A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF

APOLOGY STRATEGIES

IN ROMANIAN

By

GUSZTAV DEMETER

Bachelor of Arts

North University

Baia Mare, Romania

2000

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
May, 2006

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF

APOLOGY STRATEGIES

IN ROMANIAN

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Carol L. Moder
_____
Thesis Adviser
Dr. Rebecca L. Damron
_____

Dr. Gene Halleck
_____

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie
_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

Introduction

Teachers of English as a second or foreign language have always faced a very

difficult task: how to teach communicative competence in the target language. It has

become clear that teaching the grammar and vocabulary of a language is not enough. One

also needs to teach pragmatic and cultural competence. Understanding how such socially

and culturally specific aspects of language function in different languages is also

important, as learners should be aware of the differences between not only their native

language and the target language, but also between the two cultures. Being aware of such

differences, but also of similarities, would help them better understand the target culture,

and thus use the target language in a socially and culturally appropriate way.

More than any aspect of language, speech acts are probably the most culture

specific. There are numerous definitions of speech acts, from many different

perspectives, but the most common and general view of speech acts is of utterances that

when issued perform an action (Austin, 1975). The speech act that is the object of the

present study is the apology. As a generalization, an apology is the speech act that is

required either when the social norms of politeness demand the mending of a behavior or

when a linguistic expression has offended another person (Trosborg, 1995) or when

somebody is offended due to the fact that personal expectations are not fulfilled (Fraser,

1981). Usually, this speech act requires the presence of two participants, namely the person who is apologizing and the person who expects an apology, be it real or potential.

Apologizing is not an easy matter in one's own language, and having to do it in a second or foreign language is even more complicated. That is why studying the way people apologize in different languages is important in order to understand the intricacies of language. More than that, comparative studies on languages that are often taught as second or foreign language are essential in order to improve teaching methods and techniques.

The present paper is therefore a part of a larger research project that intends to examine the differences and similarities between Romanian and English concerning the way speakers apologize in these languages. The aim of this thesis is to investigate the strategies that Romanian speakers use in apologizing in different situations. The need for such a study is imperative as there are no studies on apologies in Romanian. The results presented are also planned to be used in a future comparative study.

This thesis is structured in six chapters. The purpose of *Chapter II: Review of Literature* is both to introduce the key theoretical concepts that the study is based on, and to provide an overview of previous research that has been carried out on apologies in different languages.

Chapter III: Methodology introduces the questions the present study attempts to answer. It also describes the procedures and instruments used to collect the data, the participants in the study, as well as the way the data were analyzed.

Chapter IV: General Results presents the results of the study in terms of the overall use of apology strategies in order to answer the research questions.

The next chapter, *Chapter V: Discussion of Situations* is an in-depth discussion of the results for each of the ten situations for which the participants in the study had to provide an apology. The discussion will be based both on a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of the data.

Finally, *Chapter VI: Conclusions* will summarize the most important findings of the study, as well as present the implications of these results to further studies.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

Understanding and producing speech acts seem to be among the most difficult aspects insofar as the sociopragmatic competence of learners of a second or foreign language is concerned. Lacking the cultural, social, and pragmatic context in cross-cultural communication can lead to misunderstandings, both in producing the appropriate speech act and in perceiving the intended meaning of one uttered by somebody else. That is why it is important to know how speech acts are produced both in the native and target language of foreign or second language learners.

The importance of these issues is reflected in the numerous studies that have been carried out over the past few decades. These studies looked at English (Bharuthram, 2003; Butler, 2001; Deutschmann, 2003; Edmundson, 1992; Holmes, 1990) but also at many other individual languages like Akan (Obeng, 1999), German (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989), Lombok (Wouk, In Press), and Japanese (Kotani, 1999; Suzuki, 1999; Tamanaha, 2003). Most of the studies had, however, an interlanguage comparative approach, mostly by looking at learners of English who spoke different native languages such as Danish (Trosborg, 1987), French (Harlow, 1990; Olshtain, 1989), German (Olshtain, 1989), Hungarian (Suszczynska, 1999), Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, & Kasper, 1995; Nagano, 1985; Rose, 1994; Sugimoto, 1999; Taguchi, 1991), Korean (Jung, 2004), Polish (Lubecka, 2000; Suszczynska, 1999), Russian

(Savina, 2002), Spanish (Cordella, 1992; Garcia, 1989; Márquez-Reiter, 2000; Mir, 1992), and Thai (Bergman & Kasper, 1993).

However, before discussing the approaches, findings, and interpretations of these studies, it is necessary to present an overview of the concept of speech acts and the different types of speech acts, as well as the speech act that is the focus of the present study, namely the apology.

2.1. Speech Acts

Saussure (1959) defined language as "a system of signs that express ideas" (p. 16), in what came to be known as semiology. In semiology, the unit of language is the sign, which consists of two inseparable parts, namely the signifier – what the speaker utters or writes – and the signified – the concept which is conveyed with the help of speech. Even though this theory is the basis of modern linguistics, Saussure's definition does not cover all aspects of language. Thus, language is not only used to represent concepts in isolation, but also to express different actions that speakers perform or require them to be performed by others (Austin, 1975). John Austin (1975) and John Searle (1969) are the forerunners of speech act theory, which, according to them, encompasses the way people apologize, promise, request, and perform other linguistic acts.

2.1.1. Definitions of Speech Acts

The concept of speech acts was first defined by Austin (1975) in the first edition of the book "How to do things with words" published in 1962. He did not use the term speech act, but "performative sentence" or "performative utterance," which indicated that "the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action" (p. 6). The term itself was

first used by Searle (1969) who claimed that "talking is performing acts according to rules" (p. 22), and that "speech acts […] are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication" (p.16).

However, Back and Harnish (1979) believed that there is more to a speech act than this. In their view, speech acts are a complex combination between utterances, locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Thus, the speech act schema, or SAS, is as follows, where *e* is an expression, *S* the speaker, and *H* the hearer: "In uttering *e* [utterance act], *S* says something to *H* [locutionary act]; in saying something to *H*, *S* does something [illocutionary act]; and by doing something, *S* affects *H* [perlocutionary act]" (Bach & Harnish, 1979, p. 3). What is also important in this schema is that for the perlocutionary act to be successful, the hearer must identify at least one of the other components of the speech act. This is what can cause misunderstandings in cross-cultural communication, as learners of a foreign or second language may not be able to recognize these acts if they do not possess pragmatic competence. Moreover, every speech act must communicate at least one or even more illocutionary acts (Allan, 1998).

More recent studies proposed definitions of speech acts that are more conversational (Geis, 1995; Wee, 2004) or socially and culturally oriented (Capone, 2005; Cutting, 2001; Mey, 1993). Geis (1995), for example, proposed what he called a "dynamic speech act theory" (p. 9), which needs to be an integrated part of conversation theory. Instead of viewing speech acts as the uttering of single expressions or sentences, it would define them as multiturn interactions that perform requests, invitations, apologies, and other such actions.

By focusing on communication, Wee (2004) argued that the definition of speech acts needs to include other ways of communication, as well, not only linguistic ones. Thus, he suggested that a theory of communicative acts would be more useful and exhaustive than one of speech acts. If we were to apply this idea to Bach and Harnish's (1979) speech act schema, one can easily substitute the utterance act with a behavior act, which would maintain the effect of all the other acts. Thus, the schema of a communicative act could be as follows, where *b* is behavior: In performing *b* [behavior act], *S* says something to *H* [locutionary act]; in saying something to *H*, *S* does something [illocutionary act]; and by doing something, *S* affects *H* [perlocutionary act]. However, not all researchers agree with this inclusion of non-verbal forms of communication, which convey the same action, but cannot be called speech acts (Geis, 1995).

The relationship between behavior, language, and social context was taken even further by Capone (2005). He drew on Mey's (1993) claim that speech acts need to be both situationally and socially oriented. Such a relationship would be more suitably termed a "pragmeme," which "is a situated speech act in which the rules of language and of society synergize in determining meaning, intended as a socially recognized object, sensitive to social expectations about the situation in which the utterance to be interpreted is embedded" (Capone, 2005, p. 1357). This view leads to a more integrated theory of speech acts in the larger frame of communication theory. One could go even further and claim that features of the behavior of both the speaker and the hearer during speech act production, as well as supra-segmental features of the utterance need to be taken into consideration in building the meaning that the speech act intends.

However, Wierzbicka (1991) claimed that most of the early definitions of speech acts are ethnocentric, and that thus they fail to take into consideration what she believed is one of the most important characteristics of speech acts, namely cultural specificity. She says that, cultural values and characteristics such as indirectness, objectivism, courtesy, and cordiality are reflected in the way speakers produce speech acts. Not taking this into consideration can have serious practical implications, especially in multicultural societies such as the United States or Australia, which have a great variety of cultures and thus a great variety of speech act production.

The conclusion is that speech act theory is still a much disputed field, and there is no commonly accepted definition of what a speech act is. This multitude of definitions also leads to a multitude of taxonomies. I will deal with the most important classifications of speech acts in the following section.

2.1.2. Types of Speech Acts

According to Allan (1998) there are two ways of classifying speech acts. One is what he calls a lexical classification, which distinguishes among speech acts according to the illocutionary verbs they express. The second approach classifies them according to the act they express, such as requesting, apologizing, promising, and so on. Nonetheless, Austin (1975) first classified speech acts into five categories: "verdictives," which represent acts that give a verdict, "exercitives," which express power on the hearer, "commissives," which commit the speaker to doing something, "behabitives," which express different social behaviors such as apologizing, congratulating, and the like, and "explositives," which are conversation or argument related, such as "I assume" or "I concede" (p. 151). However, this categorization had several problems, such as the fact

that the categories are not mutually exclusive, and that there is an assumption that speech acts and speech act verbs correspond exactly (Márquez-Reiter, 2000). Consequently, over the years, many researchers have attempted to devise a taxonomy of speech acts that would be generally accepted.

Communicative approaches to speech act theory mostly categorize speech acts according to what they communicate to the hearer. Thus, Searle (1976) proposed five types of speech acts, namely: representatives/assertives (present the way things are), directives (instruct somebody to do something), commissives (when one commits oneself), expressives (express feelings and attitudes), and declarations (that bring about changes with the use of utterances). Following this classification, Leech (1983) distinguished speech acts by the verbs that express them, as he believed that it was impossible to create a taxonomy of illocutionary acts. Thus, speech act verbs can be divided into the following categories: assertive verbs, directive verbs, commisive verbs, rogative verbs, and expressing verbs.

A very similar taxonomy, but one that differentiates more subtly between the types of illocutions the acts entail was given by Bach and Harnish (1979). They classified speech acts in terms of the illocutionary act entailed into four major types. The first three have several subcategories, while the last one has some specific verbs attached: constatives (assertives, predictives, retrodictives, descriptives, ascriptives, informatives, confirmatives, concessives, retractives, assentives, disentives, disputatives, responsives, suggestives, supportives), directives (requestsives, questions, requirements, prohibitives, permissives, advisories), commissives (promises, offers), and acknowledgements (apologize, condole, congratulate, greet, thank, bid, accept, reject).

The most important problem with these early taxonomies is that, again, they are too closely linked to the verb that expresses the respective illocutionary act. However, as will be made clear in the following chapter in the case of apologies, speech acts can be expressed by other means as well, not only by illocutionary verbs. Also, not all illocutionary verbs express the speech act that one would expect from their basic meaning. Thus, Searle (1979) found that a certain illocutionary act can be "performed indirectly by way of performing another" (p. 31). Searle called this type of illocutionary act an indirect speech act, as opposed to a direct speech act. While in the case of a direct speech act the content of the utterance is the same as the intention of the speaker, in an indirect speech act content and intention are different. Holtgraves (1986) has clarified this difference even further by claiming that indirect speech acts not only use a certain illocutionary act to express another, but rather provide multiple meanings, as opposed to only one meaning expressed by direct speech acts. On the other hand, Geis (1995) has argued against a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts. He believes that, due to the fact that it is impossible to create what he called a mapping between the verbal forms and the speech act they convey, such a distinction is not useful at all. However, I believe that such a distinction is important, because it is the only way one can account for the use of certain apology strategies that apparently might seem inappropriate, but which are used to actually suggest something different from their literal meaning. This is the case with the present study as well; the chapters presenting the results will discuss examples of indirect speech acts.

Another approach to classifying speech acts is from the perspective of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness, more precisely according to the way the function

that the speech act expresses threatens face, as well as according to the relationship that the act has with the speaker or the hearer (Staab, 1983). Thus, Staab differentiated between four categories of face threatening acts:

(a) threats to a speaker's negative face: expressing thanks, excuses, or the making of an unwilling promise or offer, (b) threats to a speaker's positive face: apologies, self-contradicting, or confessions, (c) threats to a hearer's negative face: orders, requests, suggestions, and warnings, and (d) threats to a hearer's positive face: criticism, insults, contradictions, and complaints (p. 27).

Based on many of the taxonomies presented above, Cohen (1996b) devised his own classification of 14 speech acts grouped into 5 major categories. The first one is representatives, and contains the speech acts assertions, claims, and reports; the second is represented by directives: suggestions, requests, commands; the next one groups under expressives the acts of apology, complaint, and thanks; commisives represent the fourth groups that contains promises, threats, and offers; finally, decrees and declarations are grouped under declaratives. While the names of these groups may vary in other classifications given by different scholars, the names of the speech acts from Cohen's taxonomy seem to have been more widely accepted.

As this section has shown, there are many ways of classifying speech acts by making use of different criteria. As with defining speech acts, there is no taxonomy which is considered the best, each of them having advantages and disadvantages. For example, it seems to be clear that speech acts can be expressed by other means as well, not just using the illocutionary verb that conveys the respective act. Also, I believe it is necessary to account for non-verbal ways to expressing speech acts, as communication is

much more than the use of verbal language; it also involves body language, the use of which can influence the meaning of the respective speech act. Consequently, elements such as illocutionary verbs, indirect speech acts, and even non-verbal elements should all be included when devising a good taxonomy of speech acts. This situation has lead to scholars creating their own categorization of speech acts that would fit best the specific needs of their study.

2.2. Speech Acts and Politeness

Speech act theory is also closely related to the concept of politeness. Early studies on politeness claimed that this concept is universal (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Lakoff, 1973). According to Lakoff (1973) there are three main rules of politeness, namely "don't impose," "give options," and "make [the hearer] feel good – be friendly" (p. 298). Answering objections to the universality of politeness, Lakoff claimed that his theory does not contradict the fact that different cultures have different customs. He believed that what creates differences in the interpretation of politeness across cultures is the order these rules take precedence one over the other.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), all members of a society tend to keep a certain image of themselves, an image that they call "face." Brown and Levinson distinguish between two types of face, namely "negative face" and "positive face." While the first one is defined as one's desire that nobody impede his or her actions, the second one implies that people expect their needs to be desirable to others, as well.

Thus, those functions of language that are expressed with the help of speech acts are intended either to prevent a threat to the speaker's or hearer's face – by being polite when requesting something, for example – or to recover, or save face – in the case of

apologies, for example (Staab, 1983). Insofar as apologies are concerned, Lubecka (2000) claimed that they are face threatening, as apologizing means admitting that the speaker has done something wrong, but also face saving, because if accepted, the apology is supposed to alleviate the offense of the speaker.

However, many scholars still do not agree with the theory that the notion of face is universal. Studies have shown that Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of face does not apply to Japanese (Matsumoto, 1988) or Chinese (Gu, 1990) speakers, which leads to the conclusion that the notion of face is also culture specific. Thus, according to Matsumoto (1988), the Japanese, unlike Europeans, do not define themselves as individuals, but as belonging to a group based on rank relationships. Thus, saving face, for example, means something else than caring for the individual's well-being.

Similar claims have been put forward by Gu (1990), as well. In the Chinese culture, politeness is more than what Brown and Levinson mean, in that it is a social norm whose infringement brings along social reprimand. This leads to the fact that for the Chinese negative face is never threatened, as speech acts such as offering or inviting will never be considered as threatening to one's face. According to Gu, for the Chinese "politeness exercises its normative function in constraining individual speech acts as well as the sequence of talk exchanges" (p. 242). Consequently, as speech acts are linked to this concept of face, using the wrong speech act in cross-cultural communication can have as a cause the differences in the perception of face that each culture has.

In light of such findings, Nwoye (1992) believed that it is necessary to sub-classify the concept of face into "individual face" and "group face." Thus, individual face "refers to the individual's desire to attend to his/her personal needs and to place his/her

public-self image above those of others" (p. 313), while group face "refers to the individual's desire to behave in conformity with culturally expected norms of behavior that are institutionalized and sanctioned by society" (p. 313). Nwoye has also shown that in some cultures, in light of this reclassification of the notion of face, speech acts such as requests, offers, thanks, and criticisms are no longer face threatening acts. For example, in the culture of the Igbo, people follow a system where the sharing of goods and services is a norm. Thus, whereas in some civilizations a certain request may be imposing, in this particular culture it is not, since people are expected to share as a social norm. This idea of a "group face" was also put forward by Obeng (1999), who gave the example of the Akan language, where acts are threatening the face not only of the speakers, but of the entire ethnic group.

More than that, politeness is not only culturally, but also contextually determined. Fraser (1990) has argued that language functions and actions that are considered to be polite under normal circumstances in human interaction may not be so under contextually determined factors. For example, people who are being much more polite than the social norms would call for could be considered, according to Fraser, arrogant, disrespectful, and even impolite.

Another problem that speech acts raise in connection with politeness is the fact that some speech acts seem to be impolite by their nature, such as orders or commands, while others are polite by nature, such as offers or invitations (Leech, 1983). Thus, according to Leech, when we talk about speech acts, we must distinguish between positive politeness, which increases the politeness in the case of inherently polite speech acts, and negative politeness, which reduces the impoliteness of inherently impolite

speech acts. He also argued that one has to pay attention to the relativeness of politeness, as this depends, as it is believed by authors of studies presented above, on the culture of the speakers.

The desire to be polite also influences what kind of speech act one decides to use. Thus, one may choose an indirect speech act instead of a direct one in order to be more polite (Leech, 1983). Leech called this the metalinguistic use of politeness in speech acts.

The relationship between politeness and speech acts seems therefore very much similar to that between direct and indirect speech acts. It is very difficult to label a certain speech act as polite or impolite, and use these labels as rules. Whether the meaning a certain speech act conveys is polite or impolite is rather very much dependent on the contextual circumstances in which they are uttered.

To sum up this section on speech acts, speech act theory is a widely disputed field and issues such as what speech acts are and how they are classified seem to be culture specific, and not as universal as some of the studies presented above have described. Evidence on speech act perception and realization from different cultures have demonstrated that more research needs to be done in order to provide a theory that has an integrated approach to speech acts. Thus, besides carefully defining the term used in the research and creating an appropriate taxonomy, social, cultural, and pragmatic influences on the meaning, perception, and production of speech acts need to be considered.

2.3. Apologies

As a type of speech act, the apology has also been the object of numerous studies that attempted to clarify what exactly an apology is and how the different ways of apologizing can be classified, and also how this particular speech act is performed and

perceived both in English and in different languages around the world. The following sections will give an overview of these issues.

Just as in the case of speech acts, different scholars define apologies in different ways. Also, as there are different types of speech acts, there are different types or categories of apologies, as well. Some of these categories overlap in the different studies, yet other ones are unique to certain studies, mostly according to the specific features of the different populations used.

In what follows, I will give an overview of the most important definitions as well as the different categorizations of apologies, with special focus on the ones considered or adapted for my own taxonomy used in this study, a taxonomy that will be presented in detail in the Methodology section of this paper.

2.3.1. Definitions of Apologies

Bergman and Kasper (1993) defined an apology as a "compensatory action to an offense in the doing of which S was casually involved and which is costly to H" (p. 82). The cost can be in terms of losing face or even a severe misunderstanding. It is clear that different cultures have different degrees in perceiving how costly such an offense is, and therefore how necessary an apology is. An action, in Bergman and Kasper's terminology, that is considered very serious in one culture, may not require an apology at all in another culture. Also, the severity of such a face threatening act seems to be in a direct relationship with the type of apology chosen to defend face. Brown and Levinson (1987) claimed that all speakers choose the same strategy under the same conditions, and tried to demonstrate this by looking at three different languages, namely English, Tzeltal (a Mayan language), and South Indian Tamil. However, this theory has been challenged by

several researchers who claim that different individual factors are involved in both considering an act as face threatening, and the strategy used in apologizing (Trosborg, 1987). According to Trosborg these factors are determined by one's social and cultural patterns, and by the behavioral norms of one's culture. This leads to the assumption that not only do speakers of different languages perceive the necessity of an apology differently, but also use different ways of apologizing.

