

APOLOGY STRATEGIES PERCEIVED TO BE APPROPRIATE BY FILIPINO-SPEAKING COUPLES

Leonisa A. Mojica
De La Salle University-Manila

This study is an attempt to investigate how couples perceive themselves making amends for an offense which they believe might have damaged the addressee's face needs (Brown and Levinson, 1999). It specifically aims to investigate what apology strategies Filipino-speaking couples choose to employ in certain contrived situations; how the weight of the offense influence the type of apology strategy use; if there is any difference in the females' choice of apology strategies from that of their partners; and what implications can be derived from the respondents' choice of apology strategies in terms of functions. Since literature on this aspect is scarce and very few studies are available to support it, the study will be a contribution in the field of sociolinguistics in the country. The results may be considered useful, too, for their pedagogical implications. Classroom activities during values integration sessions can be geared towards familiarizing students with effective ways of satisfying each other's positive and negative face wants.

1. INTRODUCTION

Every human being's need to appreciate the role of communication in negotiating social relations is well recognized, particularly in the fields of sociology, anthropology and the different branches of linguistics. It has been observed, however, that not everyone is fully aware of the discourse being used " . . . not only...for exchanging information but...in shaping interpersonal and intergroup relations" (Jaworski and Coupland, 1999, p. 291). In search for more credible claims concerning this issue, scholars continue to conduct investigations, and their updated theories undoubtedly inspire researchers in investigating the role of language in social relations. Malinowski's (1999) theory on phatic communion, for instance, provides information on how closeness between people is realized through language. Such type of communion is regarded as "important and intricate discursive practice, co-constructed by all participants in delicate negotiations of face and social distance" (p. 293). Wolfson's bulge theory (1988, cited in Jaworski & Coupland, 1999) implies that similar rules are observed between intimates, status unequals and strangers in their spoken discourse, while differences on rules in the same type of discourse are noted between non-intimates, status unequal friends, co-workers and acquaintances. Goffman's (1999) contributions through his face-work concepts cannot be overemphasized. His theory has been developed further in the formulation of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, both frameworks lending usefulness in analyzing why and how people's face needs ought to be addressed.

Theories involving face and politeness are often used in investigating the interlocutors' communicative behavior. Face, as defined by Goffman (1999), is "the positive

social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p. 306). Goffman considers face as "an image of self portrayed in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing...for himself" (p. 306). This definition finds its relation to the dictionary's definition of the term which is "value or standing in the eyes of others; dignity; prestige" (*Reader's Digest Universal Dictionary*, p. 547) – an aspect of one's being that needs to be preserved.

Brown and Levinson (1999) who regard face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 321), present two aspects of face: negative face and positive face, the former referring to one's "basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition." One's negative face is threatened when another person makes requests, or gives orders, suggestions, advice, reminders, threats, warnings, as these acts tend to transgress his/her freedom of action, his/her freedom from imposition. Positive face, on the other hand, refers to the "positive consistent self-image or 'personality'...claimed by interactants" (p. 321). The second type of face can be transgressed when the speaker expresses disapproval, criticisms, insults, and other forms of negative evaluation, threatening the addressee's positive regard for his/her own image.

Human nature dictates that just as one person endeavors to maintain his/her face, he/she shows awareness of other people's need to preserve their own faces as well. When another person's face is lost due to offenses, also termed transgressions or interferences, a form of redress is effected to restore the addressee's face. The intention to prevent any potential damage on another person's face is likewise shown through an advanced form of redress. Thus, one who might want a friend to wait for her/him will most likely be heard saying, "*I'm sorry to cause you some inconvenience, but can you just stay on until I come?*"

Interlocutors find apologies useful for redress purposes. Holmes (1990) regards apologies as social acts which are meant to convey affective meaning. The term apology is defined in various ways, one of which is to limit it to expressions like *sorry* and *I apologize* (Owen, 1983, cited in Holmes, 1990, p. 159). Goffman (1971, cited in Holmes, 1990, p. 159) refers to the term as a "remedy" for an offense which can help repair whatever damage was done. Holmes defines apology as "a speech act addressed to B's face needs and intended to remedy an offense for which A takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B (where A is the apologizer, and B is the person offended" (p. 159). Scher (1989), on the other hand, uses the term to mean "an expression of lack of intent for the offense that has occurred" (p. 4). The dictionary defines it as a statement, either in written or spoken form, the aim of which is to express regret or ask pardon for a fault or offense. There appears to be a point of commonality among these definitions, and that is the intention of doing repair in order to appease the offended party, thereby restoring social balance and re-uplifting one's value or dignity that might have been lost.

