

THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY IN SETSWANA EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

by

BRIDGET KESAOBACA MANGWEGAPE



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

STUDY LEADER: DR M DLALI

APRIL 2005

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.

BK MANGWEGAPE

DATE

ABSTRACT

An apology in Setswana 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 chioce 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 immidiately.

It is not all the males who do not want to apologize directly to females, but there are some 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 to Setswana 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 manifested.

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 a few strategies.

OPSOMMING

'n Apologie in Setswana word gedoen wanneer 'n individu 'n sosiale norm oortree het, of enige vorm van 'n klagte wil herstel. Wanneer dit gegee word, dien 'n apologie as remediële werk, ontwerp om enige sosiale ontwrigting wat veroorsaak is, uitstryk. Somtyds kan 'n persoon wat veronderstel is om 'n apologie aan te teken, redes vind om die graad van die oortreding te minimaliseer. Indien die oortreding baie groot is, kan 'n verbale apologie onvoldoende wees om die beskadigde verhouding te herstel.

Manlike en vroulike Setswana-sprekende leerders pleeg talle oortredings teenoor mekaar by die skool, en hulle is verplig om apologie aan te teken teenoor mekaar. In die proses van apologie aanteken, word hulle gekonfronteer met 'n wye verskeidenheid strategieë waaruit hulle kan kies. In die meeste gevalle, het leerders die neiging om 'n verduideliking te gee vir hulle oortredings. Hulle kies nie altyd 'n direkte apologie nie. In die aanvaarding van hulle oortredings, kies hulle langer strategieë om apologie aan te teken. Manlike persone blyk óf te trots óf te skaam te wees om apologie aan te teken teenoor vroulike leerders. Vroulike leerders, hierteenoor, wil nie langer strategieë aanwend om apologie aan te teken nie, en hulle vra onmiddellik vir vergiffenis

Dit is egter nie alle manlike leerders wat nie direk apologie aanteken teenoor vroulike leerders nie – sommige manlike leerders teken wel direk apologie aan, maar die gebruik daarvan is nie so gewild nie. Hulle is die manlike leerders wat die vroulike leerders as hulle gelykes sien en 'n goeie verhouding met hulle wil handhaaf. 'n Klein getal vroulike leerders gebruik langer strategieë om verskoning aan te teken en hulle gebruik nie direkte strategieë nie. Daar is ander strategieë wat ook bruikbaar is vir Setswana-sprekende manlike en vroulike leerders, maar die gebruik daarvan is nie so populêr nie. Strategieë soos die aanvaarding van blaam, en uitdrukking van self-tekort, word die minste gemanifesteer.

'n Apologie word gewoonlik beïnvloed deur die wyse waarop 'n klaer sy/haar ontevredenheid wys. Manlike en vroulike leerders verskil ook t.o.v. die wyse waarop hulle kla – hulle gebruik klagte-strategieë verskillend. Sowel manlike as vroulike leerders gebruik direkte en indirekte aantygings uitgebreid. Vroulike leerders neem egter langer met hulle klagtes as manlike leerders. Vroulike leerders wys hulle ontevredenheid deur meer klagte strategieë te gebruik, terwyl manlike leerders nie lank neem om te kla nie – hulle gebruik slegs 'n paar strategieë.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr M.Dlali for his consistent support in getting this work completed and mostly for believing in me. Thank you for the model you are in my life.

To Patience Mbanjana, the tables would have been a nightmare, without you and I thank you for all the time, efforts and dedication you have put in my work.

My mother- in – law, Oriel Mangwegape, for being a great support and counsellor, to me and I can never pay you enough for your input in my life.

To my father, Kgari Sehularo, and my brother and sisters, I am deeply indebted for the unselfish way in which they made it possible for me to pursue my studies and for the inspiration I got from them.

My greatest and warmest gratitude goes to my husband, Mogotsi, and my children Tebogo and Gomolemo, who persevered all those many hours and days of neglect while studying. You are a source of inspiration and motivation in my life.

Lastly, I would like to thank my God the Almighty for the strength and endurance for keeping me focused and to emerge victorious. Thus I can confidently put it that “With God everything is possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
SUMMARY	ii
OPSOMMING	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 AIM OF THE RESEARCH.....	1
1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	1
CHAPTER 2: THE SPEECH ACT AND POLITENESS THEORY	
2.1 SPEECH ACTS	3
2.1.1 Thomas (1995).....	3
2.2 APOLOGIES IN NEW ZEALAND ENGLISH.....	5
2.2.1 Janet Holmes.....	5
2.3 DEFINING AN APOLOGY	6
2.4 APOLOGIES AND FACE	8
2.5 METHODOLOGY AND THE CORPUS	11
2.6 APOLOGY STRATEGIES	12
2.7 SYNTACTIC-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF APOLOGIES	15
2.7.1 Variant of apologize or apology/ies.....	16
2.7.2 I'm afraid as an apology	16
2.7.3 Variant of sorry	17
2.7.4 Other patterns.....	18
2.8 DISTRIBUTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES	19
2.9 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OFFENSE.....	19
2.9.1 Types of offense	19
2.10 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS.....	23
2.10.1 Social distance	23
2.10.2 Power	24
2.11 OVERALL WEIGHTINESS OF THE OFFENSE.....	24
2.11.1 Adam Jaworski	26
2.11.2 Variation and discreteness in apologies.....	26
2.11.3 Apologies in politeness theory.....	27
2.11.4 Some Polish data: Unprototypical apologies	29
CHAPTER 3: THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY	
3.1 SCHER AND DARLEY (1997).....	33
3.2 HOLMES (1990)	36

3.2.1	The function of apology.....	37
3.2.2	Defining and apology	38
3.2.3	Apologies and face	40
3.2.4	Methology and the corpus	43
3.2.5	Apology strategies	44
3.2.6	Syntactic-semantic features of apologies.....	47
3.2.7	Distribution of apology strategies.....	50
3.2.8	Characteristics of the offense.....	51
3.2.9	Relationship between the participants	55
3.2.10	Overall weightiness of the offense	56
3.3	JAWORSKI (1994)	57
3.4	THOMAS	64
CHAPTER 4: APOLOGY STRATEGIES		66
4.1	TROSBORG	66
4.2	FRASER (1981).....	81
CHAPTER 5: APOLOGIES IN SETSWANA.....		84
5.1	AIM.....	84
5.2	APOLOGY SITUATIONS.....	84
5.3	COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	101
5.4	ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGIES	101
5.4.1	Apology situations and apology strategies	101
5.4.2	Individual difference in major situations.....	110
5.4.3	Strategies between males and females.....	115
5.4.4	Strategies in the major situations.....	118
5.4.5	Individual strategies.....	123
CHAPTER 6: THE EXPRESSION OF THE OFFENCE IN SETSWANA		
6.1	TASK 1: THE COMPLAINT STRATEGIES.....	129
6.2	TASK 2: TOTAL NUMBER OF STRATEGIES	130
6.2.1	The major situations	131
6.2.2	The subsituations	132
6.3	TASK 3: STRATEGIES IN MAJOR SITUATIONS	138
6.3.1	Total number of strategies	140
6.3.2	Strategies between males and females.....	143
6.4	TASK 4: INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES	146
6.4.1	Total number of strategies	146
6.4.2	Strategies between males and females.....	147

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 an offer of repair.

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

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 deals with the aims and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 of this study deals with the speech acts and politeness as postulated by 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 act of order or command, request and warning were dealt with extensively. George Yule concentrated on three acts namely: 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 explain how the Cross – Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) was useful to the expansion of the speech act of apology.

Holmes also explain the speech act of apology as function – centred. He argues that an 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 also in this chapter where Jaworski talks about variation in the degree of directedness 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 these are some Setswana examples based on such strategies.

Chapter 5 deals with apology situations in Setswana 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: Possession, Talking, Space, Service, and Time.

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

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

CHAPTER 2

THE SPEECH ACT AND POLITENESS THEORY

2.1 SPEECH ACTS

2.1.1. Thomas (1995)

Austin (1962) brought into existence interest in pragmatics. Thomas (1995) 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 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.

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 and his group were trying to react against Oxford based philosophers like G.E. Moore and Bertrand Russell and others who believed that such a 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 language such as perceived imperfections and illogicalities and create an ideal language.

It is because of the above ideas that Austin (1962) 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 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 kind 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 subjects 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 the subject and verb.

2.2 APOLOGIES IN NEWZEALAND ENGLISH

2.2.1 Janet Holmes

The function of apologies is discussed within the context of a model of interaction with two intersecting dimensions.

-Affective and referential meaning.

An account is provided of the kinds of social relationships and the range of offences, which elicited apologies in this New Zealand corpus.

It is suggested that Wolfson's "bulge" theory more adequately account for a number of patterns in the data. In particular, the functions of apologies between friends may be more complex than a simple linear model suggests.

An apology is primarily and essentially a social act.

It is aimed at maintaining good relations between participants. To apologize is the act politely; both in the vernacular sense and in the more technical sense of paying attention to the addressee's face needs. (Brown & Levinson 1978,1987).

On most occasions, apologizing for an offence is very evidently in the speaker's interests and thus, at least in the longer term, is undeniably relational behaviour and an efficient use of communicative time.

Apologies provide good evidence that an adequate account of communication will require reference to a basic social or Principle (Leech 1983), as well as the more information – oriented maxims derived from Grice's Cooperative Principle, which as Brown and Levinson pointed out, establish a "socially neutral presumptive framework for communication" (1987).

To provide a satisfactory analysis one needs a model, which takes account of the different emphasis that participants put on referential versus social meaning in different types of interaction.

It seems to me that a graphed square or two-dimensional plot provides a model, which adequately represents the interdependence of these two important dimensions in any interaction: social or affective meaning on the one hand, and referential or propositional information on the other.

The area within the four quadrants of the square represents interactional space. Any utterance, expression, or interaction may be located in that space according to the extent to which it expresses both referential content, on a scale from 0-100 percent, and affective meaning on a scale running from high solidarity at one end to maximum social distance or deference at the other.

An apology may be located low on the referential axis but at the solidarity or positive politeness end of the affective dimension, reflecting the fact that such speech acts may convey little referential content but express a message high in affect or social meaning.

The form of the model has quite specific implications then. Although the referential axis represents a scale extending from minimum referential or propositional content at its base to maximum referential content at the top, the affective axis does not represent a scale of minimum to maximum affect. The affective axis thus combines Brown and Levinson's (1987) concepts of power (P) and distance (D) or Brown and Gilman's (1960) concepts of power and solidarity.

2.3 DEFINING AN APOLOGY

The term apology has generally been used to describe what Goffman referred to as a remedy (1971), the one essential element in a remedial interchange. This term nicely highlights the central function of apologies – provide a remedy for an offence and restore social equilibrium or harmony (cf. Edmondson 1981:280; Leech 1983:125). Hence, a broad definition of an apology as it is used in this article takes function as the crucial criterion:

An apology is a speech act addressed to B's face-needs and intended to remedy an offence for which A takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B (where A is the apologizer, and B is the person offended).

It is difficult to further specify the content of an apology in any helpful manner, since this function may be achieved in an infinite number of ways depending on the offence addressed.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983:20) suggested that it is possible to specify, “all the potential types of sentences or utterances that together create a set of parameters” for a particular speech act. Further, they proposed that “our goal be the description of the maximal potential set of semantic formulas for each act, [and a] speech act set [would thus] consists of the major semantic formulas, any one of which could suffice as an ‘emic’ minimal element to represent the particular speech act” (1983:20-21). Olshtain and Cohen noted that both direct and indirect speech acts may function as apologies. The following list might serve an apology in an appropriate context and with appropriate intonation and paralinguistic support:

That was stupid of me.

I forgot my key.

My fault.

Bus was late.

I have just done it again.

The list is potentially infinite. More promising is the approach of advocated by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), followed by Fraser (1981), namely, to specify not the semantic formulae but the felicity conditions under which a particular utterance would count as an instance of a particular speech act. Because there is no independent way of establishing felicity, the results are circular.

For the purposes of this study, then, the function-centered definition provided earlier has been used to identify those utterances that qualify as apologies. The elements of the definition imply the following minimal felicity conditions:

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

In these circumstances it is likely that what A says will be interpreted as an apology. But it is not possible to predict exactly what form A’s utterances will take. On the other hand, it is also possible that A might choose not to apologize and instead might produce one of the following utterances:

That’s the way the cookie crumbles.

Next please.

Time for lunch.

Though it is not possible to specify a complete speech act set for apology, it is both possible and useful for descriptive purposes to categorize the range of strategies which were used in a corpus of apologies collected from native speakers of English, as I illustrated in the following. The range includes any speech act which satisfies the definition given earlier and may further seem very broad.

An apology will typically address an offense performed by the apologizer, as in the following example:

[A bumps into B, who is standing still.]

A: Sorry.

B: That's OK.

It is sometimes the case however that 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.

[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.

Thus, the definition refers to the person who takes responsibility for the offence rather than the offender.

2.4 APOLOGIES AND FACE

Apologies, like compliments, are primarily aimed at maintaining or supporting the addressee's and, in some cases, the apologizer's "face" (Goffman 1967). Apologies are generally aimed at face redress associated with FTAs (face-threatening acts) or offences which have damaged the addressee's face in some respect and can therefore be regarded as negative politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson 1978:65,192).

It is worth noting, however that although the speech act serving most directly as the apology functions as a negative politeness strategy, accompanying elements may address transgressions to positive or negative face wants.

Apologies redress negative face when the offence has ignored B's "want that his [sic] actions be unimpeded by others" (Brown & Levinson 1978:67). The following examples illustrate apologies intended to remedy a threat to B's negative face.

Apologies address positive face wants when the transgression offends B's need that his or her "wants be desirable to at least some others" (Brown & Levinson 1978:67). This includes the individual's need that others recognize her or his achievements and respect them. Hence the second example redresses damage to the victim's positive face.

[Introducing B to C, A has used Mr. Instead of Dr. for B.]

A: Oh I am sorry - its Dr. Hall not Mr. Forgive me.

[B smiles in an embarrassed way and addressee C.]

B: Nice to meet you.

In addition to addressing the victim's face loss, apologies may simultaneously address the loss of positive face incurred by the speaker. Where a remedial exchange includes an explanation, the speaker's positive face needs are generally taken into account.

[A is phoning B to warn her of potential inconvenience.]

A: I'm sorry but I'm going to be a bit 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 are here by six, COs I'm going then.

Though FTAs are generally described and analyzed as unintentional transgressions or at least as transgressions that cannot easily be avoided, it is worth noting that apologies may be in some circumstances be associated with deliberate offences. Paddy Austin (1988) introduced the term face attack act (FAA) for that subcategory of FTAs that involve intentional attacks on the addressee's face, such as insults and accusations. An apology accompanying an FAA will often be performed by someone other than the face attacker, who nevertheless takes responsibility for the offense caused.

[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 all right Brigid, she doesn't mean it. She's just a bit scratchy today.

B: [No visible response. Carries on playing.]

It is also possible, however, for the face attacker to apologize for the FAA. This involves very explicitly what Goffman described as "a splitting of the self into a blameworthy part and a part that stands back and sympathizes with the blame-giving" (Goffman 1971:113), that is, a simultaneous recognition of the offense and an attempt to dissociate oneself from the offending action. The following example illustrates this.

[A, renegeing on an earlier agreement, tells B's family that she cannot now put them up.

B can reasonably feel insulted and discontinued. Apology comes some time later.]

A: Look I'm terribly 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 that time.

It should be noted that, like many utterances, those serving as apologies can express other functions too. Utterances that express regret for an offence may also serve as an admission, with the addressee learning of the offense through the utterance that serves as an apology. Thus one utterance simultaneously performs the function of conveying bad news. (Cf. Brown & Levinson 1978:73) and apologizing for it:

[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!

Utterances like these illustrate the complexity of interaction, since they simultaneously express a FTA while administering face redress as a politeness strategy mitigating the effect of the FTA. An utterance, which serves as an apology simultaneously provides an explanation or excuse for the offence, as, illustrated in the example below. The categorization as apology often depends on appropriate "apologetic" intonation in these cases.

[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.

At more general level, Norrick (1978) pointed out that, in addition to convincing the victim of the speaker's regret, apologies often serve such social functions as "to evince good manners, to assuage the addressee's wrath, or simply to get off the hook and be one one's way" (1978: 281).

2.5 METHODOLOGY AND THE CORPUS

Most of the research on apologies has used elicited instances, usually based on suggested role-plays of some kind, written or spoken (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984; Cohen & Olshtain 1981; Olshtain 1983; Olshtain & Cohen 1983; Trosborg 1987).

Cohen and Olshtain (1981:117; Olshtain & Cohen 1983:24), responding to Manes and Wolfson's (1981) advocacy of an ethnographic approach, commented on the problems in collecting spontaneous speech in natural settings. They pointed out that it is time consuming and there is no guarantee that one will collect sufficient examples of the relevant speech act. In subsequent discussion, it emerged that the respondents had felt "that it was only polite to give a brief apology and then wait for the other person to respond" (Olshtain & Cohen 1983:32). In genuine interaction, the full remedial exchange may be distributed between several turns, as the following example illustrates:

[A and B are carrying coffee and cakes back to their seats in a café. A man bumps into A, who knocks B, who spills coffee on her blouse.]

A: Oh I'm sorry.

B: That's OK –it wasn't your fault.

A: Look your blouse is all splashed with coffee. I'm so sorry.

B: It's OK it'll wash.

A: I hope so. What a boor! Shall I get you a serviette?

B: No no don't worry.

So, although elicited data have the undoubted attraction of obtaining the responses of a controlled group of respondents to the "same"situations, the responses can only provide information on the

strategies the informants know. We cannot be sure what they would actually say in a real encounter nor of how they would respond in the much wider range of situations requiring apologies, which they face outside the laboratory.

The ideal methodology would involve “a two-pronged approach” (Wolfson 1986:697) combining aspects of both ethnographic observation and elicited responses, by exploring the spontaneous utterances of a range of respondents in the same natural context.

As a preliminary step, however, it seems sensible 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 offenses which are fruitful in eliciting them,

And the kinds of social factors that appear to be related to different types of apology.

This corpus used in this analysis consists of 183 remedial interchanges, that is, apologies and apology responses, collected with the assistance of New Zealand students who selected the task as one option in a list of possible course assignment. The data collection method was the ethnographic method deriving from anthropology, which has been advocated.

2.6 APOLOGY STRATEGIES

In developing a satisfactory categorization system for the naturally occurring data in the New Zealand corpus, I have built on the work of these earlier researches and have followed Olshtain and Cohen’s (1983) framework, in particular, very closely.

Four broad basic categories were used, with a number of subcategories where necessary.

- A. An explicit expression of apology
 - Offer apology/IIFD (i.e. illocutionary force indicating device), “I apologize”
Express regret, e.g., “I’m afraid”; “I sorry”
 - Request forgiveness, e.g.. “excuse me”; “forgive me”
- B. An explanation or account, an excuse or justification
 - E.g., “I wasn’t expecting it to be you”; “ we’re both new to this”

- C. An acknowledgement of responsibility
 - Accept blame, e.g., “It was my fault”
 - Express self-deficiency. “I was confused”; “I wasn’t thinking”; “didn’t see you”.
 - Recognize H as entitled to an apology, e.g., “you’re right”; you deserve an apology”
 - Express lack of intent, e.g., “I didn’t mean to”
 - Offer repair/redress, e.g., “we’ll replace it for you”; “I’ll bring you another
- B. A promise of forbearance
 - E.g., “I promise it won’t happen again

It is important to note, however, that the strategies are not mutually exclusive; they may co-occur. The following example illustrates this well since it involves all four basic strategy types.

[A and B are flatmates. B has asked A to put out her washing and he has forgotten.]

B: Thanks for putting my washing out Gerry.

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

Any one strategy alone may count as an apology in the appropriate context.

Instances in category A are directed speech acts functioning as apologies, whereas, when they occur alone without an explicit apology form, those in categories B, C, and D are directed apologies, since their surface function appears to be to make an excuse or to take responsibility for some undesirable action or to make a promise.

There has been some debate over whether less direct speech acts are more polite than more direct ones. Leech (1983:127) claimed this quite explicitly in his discussion of impositives or directives, and it is also explicit in Brown and Levinson’s (1978) organization of politeness strategies from least to most direct.

- (a) Politer apologies normally include an explicit apology at some point, together with another strategy. The categories are also arranged in increasing order in terms of how heavily ranked they are as politeness strategies.
- (b) Apologies in category A are the simplest and least heavily weighted strategies. Those in category C and D are more complex and heavily weighted apology strategies. (Cf. Leech 1983).

It is quite clear that an explicit expression of apology, and in particular, the strategy of expressing regret is the most frequent apology strategy selected.

This strategy accounts for almost exactly half of all the strategies in the data. The only other strategy that is used extensively is strategy B-providing an account or excuse. The remedial interchanges in the corpus involved some combination of strategies. In fact, only strategies A and B occur alone, and although 43 percent of the remedial interchanges use strategy A on its own, strategy B occurs alone only four times. An example is given in the following dialogue:

[B answers the phone and A mistakes her voice for her mother's.]

A: Hello. Margot?

B: No it's her daughter speaking.

A: Oh gosh you sound like your mother-is that the baby of the family?

B: Yes that's right.

Yet it is important to consider how strategies combine as well as which strategies native speakers use.

- a. In examining the possible combinations of strategies, there are two factors, which deserve attention. First, the numbers of strategies that co-occur are worth comment; and second, it is interesting to note the co-occurrence patterns that characterize the data.

Seventeen different combinations of apology strategy occur in the data but they are far from being evenly distributed. The second most frequent pattern is one involving a combination of an explicit apology with an account or explanation (AB or BA); these account for 28.4 percent of the data.

- b. It is interesting to note that a remedial interchange may involve more than one occurrence of the same apology strategy. The following provides an example with two instances of the speaker expressing self-deficiency and one accepting the blame, all of which are C strategies (acknowledging responsibility).

[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 what was field independence.

Another interesting point is the relative flexibility of position that different strategies demonstrate. Strategy A (an explicit apology) and strategy C (an acknowledgment of responsibility) may occur in any position, whereas B does not occur in place 4, and D never occurs in initial position or in place 3. I am not suggesting, of course, that these patterns should be regarded as absolute co-occurrence restrictions. It seems perfectly feasible that strategy D would occur in place 3, for instance.

Finally, it is worth noting that in the small number (i.e., (10) of written apologies in the corpus, there was always an explicit apology strategy at some point. Indeed, all but 5 percent of the apologies in the corpus included an explicit apology are conversations between intimates, where the intonation very clearly signals the function of the utterance as an apology. An example is given in the following encounter.

[B, one of A's three daughters, answers the phone.]

A: Hello.

B: Hi Mum.

A: Oh which one's that?

B: Jeannie.

A: Oh so it is-I was just waiting to hear from Em so I wasn't expecting you.

B: Huh!

In summary, then, the analysis demonstrates that an explicit apology without any elaboration or further supporting comment is the most widely occurring strategy in this corpus of naturally occurring apology exchanges. It is also evident that New Zealanders frequently combine an explicit apology with other strategies and may even reduplicate their chosen strategy on occasion.

2.7 SYNTACTIC-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF APOLOGIES

Where an apology is explicitly expressed, it is possible to classify its form. Though Goffman commented, "whether one runs over another's sentence, time, dog, or body, one is more or less reduced to saying some variant of 'I'm sorry'" (1971:117), in fact the range of possible formulae is little wider than that.

2.7.1 Variant of APOLOGIZE or APOLOGY/IES

Variants using the explicit performative formula are, as Owen noted, relatively rare. She found only two instances in her spoken corpus and two instances in written form, all of which she characterized as occurring in “a kind of monologue” (1983:65), such as lecture or a formal notice, reflecting the fact that the relationship between the participants is rather distant and formal.

In the New Zealand data too, these forms occur in more formal interactions or in writing. In speech they tended to characterize interactions where the participants did not know each other. This is provided in the following example:

[Waitress to customer in restaurant.]

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

Half of the total instances of written apologies in the corpus used these explicit formal apology forms; in such cases they tended to occur not only in formal notices, but also between those who knew each other but who were not close friends.

[Letter from one colleague to another.]

Dear Dave,

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

[Letter from writer to editor whom he knows.]

Dear Jean,

My apologies for the slightly belated arrival of this paper.

These forms are thus relatively infrequent and restricted to more formal or written interactions.

2.7.2 I'M AFRAID as an apology

Owen (1983:88-92) provided an interesting account of how I'm afraid might serve to express an apology. She argued that when followed by a full complement sentence, the primary function of the utterance is to inform (as in (9)), though the I'm afraid clearly expresses regret and thus “some remedial effect may be achieved” (1983:89). In other cases (when followed by a sentence pro-form

such as so or not), she suggested the primary function is remedial, since the pro-form presupposes the addressee's knowledge of the offense. There were no examples in the original corpus, but the following is an attested additional example.

[A walk 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.

Owen did not say how many instances there were in her corpus, though she cited seven examples in the discussion. In the New Zealand corpus, there were only five examples of I'm afraid functioning as an apology, four in speech and one in writing, that is 2.9 percent of the syntactic patterns used to express the apology explicitly. Interestingly, this form appears to be appropriate in response to weightier offenses, though the reason for the weight, that is, P, D, or R (Brown & Levinson 1978:79), differed in each case. One stance involved a minor infraction between strangers on the telephone (i.e., where D was high), another involved participants who differed in status (i.e., high P), and another (see occurred between very close friends but involved a serious offense (i.e., high R).