Differences in apology strategy use have been demonstrated to be correlated with cross-cultural differences by both interlanguage studies and studies that looked at the way speakers of different languages apologize in their own language. Such studies seem to give a clearer view on the relationship between speech acts and cultural factors (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Suszczynska, 1999). The choice of apology strategies is also determined by social differences such as sex, age, and social status. Holmes (1993) has shown in a study on New Zealanders that there are significant differences in the distribution of apologies between men and women, and also that women apologize more than men.

A definition that limits very much the concept of an apology is the one given by Owen (1983). According to him, apologies are remedial moves that follow what he called a priming move on the part of the person who expects the apology, which is a move that triggers the apology. While such an approach makes sense, the problem with Owen's definition is that he restricts the use of the term apology to only those utterances that actually contain the explicit phrases "I'm sorry" or "I apologize" and variants of these. Such a definition would exclude from the start any indirect ways of apologizing, and

17

would render inexistent many of the types of apologies that will be presented in the following chapter. Owen's definition would apply only to explicit apologies.

Trosborg (1995) between apologies and complaints, in that "apologies are expressive illocutionary acts which can be differentiated from complaints, which are also expressive acts, by being convivial in nature" (p. 373). However, because apologies are not the only convivial acts, Trosborg narrows down the definition even further by claiming that apologies have a remedial function, and this function is the one that differentiates them from thanking, congratulating, and other convivial acts. Thus, she follows Owen's (1983) definition of apologies but she broadens it by including other utterances that express apologies, not just the ones that are explicit apologies.

Leech (1983) viewed apologies as an attempt to recreate an imbalance between the speaker and the hearer created by the fact that the speaker committed an offence against the hearer. According to him, it is not enough to apologize, this apology needs to be successful in order for the hearer to pardon the speaker, and thus reestablish the balance.

Finally, Holmes (1990) defined apologies as "social acts conveying affective meaning" (p. 155), and believes they are politeness strategies meant to remedy an offense on the part of the speaker. Holmes also made an interesting and important clarification in defining apologies that has not been considered before. Thus, when defining apologies, one must take into consideration the possibility of a speaker to apologize for somebody else's behavior. This leads to the conclusion that "the definition refers to the person who takes responsibility for the offense rather than the offender" (p. 161).

In order to cover all the possible aspects of apologies, a study should use combination of definitions, or take account of the features of all the definitions mentioned above. Most importantly, what an apology is varies across cultures, and therefore it is even impossible to use one and the same apology to study the way apologies are produced in different cultures. However, no matter what features one includes in a definition, what should be present in any definition is the fact that an apology is given not only when there is a behavior (be it an action, the lack of an action, or a verbal behavior) that violates the social norms of the respective culture, but also as an anticipation in case a future or proposed behavior may violate such norms.

2.3.2. Types of Apologies

The way apologies are classified depends very much on the way they are defined. Thus, the diversity in definitions of apologies also brings about diversity in classification. There are certain types of apologies that are common across different categorizations, while other types are unique.

Bergman and Kasper (1993) distinguished seven different apology categories. According to them, the most commonly used seems to be the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) such as in "I'm sorry." The other strategies are intensified IFID ("I'm terribly sorry"), taking responsibility ("I haven't graded it yet"), giving an account of the reasons that led to the action that requires an apology ("I was suddenly called to a meeting"), minimizing the effects and severity of the action ("I'm only 10 minutes late"), offering repair or compensation ("I'll pay for the damage"), and verbal redress ("It won't happen again"). The last one seems to be very close to the minimization category, if we

take into account the example used by the authors, "I hope you didn't wait long"

(Bergman & Kasper, 1993, p. 86).

A categorization of apology strategies that would be constantly revisited by many

other scholars was made by Olshtain and Cohen (1983). They proposed seven categories,

as well, but divided into two parts. The first part contains five main categories of

apologies in cases where the offender feels the need to apologize, namely an expression

of apology, an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of

responsibility, an offer of repair, and a promise of forbearance. Each of these categories

has several sub-categories in order to make a further delimitation of strategies. The

second part contains two strategies for the case when the speaker does not feel the need to

apologize. These are a denial of the need to apologize and a denial of responsibility. This

categorization is a very important one and useful for the present studies because, unlike

Bergman and Kasper's (1993) taxonomy, it takes into account situation when even

though the hearer believes the speaker should apologize, the latter does not. I would even

include another category in the second part, namely postponing an apology, as in this

case there is no apology given at the moment of speaking, either.

A very similar taxonomy was the basis of the Cross-Cultural Speech Act

Realization Project (CCSARP), and it comprises seven strategies to perform apologies:

using an illocutionary force indicating device, taking on responsibility, explanation or

account of what happened, offer to repair the offending act, promise of forbearance

(Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989b; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). These strategies

can be used, according to the authors, by themselves, or in any combination or sequence.

Olshtain and Cohen's (1983) taxonomy was also modified by Holmes (1990), who believed that it was necessary to rearrange these strategies in order to make them clearer. Thus, she divided apologies into four main categories, each category having sub-classifications. The first one is "an explicit expression of apology" and contains the subcategories "offer apology/IFID," "express regret," "request forgiveness." The second main category is represented by "an explanation or account, an excuse or justification." The largest group, "an acknowledgment of responsibility," contains "accept blame," "express self-deficiency," "recognize H as entitled to an apology," "express lack of intent," "offer repair/redress." Finally, the last category is "a promise of forbearance" (p. 167). While most of these categories are present in other taxonomies, as well, one can note that most of the ones in the "acknowledgment of responsibility" group are unique to Holmes.

A slightly different taxonomy was proposed by Trosborg (1995), who distinguished five categories. She found that apologetic strategies can be divided according to whether the speaker considers that an action that requires an apology occurred or not. The first two categories come from the speaker's not accepting that an apology is necessary, and are explicit denial and implicit denial. The remaining three categories are the result of the speaker accepting the fact that there is a need for an apology: giving a justification, blaming someone else, or attacking the complainer.

In accordance with his own definition of apologies discussed earlier in this paper in the section on definitions of apologies, Owen (1983) classified apologies by the type of utterance they incorporate. Thus, he identified three types of apologies: one that incorporates "apology," "apologies," or "apologize;" one that incorporates "sorry;" and

finally, the one that is created by the phrase "I'm afraid" followed by a sentence. Owen incorporated apologies in the broader context of primary remedial moves. Thus, there are seven strategies for primary remedial moves: "assert imbalance or show deference," "assert that an offence has occurred," "express attitude towards offence," " request restoration of balance," "give an account," "repair the damage," and "provide compensation" (Owen, 1983, p. 169). The first four are grouped under non-substantive strategies, giving an account is considered a semi-substantive strategy, while the last two are substantive strategies.

Similarly, Fraser (1981) designed a categorization of apologies based on the intent of the speaker. He distinguished nine categories, namely "announcing that you are apologizing," "stating one's obligation to apologize," "offering to apologize," "requesting the hearer accept an apology," "expressing regret for the offense," " acknowledging responsibility for the offending act," "promising forbearance from a similar offending act," and "offering redress" (p. 263). While some of the strategies above are recurrent in several studies on apologies, what makes Fraser's taxonomy different is that he distinguishes several categories that other scholars would place under the category illocutionary force indicating device (IFID). While this might be useful when studying IFIDs, a very minute differentiation of the different types of IFIDs may not be too useful when studying all the categories one uses to apologize.

The importance of cultural influence on apologizing also needs to be reflected in the taxonomy of this speech act, and this can sometimes lead to some categories that would seem surprising, or even strange, to western cultures. Thus, Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) interviewed native speakers of Japanese and American English to create

the following set of 12 modes of apologizing: "not saying or doing anything,"

"explaining the situation, " "apologizing ambiguously," "apologizing nonverbally,"

"casually saying 'sorry'," "acting helpless," "saying directly 'I am very sorry '," "writing

a letter, " "apologizing several times in several ways, " "offering to do something for the

other person," "leaving or resigning," " committing suicide" (p. 198). What is interesting

in this classification is the inclusion of non-verbal ways of apologizing. Barnlund and

Yoshioka are the only ones to include such categories in a study on apologies. Even

though non-verbal strategies account for only 8.6% of the responses in the case of the

Japanese subjects, and 6.1% in the case of the American ones, these categories are

nevertheless used, with the exception of the strategy "committing suicide," which yielded

results only in the case of the Japanese subjects.

Finally, a completely different approach to creating a taxonomy of apologies has

been attempted by Deutschmann (2003). After analyzing The British National Corpus he

proposed three main categories of apologies according to the function they express: real

apologies, which were the most frequent ones such as "I apologize for this"; formulaic

apologies, which consist of simple IFIDs as in "I'm sorry"; and "face attack" apologies,

which were intended, according to the author, to "disarm" the hearer as in the following

example: "Excuse me David, I'm talking to Chris" (p. 75).

As a conclusion, there are many different categorizations of apologies. However,

as already mentioned in the section on Definitions of Apologies, this speech act is culture

specific, so not all the categories in these taxonomies would work for all the cultures.

Thus, when creating the taxonomy for a study one should choose those categories that are

used in the respective culture. Also, one should account both for explicit and implicit

apologies. Finally, categories such as avoiding and postponing apologies should also be part of the taxonomy, as choosing not to apologize or apologize later is also a strategy used when an apology is required.

2.4. Previous Studies on Apologies

Over the recent years there has been a large diversity of studies on the speech act of apology. The greatest number of these studies looked at the way one apologizes in English, both with native and non-native speakers. Nonetheless, there are other studies that investigated the perception and production of apologies in different languages. Finally, more recent studies take a comparative approach, by mostly examining the way learners of foreign and second languages use and perceive apologies in both their native and target language.

The next sections of this paper will be an attempt at presenting some of these studies, without trying an exhaustive presentation, but rather an overview of the ones that are relevant for the purpose of the present paper. However, as Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989a) have very well asserted, many of the important issues are still unanswered, mostly because the fact that the studies used different methodological approaches and are based on different theories of speech acts.

2.4.1. Studies on English

Most of the studies done on English focused on how speakers of different languages who are learning English apologize. However, there are a few studies that looked exclusively at the different dialects of English. One of the studies that investigated the perception of apologies by American native speakers of English was conducted by

Edmundson (1992). He investigated the cues 161 native speakers used to judge whether apologies in a number of television programs were appropriate, sincere, and acceptable. One of the interesting findings of this study in light of some cross-cultural research on apologies presented in following chapters of this paper was that besides sincerity, which was the most frequently used criterion to decide whether an apology was appropriate, the second next reason for labeling an apology as inappropriate was the length of the apology. Most of the subjects stated that some of the apologies were too short, and the speaker should have kept apologizing longer. Many of the interlanguage studies discussed in this paper found that the length of apologies in the case of non-native speakers is greater than with native speakers. However, none of the studies has actually quantified the exact length of the apologies in order to be able to tell how long an apology should be in order to be deemed acceptable and appropriate. Edmunson also claimed that studying the way apologies are perceived can lead to the understanding of the pragmatic principles that determine how one apologizes in English.

Other criteria have also been found to affect the perception of apologies. In a later study, Butler (2001) found that context is a very important factor in evaluating the appropriateness of an apology, in that contextual clues are the ones that determine what type of apology to use in a give situation. His conclusion was that understanding how native speakers perceive apologies in English is a good tool in teaching such speech acts to learners of English as a second language.

An extensive analysis on apologizing in British English was conducted by Deutschmann (2003). The author examined the forms and functions of apologies, as well as their social and conversational variation as they appeared in the British National

Corpus, which consists of recordings of a great variety of over 1700 speakers in different contexts and situations, from formal to informal. The results of this study show that the frequency of strategies that imply speakers trying to minimize their responsibility was four times greater than those that imply assuming responsibility. Also, the choice of strategies was influenced by the degree of formality of the setting in which the apology was performed. Audience is, according to Deutschmann, one of the factors that has been ignored when analyzing apologies; a factor that has, nevertheless, a great influence on the way British speakers of English apologize.

Corpus analysis is also the focus of a study of apologies in New Zealand English. Holmes (1990) made an ample description of the strategies used by New Zealand speakers of English by using a corpus of 183 apologies collected by students using the ethnographic method. The conclusion of the study is that there was equality between the instances where a single strategy was used and the ones that included combinations of strategies. According to Holmes (1990) this is due to the nature of the situations, as in the case of more serious offenses there were several categories in apologies, whereas with lighter ones there were mostly single categories. Also, the findings show that almost all the instances included an explicit apology (see above Holmes's taxonomy discussed under Types of Apologies for the categories included under explicit apologies).

In a later study on the same corpus of apologies in New Zealand English, Holmes (1993) showed that there are significant differences in the distribution of apologies between men and women, and also that women apologize more than men. She concludes that the reason for such findings is that "women perceive [apologies] as important face-support strategies while men appear to regard them as more dispensable" (p. 105). Also,

the author claimed that New Zealand women provided longer responses than American women did. However, more studies on the distribution of apologies across gender in the different dialects of English are needed before generalizing such results.

The speech act of apology has also been investigated in the case of the English speaking Hindu Indians from South Africa. Bharuthram (2003) used a combination of data collection methods, namely interviews and discourse completion task questionnaires which were then analyzed using the coding system developed for the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989b). The author aimed at demonstrating that in the culture of the English speaking Indians from South Africa, the concept of face is different from that described by Brown and Levinson (1987), and that it is more consistent with findings on Asian languages such as Chinese and Japanese (as described above in the section on Speech Acts and Politeness). Thus, what these speakers care about when apologizing or requesting is the face of others, rather then their individual face. One of the examples that the author gave is the inclusion of the phrase "please" into both apologies and requests, which demonstrates the importance of politeness in their culture.

These studies on apologies in English demonstrate that speech acts in general, and apologies in particular, are very much culture related, as even in the case of the same language, there are differences across the different dialects spoken in the different cultures. What this section on apologies in different English speaking cultures has demonstrate, is that the way an apology is both perceived and produced is not so much dependent on the language in which one apologizes, but on the social and cultural norms of the culture in which it is spoken. This situation in the case of English is also consistent

with studies on other languages that are spoken in different cultures, which will be discussed in the following sections.

2.4.2. Studies on Different Languages

Even though most of the studies on apologies take either a comparative approach between a certain language and English, or investigate the way speakers of different languages apologize in English, there are also studies that investigated how apologies are produced in other languages. Thus, Vollmer and Olshtain (1989) attempted to replicate in German the study of the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989b). The authors used a discourse completion questionnaire on 200 German speaking students. One of the problems that Vollmer and Olshtain encountered when attempting to code and analyze the data was that the CCSARP methodology could not be used adequately for the combinations of different strategies that the German speakers used. Thus, according to Vollmer and Olshtain (1989) the categories used by the CCSARP were too broad and unspecific, while in the German data sometimes what would be a single category following the CCSARP methodology could actually be considered a combination. Therefore, the study analyzed in more depth the way illocutionary force indicating devices (IFID) are realized in German, as this strategy and assuming responsibility were by far the ones used most often.

A study on a much larger scale was conducted on Akan, a language group spoken in Ghana and the Ivory Coast. This study was based on data collected through natural interactions over a period of thirteen months (Obeng, 1999). Thus, apologies in this culture are closely linked to the social rules of power relations, as the speakers have to use high degrees of politeness when interacting with each other. Thus, a superior would

rarely apologize to a subordinate, as the superior could be considered too humble. Finally, Obeng has concluded that in Akan, apologies rarely consist of single strategies; most of the time they are either complex or compound. Complex apologies combine explicit and implicit strategies, while compound ones combine two or more implicit apology strategies (Obeng, 1999).

Another language that was investigated is Lombok, spoken on the island with the same name in Indonesia. Wouk (In Press) has found that in most situations speakers in Lombok use a single phrase to apologize, in which they ask for forgiveness. Unlike other languages presented above, Lombok seems to employ more standalone strategies, combinations being rarely used. However, the author drew attention to the limitation of the study, the small number of situations used for data collection, which does not allow for a generalization of the findings.

Finally, one of the more extensively studied languages insofar as apologies are concerned is Japanese. Kotani (1999) has found that there is a special category of apology which is prevalent with Japanese speakers, namely what she called the "feel-good" apology. This type of apology is used in situations when the speaker does not feel responsible for an offense, but shows empathy with the person who suffered the offense. The data the author collected by interviewing Japanese students in a university in the United States has shown that many of the apologies used were intended to make the listener feel good. Kotani concluded that even though there are many other types of apologies, this type is very important in the Japanese apologetic discourse, and it is representative for the Japanese culture, even though it may not always be an effective apology. Suzuki (1999) also agreed that culture is deeply reflected in the Japanese

discourse of apology. Thus, social rank is an important factor in determining even the need for an apology. Also, according to Suzuki, it is not as much how an apology is uttered that matters, but who the speaker and the hearer are.

2.4.3. Cross-cultural Studies

Research focusing on interlanguage pragmatics started only in the 1980s, but has been seriously increasing ever since, with more and more speech acts being investigated (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a). The cross-cultural studies on apologies investigate, according to Blum-Kulka et al., the way this speech act is both perceived and produced by a group of learners in their native and the target language. Also, most of the studies focus on communication and pragmatic competence as compared to the way native speakers use this speech act (Jordá, 2005), and less on how this competence is to be taught. Nonetheless, such studies are very important as they contribute to a better understanding of the differences between cultures that lead to the differences in the production of apologies in particular, and of speech acts in general.

Whether it is called pragmatic competence (Harlow, 1990; Jordá, 2005), sociocultural and sociolinguistic abilities (Cohen, 1995), or sociocultural choices (Cohen, 1996a), this ability or competence determines the use of the speech act that is appropriate to the situation, in accord with the social and cultural norms of the target language. This concept is the focus of most of the interlanguage studies, whose findings try to give an insight into what learners need to do in order to acquire this competence.

One of the most important interlanguage studies on apologies is the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project, or CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984), which examined the differences in the realization of requests

30

and apologies across eight languages. Besides the crucial insight that the results of this project provide for the study of apologies across cultures, this study is especially important because its methodology and coding system was used and replicated by many other studies on different languages. The study used a discourse completion test which contained a description of the situation followed by incomplete discourse sequences. The data were analyzed using a coding scheme developed for this study that was discussed in the section on Types of Apologies above.

One of the studies that used the CCSARP methodology was conducted on speakers of Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and German (Olshtain, 1989). The aim of the study was to examine the differences and similarities in the way apologies are produced across the four languages. Even though the authors' hypothesis was that the strategy selected by speakers of different languages is culturally influenced by social distance and power, the results rejected this hypothesis. The authors place the reasons for this on the fact that the instrument used was a universal one rather than specific to the needs of each language. More precisely, the situations used in the instrument were collected in order to represent situations which would be similar across western cultures. This shows, as already discussed in the previous chapters, the importance of using the appropriate methodology in studying apologies across cultures.

This was not the case, however, with a study conducted on Japanese and American speakers. Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) have shown that there are some "critical cultural variables" (p. 197) that influence the way speakers apologize. Thus, the study has shown that Japanese speakers used more direct and extreme apologies, while Americans were more indirect. The methodology used was, however, different than the

one in the CCSARP, which could also be one of the reasons that the findings differed. The authors used a scale type response questionnaire of 14 situations that were selected after conducting semistructured interviews with native speakers of both cultures. These findings were also confirmed by other studies (Nagano, 1985; Taguchi, 1991) and even on a much larger scale by a study conducted on 200 American and 181 Japanese students (Sugimoto, 1999). Moreover, Sugimoto (1999) claimed that Japanese speakers seem to have a greater likelihood of apologizing than American students, and also that Japanese speakers would expect an apology in far more situations than the American ones would. For example, in four out of the twelve situations in the survey, the difference between the percentage of Japanese speakers who considered that an apology was expected and that of the American speakers was greater than 10%. The conclusion is that such differences in apology styles are the result of significant cultural differences between the two cultures.

Similar findings have been reported by another study that compared speakers of American English and Japanese. However, this time the focus of the investigation was comparing American learners of Japanese to both native speakers of English and of Japanese (Tamanaha, 2003). According to the study, native speakers of English used more rational strategies, while native speakers of Japanese more emotional ones. For example, the Japanese speakers would express remorse and use explicit expressions of apology, while the American speakers would give an explanation or justification to the offense and then use an explicit apology. Tamanaha has attributed these results to the fact that there are important underlying differences between the American and Japanese cultures.

Significant cross-cultural differences in the selection of apology strategies were also found in the case of Spanish learners of English as a foreign language from Spain when compared to American native speakers of English (Mir, 1992). The results of this study have shown that native speakers of English use a greater variety of strategies when apologizing as compared to the ones used in English by the Spanish learners. Thus, the Spanish learners would mostly use IFIDs when apologizing in English, as opposed to the native speakers of English which would combine different strategies. Also, significant differences in the use of explicit apologies and offers to repair suggest that the Spanish learners are not aware of when these strategies are required in the target language, and therefore transfer their pragmatic competence from their native language.

