Louisiana State University

LSU Digital Commons

2017

Social Media And Discourse: A Comparative Study Of English And Spanish Apologies

Adam Logan Majors
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

SOCIAL MEDIA AND DISCOURSE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
ENGLISH AND SPANISH APOLOGIES

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Masters of Hispanic Studies

in

The School of Humanities And Social Sciences

by
Adam Logan Majors
B.A., Oklahoma State University, 2015
May 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This academic achievement would not have been possible without the support and guidance of multiple people in my life. I will always be in debt for everything they did for me, and will strive to help those seeking my own aid with the same commitment and encouragement that I myself received.

I would not be here at all if it were not for the Spanish department at Oklahoma State University, and especially Dr. Christopher Weimer. I will forever be indebted to him for his patience and knowledge as he guided me towards pursuing a career in academia, and will always view him as both a friend and role-model.

My committee members, Dr. Jeremy King, Dr. Mary Brody, and Dr. Carmela Mattza, deserve my deepest thanks and appreciation for all the time they invested in aiding me. Each member provided me with invaluable advice and reassurance, for which I will always be deeply thankful. And to Dr. King, I especially want to thank you for dealing with my time constraints and stubbornness, I owe you one.

Last, I would like to thank my family for all the love and support they showed throughout not just this process, but my entire life. To my parents, Michael and Pamela, my brother, Andrew, and my sister, Allison, I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This research is based on the combination of the age-old discussion between written and oral discourse with the emergence of using multimedia to publish apologies for widespread audiences. Because social media applications like Twitter and YouTube give instant publication access to its users, the continuum between written and oral discourse is continuing to shorten not just amongst Americans, but numerous cultures. The aim of this thesis is to observe a number of tweets and videos to determine whether or not multimedia is aiding this movement, as well as whether English and Spanish speech act-making strategies (specifically for apologies) are affected. Results show that while written discourse appears to be more useful at creating apologies with media, the continuum does appear to be tightening, due in part to the lack of thought needed to publish both tweets and live discourse. Furthermore, results show that Spanish speakers prefer apology strategies that clearly illustrate an acceptance of blame, while their English-speaking counterparts prefer non-apology strategies that help distract the audience from noticing a lack of accepting responsibility.

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

Offending someone verbally is an inevitable miscalculation that occurs on a daily basis. Whether we mean to or not, something we say is eventually going to offend someone, which will then prompt the need for an adequate response in an effort to try and save face. This response would be known as the apology. Based on the *sincerity condition*, as described by John Searle, it is not linguistically possible to offer such an apology without genuinely regretting the act that might have caused the need to apologize (Searle 1976: 4). However, is it possible that one form of discourse could outperform another in terms of efficiency when it comes maintaining face?

This question leads into the difference between oral discourse versus written discourse. Of course, the relationship between these two types of communication has been critiqued and examined for years. Even so, recent developments in technology not only introduce new forms of written and oral discourse, but they also allow us the opportunity to better analyze the both as well. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to analyze two modern-day forms of media (tweets from the social-media website Twitter, and uploaded videos of life-feed television from YouTube) for uses of apologies to see whether or not one form of discourse could be more effective than the other. However, because these technologies are so widely utilized on a global scale, it would be prove profitable to simply observe a small proportion of users that are specifically tied to one language. Thus, this thesis will examine how speakers of English or Spanish manipulate multimedia to offer their apologies.

CHAPTER 2.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The focus of studying apologies stems from the investigation of illocutionary acts in general. Illocutionary acts, or "acts that entail the production of certain…non-material states of affairs…that [help] the speaker let the audience know that the act is performed" are important due to the fact that they invoke the use of performative verbs (Doerge, 2006: 6). By performative verbs, I make a reference to verbs that "are part of the doing of an action" (Doerge, 2006: 15). Examples of these would be "I promise", "I declare", or even "I apologize". Because there is such a variety of these types of verbs that exist and could be classified as performative verbs, John Searle classified illocutionary acts into five basic categories: "representatives (or assertives), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations" (Searle, 1976: 1). For the sake of this thesis, we will be focusing on the expressives category, the category that is used to "express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content" (Searle, 1976: 12). Searle continues to state that this category is unique because "in expressives there is no direction of fit" (Searle, 1976: 12). He explains this concept by stating that the point of an apology, for example, is not to claim that something happened, nor are you trying to actually get the act performed in the first place. You are simply acknowledging that something did in fact occur. This is why I believe that the area of apologies presents an interesting area of research, because it leaves open the possibility for many different variations to its structure.

Now that we are directing our attention to one specific illocutionary act, we must first define what exactly an apology is so that we can better understand exactly what criteria are that

is being investigated. For this study, I have selected the definition by Elite Olshtain which states that an apology is "a speech act which is intended to provide support for the H (hearer) who was actually or potentially malaffected by a violation X" (Olshtain 1989: 156). Furthermore, by deciding to initiate the act of creating an apology, whether verbal or written, "the S (speaker) is willing to humiliate himself or herself to some extent and to admit to fault and responsibility for X" (Olshtain 1989: 156). We can then conclude that the above definition applies both to people who did or did not intend to act in such a way that offended the H in the situation. This notion is further supported by the claim that "other factors (such as intentionality) can exacerbate offense, but are not necessary conditions" (Voinov 2012: 2).

If we follow this notion, then we can further say that the speech act of the apology itself is therefore removed from whether or not the S holds the blame in the situation. The apology is simply a tool that the S can use to try and rectify the situation whether he or she feels they are actually the ones to blame. This is an important note to remember as we prepare for this study, because as we will see, there are a number of scenarios we will analyze where the S either does not appear to have committed or does not feel as if he or she committed an act that requires the use of an apology. This means that the overall functionality of the apology is to allow the S to try and save face with anyone that they may have offended.

To accurately define "saving face", we must first cover exactly what "face" is, as well as when it is established in conversation. According to Erving Goffman (2014), when a person engages in face-to-face conversation, they are actively participating in the portrayal of "lines", or "pattern[s] of the verbal and nonverbal acts by which [the subject] expresses his view of the situation" (Goffman 2014: 287).

However, I would like to expand upon this notion of lines. As stated earlier, the lines we interact in are used through face-to-face conversation. This would imply that once the conversation is over, the H's opinion of the S would remain unchanged until they interact in conversation with the S again in the future. I will argue below that this notion has changed significantly with not only the introduction of Multimedia, which makes it easy for a person to access information in a matter of seconds.

A variety of websites (YouTube, Dailymotion, Metacafe, etc.) allow users to easily access videos of past events whenever they please. Furthermore, social media sites (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.) allow people to instantly view the opinions and thoughts of people with whom they interact with daily (friends, family, coworkers) as well as public figures they see on television (actors, professional athletes, government officials, etc.). These videos and social media posts, although they may or may not be verbal conversation, create a permanent record that, whether it is intended or not, may offend people even years after the original production.

A current example of this would be how University of Oklahoma football running-back Joe Mixon has experienced an onslaught of negative attention as a result of a recently released video which contains footage of him punching a woman in the face in a public restaurant in 2014. Even though this happened over two years ago, and even though he already apologized and served a one-year suspension from playing football, he is now experiencing even more hostility from fans and critics around the nation for his actions thanks to the presence of this video. Because of this, I would state that with the kinds of technology we have at hand today, we engage in these "lines" whenever we expose ourselves to the public realm. This includes exploring the online public realm, including publishing videos and/or posts on public forums, as well as simply going out into the public.

If we accept this viewpoint, then we can discern that whether the S and H are aware of it or not, as soon as they engage in any activity where they are exposing their actions or their beliefs to the public, they have started displaying these lines for others to interpret. This is then how one develops their "face", which is "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman 2014: 287).

Therefore, whether the S is speaking to a life-long friend or a new acquaintance does not matter, because as the conversation carries on, the face of the S will continue to develop as the H's assumptions of the S's character continue to develop. From this definition, we can then assume that "face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced" throughout the duration of a conversation (Brown & Levinson 2014: 300). This is where the term "saving-face" comes into play, because when the S acts in a way that harms their face, the H's opinion of them will be damaged. This is why the apology exists, for its sole function is to present the S with a tool they can use to try to "sustain an impression for others that [they] have not lost face" at all, or in other words, to save-face (Goffman 2014: 288).

The act of performing an apology does bring up an issue for the S, one I would like to discuss further. The simple act of giving an apology to H or A, A being the audience or third-persons in the situation, means that the S is putting himself/herself into a position of weakness where he/she lowers his/her self-worth in the public eye. The idea of such an act may seem unappealing to many, however Goffman argues that self-abasement is a valid tactic that does not harm the overall image of S. In fact, when S does utilize a self-abasement apology strategy (e.g. apologizing while tears, belittling himself/herself), he/she does "not seem to profane his/[her] own image" (Goffman, 2014: 296). Accordingly, as S underplays his/her positive qualities, there is an understanding that these statements will be taken as a complete representation of S's

character. This understanding comes from the S's voluntary will to speak against himself/herself, "as if he[/she] had the right of insulation and could castigate himself[/herself] qua actor without injuring himself[/herself] qua object of ultimate worth" (Goffman, 2014: 296). Therefore, H will not take into serious consideration the belittlement of S, meaning that S can successfully apologize without fear of losing self-worth in the public eye.

We should also take a moment to acknowledge the presence of "non-apologies", so that we may further understand which examples in the study are actual apologies that remain true to the speech act's definition. Zohar Kampf defines that whenever a user takes advantage of "tactics that manipulate the form of an apology in order to minimize the offender's responsibility", they are performing what is called a non-apology (Kampf 2009: 2258). These manipulations can appear from a variety of different methods that include lexical (for English speakers: *I'm sorry* instead of *I apologize*, and for Spanish speakers: *Lo siento* instead of *Lo lamento*), syntactic (for example, the use of passive), or even a difference in apology strategies (apology vs. non-apology strategies). In other words, the S will utilize the apology in order to create an excuse for why the H was offended, therefore negating any blame on their part. It is important to maintain the difference between these and actual apologies because as we will discuss further on, there is a clear difference between how native English speakers and native Spanish speakers utilize apologies and non-apologies.

In order to further understand the exact nature of the apology, we must also ask why exactly we feel the need to apologize in order to save face. To answer this, it depends on what perspective is taken. For the average human being, this could simply be because they find it uncomfortable to be "in wrong face", which occurs when "information is brought forth in some way about his social worth which cannot be integrated, even with effort, into the line that is

6

being sustained for him" (Goffman 2014: 288). This means that whether they meant to or not, the S began to "lose face" with those around them because the line they are engaging in is offensive for all those who heard and/or saw it.

This is a problem for society because, as humans, we possess an inherent desire to be "understood, approved of, liked or admired", a desire that creates our positive face (Brown & Levinson, 300). Because of this, it only becomes natural that people would want to try and save face whenever the condition of their positive face is threatened. That is why the apology is such an important speech act, because any act that "lessens or removes the threat of losing face" in such a tense situation could be the difference between maintaining the approval of your peers and losing it (Trask, 242).

Another need for the apology can occur for those in the public sector who have a very popular fan-base and rely on these fans to earn a living, such as singers and actors. If they were to do anything that might cause them to lose face with their fans, this could greatly impact the number of people who go to see them perform, and eventually could damage their careers. This has occurred to many people, such as Mel Gibson, for his anti-Semitic comments, as well as Michael Richards when he used racially charged language aimed at African Americans, an action that was sparked from a heated argument he was having with his ex. After these incidents occurred, it was very difficult for them to get work again, and even when they did, they did not share nearly the same level of success as they had previously. So while these examples include events that are seen as complete career-enders, the actors may have been able to better rectify the situation if they had incorporated better apology techniques.

Lastly, apologies also play a heavy role with politicians and nation-to-nation relationships. Politicians are always trying to win over their voters by promoting their honest

characters and by portraying themselves as leaders for the people. Therefore, when they make an error and get caught doing something that is seen as highly inappropriate, it is imperative for them to quickly apologize and save-face with the voters. For some, a well-executed apology could make all the difference. This could be said for recently elected president Donald Trump, who had to apologize amidst his campaign for the crude comments he made about women in 2005. However, despite being caught saying such vulgar words, he was able to still win the presidential election only one month later.

So, whether the apology is used in order to prevent S (the speaker) from losing a position of power in front of the H (the hearer), or whether it is to repair the damage that one friend has forced upon another, it is clear that the apology is a much needed speech act that can be very beneficial if used correctly in the right circumstance.

Now, the degree to which apologies can actually help with the concept of saving face depends on a number of factors, one of which is the severity of the offense that was committed. Let me first explain this topic by introducing politeness theory. According to Brown and Levinson, we can divide face into two different types. There is negative face, which is "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others", as well as positive face, "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 300). This would mean that in conversation, an apology would be necessary when the S violates the H's negative face because their desires were impeded upon, while the S's positive face would be at risk because their actions were not desired by the intended audience (A). So with the apology, H's negative face would be threatened when they accept an apology because they "may feel constrained to minimize [the] debt or transgression", and S's positive

face would be damaged because by "indicat[ing] that he regrets doing a prior FTA, [he] thereby damag[es] his own face to some degree" (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 303).

Accordingly, both S and H need to work together in order to maintain each other's face. Consequently, "it is in general in every participant's best interest to maintain each other's face" so that no party member, whether an acquaintance or a by passer, feels threatened by another's actions (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 300). In order to accomplish this, Brown & Levinson have created the concept of positive politeness and negative politeness, and how S can act upon them in order to maintain a peaceful environment throughout discourse. "Positive politeness is orientated toward the positive face of H, the positive self-image that he[/she] claims for himself[/herself]", meaning that S wants the same wants as H (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 304). This can be obtained by treating H as a long-life friend or as a member of a particular group that shares similar interests. This permits the S to engage more naturally with H because the possibility of a face-threatening act declines due to the similarity in wants between S and H. Therefore, by keeping in mind the positive face of H, S is able to engage in a more enjoying conversation with H as well as speak free from the fear of performing an FTA. The other concept, negative politeness, focuses on "satisfying…H's negative face, [or] his[/her] basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination" (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 304). In other words, negative politeness strategies focus on S's restraint in his/her own actions or discourse so that he/she does not impede upon the desires of H. This is why face-threatening acts are redressed with apologies for interfering or transgressing" upon these desires, because by disrespecting H's wants, S harms his/her own face. In summary, politeness theory therefore focuses on both S's and H's intent to not become burdened or burden other parties.

On the opposite spectrum, Jonathan Culpeper has introduced impoliteness theory, which consists of "language or behaviors which are negatively evaluated in a particular context…because they attack someone's identity or rights…[or] cause specific emotional reactions" (Culpeper 2011: 15). Types of actions that would fall under this category would include name-calling, dismissing someone, threats, or even demanding that someone stop talking. These methods are rather direct, but more indirect methods exist as well, including sarcasm and the use of gesture and body language. So in general, impoliteness is used when there is intent "to produce disharmony between interlocutors in social interaction" (Mohammed & Abbas 2015: 198).

This differs greatly from politeness, which includes "forms of behavior which have been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in interpersonal interaction" (Mohammed & Abbas 2015: 196). So when someone strays from these polite tactics and instead says or does something, whether intentional or not, that greatly offends H, they are engaging in "face-threatening acts", or FTA's (Mohammed & Abbas 2015: 197). Depending on the severity of the FTA, the H may either be more or less inclined to completely accept the apology. Because of this, the S's positive face will always be damaged when they have to offer an apology.

