

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF APOLOGETIC STRATEGIES
IN THAI AND ENGLISH

by
JOHN H. BRINEGAR

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Linguistics
and the Honors College of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts

August 1990

APPROVED:

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the approver.

Derry Malsch

An Abstract of the Thesis of

John H. Brinegar for the degree of Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of Linguistics to be taken August 1990

Title: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF APOLOGETIC STRATEGIES IN THAI
AND ENGLISH

Approved: _____

Derry Malsch

This thesis compares the apologetic behavior of native speakers of Thai with that of native English speakers. The basis for comparison is the set of conventional politeness strategies developed by Penelope Brown and Steven C. Levinson. Data was collected from ten Thai speakers and ten English speakers by means of a questionnaire, which was designed to measure changes in apologetic strategy due to varying social relations with the person apologized to and varying magnitude of offense. The most important results show that Thai speakers ask forgiveness frequently and express regret infrequently, while the opposite is true of English speakers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. DATA COLLECTION.....	4
III. DATA ANALYSIS.....	8
IV. RESULTS.....	12
V. DISCUSSION.....	25
VI. CONCLUSION.....	27
APPENDIX	
A. TABULATED DATA.....	28
B. DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE.....	31
C. PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES.....	32
NOTES.....	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. English Responses.....	28
2. Thai Responses.....	28
3. English Male Responses.....	29
4. English Female Responses.....	29
5. Thai Male Responses.....	30
6. Thai Female Responses.....	30

I. INTRODUCTION

Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson's book-length essay Politeness: Some universals in language usage has been widely influential in sociolinguistic studies. The authors' theory is that concern for "face", or the desire to be socially acceptable and not to have one's actions curtailed, accounts for speech which is more complex than its content requires. This notion of "face" has been utilized in studies of phenomena such as offers, requests, promises, and apologies. The present paper combines Brown and Levinson's theory of strategies for attending to face needs with the methodology of Andrew D. Cohen and Eliezer Olshtain's studies of cross-cultural apologetic behavior¹ in order to compare the apologetic strategies of native speakers of Thai with those of native English speakers. The ways in which the speaker's social relationship with the person apologized to, the magnitude of the offense, and the speaker's gender affect the choice of apologetic strategy are the bases for comparison.

Brown and Levinson's work makes a particularly appropriate basis for a study of this kind, since their theory presents universal strategies for attending to face needs. Both English and Thai speakers should therefore use the same strategies in apologies. This study shows that both groups do in fact

use the same strategies, furthering Brown and Levinson's claim to have discovered universals of politeness. The theory rests on two sets of desires which account for conventionally polite linguistic behavior. The first, known as positive face, is the desire to be socially acceptable and to have one's wants and needs valued. In the case of apology, the person who apologizes (or S, for "speaker") may wish to acknowledge this desire on the part of the one apologized to (or H, for "hearer") because the action for which S is apologizing has caused H to believe that S does not recognize it. The second desire, called negative face, is the desire not to have one's actions impeded. Since the cause of an apology is very frequently an impingement on someone's freedom of action, acknowledgement and satisfaction of this desire plays a large part in apologetic behavior.

Cohen and Olshtain's studies of the ability of second-language learners to apologize competently in their second language provide a thorough and effective method of gathering a wide range of apologetic behavior. An interviewer plays the part of the offended party in each of eight different situations, eliciting various apologies from the interviewee. The situations vary in degree of infringement and the social relation of speaker to hearer.

This study adopts their method, with a few changes, because it allows the observation of the way in which apologetic strategies change due to the above variables.

The value of this study lies in its direct comparison of English and Thai apologetic strategies. While Cohen and Olshtain's work involves data from both native speakers of English and Hebrew, they never directly compare the apologetic behavior of the two speaker groups. The present paper is thus fairly novel in that it compares the different ways in which speaker groups use universal face-attentive strategies to achieve the common end of apology. It is also the only study of Thai apologies that I know of, making it a worthwhile addition to the field of sociolinguistics.

II. DATA COLLECTION

I chose to use Cohen and Olshtain's method of data collection with very few changes because it was quite compatible with Brown and Levinson's theory. In their article "Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: the case of apology," Cohen and Olshtain were interested in eliciting apologies which varied in intensity (e.g. "I'm sorry" as opposed to "I'm extremely sorry") and in formality (e.g. "I'm sorry" as opposed to "I must apologize"). To accomplish the former, they devised four situations, as follows: backing into a stranger's car, bumping into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying, bumping into a lady, shaking her up somewhat, and unavoidably bumping into a lady because she was in the way². These were of interest to me because they varied in the degree to which they affronted face needs, especially negative face. Backing into someone's car is obviously a greater impingement on freedom of action than unavoidably bumping into someone. By using these situations, I was able to examine how speakers modify their apologetic strategies to conform to varying degrees of disregard of face. Similarly, Cohen and Olshtain's elicitation of apologies of varying formality was useful in examining how

speakers change strategies based on their relations with the person to whom they apologize. Their four situations demanding varying formality were insulting someone at a meeting, forgetting a meeting with one's boss, forgetting a get-together with a friend, and forgetting a date to take one's son shopping³. These correspond respectively with no relations with the person apologized to, power-based relations, solidarity-based relations, and kin relations. Using these definitions of the situations, it was possible to examine their effect on choice of apologetic strategies.

In order to make the situations somewhat more realistic to the college students who were my subjects, I felt that a few minor changes were necessary. I changed "insulting someone at a meeting" to "inadvertently insulting another student, who you don't know, in a class discussion" because the latter was more likely to be an experience that the subjects had had. For similar reasons, I changed "forgetting a meeting with one's boss" to "arriving fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor" and "forgetting a date to take your son shopping" to "forgetting a date to take your younger brother (or sister) shopping". It should be noted that Cohen and Olshtain's subjects were also college students, and seem not to have had difficulty relating to the situations as originally given. My emendations, however, did not adversely affect the quality of the responses I received, leading me to believe that they were sound.