Related studies on the analysis of apologies suggest that the strategies used by transgressors or potential transgressors vary across cultures and are dependent on the observed practices in a given speech community. A typical example is Wagner's (1999) sociopragmatic characterization of apologies in Mexican Spanish which enabled her to reject the position that an apology refers to the same social act across all cultures and societies. Wagner argued that the need to apologize and the apology strategies used are not global in nature; social and cultural factors influence the employment of this speech act.

In analyzing apologies collected from pakeha New Zealanders, Holmes (1990) noted similarities in their apology strategies and those found in Olshtain and Cohen's (1983, cited in Holmes, 1990) data. Holmes also observed that the greater weight the offense had, the more "compensatory" (p. 193) strategies were used by the speaker to satisfy the addressee's face needs. Another interesting finding in Holmes' study was a slight tendency among friends "to receive higher ranked apology strategies than average and...to receive an explanation...as one component in the remedial exchange more frequently than intimates or strangers do" (p. 186). This is in contrast to Fraser's (1981, cited in Holmes, 1990) observation that "as the degree of familiarity increases between the interactants, the need (or at least the perceived need) to provide elaborate apologies decreases" (1981, p. 269, cited in Holmes, 1990).

Irizarry Muñoz (2000) did a cross-cultural pragmatics study on Puerto Ricans return migrant and non-migrant students' apology performance and evaluation. She observed notable differences in at least three of the nine strategies used. Irizarry Muñoz likewise observed similarities in the participants' apologies in terms of semantic and syntactic formulas.

Butler's (2001) study involving the role of context in apology speech act among native English-speaking college students was an attempt to understand how context affects the perceived appropriateness of apologies by varying the amount of context. Findings show the need to increase the amount of context included in research instruments. Likewise, it was found that meaning is constructed in each unique situation, implying that the more the situation is understood, the easier it is to determine the appropriate apology strategies to employ.

Effects of apologies and apology structure on social perception and social action were investigated by Scher (1989) who conducted two experiments to examine how apologies work to change respondents' perceptions of transgressors, and how changing the structure of the apology would change those effects. Scher notes that the amount of negative affect (guilt and remorse) which the respondents attribute to the transgressor is influenced by the apology structure. He also observes that affect influences judgments about the identity of the transgressor and the amount of sanctions participants want to give the transgressor.

In the Philippines, the only known study on apologies is that of Bautista (1987) who analyzed this speech act together with compliments, directives, and probes. She obtained her data from the scripts of seven most popular Pilipino (now Filipino) radio-dramas in 1977-78, each script running for 30 minutes. Bautista's findings show that the form of apologies to be used was dependent on the weight of the offense, with social distance between those involved playing a very minor role. Bautista observed the following components in the Pilipino apology structure in radio dramas: admission of the wrong, an explicit acknowledgment of the need to apologize, an explanation or justification, and a promise not to repeat the offense. These components were observed to exist too in the New Zealand apology structure (Holmes, 1990), the data of which came from apologies and apology responses noted down by New Zealand students who volunteered to do the task in exchange for another course assignment. Such components are likewise contained in the definitions of apologies cited earlier.

It would be interesting to make a follow-up study after Bautista's exploratory analysis of Pilipino apologies. Although the corpora in both studies cannot be regarded as

natural -- Bautista's having come from scripted dialogues, and this study's, based on the respondents' choices in contrived situations, the latter is believed to be a closer representation of the naturally-occurring language used by Filipino-speaking couples. The situations and some of the choices used in the instrument for this project were suggested by married friends and cousins. I believe the results can give more insights on the structure and functions of apologies, specifically among Filipino-speaking couples, using a medium that is nearer the type of language actually used by the speakers in their daily encounters.

1.1 Purpose of the study

This study investigated the following:

1. What apology strategies do Filipino-speaking couples prefer to employ in certain contrived situations?
2. How does the weight of the offense influence the type of apology strategies to use?
3. Do husbands and wives differ in their choice of apology strategies?
4. Do couples in the semi-urban community differ from those in the urban area in their choice of apology strategies?
5. What implications in terms of functions can be derived from the respondents' choice of apology strategies?

