ABSTRACT
          A study of the structure of the speech act known as
an apology looked at the differences in linguistic strategies used by
advanced nonnative English language learners and native speakers in
apology behavior, and whether the differences result from the
severity of the offense or the familiarity of the interlocutors. An
apology is seen as consisting of five major linguistic strategies: an
expression of an apology, an explanation or account of the situation
used as an indirect act of apology, an acknowledgment of
responsibility, an offer of repair, and/or a promise of forbearance.
The 180 subjects included 96 native English-speaking students at 6
United States universities and 84 advanced learners of English at
Israeli universities. Two versions of a language use questionnaire
designed to elicit apologies in varied situations were administered
to the subjects. The responses were categorized by strategies used in
the apologies elicited and combination or modification of strategies.
The findings indicate that nonnatives lack sensitivity to certain
distinctions that natives make between forms for expressing apology
and between intensifiers, with the nonnative tendency being to
overgeneralize or use a variety of forms. It was also found that
nonnatives tend to avoid interjections and curses, and do not
consistently produce comments providing the appropriate social
lubricant in difficult situations. Whether or not it is worthwhile to
teach learners these distinctions is still under consideration.
(MSE)

ADVANCED EFL APOLOGIES: WHAT REMAINS TO BE LEARNED?[*]

ANDREW D. COHEN

School of Education
Hebrew University

ELITE OLSHTAIN

School of Education
Tel-Aviv University

DAVID S. ROSENSTEIN

English as a Foreign Language
Ben-Gurion University

March 1985

INTRODUCTION

1. In recent years, teachers have been encouraged to give attention to speech strategies that are expected, and perhaps even essential, in given situations -- such as the appropriate strategies for apologizing, complaining, requesting. The empirical study of speech acts has been undertaken to gather information on what appropriate use of linguistic forms in different sociocultural contexts actually comprises. A number of studies have shown that nonnative speakers may fail to communicate effectively in a given situation even though their command of grammar and vocabulary is fine (Sullivan 1979, Rintell 1981, Wolfson 1981, Freundlich 1981, House 1982, Blum-Kulka 1982, Blum-Kulka, Danet, & Gerson ms, Thomas 1983, Rubin 1983, Eisenstein & Bodman 1984). As the studies begin to multiply, a picture is emerging as to the basic structure of speech act sets — i.e., the major linguistic and pragmatic strategies which alone or in combination would represent the particular speech act in a given situation. For example, in one apology situation, "sorry" may serve quite adequately as a full-fledged apology. In another situation, it may be necessary to say something like "I am really very sorry" in order to obtain the desired effect.

1.1. APOLOGY SPEECH ACT SET. Empirical studies concerning the nature of apologies in a variety of languages and cultures have been conducted (e.g., Cohen & Olshtain 1981, Olshtain 1983, Olshtain & Cohen 1983, Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984, Olshtain & Cohen ms), and as a result, there is considerable information on the basic strategies for apologizing. The following is a description of the apology speech act set according to its development in Olshtain & Cohen 1983 (based on Fraser 1980):

a. an expression of an apology, whereby the speaker uses a word, expression, or sentence which contains a relevant performative verb such as: "apologize," "forgive," "excuse," "be sorry." While all languages can be expected to have a number of such performative verbs, some of these verbs will have a more conventionalized use than others. An expression of an apology can be intensified whenever the apologizer feels the need to do so. Such intensification is usually brought about by adding suitable intensifiers (e.g., "I'm really sorry," "I'm really very sorry"). The type of intensification chosen by a speaker is language- and situation-specific.

b. an explanation or account of the situation which indirectly caused the apologizer to commit the offense and which is used by the speaker as an indirect speech act of apologizing. The criteria for choosing the particular utterance are therefore semantic rather than formal. Given the context of the offense, the statement is intended to "set things right." In some cultures this may be a more acceptable way of apologizing than in others. Thus, in an environment where people have great difficulty with transportation, coming late to a meeting and giving an explanation like, "The bus was late," might be perfectly acceptable. In other cultures, however, where transportation is expected to be good and on a regular schedule, it is the person who is considered late and not the bus, and therefore perhaps the excuse is less acceptable as an apology.

c. acknowledgment of responsibility, whereby the offender recognizes his/her fault in causing the infraction. The degree of such recognition on the part of the aplogizer can be placed on a scale. The highest level of intensity is an acceptance of the blame: "It's my fault." At a somewhat lower level would be or an expression of self-deficiency: "I was confused/I didn't see/You are right." At a still lower level would be the expression of

lack of intent: "I didn't mean to." Lower still would be an implicit

expression of responsibility: "I was sure I had given you the right

directions." Finally, the apologizer may not accept the blame at all, in which

case there may be a denial of responsibility: "It wasn't my fault," or even

blaming of the hearer: "It's your own fault."

d. an offer of repair, whereby the apologizer makes a bid to carry

out an action or provide payment for some kind of damage which resulted from

his/her infraction. This strategy is situation-specific and is only

appropriate when actual damage has occurred.

e. a promise of forbearance, whereby the apologizer commits

him/herself to not having the offense happen again, a strategy which is again

situation-specific and less frequent than the others.

The five major strategies which make up the apology speech act set are

available to speakers across languages, yet the preference for any one of

these or for a combination of them will depend on the specific situation

within the given language and culture group.

1.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS. Empirical studies of apology have been conducted

for the most part with intermediate learners, under the assumption that

advanced nonnatives would already have mastery over even the more complex

speech act sets such as apologizing, and hence there would not be much to

learn from assessing this group's ability. However, it has become

increasingly clear to researchers that even advanced speakers of a language

may lack mastery of some of the more complex speech acts. The present line of

investigation sought to determine the nature and extent of gaps between native

and advanced nonnative apologies.

The research questions being asked in this study are as follows:

(1) What difference do we find between advanced nonnative learners and native speakers in their apology behavior

    a. in the five main strategies?

    b. as regards modifications of the main strategies?

The five strategies are those enumerated above — i.e., apology, explanation, responsibility, repair, and promise of forbearance. Modifications on these refer to the intensity of the apology, minimizing or denying responsibility, emotionals, minimizing the offense, and comments.

(2) Are there differences in apology behavior resulting from

    a. the severity of the offense?

    b. the familiarity of the interlocutors?