The subjects of the study were twenty college students drawn from the

University of Oregon. Ten of these were native speakers of Thai, none of whom had been in the United States for more than five years. The other ten were native English speakers. Both groups were composed of five male and five female subjects, in order to facilitate examining gender-based differences in apologetic strategy. The Thai students were selected by Ms. Achara Wongse-Ek, who also assisted me in administering the data-collecting procedure to them. The English speakers were

selected by myself, paying no special attention to any feature except gender, from acquaintances and other students in classes in which I was enrolled.

The procedure by which I collected data underwent some changes during the course of collection. My original intent was to do as Cohen and Olshtain had done and elicit spoken apologies by first reading a short description of the situation and then giving a verbal cue appropriate to the role of the person apologized to. As an example, in presenting the situation of being late for an appointment with a professor, I would say "You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor" and then give a cue such as "Well, you're late". The series of eight situations was prefaced by a short explanation, as follows: "I'm going to present you with a series of eight situations in which you'll be talking to another person, who I'll represent. I will first read a short description of the situation and then begin the conversation. The conversation will end when I say "Stop", and we'll move on to the next situation." This procedure was used in a pilot study to determine its effectiveness. Two native English speakers, one male and one

female, were used as subjects and provided reasonable responses. There was no confusion on the subjects' part as to what they were to do, and consequently I concluded that the procedure would work. When I attempted to obtain data from Thai students with the assistance of Ms. Wongse-Ek, who administered the above procedure in Thai, the results were less successful. The Thai subjects showed some confusion as to our expectations and produced data which were, in Ms. Wongse-Ek's opinion, non-normative. After collecting data from three Thai subjects and not getting a useful set, I concurred with Ms. Wongse-Ek's suggestion that a questionnaire format might elicit better data. I prepared a questionnaire using the eight situations⁴, which I then gave to Ms. Wongse-Ek to distribute to other Thai students. The data on the returned questionnaires was certainly more varied than the orally collected data, suggesting that the questionnaire had overcome the difficulties of the other procedure. In light of this development, I chose to administer the same questionnaire to the English-speaking subjects as well in order to give all the subjects essentially the same experience. While spoken data is preferable to written data because of its greater similarity to everyday language usage, I did not believe that using spoken English and written Thai would provide a balanced comparison of apologetic strategies in the two languages. The English written responses were generally as lifelike as the spoken responses from the pilot study, suggesting that not much verisimilitude was lost in the change. The end result of the revised data-

collection procedure was the production of seventy-five Thai and seventy-nine English apologies for analysis⁵.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

Since the purpose of the study was to examine and compare the apologetic strategies of Thai and English speakers, the basis for data analysis had to deal directly with those strategies. After examining both the Thai and the English responses, I went to Brown and Levinson's list of strategies for attending to face in order to see which had appeared in the data and found a group which described both sets equally well. This group consisted of the following⁶:

1. Positive politeness strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers
2. Positive politeness strategies 9, 10 and 15: Assert speaker's knowledge of hearer's wants/offer aid to hearer/give aid to hearer.
3. Negative politeness strategy 5: Give deference
4. Negative politeness strategy 6: Apologize
 - a. admit impingement (take responsibility)
 - b. indicate reluctance (impingement regretted)
 - c. beg forgiveness (ask for cancellation of impingement)
 - d. overwhelming excuse (impingement unavoidable)

This group provides seven different strategies for use in apologies.

Operational definitions were required for these in order that they could be identified in the subjects' responses. For number 4 above, these were fairly simple. Admitting impingement consisted of utterances such as "It's my fault" or overt statements of the cause of the apology (e.g. "I'm sorry that I

broke the lamp" rather than "I'm sorry"). Indicating reluctance consisted of an overt statement of reluctance, as in "I didn't mean to do that" or "I'm sorry". Begging forgiveness consisted of utterances like "Pardon me" or "Excuse me". The most common apologetic form in Thai, *khoo thôt*⁷, falls into this category. Its literal meaning is "I deserve punishment", but the speakers do not expect any punishment to be given; in other words, they expect forgiveness. Finally, giving an overwhelming excuse was marked by overt statement of the excuse (e.g. "Sorry I'm late; I got held up in traffic."). Number 2 was likewise easy to define; it consisted of offers of reparation or assistance (e.g. "I'll pay for the damage"). The reason that 2 combines three of Brown and Levinson's strategies is that it is not possible to ascertain from these limited responses whether an offer would actually be carried out, and therefore it is necessary to treat the offer and the performance as the same strategy.

Numbers 1 and 3 were somewhat more difficult to define, since these strategies are realized differently in Thai and English. Thai has well-documented in-group identity markers, making definition of 1 easy for the Thai data. Use of the sentence-final particle *ná*, or *jâ* with a social equal, as well as a shortened apology (*thôt* for *khoo thôt*), are the Thai in-group markers appearing in the data. *Ná* is a particle used to be persuasive, and *jâ* indicates solidarity when used with a person of approximately the same age and social standing. The English in-group markers were harder to identify. I

finally settled on exclamations (e.g. "Oh my gosh!") and condensed syntax and/or slang (e.g. "I spaced" as opposed to "I forgot to meet you") as indicative of in-group identity. Exclamations were included because, in Brown and Levinson's theory, they are behavior which lessens the positive face of those who engage in them by showing lack of control over their speech. Such lack of control is presumed to be allowable among one's in-group.

Number 3, while having slightly different definitions for Thai and English speakers, was easier to deal with. The Thai speakers gave deference to their addressees by addressing them by their titles, using a formal apologetic form (*khoo prathaan thôt*), or expressing obligation by saying "I *must* apologize" (*tong khoo thôt*). In addition, the female Thai speakers showed deference by using a formal first-person pronoun (*dichan* as opposed to the normal *chan*). English speakers showed deference by using titles for address and engaging in self-abasement (e.g. "I'm such an idiot to have forgotten this").

Using these operational definitions, I proceeded to analyze the data. I went through the questionnaires, marking the presence of the above seven strategies in each situation. This produced a record of the percentage of each group that used a particular strategy in a given situation. I also broke the groups into male and female halves to get the percentage of males, as opposed to females, that used particular strategies. Situations 1 through 4⁸ were intended to examine how apologetic strategy varied with social relation,

while 5 through 8 were intended to examine the variation in apologetic strategy caused by varying the magnitude of the offense.

