilaela kha khonani yanu u sa fara hawe tshifhinga ngeno inwi no tou litsha na mishumo.

Offence.

You complain to your friend for being late to your appointment, considering that you postponed to do the other work later.

Pfarelo.

Khonani yanu u khou humbela pfarelo ya vhukhakhi ha u sa fara tshifhinga tshe na langana.

Apology.

Your friend apologizes for the offence of arriving late to your appointment.

5. POSSESSION.

5.1. Money

Khonani yanu o da a hadzima R5-00 ya u la nga bureiki. No do fhedza no mu fha lwe a fulufhedzisa u i vhuisa vhege i sa athu u fhela. Nwedzi zwino wo no fhela u bva tshe a hadzima tshelede nahone a i athu u vhuya.

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 he/she promised to pay back within the end of the week. It is now a

month since he/she has borrowed your money and he/she has not yet paid it back.

Vhukhakhi.

Ni khou vhilaela kha khonani yanu u sa vhuisa hawe tshelede ngeno tshifhinga tshe a amba tsho no fhira.

Offence.

You are complaining to your friend for not paying back the money he/she borrowed because it is now a month since he/she took it.

Pfarelo

Khonani yanu u hambela pfarelo u balalwa hawe u vhuisa masheleni hu tshe na tshifhinga.

Apology

Your friend apologizes for being unable to pay the money back in time.

5.2. Clothes

Ho vha hu nga bureiki ni tshi khou la zwiliwa fhethu ha u lela.
Munwe o ri a tshi khou bva u phakha zwiliwa, a suvha lwe
phuleithi yawe ya wela ntha ha vhurukhu hanu.

It was break and you were eating food in the dining hall. One of the learners on his/her way from taking food slipped and his/her plate fell on you and your trouser was spilled with food.

Vhukhakhi.

Ni khou vhilaela kha mutshudeni uri vhurukhu hanu ho tswuka nga zwiliwa zwawe.

Offence.

You are complaining to the learner that your trouser was spilled with his/her food.

Pfarelo.

Mutshudeni u khou humbela pfarelo ya zwiliwa zwo shelaho vhurukhu hanu

Apology.

The learner apologizes for your trouser that was spilled with his/her food.

5.3. Class notes.

Munwe mutshudeni o vha a songo da tshikoloni mulovha. O do hadzima notsi dzanu uri a kope u do vhuisa matshelo. Li tshi tsha a sa de nadzo.

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

Vhukhakhi.

Ni khou vhilaela kha mutshudeni u sa da hawe na bugu yanu ya notsi.

Offence.

You are complaining to the learner for failing to bring the book on the day he/she had promised.

Pfarelo.

Mutshudeni u hambela pfarelo ya u balelwa u vhuisa bugu sa zwe a vha o amba.

Apology

The learner apologizes for failing to bring the book back as he/she had promised.

5.3.1 COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire was completed by grade 11 learners from Ndaedzo Secondary School found in the Northern Province. The completion of this questionnaire was done by 20 learners. Males completed the part of the offence or complaint for 10 questionnaires while females did the same with the other 10. After that males took questionnaires completed by females to complete the apology part and females also completed apology part of those which were first done the offence or complaint part by males.

5.4. ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGIES.

5.4.1. APOLOGY SITUATIONS AND APOLOGY STRATEGIES

Male	Female
------	--------

		%	No	%	No	%
1.INCONVENIENCE	125	19.7	71	11.2	54	8.5
1.1.Wrong Information	45	7.1	25	3.9	20	3.2
1.2.Inadequate service	44	7.0	26	4.1	18	2.8
1.3 Forgetting message	36	5.7	20	3.2	16	2.5
2. SPACE	133	21.0	70	11.1	63	2.5
2.1. Accident	49	7.7	26	4.1	23	3.6
2.2. Seat	38	6.0	20	3.2	18	2.8
2.3. Queue	46	7.3	24	3.8	22	3.5
3. TALK	126	19.9	66	10.4	60	9.5
3.1. Insult	42	6.6	23	3.6	19	3.0
3.2. Phone	41	6.5	21	3.3	20	3.2
3.3. Noise	43	6.8	22	3.5	21	3.3
4. TIME	111	17.5	53	8.4	58	9.2
4.1. Forgetting	40	6.3	19	3.0	21	3.3
4.2. Assignment	35	5.5	15	2.4	20	3.2
4.3. Late arrival	36	5.7	19	3.0	17	2.7
5.POSSESSION	138	21.8	71	11.2	67	10.6
5.1. Money	40	6.3	20	3.2	20	3.2
5.2. Clothes	50	7.9	28	4.4	22	3.5
5.3. Class notes	48	7.6	23	3.6	25	3.9
TOTAL	633		331	52.3	302	47.7

In Table 1 above, the various apology situations 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 above. 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. in situation 1 (Inconvenience) a total number of 125 strategies have been used, i.e. 19.7 % of the total number of strategies. Of these 125 strategies, 71 (11.2 %) have been used by males and 54 (8.5 %) by females.

5.4.1.1. The major situations

	Situation	Total	Male	Female
1.	Inconvenience	19.7	11.2	8.5
2.	Space	21.0	11.1	10.0
3.	Talk	19.9	10.4	9.5
4.	Time	17.5	8.4	9.2
5.	Possession	21.8	11.2	10.6

According to the table above, the apology strategies which have been used in each situation may be classified as follows:

5.4.1.1.1. Total number of strategies in a situation

These situations may be grouped into three categories:

Situation 2, 5:	21 %, 21.8%
Situation 1, 3:	19.7 %, 19.2%
Situation 4:	17.5 %

From the above categories, it can be deduced that in situations relating to space (no.2) and possession (no. 5), people try to use more apology strategies. The reason behind this is that they want to make sure that, even though they accept the offence, their offence was not intentional and that they really apologize for that. They want to make sure that their apology is accepted to maintain a good relationship.

5.4.1.1.2. 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 1, 2, 5:	11.2, 11.1, 11.2
Situation 3:	10.4
Situation 4:	8.4

Females

The most frequent situation in order:

Situation 2, 4: 10, 10.6

Situation 3, 4: 9.5, 9.2

Situation 1: 8.5

Situations 2 and 5 are again involved with the most number of strategies by both males and females. The reason for this is that in both situations by both males and females, the offences were committed as a result of either a mistake, lack of knowledge or something beyond the apologizer's power.

Situation 3 has the second most strategies with both males and females because, when compared to situations 2 and 5, its offences do not involve lack of knowledge, but were done deliberately in a way that the speaker is feeling guilty.

Situation 4 has the least number of strategies with males (8.4) but second most with females (9.2) because both males and females undermined the actions they were suppose to have done during a given time and again, there has been a prioritization of of their own tasks first. But males are second to females because they wanted to

be, at least, faithful by doing what they were assigned to do in time.

Situation 1 has the least number of strategies with females but the most number of strategies with males because females are afraid to cause a lot of inconveniences. If females cause inconveniences it can be interpreted as a mistake but there is a strong possibility that males can deliberately cause the inconvenience to females because they take themselves as a stronger sex.

5.4.1.1.3. Strategies between males and females in each major situation.

The number of strategies which have been used by males and females according to the table above, do not differ very much in each major situation:

Situation 1:	11.2, 8.5	=	2.7 %
Situation 2:	11.1, 10	=	1.1 %
Situation 3:	10.4, 9.5	=	0.9 %
Situation 4:	8.4, 9.2	=	0.8 %
Situation 5:	11.2, 10.6	=	0.6 %

Thus, it is clear that there is a significant difference in the number of strategies which have been used by males and females in situation 1, i.e. 2.7 % because, as in (b) above, most males do not see it as a problem to cause the inconveniences to females because they know that females will do no harm to them. On the other hand, females are afraid of causing any inconvenience to males because they know they can end up in danger.

In the other situations there is no significant differences between the use of strategies between males and females.

5.4.1.2. The subsituations

5.4.1.2.1. Inconvenience

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
1.	Wrong information	7.1	3.9	3.2
2.	Inadequate service	7.0	4.1	2.8
3.	Forgetting message	5.7	3.2	2.5

5.4.1.2.1.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation

Group 1: 1.1, 1.2 (7.1, 7.0)

Group 2: 1.3 (5.7)

In group 1 there is an indication that the apologizers are feeling sorry for the occurred offence. In subsituations like wrong information and inadequate service, there nothing one can do except to accept that an offence has occurred and apology is needed thereof. It is an indication that it was not deliberate to give wrong information and inadequate service.

Group 2 shows lesser number of strategies used because apologizers feel it is understandable that one has to forget.

5.4.1.2.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females.

Males

Group 1: 1.2, 1.1 (4.1, 3.9)

Group 2: 1.3 (3.2)

Females

Group 1: 1.1 (3.2)

Group 2: 1.2, 1.3 (2.8, 2.5)

With both males and females, more strategies have been used in group 1 because both of them feel sorry for giving wrong information. But males have the highest number for the subsituation of inadequate situation (4.1) because they do not want

females to interpret in a way of saying that they supplied with inadequate service because they know they are powerful.

In group 2, it is again males who have a higher number of strategies than females. Males are giving more explanation to females because they are proud of asking for a direct apology.

5.4.1.2.1.3. Strategies between males and females in this situation

Subsituation 1.1: 3.9, 3.5 = 0.4

Subsituation 1.2: 4.1, 2.8 = 1.3

Subsituation 1.3: 3.2, 2.5 = 0.7

In subsituations 1.1 and 1.3, there is no significant difference because they are all taking it as their responsibility to clear the situation on how an offence has occurred.

In subsituation 1.2, the difference is significant because males are trying to be cooperative by apologizing with an explicit explanation so that females can accept their apology. Females do not want to elaborate too much because they think, as softer sex, their situation will be justifiable.

5.4.1.2.2. Space

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
2.1	Accident	7.7	4.1	3.6
2.2	Seat	6.0	3.2	2.8
2.3	Queue	7.3	3.8	3.5

5.4.1.2.2.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation:

Group 1: 2.1, 2.3, 2.2 (7.7, 7.3, 6.0)

All the above subsituatuons have high number of strategies used. It means the offences, as a result of the above subsituations, were not committed intentionally because apologizers are taking time to explain their positions.

5.4.1.2.2.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Male

Group 1: 2.1, 2.3 (4.1, 3.8).

Group 2: 2.2 (3.2)

Female

Group 1: 2.1, 2.3 (3.6, 3.5)

Group 2: 2.2 (2.8)

With both males and females, the most strategies have been used in subsituations 2.1 and 2.3. The reason behind this is that accident is beyond males and females control and if it occurs, it needs to be apologized for. The same applies to the jumping of a queue. It was done because of lack of knowledge, that is why both males and females are giving a full explanation about their apology. High number of strategies is because both males and females want their apologies to be understood.

In group 2 there is subsituation 2.2 which has less number of strategies used by both males and females. The reason for the less strategies is that both males and females feel it is justifiable to occupy someone's seat because everybody can see that their seat is exposed to the sun. They feel it is not necessary to expand their apology.

5.4.1.2.2.3.Strategies between males and females in this subsituations:

Subsituation 2.1: 4.1, 3.6 = 0.5

Subsituation 2.2: 3.2, 2.8 = 0.6

Subsituation 2.3: 3.8, 3,5 = 0.3

With all the subsituations above, it is clear that there is no significant difference in number of strategies between males and females. The reason is that both males and females feel equal responsible for the offences they have committed.

5.4.1.2.3. Talk.

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
3.1	Insult	6.6	3.6	3.0
3.2	Phone	6.5	3.3	3.2
3.3	Noise	6.8	3.5	3.3

5.4.1.2.3.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation

Group 1: 3.3, 3.1, 3.2 (6.8, 6.6, 6.5)

All the above subsituations are involved with many number of strategies used. The apologizers feel it the same that they must make sure that their apology is understood. They try to do this by giving a long explanation.