2.0. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1. SUBJECTS. The 180 respondents for this study included 96 native English-speaking college students, studying at one of six U.S. universities, and 84 advanced learners of English, who were native Hebrew-speakers studying at one of five Israeli universities. The average age of the English speakers was 28. Fifty-one percent were studying in English teaching programs, 25% in English language and literature programs, and 24% in other programs. The average age of the Hebrew speakers was 24. Twelve percent were studying English teaching, 77% English language and literature, and 11% in other programs. They had studied English from fourth or fifth grade, and had taken at least a year or more of English at the university level. Twenty-one percent rated themselves as "good" speakers of English, 73% as "fair," and 6% as "poor." The majority (52%) reported living from one month to a year in an English speaking community, 16% reported spending more time in an English speaking community (2-10 years), while 32% had no such experience at all.

Fifteen percent reported using English frequently with native speakers, 52%
occasionally, and 33% rarely. Whereas their use of the language in speaking
was limited, it is reasonable to assume that they had frequent receptive
contact with the language through movies and television.

2.2. INSTRUMENTATION. Two versions of a language use questionnaire were
designed so as to elicit apologies in a series of situations for which the
degree of offense and the familiarity of the interlocutors were varied.
Six other speech act situations (involving "compliments," "complaints,"
and "regrets") were included so as to avoid a response set (i.e., whereby the
respondents answer mechanically, using the same forms for all the
situations). Each version of the questionnaire included eight apology
situations. Either the severity of the offense or the familiarity of the
interlocutors was varied by situation between the two versions of the
questionnaire. In two cases, the situation was also altered somewhat. A
description of the situations according to severity of offense and
familiarity between interlocutors is provided in Table 1.

The respondents were asked to put themselves in each situation and to
assume that in each case they would, in fact, say something. They were
asked to write down in English what they would say. Before commencing with
the situations, they were asked to provide background information, which,
in the case of the Hebrew speakers, included language proficiency and use.
The Appendix contains a sample questionnaire, with versions A and B combined
to facilitate comparison.

2.3. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES. The questionnaires were distributed in
November 1983, and the last were returned from overseas by March 1984.
The questionnaires were filled out in class, for the most part. Forty-four

English speakers and 45 Hebrew speakers filled out version A, while 52 English

speakers and 39 Hebrew speakers filled out version B.

   2.4. DATA ANALYSIS. Each apology situation was analyzed according to

thirteen variables:

   (1) Five apology strategies:
      a. apology - "sorry," "excuse," "forgive," "apologize," "pardon,"
      + combinations and repetitions.
      b. explanation - non-specific (e.g., "There've been a lot of things
      distracting me at work lately") and specific (e.g., "My boss called
      me to an urgent meeting")
      c. responsibility - implicit ("I was sure I gave you the directions
      correctly"), lack of intent ("I didn't mean to"), self-deficiency
      ("How could I be so clumsy?"), self-blame ("It's my fault").
      d. repair - unspecified ("Can I help you?"), specified ("Let me pick
      up these books for you").
      e. promise of forbearance (e.g., "I promise it won't happen
      again").

   (2) Combination of/absence of Apology Strategies:
      a. combination of strategies
      b. no apology strategy

   (3) Modifications of Apology Strategies:
      a. intensity of apology - "really," "very," "so," "terribly,"
      "awfully," "truly," "please" + combinations and repetitions.
      b. minimizing responsibility (e.g., "Didn't I tell you I don't know
      the bus stops so well?").
      c. denial of responsibility - denial of fault ("It's not my
      fault"), blaming hearer ("It's your fault!").
      d. emotionals - interjection ("Oh!" "Oops!"), invocation ("god!"
      "Jesus!") or curse ("shit!") + combinations.
      e. minimizing offense (e.g., "It's O.K. No harm done.").
      f. comments - about self ("How could I?"), about others ("Are you
      O.K.?"), about situation ("I don't see any damage, thank goodness!")
      + combinations.

The data were coded by two research assistants. Interrater reliability was

calculated on 10% of the questionnaires and the reliability was 90%. One of

the investigators then recoded all the questionnaires, focusing primarily on

the areas of disagreement between the two raters.

Since many of the variables were nominal in nature and had values that

were not incremental (e.g., types of intensification, such as "awfully,

"terribl·," "truly," etc.), the data were analyzed using crosstabulations and
the chi-square statistic.

FINDINGS

3. APOLOGY BEHAVIOR OF NATIVES VS. ADVANCED NONNATIVES. First, the
findings for the five main strategies for apologizing will be considered,
then those for the various modifications on these main strategies, and then
the effect of specific situations on the apology behavior.

3.1. MAIN STRATEGIES. The findings showed that there were not many
differences between the natives and the nonnatives with regard to the main
strategies for apologizing, which would be expected given the nonnatives'
advanced level of English (see Tables 2-5). Let us consider the similarities
and differences, strategy by strategy.

3.11. EXPRESSION OF APOLOGY. For the most part, the advanced nonnatives
used this strategy in much the same way as the natives did. There was only one
case of significant difference in the presence or absence of the strategy --
the case of forgetting to buy medicine for a neighbor's sick child. Two-
thirds of the nonnative speakers used this strategy while only one-third of
the natives did (Table 5). The natives seemed more likely than the nonnatives
to use an emotional and an offer of repair in place of the formal expression
of apology. There was also a significant difference in the selection of the
linguistic form for expressing the apology in the two situations involving
bumping into someone and knocking over that person's books in the library. A
quarter of the natives on version A and 17% on version B used "excuse me,"
while few if any nonnatives did (Table 4). It would seem that the nonnatives
were limiting themselves to the use of "sorry" in contexts where "excuse me"
would also be acceptable and possibly preferable.

9

3.12. EXPLANATION. There were six situations that elicited the strategy of explanation or excuse. In three of them, nonnatives provided an explanation or excuse with significantly greater frequency -- in assigning the wrong sex to a baby of an acquaintance and of a stranger (Table 2), and in forgetting to buy medicine for a neighbor's child (Table 5). In two other situations -- forgetting to bring some class notes to the friend of a classmate (Table 3) and forgetting to buy a newspaper for a neighbor (Table 5) -- nonnatives also provided explanations with greater frequency, but not significantly so.