IV. RESULTS

The objective of the study was to determine how the choice of apologetic strategy in Thai and English varies with social relation, magnitude of offense, and gender of the apologizer, and how the patterns of variance in the two languages compare with each other. I first examined the English data, identified general tendencies, and broke these down by gender. I then did the same for the Thai data, and finally compared them to each other.

The most frequent strategy used by English speakers was negative politeness strategy 6b: indicating reluctance. This most often took the form "I'm sorry". This strategy was unresponsive to differences in social relation; 80 percent used it with strangers, power figures, and friends (solidarity figures), and 90 percent used it with kin. It did, however, respond to magnitude of offense. 100 percent of the English speakers indicated reluctance in damaging the car (the highest-magnitude offense), 80 percent did so in knocking down the woman, 50 percent in bumping into her and shaking her up, and none in bumping into her because she stepped out suddenly (the lowest-magnitude offense). Indicating reluctance is thus clearly a strategy that English speakers use to apologize for high-magnitude offenses.

Negative politeness strategy 6c, begging forgiveness, is fairly rare among English speakers. 20 percent used it with strangers in the classroom situation, 10 percent used it with the professor, and none with the friend or brother, suggesting that it is also non-responsive to social relation. In the series which

examines magnitude effects, the occurrence of begging forgiveness increases as the magnitude of offense decreases. No one asks for forgiveness in the car situation, but 90 percent do in the unavoidable collision. Apparently, begging forgiveness is used by English speakers only when they are fairly sure of getting forgiveness.

Offering an overwhelming excuse, negative politeness strategy 6d, is more responsive to differing social relations. 40 percent use it with power figures and 80 percent use it with kin, as opposed to no occurrences with strangers or friends. Apparently excuses are appropriate where there is an obligation, as to a professor or a brother. This is not wholly satisfying, however, since friendship could reasonably create a similar obligation but does not produce excuses. The magnitude series prompted few excuses: 30 percent used this strategy in the car scenario and 10 percent in bumping into and shaking up the woman. Excuses are thus apparently prompted by high-magnitude offenses; this makes sense, since the more grave the offense, the more desirable it is to shift blame for it away from oneself. The small percentages making excuses for the car damage may be due to the fact that the person apologized to is a stranger, and strangers received no excuses in the relations series.

Admitting impingement, negative politeness strategy 6a, responds to both social and magnitude changes. 90 percent of English speakers admit responsibility to power figures, 80 percent to friends, 40 percent to kin and 20 percent to strangers. This suggests that responsibility is important in

relations of power and solidarity for English speakers, and less so in other relations, but the pattern of change is not as clear as in the magnitude set. As in the case of indicating reluctance, the incidence of admitting responsibility is high when the magnitude of offense is high, decreasing from 70 percent for the highest-magnitude offence to none for the lowest. This tendency is also easily explained. A low-magnitude offense is less important, and it is thus less necessary to acknowledge responsibility.

The combination of positive politeness strategies 9, 10, and 15, making reparations, applies overwhelmingly to kin. 70 percent of the English-speaking subjects offered reparations to their kin, as opposed to 10 percent doing so to a friend and none for the other categories. Obviously, when the offense is minor, reparations are due only to kin. The magnitude series reveals interesting behavior as regards reparations. The highest-magnitude situation had 40 percent offering reparations, while the next highest had 90 percent, followed by 20 percent and none for the next-to-lowest and lowest. I believe this to be the effect of two factors: the magnitude of the offense and the ease with which reparations can be made. Damaging a car is a high-magnitude offense, but it is also difficult to make reparations because of their cost. Knocking someone down has less magnitude, but helping them to pick up their load is comparatively easy; thus the incidence of offering reparations is higher in the second case despite the lower magnitude of offense.

The use of in-group identity markers is not very revealing in English apologies. Unsurprisingly, their most frequent use is with friends, where

their presence would be appropriate in any kind of discourse. Even here, only 60 percent of the subjects used them. 30 percent used them with kin, and none used them with strangers or power figures, which is again unsurprising. There is some strategic use in the magnitude series, however; the highest-magnitude situation had in-group markers in 40 percent of the responses, steadily decreasing to none in the lowest situation. This suggests that English speakers sometimes use in-group markers in an apology to try to lessen the magnitude of an offense.

Giving deference is also not used much in English apologetic behavior. The highest percentage appearing was 30 percent when apologizing to a friend. 20 percent gave deference to power figures and strangers, while none gave deference to kin. The magnitude series was no more revealing; 20 percent gave deference in the two middle-magnitude situations, but none did so for the highest or lowest. I concluded that deference was simply not a popular apologetic strategy in English.

Examining gender-based differences in the English speakers' apologetic strategies revealed a few interesting tendencies. Males offered excuses significantly more often than females, and offered them in more situations. 60 percent of the men offered excuses to power figures, as opposed to the 20 percent of women who did so. Similarly, 100 percent of the men offered excuses to kin while only 60 percent of the women did so. Men also offered excuses in two situations where women offered none; in the magnitude series, 40 percent did so in the highest-magnitude situation and 20 percent

did so in the next-to-lowest-magnitude situation.

Male English speakers admitted impingement in a wider range of situations than did female speakers. The males used this strategy in seven of the eight situations, forgoing it only in the lowest-magnitude situation, whereas the females used it in only four situations: apologizing to power figures, friends, and kin, and apologizing for the highest-magnitude offense. In these four situations, the percentages of male and female users were approximately equal. The largest variance was in apologizing to kin; 60 percent of the males admitted impingement while only 20 percent of the females did so.

Similarly, the strategy of offering reparations was used more widely by male speakers than by females. The males offered reparations to friends and kin, and in all of the situations in the magnitude series except the lowest-magnitude offense, while the females did so only to kin and in the two higher-magnitude series. The percentages of male and female speakers in the three situations where both groups admitted impingement are approximately equal.

The strategies of indicating reluctance and begging forgiveness show no signs of being affected by gender. Males and females showed almost identical usage of the former strategy, and use of the latter has only one anomaly. In the next-to-lowest-magnitude situation, 40 percent of the females asked for forgiveness while 100 percent of the males did so. I cannot find much significance in this, since usage of this strategy in the other situations is

equally common for males and females.