5.4.1.2.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Male

Group 1: 3.1, 3.3, 3.2 (3.6, 3.5, 3.3)

Female

Group 1: 3.3, 3.2, 3.1 (3.3, 3.2, 3.0)

From the above group of both males and females, it is clear that there is almost equal numbers of strategies used. But males' strategies are a little bit higher than females' because males do not want to strain their good relationships with females, and that is why they involve many strategies.

5.4.1.2.3.3. Strategies between males and females in this subsituation:

Subsituation 3.1: 3.6, 3.0 = 0.6

Subsituation 3.2: 3.3, 3.2 = 0.1

Subsituation 3.3: 3.5, 3.3 = 0.2

All the above subsituations show no significant difference in the use of strategies between males and females. Again, it is a sign of taking equal responsibility. But subsituation 3.1 has the highest difference even though it is not significant. This is because males are trying to be cooperative by involving many strategies to apologize.

5.4.1.2.4. Time.

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
4.1	Forgetting	6.3	3.0	3.3
4.2	Assignment	5.5	2.4	3.2
4.3	Late arrival	5.7	3.0	2.7

5.4.1.2.4.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation:

Group 1: 4.1, 4.3, 4.2 (6.3, 5.7, 5.5)

Again, here there has been an equal commitment made for all the subsituations in the same group.

5.4.1.2.4.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males

Group 1: 4.1, 4.3, 4.2 (3.0, 3.0, 2.4)

Females

Group 1: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 (3.3, 3.2, 2.7)

Both males and females are having more strategies in the same group for both subsituations. It again shows a commitment to both males and females. Females show more commitment by involving

more strategies than males. Females are indicating that they did not forget nor arriving late intentionally.

5.4.1.2.4.3. Strategies between males and females in this
 susituation

Subsitution 4.1: 3.3, 3.0 = 0.3

Subsitution 4.2: 3.2, 2.4 = 0.8

Subsitution 4.3 3.0, 2.7 = 0.3

The above subsituations indicate no significant difference in the number of strategies used between males and females. It also shows that both males and females are taking equal responsibility to apologize.

5.4.1.2.5. Possession.

	Subsitution	Total	Male	Female
5.1	Money	6.3	3.2	3.2
5.2	Clothes	7.9	4.4	3.5
5.3	Class notes	7.6	3.6	3.9

5.4.1.2.5.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituations:

Group 1: 5.2, 5.3 (7.9, 7,6)

Group 2: 5.1 (6.3)

Subsituations 5.2 and 5.3 have more numbers of strategies used because the apologizers feel sorry for the trouser which was spilled with soup and notes which were forgotten at home. It shows that the offences were not committed deliberately.

Again group 2 has fewer number of strategies because apologizers are facing an offence of failing to return the money borrowed. This is an offence which is beyond the apologizers' power because there is nowhere they can get money from.

5.4.1.2.5.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Male

Group 1: 5.2, 5.3 (4.4, 3.6)

Group 2: 5.1 (3.2)

Female

Group 1: 5.3, 5.2, 5.1 (3.9, 3.5, 3.2)

Both males and females have more number of strategies in group1 for subsituations 5.2 and 5.3. The reason which still applies is that both males and females are committed to maintain a good

relationship between themselves. But an indication is that males are more committed than females. They do not want to be misinterpreted that they are offending because they want something from females.

5.4.1.2.5.3. Strategies between males and females in this subsituation:

Subsituation 5.1: 3.2, 3.2 = 0

Subsituation 5.2: 4.4, 3.5 = 0.9

Subsituation 5.3: 3.9, 3.6 = 0.3

The above subsituations show no significant difference in number of strategies used between males and females. But in subsituation 5.2, males try to be more cooperative by showing their apology with a long explanation.

5.4.2. APOLOGY STRATEGIES IN SUBSITUATIONS

5.4.2.1. Inconvenience

5.4.2.1.1. Wrong information

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	1	2.2	1	2.2	-	-
1.2-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	1	2.2	1	2.2	-	-
2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2	2	4.4	-	-	2	4.4
2.3	3	6.6	2	4.4	1	2.2
2.4	1	2.2	1	2.2	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	3	6.6	1	2.2	2	4.4
3.2	10	22.2	6	13.3	4	8.9
4.1	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2
4.2	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2
4.3	17	37.8	10	22.2	7	15.6
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	4	8.9	2	4.4	2	4.4
7	1	2.2	1	2.2	-	-
Total	45		25	55.6	20	44.4

5.4.2.1.1.1. Total number of strategies

According to the table above, it is clear that some strategies have been extensively used, especially those which are directly connected to the giving of an apology. The following classification can be made with reference to the number of strategies in each specific strategy:

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 37.8 %

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 22.2 %

Group 2

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 8.9 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 6.6 %

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 6.6 %

Group 3

The other strategies have a very limited number, ranging from 4.4 % (strategy 2.2) to 2.2 %, and some have not been used at all e.g. 1.2, 2.1, 2.5, 2.6 and 5.

Groups 1 and 2 have been used frequently. The strategy of request for forgiveness has the most number because apologizers are

accepting to have offended someone and as such they are asking to be forgiven so that life can go on as before.

The strategy of explicit explanation has the second most number because the apologizer wants it to be clear that the offended person to know what made him or her to commit such an offence. It is a strategy that also accepts the commitment of the offence and with a good and clear explanation, the offended person becomes clear.

Other people are involving the strategy of promise of forbearance. Even here, these people are accepting the fact of committing an offence. They want to show the complainant that they are sorry for the offence to an extent of promising that they will never give wrong information again.

Expression of lack of intent is also used frequently. People are trying to show that they did not give wrong information intentionally. It is something which happens by mistake. It is also reflecting a sign of remorse.

People also use implicit explanation strategy to apologize. Even though it is not a clear explanation, there is a sign of accepting an offence of giving wrong information. They use this strategy so that

complainant can just understand that apology is given but with no clear motivation.

5.4.2.1.1.2.Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	4.3, and 3.2
	Group 2:	2.3 and 6
	Others:	Negligent

Females:	Group 1:	4.3 and 3.2
	Group 2:	2.2, 3.1 and 6
	Others:	Negligent

With both males and females, the most strategies used are 4.3 and 3.2 in group 1. Both males and females find it necessary to ask to be forgiven and again give a clear explanation of why an offence has occurred. This is done with the acceptance of having offended someone. It also tells us that males and females have a heart of maintaining good relationships with regards to some situations.

Males, on the other hand, apologize with an indication that an offence was not done with the aim of causing pain or harm to the complainant. They say so because they are shy to come with a full explanation of the cause of the offence.

The strategy that females used also is explicit acknowledgement. They apologize and at the same time showing that the offence is as a result of them. Females know that if they can claim responsibility of their offence, anger from the complainant may be reduced. Females also minimize problems by promising that an offence will never happen.

5.4.2.1.2. Inadequate service

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	1	2.3	-	-	1	2.2
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	2	4.5	1	2.3	1	2.3
2.2	2	4.5	-	-	2	4.5
2.3	6	13.6	3	6.8	3	6.8
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	7	15.9	5	11.4	2	4.5
3.2	10	22.7	6	13.6	4	9.1
4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

4.2	1	2.3	-	-	1	2.3
4.3	12	27.3	8	18.2	4	9.1
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	4.5	2	4.5	-	-
7	1	2.3	1	2.3	-	-
Total	44	100	26	59.1	18	40.9

5.4.2.1.2.1.Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 27.3 %

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 22.7 %

Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 15.9 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 13.6 %

Group 3

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 4.5 %

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 4.5 %

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 4.5 %

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 2.3 %

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 2.3%

Other strategies were not used.

In group 1, there has been an extensively use of strategies 4.3 and 3.2. Request for forgiveness (strategy 4.3) has the higher number Because the complaine is feeling guilty and sorry for the offence that he or she has committed. The complaine wants the complainer to forgive him or her so that they may live normal life.

Explicit explanation (strategy 3.2) has also been employed extensively because the complaine is admitting that what he or she has done, by not coming to help a friend with his or her project, was undesirable and he or she is trying to lessen the blame by referring to mitigating circumstances that may excuse his or her behaviour.

Strategies 3.1 and 2.3 are in group 2. They were also involved in the framing of apologies. It is an indication that the complaine did not offend the complainer intentionally because he or she shows that the offence was never meant to hurt the complainer. Sometimes the complaine uses implicit explanation which does not stipulate the mitigating circumstances clear because he or she is hiding it.

5.4.2.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 4.3, 3.2 and 3.1
 Group 2: 2.3 and 6
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.3 and 3.2
 Group 2: 2.3, 2.2 and 3.1
 Others: Negligent

Both males and females have extensively used strategies 4.3 and 3.2 in group 1. It shows that both of them do not want the offence to separate them. That is why they both try to indicate the circumstances that led to their failure to help with the project. They even ask to be forgiven so that they can always be available for each other next time.

Males have also tried to use implicit explanation because most of them in real life do not want to be open to females.

In group 2 both of them show lack of intent to the offence. This means that what they did to the complainer was not meant to hurt him or her. It does not matter that they were not intending to hurt the complainer but they apologize. The reason here is to make sure that there is peace between them. Males have used strategy 6 in group 2 in a way of showing regret for the offence. They are doing

this in order to make sure that the complainer may come again to him or her for help.

Females are also ready to admit having offended the complainer. It is because they are afraid of males. They think that if they quickly accept responsibility, males can forgive them. Females again show their fright to males by using few implicit explanations because they know that if they are not clear enough, they can end up in trouble.

5.4.2.1.3. Forgetting message.

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2	9	25.0	7	19.4	2	5.6
2.3	2	5.6	1	2.8	1	2.8
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	4	11.1	2	5.6	2	5.6
3.2	9	25.0	4	11.1	5	13.9

4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2	3	8.3	1	2.8	2	5.6
4.3	6	16.6	3	8.3	3	8.3
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	3	8.3	2	5.6	1	2.8
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	36	100	20	55.6	16	44.4

5.4.2.1.3.1.Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement:25.0 %

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 25.0 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 16.6 %

Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 11.1 %

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 8.3%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 8.3 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 5.6 %

In group 1, there has been an extensively use of strategies 2.2, 3.2 and 4.3, i.e. explicit acknowledgement, explicit explanation and

request for forgiveness respectively. The complainees found it important that after failing to convey the message as requested, they ought to acknowledge that it happened. In order to restore good friendship, they had to accept the offence so that there can always be a good relationship between each other.

Other complainees opted for an explicit explanation so that they can indicate to the complainant the circumstances that led to their failure to convey the message. The complainees think it is good to expose such circumstances because it can help to lessen the blame.

Those who thought that the above explained strategies would not be enough, used a request for forgiveness strategy. This was employed because the complainees thought there was no better way of apologizing than to ask to be forgiven. Usually people think that by asking for forgiveness directly without much explanation, the complainant quickly accept that the complainees indeed did not offend intentionally.

Implicit explanation strategy has the highest number of occurrence in group 2. People do not always want to expose their problems all the times but they can just make you aware that something has disturbed them. That is why this strategy was used to this extent.

Other strategies like offer of apology, expression of lack of intent and promise of forbearance are also involved in group 2. One other way of reducing the extent of an offence is to offer an apology but the problem is that complainant may opt not to accept the apology. Complainees used this strategy because they think they have not offended to an extreme condition. Other complainees used an expression of lack of intent because they want to show to the complainants that the offence was never meant to cause any harm. There is also a use of promise of forbearance whereby complainees are accepting to having offended the complainant and as such they want to make sure that the complainant knows that the offence will never happen again. The complainees are ready to help the complainant in future.

