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ABSTRACT

Traditional approaches to the treatment of apologies have analyzed this function of language within the rigid confines of speech act theory. Speech act theory maintains that verbal acts are structured and regulated by such universal principles as cooperation, directness, politeness and face (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; 1975; Brown and Levinson, 1978 and Leech, 1983). However, a large portion of this claim is based upon studies which have targeted but one language: English. Studies of these types will allow one to test the theoretical notion that all languages manifest the same primary characteristics in terms of speech act realization.

The current undertaking focuses on one specific speech act: the act of apologizing. I reject the position than an apology refers to the same social act across all cultures and societies and argue that notions of offense, the obligation to apologize and the means by which an apology is rendered are not global in nature, but rather are socially and culturally defined. This doctoral dissertation includes: 1) a review of the literature on apologies within speech act theory, cross-cultural- interlanguage- and sociopragmatics, focusing on the relationship between apologies and such previously noted
universals as cooperation, directness, politeness and face; 2) a review of the literature of recent investigations of apologies across many different languages; 3) an original investigation into the perceived nature of apologies within two speech communities (Cuernavaca, Mexico and Granada, Spain) and 4) an in-depth analysis of a corpus of apologies collected from the speech community of Cuernavaca using two approaches to data collection: a) written questionnaires and b) ethnographic notebook recordings. I specifically isolate the variable of gender and discuss the influence of this variable in contributing to both the realization of an apology and the communicative strategies used by males and females to perform this function of language.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

1.1 Introduction and Rationale for the Study

Many scholarly investigations of apologies have been based on the assumption that an apology refers to the same social act across all cultures and societies (Wolfson, Marmor and Jones, 1989). This assumption has led to a proposed set of universal principles by which apologies may be characterized: cooperation, directness, politeness and face. The present investigation rejects this position in favor of the view that these principles operate differently for diverse societies. It is believed instead that notions of offense, obligation to apologize, and the means by which an apology is rendered are not global in nature, but rather are culturally and socially defined. Therefore, for a given speech community, it is important to investigate both the types of strategies used by speakers to apologize, and the situations that call for an apology in the first place.

The present investigation will focus on the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico. Due to the obvious complexity of characterizing
apologies within the multifaceted parameters of sociopragmatics, an 
eclectic approach to data collection was employed. First, written 
questionnaires were administered to a control group of Mexican Spanish-
speakers in order to: 1) identify several of the situations which merit an 
apology in Mexican Spanish; 2) discuss the level of severity of the perceived 
offense, and 3) investigate a number of the situational and social variables 
hypothesized to influence the choice of apologizing strategy (perceived 
relative power and social distance between interactants, perceived severity of 
offense, and the gender of the respondent). The researcher then compares and 
contrasts the findings for Mexican Spanish with those findings of a 
previously conducted study of Andalusian Spanish, demonstrating the act of 
apologizing as a socio-culturally and dialectally defined function of 
interaction, partially expressed through language. Next, a second written 
questionnaire was distributed to a larger sample in hopes of eliciting reactions 
to a number of potentially offensive situations. To lend supporting evidence 
to these instances of “reported language,” actual apologies were collected 
ethnographically and were manually recorded in a notebook as they occurred. 
In addition to the spoken discourse itself, the researcher noted both the 
contextual factors, such as the domain and situation in which the apology was 
framed, and social factors, such as the gender of the informants and the social 
distance (familiarity) between them. Special note was also taken of 
extralinguistic factors such as kinesics and additional audience members,
other than the speaker and the addressee, who were present at the time of the interaction. An analysis of both the questionnaire and ethnographic data collected at this point revealed an overwhelming tendency for Mexican informants to use more than one strategy for each act of apologizing. With this in mind, a third questionnaire was added to investigate 1) whether the use of two strategies was perceived as constituting a stronger apology than the use of a single apology strategy, and 2) whether the order of the two strategies in relation to each other within the discourse proved to be a determining factor in the perception of the apology's overall strength.

In sum, apologies will be presented within an integrated framework of speech act theory and sociocultural pragmatics. This framework will address the interplay of such sociocultural concepts of cooperativeness, directness, politeness and face with the act of apologizing. Because this inquiry maintains that apologizing is a speech act which is both socio-culturally and dialectally defined, existing models of speech act theory which have characterized this function of language in terms of language usage and universals will be shown to be inadequate. Finally, where feasible, parallels will be drawn between the current study and previously conducted studies of apologies within the domain of cross-cultural pragmatics.
1.2 Theoretical Framework

The present investigation will take the following as its theoretical framework: 1) speech act theory, 2) face theory and politeness and 3) findings from studies of cross-cultural pragmatics. The subsequent sections present the foundations of each model, highlighting those premises which have contributed toward a better understanding of the nature of apologies. The continuous evolution of each model, sometimes within a single theoretical work, indicates that apologies are highly complex speech acts which are best characterized not by universal principles of language use or social dynamics alone, but by these principles in conjunction with context-sensitive sociocultural factors and norms of interaction operating on micro- and macro.levels within a given speech community.

1.3 Speech Act Theory: Contributions by J. L. Austin and J. P. Searle

1.3.1 Austin's Original Classification of Speech Acts: Propositional Content

J. L. Austin's (1962) unprecedented work *How to Do Things with Words* set out to challenge the assumptions of logical positivists that all declarative sentences are used with the intention of making true or false statements about a particular state of affairs. He identified a cast number of sentences which were not merely "saying things" by stating a proposition whose content could be evaluated as "true" or "false," but were actually
“doing things” by performing an action upon being uttered. The following examples illustrate this point (Levinson, 1983: 228):

(i) I hereby christen this ship the H.M.S. Flounder
    I declare war on Zanzibar
    I apologize

Austin named these sentences *performatives*, and contrasted them with utterances whose propositional content could indeed be measured in terms of truth or falsity by naming the latter “constatives.”

It is worth noting that at this point *How to Do Things with Words* is an evolving theory in its own right, and must be read as such. What begins as a specific theory of performatives results in a general theory of utterances and language usage. The beginning sections of Austin’s work advocate that performatives comprise a special class of sentences with unique syntactic and pragmatic properties, which differentiate them from constatives or other types of utterances. Shortly thereafter Austin rejects this simple dichotomy, dividing “performatives” into two subcategories: 1) explicit performatives and 2) implicit performatives. It becomes clear that those utterances originally regarded by Austin as “performatives” came to be known as “explicit performatives,” while the label “indirect performatives” was reserved for a hodgepodge of utterances not fitting into the former category. Paralleling this
shift is the substitution of a general theory of speech acts in lieu of the specific, rigid dichotomy of performative versus constative.

1.3.2 Austin’s Original Classification of Speech Acts: Forces and Effects

By the end of his work, Austin claims that all utterances, in addition to their propositional content, “do things” by means of having specific “forces” and “effects” (it should be pointed out here that statements which do not seem to support this claim are treated by Austin as special cases). To differentiate between the various ways in which saying something is doing something, Austin identifies four principal concepts related to acts: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts.

(i) locutionary act: the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference

(ii) illocutionary act: the making of a statement, offer, promise, etc. in uttering a sentence, by virtue of the conventional force associated with it (or with its explicit performative paraphrase)

(iii) perlocutionary act: the bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance
(iv) illocutionary force: The implicit or explicit linguistic configuration of the propositional content of an utterance, such as a question, an order, a request, etc. (Fontanillo Merino, 1991: 24) (English translation mine).

The focus of Austin's contribution to speech act theory and the scope of the current research project center on the illocutionary act, which has become synonymous with the term speech act. Because it is obvious that (i) addresses meaning, a concept that may proceed independently from the realm of speech act theory, a sizable remainder of Austin’s book is dedicated to the distinction and relationship between (ii) and (iii). Consider the following example:

I apologize for what I said earlier:

One may say that this utterance has the illocutionary force of apologizing and the perlocutionary effect of persuading the addressee to forgive or not to forgive the infraction committed by the speaker. In essence, an illocutionary act is what directly results from the conventional force associated with the delivery of a certain type of utterance according to conventional principle. A perlocutionary act, on the other hand, is specific to the circumstances under which it is uttered. It is not achieved by its mere utterance, but rather it includes all possible effects which its utterance in a particular context may cause. While this distinction is often turbid at best, Austin recommends as a
test trying to restate the illocutionary force of the utterance in question as an explicit performative: if one can do so, the act is illocutionary, but if one cannot, the act may well be perlocutionary.

1.3.3 Austin's Original Classification of Speech Acts: Proposed Formal Categories

On a final note, while the formalized classification system proposed by Austin (1962: 150-163) has been labeled "problematic" (see especially Searle 1969, 1977, 1981; Leech 1983; Levinson 1987; and Mey 1993), it is worth a brief look inasmuch as it serves as the basis for much of the literature generated to date on the subject of speech act theory.

VERDICTIVES

Verdictives are those utterances rendering a verdict or a judgment of some sort. However, such judgments need not be final.

Example: I find his sense of humor very unique.

EXERCITIVES

These utterances exercise their own power, rights, or influence.

Example: I order you to stop running!
COMMISSIVES

These utterances include promises to do some future act, announcements of intentions to do some future act, or espousals.

Example: I plan on finishing my thesis this year.

BEHABITIVES

Austin states that this category comprises “a very miscellaneous group... which includes apologizing, congratulating, commending, cursing, etc.”

Example: I apologize for not returning your phone call sooner.

EXPOSITIVES

Austin admits that this category is “difficult to define.” He adds that these utterances are expository in nature and that their goal is to make clear how other utterances fit into discourse.

Example: I argue that classifying apologies is a complex task.

The next section presents the reader with a brief summary of the criticisms offered by J. P. Searle of Austin’s speech act classification system as reviewed above, and an overview of the contributions made by Searle in the wake of such criticisms.
1.4 Searle’s Criticisms of Austin’s Original Classification of Illocutionary Acts

Searle (1977) rejects Austin’s above classification of illocutionary acts on the grounds of Austin’s general classification criteria, proposed categorical definitions and subsequent placement of language elements. In its place, he offered the following classification (Searle, 1981): assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. Apologies are grouped under the category expressives:

EXPRESSIVES
The illocutionary point of expressives is to express one’s psychological state. There is no direction of fit because the truth of the expressed proposition is presupposed. An example is “I apologize for jumping to conclusions.”

It is obvious that Searle’s classification resembles Austin’s in many ways. Like Austin, Searle distinguishes five classes of speech acts. In addition, one of Searle’s classes, what he calls “commissives,” is almost parallel to the class defined by Austin under the same name (Mey, 1993: 169). Searle’s proposal includes mention of the numerous criteria which one could potentially employ in order to improve on the lack of coherence and cohesion he identifies in Austin’s classification. Nevertheless, the reader is inclined to believe that the time and space Searle spends to make his point is really a case of “much ado about nothing.” In the end, Searle chose to apply
but four of the twelve criteria he had previously enumerated to his formalized scheme (Mey 1993: 163): illocutionary point, direction of fit, psychological state, and content. Each of these criteria is briefly explained in the following subsections of the current work.

1.4.1 Searle’s Criterion of Illocutionary Point

If one asks what the point is of apologizing, the answer will refer to someone trying to make things right again for something negative that happened. In the subsequent sections of the current work (see esp. section 1.7.4), apologies will be presented as having the essential condition of evoking repair made by the speaker. Thus, repair constitutes the point of apologizing. Searle makes an effort to distinguish this illocutionary point from illocutionary act (basically referring to the general concept of speech act) and illocutionary force. To make this distinction clear, Mey (1993: 155) offers the following example: Compare the difference between an order and a request. An order and a request are different speech acts which nevertheless happen to have the same point (to get someone to do something). They differ, however, in terms of their respective illocutionary forces.

1.4.2 Searle’s Criterion of Direction of Fit

The term fit refers to the relation between language and reality. Ergo, "fit" may be constructed from either language to reality or from reality to
language. For example, if I say “I don’t get paid until the end of October,” my utterance is describing a particular state of affairs in the world and thus shows the fit “language to reality.” However, if I say “I wish I had waited to purchase my ticket to Colorado” (expressing a wish), or “please loan me $1000” (making a request), my utterances show the fit “reality to language.” Regardless of the direction of fit, utterances, by virtue of being uttered, change the world. Nevertheless, utterances, on this criterion alone, do not constitute a special class of speech acts called *performatives* as Austin (1962) had previously hypothesized (see Leech 1981 for a thorough discussion of this so-called *Performative Fallacy*). At the same time, most speech acts do not operate on the very fact that they are realized (exceptions being “true performatives which operate ex opere operato” (Mey 1993: 155)).

1.4.3 Searle’s Criterion of Expressed Psychological State

Searle explains that this criterion allows us to regard a number of apparently different speech acts from the view that utterance form doesn’t necessarily equate with a speaker’s intention. For example, it is possible to express a state of mind in a variety of ways, using different speech acts. Take the state of mind belief: “belief collects not only statements, assertions, remarks and explanations, but also reports claims, deductions, and arguments” (Searle 1977: 29). On the other hand, it is usually not possible for one to express a psychological state by means of a speech act without being in
that particular psychological state. Consider the following paradox: Milena is in Italy, but I don’t believe it. Here, the speaker utters something about herself in relation to reality: in making the first assertion, the speaker indicates that she believes that Milena is in Italy and not, for example, Spain. However, then she follows by partially retracting this statement.

1.4.4 Searle’s Criterion of Content

This criterion provides a way in which to separate speech acts according to what they are “about.” For example, within the dimension of time as it operates in the real world and assuming there are no paranormal conditions at work (psychic visions, time travel, etc.), future events can never be the object of testimonials, only of statements and predictions. Therefore, if an event has not yet happened, one cannot perform the act of testifying.

1.5 Speech Acts versus Speech Act Verbs

With labels and technicalities aside, the single greatest criticism Searle harbored toward Austin’s work concerned the notion of speech act versus speech act verbs. According to Searle, Austin not only failed to recognize the difference between these two notions, but he also equated the existence or non-existence of speech act verbs with speech acts themselves, using the two terms basically interchangeably. However, Searle advocated that it is quite
possible for a speaker to perform a speech act without using a speech act (or performative) verb. A case in point is exemplified in the following utterance:

Maria: I'm hungry.

This statement may be just that, a statement whose force expresses a declaration of the reality in which the speaker finds herself (she feels hungry). However, if uttered to someone else, the same utterance may also carry the force of a request, in this case a request for food, albeit an indirect one. Notice, however, that there is no such performative or speech act verb included in the utterance. This awareness was precisely the motivation behind Searle's strongest contribution to speech act theory, that being a description and classification of indirect speech acts. The next section of the current work considers the illocutionary forces of utterances in terms of Searle's dichotomy of directness versus indirectness.

1.6 Direct versus Indirect Speech Acts: An Important Contribution of Searle's Theory

While speech acts have been defined and characterized by numerous criteria, one of the most basic divisions is that of direct speech acts versus indirect speech acts. A direct speech act is based on the notion that sentences contain an inherent illocutionary force, or "the conventional force or the
explicit performative associated with uttering a sentence in which some act is achieved” (Levinson 1992: 236-7). The offering “I apologize” has the same illocutionary force built into its sentence form as it does into its meaning. By offering this utterance, a speaker not only conveys his/her intention in terms of the content encoded in the message, but actually performs the act of apologizing. Speech acts are said to be direct if they demonstrate one-to-one mapping between meaning and illocutionary force. Indirect speech acts, on the other hand, may have more than one force associated with their meaning. The utterance “I promise that it won’t happen again” may be regarded as either 1) an example of a direct speech act, in which a promise is made by virtue of the explicit performative verb “promise,” or 2) as an indirect speech act in which the act of apologizing is performed through the use of a strategy promising appeasement to the addressee.

According to Searle (1981), the speaker communicates to the hearer more than what is actually being said by relying on several factors: the inferential abilities of the hearer and mutually shared linguistic and extra-linguistic information. He further states that “the apparatus necessary to explain the indirect part of indirect speech acts includes a theory of speech acts, certain principles of cooperative conversation... and mutually shared factual background information of the speaker and the hearer, together with an ability on the part of the hearer to make inferences” (1981: 31). The hearer’s job is a complex one: he/she needs to develop a strategy for
establishing the existence of an illocutionary point beyond the illocutionary point present in the structure of the utterance.

In essence, a subtle yet crucial driving force underlying indirect speech acts is that their illocutionary force is much more dependent on context than on structure. While directness is a crucial linguistic factor used to parse the logical form of an utterance and its resulting meaning, as well as communicative function, there are also numerous contextual factors operating on both micro- and macro-social levels, which may determine the very way in which a given speech act is realized. Examples of contextual factors include, but are not limited to: 1) the situation, 2) the roles of the speaker and the hearers, 3) past conversational history between the participants, 4) manner of speaking, 5) the domain of interaction, and 6) prescribed social conventions operating for a given event, e.g., filing a lawsuit. In sum, neither Austin nor Searle mentions the notion of context as it relates to the validity and legitimate performance of speech acts.

Section (1.7) of the present undertaking contemplates the notion of two basic principles deeply rooted in the study of pragmatics: politeness and face. While each of these principles deserves consideration in its own right, the next section highlights their common connection in being important components which both reflect and regulate language use. Specifically, the discussion of politeness and face in section (2.3) centers on the contributions
of these principles to language use, as manifested in the speech act of apologizing.

1.7 Politeness, Face and Apologies

Politeness has been regarded as an element which is present in every interaction. However, researchers have found defining 'politeness' quite problematic. In his work entitled *Perspectives on Politeness*, Fraser (1990) identifies four major perspectives on the treatment of politeness: 1) the *conversational-contract view*; 2) the *conversational-maxim view*; 3) the *social-norm view*; and 4) the *face-saving view*. The current discussion will briefly outline the above views, placing special emphasis on the perspectives of face-saving.

1.7.1 The Conversational-Contract View of Politeness

According to Fraser and Nolan (1981), speakers operate in terms of a conversational contract. This contract serves as the unspoken guidelines for successful communication. When the conversational contract is violated, one possible result is impoliteness. Fraser and Nolan view politeness as a voluntary action which is not inherently present in sentences (1981: 96). Instead, the judgment of politeness is determined by the conditions under which utterances are used. It is the hearer who ultimately judges whether an utterance is polite or impolite. These judgments made by the hearer are both
individual and social in nature. It is not uncommon for two hearers to interpret a given utterance differently. However, for the majority of conversational exchanges to be successful, there must be a certain set of norms which determine whether an utterance is judged as polite or impolite under specific conditions.

1.7.2 The Conversational-Maxim View of Politeness

The conversational-maxim view of politeness is based principally on Grice’s (1975) work *Logic and Conversation*. In this paper, Grice developed a theory of implicature which addresses the notion of how people use language. He suggests that conversational conduct is guided by a set of omni-supporting assumptions which follow from basic rational concepts and may be formulated as guidelines for using language efficiently and effectively to further cooperative ends in conversation. Grice proposes guidelines of this nature in the form of four basic maxims of conversation which underlie the efficient and cooperative use of language, and together express a more general cooperative principle:

COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE

Make your conversational contribution such as is required at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (1975: 45).
MAXIMS:

Quantity:
1. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality:
Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:
1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack evidence.

Relevance:
Make your contributions relevant.

Manner:
Be perspicuous, and specifically:
1. Avoid obscurity.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

The Cooperative Principle and its concomitant maxims allow speakers to accommodate their audiences and facilitate those interpretations of their communicative intent (speaker meaning) which extend beyond the logical meanings of what they say. When conversation does not subscribe to these principles, inferences arise on the part of the audience to maintain the
assumption that the speaker is being cooperative. Grice identifies these types of inferences as *conversational implicatures*. Given this information, what is the relationship between Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and politeness? Simply stated, the CP makes reference to an asocial framework of communication which assumes that no such deviation will occur without a reason. Politeness principles are, on the other hand, prescriptive reasons for deviation which are deeply rooted in patterns of social interaction as manifested through language usage. With this said, let us now consider the connection between cooperation, in the Gricean sense, and politeness as they relate to face-threatening acts (FTAs). Speakers closely adhere to the CP and subsequent maxims when performing a FTA when maximum efficiency is more important to their overall communicative intent than their desire to satisfy their own face wants and/or those of the hearer.

