

# **USING PARALLEL CORPORA TO COMPARE APOLOGIES OF NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS AND JAPANESE LEARNERS OF ENGLISH**

S. Kathleen Kitao  
(kkitao217@yahoo.com)  
Doshisha Women's College

Kenji Kitao  
Doshisha University

## **Abstract**

In this paper, we look at apology strategies, some subtypes of apologies, and ways of collecting data to study speech acts, including discourse completion tests, collection of natural data, role plays, and spoken corpora. We used a corpus of interviews with Japanese learners of English for the Standard Speaking Test and in a parallel corpus of interviews with native English speakers to study how Japanese speakers apologized in English and how those apologies compared to those of American English speakers. In order to identify apologies, we used a concordancing program to do lemmatized searches for five keywords, “sorry,” “apologize,” “pardon,” “excuse,” and “forgive,” in the corpus. Using an adapted version of Cohen and Olshtain's (1981) typology of apology strategies, we analyzed the strategies used in the apologies and compared the Japanese speakers with the native English speakers. In addition, we compared the strategies that the two groups used in a role play that required an apology.

## **1 Introduction**

Maintaining a relationship often requires an apology. When a speaker apologizes, he/she is admitting that an offense has been committed is trying to mend the relationship. In addition to the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (e.g. “I'm sorry,” “I apologize”), strategies for apologizing include offering a repair, taking responsibility, and explaining how the offense happened. Leech's (1983) classified an apology is a convivial speech act, that is, a speech act intended to repair or maintain a relationship.

However, apologies can be complex. Speakers have a variety of strategies to choose from, which can be used in different combinations. Also, making an apology downgrades the speaker's face and requires him/her to concede a mistake, while the lack of apology might threaten the interlocutor's face and threaten the relationship between the two (Wipprecht, 2004; Salago, 2011).

### ***1.1 Apology strategies***

Among the first to study apologies were Cohen and Olshtain (1981), who developed a typology of apology strategies based on the results of research with Discourse Completion Tests

(DCTs). This typology has been adapted by Hitomi Abe (personal communication, March 5, 2012) and Kitao (2012) (see Appendix). The typology includes the Illucutionary Force Indicating Device, or IFID, which uses a performative word such as “sorry” or “forgive;” a statement of the situation (a statement of what the speaker is apologizing for); an explanation for how the offense happened or why the speaker committed the offense; repetition (saying the IFID more than once); an acknowledgement of responsibility; an offer of repair; an expression of lack of intent; a statement of an alternative; a promise of non-reoccurrence; an emotional expression or an expression of embarrassment (e.g. “Oh, no!”); a suggestion for avoiding the situation in the future; gratitude; self-justification, request for understanding; and verbal avoidance, some of which are divided into subcategories. The typology also includes adjuncts to apologies, such as using intensifiers (e.g. so, very, or really), minimizing the offense, an expression of reluctance; and expressing concern for the interlocutor.

Studies of apologies have primarily used Discourse Completion Tests (Demeter 2012), which do not involve interaction. Two studies that used corpus methods (Demeter 2012; Kitao 2012) identified the following subtypes of apologies, some of which involve interaction.

1. Co-constructed apologies: apologies where two or more speakers participate, when more than one person were involved in the offense (e.g. “I’m sorry we forgot your birthday.” “Yeah, we’ll make it up to you next year.”)
2. Repair apologies: apologies used when a speaker makes a correction or otherwise repairs an error (e.g. “The deadline is June 12, sorry, I mean July 12”).
3. Apologies in advance: apologies where a speaker apologizes for something that he/she is about to do (e.g. I’m sorry to do this, but...)
4. Mutual apologies: apologies where two interlocutors apologize to each other (e.g. “I’m sorry.” “No, I’m sorry.”) because each committed an offense
5. Conditional apologies: apologies that make use of a conditional form (e.g. “I’m sorry if I was mistaken.”)