5.4.2.1.3.2.Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	2.2 and 3.2
	Group 2:	4.3, 3.1 and 6
	Other:	Negligent
Females:	Group 1:	3.2 and 4.3
	Group 2:	2.2, 3.1 and 4.2
	Others:	Negligent

Both males and females use strategy 3.2 in group 1. They all believe that for an offence to be clearly interpreted, a clear and good explanation thereof is important. They want to make sure that the complainant understands the circumstances that contributed to the occurrence of the offence.

In group 1 again, males have dominated with the use of explicit acknowledgement strategy. They are trying to show females that they are not so stubborn that they cannot see that they have committed an offence. Males are restoring good friendship with females.

Females were also quick to ask for forgiveness in group 1 because they do not want to anger males. They know males can be short tempered to them and by quickly asking for forgiveness, they thought it could help.

In group 2, both males and females have used strategy 3.1 (implicit explanation). Both of them are accepting that an offence has occurred because of them but they do not want to expose the circumstances that failed them to convey the message they were suppose to. They might have failed to convey the message by something that the complainant cannot be happy with.

Males did not quickly ask for forgiveness because they wanted to explain first why they failed to convey the message. They are now using this strategy after they have convinced females. The reason being that males are proud enough to quickly ask for forgiveness. Females are now found to be accepting to having offended the males. They know they can accept because the circumstances that failed them are now clear.

Males are again seen promising that the offence is not going to happen. Even here they want to be cooperative with females because they know it is important. Lastly females are offering an apology because they know males will accept it.

5.4.2.2. Space

5.4.2.2.1. Accident.

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	1	2.0	1	2.0	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2	1	2.0	-	-	1	2.0
2.3	6	12.2	4	8.2	3	6.1

2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	4	8.2	2	4.1	2	4.1
3.2	11	22.4	8	16.3	3	6.1
4.1	1	2.0	-	-	1	2.0
4.2	3	6.1	-	-	3	6.1
4.3	14	28.6	8	16.3	6	12.2
5	1	2.0	-	-	1	2.0
6	3	6.1	2	4.1	1	2.0
7	3	6.1	1	2.0	2	4.1
Total	49	100	26	53.1	23	46.9

5.4.2.2.1.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 28.6 %

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 22.4 %

Group 2

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 12.2 %

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 8.2 %

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 6.1 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 6.1 %

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 6.1 %

Group 3

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 2.0 %

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 2.0 %

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 2.0 %

In group 1, there has been a great use of request for forgiveness and explicit explanation strategies. In a situation of an accident there is no better way of apologizing than doing it directly. Request for forgiveness as a strategy is pleading for a direct apology because the complainant has been hurt. Apart from a requisition of forgiveness, explicit explanation can satisfy the complainant because he or she can understand why the accident has happened.

It is not surprising to see the strategy of expression of lack of intent being on top in group 2. As an accident, complainees are showing that what happened was not planned. It was something that just happened and as such the complainant should not take it personal.

Implicit explanation is second from top in group 2. Because an accident happened in the eyes of everybody, the complainees feel it unnecessary to give clear circumstances. He or she thinks the complainant saw what happened.

Other complainers used the strategy of offering an apology. This is also because the complainers know that the accident was not deliberately done.

In order to confirm their innocence, other complainers promise that the incident will never happen again. They know the complainant saw them that the accident occurred while they were running to the class and that the same action is not going to take place all the time.

An offer of repair is also important. If a person is injured as a result of your actions, it is better to help him or her by sending him or her to the hospital and this is the reason why this strategy was used.

Other strategies were minimally used and they are in group 3.

5.4.2.2.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	3.2 and 4.3
	Group 2:	2.3 and 3.1
	Others:	Negligent

Females:	Group 1:	4.3, 2.3, 3.2 and 4.2
	Group 2:	3.1 and 7
	Others:	Negligent

The strategy of explicit explanation (3.2) is mostly used in group 1 by both males and females. Both of them think that, though they see their actions as undesirable, they must clearly explain the circumstances that contributed to an accident which might lessen the blame.

They are also involved with the use of the strategy of asking for forgiveness. An accident needs a direct apology so that the complainant may not get angry. Even though the complainant is hurt, there is no way that he or she can deny a requisition for forgiveness. As long as the complainees accept responsibility for the offence, the complainant will understand.

Females are also on top with the use of expression of lack of intent and offer of apology strategies. They used these strategies so that they might convince the complainant that the offence was mistakenly committed.

Implicit explanation is in group 2 for both males and females. The use of this strategy in this situation is because complainees have

accepted the responsibility of the offence but they do not want to disclosed everything that caused the accident.

Other females feel it necessary to compensate for the offence. Females are using this strategy to show males that they are ready to carry the pains they inflicted to others. On the other hand, males have lesser number of the strategy of expression of lack of intent because they know females will be forced to understand the situation.

5.4.2.2.2. Seat.

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2	1	2.6	1	2.6	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	1	2.6	-	-	1	2.6
2.2	2	5.2	1	2.6	1	2.6
2.3	5	13.2	3	7.9	2	5.3
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	3	7.9	3	7.9	-	-
3.2	12	31.6	7	18.4	5	13.2

4.1	2	5.2	-	-	2	5.3
4.2	1	2.6	-	-	1	2.6
4.3	7	18.4	3	7.9	4	10.5
5	1	2.6	-	-	1	2.6
6	2	5.2	1	2.6	1	2.6
7	1	2.6	1	2.6	-	-
Total	38	100	20	52.6	18	47.4

5.4.2.2.2.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 31.6 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 18.4 %

Group 2

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 13.2 %

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 7.9%

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 5.2 %

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 5.2 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 5.2 %

Group 3

Strategy 1.2: Querying precondition: 2.6 %

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 2.6 %

Strategy 4.2:	Offer of apology: 2.6 %
Strategy 5:	Expressing concern for hearer: 2.6 %
Strategy 7:	Offer of repair: 2.6 %

Strategies 3.2 and 4.3, i.e. explicit explanation and request for forgiveness respectively, were used extensively. Considering the situation of taking someone's seat, it is understandable that the complainees has to clearly explain why he or she took the seat. Apart from explaining, we also expect apology itself to be conveyed. This is an indication that the complainees did not just take someone's seat but there was a reasonable cause.

Expression of lack of intent is on top of group 2. It was used so as to indicate to the complainant that his or her seat was taken without thinking that he or she would interpret as an offence.

Complainees are taking responsibility of the offence.

Implicit explanation was used because the complainees was sure that the complainant could see by him or herself that his or her seat was exposed to the sun. He or she thinks that to accept responsibility is enough.

Explicit acknowledgement is in group 2 because complainants do not consider the occupation of someone's seat with a reason as a

real offence. Again, a very limited number of expression of regret was used. The reason of occupying the complainant's seat is considered as light. A very few number of a promise of forbearance was used by those who were afraid of the complainant, even though they could see the reason of occupying the seat.

Group 3 is having strategies that have a very limited number.

5.4.2.2.2.2.Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	3.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 4.3
	Others:	Negligent

Females:	Group 1:	3.2, 4.3, 2.3 and 4.1
	Others:	Negligent

Both males and females have almost the same number of strategies. All of them have strategy 3.2 having the highest number because an explanation of occupying someone's seat was important. This strategy was used to inform the complainant that the seat of the complaine was in direct position with the sun.

Apart from an explicit explanation, request for forgiveness is necessary. This strategy helps to show the complainant that the complaine is sorry for what happened.

The complainant was not satisfied with the occupation of his or her seat, that's why the complaine was forced to indicate that he or she was not aware that the problem will be taken as an offence.

Males, on the other hand, have strategy of implicit explanation in group 1. Males do not want to divulge the whole reason of occupying the complainant's seat. They are trying to undermine females because they know they can't do them anything.

Females are showing regret for the offence they committed. They know that if they do not do that, they will be punished.

5.4.2.2.3. Queue.

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	3	6.5	3	6.5	-	-
1.2	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2
2.2	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2

2.3	3	6.5	3	6.5	-	-
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	4	8.7	3	6.5	1	2.2
3.2	14	30.4	6	13.0	8	17.4
4.1	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2
4.2	1	2.2	-	-	1	2.2
4.3	11	23.9	6	13.0	5	10.9
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	4.3	1	2.2	1	2.2
7	4	8.7	2	4.3	2	4.3
Total	46	100	24	52.2	22	47.8

5.4.2.2.3.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 30.4 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 23.9 %

Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 8.7 %

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 8.7 %

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 6.5 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 6.5 %

Explicit explanation and a request for forgiveness strategies are again found in group 1. The situation of jumping a queue unaware also needs to be clearly explained for and to ask a direct apology to the complainant. This shows that most of the complainees were in a hurry that they couldn't see a queue.

Implicit explanation is again found in group 2. It was not used that much because if the complainees was not clear enough, the complainant would interpret the action as deliberate. Offer of repair was necessary because it is essential that the complainees should go to the end of the queue. The complainant was angry to an extent that the complainees found it necessary to minimize the extent of the offence. Some of the complainants showed that they offended unaware and that's why they used an expression of lack of intent.

5.4.2.2.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	3.2 and 4.3
	Group 2:	1.1, 2.3 and 3.1
	Others:	Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.2 and 4.3
 Others: Negligent

In this situation, it is very clear that both males and females are on top of the crest with the use of strategies 3.2 and 4.3. Both of them are feeling guilty of jumping the queue and they want the complainant to be clear about what happened by giving a sound explanation to him or her. Some complainants thought explicit would not be enough, and they decided to apologize directly.

Males also used the strategy of minimizing the offence so that the complainant couldn't worry too much. Others opted for the expression of lack of intent which helped them to lessen the blame. Those who used implicit explanation seem to have offended deliberately. That is why they didn't want to disclose the reason of jumping the queue clearly.

5.4.2.3. **Talk**

5.4.2.3.1. **Insult.**

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	4	9.5	4	9.5	-	-
1.2	1	2.4	1	2.4	-	-

1.3	1	2.4	1	2.4	-	-
2.1	2	4.8	-	-	2	4.8
2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3	10	23.8	5	11.9	5	11.9
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	2	4.8	1	2.4	1	2.4
3.2	4	9.5	4	9.5	-	-
4.1	2	4.8	2	4.8	-	-
4.2	1	2.4	-	-	1	2.4
4.3	13	30.9	4	9.5	9	21.4
5	1	2.4	1	2.4	-	-
6	1	2.4	-	-	1	2.4
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	42	100	23	54.8	19	45.2

5.4.2.3.1.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 30.9 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 23.8 %

Group 2

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 9.5 %
Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 9.5 %

In this situation of insult, the highest number of strategies used is in request for forgiveness and expression of lack of intent. Request for forgiveness was used in order to calm the complainant who seemed to be angry. By asking for a direct apology, the complainees lessened the extent of his or her offence.

In a meeting everybody is allowed to raise his or her views, and it is because of this fact that the complainees didn't think he or she was committing an offence by answering the way he or she did. So, it was necessary for him or her to indicate to the complainant that the action was not meant to hurt anybody but to solve the problem.

Minimizing of an offence was also important to be done because the complainant was very angry. It helped minimize the anger of the complainant. This strategy is in group 2 because it was not used that much because the complainees were afraid of the complainant. The same applies to the strategy of explicit explanation that it was not used extensively. The reason is that because the complainant was very angry, it was not advisable to talk too much to him or her.

5.4.2.3.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males: Group 1: 2.3, 1.1, 3.2 and 4.3
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.3 and 2.3
 Others: Negligent

Both males and females have strategies 2.3 and 4.3 used the most. As the complainant interpreted the action of answering him or her as an insult, the complaine found it necessary to accept having offended him or her and to directly apologize for the action. This helped to lessen his or her anger.

Males also involved the strategy of minimizing and explicit explanation. They are doing this because they are not afraid of the angry females.