1.7.3 The Social-Norm View of Politeness

The social-norm view of politeness has as its historical basis the general understandings of politeness possessed by the public in English speaking parts of the world. This view assumes that each society has a certain set of social norms based on rules that prescribe a particular behavior, a state of affairs, or a manner of thinking in a context (Fraser 1990: 220). According to this belief, politeness arises when an action adheres to the norm, while impoliteness or rudeness results when an action stands in violation of the
norm. It is also crucial to note that the social-normative view historically relates politeness to speech style, and in doing so equates a higher degree of formality with greater politeness. Furthermore, Garfinkel conducted studies in the 1970s in which students were instructed to act more politely than usual towards their families and to note the reaction. The majority of the students participating in the studies equated increased politeness with increased formality, while their families viewed their more formal behavior as impolite and disrespectful. In terms of traditional linguistic contributions, politeness was referred to very rarely. Given the stronger focus on prescriptive grammar at this time, Fraser (1990: 221) hypothesizes that what little mention of politeness could be found was indeed equated with language usage and not with language itself.

1.7.4. The Face-Saving View of Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) place politeness within a framework in which the rational model person has face. Face refers to two basic wants of an individual: 1) to be approved of by others, and 2) to have his/her actions and thoughts unimpeded by others (Brown and Levinson 1987: 58). The framework surrounding the notion of face places emphasis on the wants of the participants involved in a given interaction rather than the interaction itself or the norms operating in society. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 61-2), there are two types of face: positive face and negative face.
Positive face concerns the first of the two wants laid out above, negative face to the second. Brown and Levinson (1987: 65) organize their theory of politeness around the notion that many speech acts are intrinsically threatening to face. They are threatening in that they do not support the face-wants of the addressee and/or the speaker. Brown and Levinson (1987: 65-67) divide face-threatening acts (FTAs) into two types, based on which type of face they threaten. Acts which threaten positive face-wants include those acts in which a speaker demonstrates that he/she does not approve of the addressee's positive face (e.g. complaints, criticisms, accusations, etc.) or does not care about the addressee's positive face (mention of taboo topics, interruptions, bearing bad news to the addressee, etc.). Acts which threaten negative face include instances in which the addressee is pressured to do or to refrain from doing a future-oriented act (e.g. requests, suggestions, threats, etc.), when he/she is pressured to accept or to reject a future act of the speaker (e.g. offers, promises), or when the addressee had reason to believe that the speaker has a desire toward the addressee's goods such that he/she may have to protect those goods or concede them to the speaker (e.g. compliments, expressions of strong emotions such as hate, lust, etc. by the speaker toward the addressee). Another manner in which FTAs may be divided is by distinguishing between acts which primarily threaten the addressee's face (those acts mentioned above) and those which primarily threaten the speaker's face. Examples of FTAs to the speaker's positive face are exemplified by apologies, acceptance of
a compliment, loss of control over bodily functions, self-humiliations, confessions, etc. Some of the FTAs that are threatening to the speaker’s negative face include expressing gratitude, accepting a thank-you or an apology, accepting an offer, and committing to future acts by making promises or offers (Brown and Levinson 1987: 67-8).

An apology is an attempt by the speaker to make up for a previous action that interfered with the hearer’s face-wants (Brown and Levinson 1987: 187). Thus, the aim of apologizing is to restore equilibrium between speaker and hearer (Leech 1983: 125). As Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989: 12) describe it, in an apology “the speaker acknowledges that a violation of the social norm had been committed and admits to the fact that he or she is at least partially involved in its cause.” An apology may be considered a “post-event,” for it signals the fact that the event has already taken place. Apologies count as remedial work (Goffman 1971; Owen 1980) and are inherently hearer-supportive (Edmonson 1981; Fraser and Nolan 1981; Olshtain and Cohen 1983). The present study recognizes all of these factors as contributing to the occurrence and functions of apologies. However, the extent to which apologies are shaped by the above stated factors depends on the perceived obligations and expectations of the participants.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 13) believe the notion of face to be universal, but add that “in any particular society we would expect [face] to be the subject of much cultural elaboration.” On the one hand, they recognize
face as a concept which is subject to cultural specifications of many
types—what kinds of acts may be considered face-threatening, what types of
persons have special rights to face protection, and what sort of personal style
is especially appreciated. On the other hand, they reiterate that notions of face
naturally connect to some of the most fundamental cultural ideas about the
nature of social persona, honor and virtue, and shame and redemption.
Brown and Levinson state that assessing the seriousness of a FTA involves
the following factors:

(i) the social distance (D) of speaker (S) and hearer (H)
(ii) the relative power (P) of S and H
(iii) the absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture

The seriousness of a face-threatening act is composed of risk to the speaker’s
face and risk to the hearer’s face in a proportion relative to the nature of the
face-threatening act. Brown and Levinson (1987: 76) calculate the weightiness
WX of a FTA using the following formula: WX = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + RX. As a
complementary component to their theoretical model they provide the
following apparatus by which to describe cross-cultural variation (1987: 244-5):
(i) The general level of WX (the weight of the FTA as represented as a numerical value) in a culture, as determined by the sum of P, D, and R values.

(ii) The extent to which all acts are FTAs and the particular kind of acts that are FTAs in a culture: e.g. compliments and threats are both FTAs in culture X, but threats are stronger FTAs than are compliments; invitations are not FTAs in culture X.

(iii) The cultural composition of WX: the varying values (importance) attached to P, D and RX and the different sources for their assessment: e.g. in culture X, R is the most important variable in determining the weight of a given FTA, while D and P play secondary roles.

(iv) The different criteria used to decide to whom an actor wants to direct facework and the extent to which such characterizations are extended: e.g., is the relevant person a member of a highly limited and restricted class, or is she/he part of an extensive set?

(v) The nature and distribution of strategies over the most prominent interactive relations in a particular society: are they distributed symmetrically? asymmetrically? in particular configurations?
The current work does not intend to implement the formula developed by Brown and Levinson, nor does it propose to implement any other formula for mathematically calculating the seriousness of a particular FTA in any given speech community. However, it is essential to closely examine Brown and Levinson’s proposal, as it is the most formalized one to date. For the sake of clarity, let us address the various components of Brown and Levinson’s model point by point. First, in addressing the general weight which a culture places on a particular FTA (see (i)), Brown and Levinson assume that members of this culture arrive at this value by means of an additive evaluation of the three independent values they ascribe to P, D and R. What happens if for culture X these values are not additive, but rather multiplicative? Clearly, the proposed model would fail to yield valid results. Second, in (ii), Brown and Levinson’s model requires that one knows which particular acts are FTAs in a given culture, what type of FTAs they are, and to what extent they are considered as such. This is a tall order for any single project, as is obvious by the lack of works which even attempt such a feat, much less accomplish it. Third, in (iii), Brown and Levinson’s formula necessitates that the weight of a given FTA be culturally defined in terms of the importance members place on the individual variables of P, D and R. What happens if in culture X, the variable of D is not even relevant to the equation? Once again, Brown and Levinson’s model assumes an intricate awareness of FTAs, as well as societal and cultural norms underlying
everyday interaction. Fourth, in (iv), Brown and Levinson’s model cannot account for cultural differences in terms of greater emphasis being placed upon or valued for positive or negative facework. At the same time, this model does not consider the importance placed on a speaker’s face-wants and a hearer’s face-wants in a given society. Brown and Levinson’s approach assumes equal importance for these two factors, a risky assumption. Lastly, (v) requires that the investigator consider the distribution of strategies for performing a particular FTA in terms of the directness and politeness systems operating across “social dyads” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 249). Both directness and politeness are research domains in themselves. To adequately address the last type of variability identified by Brown and Levinson would require nothing less than an investigation of serious magnitude.

In brief, Brown and Levinson (1987) have excluded extrinsic weightings of face-wants from their model on investigating cross-cultural variability of FTAs. Their politeness model cannot account for cultural differences in terms of greater emphasis on positive-face satisfaction or on negative-face satisfaction. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson’s model does not consider the possibility that a speaker’s face-wants and a hearer’s face-wants may not be regarded with equal importance in a given society. For example, in some societies it is a terrible FTA to allow one’s own face to be threatened. In societies where pride is a supreme virtue, apologizing may be a greater FTA than transgressing on an addressee’s face by having committed a FTA and not
apologizing (Brown and Levinson 1987: 248). Variability concerning the type of face-wants (positive versus negative) being emphasized, or one type of interlocutor (speaker versus hearer) being more important than the other, has definite consequences in terms of the use and elaboration of potential communicative strategies. However, the inclusion of extrinsic weighting of face wants would lead to cultural explanations of cross-cultural differences superseding universals. Brown and Levinson openly recognize this fact, and choose to accept its consequences on the premise of advocating universal social dimensions for the variables of social distance, relative power, and absolute ranking of the imposition. The question thus arises: at what point is it worth trying to classify a deeply rooted sociocultural phenomenon such as apologies via a cross-cultural model which fails to consider extrinsic weightings of variables directly relevant to this classification? Brown and Levinson’s model is the most elaborate one to date, and has been a notable advance for pragmatics. Nevertheless, there are a number of issues which deserve further attention. Crucially, what is needed is an in-depth investigation of positive and negative face-wants as they are manifested in different speech acts across a variety of societies. Until this is undertaken, studies such as the current investigation will continue to uncover relevant information necessary for a more complete understanding of sociocultural differences operating for specific face-threatening acts.
1.8 The Research Question

The discussion to this point will have provided the reader with enough background information and relevant frameworks to support but one conclusion: social interaction of any type is very complex. Thus, it is important not to lose sight of the research question addressed in the current work. The purpose of this investigation is multi-fold: 1) to identify a few of the situations which merit an apology in Mexican and Andalusian Spanish; 2) to determine the perceived severity of a given FTA; 3) to measure the strength of several possible apology strategies, as perceived by the speakers of Mexican and Andalusian Spanish; 4) to determine what effect, if any, the sequence and repetition of strategies has on the overall perceived strength of an apology; 5) to empirically investigate some of the potential sociocultural variables believed to influence the choice of apology strategy (perceived relative power, sociocultural distance, severity of offense, nature of offense, and gender of the respondent) and 6) to determine the most stereotypical strategy employed by the participants in responding to a situation which potentially calls for an apology on their parts.

1.9 Limitations of the Investigation

This investigation has an integrated format which utilizes both survey and ethnographic research. While it is felt that these two techniques to data collection together provide an inclusive view of the nature of apologies in
the targeted speech community, there are two important factors of interest which were not considered. For instance, do Mexican people place equal emphasis on positive and negative face-wants? Also, are the face-wants of the speaker and hearer regarded as equally important when engaging in a FTA such as apologizing? Because these issues were not systematically measured, it is impossible to formulate a complete sociocultural model of apologies for Mexican Spanish. Specific issues concerning the methodology and data collection techniques utilized in the current work are discussed in further detail in Chapter 3.

The next chapter (Chapter 2) presents the reader with a critical overview of recent works dedicated to the investigation of apologies within a vast variety of languages. It is intended to provide the reader with a composite profile of the theoretical frameworks in which these studies have been centered, the approaches which have been taken, the factors focused upon, and the results such endeavors have generated. Despite the vast amounts of literature on apologies generated to date, there remains considerable work to be done. This fact serves as a rationale for the current undertaking.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

Apologies have been researched from numerous theoretical points of departure, ranging from the sociopragmatic domains of the current study to those of psycholinguistics, information processing, communication and cultural anthropology. In addition to the cognitive, social and cultural studies undertaken by these disciplines, popular culture has produced and/or documented a number of anecdotal discussions on apologies. While these studies are interesting and meritorious in their own right, the present work concentrates on characterizing apologies within those sociopragmatic and cultural frameworks outlined in Chapter 1 (facework, politeness, indirectness and cooperativeness), as they pertain to the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico.

It was established in Chapter 1 of the current work that theoretical investigations of speech acts are based to a great extent on intuited data consisting of an isolated utterance (specifically, the sentence). The theoretical
models of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1977, 1979) fail to connect the communicative functions of speech to the micro- and macro-contexts in which they are embedded. As new studies have been undertaken and greater insights have emerged, it has become increasingly clear that traditional theoretical models of speech acts, like those proposed by Austin and Searle, cannot handle the interactive components of language use. To date there exists two main approaches to the study of speech acts as interactive phenomena subject to the rules and principles of language use: 1) contrastive pragmatics and 2) interlanguage pragmatics.

Contrastive pragmatics is concerned with extending the scope of traditional linguistics beyond its core components (phonology, syntax and semantics) to encompass language use at the discourse level. Various studies have revealed common features in the discourse structure of different languages, as well as notable cross-cultural variation in the selection, distribution and manifestation of various pragmatic functions of said discourse (Tannen 1981, 1984; House 1982a, b, c and Faerch and Kasper 1983). Two specific issues in the cross-cultural investigation of speech acts which have been of particular importance are: a) the value and function of politeness or deference in speech act realization, and b) the universality of politeness phenomena across language and culture (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 7). In targeting the speech act of requesting, Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki and Ogino (1986) empirically investigate linguistic politeness in
Japanese and American English, while House (1986) studies the relationship between perceptual differences of indirectness and politeness in German and British English, and Blum-Kulka (1987) does so for American English and Hebrew. The results of these investigations reveal culture-specific features of discourse and thus serve as further evidence for the hypothesis that "...speech communities tend to develop culturally distinct interactional styles" (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 7).

Interlanguage pragmatics is an area of study which developed in the early 1980s as a response to the groundbreaking work of Canale and Swain (1980), which called for the need to include learners' pragmatic and discourse knowledge within the scope of interlanguage research. To date, dozens of studies have been conducted on speech acts within the domain of interlanguage pragmatics. More often than not, such studies have taken the form of contrastive analysis of bilingual, native and non-native performance. Topics include, but are not limited to: compliments, thanks, refusals, requests and apologies. For the purpose of the present research project, the results from previously conducted studies on speech act realization among learners of Spanish as a second language will be useful, inasmuch as many use control groups composed of native Spanish speakers. Findings from such control groups may be viewed as preliminary indicators of those linguistic and extralinguistic variables which ultimately regulate apology behavior for native speakers of Spanish in a number of high frequency contexts.
Chapter 2 begins with the presentation of a theoretical compendium of facework, originally established by Goffman (1971; 1972), and later enriched by Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987). Following this, Section 2.1 offers a critical review of the most recent investigation of apologies in Spanish within the domain of contrastive pragmatics. Next, Section 2.2 discusses the most relevant findings yielded by studies on apologies by investigators within interlanguage pragmatics, critically addressing the design and analytical frameworks of these projects in terms of the overall validity of their results. The focus is on the core components which shape the nature of interaction as it is defined by the goal of apologizing (facework, politeness, directness and overall cooperative behaviors), as well as the verbal strategies utilized by native Spanish speakers in their realization of this particular speech act. The reviews contained under the heading of Section 2.3 provide information on the role of sociopragmatic variables in determining the nature of apologies. Specifically, the investigations presented address the social and situational variables of social status, social distance, relative power, gender or apologizer, nature and perceived severity of offense, as they contribute to the type of strategy/strategies employed in a given context. Finally, Chapter 2 concludes with a synthesis of those contributions made by both contrastive and interlanguage pragmatics toward a composite profile of apologies for native speakers of Spanish.
2.2 Theoretical Background

A thorough discussion of apologies has been carried out by scholars in the field of ethnomethodology, most notably by Erving Goffman. In Goffman (1971; 1972), apologies and other remedial exchanges between interlocutors are considered part of an interlocutor’s preservation of face. According to Goffman (1971: 138), remedial interchanges serve as a means to prevent the worst possible interpretation of events. Apologies are an acceptance of responsibility by the speaker, and an implicit self-judgment against the speaker. Goffman’s discussion on the function of apologies as order-maintaining devices has contributed to a conceptual framework which has served as the basis for numerous empirical studies.

Following the work of Goffman, Brown and Levinson (1987) examine apologies within the larger scope of face-threatening acts. They identify three independent, culturally sensitive variables, which they feel subsume all others with regard to the need for and the nature of remedial work and repair: 1) relative power; 2) social distance, and 3) absolute ranking of the imposition (Brown and Levinson 1987: 77-80). Relative power refers to the power of the speaker with respect to the hearer; it reflects the degree to which the speaker can impose his/her will onto the hearer. Social distance refers to the degree of familiarity and solidarity between the speaker and the hearer. Finally, absolute ranking of the imposition refers to the potential expenditure of goods and/or services by the hearer according to macro-level socio-cultural
norms operating within a given culture. According to Brown and Levinson, absolute ranking of the imposition demonstrates the degree to which this imposition interferes with an individual's positive and negative face-wants. It includes reference to the right of the speaker to perform the act and the degree to which the hearer welcomes the imposition. According to Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989), the relative power and social distance between any given interlocutors may be perceived as constant across all speech acts for those same interlocutors. However, absolute ranking of the imposition varies according to the particular speech act in question.

2.3 Investigating Contrastive Pragmatics: Cross-Cultural Studies

Investigations within the area of cross-cultural pragmatics provide evidence for the claim that speech communities demonstrate variation in the selection, distribution and employment of various pragmatic and discourse strategies. Gumperz (1982) has shown that cross-cultural differences in the use of signaling devices, interpretive strategies and expectations of linguistic behavior often lead to breakdowns in communications. Through empirical sociopragmatic studies of speech acts, we can address issues such as which situational factors affect the nature of speech, and whether these factors affect linguistic behavior differently across cultures. When considering the performance of speech acts, the issue of universality versus language- and culture-specificity is a highly debated issue in linguistics and the social
sciences. Any attempt to support the position that speech acts are subject to
universal principles of language and of communication must begin with
empirical studies of many different varieties of language. The goal of such
investigations is to discover any pragmatic regularities which determine the
realization of specific speech acts, such as apologies, both within a given
variety of language and across many different varieties of language.
Furthermore, investigations in the field of interlanguage pragmatics may
provide additional evidence for discovering: 1) the type(s) of language
behaviors regarded by universal constraints and principles of language use; 2)
the sociopragmatic variables which affect the realization patterns of a given
speech act, and 3) the similarities and differences between native and non-
native speakers of a given variety of language relative to the same social
constraints (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 12-13). The reviews
presented in the following sections of Chapter 2 are but a sampling of the vast
number of small-scale investigations performed on apologies to date.
Nevertheless, the individual studies presented and critiqued in Chapter 2
reflect language, population and cultural diversity, as well as a wide range of
theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of apologies. While
many of these studies contain inherent flaws in their theoretical premises,
research procedures and/or data analysis, it is crucial to examine these
particular studies in terms of their positive contributions toward
understanding the speech act of apologizing.
Previously conducted research into cross-cultural pragmatics confirms that speech acts such as apologies, requests and refusals often evoke different communicative styles across cultures (Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz 1990). These stylistic differences may be due in part to speakers’ differences in perception of relative power, social distance, and degree of imposition operating on both the macro- and micro-levels of interaction. The way in which these variables are viewed is reflected in the selection of those conventions used to indicate levels of formality, directness and politeness. According to Hudson, Detmer and Brown (1989: 9), it is important to note that the employment of communicative strategies and other linguistic devices is rarely a communicative means exclusive to a particular culture or linguistic group. Rather, the combinatory properties and use of such items may vary according to perceived values of power, social distance and degree of imposition.

Pilavachi (1994) undertakes cross-cultural research focusing on face-repair strategies in embarrassing situations. American students at Indiana University at Bloomington and Japanese students at Kansas University at Osaka were presented with six cases involving situations likely to be embarrassing. Subjects were asked to report in writing what their verbal and non-verbal responses would be. Percentages and a chi-square analysis of 114 Americans and 118 Japanese responses indicated that Japanese students used more apologies and remediations but fewer excuses than did their American
counterparts. Also, while Japanese students used a smaller repertoire of face-repair strategies, they also expected longer interactive facework. The Japanese respondents viewed excuses as less polite and a less effective means of performing an apology, especially when these excuses were elaborate and based on external factors.

2.4 Interlanguage Pragmatics: Relevant Findings for Apologies among Native Speakers of Spanish

Interlanguage pragmatics is defined by Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993: 3) as a “second-generation hybrid” whose origins may be traced to two interdisciplinary domains: pragmatics and second-language acquisition. According to Kasper and Dahl (1991), interlanguage pragmatics examines the comprehension and production of the speech acts of non-native speakers, and how they acquire the knowledge for performing these skills on speech acts in L2. An important consideration for research in this field concerns the types of experiments which its theoretical foundations permit. Research largely takes place in controlled settings (i.e. classrooms) whose contextual purpose is one of language learning. Still, there remains the possibility of using more ethnographic methods to observe interlanguage as a byproduct of communication (Kasper 1989: 191) (e.g. study abroad programs, where interlanguage becomes the subject’s means by which he/she takes care of basic communicative needs in the L2 culture with native speakers of the target
language). The crucial inquiry for the field of interlanguage pragmatics is to determine which aspects of second language emergence are universal and which are language- and culture-specific.