3.13. RESPONSIBILITY. Natives and nonnatives responded similarly with regard to this strategy except in two situations. In one situation, spilling coffee on a friend, nonnatives used this strategy significantly more than natives (Table 5). In another situation, the car accident without damage, nonnatives preferred some linguistic form indicating self-blame such as "it was my fault," while natives preferred to indicate lack of intent (e.g., "I didn't mean to") or self-deficiency (e.g., "I didn't see you") (Table 4).

3.14. REPAIR. As with the other main strategies, natives and advanced nonnatives offered repair to a similar extent -- 70% or more of both groups in forgetting to bring notes (Table 3), causing both a stranger and a friend to drop books in the library (Table 4), and spilling coffee on a stranger and on a friend, with about 35% in forgetting a newspaper (Table 5). In two cases, there were differences in frequency of use. In forgetting the medicice and spilling coffee on a stranger, the natives repaired more (Table 5). In two cases, there were differences in the linguistic forms used to represent the strategy. In the auto accident with damage to the other car (Table 4) and in forgetting to help a friend buy a bike (Tabe 3), the nonnatives specified their repair more than the natives did. For example, in the auto accident situation, whereas natives were as likely to say "I'll take care of it" as

they were to be more specific, nonnatives tended to offer the other person
their phone number and the name of their insurance company.

3.15. PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE. This strategy appeared in only six of the
situations in this study, and its use was limited just to several respondents.
The situations included both instances of faulty bus directions, the bike and
the class notes situations, causing a stranger's books to be dropped in the
library, and forgetting the newspaper.

3.2. COMBINATION OR ABSENCE OF STRATEGIES.

3.21. COMBINATION OF STRATEGIES. In only one situation were the
combinations of strategies significantly different for the natives and the
nonnatives. This was in the case of forgetting the medicine for the
neighbor's child. Most of the natives who combined strategies used
"responsibility" and "repair," while few nonnatives used this combination.
Nonnatives employed a variety of combinations (Table 5).

3.22. NO APOLOGY. The two groups behaved similarly regarding whether they
saw the need to apologize at all. In the two situations involving bus
directions, a quarter of both groups, on the average, did not use any apology
strategy in their responses (Table 3). In four other situations — the two
situations with the baby (Table 2) and the two with the car accident (Table 4)
— about 10% or so of each group did not apologize.

3.3. MODIFICATIONS OF MAIN STRATEGIES. While natives and nonnatives were
not seen to differ markedly in the use of main strategies for apologizing,
striking differences emerged in what are being referred to as the various
modifications of such apologies. This seemed to be the area that actually
distinguished natives from nonnatives. These phenomena included the intensity
of the apology, minimizing or denying responsibility, the use of emotionals,

minimizing the offense, and commenting. Each will be looked at in turn.

3.31. INTENSITY OF APOLOGY. The nonnatives were found to intensify their expression of apology significantly more in one situation -- that of forgetting to help a friend buy a bike (Table 3) -- and there was a marked trend in that direction in five other situations (taking a stranger's chair at the beach (Table 2), the two situations about bus directions (Table 3), and the two about causing books to be dropped at the library (Table 4)). This extra intensity on the part of the nonnatives was not necessarily warranted, given the generally low or moderate severity of the offense in those situations.

Not only did the nonnatives tend to intensify more, but they also used a variety of forms (e.g., "terribly," "awfully," "truly") more frequently than did the natives. This finding suggested that the nonnatives were less discriminating as to which form of intensification would be appropriate in the given situation. As a case in point, the nonnatives did not use "really" in the way that natives did. They attributed to the intensifier "very" the same semantic properties as to "really," while the natives tended to make a distinction -- i.e., such that "really" expressed a greater depth of apology and concern. For example, in the situation of scalding a friend with coffee, natives tended to use "really sorry" while nonnatives used "very sorry" (Table 5). There was a trend in this direction in three other situations -- the two situations regarding bus directions (Table 3) and knocking over a friend's books in the library (Table 4). There was also a situation (forgetting to help a friend buy a bike) where no natives used "very" while nonnatives divided evenly between "very" and "really" (Table 3). In another situation (the auto accident without damage) two-thirds of the natives used "really" and one-third used "very," while only 6% of the nonnatives used "really," a

third used "very," and the rest used other forms ("terribly," "so," "truly," "please") (Table 4).

3.32. MINIMIZING OR DENYING RESPONSIBILITY. In the situations selected for this study, it was found that respondents rarely minimized or denied responsibility. The two similar situations that did draw such responses dealt with the faulty bus directions. In the case where the acquaintance missed half of the movie because of the faulty directions, the nonnatives minimized their responsibility significantly more then the natives (e.g., "Didn't I tell you I don't know the stops so well?"). For these same situations, several respondents — especially from among the nonnatives — denied fault or even blamed the hearer ("It's your own fault for trusting my directions") (Table 3).

3.33. EMOTIONALS. In all but one situation, the natives used emotionals more frequently than did the nonnatives, this difference being statistically significant in six situations (taking a friend's chair, the baby incident with a stranger, forgetting about the bike, causing a stranger's library books to be dropped, forgetting to buy medicine, forgetting to buy a newspaper). Usually this meant mostly the use of an interjection, like "Oh!" but ocassionally it meant both an interjection and a curse — especially in the bike, medicine, and newspaper situations.

3.34. MINIMIZING THE OFFENSE. This modification strategy did not appear in six situations and appeared only minimally in eight others. The two situations where it was noticeable were that of the bus directions where the acquaintance still saw the show (Table 3) and the car accident without damage (Table 4), the latter being the most conspicuous case. Here 44% of the nonnatives and 41% of the natives minimized the offense, pointing out that no damage was done so there was no need to be upset. In this case the situation

clearly leant itself to this modification strategy.

3.35. COMMENTS. In most situations the commenting behavior of natives and nonnatives was similar, both with respect to amount and nature. In two instances, however, there were significant differences. In the coffee incident where a stranger was scalded, natives commented far more than the nonnatives (61% vs. 27%), and also focused most of their comments on the other person (Table 5). Forty-five percent of the natives included "Are you all right/O.K.?" in their comment. Again, among the nonnatives there was only one such comment. In the car accident without damage, the same percent of respondents commented in both groups (45%) but the natives once again tended to comment about the other person, or about the other person and the situation, rather than just about the situation, as the nonnatives did (Table 4). A quarter of the natives included "Are you all right/O.K.?" in their comment. Only one of the nonnatives did so.