[A and B are close friends. A has given B a serious fright by forgetting to inform her

Of a change of arrangements.]

A: I want to make an abject apology

B: You need to.

A: I really am sorry. I'm afraid I forgot the arrangements had been changed.

A serious offense between intimates will thus result in an overall offense weighting that involves adopting a higher ranked remedial or negative politeness strategy. In fact, the apologizer employs all three of the highest ranked explicit apology strategies in combination. On a number of grounds, then, it seems that I'm afraid tends to co-occur with relatively heavily weighted offenses.

2.7.3 Variant of SORRY

Owen (1983:66) provided 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:

I'm	(that) S
([Intensifier]) sorry	to VP
I am	if S
	About that

She commented that, “out of 24 possible combinations derivable from [the rule], only twelve occur, and of these only several occur more than once... suggesting that certain forms-roughly a third of the possibilities-predominate strongly” (Owen 1983: 67). There is a clear difference between speech and writing, however, reflecting the fact that the written examples in the corpus are generally more formal and addressed to a less familiar audience. Only one instance in the written data uses the form *sorry*, and this one example occurs on a postcard between two colleagues who are on very good terms.

[Postcard from A to B, a colleague and friend.]

Dear Larry,

Sorry to put you in the embarrassing position of having to ask if you owe me money.

You do not.

2.7.4 Other patterns

Only four other patterns were identified in the New Zealand data as ways of expressing an apology explicitly: *excuse me / us* (9 instances); *pardon (me) / I beg your pardon* (4); *forgive me* (3); *we regret that S* (1). The latter two occur only as written forms, and apart from one instances of *excuse us* observed on a notice to customers, the first two patterns occur as speech forms. The speech forms tend to be apologies for socially frowned on behavior, such as burping, or for actions, which inconvenience addressees, such as learning in an error, which inconveniences B.

[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.

The formulae involved draw on a very narrow range of lexical items, less than 10 in total: *apology*, *apologize*, *be afraid that*, *excuse*, *forgive*, *sorry*, *regret*; and 79 percent of all the apologies collected included some form of *sorry*.

2.8 DISTRIBUTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES

Before examining some of the sociolinguistic features of the context in which different apology strategies occurred, it is worth considering what one might expect to find in the way of correlation between linguistic and nonlinguistic factors. Apologies function as remedies for offenses and are aimed at restoring social harmony between people.

In this article, I offer a preliminary and relatively informal exploration of two ways in which it seems that apologizers modify the politeness of an apology in relation to weight of the offense:

They may vary the number of strategies used in any interaction

They may vary the kinds of strategies used.

2.9 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OFFENSE

In this section, I have also considered the crucial factor of the relative seriousness or ranking of different offenses in the contexts in which they occurred.

2.9.1 Types of offense

As far as I am aware, there is no formal existing classification of types of offense, though Goffman (1971) provided a very useful discussion of relevant factors, and Owen (1983) commented at various points on the effect of different types of offense on the particular form selected in her data. Building on their observations, the following categories proved workable and appeared to account for all of the instances in the New Zealand data: inconvenience, space, talk, time, possessions, and social gaffe.

Inconvenience: A large proportion of the apologies in the corpus (39.3%) can be described as relating to actions that have inconvenienced the addressee in some way. Where the apologizer could not provide the correct change or required information, for instance, apologies were classified in this category. It also includes examples where the apologizer had not performed adequately in a particular context or had provided inadequate service and so had inconvenienced the addressee. The following two examples illustrate this category:

[B has requested that a docket be stapled to a bankcard 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.

[A has rung B, a friend, and waited some time for her to answer.]

A: You're puffed.

B: I've just run upstairs. I was down in the office.

A: Oh sorry. I should have rung your office.

Space: Goffman (1971) provide a detailed discussion of the range of infringements on another's personal space, which may occasion apologies. Examples include walking too close to or in front of another person, bumping into them, and taking their seat or desk space. These offenses sometimes threaten the addressee's negative face by impeding her freedom of movement, though more often they are in fact very slightly inconveniences and the apology addresses the "virtual offense" (Goffman (1971:138-39). Though, the following is one of the rare examples where the seriousness of the offense warranted an explanation as well.

[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 watch where you're going.

The correlation of a space offense with a simple explicit apology strategy almost always a form of sorry – is nevertheless one of the clearest patterns in the data.

Talk: There are 30 examples (16.4%) where the offense involves some kind of instruction on the addressee's talk or talking turn or another infringement of the rules for polite talk. The most frequent examples relate to an interruption, but others include verbal insults, the introduction of an inappropriate topic, a slip of the tongue, not hearing someone, and offenses such as talking too loud or too long. An interesting example is provided in the following encounter.

[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.

These offenses can often be perceived either as encroachments on the addressee's positive or negative face. An interruption, for instance, can be interpreted as implying that what the addressee is saying is not worth attention and therefore as a threat to positive face; alternatively, it can be seen as impeding the addressee's freedom to talk and thus as a threat to negative face. When an account or excuse forms part of the apology, it will often address the most obvious interpretation in the particular context, repeated here for convenience, where A adopts the strategy of self denigration, where the explanation focuses on the negative face threat:

[A is a waitress who has served B the wrong drink.]

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

[Woman to fellow student in tutorial discussion.]

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

Occasionally, a component of the remedial exchange will overtly redress the speaker's loss of positive face, as in the following slip of the tongue.

[A, radio announcer, has mispronounced B's name.]

A: I'm sorry. That's a difficult name though you must admit.

Time: There are a number of offenses (14.2%) which involve one person wasting another person's time or in some way not taking appropriate account of the value of another's time. Where the apologizer has kept the addressee waiting, or has forgotten or arrived late for an appointment, the infringement involves an imposition on the addressee's time. Negative face is threatened by impeding the addressee's freedom of action in most cases. The addressee has remained in one place for the apologizer's benefit. The following example is a clear instance of this type of offense.

[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 sorry. I thought you meant tonight. Oh boy I hope You're not too cheesed off with me.

Here, self-denigration is the form the explanation takes. A intensifies the threat to her own positive face with the self-directed insult, "what a nong," thus strengthening the effect of the apology.

It is interesting to note that the most common pattern of time apologies involves a combination of an A and B strategy. Half of these apologies combined an explicit apology – usually a form of sorry – with an explanation or account, a much higher proportion than was typical of the whole sample (where only 34.1 % in the total sample) involved such combinations).

Possessions: A fifth category of offense involved some damage or loss to the addressee's possessions, including money. Offenses in this category involve damage to or removal of something, which belonged to the addressee, or they directly cost the addressee money. Offenses such as bumping into someone's car, spilling something on their clothes, damaging their pen, breaking their washing machine, failing to pay a bill on time, or losing a book all come into this category. These are generally offenses to positive face since they imply that the apologizer does not value the thing the addressee values. Often in such cases one element in the remedial exchange directly addressed this Implication.

[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.

Social gaffe: There were a small number of apologies (5) which occurred when the apologizer broke a social etiquette rule relating to socially frowned on behavior, such as burping or speaking while eating. An example is given in the following sentence:

[A, talking to B on the phone, has just had a coughing bout.]

A: Excuse me coughing.

These apologies can be interpreted as hearer – oriented negative politeness strategies since they acknowledge an unwelcome intrusion on the hearer. All the examples in the data elicited a simple explicit apology that took one of the following forms: excuse me; pardon me, I'm sorry.

2.9.2 Seriousness of offense.

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

- (1) Light offense: for example, bumped into someone; forgot to return a book to the Library on time.
- (2) Medium offense: for example, kept someone waiting and made them late for a film; Broke someone's stapler.
- (3) Heavy offense: for example, knocked someone over and hurt them; made someone Miss an important engagement.

Examining the apology strategies used with offenses of different seriousness, it is clear that the great majority of:

- a. Light offenses elicited a simple explicit apology.
- b. Medium offenses, on the other hand, were much more likely than light offenses to involve an explanation as well as an explicit apology. And medium offenses were also more likely to be accompanied by an acknowledgement of responsibility than was typical of the data as a whole (62%vs. 46%).
- c. The heavy offenses were much less likely than others to be responded to with just a simple apology.

2.10 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS

2.10.1 Social distance

The corpus includes apologies between participants who differ widely in terms of how well they know each other or the degree of social distance that characterizes the relationship. Three categories were used to classify the data:

- a. I – very close friends or intimates, for example, spouses, partners, family members; F -

- b. Friends or colleagues; S – distant acquaintances or strangers.
- c. Table 8 can be interpreted as providing interesting support for Wolfson's bulge theory of Interaction (Wolfson 1988).
- d. The interaction of apology strategies and social distance relates to the order of strategies used in a remedial exchange. There was a tendency for apologies to begin with explanations, and even to consist of explanations alone, to intimates more often than to nonintimates. Intimacy evidently permits shortcuts and substitutions. Similarly, minor or light offenses between intimates require only the briefest apologetic noise.

2.10.2 Power

Determining the relative power relations in an interaction is often a difficult task. One relevant factor is the relative status of the participants, but other factors are also important. Between children, for instance, relative size and age are important factors. In some contexts, relative experience, knowledge, or expertise will be crucial. In transitional relationships, the roles of participants, such as customer-sales assistant or teacher-student, may be more important than any considerations of relative social status (see Leech 1983:126).

Three categories were used: U – apology was made to a person with more P; E – apology was made to a person of equal P; D – apology was made to a person with less P.

2.11 OVERALL WEIGHTINESS OF THE OFFENSE

It is now possible to consider the effect of a combination of the various non-linguistic factors analyzed on the choice of apology strategies. The data in this corpus allowed a correlation of apology strategies with offense weight by combining the effects of:

The offense (R), the relative power of the participants (P), and their relative social distance (D). In other words, what support do the data provide for Brown and Levinson's theory of the relationship between the weight of an FTA (measured as a combination of P, D, and R) and politeness strategies used to redress damage to face? It is clear from the preceding discussion that, in general, a serious offence elicits more elaborated apology strategies and that a powerful victim receives more elaborated

strategies than an equal or less powerful one. The rogue factor assessed in terms of Brown and Levinson's model appears to be social distance.

To explore the interrelationships of the three factors, the number and range of apology strategies in particular exchanges were examined, using these as a measure of the level of politeness expressed in the exchange.

One would expect that strategy an alone, for instance, would generally not suffice for a more heavily weighted offense. It would not be rated as polite enough. And in fact the data support this prediction. There are no examples of a simple explicit apology being used with maximum P, D, and R. So, despite the prevalence of apologies using strategy an alone in the corpus as a whole (43.2%).

There are no examples of strategy A in isolation in contexts where P, D, and R have maximum values.

There is also some support for the hypothesis that weightier offenses (assessed as high P, D, and R) tend to elicit more complex apologies.

Support for Brown and Levinson's model is provided by examining the strategies used in apologies between maximally distant interlocutors of different status when the less powerful person has committed an offense of medium seriousness or a lighter offense. The apology interchanges in these cases generally involve at least two strategies and sometimes three or, in the case of medium offenses four co-occurring strategies.

It appears, then, that the predictions derived from Brown and Levinson's model find some support in these data.

There is clear evidence too that the less weighty the offense, the more likely a single simple explicit apology will be used.

An offence between friends sometimes appeared to elicit a more elaborated apology than Brown and Levinson's model would predict.

Apologies and non – apologies:

Negotiation in speech act realization*

2.11.1 Adam Jaworski

This paper examines several unprototypical examples of apologies, which found their way into the corpus. As one looks at the earlier studies of apologies, and other acts, it is apparent that the degree to which unprototypical examples of the speech acts in question are studied varies, and partly depends on the data collection method (cf. below). Researchers' relative disinterest in ambiguous speech acts should not be confused with the widely –studied phenomena of indirectness (e.g., Blu-Kulka, 1987; Tannen, 1981; Weizman, 1985; and others), 'structural' variation (Walters, 1981), and 'plurivalent' speech acts (Thomas, 1985a).

Other researchers, however, have commented on non-apologies, which have entered their corpora. In her experimental study of native (English) and non-native (Danish-English) apologies, for example, Trosborg (1987:149) found that her subjects who engaged in role-play did not always accept responsibility for the offensive act in question, which led to the use of several non-apology strategies:

- (a) Explicit denial of responsibility;
- (b) Implicit denial of responsibility;
- (c) Providing justification for the act;
- (d) Blaming a third party;
- (e) Blaming the complainer ('attack').

2.11.2 Variation and discreteness in apologies

This paper discusses the problem of how native speakers of one language (here Polish) vary with respect to their notions of when it is appropriate to apologize, and what happens when two interactants disagree on this issue.

For example, Fraser comments on Goffman's (1971) description of apology, and concludes that it 'does not get at the basic notion of what it is to apologize' Fraser, (1981:270, note 2). Then Fraser lists the following nine strategies for apologies for apologizing:

Strategy 1: Announcing that you are apologizing

'I (hereby) apologize for....'

Strategy 2: Stating one's obligation to apologize

'I must apologize for....'

Strategy 3: Offering to apologize

‘I (hereby) offer my apology for....’

Strategy 4: Requesting the hearer accept an apology

‘Please accept my apology for....’

‘Let me apologize for....’

‘I would appreciate it if you accept my apology for....’

Strategy 5: Expressing regret for the offense

‘I’m (truly/very/so/terribly) sorry for....’

‘I (truly/very much/so....) regret that I....’

Strategy 6: Requesting forgiveness for the offense

‘Please excuse me for....’

‘Pardon me for....’

‘I beg your pardon for....’

‘Forgive me for....’

Strategy 7: Acknowledging responsibility for the offending act

‘That was my fault’

‘Doing that was a dumb thing to do’

Strategy 8: Promising forbearance from a similar offending act

‘ Promise you that will never happen again’

Strategy 9: Offering redress

‘Please let me pay for the damage I’ve done’

(Fraser, 1981:263).

2.11.3 Apologies in politeness theory

For Brown and Levinson apologies are face-threatening acts (FTAs) that are damaging to the speaker’s (S’s) positive face (speakers want to be approved of and liked):

On the other hand, apologies belong to negative politeness strategies in performing acts threatening to the hearer’s (Hs) face.

The speaker may go with his/her apology for a face-threatening act 'on record' using one of several strategies to apologize. The following list of strategies for apologies has been excerpted from Brown and Levinson's work (1987:187-190) and it is treated here as open-ended.

Admit the impingement. S can simply admit that he is impinging on H's face, with expressions like:

'I'm sure you must be very busy, but...'

'I know this is a bore, but...'

'I'd like to ask you a big favour:'

'I hope this isn't going to bother you too much: ...'

Indicate reluctance. Secondly, S can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on H with the use of hedges ... or by means of expressions such as the following:

'I normally wouldn't ask you this, but...'

'Look, I've probably come to the wrong person, but...'

'I don't want to bother/interrupt you, but...'

'You've never bothered me, I know, but...'

Give overwhelming reasons. Thirdly, S can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the FTA (for example, his own incapacity) thereby, implying that normally he wouldn't dream of infringing upon H's negative face:

'I can think of nobody else who could...'

'I simply can't manage to...'

'I'm absolutely lost...'

'Can you possibly help me with this, because I can't manage it/because there's no one else I could ask.'

Beg forgiveness. Finally, S may beg H's forgiveness, or at least ask for 'acquittal'- that is, H should cancel the debt implicit in the FTA.

'Excuse me, but...'

'I'm sorry to bother you...'

'I hope/Please/Would you forgive me if...'

'I beg your indulgence...'

An apology can be performed indirectly, or 'off record'. A possible off-record apology may take the form of an overstatement, for example:

I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer. (Brown and Levinson, 1987:21).

If any apology is used to remedy a face-threatening act, it is necessary to recall here how Brown and Levinson arrive at their calculation of the weightiness of a face – threatening act as this will also be a crucial element in a speaker's decision whether to apologise, or not to apologise for performing a face-threatening act. The three factors suggested by Brown and Levinson are:

'Social distance' (D) of S and H (solidarity/symmetrical)

Relative 'power' (P) of S and H (power/asymmetrical)

Absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture (degree to which goods and services have to be expended in a given culture).

(Brown and Levinson, 1987:74)

2.11.4 Some Polish data: Unprototypical apologies

In the remaining part of this paper I am going to look at some examples of apologies collected from Polish, and we'll see that the form of apologies is not always formulaic, that they often involve negotiation of the relative status and power relationship of the participants, and the assignment of the degree of imposition associated with the offending act in question.

The following are just a few examples of such prototypical apologies:

F1 bumps into F2 on a crowded tram.

F1: 'Oh, excuse me

F2: 'Oh, never mind'.

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

F1: I'm sorry that I said that. I'm a little upset by this exam.'

Receiving change in a shop.

Saleswoman: 'Oh I'm sorry. [It's] these new twenties [twenty coins].

Over ten percent of the examples, however, involve less prototypical and/or negotiated apologies, some with notably longer exchanges between participants.

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

M: 'Majusiu, you're treading on my bag'.

D: 'Why did you leave it here?'

M: 'OK, just move it'.

In this example, the daughter avoids an apology by renegotiating the power dimension (P), blaming her mother for placing the bag in the wrong place (victim becomes offender, and vice versa).

At a stop during a train journey F1 (aged 25) leaves her seat in the compartment for a few minutes to get a drink on the platform. F2 (c.60) takes her seat when she is gone. F1 comes back.

F2: 'I'm only [going] to Oborniki. You 're a young lady. You can stand'.

In a busy street M (c.60) bumps heavily into F (c.25). She turns her head and looks at him waiting for an apology.

M: 'You should apologize to me. You're walking on the wrong side of the pavement.

The speaker's use of the expletive may indicate either shifting the blame for tripping over the woman's bags from him onto the woman (or her bags), which seems to be a justified thing for him to do, or he tries to signal his misfortune, and thus win the woman's sympathy and forgiveness for walking into her belongings. In the former case he would be manipulating the power (P) dimension, while in the latter the solidarity/distance (D) dimension.

M1 and M2 (roommates, both over 20) 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: 'United we stand, divided we fall'.

M1 clearly manipulates distance (D) between himself and M2 by the use of the positive politeness strategies, which includes giving a gift (i.e., wine), and use of a formula, which explicitly calls for solidarity. (Accompanying nonverbal behavior: extended hand, smile, etc. were probably equally significant here as markers of intended solidarity.)

"This soup is inedible. How can you be not ashamed of serving things like that?"

F: And what do you think [sir]? You should try and slave [here] in such conditions for such [lousy] wages'.

In this example, the saleswoman avoids an apology by trying to win the customer's sympathy (manipulation of D) claiming that working in a terrible place and for low wages is enough of a punishment for serving bad dishes to customers.

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: 'Damn it! Who's eaten my cutlet?'

F: 'Well, I'm afraid it was me. I'm sorry, I didn't know.'

M: 'It's nothing. Cutlets are very bad for you'.

F: 'Don't be angry. How could I know it was yours?'

M: 'Yes, I forgot to attach my card to it!'

F: 'You know, I think there's something else in the freezer. Wait a little and I'll prepare it for you'

M: 'Well, OK, if I don't starve to death first'.

The above example is interesting for several reasons. First of all it starts with a fairly formulaic and predictable apology from F. However, in her attempt to save her face, she gives a false reason for committing the offending act: 'I'm sorry, I didn't know'.

The last, somewhat lengthy example to be discussed here illustrates even more evidently the nature of apologies as negotiated acts:

M1: M2, and M3: Polish students, 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: 'Hello gentlemen! What's [new] with you?'

M2: 'Or, rather, what's [new] with you? Where have you been?'

M1: 'Well, you know, they talked me into a game [of cards] and we finished at four [a.m.]. And then, of to work at eight. ...'

M2: 'And didn't it cross your mind to give us a call?'

M1: 'I called at least five times, old man, but nobody answered!'

M3: 'Impossible, we were all at home from nine.'

M2: 'You see, we here—'

M1: 'Well, I'm sorry, but you know ---'

M2: [Gets very angry] "you know"! We are living here together and we've got some

Rules to follow. Specially as we're not at home. Now, put yourself in our situation—'

M1: I [Interrupts again] 'But don't turn this into a tragedy!'

M2: 'Don't interrupt me, OK? The fact is that you acted like a fool. I think that if you

Were not able to get in touch with us you should have simply come back and

Nothing would be the matter. And now, how do you look?'

M1: 'Now you are exaggerating. And anyway, stop treating me like some piece of turd. I

Said I was sorry, that I felt stupid, but don't act like a hysterical mother. Do you

Want me to kiss you on your hand?'

M3: 'Stop it now. It's only that nobody knew where you were and what you were doing.'

M1: 'That's why I'm sorry. It won't happen again, OK?'

M3: 'OK, no problem.'

CHAPTER 3

THE SPEECH ACT OF APOLOGY

3.1 SCHER AND DARLEY (1997)

Apologies are offered when an individual has violated a social norm.

Apologies serve as remedial work, designed to smooth over or remedy any social disruption that was caused by the norm violation.

Five strategies that form the 'apology speech act set' i.e. the strategies that can be used to apologize are:

- (a) An illocutionary force indicating device, i.e. IFID such as "I am sorry", "I apologize," or "Excuse me".
- (b) An explanation or account of the cause which brought about the violation.
- (c) An expression of the speaker's responsibility for the offence.
- (d) An offer of repair
- (e) A promise of forbearance.

Research on the effectiveness of apologies has examined how judgements made about a transgressor, and the amount of blame and punishment assigned to transgressors, differs when a transgressor apologizes versus when no apology is given:

- (a) Apologies reduce sanctioning applied to transgressors by reducing negative evaluations of the identity of the transgressor.
- (b) They may also affect sanctioning by reducing the anger victims feel after the transgression
- (c) Whether or not, apologies also reduce blame is somewhat unclear. Apologies actually increase blame. Apologies have been shown to reduce blame judgements by, Derby & Schlenker (1982).

There has been only limited examination of differing effects of different forms of apologies. Derby & Schooner (1982) examine the differences in children's responses to a transgressor who either did not

apologize, gave a perfunctory apology (“excuse me”), a “standard apology” (I am sorry, I feel bad about this. Please let me help you”). There are two functions served by apologies in social discourse:

- (a) The speaker is aware of the social requirement to apologize in certain situations.
- (b) An apology communicates important information about the psychological state of the speaker.

Two apology strategies identified by the CCSARP convey information that is a required part of an apology in certain situations:

- (a) The speaker must acknowledge responsibility for having committed some offending acts.
- (b) He or she must express regret about the offence.

Remorse or regret is the primary information intended to be conveyed by an apology. The paradigmatic apology typically consists of an expression of feeling e.g. (“I’m sorry”)

A promise of forbearance increases the effectiveness of an apology by assuring that the speaker will not repeat his or her transgression.

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 had not occurred.

An explanation or account, while often given in conjunction with an apology, is not part of an apology. The offering of external, mitigating circumstances forms part of an excuse.

Each apology strategy should improve perceptions of the speaker’s identity, reduce the sanctioning applied to the speaker, increase the remorse or regret attributed to the speaker, and increase perceptions of the appropriateness of the apology.

Subjects were presented with different versions of apologies that systematically manipulated each of the four apology strategies in the apology speech act set, and indicated how they would judge the transgressor if he had given each apology. These apology strategies are:

- (a) Promise of forbearance
- (b) expression of responsibility
- (c) Offer of repair
- (d) IFID/ remorse expression.

The presence or absences of the four apology strategies were operationalised with the statements in Table1:

Table 1. Operationalization of Apology Components & Definitions for strength Ratings

- a. Remorse / IFID “ I`m really sorry I didn`t call you the other day with the information”.
[An expression of remorse or sadness about one`s actions].
- b. Responsibility expression “I know what I did was wrong”.
[an acknowledgement that some rule or norm of social conduct has been violated].
- c. Promise of forbearance “I promise something like this will not happen again”.
[a promise to keep one`s word in the future].
- d. Offer of repair “If there is any way I can make it up to you please let me know”.
[An offer to make recompense for one`s actions].

Subjects were asked how appropriate and apologetic they thought Ralph`s response to the situation was, how bad Ralph felt about what he had done, how much they would blame Ralph for what happened, and how much they would condemn him for his actions.

“That is, how much would you want to avoid him or being friendly to him?”

Subjects were asked how reliable a friend Ralph was, and how conscientious he was.

The four apology strategies examined in this study each affected reactions to the apologies and to the transgressor.

Trend Analysis.

The equal effects of the strategies suggest the possibility that there is a linear relationship between the number of strategies used and the dependent variables.

There were strong linear components in the relationships between the number of apology components and the dependent variables.

This study shows the strategies people use to realize the speech act of apologizing have clear and independent effects on the judgements people make about the transgressor. The addition of each strategy seems to have had an additive effect on judgements of how appropriate the utterance of the transgressor was and how much the transgressor was blamed and sanctioned for the transgression and on judgements related to the identity of the transgressor.

The greatest improvement in perceptions came from the addition of one apology strategy that is, offering of an apology, compared to no apology.

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

Each of the four apology strategies identified by the CCSARP has something to offer apologizers in their attempts to remedy the social relationships that have been threatened by the transgressions.