## ***1.2 Issues related to gathering data to study speech acts***

One of the difficulties with research on speech acts is the issue of gathering data in order to describe how speech acts are used. Each method of gathering data has its advantages and disadvantages. There are four major methods of gathering data to study speech acts.

### ***1.2.1 Naturally occurring data***

While naturally occurring data is considered the “gold standard” for speech act research (Demeter 2012), it is not often used. Naturally occurring data would tell us how speakers actually use speech acts in real conversation, but it is difficult to gather such data. Researchers just have to wait for the speech act to occur, and they cannot manipulate variables such as the relationship between the speakers. Also, the researchers may not find enough examples to compare variables (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989). In addition, there are privacy issues with recording people in natural situations, even if permission is requested.

### ***1.2.2 Discourse completion tests (DCTs)***

In a DCT, participants respond to a prompt with what they would say. The main advantages of DCTs are that researchers can gather a great deal of data in a relatively short period of time and that they can manipulate the variables, for example, by manipulating the severity of the offense in the descriptions. However, DCTs involve what the participants believe they would say rather than what they would actually say, and they do not involve any interaction or negotiation. DCTs are traditionally written, but they can also be oral.

### ***1.2.3 Role plays***

Role plays involve giving the participant and a confederate a situation to act out. They involve interaction, they are expected to be natural, and variables can be manipulated. However, they depend on the training of the confederate to be consistent across many repetitions of the role play. In addition, judging from role play transcripts that we have read, they may not be as natural as they are intended to be. For example, the confederate might draw out the role play in a way that might not happen in a natural conversation in order to maximize the sample of language from the participant.

### ***1.2.4 Spoken corpora***

Spoken corpora are usually compiled from transcripts of recordings of conversations, speeches, interviews, etc., though they can also be compiled from subtitles or scripts from movies and television programs. While the speech acts that can be studied using speech corpora are limited, there are some where corpora are useful. Apologies are one speech act in which spoken corpora are useful, because most apologies make use of forms of one or more of five performatives: sorry, excuse, pardon, forgive, and apologize (Kitao, 2012). Their usefulness also depends on the purposes of the research and the composition of the corpus. For example, a spoken corpus made up of lectures, interviews, etc., would not be of use to a researcher who is interested in a speech act in natural conversation.

## **1.3 Research questions**

In this paper, we will look at the following research questions:

1. What strategies do Japanese learners of English use in apologizing?
2. How do the apology strategies Japanese learners of English compare with those of native English speakers?

## **2 Methodology**

### ***2.1 Overview***

In this study, we analyzed apologies in English by Japanese speakers from the Corpus of Learner English. In this study, we used approximately the first 600 examples of “sorry” out of 2342 hits and all the examples of “excuse,” “forgive,” “pardon,” and “apology.” We categorized apology strategies based on Cohen and Olsain’s (1981) typology of apology strategies, adapted by Hitomi Abe (personal communication, March 5, 2012) and Kitao

(2012). In addition, we searched for the five keywords in a parallel corpus of 20 American native English speakers and compared the results to the Japanese speakers and looked at the apologies in one role play.

## **2.2 Materials**

For this study, we used the Corpus of Learner English (CLE) (Izumi, Uchimoto, & Isahara, 2004). This corpus was compiled from transcripts of 1281 interviews of native Japanese speakers for the Standard Speaking Test (SST). The interviews were entirely in English and lasted from 15 to 20 minutes. The interviews included general conversation, role plays, description of pictures, and storytelling based on a series of pictures. Based on the interviews, the interviewees' spoken proficiency in English was rated on a scale of 1 to 9.

We searched for "sorry" and had 2342 hits, of which we analyzed the first 591. From this, we eliminated non-apologies and apologies by the interviewer, and we found 234 apologies.

Izumi, Uchimoto, and Isahara (2004) also compiled a corpus of native English speakers taking the SST. They were 20 US university students in Japan. By searching for "sorry" and eliminating the non-apologies and apologies by the interviewer, we found 25 apologies.