3.4. EFFECTS OF SITUATION. In order to determine the extent to which the severity of the offense and the familiarity of the interlocutors influenced native and nonnative apologies, the mean frequencies of responses for those answering version A of the questionnaire were compared with those who answered version B. Because the data were from different subsamples responding to different versions of the same instrument, chi-square could not be calculated and the findings are based instead on simple analysis of difference in percentages (20% or more constituting a difference). These comparisons are meant to be suggestive, rather than definitive, given the nature of the comparisons.

3.41. SEVERITY OF OFFENSE. In the two cases of the bus directions, when the acquaintance missed half of the movie, both natives and nonnatives intensified their expression of apology more than when none of the movie was

missed. In the two cases of the auto accident, when there was damage, both natives and nonnatives offered an expression of apology and repair less, and used more emotionals. Finally, forgetting medicine for a neighbor's child elicited more repair from natives than did forgetting to buy the neighbor a newspaper.

3.42. FAMILIARITY. Familiarity of interlocutors seemed to have its main influence on the modification strategy of intensifying the expression of apology. In three situations, the native speakers intensified their apology more to the stranger than to the friend — i.e., causing books to be dropped in the library, scalding the person's arm with coffee, and forgetting to bring class notes to a stranger vs. forgetting to help a friend buy a bike.

DISCUSSION

4. It was expected that advanced learners of English as a foreign language would have good control over much of the apology speech act set. What was not clear was where the gaps would be found, if there were any. This study has demonstrated that there are gaps, but that these gaps lie more in the area of modifications of the main strategies, rather than in the main strategies themselves.

In previous research with Hebrew speakers who were intermediate-level learners of English (Cohen & Olshtain 1981), it was found that the nonnatives occasionally underutilized the main strategies of expressing an apology, acknowledging responsibility, and offering repair when compared with natives. In the current research with advanced learners this was not found to be the case. Most likely the types of problems that had led to the deviations with the intermediate learners — namely, negative transfer from Hebrew-speaker patterns due to a lack of sociocultural awareness and a lack of grammatical

competence — were no longer prevalent among the more advanced learners.

The fact that a fair number of natives selected "excuse me" while the nonnatives stuck to "I'm sorry" as the form for expressing apology in knocking over someone's books in the library, suggests that the nonnatives were still overgeneralizing the use of "sorry" — most likely considering it a safe strategy. It would appear that they had not acquired the distinction whereby "excuse me" functions more as a formula for remedying a breach of etiquette or other minor offense on the part of the speakers, while "I'm sorry" is more an expression of regret at an unpleasantness suffered by the addressee (Borkin & Reinhart 1978).

With respect to modifications of the main strategies, intermediate learners of English had been found to intensify their expression of apology less than natives in certain situations (as in bumping into an old lady, hurting her)(Cohen & Olshtain 1981). In the current work with advanced learners, the patterns of intensity were, if anything, overlearned and appeared to be used indiscriminately. The pattern of sticking to one overgeneralized form, such as "very," could be seen as a means of playing it safe. It is possible that the overgeneralized use of "very" on the part of nonnatives also reflects a preference by textbook writers for "very" as opposed to "really" in the English as a foreign language textbooks that these Israeli students had used.

It would seem that the nonnatives used intensity in place of interjections and offer of repair. The question would be whether such use was purposive or accidental. In the case of the native speakers, a well-placed interjection or curse and offer of repair sometimes took the place of an expression of apology with an intensifier ("Oh, shit! Here, let me help you pick them up" vs. "I'm very sorry that I bumped into you"). It could also be seen that natives had a sense of the appropriate comment to use in a given situation as a social

lubricant to reinforce the apology (e.g., "Are you O.K.?" after possibly hurting someone).

There is clearly more work needed in investigating apology behavior in situations where the severity of the offense is quite high. It has already been demonstrated that apology behavior may be lessened or even curtailed once the offense reaches a certain level. The case in point was role play about a borrowed dress being returned dirty, torn, or not returned at all because it was lost. If the dress was lost, there was a tendency to apologize less (Olshtain & Cohen 1983:26-27). This tendency to apologize less under circumstances of greater severity was not so apparent in the current study, although there was a sharp decline from expressing apology in the car accident with no damage as opposed to expressing apology when there was damage. The fact that natives intensified their apology more to strangers than to friends while nonnatives did not, may demonstrate the natives' finely-tuned ability to vary the intensity according to the situation. It may also be an indication of different cultural perceptions of friendship, and the degree of intensity may reflect this perception.

Future research could probe further into the relationship between severity of offense and familiarity of interlocutors. Although this research study kept one of the two variables constant while the other was varied, the one kept constant still had its influence on the outcomes. So, for example, the auto accident with damage and without damage took place with a stranger. It may be beneficial to compare these data to those where in both cases the other driver is a friend.

In summary, the purpose of this study was to obtain a detailed description of how apologies are realized by natives and nonnatives of English. The intent was to describe the nature and extent of gaps between native and

advanced nonnative apologies. It was thought that on the basis of this description curriculum materials could be designed for rectifying the problem of gaps. The current study has shown that there is not that much to be taught to advanced learners. The basic finding was that nonnatives lack sensitivity to certain distinctions that natives make between forms for expressing apology such as "excuse me" and "sorry," and between intensifiers such as "very" and "really." The nonnative pattern is either to overgeneralize one of the forms ("very" and "sorry") or to use a variety of forms. Nonnatives also tend to avoid interjections and curses, and cannot necessarily be counted on to produce comments providing the appropriate social lubricant in difficult situations (e.g., "Are you O.K.?"). The question we are now considering is whether it pays to explain some of these fine points to advanced learners and to see which learners stand to benefit such overt instruction and in what ways they may benefit.