3.2 HOLMES (1990)

The function of apologies is discussed within the context of a model of interaction with two intersecting dimensions:

-Affective and referential meaning.

An account is provided of the kinds of social relationships and the range of offences, which elicited apologies in this New Zealand corpus.

It is suggested that Wolfson's "bulge" theory adequately account for a number of patterns in the data. In particular, the functions of apologies between friends may be more complex than a simple linear model suggests.

3.2.1 The function of an apology

Apologies in a model of interaction. An apology is primarily and essentially a social act:

- a. It is aimed at maintaining good relations between participants. To apologize is to act politely, both in the vernacular sense and in the more technical sense of paying attention to the addressee's face needs.(Brown & Levinson 1978,1987).
- b. On most occasions, apologizing for an offense is very evidently in the speaker's interests and thus, at least in the longer term, is undeniably relational behaviour and an efficient use of communicative time.
- c. Apologies provide good evidence that an adequate account of communication will require reference to a basic social or Principle (Leech 1983), as well as the more information – oriented maxims derived from Grice's Cooperative Principle, which as Brown and Levinson pointed out, establish a "socially neutral presumptive framework for communication" (1987).

To provide a satisfactory analysis one needs a model, which takes account of the different emphasis that participants put on referential versus social meaning in different types of interaction.

A graphed square or two-dimensional plot provides a model, which adequately represents the interdependence of these two important dimensions in any interaction: social or affective meaning on the one hand, and referential or propositional information on the other.

The area within the four quadrants of the square represents interactional space. Any utterance, expression, or interaction may be located in that space according to the extent to which it expresses both referential content, on a scale from 0-100 percent, and affective meaning on a scale running from high solidarity at one end to maximum social distance or deference at the other.

An apology may be located low on the referential axis but at the solidarity or positive politeness end of the affective dimension, reflecting the fact that such speech acts may convey little referential content but express a message high in affect or social meaning.

The form of the model has quite specific implications then. Although the referential axis represents a scale extending from minimum referential or propositional content at its base to maximum referential content at the top, the affective axis does not represent a scale of minimum to maximum affect. The affective axis thus combines Brown and Levinson's (1987) power (P) and distance (D) or Brown and Gilman's (1960) concepts of power and solidarity.

3.2.2 Defining an apology

The term apology has generally been used to describe what Goffman referred to as a remedy (1971), the one essential element in a remedial interchange. This term nicely highlights the central function of apologies – provide a remedy for an offense and restore social equilibrium or harmony (cf. Edmondson 1981:280; Leech 1983:125). Hence, a broad definition of an apology as it is used in this article takes function as the crucial criterion:

An apology is a speech act addressed to B's face-needs and intended to remedy an offence for which A takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B (where A is the apologizer, and B is the person offended).

It is difficult to further specify the content of an apology in any helpful manner, since this function may be achieved in an infinite number of ways depending on the offence addressed.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983:20) suggested that it is possible to specify "all the potential types of sentences or utterances that together create a set of parameters" for a particular speech act. Further, they proposed that "our goal be the description of the maximal potential set of semantic formulas for each act,[and a] speech act set [would thus] consist of the major semantic formulas, any one of which could suffice as an 'emic' minimal element to represent the particular speech act" (1983:20-21). Olshtain and Cohen noted that both direct and indirect speech acts may function as apologies. The following list might serve an apology in an appropriate context and with appropriate intonation and paralinguistic support:

That was stupid of me.

I forgot my key.

My fault.

Bus was late.

I have just done it again.

The list is potentially infinite. More promising is the approach advocated by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), followed by Fraser (1981), namely, to specify not the semantic formulae but the felicity conditions under which a particular utterance would count as an instance of a particular speech act. Because there is no independent way of establishing felicity, the results are circular.

For the purposes of this study, then, the function-centered definition provided earlier has been used to identify those utterances which qualify as apologies. The elements of the definition imply the following minimal felicity conditions:

- (a) an act has occurred;
- (b) A believes the act has offended B; and
- (c) A takes some responsibility for the act.

In these circumstances it is likely that what A says will be interpreted as an apology. But it is not possible to predict exactly what form A's utterances will take. It is also possible that A might choose not to apologize and instead might produce one of the following utterances:

That's the way the cookie crumbles.

Next please.

Time for lunch.

Though it is not possible to specify a complete speech act set for apology, it is both possible and useful for descriptive purposes to categorize the range of strategies which were used in a corpus of apologies collected from native speakers of English, as I illustrated in the following. The range includes any speech act which satisfies the definition given earlier and may further seem very broad.

An apology will typically address an offense performed by the apologizer:

[A bumps into B, who is standing still.]

A: Sorry.

B: That's OK.

It is sometimes the case, however, that 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:

[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.

Thus, the definition refers to the person who takes responsibility for the offense rather than the offender.

3.2.3 Apologies and face

Apologies, like compliments, are primarily aimed at maintaining or supporting the addressee's and in some cases the apologizer's "face" (Goffman 1967). Apologies are generally aimed at face redress associated with FTAs (face-threatening acts) or offences which have damaged the addressee's face in some respect and can therefore be regarded as negative politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson 1978:65,192).

It is worth noting, however that although the speech act serving most directly as the apology functions as a negative politeness strategy, accompanying elements may address transgressions to positive or negative face wants.

Apologies redress negative face when the offence has ignored B's "want that his [sic] actions be unimpeded by others" (Brown & Levinson 1978:67).

Apologies address positive face wants when the transgression offends B's need that his or her "wants be desirable to at least some others" (Brown & Levinson 1978:67). This includes the individual's need

that others recognize her or his achievements and respect them. The apology below redresses damage to the victim's positive face.

[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 and addressee C.]

B: Nice to meet you.

In addition to addressing the victim's face loss, apologies may simultaneously address the loss of positive face incurred by the speaker. Where a remedial exchange includes an explanation, the speaker's positive face needs are generally taken into account:

[A is phoning B to warn her of potential inconvenience.]

A: I'm sorry but I'm going to be a bit 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.

Though FTA^s are generally described and analyzed as unintentional transgressions or at least as transgressions that cannot easily be avoided, it is worth noting that apologies may be in some circumstances be associated with deliberate offences. Paddy Austin (1988) introduced the term face attack act (FAA) for that subcategory of FTAs which involve intentional attacks on the addressee's face, such as insults and accusations. An apology accompanying an FAA will often be performed by someone other than the face attacker, who nevertheless takes responsibility for the offense caused:

[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 all right Brigid, she doesn't mean it. She's just a bit scratchy today.

B: [No visible response. Carries on playing.]

It is also possible, however, for the face attacker herself to apologize for the FAA. This involves very explicitly what Goffman described as "a splitting of the self into a blameworthy part and a part that stands back and sympathizes with the blame-giving" (Goffman 1971:113), that is, a simultaneous recognition of the offense and an attempt to dissociate oneself from the offending action:

[A, renegeing 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 terribly 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 that time.

It should be noted that, like many utterances, those serving as apologies can express other functions, too. Utterances which express regret for an offense may also serve as an admission, with the addressee learning of the offense through the utterance which serves as an apology. Thus one utterance simultaneously performs the function of conveying bad news. (cf. Brown & Levinson 1978:73) and apologizing for it:

[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!

Utterances like these illustrate the complexity of interaction, since they simultaneously express a FTA while administering face redress as a politeness strategy mitigating the effect of the FTA. An utterance which serves as an apology simultaneously provides an explanation or excuse for the offense, as illustrated in (10) . The categorization as apology often depends on appropriate "apologetic" intonation in these cases.

[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.

At more general level, Norrick (1978) pointed out that, in addition to convincing the victim of the speaker's regret, apologies often serve such social functions as "to evince good manners, to assuage the addressee's wrath, or simply to get off the hook and be one one's way" (1978: 281).

3.2.4 Methodology and the corpus

Most of the research on apologies has used elicited instances, usually based on suggested role plays of some kind, written or spoken (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984; Cohen & Olshtain 1981; Olshtain 1983; Olshtain & Cohen 1983; Trosborg 1987).

Cohen and Olshtain (1981:117; Olshtain & Cohen 1983:24), responding to Manes and Wolfson's (1981) advocacy of an ethnographic approach, commented on the problems in collecting spontaneous speech in natural settings. They pointed out that it is time consuming and there is no guarantee that one will collect sufficient examples of the relevant speech act. In subsequent discussion, it emerged that the respondents had felt "that it was only polite to give a brief apology and then wait for the other person to respond" (Olshtain & Cohen 1983:32). In genuine interaction, the full remedial exchange may be distributed between several turns:

[A and B are carrying coffee and cakes back to their seats in a café. A man bumps into A, who knocks B, who spills coffee on her blouse.]

A: Oh I'm sorry.

B: That's OK –it wasn't your fault.

A: Look your blouse is all splashed with coffee. I'm so sorry.

B: It's OK it'll wash.

A: I hope so. What a boor! Shall I get you a serviette?

B: No no don't worry.

So, although elicited data have the undoubted attraction of obtaining the responses of a controlled group of respondents to the "same" situations, the responses can only provide information on the strategies the informants know. We cannot be sure what they would actually say in a real encounter nor of how they would respond in the much wider range of situations requiring apologies, which they face outside the laboratory.

The ideal methodology would involve "a two-pronged approach" (Wolfson 1986:697) combining aspects of both ethnographic observation and elicited responses, by exploring the spontaneous utterances of a range of respondents in the same natural context.

As a preliminary step, however, it seems sensible to observe in as wide a range of situations as possible to obtain some idea of:

- a. the range of contexts in which apologies occur,
- b. the type of offenses which are fruitful in eliciting them,
- c. and the kinds of social factors which appear to be related to different types of apology.

This corpus used in this analysis consists of 183 remedial interchanges, that is, apologies and apology responses, collected with the assistance of New Zealand students who selected the task as one option in a list of possible course assignment. The data collection method was the ethnographic method deriving from anthropology, which has been advocated.

3.2.5 Apology strategies

In developing a satisfactory categorization system for the naturally occurring data in the New Zealand corpus, I have built on the work of these earlier researches and have followed Olshtain and Cohen's (1983) framework, in particular, very closely.

Four broad basic categories were used, with a number of subcategories where necessary:

A. An explicit expression of apology:

- Offer apology/ID (i.e. illocutionary force indicating device), "I apologize"
- Express regret, e.g., "I'm afraid"; "I sorry"
- Request forgiveness, e.g., "excuse me"; "forgive me"

B. An explanation or account, an excuse or justification

- E.g., "I wasn't expecting it to be you"; "we're both new to this"

C An acknowledgement of responsibility

- Accept blame, e.g., "It was my fault"
- Express self-deficiency, "I was confused"; "I wasn't thinking"; "didn't see you".
- Recognize H as entitled to an apology, e.g., "you're right"; "you deserve an apology"
- Express lack of intent, e.g., "I didn't mean to"
- Offer repair/redress, e.g., "we'll replace it for you"; "I'll bring you another"

B. A promise of forbearance

- E.g., "I promise it won't happen again"

It is important to note, however, that the strategies are not mutually exclusive; they may co-occur:

[A and B are flatmates. B has asked A to put out her washing and he has forgotten.]

B: Thanks for putting my washing out Gerry.

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

Any one strategy alone may count as an apology in the appropriate context.

Instances in category A are directed speech acts functioning as apologies, whereas, when they occur alone without an explicit apology form, those in categories B, C, and D are directed apologies, since their surface function appears to be to make an excuse or to take responsibility for some undesirable action or to make a promise.

There has been some debate over whether less direct speech acts are more polite than more direct ones. Leech (1983:127) claimed this quite explicitly in his discussion of impositives or directives, and it is also explicit in Brown and Levinson's (1978) organization of politeness strategies from least to most direct.

- (a) Politer apologies normally include an explicit apology at some point, together with another strategy. The categories are also arranged in increasing order in terms of how heavily ranked they are as politeness strategies.
- (b) Apologies in category A are the simplest and least heavily weighted strategies. Those in category C and D are more complex and heavily weighted apology strategies. (Cf. Leech 1983).

It is quite clear that an explicit expression of apology, and in particular, the strategy of expressing regret is the most frequent apology strategy selected. This strategy accounts for almost exactly half of all the strategies in the data. The only other strategy which is used extensively is strategy B-providing an account or excuse. The remedial interchanges in the corpus involved some combination of strategies.

In fact, only strategies A and B occur alone, and although 43 percent of the remedial interchanges use strategy A on its own, strategy B occurs alone only four times:

[B answers the phone and A mistakes her voice for her mother's.]

A: Hello. Margot?

B: No it's her daughter speaking.

A: Oh gosh you sound like your mother-is that the baby of the family?

B: Yes that's right.

Yet it is important to consider how strategies combine as well as which strategies native speakers use:

- a. In examining the possible combinations of strategies, there are two factors, which deserve attention. First, the number of strategies which co-occur are worth comment; and second, it is interesting to note the co-occurrence patterns which characterize the data.

Seventeen different combinations of apology strategy occur in the data but they are far from being evenly distributed. The second most frequent pattern is one involving a combination of an explicit apology with an account or explanation (AB or BA); these account for 28.4 percent of the data.

- b. It is interesting to note that a remedial interchange may involve more than one occurrence of the same apology strategy:

[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 what was field independence.

Another interesting point is the relative flexibility of position that different strategies demonstrate. Strategy A (an explicit apology) and strategy C (an acknowledgment of responsibility) may occur in any position, whereas B does not occur in place 4, and D never occurs in initial position or in place 3. I am not suggesting, of course, that these patterns should be regarded as absolute co-occurrence restrictions. It seems perfectly feasible that strategy D would occur in place 3, for instance.

Finally, it is worth noting that in the small number (i.e., (10) of written apologies in the corpus, there was always an explicit apology strategy at some point. Indeed, all but 5 percent of the apologies in the corpus included an explicit apology are conversations between intimates, where the intonation very clearly signals the function of the utterance as an apology:

[B, one of A's three daughters, answers the phone.]

A: Hello.

B: Hi Mum.

A Oh which one's that?

B: Jeannie.

A Oh so it is-I was just waiting to hear from Em so I wasn't expecting you.

B: Huh!

In summary, then, the analysis demonstrates that an explicit apology without any elaboration or further supporting comment is the most widely occurring strategy in this corpus of naturally occurring apology exchanges. It is also evident that New Zealanders frequently combine an explicit apology with other strategies and may even reduplicate their chosen strategy on occasion.

3.2.6 Syntactic-semantic features of apologies

Where an apology is explicitly expressed, it is possible to classify its form. Though Goffman commented, "whether one runs over another's sentence, time, dog, or body, one is more or less reduced to saying some variant of 'I'm sorry'" (1971:117), in fact the range of possible formulae is little wider than that.

Variant of APOLOGIZE or APOLOGY/IES:

Variants using the explicit performative formula are, as Owen noted, relatively rare. She found only two instances in her spoken corpus and two instances in written form, all of which she characterized as occurring in "a kind of monologue" (1983:65), such as lecture or a formal notice, reflecting the fact that the relationship between the participants is rather distant and formal.

In the New Zealand data too, these forms occur in more formal interactions or in writing. In speech they tended to characterize interactions where the participants did not know each other:

[Waitress to customer in restaurant.]

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

Half of the total instances of written apologies in the corpus used these explicit formal apology forms; in such cases they tended to occur not only in formal notices, but also between those who knew each other but who were not close friends.

[Letter from one colleague to another.]

Dear Dave,

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

[Letter from writer to editor whom he knows.]

Dear Jean,

My apologies for the slightly belated arrival of this paper.

These forms are thus relatively infrequent and restricted to more formal or written interactions.

I'M AFRAID as an apology:

Owen (1983:88-92) provided an interesting account of how I'm afraid may serve to express an apology. She argued that when followed by a full complement sentence, the primary function of the utterance is to inform, though the I'm afraid clearly expresses regret and thus "some remedial effect may be achieved" (1983:89). In other cases (when followed by a sentence pro-form such as so or not), she suggested the primary function is remedial, since the pro-form presupposes the addressee's knowledge of the offense. There were no examples in the original corpus, but below is an attested additional example:

[A walk 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.

Owen did not say how many instances there were in her corpus, though she cited seven examples in the discussion. In the New Zealand corpus, there were only five examples of I'm afraid functioning as an apology, four in speech and one in writing, that is 2.9 percent of the syntactic patterns used to express the apology explicitly. Interestingly, this form appears to be appropriate in response to weightier offenses, though the reason for the weight, that is, P, D, or R (Brown & Levinson 1978:79), differed in

each case. One stance involved a minor infraction between strangers on the telephone (i.e., where D was high), another involved participants who differed in status (i.e., high P), and another occurred between very close friends but involved a serious offense (i.e., high R):

[A and B are close friends. A has given B a serious fright by forgetting to inform her of a change of arrangements.]

A: I want to make an abject apology

B: You need to.

A: I really am sorry. I'm afraid I forgot the arrangements had been changed.

A serious offense between intimates will thus result in an overall offense weighting that involves adopting a higher ranked remedial or negative politeness strategy. In fact, the apologizer employs all three of the highest ranked explicit apology strategies in combination. On a number of grounds, then, it seems that I'm afraid tends to co-occur with relatively heavily weighted offenses.

Variant of SORRY:

Owen (1983:66) provided 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:

I'm	(that) S
([intensifier]) sorry	to VP
I am	if S
	About that

She commented that, "out of 24 possible combinations derivable from [the rule], only twelve occur, and of these only several occur more than once... suggesting that certain forms-roughly a third of the possibilities-predominate strongly" (Owen 1983: 67). There is a clear difference between speech and writing, however, reflecting the fact that the written examples in the corpus are generally more formal and addressed to a less familiar audience. Only one instance in the written data uses the form sorry, and this one example occurs on a postcard between two colleagues who are on very good terms:

[Postcard from A to B, a colleague and friend.]

Dear Larry,

Sorry to put you in the embarrassing position of having to ask if you owe me money.

You do not.

Other patterns:

Only four other patterns were identified in the New Zealand data as ways of expressing an apology explicitly: *excuse me / us* (9 instances); *pardon (me) / I beg your pardon* (4); *forgive me* (3); *we regret that S* (1). The latter two occur only as written forms, and apart from one instance of excuse us observed on a notice to customers, the first two patterns occur as speech forms. The speech forms tend to be apologies for socially frowned on behavior, such as burping, or for actions, which inconvenience addressees, such as learning in an error, which inconveniences B:

[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.

The formulae involved draw on a very narrow range of lexical items, less than 10 in total: *apology*, *apologize*, *be afraid that*, *excuse*, *forgive*, *sorry*, *regret*; and 79 percent of all the apologies collected included some form of sorry.

3.2.7 Distribution of apology strategies

Before examining some of the sociolinguistic features of the context in which different apology strategies occurred, it is worth considering what one might expect to find in the way of correlation between linguistic and nonlinguistic factors. Apologies function as remedies for offenses and are aimed at restoring social harmony between people.

In this article, I offer a preliminary and relatively informal exploration of two ways in which it seems that apologizers modify the politeness of an apology in relation to weight of the offense:

1. They may vary the number of strategies used in any interaction
2. They may vary the kinds of strategies used.

3.2.8 Characteristics of the offense

In this section, I have also considered the crucial factor of the relative seriousness or ranking of different offenses in the contexts in which they occurred.

Types of offense:

As far as I am aware, there is no formal existing classification of types of offense, though Goffman (1971) provided a very useful discussion of relevant factors, and Owen (1983) commented at various points on the effect of different types of offense on the particular form selected in her data. Building on their observations, the following categories proved workable and appeared to account for all of the instances in the New Zealand data: inconvenience, space, talk, time, possessions, and social gaffe:

Inconvenience. A large proportion of the apologies in the corpus (39.3%) can be described as relating to actions which have inconvenienced the addressee in some way. Where the apologizer could not provide the correct change or required information, for instance, apologies were classified in this category. It also includes examples where the apologizer had not performed adequately in a particular context or had provided inadequate service and so had inconvenienced the addressee:

[B has requested that a docket be stapled to a bankcard 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.

[A has rung B, a friend, and waited some time for her to answer.]

A: You're puffed.

B: I've just run upstairs. I was down in the office.

A Oh sorry. I should have rung your office.

Space. Goffman (1971) provide a detailed discussion of infringements on another's personal space, which may occasion apologies. Examples include walking too close to or in front of another person, bumping into them, and taking their seat or desk space. These offenses sometimes threaten the

addressee's negative face by impeding her freedom of movement, though more often they are in fact very slightly inconveniences and the apology addresses the "virtual offense" (Goffman (1971:138-39). Though, below is one of the rare examples where the seriousness of the offense warranted an explanation as well:

[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 watch where you're going.

The correlation of a space offense with a simple explicit apology strategy almost always a form of sorry – is nevertheless one of the clearest patterns in the data.

Talk. There are 30 examples (16.4%) where the offense involves some kind of instruction on the addressee's talk or talking turn or another infringement of the rules for polite talk. The most frequent examples relate to an interruption, but others include verbal insults, the introduction of an inappropriate topic, a slip of the tongue, not hearing someone, and offenses such as talking too loud or too long:

[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.

These offenses can often be perceived either as encroachments on the addressee's positive or negative face. An interruption, for instance, can be interpreted as implying that what the addressee is saying is not worth attention and therefore as a threat to positive face; alternatively, it can be seen as impeding the addressee's freedom to talk and thus as a threat to negative face. When an account or excuse forms part of the apology, it will often address the most obvious interpretation in the particular context as below repeated here for convenience, where A adopts the strategy of self denigration, and where the explanation focuses on the negative face threat.

[A is a waitress who has served B the wrong drink.]

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

[Woman to fellow student in tutorial discussion.]

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

Occasionally, a component of the remedial exchange will overtly redress the speaker's loss of positive face, as in the following slip of the tongue:

[A radio announcer, has mispronounced B's name.]

A: I'm sorry. That's a difficult name though you must admit.

Time. There are a number of offenses (14.2%) which involve one person wasting another person's time or in some way not taking appropriate account of the value of another's time. Where the apologizer has kept the addressee waiting, or has forgotten or arrived late for an appointment, the infringement involves an imposition on the addressee's time. Negative face is threatened by impeding the addressee's freedom of action in most cases. The addressee has remained in one place for the apologizer's benefit:

[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 sorry. I thought you meant tonight. Oh boy I hope you're not too cheesed off with me

Here, self-denigration is the form the explanation takes. A intensifies the threat to her own positive face with the self-directed insult, "what a nong," thus strengthening the effect of the apology.

It is interesting to note that the most common pattern of time apologies involves a combination of an A and B strategy. Half of these apologies combined an explicit apology – usually a form of sorry – with an explanation or account, a much higher proportion than was typical of the whole sample (where only 34.1 % in the total sample) involved such combinations).

Possessions. A fifth category of offense involved some damage or loss to the addressee's possessions, including money. Offenses in this category involve damage to or removal of something, which belonged to the addressee, or they directly cost the addressee money. Offenses such as bumping into

someone's car, spilling something on their clothes, damaging their pen, breaking their washing machine, failing to pay a bill on time, or losing a book all come into this category. These are generally offenses to positive face since they imply that the apologizer does not value the thing the addressee values. Often in such cases one element in the remedial exchange directly addressed this Implication:

[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.

Social gaffe. There were a small number of apologies (5) which occurred when the Apologizer broke a social etiquette rule relating to socially frowned on behavior, such as burping or speaking while eating:

[A, talking to B on the phone, has just had a coughing bout.]

A: Excuse me coughing.

These apologies can be interpreted as hearer – oriented negative politeness strategies since they acknowledge an unwelcome intrusion on the hearer. All the examples in the data elicited a simple explicit apology which took one of the following forms: excuse me, pardon me, I'm sorry.

Seriousness of offense.

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

- (1) light offense: for example, bumped into someone; forgot to return a book to the library on time.
- (2) medium offense: for example, kept someone waiting and made them late for a film; broke someone's stapler.
- (3) heavy offense: for example, knocked someone over and hurt them; made someone miss an important engagement.

Examining the apology strategies used with offenses of different seriousness, it is clear that the great majority of:

- a. Light offenses elicited a simple explicit apology.

- b. Medium offenses, on the other hand, were much more likely than light offenses to involve an explanation as well as an explicit apology. And medium offenses were also more likely to be accompanied by an acknowledgement of responsibility than was typical of the data as a whole (62%vs. 46%).
- c. The heavy offenses were much less likely than others to be responded to with just a simple apology.

3.2.9 Relationship between the participants

Social distance:

The corpus includes apologies between participants who differ widely in terms of how well they know each other or the degree of social distance that characterizes the relationship. Three categories were used to classify the data:

I – very close friends or intimates, for example, spouses, partners, family members; F - friends or colleagues; S – distant acquaintances or strangers.

The interaction of apology strategies and social distance relates to the order of strategies used in a remedial exchange. There was a tendency for apologies to begin with explanations, and even to consist of explanations alone, to intimates more often than to nonintimates. Intimacy evidently permits shortcuts and substitutions. Similarly, minor or light offenses between intimates require only the briefest apologetic noise.

Power:

Determining the relative power relations in an interaction is often a difficult task. One relevant factor is the relative status of the participants, but other factors are also important. Between children, for instance, relative size and age are important factors. In some contexts, relative experience, knowledge, or expertise will be crucial. In transitional relationships, the roles of participants, such as customer-sales assistant or teacher-student, may be more important than any considerations of relative social status (see Leech 1983:126).