2.4.1 Investigations of Apologies in Interlanguage Pragmatics

In an investigation conducted by Fraser, Rintell and Walters (1980), Spanish non-native speakers of English performed role plays in which they made requests and apologies to an addressee who was a native speaker of English. Controls were established in the form of a group of native speakers of English and a group of native speakers of Spanish who also performed these role plays. Fraser, Rintell and Walters found the variables of addressee’s age and addressee’s status to correlate with the amount of deference he/she was paid by the speaker. For all three groups, there was an increase in the amount of deference paid to the addressees as the age of the addressee increased. Likewise, an increase in the addressee’s status led to an increase in deference on the part of all speakers. However, native speakers of English showed a lesser increase in deference than did both groups of native speakers of Spanish.

García (1989) investigates apologies performed in open-ended role plays by non-native speakers of English from Venezuela compared with those performed by native speakers of American English. Findings from the analysis of these role plays show that in the situation in which the
informants apologized to a host for not having attended his party, the
Venezuelan informants used a positive-politeness approach, expressing
themselves in terms of familiarity and solidarity. The Venezuelan speakers'
positive politeness strategies included offering explanations for not attending,
exaggerating reasons for not attending, avoiding disagreement with the host,
repetition of the host's words (supportive moves) and in-group identity
markers. In brief, the Venezuelans attempted to emphasize common ground
between themselves and the host through the use of familiarity and
cooperation. However, this approach often led to disharmony between the
Venezuelans and the American host. The American informants, on the
other hand, used a negative-politeness approach, showing deference and self-
effacing behaviors. The negative-politeness strategies employed by the
American informants consisted of maintaining distance and expressing
derence to the American host. The use of these strategies resulted in
harmony between the American apologizers and the American apologizee.
These differences support Brown and Levinson's hypothesis that speech acts
may be affected by underlying components for which their supposed cross-
cultural theoretical model does not account, specifically, the idea that a
particular culture or speech community's verbal behavior may be regulated by
particular norms and preferences of interaction concerning the notions of
politeness, directness, cooperation and face.
García’s study has one serious design flaw which concerns the identification and isolation of potentially important variables. Consider the independent variable of gender and the way it may affect two arguably codependent variables, perception of social distance and perception of social status between the interlocutors on part of the apologizer. Based on their selection of politeness strategies, García concludes that the Venezuelan women in her study perceived the social relationship between themselves and the host as a low-distance, familiar relationship in which there was little or no difference of social status. By comparison, García argues that the American women in her study considered the relationship between themselves and the host to be of high distance, as well as more formal and less familiar than the relationship as perceived by their Venezuelan counterparts. These generalizations made by García are powerful, yet highly questionable. Let us examine the facts surrounding the sampling procedure and subsequent data analysis. First, all apologies are made from a female group of native and non-native speakers of American English to one American male (the addressee). The question thus arises: does the gender of the person receiving the apology determine the shape of the apology in any way? And, does the gender of the person making the apology add to the complexity of this variable? It is impossible to answer these questions, for García fails to isolate the binomial variable of gender beyond that of speaker, as no female ever plays the role of addressee (see also Ruzickova 1998: 144)
for additional comments). Second, the issue of gender aside, there is only one addressee on the receiving end of these apologies: an American male. Therefore, even if one holds the variable of gender of the addressee as a constant, one cannot reasonably conclude that any variance is the result of the addressee's being a male. Just as plausible would be the idea that the apparent variance is really but a subjective verbal reaction to that particular addressee as an individual entity. As a result, García's study is unable to achieve internal validity. She cannot state with any certainty that changes in the dependent variable of apologizing were caused by any specific treatment (in this case being a native or non-native speaker or American English), nor can she be absolutely certain that the assumed correlation between positive / negative politeness approaches and native/non-native language status is not due to other intervening variables which she has failed to isolate. At times, one must sacrifice degrees of internal validity in order to achieve external validity, i.e. the ability to generalize over populations larger than the one targeted in a given investigation. However, as this is a case of quasi-experimental research conducted in the classroom, external validity may only be achieved for like populations of the same type, i.e. native and non-native apology performance within an artificial educational setting.

The data gathered in Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990) are the results of a written questionnaire supplied by the National Foreign Language Resource Center at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. The informants were
given a short situational description and a dialogue with a missing speech act (e.g. request refusal, or apology). There was a multiple-choice section in which the informants were instructed to select what they believed to be the most pragmatically correct utterance to fill in the missing speech act. There were four choices for each situation. In the open-ended response section, informants were given a situation followed by an incomplete dialogue. The description and the dialogue served to define the content of the situation and included information about the roles of the two participants, including power relationships, social distance between the two participants, and the degree of imposition involved in the speech act. Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz found several differences with regards to the order, frequency, and content of the semantic formulae employed by Japanese and American speakers of English. In both Japanese (L1) and English (L2), the Japanese speakers typically made excuses in sentential second position in situations where status between the interlocutors was unequal. It is unclear what Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz mean by sentential position, as they never adequately define this term for their readers. Based on the information presented, however, the term appears to refer to the placement of lexical- or clausal-level discourse elements in relation to one another within a single sentence (my interpretation). Americans, on the other hand, made excuses in sentential third position with status unequals, while they made their apology or declaration of regret first when they had lower status than their addressees,
and tended to omit apologies and regrets altogether when they had higher status than their addressees. In addition to differences in order, the researchers found that the Japanese non-native speakers negatively transferred the frequency of particular communicative strategies. For example, Japanese speakers of English produce the strategy “I’m sorry” much more frequently than did their American counterparts. Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz attribute this linguistic behavior to the apparent need for the Japanese speakers to fill the apology slot explicitly. The data show that excuses used by Japanese speakers in both L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) were more formal and more vague than the excuses offered by Americans in their L1 (English). The American informants tended to be less formal, but more specific in their excuses and rejections on invitations. Furthermore, they often provided their addressee with detailed information and specific reasons as to why they could not accept an invitation.

Mir’s (1992) work focuses on how native speakers of Spanish were found to increase the frequency with which they apologized in English (L2) as a reaction to what they perceived as a greater frequency of apologies on the part of native speakers of English. In her corpus, Mir found the native English speakers to use more repairs as apology strategies than did the native Spanish speakers both in Spanish (L1) and English (L2). In other words, repairs did not constitute one of the preferred apology strategies for Spanish speakers regardless of the language they were using (Spanish or English).
Even if the sociopragmatic and communicative competence underlying speech act performance in English regards repairs as a high frequency strategy for apologizing, speakers of Spanish did not change their active repertoire of strategies in accommodation to English as their L2. Mir postulates that these results may be connected to three factors, which I have summarized and reformulated as follows: 1) the learners’ lack of linguistic knowledge of L2 may affect their apology performance; 2) the learners’ preference for using IFIDs such as I’m sorry and Excuse me may be due to lack of communicative or sociopragmatic knowledge, i.e. they had not been exposed to other appropriate strategies at this point in their learning experience; and 3) the learners’ lack of awareness of how to use other strategies in L2 (sociopragmatic competence) may lead to their use of patterns from L1 and may ultimately constitute cases of negative transfer.

Overfield (1997) addresses the issue of pragmatic competence and the second-language learner from a pedagogical standpoint. Specifically, she asks whether second-language learners can be taught to effectively perform and respond to the speech acts of apologizing, requesting and refusing. The pedagogical focus of her research aside, Overfield’s work does include a section on apology strategies, as realized by native and non-native speakers of Spanish in the form of written questionnaires. The group of non-native speakers of Spanish was composed of two sections of Spanish 4 students at the University of Pittsburgh (N=21). The native speakers of Spanish participating
in this study were all speakers of Mexican Spanish (N=17), and were secured using a networking approach (friends and family of the teacher of the Spanish 4 class). In her coding and analysis of apologies, Overfield used the four basic apology strategies listed by Fraser (1981) and Holmes (1989). These strategies include: 1) an explicit apology strategy (e.g. an offer of apology, I apologize; an expression of regret, I’m sorry; or a request for forgiveness, Please forgive me); 2) an explanation or an account (e.g. The traffic was horrible); 3) an acknowledgment of responsibility (e.g. accepting the blame, It’s my fault; expressing self-deficiency, That was so stupid of me; expressing lack of intent, I didn’t mean to hurt you; recognizing the victim as being deserving of an apology, You have a right to be angry at me; or an offer of repair or redress, Tell me what I can do to make it up to you); and 4) a promise of forbearance (e.g. I promise it won’t happen again). Overfield found the most common apology strategies employed overall in response to the six discourse situations depicted in her questionnaire to be one of requesting forgiveness (61.00%), followed by an explanation or account (22.23%) and a promise of forbearance (21.5%). The average use of all nine strategies coded by Overfield (1997: 75) may be seen in Table 2.1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Expression of Regret</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Request for Forgiveness</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Explanation or Account</td>
<td>22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Accepting Blame</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Self-Deficiency</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Lack of Intent</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Recognizing Victim as Entitled to Apology</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Offer of Repair</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Promise of Forbearance</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Strategy type and percentage of use across six potentially offensive situations.

Next, I will chart the three most frequently used strategies for each situation as indirectly shown in the percentages in Overfield (1997):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION</th>
<th>THREE MOST FREQUENTLY EMPLOYED STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Insult</td>
<td>1) Request for Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Explanation of Lack of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Explanation/Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Forget Meeting</td>
<td>1) Request for Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Explanation of Lack of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Explanation/Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Forget Dinner</td>
<td>1) Request for Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Promise of Forbearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Explanation/Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Bump and Injure Shopper</td>
<td>1) Request for Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Promise of Forbearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Expression of Regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Bump Shopper</td>
<td>1) Request for Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Expression of Regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Explanation/Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Forget Birthday</td>
<td>1) Request for Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Explanation/Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Expression of Regret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Most frequently employed strategies by situation.

It is obvious by the above distribution that all seventeen informants preferred to use the strategy request for forgiveness above all other possible strategies for each situation presented. However, when considering the types of
potentially offensive situations depicted, it is clear that many have various elements in common. Take for example situations two and three:

SITUATION 2: You forget, for the second time, about having an important meeting with your boss. You call him/her. What do you say to him/her?

SITUATION 3: You forget, for the second time, about having a dinner date with a friend. What do you say to him/her?

In both situations, the infraction at hand constitutes breaking an explicit commitment to meet someone for a specific event. In addition, both cases are instances of behavior which has happened before, thus constituting a repeat offense. Also encoded in the situation is the reason for breaking the impending commitment: the speaker forgot. Where these two situations differ, however, is in the social relationship between the two interactants (situation 2 contains an employee and a boss, an asymmetrical relationship, while situation 3 contains two friends, a symmetrical relationship), as well as in the nature of the event to which a commitment has been broken (situation 2 is an important business meeting, whereas situation 3 is a social dinner engagement). Despite these differences, informants used almost identical strategies in responding to these two situations. The only differences are in the degree to which promise of forbearance and explanation/account are
employed by the informants. This discrepancy is due in part to the additional strategy expressing lack of intent which, along with explanation/account, was used by 24% of the informants in the case of situation 3. The strategy lack of intent could possibly signal an increased concern on the part of the speaker for the hearer’s wellbeing and for the possible effects this deed may have on the harmonious conditions of their friendship. Situation 6 also involves forgetfulness and the breaking of a commitment of sorts:

SITUATION 6: You forget your father’s birthday. What do you say to him?

The most frequently employed strategies after request for forgiveness are explanation/account and expression of regret. While the strategy explanation/account is also a common strategy for all three cases of breaching a commitment, expressing regret is used in situation 6 but not in situations 2 and 3. The one fact that stands out is the nature of the commitment in situation 6: here is an example of an implicit commitment between family and friends that birthdays are special and should be remembered at least verbally, if not by more elaborate means such as cards, presents, parties, songs and cake. Birthdays have become an occasion by which people celebrate their loved ones. Therefore, not to be remembered on one’s special day has the implication that one is not important, and the closeness of a social relationship may become damaged as a result of this oversight.
Situations 4 and 5 are classic examples of invading another’s personal space in an unwanted fashion and committing a social gaffe of the type proxemics:

SITUATION 4: In a fancy store you bump into an older woman, knocking down her packages and hurting her. What do you say to her?

SITUATION 5: In a fancy store you bump into an older woman, knocking down her packages, but you are both O.K. What do you say to her?

Both of the situations involve social distance (the participants are assumed to be strangers), and there is an encoded component of the addressee’s age and gender (she is an older woman), which may carry implications with regard to deference and language choice. Mexican informants responding to the questionnaire chose to use a request for forgiveness and an expression of regret as among their top three choices of apology for both situations. However, Mexican respondents to situation 4 used the strategy promise of forbearance in 47% of their apology sets, while respondents to situation 5 used this strategy only 6% of the time. What is different about situations 4 and 5? Basically, the difference lies in the degree of physical harm to the addressee: in situation 4, the older woman’s packages are knocked to the ground and she is
injured, while in situation 5, the older woman’s packages are neither knocked out of her hands nor is she physically harmed. The logical inference would be that an offer of repair is called for in the case of damage to an individual or that individual’s goods (i.e. “Let me help you up,” “Do you need a doctor?” etc.). However, no such strategy type is employed. Instead, one finds a rather high percentage of the strategy forbearance. If the two interactants are strangers, there was no social relationship or no expectations involved for their conduct and behavior with one another other than those norms of common courtesy and politeness. Therefore, it is puzzling why the speaker would promise not to commit this offense again, for the chance that he/she will encounter this woman in a potentially threatening situation at a future point in time is slim to none. The other situation which demonstrates harm is situation 1:

SITUATION 1: You are at a meeting and say something that another person believes to be an insult. What do you say to him/her?

Unlike situations 4 and 5, the type of harm depicted in situation 1 is one of emotional distress, not physical injury. Native Mexican informants chose request for forgiveness and explanation/account as apology strategies for situations 1, 4 and 5. While the strategy lack of intent was the second most frequently employed strategy used to respond to situation 1, it did not make
the top three most frequently used strategies employed in responding to situations 4 and 5. Nevertheless, it is important to note that while this is true, situations 1 and 4 (harm to the addressee) show identical percentages of use for this strategy (29%), while situation 5 (no harm to addressee) does not produce an instance of this communicative strategy.

While the most important aspects of Overfield’s (1997) study for the purpose of the current research question involve the responses of native speakers of Mexican Spanish, it is interesting to compare the preferences of L2 speakers of Spanish with those of native speakers. Overfield (1997: 78) reports that the L2 speakers of Spanish responding to her apology questionnaire in L2 (N=21) often showed preference for the strategy expression of regret over the strategy request for forgiveness. It is crucial to note that this may be a case of negative transfer from English and/or a direct result of the limited sociopragmatic competence and communicative strategies available to the speakers at this level of their interlangauge.

In conclusion, Mexican Spanish speakers showed a preference for the strategy request for forgiveness both overall and in responding to specific situations. However, there were some frequency differences with regard to how often this strategy was actually employed. Furthermore, while Overfield’s data show a lot of similarities with regard to the other strategy types employed in high frequency by native Spanish-speaking Mexican respondents, there are some preference differences which vary according to
the situational factors such as type of infraction, seriousness of offense, and social distance. One must keep in mind, however, that the composition of Overfield’s study with regards to investigating both the social and situational variables depicted within the questionnaire and those brought to the investigation via the informants, does not permit much internal validity. Furthermore, the small sample size of this corpus of L1 and L2 speakers of Spanish does not establish any external validity for the field of contrastive pragmatics. At the same time, the essence of Overfield (1997) was not one of contrastive pragmatics, but one of teaching pragmatic competence to L2 speakers of Spanish via comprehensible input, interaction and consciousness-raising.

2.5 Pragmatic Studies of Apologies in Specific Languages

2.5.1 Apologies Across Languages: Results of the CCSARP

Olshtain (1989) focuses on the similarities and differences of the realization patterns of apologies cross-linguistically relative to the same social and situational constraints. Her study includes data from the CCSARP Questionnaire administered to speakers of the following languages: Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French and German. Olshtain hypothesized that there are two main universal strategies for apologizing: an IFID and an expression of responsibility. Because these strategies are not context specific, she maintains that they will be the most widely used strategies for making an
apology. Respondents from the four languages used IFIDs between 63% and 79% out of the potential stock of possibilities across all situations in the CCSARP Questionnaire (Olshtain, 1989:164; 166). Equally strong was the use of an expression of responsibility for speakers of these four languages across all apology situations represented in the CCSARP Questionnaire. Respondents used this strategy between 66% and 75% (Olshtain, 1989:164; 166). Table 2.3 illustrates these percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian French</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian English</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. Use of IFIDs and expressions of responsibility in CCSARP.

2.5.2 Apologies in Cuban Spanish

Ruzickova (1998) investigates positive and negative politeness strategies in apologies in Cuban Spanish. While much of Ruzickova’s discussion is beyond the scope of the current investigation, a review of her
findings is worthwhile inasmuch as it includes apologies by native speakers of Spanish. Part of a larger corpus of speech acts, the apology set of Ruzickova's data contains 28 apologies. Forty two speakers participated, of which 57% were females and 43% were males. The Cuban apologies were collected in a total of 11 locations and may be divided into the following types of speech situations: 1) conversations (3); 2) a radio talk show; 3) public domains (bus station, post office, pizza stand, bus ticket agency and a bodega), and discussions (2), one of a scholarly paper and one of a documentary about a famous actress between a panel and the audience.

Speakers in Ruzickova's corpus apologized for a wide range of offenses, the most common being interruptions (25%), bothering someone excessively (25%) and time offenses (25%). In the Cuban data, 89% of the apologies contained an IFID. This finding is much higher than the use of IFIDs reported in the CCSARP for speakers of Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French and German, whose range was between 60 and 70%.

2.6 Conclusions.

In Chapter two, I have presented the reader with a theoretical compendium of facework, originally established by Goffman (1971; 1972), and later enriched by Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987). Next, I have offered a critical review of the most recent investigation of apologies in Spanish within the domains of contrastive and interlanguage pragmatics, critically addressing
the design and analytical frameworks of these projects in terms of the overall validity of their results. The focus is on the core components which shape the nature of interaction as it is defined by the goal of apologizing (facework, politeness, directness and overall cooperative behaviors), as well as the verbal strategies utilized by native Spanish speakers in their realization of this particular speech act.

Chapter three provides the reader with an in-depth profile of the research design of the current investigation of apologies in Mexican Spanish. A discussion of the principle foundations of pragmatics and the ethnography of communication is included to enable the reader to understand which components have been employed from these disciplines and the rationale for their incorporation in the project at hand. Special attention is paid to identifying the advantages and disadvantages which correspond to the chosen methodology and data collection techniques.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Introduction

In Chapter two, the reader was provided with a review of the literature available on the act of apologizing. Previously conducted studies have approached speech acts such as apologizing from numerous theoretical and methodological points of departure. The most salient of these points, in terms of their depth of scope and overall theoretical contributions to the research question may be grouped as follows: 1) pragmatics (speech act theory, cross-cultural pragmatics, sociopragmatics and interlanguage pragmatics), and 2) ethnography of communication. In this chapter, I briefly outline the foundations of these approaches, focusing on their theoretical principles, methodology and goals, as they relate to universals of language use. Next, I describe the research approach utilized in the current investigation, highlighting the background assumptions and goals which shape its design. Finally, I conduct an in-depth critical discussion of the individual components of my research design, including the following: 1) hypotheses,
2) procedure, 3) speech community profiles, 4) informant profiles and selection procedures, 5) methodological considerations to data collection, and 6) data analysis.