So why does the seriousness of the FTA matter? That would all depend on whether or not S desires to save their positive face that A has of them. If H does not care about the effects that S's impoliteness might have, than there would be no need for an apology. However, if S does intend to try and save face, he must organize an apology that utilizes the right strategies in order to help stop the damage he has already caused. If the FTA were serious enough, no type of apology would suffice. For example, when professional football player Michael Vick was tried and arrested for organizing and running a series of underground dog fights, he apologized

numerous times for his actions. However, his pleas for forgiveness went unheard as he lost all the support from his fans, team, and endorsement companies. So it is my opinion that at times, there are some FTAs that are so serious that no amount of apology can ever help maintain any trace of face.

Having said that, a well-constructed apology could in fact make the difference between saving a person's career and losing it permanently. Mast references a case in which televangelist Jimmy Swaggart was able to save his ministry after it was proven that he had had a "sexual liaison with a prostitute" (Mast 2015: 40). How was the televangelist able to do this? During his apology, he was recorded on television crying and simply said, "I have sinned", while completely ignoring the need to give details about his transgression (Mast 2015: 40). While this seems extraordinary, it is simply proof that depending on who your audience is, the right apology can be irreplaceable when seeking forgiveness.

Therefore, it would be prudent to demonstrate what exactly are the different strategies towards making an apology. In order to accomplish this, I will divide the strategies into two categories: one will consist of strategies that constitute a non-apology, and those that make a true apology. Furthermore, the strategies that I am utilizing come from Blum-Kulka's Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) Coding Manual (1989), and I am simply arranging them in a manner that I will be using for my own analysis. First I will categorize the non-apologies, which are classified as apologies made by using "syntactic…and lexical…tactics that manipulate the form of apology in order to minimize the offender's responsibility" (Kampf 2009: 2258).

The key to non-apologies is that the speaker is able to issue an apology where they do not have to hold the burden of blame on their shoulders. One such strategy would be simply refusing

to acknowledge any guilt at all. This would consist of "denial of responsibility" (I did not do it), "blam[ing]" the hearer (You should have known better) and "pretend[ing] to be offended" (I'm the one who was hurt by all this!) (Blum-Kulka 1989: 292). By inputting these types of tactics into an apology, S could completely shift the blame onto another person, including the S or A who claims that S acted out of character. Other strategies that would follow this type of mindset would be providing excuses, downgrading the offense, admitting that you did in fact commit the actions you are being accused of but not taking responsibility for them, and providing a lack of intent. What these strategies have in common is that they distract the A from noticing whether or not S really ought to take responsibility for what happened. All these strategies can be used in conjuncture with a simple "I'm sorry" to create the appearance of an apology where the speaker does not have to threaten his own positive face as much as if it were a genuine apology.

On the other hand, there are the strategies that S can use in order to enhance their apologies and strengthen their acceptance of responsibility. Among these strategies is the inclusion of an illocutionary force indicating device, commonly known as an IFID. These IFIDs are "explicit, performative verbs that express an apology" (Mulamba 2011: 87). The various IFID's have their own levels of strength amongst themselves, but what can really add to their strength is the use of intensifiers. These intensifiers are adjectives that heighten the emotion behind the apology, like *very, extremely, woefully*, etc. These intensifiers are usually key signs that indicate when a person is truly attempting to save face. Other strategies would include pleading, showing concern for the offended parties, admitting explicit self-blame, expressing embarrassment on S's part about the error, justifying the hearer's feelings so that they know S understands their frustration, offering reparations for what S has done, promising that S will not ever repeat their offense, and using repetition.

However, I do think it should be noted that some of these strategies could be used to create both apologies and non-apologies. For example, showing a lack of intent could at times be used to strengthen an actual apology. One example could be if S accidently pushed someone over while the S and H were chasing a ball. Here, the incident would have occurred because of an accident, and so there truly was no offense intended. Non-apologies take advantage of this by using the strategy in a similar way. For example, maybe S hurt someone's feelings because he/she unknowingly called a dessert too salty while being unaware that H had made it. S could easily say that it was not his/her intent to upset H; however this would mean that S is trying to push the blame away from himself/herself due to his/her own ignorance of the situation. Whether the insult was intentional or not does not matter, because an apology would still be expected from S.

This is why it is important for us to continue analyzing apologies as language use continues to change; this point brings us to the current study. The emergence of multimedia has given us the capability to publish our own thoughts and ideas on the Internet, from anywhere in the world, for an unlimited number audience members to see in only a matter of seconds. It also allows us to go on unscripted television programs, such as a game show, and have thousands of viewers watch our every move from the comfort of their own homes. While this is exciting and innovative, it also allows for more opportunities for us as speakers to damage our face in front of large audiences.

Two examples of multimedia that I will provide are Twitter and YouTube. Twitter allows a person to publish a quick message of no more than 140 characters to a social media site that can be seen by all those who 'follow' them (i.e., view their published content) and depending on their security settings, others who happen to search for keywords that were mentioned in their

tweets. YouTube takes a different route by allowing people to easily search through a collection of videos that can be either original recorded individually by people, or recordings of television programs that were posted to YouTube. I will argue that these two sites offer linguists a new venue in which to study an age-old comparison in the modern world: the difference between spoken and written language.

This discussion of difference can be traced back thousands of years to the point where Aristotle claimed "it should be observed that each kind of rhetoric has its own appropriate style" (qtd. in Chafe & Tannen 1987: 384). Since then, more and more research has been done to try and see how the two styles differ in quality of discourse. These results have varied drastically. In 1929, Lull conducted a study where he asked 1st through 8th grade students to comment on any historical, geographical, or nature topic both orally and in writing. What he found was that "by the first half of the 5th grade, pupils began to write better than they speak" (Chafe & Tannen 1987: 384). Bushnell conducted a different study a year later by asking 10th grade students to speak on a variety of topics, and then 12 days later write about the same themes. His results "found that the written themes were rated higher in thought content and sentence structure, and contained fewer grammatical errors" (Chafe & Tannen 1987: 384). These studies clearly favor writing as the superior form of discourse, but other studies have found differing results. Blankenship found that in a study comprised of college students, there was "little difference between speeches and the writings with respect to sentence length or complexity" (Chafe & Tannen 1987: 385). In 1975, Blass & Siegman also found opposite results when they observed how nursing students responded to interview questions both orally and in written form. Their findings suggested that "spoken answers showed faster reaction times and production rates, greater verbal productivity, [and] higher silence quotients" (Chafe & Tannen 1987: 386).

14

Obviously, there is much debate as to how verbal and written discourse differs, for "numerous studies in functional linguistics, which focus on the interaction of discourse and grammar, have documented how spoken and written register differences help to explain the patterns of variation for a linguistic feature" (Biber, 2006: 1). Yet even though this is an area of research that receives a significant amount of attention, few studies are able to completely analyze register differences in a language due to the difficulty in obtaining usable data. However, this has since changed due to the appearance of online materials that are readily available for researchers. Biber was able to use such methods in his study where he focused on analyzing "the distribution of a large set of linguistic features in a wide range of spoken and written registers" amongst a number of languages and found that some "Spanish dimensions correspond closely to dimensions identified for other languages", with dimensions being patterns found of linguistic co-occurrence (Biber, 2006: 1). This presents us with the notion of the oral and written continuum, and how even though the two types of discourse have different qualities, the distance between the two could be lessening. Because of this continuum, I believe that analyzing data from Twitter and YouTube will provide us with evidence to suggest that even more similarities are emerging between written and oral discourse.

Furthermore, we will be able to more accurately differentiate data between different registers. Davies provides an excellent example of doing just this with his own research over register variation in Spanish syntax by developing a corpus that "is divided evenly between speech…fiction, and non-fiction" (Davies, 2007: 74). My own thesis will expand upon the framework laid out by Davies by bridging the gap between informal and formal discourse. These two registers often distract from the overall research of language variation between oral and written discourse because researchers were only able to obtain data in a formal setting (as seen in

the studies mentioned above). However, thanks to social media, subjects are now able to issue formal apologies in an informal setting, meaning that there is a possibility that not only the gap between oral and written discourse is shortening, but also that perhaps the same pattern is occurring between formal and informal discourse.

While I am introducing popular phone applications and multimedia to discourse analysis, this thesis is not the first to observe how social media is affecting speech acts. Maíz-Arévalo used Facebook as her social media platform while researching how subjects respond to compliments that were received on the application, and discovered that factors such as "disembodiment, asynchronicity [and] relative lack of privacy have a crucial say in how online users respond to compliments" (2013: 47). However, to my knowledge there is no research that, while focusing on English and Spanish speaking celebrities, compares the two forms through Twitter. Such a comparison would not only investigate how both types of discourse have evolved over the years, but it would also allow us to observe such dialogue in atmospheres where the subjects were speaking in their vernacular. I believe that while past research has been very beneficial, a mast majority of it has focused their studies in professional environments. In other words, even if the subjects were relaxed, they would be unable to speak or write like they would normally in day-to-day conversation because the prompts, as well as the environments, prevented them from doing so. But by analyzing multimedia for discourse, we are able to select examples of speech acts from situations when the S would have had no idea that a linguist would analyze their discourse. Such a corpus would allow us to take a new approach on a seasoned topic.

By focusing on forms of multimedia, one question presents itself: Why should we analyze the creation of an apology between two parties differently just because it was created via Twitter or on live television? Generally speaking, this question brings up a valid point. Just

because the apology is created via a different platform does not mean that the format of the apology should be drastically altered. However, one variable makes this area of study worth further investigation: the role of A.

Allan Bell created a hierarchy of audience roles which states that "the effect of each audience member on a speaker's style design is graded according to role distance" (Bell, 1984: 160). In other words, "third persons…affect style to a lesser but regular degree", with style referring to the "speakers' response to their audience" (Bell, 1984: 145). This system would then determine that the Hearer would be most responsible for how the Speaker decided to arrange his apology, and while third-person observers would still have an affect overall, it would be minimal in comparison. I believe that multimedia has brought a need to alter this hierarchy. Because celebrities are so focused on maintaining their public image, it would be more prudent of them to stay in the good graces of their fans, or A, rather than fellow celebrities that do not endorse or support their own careers. So, for example, if a famous singer were to inadvertently offend another popular musical artist, he/she may decide that the best move would be to issue an apology that demonstrated to his/her fans that he/she was sorry rather than to apologize to the actual offended H. If this were to be the case, it would mean that the third persons would in fact be the stronger influence on the speaker's style, and not the actual hearer. This is why it is important to study the effects that multimedia has had on speech acts, because it is now entirely possible that, for a celebrity, losing face with one person they know in order to maintain face with thousands of others they will never meet may often be the most beneficial option to their careers.

However, because these forms of social media are relatively new, it would not be beneficial if we picked only a handful of examples of tweets and videos all from the same

culture, hence why Spanish speakers are added to the study. The addition of a second culture

presents two opportunities to improve my research. Firstly, this will help address the

advancement of how speech acts are used in communication from previous research. For

example, in a study over request modification use in both Early Modern Spanish and modern

varieties, King discovered that "request modification usage in Early Modern Spanish was found

to be remarkably similar to that in modern varieties of the language" (King, 2012: 151).

However, these results conflict directly with previous findings by King that found that

"significant differences between modern and Early Modern request formulation" exist, meaning

that we are currently unable to confidently state whether or not there is a difference in the use of

speech acts between the past and the present (King, 2012: 151). Secondly, adding one more

culture to the study broadens the type of subjects using the speech act, which in this case would

be an expressive. By analyzing the patterns of both English and Spanish speakers, I will be able

to observe whether speech act habits and technology are producing a change in apology creations

for just one culture, or whether a difference is apparent at all for either language.

While there is not much, past research on apologies between English and Spanish

speakers has shown that English speakers tend to opt for different apology-making strategies

than do Spanish speakers. Hickey remarked in 2005 that "Brown and Levinson's division of

politeness into positive and negative applies directly to Spanish society which, on a positive-

negative cline, is very close to the positive end", which then prompted González-Cruz to

decipher that "this means that English speakers will tend to use more negative politeness

strategies than Spanish speakers" (González-Cruz 2012: 548).

In 2000, Márquez-Reiter observed that "Uruguayans valued negative politeness less

highly than the British, who also tended to give more explanations" (González-Cruz 2012: 549).

18

A year later in another comparative study of Uruguayan Spanish and British English, Márquez-Reiter discovered that Uruguayans "showed a marked preference for the non-intensification of their expressions of apology" (González-Cruz 2012: 549). Then in 2004, Wagner performed a study that focused on the apology-making strategies of a speech community in Cuernavaca, Mexico and found "both positive-and negative-politeness strategies within the apology acts" (22).

So while some research does exist, there is still work to be done in the area of comparing how English speakers and Spanish speakers tend to make their apologies. Therefore, if we combine this comparative aspect with the concentration on multimedia discourse as well, we should be able to accurately examine how new technology is affecting the use of apology-making strategies cross-culturally.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study will combine the analysis of YouTube videos that show live instances of both scripted and unscripted television (for example, news broadcasts or interview programs) where someone on the show said something that instantly triggered the need for an apology, as well as 50 tweets from Twitter (25 in English, and 25 in Spanish) that were written in response to face-threatening acts that they had committed soon before the tweet's publication. These sources are in both Spanish and English, and were found by searching keywords such as "apology", "sorry" and "regret" in the search bars of the two aforementioned websites, as well as searching for apologies on search-engine related sites, such as Google for example.

While analyzing the YouTube videos, methods from multimedia discourse analysis (MDA), which is "an emerging paradigm in discourse studies which extends the study of language per se to the study of language in combination with other resources" (O'Halloran 2011: 120), will be used to not only analyze the speech of the apologizer, but also other factors that include their body language, the reactions of the offended, how the camera operators react and maneuver the camera, etc. This method will allow us to analyze so much more than just simply the speech of the subjects on-screen. For instance, we will be able to analyze the body language of both the S and the H, and perhaps even the reactions of the audience.

This is important because by observing the S's body language, we will be able to instantly see how he/she reacts to the action he/she has just committed, and will be able to get a better grasp for whether or not S is truly sorry for their actions, as well as to better evaluate whether or not their apology is sincere. However, more importantly, we will be able to see H's reactions and whether or not the apology was well received (i.e., the pragmatic *uptake*). Other

factors that can be analyzed include but are not limited to how the camera operator reacts and whom he or she chooses to focus the camera on, how the live audience reacts and whether they make any audible noises to show their discontent, and whether the managers of the show simply choose to go to commercial or try to quickly move past the event. By doing this, we will not only be able to see how certain apology methods work in real time when there is almost no time for speakers to react and think of an appropriate response for the transgression. It will also allow for side-by-side comparisons of how Spanish speakers choose to apologize compared with English speakers.

However, it is important to note that there are limitations to this method. For starters, we will only be able to analyze the facial reactions from what we see on the screen. Therefore, it will be impossible to know whether certain other variables exist, such as if the subjects on screen are distracted and receiving instructions from someone off-camera, as well as how the A at home reacted to the occurrence at that particular moment in time. Also, it should also be noted that some apologizes are most likely written by other people, and so they are scripted for S to read. However, I will argue that these are still valuable examples, because since they are being recorded while giving the apology, S may intentionally or unintentionally make alterations to the script and say something else that displays their true feelings regarding the situation, thereby improving or ruining the scripted apology. This is why scripted apologies were not separated from the data.

With regard to the tweets, news discourse analysis will be used to examine these miniature publications. Although they are not all technically considered news, I believe that tweets could be a development of how we will read the news in the future. Newspapers reel in their readers with headlines, therefore making punctuation and lexical choices a matter of great

importance. The same goes for Twitter due to the small number of characters allowed. Also, just as with newspapers, readers of tweets tend to have their own political opinions about current events. These opinions can be communicated through the discourse choices made by the users on Twitter. Therefore, due to their need to voice their own opinion, these tweets tell so much more about the author than what is simply portrayed by the twenty to thirty words typically contained in a tweet.