Three categories were used: U – apology was made to a person with more P; E – apology was made to a person of equal P; D – apology was made to a person with less P.

3.2.10 Overall weightiness of the offense

It is now possible to consider the effect of a combination of the various non-linguistic factors analyzed on the choice of apology strategies. The data in this corpus allowed a correlation of apology strategies with offense weight by combining the effects of: the seriousness of the offense (R), the relative power of the participants (P), and their relative social distance (D). In other words, what support do the data provide for Brown and Levinson's theory of the relationship between the weight of an FTA (measured as a combination of P, D, and R) and politeness strategies used to redress damage to face? It is clear from the preceding discussion that, in general, a serious offence elicits more elaborated apology strategies and that a powerful victim receives more elaborated strategies than an equal or less powerful one. The rogue factor assessed in terms of Brown and Levinson's model appears to be social distance.

To explore the interrelationships of the three factors, the number and range of apology strategies in particular exchanges were examined, using these as a measure of the level of politeness expressed in the exchange.

One would expect that strategy A alone, for instance, would generally not suffice for a more heavily weighted offense. It would not be rated as polite enough. And in fact the data support this prediction. There are no examples of a simple explicit apology being used with maximum P, D, and R. So, despite the prevalence of apologies using strategy A alone in the corpus as a whole (43.2%). There are no examples of strategy A in isolation in contexts where P, D, and R have maximum values.

There is also some support for the hypothesis that weightier offenses (assessed as high P, D, and R) tend to elicit more complex apologies.

Support for Brown and Levinson's model is provided by examining the strategies used in apologies between maximally distant interlocutors of different status when the less powerful person has committed an offense of medium seriousness or a lighter offense. The apology interchanges in these cases generally involve at least two strategies and sometimes three or, in the case of medium offenses four co-occurring strategies.

It appears, then, that the predictions derived from Brown and Levinson's model find some support in these data.

There is clear evidence too that the less weighty the offense, the more likely a single simple explicit apology will be used.

An offence between friends sometimes appeared to elicit a more elaborated apology than Brown and Levinson's model would predict.

3.3 JAWORSKI (1994)

This paper examines several unprototypical examples of apologies, which found their way into the corpus. As one looks at the earlier studies of apologies, and other acts, it is apparent that the degree to which unprototypical examples of the speech acts in question are studied varies, and partly depends on the data collection method (cf. below). Researchers' relative disinterest in ambiguous speech acts should not be confused with the widely –studied phenomena of indirectness (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1987; Tannen, 1981; Weizman, 1985; and others), 'structural' variation (Walters, 1981), and 'plurivalent' speech acts (Thomas, 1985a).

Other researchers, however, have commented on non-apologies, which have entered their corpora. In her experimental study of native (English) and non-native (Danish-English) apologies, for example, Trosborg (1987:149) found that her subjects who engaged in role-play did not always accept responsibility for the offensive act in question, which led to the use of several non-apology strategies:

- (a) explicit denial of responsibility;
- (b) implicit denial of responsibility;
- (c) providing justification for the act;
- (d) blaming a third party;
- (e) blaming the complainer ('attack').

Variation and discreteness in apologies:

This paper discusses the problem of how native speakers of one language (here Polish) vary with respect to their notions of when it is appropriate to apologize, and what happens when two interactants disagree on this issue.

For example, Fraser comments on Goffman's (1971) description of apology, and concludes that it 'does not get at the basic notion of what it is to apologize' Fraser, 1981:270, note 2). Then Fraser lists the following nine strategies for apologies for apologizing:

Strategy 1: Announcing that you are apologizing

'I (hereby) apologize for....'

Strategy 2: Stating one's obligation to apologize

'I must apologize for....'

Strategy 3: Offering to apologize

'I (hereby) offer my apology for....'

Strategy 4: Requesting the hearer accept an apology

'Please accept my apology for....'

'Let me apologize for....'

'I would appreciate it if you accept my apology for....'

Strategy 5: Expressing regret for the offense

'I'm (truly/very/so/terribly) sorry for....'

'I (truly/very much/so....) regret that I....'

Strategy 6: Requesting forgiveness for the offense

'Please excuse me for....'

'Pardon me for....'

'I beg your pardon for....'

'Forgive me for....'

Strategy 7: Acknowledging responsibility for the offending act

'That was my fault'

'Doing that was a dumb thing to do'

Strategy 8: Promising forbearance from a similar offending act

'Promise you that will never happen again'

Strategy 9: Offering redress

‘Please let me pay for the damage I’ve done’

(Fraser, 1981:263).

Apologies in politeness theory:

For Brown and Levinson apologies are face threatening acts (FTAs) which are damaging to the speaker’s (S’s) positive face (speakers want to be approved of and liked):

On the other hand, apologies belong to negative politeness strategies in performing acts threatening to the hearer’s (Hs) face.

The speaker may go with his/her apology for a face-threatening act ‘on record’ using one of several strategies to apologize. The following list of strategies for apologies has been excerpted from Brown and Levinson’s work (1987:187-190) and it is treated here as open-ended

Admit the impingement. S can simply admit that he is impinging on H’s face, with expressions like:

‘I’m sure you must be very busy, but...’

‘I know this is a bore, but...’

‘I’d like to ask you a big favour:..’

‘I hope this isn’t going to bother you too much: ...’

Indicate reluctance. Secondly, S can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on H with the use of hedges ... or by means of expressions such as the following:

‘I normally wouldn’t ask you this, but...’

‘ Look, I’ve probably come to the wrong person, but...’

‘I don’t want to bother/interrupt you, but...’

‘You’ve never bothered me, I know, but...’

Give overwhelming reasons. Thirdly, S can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the FTA (for example, his own incapacity) thereby, implying that normally he wouldn’t dream of infringing upon H’s negative face:

‘I can think of nobody else who could...’

‘I simply can’t manage to...’

'I'm absolutely lost...'

'Can you possibly help me with this, because I can't manage it/because there's no one else I could ask.'

Beg forgiveness. Finally, S may beg H's forgiveness, or at least ask for 'acquittal'- that is, H should cancel the debt implicit in the FTA.

'Excuse me, but...'

'I'm sorry to bother you...'

'I hope/Please/Would you forgive me if...'

'I beg your indulgence...'

An apology can be performed indirectly, or 'off record'. A possible off-record apology may take the form of an overstatement, for example:

I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer. (Brown and Levinson, 1987:21).

If any apology is used to remedy a face -threatening act, it is necessary to recall here how Brown and Levinson arrive at their calculation of the weightiness of a face – threatening act as this will also be a crucial element in a speaker's decision whether to apologise, or not to apologise for performing a face-threatening act. The three factors suggested by Brown and Levinson are:

- (i) 'social distance' (D) of S and H (solidarity/symmetrical)
- (ii) relative 'power' (P) of S and H (power/asymmetrical)
- (iii) absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture (degree to which goods and services have to be expended in a given culture).

(Brown and Levinson, 1987:74)

Some Polish data: Unprototypical apologies:

In the remaining part of this paper I am going to look at some examples of apologies collected from Polish, and we'll see that the form of apologies is not always formulaic, that they often involve negotiation of the relative status and power relationship of the participants, and the assignment of the degree of imposition associated with the offending act in question.

The following are just a few examples of such prototypical apologies:

F₁ bumps into F₂ on a crowded tram.

F₁: 'Oh, excuse me'.

F₂: 'Oh, never mind'.

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

F₁: 'I'm sorry that I said that. I'm a little upset by this exam.'

Receiving change in a shop.

Saleswoman: 'Oh I'm sorry. [It's] these new twenties [twenty coins].'

Over ten percent of the examples, however, involve less prototypical and/or negotiated apologies, some with notably longer exchanges between participants.

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

M: 'Majusiu, you're treading on my bag'.

D: 'Why did you leave it here?'

M: 'OK, just move it'.

In this example, the daughter avoids an apology by renegotiating the power dimension (P), blaming her mother for placing the bag in the wrong place (victim becomes offender, and vice versa).

At a stop during a train journey F₁ (aged 25) leaves her seat in the compartment for a few minutes to get a drink on the platform. F₂ (c.60) takes her seat when she is gone. F₁ comes back.

F₂: 'I'm only [going] to Oborniki. You 're a young lady. You can stand'.

In a busy street M (c.60) bumps heavily into F (c.25). She turns her head and looks at him waiting for an apology.

M: 'You should apologize to me. You're walking on the wrong side of the pavement.'

The speaker's use of the expletive may indicate either shifting the blame for tripping over the woman's bags from himself onto the woman (or her bags), which seems to be a justified thing for him to do, or

he tries to signal his misfortune, and thus win the woman's sympathy and forgiveness for walking into her belongings. In the former case he would be manipulating the power (P) dimension, while in the latter the solidarity/distance (D) dimension.

M₁ and M₂ (roommates, both over 20) had an argument about M₁' 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: 'United we stand, divided we fall'.

M₁: clearly manipulates distance (D) between himself and M₂ by the use of the positive politeness strategies, which include giving a gift (i.e., wine), and use of a formula, which explicitly calls for solidarity. (Accompanying nonverbal behavior: extended hand, smile, etc. were probably equally significant here as markers of intended solidarity.)

This soup is inedible. How can you be not ashamed of serving things like that?

'F: And what do you think [sir]? You should try and slave [here] in such conditions for such [lousy] wages'.

In this example, the saleswoman avoids an apology by trying to win the customer's sympathy (manipulation of D) claiming that working in a terrible place and for low wages is enough of a punishment for serving bad dishes to customers.

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: 'Damn it! Who's eaten my cutlet?'

F: 'Well, I'm afraid it was me. I'm sorry, I didn't know.'

M: 'It's nothing. Cutlets are very bad for you'.

F: 'Don't be angry. How could I know it was yours?'

M: 'Yes, I forgot to attach my card to it!'

F: 'You know, I think there's something else in the freezer. Wait a little and I'll prepare it for you'

M: 'Well, OK, if I don't starve to death first'.

The above example is interesting for several reasons. First of all it starts with a fairly formulaic and predictable apology from F, however, in her attempt to save her face, she gives a false reason for committing the offending act: 'I'm sorry, I didn't know'.

The last, somewhat lengthy example to be discussed here illustrates even more evidently the nature of apologies as negotiated acts:

M₁, M₂, and M₃: Polish students, 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: 'Hello gentlemen! What's [new] with you?'

M₂: 'Or, rather, what's [new] with you? Where have you been?'

M₁: 'Well, you know, they talked me into a game [of cards] and we finished at four [a.m.]. And then, of to work at eight. ...'

M₂: 'And didn't it cross your mind to give us a call?'

M₁: 'I called at least five times, old man, but nobody answered!'

M₃: 'Impossible, we were all at home from nine.'

M₂: 'You see, we here—'

M₁: 'Well, I'm sorry, but you know ---'

M₂: [Gets very angry] "you know"! We are living here together and we've got some rules to follow. Specially as we're not at home. Now, put yourself in our situation—'

M₁: I [Interrupts again] 'But don't turn this into a tragedy!'

M₂: 'don't interrupt me, OK? The fact is that you acted like a fool. I think that if you were not able to get in touch with us you should have simply come back and nothing would be the matter. And now, how do you look?'

M₁: 'Now you are exaggerating. And anyway, stop treating me like some piece of turd. I said I was sorry, that I felt stupid, but don't act like a hysterical mother. Do you want me to kiss you on your hand?'

M₃: 'Stop it now. It's only that nobody knew where you were and what you were doing.'

M₁: 'That's why I'm sorry. It won't happen again, OK?'

M₃: 'OK, no problem.'

3.4 THOMAS

Searle claims to be setting out rules for speech acts, but all he is really doing is describing the semantics of speech act verbs. Be that as it may, the question which concerns us here is whether it is possible to extend Searle's conditions to cover at least some of the subtleties of a speech act. In this section which follows I have tried to establish a set of Searlian conditions for a slightly more complicated example than those I have given so far—the speech act of apologizing (these rules are modeled closely on Searle's (1969:67) rules for thanking).

The speech act of apologizing: a case study:

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

Let us again see how this might work out with a concrete example: Pat says to Michael: 'I'm sorry I broke your nose'.

Propositional act	The speaker (Pat) expresses regret for a past act (breaking Michael's nose) which the speaker herself performed.
Preparatory condition	Pat believes that breaking Michael's nose was not in Michael's best interest.
Propositional act	The speaker expresses or implies or in some other way indicates regret of a past, present act performed by the speaker, or someone or something for which the speaker has responsibility (but perhaps has no responsibility whatsoever).
Preparatory condition	The speaker may or may not believe that the act was, is or will be against H's best interests ... and so on.

Producing formal rules for the way in which speech acts operate is immensely appealing; unfortunately the rules only work in very restricted circumstances: not only do they exclude perfectly normal instances of speech acts, but they exclude perfectly normal instances of speech acts, but they are also so

general in their specification that they fail to eliminate anomalous use, as will be shown in the following section.

Over-generality of rules:

So far I have discussed perfectly ordinary examples of given speech acts which Searle's rules cannot cope with; we can also find totally anomalous examples which his rules will not eliminate. The following is a case in point. (The then leader of the British Labour Party) issued a series of explicit 'warnings'.

Example

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

Mr Kinnock observes all Searle's conditions for warning (1969:67):

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

CHAPTER 4

APOLOGY STRATEGIES

4.1 TROSBORG

The restoration of a complainable may be performed by means of a clear apology using one of the verbs directly signaling 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 sufficient, 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.

Category O: Output Out:

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/she can be held responsible, either by justifying his/her attacking the complainer.

The five categories can be described as follows:

Category 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility

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

Example:(i) Seo, ga ke se itse.
(That, I don't know).

(ii) Ga ke itse gore go diragalang
(I don't know what is happening).

0.2 Implicit denial of responsibility

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

Example: A person is being asked why he has stolen his friend's pen and he answers:

(a) O a itse gore nka se dire selo se se ntseng jalo.
(You know that I would never do a thing like that)

(b) Nka se lo tlabise ditlhong ka go dira jalo.
(I won't disappoint you by doing that).

0.3 Justification

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

Example: (a) Nka go netefaletsa
(I can assure you).

(b) Tota ke go belelela boamaruri
(I am really telling you the honest truth).

0.4 Blaming someone else:

The complainees seeks to evade responsibility by blaming someone else. He/she may blame a third party or even the complainer him/herself (in which case the complainees is likely to cause further offence.)

Example (a) Ga ke itse gore go diragalang, gongwe mongwe a ka nna le kitso.

(I don't know what is happening; perhaps someone may have an idea)

(b) Mongwe a ka tlhalosa botokwa.

(Somebody can explain better).

0.5 Attacking the complainees:

The complainer lacks an adequate defense for his/her behaviour; he/she may choose to attack the complainer instead.

Example: (a) Ga ke itse sepe ka yona!

(I know nothing about it!)

(b) Go thata ga ke tlhaloganye sepe

(It is difficult, I understand nothing).

Evasive Strategies**(a) 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/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.

Minimizing e.g.

Se tshwenyege, go tla siama.

(Don't get worried, it will be all right).

Se utlwe botlhoko; O tla atlega gape, seo ke dinyana.

(Don't get hurt, you will be successful again, those are minor things).

Querying preconditions e.g.

Go bonala batho ba tlwaetse go dira jalo: Ga ba kgathalele bana ba bona.

(It looks like people are used to do that; they don't care about their children).

Go ne go jalo. Botshelo mareledi

(It is like that. There are ups and downs in life).

Blaming someone else e.g.

O ne a ithuta, fela ga a falola ditlathobho.

(She was learning by hard, but she failed her exams).

Bana ba ga ba dumedise. Go tswa kwa lapeng;

(These children are not greeting. The background counts).

Indirect Apologies**Acknowledgement of responsibility**

When a complainees 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 complainees accepts the blame.

(i) Implicit acknowledgement

e.g. Ke nnete. Ke tla tokafatsa

(It is true. I will improve on that).

(ii) Explicit acknowledgement

e.g. Ke tla leka, le fa ke paletswa

(I will try, though I failed).

(iii) Expression of lack of intent

e.g. Seo se diragetse kwa ntle ga taolo yame.
(That happened beyond my control).

(iv) Expression of self-deficiency

e.g. Ke tshogile, ke tshaba go bua mo pele ga matlho a batho.
(I am frightened; I am shy to speak in front of people).

(v) Expression of embarrassment e.g.

e.g. Ke ditlhong ka se se diragetseng.
(I am ashamed of what happened).

(vi) Explicit acceptance of the blame e.g.

e.g. Ke ne ke sa tshwanela gore ke a bo ke dirile jalo. Ke gona ntshwaye phoso.
(I was not supposed to have reacted like this, therefore blame me).

Explanation or Account

A complaineer 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 explanation or account becomes clearly or should then be made.

(i) Implicit explanation e.g.

- (a) A o a tlhologanya. O a bona ?
(You understand. You see?)
- (b) Ke mmitse ka gobo a sa reetse.
(I hit her because she is not listening).

(ii) Explicit explanation: e.g.

- (a) Ke tla leka, le fa ke paletswa.
(I will try, though I failed).
- (b) Ke maswabi ke thari, fela go ne go le pharakano e ntsi mo tseleng.
(I am sorry I am late, but it was peak hours).

The strategies of implicit explanation and explicit explanation differ from the strategy of implicit denial of responsibility, with respect to the speaker's acknowledgement of responsibility. In an explanation or account, a complaineer 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 /her behaviour. An explanation or account serves as an excuse for a committed offence, whereas in justification the complaineer does not acknowledge that an offence has occurred.

4. Direct Apologies

Expression of apology

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

Austin (1962) 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.

(a) Expression of regret e.g.

- (i) Ke maswabi
(I am sorry).
- (ii) Ke tlhomoga pelo go utlwa ka seo.
(I am sorry to hear about that).

(b) Offer of apology e.g.

- (i) Ga jaana ka re nkinele matsogo metsing.
(I hereby apologize for....)

(ii) Ke kopa o ntebalele melato ka tsweetswee.

(Please forgive me and forget about everything).

Request for forgiveness, e.g.

(i) Nxae, ke a go rapela

(Please forgive me, I beg you).

(ii) O intshwarele ka tsweetswee ke maswabi.

(Please forgive me, I am sorry).

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.

(a) Expressing concern for hearer-strategy 5.

In order to soothe the anger of a complainer, the complainees may express concern for his / her well being, condition etc.

(b) Promise of forbearance- strategy 6

When apologizing, the speaker takes responsibility by expressing regret, and he/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/her behaviour in a number of ways. Such responses are often signaled by the performative verb promise.

e.g. O a bo o tla thari gape? Ke solofetsa go tla ka nako e sa le teng. Ga gona go diragala gape.

(You will be coming late again? I promise I will come early, it won't happen again)

O a be o tla lebala dipitsa mo isong gape. Ga ke na ke di lebala, ke a solofetsa.

(You will be forgetting the pots on the stove again. I will never forget them again, I promise).

Offer of repair – Str. 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.

e.g.

Repair:(a) O thutse koloi ya me. Ke tseela gore tlhomamiso ya koloi e tla akaretsa ditshenyegelo.

(You have damaged my car; I presume your insurance will cover the insurance)

Compensation: (b) Ke latlhile buka ya gago, ke tla duela R100.00, gore o e reke.

(I have lost your book; I will pay you R100.00 to buy it).

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.

(a) Ke phoso e ke se kitlang ke e dira gape.

(It is a mistake. I will never repeat it again).

(b) E ne e se maikemisetso a me go go goeletsa. Ke ditlhong.

(It was not my aim to shout at you. I feel ashamed)

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

Apologies as Strategic disarmers.

Apologies may themselves function as strategic disarmers as preparators for other acts, typically as softeners, preparing for request, complaints, and refusals.

e.g

(a) Intshwareleng go lo tshwenya, a ga go botokwa go lebelela telebeshene ka dipone di tuka.

(Sorry for troubling you but isn't it better to watch TV with the lights on.

(b) Ke tshwenyegile, e kete lo ka tlhompha batho fa ba robotse.

(I am worried, it seems you could have respect for people who are sleeping).

Apologies, which occur prior to the offence, involving the types of apology described above, can be justified on the grounds that it is possible for the speaker to apologize for something he/she is in the course of doing, or has not yet done, provided that both speaker and hearer have good grounds to believe that it will be done (Owen 1983: 117).

In the present work, I can concentrate on apologies as remedial responses to offending acts, and as the occurrence of apologies as strategies disarmers is not subjected to investigation.

Internal Modification

On the one hand, I shall focus on internal modifiers which serve to mitigate the circumstances under which an offence was committed and which, consequently, lessen the blame that can be attached to the complaine. In the case of an attack, these elements play down the guilt that can be attached to the apologizer.

On the other hand, I am concerned with markers that serve the purpose of remediation, either by means of intensification of an apology, excuse, or simply as verbal devices to restore harmony.

This means that the categories of internal modifiers subjected to analysis include downgraders, as well as upgraders.

Categories 1-4 minimize the complainable and hence play down the blame that can be attached to the complaine. These strategies are directed at the saving of the apologizer's face making him/her appear less guilty.

Categories 5 maximizes the apology, excuses, etc; and thus upgrades the impact of the apology on the receiver, while category 6 emphasizes the apologizer's belief in the complainer's positive attitude with regard to the proposition. Categories 7-8 function at the interpersonal level of discourse to restore harmony between two interlocutors.

Eight categories of internal modifiers – 'modality markers'

1. **Down-toners:** Adverbial sentence modifiers, such as just, simply e.g
 - (a) Ke sa tswa go mo letsetsa mogala jaanong.
(I have just phoned him now).
 - (b) Thari fela ka gobo o diilwe ke pharakano.
(You are late simply because you were delayed by traffic).

2. **Understaters:** Phrasers that under- represent the state of affairs denoted in the complaine e.g. a little bit, a second, not very much.
 - (a) Ke sentse nako e nnyane moo.
(I wasted a little bit of time there).
 - (b) Ke letile go feta motsotswana.
(I waited more than a second).

3. **Hedges:** Adverbial by means of which the complaine avoids a precise prepositional specification, e.g. kind of, sort of, somehow.
 - (a) Go diragetse ka mokgwa mongwe gore re fapane ka ditsela.
(Somehow it happened that we missed each other).
 - (b) O mofuta wa motho yo o ratang go thusa.
(You are a kind of person who is willing to help).

4. **Subjectivizers:** Modifiers that characterize the proposition as the speaker's personal opinion, e.g. I think, I suppose, I am afraid, in my opinion.
 - (a) Ke akanya gore dilo di tla siama.
(I think that things will sort themselves out).
 - (b) Ke itlhome fa lo siamisitse dipharologanyo magareng ga lona.
(I suppose you have sorted out your differences).

5. **Intensifiers:** Adverbials intensifying part of the proposition, e.g. intensifying a lack of attention, and expression of regret or embarrassment.
- (a) Ke maswabi; ke ne ke se mo maikaelelong a go go utlwisa botlhoko.
(I am very sorry; it was not my intention to hurt you).
- (b) Intshwarele, ke ne ke sa ikaelela go itshwara ka mokgwa oo.
(I am terribly sorry; I didn't mean to behave in that manner).
6. **Commitment Upgraders:** Sentence modifiers expressing a special commitment towards the proposition.
- (a) Ke ne ka tlhomamisa fa o rata re ka kopana gape.
(I was certain that you would like us to meet again).
- (b) Ke ne ke edile ka ke lemoga gore o amogetse maipolelo a me.
(I was positive as I realized you have accepted my confession).
7. **Cajolers:** Gambits functioning at the interpersonal level of discourse with the function of restoring harmony between two interlocutors, e.g. you know, you see.
8. (a) O itse gore o nna le kitso fa o bala
(You know that you become knowledgeable when you study).
- (b) Ke raya gore batho botlhe ba go bogela
(I mean all the people are admiring you).
- (c) O a bona, go jalo mo botshelong.
(You see, it is like that in life).
9. **Appealers:** Discourse elements (including tags) intended to elicit a response from the complainer, appealing to his/her understanding, e.g. okay, right, don't you think?
- (a) Go siame go itshwara jalo.
(It's okay to behave in that manner).
- (b) Ga o gopole gore re balele pele?
- (c) Don't you think we should study further)?

5.1 Blum-Kulka et al

The five strategies which make up the speech act set of apology (Olsthain & Cohen, 1983) consist of two which are general and three which are situation specific. The two general are the : IFID

(Illocutionary Force Indicating Device), which contains the formulaic, routinized forms of apology, (various apology verbs) and the expression of the S's responsibility, which relates to the S's willingness to admit to fault.

Potentially, the IFID and /or the expression of S's responsibility could realize an apology in any situation.

The IFID contains the explicit, performative verbs which express an apology for a violation, can be used across all situations which require the act of apology.

The other three strategies, the explanation, the offer of repair, and the promise of forbearance, are situation-specific and will semantically reflect the content of the situation.

The general import of these five major strategies is fairly transparent, when we remark that IFIDs explicitly clarify that an apology is being carried out. In the following example, all five strategies are used.

Illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs). IFIDs are formulaic, routinized expressions in which the speaker's apology is made explicit. Example: sorry, excuse me, I apologize for, forgive me, pardon me for, I regret that, I'm afraid.