1.2 Framework of the study

This study adopted the framework used by Olshtain and Cohen (1983, cited in Holmes, 1990, p. 167) for initial categorization of the data. Basic categories with accompanying examples are given below:

- A. An explicit expression of apology
 - offer apology IFID (i.e. illocutionary force indicating device), e.g. *Sori* instead of *Humihingi ako ng tawad* 'I apologize.'
 - express regret, e.g., *Ikinalulungkot ko* 'I'm sorry.'
 - request forgiveness, e.g., *Pasensya ka na* 'Please forgive me' or 'Please bear with me.'
- B. An explanation or account, an excuse or justification
e.g. *Inaantok na kasi ako* 'I was feeling sleepy, that's why.'
- C. An acknowledgment of responsibility
 - accept blame, e.g., *Kasalanan ko nga yon* 'It was my fault.'
 - express self-deficiency, e.g., *Napakahina ko kasi* 'I was so vulnerable, that's why.'
 - recognize it as entitled to an apology, e.g., *Tama ka* 'You're right.' *Dapat akong humingi ng tawad sa iyo* 'You deserve an apology.'
 - express lack of intent, e.g., *Di ko sinasadya* 'I didn't mean to.'
 - offer repair/redress, e.g., *Papalitan ko agad yung nawala* 'I'll replace what was lost immediately.'
- D. A promise of forbearance
e.g. *Hindi ko na uulitin, pangako* 'I promise it won't happen again.'

Category A, which is considered the simplest and least heavy-weighted strategy in asking for forgiveness, includes direct speech acts expressing sorrow and implying some

form of redress. Categories B, C, and D are indirect ones. Those with heavier weight, considered as more polite strategies (Leech, 1983, cited in Holmes, 1990), belong to categories C and D.

The study likewise makes reference to Brown and Levinson's (1999) concepts of R, P, and D, where R means ranking of the imposition, P means the relative power of the hearer (H) over the speaker (S), and D means the social distance between the participants. Such concepts can facilitate the analysis of data among intimates who are said to belong to one of the extreme ends of the social distance scale. One other point that can be analyzed is the possible relation between R and the respondents' chosen apology strategies. Finally, the data might show if P exists between the members of each couple.

1.3 Significance of the study

The findings can form part of the researcher's contributions in the field of sociolinguistics in terms of the following: identification of the role of apologies in maintaining/negotiating social relations between Filipino-speaking couples, and enrichment of the literature involving the use of speech acts -- apologies in particular -- among the speakers of the native language. Moreover, the results can help develop the students' awareness of the importance of satisfying each other's face needs in order to maintain good social relations.

2. METHODOLOGY

A total of 160 Filipino-speaking couples was requested to participate in the study. Half of the respondents belong to the urban sector and half reside in a semi-urban province, with both groups coming from both the middle income and upper income brackets of the society. More than half of the respondents -- from both the urban and semi-urban sectors, speak Filipino. *Taglish*, a combination of Filipino and English, is spoken by 50% of urban couples, and 35% by semi-urban respondents. Most of the couples have been married for 30 years or less; very few have been together for more than 30 years. Their ages range from 20-50 with a few belonging to the above-50 bracket. The availability type of sampling was used with the urban group being represented by parents, guardians and employees of De La Salle University (DLSU), Manila, and the Philippine Women's University (PWU). Semi-urban counterparts come from a private secondary school and a government-run elementary school in the town of Alfonso, Cavite, where life is neither too progressive nor too far behind modern civilization.

A researcher-constructed instrument consisting of 12 contrived situations (see Appendix) was distributed to the first 80 Filipino-speaking couples who were asked to choose the apology strategies they deemed appropriate in given events. Bases in providing situations were the responses given by some friends, colleagues, and co-workers. The accomplished papers were then distributed to the other 80 couples who were asked to rate the first group's chosen apology types on a scale of 1-5 (See Appendix). The responses of the second batch were meant to substantiate the appropriateness of the apology strategies selected by the first group. Unfortunately, retrieval rate was very poor; hence, the second set of data was excluded.

The Chi-square test was employed to determine if the following exist: significant association between the weight of the offense and the strategies chosen, significant differences between husbands' and wives' preferred apology types, and significant differences between semi-urban and urban couples in their choice of apologies. The null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected at the .05 level if the Chi-square critical value (X^2) was equal to, or greater than, 7.815, the degrees of freedom (df) being equal to three.

The descriptive design was employed and the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively using the framework discussed earlier.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Respondents' preferred apology strategies

Of the six given general categories of apologies, females and males, regardless of points of origin, prefer to employ a combination of apology strategies. Table 1 shows the frequency of apology types used. Only categories with at least one two-digit frequency and those without 0 entries have been included.