Twitter also presents a very interesting area of study because it allows people to apologize quickly and efficiently to a large audience within seconds. This means that an S could improve his/her apology by addressing the issue as soon as possible, therefore eliminating the added insult of waiting too long after committing their social infraction. Whether or not the apology is indeed intended for millions of people to see, the social media site nevertheless creates an open-space forum that allows people to apologize to those whom they cannot meet face-to-face. Furthermore, we will be able to analyze the comments that members of A have left on the "tweet" in order to see how some have reacted to the apology and whether or not is was well-received.

In both cases, the apology will be separated by removing the head act, or the "minimal unit which can realize a[n apology]" (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989: 275) from the rest of the statement, which will then be broken down into groups to identify which apology strategies were utilized. Then, based on whether the piece of data is a video or a tweet, other factors besides just the verbal/written apology will be taken into account, and then all these observations will be compared with the videos that are in English to those that are in Spanish. For this analysis, I will be using the CCSARP Coding Manual presented by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) with both languages, because as Blum-Kulka point out, "the use of the same coding scheme for the

analysis of patterns in different languages is meant to ensure cross-linguistic comparability"
(Blum-Kulka, 1987: 132). The apology and non-apology strategies that I detailed previously
will also be used in the analysis.

Therefore, my research questions are as follows: First, has the emergence of multimedia
altered the relationship between oral and written discourse? Second, have these new social media
applications altered the strategies used by both English and Spanish speakers in their creation of
apologies? Finally, how can apologies created via multimedia platforms be analyzed most
effectively in light of traditional theories of politeness and speech acts?

CHAPTER 4.

ANALYSIS

English Videos

(1)   "We need to acknowledge an unfortunate mistake that I made in one of the teases we bring to you for this program. While we were live just after 10:00 I said a word that many people find offensive. I'm truly sorry, it was a mistake on my part and I sincerely apologize. " – Sue Simmons

The first video is a news broadcast on NBC New York of one of the previews the company airs before the actual program. After explaining that she will tell their viewers what grocery store will allow them to save money, the anchor Sue Simmons raises her voice and almost shouts out "the fuck are you doing?" to someone else in the room. It is not clear at whom she was yelling because the news desk was not being shown, being replaced instead by a cruise ship in the bay. One could possibly assume that she thought the live feed had been cut and that they were no longer broadcasting. Once the live program started later that evening at 11, she very quickly addressed that she had said something that "many people find offensive" and with a look of regret on her face, said "I'm truly sorry, it was a mistake on my part and I sincerely apologize". So with our first example, we encounter the very real possibility that this apology was scripted either by or for her.

In this instance, I would argue that the apology contains two head acts: "I'm truly sorry" as well as "I sincerely apologize". Both of these statements would clearly denote an apology by themselves, yet both versions also include Intensifying Adverbials, which adds to the overall strength of the apology.

When looking at the transcription of her apology, the two words that pop up instantly are "truly" and "sincerely". Rather than simply saying she was sorry, or even saying she was really sorry, the choice of these two words makes it appear that she infact did not mean for the viewers to hear her remark, and, that she knew that it was unacceptable that she said what she did. Plus, her choice of the word *apologize,* a performative verb, adds another factor of remorse since she did not repeat *sorry* or use a non-performative, potentially weaker-sounding word like *regret.* She also clearly uses first person pronouns and possessive pronouns (*I'm, my* and *I*) to clarify that she herself is taking on all the blame for the situation, and is not trying to pawn it off on someone else. Based on her lexical choice, it would appear that she truly was sorry for her offensive actions.

Furthermore, it is very interesting that she does not provide an excuse as to why she said the word *fuck*. One possible strategy that could be used here would be to perform a non-apology so that the user could take advantage of "tactics that manipulate the form of apology in order to minimize the offender's responsibility" (Kampf 2009: 2258). This situation would be a prime example of when someone might try to offer a non-apology because clearly someone distracted her enough to elicit the type of behavior she displayed. However, because she chose to take full responsibility and not create any sort of excuse, it further adds to the sincerity of her apology.

This sense of responsibility is further heightened by the position of the camera angle. While she is offering the apology, the camera is zoomed-in on her face the whole time, meaning her co-anchor was not a part of the shot. This could suggest one of two things. First, by having the camera focus solely on her, it reiterates the fact that she is alone in having performed the offensive act, and is taking the entirety of the blame for it.. However, it could also suggest that NBC as a corporate entity wanted to demonstrate that they in no way had any part to do with her

behavior, and did not want to share any of the blame for airing such a profane word on live TV. This brings into question whether or not the network wrote this apology for her. Whichever the case, it was a well-scripted apology that was quick, straight to the point, and allowed her to quickly attempt to try and save face.

(2)

Anderson Cooper: You are gonna be on Celebrity Apprentice All-Stars, next month.

Lisa Rinna: I know, can you believe it?

(applause from audience)

Anderson Cooper: Yeah.

(applause from audience)

Lisa Rinna: Hahaha I know. It is kind of shocking.

Anderson Cooper: Yeah, now are you feuding with somebody? Or you had the thing with Gary Busey.

Lisa Rinna: Well I have a little thing. I, I do and I have to be honest about it. I, yes I do (laughter).

Anderson Cooper: But he seems, I don't know how, what, what the right word is.

Lisa Rinna: Bat shit crazy? Whoops! Did I just say that?

(laughter/applause from audience)

Anderson Cooper: Is that the word you used? Not my word. What? What did you say?

Lisa Rinna: I said bat shit crazy!

(laughter from audience)

Anderson Cooper: Oops.

Lisa Rinna: Oops! Oh I can't –

Anderson Cooper: Yeah, yeah.

Lisa Rinna: Oh, it is live! Oh shoot. Bat, yeah. Just a little-

Anderson Cooper: Yes, anyway-

Lisa Rinna: Cray cray. Anyway, whoops!

(Man off-screen):   Lisa, you have to leave right now!

(laughter from audience)

Lisa Rinna: I just got in trouble! Oops! Anyway-

(Man off-screen):   We got it, we got it.

Anderson Cooper: We'll apologize for that. Anyway-

Lisa Rinna: Please, I'm so sorry. That's (gasp). (looking at Cooper)

Anderson Cooper: That's okay.

Lisa Rinna: It is live television. Anyway he's a little ku-ku.

Anderson Cooper: (laughter)

Lisa Rinna: (laughter)

The next clip involved the celebrity Lisa Rinna while she was making a guest appearance on the show "Anderson Live". Host Anderson Cooper mentioned that she would be appearing on The Celebrity Apprentice, and asked her about her relationship with actor Gary Busey, to which she admitted that there was some bad blood between them. Then, after Cooper mentions that he doesn't quite know the right word to describe him, Rinna blurts out that he is "bat shit crazy" and after a moment or two suddenly covers her mouth with her hands and laughs as A bursts into laughter. Cooper was not paying close attention at the time, and after realizing the shocked look on her face, he asked her what she had said. Her response was to once again say "bat shit crazy", to which he then clearly showed his disapproval on his own face. A man off screen, possibly the

producer, plays it off as a joke to lighten the mood, and she soon looks at the camera, and says "please, I'm so sorry". Then the show quickly continues with the program.

This is an interesting situation because it involves a celebrity instead of a normal, everyday person. Depending on the situation, "when celebrities use slurs, they get into more trouble than the average citizen", and while this isn't as dangerous as a racial slur, the comment is still definitely harmful to the reputation of Gary Busey (Isaacson 2013: 4). It also seems as if this apology is forced out and almost swept away in an attempt to try and get back on topic and continue the conversation. However, there are numerous factors that we must take into consideration here.

First off, one must consider Rinna's facial expressions and body gestures while this frenzy occurred. After saying the swear word, there was a moment or two before it registered with her that she should not have said that on live TV. This shows that profanity is a part of her everyday speech since it came out so fluidly, and that she did not even realize she had done something wrong for a few seconds. In fact, by her reaction of simply laughing, it could be possible that she truly did not feel as if she had done anything wrong. This could further explain why she went ahead and repeated what she had said when Cooper asked about what words she had used. Only after seeing the shock on his face did it register that she should stop what she was doing and try to move on.

This demonstrates how the principle of power comes into play with apologies. Being a celebrity, she is used to having the spotlight on her and being the most dominant person in the room. However, while appearing as a guest on someone else's show, she is removed from that role because the host, Anderson Cooper, was naturally the person in power in this situation. As such, he has to maintain a certain line throughout every episode, because that is what his viewers

28

have come to expect from him. By switching to a different line, Rinna demonstrated that she was out of character because she had broken one of the rules of live television. So if she had been the person in power here, she might have completely neglected to apologize for her utterance. However, after seeing the look on Cooper's face when he realized what she had said, she suddenly understood that she needed to quickly rectify the situation.

We should also note her use of laughter to try and ease the situation. Instead of apologizing, she elected to try and create a humorous moment for A by playfully taking on the role as the silly guest and responding to the A's laughter. In normal circumstances on live TV, this would have been a terrible option. However, she may have been reacting to the A's response. Since A began to laugh, with even a few applauding, it might have appeared to her that the circumstance did not call for an apology. This could also explain why she may have been looking off-camera towards the A while she laughed and waited for the host to come back to the conversation. So in her eyes, she was simply trying to maintain face with A to try and stay in their good graces. Basically, there was no need to try and save face because A did not show signs of unhappiness with her.

So while it may seem odd that she waited so long to issue an actual apology, this might have been the best option in her opinion to carry out so that she could try and stay keep A entertained. However, she failed to take into account the non-present A that was not sitting in the stands. Even though she may not have offended anyone who was present, there is a great possibility that some people watching at home were not too happy with what they had just watched. Because of this, it seems that her apology did not meet the standards for what she had done. Of course, it does help that she added the amplifying word "so" to her apology, during which she did finally look embarrassed and regretful. Nevertheless, in terms of an actual

apology, this would appear more like a non-apology that was simply given because the situation called for one, even though we can see that Rinna is clearly violating Cooper's negative face by impeding upon his desire to host a family friendly television show.

Spanish Videos

(1)

(Reportero)   Majestad, muy buenos días, cómo se encuentra, por favor?

(Juan Carlos) Mucho mejor…Lo siento mucho. Me he equivocado. No volverá a ocurrir.

This video emerged after King Juan Carlos of Spain was hospitalized during a hunting accident in Botswana during a time of economic instability. This action caused him to receive heavy backlash from both animal lovers and concerned citizens who wanted to know just how much he was spending on this extravagant trip. First, let us start by looking at the speech by Carlos. S is presented with a question by H that concerns his personal health and how he is recovering from his injury. Carlos quickly answers this question with some dialogue that I do not include because it does not concern my area of study. However, as soon as he stops his explaining how he is feeling, Carlos immediately begins to address the issue of his trip and clarify that he will not repeat his actions again. The head act he presents is interesting here because not only does it signify that an apology is being given, it also completely shifts the focus of the conversation. Therefore, Carlos appears to be using his apology to try and quickly rid A of any chance to ask difficult questions that he was not prepared for. This then brings the possibility that he had previously prepared this statement of regret, and wanted to present it as quickly as possible so that there would be evidence that he did in fact apologize to A. This likelihood is supported by S's inability to focus his attention on H while he speaks, instead opting to stare

30

down at his feet while he speaks. This action gives off the impression that the normal behavior of maintaining eye contact would distract him from remembering his carefully thought out speech.

This instant determination to address his actions also demonstrates that Carlos has no interest in continuing a conversation between just himself and H. Even though his comments were directed at H, Carlos completely changed the course of the conversation to address A. This claim is further supported by Carlos's immediate departure from the room after he finishes his apology, leaving H with no opportunity to respond or ask another question. Therefore, H serves no purpose in this exchange except to initiate the beginning of the conversation. This is why I claim that Bell's hierarchy system needs to be adapted to fit today's culture, because Carlos shows that "third persons" are in fact becoming the targeted subjects when discourse is observed by a massive audience. (Bell, 1984: 145).

As for the apology itself, Carlos does succeed in using apology strategies to seek forgiveness. This is especially evident with the last, and perhaps strongest, statement where he claims that he will not repeat his transgression. By promising forbearance of his actions, Carlos demonstrates that he realizes that if he continues to act in a similar manner, he will continue to act against A's negative face. Therefore, it would appear that instead of simply apologizing for something, S understands why he needs to apologize.

English Tweets

(1)   "We apologize for the tweets that came from a guest of our organization. They were inappropriate and do not reflect the LA Kings."[1] – Los Angeles Kings, NHL, May 21, 2013

---

[1] All tweets that are presented in this thesis maintain the same grammar choices made by the publisher.

This tweet came from the Los Angeles Kings on May 21, 2013 after one of its guest employees, a local-radio host named Kevin Ryder, tweeted from the Kings' account that one of the teams' players "just got sexually assaulted" by the goalie of the opposing team.

First and foremost, the head act "We apologize" succeeds in using the word apologize instead of sorry, so the lexical choice was stronger than just simply stating "We are sorry". The reason for this is because the word apologize means to express regret for something wrong that has been done. The key word in that definition is "regret", which means that the Kings were able to quickly show that they do in fact feel remorseful about what happened. Also worth noting is the use of 1st person plural "we" instead of "I". Because the Kings as an organization needed to apologize for this, the twitter account uses the first person plural pronoun, implying that every employee of the organization is apologizing. However, I would argue that the plural is used because it eliminates the need to put any one staff worker in the spotlight. Even though it would make sense for someone like the supervisor of the social media department to receive the most blame (since they were supposed to monitor this type of company activity), they are able to spare that individual any further embarrassment. This also keeps the blame solely on Ryder, the guest who committed the offense.

It should be noted, however, that the tone of this tweet is very short and abrupt. Since the topic of the controversial tweet was based on a taboo topic, one could say that this apology lacks any sense of emotion to it. It sounds like a simple, pre-written line that could be used in any circumstance, and therefore does not feel like it was tailored for this occasion. This is important, because even though Twitter does not allow its users to make posts containing more than 140 characters of text, the Kings had the option to at least write something that contained a bit more context and emotion, which would have made a more sincere apology.

One way in which this problem could have been resolved is that more IFIDs could have been used to intensify the apology. The whole apology post comes off to some as emotionless and cold, something that could have been helped by adding the word "truly" in front of apology. Also, there is no indication as to whom the Kings are apologizing. In fact, the tweet was so terse that a wider A was offended because when they asked about it in the comments and learned about what had happened, it just spread around the fact that someone from their organization was writing sexual assault jokes. With such a lack of direction, what at first started as a generic apology has almost turned into an insult for some.

Furthermore, by deflecting the blame and saying that the tweet doesn't reflect the views of their organization, the Kings seem to be ignoring the fact that they originally and willfully gave Ryder control of their Twitter account and trusted that he would do a professional job at publishing in their name. Having given him this permission, they should be accepting just as much of the blame as Mr. Ryder should for writing the tweet. However, by simply trying to brush it off to the side, it looks as if they do not feel remorse for what took place. Was the event truly the fault of the organization? According to A, the organization was not to blame for the incident. However, the team organization is expected to share some of the fault here because it still happened under their watch.

Even the inclusion of the phrase "guest of our organization" implies that the actual organization takes no blame here. In just 23 words, it would appear that they tried everything possible to distance themselves from Mr. Ryder and make him the outcast on whom everyone should focus their outrage. This adds an unpleasant feeling to the apology, and diminishes the original head act. Based on the addition of this phrase, less and less responsibility is being claimed by the team, weakening the overall strength of the apology.

Overall, this tweet does take the form of an apology, and the timeliness was very efficient since they were able to release the statement soon after the incident occurred. However, this attempt to act quickly may have been ill advised since the solution they came up with lacked emotion and felt disconnected from the whole situation. With the transgression being over such a delicate topic, it would have been better if they had released a humbler post rather than attempting to bypass the whole thing as a mistake made by someone unaffiliated with them made.