This is the case with speakers of Spanish from other cultures, as well. In the case of Uruguayan speakers of Spanish compared to British English speakers differences in the use of apologies have also been demonstrated to be caused by cultural differences. Thus, while intensified illocutionary indicating devices were expected to exist in most apologies in British English, they were considered inappropriate in the case of the Uruguayans (Márquez-Reiter, 2000). Differences exist in other types of apologies as well. For instance, speakers of British English give more explanations when apologizing. Márquez-Reiter believed that these differences arise from the fact that the British English speakers place a greater importance on saving face.

Venezuelan speakers of Spanish had less preference for deference politeness strategies when apologizing to native speakers of English as compared to Americans (Garcia, 1989). This situation has even led to miscommunication, with the person expecting an apology being offended by the attitude of the offender. This was the case

even though, as compared to Márquez-Reiter's (2000) study, Garcia believed that the American conversational style is considered to be less formal than the British one. According to Garcia this is not an indication that Venezuelans are impolite, but a clear demonstration of the fact that social and cultural rules have a significant influence on the choice of apologetic strategies. She claims that Venezuelans prefer to establish an attitude of equality in such situations rather than one of deference.

Finally, a study that compared the way native speakers of Australian English and Chilean speakers of Spanish use explanations in their apology strategies also attributed the differences on cross-cultural differences (Cordella, 1992). The author claimed that the most important reason for the differences lies in the fact that Chilean culture places a much greater emphasis on family than the Australian one, and thus their explanations were mostly related to family matters. However, insofar as the complexity of the explanations is concerned, the study found no significant differences.

Not all scholars agree, however, with the importance placed on social and cultural factors in strategy selection. Harlow (1990), showed that social variables such as age, familiarity and relationship between the speakers do not have an effect on apologizing in the case of French learners of English. However, she admitted that these results may also be the effect of a certain ambiguity in the instrument used for collecting data. Nonetheless she agreed that pragmatic competence is what decides the correct use of these speech acts, even if this competence is not influenced by age or familiarity of the speakers.

Though fewer, there are also studies that investigate the proficiency of the speakers and also pragmatic competence transfer from one's native language to the target

language. Thus, in her study on Danish learners of English as a foreign language Trosborg (1987) concluded that in most of the cases the learners transferred their sociopragmatic competence regarding the type of apology used from their native language to the target language.

Trosborg's findings were confirmed in the case of other languages, as well. Thus, in a study conducted on Korean learners of English, Jung (2004) has also found that even though in some situations more advanced learners avoided transfer from their native language, most of the differences in their use of apologetic strategies from those of native speakers of English were due to transferring the strategies from their native language. In most cases, this is due to the fact that the students are not aware of the social and cultural differences between their language and the target one. This is also the case with Japanese learners of English, (Maeshiba et al., 1995) as well as with American students learning Japanese (Tamanaha, 2003). Finally, insofar as the use of multiple strategies is concerned, both Korean and Japanese students were found to provide multiple strategies for an apology as opposed to Americans in Japanese, which confirms previous findings on Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990) and other languages, as well (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989). Maeshiba et al. have also concluded that the proficiency level of learners of English as a foreign language has an influence on the way learners apologize in the target language.

Such findings are also similar to the ones on Thai investigated by Bergman and Kasper (1993). They used complementary instruments, namely an assessment questionnaire and a dialogue construction questionnaire to compare apologetic strategy use across three groups, namely Thai native speakers, American native speakers, and

Thai-English interlanguage speakers. From all the strategies used, the three groups differed mostly in downgrading the severity of the offense that triggered the apology. The authors attributed about 55% of these differences to pragmatic transfer from the speakers' native language to the target language.

Transfer from the first language to the target language is not, however, the only type of pragmatic transfer that takes place. Savina (2002), in her study on native speakers of Russian living in the United States, has shown that the strategies speakers choose to apologize in their native language are also influenced by the target language and culture. The most conclusive example the author gave to illustrate these findings was the incorporation by the Russian native speakers of "sorry" as an apology for accidentally touching someone. This is, according to her, clearly a result of cultural transfer, as such a situation does not require an apology in the Russian culture.

Finally, a comparative study that, instead of comparing the way the same subjects apologize in their native and target language, investigated native speakers of English, Hungarian, and Polish to compare the way apologies are realized across these languages was conducted by Suszczynska (1999). As a methodology, she used a combination of taxonomies from previous studies, including the CCSARP study. Suszczynska found both similarities and differences across the three languages. For example, in the case of all the three languages, the speakers began a remedial apology with an IFID. However, differences seem to be more significant. Thus, with the Hungarian apologies there is a high percentage of assuming responsibility, which is the most often used strategy after the IFID. As far as Polish apologies are concerned, 85% of the respondents used the Polish expression equivalent to "I'm sorry," which was always intensified. Lubecka

(2000) called it the "super apology" (p. 190), and claimed that it is a product of the Polish culture being based on the power-distance relationship between people.

To conclude this section on comparative studies on apologies, it seems to be clear that, in spite of some of the studies presented, the speech act of apology is very much influenced by socio-cultural factors. Also, in the case of inter-cultural communication, the choice of apology strategies depends on both the cultural background of the speaker and that of the hearer. Additionally, since most of the studies presented in this section focus on comparing the way speakers of different languages apologize in English to the way native speakers of English do, it has been shown that the choice of apologies is very much shaped by both language proficiency and the pragmatic competence of the speakers in case they are apologizing in a second or foreign language. Even though the differences between one's native language and the target language depend very much on one's culture, all of the studies presented demonstrate the fact that such differences do exist, and that these differences correlate with the sometimes inappropriate use of apologies in the target language. Finally, the studies presented concur in the pedagogical implications of their results in that learners should be made aware of such differences in how apologies are produced in their native language and in the target language, and that this would improve their pragmatic competence in the target language.

2.4.4. Studies on Romanian

Even though there are studies on pragmatics and conversation strategies in Romanian, at the time that this study was written there were no studies available that discuss apologizing in Romanian. Moreover, Romanian is not part of the many languages that have been studied in comparison with English insofar as the perception and

production of apologies is concerned. This status quo makes the effort of the present paper even more important, as it attempts to set a basis for the study of apologies in Romanian.

2.5. Methodological Issues in the Study of Speech Acts

As can be seen from the studies on apologies outlined above, there are significant differences, and even contradictions, from one study to another. There can be many reasons that would account for such a situation, ranging from the differences in the size and composition of the population under scrutiny, the way the scholars defined and categorized apologies, to cross-cultural differences in the comparative studies. What is even more significant is that such differences can be influenced by the methodology used to carry out the study. The only consensus across studies seems to be concerning the fact that the data collected for the study should be authentic (Beebe & Cummings, 1995; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a; Cohen & Olshtain, 1994; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989).

This brings into discussion the validity and effectiveness of the instruments used in speech act research. Cohen and Olshtain (1994) discussed the benefits and drawbacks of different instruments used in collecting data, emphasizing the fact that a combination of instruments is the ideal situation. Thus, the main instruments used for speech act production are, according to Cohen and Olshtain, the discourse completion test (DCT) and role-play interviews. The DCT has also a sub-variant that has been used less in studies, namely one that includes the response of the hearer to the presumed speech act. However, no significant differences in results have been found when comparing the two methods of DCT (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a; Rose, 1992).

38

The concerns that the DCT raises is that it may not be an accurate representation of what the speaker would say in naturally occurring situations. This seems to be directly related to whether the situations selected for the DCT are authentic themselves. If the subjects could not picture themselves in the respective situations, they would, indeed, merely speculate on what they would do, and they might act differently if actually put in those situations. Selecting such situations that are not only authentic, but also situations that the subjects would often find themselves in, would lead to more accurate responses on their part. Another concern is that the subjects may use portions of the written situation in their responses. Again, this can be overcome by phrasing the situations carefully so that the possibility of using them in the responses is minimized. From these points of view, role-plays seem to be more effective; however, role-plays can sometimes result in unnatural behavior on the part of the subjects (Jung, 2004). In addition, not all role-plays are the same. While open role-plays provide a wider context in which the speech act is produced as opposed to closed ones, they are more difficult to transcribe and code and offer less control of the variables involved in the study (Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

Furthermore, research has found that role-play interviews produce a wider range of speech act production strategies than discourse completion tests do (Sasaki, 1998), as well as considerably longer responses (Rintell & Mitchell, 1989). They also produce different responses on the part of the subjects as opposed to DCTs. However, as the results of Rintell and Mitchell's study on non-native speakers of English could not be replicated on native speakers, the difference may not necessarily be due to differences in the methodology used. While Rintell and Mitchell (1989) believed that written questionnaires are as valid for gathering data on apologies as oral instruments, Sasaki

(1998) claimed that one cannot choose which one of the two is better; while DCTs are more appropriate for studying the main types of strategies in speech act production, role-plays seem a better choice when the interaction between the speaker and hearer are also important for the study.

There are also studies that claim that data collected by written questionnaires do not reflect accurately speech that occurs in natural conditions. One of the reasons for this is that, unlike short dialogues, for example, questionnaires do not provide the necessary context for the situation that elicits the apology or for the persons involved (Wolfson, Marmor, & Jones, 1989). Also, some of the possible strategies to apologize, such as avoiding or postponing an apology could be left out in written questionnaires (Beebe & Cummings, 1995). This seems to be the cause of the fact that such instruments induce in the respondent the need to provide an apology to all the situations in the survey. Beebe and Cummings (1995) support, nonetheless, the use of the DCT as a data collection instrument for apologies, as, even though it has some shortcomings, it is not better or worse in this respect from other types of instruments. All the data collection methods have both positive and negative aspects, and thus one cannot clearly state which one is the best and most accurate.

Besides DCT and role-plays, there are also other types of instruments appropriate to collect naturally occurring samples of apologies. These would support Manes and Wolfson's (1981) claim that the best way to collect data is by eliciting spontaneous speech without the subjects knowing that they are studies. One such instrument is collecting telephone conversations. Beebe and Cummings (1995) compared this instrument to the DCT in order to see whether it is actually a better data collection

method. As in the case of role-plays discussed above, telephone conversations offered longer and more complex responses, but, as the scholars conclude, there were more similarities between the two methods of collecting data than differences.

The most exhaustive study of data collection methods is, nonetheless, Kasper and Dahl (1991), which analyzed the methods used in 39 studies of interlanguage pragmatics. Besides the ones already described in this chapter, they also mention multiple choice surveys and interview tasks, which they placed at the lowest end of the continuum, and suggested that should be used only for studying the perception of speech acts. The highest position in the continuum is taken by the observation of authentic discourse, which the authors considered the best way of collecting data on the production of speech acts. However, this does not mean that using naturally occurring data does not have its disadvantages. There might be an observer affect, as the participants may be more or less consciously influenced by the simple fact that somebody is observing them. Moreover, it is more difficult to control variables in this kind of data, and therefore it is more difficult to establish the exact causes that lead to the particular results of the study. Finally, it is very difficult to collect enough examples for analysis. The DCT, as a production instrument, is considered to be in the middle of this continuum, which would suggest a position of balance between the two extremes presented above. Nevertheless, the conclusion of the authors was that each method has advantages and disadvantages, and a combination of instruments is the best approach. This confirms findings of other studies discussed above.

The inter-instrument validity and reliability of these collection methods are not the only issues to be taken into consideration. One should also consider the

appropriateness of any of the instruments used to the socio-cultural context of the target population. According to Wolfson, Marmor and Jones (1989), the most important problem of studies on apologies across cultures is that their authors assumed that the apology as a concept represents the same social act no matter what the culture of the subjects is. However, this is far from being the case, as concepts like offense and obligation are very much culture specific. Thus, Rose (1994) claimed that the discourse completion test is not appropriate for collecting speech act data in the case of Japanese speakers, and extrapolates his findings to non-western cultures. However, Rose's use of multiple choice questionnaires as a means of testing the validity of DCTs raises methodological issues in itself, more research being needed in order to support his claims. Nonetheless, when comparing apologies across cultures, one needs to be careful what situations are selected when preparing any types of data collection instruments by making sure that the underlying behavior in the situation would be in violation of the social norms in all the cultures that are compared (Cohen & Olshtain, 1985).

Consequently, the study of speech act production in general, and that of apologies in particular, are a complex endeavor, and much care needs to be taken in designing and administering data collection instruments, and also in analyzing the results. In the absence of a unanimously accepted and reliable instrument, the best solution is, as Cohen and Olshtain (1994) stated, to use a combination of instruments. The conclusion that one can draw from the discussion on the different types of instruments, is that one should choose the one that is most appropriate to the specific purpose of the study. Thus, insofar as the study of apologies is concerned, whereas written questionnaires would be appropriate for studying perception of apologies, the DCT or role-plays would be

42

appropriate for studying their production. Finally, if the situations are carefully chosen, the DCT seems to have more advantages than disadvantages when compared to role-plays, as variables can be more easily controlled when studying what triggers the use of specific strategies in apologizing.

2.6. Purpose of the Study

The present study is an attempt at filling the gap created by the lack of studies on apologies in Romanian. It is part of a larger research whose aim is to compare the way Romanian students learning English as a foreign language and native speakers of English apologize. However, in order to be able to conduct a comparative study, it is necessary to create a knowledge base about apologies in Romanian.

As this literature review has shown, speakers of different languages prefer different ways of apologizing. Also, speakers of some languages use a single category in most of the apologies, while speakers of other languages prefer to combine several categories of apologies in their strategies. Therefore, some of the questions that this study intends to answer are what categories Romanian speakers prefer in their apologies, whether they prefer single categories or combinations, and, if combinations are used, which ones are most frequently used.

Finally, another important aspect that results from the literature review is the importance of using the appropriate methodology in studying apologies. In order to make the situations used for this study as authentic as possible while still allowing for the control of certain variables, the TV show *Friends* was used as the source of the situations. Thus, the last question that the study tries to answer is how the apologies given by the participants in the study compared to the ones on the show.

Chapter III

Methodology

The present paper aims at giving an insight into the speech act of apologizing in Romanian. More specifically, it is a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the different categories Romanians use to apologize, postpone, or avoid an apology in different situations that can arise in interactions among friends.

The larger goal is to set the basis for a future comparison, as this thesis is intended to be a part of a larger research project on apologizing in Romanian and English. In order to do this, and mostly due to the lack of literature on Romanian pragmatics in general, and on apologies in Romanian in particular, a detailed analysis of apologies in Romanian is necessary.

3.1. Research Questions

In light of the findings presented in the literature review section, and in order to contribute to filling the gap in research concerning apologetic speech acts in Romanian, the present paper will attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the categories of the speech act apology that speakers of Romanian use in different situations, and how do these categories combine in their apologies?

2. How do these categories compare to the way the characters in the show "Friends" apologized in the same situations?

3.2. Procedures/Instruments

As the literature review has shown, choosing the right instrument in order to study speech act production is a complex issue. After weighing the arguments for and against the different types of instruments, the one that seemed to be most appropriate for the present research was a discourse completion survey. As already mentioned in the section on Methodological Issues in the Study of Speech Acts, many studies (Beebe & Cummings, 1995; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Sasaki, 1998) support the use of this instrument for studying the production of speech acts, which is also the purpose of the present study. Insofar as the concerns of disadvantages of this instrument are concerned, these were minimized or eliminated, as will be explained in this section. One of the main concerns that the DCT raised was the authenticity of the situations used, both related to whether they would solicit authentic data, and to whether they would be socially and culturally appropriate for the target population of the study. To address these issues, the situations for the survey were taken from the American TV show "Friends" and translated into Romanian. Thus, the survey contained 10 situations adapted from the show for which the respondents had to provide an apology in their native language, Romanian.

The reason a TV show was chosen is that even though such a show is the product of a pre-written script, the language used is close to naturally occurring speech. Also, the situations that appear in the show that require apologies are also inspired from situations occurring in real life. The reason a comedy was used is that this kind of TV show is what Romanian learners of English are exposed to and what might influence their pragmatic

competence. Moreover, as the demographic information about the subjects shows, only 6.32% of the subjects have been to an English speaking country. Also, a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 represents never or almost never and 5 always or almost always, the mean rating for the question "How often do you have opportunities to interact with native speakers of English?" was 1.97. Therefore, watching TV in English might be one of the most frequent ways of listening to native speakers. This hypothesis is supported by the subjects' answer to the question "How often do you watch TV shows and movies that are in English?" which has a mean of 3.78 on the same 5 point scale, with 34.2% of the respondents stating that they watch TV and movies in English often, and 21.9% that they watch regularly.

Finally, the reason that the show "Friends" was chosen is that it is very popular in Romania, and many people in the age range of the target population of this study watch and like this show. This addresses one of the concerns of the DCT, by making sure that the subjects of the survey are familiar with the situations in the survey, and that these situations are of such nature that the subjects themselves can often find themselves in. "Friends" is about six friends in their mid to late twenties, 3 female and 3 male, and about their everyday lives in New York City. The show debuted in 1994 and ran for ten seasons in the United States and many countries of the world.

The situations for the questionnaires were selected after viewing 35 episodes of the show in its DVD version. The apologies provided on the show were transcribed from the DVD version of the show, as well. In all the 35 episodes there were 13 situations that required apologies. Out of these, there were several that required an apology for being late, out of which 2 were not selected. Also, other situations did not seem too appropriate

for the questionnaire, such as the one that involved apologizing for hitting another

character's father. Thus, 10 situations were selected to be included in the questionnaire.

These English translations of these situations are presented in Table 1 below. The original

Romanian version can be seen in the survey in Appendix B. The English translation of

the survey is given in Appendix C.

Table 1: *List of situations used for the study*

Name	Situation
1. Wearing Wrong Clothes	Joey did not have time to change before going to the wedding of his best friend, and therefore he is wearing sports clothes.
2. Missing the Wedding Ceremony	Dennis is the groom's mother's boyfriend, and he missed the wedding ceremony. He now meets the groom at the reception after the wedding ceremony.
3. Smoking	Chandler had promised his wife that he would stop smoking. However, he started again, and his wife can tell that he was smoking again.
4. Late for Birthday Dinner	It is the birthday of Ross's friend. The friend invited Ross to a birthday dinner at a restaurant, but Ross is late.
5. Breaking a China Plate	By mistake, Rachel breaks one of her friend's China plates, a plate that is part of a set that initially her friend did not want to use for fear one of the plates might break.
6. Lying to Best Friend	Chandler lied to his best friend saying that he could not go with him to a game because he had to be at his job in a different town. In fact, he wanted to spend the evening with his wife. However, his friend finds out.
7. Being away for Christmas	Chandler, who has a job in a different town from the one he is living in with his wife, needs to be at his job for Christmas. He feels sorry for this, and he is telling his wife.
8. Being Late	Ross was supposed to come and meet his friend in his office, but he was late. He finally arrives.
9. Deleting Speech from the Computer	The night before his friend has an important speech to make at a conference Chandler deletes by mistake his friend's speech from the computer. He now tells this to his friend.
10. Taking Friend's Jeans	Rachel took her friend's blue jeans without telling her about that. Now her friend has found out and Rachel admits to taking them.

There were several reasons for choosing these particular situations for the survey.

First, the intention was to select situations that represent interactions among the group of

six friends who are the main characters on the show. Thus, 8 of the situations were

interactions among friends, and 2 (situations 3 and 7) were interactions among husband

and wife. However, the husband and wife were part of the same group of friends that

participated in the interactions in the other situations used for the survey. The second

reason was that these situations, besides giving homogeneity to the survey insofar as the

participants were concerned, also represented various types of interactions that require an

apology. Finally, the situations needed to be socio-culturally appropriate for the

Romanian subjects of the study. For example, as in the U.S., there is a dress code for

weddings in Romania, as well; therefore wearing wrong clothes at a wedding does

require an apology on the part of Romanian speakers. On the other hand, another

situation that involved a character hitting a friend's dad was not chosen, since while this

situation would be all right in a comedy, it would not be appropriate in real life.

Besides providing apologies for these situations, the subjects had to answer 8

questions about their age, the length of time they had been studying English, their

opportunities to interact with native speakers of English, and whether they had been to an

English speaking country before. Most of these background questions were designed for

a future comparison between apologies in Romanian and the way students perceive

apologies in English, and thus not all of them are relevant for the present discussion of

apologies in Romanian. The participants filled out the questionnaire during class-time,

under the supervision of their instructor.