3.2 Toward Universals of Language Use

3.2.1 Theoretical Points of Departure: Speech Act Theory, Cross-Cultural Pragmatics and Interlanguage Pragmatics

Recent investigations on speech acts have resulted in a more complete composite of the variables one must consider when proposing a characterization of this particular domain of language use. At this point, it is worthwhile to summarize how the rethinking of theoretical considerations has led to a greater understanding of speech acts. Speech act theory, the first discipline to offer a formalized contribution to the study of speech acts such as apologizing, attempted to validate claims concerning the universality of the structural properties of speech acts. Focusing on form, speech act theorists defined the basic unit of analysis for the study of speech acts as the sentence. Pragmatists other than speech act theorists, however, recognized that meaning is often realized by individual units larger or smaller than that of the sentence, or by discrete units in combination with other units located elsewhere in the discourse. Therefore, they chose not to limit the basic unit of analysis for acts such as apologizing to that of the sentence. Rather, they emphasized the importance of discourse context as their variable domain of
analysis. Sociologists of language, ethnographers of communication, and sociopragmatists agreed with the pragmatists' identification of context as an important notion in characterizing speech acts. However, they went a step further. They called for an expanded definition of context to include not only the placement of a speech act with in a particular discourse, but also those sociocultural factors which both help to shape said discourse and are manifested by it. Although subtle differences may be found in terms of the emphasis placed by cross-cultural, socio, and interlanguage pragmatists with regard to target variables and populations of study, they have in common one goal which separates them from speech act theorists and pragmatists: to highlight the potential universals of various language functions (e.g. apologizing, requesting, inviting, etc.) by proposing the culture-specific nature of those forms utilized to perform these functions. While this is an important development, there is still room for improvement. For instance, cross-cultural- socio- and interlanguage pragmatists have failed to recognize the importance of investigating how the socio-culturally defined internal perceptions of members concerning the nature of particular speech acts shape their verbal performance. In fact, Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) suggest the key to understanding how interactional styles of communication reflect and are reflected by a culture's ethos may require studies of members' linguistic perceptions of language use, as well as members' language use itself. The next section presents the foundations of the scholarly field known as
ethnography of communication. Because ethnography of communication is ultimately concerned with the sociocultural nature of meaning, it is a field which may help to illuminate which areas are potentially important in proposing a characterization of a specific speech act for a given speech community.

3.2.2 Ethnography of Communication

Like the pragmatic approach to speech acts outlined above, the ethnographic approach seeks to discover universals of language use. However, the focus for ethnographers of communication is one of meaning rather than form. Ethnographers conduct in-depth investigations within specific speech communities in order to determine culture-specific categories. In essence, ethnographic research is conducted for the purpose of establishing typologies to organize culture-specific versus universal patterns of verbal and non-verbal communication for a given speech community (Davis and Henze, 1998:401).

Ethnographic studies rely heavily on triangulation, an integration of methodologies usually consisting of multiple sources, techniques and the use of numerous investigators in the collection and analysis of data for a single project. More often than not, triangulation specifically refers to the data collection techniques themselves, which are often based on an eclectic composition of observation, questionnaires and other documents. An
ethnographer begins with participant observation, in which he/she attempts to identify and categorize the types of communicative situations in which speech community members participate. The ethnographer then may choose to focus on a particular speech event (e.g. intimate conversation, religious services, educational settings, etc.). He/She relies to a large extent on a self-made re-constructed description of the behaviors practiced in the community under consideration. Unlike pragmatists who operate within discrete categories known as etic frameworks, ethnographers focus on a given community and its members and their internal (emic) perspective. Ethnographers do not bring to an investigation a preconceived scheme for characterizing a particular group or behavioral phenomenon. Rather, the goal of their research is to use prolonged engagement in the community to acquire the data necessary for constructing such a scheme. From this observation, ethnographers are able to create hypotheses concerning expectations for language and other social behavior. These hypotheses are further tested by means of interviews. This process of observation and interviewing may be repeated until the researcher recognizes enough repetition of a pattern so as to consider this phenomenon salient for members of a given speech community. Ethnographers submit to the notion that research descriptions are subjective, and thus do not seek to validate discoveries of truth or empirical facts. Instead, the result of ethnographic research is presented in the form of grounded theories. Grounded theories
are those theories about human behavior which are based on inductive analyses of data from a particular cultural group (Davis and Henze, 1998).

While ethnography of communication is primarily a qualitative approach to the study of language and culture, many ethnographers do choose to employ quantitative methods of investigation. The degree to which quantitative data is viewed as a valuable component of ethnographic research remains a highly debated issue within the field. Nevertheless, there are a number of principles and practices within ethnography of communication to which most ethnographers adhere. To contrast the theoretical and methodological considerations of the ethnography of communication with those previously outlined for pragmatics and speech act theory (see Chapters 1 and 2 of the current work), a brief sketch of the former is needed. Davis and Henze (1998:401) offer the following list to illustrate some of the most commonly shared practices among ethnographers:

Common Assumptions and Practices Shared Among Current Ethnographers

(1) a belief that realities are multiple, constructed and holistic
(2) an overt recognition of the researcher’s own positionality
(3) a concern with documenting variation and cultural change across a community.
(4) prolonged engagement and persistent observation
(5) triangulation of data sources
(6) working (grounded) hypotheses
(7) thick description
(8) application of research findings to address social issues
In summary, there are two distinct approaches used to address the universality of speech act behavior: 1) the pragmatic- and speech act theory-based approaches, whose focus is on the structural properties of speech acts by means of contrastive analysis of language units, and 2) the ethnographically-oriented approaches, whose goal is to illuminate the differences in speaker perception of language and its use by focusing on a given speech community and its members.

The following sections present an overview of the research design chosen for the current research project on apologies in Mexican Spanish. The result is a discussion concerning both the individual components of its design and the critical factors which led to their implementation. My decision to combine these essential theoretical and methodological elements from both pragmatics / speech act theory and the ethnography of communication is based on the overall goals of this research endeavor: to propose a socioculturally- and situationally-sensitive analysis of the perceptual notions of offense and obligation to apologize within the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico and to identify and characterize the most common communicative strategies used by its members in performing this speech act.
3.3 Defining the Current Research Question

The current research project does not fall neatly within the theoretical framework or methodological practices of any one discipline. Instead, my investigation is based on a number of key theoretical principles and methodological approaches from 1) speech act theory and pragmatics, and 2) ethnography of communication. I will now highlight the components of each discipline which serve as the basis for the investigation at hand.

In accordance with the domains of speech act theory and pragmatics, I have chosen to specifically identify my unit of analysis as that of the communication strategy. I do not subscribe to the notion that apologies are best studied using a prescribed linguistic-level (e.g. discourse-level, sentential, phrasal, lexical) unit of analysis. However, my goal here is to investigate a defined set of conventional strategies available to Spanish-speaking informants for realizing an apology. The possible meaning inherent in these forms and the functional ends which these strategies achieve must not be assumed, but rather empirically tested. For this reason, I have opted to use survey research instruments (written questionnaires) and quantitative analysis to empirically test and systematically control for the various situational and social variables hypothesized as pertinent to my characterization of apologies (see Section 3.2.2 for hypotheses). The current study uses three types of written questionnaires. Questionnaire # 1 is a modified version of the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Research
Parameters Questionnaire used by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989). The purpose of this questionnaire is to probe informant perceptions concerning a) the inherent social and situational parameters encoded in Questionnaire # 2, and b) the inherent force equated with specific conventional apology strategies. Questionnaire # 2 is a modified version of the CCSARP Questionnaire, used by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989), which includes numerous potentially offensive situations. It is designed to elicit actual responses from informants in the form of written language. Questionnaire # 3 investigates a) informant perceptions regarding the force of single versus complex apology strategies (those strategies using more than one strategy type), and b) the role which repetition of a given strategy and the order of complex strategies play in informant perceptions of apology strength.

In accordance with the ethnography of communication, I view speech acts as complex communicative exchanges which are shaped by cultural nuances operating within a given speech community. Therefore, I have chosen to enrich my questionnaire data with examples of ethnographically recorded apology exchanges among members of the Cuernavaca speech community. This integrated approach is a typical application of triangulation (see Section 2.2 for previous discussion). This eclectic means of data collection and analysis allows for a more complete characterization of apologies within the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico than may
possibly be allowed by either the pragmatic-speech act theory or the ethnographically-oriented approach alone.

3.4 Statement of Preparedness

My research interests in the act of apologizing originate from: 1) extensive reading on the topic within speech act theory and a subsequent lack of scholarly and personal conviction concerning the proposed set of universal principles upon which much of the literature is based, and 2) personal insights and experiences as a functional member of the two speech communities targeted in the current investigation (Granada, Spain and Cuernavaca, Mexico) which have provided me with enough testimonial evidence to merit a sociopragmatic investigation of the speech act of apologizing within these two speech communities.

3.5 Hypotheses

1) If one subscribes to the notion that speech is a medium through which one partially creates and affirms cultural identity (Hymes, 1972; 1974), different speech communities provide an important domain for the exploration of speech as a cultural phenomenon. What is viewed as a Face threatening Act (FTA) in one speech community will not necessarily be viewed as such in another. Therefore, I examine whether the set of FTA situations proposed in the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project
(CCSARP) Questionnaire hold for speech communities other than those upon which it has been tested. The first part of this project targets two separate Spanish-speaking speech communities: Granada, Spain and Cuernavaca, Mexico. Results from Questionnaire # 1 are expected to illustrates differences between members of the Cuernavaca speech community and their counterparts from Granada on the following points:

a) perception of potential FTAs as offensive and necessitating an apology (binomial values)
b) evaluation of social distance and social status of the interlocutors included in the situations.
c) perceived severity of the sample FTAs (gradial values)
d) ranking of the force associated with sample apology strategies

2) In addition to the internal perceptual differences manifested by members of the two targeted speech communities in terms of their ethnocultural diversity, membership within each speech community involves a complex network of social factors such as being Mexican or Andalusian. Consequently, I predict that perceptual differences will also manifest themselves in terms of the age and gender of the respondents (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Scollon and Scollon, 1985). Women will perceive the potential offenses as more offensive than their male counterparts (vid. De Mente, 1996 for sociocultural discussion of gender).

3) In line with the conventionalized nature of IFIDs as an apology strategy, respondents are expected to utilize them with greater frequency than they do any other strategy type in responding to Questionnaire # 2.
4) Male and female members of the Cuernavacan speech community will prefer to use different strategies to apologize for the same offense.

5) Because the use of more than one apology strategy in rendering a single apology demonstrates a greater desire on the part of the speaker to repair the infraction, informants should consider the use of two or more strategies as constituting a stronger apology than the use of a single apology strategy when responding to an offensive situation. In addition, it is expected that the use of two different apology strategy types will be regarded as a stronger apology than the use of two of the same strategy types in response to a single offense.

6) Two different apology strategies are often used to create a complex apology. IFIDs have become a high frequency strategy type for apologizing and are often combined with other strategy types to form said complex strategy. Because their lexical force matches a speaker’s communicative intent, they are easily recognized as what they are: an apology strategy. When one of the two strategy-types utilized is an IFID, informants will perceive different forces for these types of complex strategies according to the placement of the IFID in relation to the other strategy. Specifically, it is hypothesized that a complex strategy which includes the use of an IFID before the use of another strategy type will be perceived as stronger than the same complex strategy which has a non-IFID strategy-type placed before the IFID
strategy-type. This expected outcome is a direct result of the conventional role IFIDs play in apology behavior.

7) Apologies collected by means of ethnographic notebook recordings are expected to support the notion that questionnaires are valid instruments for identifying the conventions of use a speaker will be most likely to employ in apologizing for specific offenses. This will be apparent in cases in which real-life situations have been recorded which closely parallel those hypothetical situations depicted in Questionnaire # 2.

3.6 Procedure
3.6.1 Instrument Testing

As previously mentioned in Section 3.3 of the present chapter, Questionnaire #1 was implemented to test informant perceptual notions of offense, the obligation to apologize and the force equated with a select number of apology strategies in two speech communities: Granada, Spain and Cuernavaca, Mexico. Before data collection began in Granada, Questionnaire # 1 was tested on a group of (10) informants from Granada to check the clarity of the questions, the naturalness of the language employed and the format of the questionnaire. While the format and clarity of the questions were regarded as satisfactory by all of the informants, there were some changes made in various lexical items in order to achieve more naturalness. Likewise, Questionnaire # 2 was tested on a group of ten
Mexican informants from Cuernavaca before data collection began in Cuernavaca, Mexico. The informants felt that no additional changes were necessary.

As one may recall from Section 3.3 of the current chapter, Questionnaire # 2 was designed to elicit actual apologies from members of the Cuernavacan speech community in the form of written responses. Questionnaire # 2 was tested on a group of fifteen informants from Cuernavaca, Mexico before the commencement of data collection. Two informants responded to the situations by telling the researcher what the interactant "would say" (indirect language) instead of the actual dialogue of the interactant (direct language). I decided to verbally communicate to the informants that they should write the exact words, in the form of a direct quote, that the interactant would use to respond to the situation.

In Section 3.3, I described the purpose of Questionnaire # 3 to be that of testing informants perceptions with regards to a) the strength of complex strategies and b) how the order of the IFID in relation to the other strategy-type included affects the overall strength of the complex apology strategy. Because Questionnaire # 3 was designed using actual data taken from responses to Questionnaire # 2, and the same scales were used in its design as those which were used in Questionnaire # 1, no pilot testing was done on this instrument.
2.6.2 Speech Communities Targeted in the Current Investigation: Profiles of Cuernavaca, Mexico and Granada, Spain

Part of this study was undertaken in Cuernavaca, Mexico, the capital city of the state of Morelos. Located approximately one hour to the south of Mexico City, Cuernavaca is considered part of Central Mexico. Cuernavaca is a large metropolitan area with a population of approximately one million inhabitants (http://www.giga.com/cuahua/cuernav.html). While Cuernavaca originated as a refuge for Mexico City's elite, today's city is home to people of distinct economic and social levels. This community was selected as the target site for the current investigation for the following reasons: 1) I had established previous contacts with members of the speech community, making informants easily accessible; 2) I had formerly lived and worked in Cuernavaca, and was offered a similar short-term position there during the perceived timeframe of data collection thus I had acquired intuitions and testimonial knowledge of the socio-cultural norms operating within this speech community), and 3) to date, no in-depth research has been completed on apologies in Mexican Spanish.

The second speech community focused upon in the current investigation is the capital city of the Province of Granada, Granada or Granada capital. Located in the southern region of Spain known as Andalusia, the Province of Granada is considered part of Eastern Andalusia.
Granada is a mid-sized Spanish city with a population of approximately 263,500 (http://www.red2000.com/Span/Index.html.1997). While Granada is famous for its historical and cultural importance at the end of the Moorish occupation of Spain, today's city is a bustling center of urban activity. The University of Granada is a well-respected institution of higher learning which attracts students from all parts of Spain. Therefore, there is a very large university population in Granada Capital. This population should be considered transient, as students often leave Granada once they have completed their academic programs. This community was selected as one of the target sites for the current investigation for the following reasons: 1) Granada is a mid-sized city which can easily be covered on foot; 2) I had established previous contact with members of the speech community, making informants readily accessible, and 3) I had resided in Granada for considerable periods of time, thus having acquired knowledge of the socio-cultural norms operating within this speech community.

3.6.3 Informant Profile and Selection Procedure

This research project uses human subjects to respond to three different questionnaires. For Questionnaire # 1, the respondents are a group of thirty individuals from Cuernavaca, Mexico and thirty individuals from Granada, Spain. The respondents of each variety of Spanish are divided into two groups of fifteen persons each according to gender. This division results in
two groups of fifteen male respondents and two groups of fifteen female respondents. Informants were selected via a networking approach to quota sampling. This approach involved using friends and colleagues to establish further contacts with other native members of the target speech communities. Informants were chosen on the grounds of availability to the researcher, their willingness to participate, and their ability to fill one of the cells established on the basis of gender. In order to eliminate possible dialectal variation, all informants verbally confirmed that they had resided their entire lives in either Cuernavaca, Mexico or Granada, Spain.

For Questionnaire # 2, a total of one hundred twenty five individuals from the speech community of Cuernavaca responded. Once again, informants were selected via a networking approach, this time using a snowball sampling technique. Snowball sampling involves using contacts to secure additional informants without regard for filling a given cell in order to contribute to a pre-established number of informants fitting that particular profile. None of the one hundred twenty five respondents who responded to Questionnaire # 2 had participated in Questionnaire # 1. Due to the larger number of informants required for this phase of the current investigation, no attempt was made to establish a corpus with an even number of informants in each cell. However, every attempt was made to secure a heterogeneous group of respondents. Once again, all informants verbally indicated that they had resided their entire lives in Cuernavaca, Mexico.
3.7 Data Collection: Methodological Considerations and the Chosen Approach

Human subject research carries the inherent flaw of being dynamic. Thus, it is difficult to control for the many variables which may contribute to the outcome of a given investigation. In the study of speech acts, there are a number of approaches which have been used in data collection: 1) written questionnaires, 2) open-ended role plays, 3) ethnographic data collection in notebook form, and 4) recordings of spontaneous speech in authentic contexts (Manes and Wolfson, 1980; Blum-Kulka, 1982; Olshtain, 1983; Olshtain and Cohen, 1983; Bodeman and Einstein, 1988; Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989; Runtell and Mitchell, 1989; Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Beebe, 1992; Beebe and Cummings, 1996; Overfield, 1997 and Ruzickova, 1998). Since the current investigation views the speech act of apologizing as an essentially social act, it is logical to assume that apologies would best be studied as they occur in real-life interaction. However, this approach to data collection is not always feasible. To observe and record authentic interaction would require either the presence of audio-video equipment and / or the presence of a trained researcher. The observer’s paradox (Labov, 1972) thus arises and one might ask, “How natural is the interaction now?” While data collected in this manner may not be natural, it is nevertheless authentic.
One of the principal undertakings of this project concerns the identification of situations which require an apology. Because apologies are complex speech acts which require that an offense be created in the first place, they are not easily elicited. Setting up audio-video equipment in a single domain may indeed prove fruitful in terms of the type of potentially offensive situations in which they occur. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the situational parameters important in the current research could only be explored using a number of different domains. This endeavor would involve a much larger timeframe and budget than the researcher has available.

Finally, one of the reoccurring problems in experimental research is a low rate with which the results of one investigation may be compared to those of another. Research design and procedural differences in the investigation of a given phenomenon may make data comparisons difficult at best. Consequently, I chose to employ one of the instruments used in number of previously conducted studies on apologies (CCSARP’s Parameter’s Questionnaire) to evaluate situations and social parameters inherent in the CCSARP Questionnaire (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989) (English to Spanish translation mine) and a modified version of the CCSARP Questionnaire (modified version mine).

The first data collection technique used in the current investigation is the administration of three types of written questionnaires. Although
written questionnaires in the form of Discourse Complete Tests (DCTs) continue to be the most commonly employed ways of eliciting speech act data across different languages (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Olshtain, 1983; Olshtain and Cohen, 1983; Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989; Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz, 1990, and Pilavachi, 1994), they have received less than favorable responses from sociolinguistics because they are considered instances of reported speech. It has been proven that reported speech and other reported social behaviors often differ greatly from those behaviors actually observed for a given population (Wolfson, D’Amico-Reisner and Huber, 1983; Beebe, 1985). Bodeman and Einstein (1988) compare data collected through DCTs, open-ended role plays and field notes of naturalistic data. They note that the data differed in terms of length and complexity, as written data was found to be shorter and less complex than the other two types. Beebe and Cummings (1996) compare data from written DCTs and telephone conversations in their study of refusals in American English. Written DCTs were found to "...bias the response toward less negotiation, less elaboration, less repetition, less hedging, less variety and less speech in general" (Beebe and Cummings, 1996:71). However, the semantic formulae produced in both types of data elicitation were remarkably similar. According to Hill et al. (1986:353), by using written elicitation techniques, one is able to obtain "...the prototype of the variants occurring in the individual’s actual speech.” In other words, written speech yields more stereotyped responses and becomes a valuable too
for conducting cross-cultural investigations. Beebe and Cummings (1996:73) add that DCTs are "...a good way to discover what semantic formulae are frequently used or expected in performance of a speech act." Finally, Bernard (1988:146) states that questionnaire research is "...an effective component of overall field research...". In sum, quantitative techniques in the collection of speech act data nicely compliment qualitative techniques of ethnographic approaches: they provide an inherent structure by which discrete categories may be identified, measured and characterized.

Due in large part to questions of access, time, finances and overall projected yield of apology samples, I chose to ethnographically record instances of naturally occurring speech using one of the tools traditionally associated with cultural anthropology: the notebook. While this technique loses some validity in that it is an account of authentic interaction as perceived and documented by a human observer, it has two main advantages which directly correlate with the intentions and goals of this particular investigation: a) this technique provides for a wide range of social and situational parameters, which are the targeted variables of this study, in a most economical and timely fashion, and b) it adds some additional external validity to the perceptions of speech community members and the sample apology strategies they offered in responding to the written questionnaires.
3.7.1 Questionnaires

The present study uses as its basis a modified version of those instruments designed for the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989). Before proceeding any further, a brief overview of the CCSARP Instruments is in order. The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project involved the implementation of two data collection instruments in the form of written questionnaires: 1) The Parameters Questionnaire and 2) The Situational Questionnaire.