## **2.3 Participants**

We analyzed apologies 144 female and 149 male Japanese speakers. They ranged in age from their teens to their 60s. It was unclear from the information given how long the participants had been overseas, or whether they had been overseas in counties where English is the primary language. Their average STT score was 6.18, with a range of 2 to 9.

From the native English speaker corpus, we analyzed the apologies from 25 American university students in Japan. They were all of university age and included 6 females and 19 males.

## **2.4 Procedure**

Using AntConc, we did lemmatized searches of the CLE and its parallel native English speaker corpus for five apology performatives: "sorry," "pardon," "excuse," "forgive," and "apologize." We analyzed the first 591 hits for "sorry" and all hits for "excuse," "forgive," "pardon," and "apologize." We eliminated the non-apologies and apologies by the interviewer. We also did lemmatized searches for the five keywords in the native English speaker corpus and analyzed the apologies using the same procedure. We compared the strategies used by native English speakers with those used by the Japanese speakers.

In addition, there was one role play which required the interviewee to apologize over the telephone for having missed a party at which he/she was to be the guest of honor. We separated these role plays from the rest of the data and analyzed them separately, counting the strategies and comparing the strategies used by Japanese speakers and English speakers.

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 Strategies for all apologies

##### 3.1.1 Apologies using “Sorry”

In the first 591 occurrences of “sorry” in the Japanese speakers’ transcripts, there were a total of 234 apologies. Of these, 120 of the apologies occurred in the informal conversation section, 79 as part of role plays, and 35 as part of picture descriptions or storytelling. We found a total of 56 occurrences of “sorry” from the native English speakers’ data. From these, we found a total of 25 apologies on the part of the interviewees. Ten of these were part of the information conversation, 13 were part of role plays, and 2 were part of picture descriptions or storytelling.

“Sorry” was used by the Japanese speakers for both large and small offenses. In the case of large offenses, repetition and intensifiers were frequently used. Expressions included “Sorry,” “I’m (so) sorry,” “I’m sorry for that/about this,” “I’m (really) sorry, but...,” and “I’m very sorry that...”

Table 1 shows the number of apology strategies in each category and the percentage of all apologies using “sorry” that they represent.

**Table 1. Occurrence and frequency of apologies using “Sorry”**

	Japanese speakers	Native English speakers
Statement of the situation	96 (41.2%)	12 (48.0%)
Intensifier	68 (29.2%)	8 (32.0%)
Repetition	62 (26.6%)	10 (40.0%)
Explanation	59 (25.3%)	8 (32.0%)
Offer of repair	35 (15.0%)	3 (12.0%)
Emotionals/embarrassment	19 (8.1%)	1 (4.0%)
Lack of intent	14 (6.0%)	1 (4.0%)
Acknowledgement of responsibility	4 (1.7%)	2 (8.0%)
Request for understanding	3 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Promise of non-reoccurrence	2 (0.8%)	2 (8.0%)
Reluctance	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)

The differences of the frequency in which the Japanese speakers and native English speakers use the strategies do not vary greatly. The biggest differences are in repetition, explanation, promise of non-reoccurrence, and acknowledgement of responsibility, all of which the native English speakers use more. However, due to the small number of native English speakers, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions.

Among the subcategories (collaborative, conditional, advance, mutual, and repair), only the repair apology was used frequently, with 56 occurrences (24.0% of all apologies) among the Japanese speakers and 3 occurrences (12.0%) among the native English speakers. In addition,

there was 1 occurrence (4.0%) of an apology in advance among the native English speakers. Considering that the corpus is compiled from an oral test, it is not surprising that there would be a relatively large number of repair apologies but few or none in the other subcategories.

### **3.1.2 Apologies using “Pardon”**

In the Japanese speakers’ corpus, there were 261 hits for “pardon,” but none of them were for apologies. “Pardon” was mainly used to indicate lack of comprehension. Common expressions included “Pardon?” “Pardon me?” “I beg your pardon,” and “Please beg your pardon.” It was sometime combined with sorry in expressions such as “I’m sorry, I beg your pardon” and “Sorry? Pardon?”