(2)   "i never have any intent to upset or let anyone down. and Im not okay with things being exaggerated. once again sorry for anyone upset." – Justin Bieber, March 5, 2013

This tweet was produced by Justin Bieber on March 5, 2013 after he showed up two hours late to a concert in London. The problem with this is that a massive majority of his fans in attendance were teenagers and were forced to leave before they could even see him perform, resulting in a huge number of heartbroken fans and angry parents.

As for the analysis of the tweet, here we can see the very faint presence of a head act with the word "sorry". However, this is the only aspect of this tweet that replicates what an apology would look like. If we focus on solely the fragment "once again sorry for anyone upset", we can see that the author does not even specify to who he is apologizing. By not addressing a specific A with his statement, it may appear that he is simply leaving this open ended so as to include everyone that he could have potentially offended. However, I prefer to look at this as an intentional phrase that was used in order to create a tacit understanding between Bieber and those who see this tweet that he does not feel like his behavior was wrong. Not only is there an overwhelming lack of IFIDs in this sentence, he also does not even include a pronoun to indicate that he is in fact the one who is sorry. Of course, since it was he who issued the statement, we

can assume that he is talking about himself. However, the lack of "I'm" in the statement takes away from the apology.

The claim that this apology lacks any authenticity is backed up by the sentence "and Im not okay with things being exaggerated". Here, it would appear that Justin believes that the allegations against him were false and/or overstated (or: blown out of proportion). By including this statement, Bieber appears to be distracting from the issue at hand. By downgrading the original claims against him, he is also downgrading his apology, or refusing to acknowledge any guilt. This then calls into question whether or not he was forced to issue the apology by someone else, or whether he felt pressured to do so in order to try and save face. In fact, it would appear as if "he [was] forced against his will…and his honor [was] seriously threatened" by giving the apology (Goffman, 2014: 296). On the other hand, this statement could also have been included as an attack against those he feels are complaining just to attack his character. The tone of the apology changes drastically here, almost as if he is challenging people to try to contradict him again. If this is the case, then the final sentence where the actual apology is presented would simply appear as an afterthought, making the overall purpose of the tweet to defend himself rather than seek retribution from his fans.

Either way, we are still presented with an interesting case because even in the presence of the apology, it would appear that this determination to imply that he did nothing wrong resulted in an impolite act being included with the apology. Because of this, the apology is almost completely nullified. However we look at this, it is clear that while taking the appearance of an apology, the tweet does not accurately convey any feelings of shame or guilt.

(3)   "Deepest apologies for an irresponsible tweet that is in no way a representation of the brand's opinion. #nbcpolitics" – KitchenAid, October 3, 2012

This tweet was issued by KitchenAid following a speech by President Barack Obama after he cited his grandmother, who passed away just days before he became president, in a speech. An employee who thought he was using his own personal twitter account instead of the company's tweeted out saying that even Obama's grandmother knew that her grandson being elected was bad, hence why she passed away.

KitchenAid starts off the apology with a strong head act by stating "Deepest apologies", a move which helps create a tone of remorse and actual regret. Just like the situation with the Los Angeles Kings, KitchenAid uses the noun form of the performative verb *apologize* to strengthen the tweet, as well as demonstrate that they do feel a sense of regret for what has happened. However, by adding the IFID intensifier "Deepest" to the statement, the tweet gains an air of humility, something that can be hard to portray in such a short publication without the ability to show facial expressions or gestures.

Their lexical choices continue to further enhance the apology by including the word "irresponsible" when describing their own actions. This helps show that the company knows that their actions were wrong and that they are taking on a sense of responsibility for what happened. It would now appear that the company is thoroughly regretful for the actions they allowed.

However, two problems exist. First off, the tweet includes the phrase "in no way a representation of the brand's opinion". This would appear to simply show that the company wishes to tell the world that as a whole, they do not condone such behavior and would normally never allow something like this to happen. This would seem like a good maneuver for a large retail business to try and save face. Unfortunately, this statement also completely deflects a sense of blame from the company. Since one individual employee was responsible for the twitter account, it becomes abundantly clear that KitchenAid is trying to defend themselves rather than

36

take the blame completely. This is also a rather contradictory statement, because if the company's opinion truly did not reflect that of the tweet that was sent out, then they would not be in this situation to begin with. By giving control of the twitter account to someone who had the desire to say such harsh things against the Obama family to begin with, they are tacitly saying that they agree with anything that person publishes on social media. Therefore, it appears that this message appears too late for the company to say that the occurrence does not reflect their own beliefs, because clearly these were the beliefs of someone that the company trusted to publish comments on their behalf.

Second, there is no mention as to whom the apology is addressing. The original tweet that was sent out was a serious insult to President Obama, and therefore the apology tweet should include a direct apology to him and his family. By not selecting President Obama as A or H, the company dodges the task of saving face in front of the people who were directly attacked by the impolite act, an act that was intentional and meant to cause harm. We can of course assume that the company sent this tweet to try and address not only the President and his family, but also the millions of Americans who were also offended by the tweet. However, this does not exclude the fact the actual victim of the verbal attack had not been specifically addressed. This raises an important question: Is this apologetic tweet simply apologizing for the fact that a tweet was sent out, or is the tweet actually apologizing to President Obama and his family? Or is the tweet possibly apologizing only to people who actually saw the original offensive message? The last question here brings up yet another point that maybe the company was simply trying to cover up an accident that only some of its followers saw. If this were in fact the case, then we can assume that the directed A would in fact be the followers of KitchenAid, and not the Obama family. Therefore, this open-ended apology would be an attempt to try and quickly cover up the event

and hopefully move on before anyone else caught wind of what happened. Either way, this tweet is clearly an attempt for KitchenAid to deflect responsibility onto the individual who sent out the offensive tweet.

(4)   "Made a thoughtless comment about John Travolta. I sincerely apologize. No one's personal life is my business." – Rashida Jones, August 14, 2012

Rashida Jones sent this tweet out after she did an interview with the website Spinning Platters where she urged actor John Travolta to admit to the public that he is gay. In my opinion, this twitter apology stands out as one of the better examples of a sincere apology done correctly via social media.

The head act in this apology, "I sincerely apologize", is a perfect example of the use of an IFID intensifier in order to heighten the apology. By adding "sincerely" in front of the performative verb "apologize", the tweet instantly begins to appear heartfelt and clearly demonstrates her sense of guilt. Not only that, but these two lexical choices also help illustrate that no harm was meant by the original comment, making it appear that the actress realized her attempt at humor was a mistake and knows she needs to take responsibility for her actions.

Furthermore, by adding in the other two sentences in the tweet, Jones is able to touch on a few other critical necessities that should be present in an apology that is being made in an environment that is not face-to-face. For starters, she clearly states that the comment was about "John Travolta". By doing this, she is not trying to hide the fact that she committed an offense against him, nor is she trying to cover up her error by providing a vague and open-ended comment about how she said something that may or may not have been disrespectful. She openly comes out and declares that she committed an offense against Travolta, and therefore is directly addressing the situation but no H or A. Therefore, this is an example where simply saying "I'm

sorry" or "I apologize" without adding in a Direct object afterwards (e.g. "I'm sorry, Mr. Travolta") is acceptable because she has directly addressed the subject of whom she offended, as well as recognizes that she may have offended others in the process.

Finally, by using the last sentence that states "No one's personal life is my business", Jones acknowledges not only the fact that she did something wrong, but show that she understands why her actions were considered impolite. Even though she did not mean to cause any harm, she addresses the issue at hand and directly states that her specific action was wrong. There is no deflection, no attempt to minimize the damage, no excuse or denial of blame, nor any notion that she is trying to distract the public's attention away from the situation. Therefore, I believe that this is an example of a successful apology.

(5)   "Gerald Scarfe has never reflected the opinions of the Sunday Times. Nevertheless, we owe major apology for grotesque, offensive cartoon." – Rupert Murdoch, January 28, 2013

Rupert Murdoch issued this apology via Twitter after a *Sunday Times* cartoon was published that was received as anti-Semitic by the general public. This apology starts off in a unique way, because from the very onset it is clear that Murdoch does not accept full responsibility for what happened. He explicitly cites who the author of the cartoon in question is and definitively states that that individual does not represent the opinions of the publication. Of course, it has already been argued in this study that companies do in some way share the beliefs of their employees when they allow the employee to publish the material in the first place. However, this situation takes a different turn by singling out the one who is to blame for all the negativity. Therefore, it appears evident that Murdoch uses this apology in order to defend not only his own character, but that of the institution of *Sunday Times* as well. In other words, he is

throwing Gerald Scarfe's name out to distract the public and give them somewhere else to aim their criticism.

However, Murdoch goes on to add the word "nevertheless", which completely shifts direction of the tweet. Although it is clear that he does not accept full responsibility for what happened, by including the word "nevertheless", Murdoch shows that he understands that the offense was given and that, regardless of the details, the incident requires more than simple finger-pointing. This is then followed up by "we owe major apology for grotesque, offensive cartoon", the part where we find the actual apology and the head act.

We will ignore the lack of grammatical accuracy here since Twitter has such a restricted number of characters that can be used which made the tweet short, as well as the fact that there is a lack of the articles because "a" and "the" do not inhibit the apology. With regard to the head act, "we owe major apology", Murdoch does well to include an IFID intensifier in order to strengthen the apology. Furthermore, by saying "we" as opposed to simply stating the company's name again shows that he does in fact share in the responsibility for the cartoon's publication. Therefore, we finally get a sense of humility that adds to the effectiveness of the apology, even though the first half is a blatant attempt at distraction. Then, by calling the cartoon itself "grotesque" and "offensive", A is shown that Murdoch does in fact understand that the cartoon was distasteful and understands why the apology is needed.

This, however, could be seen as a double-edged sword: By including these words to directly insult the cartoon, Murdoch could in fact once again be trying to deflect the blame towards the creator of the cartoon itself. It even appears as if he is joining the general public in criticizing the illustration, which creates the possibility that the whole purpose of this apology was to distract attention from the publication itself and once again focus instead on the cartoonist

who was mentioned at the beginning, Gerald Scarfe. Essentially, it would appear that this tweet serves as an attack on the creator that has been hidden in the form of an apology, as well as a "tactical move by which the speaker tries to divert the hearer's attention from his or her own responsibility for the offence" (Blum-Kulka, 1989: 293).

(6)   "I regret any disruption my accident last weekend may have caused members of the community and want to thank the local authorities" – Jason Kidd, July 20, 2012

Ex-professional basketball player and current coach Jason Kidd issued this apology on Twitter after being arrested for a DUI in the Hamptons. However, this apology was met with skepticism and, in some peoples' minds, worsened the athlete's public image. One major reason why that happened could be to do with the head act of the apology itself, "I regret". By definition, this is an acceptable statement that would fall under the category of apologies. In fact, it flat out portrays that Jason does in fact regret his actions, showing that he understands what he did caused harm to his face.

The problematic issue comes later on in the sentence when he refers to the incident as an "accident". By using the word "accident", Kidd stumbled upon a couple of issues. To begin with, it would appear that the word was used in order to hide the fact that he was arrested for driving under the influence. Knowing that being arrested for such a decision could negatively affect him, it is possible that Kidd decided to use the word "accident" in order to hide from his followers what exactly happened. In other words, followers of his who were not aware of what happened would see this and simply overlook it since they did not know what he was referring to, and instead might incorrectly assume that he was talking about something basketball related. If this was not in fact his intention, the selection of this word is nonetheless a poor choice because the term is so vague. "Accident" implies that something happened where the outcome was

41

completely unintentional and could in fact have been no one's fault. Therefore, complete acceptance of blame is not achieved here because the actual DUI is not directly addressed.

Further, Kidd states that only the "members of the community" {the Hamptons} are the A of his apology. This would normally be an acceptable move because he is directly addressing the people who were most affected by his actions. However, Kidd completely ignores the rest of his A who may have been offended by his decision to drive while under the influence of alcohol. Furthermore, he only apologies for the "disruption" that he might have caused, which once again shows that he is trying to minimize the severity of his actions, or rather distract from the offense. Overall, even though there is a sense of general humility, it would appear that this apology lacks a true sense of authenticity and rather was issued solely for to address the situation.

(7)   "Mr. Keef! I'm sorry if I offended you. I heard a lot of people guesting on the song & did not even know it was you in particular." – Katy Perry, May 23, 2013

This apology was published by singer Katy Perry after rapper Chief Keef reacted negatively to an earlier tweet of hers that showed her disapproval of the lyrics his song "I Hate Being Sober". I feel that it is important to note that her criticism was not directed specifically towards Chief Keef, but rather towards the lyrics of the song in general.

This apology starts off strong with Perry first addressing the H as "Mr. Keef", and only him, as the person to whom the apology is directed. Here, we are presented with an interesting situation because Perry is using a source of social media in order to issue an apology intended for only one person. This immediately hints that Perry's intentions might not be as specific as the apology may seem. For example, it is quite possible that by utilizing Twitter instead of trying to reach out to him more indiscreetly, she may have been using the situation as an attempt to

enhance her public image in front of her A. This would mean that the tweet was then used more as a publicity stunt rather than an actual apology.

We are then presented with the head act of the apology, "I'm sorry if I offended you". This instantly shows that she lacks intent, or rather does not feel like she did anything wrong. By saying "if", she is displaying her opinion that what she said should not have caused so much offense. Therefore, this apology lacks a sense of humility. This claim is further supported by the lengthy explanation she gives afterwards to demonstrate why no insults were directed at Chief Keef. In other words, she is admitting the facts that happened, yet denying any responsibility. If she had truly been sorry, she would have skipped the explanation and instead given a statement that addressed her regret and how she understands her actions were wrong. Instead, she uses the apology as an attempt to defend her actions and explain why Keef in fact was wrong to assume that she was directing her comments towards him. Overall, the tweet does take the form of an apology. However, any trace of humility is hidden by the defensive tone.

(8)   "I removed the tweet at the request of Nielsen. I intended no harm and apologize for the reference." – Oprah Winfrey, February 13, 2012

Oprah Winfrey released this tweet after a previous tweet of hers asked her followers to tune into her new show *Oprah's Next Chapter*, especially if they had a Nielsen box. Nielson demanded that she remove the tweet because it was thought that she was trying to influence her own ratings.

By looking at the head act, "apologize for the reference" we can see that she chooses a stronger word than 'I'm sorry'. However, this is the only part of the tweet where any regret is noted, as the rest of the publication seems distant and unenthusiastic. For example, by stating that she is sorry "for the reference", her phrasing implies that she does not view her actions as all that

harmful, something that detracts from the apology. This is further supported by her previous sentence where she states that she only removed the tweet because the company asked her to do so. Therefore, A is left to believe that she would have left the tweet online if she had not been approached, which then means she never would have felt the need to apologize in the first place.

Finally, even though Twitter only allows 140 characters per tweet, this apology feels so brief that there is no hint of emotion behind it. This lack of emotion is highlighted further by Winfrey stating that she did not intend any harm. Once again, Winfrey provides evidence that she does not view her actions as a wrongdoing, which makes us believe that this statement was provided solely out of necessity. Yes, the apology does highlight exactly what she is apologizing for, and in fact does include an actual apology. But it does not easily answer whether or not she feels any remorse for her actions is up to question.

(9)   "I am a huge fan of the show Orange is the New black, actress Uzo Aduba, and the character she has created." – Julianne Hough, October 26, 2013

Julianne Hough published this tweet after receiving backlash for wearing a controversial blackface costume of Uzo Aduba's character in *Orange is the New Black* during a Halloween party. However, this tweet does not contain a head act that would classify it under the category of apologies. I provide this example to showcase how tweets can still be related with real-time conversations, because due to this lack of a head act, one could argue that this is not an apology at all since it does not fall under the category of expressives. However, based upon the situation that called for this tweet to be published, as well as the fact that Hough created the tweet in order to demonstrate to her A, which in this case would be the third party observers, that she is expressing her feelings of regret through a different means than by using performative verbs. So

even though she had time and space enough to type out her response and edit it before publication, the tweet was still sent out without any overt apology.