The Parameters Questionnaire was developed by Vollmer and Olshtain (1989) in order to check the validity of their assumptions concerning the parameters inherent in the situations present in the CCSARP Situational Questionnaire. A group of forty respondents were given the full description of the same apology situations presented in the CCSARP Situational Questionnaire and were asked to evaluate the following variables on a scale from (1) to (3) (1 = high, 2 = average, 3 = low): social status of the speaker with respect to the addressee, social distance between the two interactants, level of obligation of the speaker to perform an apology and the extent to which the addressee might expect an apology in each case.

The Situational Questionnaire contained a total of eight scripted dialogues designed to elicit an apology. In addition to the script, each dialogue included a short prelude which described the setting of the interaction and the roles of the interactants in relation to each other. The
role relationship depiction contained the inherent parameters of social
distance and social status. The dialogues themselves included blank space,
where it was hoped that the respondent would provide the speech act being
elicited. Finally, all dialogues were comprised of a response to the supposed
indicate that this response served two functions: a) to provide the respondent
with contextual clues for supplying the speech act intended to complete the
dialogue, and 2) to signal illocutionary up-take (recognition by the recipient
of the speech act that the speech act has been communicated, and that both
the force and the content of the utterance used to perform said speech act
have been understood) (Austin, 1962:116).

For the purpose of the current investigation, I have translated from
English into Spanish the Parameters Questionnaire developed by Vollmer
and Olshtain (1989), making two minimal changes. First, Vollmer and
Olshtain (1989) consider obligation of speaker to apologize to encompass
perceived severity of offense to be one and the same variable. I do not share
their view. It is certainly possible for informants not to perceive an offense as
severe, yet still feel the speaker obligated to apologize. Second, unlike
Vollmer and Olshtain (1989), I do not measure the variable addressee’s
expectation for an apology. My decision to exclude this variable is based on
the notion that it is hard to argue the existence of a systematic relationship
between the performance of an apology by the speaker and the addressee’s
expectation for an apology. In other words, to what extent an addressee’s expectations are able to shape the face-work of a speaker cannot be predicted. A particular speaker may render an apology solely on the basis of knowing that his / her addressee expects one. It is unclear what Vollmer and Olshtain hope to gain by including this variable.

I have opted to modify the form of the CCSARP Situational Questionnaire, with the modified version being subsequently referred to as Questionnaire # 2 (vid. Appendix C). Like Questionnaire #1, Questionnaire # 2 was written in Spanish. Instead of providing respondents with a scripted dialogue, I have chosen to provide them with a brief description of the situation at hand (my translation of the “prelude” supplied by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989). A scripted dialogue introduces bias in two ways: 1) it provides respondents with information, in the form of illocutionary up-take, which is not normally available to them at the point in natural discourse where they may chose to perform or not to perform a given speech act, and 2) the presence of illocutionary up-take coupled with limited amount of writing space may force respondents to complete their speech act in one turn of talk. It is worthwhile to explore these two biases in more detail. In terms of the first bias, not every speech act contains illocutionary up-take on part of the addressee. However, each dialogue in the CCSARP Situational Questionnaire clearly indicates that the elicited speech act will be accepted by the addressee via illocutionary up-take present in his / her response, e.g.,
O.K., but please remember it next week. (see $S_4$ of CCSARP Situational Questionnaire by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989). Where the second bias is concerned, Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989:14) point out that speech act realization in natural discourse often takes several turns. This important realization, however, is not reflected in the design of their Situational Questionnaire. In the dialogues presented in the CCSARP Situational Questionnaire, the turn which follows the blank space is reserved for the addressee, and the response of the addressee necessarily confirms the successful realization of the speech act in question. Thus, the format and content of this part of the Situational Questionnaire discourages the respondent from providing longer and more elaborate strategies. By choosing to design Questionnaire # 2 in a less confining spacial and contextual format, I hope to eliminate these two internal biases clearly present in the original version.

3.7.1.1 Questionnaire # 1

Questionnaire # 1 (vid. Appendix B) was designed to evaluate the following variables inherently found in the situational depictions presented in Questionnaire # 2 (vid. Appendix C): a) social status of the speaker with respect to the addressee; b) social distance between the speaker and the addressee, c) level of obligation of the speaker to apologize, d) the perceived severity of the act in question, and e) the strength of a given apology strategy
independent of an specific offensive act. At the present time, it is not known to what extent respondents will differ in their perceptions of these variables. However, respondents' perceptual differences may determine: a) whether or not they deem the situation to be offensive, and b) if they do find the situation offensive, the way in which they chose to repair the offense. Respondents were asked to evaluate each of these variables on a scale. The scale included binary values to determine whether the situation merited an apology (yes, no), and trinary values (yes, maybe, no) to measure each of the following: a) the perceived obligation by the informant for the speaker to apologize, b) the perceived social relationship, on the part of the informant, between the two parties represented in the interaction (friends, acquaintances, strangers), and c) the perceived social status, on the part of the informant, of each party represented in interaction relative to the other party (speaker +, hearer -, speaker / hearer =), and five-point values to characterize the force of a given apology strategy independent of context (1 = very strong, 2 = strong, 3 = average, 4 = weak, 5 = very weak). Questionnaire #1 differs from the CCSARP Parameters Questionnaire in two ways: a) first, Questionnaire # 1 contains five out of the original eight potential apology situations found in the CCSARP Parameters Questionnaire. The three situations not depicted in Questionnaire # 1 are situation 6 (S₆) (manager to student over keeping him / her waiting), situation 8 (S₈) (waiter to customer over mix-up of order) and situation 14 (S₁₄) (co-worker A to co-worker B over remarks made by the
former which have offended the latter). $S_6$ was eliminated from
Questionnaires # 1 because it is not clear whether the student waiting to be
interviewed by the manager had a previous appointment or if he / she was
waiting to be interviewed by the manager on a walk-in basis. Such
information may affect whether an informant feels that the manager has
committed an offense. $S_8$ was eliminated due to the complex nature of the
social conventions and norms of power associated with the two roles depicted
in this situation. $S_{14}$ was removed from Questionnaire # 1 for two distinct
reasons: 1) the informants were not provided with a description of the exact
moment in which the potential offense occurred, and 2) the addressee’s
offense is explicitly expressed in the wording of the situation. Therefore, it is
impossible to assess whether an informant will be led to believe that a FTA
has occurred due to the wording of the situation; b) second, this investigation
seeks to identify the strength of the illocutionary force inherent in various
apology strategies. In order to do this, a random group of potential apology
strategies were presented out of context to the informants. Context is used
here to refer to the immediate situational parameters within which the
scripted interaction is confined, and has been intentionally eliminated so as to
insure that informants do not evaluate the potential strategies in terms of
their perceived perlocutionary effects. Perlocutionary effects are those effects
brought upon the audience by means of realizing an utterance, which are
special to the circumstances in which that utterance is made (Levinson,
1983:236). Once the conventional force of a particular strategy has been characterized, the next step will be to test these sample strategies in a variety of contexts in order to determine their perlocutionary effect(s) for a given situation. However, this endeavor will be left to further research.

3.7.1.2 Questionnaire # 2.

Questionnaire # 2 involves a set of potential FTAs presented in a situationally descriptive format. Each situation depicts the circumstances surrounding a potential FTA, and includes role designation for the person committing the supposed infraction (speaker) and the person who this behavior most directly affects (addressee). Respondents were instructed to indicate the direct discourse the speaker would use in response to the given situations. A few lines of blank space follow each situation, therefore allowing the respondent space for a number of potential transition relevant places in which to complete the speech act or continue its development. Furthermore, no up-take is present via a response by the addressee, allowing the respondents complete freedom in deciding if and when they have effectively addressed the situation at hand.

3.7.1.3 Questionnaire # 3.

Observation of the speech act data set obtained for the current investigation leads one to conclude that the coding scheme employed in
Questionnaires # 1 and # 2 and in the CCSARP Parameters Questionnaire and Situational Questionnaire are only able to capture the more general tendencies and pragmatic forces underlying the apology behavior of Mexican informants. The issue concerning the combination of different strategies when making a single apology poses a problem in evaluating the illocutionary force of the apology as a whole. A third questionnaire was developed to test the hypothesis that the use of two strategies makes for a stronger apology than the use of one strategy. Furthermore, Questionnaire # 3 seeks to determine whether the position of an IFID in relation to another strategy (before or after) influences the perceived strength of the apology. Forty respondents participated in this questionnaire, ranking the strategies and combinations of strategies on a scale of (1) very strong to (5) very weak.

3.7.2 Ethnographic Method.

A corpus of two-hundred apologies was collected from live encounters characterized by natural speech. I carried around a notebook and manually recorded the discourse of the interaction, making a special effort to accurately note the exact language of the utterances. In addition, special note was made of the setting of the encounter, describing the place and general situation in which the apology occurred. Finally, I included a profile of the speakers present, indicating the gender and age of the participants (age approximations made when necessary), as well as their social relationship (family / friends,
acquaintances, or strangers). When noteworthy, kinesics were also described. This ethnographic collection is used to support the perceptions and the actual apologies rendered by the informants in the form of their written questionnaire responses.

3.8 Data Analysis.

3.8.1 Questionnaires.

3.8.1.1 Questionnaire # 1: Apology Perceptions.

It was previously established that the purpose of Questionnaire # 1 was to enable the researcher to check the nature of the situational and social parameters encoded in Questionnaire # 2. First, respondents were given a full description of the apology situation and were asked to evaluate the following components on a scale from (1) to (3) \( (1 = \text{high}, \ 2 = \text{average} \ \text{and} \ 3 = \text{low}) \): Social status of the speaker with respect to the addressee; social distance between the two interlocutors, the respondent's perceived obligation, of the speaker to apologize, and the respondent's perception as to what extent the addressee may expect an apology in each situation. The results of these situational assessments are presented as weighted means in a tabulated format. In addition, I have calculated the strength assessments of the thirteen sample apology strategies. Furthermore, these data are presented in terms of the independent variable of gender for each of the thirty informants.
Finally, a comparison was made between the above findings for speakers of Mexican Spanish and those previously acquired for speakers of Andalusian Spanish. The tables used to present the data from speakers of Mexican Spanish were applied to the data from speakers of Andalusian Spanish. Following this, a comparative and contrastive analysis was performed on the results yielded from the current study with those yielded from the CCSARP (Olshtain, 1989).

3.8.1.2 Questionnaire # 2 and Ethnographically Collected Samples: Apology Performance.

Questionnaire # 2 and the samples of natural speech collected in notebook form were encoded using the following scheme as outlined in the CCSARP Coding Manual for apologies (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989: 289-294). Minor modifications have been made to capture several structures and devices available and frequently used by speakers of the Spanish language:

1. Segmentation. Apologies may be performed by employing any one of the following major strategies, or by employing any combination of the same:
   a) Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)
   b) Taking Responsibility
   c) Explanation or Account
d) Offer of Repair

e) Promise of Forbearance

The following example illustrates all five strategy types in the order in which they occur in the above listing.

Example:

IFID RESPONSIBILITY EXPLANATION / ACCOUNT
Lo siento. Me quedé dormida y por encima de todo había tanto tráfico que no podía
OFFER OF REPAIR PROMISE OF
manejar rápido. Si puedes, nos podemos quedar hasta que lo terminemos. No vuelve a
FORBEARANCE
pasar.

Also included in the CCSARP Coding Manual is a set of coding categories complete with numerous examples. The researcher has chosen to use this basic system, making modifications where deemed necessary. Such modifications are clearly indicated below.

2. Coding Categories.

a) Alerters. Alerters are elements whose function is to alert the hearer to the forthcoming speech act. Some types of possible alerters are: (i) titles (profesor, señora, don, etc.); (ii) proper names (Juan, Carmen, Morales, etc.); (iii) terms
of endearment (*querido, mi vida, cielo,* etc.); (iv) offensive labels *cabrona, hijo de la chingada madre,* etc.); (v) pronouns (*Ud, tu, Uds,* etc.) and (vi) attention getters (*oiga, mire, escuchen,* etc.).

b) *Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs).* IFIDs are conventional expressions in which the speaker’s apology is made explicitly. In addition IFIDs may be divided into two types: (i) direct IFIDs (*disculpa, perdóname,* etc.) and (ii) indirect IFIDs (*lo siento, lo lamento,* etc.)

c) *Intensifiers of the Apology.* A few types of intensifiers include: (i) adverbials: *muy, tan, de verdad,* etc.); (ii) emotional expressions: (*ay Dios mío, Santa María, madre mía,* etc.) and (iii) please (*por favor*).

d) *Taking Responsibility.* Sometimes in an attempt of appease the hearer, the speaker will express responsibility for the offense, either on his / her own behalf or on the behalf of someone else. The subsequent types of strategies may be used for this purpose: (i) explicit self-blame: (*fue mi culpa, me equivoco,* etc.); (ii) lack of intent: (*no fue mi intención, Perdí su libro,* etc.); (iii) hearer justification: (*tiene el derecho a enojarse, tienes toda la razón,* etc.) and (iv) expression of embarrassment: (*estoy tan avergonzada, qué vergüenza,* etc.).
e) **Admission of Facts but Not of Responsibility.** The speaker does not deny being involved in the offense, but he / she does not openly accept responsibility. A few strategies used in this manner are: *Se me perdió, se cayó, etc.*

f) **Refusal to Acknowledge Guilt.** Here, the speaker completely dismisses responsibility for the offense in one or more of the following ways: (i) denial of responsibility: *no fue mi culpa, no soy culpable, etc.*; (ii) blaming the hearer: *mi re lo que Ud. me hizo, fue tu culpa, etc.*; (iii) pretending to be offended: *yo tengo derecho de enojarme, etc.* and (iv) blaming a third party (party other than speaker or hearer): *el chofer maneja como loco, deben tener cuidado, etc.*.

g) **Explanation or Account.** (i) This category is used to code all reasons offered by the speaker for the violation at hand, excluding the uses of first person and *se*. First person explanations are coded as a sub strategy of *taking responsibility*, whereas pronominal verb constructions have been divided into two types: (ii) admission of fact, in which a pronominal verb is used, and (iii) disclaimer of responsibility and self portrayal as a victim. The following examples illustrate these differences:

(i) explanation or account: *el tráfico fue horrible*

(ii) admission of fact: *se cayó la bolsa*
(iii) disclaimer of responsibility and self portrayal as a victim: \textit{se me perdió el libro}

h) \textbf{Offer of Repair}. If there is physical damage to the addressee’s person and/or belongings, the speaker may opt to offer repair. This offer must be directly related to the damage or inconvenienced person or possession(s). Sample offers of repair include: \textit{le pago el daño, llamo mi compañía de seguros}, etc.

i) \textbf{Promise of Forbearance}. The speaker makes the addressee a promise that the infraction will never occur again. Some examples are: \textit{No volverá a pasar, la próxima vez llegaré a tiempo}, etc.

j) \textbf{Offense Distracters (Downgrading)}. These strategies are tactical moves which the speaker employs to divert the addressee’s attention from his/her own responsibility for the offense. Some sample strategies include: (i) query precondition: the speaker questions the terms of a previous commitment which he/she has broken: \textit{nos íbamos a quedar a las 10’00?}; (ii) innocent act: \textit{llegó tarde?}; (iii) future/task oriented remark: \textit{empecemos a trabajar} and (iv) appeaser: compensatory offer which is not directly related to the infraction (infraction = lateness > \textit{te invito a un café}).
3.8.1.3 Questionnaire # 3: Perceptions on Strategy Repetition and Order within Complex Apologies

The purpose of Questionnaire # 3 is to assess the perceived strength of IFIDs when combined with another IFID or a distinct strategy to render a single, complex apology and seeks to answer the following questions: Does the addition of another strategy to the IFID increase the perceived strength of the overall apology? Does repetition of the same IFID create a stronger or weaker apology than an IFID combined with a different apology strategy type? Finally, in the case of a complex strategy does the placement of the IFID in relation to the other strategy type make a difference in terms of the perceived strength of the complex apology strategy? As in the case of Questionnaire # 1, Questionnaire # 3 uses a five-point scale to characterize the strength of an apology (1 = very strong, 2 = strong, 3 = average, 4 = weak and 5 = very weak),

3.9 Conclusions

In Chapter Three, I have presented a detailed account of the research design used in the current work. My investigation of apologies, as they are perceived and rendered by members of the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico, includes theoretical considerations and data collection techniques and analyses from two distinct disciplines: a) pragmatics / speech act theory and b) the ethnography of communication. Due to the eclectic nature of this project, special attention was paid to the rationale justifying the creation and
implementation of the various instruments and means of data collection and analyses employed. As previously stated, the design of this research project reflects its overall goals: a) a sociocultural and situational analysis of the perceptual notions of offense and the obligation to apologize in Cuernavaca, Mexico and b) a sociopragmatic characterization of the most common communicative strategies used by its members in realizing said speech act. Chapter four provides the reader with a quantitative analysis of the data collected from the three questionnaires discussed in this chapter through the application of two-tailed t-tests.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRES

4.1 Introduction.

In Chapter three, the reader was provided with a detailed description of the research design of the current work. As previously stated, the data collection techniques employed included both written questionnaires and ethnographic notebook recordings. Two out of the three written questionnaires administrated measured native-speakers’ perceptions regarding several situational and social variables encoded in the situational descriptions presented to respondents in Questionnaire #2. The perceptions of these variables were hypothesized to be crucial factors in determining degrees of offense, the obligation of a speaker to apologize and the most appropriate strategy or strategies one should employ based on the above considerations.

This study maintains that social and situational variables such as those encoded in Questionnaire # 1 and the CCSARP Parameters Questionnaire may help to determine if an apology is called for, and if so, the way in which
it will be rendered. Therefore, it is important to discover how informants perceive these variables. Unlike the designers of the CCSARP Questionnaires, I do not believe that speaking the same language automatically results in uniform perceptions of these variables. Instead of viewing language as the principle variable which shapes the perception and performance of speech acts, I suggest speech community membership and its sociocultural composition as primary factors in characterizing this function of language. I hypothesize that perceptions of social status, social distance, severity of offense and the obligation of a speaker to apologize are shaped to a great extent by those sociocultural factors which determine group membership and regulate norms of interaction operating across and within every speech community. The results of Questionnaire # 1 support this line of reasoning, as the data reflect statistically significant perceptual differences between: 1) Mexicans and Andalusians and 2) males and females.

Chapter four begins with an exploration of the perceptual similarities and differences of the situational and social parameters for the five apology situations, as obtained from Mexican and Andalusian informants in response to Questionnaire # 1. The data are first presented in raw numerical form. Notable similarities and differences between Mexican and Andalusian informants’ perceptions are discussed for each situation. Next, a two-tailed t-test was applied to these raw numerical values to determine whether the differences found for both groups may be considered statistically significant.
In addition to testing the informants' perceptions of the social and situational parameters encoded in the situations, Questionnaire # 1 tested the perceptions of informants concerning the strength or force of various types of common apology strategies independent of context. These strategies were grouped according to the typology outlined in Chapter three, section 3.5.1.2. The numerical strength values equated to these apologies by informants were compared to two independent variables: *speech community membership* (Cuernavaca vs. Granada) and *gender of the informant.* (male vs. female).

The second part of my data analysis addresses the perception data collected from Questionnaire # 3. The purpose of this questionnaire was to test the following hypotheses using informants from the Cuernavacan speech community: 1) the use of more than one apology strategy within a single act of apologizing increases the perceived strength of the overall apology, 2) the use of two different IFIDs in a complex apology is perceived as constituting a stronger apology than is the case when the same two IFIDs are used and 3) the placement of an IFID before another strategy type within a complex strategy unit results in the perception of a stronger apology. The reader is provided with the raw numerical data secured through quantification, as well as the results of a two-tailed t-test on the statistical significance of these differences.
4.2 Results of Questionnaire #1: Perceptions of Social and Situational Parameters

The social and situational variation embedded in the five apology situations relates to the following parameters: 1) social distance between the interactants (speaker and addressee), 2) relative social status of the speaker with respect to the addressee, 3) severity of offense, and 4) obligation of the speaker to apologize. In order to validate the assumptions concerning the inherent parameters presented in the situations depicted in the modified version of the CCSARP Questionnaire used in this investigation, a study was conducted in which members of the Mexican and Andalusian speech communities assessed the apology situations. The thirty respondents from each community were given a complete description of the apology situations and were asked to evaluate the following variables on a scale from 1 (high) to 3 (low): 1) social status of the speaker with respect to the addressee, 2) social distance between the two interactants, 3) the perceived level of severity of the offense, and 4) the obligation of the speaker to apologize. The weighted means of the situation assessments may be seen in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION (Sₙ) and OFFENSE TYPE</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final paper</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Accident</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARAMETER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Speaker</th>
<th>1.90</th>
<th>1.70</th>
<th>1.43</th>
<th>1.80</th>
<th>2.97</th>
<th>2.93</th>
<th>1.80</th>
<th>1.47</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologize</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Validity study for members of Mexican (M) and Andalusian (A) speech communities for social and situational parameters (Xₙ = weighted means, ranging from 1.00 (high) to 3.00 (low). Total number of informants, N = 60.
4.2.1 Social Status.