For the native English speakers, there were two hits for “pardon,” both of which indicated lack of comprehension.

### **3.1.3 Apologies using “Forgive”**

In the Japanese speakers’ corpus, there were 11 hits for “forgive,” 6 of which were apologies. All of these apologies were in a role play in which the test subject was calling to apologize for having missed a party in his/her honor. Usually, these were near the end of the role play as a culmination of the apology. Expressions used included “So forgive me this time,” “Please forgive this time,” “Forgive me,” and “Forgive me not able to come to your party.”

There was only one hit for “forgive” in the native English speakers’ corpus, and it was not an apology.

**Table 2. Occurrence and frequency of apologies using “Forgive”**

	Japanese speakers	Native English speakers
Intensifier	11 (183.3%)	
Statement of the situation	6 (100%)	
Repetition	6 (100%)	
Explanation	6 (100%)	
Offer of repair	6 (100%)	
Lack of intent	1 (16.7%)	
Request for understanding	1 (16.7%)	
Promise of non-reoccurrence	1 (16.7%)	

Whenever the Japanese speakers used “forgive” as an IFID, they also used an intensifier (sometimes more than once), a statement of the situation, repetition, an explanation, and an offer of repair.

### **3.1.4 Apologies using “Excuse”**

In the Japanese speakers’ corpus, there were 272 hits for “excuse” and 30 apologies. These apologies were mainly for minor offenses, such as sneezing or coughing, having to start over on an answer or a role play, and inadvertently using Japanese. It was sometimes used in

combination with “sorry,” for example, in “I’m sorry, excuse me.” Among the apologies, the Japanese speakers used the IFID “excuse” for repair in 4 cases (13.3% of the apologies), in response to “May I help you?” (possibly transfer from Japanese), and to apologize for saying something insulting about the merchandise. As non-apologies, they also used it to indicate lack of comprehension or to get attention.

For native English speakers, there were 8 hits, two of which were apologies. They were both repair apologies. No other strategies were used by the native English speakers.

**Table 3. Occurrence and frequency of apologies using “Excuse”**

	Japanese speakers	Native English speakers
Repetition	6 (20%)	
Explanation	1 (3.3%)	

As an IFID, “excuse” was usually used by itself, probably because it was used only for minor offenses and other strategies were not thought necessary.

### 3.1.5 Apologies using “Apologize”

Among the Japanese speakers, there were 86 hits for forms of “apologize.” Of these, 22 were apologies, and 21 were used in the role play involving the missed party. The expressions used included “I’m- I apology, er, to you very much,” “I apologize a lot that I couldn’t go,” “So, er, plea- er, please, er, accept my apolo- apologize apology,” “...[U]h ur I really, err, apology, ee, apologi- apologize to you, ur, about it,” “I apologize,” “I really apologize, but...,” “Uh, so, uh, please apologize,” and “I would like to/have to apologize (you).” Though the Japanese speakers seemed to want to use an expression involving “apologize” in situations involving serious situations, they often did not know the grammatical form.

In the native English speakers’ corpus, there were 3 hits and 2 apologies, both of them in the role play involving missing the party. The expressions the native English speakers used were “I wanted to, ur, apologize about not making it to your party” and “I just wanna apologize to you for not showing up.”

**Table 4. Occurrence and frequency of apologies using “Apologize”**

	Japanese speakers	Native English speakers
Statement of the situation	22 (100%)	2 (33.3%)
Explanation	22 (100%)	2 (33.3%)
Repetition	21 (95.5%)	2 (33.3%)
Intensifier	18 (81.8%)	2 (33.3%)
Offer of repair	15 (68.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Gratitude	5 (22.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Emotionals/embarrassment	4 (18.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Promise of non-reoccurrence	3 (13.6%)	0 (0.0%)

Lack of intent	1 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Request for understanding	1 (4.5%)	1 (16.7%)

The Japanese speakers used all of the strategies that they used at a higher frequency than the native English speakers did, except for a request for understanding.