The usage of deference among English speakers breaks down very clearly along gender lines. Male speakers showed deference to strangers and in the middle two situations of the magnitude series, while females deferred to power figures and friends. This would suggest that males defer to strangers in cases of medium to minor offense, while females use deference in relations of power and solidarity.

Finally, using in-group markers is somewhat more common for women than for men. Women used in-group markers about twice as often as men did in apologizing to friends and kin. The only situation where men used this strategy more frequently than women was in the highest-magnitude situation, suggesting that men may view in-group marking as a method of lessening an offense. Note that gender differences make this strategy more revealing than the combined figures would suggest.

At this point, a general summary of English speakers' use of these apologetic strategies may be helpful. English speakers indicate reluctance as their most common apologetic strategy; usage of this strategy is not sensitive to social relation or gender of the speaker, but does lessen as the magnitude of the offense lessens. Begging forgiveness, while less commonly used, is similarly unresponsive to the speaker's gender. It is not used with friends or kin, and its use increases as the magnitude of offense lessens. Offering excuses is also fairly uncommon, but males do it more often than females. They are most often offered to kin, and less often to power figures; they are

also used in apologizing for high-magnitude offenses. Admitting impingement is a frequent strategy, more widely used by men than by women, which is most commonly used in relations of power and solidarity. Its frequency decreases with the magnitude of the offense apologized for. Offering reparation is another strategy which men use more widely than women. It is used almost exclusively with kin when the offense is minor; for greater offenses, its use depends on the magnitude of the offense and the ease of providing reparation.

The use of in-group markers is more common for women than for men when apologizing to friends and kin, but men use it more often than women in apologizing for high-magnitude offenses. Lastly, deference breaks down cleanly along the gender division, with women giving deference to power and solidarity figures and men doing so when apologizing to strangers for medium to minor offenses.

The Thai responses were somewhat easier to interpret than the English ones were. Indicating reluctance was a much less common strategy than it was in English. 60 percent of the Thai speakers indicated reluctance to strangers, and this was the main usage of this strategy. It also showed up infrequently in the magnitude series. Begging forgiveness, however, was much more common in Thai than in English, with percentages of users between 80 and 100 percent in all situations except apologizing to a power figure. In this case, only 50 percent of the Thai subjects asked for forgiveness. As previously mentioned, the most common form of apology in Thai, *khoo*

thôot , is essentially a request for forgiveness, so the frequency of this strategy was expected.

Offering excuses is not a frequently used strategy in Thai. It does not seem to be very responsive to social relation; the percentage of users ranges from none offering excuses to strangers to 30 percent offering them to kin. The largest percentage of users of this strategy was 50 percent in the highest-magnitude situation. The other situations received little or no usage of this strategy, suggesting that Thai speakers use it primarily for high-magnitude offenses.

Admitting impingement was responsive to social relation but not so much so to magnitude of offense. As in the English data, the percentages of usage form a hierarchy of social relations, but the Thai hierarchy is different. 80 percent used this strategy with power figures, 60 percent with strangers, 50 percent with friends, and 30 percent with kin. The largest difference between the Thai and English orderings is the position of strangers, who are second in Thai but last in English, suggesting that Thai speakers have a higher concern for strangers' face than do English speakers. The highest percentage in the magnitude series was 30 percent for the most serious offense, with a steady decrease to none for the least serious. This parallels the English pattern, although the incidence of the strategy is less frequent in Thai.

The pattern of incidence of offering reparations among the Thai subjects is very reminiscent of the English speakers' usage. The only social relation situation to receive this strategy was apologizing to kin, where 50 percent of

the subjects used it. The magnitude situations where it occurred were the two most serious ones; 40 percent used it in the most serious situation and 60 percent in the next most serious, showing the interaction of offense magnitude and ease of providing reparation which showed up in the English data.

Giving deference is used in very definite environments in Thai apologies. 60 percent gave deference to power figures, as compared to 10 percent doing so to strangers and none for the other social relations. Similarly, 50 percent gave deference regarding the most serious offense and 30 percent did so for the next greatest offense. None of the subjects gave deference for the lower offenses. Clearly, deference is only appropriate when apologizing to power figures or for a serious offense.

The use of in-group identity markers in Thai was much more prevalent than in English; at least one subject used it in every situation. The highest percentages of use were 80 percent in apologizing to kin and 70 percent in apologizing to friends. The percentages of use ranged from 10 percent to 30 percent in the other situations. This pattern is essentially what one would expect of normal speech, however, and thus does not represent strategic use of this feature.

For most of the strategies examined in this study, differences to the gender of the speaker were even less prevalent in Thai than they were in English. The incidence of indicating reluctance was largely the same for male and female Thai speakers. The main difference was that twice as many females as

males indicated reluctance when apologizing to strangers. The females were also more consistent in indicating reluctance for high-magnitude offenses. The incidence of begging forgiveness is almost exactly the same in each situation, regardless of gender, as are the incidence of admitting impingement and offering reparations. The incidence of offering excuses is slightly different, but there are so few tokens of this strategy in the Thai data that making valid observations is somewhat difficult. The major incidence of this strategy, in apologizing for the highest-magnitude offense, shows almost identical behavior from male and female Thai speakers. Likewise, male speakers of Thai use in-group identity markers in a wider range of situations than female speakers do, but the percentages of users are nearly identical in the situations where both use them. Based on these strategies, one would conclude that gender is not a significant factor in Thai apologetic behavior. Upon examining the usage of deference, however, it becomes apparent that gender is indeed significant. Almost all of the incidences of giving deference in the Thai data come from female speakers. One male speaker gave deference to a power figure, and two did so in the highest-magnitude offense situation; all other tokens were produced by females. Clearly, deference is primarily a female apologetic strategy in Thai.