3.3. The Pilot Study

Before administration, the survey was piloted on 4 subjects, relatively close to the

profile of the target population, in order to fine-tune the questions, instructions, and

procedures. In the pilot, besides completing the survey, the subjects were also asked to

make comments on the clarity of the situations, and to give comments about the process

of completing the survey, as well. The data thus collected were then analyzed both as

preliminary results and in terms of the design of the survey, the collected comments being taken into consideration in revising the final version of the survey. As some of the respondents gave several alternative answers to one and the same question, or gave hypothetical answers that would either describe or explain what they would do instead of saying the apologies themselves, the instructions of the survey needed some changes in order to make it clearer to the respondents what they had to do. While originally the instructions asked the subjects to say how they would apologize in each of the situations, following the pilot two sentences were introduced, namely "Imagine you are the person in the situation below" and "Please write exactly what you would say in each of the situations."

Finally, due to the fact that almost all the answers in the pilot survey tended to fill up all the space provided for the answer, the number of lines available for the answer was reduced in the final version from seven to five.

3.4. Participants

The instrument was administered to 158 students attending a state university in Romania, namely Universitatea de Nord Baia Mare. All students were English majors, enrolled in one of two programs: Romanian and English Languages and Literatures (both majors) and Applied Modern Languages. The participants were from all levels of study, from students in their first year of study up to the fourth year.

Out of the 158 responses, 2 were left out as not all the background information questions had been answered. One hundred and fifty of the respondents turned out to be females, and only 6 males. Initially, one of the questions that the present research was intended to answer was whether there was a relationship between gender and the

categories or combination of categories used to apologize. However, due to the fact that the number of males was so small, the quantitative analysis of the data was only done on the female respondents, and gender thus became a controlled variable.

The average age of the subjects was 21.73, with a range of 18, with a minimum of 19 and a maximum of 37. Also, the respondents had been studying English for an average of 10.03 years at the time of the administration of the survey, with 4 years being the lowest number of years and 16 the maximum. As mentioned above, only 9 of the respondents had been to an English speaking country, with 7 out of the 9 spending 4 months or less in the respective country, and two spending 2 years or more.

3.5. Data Analysis

In order to answer the research questions, two types of analysis were carried out on the collected data. One of them was a quantitative analysis in terms of what kind of strategies speakers use most often when apologizing. Unlike most of the previous studies that looked at speech act production, the present analysis is an attempt not only at finding the frequency of different types of apologies in Romanian, but also at the different ways these types combine. Initially, it was our aim to try and define a category for each combination. However, preliminary data displayed a very large number of combinations of two, three, and sometimes four different types of apologies. Consequently, a number of basic categories of apologies have been set in order to code the data. Some of the categories were adapted from Olshtain and Cohen (1983), Trosborg (1987), and Bergman and Kasper (1993). Some of their categories needed to be changed or merged in order to accommodate for the specificities of our data. Thus, from the list of categories described below, category 1 was taken from Bergman and Kasper (1993), while category 2 is only

part of a larger strategy in these researchers' taxonomy. Numbers 3, 4, 5, and 8 are present with both Olshtain and Cohen (1983), and Trosborg (1987), while 6 and 7 are present as stand alone categories only in Trosborg (1987) and part of larger categories in Bergman and Kasper (1993). As none of the previous studies considered postponing an apology as a category, this situation was included with avoiding to apologize, a category present in both Olshtain and Cohen (1983), and Trosborg (1987). Finally, the high frequency of different pleadings for understanding led to the creation of a separate category for such speech acts.

The basic categories of apologetic speech acts are described below. The examples are taken from the collected data. I will first give the original Romanian apology, followed by the word by word gloss, and finally the English translation. A complete list of the abbreviations used in the glosses given in Appendix E.

0. Avoiding or postponing an apology: the speaker avoids apologizing by speaking about something else or stating that the situation does not require an apology:

   Vreau să fiu mereu acelaşi! Aşa cum mă ştii…
   Want-1st-sg. would-1st-sg. be always same! As how me know-2nd-sg.
   'I want to be always the same! As you know me.'

In the above example, instead of apologizing, the subject makes a comment about her personality, implying that because what she has done is her usual behavior, and since the hearer knows this, no apology is needed. This category

also contains situations in which, for different reasons, the speaker says she will apologize another time:

> Cel mai bine ar fi să ne distrăm azi... iar explicaţiile le primeşti mâine...
>
> That more good have-aux-3rd-sg. be would ourselves have-fun-2nd-pl…
>
> and explanations them get-2nd-sg. tomorrow…
>
> 'It would be best for us to have fun today… and you'll get the
>
> explanations tomorrow.'

1. Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID): the explicit speech act expressing an apology:

> Îmi pare rău.
>
> To-me seems bad.
>
> 'I'm sorry.'

> Îmi cer scuze!
>
> To-me ask-1st-sg. apologies!
>
> 'I apologize!'

The most often used lexical items that belong to this category are "Îmi pare rău" ('I'm sorry'), "Regret că..." ('I regret that…'), "Îmi cer scuze" ('I apologize'), "Scuze" ('I apologize'), "Scuză-mă" ('Forgive me'), and "Iartă-mă" ('Forgive me').

2. Intensified IFID: an element that shows the degree of the intensity of the IFID is also introduced:

Îmi pare atât de rău...

To-me seems so of bad…

'I'm so sorry…'

Îmi pare foarte, foarte rău...

To-me seems very, very bad…

'I'm very, very sorry!'

Some of the intensifiers used here are "atât" ('so') as in "Îmi pare atât de rău" ('I'm so sorry'); "foarte" ('very') as in "Îmi pare foarte rău" ('I'm very sorry'); "nespus de" ('unsaid of') as in "Îmi pare nespus de rău" ('I'm incredibly sorry'). Also the phrase "mii de scuze" ('thousands of thanks') is also used to form the intensified IFID that can be translated to 'I'm terribly sorry.' While the illocutionary force indicating devices that contain nouns are intensified with the help of the lexical items given above, the ones that contained a verb and thus cannot contain an intensifier, were considered to be an intensified IFID when the IFID was repeated, such as in this example: "Scuze, scuze, scuze" ('Sorry, sorry, sorry').

3. Providing a justification: trying to give an explanation of why the situation that required the apology happened:

Am uitat la ce oră e nunta şi... eram la pescuit.

Have-aux-1st-sg. forgotten at what hour is wedding and… was-1st-sg. at

   fishing.

'I forgot at what time the wedding was and… I was fishing.'

4. Acknowledgment of responsibility: the offender takes responsibility by overtly admitting that the situation is his or her fault. For example:

Ştiu că am întârziat...

Know-1st-sg. that have-aux-1st-sg. been-late…

'I know I am late…'

Ţi-am şters discursul de pe calculator...

To-you have-aux-1st-sg. deleted speech from on computer…

'I have deleted your speech from the computer

Some of the apologies included in this category contain lexical items that make this acknowledgment explicit, such as "ştiu că..." ('I know that…'), "recunosc că..." ('I admit that…'), "ce neîndemânatică sunt" ('I'm so clumsy'), "ce gafă am făcut" ('I made a gaffe'). Other apologies contained an account of what the subject did, which was also considered an acknowledgment of responsibility.

5. Offer of repair: usually used to offer a remedy for the physical or moral damage that the speaker has caused:

Promit să-ţi cumpăr un alt set de farfurii.

Promise-1st-sg. would-1st-sg. to-you buy-1st-sg one other set of plates.

'I promise I'll buy another set of plates.'

6. Blaming someone else or denying of responsibility: this category is a borderline one with category number 3. The difference is that while "providing a justification" refers to explaining why the offender has done what he has done, this category mostly tries to place the responsibility on someone or something else either overtly – by blaming somebody or something – or covertly, by denying responsibility:

> Traficul a fost îngrozitor.
>
> Trafic-the has-aux-3rd-sg. been terrible.
>
> 'The traffic was terrible.'

7. Promise of non-recurrence: the speaker promises never to repeat the action that required the apology. For example:

> Îți promit că nu se va mai întâmpla.
>
> To-you promise-1st-sg. that no itself will-aux-3rd-sg. more happen.
>
> 'I promise you this will never happen again.'

8. Attacking the complainer: the speaker attempts to save face by confronting the listener instead of apologizing. For example:

> ... dar tu nu ai nici un drept să mă iei la rost...
>
> … but you no have-aux-2nd-sg. no one right would-2nd-sg. me take to sense…
>
> '… but you have no right to question me…'

Mai degrabă renunț la tine decât la fumat!

More rather give-up-1st-sg. to you-2nd-sg. than to smoking!

'I'd rather give you up than give up to smoking!'

9. Pleading for understanding: the speaker tries to save face by appealing to the understanding of the listener. For example:

Sper c-ai să mă înțelegi!

Hope-1st-sg. that have-aux-2nd-sg. would-2nd-sg. me understand-2nd-sg.!

'I hope you'll understand!'

The term "category" or "basic category" will be used in this paper to refer to the categories presented above. The term "strategy" or "apology strategy" will be used to refer to the choice the respondents made in order to apologize. The apology strategy can consist of a single (standalone) category or of a combination of several categories. Here is an example of an apology strategy that consists of a single category, namely "offer of repair:"

Îți fac cadou unul nou.

To-you make-1st-sg. present one-the new.

'I'll give you a new one as a present.'

And here is an example of a combination of the categories "IFID" and "offer of repair:"

Iartă-mă, te rog, ... **[IFID]**

... o să-ți cumpăr altul. **[Offer of repair]**

Forgive-me, you-Obj-sg., it would to-you buy-1st-sg. other-the.

'Please forgive me, …' **[IFID]**

'… I'll buy you another one.' **[Offer of repair]**

The quantitative analysis was done with the help of the SPSS software. Each of the above categories was assigned a number between 0 and 9 and a single number or a combination was entered for each response according to the categories used to apologize. This procedure allowed for the possibility to run both frequencies of each basic category whether it appeared as a standalone or in a combination with other categories; and of the different combinations of up to five such basic categories.

Besides the need to create new categories in order to reflect the specificity of the data that I described above in this section, there were other issues encountered during the coding process. The most important one was that with some responses it was difficult to decide which category it would fit. In this case, the one considered the closest match was chosen. For example, the phrase "Nu te supăra!" ('Don't get upset') does not fit any of the categories strictly, but it resembles a plead for understanding, so it was coded as "pleading for understanding." Yet other responses would not fit in any of the categories, and did not suggest an apology at all, but were part of the strategy to apologize. Such were the sentences "Draga mea, şti că te iubesc enorm. Tu eşti totul pentru mine." ('My dear, you know that I love you very much. You are everything to me.'), which in the context of the situation in which it appeared was considered to be a "preparation" for the

57

categories to come in the apology strategy in which it appeared. Please see the discussion of this in the context of the situation in the section Situation 7: Being away for Christmas.

The second type of analysis, a qualitative one, allowed for a more in depth look at the different strategies that speakers of Romanian use in order to apologize in different situations. Aspects such as length of responses, patterns of responses, the types of lexical items or constructions used for the different categories of apologies (for example different ways of providing justification, different things and persons blamed for what happened) as well as the relationship between the strategies used and the circumstances of each situation were looked at. Also, some of the more unique, less common or unexpected responses were also analyzed. A qualitative analysis is essential for the proper understanding of the different choices that the Romanian speakers made in each situation, as a mere interpretation of the frequencies for each category and strategy is not enough. Only a qualitative analysis would be able to account for the use of indirect speech acts (see Types of Speech Acts above), when an apology, even though it belongs to a certain category, performs a different function. It is exactly this kind of use that is important for learners of a foreign language to learn, since they require cultural and pragmatic competence to perform in a foreign language. Attacking the complainer during an apology, for example, as a humorous way to lessen the threat to one's face is something that would not be possible in all cultures or in all situations.

Therefore, the following chapter will present the general findings of the study, namely how the categories described above in this chapter were used to apologize in the entire data set, as well as how they combined to form apology strategies.

Chapter IV

General Results

In order to answer the research questions set forth for this study, the data collected with the help of the survey were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The present chapter will present the overall results concerning the use of the categories defined in the Methodology chapter, as well as the way these categories combined in the apologies given by the respondents. This is necessary in order to find out which the most frequently used basic categories were, as well as what kind of combinations of these categories the Romanian speakers preferred when apologizing. Chapter 5, Discussion of Situations, will then investigate these issues in the case of each of the ten situations from the survey, in order to establish what kind of basic categories and combinations were used in specific situations, and what the relationship between the circumstances of the specific situations and the strategy chosen to apologize is.

Out of the 1,500 apologies given to the ten situations by the 150 respondents, 1,496 were valid, and 4 instances had missing values, as the respondents did not provide an apology for that particular situation. This number is spread across 109 different strategies of apologizing, whether containing standalone categories or combinations of these. The results show that 15.51% of the apologies contained one of the ten categories by themselves, while 84.49% contained combinations of two up to five categories. Out of the strategies consisting of combinations, 68.43% were combinations of two categories,

27.69% of three categories, 3.80% of four categories, and 0.08% (i.e. one instance) of five categories.

This great variety of strategies used to apologize is surprising, taking into consideration that the situations that required an apology were relatively homogeneous, being mostly interactions between friends, with a few being between husband and wife. However, there are strategies that were more frequent, many strategies being used, nevertheless, only in a few instances.

It is clear from these findings that the Romanian speakers that participated in the survey overwhelmingly preferred to use more than one category when apologizing. Moreover, more than half of all the respondents, namely 57.82%, prefered using two categories. Table 2 shows the most frequent 15 strategies used. A table with the frequencies of all the strategies used in the data set can be seen in Appendix A.

Table 2: *Most frequent 15 strategies used to apologize*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	277	18.52%
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	170	11.36%
Providing a justification	78	5.21%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	60	4.01%
IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	55	3.68%
IFID + Offer of repair	54	3.61%
Intensified IFID + Offer of repair	52	3.48%
Avoiding or postponing an apology	49	3.28%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	49	3.28%
Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	46	3.07%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	33	2.21%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	29	1.94%
Providing a justification + Offer of repair	28	1.87%
IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	25	1.67%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	24	1.60%

Even though, as already mentioned above, there were many different combinations used, there are two combinations, however, that seem to have been favored by the respondents. These were "IFID" combined with "providing a justification," which was used in 18.52% of all the responses, and "IFID" combined with "blaming someone else or denying responsibility," used in 11.36% of the instances.

Therefore, these findings are different than the ones reported by some of the studies presented in the literature review section of this paper, which stated that in the case of English speakers from New Zealand, the proportion of apologies that had single categories was almost the same as that of apologies using combinations (Holmes, 1990). They are also different from the ones on Lombok, where combinations were rarely used (Wouk, In Press). However, the findings are consistent with the ones on German, that used mostly combinations of categories (Olshtain, 1989; Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989).

As can be seen in Table 2, almost all of the above strategies contain either an "IFID" or an "intensified IFID" on the one hand, and either the category "providing a justification" or "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" on the other hand. Examining the frequency of the basic categories, whether they were used as standalone categories, or as part of a combination, it is not surprising then that these four categories are among the most often used ones, as Table 3 below shows.

Table 3: *Frequency of categories in apologies*

Category	Frequency	Percent
IFID	827	55.28%
Providing a justification	794	53.07%
Offer of repair	358	23.93%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	293	19.59%
Intensified IFID	271	18.11%
Pleading for understanding	265	17.71%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	205	13.70%
Promise of non-recurrence	109	7.29%
Avoiding or postponing an apology	52	3.48%
Attacking the complainer	35	2.34%

Therefore, the most often used category was the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device, which was used in 55.28% of the instances. If we add the 18.11% of the apologies that contained an intensified IFID, 73.39% of the responses contained explicit expressions of apology, as Olshtain and Cohen (1983) and Holmes (1990) classified them. This suggests the fact that Romanian speakers feel the need to be explicit; they do not want to risk the hearer not interpreting their response as an apology. And this is so even in interactions among friends, as is the case with the situations in the survey. These findings are consistent with most of the previous studies, which found that an explicit expression of apology was present in most of the combinations (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Holmes, 1990), or that apologies given were direct (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Nagano, 1985; Taguchi, 1991).

Another category that was used in more than half of the apologies, that is in 53.07% of the apologies, was "providing a justification." The speakers in the study felt that they needed to justify the act that led to an apology, which would be an attempt at minimizing their responsibility. This attempt is taken even further in other 19.59% of the

apologies, as these contained the category "blaming someone else or denying responsibility."

The high frequency of these two categories, as well as the presence of the category "offer of repair" in 23.93% of the apologies would suggest that the Romanian speakers in the survey were very concerned about saving face. They would give an explicit apology, as shown above, but would follow it up with an attempt to either deny responsibility, try to justify their act, or offer to make up for it in order to maintain their image in front of the friend. This attention given to one's face is consistent with Márquez-Reiter's (2000) findings about British speakers of English.

However, it is not only one's own image that seems to be at stake here. The use of these categories seems to be an attempt at assuring that the relationship with the friend is not compromised. This is demonstrated by some of the apologies that make this explicit, such as in this example: "I believe that a plate, no matter what kind it is, is not worth being a reason for the two of us to fight" (R71). This is similar to what Nwoye (1992) called "group face," though it does not go as far as the desire of the Akan speakers to save the face of the entire ethnic group as Obeng (1999) has shown.

Finally, there is the length of the apologies. Most of the responses used up as much of the provided space as possible, if not all the space. Even though it might seem like that, this is not related to the size of the respondents' writing, not to the fact that the apologies have combinations of up to five categories. Even the responses that contained only one or two categories were long, as can be seen in the example below, which contains an "IFID" followed by "providing a justification" and filled in all the space provided for the response:

Îmi pare rău că ți-am luat pantalonii, dar vroiam doar să-i arăt croitoresei mele pentru a-mi putea confecționa o pereche la fel. Mă gândeam că dacă ți-aș cere, ai refuza să mi-i împrumuți pe motiv că nu vrei să ne îmbrăcăm la fel.

To-me feels bad that your have-aux-1st-sg. taken pants-the, but want-imperf.-1st-sg. only would them show-1st-sg. tailor-fem.-dat. Mine for to to-me can create a pair at same. To-me think-imperf.-1st-sg. that if to-you would ask, have-aux-2nd-sg. refuse would to-me them lend-2nd-sg. on motive that no want-2nd-sg. would ourselves dress-1st-pl. at same.

I'm sorry I've taken your pants, but I only wanted to show them to my tailor, so that she could make a pair like that. I was thinking that if I had asked, you would have refused to lend them to me because you don't want us to dress alike.

However, not all the responses were so long. There were also short responses, especially the ones that had only one category.

To summarize, the general quantitative results of this study show that overall the Romanian speakers in the survey used a great variety of strategies to apologize. The following chapter will show that some situations had a greater variety than other situations, so this seems to be related to some extent to the circumstances of the situations. However, speakers tended to prefer some categories over other. The most important one is that there was a preference for explicit expressions of apology, namely "IFID" and "Intensified IFID." Also, the high frequency of the categories "providing a justification" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" suggest a preference

64

for categories that attempt to minimize or deny the responsibility of the speaker. Finally, the Romanian speakers preferred overwhelmingly the use of strategies that had combinations of categories rather than standalone categories, with combinations of two categories being the ones most often used, followed closely by those containing three categories.

Chapter V

Discussion of Situations

While the general results presented in the previous chapter are important to create an overall impression of the use of different categories of apologies and the way they combine in Romanian, it is also necessary to have a more in-depth look at the relationship between the different categories and the situations in which they appear. Therefore, this chapter will discuss each of the ten situations for which the subjects of the study had to provide apologies. This chapter will combine a quantitative analysis of the types of apologies used with a qualitative discussion of some of the most important aspects of the apologies provided by the respondents.

5.1. Situation 1: Wearing Wrong Clothes

The first situation in the questionnaire required an apology for showing up to a best friend's wedding wearing sports clothes. The apology that the character Joey offered on the show was "I'm sorry, OK? I went down to the gift shop and it's either this or the bathrobe" (Crane & Kauffman, 2001). The setting of this situation was in a hotel away from the homes of any of the characters, which is important to understand why the character was buying clothes at the gift shop. However, the subjects that completed the questionnaire were not necessarily aware of this setting, as some of them might or might not have known that the situation was taken from this TV series. Thus, the apology

66

provided on the show is a combination of the category "IFID" and "providing a justification."

The typical apology that the respondents provided to this situation contained an "IFID" and a justification, as well, as in the example below:

Îmi cer scuze că am venit la nunta ta în haine de sport, ... **[IFID]**

... dar tocmai m-am întors dintr-o excursie şi nu am avut timp să merg pe acasă să mă schimb. **[Providing a justification]**

To-me ask apologies that have-aux-1st-sg. come to wedding your in clothes of sport, but just me have-aux-1st-sg. returned from a trip and no have-aux-1st-sg. time would-1st-sg. go by home would-1st-sg. myself change.