### **2.1 Strategies for the missing party role play**

Because the missing party role play involved a serious offense which required an apology and because it involved the most complex combination of strategies, we analyzed those apologies separately.

Among the Japanese speakers, the role play was used 46 times, with 34 females and 12 males. Because it was used only with more advanced test takers (the lowest score was 5), the average STT score was 7.15. Among the native English speakers, there were four role plays, all with males.

**Table 5. Strategies used in the role play**

	Japanese speakers	Native English speakers
Intensifier	55 (119.6%)	4 (100.0%)
Explanation	45 (97.8%)	4 (100.0%)
Statement of the situation	44 (95.7%)	4 (100.0%)
Repetition	43 (93.4%)	3 (75.0%)
Offer of repair	30 (65.2%)	3 (75.0%)
Emotionals/embarrassment	18 (39.1%)	1 (25.0%)
Lack of intent	12 (26.1%)	1 (25.0%)
Acknowledgement of responsibility	4 (8.7%)	2 (50.0%)
Request for understanding	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Promise of non-reoccurrence	2 (4.3%)	2 (50.0%)
Reluctance	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)

Again, it is difficult to draw conclusions with such a small number of apologies from native English speakers. However, the Japanese speakers used intensifiers, repetition, and emotionals/expression of embarrassment more frequently and the native English speakers used an offer of repair and acknowledgement of responsibility more frequently. One of the apologies among the Japanese speakers was a repair apology.

Of the 46 Japanese speakers, only two apologized explicitly for not having called sooner. In contrast, all four of the native English speakers apologized explicitly for not having called.

Another difference between the role plays with the Japanese speakers and those with the native English speakers was that the Japanese speakers tended to repeat the IFID more often (3.58 times for each of the apologies for missing the party), while the native English speakers tended to be more explicit and detailed in explaining why they had missed the party but used the IFID less often (2.0 times for each of the apologies for missing the party.)



The following two examples demonstrate the contrast in the justification for missing the party and the use of the IFID. The first role play is with a 24-year-old male university student who is a native English speaker. (Note: E1 is the interviewer; E2 is being interviewed.)

E1: Hello? This is A here.

E2: Hi, A. This is B. How are you?

E1: B.

E2: Yes. I know, A. Er, really sorry I- I- I couldn't show up at at your dinner party this past weekend. Un- unfortunately, I- I just had some things come up a- a- at the last minute.

E1: They were so important.

E2: Erm. Uh A, erm eh a- a- as much as I wanted to go to your to your dinner party, erm my brother-in-law called me er before I walked out the door er to let me know that that er his grandfather had died. Erm he was very close to his grandfather. And since my sister er is married to him, I- I- I went over there to talk to them. Erm and they were just very upset and they need someone to talk to. Er

E1: Well yeah. I'm sorry to hear that. Erm I just wondered though, I mean your sister's just close by. I- that's- we're on the way I know we're on the way. You could have popped in.

E2: Y- y- y- you know, y- y- you're right. Erm but sometimes, er circumstances happen. And you just go with your gut feeling on how to react to such situations a- a- and you just react to them that way. Erm and, you know, looking back at it, you know, I could have stopped at your at your party which er I- I probably should have should have done. Erm but nonetheless, I- I- I made I made a decision that at the time, I felt very comfortable with. Erm I feel that family obligations are are are the utmost importance. Erm and um so, you know, nonetheless, I- I- I would appreciate, you know, if you could include me er in your future future plans.

E1: Sure. I mean that isn't a problem. I do understand the situation. But I just wonder did you didn't even call?

E2: Yeah. Yyy you know, i- it that that was that was wrong of me to do. Erm I- I- I- I should have called. You are right. Er I mean uh uh er I mean you've been a very good friend to me, A.

E1: [Laughter]

E2: Erm and it's and for me, not to call is i- is uh it's it's kind of a a bad thing to do it's a- to such good friend. But, you know, I mean I'll I'll I'll I'll I'll I'll try to do better in the future, you know.