5.4.2.3.2. Phone

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	2	4.9	2	4.9	-	-
1.2	2	4.9	-	-	2	4.9

1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2	3	7.3	-	-	3	7.9
2.3	5	12.2	4	9.8	1	2.4
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	1	2.4	1	2.4	-	-
3.1	4	9.8	4	9.8	-	-
3.2	12	29.3	6	14.6	6	14.6
4.1	1	2.4	-	-	1	2.4
4.2	2	4.9	-	-	2	4.9
4.3	7	17.1	3	7.3	4	9.8
5	1	2.4	-	-	1	2.4
6	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	1	2.4	1	2.4	-	-
Total	41	100	21	51.2	20	48.8

5.4.2.3.2.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 29.3 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 12.2 %

Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 9.8 %
Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 7.3 %

Group 3

All the strategies that are less than 5 %.

In a situation of taking long with a public phone, strategy 3.2 and strategy 2.3 are in group 1. Explicit explanation is important for this situation because it helps to explain to the complainant the reason for taking long. Other phone users are suppose to know why the complaineer is prolonging with the phone.

Expression of lack of intent is also on top because it was used by the complaineer trying to tell the complainant that taking long with the phone is not intentional and that's why it was never meant to hurt anybody.

Implicit explanation was not use very much and it is in group 2. It was used less because complainees were knowing that complainants were aware that they were taking longwith the phone. Most of them did not want to hide what was delaying them in the phone.

Very few complainees accepted responsibility of taking long with the phone. Others couldn't accept because they knew the delay was not deliberate.

5.4.2.3.2.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males:	Group 1:	3.2, 2.2 and 3.1
	Group 2:	4.3
	Others:	Negligent.

Females:	Group 1:	3.2 and 4.3
	Group 2:	2.2
	Others:	Negligent

Both males and females have strategy 3.2 in their group 1. Both of them knew that complainants were not aware of what was delaying them. That is why they all embarked on giving an explanation to clear the situation.

Males are also on top with the use of strategy 2.2 because they do not want to hurt females. They think that to quickly accept responsibility will also make females comfortable. But some of the males are not cooperative to females because they are not telling what exactly is delaying them.

Some of the females are using a request for a direct apology. They are opting for this because they know males will not have time to listen to their stories but if they can apologize, it will be fine.

Males who used a request for a direct apology are not so many because they always feel proud to ask for forgiveness to females. They think it is better to explain than to apologize. Females who did not use request for forgiveness used the strategy of explicit acknowledgement. They used it because they know that males always want to be superior to females and as such it is better for them to accept responsibility. Males cannot have more power of insisting to complain if females accept responsibility.

5.4.2.3.3. Noise.

			Males		Females	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	5	11.6	4	9.3	1	2.3
1.2	2	4.6	1	2.3	1	2.3
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	1	2.3	1	2.3	-	-
2.2	4	9.3	3	6.9	1	2.3
2.3	5	11.6	4	9.3	1	2.3
2.4	1	2.3	1	2.3	-	-

2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	1	2.3	-	-	1	2.3
3.2	7	16.2	3	6.9	4	9.3
4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2	3	6.9	-	-	3	6.9
4.3	9	20.9	3	6.9	6	14.0
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	3	6.9	1	2.3	2	4.6
7	2	4.6	1	2.3	1	2.3
Total	43	100	22	51.2	21	48.8

5.4.2.3.3.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 20.9 %

Systrategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 16.2 %

Group 2

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 11.6 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 11.6 %

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 9.3 %

Group 3

Strategy 4.2:	Offer of apology: 6.9 %
Strategy 6:	Promise of forbearance: 6.9 %
Strategy 1.2:	Querying preconditions: 4.6 %
Strategy 7:	Offer of repair: 4.6 %

Group 4

They are all the strategies that have been used for less than 4.0 %

Group 1 consists of strategies 4.3 and 3.2 because there is no better way of reconciling without asking for forgiveness and giving an explanation. In order to reconcile with others, one needs to explain the circumstances that led to the offence.

Group 2 has the strategy of minimizing the offence on top. Considering the offence of making noise to others while they are reading, the complainees decided to minimize the degree of an offence so that the complainant may not take it personally.

To show that an offence did not occur as planned, other complainees used the expression of lack of intent. It is an indication that they are regretting that an offence has occurred. Others are opting to accept full responsibility of an offence. Because a phone disturbed others by ringing while they were

reading, the complainees found it unnecessary to argue further but acknowledges the offence.

In group 3 there is strategy 4.2 which tops the others. The complainees do not see this as a major problem and as such they offer their apology. Another one which is on top is a promise of forbearance whereby the complainees decided to promise the complainant that the offence will never happen by switching off the phone.

Very few decided to be uncooperative by asking funny questions about their offence. They are not accepting the fact that their phone has made noise to the others.

5.4.2.3.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	1.1, 2.3, 2.2, 3.2 and 4.3
	Others:	Negligent
Females:	Group 1:	4.3, 3.2 and 4.2
	Group 2:	6
	Others:	Negligent

On top of group 1 of males category there is a strategy of minimizing an offence. This is so because most males do not want to apologize to females. Again, to avoid an apology, males used the strategy of an expression of lack of intent. The users of this strategy may offend deliberately but act as if they were not aware that the offences were taking place or took place.

It is not all the males who are uncooperative to females. This can be observed by the fact that other males are quick to accept responsibility of an offence.

Both males and females have almost the same number of strategies of request for forgiveness and explicit explanation. This is a group of people who believe in mutual relationship. They know that we need each other in order to live well.

Females are also seen offering an apology to males. Females, as always, do not want to be uncooperative to males. But this is usually caused by the fact that females are afraid of males.

5.4.2.4. **Time**

5.4.2.4.1. Forgetting

			Male	Female
--	--	--	------	--------

	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	2	5.0	2	5.0	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	1	2.5	1	2.5	-	-
2.2	4	10.4	3	7.5	1	2.5
2.3	1	2.5	1	2.5	-	-
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	7	17.5	4	10.0	3	7.5
3.2	8	20.0	3	7.5	5	12.5
4.1	2	5.0	1	2.5	1	2.5
4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.3	10	25.0	2	5.0	8	20.0
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	3	7.5	1	2.5	2	5.0
7	2	5.0	1	2.5	1	2.5
Total	40	100	19	47.5	21	52.5

5.4.2.4.1.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 25 %

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 20 %
Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 17.5 %

Group 2

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 10 %
Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 7.5 %
Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 5 %
Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 5 %
Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 5 %

On top of group 1 there are strategies of request for forgiveness, explicit explanation and implicit explanation. There is no better way of excusing for an offence of forgetting than to apply the above strategies. To apologize, the complainees had to ask for a direct forgiveness so that complainants could cool down. Others had to explain why they forgot because they thought they had a reasonable excuse to forget. Those who forgot because they were up to something that they were hiding from the complainant had to use implicit explanation.

In group 2 there is an explicit acknowledgement which is on top. This was used by complainees who didn't want to anger the complainants because they knew that if they could accept responsibility, complainants would understand. Promise of

forbearance was used by complainees who also didn't want to anger the complainants.

Some complainants were wise enough to minimize the degree of an offence because they could see that the complainant was angry. To minimize the offence helps because the complainant will see an offence in another way.

There are not so many complainees who used an expression of regret because it is not relevant to regret to forget but instead an apology is appropriate. The same applies to an offer of repair, it is not appropriate and that is the reason it was not used that much.

5.4.2.4.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	3.1, 2.2 and 3.2
	Group 2:	1.1 and 4.3
	Others:	Negligent
Females:	Group 1:	4.3 and 3.2
	Group 2:	3.1 and 6
	Others:	Negligent

High number of percentage is found in females category, especially with the use of a request for forgiveness. Females are always afraid of males and that's why they are quick to apologize when they have offended them. Males are above with the use of implicit explanation. The reason is that males always undermine females. They know that it will do no harm to say whatever is insufficient to females even though they have offended them.

Both males and females have explicit explanation in group 1. This strategy was used because there is an indication that there message was not deliberately forgotten. The explanation is done to indicate to the complainant that something influenced the offence.

Some males are showing that they are sometimes reasonable towards females. This is clear when we find that some males are quickly accepting responsibility of an offence. They are males who are ready to cooperate with females.

In group 2, males are again on top with the use of minimizing strategy. The reason is that they do not want to directly apologize but rather reduce the degree of an offence.

An indication again is that not so many males want to directly apologize to females. This is shown by the less percentage of the use of request for forgiveness by males.

Very few females are brave towards males. This is confirmed by the 7.5 % of implicit explanation. They are not expecting a harsh response from males. Other females have at least promised males that the offence will never happen again. This shows the readiness of cooperation by females to males.

5.4.2.4.2. Handling of an assignment.

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	2	5.8	1	2.9	1	2.9
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2	3	8.7	1	2.9	2	5.8
2.3	2	5.8	1	2.9	1	2.9
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	6	17.4	3	8.7	3	8.7
3.2	11	31.4	6	17.1	5	14.3

4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.3	8	22.9	2	5.8	6	17.1
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	5.8	1	2.9	1	2.9
7	1	2.9	-	-	1	2.9
Total	35	100	15	42.9	20	57.1

5.4.2.4.2.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 31.4 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 22.9 %

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 17.4 %

Group 2

Strategy 2.2: Explicit explanation: 8.7 %

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 5.8 %

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 5.8 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 5.8 %

In a situation of handling an assignment, the three strategies, namely; explicit explanation, request for forgiveness and implicit explanation were used extensively. The same reason is that for a

healthy relationship, an apology is appropriate to any offence. Complainees who were involved in these strategies wanted to maintain a good relationship amongst each other. This is also clear by the less percentage of the use of implicit explanation.

Group 2 is having explicit explanation with the most number of being used. It did not fall into group 1 because most complainees saw no reason of giving an explanation instead of apologizing directly. But those who used it felt it was necessary to explain why they couldn't submit the assignment on time.

Some of the complainees used minimizing strategy so as to lessen the degree of an offence. Again, very few complainees saw it necessary to apologize by telling the complainant that they didn't think that to fail to submit the assignment on time would really affect them. In other words complainees took the matter very simple but now they could see the importance of submitting it on time.

Again in this group, there is a use of a promise of forbearance. This strategy was used by complainees who didn't want to strain their relationship with complainants. They knew that if they could just say they will never commit the offence again, their relationship will be restored.

5.4.2.4.2.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	3.2
	Group 2:	3.1 and 4.3
	Others:	Negligent
Females:	Group 1:	4.3 and 3.2
	Group 2:	3.1 and 2.2

Males have strategy 3.2 with the most number of strategies used because they do not want to directly apologize to females. They, instead, dwell on giving an explanation.

Females in their group 1 show that they are ready to ask for a direct apology to males if they have offended them. The reasons vary from wanting to restore a good relationship with them to being afraid of them. There are some females who opted for the use of explicit explanation. They are females who thought an apology without an explanation would be meaningless to males.

Both males and females have used strategy 3.1 in group 2. This indicates that both of them had something that delayed them to submit the assignment which they did not want to disclose.

Few males were involved with the use of a request for forgiveness. It also shows that not all males are rude to females. It is a sign of cooperation.

Females showed their cooperation to males by accepting responsibility of an offence they committed. They acknowledged that an offence occurred because of them.

5.4.2.4.3. Late arrival

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	4	11.2	4	11.2	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	2	5.6	1	2.8	1	2.8
2.2	2	5.6	2	5.6	-	-
2.3	2	5.6	1	2.8	1	2.8
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	6	16.8	4	11.2	2	5.6
3.2	7	19.8	4	11.2	3	8.4

4.1	1	2.8	-	-	1	2.8
4.2	1	2.8	-	-	1	2.8
4.3	8	22.2	2	5.6	6	16.7
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	5.6	1	2.8	1	2.8
7	1	2.8	-	-	1	2.8
Total	36	100	19	52.8	17	47.2

5.4.2.4.3.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

- Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 22.2 %
- Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 19.6 %
- Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 16.8 %
- Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 11.2 %

Group 2

- Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 5.6 %
- Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 5.6 %
- Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 5.6 %
- Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 5.6 %

Request for forgiveness tops all the other strategies in group 1.