'I apologize for having come to your wedding wearing sports clothes,…' **[IFID]**
'… but I have just returned from a trip and I did not have time to stop by home and change.' **[Providing a justification]**

While this example is similar to the one on the show, in that it provides a concrete and simple explanation, yet other answers gave a more complicated explanation of the situation that led to the speaker being late. Many of such apologies also pleaded for understanding on the part of the listener:

Îmi cer scuze că am venit aşa îmbrăcat,... **[IFID]**

67

... dar vin de la antrenament şi mi-am pierdut cheile. Aşadar, nu aveam cum să intru în apartament şi nici bani nu aveam la mine să-mi cumpăr alte haine. Aşa că am venit aşa îmbrăcat,... **[Providing a justification]**

... sper să mă ierţi. **[Pleading for understanding]**

To-me ask apologies that have-aux-1st-sg. come so dressed, but some-1st-sg. from practice and my have-aux-1st-sg. lost keys-the. Therefore, no have-aux-imperf.-1st-sg. how would-1st-sg. enter-1st-sg. in apartment and neither money no have-aux-imperf.-1st-sg at me would-1st-sg. to-me buy-1st-sg. other clothes. So that have-aux-1st-sg. come so dressed, hope-1st-sg. would-1st-sg. me forgive-2nd-sg.

'I apologize for having come dressed like this,…' **[IFID]**

'… but I am coming from practice and I have lost my keys. Therefore, I couldn't enter my apartment, nor did I have money on me to buy new clothes. Therefore I came dressed like this,…' **[Providing a justification]**

'… I hope you'll forgive me.' **[Pleading for understanding]**

The results for this situation show that 42% of the respondents had in their answers the same combination of apology categories as the character on the show had. Also, 14% of the replies were combinations of three categories that contained an IFID and provided a justification. Table 4 shows which the third categories were in this case.

68

Table 4: *Combinations of categories for situation 1: Wearing Wrong Clothes*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	63	42%
IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	12	8%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	6	4%
IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	2	1.3%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	1	0.7%

Thus, the categories used in combination with "IFID" and "providing a justification" for this particular situation were "intensified IFID," "acknowledgment of responsibility," "offer of repair," and "pleading for understanding."

Considering the two categories that were used on the show, namely "IFID" and "providing a justification," only the latter appeared as a standalone category for an apology. Thus, 2.7% of the respondents considered that this situation only required a justification, and nothing else. Nonetheless, these two categories appeared alongside other categories in combinations of two or three other than the ones noted above. Therefore, 70% of the apologies provided contained an IFID, while 78% provided a justification. Table 5 shows the percentages that each of the basic categories was used.

Table 5: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 1: Wearing Wrong Clothes*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	10	6.66%
IFID	105	70%
Intensified IFID	30	20%
Providing a justification	117	78%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	6	4%
Offer of repair	2	1.33%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	22	14.66%
Promise of non-recurrence	0	0%
Attacking the complainer	0	0%
Pleading for understanding	23	15.33%

As Table 5 shows, except for the category "avoiding or postponing an apology," which appeared only as a standalone category, and "providing a justification," which appeared both as a standalone and as part of a combination, all the other categories appeared in combinations of two or three categories. Also, there were two categories that were not used at all in providing an apology for this situation. These results are perfectly expected due to the nature of the situation. As the circumstances include a wedding, and one would infer that you would only show up at somebody's wedding once, it would be useless to promise never to show up at somebody's wedding wearing the wrong clothes. Similarly, attacking the complainer would not make sense either, due to the nature of the situation.

Another aspect that Table 5 shows and is noteworthy is the presence of the category "offer of repair" in the apologies. Though the number of instances this category appeared was very small, namely 2 instances out of the 150 responses, the explanations given above for the two categories that were not present at all would work for this category, as well. Both instances appeared in combinations of three categories, one with "IFID" and "providing a justification," and one with "intensified IFID" and "providing a justification." However, after looking at the two responses and at what kind of repair is offered, both make perfect sense, as both offer to go and change into more appropriate clothes. The justification offered in both cases – as both cases also provide a justification – mentioned the fact that the subjects preferred to come wrongly dressed to missing or being late for the important ceremony, after which they were to go and change.

Another interesting result is provided by the category "blaming someone else or denying responsibility." This category combined with "IFID," "intensified IFID," and

"pleading for understanding" to provide a more expedited apology. Thus, the most uses

of this category were in order to blame the dry-cleaners who did not have the proper

clothes ready in time (R42, R54), an airline for having lost the luggage (R43, R85), the

trainer for keeping the team longer than expected (R55) or the girlfriend spilling coffee

on the suit (R59) While these explanations might be likely to be believed, there were also

some that sounded farfetched, such as blaming the wife for not having left the keys, and

thus the respondent was unable to change (R44), the wife having left the husband taking

all his clothes (R51), the apartment being flooded and thus the suit getting all wet (R82)

or even the car in which the person was driving having caught fire and the suit burned

(R89).

However, the most significant result seems to be the fact that two categories,

namely "providing a justification" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility,"

accumulated appeared in 92.66% of the apologies. This suggests the fact that Romanian

speakers consider it very important not to lose face in situations such as the one under

scrutiny by trying to justify their action or blaming someone else. These strategies would

either lessen the severity of the act that called for the apology, or even exempt them from

any responsibilities.

Coming back to the different ways that the basic categories are combined, the

results show that 71.33% of the apologies had a combination of two categories, while

19.33% had three categories. From this point of view, the results are in agreement with

the apology given on the show, which was also one created by using two categories.

Nonetheless, as in the case of all the situations, the overwhelming majority of the

apologies provided in the questionnaire were much longer than the one on the show.

While one can claim that brevity is part of the TV comedy, when compared to previous studies on English (Edmundson, 1992), verbosity seems to be a significant characteristic of Romanian apologetic speech acts.

5.2. Situation 2: Missing the Wedding Ceremony

This situation is similar in context to the previous one, in that it also takes place at a wedding. It is also taken from the same episode as the first situation. The groom's mother's boyfriend missed the wedding ceremony, and only arrived at the reception that was given afterwards. Thus, he apologized to the groom: "Oh, I'm so sorry I missed the ceremony, I was stuck at auditions." (Crane & Kauffman, 2001). Therefore, the apology for this situation is also a combination of categories, this time between "IFID" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility."

I will provide examples for the first three most often used strategies used for this situation. Thus, below is an example of an apology that uses a combination of the categories "IFID" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility:"

Îmi cer scuze că nu am ajuns în timp util,... **[IFID]**

... dar mi s-a stricat maşina. **[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]**

To-me ask apologies that not have-aux-1st-sg. arrive in time useful but to-me/my have-aux-3rd-sg. broke car-the.

'I apologize for not having arrived on time…' **[IFID]**

'… but my car broke down.' **[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]**

72

The car and traffic are the ones most often blamed for being late in this situation. However, as mentioned above, there were many responses that instead of blaming someone else provided a justification after the IFID:

Îmi cer scuze că am ajuns aşa de târziu... **[IFID]**

… Am avut o mică problemă, dar s-a rezolvat. **[Providing a justification]**

To-me ask apologies that have-aux-1st-sg. arrived so of late. Have-aux-1st-sg. had a small-fem. Problem, but itself-have-aux-3rd-sg. solved.

'I apologize for arriving so late…' **[IFID]**

'…I had a small problem, but it's been taken care of.' **[Providing a justification]**

While in the case of the situation with wearing wrong clothes at the wedding the respondents gave detailed and elaborate justifications in their apologies, with missing the ceremony the category "providing justification" contained reasons that are more vague, and do not give detailed accounts of the fact that prompted the need for an apology. As in the example above, many of the subjects mentioned the fact that "something came up," or "there was something I needed to take care of" as justification for being late. This situation is true in the case of inter-subject responses, as some respondents who gave vague justifications for the second situation had given detailed ones for the first one. More detail in the apologies for wearing wrong clothes would suggest that the subjects considered it a more serious threat to their face, and thus the apology required a more elaborate explanation, than in the case of being late for the wedding ceremony.

Finally, here is an example of an intensified IFID followed by blaming something else:

Îmi cer mii de scuze pentru întârziere,... **[Intensified IFID]**

…dar am prins un blocaj pe autostradă şi a trebuit să aştept aproape două ore până s-a reluat circulaţia. **[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]**

To-me ask thousands of apologies for delay, but have-aux-1st-sg. caught a blocking on highway and have-aux must would-1st-sg. wait almost two-fem. hours until itself have-aux-3rd-sg. resumed traffic.

'I'm terribly sorry for being late,…' **[Intensified IFID]**

'…but I got caught in traffic on the highway, and I had to wait for almost two hours before the traffic resumed.' **[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]**

Unlike the first situation, where there was one combination with a clearly higher frequency than all the others (the combination which was also the one present on the show), with this situation there are two combinations that had a much higher frequency than the other combinations. The first one, also the one with the highest frequency, is, again, the combination that was uttered on the show, namely an "IFID" followed by "blaming someone else or denying responsibility. This combination accounted for 32% of the responses, 48 subjects out of the total of 150 choosing this strategy for their apology. However, there was also another combination whose frequency was high enough to be considered an important one for this situation. This is represented by an "IFID" followed

by "providing a justification," and it was present in 19.3% of the responses, that is it had

a frequency of 29 out of 100. Finally, the third highest combination is a variation of the

first combination mentioned above, namely intensified "IFID" and "blaming someone

else or denying responsibility." This combination represented 8% of the total apologies

given, which means a frequency of 12 responses. Consequently, as these combinations

accounted for 59.3% of the apologies for this situation, they can be considered as the

typical responses. Table 6 presents the most often used combinations of categories for

this situation.

Table 6: *Combinations of categories for situation 2: Missing the Wedding Ceremony*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	48	32%
IFID + Providing a justification	29	19.3%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	12	8%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	9	6%
IFID + Pleading for understanding	5	3.3%
Intensified IFID + Pleading for understanding	4	2.67%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Pleading for understanding	4	2.67%
Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	3	2%
IFID + Offer of repair	1	0.67%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Pleading for understanding	1	0.67%

As can be seen in Table 6, 77.33% of the responses represent the ten different

combinations of two basic categories. While combinations of two categories were the

case with most of the responses, six of the basic categories were also used as standalone

apologies. Avoiding or postponing an apology was the category most often used by itself,

with 3.3% of the respondents choosing this strategy. However, all these fall under

postponing the apology, and not avoiding it, the subjects saying that they will explain

later, they should have a good time at the wedding reception. There were also five different combinations of three, and two of four basic categories.

Coming back to the basic categories, Table 7 shows the frequency each of them was used as standalone or in combinations for this situation:

Table 7: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 2: Missing the Wedding Ceremony*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	5	3.33%
IFID	98	65.33%
Intensified IFID	34	22.66%
Providing a justification	51	34%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	2	1.33%
Offer of repair	4	2.66%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	75	50%
Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.66%
Attacking the complainer	0	0%
Pleading for understanding	28	18.66%

Just as with the first situation involving going to a wedding ceremony dressed in the wrong clothes, with this situation, namely missing a wedding ceremony, "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" and "providing a justification" were used in a great percentage of the apologies. For this situation, this percentage was only a little less, 84% as opposed to 92.39% with the first situation. I have argued in the previous section that this means that speakers of Romanian consider recovering the lost face caused by the situation very important. The smaller percentage for the second situation may suggest that this situation is somewhat less face threatening than the first one, but is nevertheless a high face threatening situation, as the difference is very small.

Finally, one of the interesting results that Table 7 shows is the presence of one apology that used the category "promise of non-recurrence." The category appears as part

of a combination of four categories, namely: "IFID," "blaming someone else or denying responsibility," "promise of non-recurrence," and "pleading for understanding." However, the promise of non-recurrence does not refer to the subject never missing the friend's wedding ceremony again, which would be not only strange, but also pragmatically inappropriate. The respondent stated that "I promise you that I won't be late for the christening" (R11). As this is the only situation where the subject used this category in her apologies, and thus is not part of a pattern or something characteristic to this subject, the conclusion is that she probably used this category to lighten up the situation.

5.3. Situation 3: Smoking

In this situation, one of the characters in the show had promised his wife to quit smoking. However, he started to smoke again, and his wife found out and confronted him. Therefore, the apology that the character used on the show was: "I messed up, it was a meeting, everybody was smoking!" (Silveri, 2002). Again, as with the previous situations, the strategy used to apologize in this situation was made up of "acknowledgment of responsibility" and "providing a justification."

Moreover, another difference when comparing this situation to the ones already discussed is that the responses that were the most typical ones in the survey are not the same as the apology on the show. The typical apologies were combinations of categories, just as with the previous situations. Below is an example of the most often used combination, of an IFID and "providing justification:"

Îmi pare rău... **[IFID]**

… dar să renunț la fumat nu e chiar atât de uşor pe cât mi-am închipuit. Am avut un moment de slăbiciune. **[Providing a justification]**

To me seems bad but would-1st-sg. give up-1st-sg. to smoking not is even so of easy-masc. on how myself have-aux-1st-sg. imagined. Have-aux-1st-sg. had a moment of weakness.

'I'm sorry…' **[IFID]**
'… but giving up smoking is not as easy as I have imagined. I had a moment of weakness.' **[Providing a justification]**

Another typical strategy that is very close to the one above in terms of frequency is represented by a combination of three categories, containing the above combination, but followed by a promise of non-recurrence:

Iartă-mă iubito,... **[IFID]**
… dar în perioada aceasta sunt foarte stresat. ... **[Providing a justification]**
... Îți promit că voi renunța la fumat când voi fi mai liniştit. **[Promise of non-recurrence]**

Forgive-imper.-2nd-sg. me loved-one-voc., but in period this am very stressed. To-you promise-1st-sg. that want-aux-1st-sg. give-up to smoking when want-aux-1st-sg. be more calm.

'Forgive me, honey,…' **[IFID]**
'… but I've been very stressed lately. …' **[Providing a justification]**

'… I promise you I'll give up smoking when I calm down.' **[Promise of non-recurrence]**

As already mentioned above, this situation is different from the previous ones, in that the results show a different strategy to apologize than the one that was used on the show. However, the two are not completely different, as the most frequent combinations contained the category "providing a justification" used on the show, with an "IFID" – in 12% of the responses – or with an "IFID" and "promise of non-recurrence" – in 10% of the responses. Also, "Smoking" is the situation that had the highest number of strategies used (including both standalone categories and combinations), namely 44. Out of these, 5 strategies represented standalone categories, 15 combinations of two categories, 15 combinations of three categories, and 9 combinations of four categories. This wide use of different strategies is the reason why each of them had a relatively lower frequency of use as opposed to previously discussed situations. Table 8 shows the most frequent combinations used for apologizing in the case of the "Smoking" situation:

Table 8: *Combinations of categories for situation 3: Smoking*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	18	12%
IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	15	10%
IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	10	6.7%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	8	5.3%

However, it is necessary to mention that the category used on the show, "providing justification," even though it only appeared in 9 responses as a standalone category, it was also present in 23 different combinations of two, three, and four categories. Thus, overall, "providing a justification" was used as a standalone category or

as part of a combination in 107 out of the 150 responses, which makes it the most often used category for this situation.

The above data would suggest the fact that the results of the study are not so far away from the strategy used on the show, after all. By using this category more in combinations than as a standalone, the Romanian speakers seem to feel again that merely providing an explanation of what happened is not enough for this situation. Therefore, they used different ways of making their apology more convincing by adding one, two, or even three other categories. Nonetheless, there were other categories used quite frequently in apology strategies for the situation "Smoking," as can be seen in Table 9:

Table 9: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 2: Smoking*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	3	2%
IFID	72	48%
Intensified IFID	10	6.66%
Providing a justification	107	71.33%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	46	30.66%
Offer of repair	2	1.33%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	5	3.33%
Promise of non-recurrence	46	30.66%
Attacking the complainer	19	12.66%
Pleading for understanding	42	28%

As in the case of the previously discussed two situations, "Wearing Wrong Clothes" and "Missing the Wedding Ceremony," the category "IFID" had a very high frequency in this situation, as well. Except for the second situation, where it was the most often used basic category, so far it has been the second most frequent one. This suggests that speakers of Romanian feel that, at least for situations as the ones already presented, they need to provide an explicit apology. "Acknowledgment of responsibility" and

"promise of non-recurrence" were also often used, as it can be seen in the table above. While the latter was used 3 times as a standalone category, "acknowledgment of responsibility" was only used in combinations. In fact, as already mentioned above, these two categories were most often used in combination with "providing a justification."

Insofar as the category "promise of non-recurrence" is concerned, I need to mention the fact that I have included here both the responses where the subjects promise to stop smoking right away, and those that promise to do this in the future or to reduce gradually the number of cigarettes smoked. The latter case seems to be more frequent. The strength of this promise seems to be related to the reason provided as a justification. Thus, if the reason for smoking again was a momentary loss of strength or outside influence (such as other people around the subject are smoking), the respondent seemed to feel very determined in giving up smoking right away: "… but I went out with my friends, and I couldn't help myself when everybody around me was smoking. But I promise I won't put another cigar in my mouth." (R39). However, if the reason was related to the personality of the smoker, the promise was less decisive: "As I have been very stressed lately, I smoked a cigarette, but please forgive me, and I promise you I will do my best to give up smoking." (R5).

Finally, "Smoking" is the first situation so far where the category "attacking the complainer" was present in the strategies used by the subjects. More than that, as can be seen in Table 9, one could say that it was quite frequently used as opposed to the other situations, 12.66% of the responses containing this strategy. A possible reason for this is the fact that the smoker felt that his face was too much threatened to be able to recover it by an apology. Instead, the speaker considered it a better choice to make it clear that the

hearer has also committed similar or even more serious offenses, and therefore had no right to expect an apology. Most of the occurrences were as standalone categories, 12 out of the total of 19 responses. They seem to arise from the social relationship between the speaker and hearer, as they are husband and wife, such as in the following example: "I think that it would be appropriate for you yourself to quit your endless shopping, as well." (R58). There were, however, 7 instances when this category was used in combination with an "IFID," a justification, or a plead for understanding, which makes it less incisive: "… When we met, I was smoking, right? Now what do you want? Please, forgive me, because I cannot quit…." (R25).

5.4. Situation 4: Late for Birthday Dinner

In the fourth situation, one of the characters was late for a birthday dinner party given by one of his friends at a restaurant. Everybody was nervous because they could not order until everybody was there. When he finally arrived he apologized: "I'm so sorry… Rachel wasn't sure she could leave the baby" (Silveri, 2002). This apology is, again, a combination of categories, namely an "intensified IFID" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility."

Just as with the previous situation, the strategy used in the apology on the show was not the most frequently used by the subjects of the survey. The data show that the typical apology for this situation was a combination of an "IFID" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility." Nevertheless, the two are very close, as the only difference between the survey and the show is that the Romanian speakers preferred a simple IFID as opposed to an intensified IFID used on the show. Here is an example of this combination:

Îmi pare rău,... **[IFID]**

… dar am întârziat din cauza traficului. Ştii că la ora asta e foarte aglomerat.
[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]

To-me seems bad, but have-aux-1st-sg. been-late from cause traffic-the-poss.
Know-2nd-sg. that at hour this is very busy.

'I'm sorry,…' **[IFID]**

'… but I'm late because of the traffic. You know how busy it is around this time.'
[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]

Other frequent apologies included an IFID followed by a justification, instead of
blaming someone or something else:

Scuză-mă,... **[IFID]**

… dar am stat mult pe gânduri ce să iau pe mine şi am uitat cât este ceasul.
[Providing a justification]

Forgive-imper.-2nd-sg. me, but have-aux-1st-sg. stayed on thoughts what would
take-1st-sg. on me and have-aux-1st-sg. forgotten how-much is clock-the.

'Forgive me,…' **[IFID]**

'… but I've been thinking too much how to dress and I've forgotten what time

was.' **[Providing a justification]**

Even though the strategy used on the show was not typical for the population of this study, it was nevertheless the third most frequent combination, as can be seen in Table 10:

Table 10: *Combinations of categories for situation 4: Late for Birthday Dinner*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	37	24.7%
IFID + Providing a justification	29	19.3%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	10	6.7%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	8	5.3%

As the above table shows, the most frequent combination was "IFID" followed by "blaming someone else or denying responsibility," which accounted for 24.7% of the responses. If we add up the percentages of the above four most widely used strategies, they accounted for 56% of the responses. This leaves almost half of the responses spread over 32 different strategies of standalone categories or combinations of two, three, or even four basic categories. These results suggest the fact that the Romanian speakers who participated in this study had very many different ways of apologizing in the case of this situation, which would mean that the choice of strategies when apologizing for being late at a dinner party is more related to the specific individual who apologizes rather than to cultural characteristics.