In assessing the social status of the speaker in relation to the addressee, informants from the Mexican speech community equated values with this variable which ranged from a high of 1.43 in situation 2 (lateness-student to student) to a low of 3.00 in situation 5 (groceries-passenger to passenger). Also receiving a low rating for social status was the speaker in situation 3 (car accident-driver to driver). When the speaker (professor) commits a potential offense toward the addressee (student) in situation 1, the speaker is given a status rating of 1.90. However, when the speaker (student) commits a potential offense toward the addressee (professor) in situation 4, the speaker is given a status rating of 1.80. The results yielded from the Mexican informants’ assessment data show that the effect of social roles on speech act behavior undergoes modification under specific contextual circumstances. For instance, the perceptions of the social status relationship between a professor and a student varied according to who is in the role of apologizer and who is in the role of apologizee.

Informants from the Andalusian speech community perceived variation in the social status of the speaker in relation to the hearer ranging from a high of 1.47 for situation 4 (book-student to professor), to a low of 3.00 for situation 5 (groceries-passenger to passenger). Situation 3 (car accident-driver to driver) also produced a low ranking for the social status of the speaker in relation to the addressee. More balanced social status relationships
between the speaker and addressee were perceived for situation 1 (final paper-student to professor), 1.70, and situation 2 (lateness-student to student), 1.62.

4.2.2 Social Distance.

The assessment of the level of familiarity between speaker and addressee made by informants from the Mexican speech community varied from a high of 1.30 in situation 2 (lateness-student to student) to a low of 2.60 in situation 4 (book-student to professor). Contrary to the latter finding, informants assigned a high degree of familiarity to the participants in situation 1 (final paper-professor to student). Because the same social roles are depicted in both situations (professor and student), one may possible conclude that when the student is acting as the speaker and is performing the apology, informants perceived the need for the student to pay deference to the professor. The social distance value perceived for situation 3 (car accident-driver to driver) was average, 2.07. This value indicates that Mexican informants felt there to be a good chance that the drivers know one another. However, the size of the Mexican speech community targeted in this study lends itself to the unlikeness of this perceived relationship holding true.

Andalusian informants perceived the level of social distance inherent in the five situations as ranging from a high of 1.30 in situation 1 (final paper-professor to student) to a low of 2.00 in situation 3 (car accident-driver to driver). Other situations receiving comparable assessments to that of situation 3 were situation 2 (lateness-student to student) and situation 5.
(groceries-passenger to passenger), both at 1.97. Receiving a slightly higher degree of familiarity was the relationship encoded in situation 4 (student to professor) at 1.53.

4.2.3 Perception of Offense.

The Mexican respondents assessing perception of offense did not find all of the situations to be offensive. Low levels of offense were perceived for situation 1 (final paper-professor to student), 2.75, and situation 4 (book-student to professor), 2.74. The common element shared by both situations involves the speaker not complying with a promise to return the property of the addressee. A slightly higher level of offense was perceived by Mexican informants for situation 2 (Lateness-student to student), 2.50. The highest levels of offense were equated to situation 5 (groceries-passenger to passenger), 2.09, and situation 3 (car accident-driver to driver), 1.43. The element shared by these two situations is the potential damage to the addressee’s person or his / her property.

Like their Mexican counterparts, the Andalusian respondents did not assess all situations as offensive. Andalusian informants assigned maximum levels of offense (1.00) to situations 3 (car accident-passenger to passenger), 4 (book-student to professor) and 5 (groceries-passenger to passenger). Situation 1 (final paper-professor to student) was received an average rating of 1.73, while situation 2 (lateness-student to student) received a minimal rating of offense, 3.00.
4.2.4 Obligation of Speaker to Apologize.

Members of the Mexican speech community participating in this study perceived the speaker’s obligation to apologize as high across all situations. A maximum value (1.00) was assessed to this variable for situation 2 (lateness-student to student), while the lowest value for this variable was assigned to situation 3 (car accident-driver to driver). Since the Mexican informants did not show the same degree of uniformity with regards to the degree in which they found the situations to be offensive, this finding is quite unexpected. One possible interpretation is that informants expect speakers in all of the situations to offer some attempt of repair, regardless of the severity of the offense. It is equally puzzling to find that while situation 2 (lateness-student to student) received a minimal rating in terms of severity of offense, it received a maximum value in terms of the speaker’s obligation to apologize. This may be a case of an apology being offered not to repair a grave offense inasmuch as to facilitate the business at hand (e.g., the project on which the interlocutors are working).

Unlike members of the Mexican speech community, members of the Andalusian speech community did not assign like values to the variable obligation of speaker to apologize. They assigned a maximum rating (1.00) to situations 3 (car accident-driver to driver), 4 (book-student to professor), and 5 (groceries-passerger to passenger), and a average-high rating (1.73) to situation 1 (final paper-professor to student). Situation 2 (lateness-student to student) received a minimal rating of 3.00. It is important to note that this
value assigned to the variable obligation of speaker to apologize for situation 2 correlates positively with the minimal value assigned to it for the variable severity of offense.

4.3 Applying the Two-Tailed T-Test for Statistical Significance on Differences of Social and Situational Variables as Perceived by Mexican and Andalusian Informants

4.3.1 T-Test

In experimental research, the null-hypothesis states that the independent variable being measured will have no effect on the dependent variable. For example, a null-hypothesis concerning the effects of speech community membership (Andalusian vs. Mexican) [independent variable] on perceptions of the obligation to apologize [dependent variable] would predict no effect. There are two ways to test the null-hypothesis: 1) z-scores and 2) t-tests. For z-scores, one must know the value of the population’s standard deviation. Standard deviation tells how much variation there is within a group of scores, and it is calculated from the variance of the average squared deviation from the mean. For t-tests, one may substitute the standard deviation of a sample mean for the standard deviation of a population mean. In the present investigation, the standard deviation of the population mean is unknown, but the standard deviation of the sample mean may be calculated. Therefore, we choose to employ t-tests instead of z-scores.
A t-test asks whether two sample means differ enough to lead one to believe that there are statistically significant differences between the two populations. There are two types of t-tests: one-tailed and two-tailed. A one-tailed test is used when the researcher expects the independent variable to produce an effect on the dependent variable in a specific direction. A one-tailed test allows one to reject the null-hypothesis with a relatively small difference between the sample and the population. A two-tailed test is performed when the direction of the effect is unknown or unimportant. The only concern is showing that a difference between two samples is significant. A two-tailed test requires a larger difference than a one-tailed test to achieve statistical significance. Statistical significance is measured by the alpha level. The value of alpha determines the degree to which one may be sure that a relationship between two variables is not by chance. The lower the alpha level, the less likely the researcher is to commit a type I error (inferring a relationship exists when it really does not). In experimental research, an alpha level of .05 is considered statistically significant, while an alpha level of .01 is considered highly statistically significant.
4.3.2 Applying the T-Test to Variable of *Speech Community Membership*

(Andalusian vs. Mexican)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>2.1551</td>
<td>14.0684</td>
<td>.9639</td>
<td>7.9518</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL DISTANCE</td>
<td>3.8167</td>
<td>16.1146</td>
<td>.6464</td>
<td>9.0448</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVERITY OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFENSE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19.0114</td>
<td>.4819</td>
<td>1.1749</td>
<td>6.1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATION TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGIZE</td>
<td>11.5663</td>
<td>38.0228</td>
<td>5.1107</td>
<td>3.6145</td>
<td>.3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Results of two-tailed t-test for statistical significance of differences in social and situational perceptions by speech community (Mexican vs. Andalusian).

Mexican and Andalusian informants had different means for 17 out of 20 categories. Of the 17 categories showing differences, 12 out of 17 (70.59%) were statistically significant where p > .05. Statistical differences were found for the perceived values of the following variables: status of speaker in relation to the hearer (situations 1, 2 and 4), social distance between informants (situations 1, 2 and 4), severity of offense (situations 2 and 5) and obligation of speaker to apologize (situations 1, 2, 3 and 4).
4.4 Comparison of Gender Perceptions of Social and Situational Variables in Questionnaire #2.

4.4.1 Comparing Raw Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN INTERACTANTS</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITUATION 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL STATUS BETWEEN INTERACTANTS</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEVERITY OF OFFENSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBLIGATION OF SPEAKER TO APOLOGIZE</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Gender perceptions of social and situational variables (1 = high, 3 = low) for Situation 1. Number of informants, N = 60.
### SITUATION 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN INTERACTANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL STATUS BETWEEN INTERACTANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEVERITY OF OFFENSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBLIGATION OF SPEAKER TO APOLOGIZE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Gender perceptions of social and situational variables (1 = high, 3 = low) for Situation 2. Number of informants, N = 60.
### SITUATION 3

**SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN INTERACTANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL STATUS BETWEEN INTERACTANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEVERITY OF OFFENSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBLIGATION OF SPEAKER TO APOLOGIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Gender perceptions of social and situational variables by (1 = high, 3 = low) for Situation 3. Number of informants, N = 60.
### SITUATION 4

#### SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN INTERACTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOCIAL STATUS BETWEEN INTERACTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SEVERITY OF OFFENSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OBLIGATION OF SPEAKER TO APOLOGIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Gender perceptions of social and situational variables (1 = high, 3 = low) for Situation 4. Number of informants, N = 60.
### SITUATION 5

#### SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN INTERACTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOCIAL STATUS BETWEEN INTERACTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SEVERITY OF OFFENSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OBLIGATION OF SPEAKER TO APOLOGIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Gender perceptions of social and situational variables
(1 = high, 3 = low) for Situation 5. Number of informants, N = 60.
Out of the four parameters in which gender was measured, the only one to show a correlation was **obligation of speaker to apologize**. Andalusian and Mexican women rated the obligation to apologize as higher than did their male counterparts. In responding to situation 2, both Andalusian and Mexican women assessed the social relationship between the two interactants as being more distance than did Andalusian and Mexican men. Furthermore, Andalusian and Mexican women equated a higher status to the speaker than did their male counterparts. When assessing the social and situational parameters, both Andalusian and Mexican women assessed more social distance between the two interactants than did Andalusian and Mexican men.

In responding to situation 4, female informants equated greater social distance between the two interactants than did male informants. Furthermore, female informants perceived the severity of offense as greater than did their male counterparts. In responding to situation 5, males assigned slightly more equal social status between the interactants and felt the offense to be a bit less offensive than did females.
4.4.2 Applying the T-Test to Variable of *Gender*

Next, a two-tailed t-test was applied to the raw data to see which differences proved to be statistically significant at p>.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>1.2690</td>
<td>1.6430</td>
<td>.6464</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL DISTANCE</td>
<td>.7543</td>
<td>2.1574</td>
<td>1.9328</td>
<td>6.5060</td>
<td>1.6867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVERITY OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFENSE</td>
<td>1.9727</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.8554</td>
<td>8.0770</td>
<td>4.9385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATION TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGIZE</td>
<td>5.9620</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.9346</td>
<td>2.3881</td>
<td>.0964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8. Results of two-tailed t-test for statistical significance of differences in social and situational perceptions by gender p>.05.

Male and female informants had different means for 16 out of 20 categories. Of those categories showing differences, 7 out of 16 (43.8%) were statistically significant using a two-tailed test and an alpha level of .05. There were no statistically significant differences between the genders for the perception of *social status of speaker in relation to the hearer*. There were statistically significant differences of the following variables: social distance (situations 2
and 4), severity of offense (situations 3, 4 and 5) and obligation to apologize (situations 1 and 4). It is obvious that gender is a less influential variable than is speech community membership in determining statistically significant differences. This is apparent in both the number of cases showing statistical significance and the level of statistical significance they reach.
4.5 Perceived Strength of Apology Strategies from Questionnaire #1 by Andalusian and Mexican Informants

4.5.1 Raw Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andalusians</td>
<td>Mexicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo siento</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fue culpa mía</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fue mi intención</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiene derecho a enojarse</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se me olvidó</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fue mi culpa</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el tráfico fue horrible</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te pago el daño</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no vuelves a pasar</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿nos íbamos a quedar a las 10’00’?</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿llego tarde?</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te invitó a un café</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perdóname</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. Perceived strength of apology strategies from Questionnaire #1 (1 = high, 5 = low). Number of informants, N = 60.
As a group, Andalusian informants responding to Questionnaire #1 rated these strategies as slightly weaker (3.37) than did their Mexican counterparts (3.23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANDALUSIANS</th>
<th>MEXICANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY TYPE</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monetary repair</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other repair</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admission of guilt</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denial of intent</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forbearance</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignorance</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denial-responsible</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. Strategy type and average perceived strength value in order from strongest to weakest by Andalusian and Mexican informants (1 = very strong, 5 = very weak). Number of informants, N = 60.
Monetary repair was the strongest type of strategy for both Andalusian and Mexican informants. Andalusian and Mexican informants had four out of the five strongest strategies in common: monetary repair, admission of guilt, denial of intent and promise of forbearance. An interesting difference, however, is the assessed force of the IFIDs. For Mexican informants, the IFIDs are the fourth strongest apology strategy, while for Andalusian informants they are the third weakest. If the strongest form of an apology is a direct apology across all languages and societies, and IFIDs are strategies for making a direct apology, one would expect a stronger assessment of their strength. However, although Mexican informants perceived IFIDs as the fourth strongest apology strategy out of the given set, they still only received a value of 3.14 (1.00 = very strong, 5.00 = very weak).
4.5.2 Perceived Differences in Apology Strategy Strength by Andalusian and Mexican Informants: Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY TYPE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monetary repair</td>
<td>4.3147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other repair</td>
<td>1.4532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admission of guilt</td>
<td>3.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denial of intent</td>
<td>2.2843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forbearance</td>
<td>9.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignorance</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>9.9379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame elsewhere</td>
<td>8.5025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation / no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>5.7107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denial of responsibility</td>
<td>9.8985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11. Strategy type and assessment of strength by speech community: Results of two-tailed t-test, p>.05.
At p>.05, statistically significant differences were found between the strength assigned to the strategy type by Andalusian and Mexican informants in eight out of the nine cases (88.9%).

4.6 Perceived Strength of Apology Strategies from Questionnaire #1 by Gender (1.00 = very strong, 5.00 = very weak). Number of informants, N=60.

4.6.1 Raw numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lo siento</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>IFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fue culpa mía</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Admission of Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fue mi intención</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Deny Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiene derecho a enojarse</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>Appease Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se me olvidó</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Explanation -Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fue mi culpa</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>Denial -Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el tráfico fue horrible</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te pago el daño</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>Monetary Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no vuelve a pasar</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Forbearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿nos íbamos a quedar a las 10:00?</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>Ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿llego tarde?</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te invito a un café</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>Repair: other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perdono</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>IFID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12. Strategy type and average perceived strength value in order from strongest to weakest by male and female informants (1 = very strong, 5 = very weak). Number of informants, N = 60.
Women perceived stronger values for the apology strategies in ten out of thirteen cases. The three apology strategies for which women assessed a weaker strength value were: *se me olvidó*, *no fue mi culpa* and *el tráfico fue horrible*. Do these strategies have anything in common? Yes, they do. Upon closer consideration, one finds that these strategies are alike in that the speaker takes no responsibility for the offense. Overall, men and women agreed on the five strongest strategies of the given set:

1) *te pago el daño*
2) *no vuelve a pasar*
3) *fue culpa mía*
4) *tiene el derecho a enojarse*
5) *perdone*
4.6.2 Perceived Differences in Apology Strategy Type Strength by Male and Female Informants: Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
<th>STRATEGY TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lo siento</td>
<td>.8832</td>
<td>IFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fue culpa mía</td>
<td>17.5904</td>
<td>admission of guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fue mi intención</td>
<td>5.0592</td>
<td>deny intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiene derecho a enojarse</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>extra facework: hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se me olvidó</td>
<td>4.9689</td>
<td>explanation -responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fue mi culpa</td>
<td>3.2995</td>
<td>deny responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el tráfico fue horrible</td>
<td>4.7000</td>
<td>explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te pago el daño</td>
<td>20.9639</td>
<td>repair: monetary comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no vuelve a pasar</td>
<td>12.6904</td>
<td>forbearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿nos íbamos a quedar</td>
<td>4.3057</td>
<td>ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a las 10’00?</td>
<td></td>
<td>ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿llegó tarde?</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
<td>repair: other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te invito a un café</td>
<td>10.2215</td>
<td>IFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perdono</td>
<td>4.9516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13. Strategy type and assessment of strength by gender: Results of two-tailed t-test, p>.01.

Out of the thirteen strategies showing raw numerical differences for strength among male and female informants, eleven showed statistical significance at the p > .01 level.

What do these perceptual differences between members of the two target speech communities and the two genders mean in terms of the actual
performance of apologies? They show that notions of offense and the
obligation to apologize are not universal phenomena, but rather are socially
and culturally defined functions of language. Furthermore, while speakers of
a given language have available to them the same communicative strategies
for performing an apology, the way they perceive the strength of an apology
will partially determine the type of situation to which it is applied.

4.7 Complex Apology Strategies

It has become apparent that the coding schemes employed thus far in
both the present investigation and the CCSARP Questionnaire have been able
to capture only the more general tendencies and pragmatic forces underlying
the apology behavior of Mexican informants. The issue concerning the
combination of different strategies within a single apology has posed a
problem for the evaluation of its force. A second perception questionnaire
was developed to test the hypothesis that the use of two strategies yields a
stronger apology than does the use of a single strategy. In addition, the
questionnaire sought to determine whether the placement of an IFID in
relation to another strategy within a single apology influences the perceived
strength of the apology.

It is hypothesized that the strength of an apology may be intensified
through the use of multiple strategies within a single apology. For example,
adding an offer of repair or an expression of responsibility to an IFID would
intensify an apology by increasing the sincerity of the speaker. By intensifying
an apology, the speaker emphasis his/her interest in reestablishing harmony and good relations with the hearer and alerts the hearer that he/she recognizes the seriousness of the offense. A speaker may choose to repeat the same strategy or to use two or more different strategies to achieve intensification. With this in mind, an interesting question arises: does the use of two different strategies result in a stronger apology than the use of the same strategy more than once? This perception questionnaire specifically measured perceptions as to whether using two different IFIDs resulted in a stronger apology than did the use of the same IFID twice. Forty respondents participated in ranking a select group of strategies on a scale from 1(very strong) to 5 (very weak). The strategies selected for evaluation were among the most common strategies employed by Mexican respondents in the performance questionnaire (Questionnaire # 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perdón</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpame, pero se me olvidó</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Este maneja como loco. Perdónname.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay qué pena.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se me olvidó. Discúlpame.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lo vi. Perdón</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdónname, pero este maneja como loco.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si quiere se lo llevo a una tintorería.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, perdón.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, no lo vi.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento pero había tanto tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpeme</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, discúlpeme</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdone</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disculpe</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14. Strength values perceived by Mexican informants for strategies out of context (1 = very strong, 5 = very weak). Number of informants, N = 40.

These data confirm the hypothesis that the use of more than one strategy results in the perception of a stronger apology among Mexican informants.

When IFIDs appear as a single apology, their perceived strength by respondents to Questionnaire # 3 was similar to that of Mexican respondents to Questionnaire # 1:
Are there differences between the perceptions of male and female informants with regards to this phenomenon? The following chart presents the raw data strength values equated to the sample strategies by male and female informants:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpame, pero se me olvidó</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Este maneja como loco. Perdónname.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay qué pena.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se me olvidó. Discúlpame.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lo vi. Perdón</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdónname, pero este maneja como loco.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si quiere se lo llevo a una tintorería.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, perdón.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, no lo vi.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento pero había tanto tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpeme</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, discúlpeme.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdone</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disculpe</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15. Strength values perceived for strategies by male and female members of the Cuernavaca speech community (1 = very strong, 5 = very weak). Number of informants, N= 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perdón</td>
<td>1.0776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpame, pero se me olvidó</td>
<td>2.6718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento</td>
<td>7.5431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Este maneja como loco. Perdónname.</td>
<td>9.6366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay qué pena.</td>
<td>16.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se me olvidó. Discúlpame.</td>
<td>9.5057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lo vi. Perdón</td>
<td>4.9492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdónname, pero este maneja como loco.</td>
<td>5.6759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si quiere se lo llevo a una tintorería.</td>
<td>4.8193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, perdón.</td>
<td>3.4072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, no lo vi.</td>
<td>3.0464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento pero había tanto tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>2.6110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpeme</td>
<td>3.8023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón, discúlpeme.</td>
<td>2.7701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>4.3103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdone</td>
<td>2.2901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disculpe</td>
<td>2.4096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16. Perceived strength values for strategies and gender: Two-tailed t-test of statistical significance, p>.05.