This shows that the complainers didn't commit the offence

deliberately and they are also accepting responsibility of such the offence. Explicit explanation strategy comes second because it is important to ask for forgiveness by submitting a good explanation of what actually happened.

Some of the complainees embark on the use of implicit explanation. They are apologizing but they don't want to clearly say what happened because it may bring back the pain to the complainant. Those who felt that their offences hurt the complainants, decided to use the minimizing strategy. This helps to soothe the complainant.

In group 2 there are strategies of implicit acknowledgement, explicit acknowledgement, expression of lack of intent and promise of forbearance which have equal number of being used. Those who used implicit acknowledgement did so to indicate that they were accepting responsibility of the offence but they didn't want to accept it directly. They were proud of apologizing directly. Some complainees were not proud to accept responsibility directly. They used explicit acknowledgement because they were accepting that an offence occurred because of them.

Expression of lack of intent strategy was used by complainees who did not commit the offence deliberately. They offended without

knowing that it would cause an undesirable behaviour. Promise of forbearance strategy was also used to show future readiness of cooperation with the complainant.

5.4.2.4.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	1.1, 3.1 and 3.2
	Group 2:	2.2 and 4.3
	Others:	Negligent

Females:	Group 1:	4.3 and 3.2
	Group 2:	3.1
	Others:	Negligent

Males, as always, are showing that they are not ready to directly apologize to females. This is clear by the use of minimizing strategy. They know that they have offended but they opt to lessen the degree of their offence. Again, they embark on the use of explanations. Others used implicit explanation because they don't want to expose their reason of arriving late. But some of them clearly explain why they arrived late. Males who clearly explain their reason of arriving late, want to maintain a good relationship with females.

Females, on the other hand, are ready to apologize for their offences and the use of a request for forgiveness and explicit explanation is an indication. Females are forced to apologize for their offences because males can even beat them. That is why they also give a clear explanation about their failure of arriving early.

In group 2, males were high with the use of explicit explanation and a request for forgiveness. It is again a sign that some males do not believe in power and threat. They consider females as their equals.

Some females in group 2 do not want to be clear about why they arrived late. They think it is enough to apologize without disclosing too much.

5.4.2.5. Possession

5.4.2.5.1. Money

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	1	2.5	1	2.5	-	-

2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3	2	5.0	1	2.5	1	2.5
2.4	1	2.5	-	-	1	2.5
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	3	7.5	2	5.0	1	2.5
3.2	15	37.5	9	22.5	6	15.0
4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2	2	5.0	-	-	2	5.0
4.3	4	10.0	1	2.5	3	7.5
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	8	20.0	4	10.0	4	10.0
7	4	10.0	2	5.0	2	5.0
Total	40	100	20	50.0	20	50.0

5.4.2.5.1.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 37.5 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 20 %

Group 2

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 10 %

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 10 %

Strategy 3.1:	Implicit explanation: 7.5 %
Strategy 2.3:	Expression of lack of intent: 5 %
Strategy 4.2:	Offer of apology: 5 %

The two strategies that are in group 1 are there as an indication of the readiness to apologize by the complainers. The complainers have used these strategies because they were aware that they have committed an offence. They didn't want to go away with their offences and that is why they are giving an explanation of why they couldn't return the money on time and others are promising to return the money immediately they get it.

Group 2 has a request for forgiveness on top. It was used by complainers who want to be forgiven for their offences because they are accepting responsibility of the undesirable behaviour. They do not want to say too much but to be forgiven only.

Other complainers in group 2 could see the problem they are causing by failing to return the money as agreed and they are even promising to pay back immediately. Some complainers did not want to say what exactly is delaying them to pay back because they knew the agreement never included the difficulty of paying back.

Expression of lack of intent as a strategy was used by complainers who didn't know that they would experience some problems with the paying back of money. In other words they are trying to sympathize with the complainants.

The last strategy is an offer of an apology which was used to show the readiness of apologizing. It is a sign of feeling guilty about the offence.

5.4.2.5.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males:	Group 1:	3.2 and 6
	Group 2:	3.1 and 7
	Others:	Negligent

Females:	Group 1:	3.2, 6 and 4.3
	Group 2:	4.2 and 7

Both males and females have strategy 3.2 in group 1. It indicates that both of them are failing to return the money with a reason. Both of them are ready to pay back the money immediately they get it. Both of them were even cooperative by promising that next time they'd bring it. But females have gone further by apologizing

for the offence of not paying the money back. Females know that for every offence committed, apology is appropriate.

In group 2, males were again found giving an unclear explanation about their failure to return the money. They were shy to say I'm sorry I could't get the money to pay you back.

Both males and females have used strategy 7 in group 2. They used this to show that they have not taken the money for good. They are ready to pay it back. In this same group, females are again ready to offer their apology. They always want to leave matters resolved .

5.4.2.5.2. Clothes

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	2	4.0	2	4.0	-	-
2.2	3	6.0	-	-	3	6.0
2.3	9	18.0	5	10.0	4	8.0
2.4	1	2.0	1	2.0	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

3.1	3	6.0	2	4.0	1	2.0
3.2	8	16.0	5	10.0	3	6.0
4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2	2	4.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
4.3	9	18.0	4	8.0	5	10.0
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	13	26.0	8	16.0	5	10.0
Total	50	100	28	46.0	22	44.0

5.4.2.5.2.1. Total number of strategies:

Group 1

- Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 26 %
- Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 18 %
- Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 18 %
- Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 16 %

Group2

- Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 6 %
- Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 6 %

In a situation of spilling a trouser with soup, the most number of complainers used offer of repair as a strategy. They knew there

would be nothing more to do unlike to clean up the mess they have done. They thought it would not be enough to just say I apologize for the offence, but to offer to wash the trouser was the best solution.

Lack of intent as a strategy was used by complainees to show that what happened was as a result of an accident. Some complainees felt it necessary to ask to be forgiven for the act. Usually, most complainants are not satisfied with any other thing unlike the words of asking for forgiveness and that's why this strategy was also used.

Some complainees used explicit explanation so that complainants could know the exact reason of what caused the accident.

In group 2 there is explicit acknowledgement which shows that complainees were aware that they've indeed caused an undesirable behaviour. They were trying to take the whole responsibility. Some of the complainees used implicit explanation, which is sometimes good because it tries to console the complainant.

5.4.2.5.2.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: 7, 2.3, 3.2 and 4.3

Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.3, 7, 2.3, 2.2 and 3.2

Others: Negligent

Both males and females are accepting responsibility by promising to clean up the mess from the trouser. They know that if they can do that, complainants will be satisfied. Another thing about both of them is that they are quick to ask for a direct apology because they understand that offence they committed is undesirable. To show that the accident occurred as a result of an accident, both of them are accepting the responsibility of the offence by the use of the strategy of an expression of lack of intent.

Both of them are being cooperative towards each other because they take time to clearly explain how an accident took place. But Females have gone further by using explicit acknowledgement in group 2. They do not want to anger males and that is the reason of quickly admitting that they have done something wrong.

5.4.2.5.3. Class notes

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2	-	-
2.2	5	10.4	3	6.3	2	4.2
2.3	5	10.4	3	6.3	2	4.2
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1	5	10.5	4	8.3	1	2.1
3.2	11	22.9	5	10.4	6	12.5
4.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	-	-
4.2	2	4.2	-	-	2	4.2
4.3	8	16.7	3	6.3	5	10.4
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	6	12.5	2	4.2	4	8.3
7	3	6.3	-	-	3	6.3
Total	48	100	23	47.9	25	52.1

5.4.2.5.3.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 22.9 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 16.7 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 12.5 %

Group 2

Strategy 2.2:	Explicit acknowledgement: 10.4 %
Strategy 2.3:	Expression of lack of intent: 10.4 %
Strategy 3.1:	Implicit explanation: 10.4 %
Strategy 7:	Offer of repair: 6.3 %

The strategy of explicit explanation is found on top of group 1. It was used in order to show complainants that class notes are not forgotten intentionally. Some of the complainers used request for forgiveness because they felt to have offended the complainants. Accepting responsibility of the offence helps because the complainant does not feel undermined. The other complainers used promise of forbearance to make sure that complainants understand that class notes will indeed be brought back next time.

In group 2 there is the strategy of explicit acknowledgement. This strategy was used because the complainant becomes happy on hearing that the complainer has accepted responsibility of the offence. Expression of lack of intent was used by complainers who felt the offence occurred accidentally. The book was not forgotten to offend the complainant. Implicit explanation as a strategy was used by complainers who also accepted responsibility of the

offence but did not want to say what exactly caused them to forget the book.

5.4.2.5.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females:

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 3.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 4.3
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.2, 4.3, 6 and 7
 Others: Negligent

Both males and females have strategy 3.2 on top of group 1. This is an indication that both of them are really forgetting to come to school with the class notes. They are trying to show complainants that somehow they are forgetting the book. But males have also used implicit explanation to apologize. They did not want to expose to females why they were not coming with the book.

Males are also seen using the strategy of explicit acknowledgement. They are males who are cooperative to females. They take them as partners in life and they do not undermine them. Other males who are also cooperative have used the strategy of expression of lack of intent. They are showing females that the offence was never meant to disturb them as it occurred accidentally

Both males and females have used the strategy of a request for forgiveness. But females used this strategy more than males. Females always want to ask for an apology for any offence they commit. Very few males used this strategy as it is now common sense that most of them are not ready to apologize to females.

Females have also used the strategy of promise of forbearance. They want to make sure that they bring the book the next day. They are also ready to pay for the book. It shows that females do not want to undermine males.

5.4.3. INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES IN MAJOR SITUATIONS

1. Inconvenience

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1.1	2	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.2
Strategy 1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 1.3	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Strategy 2.1	2	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.2
Strategy 2.2	13	2.1	7	1.1	6	0.9
Strategy 2.3	11	1.7	6	0.9	5	0.5

Strategy 2.4	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Strategy 2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 3.1	14	2.2	8	1.3	6	0.9
Strategy 3.2	29	4.6	16	2.5	13	2.1
Strategy 4.1	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
Strategy 4.2	5	0.8	1	0.2	4	0.6
Strategy 4.3	35	5.5	21	3.3	14	2.2
Strategy 5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 6	9	1.4	6	0.9	3	0.5
Strategy 7	2	0.3	2	0.3	0	0

2. Space

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1.1	4	0.6	4	0.6	0	0
Strategy 1.2	2	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.2
Strategy 1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.1	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
Strategy 2.2	4	0.6	1	0.2	3	0.5
Strategy 2.3	14	2.2	10	1.6	4	0.6
Strategy 2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0

Strategy 2.5	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
Strategy 2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 3.1	11	1.7	8	1.3	3	0.5
Strategy 3.2	37	5.8	21	3.3	16	2.5
Strategy 4.1	4	0.6	0	0	4	0.6
Strategy 4.2	5	0.8	0	0	5	0.8
Strategy 4.3	32	5.1	17	2.7	15	2.4
Strategy 5	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
Strategy 6	7	1.1	4	0.6	3	0.5
Strategy 7	8	1.3	4	0.6	4	0.6

3. Talk

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1.1	11	1.7	10	1.6	1	0.2
Strategy 1.2	6	0.9	2	0.3	4	0.6
Strategy 1.3	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Strategy 2.1	3	0.5	1	0.2	2	0.3
Strategy 2.2	7	1.1	3	0.5	4	0.6
Strategy 2.3	20	3.2	13	2.1	7	1.1
Strategy 2.4	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Strategy 2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0