Table 1

Description of Apology Situations by Severity and Familiarity

VERSION A		VERSION B		Severity of Offense		Familiarity	
Item	Situation	Item	Situation				
1	Chairs	1	Chairs	Low	Low	Stranger	Friend
3	Baby	3	Baby	Low	Low	Acquaintance	Stranger
5	Bus to movie	5	Bus to movie	Low	Hi	Acquaintance	Acquaint.
6	Buying bike	7	Class notes	Moderate	Mod.	Friend	Stranger
3	Library	9	Library	Low	Low	Friend	Stranger
10	Car accident	10	Car accident	Moderate	High	Stranger	Stranger
12	Medicine	12	Newspaper	High	Low	Friend	Friend
14	Coffee	14	Coffee	High	High	Stranger	Friend

Apology Behavior of Natives (El) vs. Advanced Nonnatives (Hl) (data in percentages)

	APOLOGY		INTENSITY		EXPLANA-TION		RESPONSI-BILITY		MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY		DENYING RESP.		REPAIR		PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE		STRATEGY COMBINATIONS		NO APOLOGY		EMOTIONALS		MINIMIZING OFFENSE		COMMENTS	
	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl

CHAIR: Form A, Lo Offense, Stranger

- APOLOGY: none; sorry 11/7, 84/89; excuse 5/2; combination 0/2
- INTENSITY: none; really 100/82, 0/2; so 0/2; terribly 0/9; combination 0/5
- EXPLANATION: none; explicit 93/93, 7/7
- RESPONSIBILITY: none; implicit 18/22, 7/2; self-deficiency 75/76
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none; yes 93/87, 7/13
- DENYING RESP.: none; no fault 100/93, 0/2; blame hearer 0/5
- REPAIR: none; specified 91/91, 9/9
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100/100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none; apol+resp 25/20, 59/65; apol+expl+resp 7/2; apol+resp+repair 7/7; other 2/6
- NO APOLOGY: none; yes 98/98, 2/2
- EMOTIONALS: none; interjection 68/80, 32/20
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none; yes 100/100
- COMMENTS: none; about self 74/94, 2/2; about other 9/2; about situation 12/2

CHAIR: Form B, Lo Offense, Friend

- APOLOGY: none; sorry 15/20, 83/77; excuse 0/3; combination 2/0
- INTENSITY: none; so 98/97, 2/0; combination 0/3
- EXPLANATION: none; explicit 92/87, 8/13
- RESPONSIBILITY: none; implicit 44/36, 6/10; self-deficiency 50/54
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none; yes 94/92, 6/8
- DENYING RESP.: none; no fault 98/92, 2/5; blame hearer 0/3
- REPAIR: none; unspecified 86/80, 4/0; specified 10/20
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100/100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none; apol+resp 42/28, 39/39; apol+repair 2/10; apol+expl+resp 2/10; apol+resp+repair 10/10; other 6/3
- NO APOLOGY: none; yes 90/87, 10/13
- EMOTIONALS: none; interjection 54/79, 46/18; curse 0/3 **
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none; yes 100/97, 0/3
- COMMENTS: none; about self 83/85, 4/0; about other 0/3; about situation 13/10; combination 0/2

BABY: Form A, Lo Offense, Acquaint.

- APOLOGY: none; sorry 57/58, 36/36; excuse 7/4; pardon 0/2
- INTENSITY: none 100/100
- EXPLANATION: none; implicit 68/47, 11/2; explicit 21/51 **
- RESPONSIBILITY: none; implicit 84/80, 0/5; lack intent 2/4; self-deficiency 9/11; self-blame 5/0
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none; yes 100/96, 0/4
- DENYING RESP.: none 100/100
- REPAIR: none; unspecified 68/49, 2/7; specified 30/44
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100/100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none; apol+expl 66/40, 12/18; apol+repair 7/15; expl+repair 2/9; resp+repair 0/7; apol+expl+resp 2/9; other 11/2
- NO APOLOGY: none; yes 86/93, 14/7
- EMOTIONALS: none; interjection 48/62, 45/38; interj+curse 7/0
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none; yes 96/96, 4/4
- COMMENTS: none; about self 66/71, 2/0; about other 21/22; about situation 9/2; combination 2/5

BABY: Form B, Lo Offense, Stranger

- APOLOGY: none; sorry 48/54, 46/44; excuse 4/0; pardon 2/2
- INTENSITY: none; really 100/92, 0/3; so 0/5
- EXPLANATION: none; implicit 69/51, 0/8; explicit 31/41 *
- RESPONSIBILITY: none; implicit 83/92, 2/0; self-deficiency 15/8
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none; yes 96/92, 4/8
- DENYING RESP.: none 100/100
- REPAIR: none; unspecified 40/46, 2/3; specified 58/51
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100/100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none; apol+expl 42/44, 9/15; apol+repair 25/20; expl+repair 6/8; apol+expl+resp 6/2; other 12/11
- NO APOLOGY: none; yes 90/90, 10/10
- EMOTIONALS: none; interjection 31/62, 67/38; interj+curse 2/0 **
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none; yes 98/95, 2/0
- COMMENTS: none; about self 59/51, 10/3; about other 29/38; about situation 2/5; combination 0/3

Chi-square * p<.05 ** p<.01

Table 3

	APOLOGY		INTENSITY		EXPLANA-TION		RESPONSI-BILITY		MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY		DENYING RESP.		REPAIR		PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE		STRATEGY COMBINATIONS		NO APOLOGY		EMOTIONALS		MINIMIZING OFFENSE		COMMENTS	
	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl	El	Hl

BUS: Form A / Lo Offense / Acquaint.

- APOLOGY: none 39 31; sorry 59 65; forgive 0 4; apologize 2 0
- INTENSITY: none 98 75; really 2 7; very 0 7; so 0 7; terribly 0 2; awfully 0 2
- EXPLANATION: none 96 91; implicit 4 7; explicit 4 2
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 53 53; implicit 27 16; lack intent 2 9; self-deficiency 18 22
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 77 82; yes 23 18
- DENYING RESP.: none 98 91; deny blame 0 9; blame hearer 2 0
- REPAIR: none 98 96; unspecified 2 4
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 98; yes 0 2
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 66 51; apol+expl 2 7; apol+resp 25 36; apol+repair 5 0; other 2 6
- NO APOLOGY: none 77 76; yes 23 24
- EMOTIONALS: none 64 78; interjection 36 20; interj+curse 0 2
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 93 87; yes 7 13
- COMMENTS: none 48 51; about self 7 5; about other 5 9; about situation 36 33; combination 4 2

BUS: Form B / Hi Offense / Acquaint.