While it does show clear support for both the actress and her character, it fails to address either her actions or her desire to request forgiveness. In other words, this would be an excellent beginning to an apology, something that could easily be followed up by the actual apology. However, because Twitter allows you to post instantly to the Internet, Hough's followers would have only seen this tweet before any other form of publication could have been made on a different platform. This is especially problematic when we consider the fact that there was an ample amount of space for her to write "I'm sorry".

(10)I   "I love my boys and maybe things have gone a little sideways I apologise for that. We are only in our 20's we all do stupid things at this age." – Liam Payne, May 31, 2014

One Direction singer Liam Payne issued this tweet after a photograph went viral on the Internet of him and some other members of the band smoking marijuana. This was especially problematic due to the fact that many of the band's followers are adolescents who could be easily influenced by the band's actions.

The head act of Payne's apology, "I apologise", accomplishes the task of using a stronger word than simply "sorry" via a performative verb. This helps add a feeling of regret to the tweet, something that was very important for him to display to not only his fans, but also the parents of his fans. His lexical choice was well selected.

However, there are two critical areas to this apology that create a lack of acceptance of responsibility for his actions. First, the first sentence of the tweet includes the hedges "maybe" and "little", words used to help diminish   any acknowledgement of guilt. The first word is of course one that could lead the reader to assume that there is a sense of doubt as to whether or not

the speaker believes they truly committed an error. Other lexical choices could have better portrayed a sense of guilt that would have allowed A to better understand that Payne fully understands the seriousness of his actions. Meanwhile, the second word appears to have been selected in order to downplay the severity of the drug-related incident. Here again is another point where a different lexical choice could have made all the difference, and could have helped switch the tone to sound more professional.

The second area of this apology that lacks substance is the final sentence of the tweet. By stating that that "We are only in our 20s we all do stupid things at this age", it would seem that the speaker is trying to appeal to his older followers. He openly admits that the actions were imprudent, and offers a humorous approach so that maybe readers will then reflect on their own mistakes and agree with him. However, the phrasing he selects turns this into an excuse for his actions, meaning that he should be forgiven simply because he is so young and should be expected to make such mistakes. Instead of creating a connection between speaker and listener, this strategy actually weakens the apology because the blame is being pushed away from the speaker who is refusing to acknowledge his guilt in the situation by giving "reasons for the violation at hand" as an "explanation" (Blum-Kulka, 1989: 293). Accepting one's actions in order to save face is the whole point as to why we apologize in the first place; therefore, Payne's tweet would have been more successful had he attempted to take full accountability.

(11)   "I'd like to apologize wholeheartedly to Miss Colombia & Miss Philippines for my huge mistake. I feel terrible." – Steve Harvey, December 20, 2015

While hosting the 2015 Miss Universe competition, Steve Harvey announced Miss Colombia as the winner of the competition live on television. Only after the celebrations had begun and the crown was placed on her head did he realize his error that Miss Philippines was

the winner and correct himself, leaving a visually confused and devastated Miss Colombia standing awkwardly on the stage.

Harvey does something that we have not seen thus far; he adds an IFID intensifier immediately after the head act. This has an interesting effect on the apology as a whole. First, the word "wholeheartedly" instantly adds a humble tone to the tweet, something that can be hard to accomplish when writing on a social media forum in such a small number of words. Additionally, he adds that he would "like to apologize" instead of just saying *I'm sorry* or *I apologize*. This possible deflection allows him to reach out towards Miss Colombia and Miss Philippines, both of whom he specifically addresses later on, while at the same time making it abundantly clear that he is seeking their forgiveness rather than simply expecting them to accept his plea.

His final statement further supports this idea where he states that he "feels terrible". By displaying his emotions about the event, Harvey expresses his embarrassment about his error. Even though the damage was significant and an apology could not fully excuse what happened, this public embarrassment shows his followers that he never intended to cause any harm to the contestants. Furthermore, he does not offer an excuse as to why he announced the wrong winner. It would have been very easy for him to explain why he made the mistake when announcing the official winner, but instead he chooses to forgo this route and assume all responsibility. All these criteria allow him to publish a "heartfelt" apology.

(12)   "#AppleMusic will pay artists for streaming, even during customer's free trial period" – Eddy Cue, June 21, 2015

This tweet was sent out after a number of artists, most noticeably Taylor Swift, became enraged that Apple's online music streaming application would not pay the singers for the first

47

few months of a customer's membership. This then led to singers revoking their music from the application, forcing Eddy Cue, Apple's senior vice president, to make a public statement.

This tweet is clearly not an apology. However, I include it because while it does not contain any apology criteria, Cue clearly thought it would be acceptable to use in place of an apology while at the same time achieving the same overall objective that a normal apology would accomplish. By stating that the company would still be paying all artists for their music, even during the promotional period, Cue openly suggests that his company's decision was wrong. He also knew that he needed to act quickly in order to appease the stars of the music industry so that his application would not fail before it even began. Therefore he opted to instead repair the situation by immediately granting their wishes and paying them for their work, a sound strategy because "the damage or inconvenience which affected the hearer can be compensated for" in this instance (Blum-Kulka, 1989: 293). Since time was of the essence, one could argue that Cue acted wisely, because behind the simple announcement, the action implies that the company was in fact sorry for its actions.

It could also be maintained that this serves as an adequate "apology" because of the position that Cue was in. As senior vice president for the one of the world's top companies, it would have made him look quite weak if he had tried to make pleas to innumerable artists for forgiveness on an individual basis so that they would allow Apple permission to stream their music. At the same time, no action would have resulted in catastrophic backlashes that could have cost the company a significant amount of money. Therefore, by simply giving into their demands, he is still asking for their forgiveness by implication so that they will continue their business with him. The situation also did not call for a strong apology, because no serious offense to the company's face had occurred. This was simply a business decision on their part

that only affected the business aspect of artists' lives. This was not an attack on their work, nor was Apple saying that the celebrities would never get paid. Therefore, a regular apology would not have worked because there was only one thing that would settle the artists' needs: money.

(13)   "I'm sorry Taylor" – Kanye West, September 4th, 2010

This tweet came from Kanye West's account after he interrupted Taylor Swift's acceptance speech after she won the category Best Female Video at the 2009 MTV Video Music Awards. However, this tweet came almost a year after the event had occurred. This then begs the question: what was the point of this apology?

While appearing very late and unemotional, this apology actually holds a significant amount of sentiment behind it. Due to the fact that it was issued close to the one-year anniversary of the event, West's fans, as well as Swift's, would have known exactly what he was referring to when he specifically addressed his message to "Taylor". Therefore, this simple three-worded tweet is an action in which West is openly admitting that he has not yet atoned for what he did to her, and is still seeking her forgiveness. Even though the famous artist could have easily decided to let the past rest and try to move on, he instead openly brought attention to his error, and by doing so took ownership and in his own way expresses concern for the hearer.

However, there is another possibility. Considering that such a popular awards show would garner much attention, the memory of what happened one year prior was no doubt being brought up again. This would only be natural since that was the one event that everyone remembered from the previous show. Therefore, West could have simply been acting to try and play along with the general public, meaning that he only tweeted the apology because he knew others were already talking about an event with which he was negatively associated. If he were to have tried and ignore all the chatter, he might have damaged his face even further. Because of

this, this apology may have been issued solely to try and maintain the face he had built for himself again.

(14)   "The truth is I think @taylorswift13 is amazing + an incredible example of what's possible. If I hurt her or her fans my sincerest apologies" – Jared Leto, December 7, 2015

Actor and singer Jared Leto published this tweet after a video of him was released that showed him speaking very poorly of Taylor Swift's music. This brought quite a bit of backlash from Taylor's fans, as well as from the music community in general. Since the video caught him in the act of intentionally saying disparaging things about Swift's music, this impolite act would have required an excellent apology to try and help slow down any damage that he may have caused to his character.

First off, Leto does a good job by offering his sincerest apologies. To use the word "sincere" would indicate that he is expressing his genuine emotions. So, by using this word in conjunction with "apologies", he is clearly portraying both a sense of guilt as well as sincerity. What helps even more is that he specifically offers these apologies to both H and her A, although this section of the tweet could also come off as a little damaging to the overall tone. This is because he specifically says "if" he hurt their feelings, a tactic one uses in order to show that there is a refusal of acknowledging guilt. By doing using the word "if", Leto is suggesting that there was a lack of intent behind his insults when they were said. However, one could argue that what he did not intend for was that he would be caught on camera. By saying anything negative about a fellow artist in the form of a disparaging comment, the speaker intends for those words to cause damage to the subject's character. For this reason, Leto would have been better off removing the word "if", and simply admitting that he had in fact hurt Swift's, and her fans', feelings.

This error alone does not ruin the apology. By praising her with such high words in the first half of the tweet, Leto is swallowing his pride and openly admitting that Swift is a talented artist. In fact, by "treating [Swift] as a member of an in-group", positive politeness is achieved by bridging the gap formal gap between S and H (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 305). This creates a few possibilities; with one of them implying that perhaps his previous comments were made out of jealousy. If this were the case, the speaker would at least have an excuse, albeit a poor one, for saying what he did. What is more important is the fact that instead of just apologizing, Leto also praises the recipient of his apology. More importantly, he does this prior to introducing the head act where the apology actually occurs. Had he done this afterwards, it might have appeared that he was trying to distract from the issue and instead focus on how wonderful Swift is. However, he is able to praise her in a manner that adds a level of respect, something that is very important because he clearly did not show the same respect before. So while the tweet does include one area that could be interpreted differently, overall the tweet succeeds in making an apology which appears sincere.

(15)   "I sincerely apologize for my thoughtless insensitive remarks. I in no way meant to hurt or demean those going through a similar journey." – Drake Bell, June 4, 2015

After Caitlyn Jenner's gender reassignment surgery, actor Drake Bell stated that he would still be calling the celebrity Bruce via his twitter account. This comment was met with heavy criticism from the public, prompting Bell to publish the above apology in response.

Bell starts off his apology immediately with the head act by including the intensifier "sincerely" before he uses the word "apologize". This helps create an atmosphere where it is very easy to see that the actor openly accepts the fact that he was wrong, as well as regrets his earlier decisions. We know this to be the case by looking in the same sentence where he calls his

statement "thoughtless" and "insensitive". His lexical choices clearly dictate that he is humbly asking for forgiveness, admitting that he has thought about what he did and understands why exactly he needs to apologize. Unfortunately, two other aspects take away from the initial apology that started off very strong.

First off, we can focus on the second sentence. By vividly stating that he did not mean to hurt anyone's feelings, a clear lack of intent is being shown. In other words, he is essentially saying that he believes that people should not have been offended by what he said because there was no ill intent behind his words. It is understandable that he does not believe that he said anything wrong, yet by stating this in his apology, he unintentionally refuses to take responsibility for the harm he may have caused. Just by simply sounding apologetic does not mean that you are fully taking a humble approach if you still refuse to take on full responsibility for your actions, something that overall lessens the amount of face you can truly save.

Secondly, Bell never addresses specifically to whom he is apologizing. He simply states that he is sorry for his comments. This is problematic since his comments were directly aimed towards Caitlyn Jenner, not "those going through a similar journey". This would include only a small percentage of those who were initially insulted by the comment. Thus, he is completely ignoring both the person whom he insulted, as well as the majority percentage of the offended. The speaker would have had more success had he reworded his tweet to at the very least address all of the general public.

(16)   "I thought I was being called out. I missed the point, I misunderstood, then misspoke. I'm sorry, Nicki" – Taylor Swift, July 23, 2015

This situation began when Nicki Minaj tweeted out her frustration against the MTV Music Video Awards for not nominating one of her music videos for an award, citing that her

video would have undoubtedly been nominated if she had hired models with slimmer bodies. Taylor Swift felt that this was an outcry against one of her own videos that had been nominated for the award, and quickly defended herself. Once it was clear that she had misspoken, Swift quickly send the above tweet to apologize.

Here we have an example where the head act is presented at the very end of the apology. While it is very simple, it does succeed in directly addressing the person the speaker is apologizing to. This is an important trait to have when posting an apology to one specific person via Twitter so that no misunderstanding occurs during interpretation. Having said that, this tweet presents a different, interesting scenario that we have not seen yet where an explanation might help with the acceptance of responsibility.

Swift clearly opens up with a short description as to why she acted the way she did. However, her explanation differs from the majority of other accounts primarily because she emphasizes the pronoun "I" throughout. By stating that "I missed the point" and "I misspoke", the speaker's explanations don't distract A from the original offense, but rather they invoke a sense of self-criticism. Swift is publicly stating that she was the one who acted in error instead of focusing her explanation on the unclear words of Minaj that prompted her aggression. This is why, as Blum-Kulka states, "whenever First Person is used…the expression should be coded as one of the substrategies of "Taking on Responsibility"" (Blum-Kulka 1989: 293). In fact, this particular explanation would even be an acceptable example of explicit self-blame, further adding to the legitimacy of the apology. So while the Tweet is even briefer than the average Twitter publication, the fact that she self-deprecates allows her to assume the position of someone who is humbly asking for forgiveness. This means that we now have proof as to how a

person can utilize Twitter to publish a statement that is brief, yet still accomplishes the task of portraying a proper apology.

(17)   "My comments about women running for president were unequivocally insensitive and wrong. I sincerely apologize to everyone I offended" – T.I., October 13, 2015

Professional rapper T.I. sent out this tweet after he began to receive heavy backlash for his comments that doubted whether Hillary Clinton, or any woman in general, could handle being the president of the United States.

T.I. follows a similar pattern we have seen with his head act by stating that he would like to "sincerely apologize", adding an intensifier as well as the stronger word instead of simply using "sorry". The head act is then strengthened by the second half of the sentence, which states, "to everyone I offended". Even though the word "everyone" is vague and imprecise, the speaker does well to make sure that he leaves no one out of his apology considering that he only has a limited amount of characters to work with. This means that Hillary Clinton is included in the apology. While a direct recognition of her would have been appropriate, the tweet demonstrates that T.I. is aware that he offended more than just one single person with his comments. Because of this, he accurately decides to use a more general approach.

The most successful part of this apology lies in the first half. First, he specifies exactly what he is apologizing for by directly admitting that his comments were about women running for president. Instead of worrying about followers who would read this but did not know what he was talking about, the speaker takes the risk of inviting more criticism by fully owning up to his own actions. There is no distraction from the offense, and he immediately takes responsibility. Second, he states that his comments were "unequivocally insensitive and wrong". This self-criticism reflects the awareness that the speaker now understands about his actions and why they

were wrong. Whether he intended to offend this many people matters not, and he knows this. By specifically establishing the fact that his comments were egregious, and by not trying to defend them in any way, T.I. successfully puts himself in a position where he asks for forgiveness without pleading his innocence at the same time. By eliminating any chance of self-defense, the apology takes a more honest tone than many of the others we have seen thus far.

(18)   "@ladygaga I acted like a child last night. Just not into publicity stunts call me & we will end this like adults I dont want 2 fight anymore." – Kelly Osbourne, October 28, 2013

This tweet appeared as the result after an altercation between professional singer Lady Gaga and British celebrity Kelly Osbourne broke out via Twitter. Lady Gaga had sent a picture of herself with Kelly's mother where the two of them had a birthday cake for Kelly. However, Kelly was insulted due to the fact that she was in a completely different country at the time, and preceded to lash out.