Strategy 2.6	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Strategy 3.1	7	1.1	5	0.8	2	0.3
Strategy 3.2	23	3.6	13	2.1	10	1.6
Strategy 4.1	3	0.5	2	0.3	1	0.2
Strategy 4.2	6	0.9	0	0	6	0.9
Strategy 4.3	29	4.6	10	1.6	19	3.0
Strategy 5	2	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.2
Strategy 6	4	0.6	1	0.2	3	0.5
Strategy 7	3	0.5	2	0.3	1	0.2

4. Time

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1.1	8	1.3	7	1.1	1	0.3
Strategy 1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.1	3	0.5	2	0.3	1	0.2
Strategy 2.2	9	1.4	6	0.9	3	0.5
Strategy 2.3	5	0.8	3	0.5	2	0.3
Strategy 2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0

Strategy 3.1	19	3.0	11	1.7	8	1.3
Strategy 3.2	26	4.1	13	2.1	13	2.1
Strategy 4.1	3	0.5	1	0.2	2	0.3
Strategy 4.2	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
Strategy 4.3	26	4.1	6	0.9	20	3.2
Strategy 5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 6	7	1.1	3	0.5	4	0.6
Strategy 7	4	0.6	1	0.2	3	0.5

5. Possession

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.1	5	0.8	5	0.8	0	0
Strategy 2.2	8	1.3	3	0.5	5	0.8
Strategy 2.3	16	2.5	9	1.4	7	1.1
Strategy 2.4	2	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.2
Strategy 2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 3.1	11	1.7	8	1.3	3	0.5

Strategy 3.2	34	5.4	19	3.0	15	2.4
Strategy 4.1	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Strategy 4.2	6	0.9	1	0.2	5	0.8
Strategy 4.3	21	3.3	8	1.3	13	2.1
Strategy 5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strategy 6	14	2.2	6	0.9	8	1.3
Strategy 7	20	3.2	10	1.6	10	1.6

5.4.3.1. Total number of strategies

1. Inconvenience:

Group 1

- Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 5.5 %
- Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 4.6 %
- Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 2.2 %
- Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 2.1 %

Group 2

- Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 1.7 %
- Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 1.4 %

Group 3

- Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 0.8 %

Group 4

Insignificant

In group 1 there is request for forgiveness which is on top. The reason is that most learners used it to apologize. Most learners always go for a direct apology. They don't want to take long to apologize. Other learners dwell on explicit explanation. They are those learners who always want to take long to ask for forgiveness. Other strategies were also used but in a minimal way.

2. Space.

Group 1

Strategy 3.2:	Explicit explanation: 5.8 %
Strategy 4.3:	Request for forgiveness: 5.1 %
Strategy 2.3:	Expression of lack of intent: 2.2 %

Group 2

Strategy 3.1:	Implicit explanation: 1.7 %
Strategy 7:	Offer of repair: 1.3 %
Strategy 6:	Promise of forbearance: 1.1 %

Group 3

Strategy 4.2:	Offer of apology: 0.8 %
Strategy 1.1:	Minimizing: 0.6 %
Strategy 2.2:	Explicit acknowledgement: 0.6 %
Strategy 4.1:	Expression of regret: 0.6 %

Group 4

Insignificant

In this situation of space, most learners used explicit explanation. They wanted to clear why they occupied the seat. But some of the learners went for a direct apology.

3. Talk

Group 1

Strategy 4.3:	Request for forgiveness: 4.6 %
Strategy 3.2:	Explicit explanation: 3.6 %
Strategy 2.3:	Expression of lack of intent: 3.2 %

Group 2

Strategy 1.1:	Minimizing: 1.7 %
Strategy 2.2:	Explicit acknowledgement: 1.1 %
Strategy 3.1:	Implicit explanation: 1.1 %

Group 3

Strategy 1.2:	Querying preconditions: 0.9 %
Strategy 4.2:	Offer of apology: 0.9 %
Strategy 6:	Promise of forbearance: 0.6 %
Strategy 2.1:	Implicit acknowledgement: 0.5 %
Strategy 4.1:	Expression of regret: 0.5 %
Strategy 7:	Offer of repair: 0.5 %

Group 4

Insignificant

Request for forgiveness is again on top. Most learners believe that its use maintain a good relationship with others. As learners, there are others who always want to give an explanation. That is why explicit explanation is second.

4. Time

Group1

Strategy 3.2:	Explicit explanation: 4.1 %
Strategy 4.3:	Request for forgiveness: 4.1 %

Group 2

Strategy 2.2:	Explicit acknowledgement: 1.4 %
---------------	---------------------------------

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 1.3 %
Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 1.1 %

Group 3

Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 0.8 %
Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 0.6 %
Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 0.5 %
Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 0.5 %

Group 3

Insignificant

The same is applicable to the situation of time where request for forgiveness and explicit explanation as strategies are mostly used. But in this situation, the two have equal number of being used.

5. Possession

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 5.4 %
Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 3.3 %
Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 3.2 %
Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 2.5 %
Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 2.2 %

Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 1.7 %

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 1.3 %

Group 3

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 0.9 %

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 0.8 %

Group 4

Insignificant

Explicit explanation and request for forgiveness are again considered by most learners. Most learners go for either a direct apology or give an explanation.

5.4.3.2. Total strategies between males and females

1. Inconvenience

Males:	Group 1:	4.3 and 3.2
	Group 2:	3.1 and 2.2
	Group 3:	2.3 and 6
	Others:	Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.3 and 3.2
 Group 2: 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, 2.3 and 6
 Others: Negligent

Both male and female learners have used request for forgiveness and explicit explanation. Both the two strategies seek for an apology.

2. Space

Males: Group 1: 3.2 and 4.3
 Group 2: 2.3 and 3.1
 Group 3: 1.1, 6 and 7
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.2 and 4.3
 Group 2: 4.2, 2.3, 4.1, 7, 2.2 and 6
 Others: Negligent

Again, it is request for forgiveness and explicit explanation which have been used the most by both males and females

3. Talk

Males: Group 1: 2.3, 3.2, 1.1 and 4.3
 Group 2: 3.1 and 2.2
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.3, 3.2 and 2.3
 Group 2: 4.2, 1.2, 2.2 and 6
 Others: Negligent

Even this time, the two strategies, request for forgiveness and explicit explanation, were used mostly but females are showing that they are the ones who are frequenting it. The number of use for this strategy is lower than that of females.

4. Time

Males: Group 1: 3.2, 3.1 and 1.1
 Group 2: 2.2, 4.3, 2.3 and 6
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 4.3, 3.2 and 3.1
 Group 2: 6, 2.2 and 7
 Others: Negligent

In group 1, males did not involve request for forgiveness but females have used it extensively. Males are now involving a lot of explicit explanation.

5. Possession

Males: Group 1: 3.2
 Group 2: 7, 2.3, 4.3 and 3.1
 Others: Negligent

Females: Group 1: 3.2 and 4.3
 Group 2: 7, 6 and 2.3
 Group 3: 2.2, 4.2 and 3.1
 Others: Negligent

In possession situation, males are also not using request for forgiveness in group 1 as their apology strategy. They are using an explanation whereas most females are going for a request for forgiveness.

5.4.4. INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES

			Male	Female
--	--	--	------	--------

	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.1	25	3.9	22	3.5	3	0.4
1.2	8	1.3	3	0.5	5	0.8
1.3	2	0.3	2	0.3	-	-
2.1	14	2.2	9	1.4	5	0.8
2.2	41	6.5	20	3.2	21	3.3
2.3	67	10.6	41	6.5	26	4.1
2.4	4	0.6	3	0.4	1	0.2
2.5	1	0.2	-	-	1	0.2
2.6	1	0.2	1	0.2	-	-
3.1	62	9.8	40	6.3	22	3.5
3.2	149	23.5	82	13.0	67	10.6
4.1	12	1.9	4	0.6	8	1.3
4.2	23	3.6	2	0.3	21	3.3
4.3	143	22.6	62	9.8	81	12.8
5	3	0.5	1	0.2	2	0.3
6	41	6.5	20	3.2	21	3.3
7	37	5.8	19	3.0	18	2.9

5.4.4.1 Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 23.5 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 22.6 %

Group 2

- Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 10.6 %
Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 9.8 %

Group 3

- Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 6.5 %
Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 6.5 %
Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 5.8 %

Group 4

- Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 3.9 %
Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 3.6 %

Group 5

- Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 2.2 %
Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 1.9 %
Strategy 1.2: Querying preconditions: 1.3 %

Group 6

- Others: Insignificant

From the above grouping, explicit explanation and request for forgiveness are in group 1. It means they were used extensively

throughout. This shows that both male and female learners saw a need to explain clearly what made them to offend. Apart from that, the complainers did not want to be blamed for the offensive act. Some gave an explanation as a sign of being innocent.

A request for forgiveness is also in group 1, which is also an indication that most of the complainers were sorry about the offence they committed. For the offence they committed, they sought for an apology, which maintains a good relationship.

In group 2 there are strategies of an expression of lack of intent and implicit explanation. Expression of lack of intent is in this category because few of the complainers felt that they didn't think that the offence they committed would cause a problem. They did what they did without the aim of causing pain. Again, in this category there is implicit explanation. This strategy was used in order to avoid to remind the complainant about the things that caused the offence.

In group 3 there are three strategies, namely; explicit acknowledgement, promise of forbearance and offer of repair. These strategies were not used extensively as they range from 6.5 % to 5.8 %. Very few complainers wanted to accept responsibility of the blame. The same applies to promise of

forbearance, few complainees did not avoid to promise that the offence would never be repeated. Offer of repair was also not used so many times. This shows that most of the situations in Tshivenda do not apply to this type of strategy.

The strategies of offer of apology and minimizing were also not used that much, ranging from 3.9 % to 3.6 %. In Tshivenda situations, apology is usually asked for and not offered. That is the reason an offer of apology was not used so many times. Minimizing an offence can be done, but in these situations it was not involved too much.

Group 5 is composed of implicit acknowledgement, expression of regret and querying preconditions. This group was used by complainees who did not want to apologize directly though they did not want to hurt the complainant.

5.4.4.2 Total strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 13 %

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 9.8 %

Group 2: Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 6.5 %

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 6.3 %

Group 3: Strategy 1.1: Minimizing: 3.5 %

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 3.2 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 3.2 %

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 3 %

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 1.4 %

Group 4: Others: Insignificant

Females: Group 1: Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 12.8 %

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 10.6 %

Group 2: Strategy 2.3: Expression of lack of intent: 4.1 %

Group 3: Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 3.5 %

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 3.3 %

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 3.3 %

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 3.3 %

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 2.9 %

Strategy 4.1: Expression of regret: 1.3 %

Group 4: Others: Insignificant.

Males and females seem to differ in their use of apology strategies. In group 1, males are more inclined to give explanations (males 13 %, females 10.6 %) while females ask more for forgiveness (strategy 4.3: 12.8 % vs 9.8 %).

In group 2, males are showing that they want to lessen the degree of an offence by telling the complainant that they were not intentional in their offence. Again, they do not want to give a clear explanation about the cause of their offensive acts. Very few females use expression of lack of intent (4.1 % compared to 6.5 % of males) because most of them want to ask for forgiveness.

In group 3 males are ahead with the use of minimizing strategy. These are few males who always avoid to ask for forgiveness but to minimize the extent of their offence. Females do not want to use this strategy as it indicates above that their use of this strategy is insignificant. Few females use implicit explanation because most of them are afraid of males. But males and females have almost the same number of explicit acknowledgement (3.2 % for males and 3.3 % for females). This is a group of complainers who want to be cooperative to one another. Again, offer of repair strategy and promise of forbearance strategy have almost the same number in both males and females. It shows that some males and females are ready to repay for the damages they have caused and that they

want to create a positive atmosphere of helping each other even in future.