Out of seventeen strategies for which males and females perceived strength differences, sixteen (94%) proved to be statistically significant. These differences suggest that individual strategies may be used for different degrees of offense by male and female speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No lo vi. Perdón.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón. No lo vi.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se me olvidó. Discúlpeme.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpeme. Se me olvidó.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Este maneja como loco. Perdónname</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdónname. Este maneja como loco.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento pero había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes. Lo siento.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17. Perceived strength of complex strategies and IFID placement (1 = very strong, 5 = very weak). Number of informants, N = 40.

The raw differences between the perceived strength values for the above complex strategies indicate that when using two strategies in an apology, one of which is an IFID, the placement of the IFID before the other strategy results in a stronger strategy than placing it after the other strategy. Are these differences statistically significant?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No lo vi. Perdón.</td>
<td>4.9430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdón. No lo vi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se me olvidó. Discúlpeme.</td>
<td>2.5854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discúlpeme. Se me olvidó.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Este maneja como loco. Perdóname</td>
<td>3.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdóname. Este maneja como loco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo siento pero había mucho tráfico y no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podía llegar antes.</td>
<td>.3407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antes. Lo siento.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18. Two-tailed t-test of statistical significance for perceived strength of complex strategies and IFID placement (1 = very strong, 5 = very weak). Number of informants, N = 40.

The differences in the strength values perceived for complex strategies in which the placement of the IFID in relation to the other strategy was varied proved to be statistically significant in three out of the four examples.
4.8 Conclusions.

In conclusion, the present investigation has shown the social factors of *speech community membership* and *gender* to be important variables in determining how one perceives the social and situational parameters depicted in the five apology situations. If one uses his / her perceptions of these variables in deciding notions of offense and the manner in which an apology should be performed, sociocultural membership becomes an important consideration in characterizing the act of apologizing. To date, few investigations have considered this possibility (see Holmes, 1995).

The data resulting from the current investigation did not indicate a clear relationship between the variables of social status and / or social distance and the severity of an offense and / or obligation of the speaker to apologize. There were statistically significant differences, however, in how informants perceived the latter of these two variables. There are three possible conclusions: 1) the social status and / or social distance between interactants does not determine the severity of an offense or the obligation to apologize; 2) there are other variables at work other than those that were tested, or 3) the small sample size is obscuring the fact that a statistically significant relationship really does exist for the real population.

Chapter five presents an analysis of the apology performance data collected in the form of Questionnaire #2 and ethnographic notebook recordings. The strategies an informant chooses for apologizing will be
analyzed with respect to the type and degree of offense depicted in the situation, as well as his / her gender.
CHAPTER 5

PERFORMANCE DATA: RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE #2 AND ETHNOGRAPHIC NOTEBOOK COLLECTION

5.1 Introduction.

Chapter four presented the results of two perception questionnaires which measured informants' assessments of the various social and situational variables embedded in the situational depictions used to elicit apologies in Questionnaire #2, as well as the strength of some commonly used apology strategies. Statistical differences were found between the perceptions of informants based on their speech community membership and their gender. While Chapter four dealt with perceptual data, Chapter five deals with performance data. Chapter five considers actual apologies as they occur in response to the situations depicted in Questionnaire #2 and in natural contexts within the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Section 5.2 focuses on the types of strategies used by Mexican informants to respond to the specific situations in Questionnaire #2. These data are compared to the data collected for informants responding to the same
situations in the CCSARP. Discrepancies in these findings support my hypothesis that members of different speech communities do not apologize in the same manner. Rather, they prefer to use different strategies when responding to the same offense. Next, section 5.2 uses the results from Questionnaire #2 to present differences in strategy type selection by informants on the basis of their gender. Finally, the last sections of this chapter focus on larger questions surrounding male and female apology patterns. Using a corpus of 200 apologies collected ethnographically, sections 5.5 through 5.11 address the following issues: What deserves an apology? Who apologizes most, men or women? Who receives the most apologies, men or women? How do men and women apologize?

5.2 Questionnaire #2: Apology Strategy Choice by Situation

The first analysis on the apology data collected from 150 Mexican Spanish-speaking informants is presented below in Table 5.1 and illustrates the choice of apology strategies by Mexican informants across the five situations. The percentages in each case represent the number of choices made out of the total number which was potentially possible. Therefore, if all 150 respondents had chosen a certain strategy once in all five situations, there could have been a total of 750 tokens of that strategy. The actual number of realizations is presented as a percentage of this potential total.
### SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Paper</td>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSIFIER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFER REPAIR</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBEARANCE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNGRADING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTS</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALERTERS</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. Strategy selection type in percentage (rounded to nearest whole number) by situation in Questionnaire # 2. Number of informants, N = 150.
From examining the data presented in Table 5.1, one notices that explanations appear in rather high percentages across all situations. The use of explanations ranges from a high percentage of 100% in situation 2 (student to student), to a low percentage of 41.0% in situation 5 (passenger to passenger). Overall, this strategy was used an average of 80.6% across all situations. It is interesting to note the difference between the three strategies taking responsibility, an explanation and admitting the facts. Taking responsibility requires an explicit acknowledgement of the speaker that he/she has committed an infraction (e.g. fue mi culpa). An explanation, on the other hand, includes no such acceptance of the blame, although the speaker indicates that he/she is at least partially involved in the offense (e.g. Había mucho tráfico y por eso llegué tarde). Admitting the facts, however, includes the mention of any external reasons for the violation at hand. The speaker does not indicate his/her fault or involvement (e.g. Cerraron Morelos). Also receiving rather high percentages was the use of the strategy offer of repair. The highest use of this strategy was in situation 3 (driver to driver), 96.0%. Also receiving high percentages of the strategy of offer of repair were situation 4 (student to professor) at 93%, situation 5 (passenger to passenger) at 89% and situation 1 (professor to student) at 87%. The only situation which received a low percentage of offers of repair was situation 2 (student to student) at 7%. This may be due to the context-specific nature of the infraction. Lateness, albeit inconvenient, didn’t result in damage or loss of
goods to the addressee. An offer of repair would not be logical, as there is really no way to remedy lateness, other than promising not to arrive late again. Overall, Mexican informants used this strategy with a frequency of 74.4% across all situations.

According to the results of the CCSARP on Hebrew, Canadian French, Australian English and German, IFIDs and accepting responsibility were the two preferred strategies across all situations. The Mexican data of the current project does not support this finding, and rather shows explanations and offers of repair to be the preferred strategies across all situations. IFIDs were only used an average of 32% of the time, while taking responsibility was only used 13% of the time. These results, along with the results of Ruzickova (1998) point to two important considerations: 1) the use IFIDs in both Cuban Spanish (89%) and Mexican Spanish (32%) fall well outside of the average frequency of IFID use gathered by Olshtain in the CCSARP, and 2) the frequency of use of IFIDs in Cuban and Mexican Spanish are actually in different directions from the average frequency uses established by the CCSARP. This finding questions using language as the basic domain of analysis for studying cross-cultural pragmatics.
5.3 Explanations and IFIDs

When plotting the percentages of IFID and explanation usage in Mexican Spanish, we note some interesting similarities and differences across the five situations presented in Questionnaire #2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATIONS</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>97%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>86%</th>
<th>41%</th>
<th>79%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. Frequency of explanations and IFIDs.

For situation 4 (student to professor), the percentages for the use of the two strategies are almost equal (39% IFID versus 41% explanation). However, in situation 1 (professor to student), the frequencies between the use of these two strategies differ enormously (3% IFID versus 97% explanation). Likewise,
situation 2 (student to student) shows great differences between the frequency in which IFIDs and explanations are used, with IFIDs being used in 57% of the responses and 100% of the responses. Also, in situation 3 (driver to driver), the differences between the frequency in which these two strategies are used varies greatly (27% IFID versus 86% explanation). Finally, for situation 5 (passenger to passenger), respondents used the strategy of explanation much more frequently than they used an IFID (79% explanation versus 21% IFID). What makes situation 4 different from all of the other situations? Perhaps the answer lies in the social relationship between the two interlocutors depicted in the situation. Situation 4 was the only situation perceived by Mexican Spanish-speakers (see results of Questionnaire # 1) to depict both an intimate relationship between the interlocutors and the speaker as having superior social status as the hearer. Situations 3 and 5 depict the same variables for social status and social distance of the interlocutors (speaker is inferior to hearer and they are acquaintances), and the frequencies between the uses of the two strategies is quite similar. Further research is needed to see whether there is an interdependency between these two social variables and the frequency of the use of these two strategies.
5.4 Questionnaire # 2: Strategy Selection Type by Situation and Gender.

Next, I will consider the strategy selection types employed by Mexican informants by gender across the five situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATIONS</th>
<th>S1 Final Paper</th>
<th>S2 Lateness</th>
<th>S3 Cars</th>
<th>S4 Book</th>
<th>S5 Groceries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSIFIER</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFER REPAIR</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBEARANCE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNGRADEING</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTS</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALERTERS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Strategy selection type in percentage (rounded to nearest whole number) by situation and gender. Number of informants, N = 150.
Female informants used a greater percentage of intensifiers than did male informants in their responses to all situations except situation 2, lateness. In the situations where there were examples of strategies of no responsibility (situations 3 and 5), male informants used a higher percentage of this type of strategy than did female informants. At the same time, males admitted to the facts of the offense at least as often or more often than did females in responding to all situations except for situation 3 (car accident). Female informants used more alerters than did their male counterparts in all situations except for situation 3 (car accident).

5.5 The Structure of the IFID in Spanish Apologies

It has been argued in previous works that the most explicit realization of an apology is clearly performed by using an IFID. The IFID comprises a variety of explicit apology strategies based on apology speech act verbs (Verschueren, 1980) or through the use of weaker forms such as adverbial phrases. A non-comprehensive list of such variations in Spanish is presented in Table 5.4:
1. Lo siento. 11. ¡Qué pena!
2. Siento mucho que... 12. Me da pena.
3. Lo lamento. 13. ¿Me puedes perdonar?
6. Perdón. 16. Tienes el derecho a enojarse.
7. Perdona(me). 17. Te debo una disculpa.
8. Perdone(me) 18. No fue mi intención.
9. ¡Qué lástima! 19. ¡Qué vergüenza!
10. Me disculpo (de)...

Table 5.4. Some potential IFIDs in Spanish.

In the following sections I consider the results of my ethnographic notebook data. First, I investigate what types of offense Mexicans consider as deserving of an apology. Next, I focus on the role of gender in apology frequency within the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico. I investigate who is on the giving end and who is on the receiving end of most apologies.
Finally, I identify the most common types of offenses resulting in apologies by gender, and the types of strategies used by male and female members to apologize.

5.6 Offense Types: What Deserves an Apology?

When is an apology polite and when is it unnecessary? What are the situations in which we consider it necessary to apologize? In Chapter 1, it was indicated that social distance and social status were factors that had been identified by a number of researchers in the domain of politeness. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson’s model of politeness (1978;1987) suggests that the degree of imposition involved in the relevant speech act will influence the weight of any face-threatening act. In sum, the degree of any FTA will be determined by how well those participants know one another, the power differences between them and how much of an imposition is present in the content of the speech act. It is hypothesized that as the weight of the face-threatening act increases, so will the appropriate degree of politeness.

It is obvious that these factors are also among those relevant in determining appropriate apology behavior. A careful examination of the frequency of apologies and the types of strategies used shows a clear relationship between the seriousness of the offense on one hand, and the frequency of apologies and elaborateness on the other. For example, the
greatest number of apologies from the present corpus were for slight offenses such as bumping into someone. These situations involved the use of a simple strategy such as perdón.

Example 1:

Setting: Store

Speakers: Speaker A = female (about 45 years old), Speaker B = female (about 30 years old)

Social Relationship: Strangers

Situation: Speaker A bumps into Speaker B while in a store.

A: Ay, perdón.
   (Oh, excuse me.)

B (sonrie)
   (smiles)

A small number of remedial exchanges used very elaborate strategies. Elaborate strategies were generally used for more serious offenses. Those offenses which involve some form of damage to either an individual's person or an individual's property was regarded by Mexican informants responding to Questionnaire #1 as serious. Example 2 provides a case in point:
Example 2:

Setting: Street

Speakers: Speaker A = male (about 45 years old), Speaker B = male (about 35 years old)

Social Relationship: Strangers

Situation: Speaker A backs into Speaker B's car with his car.

Speaker A: Chingado...

(Fuck...)

Speaker B: Chin... ¿Qué haces?

(Shit...What are you doing?)

Speaker A: Disculpe, no lo vi. Me rompieron el espejo. Ay, llamo a mi seguro.

(Excuse (me), I didn’t see you. They broke my mirror. Oh, I’ll call my insurance agency.)

Speaker B: Bueno...

(O.K....)
One exception to this concerns the use of elaborate strategies by Mexican informants when failing to comply with a simple promise or request. The following exchange exemplifies this finding:

Example 3:
Setting: Home
Speakers: Speaker A = 37 years old (male); Speaker B = 35 years old (female)
Social Relationship: Husband and Wife
Situation: Speaker A asked Speaker B to pick up a particular item at the store (request), but Speaker B was unable to buy it (non-compliance).

A: Te dije que quería Negra Modelo...
   (I told you that I wanted Negra Modelo)

B: No había...fui a la Espiga, también, pero tampoco había, así que te compré Bohemia. Lo siento.
   (There wasn’t any...I went to the Espiga, too, but there wasn’t any, either, so I bought you Bohemia. I’m sorry.)

A: No me gusta...
   (I don’t like it...)

B: Pues, lo siento, no había. Así que no la tomes.
   (Well, I’m sorry, there wasn’t any. So don’t drink it.)
What types of behaviors do people perceive as needing an apology? While there are many different types of offenses, the researcher has classified the apology situations collected in the ethnographic portion of the present investigation according to the following categories:

1. Social gaffes: e.g. burping, coughing, sneezing, etc.

2. Space offenses: e.g. bumping into someone, walking in front of someone, etc.

3. Time offenses: e.g. arriving late, taking too long, etc.

4. Talk offenses: e.g. interrupting, monopolizing the floor, etc.

5. Mistake offenses: eg. giving someone wrong item, taking property of another, etc.

6. Damage to property: e.g. hitting someone's car, spilling juice on someone, etc.
7. Not complying with request: e.g. Failure to mail a letter for another, not buying item for which another asked, etc.

8. Not complying with promise: e.g. Failure to meet deadline, failure to return item to another, etc.

9. Impede hearer from something hearer wants: e.g. finishing the cereal, throwing away the newspaper before the hearer had a chance to read it, etc.

Table 5.5 shows the distribution of the offenses in the present study, as categorized by the above divisions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENSE TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social gaffe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space offense</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time offense</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk offense</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not comply with request</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not comply with promise</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S impedes H from something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H wants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5. Types of offenses collected in ethnographic portion of present study. Number of apology situations, N = 200.

As evident from Table 5.5, the single most common offense concerns violation of space (28.5%), followed by failure to comply with a request (19%). Demonstrating similar frequencies are social gaffes, time offenses and talk offenses (9%), as well as property damage (8%) and mistakes (7.5%).
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5.7 Apology Frequency: Who Apologizes Most, Men or Women?

The following analysis of the distribution of apologies between Mexican women and men is based on a corpus of 200 naturally occurring apologies in a variety of contexts. To date, there has been little systematic comparison of male and female norms of apologizing (see Fraser, 1981; Holmes, 1990, 1995). Fraser (1981:269) states, "Contrary to popular stereotype, we did not find women offering more apologies than men. In Holmes (1995) New Zealand corpus, there were significant differences in the distribution of apologies used by women and men. Holmes (1995:157) found that women gave 75% of all apologies recorded and received 73% of them. The data collected in the current investigation supports Holmes' findings that women do apologize more than men. In the Mexican data, women made 138 out of 200 apologies (69%). Men, however, made only 62 out of 200 apologies. Like Holmes, I realize that it is always possible, with ethnographic data, that the environments in which the data collected provided a higher proportion of female than male interaction. Collecting apologies consecutively in a variety of domains was an attempt to avoid this type of bias.
Table 5.6. Apologies made and gender of participants. Number of apology situations, N = 200.

5.8 Who Receives the Most Apologies, Men or Women?

While it is clear that female participants in the present corpus made more apologies than did male participants, even larger differences are manifested when one considers who receives more apologies. The following table illustrates these percentages:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Received by Females</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Received by Males</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7. Apologies received and gender of participants. Number of apology situations, N = 200.

At first glance, it seems surprising that apologies to males are much less frequent than apologies to females (12.5% to 87.5%). One might expect apologies, as negative politeness strategies, to be used more frequently to the powerful and to those with status. As signals of concern for offending or interfering with another person's freedom of action, apologies could be expected to occur most often upwards, from a person with less power and social status to a person with more power and social status. In Mexican society, it is generally accepted that males are perceived as the dominant and powerful group (see Holmes, 1995). Therefore, one might expect more apologies to men from women than to men from men, to women from men, and to women from women. However, as Tables 5.7 and 5.8 demonstrate, this is not the case with the Mexican data of the present investigation. Apologies were made upwards from women to men in only 19 out of 200
cases, while they were made downwards from men to women in 56 out of 200 cases. While men apologized very little to other men (6 out of 200 cases), does this confirm the Bulge Theory of Wolfson (1981) which states that people are more likely to apologize to people of equal status? Not necessarily. By labeling males as the dominant group and females as the subordinate group, we are not able to collect data for men apologizing upwards and females apologizing downwards. Furthermore, while men may form the dominant group on a macro-social level, not every man has more status and power than every woman. Power and dominance are indeed complex variables which may vary not only between interlocutors, between situations as well. Because this ethnographic collection of data does not include a means by which to measure these variables, no attempt will be made to discover this dynamic operating between the participants for any given situation. It is the researchers opinion that characterizing men as dominant and women as subordinate is a questionable practice at best.

Part of the explanation for the apology patterns expressed above may lie in the different perceptions men and women have of politeness devices. For instance, the types of offenses which merit apologies, the context in which the offense and apology occur, and the type of relationship existing between the two parties may differ for men and women. Likewise, norms for appropriate use of apologies may differ between men and women. As Holmes (1995:159) suggests, women may regard explicit apologies for offenses as more important
in maintaining relationships than men do. The very low number of apologies between men in both Holmes (1995) and the current research project supports this suggestion. This is to say that perhaps apologies function differently for men and women.

To further explore this notion, it becomes useful to consider a number of features of the apologies in more detail. First, I classify the apology strategies used by women and men in the data.

5.9 Most Common Types of Offense Resulting in Apologies by Gender

While men and women apologized most often for space offenses, there were some subtle differences between the two genders with regards to the frequency of apologies made for this and other types of offenses. Table 5.8 shows a large discrepancy between the frequencies in which men and women apologize for space offenses. After space offenses, talk and personal / property damage result in the most apologies by men, while women are most likely to apologize for failures to grant requests and for mistakes.
Male | Female
---|---
1. Space | 1. Space | 30.0% | 18.6%
2. Talk | 2. Failure to Grant Request | 15.7% | 16.3%
3. Damage | 3. Mistakes | 14.3% | 13.2%

Table 5.8. Most common types of offense resulting in apologies by gender

5.10 Strategy Preference: How Do Men and Women Apologize?

As previously illustrated, there are a number of linguistic strategies which can be used to apologize, and a number of researchers have developed systems for classifying different apology strategies (Fraser, 1981; Cohen and Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain and Cohen, 1983; Owen, 1983; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984; Trosborg, 1987; Vollmer and Olshtain, 1989 and Holmes, 1990). In classifying the Mexican data of the current investigation, I have built on the work of previous researchers and have closely followed the framework of Vollmer and Olshtain (1989) in particular.

First, I will consider the apology strategy preferences by gender as manifested in my ethnographic notebook recordings. Table 5.9 illustrates these findings:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFER REPAIR</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBEARANCE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9. Strategy preferences by apologizer gender. Number of apologies, N = 200. Source: Ethnographic notebook recordings.