- APOLOGY: none 33 28; sorry 63 62; forgive 0 3; apologize 2 5; combination 2 2
- INTENSITY: none 69 51; really 21 13; very 0 13; so 6 9; terribly 2 8; please 0 2; combination 2 2
- EXPLANATION: none 96 90; implicit 0 2; explicit 4 8
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 54 49; implicit 31 33; lack intent 0 5; self-deficiency 15 8; other 0 5
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 96 74; yes 4 26 **
- DENYING RESP.: none 90 87; deny fault 8 8; blame hearer 2 5
- REPAIR: none 92 95; unspecified 2 3; specified 10 20; combination 0 2
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 95; yes 0 5
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 56 44; apol+expl 4 5; apol+resp 31 44; other 9 7
- NO APOLOGY: none 73 79; yes 27 21
- EMOTIONALS: none 50 77; interjection 40 20; curse 6 3; interj+curse 4 0
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 96 95; yes 4 5
- COMMENTS: none 46 72; about self 10 5; about other 6 5; about situation 32 18; combination 6 0

BIKE: Form A / Mod Offense / Friend

- APOLOGY: none 25 22; sorry 64 67; forgive 3 5; apologize 3 0; pardon 0 2; combinations 5 4
- INTENSITY: none 79 45; really 14 13; very 0 9; so 5 13; terribly 2 9; awfully 0 2; please 0 2; combination 0 7
- EXPLANATION: none 77 69; implicit 5 7; explicit 18 24
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 20 20; implicit 5 7; self-deficiency 75 70; self-blame 0 3; self-blame 5 0
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 98; yes 0 2
- DENYING RESP.: none 100 100
- REPAIR: none 59 58; unspecified 14 0; specified 27 40; combination 0 2 *
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 95 91; yes 5 9
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 16 13; apol+expl 9 4; apol+resp 32 29; apol+expl+resp 0 7; apol+resp+repair 21 16; apol+expl+resp+repair 2 7; other 13 13
- NO APOLOGY: none 100 100
- EMOTIONALS: none 50 56; interjection 25 42; curse 2 2; interj+curse 23 0 **
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 100
- COMMENTS: none 77 71; about self 7 16; about situation 14 11; combination 2 2

NOTES: Form B / Mod Offense / Stranger

- APOLOGY: none 9 23; sorry 85 69; excuse 2 0; forgive 0 5; apologize 4 3
- INTENSITY: none 56 46; really 12 5; very 6 10; so 19 27; terribly 6 2; awfully 2 2; truly 0 3; please 22 3
- EXPLANATION: none 84 74; implicit 8 8; explicit 8 18
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 27 26; implicit 6 0; self-deficiency 67 74
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 96 97; yes 4 3
- DENYING RESP.: none 98 97; deny fault 2 3
- REPAIR: none 29 31; unspecified 10 15; specified 58 51; combination 2 0
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 92 90; yes 8 10
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 10 15; apol+resp 15 10; apol+repair 15 13; apol+resp+repair 38 31; apol+expl+resp+repair 8 10; other 14 21
- NO APOLOGY: none 98 92; yes 2 8
- EMOTIONALS: none 33 51; interjection 54 38; curse 2 0; interj+curse 9 8
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 10
- COMMENTS: none 85 87; about self 11 10; about other 29 38; about situation 4 3

Chi-square 1 22 3

23

Apology Behavior of Natives (E1) vs. Advanced Nonnatives (H1) (data in percentages)

	APOLOGY E1 H1	INTENSITY E1 H1	EXPLANATION E1 H1	RESPONSIBILITY E1 H1	MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY E1 H1	DENYING RESP. E1 H1	REPAIR E1 H1	PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE E1 HI	STRATEGY COMBINATIONS E1 H1	NO APOLOGY E1 H1	EMOTIONALS E1 H1	MINIMIZING OFFENSE E1 H1	COMMENTS E1 H1

LIBRARY: Form A, Lo Offense, Friend

- APOLOGY: none 11 29; sorry 61 67; excuse 25 4; combination 3 0 ✱
- INTENSITY: none 93 80; really 5 2; very 0 2; so 0 9; terribly 0 7; awfully 2 0
- EXPLANATION: none 100 96; implicit 0 2; explicit 0 2
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 91 78; lack intent 0 4; self-deficiency 9 16; self-blame 0 2
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 98; yes 0 2
- DENYING RESP.: none 100 100
- REPAIR: none 32 27; unspecified 9 24; specified 59 49
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 36 36; apol+resp 5 9; apol+repair 55 42; apol+resp+repair 4 5; other 0 8
- NO APOLOGY: none 98 98; yes 2 2
- EMOTIONALS: none 70 69; interjection 25 31; interj+curse 5 0
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 100
- COMMENTS: none 66 66; about self 9 16; about other 21 13; about situation 4 11

LIBRARY: Form B, Lo Offense, Stranger

- APOLOGY: none 2 8; sorry 70 82; excuse 17 0; forgive 0 2; combination 11 8 ✱✱
- INTENSITY: none 63 49; really 8 8; very 4 18; so 15 15; terribly 8 5; awfully 0 3; combination 2 2
- EXPLANATION: none 96 97; explicit 4 3
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 88 82; implicit 2 3; lack intent 4 5; self-deficiency 6 10
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 100
- DENYING RESP.: none 100 100
- REPAIR: none 17 18; unspecified 40 26; specified 39 54; combination 4 2
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 97; yes 0 3
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 13 28; apol+resp 4 0; apol+repair 73 54; apol+resp+repair 4 15; other 6 3
- NO APOLOGY: none 100 100
- EMOTIONALS: none 50 77; interjection 46 23; interj+curse 4 0 ✱
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 97; yes 0 3
- COMMENTS: none 73 85; about self 2 0; about other 17 13; about situation 6 2; combination 2 0

CAR: Form A, Mod Offense, Stranger

- APOLOGY: none 25 29; sorry 73 60; excuse 2 2; apologize 0 4; combination 0 5
- INTENSITY: none 59 65; really 25 2; very 9 11; so 5 5; terribly 2 13; truly 0 2; please 0 2 ✱
- EXPLANATION: none 86 93; explicit 14 7
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 70 69; lack intent 7 0; self-deficiency 16 7; self-blame 7 24 ✱
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 93 100; yes 7 0
- DENYING RESP.: none 100 100
- REPAIR: none 75 75; unspecified 16 18; specified 9 7
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 57 56; apol+expl 5 2; apol+resp 18 16; apol+expl+resp 7 2; apol+resp+repair 4 9; other 0 4
- NO APOLOGY: none 91 91; yes 9 9
- EMOTIONALS: none 91 96; interjection 7 2; curse 2 2
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 59 56; yes 41 49
- COMMENTS: none 55 55; about self 2 16; about other 27 2; about situation 9 27; combination 7 0 ✱✱