I will now briefly sum up this study's findings on Thai apologetic behavior. Indicating reluctance is an infrequent strategy, used most often in apologizing to strangers and less frequently to apologize for serious offenses. Female speakers use it about twice as often as do males. Begging forgiveness

is an extremely frequent Thai apologetic strategy which tends not to respond to social interaction, magnitude of offense, or gender of the speaker. Thai speakers offer excuses rarely; most often, they use them to apologize for high-magnitude offenses. Offering excuses is not responsive to gender or social relation. Admitting impingement is used most frequently with power figures and least frequently with kin, with strangers second and friends third in the hierarchy this creates. This strategy is not responsive to gender of the speaker or magnitude of the offense. Thai speakers offer reparations only to kin when offense is small, and, when offense is large, offer them based on magnitude of the offense and ease of providing reparation.

Use of in-group markers is fairly frequent with friends and kin, with male speakers using them more widely than do female speakers; this usage is consonant with normal speech and does not indicate strategic usage. Deference is primarily a female apologetic strategy, used with power figures and in cases of serious offense.

Comparing the apologetic behavior of the Thai and English-speaking subjects reveals interesting similarities and differences. The most common English strategy was indicating reluctance, which did not respond to gender or social relation but did decrease in frequency as the magnitude of offense decreased. This strategy was much less common in Thai, being used primarily for strangers. Females used it about twice as often as males. Begging forgiveness, on the other hand, was nearly ubiquitous in Thai excuses, regardless of social relation, gender, or magnitude of offense, but

shows up in English primarily in apologizing for small offenses.

Both the English and the Thai subjects offered excuses infrequently. This strategy was more prevalent in English, where it was primarily used in apologizing to kin. Both sets of informants used it in apologizing for high-magnitude offenses but not those of lower magnitude. Male English speakers offered excuses more frequently than did female speakers; there was no real gender-based difference in the Thai data. Both groups admitted impingement in varying degrees when apologizing to different social relations; both admitted it most often to power figures. In both cases, admitting impingement became less frequent as the magnitude of offense lessened. English-speaking males admitted impingement in more situations than female speakers did; gender made no difference in Thai. Both the Thai and English subjects offered reparations in the same manner; they were offered only to kin when the offense was small. When the offense was large, the frequency was affected by the magnitude of the offense and the ease of reparation. English speakers offered reparations more often than Thai speakers, and English-speaking males offered them in more situations than did females. Thai speakers showed no gender-based difference in offering reparations.

In-group marker use was not revealing for either Thai or English apologies. It was primarily used with friends and kin, where it would be used in all interactions. English-speaking females used in-group markers twice as frequently as males in the same situations; Thai males used them in more

situations than did females. Giving deference was affected by gender in both English and Thai. English-speaking males gave deference to strangers and in situations of serious offense, while females gave deference to power figures and friends. Deference was more common among the Thai subjects but was almost exclusively a female strategy, used primarily with power figures and in situations of serious offense.

The most striking similarities were in the usage of offering excuses, offering reparations and admitting impingement, each of which were largely the same for both groups of subjects. Also interesting was the dichotomy between indicating reluctance and begging forgiveness. Where one was common, the other was scarce. This makes some intuitive sense, since begging forgiveness assumes that the speaker has done something for which he feels responsible and wishes to be forgiven for it. Indicating reluctance, however, assumes that the speaker does not feel responsible for the offense, and thus they somewhat preclude each other. Finally, the difference in the use of deference between the two groups reflects the more rigid nature of the Thai social structure.

V. DISCUSSION

There are a few elements of the study which may seem confusing or erroneous. Among these is the inclusion of in-group markers in the final presentation, since they do not seem to have a strategic use in either Thai or English apologies. I originally included them because they appeared in the data and were covered under one of Brown and Levinson's strategies. Only after coding and tabulating the data did I realize that they were not used strategically. I chose to retain them as a demonstration that behavior which can be used strategically is not always used in such a fashion. In addition, my definition of in-group markers in English as including exclamations could have led to some false identifications, particularly in the case of backing into the car. This situation could easily produce exclamations that were not intended as in-group markers. Even if, however, there were some false identifications of use of in-group marking here, they are insignificant beside the number of responses produced in settings where in-group markers would be expected. Finally, there is a slight anomaly in my deference definition, in that Thai women have more ways to show deference. They can defer by using the formal pronoun *dichan*, but there is no corresponding form for males. Thus it is possible that the deference figures for females are skewed. I do not find this to be a great difficulty, however, since the more formal apology *khoo prathaan thoot* shows deference equally well and is available to males as well as females. Both genders therefore have equal ability to give

VI. CONCLUSION

The combination of Brown and Levinson's theory with Cohen and Olshtain's methodology produced a generally successful study. The modification of the data collection procedure from an oral to a written one seemingly did not distort the data. It was reassuring to find that every apologetic strategy appearing in the data could be found in Brown and Levinson's work, and the data produced some coherent and interesting tendencies.

The purpose of the study was to examine and compare the effects of social relation, gender, and magnitude of offense on the apologetic strategies of Thai and English speakers, and it was successful in this. The essential similarity in the manner in which Thai and English speakers use the strategies of offering excuses, offering reparations, and admitting impingement begins to suggest that the situations in which Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies are used are universals as well as the strategies themselves. The dichotomy between expressions of reluctance and requests for forgiveness which emerges from the comparison could also provide the basis for a study of whether one strategy or the other must be dominant in a given sociolinguistic setting.

deference.

A more serious objection to this study would be that it does not deal with intensifiers in apologies (e.g. "I'm really sorry as opposed to "I'm sorry"). Intensifiers are undoubtedly important in apologetic behavior, but they are primarily a reflection of apologetic style, not apologetic strategy. The presence of "really" in the first of the above examples does not change the fact that both are indications of reluctance. Since the purpose of this study is to examine apologetic strategy, I chose to avoid the issue of intensifiers. I believe that the subjects which I have examined provide enough interest to justify this study without investigation into further details.