Table 1
Frequency of apology types used

Category	SEMI-URBAN		URBAN		URBAN			
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
A	42	36	65	83	45	27	10	12
B	50	51	45	53	32	27	10	12
C	33	40	32	34	28	30	11	11
D	67	65	35	27	28	27	11	11
E	41	40	28	30	28	30	11	11
AB	30	27	40	27	40	27	11	11
AC	12	27	18	22	18	22	11	11
AD	28	34	18	27	18	27	11	11
AE	25	18	16	10	16	10	11	11
BD	7	4	10	5	10	5	11	11
BE	7	6	5	20	5	20	11	11
CD	17	11	14	20	14	20	11	11
ABD	14	10	15	10	15	10	11	11
ACD	22	16	11	24	11	24	11	11
ABCD	14	8	12	12	12	12	11	11

*NOTE: Overall totals of apology strategies per group: Semi-urban females: 448; Semi-urban males: 422; Urban females: 398; and Urban males: 466.

It can be noted that categories A to E have been selected by all the four groups of respondents, each obtaining a frequency ranging from 5.79 to 17.81%. Category A seems to be most preferred by urban husbands and wives, the top two ranking frequencies having been

obtained from this group's males and females, respectively. In Holmes' (1990) and Overfield's (1997, cited in Wagner, 1999) studies, Category A was likewise the most frequently selected strategy. This type, which is an explicit expression of apology, is expressed through a direct expression of regret "I'm sorry" or "Sorry" and is found in seven out of 12 given situations. Another way of exemplifying this category is through a request for forgiveness--the usual way of saying it in Filipino: *Pasensiya ka na* 'Please bear with me,' or the more formal way of saying it: *Patawarin mo (na) ako* 'Please forgive me,' which was used in two of the given situations.

Semi-urban partners, on the other hand, show a slightly higher preference for categories B and D as compared to the urban couples, except the urban males, who regard category B on an almost equal degree as the semi-urban husbands and wives.

Category B carries with it an explanation why an offense has been committed. An example is: *Nag-extend kami ng work, eh* 'We had to work for a few hours more, eh,' or *Antok na antok na kasi ako* 'I was very sleepy, that's why.' Category D, which was employed more by semi-urban females, making it obtain the highest frequency among all categories, consists of a promise not to repeat the same act. This type usually includes a resolution to make amends. Examples are: Promise, *hindi na ako mala-late*...I won't be late again.' *Bayaan mo, hindi na ganoon sa susunod* 'Don't worry, nothing of this sort will happen again.'

The only single category that did not obtain a frequency higher than 9.5% is C which is an acknowledgment of responsibility. Some examples of this type are: *Fault ko* 'My fault' or *Tama ka* 'You're right' or *Kailangan kong mag-apologize sa'yo* 'I need to apologize to you'; or *Pagkakamali ko nga yon* 'It's my fault, really.' On other occasions, Category C was used in combination with A or B or D or E, but not in frequencies of occurrence higher than 6.40%.

Category E, which is not found in Olshtain and Cohen's (1983, cited in Holmes, 1990) framework, consists of a combination of a reconciliatory remark and an attempt to transfer the guilt either to the offended party or to the subject/topic under discussion. An example is: *Smile ka na* 'Please smile.' *Masyado ka kasing punctual* 'You're too punctual.' Another example is: *Huwag ka nang magtampo* 'Don't feel bad.' *Hindi ka kasi nagtatanong, eh* 'You don't bother to ask, that's why.' The second statement is not an apology in itself but becomes part of the whole structure when the first sentence is said, thus completing the combination. A third example is: *Okay na tayo, ha?* 'Let's get settled.' *Ang tigas ng ulo ng batang yan* 'That child is so stubborn, that's why.' The two highest frequencies on Category E came from semi-urban couples with a little more than 9% each. The urban wives, on the other hand, employed this category with a frequency equivalent to slightly over 7%, and the husbands, less than 6.5%.

Among the urban males, slightly over 50% of the chosen apology types belong to Category F which is a combination of two to five strategies. The combinations AB, AD, and ACD seem to be their most favored apology types, the first two having been used with a frequency equivalent to nearly 6%, and the last, a little over 5%. The urban females, on the other hand, having used Category F with a frequency equivalent to a little less than 50%, seem to have a special preference for the combination AB, making it obtain the highest percentage - slightly over 10% - as compared to the other groups' frequencies on this type. AB is the second most frequent combination in Holmes' (1990) data. Respondents in both studies seem to favor the combination of an explicit expression of apology and explanation.

The other two combinations preferred by urban females are AC and AD, with an identical frequency equivalent to 4.5%. An example of AC is: *Pasensya ka na* 'Please bear with me' *Ang tigas ko, no* 'How inconsiderate of me' *Natiis kong hindi ka tulungan* 'I was so heartless not to have helped you!' The preceding lines were chosen to apologize for not assisting one's partner by at least preparing breakfast as she/he hurriedly tries to catch up with her/his appointment. Another example is: Sorry *talaga, Mahal* 'Am really sorry, dear.' *Kasalanan ko nga, alam ko* 'It's my fault, I know'. Category AC is a combination of an explicit expression of apology and an acknowledgment of responsibility. The combination AD enabled the respondents to express their apology explicitly and reiterate their promise of forbearance: Sorry, Darling. *Babawi ako sa susunod*, Sweetheart. 'I'll make it up next time...'

Differences were noted among semi-urban and urban couples' choices. The former also employed AB on a relatively high frequency, this category being the females' most preferred combination and the males' second. Males in this group appear to have favored the use of AD most, making it obtain a frequency equivalent to a little more than 8%. Semi-urban females' second and third choices are AD and AE, with a frequency equivalent to a little above 6% for the former, and more than 5.5% for the latter. The males used AB and AC on an equal frequency equivalent to almost 6.5%.

Combination AE appears to be the third preference of semi-urban females, making it obtain the highest frequency, a little less than 6%, among all the combinations. Of the four groups, semi-urban wives seem to favor combining an explicit expression of their apologies with an attempt to transfer guilt to the offended party or the subject under discussion. Semi-urban males and the urban couples employed this combination on lower percentages--a little above 4% for the semi-urban males and urban females, and a low 2.15% for urban males.

3.2 Interaction between the offense and the chosen apology strategies

Couples' chosen apology types were regrouped such that instead of having six general categories (A, B, C, D, E, and F), four groups were established: A (explicit expression of apology); B and E (explanation for B and combination of a reconciliatory statement and transfer of guilt for E); C and D (acknowledgment of guilt for C and promise of forbearance for D); and F (combination of at least two strategies). With these groupings, eight out of 12 situations revealed a significant interaction between the weight of the offense, termed ranking of the imposition or R by Brown and Levinson (1999), and the respondents' choice of apology types.

Table 2 shows the influence of the weight of the offense on the apology types selected by the respondents. It can be noted that the influence seems to be situation-specific.

Table 2
Influence of the offense on the choice of apology types by situations

Situation	Strategies								Chi-Square Value
	A		B & E		C & D		F		
	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	
1	17	6	11	3	8	7	22	26	11.18*
2	9.65	8.96	17.24	8.28	3.45	3.45	14.48	34.48	15.06*
3	4.46	5.10	24.84	7.01	0.64	4.46	19.75	33.76	26.00*
4	22.38	6.99	11.89	4.90	7.69	3.50	25.87	16.78	2.89
5	8.33	2.5	30.83	11.67	4.17	10	11.67	20.83	19.12*
6	9.52	4.08	4.76	6.80	10.88	18.37	8.84	36.73	18.50*
7	0.63	5.06	0.63	10.76	2.53	26.58	0.0	53.80	7.85*
8	6.52	8.70	0.0	5.07	6.52	21.01	3.62	48.55	18.02*
9	0.75	2.26	3.01	6.02	8.27	24.06	0.75	54.89	20.07*
10	6.41	0.64	10.26	3.85	15.38	11.54	27.56	24.36	7.58
11	7.43	3.38	10.14	6.76	13.51	12.16	17.57	31.76	6.55
12	5.96	1.99	19.21	10.60	9.27	7.28	22.52	23.18	4.29

*Significant at .05 χ^2 [3, .05=7.815]

Note. df = 3 obtained through the formula (2-1)x(4-1), where 2 = degree of offense and 4 = apology types. (Computations were done by situations as a different focus is contained in each of them).

L=Light; H=Heavy

With the exception of Situation 11, which concerns differences in disciplining children, situations that revealed significant differences are those that are considered *Mabigat* 'Heavy' by the respondents, and which they believe should be addressed using category F. This preference appears to be an indication that in their attempt to do repair, couples believe in the strength of employing a combination of apology types.

For a more systematic discussion, situations have been grouped into three according to concerns: (1) Personal, exemplified by numbers 2 and 3, and which deal with offenses hurting the partner's ego; (2) Parental, numbers 11 and 12, which reflect the couples' differing ways in disciplining their children; and (3) Marital, numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, which show the adverse effects of infidelity; interference of parents-in-law; seeming lack of concern for one's partner's emotional and intimate needs; and lack of openness on matters involving the couples' finances and social functions, including vices. None of the two situations categorized as parental showed any significant interaction between the offense and choice of apology strategies. One possible reason could be the respondents' divided view on these two offenses. They are probably not as bothered by these situations as their marital and personal concerns.

Of the eight situations reflecting marital concerns, two revealed no significant interaction between the weight of the offense and the preferred apology types. They tend not to be greatly affected by their partner's preference to stay in bed instead of getting up to prepare breakfast and extend moral support to a partner who is almost late for his/her morning appointment. Likewise, they seem to downplay their partner's inability to attend to their intimate needs at the time they want their attention. The insignificant effect of the weight of the offense on the respondents' choice of apology types could probably be attributed to their thinking that these situations could be regarded on a neutral basis and that remedies for these particular scenarios might be easier to achieve as compared to the others.

The remaining six situations involving marital concerns showed a relationship between the two variables--situations and choice of apology strategies. It seems most of them regard infidelity as something very serious, as revealed by high percentages on the *Mabigat* 'Heavy' column for Situations 7 and 8, and their employment of heavier forms of apologies, specifically the F type. Likewise, one's disclosure of unwise spending of money -- consuming almost all savings on gambling, in particular -- seems to be considered serious, with almost 55% of those who chose Category F rating this as *Mabigat*. A little less heavier, but still significantly interacting with the choice of apology strategies, are situations concerning lack of openness in spending the couple's money for a social function, not necessarily gambling; encouraging a partner to accept her/his parents' offer of a house and lot instead of living with one's partner's family; and habitually failing to meet wife/husband on time at a place previously agreed upon.

The two situations involving personal concerns reflect a significant influence of the weight of the offense on their preferred types of apology. The respondents seem to mind it when their egos are hurt, particularly when their partners raise their voices in anger and call them names. Many of those who regarded this situation as heavy chose to employ Category F, a combination of at least two strategies.

3.3 Couples' preferred apology types compared

In terms of gender. Table 3 shows that females' preferred apology types do not differ significantly from those of the males. The highest X^2 , 3.64, is far below 7.815, the point of significance at the .05 level. When grouped into four general divisions of apology strategies, namely: A, B and E, C and D, and F, the apologies chosen by the couples appear to be on an almost equal level.

Table 3
Relationship between preferred apology types and gender by situations

Situation	A		B & E		C & D		F		Chi-Square Value
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
1	11.19	13.99	8.39	5.59	6.29	4.2	24.48	25.87	1.89
2	9.66	6.21	11.72	16.55	5.52	3.45	23.45	23.45	2.97
3	4.83	5.52	20.69	14.48	2.76	2.76	22.07	26.90	2.34
4	13.79	17.24	11.72	5.52	5.52	5.52	20.69	20	3.64
5	7.32	3.25	21.14	22.76	8.13	7.32	15.45	14.63	1.88
6	7.10	7.10	6.45	5.16	15.48	12.90	23.23	22.58	0.28
7	4.38	2.19	4.38	5.11	12.41	13.87	31.39	26.28	1.45
8	5.15	9.56	2.94	2.21	13.97	14.71	29.41	22.06	3.28
9	2.21	0.74	4.41	3.68	16.18	15.44	28.68	28.68	0.10
10	2.08	2.78	4.17	8.33	15.28	12.5	27.08	27.78	2.45
11	5.23	3.27	7.84	11.11	11.76	13.73	21.57	25.49	1.50
12	6.29	2.80	12.59	16.08	9.09	7.69	20.98	24.48	3.02

*Significant at .05 [$pX^2_{.05} = 7.815$].

Note. $df=3$ obtained through the formula $(2-1) \times (4-1)$, where 2 = genders and 4 = apology types. [Computations were done by situations as a different focus is contained in each of them].

Note the males' and females' very close choices of apology types in Situations 4, 5, and 9. Data show the very slight difference between them -- 3.45% -- in the use of the direct expression "*Sori* 'I'm sorry'. A low 1.62% separates the two groups in their choice of Categories B and E, which consist of an explanation or account, or an excuse or justification, for the former, and a combination of a reconciliatory remark and an attempt to transfer guilt, for the latter. An even more negligible difference, 0.74%, exists between their preference for Categories C and D -- an acknowledgment of responsibility and a promise of forbearance, respectively. The most striking result on this aspect is the husbands' and wives' equal preference for Category F, a combination of strategies, both groups selecting it with a frequency equivalent to 28.68%.

Both groups' preference for the higher types of apologies is probably a manifestation of their willingness to address their partner's face needs, even when the offenses were regarded by them as *Magaan* 'Light.' This finding differs from that of Fraser (1981, cited in Holmes, 1990) who observed a decline in the use of higher types of apologies between individuals bonded by familiarity with each other. It is, however, in support of Holmes' (1990) and Olshain and Cohen's (1983, cited in Holmes, 1990) observation that the heavier the weight of the offense, the heavier weighted strategies were employed.

The finding that wives do not differ significantly from their husbands in their choice of apology types seems to be an encouraging sign. No one between the couple appears to project a more powerful personality over the other. Equality then between the couple seems unthreatened.

In terms of place of origin. Differences in urban and semi-urban couples' preferred apology types are shown in Table 4. It can be noted that Situations 10, 12, 5, and 2, in order of significance, reveal significant variations in choice of apology types among urban and semi-urban couples.

Table 4
Relationship between preferred apology types and place of residence by situations

Situation	A		B & E		C & D		F		Chi-Square Value
	Urban	Semi-Urban	Urban	Semi-Urban	Urban	Semi-Urban	Urban	Semi-Urban	
1	16.11	8.05	5.37	8.05	6.04	8.05	23.49	24.83	5.23
2	11.03	4.83	9.66	18.62	5.52	3.45	23.44	23.44	8.33*
3	6.34	4.23	17.61	18.31	2.11	3.52	23.94	23.94	1.12
4	14.48	16.55	8.28	8.97	4.14	6.90	22.07	18.62	1.60
5	8.94	1.63	19.51	24.39	5.69	9.76	17.07	13.01	8.82*
6	6.71	8.05	7.38	4.70	11.41	18.12	21.48	22.15	2.83
7	5.11	1.46	5.11	4.38	8.76	17.52	28.47	29.20	6.53
8	10.29	4.41	1.47	3.68	12.5	16.18	22.79	28.68	5.59
9	3.17	0.0	3.17	5.56	12.70	13.49	33.33	28.57	5.04
10	7.48	0.0	8.84	8.16	6.80	16.33	27.89	24.49	17.08*
11	5.26	3.29	10.53	7.89	11.84	13.82	22.37	25	1.72
12	7.69	1.40	11.89	16.78	5.59	11.19	23.08	22.38	9.95*

*Significant at .05 [$3X^2 \cdot 05 = 7.815$].

df=3 obtained through the formula $(2-1) \times (4-1)$, where 2 = places of residence and 4 = apology types. [Computations were done by situations as a different focus is contained in each of them].

Statistical computations show that the difference lies in the groups' perception of the appropriateness of Category A. Urban couples tend to favor the use of an explicit expression of apologies by choosing "Sorry, Darling" or "I'm sorry" (Situations 10, 5, and 2), and "*Pasensya ka na* 'Please bear with me' (Situation 12) much more frequently than semi-urban husbands and wives did. These findings seem to indicate that urban couples are less inhibited, and therefore somewhat more frank, than the semi-urban wives and husbands, in addressing their partners' face needs. Another probable reason could be the urban group's greater exposure to a more fast-paced city life. This exposure might have trained them to transact their businesses more speedily and in a more impersonal manner. By being explicit in their expression of apologies, urban couples probably think they are able to save on time, thus enabling them to accomplish their set tasks without undue waste of time, and possibly keeping them away from emotional stress. When combined with other strategies, however, Category A tends to become more personal and appears to have a stronger weight.

4. CONCLUSION

Apologies preferred by Filipino-speaking couples contain the different components of the apology structure observed by other researchers, specifically by Bautista (1987), who investigated the use of apologies together with other speech acts in radio dramas. These components are: (1) a direct expression of apology; (2) an explanation for the offense; (3) acknowledgment of responsibility; (4) an expression of lack of intent; and (5) a promise not to repeat the same act. It seems Filipino writers and possible users of this speech act in the native language recognize the usefulness of the same apology structure. There is an additional finding in this study, however, that had not been reported in earlier investigations - that is, the combination of a reconciliatory remark or gesture and an attempt to transfer guilt either to the offended party or to the subject under discussion by way of explanation. The presence of the first component -- the reconciliatory statement or act -- seems to have made it an acceptable apology strategy. Without it, the second element, which is transfer of guilt, would not have been considered an apology strategy at all. Whether this is culture-specific or not is something that can probably be included in future investigations involving apologies.