Those females who fail to ask for forgiveness offer their apology. They do not want to be blamed by males. Very few males show implicit acknowledgement (1.4 %) and very few females show expression of regret (1.3 %).

CHAPTER 6

THE EXPRESSION OF THE OFFENCE IN TSHIVENDA

An apology is always offered where undesirable behaviour has occurred. It is sometimes up to the complainant to express his or her dissatisfaction about an undesirable behaviour. It is in the process of expressing such dissatisfaction that different complaint strategies are followed.

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 is the problem. Though a hint is not clear about the problem, an offence can be deduced from that talk.

Strategy 2. Annoyance

This strategy is used by the complainant who is angry about a certain behaviour. The complainant shows his or her anger by saying something which is sometimes not good to the complaine.

Strategy 3. Ill consequences

The complainant complains by revealing the consequences as a result of the complaine. He or she may indicate that he or she was hurt because of the actions or behaviour of the complaine.

Strategy 4. Indirect accusation

The complainant may try to accuse the complaine for his or 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 a direct opposite of strategy 4. The complainant does not go about the bush, but he or she accuses the complaine directly. The complaine 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 a 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 that contributed to an offensive act.

Strategy 8. Explicit blame to a person

In this strategy, the blame is directly put to the person who caused an offensive act. It differs from the previous one because this one does not dwell on the behaviour.

6.2. SITUATIONS AND COMPLAINT STRATEGIES

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1. INCONVENIENCE	145	21.0	69	10.0	76	11.0
1.1 Wrong information	48	6.9	24	3.5	24	3.5
1.2 Inadequate service	48	6.9	21	3.0	27	3.9
1.3 Forgetting message	49	7.1	24	3.5	25	3.6
2. SPACE	138	20.0	63	9.1	75	10.9
2.1 Accident	49	7.1	22	3.2	27	3.9
2.2 Seat	41	5.9	19	2.7	22	3.2
2.3 Queue	48	6.9	22	3.2	26	3.7
3. TALK	138	20.0	66	9.6	72	10.4
3.1 Insult	49	7.1	25	3.6	24	3.5
3.2 Phone	45	6.5	21	3.0	24	3.5

3.3 Noise	44	6.4	20	2.9	24	3.5
4. TIME	133	19.2	61	8.8	72	10.4
4.1 Forgetting	45	6.5	18	2.6	27	3.9
4.2 Assignment	45	6.5	20	2.9	25	3.6
4.3 Late arrival	43	6.2	23	3.3	20	2.9
5. POSSESSION	137	19.8	59	8.5	78	11.3
5.1 Money	51	7.4	23	3.3	28	4.1
5.2 Clothes	45	6.5	20	2.9	25	3.6
5.3 Class notes	41	5.9	16	2.3	25	3.6
TOTAL	691		318	46.0	373	54.0

6.2.1. THE MAJOR SITUATIONS

	Situation	Total	Male	Female
1.	Inconvenience	21.0	10.0	11.0
2.	Space	20.0	9.1	10.9
3.	Talk	20.0	9.6	10.4
4.	Time	19.2	8.8	10.4
5.	Possession	19.8	8.5	11.3

6.2.1.1. Total number of strategies

These situations may be grouped into three categories

Situation 1:	21 %
Situation 2 and 3:	20 % in all
Situation 4 and 5:	19.2 % and 19.8 %

Situation 1 indicates that it has the most number of complaint strategies. This shows that learners use many strategies in cases where they have been inconvenienced. Space and talk situations are second because learners do not want their seat to be taken by others. Another thing which learners do not want is an insult. They become angry when they are insulted and they use more strategies to complain.

The other situations are the last ones, but their numbers show that they were used extensively. It indicates that learners do not want to be offended in any other situation.

6.2.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males

Situation 1:	10 %
Situation 2 and 3:	9.1 % and 9.6 %
Situation 4 and 5:	8.8 % and 8.5 %

Females

Situation 1 and 5: 11 % and 11.3 %

Situation 2, 3 and 4: 10.9 %, 10.4 % and 10.4 %

Females and males have most strategies in situation 1 but females have used more of them than males. Females get worried by inconveniences more than any other thing. Males do not want to complain too much because they know that to be heard does not need to say too much. Females are also worried by the loss of their possessions. In order to be heard, they rely on more complain strategies. The other strategies were also partially used.

6.2.1.3. Strategies between males and females in each major situation

Situation 1:	10, 11	= 1 % insignificant
Situation 2:	9.1, 10.9	= 1.8 % significant
Situation 3:	9.6, 10.4	= 0.8 % insignificant
Situation 4:	8.8, 10.4	= 1.6 % significant
Situation 5:	8.5, 11.3	= 2.8 % significant

In situation 1 the difference in use of strategies between males and females is not significant because both of them feel equally offended by being inconvenienced. Actually, in all the situations females always feel offended in a way that they involve a lot of

strategies. Females always think that males undermine them and that makes them to complain a lot. But in situation 5 (possession), females are more worried than the others. They think that males take their possession deliberately with the aim of not returning them.

6.2.2. THE SUBSITUATIONS

6.2.2.1. Inconvenience

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
1.1	Wrong information	6.9	3.5	3.5
1.2	Inadequate service	6.9	3.0	3.9
1.3	Forgetting message	7.1	3.5	3.6

6.2.2.1.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation

Group 1: 1.3 (7.1)

Group 2: 1.1, 1.2 (6.9, 6.9)

Subsituation of forgetting message has the most strategies because the complainant is complaining about the consequences of missing a test. Learners do not want to miss a test.

6.2.2.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males

Group 1: 1.1 and 1.3 (3.5 % and 3.5 %)

Group 2: 1.2 (3 %)

Females

Group 1: 1.2 (3.9 %)

Group 2: 1.3 and 1.1 (3.6 % and 3.5 %)

Males are more worried with wrong information they receive and forgetting of message which has negative effect. Females are more worried with forgetting message which makes them miss tests.

6.2.2.1.3. Strategies between males and females in this subsituation

Subsituation 1.1: 3.5, 3.5 = 0 no difference

Subsituation 1.2: 3.0, 3.9 = 0.9 significant

Subsituation 1.3: 3.5, 3.6 = 0.1 insignificant

In subsituation 1.1 (wrong information), both males and females feel equally offended. They all do not like a point of missing a test by being given wrong information. Subsituation 1.2 shows that

females do not want to be dissappointed. If you promise them something, they want it to be done like that.

6.2.2.2. Space

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
2.1	Accident	7.1	3.2	3.9
2.2	Seat	5.9	2.7	3.2
2.3	Queue	6.9	3.2	3.7

6.2.2.2.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 2.1, 2.3 (7.1, 6.9)

Group 2: 2.2 (5.9)

Subsituation 2.1 (accident) has the most strategies because complainants are feeling pain of being bumped onto. They are showing their anger by using many strategies. The subsituation of a queue is also having more strategies because complainants think that the complainees are aware of the queue but they are just ignoring it.

6.2.2.2.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Male

Group 1: 2.1 and 2.3 (3.2 % in all)

Group 2: 2.2 (2.7 %)

Female

Group 1: 2.1 and 2.3 (3.9 % and 3.7 %)

Group 2: 2.2 (3.2 %)

Both males and females have involved more strategies in the subsituation of an accident and queue. It indicates that when they are hurt, they become furious and use many strategies to complain. The subsituation of a queue has many strategies involved as an indication that learners do not want to be jumped in a queue.

6.2.2.2.3. Strategies between males and females

Subsituation 2.1: 3.2, 3.9 = 0.7 significant

Subsituation 2.2: 2.7, 3.2 = 0.5 significant

Subsituation 2.3: 3.2, 3.7 = 0.5 significant

In all the subsituations above, the difference in the use of strategies by males and females is significant. In all the instances, females are the ones who involved many strategies. They involve many strategies because they think males offend them deliberately and

that makes them angry. Males do not want to involve many strategies because they know that if they can complain once, females will quickly understand as they are afraid of them.

6.2.2.3. Talk

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
3.1	Insult	7.1	3.6	3.5
3.2	Phone	6.5	3.0	3.5
3.3	Noise	6.4	2.9	3.5

6.2.2.3.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 3.1 (7.1)

Group 2: 3.2, 3.3 (6.5, 6.4)

Subsituation 3.1 (insult) has most strategies because learners do not want to be insulted especially in a meeting in front of others. They think they are insulted to be disappointed. Subsituations of phone and noise have fewer strategies because it was clear that the complainers mistakenly offended the complainants.

6.2.2.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Male

Group 1: 3.1 (3.6 %)
 Group 2: 3.2, 3.3 (3.0 % and 2.9 %)

Female

Group 1: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 (3.5% in all)

Both males and females become angry when they are insulted.
 They show their anger by complaining for a longer time.

6.2.2.3.3. Strategies between males and females

Subsituation 3.1: 3.6, 3.5 = 0.1 insignificant
 Subsituation 3.2: 3.0, 3.5 = 0.5 significant
 Subsituation 3.3: 2.9, 3.5 = 0.6 significant

In subsituation 3.1 both males and females have almost the same number of strategies, and this makes the difference to be minimal.
 Both males and females do not want to be insulted.

6.2.2.4. Time

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
4.1	Fogetting	6.5	2.6	3.9
4.2	Assignment	6.5	2.9	3.6
4.3	Late arrival	6.2	3.3	2.9

6.2.2.4.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 (6.5, 6.5 and 6.2)

All the subsituations of time have almost the same number of strategies. It is a sign that the complainants want to be puntual. They are taking long to complain because they feel they were not taken seriously.

6.2.2.4.2. Total number of strategies males and females

Male

Group 1: 4.3 (3.3 %)

Group 2: 4.2 and 4.1 (2.9 % and 2.6 %)

Female

Group 1: 4.1 and 4.2 (3.9 % and 3.6 %)

Group 2: 4.3 (2.9 %)

Males are taking long to complain for late arrival because they do not want to wait for a long time. Most females on the other hand are taking long with the subsituation of forgetting. They are worried about males who sometimes forget about their

appointments with females. Other females are complaining about the assignment which was not submitted on time. They know that late submission has negative effect.

6.2.2.4.3. Strategies between males and females in this subsituation

Subsituation 4.1: 2.6, 3.9 = 1.3 significant

Subsituation 4.2: 2.9, 3.6 = 0.7 significant

Subsituation 4.3: 3.3, 2.9 = 0.4 insignificant

Subsituation 4.1 (forgetting) has the most significant difference in the use of strategies by males and females. This shows that females are more sensitive to be kept waiting by males who end up not remembering their appointments. This makes females to take long in their complaints. Again, female learners want to do their school work with distinction, but the fact that their assignment was submitted late makes them angry.

6.2.2.5. Possession

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
5.1	Money	7.4	3.3	4.1
5.2	Clothes	6.5	2.9	3.6
5.3	Class notes	5.9	2.3	3.6

6.2.2.5.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1:	5.1 (7.4)
Group 2:	5.2, 5.3 (6.5, 5.9)

The subsituation of money has the longest strategies than the others. Money is very important to learners and they can't live without it because they use it as their pocket money. They become angry if their pocket money is not returned.

6.2.2.5.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Male

Group 1:	5.1 (3.3 %)
Group 2:	5.2 and 5.3 (2.9 % and 2.3 %)

Female

Group 1:	5.1 (4.1 %)
Group 2:	5.2 and 5.3 (3.6 % in all)

Both males and females complain most for their borrowed money. This is so because both of them need money at school for their

pocket money. However, females seem to be longer than males in this subsituation as females are always talkative.

6.2.2.5.3. Strategies between males and females

Subsituation 5.1: 3.3, 4.1 = 0.8 significant

Subsituation 5.2: 2.9, 3.6 = 0.7 significant

Subsituation 5.3: 2.3, 3.6 = 1.3 significant

All the subsituations above have significant difference in the use of strategies between males and females significant. In all the instances, it shows that females are more talkative than males. They always want their complaints to be heard.