CAR: Form B, Hi Offense, Stranger

- APOLOGY: none 48 44; sorry 52 54; apologize 0 2
- INTENSITY: none 63 69; really 17 3; very 10 0; so 4 13; terribly 2 3; please 2 2; combination 2 2
- EXPLANATION: none 92 84; implicit 2 8; explicit 6 8
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 69 69; implicit 2 5; self-deficiency 10 10; self-blame 19 16
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 95; yes 0 2
- DENYING RESP.: none 98 97; deny fault 2 3
- REPAIR: none 36 20; unspecified 33 18; specified 31 59; combination 0 3 ✱
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 46 41; apol+expl 0 5; apol+repair 23 15; resp+repair 11 5; apol+expl+repair 4 8; apol+resp+repair 12 20; other 4 6
- NO APOLOGY: none 86 92; yes 14 8
- EMOTIONALS: none 69 79; interjection 21 10; curse 6 3; interj+curse 4 8
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 95; yes 0 5
- COMMENTS: none 50 46; about self 12 8; about other 17 15; about situation 17 23; combination 4 8

Chi-square
✱ p<.05
✱✱ p<.01

25

24

Apology Behavior of Natives (E1) vs. Advanced Nonnatives (H1) (data in percentages)

	APOLOGY		INTENSITY		EXPLANA-TION		RESPONSI-BILITY		MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY		DENYING RESP.		REPAIR		PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE		STRATEGY COMBINATIONS		NO APOLOGY		EMOTIONALS		MINIMIZING OFFENSE		COMMENTS	
	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1	E1	H1

MEDICINE: Form A, Hi Offense, Friend

- APOLOGY: none 66 29; sorry 34 67; excuse 0 2; apologize 0 2 **
- INTENSITY: none 89 80; really 2 4; so 5 9; terribly 2 7; combination 2 0
- EXPLANATION: none 98 71; implicit 0 7; explicit 2 22 **
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 21 24; implicit 2 5; lack intent 2 0; self-deficiency 75 71
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 100
- DENYING RESP: none 100 100
- REPAIR: none 18 44; unspecified 9 5; specified 73 51 *
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 20 20; apol+resp 5 20; apol+repair 9 4; resp+repair 43 5; apol+compl+repair 0 9; apol+resp+repair 21 25; apol+expl+resp+repair 0 9; other 2 8 **
- NO APOLOGY: none 98 98; yes 2 2
- EMOTIONALS: none 29 53; interjection 50 45; interj+curse 21 2 **
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 100
- COMMENTS: none 87 91; about self 0 5; about other 9 2; about situation 2 2; combination 2 0

NEWSPAPER: Form B, Lo Offense, Friend

- APOLOGY: none 37 46; sorry 63 51; forgive 0 3
- INTENSITY: none 84 90; really 4 3; very 2 3; so 8 0; terribly 2 2; please 0 2
- EXPLANATION: none 90 74; implicit 4 16; explicit 6 10
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 17 20; self-deficiency 83 80
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 100
- DENYING RESP: none 98 100; deny fault 2 0
- REPAIR: none 65 59; unspecified 0 5; specified 35 36
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 98 100; yes 2 0
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 19 31; apol+resp 38 18; apol+repair 6 0; resp+repair 19 13; apol+expl+resp 2 15; apol+resp+repair 10 18; other 6 5
- NO APOLOGY: none 96 97; yes 4 3
- EMOTIONALS: none 29 54; interjection 56 44; interj+curse 6 2 *
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 97; yes 0 3
- COMMENTS: none 92 93; about self 8 0; about other 0 5; about situation 0 3; combination 0 2

COFFEE: Form A, Hi Offense, Stranger

- APOLOGY: none 11 12; sorry 72 78; excuse 5 0; forgive 2 2; pardon 0 2; combination 10 6
- INTENSITY: none 41 51; really 9 4; very 5 6; so 32 18; terribly 11 11; awfully 0 4; truly 0 4; other 2 2
- EXPLANATION: none 100 98; implicit 0 2
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 96 78; implicit 0 2; lack intent 2 9; self-deficiency 2 11
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100 100
- DENYING RESP: none 100 100
- REPAIR: none 18 33; unspecified 9 31; specified 71 27 **
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 25 18; apol+resp 2 18; apol+repair 71 56; other 2 8
- NO APOLOGY: none 100 98; yes 0 2
- EMOTIONALS: none 41 62; interjection 48 36; interj+curse 11 2
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 100 100
- COMMENTS: none 39 73; about self 5 9; about other 50 9; about situation 2 9; combination 4 0 **

COFFEE: Form B, Hi Offense, Friend

- APOLOGY: none 23 18; sorry 77 72; excuse 0 3; combination 0 7
- INTENSITY: none 63 56; really 10 0; very 2 8; so 23 15; terribly 2 13; truly 0 3
- EXPLANATION: none 98 97; implicit 0 3; explicit 2 0
- RESPONSIBILITY: none 94 74; lack intent 0 8; self-deficiency 4 18; self-blame 2 0 *
- MINIMIZING RESPONSIBILITY: none 100; yes 0 3
- DENYING RESP: none 98 100; deny fault 2 0
- REPAIR: none 34 29; unspecified 29 20; specified 35 48; combination 2 3
- PROMISE OF FORBEARANCE: none 100 100
- STRATEGY COMBINATIONS: none 30 28; apol+resp 6 8; apol+repair 52 44; apol+resp+repair 2 18; other 2 2; apol+resp+repair ...
- NO APOLOGY: none 92 92; yes 8 8
- EMOTIONALS: none 25 69; interjection 65 26; curse 2 0; interj+curse 8 5 **
- MINIMIZING OFFENSE: none 98 97; yes 2 3
- COMMENTS: none 30 69; about self 15 8; about other 25 10; about situation 10 10; combination 0 2

Chi-square

REFERENCES

BLUM-KULKA, SHOSHANA. 1982. Learning to say what you mean in a second
language: A study of the speech act performance of Hebrew second
language learners. Applied Linguistics 3.29-59.