On the other hand, as can be seen from the distribution of the basic categories in the strategies used for this situation represented in Table 11, there were nevertheless some favored ones which were used frequently, but in many different combinations:

Table 11: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 4: Late for Birthday Dinner*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	3	2%
IFID	98	65.33%
Intensified IFID	30	20%
Providing a justification	62	41.33%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	11	7.33%
Offer of repair	14	9.33%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	68	45.33%
Promise of non-recurrence	6	4%
Attacking the complainer	1	0.66%
Pleading for understanding	25	16.66%

The most frequently used category was "IFID," which was used in 98 out of the total 150 apologies, which accounts for 65.33%. This confirms what previous situations have shown, namely that this is a very frequent category, Romanian speakers feeling the need for an explicit apology for the situation "Late for Birthday Dinner," as well. "Blaming someone else or denying responsibility" and "providing a justification" follow closely with 45.33% and 41.33% respectively.

What is interesting with the use of the category in both the show and the survey data is that not losing face seems to be very important in both cultures. Out of all the strategies that can be used to apologize, "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" is the one that implies the least threat to the speaker's face.

One of the aspects of the results presented in Table 11 that might seem strange is the use by one respondent of the category "attacking the complainer." The category is combined in this particular apology with two other basic strategies, namely "intensified IFID" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility." Apparently, such a combination would seem strange, as it would be difficult to understand why somebody who uses an explicit apology as strong as an intensified IFID, and also claims that the act

that triggered the apology was not his or her fault, would also blame someone else. However, looking at the exact way the apology was framed, it turns out to be an indirect speech act that intends to do something else, namely use humor to lessen the threat to the speaker's face: "… So let's have fun, and stop giving me moralizing speeches!" (R139).

Insofar as "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" is concerned, this situation is similar to situation 2, "Missing the Wedding Ceremony," in that the subjects mostly blamed their car (R74, R76, R94, R106) or traffic (R78, R80, R110) for being late. These are closely followed by business meetings or superiors (R77, R89, R95) as the ones to blame. Sometimes, however, spouses (R147), girlfriends (R131), family (R69, R117), and guests (R141) are also the target of their blame.

5.5. Situation 5: Breaking a China Plate

"Breaking a China Plate" is a situation in which one of the characters on the show accidentally broke one of her friend's China plates. Her friend was very fond of this plate. Moreover, she hesitated to lay the set on the table for fear that somebody might break it. However, what she was afraid of happened, and the character that broke the plate apologized: "Mon, I'm so sorry!" (Goldberg-Meehan, 2002). As with the third situation discussed, "Smoking," the apology for this situation consisted of a standalone category, namely an "Intensified IFID."

Unlike on the show, there was not even one instance when this category was used as a standalone. Nor was it the most frequent standalone category used for this situation. Typical apologies for this situation included a combination of either an intensified IFID or an IFID with the category "offer of repair," as in the examples below:

Îmi pare tare rău pentru ce s-a întâmplat!... **[Intensified IFID]**

... Chiar acum plec să-ți iau un nou set de farfurii chinezești! **[Offer of repair]**

To-me seems strong bad for what itself-have-aux-3rd-sg. happened! Right now go-1st-sg. would to-you buy-1st-sg. a new set of plates Chinese!

'I'm very sorry for what happened!...' **[Intensified IFID]**

'... I'm leaving right now to buy you a new set of Chinese plates!' **[Offer of repair]**

While the example above contains an intensified IFID, the one below contains a simple IFID:

Vai, scuze,... **[IFID]**

... am să cumpăr alta. **[Offer of repair]**

Oh, apologies, have-aux-1st-sg. would buy-1st-sg. another.

'Oh, I'm sorry, …' **[IFID]**

'… I'll buy you a new one.' **[Offer of repair]**

Just as with the previous situation, there was a great variety of strategies used in the case of "Breaking a China Plate," namely 35, out of which were 6 standalone categories, and 29 combinations. Moreover, even fewer apologies clustered around the more frequent ones. Table 12 shows the most frequent combinations of basic categories used for this situation that had a frequency above 5%.

Table 12: *Combinations of categories for situation 5: Breaking a China Plate*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
Intensified IFID + Offer of repair	25	16.7%
IFID + Offer of repair	22	14.7%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	17	11.3%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	9	6%

The most frequent combination was, as can be seen in Table 12, one between an "intensified IFID" and "offer to repair," which was used in only 25 out of the 150 responses, accounting for 16.7%. The second most frequent one was the combination of an "IFID" and "offer of repair" with a frequency of 22, that is 14.7%. This makes a generalization impossible in the case of this situation, as the frequencies were too low for the strategies to be called typical. Besides the combinations presented above, there were also other 16 combinations of "offer of repair" with other basic categories, each having been used in 1 to 7 instances. Also, there were 13 combinations besides the ones in Table 12 that comprised the category "providing a justification", each with a low frequency as the combinations with "offer of repair."

Not only were these two basic categories used as standalone or combination, almost all of the categories were present in apologies for "Breaking a China Plate." The most often used basic category, be it as a standalone one or in combination with other categories, was "offer of repair." Insofar as the offer is concerned, most of the respondents offered to either buy a new plate identical to the broken one, or to pay for it. Yet others offered to fix or glue the plate together. There were also a few responses that gave a more general or vague offer of repair, similar to the following example: "I'm very sorry, but I'll make it up to you somehow" (R82). Table 13 presents the distribution of all the categories for this situation.

Table 13: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 5: Breaking a China Plate*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	3	2%
IFID	64	42.66%
Intensified IFID	60	40%
Providing a justification	64	42.66%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	17	11.33%
Offer of repair	117	78%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	1	0.66%
Promise of non-recurrence	2	1.33%
Attacking the complainer	0	0%
Pleading for understanding	30	20%

Unlike the situations discussed previously, when there were one or two basic categories with a higher frequency, in the case of "Breaking a China Plate," there were also three more categories except the most frequent one that had a relatively high and similar frequency. These were "IFID," "providing a justification" (both used in 42.66% of the apologies), and "intensified IFID" (used in 40% of the apologies). However, except "providing a justification" which was used only twice as a standalone category, they were used in combinations that I have already mentioned above. The two categories that represent explicit and direct strategies of apologizing, namely "IFID" and "intensified IFID," were used in 82.66% of the apologies. This demonstrates the fact that the surveyed speakers preferred the use of an explicit and direct apology for this situation, as well.

A very interesting aspect of the apologies for this situation is that some of them try to lessen the importance of the perpetrated act. This is done by reducing the value of the object, not of the specific plate in question, but of it being merely an object, which thus does not deserve such attention, friendship and inter-human relationships being more important. Here are a few examples that illustrate this: "… However, these are merely

objects." (R64); "I believe that a plate, no matter what kind it is, is not worth being a reason for the two of us to fight." (R71); "… but it's not material things that should be appreciated in this world" (R76). Also, quite a few other responses use a different approach to the same issue by mentioning that potsherds bring about luck, which is a Romanian saying (R51, R56, R80, R83, R90, R102, R116, R142).

Finally, there was one instance when "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" is used as an apology strategy. This is worth mentioning as the respondent blamed the wind for breaking the plate, which would be quite hard to believe. However, the speaker seems to be doing everything she can in order to save face: "You know, the window was open, and a terrible wind was blowing. Then the windows slam shut, I got frightened and dropped the plate. It wasn't my fault, it was the wind." Even though the subject may or may not have intended, this apology turned out to be a humorous one.

5.6. Situation 6: Lying to Best Friend

The sixth situation involved apologizing for lying to a friend. One of the characters on the show was supposed to go to a game with his best friend. However, due to the fact that he had been working in another town recently, he wanted to use the opportunity of being in town to spend some time with his wife, instead. So, he told his best friend that he could not go to the game, as he was working out of town. Unfortunately for him, his friend dropped by and found out that he was home. Therefore, this is the apology he used: "I'm sorry… I… I told you I was in Tulsa because I wanted to spend the night with Monica… Yeah… I feel so bad. Is there… is there anything I can do to make it up to you?" (Kunerth, 2002). For the first time, the strategy used to

apologize was a combination of three basic categories. The character on the show first used an "IFID," followed by "providing a justification," and "offer of repair."

Typical responses for this situation only partially fit the one on the show, in that the combinations did not have the category "offer of repair," or were represented only by the standalone category "providing a justification." Here is an example for the most typical combination:

Îmi cer scuze,... **[IFID]**

… dar familia este mai importantă decât orice altceva şi tu ştiai asta. **[Providing a justification]**

To-me ask-1st-sg. apologies, but family-the is more important than anything other and you know-imperf.-2nd-sg this.

'I apologize, …' **[IFID]**

'… but family is more important than anything else, and you knew that.'
[Providing a justification]

Other responses, however, did not contain an "IFID" either, the subjects considering that providing a justification is enough:

I-am promis soţiei o seară de neuitat şi am uitat de întâlnire, credeam că trebuia să fie săptămâna viitoare. **[Providing a justification]**

To-her-have-aux-1st-sg. promissed to-wife-the an evening of unforgotten and have-aux-1st-sg. forgotten of meeting-the, think-imperf.-1st-sg. that had would be week-the next.

I promised my wife an unforgettable evening and I forgot about our meeting, I thought it was next week. **[Providing a justification]**

Just as the previous situation, the apologies for "Lying to Best Friend" were also spread across many different strategies. There were 43 strategies, out of which there were 6 standalone categories and 37 combinations of basic categories. The spread is even greater with this situation than in the case of the previous ones, as only two strategies had a frequency above 10%, with most strategies having between 1 and 4 instances. This might be due to the nature of the situation, as socio-cultural norms would require an explanation when being caught lying rather than using any other strategy. Also, this situation is the first where a standalone category was present as the second most used strategy, the situations discussed previously having combinations as the most often used strategies, as can be seen in the table below:

Table 14: *Apology strategies for situation 6: Lying to Best Friend*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	32	21.3%
Providing a justification	22	14.7%
Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	9	6%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	8	5.3%

As Table 14 shows, the strategy with the highest frequency was "IFID" followed by "providing a justification." Other often used combinations also contained the basic category "providing a justification," which was mostly combined with "pleading for

understanding," in 6% of the responses, and "acknowledgment of responsibility, in 5.3%

of the responses. All the other strategies used for this situation account for less than 5%

each. The combination used on the show, namely "IFID," "providing a justification," and

"offer of repair" appeared in only 4 of the responses, which means 2.66%, making this

strategy the eighth most often used one.

Even though there is such a great variety of strategies used to apologize in this

situation, most of these strategies contained an explanation or justification for the action

that led to the need to apologize. Thus, as can be seen in Table 15, "providing a

justification" is by far the most used category either as a standalone or in combinations, it

being present in 118 of the responses, which accounts for 79.72%.

Table 15: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 6: Lying to Best Friend*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	1	0.67%
IFID	69	46.62%
Intensified IFID	9	6.08%
Providing a justification	118	79.72%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	29	19.59%
Offer of repair	30	20.27%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	11	7.43%
Promise of non-recurrence	7	4.72%
Attacking the complainer	8	5.40%
Pleading for understanding	32	21.62%

Looking at the responses that contained the category "providing a justification,"

most of the subjects explained their wish to spend the evening with the wife instead of

going to the game with the friend. However, this was not the only justification provided

for lying. Other reasons provided for having lied were that the friend would not

understand, and therefore the lie was necessary (R13, R83, R111), fear that the friend

would get upset (R12, R85, R101, R106, R126), or that the friend would make fun of him if told the truth (R104, R108). Yet other reasons were vaguer, such as an important family event (R90, R118), or yet another lie, such as that the business trip got cancelled (R109).

Out of the remaining 30 responses that did not contain the category "providing a justification," 11 included the strategy "blaming someone else or denying responsibility." In all these instances, the respondents blamed the wife for having to lie to the friend. The reasons were more or less direct, such as the wife insisting that he stayed home (R17, R47, R62, R75, R82, R89, R116, R125, R135), the wife asking him to choose between her and his friends (R78), or even that she would file for a divorce (R131). What it is interesting here is the fact that the subjects of the survey, which are females, consider that males would blame their wives in this situation.

After discussing the results of the previous five situations, it is not surprising to find "IFID" as the second most used category for the situation "Lying to Best Friend." This time it was present in 69 responses, that is 46.62%, and together with "intensified IFID" accounts for more than half of the instances containing an explicit apology.

Finally, two more aspects of the results presented in Table 15 draw one's attention. One of them is the fact that only 29 respondents (19.59%) explicitly acknowledged the fact that they are responsible for having lied. Out of these, 23 instances appeared in combination with "providing a justification," which suggests a strategy of diminishing this responsibility. The other one is the low frequency of the strategy "offer of repair," which was present in only 30 of the responses (20.27%). Both the circumstances of the situation (missing a game with a friend) and the fact that this

94

strategy was used in the apology on the show predicted a higher frequency. A possible explanation for these results could be that Romanian speakers that did not make this offer implied that there will be other situations in which the two could go and watch a game together, or that the offense was not as serious as to prevent the two from going to games in the future. One could also consider the socio-cultural implications of lying in Romanian culture. Lying is considered a serious offense, especially if one lies to his or her best friend. Therefore, it is not surprising that the respondents try to do their best to save face in this situation.

5.7. Situation 7: Being away for Christmas

Just like the "Smoking" situation, this situation is between husband and wife, as opposed to the other eight situations that take place among friends. One of the characters in the show had recently moved his job to another town, away from his wife. Christmas came and it turned out that he had to work, and thus he had to be away from his wife over the holidays. He told this to his wife and apologized: "I'm sorry I won't be here." (Abrams, 2002). Thus, the strategy used on the show was, again, as with the other situation among husband and wife, a standalone category, namely an "IFID."

While "IFID" was used in combination with other categories in many instances, it did not appear as a standalone category in the survey results at all. Typical apologies in this situation included, besides an "IFID," either "offer of repair" or "providing a justification." Below is an example of an apology that combines "IFID" and "offer of repair" in the strategy used to apologize:

Draga mea, îmi pare rău că nu putem petrece acest Crăciun împreună,... **[IFID]**

... dar am să mă revanşez cu următoarea ocazie. **[Offer of repair]**

Dear-fem. my-fem., to-me feels bad that no can-1st-pl. spend this Christmas together, but have-aux-1st-sg. would to-me make-up-1st-sg. with next occasion.

'My dear, I'm sorry we won't be able to spend this Christmas together, …'
[IFID]

'… but I'll make it up to you as soon as possible.' **[Offer of repair]**

And here is an example of an apology that combines the category "IFID" with "providing a justification:"

Îmi pare rău că nu voi putea veni de Crăciun,... **[IFID]**
... dar ştii cât contează pentru mine să mă realizez profesional. Şi apoi, vom avea mai mulţi bani. **[Providing a justification]**

To-me feels bad that no want-aux-1st-sg. can come of Christmas, but know-2nd-sg. how-much matters for me would to-me succeed-1st-sg. professionally. And then, want-1st-pl. have degr. many money.

'I'm sorry I won't be able to come for Christmas, …' **[IFID]**
'… but you know how much building a career means to me. And then, we'll have more money.' **[Providing a justification]**

The apologies for this situation were only slightly less in number than the previous ones, but there were fewer instances for the most common ones than in the case of previously discussed situations. Moreover, out of all the situations already discussed,

"Being away for Christmas" had the lowest frequency for the most often used strategies, namely only 16 instances (10.7%) for the combination of "IFID" and "providing a justification," and 14 (9.3%) for "IFID" and "offer of repair." This means that unlike previous situations, where, even though the number of different strategies used was high, the responses were clustered around a few typical ones, and the other strategies had between 1 and 3 instances, in the case of this situation, the less often used strategies had a slightly higher number of instances. Variety is, therefore, the key word for this situation, there being many ways one can apologize in this situation. Table 16 shows the 5 most often used strategies:

Table 16: *Apology strategies for situation 7: Being away for Christmas*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	16	10.7%
IFID + Offer of repair	14	9.3%
Providing a justification	13	8.66%
Avoiding or postponing an apology	10	6.66%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	10	6.66%

Another aspect that Table 16 shows is that this time two of the first five most often used strategies were standalone categories, and only three were combinations, unlike most of the situations where the most common strategies were only combinations of basic categories. Thus, the "providing a justification" besides being part of the combination that is the most frequently used strategy, appeared by itself as the third most often used strategy in this situation, with a frequency of 13 out of the 150 responses, that is 8.7% of all the responses. The second standalone category was "avoiding or postponing an apology," which was the fourth most frequent strategy, with 10 instances,

that is 6.7% of the apologies in this situation. I will discuss this category more later on, when discussing the basic categories.

While "providing a justification" and "avoiding or postponing an apology" were often used as standalone categories in apology strategies, they were not the most often used basic categories overall in this situation either as standalone or in combinations. Table 17 shows the distribution of the basic categories in this situation:

Table 17: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 7: Being away for Christmas*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	10	6.66%
IFID	53	35.33%
Intensified IFID	34	22.66%
Providing a justification	82	54.66%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	0	0%
Offer of repair	65	43.33%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	22	14.66%
Promise of non-recurrence	9	6%
Attacking the complainer	0	0%
Pleading for understanding	31	20.66%

The variety of strategies in the case of this situation discussed earlier is demonstrated by the high frequency of many of the basic categories, as can be seen in Table 17. The most often used basic category, be it as a standalone category or in combinations, was "providing a justification," which was present in 82 of the 150 apologies, that is in 54.66% of the responses. This situation is different than the other ones in the survey, in that the situation is clearly out of the control of the person who apologizes. This needs to be taken into consideration when analyzing the results. What is interesting here is that in spite of not being responsible for the action, the respondents believed that this situation requires a justification or explanation. Also, 65 apologies,

which accounts for 43.33% of the responses, used the category "offer of repair" in order to lessen the effects of the fact that the husband and wife were not going to spend Christmas together. Finally, the two categories "IFID" and "intensified IFID" had a high frequency, as well, and were mostly used in combinations with the other two basic categories presented above.

Insofar as the category "providing a justification" is concerned, the justification given in most of the cases was either the fact that the job and a career is important for the apologizer (R2, R67, R70, R77), that doing this would mean a better way of living in the long run (R6, R29, R72, R105), or that this job means earning more money (R6, R76, R91, R92). The apologies that made use of the category "offer of repair" can broadly be divided into two. Some responses gave vague offers, mostly using the phrase "I'll make it up to you somehow" without specifying what the repair would consist of (R24, R27, R79, R145). Other respondents promised either that they will spend New Year's Eve together with their wife (R8, R46, R102, R110, R122), or that they will find other occasions to spend time together (R7, R9, R54, R150).

Another interesting result that can be seen in both Table 16 and Table 17 is the relatively high frequency of the category "avoiding or postponing an apology," not that much as percentage of all the responses, but considering the fact that most of the common strategies had relatively low frequencies in this situation. What the respondents did instead, was explain to the wife how miserable they will feel due to not spending Christmas together (R1, R21, R68, R130), say that they will nevertheless communicate on the phone or be together in spirit (R100), downplay the importance of Christmas (R128, R154), or merely explain the situation without apologizing, or this explanation

being phrased as a justification for not being home for Christmas (R146). Yet other subjects asked the wife to go with him instead (R129, R134).

Finally, there is one more aspect that makes the apologies to this situation interesting and unique. Even though this is not typical, there were quite a few apologies that started out with a "preparation" of the listener for what was to come, in order to diminish the severity of the act that required the apology. Thus, some respondents started their apology by stating to the wife that Christmas is an important holiday for them, and that they value spending time with their wife during such holidays. Here are a few examples of such preparations: "My dear, you know I love you very much. You are everything for me…" (R11), "Spending Christmas with you is what I like most…" (R32), "Honey, you know that what I want the most is to spend all the time with you, especially holidays…" (R69). The use of this strategy that is not an apology, but builds up to the apology that follows, suggests the fact that the respondents consider Christmas a very important holiday in their life, one that needs to be spent with one's family. It is also an indirect acknowledgment on the part of the speaker of the fact that not being home for Christmas is a very face threatening situation, one for which apologizing does not seem to be enough, and extra steps need to be taken in order to save one's face.

5.8. Situation 8: Being Late

Situation 8 is again related to being late, as was the fourth situation, "Late for Birthday Dinner." However, this time, even though the situation was still among friends, it was somewhat less formal. The character who was late was supposed to meet his friend in the latter's office, as opposed to being late from a dinner party at a restaurant in

situation 4. The strategy used to apologize was a standalone category, "IFID:" "Hey! I'm sorry I kept you waiting so long." (Buckner & Jones, 2001).