Intensifiers of the apology

IFID internal:

Intensifying Adverbials

- (a) Ke swabile /thata fela // tota / /maswabi tota.
(I'm sorry / terribly / so / really / awfully sorry).

Emotional expressions / exclamation

(a) O!

(Oh)!

(b) O hee!

(Oh no)!

(c) O Morena!

(Oh Lord)!

(d) Modimo!

God!

Expressions marked for register

- (a) Ke tota ke kopa maitshwarelo.
(I do apologize)

Double intensifier or repetition of intensifying adverbial.

- (a) Ke tota ke le maswabi
(I'm really dreadfully sorry)
- (b) Ke tota, tota, ke swabile
(I'm very, very, sorry).

Please

- (a) Intshwarele tsweetswee
(Please forgive me).

Other: Concern for the hearer. The speaker takes explicit cognizance of the hearer's feelings, which he or she may have offended.

- (a) Ke tshepa gore ga ke a go kgopisa.
(I hope I didn't hurt you).

Taking on responsibility

In an attempt to placate the hearer, the speaker chooses to express responsibility for the offence, which created the need to apologize.

Explicit self-blame. The speaker explicitly acknowledges the fact that he or she has been at fault.

- (a) Phoso ya me
(My mistake)
- (b) (Ke molato wa me otlhe
(It's my entire fault).

Lack of intent. The speaker explicitly states that he or she had not intended to hurt the hearer through his or her offence.

- (a) (Ke ne ke sa ikemisetsa go go kgopisa
(I didn't mean to hurt you)
- (b) E ne e se maikemisetso a me go go kgopisa
(It was not my intention to upset you).

Justify hearer. The speaker communicates to his or her hearer that he or she fully understands the later's reactions to the offense inflicted upon him or her.

- (a) O tshwanetse go kgopise ga
(You are right to get angry).

Expression of embarrassment.

- (a) Ke utlwa ke le maswabi ka seo.
(I feel awful about it).

Admission of fact but not of responsibility. The speaker does not deny his or her involvement in the offensive act but abstains from openly accepting responsibility.

- (a) Ga ke a e bala
(I haven't read it)
- (b) Ke siilwe ke bese
(I missed the bus)
- (c) Ke lebetse ka seo
(I forgot about it)
- (d) Ga ke a nna le tshono ya go tshwaya
(I haven't had time to mark it yet).

Refusal to acknowledge guilt. The speaker completely rejects responsibility for the offence, in one or more of the following ways:

Denial of responsibility

- (a) E ne e se phoso ya me
(It wasn't my fault)

Blame the hearer

- (a) Ke molato wa gago
(It's your own fault)

Pretend to be offended

- (a) Ke nna ke diretsweng phoso
(I am the one to be offended)

Explanation or account

This category covers any external (+/- human) mitigating circumstances offered by the speaker, i.e., "objective" reasons for the violation at hand. Whenever first person is used, e.g. "I missed the bus", however the expression should be coded as one of the sub strategies of "Taking on Responsibility".

- (a)Pharakano e ne e boitshega
(The traffic was terrible)
(a) Motlhatlhededi wa me ontiegitse
(My tutor kept me late)

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; in other words, you can only repair a reparable.

- (a)Ke tla duela ditshenyegelo
(I'll pay for the damage)
(b)Ke tla ya go botsisa kwa boapelong)
(I'll go and inquire in the kitchen)

Promise for 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.

- (a) Se ga se na se diragala gape
(This won't happen again)

5.2 FRASER (1981)

There are cases in which an expression ordinarily used to apologize is intended quite differently. The use of “Excuse me” is one such example. On the one hand, this expression might be used as a bona fide apology; on the other hand it might be used as a request for sufferance in the sense discussed above.

Similarly, the use of “I am sorry” may have the force of an apology, or simply count as the expression of regret on the part of the speaker, with absolutely no implication of speaker responsibility intended. The use of “I am sorry” to the relative of one just passed away comes to mind as one example of this expression not being used as an apology.

The use of “Please let me pay for the damages” may be used as an apology under certain circumstances; it may also be used as a simple offer to the injured without any implication intended that the speaker is either responsible in any way for the offense or harbors any regret for the offense sustained. One need not go further to establish the point, namely, that although there are certain strategies for apologizing, some of which are better known and more frequently used than others, none can be uniquely interpreted as being used as an apology, except perhaps the perhaps the performative form, though this, also, is subject to certain alternative interpretation.

The expression of regret on the part of the speaker is certainly one of the primary strategies semantic formulae – for apologizing.

Strategy 1: Announcing that you are apologizing

“(hereby) apologize for....”

Strategy 2: Stating one’s obligation to apologize

“I must apologize for...”

Strategy 3: Offering to apologize

“I (hereby) offer my apology for....”

“I would like to offer my apology to you for...”

Strategy 4:

“Please accept my apology for...”

“Let me apologize for...”

"I would appreciate it if you would accept my apology for..."

Strategy 5: Expressing regret for the offence.

"I'm (truly/very/so/terribly) sorry for..."

"I (truly / very much / so)... regret that I..."

Strategy 6: Requesting forgiveness for the offence.

"Please excuse me for..."

"Pardon me for..."

"I beg your pardon for..."

"Forgive me for..."

Strategy 7: Acknowledging responsibility for the offending act.

"That was my fault"

"Doing that was a dumb thing to do"

Strategy 8: Promising forbearance from a similar offending act.

"I promise you that will not happen again."

Strategy 9: Offering redress

"Please let me pay for the damage I've done."

The first four strategies seem to fall together since they are relatively direct: in each, the speaker mentions that an apology is at issue, though only in the first, the performative form, does he actually say that what he is doing is apologizing. The other strategies—that of expressing the obligation to apologize, offering to apologize, and requesting the hearer accept an apology do not literally count as announcing that one is apologizing, but there is little likelihood that the speaker's intentions are other than to apologize in choosing one of these strategies.

The next five strategies are much more indirect than the first four; in these, the speaker does not say that an apology is at issue. In strategy 5 the speaker is, however, explicitly expressing regret for the offense as well as explicitly acknowledging responsibility for the act itself. In using the more abbreviated form of "I am sorry" or just "Sorry", the speaker must assume that the identity of the offending act is shared by both parties.

In requesting forgiveness for the offense, strategy 6, the speaker is again explicitly acknowledging responsibility for the offending act, but not explicitly expressing regret. By saying “Please excuse me for stepping on your toe” I have not specifically said that I have any regret for having offended you, though there is certainly an entailment that I feel it; why else would I be seeking your forgiveness? .

The same point holds for strategy 7 in which the speaker is expressing responsibility for the offending act (“that was my fault”) but here the regret is only implied, not entailed. Whereas the seeking of forgiveness or seeking to be excused from the consequences of some prior act does indeed linguistically entail regret for having brought about those unfavourable consequences, this does not hold for simply admitting that one previously did something.

In choosing the 8th strategy, the speaker expresses neither responsibility for having performed the act nor regret for the offense committed. Both of these apology conditions must be inferred by the hearer from the context of speaking and knowledge of what had previously occurred.

A similar situation holds for the 9th strategy in which the speaker offers to make redress for the offense. In saying “What can I do to make amends” or “How can I ever repay you” the speaker is certainly implying that he has some responsibility and feels regret, but this does not necessarily follow. One can easily imagine hearing from a wealthy father whose son had just broken a neighbour’s picture window, “Let me pay you for the damages”, not because he felt any regret for the damage nor any responsibility for the act, but because he felt it easier to offer to pay the damages at that point and be done with it rather than wait until later.

CHAPTER 5

APOLOGIES IN SETSWANA

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 APLOGY 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 instances in school situations.

Possessive involves some damage or loss to the addressee's possession. It's subsituations are clothes, jacket, class-notes and money.

In talking 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 talking situation include noise, insult and phone.

In a space situation, there is a range of infringements on another's personal space, which make occasion apologies. Its subsituations are: Queue, parcel, bicycle and desk

In service, the offence failed to deliver, to keep promises and offer the assistance that was expected of him/her. It's subsituations are help, information and message

The situation of time 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; appointment and assignment.

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

5.3. QUESTIONNAIRE

1. POSSESSION

1.1 Clothes

Wearing of another person’s clothes without permission

Situation:

O mo phaphosing e le nngwe. Maitseboa mangwe tsala enngwe ya gago e ile ya go laletsa go ya le Wena le tsala ya gago lo dula mmyona kwa moletlong. Fela ga o na diaparo tse di maleba tsa moletlo. O ile wa tsaya diaparo dingwe mo kobotlong ya tsala ya gago, mme wa di apara kwa ntle go tetla ya gagwe.

You and your friend stay together in one room. One evening another friend of yours invited you to go to a dance-party with you. But you do not have the right clothes for a party. You then took some clothes from the cupboard of your friend and you put them on without permission.

Complaint:

Fa o busa diaparo moso o o latelang, tsala ya gago e ile ya ngongorega:

When you returned the clothes the following morning after the party, your friend complained:

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

Apology:

O ile wa kopa maitshwarelo go tsala ya gago:

You then apologize to your friend:

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

1.2 Clothes

Somebody stained my clothes by spilling coffee

Situation:

Wena le modiramongo, lo mo kantorong e le nngwe. O tswa go dira kofi, o feta ka kopi ka fa morago ga gago. Ka nako e a fetang, ke fa o ema, mme kofi ya tshelagela mo baking ya gago.

You and your co-worker, work in the same office. She went to make a cup of coffee for herself. The time she passes you at the back, you stood up and the coffee spilled your jacket.

Complaint:

Fa o apola baki ya gago, wa fitlhela e na le phatshwa. O ile wa ngongorega.

When you take off your jacket, you realized that it was stained, and you complained.

Apology:

Jaanong o ikopila maitshwarelo.

She now apologise to you.

1.3 Class notes

Failed to return a book of class notes from which you copied notes.

Situation:

Tsala ya gago e go adimile buka ya lokwalo ya phaphosi borutelo, gore o tle o tsee malebela mo go yona. Fa o fetsa ka yona, ga o tseye matsapa a go e busa.

You friend has borrowed you a book of classnotes from which you copied notes. After you have finished with the notes, you failed to return the book..

Offence:

Tsala ya gago e ile ya ngongorega fa o sa tlisa buka ya lokwalo.

Your friend complained about the book of class notes that was not returned.

Apology:

O ikopela maitshwarelo go tsala ya gago ka molato o.

You apologize to your friend about this offence.

1.4 Money:

Did not return borrowed money in time.

Situation:

Tsala ya me e ne ya adima madi a le mo mathateng a go duela madi a sekolo. Ngwana wa gagwe o ne a sa letlwa go kwala ditlhatlhobo tsa magare a ngwaga fa a sa duele. Ke ne ka mo adima madi a ke neng ke a beetse go rekela bana diaparo tsa mariga. Ke ile ka mo adima ka tumalano ya gore o tla a busa fa kgwedi ya Seetebosigo e fela, le jaanong ga go nko e e tswang lemina.

My friend had financial problems. She came to me to borrow money to pay for his son's tuition fees because if she does not pay, her son will not be allowed to sit for the examination. I only had money to spend for my children's winter clothes.

I lend her with an agreement that she'll return the money at the end of June, but to no avail.

Complaint:

Mo bekeng ya bobedi ya kgwedi e e latelang ke ne ka itlhagisa, ka ngongorega.

In the second week of July, I approached her and complained.

Apology:

O ile a kopa maitshwarelo.

She then apologised to me.

2.TALK**2.1 Noise****Making noise while other people are studying.****Situation:**

Baithuti ba mo phaphosing borutelo. Ke nako ya motshegare ya go bala. Moithuti mongwe le mongwe o lebane le dibuka tsa gagwe. Go setlhopha sa

baithuti ba ba ba tsayang kgang ka buka ya Setswana e ba e sekasekang. Se, se baka modumo o o feretlhang baithuti ba bangwe.

Learners are in the classroom. It is time for the afternoon studies. Every learner is concentrating on his / her work But, there is a group of learners who are discussing a Setswana literature book, which they need to analyze. This causes disturbance to other learners.

Complaint:

Mongwe wa baithuti o ile a ya go morutabana go ngongorega ka modumo o o dirwang ke setlhopha se, sa baithuti.

One of the learners went to the teacher and complain about the noise caused by the group of learners

Apology:

Setlhopha sa baithuti se ile sa kopa maitshwarelo go baithuti ba bangwe.

A group of learners then apologized to other learners.

2.2 Insult**Offend/insulted someone in a meeting.****Situation:**

Mo kopanong, batla pitsong ga ba utlwane le se motshwaramarapo a se dirang. O reetsa yo, a bue le yo, a sa bue pele le go fetsa pele le motho a le mongwe go mo utlwelela le go fetsa ka puo ya gagwe. Kwa bofelong ga a rarabolole sepe. Se, se kgopisa mongwe wa batla pitsong, e bile o mmolelela gore e kete o tlohlwa ke maemo, a role marapo, a fe motho yo a mo tshwanetseng.

In a meeting, the people are not in favour of the way the chairperson is addressing the issues. There is no individual attention; he treats every thing simultaneously. One of the people who came to the meeting told him that he is not capable enough to hold a meeting, he must step down and give somebody who is capable.

Complaint:

Mongwe wa batla pitsong o ile a ngongorega ba ntse ba le mo pitsong.

One of the people complained while in the meeting.

Apology:

O ile a kopa maitshwarelo mo motla pitsong.

He then apologizes to one of the members.

2.3 Phone

Speak too long on public phone.

Situation:

Go na le mogala wa setshaba o le mongwe kwa posong. Batho ba ba ntsi ba tlile go letsa mogala, e bile mola o moleele. Fa e sa le batho ba eme;ba letile mosadi a le mongwe yo o buang ka mogala nako e telele a sa fetse.

There is only one public phone at the post office. Many people stand in a queue to make some calls. People are increasing in numbers, and waiting for one woman on the phone who talk for a long time not finishing.

Complaint:

Morago ga gore a fetse go bua, ke fa batho ba ba mo moleleng ba ngongongorega.

After she has finish to talk, people in the queue were complaining.

Apology:

O ile a kopa maitshwarelo.

She then apologizes to the people.

2.4. Group discussion

Not taking part in group discussion

Situation:

Baithuti ba kgaogantswe ka ditlhopha. Ba filwe setlhogo se ba tshwanetseng go se sekaseka. Botlhe ba tsa karolo kwa ntle ga moithuti a le mongwe, yo o didimetseng fela, mo setlhopheng seo.

Learners are divided into groups. They are given a topic to discuss it as a group. They are all participating with the exception of one learner who is quiet in that group.

Complaint:

Moeteledipele wa setlhopha o bitsa morutabana , a ngongorega ka moithuti yo.
 The group leader calls the teacher to complain about this learner.

Apology:

Moithuti o kopa maitshwarelo go baithuti.
 The learner apologizes to the group.

3. CLEANING

3.1.Cleaning in groups

Cleaning in-groups, others are not cooperative.

Situation:

Baithuti ba phephafatsa phaphosi borutelo ka ditlhopha go ya ka matsatsi. Ditlhopha dingwe ga di phephafatse fa e le letsatsi la bona la go phephafatsa.

Learners are divided into groups to clean the classroom. This is done according to days. Some groups do not clean the classroom when it's their turn.

Complaint:

Letsatsi le le latelang, fa baithuti ba tsena mo phaphosing borutelo, ba fitlhela e le leswe e sa phephafatswa. Ba a ngongorega.

The following morning when other learners get into the classroom, they found it dirty not being cleaned. They complain.

Apology:

Ba kopa maitshwarelo go morutabana le baithuti.

They apologize to the educator and the learners.

4 SPACE**4.1 Queue**

Somebody jumped the queue.

Situation:

Kgwedi e fedile, ke mo bankeng, mola o moleele. Go na le rre mongwe yo o fetang batho ba e leng kgale ba eme mo moleng. O fetela kwa pele a batla go thuswa ka bonako.

It is month end, people are standing in a long queue. There comes a certain man, who passes the people in a long queue and goes forward. He needed help urgently.

Complaint:

fa batho ba ba letileng ba bona ba fetiwa fela mo moleng o moleele, ba ile ba ngongoregela go morebolodi wa mola.

People in the long queue could not take it, they complained to the line's man.

Apology:

O ile a ikopela maitshwarelo mo bathong.

He then apologizes to the people.

4.2 Accident

Knock out a parcel out of hands.

Situation:

Go na le mosimane yo o tlang a taboga ka fa morago. Mosadi mongwe o tsamaya fa thoko ga tsela, a tshwere sephuthelwana. Fa mosimane yo a feta, ke fa a mo thula, mme sephuthelwana se, sa tswa mo matsogong a gagwe sa wela fatshe.

There is a boy coming from behind running. There is also a woman who walks on a pavement, having a parcel in her hand. When this boy passes by this woman, he knocked out a parcel out of her hand.

Complaint:

Mosadi yo, o ile a ngongoregela go mosimane fa a digile sephuthelwana.

This woman complained to the boy about his parcel.

Apology:

Mosimane o ile a kopa maitshwarelo go mosadi.

Then then boy apologizes to the woman.

4.3 Accident

Knock down by the bicycle while walking down the street.

Situation:

E ne e le ka nako ya mariga fa mosadi mongwe a ne a tsamaya mo thoko ga tsela, go le maitseboa. O ne a apere diaparo tse di lefifi. Go ne ga tlhaga monna ka baesekele ka fa morago ga mosadi yo. Monna ga a mo lemoga ke fa a thula mosadi.

It was wintertime when one woman was walking down the street. It was in the evening. The woman was wearing dark clothes. The man with a bicycle did not notice her, and she was knocked down from behind.

Complaint:

Fa mosadi a ema, o ile a ngongorega go monna yo.

When the woman stand up, she complained to the man.

Apology:

Monna o ile a ikopela maitshwarelo.

He then apologizes to the woman.

4.4 Accident

Bumped into a student who fell down and hurt himself/herself.

Situation:

O kwa mebaleng ya motshameko. O tshameka bolo tloa. O tlolela kgwele, mme o thulana le moithuti gore a be a wele fatshe a be a ikgobatse.

You are at the sports ground, playing net ball. When you jump for the ball, you bumped into the student and she fell and hurt herself.

Complaint:

Moithuti yo o rapaletseng mo lebaleng, o ngongorega fa a utlwile botlhoko mo thamong.

The student that lie stretched out on the ground, complain of a pain in the neck

Apology:

O kopa maitshwarelo go moithuti.

You apologize to the student.

4.5 Seat**Took another student's desk in class.****Situation:**

Lo mo phaphosing borutelo. Moithuti o tsaya tafole ya moithuti yo mongwe, ka a lemoga fa ya gagwe e le botlhaswa thata. O batla e e phepha mme o a di ananya. Fa moithuti wa tafole a dula, o lemoga fa e se tafole ya gagwe.

You are in the classroom. You take another student's desk as you have realized that yours is untidy. You want the clean one and you exchange the desk. When this student sit on his desk, he realize that this is not his desk.

Offence:

Moithuti o ngongorega mo go wena fa o tseile tafole ya gagwe.

The student complains to you about the exchange of desks.

Apology:

O ikopela maitshwarelo go moithuti ka molato o.

You apologize to the student for this offence.

5. INCONVINIENCE

5.1 Copy

Copied from a friend in the classroom.

Wena le tsala ya gago lo dula mo tafoleng e le nngwe. Go kwalwa teko mo phaphosing borutelo. Fa morutabana a tshwaya teko, o lemoga fa lo kwadile selo se le sosi.

You and your friend sit on one desk. It is in the classroom and you are writing a test. When the teacher is marking your paper, he realized that you have written exactly like your friend.

Offence:

Morutabana o ngongorega ka go kopisa ga mongwe wa lona.

The teacher complains that, one of you has copied.

Apology:

Tsala ya gago e kopa maitshwarelo ka molato o a o dirileng.

Your friend apologizes for the offence.

5.2 Inadequate service.

Promise of assistance on school project but did not help.

Situation:

Komiti ya baithuti ba setlhopha sa somepedi, se na le porojeke ya go tsenya lotseno ka go dira dikonsarata, dikgaisano tsa bo mmabontle, go sa apare diaparo tsa sekole, jj. Ba kokoanya madi a, go direla baithuti ba mophato wa somepedi moletlo wa kgaogano. Ka lamatlhatso o mongwe, komiti e ile ya kopa morutabana mongwe go ema mo kgorong gore a rekise ditekete, ga a ka a tla jaaka a solofeditse.

The grade 12 committee is busy with a project that will assist them in organizing the grade 12-farewell function. They raise funds by organizing concerts, beauty contest, not wearing uniform to school, etc. One Saturday, the committee asked one of the male educators to sell tickets at the door; he disorganized the committee by not turning up as he promised.

Complaint:

Fa ba kopana ka mosupologo morago ga konserata, komiti e ile ya mmitsa ya ngongorega. When they meet on Monday after the concert the committee complained.

Apology:

O ile a kopa maitshwarelo go komite ya setlhopha sa somepedi. He then apologizes to the grade 12 committee.

5.3 Wrong Information

Situation:

Tsala ya gago e ile ya go bolelela fa nako ya teko kwa sekolong e le ka Labone. Fa o fitlha kwa sekolong ka Labone, o fitlhetse fa tsala ya gago e go file kitsiso e e fosagetseng, le gore teko e setse e kwadilwe ka Mosupologo.

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.

Offence:

O ile wa ngongorega go tsala ya gago ka kitsiso e e fosagetseng.
You complained to your friend about this wrong information.

Apology:

Tsala ya gago o kopile maitshwarelo ka molato o.
Your friend apologizes for this offence.

5.4 Message

Message of illness of one student was not delivered to teacher and the student missed the test.

Situation:

Moithuti yo o lwalang o ile a romeletsa moithuti yo a tsenang le ena sekolo mmogo, gore a fe morutabana molaetsa wa gore o a lwala, ga a kgone go tla sekolong. Fela moithuti o tlolewa ke teko.

A sick student gave the message to the student of the same school; to tell the teacher that he is ill, he cannot come to school. The message was not delivered to the teacher and the student missed the test.

Offence:

O ngongoregela go moithuti fa a sa tlisa molaetsa.

You complain to the student for not delivering the message.

Apology:

Moithuti ka wena o ikopela maitshwarelo.

A fellow student apologizes for the offence.

6. TIME**6.1 Late arrival****Arrived late for an appointment.****Situation:**

Ke pitso ya batsadi. Motsadi wa gago ga a bonagala mo pitsong go tla go utlwa ka tsamaiso le tse di tlhokagalang mo sekolong. Morutabana o mo kwalela lekwalo gore a iponagatse kwa sekolong. O ba nako, letlha, le letsatsi la gore ba kopane.

There is parents meeting at school. Your parent did not come to the meeting to be informed about the procedure and needs for the schools. The teacher write him a letter to come to school, she set an appointment with him including; time, day and date.

Complaint:

Fa motsadi a fitlha thari ka letsatsi leo, morutabana o ne a ngongorega.

When the parent came late on that day, the teacher complained.

Apology:

Motsadi o kopa maitshwarelo go morutabana.

The parent then apologizes to the teacher.

6.2 Late assignment**Handing in of assignment**

Asked a friend to hand in your school assignment and he/she handed it in late.

Situation:

O ntse o sa tle sekolong o lwala. Fela tsala ya gago e ntse e go fa dintlha ka tiro ya sekolo gore o se salele kwa morago ka tiro. O feditse e e batlwang ka letlha le le gaufi. O neela tsala ya gago gore e go isetse tiro, mme o dula ka yona, a feleletsa tiro ya gagwe. Se, se dira gore tiro ya gago e fitlhe morago ga nako e e beilweng.

You have been absent from school due to illness. Your friend keeps you up to date with the school assignments. You try to cover your work to submit it in time. After you have finished the one that is due the same day, you give it to your friend to submit it, but he delayed as he is still busy with his. This made him to hand it in late.

Complaint:

Fa o fitlha kwa sekolong o newa tiro ya gago e e tshwailweng, o lemoga fa tiro ya gago e fitlhisitswe thari ka e ne e gogetswe maduo a go e fitlhisa thari. O ne wa ngongoregela go tsala ya gago.

When you arrive at school your corrected work was given back to you. But you realized that marks were subtracted for late submission. You complained to your friend.

Apology:

Tsala ya gago e ile ya kopa maitshwarelo.

Your friend then apologizes to you.