----, and ELITE OLSHTAIN. 1984. Requests and apologies: A cross cultural study
of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). Applied Linguistics
5.196-213.

----, BRENDA DANET, and RIMONA GERSON. ms. The language of requesting
in Israeli society. Language and social situations, ed. by J.P.
Forgas. NY: Springer-Verlag.

BORKIN, ANN, and SUSAN M. REINHART. 1978. "Excuse me" and "I'm sorry."
TESOL Quarterly 12.57-69.

COHEN, ANDREW D., and ELITE OLSHTAIN. 1981. Developing a measure of
sociocultural competence: The case of apology. Language Learning 31.113-
134.

EISENSTEIN, MIRIAM, and JEAN W. BODMAN. 1984. I very appreciate: Expressions
of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of English. NY: NYU, ms.

FRASER, BRUCE. 1980. On apologizing. Conversational routines, ed by F.
Coulmas, The Hague: Mouton, 259-271.

FREUNDLICH, JOYCE Y. 1981. No thyself: The art of refusal. New Brunswick,
NJ: Livingston College, Rutgers University, ms.

HOUSE, JULIANA. 1982. Conversational strategies in German and English
dialogues. Error analysis. Constructive linguistics and second
language learning, ed. by Gerhard Nickel and D. Nehls. Heidelberg:
Groos, 135-150.

OLSHTAIN, ELITE. 1983. Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The

case of apology. Language transfer in language learning, ed. by Susan

Gass and Larry Selinker, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 232-249.

----, and ANDREW D. COHEN. 1983. Apology: A speech-act set. In Wolfson and

Judd, eds., 18-35.

----, and ANDREW D. COHEN. ms. Speech act behavior across languages.

Transfer in production, ed. by Hans W. Dechert et al., Norwood, NJ:

Ablex.

RINTELL, ELLEN. 1981. Sociolinguistic variation and pragmatic ability: A look

at learners. IJSL 27.11-34.

RUBIN, JOAN. 1983. How to tell when someone is saying "no" revisited.

In Wolfson and Judd, eds., 10-17.

SULLIVAN, PATRICIA. 1979. Conversation: Saying hello and goodbye. TESOL

Newsletter 13.29.

THOMAS, JENNY. 1983. Cross cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics

4.91-112.

WOLFSON, NESSA. 1981. Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. TESOL

Quarterly 15.117-124.

----, and ELLIOT JUDD. 1983 (eds.) Sociolinguistics and language acquisition.

Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Appendix

LANGUAGE USE QUESTIONNAIRE - Versions A & B Combined

Background Information
Field of Study and Level _____
Age ____ Mother Tongue _____
If nonnative English speaker, rate your speaking ability:
    excellent ____ good ____ fair ____ poor ____.
Time spent in English-speaking community: ____ months, ____ years.
Previous use of English with native speakers:
    frequent ___ occasional ___ rare ___.
Current use of English with native speakers:
    frequent ___ occasional ___ rare ___.

Instructions: Please put yourself in the following situations and assume
that in each instance you will, in fact, say something. Write down what you
would say (in English) in the space provided. Make sure that you read the
whole situation carefully before you respond.

1. At a crowded pool, you see two empty chairs and quickly start to carry
them away. A stranger/friend calls out:

"Hey! Those are our chairs. Didn't you see our clothes on the ground next to
them?"

You:

2. You give a report in class. After the lesson, a student whom you don't
know very well comes up to you.

Student: "I really enjoyed your report. It was very interesting."

You:

3. Walking along the street, you meet a female acquaintance (whom you haven't
seen for some time)/notice a stranger holding a cute little 9-month old baby.

You: "What a cutie! How old is he?"

The acquaintance/The stranger: "It's a she, not a he!"

You:

4. A good friend sees you at the University.

Friend: "I really like your shirt!"

You:

5. An acquaintance you had given bus directions to the day before, sees you on the street.

The acquaintance: "You know, you told me to get off one stop too soon for the movie yesterday. But it was O.K. We still got there before the movie started."/The acquaintance: "You know, you gave me the wrong bus number for the movie theater yesterday! By the time we got there, we had already missed half the movie."

You:

6. (Version A) You promised to meet a friend at a bicycle store to help him/her choose the right bike. You forgot the meeting. The next day, you see your friend.

Friend: "Remember, we were supposed to meet at the bicycle store I waited for you at the store for an hour. I didn't want to buy the bike without you."

You:

7. (Version B) A friend of a classmate called and asked to borrow some class notes of yours. You agreed to meet her that afternoon at the library, but then forgot. That night, she calls.

Her: "Hello, this is Ruth. Remember, I called you yesterday and we agreed to meet at the library today. I waited for you for an hour."

You:

7(A)/6(B). You're eating at your friend's apartment. You think the food is terrible.

Your friend: "How do you like this dish? It's a new recipe."

You:

8(A)/9(B). At the library, you accidentally bump into a friend/an older person about 60 who is holding a stack of books. Your friend/The person is startled, but unhurt. A few of the books fall on the floor.

You:

9(A)/8(B). You're waiting in line at a bank. Someone goes right up to the teller without waiting in line and hands him/her a check to be cashed.

You:

10. You don't stop in time at a red light and bump into the car in front of you. The other driver and you get out and see that there is no damage/considerable damage to the other car. The other driver is still noticeably upset/very upset.

You:

11. You take a good friend to "the best pizza place in town" on a busy evening. When the pizza finally comes, it's cold. You call the waiter back.

You:

12. You promised you'd buy your neighbor medicine for her sick child/a newspaper while in town, but you forgot.

Your neighbor: "Did you get the medicine/paper?"

You:

13. At a party, you meet a friend you haven't seen for some time. You ask about his wife and children.

The friend: "You may not know this, but we just got divorced."

You:

14. In a cafeteria, you accidentally bump into an older person about 60/a friend who is holding a cup of hot coffee. The coffee spills all over the person/your friend, scalding his/her arm and soaking his/her clothing.

The person/The friend (shouting, startled): "Oooh! Ouch!"

You: