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1. Introduction
Language Learning is needed not only for the syntax, lexical, and grammatical knowledge but also to communicate effectively — namely it is involved in how it is appropriate to talk to intercultural people, and the topics at suitable events. Simple exposure to sociolinguistically appropriate input is unlikely to be sufficient for EFL learners in the aspect of pragmatics. Language has its own culture, the culture which is made by different types of people who follow their own social routines and norms. In terms of this, the first language learner easily acquires language from their daily existences and gradually can store it in the memory. An EFL learner, however, would be opaque and difficult to know underlying rules such as the expressions of apologising.

This study investigates the remedial act and behavior on face-management according to the background. Secondly, I wish to investigate how NS of English and Japanese EFL learners perceive and perform in apologies for being late-both of offender and offended person, and how to use the strategy in each language in various situations.

2. Background
An apology is offered to acknowledge and express compensatory action and speech to an offense, by way of reinstation of the negatively affected interaction. The importance of social interaction ritual, such as expressing apologies, is addressed by Goffman (1967). He mentions the person has an immediate emotional response to others which is related to his/her face. The person whose face is threatened may attempt to reinstate the ritual order by means of one kind of strategy. However, using the wrong strategy would violate the hearer's face and cause negative feelings. As in the politeness formulae by Brown and Levinson (1987), it has two kinds of face: the freedom of action and freedom from imposition “negative face” and the positive consistent self-image or personality claimed by others “positive face”. They categorize expressing apologies and acceptance of apologies as follows:

Negative Face:
acceptance of H's apology (S may feel constrained to minimize H's debt or transgression, as in 'It was nothing, don't mention it'.)

Positive Face:
apologies (S indicates that he regrets doing a prior FTA, there by damaging his own face to some degree especially if the apology is at the same time a confession with H learning about the transgression through it, and the FTA thus conveys bad news)

(Brown and Levinson, 1987:67-68)

As expressing an apology is a positive face, acceptance of H's apology is a face threatening act in which the speaker acknowledges a debt to the hearer — thus threatening the speaker’s negative face. Goffman (1972) formulae as apology as follows:

An apology is a gesture through which an individual splits himself into two parts, the part that is guilty of an offence and the part that dissociates itself from the delict and affirms a belief in the offended rule.

(Goffman, 1972:143)
An apology is deemed as crucial for social lubricants universally. However, the perception and performance in apology have been varied cross-culturally (i.e. Sano, 1995). Coulmas (1981) compared apologies and thanks in English, French, German, Greek and Japanese, and mentioned the link between the object of gratitude and the object of regret is the concept of indebtedness. Sakamoto and Naotsuka (1982) mentioned the differences between American and Japanese in apology. Japanese use mutual apology as a social lubricant even if the truth of the matter would not be clear. Japanese assume that it keeps the wheels of human relations running smoothly. Americans, however, tend to want to get at the truth of the matter first. Kumagai (1993) studied the general patterns of the remedial interactions of Japanese and American film scripts and TV dramas. She mentioned the major differences between Japanese and American remedial modes focusing on the face-management by apologizer: Japanese are self-threatening (mutuality expected) and Americans are self-supporting. This revealed that as it is suited to the positive face for the offended person, the offender persons try to support themselves by making an apology as well. Bergman and Kasper (1993) compared the perception and performance in American and Thai apologies. They mentioned the cross-cultural difference between them and NNS tend to do too much of a good thing, a phenomenon of gushing or less benevolently, waffling (supported by Edmondson & House, 1991). In cross-cultural study, therefore, apology is a mutual remedy for both offender and offended person.

3. Experiment

I investigated how contextual factors which are associated with ways of repairing transgressions are perceived and performed by NS of English and Japanese EFL learners in expressing apology—both of offender and offended person.

The subjects of this survey are 53 Japanese students, all sophomores at the university and 20 Canadian native speakers of English. The Canadians have no previous experience of talking to Japanese and represented both men and women, a range of ages and diverse social backgrounds. The questionnaire was prepared in an English and in a Japanese version. The English version was filled out by 20 Canadian native speakers of English. The Japanese version was filled out by 53 Japanese non-native speakers of English.

Subjects were asked to respond to four situations in the assessment questionnaire and the dialog construction questionnaire (See Appendix 1). With the assessment questionnaire, subjects were asked to rate these contexts on a 5-point rating scale for 2 context-external factors (Distance and Dominance) and 4 context-internal factors (Severity of Offense, Obligation to Apologize, Likelihood for the Apology to be Accepted, Offender’s Face-Loss). With the dialog construction questionnaire for the same contexts, subjects were asked to supply the offender’s and the offended person’s turn. I assumed that I could collect the data naturally in writing the dialog construction questionnaire.

The questionnaires’ contents are as follows:

1.) At a hotel, the tourist and guide have a misunderstanding. (Hotel)
2.) Being a little late for the meeting time with a friend. (Friend)
3.) At a school, a professor is a little late. (School)
4.) At a restaurant, a waiter takes a lot of time and brings the wrong order. (Wrong Order)

3.1. The Assessment Study

The data elicited by the assessment questionnaires is displayed in Appendix 2. I investigated them by applying Bergman and Kasper’s study (1993). The differences in offenses between the Japanese and the Canadians perceived is presented in Table 1.

3.1.1. Distance and Dominance

Analyzing the Distance and Dominance, the Japanese and Canadian ratings reflect the social relationship in their cultural norms between offender and offended person. Japanese and Canadian subjects perceived the same relationship in all these contexts between friends, who are the closest, and on the other hand perceived the most distance between strangers in servicing. They represented the same rating on situations 1, 2, 3.
the Canadians corresponded the relationship between professor and student as a medium Distance-acquaintance relationship, neither familiar nor stranger. Except for situation 4 (Wrong Order), the Japanese subjects assessed Dominance higher than the Canadians (Japanese are 65% at 5, Canadians are 70% at 4, 20% at 5). For the Japanese tend to be affected by context-external factors in Japanese social cultural norms. They tend to think and behave in the norms of “Uchi” and “Soto” and “Yoso”-familiar and stranger and social distance (i.e. Miyake, 1993).

Table 1. Differences in offenses between the Japanese and the Canadians perceived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>DO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Wrong Order</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Severity, O = Obligation, L = Likelihood, FL = Face-Loss, DI = Distance, DO = Dominance
•: great difference between groups ○: little difference between groups

3.1.2. Severity of Offense

In (Hotel) and (Friend), the Japanese and the Canadian perceived the most. Situation 2. (Friend) (according to the Canadian rating) was a light offense (the rating is 80% at 1). For the Canadians, these offenses represented minor impositions on the third person's time and face-want. While the Japanese rating was 43% at level 4 (the rating is 1% at 1). They tended to feel the need of an apology more in a minor imposition than the Canadians. The ritual of some jobs in Japanese, such as bus driver is to apologize for the time when the person is not late at all (i.e. the bus driver leaving right on time says “Omachido-sama-deshita.”). NS of English seem to be not habitually late for appointment by standards of some countries (Malaysia for instance), they are less punctual than the Japanese. (Hotel) was rated as a high severity offense by the Japanese subjects, while the Canadian subjects rated it a medium offense (Japanese 64% at 4+5, Canadians 5% at 4+5). On the pilot study, NS of English liked solving problem and knowing the matter of truth (i.e. Sakamoto and Naotsuka, 1982). As they knew the truth in this situation, if there were something to cause a misunderstanding, they justified it as medium offense. However, the Japanese felt an apology for the offended person's time and offended person's face-want was required if it would reveal the matter of truth. The Japanese tended to perceive more remedial feeling than the Canadians in Severity of Offense. Situation 3. (School) was perceived the same at level 2 by both groups. However, there is a slight difference between these assessments. The Japanese rating was, light offense as well, down to the medium rating, and the other was upgrading toward the medium. (Wrong Order) was rated as a high Severity of Offense by both subjects. Yet most of the Canadian subjects tended towards the medium offense (95% at 3+4). Most of the Japanese subjects rated this situation as a high Severity of Offense (91% at 4+5).

3.1.3. Obligation to Apology

They assessed the same rate on (Wrong Order) at 5 (JA=83% at 5, CA=75% at 5, JA=17% at 4, CA=25% at 4.) (Friend) was only rated low on Obligation by the Canadians. It was rated higher by Japanese than by the Canadians by contrast (JA=56% at 4, 18% at 5, CA=45% at 2). (School) was only rated low by the Japanese, however, the Canadians rated a greater need to apologise than the Japanese (CA=30% at 4, 30% at 5, JA=15% at 4, 4% at 5). Severity of Offense was not related to the offender's Obligation to Apology in all contexts by both subjects. For Japanese, Severity of Offense and Obligation of Apology for (Friend) was rated high, while (School) rating was rated low on both items. The difference is reflected by the balance for the context-external and context-internal. The professor who has a social distance is not required to redress the apology from the student in Japanese for such a light offense. This is the typical cross-cultural point. It is the difference in academic life style between both groups. However, other items were related between Obligation to Apology and Severity of Offense. The more severe an offense, the more it
needed an apology. This finding is supported by Olshtain (1989) and Bergman and Kasper (1993).

3.1.4. Likelihood of Apology Acceptance

An apology is an act and behavior for remedial mutual negotiation between offended person and offender. In light of the importance of social harmony, how the offended person perceives and accepts the apology is needed to be studied soci pragmatically. (Hotel), (Friend) and (School) were perceived by both subjects at the same degree. These situations were all very likely acceptable by both groups. Only (Wrong Order) was very unlikely acceptable by the Japanese, while the Canadians rated it medium.

Distance and Dominance are reflected in how the third person accepts an apology for the Japanese. Distance and dominance such as (Wrong Order) between stranger in the service industry reflect the Japanese social norms- "Soto" and "Yoso".

3.1.5. Offender's Face-Loss

All these contexts were perceived medium and high damage on the offender's face by both groups. High Severity of Offense and offender's Face-Loss were codetermined on (Wrong Order) (according to both groups). However, (Hotel) and (Friend) were not codetermined by both groups in relations between Severity of Offense and offender's Face-Loss. In the Japanese perception, by contrast, high Severity of Offense and high Face-Loss were interrelated (Hotel:Severity=64% at 4+5, Face-loss=72% at 4+5, Friend:Severity=43% at 4+5, Face-loss=79% at 3+4, Wrong Order:Severity=52% at 5, Face-loss=44% at 5). This may well be indicative of conceptual differences between the norm of "face" and severity of offense in Japanese culture in circumstances.

3.2. The Dialog Construction Study

In my data I developed the list of apology strategies used by both the offender person and offended person.

The DC data were coded into the following major categories (based on "the distribution of apology strategies" proposed by Bergman and Kasper (1993)).

<Offender's turn>
A: Apology —
1. simple and ritual speech act
   (I'm sorry, Go men nasai)
2. factors involving the increasing apologetic force.
   (I'm terrible sorry. Please accept my apology.)

B: Account —
1. excuse and justification (My watch was delayed.)
2. lack of intent (I didn't mean to do it.)
3. inability (I tried my best.)
4. blame others (there was a problem in the kitchen.)

C: Taking of Responsibility—speaker admitting the offense
   (It's my fault.)

D: Offer of Repair —
1. correct the offense (Let's get the right meal.)
2. offer of repair which the offended person wants.
   (Could I offer you your dinner free of charge as an apology?)

E: Promise of forbearance — (It won't happen again.)

F: Comments — (I should study harder.)

<Offended person's turn>
G: Acceptance —
1. simple and ritual response (It's OK.)
2. response including the reducing of the offense
   (I understand what you mean, Don't worry about it.)
3. gracious gesture or something (nod and smile to indicate offender's person's acceptance.)
4. mutual apology (It was our fault too.)
5. do behavior which the offended person express as a bad feeling as they accept. (I shouldn't leave a tip. I won't visit the same restaurant again.)
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6. no response as they accept when they are still angry.
7. simple response as they are still angry.

H : Request —
1. expressing excuse (Please explain how it happened.)
2. repair (Getting me my correct order and then providing me a free meal.)
3. admitting the offense for offender (It's your fault.)
4. promise of forbearance (It shouldn't happen again.)

I : Closing — (Let's go shopping.)
J : Non acceptance — (They leave the restaurant soon.)

The data were included in Appendix 3. It summarized the distribution of apology strategies across offense contexts and both groups. Table 2 shows the overall use of apology strategies. The contextual distribution of apology strategies were examined by comparing strategies used between both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Overall use of apology strategies (%)

Overall use of apology strategies (%) by the Canadians (N=20), the Japanese (N=53).
A=Apology, B=Account, C=Taking of Responsibility, D=Offer of Repair, E=Promise of Forbearance, F=Comments, G=Acceptance, H=Request, I=Closing, J=Non Acceptance.

3.2.1. Use of Apology Strategies

Table 2 showed the higher frequency in use of Apology by the Canadians (JA=67%, CA=90%) . As mentioned above, this occurred through the difference in social norms between the Japanese and the Canadians in the situation 3 (School). Only 11% of the Japanese subjects used apology strategies, while the Canadians were 85%.

(Hotel) was represented by a style for repeating the apologetic expressions by some subjects of both group. For 25% of the Canadian subjects and 19% of the Japanese likely used this remedial strategy: Apology (i.e. "I'm so sorry.") + Account + Apology

(243)
As mentioned above, the difference in the use of apology was caused by the difference, in perceptions of the content-external factors. The same difference was shown in the use of Acceptance. Acceptance was used in various ways by both subjects. If the offended person used a simple and ritual response (i.e. It's OK.) to the offender, they did not always stop here. They used the sequence strategy to run smooth things between them in social harmony. Acceptance 2., response including the reducing of the offense, the Canadians used more various expressions of apology than the Japanese. For example, after apology, a offended person's turn responded:

Don't worry about it.
It was a simple misunderstanding.
I might have done the same. Nobody is perfect.

By contrast, the Japanese used Acceptance 4, mutual apology, more frequently than the Canadians (Hotel: JA=23%, CA=10%) . Reducing the offense, the Japanese tended to use the mutual apology in spite of saying something. There were no observable differences in the use of Acceptance 5, do behavior, (which the offended person express as a bad feeling) as they accept by the Japanese and the Canadians. In Acceptance 3, were no considerable difference between both groups excepting (School) . The Japanese Acceptance 6, no response as they accept when they are still angry, was rated less than the Canadians in all context (they refered to (Hotel) and (Wrong Order) .). Silence of the offended person is easily recognized as a sign of anger without the gestures. This response sign puts considerable psychological pressure on the offender (Maynard, 1990). This may mean the offended person's face-want is stronger in the service industry than the Canadians. Thus, Japanese face is inextricably depended on acknowledgment by others (Kumagai, 1993). On the other hand Acceptance 7, simple response as they are still angry, was rated higher by the Canadians (Hotel: CA=25%, JA=4%, Wrong Order : CA=25%, JA=11%). They (the offended person's turn) may prefer to communicate with the offender anyway, in stead of using the strategy of
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Request 2, repair, showed considerable differences between the groups. Canadians (40%) requested a free or discount meal as apology, while Japanese were 13%. There was a difference in strategy for remedying the offense. The Canadians' face-want tend to request something as apology, the Japanese face-want prefers the saying of an expression of apology. The Japanese used Request 4, promise of forbearance, more frequently than the Canadians when being late. This may say the Japanese have a stronger sense of punctually and therefore a time-offense is a considerably, more serious event for them. For example, in Wrong Order the Japanese informants responded:

Do you have the time for me to change the dishes?
That's OK. Quickly please.

This finding was only from the Japanese subjects. Thus, it was supported by the previous study.

The unsuccessful remedial for offense with interaction was expressed by Non acceptance, however, there were no noticeworthy differences in all context. Closing were expressed in successful remedial for offense with interaction by both groups in (Hotel) and (Friend). Kumagai (1993) mentioned the specific factor of Closing as follows:

Japanese and Americans both refrained from using Closing with serious offenses, probably because it is more risky for an apologizer to take the initiative in concluding the matter in these situations. (Kumagai, 1993 : 289)

Using Closing can be effective or ineffective in certain circumstances and interactions.

4. Conclusion

I compared the style of the apologetic interaction of Japanese and Canadians. I investigated how Canadians and Japanese perceive and perform apologies in being late-both of offender and offended person and the cultural meaning of the remedial act and behavior on face-management on aspects such as the circumstances and severity of offense and interactions. This revealed the same strategies had different implications in both groups according to the circumstances. Learning a culture-specific strategy such as apology or understanding the new ways of a foreign country will be useful on the intercultural communication of EFL learners.
APPENDIX 1

日米状況別英会話

問題 次の1～4の状況にあなたがいると仮定して下さい、その時の自分の気持ちに当てはまるものの番号に○をつけてください。

状況1
（日本で）琴美は旅行会社の乗務員です。アメリカ人夫婦に京都を案内するように頼まれたので、ホテルで待ち合わせをしました。ホテルのロビーから電話をし、待ち合わせ場所を英語でat the frontと言いました。待ち合わせ時間が1時間だっても、その夫婦は現れません。様子を見に行くと、違う場所で待っていました。琴美は、待ち合わせ場所について、フロントデスクの前という意味で言ったのですが、彼らはホテルの前で待っていました。夫婦はカンカンに怒っています。琴美の言葉のat the frontは、誤解を生じさせたのです。

当てはまるものに○をつけてください
1. この状況における琴美とアメリカ人夫婦の親密度は、
   1 2 3 4 5
2. 琴美とアメリカ人の夫妻との立場関係は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   琴美の立場は夫妻より上
3. 琴美の罪はどれくらい、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
4. 琴美が謝る必要は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
5. どのようにその夫妻は琴美の謝罪を受け入れますか、
   1 2 3 4 5
   好意的に受け入れる
6. 琴美の顔（面子）は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   顔があがる

さて、琴美は夫妻に対し何と言いますか？

b. それに対して夫妻は何と言いますか？

状況2
（日本で）琴美とCandyは友達です。最近新築された映画を見た二人は、喫茶店で1時に待ち合わせをしました。琴美は待ち合わせの時間に5分から7分くらい遅れていました。

当てはまるものに○をつけてください
1. この状況における琴美とCandyの親密度は、
   1 2 3 4 5
2. 琴美とCandyとの立場関係は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   琴美の立場はCandyより上
3. 琴美の罪はどれくらい、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
4. 琴美が謝る必要は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
5. どのようにCandyは琴美の謝罪を受け入れますか、
   1 2 3 4 5
   好意的に受け入れる
6. 琴美の顔（面子）は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   顔があがる

さて、琴美はCandyに対し何と言いますか？

b. それに対してCandyは何と言いますか？

（246）
状況3
（日本で）美沙紀は大学生です。1時間目の授業で、担当教授が6分遅れてきました。
当てはまるものに○をつけてください。
1. この状況における教授と美沙紀の親密度は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   とても近い
2. 教授と美沙紀との立場関係は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   教授の立場は美沙紀より上
3. 教授の罪はどれくらい、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
4. 教授が謝る必要は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
5. どのように美沙紀は教授の謝罪を受け入れますか、
   1 2 3 4 5
   好意的に受け入れる
6. 教授の顔（面子）は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   顏があがる
さて、教授は美沙紀たち学生に対し何と言いますか？

状況4
（日本で）美沙紀はイタリア料理の店にいます。注文をしてから、40分が過ぎて料理がきました。しかし、注文をした料理とは違っていました。注文をした人と料理を持ってきたウェイトレスは同じです。
当てはまるものに○をつけてください。
1. この状況におけるウェイトレスと美沙紀の親密度は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   とても近い
2. ウェイトレスと美沙紀との立場関係は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   ウェイトレスの立場は美沙紀より上
3. ウェイトレスの罪はどれくらい、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
4. ウェイトレスが謝る必要は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   全くない
5. どのように美沙紀はウェイトレスの謝罪を受け入れますか、
   1 2 3 4 5
   好意的に受け入れる
6. ウェイトレスの顔（面子）は、
   1 2 3 4 5
   顏があがる
さて、ウェイトレスは美沙紀たち学生に対し何と言いますか？

b. それに対して美沙紀達は何と言いますか？
This is a questionnaire for researching the style of apology in an English-speaking country. Please read the sentences and answer the questions.

Situation 1
(Canada) Kotomi (a Japanese girl) is a tour guide, who has been asked to guide an American couple around Kyoto. Kotomi called their room from the lobby, and they agreed to meet her "at the front" in ten minutes. She waited at the front desk, and the couple waited in front of the hotel. After an hour, she suspected a misunderstanding, checked around, and met the couple at last. Kotomi told them she was waiting. But the couple is now really angry.

Please mark the number which you feel.

1. How close are Kotomi and the couple in this situation?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very close slightly close slightly distant very distant

2. What is the status relationship between Kotomi and the couple?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   Kotomi noticeably higher than the couple Kotomi= the couple Kotomi noticeably lower than the couple

3. How serious is Kotomi's offense?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   not serious at all very serious

4. Does Kotomi need to apologize?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   not at all absolutely

5. How likely is the couple to accept Kotomi's apology?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very likely very unlikely

6. Does Kotomi gain or lose face in this situation?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   gains face loses face

What does Kotomi say to them?

How would the couple respond?

Situation 2
(Canada) Kotomi and Candy are good friends. They promised to meet at 1:00 at the cafeteria and then go shopping. Unfortunately, Kotomi came late around 5 minutes, on that day.

Please mark the number which you feel.

1. How close are Kotomi and Candy in this situation?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very close very distant

2. What is the status relationship between Kotomi and Candy?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   Kotomi noticeably higher than Candy Kotomi= Candy Kotomi noticeably lower than Candy
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3. How serious is Kotomi's offense?

1 2 3 4 5
not serious at all very serious

4. Does Kotomi need to apologize?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all absolutely

5. How likely is Candy to accept Kotomi's apology?

1 2 3 4 5
very likely very unlikely

6. How likely is the professor to accept Kotomi's apology?

1 2 3 4 5
very likely very unlikely

What does Kotomi say to her?

How would Candy respond?

Situation 3
(Canada) Misaki is a university student. She has a class in the first period. However, the professor came in 6 minutes late.

Please mark the number which you feel.

1. How close are the professor and Misaki in this situation?

1 2 3 4 5
very close very distant

2. What is the status relationship between the professor and Misaki?

Professor noticeably higher than Misaki
Professor = Misaki
Professor noticeably lower than Misaki

3. How serious is the professor's offense?

1 2 3 4 5
not serious at all very serious

4. Does the professor need to apologize?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all absolutely

5. How likely is Misaki to accept the professor's apology?

1 2 3 4 5
very likely very unlikely

6. Does the professor gain or lose face in this situation?

1 2 3 4 5
gains face loses face
What does the professor say to Misaki?

How would Misaki respond?

Situation 4
(Canada) Misaki went to an Italian restaurant. After waiting 40 minutes, the food was served, however, it was the wrong order. The waitress is the same person who took the order and served the food.

Please mark the number which you feel.

1. How close are the waitress and Misaki in this situation?

   1  2  3  4  5
   very close  very distant

2. What is the status relationship between the waitress and Misaki?

   1  2  3  4  5
   waitress noticeably higher than Misaki
   waitress = Misaki
   waitress noticeably lower than Misaki

3. How serious is the waitress's offense?

   1  2  3  4  5
   not serious at all  very serious

4. Does the waitress need to apologize?

   1  2  3  4  5
   not at all  absolutely

5. How likely is Misaki to accept the waitress's apology?

   1  2  3  4  5
   very likely  very unlikely

6. Does the waitress gain or lose face in this situation?

   1  2  3  4  5
   gains face  loses face

What does the waitress say to Misaki?

How would Misaki respond?

I You are a. woman  b. man
II You are ___ years old.
III You come from ___________________

Thank you very much for answering this.
## APPENDIX 2 Summary of Results of All Subjects on Each Situation.

### Situation 1. Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Face-Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Situation 2. Friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Face-Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Situation 3. School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Face-Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Situation 4. Wrong Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Face-Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JA = JAPANESE, CA = CANADIANS
APPENDIX 3  Summary of Results of All Subjects on Each Situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>状況 1</th>
<th>状況 2</th>
<th>状況 3</th>
<th>状況 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: 1.simple and ritual speech act</td>
<td>JA 76</td>
<td>CA 75</td>
<td>JA 83</td>
<td>CA 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.factors involving the increasing apologetic force</td>
<td>JA 19</td>
<td>CA 25</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: 1.excuse and justification</td>
<td>JA 32</td>
<td>CA 40</td>
<td>JA 11</td>
<td>CA 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.lack of intent</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.inability</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.blame other</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: speaker admitting the offense</td>
<td>JA 45</td>
<td>CA 40</td>
<td>JA 50</td>
<td>CA 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: 1.correct the offense</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 5</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.offer of repair which the offended person's want</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Promise of forbearance</td>
<td>JA 1</td>
<td>CA 20</td>
<td>JA 1</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Comments</td>
<td>JA 13</td>
<td>CA 5</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: 1.simple and ritual response</td>
<td>JA 28</td>
<td>CA 45</td>
<td>JA 38</td>
<td>CA 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.response including the reducing the offense</td>
<td>JA 13</td>
<td>CA 30</td>
<td>JA 15</td>
<td>CA 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.gracious gesture or something</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
<td>JA 1</td>
<td>CA 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.mutual apology</td>
<td>JA 23</td>
<td>CA 10</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.do behavior which the offended person express as a bad feeling as they accept</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 5</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.no response as they accept when they are still angry</td>
<td>JA 4</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.simple response as they are still angry</td>
<td>JA 4</td>
<td>CA 25</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: 1.expressing excuse</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 5</td>
<td>JA 4</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.repair</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 10</td>
<td>JA 1</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.admitting the offense for offender</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 5</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.promise of forbearance</td>
<td>JA 32</td>
<td>CA 9</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Closing</td>
<td>JA 10</td>
<td>CA 20</td>
<td>JA 6</td>
<td>CA 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Non acceptance</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 5</td>
<td>JA 0</td>
<td>CA 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JA = JAPANESE, CA = CANADIANS
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