APPENDIX A: TABULATED RESULTS

TABLE 1. English Responses

Situations	Regret	Forgiveness	Excuse	Admission	Reparation	In Group	Deference
1. Insult	80	20	0	20	0	0	20
2. Professor	80	10	40	90	0	0	20
3. Friend	80	0	0	80	10	60	30
Brother	90	0	80	40	70	30	0
5. Car	100	0	30	70	40	40	0
6. Lady I	80	20	0	40	90	20	20
7. Lady II	50	70	10	30	20	10	20
8. Lady III	0	90	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2. Thai Responses

Situations	Regret	Forgiveness	Excuse	Admittance	Reparations	In Group	Deference
1. Insult	40	100	0	60	0	20	10
2. Professor	0	50	20	80	0	10	60
3. Friend	0	80	10	50	0	70	0
4. Brother	0	80	30	30	50	80	0
5. Car	20	90	50	30	40	20	50
6. Lady I	30	90	0	10	60	30	30
7. Lady II	0	100	20	20	0	10	0
8. Lady III	10	100	20	10	0	10	0

TABLE 3. English Male Responses

Situations	Regret	Forgiveness	Excuse	Admission	REparation	In Group	Deference
1. Insult	80	20	0	40	0	0	40
2. Professor	80	0	60	100	0	0	0
3. Friend	80	0	0	80	20	40	0
4. Brother	80	0	100	60	60	20	0
5. Car	100	0	40	80	40	60	0
6. Lady I	80	40	0	20	80	20	40
7. Lady II	40	100	20	60	40	0	40
8. Lady III	0	100	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 4. English Female Responses

Situations	Regret	Forgiveness	Excuse	Admission	REparation	In Group	Deference
1. Insult	80	20	0	0	0	0	0
2. Professor	80	20	20	80	0	0	40
3. Friend	80	0	0	80	0	80	60
4. Brother	100	0	60	20	80	40	0
5. Car	100	0	0	60	40	20	0
6. Lady I	100	0	0	0	80	20	0
7. Lady II	60	40	0	0	80	20	0
8. Lady III	0	80	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 5. Thai Male Responses

Situations	Regret	Forgiveness	Excuse	Admission	REparation	In Group	Deference
1. Insult	40	10	0	60	0	40	0
2. Professor	0	60	20	80	0	20	20
3. Friend	0	80	0	60	0	80	0
4. Brother	0	60	40	40	60	80	0
5. Car	0	80	60	40	40	20	40
6. Lady I	20	80	0	0	60	40	0
7. Lady II	0	100	20	20	0	20	0
8. Lady III	20	100	0	20	0	20	0

TABLE 6. Thai Female Responses

Situations	Regret	Forgiveness	Excuse	Admission	REparation	In Group	Deference
1. Insult	80	100	0	60	0	0	20
2. Professor	0	40	0	80	0	80	0
3. Friend	0	80	20	40	0	60	0
4. Brother	0	100	20	20	40	80	0
5. Car	40	100	40	20	40	20	60
6. Lady I	40	10	0	20	60	20	60
7. Lady II	0	100	20	20	0	0	0
8. Lady III	0	100	40	0	0	20	0

APPENDIX B: DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.
2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.
3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.
4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.
5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.
6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.
7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.
8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

The preface given above was for the Thai students' questionnaire; the preface for the English speakers ran as follows:

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

I'm sorry, THAT WAS UNTHINKING OF ME.

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

SORRY FOR RUNNING LATE. I HOPE I DIDN'T KEEP YOU WAITING.

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

WHAT CAN I SAY? I SPACED.

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

I CAN'T KEEP MY PROMISE RIGHT NOW, BUT FIRST CHANCE WE'LL GO.

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

I'M TERRIBLY SORRY. I DIDN'T EVEN SEE YOU.

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

ARE YOU ALL RIGHT? I'M VERY SORRY. CAN I HELP?

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

PARDON ME. I DIDN'T SEE YOU.

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

WHOOOPS! PARDON ME.

Male

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

APL For; inad.

Oh, Excuse me. I meant no offence.

APL apol. exc.

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

I apologize for being late. I was ~~gotten~~ detained by...

APL reg
RESP

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

Oops. I'm sorry. I completely forgot our meeting.

APL reg, exc
RECR

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

I'm sorry kid, I can't take you shopping right now. I have to... Can I take you later

APL reg
RESP

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

Are you all right? I'm sorry for the accident.

APL For
RESP
REFR

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

Excuse me I wasn't walking where I was going. Are you all right? Can I help you

APL For

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

Excuse Me.

APL For

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

Pardon Me.

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

WAIT TO SEE A RESPONSE, IF ANGER SHOWS
SAY "I'M SORRY IF I INSULTED YOU, THAT WAS
NOT MY INTENTION"

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

APOLOGIZE + EXPLAIN REASONS BUT NOT EXCUSES

REASON ARE THOUGHT OF BEFORE/EXCUSES THOUGHT OF AFTER

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

EXPLAIN "SORRY I FORGOT TO MEET YOU"
"LET'S TRY AGAIN LATER"

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

"I'M SORRY, BUT BECAUSE OF OTHER THINGS + ...
I CAN'T TAKE YOU NOW AND
LET'S RESCHEDULE"

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

"OH DAMN" THEN LEAVE NAME ETC IN NOTE ON CAR

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

"I'M SO SORRY BUT MY HEAD MUST BE ELSEWHERE
AND CAN I HELP YOU WITH
YOUR PACKAGES"

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

"~~EX~~ EXCUSE ME, I'M SORRY BUMPING YOU"

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

SAY "EXCUSE ME" VERY POINTEDLY.....

Male

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APOL reg, inad. 1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to imply ...

APOL reg, exc. 2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

I'm sorry I'm late I was (insert excuse here)

APOL reg
RESP 3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

Oh I'm sorry. I completely forgot.

APOL reg, exc.
RESP 4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

I'm sorry I forgot and guess I'd (whatever)

APOL reg.
(RESP)
REPR 5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

Oh shit! Did I do any damage. I'm sorry about that. Let me get some paper to right down insurance.

APOL reg
REPR 6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

Oh my god! Are you okay? Here let me help. I am so sorry.

APOL forg.
reg
RESP 7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

~~I'm sorry~~ Excuse me, I should pay more attention. sorry.

APOL Forg 8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

Opp. Excuse me

Female

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

APOL^{reg, inad.}

I'm sorry, I didn't mean that like it sounded.

APOL^{reg, exc.}

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

I'm really sorry to keep you waiting! This has been a really hectic day.

APOL^{reg}
RESP

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

Oh I'm such an idiot, I completely forgot! Sorry about that, I hope it wasn't a problem.

APOL^{reg, exc.}
REPR

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

I'm sorry but I'm just too busy right now. Let's try again next week.

APOL^{reg}
RESP

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

I'm really sorry, I should have looked where I was going. ~~But I'm sorry~~

APOL^{reg}
REPR

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

Oh I'm so sorry. Here, let me help you up.

APOL^{reg}
RESP

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

I'm sorry. Are you all right?

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

No, that's all right, I'm fine.

↑ assumes owed apology (no infringement on other's face; infringement of own face.)

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APOL^{reg, inad}

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

Oh, I'm sorry; I didn't mean to imply/say that you are/did...
I'm really sorry.

APOL^{reg}

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

Will/Please? - I'm so sorry I'm late. Do you still have time to talk with me?

APOL^{reg}

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

RESP

Oh my God, I was supposed to meet you at...! I completely spaced it. I'm sorry. What ~~is~~ a dolt I am...

APOL^{reg, exc}

REFR

(WSP?)

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

Oh God, I promised to take you... didn't I? I'm sorry. I'm stuck with this... + can't go now (can we do it (time)?

APOL^{reg, exc}

RESP

(REFR?)

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

I'm so sorry. I didn't see you. It's my fault. Here's my insurance card.

APOL^{reg, inad}

REFR

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

Oh my! Let me help you. I'm so sorry I certainly didn't mean to hurt you. Let me help you up.

APOL^{reg}

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

Oh my goodness. I'm sorry. Are you OK?

APOL^{reg}

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

Eep! Excuse me.

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

^{Fro}
AFOL Please excuse me

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

^{Fro}
AFOL (Pant Pant) Forgive me, Please!

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

^{Fro}
AFOL Aw, shit!

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

^{Fro}
AFOL Oh no! I'm Sorry! - (explanation)

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

^{Reg}
REFP I'm Sorry! What's your insurance #?

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

^{Reg}
REFP Pick her up. Pick up packages. Apologize profusely, possibly in several languages.

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

^{Fro}
REFP Oh! Excuse me.

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

^{Fro}
AFOL Oh! Excuse me.

Please think about what you would say in each of the following situations and then write what you would say in the space provided.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know.

APOL Reg, inad

"I'm sorry that upset you; I didn't mean it that way."

APOL Reg, inad

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

as (part, part) "Sorry I'm so late -- I hope it's not an awful inconvenience..."

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

APOL Reg

RESP.

"Oh, damn -- I was supposed to see you at noon -- I'm so sorry, I completely forgot!"

APOL Reg

RESP.

4. Your younger brother (or sister) reminds you that you promised to take him (or her) shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

"Sorry -- we'll have to go later. Is tomorrow afternoon o.k. with you?"

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

"Oh, shit!"

APOL Reg

RESP.

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

"Oops! I'm sorry -- can I help with this? Is everything o.k.?"

APOL Reg

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

"Oops! Excuse me."

APOL Reg

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

"Pardon me."

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Female

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

ขอโทษค่ะ ฉันไม่ได้ตั้งใจ

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

ต้องขอโทษอาจารย์ขอโทษมากเลยคะที่มาสาย

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

อ้อ! ขอโทษมากเลยคะ ฉันลืมไป

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

อ้อ! น้องงี้แล้ว พี่ขอโทษนะ ไปกันพรุ่งนี้ได้นะ

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

ขอโทษค่ะ ฉันไม่ระวัง ค่ะรถของคุณเสียหายมากนะคะ

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

ว๊ว! เธอตกเพราะ เดินไม่ได้ไง

APOL + formal
resp + formal pron
note

xx-7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

ว๊ว! เธอตก นิดๆ หน่อยๆ

APOL
resp

APOL + formal
resp

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

ว๊ว! เธอตก เพราะ เธอเดินออกมา

(note: อันนี้ เป็นเรื่องของเธอ) (It's something she matter)

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

male

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

c. walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

A = neutral, no and "arrif"
R =

you're
to make

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

A, exc. + neut.
R =

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

A = + neut.
R =

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Female

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

A^F + neut, inadv, intensifiers

A^R ขอโทษค่ะ ฉันไม่ได้ตั้งใจจะพูดอย่างนั้นเลย

→ overt acknowl.

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

APOL + formal pron.

APOL RESP ขออภัยค่ะ อาจารย์มาสาย

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

A^F + no pol. mark, intens., name + pron. (no honorifics)

A^R ขอโทษจริง ๆ ที่ลืมมาพบตามนัดไว้

→ overt

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

A^F + "น้า", no pol. mark,

A^R ขอโทษนะ พี่จะไปซื้อของไม่ได้

→ overt.

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

A^F + neut, intens., formal pron.

RESP ขอโทษจริง ๆ ค่ะ ดิฉันมาจอดตั้งใจ ดิฉันจะขอใช้ดาเสียหายให้ค่ะ

→ overt

REPR. inadvert.

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

A_{f+neut.}, intensifiers, formal pron.

A/R
→ overt
REPR.
ขอโทษจริง ๆ ค่ะ ดิฉันไม่ได้ตั้งใจ ดิฉันจะช่วยเหลือให้ค่ะ
similar.

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

A_{f+neut.},

A/R
→ overt
ขอโทษค่ะ ที่ทำให้คุณตกใจ

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

A_f + "น้" and "khô"

A/R
ขอโทษนะคะ คุณเป็นอะไรมาหรือเปล่าค่ะ
inquiry after welfare.

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Male

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

A_F + next, inadv.
R
ขอโทษครับ ผมไม่ได้ตั้งใจที่จะพูดอย่างนั้น

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

A_F + next.
R
ขอโทษครับที่ผมมาสาย

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

A_F + mod. mark, intons. (not as strong as mǎak or jing?)
R
ขอโทษด้วยที่ผมลืมนัด

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

A_F + short form, intons. "eh?"
R
โทษที่พี่ไปซื้อของด้วยไม่ได้

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

A_F + "must", urgent, intensifiers
R
ต้องขอโทษจริงๆครับ ผมจะชดใช้ค่าเสียหายให้

REPR

6. walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

F+neut.,

A/R ขอโทษครับที่ผมชนคุณล้ม ผมจะช่วยเก็บของให้ครับ

R→overt

REPR.

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

F+neut.

A/R ขอโทษครับที่ผมทำให้คุณตกใจ

→overt.

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

F+neut.

A/R ขอโทษครับ คุณเป็นอะไรหรือเปล่าครับ

ing.

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

A^F + "ná" and "kráp"
 R ขอโทษ นะครับ ผมไม่ได้ตั้งใจ
 overt

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

APOL^{apol} + pron. in apology (+ formal)
 REPR ผมขออภัยครับที่มาช้าไปสิบห้า นาที
 overt

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

APOL^{exc.} + "ná", no pol. mark., intens. "lá", intens.
 R ขอโทษทีค่ะ ลืมไปจริงๆ
 overt

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

exc.; + no pol. mark., intens.
 APOL
 REPR. พลมจริง ๆ เราไปกันพรุ่งนี้ก็ได้
 REPR.

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

A^F + "must", ná & kráp, intens. (3)
 REPR. ผมต้องขอโทษอย่างมากเลยนะครับ
 REPR. ผมมองไม่เห็นจริงๆ แล้วผมจะจ่ายค่าซ่อม
ให้ นะครับ

c. walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

A^{F+neut.}
/R
RER.

ขอโทษครับ คุณเจ็บตรงไหนหรือเปล่าครับ

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

A^{F+neut.}
/R

ขอโทษครับ

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

A^{F+neut.}
/R

ขอโทษครับ

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Feam

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

ขอโทษค่ะ: ดิฉันไม่ได้ตั้งใจ

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

ขอโทษค่ะ: ขออภัยในความล่าช้า

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

ขอโทษค่ะ: ดิฉันลืมที่จะไปพบคุณ

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

ขอโทษค่ะ: ขออภัยในความล่าช้า

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

ขอโทษค่ะ: ขออภัยในความล่าช้า

6. Walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

$\frac{A}{R}$ F + ^{unintentional, not on purpose}
voluntarily: volitional; involuntary: (non-volitional)
REPR.

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

$\frac{A}{R}$ F + ^{accident}
voluntarily: volitional; involuntarily: (non-volitional)
REPR? ^{imp. about health}

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

$\frac{A}{R}$ F + ^{accident}
voluntarily: volitional; involuntarily: (non-volitional)
REPR?

~~2/2/20~~ Female

- Af + intens. (day, busy)

 $\frac{1}{R} \rightarrow \text{over } T$

- A₂ ^f needs + "must", use of bible,

$\frac{1}{R}$ over 6

- A^F + no pol. mark, intens. ($\text{J} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$)

$\sqrt{R}$ —
→ over.

- unable to do it now.
A friend (kay to younger?) odd.

 $\frac{1}{R}$

- A^F + no pol. mark, intens. (mark²)

 $\mathbb{R}$

6. walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

Af +neut, intens (mask²)
R solmarangis

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

Af +neut, intens. (mask²)
R solmarangis

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

Af, exc. +neut.
R solmarangis

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

At _____

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

6. walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

Please think about what you would say in Thai in each of these situations and then write what you would say in the blanks provided. You need only to write it in Thai; it is not necessary to translate it into English. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Male

1. In a class discussion, you inadvertently insult another student, who you don't know very well.

A f + neut. ...
K
f + neut. resp.

ขอโทษนะ ครับ ที่ผมได้กล่าววาทะวาจาไม่ดี

2. You arrive fifteen minutes late for an appointment with a professor.

AP: ...
K ...

ขอโทษครับ ขออภัยที่ช้ามา ผมมันได้มาช้ากว่าวัน ๑๕ น. ครับ

3. You run into a friend whom you had promised to meet earlier, but forgot to meet.

AP: ...

อ้อ หนิ ไม่ได้เจอกันก่อนหน้านี้ ครับเคยสัญญาว่าจะไปเยี่ยมหาเขานานแล้ว แต่ก็ลืม

4. Your younger brother reminds you that you promised to take him shopping, but you are unable to do it now.

A f + neut. ...
K ...

อ้อ ขอโทษพี่นะ วันนี้พี่มีธุระไปสำคัญ เอาไว้วันหลังก็แล้วกัน

5. In leaving a parking place, you back into a stranger's car, denting it badly.

AP: ...

ห้ คุณ ผมก็ลืม = ลอดรถออกมา กดเบรคท้ายรถเขาหนักๆ ขับรถเป็นมือใหม่

c. walking down the sidewalk, you bump into a lady, knocking her over and causing her to drop the packages she's carrying.

A.T. ขยับเขยื้อน
REF. ขยับเขยื้อน
ขยับเขยื้อน = คืบ ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน ขยับเขยื้อน

7. You bump into a lady, shaking her up somewhat.

A.T. ขยับเขยื้อน
REF. ขยับเขยื้อน
ขยับเขยื้อน = คืบ

8. You unavoidably bump into a lady because she steps out in front of you suddenly.

A.T. ขยับเขยื้อน
REF. ขยับเขยื้อน
ขยับเขยื้อน = คืบ

ENDNOTES

1. See bibliography.
2. Cohen, A.D. and Elite Olshtain. 1981. Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: the case of apology. *Language Learning* 31, p. 116.
3. Ibid.
4. See Appendix 2 for the text of the questionnaire.
5. The reason that there are fewer than eighty apologies in both cases is because there were instances in which the cue did not produce an apology.
6. Brown and Levinson (1987), pp. viii-ix; the numbers of the strategies are theirs.
7. All romanization of Thai in this thesis is taken from Mary Haas' Thai-English Student's Dictionary (Stanford, 1989)
8. See Appendix A for ordering of these situations and tabulation of the results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge.
- Cohen, A.D., and E. Olshtain. 1981. Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: the case of apology. *Language Learning* 31.113-134.
- Cohen, A.D., E. Olshtain, and D.S. Rosenstein. ND. Advanced EFL apologies: what remains to be learned? *International Journal of Sociolinguistics* 62.51-74
- Olshtain, E. 1983. Sociocultural competence and language transfer: the case of apology. In S. Gass and C. Madden, eds. *Language Transfer and Language Learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Olshtain, E., and A.D. Cohen. 1983. Apology: a speech act set. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd, eds. p. 18-36.