Unlike the previously discussed situation, "IFID" is present as a standalone category with "Being Late." However, "IFID" is still not a typical response. By far the most frequent apologies for this situation were the combinations between "IFID" and either "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" or "providing a justification." Here is an example of the first combination:

Scuze pentru întârziere,... **[IFID]**

... însâ traficul este teribil şi de-abia am putut ajunge până la tine. **[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]**

Apologies for delay, but traffic-the is terrible and of-almost have-aux-1st-sg. could arrive until at you.

'I apologize for being late,…' **[IFID]**

'… but traffic is terrible and I could barely get here.' **[Blaming someone else or denying responsibility]**

As mentioned above, the second frequent combination was "IFID" with "providing a justification," as in the example below:

Îmi pare rău că am întârziat, ... **[IFID]**

… dar a trebuit să mă opresc pe la farmacie deoarece sunt cam răcit. **[Providing a justification]**

To-me feels bad that have-aux-1st-sg. been-late, but have-aux-3rd-sg. had would

to-me stop by pharmacy because am sort cold.

'I'm sorry I'm late, …' **[IFID]**

'… but I had to stop by the pharmacy as I think I've got the flu.' **[Providing a justification]**

The results show that the apology strategies for this situation were more homogeneous than for the other situations discussed. There were only 24 different strategies used, be it a standalone category or a combination, with 2 out of these accounting for 62.7% of the responses. Table 18 shows the frequencies of the first four most often used apologies:

Table 18: *Apology strategies for situation 8: Being Late*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	57	38%
IFID + Providing a justification	37	24.7%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	12	8%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	6	4%

The results in the table above demonstrate the fact that unlike on the show, the Romanian respondents believed that they need to do more in order to save face than to use only an "IFID" in their apology. Thus, 57 out of the 150 apologies, that is 38%, contained the combination "IFID" and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility," while 37, that is 24.7%, combined "IFID" with "providing a justification." Again, a standalone category was among the most frequently used apologies, namely "blaming

someone else or denying responsibility." This category was the third most often used strategy with a frequency of 12, representing 8% of the responses.

The category "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" was also the second most often used basic category either by itself or combined with other categories. 79 respondents, that is 52.66%, used this category to apologize in this situation. However, as can be seen in Table 19, the category which was used by most of the respondents either as a standalone or a combination category was "IFID," used in 115 responses:

Table 19: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 8: Being Late*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	6	4%
IFID	115	76.66%
Intensified IFID	12	8%
Providing a justification	56	37.33%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	4	2.66%
Offer of repair	1	0.66%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	79	52.66%
Promise of non-recurrence	8	5.33%
Attacking the complainer	1	0.66%
Pleading for understanding	8	5.33%

Even though out of the 115 responses that contain the category "IFID" in the apology only 3 used this category alone, these results are not so much different from the apology given on the show. The only difference is, as in the case of situation 7, "Being away for Christmas," that the subjects of the survey added another category, or even 2 categories, to the "IFID." The difference is, as already mentioned in the case of other situations, that the Romanian speakers believed that they need a stronger apology for this situation, even though it was among friends. After analyzing these two situations, it can be said that the subjects of the survey believed that the act for which they had to

apologize, namely being late, was more face threatening than what the characters on the show believed.

Additionally, the apologies given for the situation under discussion were very similar to the ones given for situation 4, "Late for Friend's Birthday," insofar as the category "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" is concerned. Again, the objects of the speakers' blame were most often the car breaking down and traffic. There were, however, some different blames that were not present in the other situation involving somebody being late. These were present due to the circumstances in which this situation takes places, namely in a business building. Thus, some of the respondents blamed the boss, a coworker, or an acquaintance they met in the building and could not get away from.

Finally, it is interesting to look at the different excuses and explanations given for the third most often used category, namely "providing a justification." Some of the justifications were precise, such as having to take care of something related to family (R101), having to stop by the pharmacy for medication (R124), mixing up the office where they were supposed to meet (R130, R154), or missing the bus (R135). As with blaming someone else, some of the justifications were related to the context of the situation, such as having to finish a project first (R90, R143, R146), or having to talk to the secretary about something urgent (R153). Most of the respondents gave, however, vaguer justifications, stating that there was something they needed to take care of and that was why they were late (R13, R15, R25, R70, R92, R96, R107, R114, R139, R142).

5.9. Situation 9: Deleting Speech from the Computer

This situation took place in a hotel room, with the participants attending a conference. One of the characters was working on his speech on a computer, when his friend entered the room and asked for permission to check his email messages. Something happened, and the friend accidentally deleted the speech from the computer. Therefore, he apologized: "I'm so sorry!" (Goldberg-Meehan & Silveri, 2003). The apology used on the show for this situation was, thus, a standalone category, namely "intensified IFID."

Insofar as the responses given on the survey, the ones with the highest frequency for this situation did contain this strategy, but they also contained an "offer of repair," as can be seen in the example below:

Vai, îmi pare nespus de rău pentru ceea ce s-a întâmplat. ... **[Intensified IFID]**

… Dar o să te ajut să faci un alt discurs. **[Offer of repair]**

Oh, to-me feels unsaid of bad for that what to-it have-aux-3rd-sg. happened. But it-fem. would you-obj. help-1st-sg. would do-2nd-sg. a-masc. other speech.

'Oh, I'm incredibly sorry for what's happened. …' **[Intensified IFID]**

'… But I'll help you write another speech.' **[Offer of repair]**

Alternatively, some of the responses contained an "IFID" instead of an "intensified IFID" in combination with "offer of repair:"

Iartă-mă, ... **[IFID]**

... o să stau până târziu şi o să-ţi fac altul cât pot de reuşit, sau o să te ajut pe tine

dacă accepţi. **[Offer of repair]**

Forgive-imper.-2nd-sg-imper. me, it would stay-1st-sg. until late and it would to-

Forgive-imper.-2nd-sg-imper. me, it would stay-1st-sg. until late and it would to-

you do another-the how can-1st-sg. of successful, or it would you-obj. help-1st-sg.

on you-obj. if accept-2nd-sg.

'Forgive me, …' **[IFID]**

'… I'll stay up late and write another one as well as I can, or I'll help you if you

accept that.' **[Offer of repair]**

However, even though these two combinations were the ones that had the highest

frequencies, they cannot be called typical, as they represent only 14.7% and 10%,

respectively, of all the responses. As was the case with many of the situations already

discussed, the apologies provided for "Deleting Speech from the Computer" were spread

across 34 different strategies using standalone categories or combinations of two, three,

and even four basic categories. Table 20 shows the apologies with the highest frequency

used in this situation, all of them including "offer of repair:"

Table 20: *Apology strategies for situation 9: Deleting Speech from the Computer*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
Intensified IFID + Offer of repair	22	14.7%
IFID + Offer of repair	15	10%
Intensified IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	12	8%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	11	7.3%
Offer of repair	10	6.7%

This situation demonstrates, once again, that the Romanian speakers in the survey

believe that using just an IFID, or even an intensified one, is not enough, that the offense

106

is serious, and it requires more on their part in order to save face. All of the strategies presented in Table 20 contained "offer of repair" either as a standalone category or in combinations. Another category that was used in the combinations presented in the table above was "acknowledgment of responsibility." Thus, 12 responses, accounting for 8% of the apologies, combined an "intensified IFID" with "acknowledgment of responsibility" and "offer of repair." Also, 11 responses, namely 7.3% of the apologies, used the combination of an "IFID" with "acknowledgment of responsibility" and "offer of repair." Insofar as the strategy used on the show is concerned, namely "intensified IFID," this was used as a standalone category only in two responses, which means only 1.34%.

It is obvious that offering to make up for the mistake was one of the preferred strategies in this situation. This can also be seen in the table below:

Table 21: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 9: Deleting Speech from the Computer*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	7	4.69%
IFID	57	38.25%
Intensified IFID	46	30.87%
Providing a justification	16	10.73%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	60	40.28%
Offer of repair	105	70.46%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	8	5.36%
Promise of non-recurrence	0	0%
Attacking the complainer	3	2.01%
Pleading for understanding	16	10.73%

Thus, 70.46% of the apologies contained an "offer of repair." There were different ways that the speakers offered to repair the act that required the apology. Some of the respondents offered to write a new speech themselves, while others offered to help

their friend rewrite the speech. Yet other subjects offered to go to the conference presentation and explain what happened and take full responsibility for having deleted the speech, or to give the speech themselves. There were also some more general offers of help, such as asking for a way to make up to the friend for having deleted the speech. An interesting aspect of the apologies that contained an offer of repair is that the person apologizing was sometimes optimistic, saying that the speech he or the two will write will be much better than the original one.

As can be seen in Table 21, the second most often used basic category, either by itself or in combinations with other basic categories, was "acknowledgment of responsibility." Thus, besides offering to help, which one might claim is an implicit way of acknowledging responsibility, in many cases the speakers made it explicitly clear that it was their fault, or that they were responsible for what had happened. However, this acknowledgment had different degrees. In some cases, the speakers took full responsibility for having done something wrong and thus deleting the speech. In other cases, the person apologizing admitted to having deleted the speech, but also mentioned that they did not know what happened, or how they did that.

Finally, as in most of the situations already discussed, the category "IFID" had a high frequency, as well, in this situation being present in 57 apologies, accounting for 38.25% of the apologies. If we add the number of times "intensified IFID" was used, that is in 30.86% of the responses, the results show that 69.11% of the apologies contained one form or another of an Illocutionary Force Indicating Device. The speakers believed, thus, in this situation, as well, that they need to utter an explicit apology.

5.10. Situation 10: Taking Friend's Jeans

The last situation in the survey took place between two female friends who share an apartment. One of them took her friend's jeans without asking, and the friend found out. Therefore, the following apology was given on the show: "All right, I took them. But I figured it'd be O.K. because you've got a big ink stain on the crotch." (Fleming Jr., 2001). This time, the strategy used by the character on the show was a combination of categories, namely between "acknowledgment of responsibility" and "providing a justification."

Even though this combination was not used at all in the responses given to the survey, "providing a justification" was present in most of the apologies. The example below is for the most typical combination, namely between an "IFID" and "providing a justification:"

Scuză-mă, ... **[IFID]**

... dar n-am apucat să vorbesc cu tine şi eram în criză de timp. Nu puteam să fac altfel. **[Providing a justification]**

Forgive-imper.-2nd-sg. me, but no-have-aux-1st-sg. catch would talk-1st-sg. with you-obj. and be-imperf.-1st-sg. in crisis of time. No can-imperf.-1st-sg. would do-1st-sg. otherwise.

'Forgive-me, …' **[IFID]**

'… but I didn't manage to talk to you, and I was running out of time. There was nothing else I could do.' **[Providing a justification]**

Besides this combination, "providing a justification" was also used sometimes as a standalone category in the apologies in the data:

Intenționam să-ți spun, dar nu te-am găsit şi aveam mare nevoie de ei. **[Providing a justification]**

Intend-imperf.-1st-sg. would to-you tell-1st-sg., but no you-obj. have-aux-1st-sg. found and have-inperf.-1st-sg. big need of them.

'I intended to tell you, but I couldn't find you and I needed them badly.'
[Providing a justification]

Besides these, "providing a justification" was part of 20 other combinations out of the total 38 combinations of categories used to apologize in this situation. Some of the most frequent strategies are presented in Table 22:

Table 22: *Apology strategies for situation 10: Taking Friend's Jeans*

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	43	28.7%
Providing a justification	14	9.3%
Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	11	7.3%
IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	8	5.3%
IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	7	4.7%

The table above shows that the combination "IFID" and "providing a justification" was the one most frequently used of all the strategies, as it was present in 43 instances, representing 28.7%. "Providing a justification" as a standalone category was the second most frequent apology, used in 14 cases, namely 9.3%. Finally, the first most often used 5 strategies contained, besides these two, combinations between

110

"providing a justification" and categories such as "IFID," "promise of non-recurrence," and "pleading for understanding."

Insofar as the distribution of basic categories is concerned, "providing a justification" was by far the most often used one either as a standalone or in combinations. This category was present in 121 apologies, accounting for 81.20% of all responses. Below are the frequencies of all the basic categories for this situation:

Table 23: *Frequency of basic categories in apologies for situation 10: Taking Friend's Jeans*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Avoiding or postponing an apology	3	2.01%
IFID	96	64.42%
Intensified IFID	6	4.02%
Providing a justification	121	81.20%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	30	20.13%
Offer of repair	18	12.08%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	2	1.34%
Promise of non-recurrence	30	20.13%
Attacking the complainer	3	2.01%
Pleading for understanding	31	20.80%

The high frequency of use for the category "providing a justification" brings about a great variety in the justifications or explanations given by the person who is apologizing. A frequently used justification seems to be the fact that the speaker had a date, and therefore needed a new pair of jeans, which she borrowed from her friend. Other justifications included not having any clean jeans left, not being able to find the friend to ask for the jeans, or that she was sure that her friend would not mind. Yet other respondents mentioned that they took the jeans without asking because if they had asked, they would have been refused.

The second most often used basic category was, as was the case with most of the situations, "IFID." This strategy was used in 96 instances, which means that 64.42% of the subjects felt the need to use an explicit apology. An additional 4.02% have used "intensified IFID" instead.

Even though the combination on the show, namely "acknowledgment of responsibility" and "providing a justification," was not present in the data at all, Table 23 shows that "acknowledgment of responsibility" was used quite often, namely in 20.13% of the responses. The same percentage of respondents also promised not to do this again, which is reflected in the 30 instances in which the category "promise of non-recurrence" was used.

Finally, an interesting aspect of the findings presented in Table 23 is the fact that two respondents used the category "blaming someone else or denying responsibility," which might sound strange considering the circumstances under which the action that triggered the apology took place, namely between two friends in the apartment they were sharing. In one of the two instances the speaker denied having taken the jeans on purpose, saying that she must have put them in her bag by mistake when packing other things (R8). This was then followed by another category, namely "pleading for understanding." The second respondent who used this category also claimed to have taken them by mistake, and blamed this on the fact that her friend's jeans look similar to her own ones. This time, the category was combined with an "IFID."

5.11. Summary

This chapter investigated the relationship between the specific circumstances of each situation and the choice of strategies that the respondents made. The chapter also

answered some of the research questions of the study, namely what the most frequently used categories were in each situation, as well as what kind of combinations the respondents used in their strategies to apologize. Different ways of realizing these categories (such as types of justifications, offers provided, for example) were also discussed.

One of the conclusions that can be drawn after discussing the situations is that there seems to be a relationship between the amount of detail provided in the apologies and the seriousness of the threat that the offense has to the face of the speaker. The seriousness of the offense is closely related to the kind of social norms that the offender violated. Thus, the more severe the offense was perceived to be by the speaker, such as wearing the wrong clothes at a wedding, missing the wedding ceremony, or being late for a birthday dinner where several friends are waiting, the more elaborate the details in providing justifications and blaming someone or something else, respectively. These three situations involved more than just the two interlocutors (the person apologizing and the recipient of the apology), so the face of the speaker was threatened even more, as his or her image would have been different in many people's opinion. As opposed to these situations, other situations in which "providing a justification" or "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" were used represented interpersonal interactions involving only the speaker and the hearer, and therefore one could claim that the offender's face was threatened less, and therefore less detail were provided in their apologies.

Besides the perceived severity of the offense, another factor that influenced the choice of strategies was whether the offense produced consequences beyond the interaction in the situation or not. Thus, in "Breaking a China Plate," where there was

material damage involved, and "Deleting Speech from the Computer," where the consequences involved the incapacity of giving a speech the next day, the category "offer of repair" was the most often used category. Thus, the consequences of the offenses in these two categories were perceived even more severe than the ones in the situations for which a justification was given or somebody or something else was blamed. Therefore, the speakers considered that they needed to offer a way to make up for such consequences in order to save their face. This hypothesis is confirmed by the use of the explicit apology categories "IFID" and "Intensified IFID," as well. They were used in all the situations, with "IFID" being always much more frequent than the "intensified IFID." However, in the two situations involving further consequences, the frequency of intensified IFIDs was higher than in the other situations, this being another way of signaling the severity of these two situations.

The category "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" is clearly preferred by the speakers in the three situations that implied being late, namely "Late for Birthday Dinner" and "Being Late." It is impossible to tell whether the choice of this apology strategy is because people in Romania are most often late due to circumstances that are out of their control, or because this is the easiest way to get out of the situation with the least threat to one's face. Probably the only way to answer this question would be to do a corpus based analysis of when exactly this category is used.

Finally, there seems to be no relationship between the socio-cultural aspects of the situations and the number of categories used in combinations. In all the situations, the proportion between the strategies using two, three, four, or five categories was about the same.

Chapter VI

Conclusions

The aim of this study was to examine the types of categories that Romanian speakers use to apologize in situations that require interaction among friends, as well as how these categories combine to form apology strategies. Some of the findings are similar to previous studies on other languages, while other findings are different than the ones reported on various languages.

The findings have shown that the most often used category, either as a standalone one or in combination with other categories, was the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device. This is consistent with Bergman and Kasper's (1993) findings on speakers of Thai and of American English. If the relatively high frequency of the intensified IFID is also considered, the conclusion is that Romanian speakers prefer explicit expressions of apology, which is consistent with previous findings on New Zealand English (Holmes, 1990) and Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Nagano, 1985; Taguchi, 1991). Also, the categories "providing a justification," "offer of repair," and "blaming someone else or denying responsibility" had a higher frequency than the other categories.

The preference for such categories suggests the fact that saving face is very important for the Romanian speakers in the survey. Also, the preference for combinations with categories that imply minimizing or denying responsibility rather than with

115

categories that acknowledge responsibility is consistent with findings on British English (Deutschmann, 2003) but unlike those on German (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989).

Insofar as the combination of basic categories is concerned, the findings show that an overwhelming majority of the apologies were combinations rather than standalone categories. This is one of the areas where Romanian differs from findings about some languages, such as English, where the proportion of combinations has been found to be around half (Holmes, 1990), or Lombok, where combinations were found to be almost nonexistent (Wouk, In Press). However, there are other languages that have been found to prefer combinations over single categories, such as Akan (Obeng, 1999) and German (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989). While this is what the findings of the different studies showed, it is not possible to generalize this as absolute truth of what the situation is in each of these languages.

Also, the most often used combinations were by far "IFID" with "providing a justification" and "IFID" with "blaming someone else or denying responsibility," which supports the idea presented above about the preference for minimizing or denying responsibility, especially in the case of the situations in which the person apologizing was late.

However, the qualitative analysis of the data has also shown that the respondents not only tried to save their own face in their apologies, but were also concerned with maintaining the friendship with the hearer, sometimes even explicitly mentioning that their friendship was more important than the action that brought about the apology. This would suggest an attempt to save what Nwoye (1992) called "group face," even though

the responses did not go to the extent of saving the face of the entire community or ethnic group.

The second question that the present study tried to answer was how the apology strategies in the survey compare to the ones actually given in each of the situations on the show from which they were taken. One of the most important differences was that even though on the show four of the situations produced apologies with a single category, and six produced combinations of categories, in the survey data the most frequently used strategies in all the situations consist of combinations of categories.

Regarding whether the apologies in the data were the same, similar, or different from the ones on the show, the most frequently used apology in the data was the same as the one used on the show only in two out of the ten situations, namely "Wearing Wrong Clothes" and "Missing the Wedding Ceremony." There were four other situations, "Smoking," "Late for Birthday Dinner," "Lying to Best Friend," and "Taking Friend's Jeans" that had similar strategies to the ones on the show. What I mean by similar is that one of the strategies used was slightly different, such as "IFID" instead of "intensified IFID," or that only one of the categories in the combination in the survey data was different from the one on the show. Four other situations had completely different apology strategies in the data than the ones on the show. These situations were "Breaking a China Plate," "Being away for Christmas," "Being Late," and "Deleting Speech from the Computer." In all of these situations, the apology on the show was a standalone category, whereas the respondents to the survey believed that the situations required a more complex apology.

The present study also has some limitations. The most important one is that due to the nature of the university whose students participated in this study (students studying philology and languages in Romania are mostly female students), the subjects turned out to be overwhelmingly skewed towards females. This led to the decision to include only females in the present study. Such a situation prevented any cross-gender analysis of apologies, which might have yielded some interesting results. Related to this issue, even though half of the situations were interactions only between males, and half included women, as well, most of the apologies (eight out of ten) needed to be given by males. Thus, the question is whether the apologies given by the respondents were what they would expect males to say, or what they think males would say. Since the data did not allow for a study of whether males and females use different strategies to apologize, it is impossible to say whether this situation would be a limitation for interpreting the findings or not. Also, even though it was not the main purpose of this paper, there is a comparison in the discussion of the results between the data findings of the survey on the one hand and the apologies on the show and in previous studies on the other hand. This comparison is by no means meant as a generalization, as this would not be possible when comparing data collected through DCT with a scripted apology in a comedy. The comparison was meant only to raise awareness of some of the differences that might exist between the two, a further study using the same situations administered to native speakers of English being needed in order to be able to draw any kind of valid and useful conclusions.