What is most interesting about this tweet is the sense of irony. Even though Osbourne claims that she is not into publicity stunts, she still took to Twitter to send this out for Lady Gaga to see. Furthermore, by suggesting that Lady Gaga could call her so that they could resolve their differences privately, Osbourne clarifies the fact that the two must have the necessary access to each other's private numbers needed in order to communicate. So why was the tweet necessary in the first place if Osbourne wanted to make amends privately? Because the target of the tweet was A, and not H.

To answer this, I will suggest that the speaker was utilizing Twitter solely to save face with the A, and not with the one person with whom she was feuding. This conclusion can be reached after analyzing the first and last sentences. I argue that "I dont want 2 fight anymore" is its own sentence, despite the lack of standard punctuation throughout the tweet. Beginning with

the first sentence, Osbourne claims that she "acted like a child". This is what I will consider the head act. While "the speaker completely rejects responsibility for the offence", there is an admission of guilt here, something that comes to the closest to an actual apology throughout the tweet. (Blum-Kulka, 1989: 292). In other words, she is downgrading, or distracting from, the offense by openly avoiding any use of performative verbs. The purpose of this is to ensure that her fans are aware that the speaker knows she acted poorly. In other words, this apology is not directly intended for Lady Gaga, but rather for her own fans. So, in fact, this is a publicity stunt in order to try and save face with the fans who support her lifestyle. Osbourne does not take responsibility, nor does she even admit that she was wrong. She simply states that her actions were not mature. Therefore, this cannot serve as an adequate apology to the offended party.

Focusing on the last sentence where she claims she no longer wants to fight, it becomes even clearer that she is also addressing the general public. Given that the feud between the two celebrities occurred on Twitter, thousands of people would have seen what was said. Therefore, Osbourne's face would have been damaged because her followers would have seen her simply as someone who instigated a fight for no reason. Whether she wants to keep fighting or not with Lady Gaga is irrelevant, because based on her reaction to the birthday cake tweet, she clearly holds some sort of personal grudge against the singer. So if it was in fact that important for her to reconcile with Lady Gaga, and if it was so important for her to not cause a publicity stunt, Osbourne would have simply just called her to begin with. But instead, she issues this apology of sorts so that her fans can see her in a mature light as someone who is above petty behavior. Therefore, we can now observe that Twitter apologies can be used as a disguise in order to maintain face in front of A.

(19)   "Bean, sorry I believed the gossip.. Mommy loves you" – Courtney Love Cobain, April 14, 2012

This situation began when Courtney Love Cobain publicly accused her daughter Frances Bean of having sexual relations with one of her late husband's former coworkers. Once she learned that the rumors were false, the singer took to Twitter to apologize with this tweet.

With this tweet, Cobain gives us a very brief example of how Twitter apologies can be seen as insincere due to the character limit. For starters, the head act consists solely of the word "sorry". By using the most basic word possible for establishing an apology, the speaker misses an opportunity to sound genuine in front of all her followers. This single word creates a very unenthusiastic tone that continues to hinder any sense of humility throughout the apology.

Furthermore, Cobain is not apologizing for any of her rude comments against her daughter, but simply for believing the rumors that she had originally heard. There is no taking on of responsibility, no offer of repair, nor is there even an explanation. Instead, all we are presented with is a distraction that seems to assign fault for everything on others for spreading gossip. Even the ending where she states that she loves her daughter seems to be added purely to try and give herself an aura of being an affectionate and loving mother. Because of this, I would surmise that this apology was simply her attempt at making a public statement about the event. Because they are mother and daughter, one could assume that an actual apology must be made in person where they are face-to-face. Despite this, the tweet does not provide an apology where the speaker is seen taking the position of seeking forgiveness.

(20)   "That couldn't have gone any worse!" – A.J. Clemente, April 21, 2013

"Tough day, Thanks for the support, We all make mistakes. Im truly sorry for mine. I'll try my hardest to come back better and learn from this." – A.J. Clemente, April 21, 2013

Here, I would like to include an analysis of both tweets and a video, because the apologies go together hand-and-hand. At 4:59 pm on NBC News in North Dakota, anchor A.J. Clemente was practicing the pronunciation of the name of London marathon winner Tsegaye Kebede. He was apparently struggling with it, because just before his co-anchor was able to introduce themselves, he said "fucking shit" out of frustration for not being able to correctly pronounce the winner's name. However, instead of apologizing right on the spot, he froze and simply began to stare at his feet. His co-anchor was also clearly thrown off-guard, and can be seen looking off-camera after pausing for a moment, unsure as to what she should do.

Clemente later acknowledged his mistake right after the airing by tweeting "That couldn't have gone any worse!", in reference to the fact that it was his first day on the job, before waiting another 6 hours to tweet his official apology that included him saying "…we all make mistakes. I'm truly sorry for mine. I'll try my hardest to come back better and learn from this" (Weisman, 2013).

First, the lack of acknowledging his error on TV was a blunder in itself. This makes it appear as if he is trying to dodge responsibility and hope that no one noticed. However, his body language completely alerts the public of his guilt. While his co-anchor is talking, he continues to stare down at his feet, shifts his weight from side to side, and cannot stop fidgeting his hands. At one moment, he raises his hand as if he looks like he is going to interrupt her so that he could apologize, however he quickly decides against this and instead continues to remain quiet.

From his body language, it is quite obvious that Clemente knows he just lost face with both his employer as well as all the viewers of the program. However, by not acknowledging his mistake immediately, he forgoes his first opportunity to try and save face, instead becoming more and more out of character. Furthermore, the fact that the very first line he took on as a new

anchor on this program was filled with profanity, he never even had the chance to try and establish a legitimate face in the first place. This just makes the lack of apology appear even more of an error on his part.

Moving on to the tweets, it is quite obvious that the first one was his attempt at using humor to try and deflect the tension of the situation. This is not so quickly followed by another deflection when he claims that "we all make mistakes" before he includes the phrase "I'm sorry" (Business Insider, 2013). These two tweets are clear attempts at a non-apology. He is mimicking the outline of an apology by including the phrase "I'm sorry", but there is no sense of remorse or acceptance of guilt coming from him. Also, if we look at the time difference between the occurrence of the incident and the second tweet, there is a total of 6 hours and 12 minutes that pass. That means that even though he had an ample amount of time to try and make up for his mistake, he continued to ignore it until the last possible moment. He was subsequently fired the next day.

(21) "I love Pharrel. I thought the outfit he wore was similar to that of my bell hop outfit in Oz. I apologize" – Zach Braff, February 9, 2015

Zach Braff took to Twitter to comment on how an outfit that Pharrel wore was very similar to that of the monkey bellhop he voiced for the movie *Oz*. However, many people saw this as racist and Braff was forced to apologize to A for his comment.

Zach chooses to put his head act at the end of the tweet, opting instead to give an explanation as to what happened before. The head act is very simple, and shows us just another example of how a celebrity selects an IFID with the verb *apologize* over 'sorry'. What is more interesting is the way Braff phrased this apology. First off, he begins by praising the person he accidently offended. This technique of treating H like "a person whose wants and personality

59

traits are known and liked" provides the idea that because S thinks so highly of H, he could not have possibly meant to harm him (Brown & Levinson, 1987, 305). Even though he has damaged the negative face of Pharrel, Braff instantly tries to appeal to Pharrel's positive face by showcasing that his character is desirable to others. It helps show a sense of respect that he has for the object of the tweet, instead of simply apologizing. However, his statement afterwards begins to take the form of a non-apology. This is because he is only stating what happened. There is no acknowledgement that he was wrong or that he understands his error, which could possibly mean that he does not think he was in the wrong to begin with. Therefore, it is quite possible that this tweet was used in order to save face with A rather than demonstrate his remorse.

(22)   "Im embarrassed that I failed to credit @danielclowes for his original graphic novella Justin M. Damiano, which served as my inspiration" – Shia LaBeouf, December 16, 2013

Shia LaBeouf found himself as the subject of much criticism when he plagiarized an entire script from one of Daniel Clowes' visual novels and claimed it as his own. He then used his Twitter feed to issue the above apology.

LaBeouf's tweet is another example of how he creates what technically could be classified as an apology, however there is no tone of actual remorse or asking for forgiveness. For example, there is no head act here for which to analyze or initiate the apology. The speaker does not even include an IFID, a technique that would make it much easier to apologize. He does include that he is embarrassed, which is a good example of using his emotions to try and portray how he feels about the event. However, his tweet only acknowledges what his actions were. There is no comment as to whether or not he accepts responsibility for them, nor is there a sign that he hopes that Daniel Clowes will accept his "apology". In fact, it would appear that if

anything, LaBeouf is more embarrassed about the fact that he was caught in the act. That would then make this tweet more of a publicity stunt so that he can at least tell his criticizers that he published a formal apology. Overall, he fails to adequately create a strong apology.

(23) "I'm honored that @michelebachmann was on our show yesterday and I'm so sorry about the intro mess. I really hope she comes back." – Jimmy Fallon, November 22, 2011

Jimmy Fallon was forced to apologize on behalf of his band after Michele Bachmann made an appearance on his show *Late Night*. When it was time to play a song for her intro, the band selected "Lying Ass Bitch", something that did not go over well with the female politician.

Before analyzing the tweet, I think it is necessary to comment on how Fallon was forced to apologize when he had nothing to do with what happened. It was his band members who made the error in judgment and offended Bachmann. In spite of this, Fallon still includes an intensifier with his IFID in the head act of the apology, making it appear as if he was in fact the person who was responsible. This alone makes Fallon appear selfless and genuine. Two other aspects of the tweet heighten this tone as well. First off, he begins by specifically mentioning H's name and how happy he was that she came on the show. By saying he was honored, he puts the subject in a spotlight of his admiration, an interesting step that many are too embarrassed to utilize when they are forced to apologize. Add to this the fact that he extends an open invitation for her to come back to the show demonstrates that he is extending a unique version of a gift that only he can offer. All of these strategies help Fallon create a true apology that completely puts him in a humble state.

(24) "Our deleted tweet was genuinely meant as a tribute, but we shouldn't have posted it. We are truly sorry." – Cinnabon, December 27, 2016

When famous actress Carrie Fisher passed away, millions of Americans mourned her death. Soft pretzel company Cinnabon tweeted a picture of her iconic Princess Leia bun styled hair as a constellation, however they replaced her hair buns with their own personal product. This outraged many, and Cinnabon quickly deleted the picture and sent out this tweet as an apology.

This head act is very similar to that of the Los Angeles Kings that we analyzed earlier. The presence of the pronoun "we" is important because the company refuses to single out any individual employee, even though the fault most likely only rested with a few people. What is also important is the intensifier they include with the IFID. By adding the word "truly" there is no doubt left that the company is putting itself at the mercy of the public and understands the severity of their action. With the head act alone, a humble tone is well established throughout the apology.

As for the rest of the tweet, it does appear that they try to defend themselves by explaining why their picture was not meant as offensive. Since this occurs at the very beginning of the tweet, the tweet does appear to be more of a non-apology at the outset. However, other than the head act, two other aspects of the tweet offset this. First, their lexical choice of "genuinely" when they stated they meant the picture as a tribute is too emotional to be seen as simply a defensive strategy. This is because it helps them establish a tone of true remorse, hoping that A can understand that truly no disrespect was meant. Second, they directly admit that they should not have acted the way they did. This is a very strong strategy that a speaker can use when apologizing so that they can show that actually accept responsibility. They do not make an attempt to distract A or deflect blame. And so even though their action was seen as greatly offensive, the issued apology does an excellent job at trying to save as much face as possible.

Spanish Tweets

(1)   "Mil disculpas por la demora, espero les guste!" – David Montoya, November 4, 2016

David Montoya is an author and YouTube sensation that has gained a massive following

of viewers who subscribe to watch his videos. As such, his subscribers grew very impatient when

he failed to upload a new video for a long duration of time. This prompted Montoya to include

the above tweet as an apology when he finally did release a new video.

Instantly the use of IFID intensifiers with the Spanish tweets. In the head act, Montoya

uses the word "mil" as an intensifier to emphasize the regret he has for not giving his fans a new

video sooner. However, the more interesting aspect of this tweet is the fact that he paired it with

a new video, a video that I will call a gift, and included that he hopes his fans like it. By

providing this gift, it would appear that he is offering a repair. He knows exactly what his

viewers want, and therefore apologizes by giving them just that. This of course differs from a

repair where someone might pay for a broken window or purchase another drink for someone

they bumped into, yet the video still serves as a sort of olive branch to try and soften the

annoyance of the subscribers. Because of this and the light nature of the situation, the polite

apology in combination with the new video seems to be very appropriate for the occasion.

Finally, I find it important to note that this particular tweet was issued even though Montoya did

not technically do anything wrong, which would then explain the light-hearted apology.

(2)   "YouMag no se esperaba una reacción por parte de los seguidores asi, y sobretodo, lo

siente mucho por todos, y pide disculpas." – YouMag, September 19, 2016

YouMag was a startup magazine that tried to follow the lives of famous YouTubers.

However, the magazine was met with much disdain from the YouTube community, and it

received such a poor following that the magazine was forced to send this apology. Incidentally, this apology also marked the end of the magazine.

The head act here can be found at the very end of the tweet with "pide disculpas", which means that they apologize. This act is not anything too fancy, but nonetheless does appear as a solid form of an apology rather than simply saying nothing and puts the digital magazine in a state of humility. This quality of not being a strong IFID is due in part because the verb *pedir* could be classified as a non-performative verb, or at the very least as a non-expressive. I say this because the verb does not directly detail exactly what type of illocutionary act is being performed. The speaker could be asking in the form of a request, or maybe the verb could be used to create a polite command. Therefore, we only know that the verb is referring to apologies because the following word explicitly states this fact.

What is more interesting is the statement before the head act where the publication states that the magazine had no idea that they would receive this type of a reaction from their followers. While it does appear to come off as an explanation, the tweet in no way tries to excuse their efforts for any type of reason, such as they thought they were being comical or that they assumed the readers wanted the type of material that they were publishing. They simply state that the reaction they got was unexpected, that the negativity was received and understood by them, and that they were sorry. So while I would classify the first section as technically an excuse, blame is not being shifted away from the speaker. Furthermore, by shutting down the magazine as an end result, they are rectifying the situation and atoning for their errors. This atonement also shows that they fully understand that their actions were not received in a positive manner, and thus they attempt to save as much face as possible and step down from any further business. Because of this, the apology appears to be sincere and helps prevent further negativity towards the speaker.

(3)   "Quiero pedir disculpas a mi equipo y a la afición por ese penalti, que nos ha privado de conseguir algo más que un punto. Lo siento" – David Mateos, November 29, 2011

Professional soccer player David Mateos published this tweet after a soccer game in which he gave up a late minute penalty that allowed the opposing team to score and tie the game, a tie that they would not be able to overcome in the end. This ended up hurting Real Madrid's ranking in the league table since they were not able to exit with the win.

It is seen that this tweet has two head acts. The first can be seen at the very beginning when Mateos says that he wants to apologize. This opening instantly allows his followers to realize that he is entering an act of humility and seeks forgiveness by "express[ing] responsibility for the offence, [his error] which created the need to apologize (Blum-Kulka, 1987: 291). If we then pair this opening with the second head act at the very end of the tweet where he once again says that he is sorry, it becomes abundantly clear that the player does in fact feel genuine remorse for what happened. While true soccer fans, A, may not have been happy with the man's play, he does succeed in forming an apology that shows he is asking for forgiveness from both his team and supporters.

This claim is further enhanced by the fact that he goes on to explain why his actions caused harm to the team. This is quite interesting because while he is giving an explanation, Mateos is avoiding the typical explanation route we saw with the English tweets where he provides reasoning as to why he did what he did. Instead, he provides an explanation as to why he needs to apologize. This action allows him to take complete responsibility for what happened, as well as demonstrate that there is not a doubt in his mind as to what came of his error. In such a short amount of space, the professional soccer player is able to apologize twice, create a humble tone, and completely avoid shifting any blame to another person or cause.