Table 5.10 demonstrates that overall, both Mexican men and women make use of the same range of linguistic strategies available to Spanish speakers. There are, nevertheless, a few suggestive differences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFER REPAIR</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBEARANCE</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10. Strategy preferences by apologizer gender. Number of participants, Number of informants, N = 150. Source: Questionnaire #2.

How do the data obtained from these two data collection techniques compare? First, in the questionnaire data, one finds an increase in the use of IFIDs and explanations by both males and females. Likewise, one finds a decrease in the frequency in which offers of repairs are made. Fairly similar results are seen for admissions of facts, no responsibility and forbearance in the two data sets. Are these differences important? Yes, they are. Differences in the data obtained from written questionnaires and ethnographic notebook recordings alert researchers to the need to consider the data collection technique
employed when comparing their findings with those of other studies. Differences between two databases may not be attributed to differences in the populations under consideration at all, but rather may be a direct result of the data collection techniques employed. It is important to remember that written questionnaires provide instances of reported speech. While they have been shown to elicit the same types of communicative strategies as naturally occurring situations, they do differ from natural speech in that they are more stereotypical (conventional), less complex and shorter. Findings from the present investigation support what one would expect from the above mentioned techniques. When comparing channels, one would expect many more IFIDs to be used in written discourse than in spoken discourse.

5.11 Offense Type and Strategy Preference by Gender

Do men and women employ different strategy types according to the type of offense for which they are apologizing? The ethnographic data collected in the present study reveal that the frequency with which men and women use a particular strategy is not based on preference for that strategy alone, but rather is determined by a combination of at least two factors: a) preference for that strategy type and b) type of offense to which it is directed. Table 5.11 illustrates these findings:
1) Failure to Grant a Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Gender of Apologist</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Facts</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbearance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Space Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Gender of Apologist</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Facts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Damage to Person / Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Gender of Apologist</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Facts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Talk Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Gender of Apologist</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Facts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Time Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Gender of Apologist</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Facts</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Mistakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Gender of Apologist</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFID</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Facts</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responsibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11. Offense type and strategy preference by gender.
These frequencies show that men prefer the strategy explanation for failures to comply with requests and time offenses, while they prefer an IFID for space offenses, talk offenses, mistakes and damage to a person / property. Women prefer the strategy explanation for failures to comply with requests and mistakes, while they prefer to use an IFID for talk offenses, time offenses, space offenses and damage to a person / property.

5.12 Offense Type and Apologies Received by Gender

Do men and women receive apologies for different types of offenses?

The findings in Table 5.12 show that men and women commit and / or apologize for the same types of offenses, but to different degrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistakes</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person / Property Damage</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistakes</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person / Property Damage</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12. Offense type and apologies received by gender.
It could be that one gender commits more offenses of a specific type and/or it could be that the two genders regard situations differently in terms of their obligation to apologize.

5.13 Conclusion.

Chapters four and five have shown the variable of gender to be a crucial factor in determining the way in which apologies are perceived and performed within the speech community of Cuernavaca, Mexico. These apparent difference in apology perception and performance support the hypothesis that apologies are not subject to universal principles of language use alone, but rather are socioculturally defined functions of language. Credibility is added to this finding through the use of t-tests which proved that the majority of these differences were indeed statistically significant and were not merely the results of chance.

In addition to making contributions to the research question at hand, the results obtained point to an important consideration in the design and implementation of a given project on language use: the type of data collection procedure and instruments being used. First, when designing a situational questionnaire which includes inherent variables such as social distance and social status, one must not assume that all groups will perceive the same values for these variables as those which were intended by the designer. Therefore, it is important to conduct perceptual tests on these
variables using informants from the target speech community before applying the situational questionnaire. Furthermore, one must recognize that deviations found when comparing one research project to another may be the result of different investigative techniques and not of the populations in question. Thus, caution is merited when comparing findings.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Until recently, most scholarly investigations of speech acts have focused on characterizing them as communicative language functions subject to universal principles of verbal interaction. The purpose of the current project was to refute these claims for one specific speech act, the act of apologizing. It was hypothesized that notions of offense, the obligation to apologize and the means by which an apology is rendered are not global in nature, but rather are socially and culturally defined. The present investigation focused on the speech communities of Cuernavaca, Mexico and Granada, Spain.

Chapter one was devoted to the origins and development of the original theory within which apologies have traditionally been characterized: speech act theory. Specific interactive phenomena such as cooperation, directness, politeness and face were introduced and discussed. Theoretical representations of these phenomena were shown to be ethnocentrically based,
as they had been suggested on the basis of limited scholarly investigations which largely targeted English speaking populations.

Chapter two represented a recapitulation of those studies on apologies conducted to date. Breaking away from the strict confines of speech act theory, several disciplines were shown to have made positive contributions toward a more realistic and complete characterization of apologies. Investigations in cross-cultural-, interlanguage-, and sociopragmatics have tested many of the theoretical principles proposed as language use universals by speech act theorists. Findings from such studies have demonstrated that realizing the act of apologizing often results in important differences in verbal behavior among speakers of different languages as well as speakers of the same language. Differences include, but are not limited to, notions of offense, the obligation to apologize and the specific strategies preferred by speakers to perform this function of language.

Chapter three provided the reader with a brief overview of the theoretical principles, research methodology and goals of several of the most salient disciplines in which work on apologies has been conducted: speech act theory, pragmatics (cross-cultural, interlanguage and sociopragmatics) and the ethnography of communication. Next, the research approach utilized in the current investigation was profiled. The background assumptions and goals which shape its design were highlighted, and an in-depth critical discussion of the components of its individual research design was undertaken. Special
attention was paid to the types of instruments and techniques used in data collection and the approaches to data analysis employed.

Chapter four included a discussion of the perceptual data collected from Questionnaires # 1 and # 3. The first hypothesis tested focused on perceptions concerning the following variables: a) need for an apology; b) level of offense and c) evaluation of social distance and social status between the interlocutors. It was hypothesized that informants from Cuernavaca, Mexico and Granada, Spain would perceive these variables differently. Raw numerical values showed differences between these two groups in 17 out of 20 categories. Two-tailed t-tests further revealed statistically significant differences in 12 out of the 17 cases. The second hypothesis stated that males and females would also perceive these variables differently. Raw numerical values indicated that males and females had different perceptions for 16 out of 20 categories. Two-tailed t-tests revealed that 7 out of 16 of these differences were statistically significant. The next hypothesis stated that speech community members from Cuernavaca and Granada would perceive the strength of apology strategies differently. In terms of the perceived strength of the sample apology strategy types, raw numerical differences were noted for values assigned to all of them by Mexicans and Andalusians. T-tests revealed statistically significant differences for these values in eight out of nine cases. In measuring the perception of individual apology strategy strength, men and women showed differences across all strategies. T-tests revealed statistically
significant differences in 11 out of 13 cases. These perceptual differences between members of the two target speech communities and the two genders show that notions of offense, the obligation to apologize and the strength of apology types and strategies available for performing an apology are not universal phenomena. In addition, it was hypothesized that apologies containing more than one strategy (complex) would be perceived as stronger than apologies containing just one strategy (simple). Raw numerical data revealed that members of the Cuernavaca speech community found complex strategies to be stronger than simple apologies. Statistically significant differences between perceptions of simple and complex apology strategies were revealed in 16 out of 17 cases. Finally, it was hypothesized that the placement of an IFID within a complex strategy would affect the perceived strength of the overall apology. Cuernavaca informants rated apologies as stronger when an IFID preceded rather than followed another strategy within a complex strategy. This difference proved to be statistically significant in 3 out of 4 cases. Finding statistically significant differences in a small sample such as the one used in the current research project encourages additional investigations of these variables within larger samples.

Chapter five investigated differences in the results of apology performance data collected from members of the Cuernavaca speech community. Specifically, when targeting the variable of gender, ethnographic data revealed that women made and received apologies with a
far greater frequency than did men (supporting Holmes, 1995). Women apologized more often to women than they did to men (also supporting Holmes, 1995). In my observations, the most common offenses committed by members of the Cuernavaca speech community overall were: a) space offenses; b) failures to grant a request, and c) mistakes. The data revealed some differences between men and women in terms of the most common offense types resulting in apologies by gender. Males apologized most often for space offenses, talk offenses and personal / property damage, while females apologized most for space offenses, failures to grant a request and mistakes. Men and women also differed in the types of offenses for which they received an apology. Men received apologies most often for space offenses, mistakes and personal / property damage, while women received apologies most often for space offenses, failures to grant a request and for the speaker keeping the addressee from something. These findings show that men and women commit and/or apologize for the same types of offenses, but with different frequencies. Furthermore, these results indicate that the gender of the addressee affects the frequency of a given offense and/or the frequency of apology performance. In terms of the specific strategy types used by male and female informants, male informants used more IFIDs than did female informants. This finding stands in contrast to my hypothesis that women would prefer to use IFIDs more than would men and Holmes' (1995) finding that New Zealand women preferred to use IFIDs more than did New
Zealand men. In the Cuernavaca speech community, male informants were found to avoid responsibility more than female informants, while female informants were slightly more likely to accept responsibility than were male informants. The data revealed that the frequency with which men and women use a particular strategy type is not based on the preference for that strategy type alone, but rather it is determined by a combination of at least two factors: a) preference for that particular strategy type explanation for failures to comply with requests and time offenses, while they preferred to use an IFID for space offenses and damage to person/property. Women preferred the strategy type explanation for failures to comply with requests, while they preferred an IFID for time offenses, space offenses and damage to person/property. When comparing the types of strategies preferred by informants in responding to Questionnaire #2 versus those they preferred in naturally occurring speech, interesting differences were found. Informants continued to prefer the strategy explanation in terms of overall frequency of use in both the questionnaire and ethnographic data. However, they used IFIDs much more frequently when responding to the written questionnaires than they did in natural speech. This important difference is one example of how data collection instruments can affect results. Scholars must take into consideration the type(s) of instruments and techniques applied when comparing the findings of one study with those of another.
This research project has focused on refuting the claim that speech acts, such as the act of apologizing, are universally regulated functions of language. Instead, it was proposed that apologies are shaped by socially and culturally defined notions of offense, the obligation to apologize and strategy type preference. The perception data collected from the Cuernavaca speech community showed differences between the genders in terms of apologies given and received, overall strategy type preference and strategy type preference for specific offenses. Until this time, investigations in cross-cultural pragmatic have focused on language as the defining factor in determining speech act behavior. This study suggests this approach to be problematic, as differences in apology performance are not defined on the basis of linguistic elements alone. Thus, there remains a crucial need for research targeting different speech acts across many different speech communities. Findings from such studies would not only enrich the field of pragmatics, but would also provide educators with the knowledge needed to develop teaching strategies and activities designed to promote sociopragmatic competence among learners of L2.
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AUTORIZACION PARA PARTICIPAR EN UN ESTUDIO SOCIAL

UNIVERSIDAD DE OHIO STATE, EE.UU
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APPENDIX B

CUESTIONARIO #2

Número de identificación ______
Sexo ______
Edad ______
Ultimo nivel de educación ______
Ocupación ______

CUESTIONARIO #1:

INSTRUCCIONES: LEA CADA SITUACION Y CONTESTE LAS PREGUNTAS. INDIQUE SU REPUESTA CON UN CIRCULO ALREDEDOR DEL NUMERO QUE SELECCIONE.

NOTA: "EL HABLANTE" SE ENTIENDE COMO LA PERSONA QUE SE DISCULPARIA Y "EL OYENTE" SE ENTIENDE COMO LA PERSONA QUE RECIBIRIA ESA DISCULPA SI FUERA LA SITUACION OFENSIVA.

1) Una profesora universitaria (hablante) le prometió a un estudiante (oyente) que le devolvería su trabajo hoy, pero cuando él pasa por su oficina, todavía no lo ha terminado de leer.

A) ¿Cuál es la relación entre la profesora (hablante) y el estudiante (oyente)?

1 desconocidos
2 conocidos
3 amigos
2 la hablante y el oyente tienen el mismo estatus
3 el estatus de la hablante es más alto que el del oyente

C) ¿Es la situación ofensiva?
1 Sí
2 No

***Si Ud. ha contestado ‘sí’ a esta pregunta, conteste la siguiente pregunta (D).
Si Ud. ha contestado ‘no’ a esta pregunta, pase a la pregunta (2).

D) Si esta situación es ofensiva, ¿cómo es la severidad de la ofensa?
1 una ofensa grave
2 una ofensa mediana
3 una ofensa pequeña

E) Si la situación es ofensiva, ¿cree Ud. que el hablante debe disculparse?
1 Sí
2 Tal vez
3 No

2) Una estudiante ya conocida por su poca puntualidad (hablante) llega tarde otra vez a una reunión con una colega (oyente) con quien está haciendo un trabajo.

A) ¿Cuál es la relación entre la estudiante 1 (hablante) y la estudiante 2 (oyente)?
1 desconocidas
B) ¿Cómo es el estatus social de las dos?
1 el estatus de la hablante es más bajo que el de la oyente
2 la hablante y la oyente tienen el mismo estatus
3 el estatus de la hablante es más alto que la de la oyente

C) ¿Es la situación ofensiva?
1 Sí
2 No

***Si Ud. ha contestado ‘sí’ a esta pregunta, conteste la siguiente pregunta (D). Si Ud. ha contestado ‘no’ a esta pregunta, pase a la pregunta (E).***

D) Si esta situación es ofensiva, ¿cómo es la severidad de la ofensa?
1 una ofensa grave
2 una ofensa mediana
3 una ofensa pequeña

E) Si la situación es ofensiva, ¿cree Ud. que la hablante debe disculparse?
1 Sí
2 Tal vez
3 No
3) Un conductor que está en un aparcamiento (hablante) da marcha atrás y choca con un coche conducido por otro conductor (oyente).

A) ¿Cuál es la relación entre el conductor 1 (hablante) y el conductor 2 (oyente)?

1 desconocidos
2 conocidos
3 amigos

B) ¿Cómo es el estatus social de los dos?

1 el estatus de la hablante es más bajo que el de la oyente
2 la hablante y la oyente tienen el mismo estatus
3 el estatus de la hablante es más alto que el del oyente

C) ¿Es la situación ofensiva?

1 Sí
2 No

***Si Ud. ha contestado ‘sí’ a esta pregunta, conteste la siguiente pregunta (D). Si Ud. ha contestado ‘no’ a esta pregunta, pase a la pregunta (4).

D) Si esta situación es ofensiva, ¿cómo es la severidad de la ofensa?

1 una ofensa grave
2 una ofensa mediana
3 una ofensa pequeña
E) Si la situación es ofensiva, ¿cree Ud. que el hablante debe disculparse?

1 Sí
2 Tal vez
3 No

4) Una estudiante (hablante) le pidió un libro a su profesor (oyente), y le prometió devolverse lo hoy. Sin embargo, se le olvidó.

A) ¿Cuál es la relación entre la estudiante (hablante) y el profesor (oyente)?

1 desconocidos
2 conocidos
3 amigos

B) ¿Cómo es el estatus social de los dos?

1 el estatus de la hablante es más bajo que el de la oyente
2 la hablante y la oyente tienen el mismo estatus
3 el estatus de la hablante es más alto que el del oyente

C) ¿Es la situación ofensiva?

1 Sí
2 No

***Si Ud. ha contestado ‘sí’ a esta pregunta, conteste la siguiente pregunta (D). Si Ud. ha contestado ‘no’ a esta pregunta, pase a la pregunta (5).
D) Si esta situación es ofensiva, ¿cómo es la severidad de la ofensa?

1. una ofensa grave
2. una ofensa mediana
3. una ofensa pequeña

E) Si la situación es ofensiva, ¿cree Ud. que la hablante debe disculparse?

1. Sí
2. Tal vez
3. No

5) Un pasajero (hablante) ha puesto una bolsa de comida en la estantería de un autobús lleno de gente. Cuando se para el autobús, la bolsa se cae encima de otro pasajero (oyente).

A) ¿Cuál es la relación entre el pasajero 1 (hablante) y pasajero 2 (oyente)?

1. desconocidos
2. conocidos
3. amigos

B) ¿Cómo es el estatus social de los dos?

1. el estatus del hablante es más bajo que el del oyente
2. el hablante y el oyente tienen el mismo estatus
3. el estatus de el hablante es más alto que el del oyente

C) ¿Es la situación ofensiva?

1. Sí
No

***Si Ud. ha contestado ‘sí’ a esta pregunta, conteste la siguiente pregunta (D).
Si Ud. ha contestado ‘no’ a esta pregunta, pase a la pregunta (6).

D) Si esta situación es ofensiva, ¿cómo es la severidad de la ofensa?
1 una ofensa grave
2 una ofensa mediana
3 una ofensa pequeña

E) Si la situación es ofensiva, ¿cree Ud. que la hablante debe disculparse?
1 Sí
2 Tal vez
3 No

6) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘lo siento’?
1 muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
5 muy débil

7) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘fue culpa mía’?
1 muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
5 muy débil

8) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘no fue mi intención’?
1 muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
5 muy débil

9) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘tiene derecho a enojarse’?
1 muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
5 muy débil

10) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘no fue mi culpa’?
1 muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
11) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘el tráfico fue horrible’?
1  muy fuerte
2  fuerte
3  mediana
4  débil
5  muy débil

12) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘se me olvidó’?
1  muy fuerte
2  fuerte
3  mediana
4  débil
5  muy débil

13) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘le pago el daño’?
1  muy fuerte
2  fuerte
3  mediana
4  débil
5  muy débil
14) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘no vuelve a pasar’?
1   muy fuerte
2   fuerte
3   mediana
4   débil
5   muy débil

15) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘¡nos íbamos a quedas a las 10’00’?’
1   muy fuerte
2   fuerte
3   mediana
4   débil
5   muy débil

16) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘¡llego tarde’?’
1   muy fuerte
2   fuerte
3   mediana
4   débil
5   muy débil

17) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘te invito a un café’?
1   muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
5 muy débil

18) ¿Cómo es la intensidad de la disculpa ‘te invito a un café’?
1 muy fuerte
2 fuerte
3 mediana
4 débil
5 muy débil
APPENDIX C

CUESTIONARIO #2

Número de identificación ________
Sexo ________
Edad ________
Nivel de educación ____________
Ocupación ____________

CUESTIONARIO #2: LEA CADA SITUACIÓN. ¿COMO RESPONDERÍA LA PERSONA INDICADA? ESCRIBA SU RESPUESTA EN EL ESPACIO BAJO LA SITUACION.

1) Una profesora universitaria le prometió a un estudiante que le devolvería su trabajo hoy, pero cuando él pasa por su oficina, todavía no lo ha terminado de leer.

La profesora:

2) Una estudiante ya conocida por su poca puntualidad llega tarde otra vez a una reunión con una colega con quien está haciendo un trabajo.

La estudiante que llega tarde:
3) Un conductor que está en un aparcamiento da marcha atrás y choca con un coche manejado por otro conductor.

El conductor que choca:

4) Una estudiante le pidió un libro a su profesor y le prometió devolvérselo hoy. Sin embargo, se le olvidó.

La estudiante:

5) Un pasajero pone una bolsa de comida en la estantería de un autobús lleno de gente. Cuando se para el autobús, la bolsa se cae encima de otro pasajero.

El pasajero a quien le pertenece la bolsa:
APPENDIX D

CUESTIONARIO #3

Número de identificación ______
Ocupación __________________
Sexo _______
Edad _______

CUESTIONARIO #3. INSTRUCCIONES: Indique la fuerza de cada disculpa, marcando un círculo alrededor de la respuesta que le corresponde.

1) Perdón.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

2) Discúlpeme, pero se me olvidó.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3) Lo siento.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

4) Éste maneja como loco.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

5) ¡Ay qué pena! Si quiere, se la llevo a una tintorería.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

6) Se me olvidó, discúlpeme.

1 Muy fuerte

2 Fuerte

3 Mediana

4 Débil

5 Muy débil

7) No lo vi, perdón.

1 Muy fuerte

2 Fuerte

3 Mediana

4 Débil

5 Muy débil

8) Perdóname, pero éste maneja como loco.

1 Muy fuerte

2 Fuerte

3 Mediana

4 Débil

5 Muy débil
9) Si quiere se la llevo a una tintorería.

1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

10) Perdón, no lo vi.

1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

11) Perdón, perdón.

1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

12) Lo siento pero había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes.

1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

13) Discúpleme.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

14) Perdón, disculpe.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

15) Había mucho tráfico y no podía llegar antes. Lo siento.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

16) Perdone.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil

17) Disculpe.
1 Muy fuerte
2 Fuerte
3 Mediana
4 Débil
5 Muy débil
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