5.3.1 COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Grade 11 learners from Kagisho Comprehensive School in the Free State Province completed this questionnaire. 20 learners did the completion of these questionnaires. 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 i.e. the offence or complaint part by males

5.4. ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGIES**5.4.1. APOLOGY SITUATIONS AND APOLOGY STRATEGIES**

		NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
1.	POSSESSION	99	22	53	23.5	46	20.8
1.1	Clothes	23	23	12	22.6	11	23.9
1.2	Jacket	24	24	13	24.5	11	23.9
1.3	Class-notes	28	28	14	26.4	14	30.4
1.4	Money	24	24	14	26.4	10	21.7
2.	TALKING	103	23.1	51	22.7	52	23.5
2.1	Noise	26	26	13	25.5	13	25
2.2	Insult	24	24	11	21.6	13	25
2.3	Phone	27	27	15	29.4	12	23
2.4	Discussion	26	26	12	23.5	14	26.9
3.	SPACE	111	24.9	56	24.9	55	24.9
3.1	Queue	26	23	12	21.4	14	25.4
3.2	Parcel	30	27	17	30.4	13	23.6
3.3	Bicycle	27	24.3	15	26.8	12	21.8
3.4	Desk	28	25.2	12	21.4	16	29
4	SERVICE	81	18.2	38	16.9	43	19.1
4.1	Help	25	30	10	26.3	15	27.2
4.2	Information	28	34.5	15	39.4	13	11.3
4.3	Message	28	34.5	13	34.2	15	27.2
5	TIME	52	11.7	27	12	25	11.3
5.1	Appointment	25	48	12	44	13	52
5.2	Assignment	27	51.9	15	55	12	48
	TOTAL	A:446		B:225		C:221	

In table 1 above, the various apology strategies 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 (Possession) a total number of 99 strategies have been used, i.e. 22% of the total number of strategies. Of these 99 strategies 53 (23.5) have been used by males and 46(20.8) by females

5.4.1.1. The major situations

	Situation	Total	Male	Female
1	Possession	22	23.5	20.8
2	Talking	23.1	22.7	23.5
3	Space	24.9	24.9	24.9
4	Service	18.2	16.9	19.1
5	Time	11.7	12	11.3

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 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, 3: 22%, 23.5%, 24.9%

Situation 4: 18.2%

Situation 5: 11.7%

From the above categories in situations relating to Possession 1, Talking 2 and Space 3, 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 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 1,2,3: 23.5, 22.7, and 24.9%

Situation 4: 16.9

Situation 5: 12

Female

The most frequent situation in order:

Situation 2, 3: 23.5, 24.9

Situation 1, 4: 20.8, 19.1

Situation 5; 11.3

Situation 1, 2, 3 are again involved with the most number of strategies by both males and females. The reason for this is that in both situations by males and females, lack of knowledge or something beyond the apologizer's power.

Situation 4 has the second most strategies with both males and females because, when compared to situation 1,2 and 3, it's offences do not involve lack of knowledge, but were done deliberately in a way that the speaker is feeling guilty.

Situation 5 has the least number of strategies with males (12) but second most with females (11.3) 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 their own task 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 5 has the least number of strategies with males but the most number of strategies with females because females are afraid of 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 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: 23.5, 20.8 = 2.7%

Situation 2: 22.7, 23.5 = .8%

Situation 3: 24.9, 24.9 = 0%

Situation 4: 16.9, 19.1 = 2.2%

Situation 5: 12, 11.3 = 0.7%

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 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. Sub-situations

5.4.1.2.1 Possessions

	Sub-situation	Total	Males	Females
1.1	Clothes	23	22.6	23.9
1.2	Jacket	24	24.5	23.9
1.3	Notes	28	26.4	30.4
1.4	Money	24	26.4	21.7

5.4.1.2.1.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 1.3 (280)

Group 2: 1.2, 1.4, (923, 24, 24)

In-group 1 there is an indication that the apologizers are feeling sorry for the occurred offences. In subsituations like wrong information and inadequate service, there is nothing one can do except to accept that an offence has occurred and an 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: 1.3, 1.4, (26.4, 26.4)

Group 2: 1.1, 1.2 (22.6, 24.5)

Females

Group 1: 1.3 (30.40)

Group 2: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 (23.9, 23.9, 21.7)

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 (26.4) because they do not want females to interpret in a way of saying that they supplied with inadequate services because they know that they are powerful.

In group 2, it is again males who have a high 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

Situation 1.1: 22.6, 23.9 = 13

Situation 1.2: 24.5, 23.9 = 6

Situation 1.3: 26.4, 30.4 = 4

Situation 1.4: 26.4, 21.7 = 4.7

In subsituation 1.3 and 1.4, 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 situation 1.1, 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 justified

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
2.1	Noise	26	25.5	25
2.2	Insult	24	21.6	25
2.3	Phone	27	29.4	23

5.4.1.2.2.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 2.3, 2.1, 2.3 (27, 26, 24)

All the above subsituations 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 their time to explain their positions.

5.4.1.2.2.2 Total number of strategies between males and females

Males

Group 1: 2.3 (29.4, 25.5)

Group 2: 2.2 (21.6)

Females

Group 1: 2.1, 2.2 (25, 25)

Group 2: 2.3 (23)

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 the 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

5.4.1.2.3 Strategies between males and females in these subsituations:

Subsituation 2.1 25.5, 25 = 0.5

Subsituation 2.2 21.6, 25 = 3.4

Subsituation 2.3 29.4, 30.4 = 1

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 equally responsible for the offences they have committed

5.4.1.2.3 Space

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
3.1	Queue	23	21.4	25.4
3.2	Parcel	27	30.4	23.6
3.3	Bicycle	24.3	26.8	21.8

5.4.1.2.3.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation

Group 1: 3.2, 3.3, 3.1 (27, 24.3, 23)

All the above subsituations are involved with many numbers 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: 3.2, 3.3, 3.1 (30.4, 26.8, 25.4)

Female

Group 1: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 (25.4, 23.6, 21.8)

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 21.4, 25.4 = 4

Subsituation 3.2 30.4, 23.6 = 6.8

Subsituation 3.3 26.8, 21.8 = 5

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 3.2 has the highest difference. This is because males are trying to be cooperative by involving many strategies to apologize.

5.4.1.2.4. Service

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
4.1	Help	30	26.3	27.2
4.2	Information	34.5	39.4	30.2
4.3	Message	34.5	34.2	27.2

5.4.1.2.4.1. Total number of strategies in this subsituation:

Group 1: 4.2, 4.3, 4.1 (34.5, 34.5, 30)

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 male and female

Male

Group 1: 4.2, 4.3, 4.1, (39.4, 34.2, 26.30)

Female

Group 1: 4.2, 4.1, 4.3, (30.2, 27.2, 27.2)

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 most strategies than males

5.4.1.2.5. Time

	Sub-situation	Total	Male	Female
5.1	Appointment	48	44	52
5.2	Assignment	51.9	55	48

5.4.1.2.5.1 Total number of strategies in this subsituation

Group 1: 5.2, 5.1 (51.9, 4.8)

In these subsituations, the number of strategies is high. This shows that there is a lot of explanation in this regard, and they make sure that their apology is taken into consideration.

5.4.1.2.5.2. Total number of strategies between male and females

Male

Group 1: 5.2, 5.1(55,44)

Female

Group 1: 5.1, 5.2 (52, 48)

From both groups, almost equal number of strategies is used. As it is, male strategies are a little bit higher than females. Males are more considerate in this relationship hence there are more strategies in this regard.

5.4.2 INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE IN MAJOR SITUATIONS

5.4.2.1 Total number of strategies

1. POSSESSION

Group 1:

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 87.6

Group 2:

Strategy: 2.3: Lack of intent 50.3

Group 3:

Strategy: 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 36.9

Group 4:

Strategy: 3.2: Explicit explanation 25.7

Strategy: 6: Promise of forbearance 24.8

Strategy: 4.2: Offer of apology 24.8

Group 5:

Strategy: 2.1 implicit acknowledgement 17.2

Request for forgiveness lead with the highest number compared to other strategies in group 1. This shows that other learners did not commit the offence deliberately; and they are are also accepting responsibility of such offence.

2. TALKING

Group 1:

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 106.4

Group 2:

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 61.8

Group 3:

Strategy: 4.2: Offer of apology: 49.3

Group 4:

Strategy: 3.2: Explicit explanation: 26.0

Strategy: 2.3: Lack of intent: 23.3

Strategy: 7 Offer of repair: 20

Group 5:

Strategy: 3.1: Implicit explanation

Strategy 2.4: Self deficiency: 13.7Strategy

6: Promise of forbearance: 12.1

Group 6:

Strategy: 4.1: Regret: 11.4

Strategy: 2.6: Accept blame 8.1

Request for forgiveness takes the highest position in this situation.. Most learners believe that it brings peace and harmony amongst themselves and develop good relationship.For the relationship to go on smoothly, other learners give explanation , hence explicit explanation is the second.

3. SPACE

Group 1:

Strategy: 4.3 Request for forgiveness: 135.3

Group 2:

Strategy 0.1: explicit denial of responsibility: 79.2

Group 3:

Strategy: 3.2: Explicit explanation: 55.6

Group 4:

Strategy: Lack of intent: 32.3

Group 5:

Strategy: 2.1 Implicit acknowledgement: 29.9

Strategy: 6: Promise of forbearance: 27

Group 6:

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 18.9

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 18.1

Group 7:

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 14.4

Strategy: 7 Offer of repair: 13.3

Group 8:

Strategy 0.5: Attack complainer: 7.7

Strategy 2.6: Accept blame: 7.5

Strategy 4.1: Regret: 7.1

Group 9:

Strategy 2.4: Self deficiency: 3.70

Group 10:

Strategy 2.5: Embarrassment: 3.8

Strategy 0.4: Blame someone else: 3.7

Learners used this strategy of request for forgiveness; to show how apologetic they are. On the other hand, they do not want to be held responsible as they are explaining their position.

4. SERVICE

Group 1:

Strategy 4.3 Request for forgiveness: 68.7

Group 2:

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology 53.9

Group 3:

Strategy 2.6: Accept blame: 27.2

Group 4:

Strategy 3.2; explicit explanation: 23.5

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 23.5

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 22.3

Group 5:

Strategy 2.1: Implicit acknowledgement: 19.5

Group 6:

Strategy 4.1: Regret: 12

Group 7:

Strategy 3.2: Explicit denial of responsibility 11.4

Strategy 2.3: Lack of intent: 11.4

Strategy 2.4: Self deficiency: 11.4

Group 8:

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 7.7

Group 9:

Strategy 3.1 Implicit explanation: 4

0.5: Attack complainer: 3.8

2.5: Embarrassment 3.8

7: Offer of repair: 3.8

1.1: Minimizing degree of offence 3.7

In group 1, there is request for forgiveness which the learners used to apologize. Most learners strive for direct apology. Other learners dwell on offer of apology and at the end accept blame of the offence.

TIME

Group 1

Strategy 4.3 Request for forgiveness: 34.2

Group 2

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology 25.4

Group 3

Strategy 2.3: Lack of intent: 21.6

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 21.6

Group 4

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 19.2

Strategy 2.5: Embarrassment: 18.8

Strategy 2.6: Accept blame: 18.8

Group 5

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 13.9

Group 6

Strategy 7: Offer of repair 10.8

Group 7

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 6.25

Strategy 3.2: Explicit denial of responsibility 6.3

Group 8

Strategy 4.1: Regret: 3.13

Strategy 4.3 is frequently used by the learners to request for forgiveness. This indeed makes it clear that their offence is not committed intentionally. For them to be forgiven, they used strategy 3.2, i.e. explicit explanation which lead to the offer of repair.

From these groups some strategies do not appear at all, e.g. 0.2, but others are repeated several times.

Learners are more apologetic, as strategy 4.3 appears to be the highest. Very few learners do not want to be blamed in this strategy, the blame is directly put to the person who caused an offensive act. It differs from the previous one in that this one does not dwell on the behavior.

5.4.3 Strategies between males and females.

1. POSSESSION

Male: Group 1:2.3

Group :4.3

Group 3: 7

Group 4: 3.2

Group 5: 2.5

Group 6: 6

Group 7: 4.1

Females:

Group 1: 4.3

Group 2: 2.3

Group 3: 7

Group 4: 6

Group 5: 3.2

Group 6: 4.1

Group 7: 0.2

Group 8: 0.3

In possession both males and females are using the strategy of request for forgiveness. Furthermore they both have explanation to the act of offence they committed.

2. TALKING

Male: Group 1:4.3

Group 2:2.2

Group 3: 4.2

Group 4: 2.3

Group 5: 3.2

Group 6: 4.1

Group 7: 6

Group 8: 7

Female: Group 14.3

Group 2: 3.2

Group 3: 2.2

Group 4: 3.1

Group 5: 2.4

Group 6: 4.1

Again both males and females use the request for forgiveness. This clearly shows that they are equally apologetic for actions which might cause undue offence. The even both explain equally to the other party.

3. SPACE

Male: Group 1: 4.3

Group 2: 3.2

Group 0.1

Group 4: 2.1

Group 5: 2.2

Group 6: 6

Group 7: 4.1

Group 8: 7

Female: Group 1:4.3

Group 2: 3.2

Group 3:0.1

Group 4: 2.2

Group 5: 4.2

Group 6: 2.5

Both male and female learners have used request for forgiveness and explicit explanation. Both, strategies seek apology for the offence they have committed

4. SERICE

Male: Group 1: 4.3

Group 2: 2.6

Group 3: 4.2

Group 4: 6

Group 5: 3.2

Group 6: 4.1

Group 7: 1.1

Female: Group 1: 4.3

Group 2: 4.2

Group 3: 3.2

Group 4: 2.6

Group 5: 0.3

Group 6: 0.1

Request for forgiveness is the most direct request strategy for both the male and female. They both offer apology to the act of offence they committed.

5. TIME

Male: Group 1 :4.3

Group 2: 3.2

Group 3: 7

Group 4:4.2

Group 5: 4.1

Female: Group 1: 4.2

Group 2:2.3

Group 3: 3.1

Group 4: 3.2

Group 5: 6

In this regard, males are more requesting for forgiveness while female offer apology. Both male and female are more explanatory their offences.

TASK 3: APOLOGIES

5.4.4 STRATEGIES IN THE MAJOR SITUATIONS

1. POSSESSION

	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1.						
0.2	1	4			1	10
0.3	3	27	1	13.8	1	6.7
0.4	1		1	6.7		
0.5						
1.1						
1.2						
1.3						
2.1	4	17.2	1	8.3	3	27.3
2.2	5	19.7	1	15	3	26.7
2.3	21	48	13	98.5	8	63.1
2.4						
2.5	3	11.4	2		1	10
2.6						
3.1	1	4.2	1			
3.2	8	21.5	4		3	20
4.1	3	12.2	1		1	19.1
4.2	6	29	5		1	9.1
4.3	29	87.6	14		15	125.1
5.						
6	6	24.8	2		4	37.2
7	11	43.9	6		5	45.8

2. TALKING

	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1.	1	3.8			1	7.7
0.2	2	7.97	1	7.7		
0.3	1	3.7	1	6.7		
0.4	1	3.8	1	7.7		
0.5						
1.1						
1.2						
1.3						
2.1	2	8.3			2	15.4
2.2	15	61.8	8	66.6	7	23.1
2.3	6	29.1	4	31.2	2	15.4
2.4	3	13.6	1	10	2	16.8
2.5						
2.6	2	8.9	1	9.1	1	
3.1	4	15.2	2	15.8	2	16.7
3.2	12	49.4	5	36.7	7	24.4
4.1	3	11.4	2	14.4	1	7.7
4.2	12	53	6	50.1	6	48.9
4.3	26	106.4	12	75.4	14	113.1
5.						
6	3	12.1	1	9.1	2	15.4
7	5	20	4	14.4	1	7.7

3. SPACE

	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1.	9	33.6	5	38.6	4	31.3
0.2						
0.3	5	18.1	4	18.9	2	12.5
0.4	1	3.7	1	7.1		
0.5			2	20		
1.1						
1.2						
1.3						
2.1	9	29.9	3	26.7	3	29.4
2.2	4	14.4	1	8.3	3	22.5
2.3	8	32.3	4	28.9	5	35
2.4	1	3.7			1	8.3
2.5	1	3.8			1	7.1
2.6	2	7.5	2	17.1		
3.1	1	3.3			1	49.9
3.2	15	55.6	8	62.2	7	49.9
4.1	2	7.1	1	5.9	1	7.1
4.2	5	18.9	2	17.1	3	21.7
4.3	37	135.3	17	142.2	20	147.2
5.						
6	3	11	1	5.9	2	12.5
7	4	13.3	3	17.6	1	7.7

4.SERVICE

	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1.	3	11.4	2	13.8	1	9.1
0.2						
0.3	2	7.7			2	13.6
0.4						
0.5						
1.1	1	3.7	1	7.14		
1.2						
1.3						
2.1	5	19.5	1	7.14	4	26.7
2.2	6	22.3	3	21.4	3	24.5
2.3	3	11.4	2	19.6	1	7.7
2.4	3	22.8	2	13.3	1	7.7
2.5	1	3.8			1	9.1
2.6	7	27.2	5	45	2	18.2
3.1	1	4			1	5.9
3.2	6	23.5	2	19.2	4	25.3
4.1	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8
4.2	11	41.9	4	33.5	7	51.7
4.3	17	68.7	10	77.4	8	62.2
5.						
6	6	23.5	3	26.3	3	17.6
7	1	3.8			1	9.1

5.TIME

	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1.	2	6.3	2		1	
0.2						
0.3						
0.4						
0.5						
1.1						
1.2						
1.3						
2.1						
2.2	4	13.9	3	21		7.7
2.3	6	21.6	2	14.4	4	29.8
2.4						
2.5	6	18.8	3	20	3	20
2.6	6	18.8	2	13.3	4	26.7
3.1	5	19.2	2	15.4	3	23.1
3.2	6	21.6	4	29.8	2	14.4
4.1	1	3.13	1	6.7		
4.2	7	25.4	2	15.4	5	36.4
4.3	10	34.2	5	35.4	5	35.4
5.						
6	2	6.24	1	6.7	1	6.7
7	3	10.8	3	22.1		

TASK 4**5.4.5 INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES**

	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1.	15	55.1	9	52.4	7	50.8
0.2	3	11.9	1	7.7	1	10
0.3	11	56.5	6	39.4	5	32.8
0.4	3	7.5	3	21.5		
0.5		3.8	3	26.7		
1.1	1		1	7.14		
1.2						
1.3						
2.1	20	74.9	5	42.2	12	131.6
2.2	34	132.1	16	132.3	16	104.5
2.3	44	142.4	25	192.6	20	151.0
2.4	7	40.1	3	23.3	4	32.8
2.5	10	77.9	5	20	6	46.2
2.6	17	62.4	10	39.5	7	36.7
3.1	12	45.9	5	31.2	7	36.7
3.2	47	171.6	23	147.9	23	134
4.1	12	45.8	6	39.5	5	33.9
4.2	41	168.2	19	116.1	22	167.8
4.3	119	432.2	58	330.4	62	483
5.						
6	20	77.6	8	48	12	89.9
7	24	169.4	18	54.1	8	70.3
TOT:	A: 440		B: 224		C: 217	

5.4.5.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 4.3 Request for forgiveness: 432.2%

Group 2

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 171.6%

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 169.4%

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology: 168.2%

Group 3

Strategy 2.3: Lack of intent: 142.4%

Group 4

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 132.1%

Group 5

Strategy 2.5: Embarrassment: 77.9%

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 77.6%

Strategy 2.1 Implicit acknowledgement: 74.9

Group 6

Strategy 2.6: Accept blame: 62.4

Group 7

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 56.5

Strategy 2.1 Implicit acknowledgement: 55.1

Group 8

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 45.9

Strategy 4.1: Regret: 45.8

Strategy 2.4: Self deficiency: 40.1

Group 9

Strategy: 0.2 Implicit denial of responsibility: 11.9

Group 10

Strategy 0.4: Blame someone else: 7.5

Group11

Strategy 0.5: Attack complainer: 3.8

From the first three groups, it shows clearly that apology is indeed emphasized. It is voiced out so as to be cleared and understood. As a result the apologizer can be forgiven and the apology be accepted

Explicit acknowledgement was also used significantly (132.19%). This shows that in most of the situations in Setswana, apologies could be accepted as the apologizer can explain and acknowledge the fault he/she has committed

In group 5 Embarrassment (77.9%), is the most used than promise of forbearance (74.9%)

Acceptance of blame was used to avoid unnecessary squabbles and misunderstandings.

It is clearly shown that the apologizer justifies whatever fault he has done. Further more, explicit denial of responsibility strategy indicates that the apologizer does not want to carry the burden in all respects

Group 8: Implicit explanation (45.9%), regret (45.8%) and Self deficiency (40.1%) clearly indicates that more damage was caused and at the end consequences reflect to the apologizer.

With regard to Implicit denial of responsibility (11.9%) and Blame someone else (7.5), the apologizer has less to say. He or she does not want to be involved in this situation

5.4.5.2. Strategies between males and females

Male

Group1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 330.4

Group 2

Strategy 2.3: Lack of intent: 192.6

Group 3

Strategy 3.2: Implicit explanation: 147.9

Group 4

Strategy 2.2: Explicit acknowledgement: 132.3

Group 5

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology 116.1

Group 6

Strategy 7: Offer of repair 54.1

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility 52.4

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 48

Group 7

Strategy 2.6: Accept blame: 39.5

Strategy 4.1: Regret: 39.5

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 39.4

Group 8

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 31.2

Strategy 0.5: Attack complainer: 26.7

Group 9

Strategy 2.4: Self deficiency: 23.3

Strategy 0.4: Blame someone else: 21.5

Strategy 0.5: Embarrassment: 20

Group 10

Strategy 1.1: Minimizing the degree of offence: 7.14

Strategy 0.2: Implicit demand of responsibility: 7.7

Female

Group1

Strategy 4.3: Request for forgiveness: 483

Group 2

Strategy 4.2: Offer of apology 167.8

Group 3

Strategy 2.3: Lack of intent: 151.0

Group 4

Strategy 3.2: Explicit explanation: 134

Strategy 2.1 Implicit acknowledgement: 131.6

Group 5

Strategy 2.2 Explicit acknowledgement: 104.5

Group 6

Strategy 6: Promise of forbearance: 89.4

Group 7

Strategy 7: Offer of repair: 70.3

Group 8

Strategy 2.6: Accept blame: 61.7

Group 9

Strategy 0.1: Explicit denial of responsibility 50.8

Strategy 2.5: Embarrassment 46.2

Group10

Strategy 3.1: Implicit explanation: 36.7

Strategy 4.1: Regret: 33.9

Strategy: 2.4: Self deficiency: 32.8

Strategy 0.3: Justification: 32.8

Group11

Strategy 0.2: Implicit demand of responsibility: 10

Females are more apologetic than males, even though they did not commit any serious offence they ask for forgiveness (females 48.3% whilst males 33.4%). Females are aware that offering apology is the most peaceful strategy to use.

Males are authoritative and want their voices to be heard. Whatever fault they have done, is due to lack of intent. (Males 192.6, females 151.05). Further more males know that females get easily convinced more especially if there is an explicit explanation that is done vividly to them. (Males 147.9) (Females 134%)

Females are more humble than males. They always carry the burden of what they are not responsible of. (Explicit denial of responsibility 50.8%), males 52.4%) males don't commit themselves easily where they will find themselves being apologetic

It is clear that males don't easily succumb to whatever fault they have done hence the explicit acknowledgement (males 132.3, females 104.5%) In this regard females offer more apology than males (females 167.8%, males 116.1%)

It is generally understood that females are more humble and have respect for males. They are not argumentative when coming to issues that lead to misunderstandings. They offer repair where they realize there is damage (females 70.3% and males only 54.1%)

However, females will accept blame (61.7 and males 39.5%) As a result, males are capable of putting blame on females and this cause embarrassment to females (46.2) and males (20%)

It is evident that males are showing justification in order to defend themselves (39.4%) females 32.8%). However this is not done genuine, hence they regret on their own (39.5%) females (33.9%) It shows clearly that the strategy of implicit denial of responsibility to males is insignificant to that of female (male 7.7% whilst female is 10%.) Females are reckoned to face challenges. However, one of the great qualities females have but are seldom respected for, is forgiveness.

CHAPTER 6

THE EXPRESSION OF THE OFFENCE IN SETSWANA

An apology is always offered where undesirable behaviour has occurred. It is sometimes up to the complainant to express his/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 (8) 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 certain behaviour. The complainant shows his /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 result of the complaine. He or she may indicate what he /she what hurt of 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 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 behaviour

This is a clear blame that is directed to the behaviour that caused a complaint. It does not blame a 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 TABLE 1: TOTAL NUMBER OF STRATEGIES

	SITUATION	NUMBER A		NUMBER B		NUMBER C	
		NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
1	POSSESSION	91	22.3	50	23.5	41	18.4
1.1	Clothes	19	21	10	20	9	21.9
1.2	Jacket	21	23.1	11	0.22	10	24.4
1.3	Class-notes	24	26.4	13	0.26	11	26.8
1.4	Money	27	29.7	16	0.32	11	26.8
2.	TALKING	83	21	46	21.6	78	34.9
2.1	Noise	19	22.9	11	23.9	8	10.3
2.2	Insult	23	27.7	11	23.9	12	15.4
2.3	Phone	21	25.3	13	28.3	8	10.3
2.4	Discussion	20	21.4	11	23.9	9	11.5
3.	SPACE	95	23.9	47	22.1	48	21.5
3.1	Queue	25	26.3	11	23.4	14	29.1
3.2	Parcel	24	25.2	12	25.5	12	25
3.3	Bicycle	24	25.2	12	25.5	12	25
3.4	Desk	22	23.1	12	25.5	10	21
4.	SERVICE	77	19.4	42	19.7	34	15.2
4.1	Help	24	31.1	14	33.3	10	21
4.2	Information	28	36.4	14	33.3	14	41.2
4.3	Message	25	32.5	14	33.3	11	32.4
5.	TIME	50	12.6	28	13.1	22	9.9
5.1	Appointment	22	44	12	42.9	10	45.5
5.2	Assignment	28	56	16	57.1	12	54.5
	TOTAL	A: 396		B: 213		C:223	

6.2.1. The major situations

	Situation	Total	Male	Female
1	Possession	22.3	23.5	18.4
2	Talking	21	21.6	34.9
3	Space	23.9	22.1	21.5
4	Service	19.4	19.7	15.2
5	Time	12.6	13.1	9.9

6.2.1.1 Total number of strategies

These situations may be grouped into four categories

Situation 3, 1 and 2: 23.9%, 23.3% and 21%

Situation 4 19.4%

Situation 5 12.6%

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 insulted and 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, 3, 2: 23.5, 22.1 and 21.6

Situation 4: 19.7

Situation 5: 13.1

Females

Situation 2: 34.9%

Situation 3: 21.5%

Situation 1 and 4: 18.4 and 15.2%

Situation 5: 9.9%

Females and males have most strategies in situation 1 but females have used more of them than males. Possession worries females 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: 23.5, 18.4 = 5.1% significant

Situation 2: 21.6, 34,9 = 13.3 significant

Situation 3: 22.1, 21.5 = 0.6 insignificant

Situation 4: 19.7, 15.2 = 4.5 significant

Situation 5: 13.1, 9.9 = 3.2 significant

In situation 1 the difference in use of strategies between males and females is 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 make them to complain a lot.. But in situation 5(time), females are more worried than the others. They think that males take their time deliberately with the aim of not returning them.