(4)   "Una de las personas que administra esta cuenta publicó por error un contenido de

carácter personal. Ofrecemos disculpas" – Segob, January 26, 2017

The Segob twitter account is run by the government's secretarial office in Mexico, and

therefore is a very professional account that would not normally post anything improper. So

when a tweet was published on this account that contained a selfie of a child's face, the

association quickly deleted the tweet and apologized for the confusion.

The head act here once again can be found at the very end of the tweet. The speaker uses

an interesting way of expressing this is an apology by stating that they offer their apologies, a

much more formal expression than one would expect to see on this form of social media. Having

said that, it fits nicely because the apology is coming from a prestigious account that would

normally only publish serious and official material. Even though the error was minor and did not

cause any source of offense, it was still unprofessional for a government account, and through 1st

person plural they clearly acknowledge that they were in the wrong.

Now, this tweet shares something in common with the other Spanish tweets that we have

seen thus far, the fact that it begins with an explanation as to what happened. However, because

this situation was without any major controversy, this explanation differs because it was simply

explaining what exactly the picture of the child's face was and how it got there. Therefore, there

was not much responsibility to be taken on by Segob. Having said that, they did make it

abundantly clear that the fault laid with one of the people in charge of the account, just to ensure

that they as a whole were not held responsible in case anyone had become upset. But it would be

more likely that the explanation simply served to inform the public as to what happened. Overall,

this tweet was quick, precise, informative, and very politely presented an apology for something

that was not such a serious matter.

(5)   "Buenos dias, ofrezco disculpas a toda la aficion @ClubAmerica por mi twitter de ayer. Nunca hubo intención de ofender." – Jose Luis Higuera, December 26, 2016

Jose Luis Higuera, CEO of the soccer club Chivas, published this apology via twitter after receiving heavy backlash from Club America fans. Higuera had previously joked about America's defeat in a recent tournament in some less than appropriate terms that included comparing the team to a child getting diarrhea from a sushi restaurant.

Higuera's head act begins by offering his apologies to Club America's fan base, or A. This is very direct and appropriate, considering that he is directly addressing exactly whom he offended. While this would normally present the tweet with a humble tone, this feeling is somewhat diminished by the denial of intent he shows towards the end of the tweet. By saying it was never his intention to offend anyone, the tweet begins to call his previous comments into question.

By the statement of his insult, there was no way he did not mean to cause offense when he compared the team's disappointing finish to toilet humor. Therefore, it would appear that the tweet does in fact serve as a simple face-saving act instead of him sincerely apologizing for his behavior. Despite this, by saying that he never intended to offend anyone, he is acknowledging that people were in fact troubled by his comments, and in doing so does claim some responsibility. However, when one considers the fact that he is CEO of a rival soccer club, it does not come as such a surprise that the apology would not be highly remorseful.

(6)   "Mis disculpas por el patinazo de urbanita ignorante del mundo rural. #NoHayExcusa" – Rafa Mayoral, December 29, 2016

Rafa Mayoral, the Secretary of Relaciones con la Sociedad Civil de Podemos, recently came under fire for referencing to the town of Huelva, Spain as 'the lost town of Huelva'.

Naturally, the citizens of this town were not too pleased by his comments, which prompted Mayoral to issue this tweet as an apology.

The speaker begins the tweet by offering his apologies as the head act of his expression of regret. In doing so, he is able to offer a stronger feeling of regret than simply stating "I'm sorry", something that we have seen through many of the apologies listed previously. However, he fails to address a specific A, instead opting rather to simply apologize for his slip.

While its true that he offended many people with his remark, it would have been beneficial to highlight the residents of Huelva, especially since they live and function in the town that he so easily looked down on. Nevertheless, this lapse of judgment is somewhat offset by his lexical choice, *ignorante,* a word that he uses to describe his previous comments. By calling his own comments ignorant, he accepts blame as well as demonstrates his understanding of the situation. This gives him the appearance of a man who has learned from his mistakes and wishes to make amends. However, the true area of interest in this apology is the hashtag that he includes at the very end. By emphasizing the fact that there are no excuses for what he did, he directly announces to the public that he firmly believes nothing can help save him from this loss of face. Therefore, the apology is given a much more sincere tone and appears more genuine than simply offering an explanation for what he did.

(7)   "Pido disculpas a todos aquellos que se puideron sentir ofendidos con lo dicho, en ningún momento la intención fue ofender… <3" – Bastian Gusman, December 10, 2016

(8)   "Pido disculpas a todas las persona que se vieron afectadas por mi comentario. NUNCA fue mi intención pasar a llevar o insultar a alguien. – Vendetta, December 10, 2016

Bastian Gusman and Vendetta, two ex-soccer players, were commentating on an All-Star soccer match between Korean and Thai players when they began to make racial jokes about what

might have been going through the players' minds. They were quickly kicked off the set, and later both decided to go to Twitter in order to issue their public apologies. Both are quite similar and cover the same occurrence, so I shall be analyzing them together.

Both commentators begin their statements by saying that they apologize to everyone they offended during the live broadcast. The main difference would be that Gusman addresses those who felt offended while Vendetta asks forgiveness from those who were affected by his comments. Both phrases directly address the Spanish people who were watching the broadcast; however, a problem still persists.

The fact that they were both in trouble for racist comments means that they should in fact be apologizing directly to the players that they insulted as well. Whether or not the absence of mentioning the Korean and and Thai athletes was intentional, this decision opens up the possibility that the apologies were not completely heartfelt since they both fail to acknowledge the people they directly offended with their impolite acts. So essentially "the speaker[s] do not deny [their] involvement in the offensive act but abstain from openly accepting responsibility" all the same (Blum-Kulka, 1989: 292). They would have been able to create much stronger apologies had they been able to specifically include these athletes.

Continuing with the analysis, both Vendetta and Gusman finish their apologies by claiming that they never intended to cause any harm to anyone with what they said. As I have argued previously, this is slightly contradictory because they knowingly said comments that could not have possibly been seen as appropriate or friendly. So while they do take responsibility by providing the apologies, they both strive to show a lack of intent as their main defense, which is a rather weak strategy amongst apology-making techniques. So yes, they do accomplish their

goal of issuing a public statement. However, it remains clear that they could have done a better job at saving face with a wider A if they had composed their tweets differently.

(9)   "Pido disculpas a la gente, cuerpo técnico y compañeros" – Valencia CF, September 11, 2016

Enzo Perez, captain for the soccer club Valencia CF, published this tweet after his struggling team suffered yet another loss. Whether or not the loss was in direct correlation with his poor performance or a single error on his part is not known, so we will assume that he issued the apology out of proper protocol since he holds the players' highest leadership position.

This tweet is short, simple, and very much to the point. The head act opens up with him simply stating that he apologizes, and then is very briefly followed up by a list of those to whom he is apologizing. While there is nothing different that is worth noting in the first half, the second half is quite interesting because Perez includes not only the team's fan base, but those who are employed by the soccer club as well. This simple apology allows the captain to take full responsibility for the team's poor play, and in doing so removes said responsibility from his teammates and coaching staff. Even though the loss was not entirely his fault, Perez continues to ask for forgiveness from everyone involved with his team.

While it may not completely let his team off the hook, this humble act allows the soccer star to redirect any negative comments about the team and focus the attention solely on him for a moment, almost as if he is offering himself as a scapegoat. This selfless act gives this very brief apology a much stronger source of genuineness than it may display solely on the surface.

(10)   "Pido disculpas a todos y especialmente a Edimar por mi acto irreflexivo en el partido de hoy" – Cristiano Ronaldo, January 24, 2015

Famous soccer player Cristiano Ronaldo went to Twitter to apologize for his reckless hit on an opposing Córdoba player, Edimar, during a game that resulted in his receiving a straight red card and immediate ejection. He too begins his tweet with the head act "pido disculpas", and then instantly turns to addressing whom he wants to apologize to. While it is very important that he apologizes to his fans, Ronaldo takes care to put emphasis on the fact that he especially wants to apologize to the player that he hit. This is important because he is asking the person he caused the most harm to for forgiveness. In the English tweets, we saw many celebrities opting to instead appeal to the masses, almost as if they were trying to save face from their fans more so than the person they transgressed against. So by citing Edimar, Ronaldo put himself in the weaker position between the two in their relationship because he was seeking forgiveness.

It is important to focus on this last statement because of just how famous Cristiano Ronaldo is. In the soccer world, he holds the most power that any professional player can hold, immediately overshadowing almost every other player with both his talent and popularity. That being said, he throws away this idea of needing to maintain his authority and humbly acknowledges his wrongdoing against an opponent. This allows his fans to see him in a more natural light, and that he is not above trying to make amends for his mistakes.

(11) "Chicos lo siento por mi comportamiento en el directo de ahora pero el Ultimate team saca lo peor de mi…" – SauuK, October 23, 2015

SauuK is a famous YouTube and Twitch streamer who records himself for others to watch while he plays videogames. Due to his popularity, people will pay him in order to subscribe to his channel and encourage him to continue this form of entertainment. So when SauuK begins to act poorly during his videos as a result of the video game, it reflects poorly on the overall quality of his stream, hence why he felt it necessary to apologize to his fans.

SauuK takes a different approach by stating that he is sorry during his head act. In my opinion, he takes this familiar tone in order to better connect with his fans on the same level. After all, he is unlike other well-known names because he is actively engaging in chat rooms with his followers, so he has already established an informal relationship with them all. This can further be established by the informal "chicos" he uses to address everyone at the beginning, which would have almost made it awkward had he tried to apologize more formally.

He then goes on to apologize specifically for his behavior, but then goes on to say that Ultimate team, the type of game he was playing, always tends to bring out the worst in him. On the surface, this would appear to be an excuse for his actions. And it is, in fact. However, this excuse is different because he is playing on the sense of humor of A, hoping that they too will be able to relate to him and understand that the game can easily make anyone frustrated. This adds to the informal tone of the apology, while at the same time allowing SauuK to establish some responsibility by pinpointing the cause of his poor behavior. In other words, he is able to save face and ask for forgiveness while at the same time maintain the easygoing relationship that he has created by addressing his followers exactly like he would a friend.

(12)   "Lo siento por este resultado. Apoyo al Señor Gato Y jugadores #VamosMálagacf" – Abdullah N Al Thani, January 8, 2017

Abdullah N Al Thani is the president of Málaga CF, a Spanish football team that has played poorly this year. So after yet another defeat, Thani took to Twitter in order to apologize for his team's poor play.

The speaker makes this tweet very brief and straight to the point, a point that makes it appear as if he is publishing it more so out of necessity than for the sake of seeking forgiveness. The head act, which does not include any intensifiers and only says that he is sorry, comprises

half of the entire apology. The other half is simply Thani saying that he is apologizing for the team's most recent loss. He then instantly switches over to advertising mode and tells everyone to continue supporting el Señor Gato, the team's new trainer, as well as the team in general.

This tweet is published with such a relaxed tone that it is almost hard to take seriously. The fact that he uses the exact same publication to promote his team that he does to apologize says that he is more concerned about ticket sales rather than saving face. As the team's president, he is the one who makes all the decisions as to which coaches get hired and which players get added to the roster. This would make him one of the more important people to blame for the team's lack of success. Despite this, he does not express any sense of taking responsibility in the tweet, nor does he try to promise for better results in the future. Therefore, Thani would have benefitted more from this apology had he tried to appear a little more humble and connect with his fans rather than simply post an unoriginal apology.

(13) "Lo siento por hundir al equipo los últimos partidos! Cabeza fría y a mejorar #baskonia"
– Rafa Freire Luz, November 26, 2016

Rafa Freire Luz is yet another professional soccer player who turned to Twitter in order to apologize to his team's fan base for a string of poor performances. This tweet is unique though because Luz blatantly comes right out and says that he is the sole reason his team is losing, and by doing so takes on complete responsibility. So even though his head act does not contain any intensifiers or more emotional vocabulary, the speaker instead invokes his genuineness by accepting all the blame for the club's failures. This adds to the apology in its own way, because fans would know that only one man was hardly to blame for all the losses that had occurred during the season. So, by spanning his apology to cover not one but many games, Luz is able to overcome his lack of formality and connect with his followers.

He then states that he will aim to keep a steady head and continue to improve in the future. This offer of reparation makes the apology even stronger because he is offering to provide exactly what his fans want, better play in the next game. As a professional athlete, this is the best gift he can offer to those who support him. So not only is he taking on responsibility for the past, but he intends to make right by improving the future, making this a very simple yet powerful apology.

(14)   "Hola @rafinha, lo siento mucho por la mala noticia, no fue mi intención hacerte daño. Espero verte pronto en el campo, un fuerte abrazo!" – Radja Nainggolan, September 17, 2015

During a soccer game, professional player Radia Nainggolan ended up in a nasty tackle with Rafinha Alcántara that resulted in Alcántara sustaining an injury. Nainggolan then published this tweet to try and apologize for his rough play.

Before getting to the head act, I think it is important to note here that while the speaker has selected twitter as his platform, he directs this tweet solely to Alcántara. This is interesting because if he only wanted to address the one person with his apology, it would have made more sense to try and obtain his personal contact information. However, Nainggolan takes advantage of how fast and convenient Twitter makes it to try and contact celebrities. So after learning that his opponent would be sidelined for a few games, Nainggolan utilized Twitter so that he might speed up the delivery of his apology in order to adhere to the third party observers. This act of timeliness adds to the overall effectiveness of the apology because it demonstrates that the speaker was emotionally invested in finding out whether or not the subject was doing okay.

As for the tweet itself, here we are presented with the first intensifier used in conjunction with "lo siento". Yes, he is only adding one word to the phrase. However, that one word, "mucho", helps distinguish this tweet amongst others that use "lo siento" as the main act because

he is placing more emphasis on his state of regret for the accident he caused. This emphasis is further heightened when he says that he never intended to cause him any harm. Of course, this is another example of a lack of intent strategy that can be used to deflect some of the blame. However, I believe that this version is much stronger because the injury came as a result of a fast-speed sporting event. Nainggolan is not apologizing for comments he was caught saying, nor is he apologizing for an act where previous thought and planning would have been necessary. He is apologizing for an event where he was intending to pursue the soccer ball and his force accidently caused harm to another person. Therefore, it would seem odd for him to not say that he did not intend to hurt anyone with his play. This sense of humility is then further heightened by his cheerful addition of hoping to see Alcántara on the field in the near future, as well as offering a hug.

While this is not exactly an offer of repair, it is important to note how the speaker makes a point to express his desire to meet up with the player on the pitch again. This seemingly genuine plea removes any suspicion that the speaker planned a dirty tackle in order to injure his opponent, and also adds a new level of affection that is rarely seen during an apology that is not face-to-face. It is unique to see that he used Twitter in order to apologize as well as set a peaceful tone for their next encounter.

(15)   "Me disculpo con todos ustedes por ser muy noob en pvp :(Solo tengo 3h para jugar y las dedico a su entretenimiento en Twitch perdónenme xD" – iTheEndeer, November 29, 2016

Here we have another example of a streamer who felt the need to apologize to his fans after some poor quality from his videos. The difference though lies in the fact that iTheEndeer is apologizing for his lack of talent. While this may seem to be something not worth apologizing for, skill level happens to be an important criteria factor for streamers to possess because their

fans want to be entertained. In other words, they do not want to pay to watch an average eSports athlete.

Here we see a different twist to the head act with the use of a reflexive verb. Just the fact that iTheEndeer is using the performative *me disculpo* rather than *lo siento* already adds to the regret level, which in turn adds strength to the overall tweet. This opener would also imply that the streamer knows his crime is a little worse than simply failing to upload a video on-time or swearing on-camera. Therefore, the deeper head act is appropriate for the situation.