E1: Well, don't worry about it. We're gonna have another party soon. So,

E2: Yeah.

E1: Please come.

E2: Please. Thank you very much.

E1: O K. Thank you very much.

In this role play, the person who missed the party only uses the IFID once, with no repetition. However, he elaborates on his explanation for having missed the party because his brother-in-law's grandfather had died by saying that his brother-in-law had been close to the grandfather and that his sister and brother-in-law had been very upset. He also states a principle (the importance of family) to further justify his choice.

In the following role play, the Japanese speaker is a 22-year-old female who has been overseas for one year. Her SST score was 7, and she had a TOEFL score of 890.

(Note: E is the interviewer; J is a Japanese speaker being interviewed.)

A: Hello?

B: Is A there?

A: Oh. Speaking.

B: Hi. This is B.

A: Oh, B, what's up?

B: Ah, ah, thank you for inviting the party, but you know, I had a mm trouble in my school, and I can't go there.

A: Oh. But your friends are already here.

B: I know. I failed the test, and I have to take the test again, so I'm sorry. I'm taking test in five minutes so I can't go.

A: Hum

B: I'm sorry.

A: Oh really? But it's your birthday party.

B: I know. I studied a lot, but I failed, and I- If I don't take the test today, I can't graduate. So, I'm sorry.

A: Oh. That's too bad. Hum. Err will the test take long time?

B: About three hours, I guess.

A: Three hours?

B: Hu-huh

A: Hum. O K. Err we have a party err until late at night.

B: About what time?

A: Oh. O K. Maybe tomorrow morning?

B: Tomorrow morning?

A: Yes.

B: I'm sorry, but I have a tennis a game tomorrow morning, so I can't stay up late.

A: Oh. O K. I see. How can I tell the guests about that?

B: Err ah te- tell them that I really wanted to go, but I have to take the test to graduate, so can you tell me that can you tell them that?

A: Oh. O K.

B: Thanks.

A: I see.. All right. Thank you.

In this role play, the Japanese speaker uses the IFID three times and justifies the offense in less detail than the native English speaker does.

#### **4 Conclusion**

As a group, the Japanese speakers used a range of apology strategies at a frequency that was often greater than to those of the native English speakers, though it is difficult to draw conclusions when the number of native English speakers is so small. In the role play, the Japanese speakers used repetition of the IFID more than the native English speakers did, which may be an example of transfer from their native language, and seemed to be less elaborate and detailed in their explanation for how the offense occurred.

#### **4.1 Limitations of the study**

The situations in which apologies might be appropriate or necessary are relatively limited in this corpus, compared to everyday life. In the everyday conversation section of the interview, the interaction is small talk with a stranger. Some of the role plays do involve situations that require apologies or where apologies are appropriate. However, given the limitations on gathering natural conversations by Japanese speakers in English, this resource is still useful.

The native English speaker corpus was small, with only 20 interviews, only four of which included the role play that was analyzed.

#### **4.2 Suggestions for future research**

In the future, it would be useful to take a more qualitative approach and consider the appropriateness of the apologies and not just the quantity of the strategies used. Another approach would be to compare students with higher proficiency and lower proficiency and/or a longer time and shorter time overseas.

A larger native English speaker corpus would be helpful, or at least more examples of the missed party role play.

In addition, it would be interesting to consider the extent to which their cultural background and apology strategies in Japanese influenced the choice of apology strategies by Japanese speakers in English, for example, the repetition of the IFID.

#### **Acknowledgment**

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25580142.  
Kenji Kitao passed away on August 20, 2014. This paper is published in his memory.

#### **References**

- Beebe, L.M., & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: Chastisement and disagreement. In M. Eiselstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Emperican studies in school language variation* (pp. 199-218). New York: Springer.
- Cohen, A.D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of socio-cultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31, 113-134.
- Demeter, G. (2012, February). Co-constructed and negotiated apologies. Contributions of corpus linguistics to the study of speech acts. Paper presented at *Asia Pacific Corpus Linguistics Conference*, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Izumi, E., Uchimoto, K., & Isahara, H. (2004). SST speech corpus of Japanese learners' English and automatic detection of learners' errors. *ICAME Journal*, 28, 31-48.