6.3. INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE IN MAJOR SITUATIONS

1. Inconvenience

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1	4	0.6	1	0.1	3	0.4
Strategy 2	30	4.3	15	2.2	15	2.2
Strategy 3	10	1.4	2	0.3	8	1.2
Strategy 4	23	3.3	7	1.0	16	2.3

Strategy 5	33	4.8	18	2.6	15	2.2
Strategy 6	6	0.9	4	0.6	2	0.3
Strategy 7	22	3.2	14	2.0	8	1.2
Strategy 8	17	2.5	8	1.2	9	1.3

2. Space

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1	8	1.2	4	0.6	4	0.6
Strategy 2	16	2.3	4	0.6	12	1.7
Strategy 3	23	3.3	10	1.4	13	1.9
Strategy 4	27	3.9	14	2.0	13	1.9
Strategy 5	42	6.1	21	3.0	21	3.0
Strategy 6	1	0.1	0	0	1	0.1
Strategy 7	15	2.2	7	1.0	8	1.2
Strategy 8	6	0.9	3	0.4	3	0.4

3. Talk

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1	8	1.2	1	0.1	7	1.0

Strategy 2	36	5.2	20	2.9	16	2.3
Strategy 3	15	2.2	6	0.9	9	1.3
Strategy 4	30	4.3	13	1.9	17	2.5
Strategy 5	30	4.3	15	2.2	15	2.2
Strategy 6	2	0.3	0	0	2	0.3
Strategy 7	12	1.7	8	1.2	4	0.6
Strategy 8	5	0.7	3	0.4	2	0.3

4. Time

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1	7	1.0	2	0.3	5	0.7
Strategy 2	24	3.5	12	1.7	12	1.7
Strategy 3	9	1.3	5	0.7	4	0.6
Strategy 4	34	4.9	17	2.5	17	2.5
Strategy 5	20	2.9	8	1.2	12	1.7
Strategy 6	10	1.4	4	0.6	6	0.9
Strategy 7	14	2.0	9	1.3	5	0.7
Strategy 8	15	2.2	4	0.6	11	1.6

5. Possession

	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Strategy 1	9	1.3	1	0.1	8	1.2
Strategy 2	16	2.3	5	0.7	11	1.6
Strategy 3	18	2.6	6	0.9	12	1.7
Strategy 4	38	5.5	19	2.7	19	2.7
Strategy 5	32	4.6	16	2.3	16	2.3
Strategy 6	4	0.6	3	0.4	1	0.1
Strategy 7	13	1.9	7	1.0	6	0.9
Strategy 8	7	1.0	2	0.3	5	0.7

6.3.1. Total number of strategies

1. Inconvenience

Group 1

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 4.8 %

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 4.3 %

Group 2

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 3.3 %

Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 3.2 %

Strategy 8: Explicit blame to a person: 2.5 %

Group 3

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 1.4 %

Group 4

Insignificant

2. Space

Group 1

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 6.1 %

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 3.9 %

Group 2

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 3.3 %

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 2.3 %

Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 2.2 %

Group 3

Strategy 1: Hint: 1.2 %

Group 4

Insignificant

3. Talk

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 5.2 %

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 4.3 %

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 4.3 %

Group 2

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 2.2 %

Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 1.7 %

Strategy 1: Hint: 1.2 %

Group 4

Insignificant

4. Time

Group 1

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 4.9 %

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 3.5 %

Group 2

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 2.9 %

- Strategy 8: Explicit blame to a person: 2.2 %
- Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 2.0 %

Group 3

- Strategy 6: Modified blame: 1.4 %
- Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 1.3 %
- Strategy 1: Hint: 1 %

Group 4

Insignificant

5. Possession

Group 1

- Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 5.5 %
- Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 4.6 %

Group 2

- Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 2.6 %
- Strategy 2: Annoyance: 2.3 %

Group 3

- Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 1.9 %
- Strategy 1: Hint: 1.3 %

Strategy 8: Explicit blame to a person: 1 %

Group 4

Insignificant

From the above groups, all the situations have involved almost all the strategies. But there are strategies which are frequented by learners. In the situation of inconvenience, strategies which have been used the most are direct accusation and annoyance.

Apart from direct accusation, learners who are inconvenienced may use annoyance strategy. This strategy is used to show complainers that complainants are angry. Other strategies were variably used but very minimally. Most learners who are annoyed want to complain directly so that complainers may be aware of their offences.

In the situation of space, direct and indirect accusations were mostly used. Complainants who feel offended by being bumped onto, have their seats taken or jumped in a queue, make sure that their accusations reach the complainers.

Annoyance is a strategy that has been used by most learners in talk situation. Learners feel annoyed by talks which they do not

approve. Apart from annoyance, some learners use direct accusation and indirect accusation. They think it is better to feel offended and make sure that the complainees becomes aware of your dissatisfaction.

In time situation, learners do not want to be direct but they become indirect in their accusations. They think that if they can be direct complainees, may be discouraged. But there are others who become annoyed by the situation of not considering time.

There are learners who tend to be direct when they want back their belongings because they know that if they cannot do that, they will never get back their things. Others do not want to be direct because they think they are hurting complainees.

6.3.2. Strategies between males and females

1. Inconvenience

Males:	Group 1:	5, 2 and 7
	Group 2:	8 and 4
	Others:	Insignificant
Females:	Group 1:	2, 4 and 5

Group 2: 8, 3 and 7
Others: Insignificant

Both males and females mostly use direct accusation and annoyance strategies. They think direct accusation to the complainee may help him or her to feel sorry. But they become annoyed by the fact that they have been inconvenienced. Some females use indirect accusation because they are afraid of males. Some males direct their blames to a behaviour because they do not want to anger females.

2. Space

Males: Group 1: 5 and 4
Group 2: 3 and 7
Others: Insignificant

Females: Group 1: 5
Group 2: 3, 4, 2 and 7
Others: Insignificant

In the situation above, most males and females are direct because they know that if they cannot be direct, their space will not be available. But there are other males who are trying to be soft to

females by being indirect. Other strategies were also used but not significantly.

3. Talk

Males:	Group 1:	2 and 5
	Group 2:	4 and 7
	Others:	Insignificant

Females:	Group 1:	4, 2 and 5
	Group 2:	3 and 1
	Others:	Insignificant

Both males and females are direct to accuse and are also annoyed by the offences of talking. Direct accusation helps complainants to make sure that their dissatisfaction is heard. Annoyance comes spontaneously and if you are angered, it comes. Indirectness show that some males and females avoid conflicts.

4. Time

Males:	Group 1:	4
	Group 2:	2, 7 and 5
	Others:	Insignificant

Females: Group 1: 4
 Group 2: 2, 5, and 8
 Others: Insignificant

In the situation of time, both males and females do not want do be direct but they are indirect. This is so because they always want a relationship without conflicts.

5. Possession

Males: Group 1: 4 and 5
 Group 2: 7
 Others: Insignificant

Females: Group 1: 4 and 5
 Group 2: 2, 3, 1 and 6
 Others: Insignificant

Both males and females are using direct accusation and indirect accusation. Those who are direct want their possession back but those who are indirect do not want to create conflict between each other.

6.4. INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS

			Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
1.	36	5.2	9	1.3	27	3.9
2.	122	17.7	56	8.1	66	9.6
3.	75	10.9	29	4.2	46	6.7
4	152	22.0	70	10.1	82	11.9
5	157	22.7	78	11.3	79	11.4
6	23	3.3	11	1.6	12	1.7
7	76	11.0	45	6.5	31	4.5
8	50	7.2	20	2.9	30	4.3

TOLTAL: 691

6.4.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 22.7 %

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 22 %

Group 2

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 17.7 %

Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 11 %

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 10.9 %

Strategy 8: Explicit blame to a person: 7.2 %

Group 4

Strategy 1: Hint: 5.2 %

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 3.3 %

From the above groups, direct and indirect accusations are in group 1. For a complaint to be clear, it must be voiced directly. It is always used by complainants who want their complain to be heard. The indirect accusation strategy used indicates that there are complainants who are afraid of the complainees. They think that if they can be direct, it can result into more differences.

Annoyance strategy was also used significantly (17.7 %). It shows that most of the situations in Tshivenda are annoying. Most situations make complainants to become angry.

In group 3, explicit blame to a behaviour (11 %) shows that it was used the most than ill consequences and explicit blame to a person strategies (10.9 % and 7.2 % respectively). Explicit blame to a behaviour was used to avoid direct confrontation with the complainees. However, ill consequences strategy above shows that

there are lot of bad results which were caused by the complainees.
Explicit blame to a person strategy was used (7.2 %) by
complainants who were not afraid of the complainees.

Very few complainants did not want to give a hint (5.2 %). Most of
them opted for direct and indirect accusations. Again,
complainants did not want to come with a blame having an
alternative of the action.

6.4.2. Strategies between males and females

Males: Group 1: Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 11.3 %
Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 10.1 %
Strategy 2: Annoyance: 8.1 %

Group 2: Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 6.5 %
Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 4.2 %

Others: Insignificant

Females: Group 1: Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 11.9 %
Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 11.4 %
Strategy 2: Annoyance: 9.6 %
Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 6.7 %

Group 2: Strategy 7: Explicit blame to a behaviour: 4.5 %

Strategy 8: Explicit blame to a person: 4.3 %

Others: Insignificant.

Most females want to be more indirect to their complaint strategy than males (females 11.9 % and males 10.1 %). Females know that indirectness is not too provoking than directness. However, some females are more direct than males (females 11.4 % and males 11.3 %). This is used by a group of females who are not threatened by males. They are females who stand for their own rights.

Females are more annoyed than males (females 9.6 % and males 8.1 %). Females become angry easily by the offence committed by males. But males commit offences that cause more consequences to females. Males want to hurt females. This is evident by females showing ill consequence strategy of 6.7 % while males' is only 4.2 %.

Males want to put blame on behaviour (6.5 %) than females (4.5 %). Males do not want to put blame of an offence to a person. This is evident by 4.3 % of females while of males is insignificant.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

In chapter 5, it is evident that the situation of possession involves a lot of number of strategies than 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 the other situations.

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 not punctual. Both of them also rely on the strategy of 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 the situations, this strategy is important to clear the circumstances that led to an offence. But females always want to make sure that for every offence they commit, they ask for a direct apology.

Male and female learners use explicit explanation (23.5 %) in all the situations in Tshivenda. They do not want to apologize directly. They have a tendency of coming with long explanations. Some of the learners who do not use long explanation use a request for forgiveness (22.6 %). They are learners who quickly accept that

they did something wrong and they must seek an apology for such an offence.

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 Tshivenda 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 the blame and expressing concern for hearer is minimal in Tshivenda.

Males are more inclined to give explanations while females ask more for 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 are also indirect in their 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 a 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 an 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 a behaviour than females but females use more strategy of explicit blame to a person than males. Females are using this strategy more because most of the actions which are done by males towards females are aimed at offending them.

BIBLIOGRAGHY

- Blum-Kulka, S et al. **Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies**, Ablex Publishing Corporation, New Jersey.
- Holmes, J. 1990. **Apologies in New Zealand English**, Cambridge University Press.
- Jaworski, A. 1994. **Apologies and non-apologies: Negotiation in speech act realization**, Walter de Gruyter.
- Scher, S.J. and Darley, J.M. 1997. **How effective are the things people say to apologize? Effects of the Realization of the Apology Speech Act**, Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, vol. No. 1, Plenum Publishing Corporation.
- Thomas, J. 1995. **Meaning in interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics**, Longman, New Jersey.
- Trosborg, A. 1995. **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies**, Mouton de Gruyter, New York.
- Yule, G. **Pragmatics**. Oxford University.