6.2.2 The subsituations

6.2.2.1 Possession

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
1.1	Clothes	21	20	18.4
1.2	Jacket	23.1	22	21.9
1.3	Class-notes	26.4	26	24.4
1.4	Money	32	32	26.8

6.2.2.1.1 Total number of strategies in this subsituation

Group 1: 1.4 and 1.3 (29.7% and 26.4%)

Group 2: 1.2 and 1.1 (21, 23.1%)

Subsituations of class-note has the most strategies because the complainant is complaining about the book that was not returned as the learner did not read

6.2.2.1.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Males

Group 1: 1.4 (32%)

Group 2: 1.3, (26%)

Group 3: 1.2, 1.1 (22%, 20%)

Females

Group 1: 1.4 (26.8)

Group 2: 1.3, 1.2 (24.4%21.9%)

Group 3: 1.1 (18.4%)

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 make them miss test

6.2.2.1.3. Strategies between males and females in this subsituation

Subsituation 1.1: 20, 18.1 = 1.9 significant

Subsituation 1.2: 22, 21.9 = 0.1 no difference

Subsituation 1.3: 26, 24.4 = 2.6 significant

Subsituation 1.4: 32, 26.8 = 5.2 significant

In subsituation 1.2 (Jacket), both males and females feel equally offended. They all do not like a point of wearing clothes asking permission. Subsituation 1.3 shows that females do not want to be scolded. If you scold them they become nervous and feel insecure

6.2.2.2 Talking

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
2.1	Noise	22.9	23.9	10.3
2.2	Insult	27.7	23.9	15.4
2.3	Phone	25.3	28.3	10.3

6.2.2.2.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 2.2 and 2.3 (27.7 and 25.3%)

Group 2: 2.1 (22.9)

Subsituation 2.2 (Insult), has the most strategies because complainants are feeling pain of been insulted. They show their anger by using many strategies. The subsituation of a phone is also having more strategies because complainants become angry for the person who is speaking too long on the phone.

6.2.2.2.2 Total number of strategies between males and females**Male**

Group 1: 2.1, 2.2 (23.9% in all)

Group 2: 2.3 (28.3%)

Female

Group 1: 2.1, 2.3 (10.3 in all)

Group 2: 2.2 (15.4%)

Both males and females have involved more strategies in the Subsituation of insult and phone. It indicates that when they are hurt, they become furious and use many strategies to complain. The Subsituation of a phone has many strategies involved as an indication that learners are impatient and angry for the person who speaks too long on the phone.

6.2.2.2.3 Strategies between males and females

Subsituation 2.1: 23.9, 10.3 = 13.6 significant

Subsituation 2.2: 23.9, 15.4 = 8.5 significant

Subsituation 2.3: 23.8, 10.3 = 13.5 significant

In all the situations 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 Space

	Subsituation	Total	Male	Female
3.1	Queue	26.3	23.4	29.1
3.2	Parcel	25.2	25.5	25
3.3	Bicycle	25.2	25.5	25

6.2.2.3.1 Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 3.1 (26.3)

Group 2: 3.2, 3.3 (25.2, 25.2)

Sub-situation 3.1(queue) has most strategies because learners do not want to be passed in a queue when they also need to be helped. They think they are undermined, as they did not acknowledge to be passed in a queue. Sub-situations of parcel and bicycle have fewer strategies because it was clear that the complainers mistakenly offended the complaints.

6.2.2.3.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Group 1: 3.2, 3.3 (25%, 25%)

Group 2: 3.1 (23.4)

Female

Group 1: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 (3.5% in all) 3.1 29.1%

Both males and females become angry when they knock out their parcel. They show their anger by complaining for longer time.

6.2.2.3.3. Strategies between males and females

Sub-situation 3.1: 23.4, 29.1 = 5.7 Significant

Sub-situation 3.2: 25.5, 25.5 = 0 No difference

Sub-situation 3.3: 25.5, 25.5 = 0 No difference

In sub-situation 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 stand in a queue for a long time.

In sub-situation 3.2 parcel and 3.3 bicycle, both male and female feel offended. Both do not want unnecessary mistakes.

6.2.2.4. Service

	Sub-situation	Total	Male	Female
4.1	Help	3.1	33.3	29.4
4.2	Information	36.4	33.3	41.2
4.3	Message	32.5	33.3	11

6.2.2.4.1. Total number of strategies in this situation

Group 1: 4.2 (36.4)

Group 2: 4.3 4.1 (32.5, 31.1)

In sub-situations 4.3 and 4.1 both male and female express their anger as they missed the test. They are taking long to complain because they feel they were deceived.

6.2.2.4.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Male

Group 1: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 (33.3 % in all).

Female

Group 1: 4.2 (41.2)

Group 2: 4.1(29.4)

Group 3: 4.3 (11)

In all the sub-situation males and females take 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 sub-situation 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 sub-situation

Sub-situation 4.1: 33.3, 29.4 = 3.9 Significant

Sub-situation 4.2: 33.3, 41.2, = 7.9 Significant

Sub-situation 4.3: 33.3, 11 =22.3 Significant

All the sub-situations have the most significant differences in the use of strategies by males and females. This shows that females are more sensitive to get disappointed by males who end up not honouring their promises. This makes females to take long in their complaints. Again, female learners get disappointed when the message was not delivered in time, and the wrong information they got, made them angry.

6.2.2.5. Time

	Sub-situation	Total	Male	Female
51	Appointment	44	42.9	45.5
5.	Assignment	56	57.1	54.5

6.2.2.5.1 Total number of strategies in this situation

Group1: 5.2 (56%)

Group2: 5.2, 5.3 (6.5, 5.9) 5.1 (44%)

The sub-situation of appointment has the longest strategies than the others. Appointment is very important to learners, as they need to be assisted in their studies. They become angry if their appointment is not honoured.

6.2.2.5.2. Total number of strategies between males and females

Male

Group 1: 5.2 (54.1)

Group 2: 5.1 (45.5)

Both males and females complain most for the assignment that was submitted late. This happened because both of them need marks to pass at school and now their blame is put across. However, females seem to be longer than males in this sub-situation as females are always talkative.

6.2.2.5.3. Strategies between males and females

Sub-situation 5.1: 42.9, 45.5 = 2.6 Significant

Sub-situation 5.2: 57.1, 54.5 = 2.6 Significant

All the sub-situations 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. TASK 3: STRATEGIES IN MAJOR SITUATIONS

1. Possessions

			Male		Female	
	N0	%	N0	%	N0	%
Cat1.						
Str:2	18	83.6	7	60.6	11	110.8
Str:3	14	63.5	6	50.6	8	78.2
Str:4	21	99	9	78.2	12	122.8
Str:5	17	78.4	1	94.6	6	50
Str:6:	5	45.6	4	34	1	10
Str:7	2	9.6	2	18.2	-	
Str:8	10	43.5	8	64	2	19.1

2. Talking

			Male		Female	
	N0	%	N0	%	N0	%
Cat1.						
Str:2	20	99.8	15	136.4	5	54.4
Str:3	13	65.8	5	45.5	8	88.6
Str:4	37	77.1	10	91	14	160.2
Str:5	10	48.6	7	63.7	3	11.1
Str:6:	2	10			2	22.2
Str:7	4	19.3	3	27.3	1	11.1
Str:8	7	34.3	4	36.4	3	32.2

3. Space

	N0	%	Male		Female	
			N0	%	N0	%
Cat1.						
Str:2	28	116	10	82.8	18	151.9
Str:3	12	49.4	5	24.8	7	56.1
Str:4	15	61.6	7	55.7	8	66.8
Str:5	19	77.4	9	72.8	10	83.5
Str:6:	5	20.4	4	30.8	1	7.7
Str:7	8	33.1	4	32	4	33.7
Str:8	10	42	10	51	-	

4. Service

	N0	%	Mal		Female	
			N0	%	N0	%
Cat1.						
Str:2	15	59.7	8	58.2	7	63.2
Str:3	16	62.4	8	58.2	8	66.5
Str:4	6	28.6	4	29.7	2	15.8
Str:5	15	59.1	9	65.4	6	54.1
Str:6:	3	10.3	1	7.1	2	13.3
Str:7	1	4	1	7.1		
Str:8	19	79.3	10	74.2	9	87.2

5. Time

	N0	%	Male		Female	
			N0	%	N0	%
Cat1.						
Str:2	3	34.7	7	54	3	34.7
Str:3	3	36.2	5	32.6	3	36.1
Str:4	3	34.7	2	30.7	3	34.7
Str:5	3	36.1	4	34.1	3	36.1
Str:6:	1	11.1	1	5.9	1	11.1
Str:7			1	5.9		
Str:8	4	47.2	8	56.7	4	47.2

6.3.1 Total number of strategies.

1. Possessions.

Group 1.

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 99%

Group 2.

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 83.6

Group 3.

Strategy 5: Direct accusation 78.4

Group 4.

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 63.5

Group 5.

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 45.6

Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person) 43.5

Group 6.

Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour) 19.3

Group 7.

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 10

3. Space

Group 1.

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 116

Group 2.

Strategy 5: Direct accusation 77.4

Group 3.

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 61.6

Group 4.

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 49.4

Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person): 42

Group 5.

Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour) 33.1

Group 6.

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 20.4

4. Service

Group 1.

Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person): 79.3

Group 2.

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 62.4

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 59.7

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 59.1

Group 3.

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 28.6

Group 4.

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 10.3

Group 5.

Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour): 4

5. Time

Group 1

Strategy 8: Explicit (person): 47.2

Group 2

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 36.2

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 36.1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 34.7

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 34.7

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 11.1

From the above groups, all the situations have involved almost all the strategies.

However, there are strategies, which are frequented by learners.

Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour) 9.6

2. Talking

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 99.8

Group 2.

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 77.1

Group 3.

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 65.8

Group 4.

Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 48.6

Group 5.

Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person) 34.3

In the possession situation learners tend to be indirect when they want back their belongings. They were trying to be polite, but at the end, they burst in anger as the offender failed to ask for permission. They therefore reacted and become direct to show the seriousness of it. It is evident that most learners who are annoyed want to complain directly so that complainers may be aware of their offences.

Annoyance is a strategy that has been used by most learners in talking situation. Learners feel annoyed by talks, which they do not approve. Apart from annoyance, some learners use direct and indirect accusation, which result to ill consequences.

They think it is better to feel offended and make sure that the complainer becomes aware of their dissatisfaction.

In the situation of space, annoyance and direct accusation are 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.

With regard to the service situation, the learners put blame on the complaine. They are terribly annoyed as the failed to help when they were requested to do so, they did not bring the relevant information and even convey the message. Hence the complainer used the direct accusations that imply that more harm was done.

In time situation, most strategies are implied on this situation. Learners blame the on the offender to show dissatisfaction, which resulted to ill consequences. However there are learners who become indirect in their accusations, they think that if they can be direct complainees may feel discouraged. There are others who become annoyed by the fact that they do not consider time and modified blame is used on them.

6.3.2. Strategies between males and females

1. Possessions

Males

Group 1. Strategy: 5

Group 2. Strategy: 4

Group 3. Strategy: 8 and 2

Group 5. Strategy: 6

Females

Group 1. Strategy: 4

Group 2. Strategy: 2

Group 3. Strategy: 3

Group 4. Strategy: 5

Group 5. Strategy: 8

Group 6. Strategy: 6

In this situation, males are direct for they want to make it clear to the complaine, that what they possess should be respected. Some females use indirect accusation as they respect males and are somehow afraid of them. Some males direct their blames to a behaviour that does not indicate dissatisfaction because they do not want to anger females.

2. Talking

Males

- Group 1. Strategy: 2
- Group 2. Strategy: 4
- Group 3. Strategy: 5
- Group 4. Strategy: 3
- Group 5. Strategy: 8
- Group 6. Strategy: 7

Females

- Group 1. Strategy: 4
- Group 2. Strategy: 3
- Group 3. Strategy: 2
- Group 4. Strategy: 8
- Group 5. Strategy: 6
- Group 6. Strategy: 5 & 7

Males are annoyed by the offences of talking. Females use indirect accusations as they avoid conflicts. Both males and females are indirect, as they want to be polite in their accusation. Furthermore, they both put blame on a person for a complainee is irritated by noise.

3. Space

Males

- Group 1. Strategy: 2
- Group 2. Strategy: 5
- Group 3. Strategy: 4 & 8
- Group 4. Strategy: 7 & 6
- Group 5. Strategy: 3

Females

- Group 1. Strategy: 2
- Group 2. Strategy: 5
- Group 3. Strategy: 4
- Group 4. Strategy: 3

Group 5. Strategy: 7

Group 6: Strategy: 6

In this situation, both males and females are annoyed and directed, because they want their space to be occupied by someone else. They are not satisfied with the action the complaineer has taken hence they show anger. Therefore in this regard, the ill consequences result in both males and females from an offence for which the complaineer is held implicitly responsible.

4. Service

Males

Group 1. Strategy: 8

Group 2. Strategy: 5

Group 3. Strategy: 2 & 3

Group 4. Strategy: 4

Group 5. Strategy 6 & 7

Females

Group 1. Strategy: 8

Group 2. Strategy: 2 & 3

Group 3. Strategy: 5

Group 4. Strategy: 4 & 6

Both males and females are direct, annoyed, and above all blame the accused for not acting responsibly. Thus, the blame on person results in the ill consequence that influences the dissatisfaction of the complainer.

5. Time

Male

Group 1. Strategy: 8 & 2

Group 2. Strategy: 5, 3 & 4

Group 3. Strategy: 6 & 7

Female

Group 1. Strategy: 8

Group 2. Strategy: 3, 5, 2 & 4

Group 3. Strategy: 6

In this situation, both males and females put blame on the person. This annoys them terribly, as the complaineer does not act responsibly.

All strategies has been used in this situation as they show their dissatisfaction at the end they put blame on the accused. In this instance, they don't compromise because they want time to be respected and honoured.

6.4 TASK 4: INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIES

Strategy	N0	%	Male		Female	
			N0	%	N0	%
1.	-					
2.	84	21.8	47	22.3	44	25.1
3.	58	15.1	29	13.9	34	19.4
4.	82	21.3	32	15.3	39	22.3
5.	64	16.6	40	19.1	28	16
6.	16	4.2	10	4.8	7	4
7.	31	8.1	11	5.3	5	2.9
8.	50	12.1	40	19.1	18	10.3
Total:	A: 385		B: 209		C: 175	

6.4.1. Total number of strategies

Group 1

Strategy 2: Annoyance: 21.8

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 21.3

Group 2

Strategy 5: Direct accusation 16.6

Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 15.1

Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person): 12.1

Group 3

Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour): 8.1

Strategy 6: Modified blame: 4.1

From the above groups, annoyance and indirect accusation are in-group 1. This is not clear as the complainants are angry but at the same time do not want to show their anger because they avoid differences.

Direct accusation is used to clarify the differences that the complainees should understand what is needed. Ill consequence (15.1) is used significantly. However more blame (behaviour)(8.1), Explicit blame (person) (12.1) is put on the complainees.

6.4.2. Strategies between males and females

Males

Group 1: Strategy 2: Annoyance: 22.3

Group 2: Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 19.1

 Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person): 19.1

Group 3: Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 15.3

 Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 13.9

Group 4: Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour): 5.3

 Strategy 6: Modified blame: 4.8

Females

Group 1: Strategy 2: Annoyance: 25.1

 Strategy 4: Indirect accusation: 22.3

Group 2: Strategy 3: Ill consequences: 19.4

 Strategy 5: Direct accusation: 16

Group 3: Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person): 10.3

Group 4: Strategy 6: Modified blame: 4

 Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour): 2.9

Females are more annoyed than males (females 25.1%) and males 22.3%). Females become angry easily by the offence committed by males.

Males are more direct than females (19.1%, females 16%). Therefore males know that directness is too provoking than indirectness. This emphasizes the point that males are straightforward when coming to serious issues that they want to address.

On the contrary, females also committed offences that cause more ill consequences to males (female 19.4% and males 13.9%). This shows that females also want to hurt males.

With regard to these strategies, males like to put blame on females. As it shows, males put blame on a person (19.1% and females 10.3%); males put on blame on behaviour (5.3 % and females (2.9%) and modified blame on males (4.8% and females 4%). This is evident that females are always blamed for the offences they did not commit. As it is, in Setswana, females respect and obey in all respect

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 usage of 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 first position in group1 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 situation 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 explicit 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 learners in a possession situation. Like in all 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 Setswana. They do not want to apologize directly. They have a tendency of coming with long explanations. Some of

the learners who do not 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 offence

Other strategies are also used Setswana 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 Setswana.

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 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 loose something, get hurt, or even fail to do something.

Males use more strategy of explicit blame than females but females use more strategy of explicit blame to a person than females. Females are using this strategy more because most of the actions that are done by males towards females are aimed at offending them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, J.L. 1962. **How to do things with words**. Harvard and Oxford: University Press.
- Blum-Kalka, S., et.al. 1993. **Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies**. Ablex Publishing Corporation, New Jersey.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. 1987. **Politeness: Some universals of language usage**. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, B. 1981. **On Apologizing in New Zealand English**. Language in Society.
- Holmes, J. 1990. **Paologies in New Zealand English**. University of London.
- Jaworski A. 1994. **Apologies and non-apologies: Negotiation in speech act realization**. Walter de Gruyter.
- Leech, G.N. 1983. **Principles of Pragmatics**. London and New York: Longman.
- Scher, S.J. & 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. 1, Plenum Publishing Corporation.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. **Speech Act: An essay in the Philosophy of Language**. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J. 1995. **Meaning in Interaction: An introduction to Pragmatics**. London and New York: Longman.
- Trosborg, A. 1995. **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies**. Mouton de Gruyter, New York.
- Yule, G. 1996. **Pragmatics**. Oxford University.

APPENDIX**TABLE 2; STRATEGIES IN SUB-SITUATION****1. COMPLAINTS****1.1. Clothes**

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
4.8	4.2	4.5	4.2	2.4,3	4	4	4.2	2.5	4.2	10	9

1.2. Jacket

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.3	4.3	5.3	5.3	2.6	4.5	4.6	5.3	7.2	2.3	11	10

1.3. Class Notes

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.3.8	5.3	8.7	5.2	5.4.6	4.4.6	5.8	4.12	5	2.8	11	11

1.4. Money

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
8.4.8.3	2.4.3	5.3	5.3.4	2.5. 8	2	4.6.8	4.2	4.8.2	5.8.3	16	11

2. TALKING**2.1. Noisy**

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
4.3	4	4.3	4	4.3	3.4	2.4	4.3	4.3.2	4.3	11	8

2.2. Insult

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
2.7.8	5.3	5.8.7	4.2.3	5.7.2	5.2	5	2.8.3	5	4. 3	11	12

2.3. Phone

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5. 2.8	4.2	5.2.2	5.8	5.2	4	5.2	8.2	5.8.2	4	13	8

2.4. Discussion

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
4.2	2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.3.2	4.7	11	9

3. Space**3.1. Queue**

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.2	5.2.3	4.8.3	4.2.6.3	2.3	4.2	8.2	3.7.2	5.7	4.2	11	14

3.2. Parcel

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.3	5.7.2	5.2.6	5.2.3	7.5.2	4	4.6	5.3.2	4.2	5.2	12	12

3.3. Bicycle

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
8.3.8	5.3.3	5.8.2.6	2.5.7.3	8.3	4	8	3.2	4.8	5.2	12	12

3.4. Desk

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.2	5.2	2.2.8	2.7	7.5.2	4.2	5.8	4,2	7	5.2	12	10

4. SERVICE**4.1. Help**

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.2.3	5.8.3	5.2.3	2.5	4. 8.3	3	4.8	3.8	8.8.3	2.8	14	10

4.2. Information

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.8	5.2.3	5.2.8	5.3.2	5.3.3	4.2.2.3.8.3	5.2	5.3	6.8.3.2	8	14	14

4.3. Massage

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.7	5. 8.3	5.8.2	8.2	8.2.3	4.3	4.4	8.3	5.3,2	8.2	14	11

5. TIME**5.1. Appointment**

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.8.2	5.8	8.2	4.2.3	5.8	4.6	4.2	5.2	4.2.3	8	12	10

5.2. Assignment

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
5.3.8	5.3.8	8.2.3	2.5.3	5.8.3.3	5.4.2	5.2.8	3.8	6.8.2	7	16	12

TABLE 2; STRATEGIES IN SUB-SITUATION**1. POSSESSIONS****1.1. Clothes**

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT. F	TOT. M
4.3.6	4.3.2.3.4.2	4.3.6	4.3.2.3.6	4.3.6	4.3.2.1.	4.3.2.1.4.3	4.3.3.2	4.3.2.1	2.2.2.3	11	12

1.2. Jacket

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4FM	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT. F	TOT. M
2.1.2.3.4.1	4.2.2.3.7	4.3.2.3	4.3.2.3.3.2	4.2.7	4.3.2.3	2.3.2.3	4.3.2.3	4.3.4.3	4.2.3.1	11	13

1.3. Class Notes

Q1F	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT.M	TOT F.
4.3.2.3. 4.3.3.2.8	4,3.2.3 3.2.4.3	2.3.3.2	3.2.6	4.3.2.2.7	4.3.2.3	4.3.0.3.2 2.3	2.3.2.2 4.3	4.3,3.2	2.5.2.3. 0.3	14	14

1.4. Money

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
4.1.6.7	4.3.2 2.7	2.5	4.1.7	4.3.2 2.7	4.3.2 3.7	0.2	4.3.0 3.7	2.2.7	2.5.0.4 4.2	10	14

2. TALKING**2.1. Noisy**

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6FM	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
4.1.2.3 4.3	4.3.2.2 2.3	4.3.4.2	2.2.4.2	4.3.2 2.6	4.1.2 2.7	4.3.2.3 0.1	0.4.2.2	4.3.3.2	2.3.0.2 4.3	13	13

2.2. Insult

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
2.1.2.2	6	3.1.4 3.6	4.2.2.3 3.1	4.2.0.2 2.4	2.2.4 3.7	4.2.2.1 4.3	7.2.6 4.3	4.3.7	4.3	13	11

2.3. Phone

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT. M	TOT. F.
4.3.3.2 2.2.4.3	4.3.2.3 3.2	3.1.3.1 4.2	3.1.3.2 4.1.4.2	4.3.3.2	4.3.3 2.7	4.2.2.2	2.2.4.3	4.3	4.2.3.2 0.3	12	15

2.4. Discussion

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
3.2.2 2.6	2.1.4.3	3.2.4 4.3.6	4.3.3.1 3.2	4.3.3.2 2.4	4.2.2.1	2.6.4.2	4.3.2.4 2.2	4.3.2.2 3.2	4.2.2.2	14	12

3. SPACE**3.1. Queue**

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT. F	TOT M
4.3.4.3 3.2.2.2	4.3.3.2	4.3.3.2	2.1.4 3.3.2	4.3.2.5 4.1.4.2	4.3.3.2 3.2	2.3.2.1	4.3.3.2	4.3.3.2	4.3.3.1	11	14

3.2. Parcel

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
2.3.2	4.3.3	4.3.3.1	4.3.2.3	4.3.3.2	4.1.2.3	4.3.2	4.3.3.2	4.3.2.2	0.3.6.7	13	17
2.4.3	2.3		7.4.3	2.3	4.3.0.3	8.7	4.3				

3.3. Bicycle

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
8.3.8	5.3.3	5.8.2.6	2.5.7.3	8,3	4	8	3.2	4.8	5.2	12	12

3.4. Desk

Q1M	Q2F	Q3M	Q4F	Q5M	Q6F	Q7M	Q8F	Q9M	Q10F	TOT.M	TOT.F.
0.1.4.2	4.3.2.3 0.1	4.3.0.1	4.3.2.6 0.1.0.3	4.3.2,4 2.1.4.3	4.2.2.3	4.3.2.1. 3.2	4.3.0.1	4.3.2.3	2.1.2.6	16	12