Even though there is some discussion about the relationship between socio-cultural norms and the choice of strategies in the case of some of the situations presented in this thesis, a more in-depth analysis of this issue is planned to be done in a future study

118

that will compare the way apologies are produced in Romanian and English. Such a comparative analysis would be more effective than the one the present thesis allows. Finally, the lack of previous studies on apologies in Romanian prevented any comparisons with other types of Romanian subjects, or other situations.

Consequently, further study is needed before any generalization can be made. The first step would be including male subjects in the study, which would open up the possibility to analyzing apologies across gender. Another possible direction could be the broadening of both the age range of the respondents, and their social background, which would lead to a better understanding of how social and demographic factors influence the choice of apology strategies. Also, comparative studies with other languages, especially English which is the most commonly studied foreign language in Romania, using the same situations and methodology would be beneficial. And it is such a comparison between the way Romanian speakers and native speakers of English apologize using the same method and the same situations for which the present study is planned to be the basis.

Finally, even though the findings of this study do not allow for a generalization, there are some important implications that can be drawn from them. The most important is that knowing what strategies native speakers of Romanian use to apologize is important in order to raise awareness among the Romanian learners of English as a foreign language regarding the differences in apologetic strategy use in Romanian and English. For example, as the findings of the study show, all of the situations had predominantly combinations of categories as apologies, whereas previous studies have shown that in English the proportion is about half combinations and half standalone

categories. Thus, if teachers are aware of the existence of such differences, they can teach which type of strategy is more appropriate for certain types of situations. Last, but not least, the findings of the present study contribute to the knowledge of how apologies are produced in different languages, which is necessary in order to better understand how speech acts work across languages and cultures.

References

Abrams, D. (Writer) (2002). The one with Christmas in Tulsa [DVD]. In R. Allen

    (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Allan, K. (1998). Speech act classification and definition. In J. L. Mey (Ed.), *Concise*

    encyclopedia of pragmatics (pp. 922-926). New York: Elsevier.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard

    University Press.

Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*.

    Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Barnlund, D. C., & Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles.

    International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14(2), 193-206. Retrieved March

    31, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (1995). Natural speech act versus written

    questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance.

    In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to*

    communication in a second language (pp. 65-88). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and

    nonnative apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage*

    pragmatics (pp. 82-107). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bharuthram, S. (2003). Politeness phenomena in the Hindu sector of the South African

    Indian English speaking community. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*(10-11), 1523-

    1544. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989a). Investigating cross-cultural

    pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper

    (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 1-36). Norwood,

    New Jersey: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989b). *Cross-cultural pragmatics:*

    Requests and apologies. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of

    speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 196-212.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*.

    New York: Cambridge University Press.

Buckner, B., & Jones, S. (Writers) (2001). The one with Rachel's date [DVD]. In R.

    Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Butler, C. D. (2001). *The role of context in the apology speech act: A socio-constructivist*

    analysis of the interpretations of native English-speaking college students.

    Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Capone, A. (2005). Pragmemes (a study with reference to English and Italian). *Journal of*

    Pragmatics, 37(9), 1355-1371. Retrieved December 22, 2005, from

    ScienceDirect.

Cohen, A. D. (1995). Investigating the production of speech act sets. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 21-44). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cohen, A. D. (1996a). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 253-267.

Cohen, A. D. (1996b). Speech acts. In S. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383 – 420). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1985). Comparing apologies across languages. In K. R. Jankowsky (Ed.), *Scientific and humanistic dimensions of language*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1994). Researching the production of second-language speech acts. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second-language acquisition* (pp. 143-156). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cordella, M. (1992). *Travels, cultures and speech acts: A pragmatic study in apology*. Melbourne: Dept. of Romance Languages, Monash University.

Crane, D., & Kauffman, M. (Writers) (2001). The one after "I do" [DVD]. In R. Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Cutting, J. (2001). The speech acts of the in-group. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(8), 1207-1233. Retrieved December 22, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Deutschmann, M. (2003). *Apologising in British English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Umeå Universiteit, Unmeå.

Edmundson, R. J. (1992). *Evidence for native speaker notions of apologizing and accepting apologies in American English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Fleming Jr., R. L. (Writer) (2001). The one with the stain [DVD]. In R. Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Fraser, B. (1981). On apologizing. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 259-271). New York: Mouton.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 219-236. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Garcia, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingua, 8*(1), 3-20.

Geis, M. L. (1995). *Speech acts and conversational interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldberg-Meehan, S. (Writer) (2002). The one with Rachel's other sister [DVD]. In R. Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Goldberg-Meehan, S., & Silveri, S. (Writers) (2003). The one in Barbados, part 1 [DVD]. In R. Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 237-257. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Harlow, L. L. (1990). Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 74*(3), 328-351. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from JSTOR.

Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society, 19*(2), 155-199.

Holmes, J. (1993). New Zealand women are good to talk to: An analysis of politeness strategies in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 20*(2), 91-116. Retrieved March 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Holtgraves, T. (1986). Language structure in social interaction: Perceptions of direct and indirect speech acts and interactants who use them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(2), 305-314. Retrieved December 20, 2005, from PsycARTICLES (10.1037/0022-3514.51.2.305).

Jordá, M. P. S. (2005). *Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jung, E. H. S. (2004). Interlanguage pragmatics: Apology speech acts. In C. L. Moder & A. Martinovic-Zic (Eds.), *Discourse across languages and cultures* (pp. 99-116). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). *Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics* (Report - Descriptive). Manoa: Hawaii University, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Kotani, M. (1999). A discourse analytic aproach to the study of Japanese apology: The "feel-good" apology as a cultural category. In N. Sugimoto (Ed.), *Japanese apology across disciplines* (pp. 125-154). Commack, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers.

Kunerth, M. (Writer) (2002). The one with Rachel's phone number [DVD]. In R. Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; Or minding your p's and q's, *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Lubecka, A. (2000). *Requests, invitations, apologies, and compliments in American English and Polish: A cross-cultural communication perspective*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., & Kasper, G. (1995). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 155-190). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 115-132). New York: Mouton.

Márquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*(4), 403-426. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mir, M. (1992). Do we all apologize the same? - An empirical study on the act of apologizing by Spanish speakers learning English. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, 3*, 1-19.

Nagano, M. (1985). *"How to say I'm sorry" : the use of apologies in Japan and the United States.* Unpublished master's thesis, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California.

Nwoye, O. G. (1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of Pragmatics, 18*(4), 309-328. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Obeng, S. G. (1999). Apologies in Akan discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(5), 709-734. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech-act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Owen, M. (1983). *Apologies and remedial interchanges: A study of language use in social interaction*. New York: Mouton.

Rintell, E. M., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 248-272). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Rose, K. R. (1992). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics, 17*(1), 49-62. Retrieved December 20, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Rose, K. R. (1994). On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-western contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15*(1), 1-14.

Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. *Journal of Pragmatics, 30*(4), 457-484. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Saussure, F. d. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Savina, E. (2002). *The influence of American English on Russian apologies*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Dominguez Hills, California.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5*, 1-23.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silveri, S. (Writer) (2002). The one with Phoebe's birthday dinner [DVD]. In R. Allen (Producer), *Friends*. United States: Warner Bros. Television.

Staab, C. F. (1983). Making implicit knowledge explicit: A review of four theories for analyzing language by function. *Language Sciences, 5*(1), 21-35. Retrieved December 27, 2005, from Science Direct.

Sugimoto, N. (1999). A Japan-U.S. comparison of apology styles. In N. Sugimoto (Ed.), *Japanese apology across disciplines* (pp. 79-104). Commack, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers.

Suszczynska, M. (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: Different languages, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(8), 1053-1065. Retrieved March 29, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Suzuki, T. (1999). A rhetorical analysis of Japanese apologetic discourse. In N. Sugimoto (Ed.), *Japanese apology across disciplines* (pp. 155-184). Commack, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers.

Taguchi, M. (1991). *Politeness strategies in requests and apologies by American-English and Japanese learners of English.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Tamanaha, M. (2003). *Interlanguage speech act realization of apologies and complaints: The performances of Japanese L2 speakers in comparison with Japanese L1 and English L1 speakers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11*(2), 147-167. Retrieved March 20, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vollmer, H. J., & Olshtain, E. (1989). The language of apologies in German. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 197-220). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Wee, L. (2004). 'Extreme communicative acts' and the boosting of illocutionary force. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(12), 2161-2178. Retrieved December 22, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Wouk, F. (In Press). The language of apologizing in Lombok, Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics, Corrected Proof*. Retrieved December 20, 2005, from ScienceDirect.

Appendices

Appendix A: Overall Use of Apology Strategies

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Providing a justification	277	18.52%
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	170	11.36%
Providing a justification	78	5.21%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	60	4.01%
IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	55	3.68%
IFID + Offer of repair	54	3.61%
Intensified IFID + Offer of repair	52	3.48%
Avoiding or postponing an apology	49	3.28%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	49	3.28%
Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	46	3.07%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	33	2.21%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	29	1.94%
Providing a justification + Offer of repair	28	1.87%
IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	25	1.67%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	24	1.60%
Offer of repair	22	1.47%
IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	20	1.34%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility	19	1.27%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	17	1.14%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	16	1.07%
IFID + Pleading for understanding	16	1.07%
Intensified IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	16	1.07%
Attacking the complainer	13	0.87%
Intensified IFID + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	12	0.80%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	11	0.74%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Pleading for understanding	11	0.74%
Acknowledgment of responsibility	11	0.74%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	11	0.74%

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	10	0.67%
Intensified IFID	10	0.67%
Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	10	0.67%
Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Pleading for understanding	10	0.67%
IFID	9	0.60%
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Pleading for understanding	9	0.60%
IFID + Attacking the complainer	9	0.60%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Providing a justification	8	0.53%
IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	8	0.53%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	7	0.47%
IFID + Offer of repair + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	7	0.47%
IFID + Promise of non-recurrence	7	0.47%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	7	0.47%
Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	7	0.47%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Pleading for understanding	7	0.47%
Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	7	0.47%
Pleading for understanding	7	0.47%
IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	6	0.40%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Pleading for understanding	6	0.40%
Intensified IFID + Pleading for understanding	6	0.40%
IFID + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	5	0.33%
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	5	0.33%
Intensified IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility	5	0.33%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	5	0.33%
Offer of repair + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	5	0.33%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Offer of repair	4	0.27%
Promise of non-recurrence	4	0.27%
Avoiding or postponing an apology + IFID	3	0.20%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	3	0.20%
IFID + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	3	0.20%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility	3	0.20%

Categories	Frequency	Percent
Intensified IFID + Offer of repair + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	3	0.20%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair	3	0.20%
Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	3	0.20%
Offer of repair + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Pleading for understanding	3	0.20%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair	2	0.13%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	2	0.13%
IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	2	0.13%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	2	0.13%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	2	0.13%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	2	0.13%
Intensified IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	2	0.13%
Intensified IFID + Promise of non-recurrence	2	0.13%
Intensified IFID + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	2	0.13%
Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Promise of non-recurrence	2	0.13%
Providing a justification + Attacking the complainer	2	0.13%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	2	0.13%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%
IFID + Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%
IFID + Providing a justification + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	1	0.07%
IFID + Providing a justification + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
IFID + Providing a justification + Attacking the complainer + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%

Categories	Frequency	Percent
IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
IFID + Offer of repair + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
IFID + Promise of non-recurrence + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
IFID + Attacking the complainer + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Providing a justification + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%
Intensified IFID + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Providing a justification + Acknowledgment of responsibility + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Providing a justification + Offer of repair + Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Providing a justification + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Providing a justification + Attacking the complainer + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	1	0.07%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Offer of repair + Promise of non-recurrence	1	0.07%
Acknowledgment of responsibility + Blaming someone else or denying responsibility	1	0.07%
Offer of repair + Attacking the complainer	1	0.07%
Promise of non-recurrence + Pleading for understanding	1	0.07%

Cum ne cerem scuze

INTRODUCERE: Acesta este un chestionar despre modalitatea în care lumea își cere scuze în diferite situații.

INSTRUCȚIUNI: Imaginați-vă ca sunteți personajul din situațiile de mai jos. Cum v-ați cere scuze în fiecare situație? Vă rugăm să precizați exact ce ați spune în fiecare situație în parte.

I.   Mircea vine la nunta celui mai bun prieten al său în haine de sport.

Mircea:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

II. Victor este prietenul mamei mirelui, și a întârziat de la ceremonia de cununie. Acum se întâlnește cu mirele la nuntă.

Victor:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

III. Vasile i-a promis soției că va renunța la fumat. Totuși, el s-a reapucat de fumat, și soția lui îl ia la rost.

Vasile:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. Este ziua de naştere a prietenului lui Dan. Acesta l-a invitat pe Dan la o cină festivă la restaurant, însă Dan a întarziat mult.

Dan:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. Din greşeala, Ioana sparge una din farfuriile chinezeşti dintr-un set pe care iniţial prietena ei nu a vrut să-l folosească de frică să nu se spargă.

Ioana:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VI. George a minţit când i-a spus prietenului lui că nu poate să meargă cu el la un meci pentru că e plecat la lucru în alt oraş. Defapt, George vroia să petreacă seara cu soţia lui. Prietenul lui George a aflat însă, şi acum îl ia la rost.

George:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VII. George, care a trebuit să-si schimbe recent locul de muncă într-un alt oraş, nu va putea fi cu soţia lui de Crăciun. Acum, el îşi cere scuze pentru asta.

George:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VIII.   Mircea ar fi trebuit să-l întâlnească pe prietenul lui în biroul acestuia, însă a întârziat. În cele din urmă soseşte în biroul prietenului său.

Mircea:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IX.   Seara înainte de o conferinţă la care prietenul lui George trebuia să prezinte un discurs important, George şterge din greşeală discursul prietenului său din calculator. Prietenul lui nu mai are nici o altă versiune a discursului.

George:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

X. Ioana a luat o pereche de pantaloni de la prietena ei, fără să-i spună nimic. Acum prietena Ioanei şi-a dat seama.

Ioana:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix C: English Translation of the Survey

How we apologize

INTRODUCTION: This is a survey that looks at the way people apologize in different situations.

DIRECTIONS: Imagine that you are the character in the following situations. How would you apologize in each case? Please write the exact words that you would say in each situation.

I.   Joey did not have time to change before going to the wedding of his best friend, and therefore he is wearing sports clothes.

Joey:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

II. Dennis is the groom's mother's boyfriend, and he missed the wedding ceremony. He now meets the groom at the reception after the wedding ceremony.

Dennis:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

III. Chandler had promised his wife that he would stop smoking. However, he started again, and his wife can tell that he was smoking again.

Chandler:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. It is the birthday of Ross's friend. The friend invited Ross to a birthday dinner at a restaurant, but Ross is late.

Ross:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. By mistake, Rachel breaks one of her friend's China plates, a plate that is part of a set that initially her friend did not want to use for fear one of the plates might break.

Rachel:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VI. Chandler lied to his best friend saying that he could not go with him to a game because he had to be at his job in a different town. In fact, he wanted to spend the evening with his wife. However, his friend finds out.

Chandler:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VII.   Chandler, who has a job in a different town from the one he is living in with his wife, needs to be at his job for Christmas. He feels sorry for this, and he is telling his wife.

Chandler:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VIII.   Ross was supposed to come and meet his friend in his office, but he was late. He finally arrives.

Ross:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IX. The night before his friend has an important speech to make at a conference Chandler deletes by mistake his friend's speech from the computer. He now tells this to his friend.

Chandler:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

X. Rachel took her friend's blue jeans without telling her about that. Now her friend has found out and Rachel admits to taking them.

Rachel:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix D: Background Questionnaire

1. Your age _____

2. For how many years have you been studying English? _____

3. Gender

   ☐ Male   ☐ Female

4. How often do you watch TV shows and movies that are in English?

   ☐ Never or almost never

   ☐ Rarely

   ☐ Sometimes

   ☐ Often

   ☐ Regularly

5. Do you read the subtitles in Romanian when watching TV programs in English?

   ☐ Never or almost never

   ☐ Rarely

   ☐ Sometimes

   ☐ Often

   ☐ Always or almost always

6. How often do you have opportunities to interact with native speakers of English?

   ☐ Never or almost never

   ☐ Rarely

   ☐ Sometimes

   ☐ Often

   ☐ Always or almost always

7. Have you ever been to an English speaking country?

   ☐ No   ☐ Yes

8. If you answered **Yes** for question number 7, for how long have you been in an English speaking country? _____

Appendix E: List of Abbreviations Used in Glosses

1st	First person
2nd	Second person
3rd	Third person
aux.	Auxiliary verb
dat.	Dative case
degr.	Degree
fem.	Feminine
imper.	Imperative
imperf.	Imperfect
masc.	Masculine
obj.	Objective case
pl.	Plural
poss.	Possessive case
sg.	Singular
voc.	Vocative case

Appendix F: Institutional Review Board Form

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Thursday, May 05, 2005

IRB Application No   AS0585

Proposal Title: The Influence of American TV Shows on the Pragmatic Competence of
Romanian Learners of English as a Foreign Language

Reviewed and   Exempt
Processed as:

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved   Protocol Expires: 5/4/2006

Principal
Investigator(s

Gusztav Demeter   Carol Moder
84 S. Univ. Place #8   205 Morrill
Stillwater, OK 74075   Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the
rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that
the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45
CFR 46.

☑ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval
stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol
   must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar
   year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are
   unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the
authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions
about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 415
Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-5700, emct@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

Gusztav Demeter

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES IN ROMANIAN

Major Field: English

Biographical:

   Personal Data: Born in Baia Mare, Maramureş county, Romania, on April 1,
        1977; son of Gusztav and Magdalena.

   Education: Graduated from "Mihai Eminescu" High School, Baia Mare,
        Romania, Romanian-English bilingual class, in 1996. Received Bachelor
        of Arts in Romanian Language and Literature and English Language and
        Literature from North University of Baia Mare, Romania, in 2000.
        Received Master of Arts in Central European History from Central
        European University, Budapest, Hungary in June 2001. Completed the
        requirements for the Master of Arts degree with a major in English,
        TESL-Linguistics option at Oklahoma State University in May 2006.

   Experience: Teacher of English as a Foreign Language at "G. Bariţiu" High
        School, from September 2001 to June 2002. Teaching Assistant,
        Department of Foreign Languages, North University of Baia Mare,
        Romania, from October 2001 to August 2003. Graduate Teaching
        Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, from
        August 2003 to present.

   Professional Memberships: Modern Languages Association, Oklahoma
        Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, European Society
        for the Study of English.

Name: Gusztav Demeter   Date of Degree: May, 2006

Institution: Oklahoma State University   Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES IN
                ROMANIAN

Pages in Study: 143   Candidate for the Degree of Master of Arts

Major Field: English

Scope and Method of Study: More than any aspect of language, speech acts are probably
        the most culture specific. Apologizing is not an easy matter in one's own
        language, and having to do it in a second or foreign language is even more
        complicated. That is why studying the way people apologize in different
        languages is important in order to understand the intricacies of language. The aim
        of the present study is to examine the types of categories that Romanian speakers
        use to apologize in situations that require interaction among friends, as well as
        how these categories combine to form apology strategies. A survey containing ten
        situations taken from the TV show "Friends" that required an apology was
        administered to 158 English major students studying at a university in Romania.
        The data thus collected was analyzed both a quantitatively and qualitatively.

Findings and Conclusions: The findings have shown that the most often used category,
        either as a standalone one or in combination with other categories, was the
        Illocutionary Force Indicating Device. If the relatively high frequency of the
        intensified IFID is also considered, the conclusion is that Romanian speakers
        prefer explicit expressions of apology.

        Insofar as the combination of basic categories is concerned, the findings show that
        an overwhelming majority of the apologies were combinations rather than
        standalone categories. Also, the most often used combinations were by far "IFID"
        with "providing a justification" and "IFID" with "blaming someone else or
        denying responsibility," which suggests the preference for minimizing or denying
        responsibility rather than acknowledging it. The qualitative analysis of the data
        has also shown that the respondents did not only try to save their own face in their
        apologies, but also were concerned of maintaining the friendship with the hearer,
        sometimes even explicitly mentioning that their friendship is more important than
        the action that brought about the apology.

        Some of these findings are consistent with the findings of previous studies on
        different languages, such as Akan, English, German, and Japanese, other aspects
        of apologizing in Romanian are different from some languages, such as German,
        Lombok, and New Zealand English.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: _Dr. Carol L. Moder_____