Certain insights can be gained from the study. First, the components found in the apology structure employed by Filipino-speaking couples indicate that this speech act, as noted in studies cited earlier, is meant as a form of redress, either to re-establish closeness with one's partner, restore damaged or lost social relations, address one's partner's face needs, or achieve all of these, even if it means losing one's own face in the process. The latter can possibly happen as one directly expresses regret over his/her own transgression, acknowledges responsibility over the act, and more so, as he/she resolves to do better when similar situations occur in the future. Respondents' employment of these strategies highlights the importance of communication in negotiating social relations and in "shaping interpersonal...relations" (Jaworski and Coupland, 1999, p. 291).

Second, there are strong indications that practices indeed vary across cultures. Fraser's (1983, cited in Holmes, 1990) observation that heavy-weighted apology strategies are not needed among interlocutors who have established a certain level of familiarity with each other is not supported by this paper, neither is it supported by Holmes' findings. The Filipino couples believe that they need to employ more of the heavy-ranked apology types in order to make amends and meet their partners' face needs. Furthermore, differences can exist in sub-cultures, as evidenced by the significant difference between the urban and semi-urban couples' use of one apology strategy. The fact that social and cultural factors influence the

interlocutors' use of apology types and that employment of this speech act is not global in nature is likewise claimed by Wagner (1999).

Lastly, the observation that females and males do not differ significantly in their choice of apology types seems to favor the existence of "phatic communion" (Malinowski, 1999, p. 303), a theory that informs people on how to enhance closeness through language. Whether age and the number of years the couples had been together are factors behind the insignificant difference between females and males' choice of apology strategies cannot be determined in this study. These could probably be included as variables in future studies.

In summary, although the data had been obtained through perceptions, instead of actual utterances, and although the second set of data was not available to support the first set, the corpus obtained from the first half of the respondents had yielded useful insights on understanding how Filipino couples value social relations. Husbands and wives have shown their sense of social awareness, as manifested by their intention to restore social balance. Their willingness to address their partners' face needs without exuding power over each other seems to be apparent. More importantly, they have displayed their concern for the preservation of their relationships and of their family's unity at that. It can be said, too, that of Brown and Levinson's (1999) R, P, D, it is the R or the ranking of the imposition that interacts most with the couples' choice of apology strategies rather than D and P.

Conducting more research on the use of apologies among Filipino speakers can provide more insights on how language and culture interact in their communicative transactions.

REFERENCES

- BAUTISTA, M. L. S. (1987). Apologies, compliments, directives, and probes: An exploratory analysis of Pilipino speech acts. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics* (pp. 139-157). Manila, Philippines: De La Salle University Press.
- BROWN, P. & LEVINSON, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 321-335). London: Routledge.
- BUTLER, C. D. (2001). The role of context in the apology speech act: A socio-constructivist analysis of the interpretations of native English-speaking college students. Doctoral dissertation, *DAI-A 62/03*, p. 991, September 2001 (UMI ProQuest).
- GOFFMAN, E. (1999). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 306-320). London: Routledge.
- HOLMES, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society*, 19, 155-199.

- IRIZARRY MUNOZ, V. (2000). Puerto Rican return migrant and non-migrant students' apology performance and evaluation: A cross-cultural pragmatics study. Doctoral dissertation, *DAI-A 60/12*, p. 4287, June 2000 (UMI ProQuest).
- JAWORSKI, A. & COUPLAND, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge.
- MALINOWSKI, B. (1999). On phatic communion. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 302-305). London: Routledge.
- Reader's digest universal dictionary*. (1992). New York: Reader's Digest Association.
- SCHER, S. J. (1989). The effects of apology strategies and apology structure on social perception and social action. Doctoral dissertation, *DAI-B 50/06*, p. 2672, December 1989 (UMI ProQuest).
- WAGNER, L. C. (1999). Towards a sociopragmatic characterization of apologies in Mexican Spanish. Doctoral dissertation, *DAI-A 60/05*, p. 1534, November 1999 (UMI ProQuest).