4. SERVICE**4.1. Help**

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
2.1.4.1	4.1.6	4.3.3.2	4.3.3.2	4.2.3.2	2.3	0.3.3.1	2.6.4	4.3.2.1	2.6	15	10
4.2.6				2.1		4.1	2.6	3.2			

4.2. Information

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
4.3.0.1	2.6.4. 3.6	4.2.2.2 7.2.6	2.4.4.3 2.3	4.2.2.2 2.1	4.3.3.2 4.3.2.6	2.5.4.3	0.1.4.3 2.6	2.6.4.3	4.2.0.5	13	15

4.3. Massage

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
4.3.2.4	4.3.2.2	4.2.2.2	2.3.1.1	4.2.0.2	2.2.4.3	4.2.2.3	4.3.2	4.3.2.4	2.2.4.2	15	13
2.2.4.2	4.3	3.2	4.2	0.1		4.3	1.6				

5. TIME**5.1. Appointment**

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
4.2.2.3	4.2.3	4.2.3.1	4.2.3.1	4.2.3.1	4.3.3.2	2.3.4.3	2.3.3.2	4.3.2.2	3.1.7	13	12
3.2	2.7	3.1	2.2	2.3							

5.2. Assignment

Q1F	Q2M	Q3F	Q4M	Q5F	Q6M	Q7F	Q8M	Q9F	Q10M	TOT.F	TOT.M
4.2.2.6	4.3.2.6	2.6.4.3	2.2.2.6	4.2.3.2	6.2.2	4.3.2.3	3.2.0.1	4.3.2.6	4.3.2.5	12	15
	2.3		4.3.7	2.6	4.1				0.1		

COMPLAINTS**TASK 2: STRATEGIES IN SUB-SITUATIONS****Situation 1.1: Clothes**

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1						
Str. 2	4	19.0	3	27.3	1	10
3	7	33.3	2	18.2	5	50
4	2	9.6	1	9.1	1	10
5	5	24	2	18.2	3	30
6	2	9.6	2	18.2	-	
7	1	4.8	1	9.1	-	
8	-		-		-	
Total	21		11		10	

Situation 1.2: Jackets

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1						
Str. 2	4	19.0	3	27.3	1	10
3	7	33.3	2	18.2	5	50
4	2	9.6	1	9.1	1	10
5	5	24	2	18.2	3	30
6	2	9.6	2	18.2	-	
7	1	4.8	1	9.1	-	
8	-		-		-	
Total	21		11		10	

Situation 1.3: Class-Notes

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-			
Str. 2	2	9.5	-		1	10
3	2	9.5	1	9.1	5	50
4	4	19.0	1	9.1	1	10
5	6	28.6	4	36.4	3	30
6	2	9.5	1	9.1	-	20
7	1	4.8	1	9.1	-	10
8	4	19.0	3	27.3	-	
Total	21		11		10	

Situation 1.4: Money

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	6	23.1	-	13.3	4	36.4
3	4	15.4	1	13.1	2	18.2
4	6	23.1	1	20	3	27.3
5	4	15.4	4	20	1	
6	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
7	-		1		-	
8	5	19.0	3	26.3	1	9.1
Total	26		15		11	

Situation 2.1: Money

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	2	10.5	2	18.2	-	
3	7	36.8	4	36.4	3	37.5
4	10	52.6	5	45.5	5	62.5
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	-		-		-	
8	-		-		-	
Total	19		11		8	

Situation 2.2: Insult

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	3	14.3	2	18.2	1	10
3	4	19.0	-		4	40
4	2	9.52	-		5	20
5	6	28.6	4	36.4	2	20
6	-		-		2	
7	3	14.3	3	27.3	-	
8	3	14.3	2	18.2	-	10
Total	21		11		10	

Situation 2.3: Phone

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	8	40	6	54.5	2	22.2
3	-		-		-	
4	3	15	-		3	33.3
5	4	20	3	27.3	1	11.1
6	1	5	-		1	11.1
7	-		-		-	
8	4	20	2	18.2	2	22.2
Total	20		11		9	

Situation 2.4: Discussion

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	7	35	5	45.5	2	22.2
3	2	10	1	9.1	1	11.1
4	9	45	5	45.5	4	44.4
5	-	28.6	-		-	
6	1		-		1	11.1
7	1	5	-		1	11.1
8	-	5	-		-	
Total	20		11		9	

Situation 3.1: Queue

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	9	39.1	3	30	6	46.1
3	2	8.7	1	10	1	7.7
4	4	17.4	1	10	3	23.1
5	3	13.0	2	20	1	7.7
6	1	4.3	-	-	1	7.7
7	2	8.7	1	10	1	7.7
8	2	8.7	1	20	-	
Total	23		10		13	

Situation 3.2: parcel

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	7	26.9	3	23.1	4	30.8
3	3	11.5	1	7.7	2	15.4
4	5	19.2	-	23.1	2	15.4
5	7	26.9	3	23.1	4	30.8
6	2	7.7	3	15.4	-	
7	2	7.7	2	7.7	1	7.7
8	-		1		-	10
Total	26		13		13	

Situation 3.3: Bicycle

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	4	16.7	1	8.3	3	25
3	6	25	2		4	33
4	2	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3
5	4	16.7	1	8.3	3	25
6	1	4.2	1	8.3	-	
7	1	4.2	-		1	8.3
8	6	25	6	16.7	-	
Total	24		12		12	

Situation 3.4: Desk

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	8	33.3	3	21.4	5	50
3	1	4.2	1	7.1	-	
4	4	16.7	2	14.3	2	20
5	5	20.8	3	21.4	2	20
6	1	4.2	1	7.1	-	
7	3	12.5	2	14.3	1	10
8	2	8.3	2	14.3	-	
Total	24		14		10	

Situation 4.1: Help

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	4	19.0	2	15.4	2	25
3	3	14.3	2	15.4	1	12.5
4	2	9.5	2	15.4	-	
5	4	19.0	2	15.4	2	25
6	-		-	15.4	-	
7	-		-		-	
8	8	38.1	5		3	37.5
Total	21		13		8	

Situation 4.2: Information

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	6	20.7	3	21.4	3	20
3	7	24.1	3	21.4	4	26.7
4	1	7.1	-		1	6.7
5	7	24.1	4	28.6	3	20
6	3	10.3	1	7.1	2	13.3
7	-		-		-	
8	5	17.2	3	21.4	2	13.3
Total	29		14		15	

Situation 4.3: Message

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Cat. 1	-		-		-	
Str. 2	5	20	3	21.4	2	18.2
3	6	24	3	21.4	3	27.3
4	3	12	2	14.3	1	9.1
5	4	16	3	21.4	1	9.1
6	-		-		-	
7	1	4	1	7.1	-	
8	6	24	2	14.3	4	36.4
Total	25		14		11	

Situation 5.1: Appointment

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Cat. 1	-		-		-		
Str. 2	6	30	4	36.4	2	22.2	
3	2	10	1	9.1	1	11.1	
4	4	20	2	18.2	2	22.2	
5	2	10	1	9.1	1	11.1	
6	1	5	-		1	11.1	
7	-		-		-		
8	5	25	3	27.3	2	22.2	
Total	20		11		9		

Situation 5.2: Assignment

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Cat. 1	-		-		-		
Str. 2	4	16	3	17.6	1	12.5	
3	6	24	4	23.5	2	25	
4	1	4	4		1	12.5	
5	5	20	3	17.6	2	25	
6	1	4	1	5.9	-		
7	1	4	1	5.9	-		
8	7	28	5	29.4	2	25	
Total	25		17		8		

APOLOGIES 1
STRATEGIES IN SUB-SITUATION

Task 2**Situation 1.1. Clothes**

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	3	13.0	1	8.3	2	18.2	
2.2	2	4.3	1	8.3	-		
2.3	3	13.0	3	25	-		
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	1	4.3	1	8.3	-		
4.4.1	-		-		-		
4.2	1	4.3	1	8.3	-		
4.3	10	43.5	4	33.3	6	54.5	
5	-		-		-		
6	4	17.4	1	8.3	3	27.2	
7	-		-		-		
Total	23		12		11		

Situation 1.2 Jacket

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	1	4.2	-		1	9.1	
2.2	-		-		-		
2.3	8	33.3	4	30.8	4	36.4	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	1	4.2	1	7.6	-		
3.2	1	4.2	1	7.6	-		
4.4.1	1	4.2	-		1	9.1	
4.2	3	12.5	2	15.3	1	9.1	
4.3	6	25	3	23.1	3	27.3	
5	-		-		-		
6	-		-		-		
7	3	12.5	2	15.3	1	9.1	
Total	24		13		11		

Situation 1.3 Class-notes

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	2	13	1	7.14	1	6.7	
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1	-		-		-		
2.2	1	3.4	-		1	6.7	
2.3	9	31.0	5	36	4	26.7	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	1	3.4	1	7.14	-		
2.6	-		-		-		
3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	5	17.2	2	14.2	3	20	
4.1	-		-		-		
4.2	-		-		-		
4.3	9	31.0	4	29	5	33.3	
5	-		-		-		
6	1	3.4	1	7.14	-		
7	1	3.4	-		1	6.7	
Total	29		14				

Situation 1.4 Money

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	1	4	-		1	10	
0.3	1	4	1	6.7	-		
0.4	1	4	1	6.7	-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	-		-		-		
2.2	3	12	1	6.7	2	20	
2.3	1	4	1	6.7	-		
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	2	8	1	6.7	1	10	
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	-		-		-		
4.4.1	2	8	1	6.7	1	10	
4.2	2	8	2	13.3	-		
4.3	4	16	3	20	1	10	
5	-		-		-		
6	1	4	-		1	10	
7	7	28	4	26.7	3	30	
Total	25		15		10		

Situation 2.1 Noise

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	1	3.8	-		1	7.7	
0.2	1	3.8	1	7.7	-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	2	3.8	1	7.7	-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	-		-		-		
2.2	5	19.2	4	30.8	1	7.7	
2.3	4	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	1	3.8	-		1	7.7	
4.4.1	2	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	
4.2	2	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	
4.3	7	26.9	2	15.4	5	38.4	
5	-		-		-		
6	1	3.8	-		1	7.7	
7	1	3.8	1	7.7	-		
Total	26		13		13		

Situation 2.2 Insult

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
0.0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	1	4.17	-		1	7.7
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1.1	2	8.3	-		2	15.4
2.2	3	12.5	1	9.1	2	15.4
2.3	1	4.17	1	9.1	-	
2.4	1	4.17	-		1	7.7
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	1	4.17	1	9.1	-	
3.3.1	1	4.17	1	9.1	-	
3.2	-		-		-	
4.4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	3	12.5	1	9.1	2	15.4
4.3	6	25	3		3	23.2
5	-		-		-	
6	2	8.3	1	9.1	1	7.7
7	3	12.5	2		1	7.7
Total	24		11		13	

Situation 2.3 Phone

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
0.0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1.1	-		-		-	
2.2	3	11.1	1	6.7	2	16.7
2.3	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.3.1	3	11.1	1	6.7	2	16.7
3.2	6	22.2	4	26.7	2	16.7
4.4.1	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
4.2	4	14.8	2	13.3	2	16.7
4.3	7	25.9	3	20	4	33.3
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
Total	27		15		12	

Situation 2.4 Discussion

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	-		-		-		
2.2	4	19.0	2	20	2	18.2	
2.3	-		-		-		
2.4	2	9.5	1	10	1	9.1	
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	1	4.8	-		1	9.1	
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	5	23.4	1	10	4	36.4	
4.4.1	-		-		-		
4.2	3	14.3	2	20	1	9.1	
4.3	6	28.6	4	40	2	18.2	
5	-		-		-		
6	-		-		-		
7	-		-		-		
Total	21		10				

Situation 3.1 Queue

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	3	11.5	2	16.7	1	7.1	
2.2	2	7.7	1	8.3	1	7.1	
2.3	1	3.8	-		1	7.1	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	1	3.8	-		1	7.1	
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	7	26.7	4	33.3	3	21.4	
4.4.1	1	3.8	-		1	7.1	
4.2	1	3.8	-		1	7.1	
4.3	10	38.4	5	41.2	5	35.7	
5	-		-		-		
6	-		-		-		
7	-		-		-		
Total	26		12		14		

Situation 3.2 Parcel

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	2	6.7	2	11.8	-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	1	3.3	-		1	7.7	
2.2	2	6.7	-		2	15.4	
2.3	4	13.3	2	11.8	2	15.4	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	1	3.3	-		1	7.7	
3.2	3	10	2	11.8	1	7.7	
4.4.1	1	3.3	1	5.9	-		
4.2	-		-		-		
4.3	11	36.7	6	35.3	5	38.5	
5	-		-		-		
6	1	3.3	1	5.9	-		
7	4	13.3	3	17.6	1	7.7	
Total	30		17		13		

Situation 3.3 Bicycle

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	7	25.9	4	28.6	3	25	
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	1	3.70	1	7.1	-		
0.4	1	3.70	1	7.1	-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	2	7.41			1	8.3	
2.2	-		-		-		
2.3	1	3.70	1	7.1	-		
2.4	1	3.70	-		1	8.3	
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	1	3.70	1	7.1	-		
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	2	7.41	1	7.1	1	8.3	
4.4.1	-		-		-		
4.2	2	7.41	1	7.1	1	8.3	
4.3	9	33.3	4	28.6	5	41.7	
5	-		-		-		
6	-		-		-		
7	-		-		-		
Total	27		14		12		

Situation 3.4 Desk

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	2	7.7	1	10	1	6.3	
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	2	7.7	-		2	12.5	
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	2	7.7	2	20	-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	2	7.7	1	10	1	6.3	
2.2	-		-		-		
2.3	3	11.5	1	10	2	12.5	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	1	3.8	1	10	-		
3.3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	3	11.5	1	10	2	12.5	
4.4.1	-		-		-		
4.2	2	7.7	1	10	1	6.3	
4.3	7	26.9	2	20	5	31.3	
5	-		-		-		
6	2	7.7	-		2	12.5	
7	-		-		-		
Total	26		10		16		

Situation 4.1 Help

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	1	4	-		1	5.9	
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	3	12	-		3	17.6	
2.2	-		-		-		
2.3	1	4	1	12.5	-		
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	2	8	2	25	-		
3.3.1	1	4	-		1	5.9	
3.2	4	16	1	12.5	3	17.6	
4.4.1	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8	
4.2	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8	
4.3	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8	
5	-		-		-		
6	4	16	1	12.5	3	17.6	
7	-		-		-		
Total	25		8		17		

Situation 4.2 Information

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
0.0.1	2	7.7	1	6.7	1	9.1
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
1.1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1.1	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
2.2	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
2.3	-		-		-	
2.4	2	7.7	2	13.3	-	
2.5	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
2.6	5	19.2	3	20	2	18.2
3.3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
4.4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	2	7.7	1	6.7	1	9.1
4.3	8	30.8	5	33.3	3	27.3
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
7	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
Total	26		15		11	

Situation 4.3 Message

Strategy	Total		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
0.0.1	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	1	3.7	-		1	7.7
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1.1	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1.1	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
2.2	5	18.5	3	21.4	2	15.4
2.3	2	7.41	1	7.14	1	7.7
2.4	1	3.7	-		1	7.7
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	1	3.7	-		1	7.7
4.4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	6	22.2	2	14.3	4	30.8
4.3	7	25.9	4	28.6	3	23.1
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
7	-		-		-	
Total	27		14		13	

Situation 5.1 Appointment

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.0.1	-		-		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1.1	-		-		-		
2.2	2	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	
2.3	4	15.4	1	7.7	3	23.1	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	-		-		-		
2.6	-		-		-		
3.3.1	5	19.2	2	15.4	3	23.1	
3.2	4	15.4	3	23.1	1	7.7	
4.4.1	-		-		-		
4.2	5	19.2	2	15.4	3	23.1	
4.3	4	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	
5	-		-		-		
6	-		-		-		
7	2	7.7	2	15.4	-		
Total	26		13		13		

Situation 5.2 Assignment

Strategy	Total		Male		Female		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
0.1	2	6.3	2		-		
0.2	-		-		-		
0.3	-		-		-		
0.4	-		-		-		
0.5	-		-		-		
1.1	-		-		-		
1.2	-		-		-		
1.3	-		-		-		
2.1	-		-		-		
2.2	2	6.25	2	13.3	-		
2.3	2	6.25	1	6.7	1	6.7	
2.4	-		-		-		
2.5	6	18.8	3	20	3	20	
2.6	6	18.8	2	13.3	4	26.7	
3.1	-		-		-		
3.2	2	6.25	1	6.7	1	6.7	
4.1	1	3.13	1	6.7	-		
4.2	2	6.25	-		2	13.3	
4.3	6	18.8	3	20	3	20	
5	-		-		-		
6	2	6.25	1	6.7	1	6.7	
7	1	3.13	1	6.7	-		
Total	32		17		15		

APOLOGIES 1 **STRATEGIES IN SUB-SITUATION**

Task 2**Situation 1.1. Clothes**

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	3	13.0	1	8.3	2	18.2
2.2	2	4.3	1	8.3	-	
2.3	3	13.0	3	25	-	
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	1	4.3	1	8.3	-	
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	1	4.3	1	8.3	-	
4.3	10	43.5	4	33.3	6	54.5
5	-		-		-	
6	4	17.4	1	8.3	3	27.2
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	23		12		11	

Situation 1.2 Jacket

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	1	4.2	-		1	9.1
2.2	-		-		-	
2.3	8	33.3	4	30.8	4	36.4
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	1	4.2	1	7.6	-	
3.2	1	4.2	1	7.6	-	
4.1	1	4.2	-		1	9.1
4.2	3	12.5	2	15.3	1	9.1
4.3	6	25	3	23.1	3	27.3
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	3	12.5	2	15.3	1	9.1
TOTAL	24		13		11	

Situation 1.3 Class-notes

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	2	13	1	7.14	1	6.7
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	-		-		-	
2.2	1	3.4	-		1	6.7
2.3	9	31.0	5	36	4	26.7
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	1	3.4	1	7.14	-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	5	17.2	2	14.2	3	20
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	-		-		-	
4.3	9	3.10	4	29	5	33.3
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.4	1	7.14	-	
7	1	3.4	-		1	6.7
TOTAL	29		14		15	

Situation 1.4 Money

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	1	4	-		1	10
0.3	1	4	1	6.7	-	
0.4	1	4	1	6.7	-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	-		-		-	
2.2	3	12	1	6.7	2	20
2.3	1	4	1	6.7	-	
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	2	8	1	6.7	1	10
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	-		-		-	
4.1	2	8	1	6.7	1	10
4.2	2	8	2	13.3	-	
4.3	4	16	3	20	1	10
5	-		-		-	
6	1	4	-		1	10
7	7	28	4	26.7	3	30
TOTAL	25		15		10	

Situation 2.1 Noise

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	1	3.8	-		1	7.7
0.2	1	3.8	1	7.7	-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	2	3.8	1	7.7	-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	-		-		-	
2.2	5	19.2	4	30.8	1	7.7
2.3	4	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	1	3.8	-		1	7.7
4.1	2	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7
4.2	2	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7
4.3	7	26.9	2	15.4	5	38.4
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.8	-		1	7.7
7	1	3.8	1	7.7	-	
TOTAL	26		13		13	

Situation 2.2 Insult

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	1	4.17	-		1	7.7
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	2	8.3	-		2	15.4
2.2	3	12.5	1	9.1	2	15.4
2.3	1	4.17	1	9.1	-	
2.4	1	4.17	-		1	7.7
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	1	4.17	1	9.1	-	
3.1	1	4.17	1	9.1	-	
3.2	-		-		-	
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	3	12.5	1	9.1	2	15.4
4.3	6	25	3		3	23.2
5	-		-		-	
6	2	8.3	1	9.1	1	7.7
7	3	12.5	2		1	7.7
TOTAL	24		11		13	

Situation 2.3 Phone

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
2.2	3	11.1	1	6.7	2	16.7
2.3	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	3	11.1	1	6.7	2	16.7
3.2	6	22.2	4	26.7	2	16.7
4.1	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
4.2	4	14.8	2	13.3	2	16.7
4.3	7	25.9	3	20	4	33.3
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	1	3.7	1	6.7	-	
TOTAL	27		15		12	

Situation 2.4 Discussion

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	-		-		-	
2.2	4	19.0	2	20	2	18.2
2.3	-		-		-	
2.4	2	9.5	1	10	1	9.1
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	1	4.8	-		1	9.1
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	5	23.4	1	10	4	36.4
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	3	14.3	2	20	1	9.1
4.3	6	28.6	4	40	2	18.2
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	21		10			

Situation 3.1 Queue

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
1.1	3	11.5	2	16.7	1	7.1
2.2	2	7.7	1	8.3	1	7.1
2.3	1	3.8	-		1	7.1
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	1	3.8	-		1	7.1
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	7	26.7	4	33.3	3	21.4
4.1	1	3.8	-		1	7.1
4.2	1	3.8	-		1	7.1
4.3	10	38.4	5	41.2	5	35.7
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	26		12		14	

Situation 3.2 Parcel

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	2	6.7	2	11.8	-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
1.1	1	3.3	-		1	7.7
2.2	2	6.7	-		2	15.4
2.3	4	13.3	2	11.8	2	15.4
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	1	3.3	-		1	7.7
3.2	3	10	2	11.8	1	7.7
4.1	1	3.3	1	5.9	-	
4.2	-		-		-	
4.3	11	36.7	6	35.3	5	38.5
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.3	1	5.9	-	
7	4	13.3	3	17.6	1	7.7
TOTAL	30		17		13	

Situation 3.3 Bicycle

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	7	25.9	4	28.6	3	25
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	1	3.70	1	7.1	-	
0.4	1	3.70	1	7.1	-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	2	7.41	1		1	8.3
2.2	-		-		-	
2.3	1	3.70	1	7.1	-	
2.4	1	3.70	-		1	8.3
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	1	3.70	1	7.1	-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	2	7.41	1	7.1	1	8.3
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	2	7.41	1	7.1	1	8.3
4.3	9	33.3	4	28.6	5	41.7
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	27		15		12	

Situation 3.4 Desk

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	2	7.7	1	10	1	6.3
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	2	7.7	-		2	12.5
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	2	7.7	2	20	-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	2	7.7	1	10	1	6.3
2.2	-		-		-	
2.3	3	11.5	1	10	2	12.5
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	1	3.8	1	10	-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	3	11.5	1	10	2	12.5
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	2	7.7	1	10	1	6.3
4.3	7	26.9	2	20	5	31.3
5	-		-		-	
6	2	7.7	-		2	12.5
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	26		10		16	

Situation 4.1 Help

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	1	4	-		1	5.9
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	3	12	-		3	17.6
2.2	-		-		-	
2.3	1	4	1	12.5	-	
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	2	8	2	25	-	
3.1	1	4	-		1	5.9
3.2	4	16	1	12.5	3	17.6
4.1	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8
4.2	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8
4.3	3	12	1	12.5	2	11.8
5	-		-		-	
6	4	16	1	12.5	3	17.6
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	25		8		17	

Situation 4.2 Information

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	2	7.7	1	6.7	1	9.1
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
2.2	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
2.3	-		-		-	
2.4	2	7.7	2	13.3	-	
2.5	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
2.6	5	19.2	3	20	2	18.2
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	2	7.7	1	6.7	1	9.1
4.3	8	30.8	5	33.3	3	27.3
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.8	1	6.7	-	
7	1	3.8	-		1	9.1
TOTAL	26		15		11	

Situation 4.3 Message

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	1	3.7	-		1	7.7
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
2.2	5	18.5	3	21.4	2	15.4
2.3	2	7.41	1	7.14	1	7.7
2.4	1	3.7	-		1	7.7
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	1	3.7	-		1	7.7
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	6	22.2	2	14.3	4	30.8
4.3	7	25.9	4	28.6	3	23.1
5	-		-		-	
6	1	3.7	1	7.14	-	
7	-		-		-	
TOTAL	27		14		13	

Situation 5.1 Appointment

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	-		-		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	-		-		-	
2.2	2	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7
2.3	4	15.4	1	7.7	3	23.1
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	-		-		-	
2.6	-		-		-	
3.1	5	19.2	2	15.4	3	23.1
3.2	4	15.4	3	23.1	1	7.7
4.1	-		-		-	
4.2	5	19.2	2	15.4	3	23.1
4.3	4	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4
5	-		-		-	
6	-		-		-	
7	2	7.7	2	15.4	-	
TOTAL	26		13		13	

Situation 5.2 Assignment

STRATEGY	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
0.1	2	6.3	2		-	
0.2	-		-		-	
0.3	-		-		-	
0.4	-		-		-	
0.5	-		-		-	
1.1	-		-		-	
1.2	-		-		-	
1.3	-		-		-	
2.1	-		-		-	
2.2	2	6.25	2	13.3	-	
2.3	2	6.25	1	6.7	1	6.7
2.4	-		-		-	
2.5	6	18.8	3	20	3	20
2.6	6	18.8	2	13.3	4	26.7
3.1	-		-		-	
3.2	2	6.25	1	6.7	1	6.7
4.1	1	3.13	1	6.7	-	
4.2	2	6.25	-		2	13.3
4.3	6	18.8	3	20	3	20
5	-		-		-	
6	2	6.25	1	6.7	1	6.7
7	1	3.13	1	6.7	-	
TOTAL	32		15		15	