Kitao, S.K. (2012). Using a spoken corpus compiled from subtitles to study apologies. *Asphodel*, 47, 50-77.

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

Salago, E.F. (2011). *The pragmatics of requests and apologies: Developmental patterns of Mexican students*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Retrieved from <http://tinyurl.com/pvyljc5>

Wipprecht, C. (2004). *The speech act of apology in an American soap opera and the German equivalent*. Munich: GRIN Verlag.

## **Appendix**

This apology strategies typology was developed by Cohen and Olshtain (1981) and adapted by Hitomi Abe (personal communication, March 5, 2012) and Kitao (2012).

- Expression of apology: Use of an expression which contains a relevant performative verb.  
e.g., "I'm sorry"; "I apologize"; "Excuse me"; "Forgive me"; "Pardon me."
- Explanation: An explanation or an account of situation which caused the apologizer to commit the offense
- Statement of the situation: A description of the situation that led to the need for apology, e.g., "I dropped your camera and broke it."
- Acknowledgment of responsibility: A recognition by the apologizer of his or her fault in causing the offense. This semantic formula can be subcategorized into:
  1. Implicit acknowledgment, e.g., "I should have called you before."
  2. Explicit acknowledgment, e.g., "It completely slipped my mind."
  3. Expression of reluctance, e.g., "I hesitate to say this, but it is true."
  4. Expression of lack of intent, e.g., "I didn't mean to."
  5. Expression of self-deficiency, e.g., "You know I am bad at remembering things."
  6. Expression of embarrassment, e.g., "I feel so bad about it."
  7. Request for understanding: asking the interlocutor to understand the speaker's situation, e.g., "I hope you understand."
- Offer of repair: An offer made by the apologizer to provide payment for some kind of damage caused by his or her infraction, which can be specific or non-specific.
  1. Non-specific offer of repair, e.g., "I'll see what I can do."
  2. Specific offer of repair, e.g., "I will do extra work over the weekend."
- Suggesting a repair: Suggesting something that the interlocutor rather than the apologizer could do. e.g., "Do you want to come with me?"
- Statement of alternative
  1. I can do X instead of Y  
e.g., "I'd rather..."
  2. Why don't we X instead of Y  
e.g., "Let's do...instead"
- Promise of non-recurrence: A commitment made by the apologizer not to have the offense happen again. e.g., "It won't happen again."
- Suggestion for avoiding the situation: e.g., "Let's put it in writing next time."

-Verbal avoidance

1. Topic switch
2. Joke
3. Finding a silver lining: Referring to something good that came out of the apologizer's mistake, e.g., "You have a lead on a new job."
4. Laugh

**Adjuncts to apologies**

1. Intensity of apology: e.g., "really," "very," "so," "terribly," "awfully," "truly," "please";
2. Repetitions, e.g., "I'm sorry, I'm sorry."
3. Minimizing offense: e.g., "It's O.K. No harm done."
4. Self-justification: explaining why the action was justified, e.g., "I'm sorry I laughed at you, but in my defense – look at you!"
5. Emotionals: e.g., "Oh!" "Oops!" "God!"
6. Gratitude: e.g., "Thank you." "I appreciate it."
7. Wishing the best after apologizing: e.g., "I hope you enjoy yourselves."
8. Concern for the interlocutor: e.g., "Are you okay?", "Have you been waiting long?"
9. Feedback: e.g., "This book was interesting."
10. Adjunct to the offer of repair: e.g., "Please wait." "Just a moment."
12. Introduction of an apology: e.g., "I need to apologize."
13. clarification: when the interlocutor misunderstands exactly what the speaker is apologizing for, the speaker clarifies, e.g., "I'm not sorry I did it, but I'm sorry I didn't tell you sooner."

**Other**

1. utterances related to apology: e.g., "Believe me." "What's wrong?"
2. utterances