However, the rest of the tweet takes a rather informal tone, especially when we consider the use of emojis that occur twice throughout the tweet. This sense of informality, which is followed up by his explanation that he prefers to dedicate his time to entertaining via Twitch, implies that the speaker is attempting to create an environment comparable to one joking around with a close friend. The entertainment comment could also suggest that the gamer is playing more poorly than usual in order to entertain a wider spectrum of his viewers, and therefore hopes that the more serious ones understand his predicament. Nonetheless, he then closes the apology with another head act where he excuses his poor performances, a move that demonstrates his humility in the situation.

(16) "Se ha exagerado mucho lo que dije pero, en cualquier caso, lo siento, me he equivocado y no volverá a ocurrir." – Gerard Piqué, October 15, 2014

Gerard Piqué, a renowned defenseman for the soccer club FC Barcelona, issued this apology after he was reported to have made many disrespectful comments towards two policemen that issued him a traffic violation. Piqué presents us with an unusual apology because he does not appear to try and create a very apologetic tone. He begins by claiming that the press greatly exaggerated his original comments, which implies that he would not even need to

apologize if reporters had stuck to the truth. Even though there is an apology in the latter half of the tweet, the fact that he begins by creating such a defensive tone, a strategy that is used not only in order to show a lack of intent but also to refuse acknowledging any guilt, partially diminishes the overall effectiveness of the tweet.

Why apologize if you are simply going to refuse to take blame for the comments? This question is of course answered simply by his need to try and save face in the public eye. Whether his comments were severe or not, the fact is that he still made negative comments about the police, an action that cannot go unnoticed for such a famous person as himself. Therefore, there is a very good possibility that he issued the apology as the result of an order to do so from one of his managers. Nevertheless, he does say he is sorry in his head act, and even follows up with an admission of guilt and a promise of forbearance in the future. This section of the tweet is a very simple apology, and was most likely written by someone other than himself. However, he does trigger a number of apology-making strategies that help strengthen his plea for forgiveness. No matter how bland or unenthusiastic the tone may be, he still is able to create comment that, if nothing else, takes on a very strong appearance of a sincere apology.

(17)   "Me gustaría pedir disculpas por el gesto a un sector de la grada respondiendo a lo insultos. Es algo que no se debería hacer." – Dani Carvajal Ramos, December 3, 2016

After his team had scored a goal, Dani Carvajal Ramos was photographed flipping off the opposing team's fans amidst his own team's celebration. He received criticism not only from those fans, but also from the soccer community in general. He then posted this apology on his Twitter profile to address the issue.

The head act of Ramos' apology appears to be one of the more formal introductions seen here as he states that he would like to offer his apologies. This much formality is rare to see on

Twitter; however, due to the severity of his actions, he accurately decides to present himself in a truly humble state. This act sets the regretful tone for the entire tweet as well, despite the fact the he continues to defend himself later on that he was responding to the insults that came from the stands. This small act of defense does impede his apology slightly, however he counteracts this by admitting that his actions should never have occurred. This comment displays his acceptance of responsibility, and helps add to the apologetic tone that he created earlier. Whether he actually was able to stop the loss of face he experienced from the photo is a good question due to how genuinely happy he appears to be, a fact which might account for the amount of humility he portrayed via his tweet.

 (18)   "Disculpen por no andar subiendo videos, pasa que hace unas semanas que estoy enfermo y aun no me recupero. Pero pronto volveré y será gg izi" – BarbaKahn, June 20, 2016

BarbaKahn, another famous online streamer, posted this apology after a prolonged absence of posting new videos. He defends himself very quickly by saying that he is sick and still has not yet recovered. Although this is a decent explanation due to the fact that he physically cannot stream very well in his current state of condition, he unintentionally pushes the blame towards something that is uncontrollable, suggesting that he is not completely at fault.

While this would normally weaken the apology, two other factors help strengthen it. First, his head act consists of him asking A to forgive him. By instantly asking for forgiveness, he makes a point to make it perfectly clear that not only does he realize he is in the wrong, but that he also wishes to be forgiven for this lack of new videos. This desire to seek his peers' approval instantly puts him in an apologetic state, something that can be harder to achieve when not face to face with the people you are apologizing to. Second, his promise to return very soon serves as an offer of repair so that his viewers know that they will receive what they desire very

soon. This reassurance that he is going to stream again is without a doubt the best, and possibly

the only, gift that BarbaKahn can offer A. Because of this, the weakened state of the apology that

occurred after the excuse was given is instantly strengthened once again.

(19)   "Pido disculpas a la afición y a todo mi equipo, no me queda más que levantarme una vez

más y aprender de este tropiezo que me pone la vida" – Rafa Marquez, April 22, 2014

This tweet came from Rafa Marquez, captain for Club León, as a result of him being

ejected from a soccer game for kicking a defenseless player in the back, an incident that sparked

instant criticism against his character. The head act of this apology is composed of him saying

that he apologizes, which of course is a stronger sentiment than simply saying that he is sorry.

However, this is quickly offset due to the fact that he apologizes only to his team and fans.

Nowhere does he even so much as mention the player that he kicked, let alone the other team or

their fans in general. Whether intentional or not, this lack of acknowledging his error in front of

the people he most offended is a major inhibitor on the overall quality of the apology. This is

problematic because even though he is admitting to making a mistake, he is only presenting this

admission to those that he knows will forgive him. Therefore, he is not truly seeking the

forgiveness of the injured party.

To add to this insult, he then goes on to say that he is going to learn from this incident.

Yes, this could be counted as a different take with the promise of forbearance strategy, but by not

directly apologizing to those he acted out against, we can assume that he in fact has not learned

from this mistake. He may have realized that he acted poorly, but by not caring enough to ask for

forgiveness from the right people, he not only portrays his lack of responsibility, he also weakens

his apology substantially.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

With regard to the first research question, it would appear that there is still a noticeable difference present between oral and written discourse. While the users of Twitter (written) were able to effectively control their emotions and utilize more apology or non-apology strategies, those appearing in YouTube videos were prone to using either scripted messages that they read or recited from memory, or became too flustered in order to create an effective apology. However, something that became quite apparent was the consistent use of the non-apology strategy among English speakers in an attempt to prove that there was a lack of intent towards causing any harm towards H. I would argue that this method not only distracts from the actual act of accepting blame, but it also weakens the overall effectiveness of the apology because one cannot completely apologize for their intentions. This is because it is hard enough for S to fully understand what his/her intentions were when the act was committed, let alone whether or not H or A actually believe that there were originally no ill intentions. Therefore, how is it possible to apologize for something that is impossible to understand? The answer is quite simply that it is not possible to do so, and therefore makes the strategy of trying to provide evidence that a lack of intent was present appear weak and ineffective.

It would also appear that the subjects in my study developed a new strategy that was not earlier expressed through the CCSARP coding manual. While the manual does take into account the methods of "showing concern" for the affected parties and establishing that S understands H's feelings, there is no area that covers a strategy where S tries to ambush H with overwhelming affection. In other words, if S loves H and respects him/her, it would therefore be impossible for S to have tried to disrespect H in any way, shape or form. I believe that this is a

good non-apology strategy that S can use to try and distract A from seeing that S is failing to completely accept blame for what he/she did. Because this strategy plays so heavily on emotions, it helps S appear more regretful for what happened, giving the non-apology the appearance of an emotional plea for forgiveness. That is why I believe that by showering H with affection, it is not possible for S to fully accept responsibility.

As for the second research question, after observing the material from social media, it would appear that Spanish speakers prefer to use apology strategies, while English speakers tend to stick with non-apology strategies. In other words, the Spanish speakers tended to accept responsibility without hesitation while the English speakers preferred to try and deflect that responsibility with explanations or other distractions. This discovery holds true to the observation originally made by Gonzáles-Cruz when she stated that "English speakers will tend to use more negative politeness strategies than Spanish speakers" (González-Cruz 2012: 548). To explain further, the English speakers in this study seemed to heavily favor giving an explanation or account as to why they did what they did, simply admitting facts instead of accepting responsibility for them, and making it clear that they did not intend to offend anyone with their actions. In other words, they focused more on distracting A from the situation so that they would not have to completely take responsibility. Meanwhile, the Spanish speakers preferred to offer repair, take on self-blame, and even offer the promise that they would not make the same error again.

Having said that, both groups did have quite a few similarities as well. For example, neither side refused to acknowledge their own guilt (at least directly), showed major concern for their subjects, nor acknowledged that the hearer's anger was justified. These similarities and differences could be due to the nature of both tweeting and appearing on live television and how

81

discourse has evolved over the years, but what remains abundantly clear is that English speakers tend to push blame away while Spanish speakers tend to take on as much blame as possible when issuing public apologies.

Continuing with this topic of similarity, it is quite clear that the use of multimedia did not change the overall use of the illocutionary act in creating an expressive, meaning that he same procedures given in the definition were used (i.e. using performative verbs, not having a direction of fit). Furthermore, the majority of the apologies occurred due to criteria that fell under Culpeper's impolite theory more so than polite theory specifically because whether or not the intent to cause harm was present, there was a clear distinction that the S in each situation attacked some belief or characteristic of the H.

Of course, one issue that did occur during this thesis is the difference in subjects amongst the English and Spanish speakers. For the English tweets, mainly performance celebrities were selected (i.e. singers and actors), while the Spanish tweets were predominately made by professional soccer players. While this does appear to create a distinct difference, I believe that the overall effectiveness of this thesis was not hindered by this due to the fact that both parties were roughly equal in public status. By this, I mean that the performance celebrities in the United States tend to be more well-known amongst the country's population, while the soccer players in Spain are in their own country's top tier of celebrity figures. So, this equality in popularity (amongst people in their own countries) allowed me to thoroughly analyze tweets from a group of people who all have a specific minimum amount of followers.

In fact, the use of such a variety in celebrities allowed me to observe a noticeable difference between how the public-face and public image of the celebrities were affected. As stated earlier, a number of the apologies appeared as if they had no interest in actually gaining

approval from H. Therefore, why would one bother to apologize when he/she does not care being forgiven? This is because the celebrities' public-face was damaged instead of public image. Because an offence was committed, each celebrity felt either obligated or pressured into issuing an apology. This is because by committing an FTA, he/she exited her normal line of behavior and went against the desires of A. However, the FTA did not hinder the overall success or image that he/she had built up for himself/herself over the years, rather it affected how the public currently viewed him/her as a person at that specific moment. Based upon how he/she normally acted in public, that celebrity gained a façade that he/she was expected to maintain for his/her fans. Therefore, the weaker apologies could have been published with no intent of manifesting signs of regret, but rather to portray to A that even though he/she acted poorly, it was all done to maintain the public image.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Language is forever changing, and with this change come new ways for S's to share their opinions with A on a grand scale. However, with these advances in technology come more opportunities for S to lose his/her face with the public. Therefore, it is still important for us to research and discover what strategies are most beneficial when trying to appropriately apologize for disrupting the wants of H. The positive politeness and negative politeness strategies introduced to us by Brown and Levinson still apply to today's discourse, so now we must discover how the CCSARP strategies can be used to allow S to save-face with not just H, but also the huge A that now has easy access to observing the timely discourse of S.

However, I believe that this analysis of tweets and videos has helped establish a new role amongst the S and H relationship. Typically, H is the direct recipient of the apology. Yet many of the examples provided in this thesis demonstrated that while H was the recipient of the apology, he/she was not the intended target. Therefore, I have realized that it would be prudent to include a new addition to this formula in the form of the Target (T). In this case, T was A that included all the fans/followers of the celebrities that were apologizing. In other words, while the apology may have been sincere and given with good intentions to H, gaining the approval of H was never the ultimate goal. Rather, the objective was to address A and make sure that S did not lose face in the public eye. Therefore, because S is able to use multimedia in order to reach out to H and A at the same time, we can no longer assume that H will always be the intended target with which S is trying to save face.

Through this research, I was also able to observe a closure in the gap between oral and written discourse. What I mean by this is that the two forms of communication are slowly

beginning to merge with one another. For example, Twitter acted as the form of written communication in this study because it allows S to think about what they are going to say, as well as review and edit, before they publish his/her statement. However, because Twitter is used in the same manner as instant messaging, and because my subjects wanted to tweet out their apologies as soon as possible, Twitter begins to adopt qualities that come with oral discourse. Users will publish tweets without thinking about what they just wrote, their attention instead focused on entertaining or addressing the attention of A. Meanwhile, YouTube presents S the opportunity to publish videos while reading from a prewritten script that may or may not have been written by someone other than S. So while the overall discourse is still oral, written qualities begin to seep into the communication. One possible clarification as to why this change in structure is occurring is because both applications allow the S to speak in his/her vernacular. Past methods of studying the difference between oral and written discourse were hampered because the subjects knew that linguists would examine their written transcripts and oral interviews. This means that while producing their data, the subjects would not be able to fully relax and engage in informal conversation. However, because my subjects did not know that I would by analyzing their publications, they were able to speak or write freely in an environment that they were comfortable in. Yes, there is an air of formality to their apologies because they are attempting to seek forgiveness. However, because they were targeting their fan base and not a group of researchers, the S's were forced to maintain the public image he/she consistently portrays, and therefore was not allowed to speak in a manner unbeknownst to others. In conclusion, because this relationship between written and oral discourse is beginning to shrink, it would be effective for the field of research in speech acts to continue studying this difference through these new forms of communication.

This study can be used to help grow the area of research that focuses on discourse in multimedia, as well as speech acts directly and how their usage differs amongst cultures. I looked at whether or not differences between oral and written discourse were still present through the use of different multimedia applications, as well as whether English and Spanish speakers used different apology making strategies while using said applications. By analyzing two different types of data, I found that the Twitter users (or users of written discourse) were able to maintain their emotions and present more professional and precise apologies while the YouTube users (oral discourse) sometimes were forced to use prewritten scripts that he/she did not originally create, or were too flustered to create a noteworthy apology. On the other spectrum, I also discovered that Spanish speakers preferred to use more apology strategies and take full blame, while the English speakers tended to use non-apology strategies and deflect as much blame as possible. Overall, my discoveries have presented information over a newer area of research that includes technology with the discussion of how oral and written discourse differ amongst various cultures. Further research can now continue this trend with other forms of multimedia and speech acts in order to help us better understand the changes that are occurring in language.

Furthermore, there are a number of restrictions that could have limited the overall success of this thesis. For starters, the Firewalls in effect while searching for foreign tweets/videos inside the United States presents a limitation on the number of examples that could be obtained. Therefore, search engines on Google, Twitter and YouTube are not sufficient to act as the only sources for procuring data. One way of countering this issue would be to go directly to websites such as *El País* or other third party media companies that can bypass such Firewalls. This would enhance the data and allow for more accurate analysis.

Another issue would be the variety of dialects that are incorporated amongst the Spanish tweets and videos. Because there was a difficulty in obtaining the Spanish data, it was not possible to try and select only data from one particular Spanish-speaking region. Consequently, I cannot make generalizations over the apology methods used by Spanish speakers. I can only make generalizations about the data that was collected. So while my research does in fact answer the question as to whether Spanish speakers use different apology strategies while using Twitter and YouTube, it leaves open the need for future research to focus different particular dialects. This would then improve the information we have on the differences between English and Spanish speakers with apologies.

REFERENCES

Bell, A. (1984). Language syle as audience desing. *Language in Society*, *13*(2), 145-204.

Biber, D., Davies, M., Jones, J.K., & Tracy-Ventura, N. (2006). Spoken and written register variation in Spanish: A multi-dimensional analysis. *Corpora, 1*(1), 1-37.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Blum-Kulka, S., (1987). Indirectness and Politeness in Requests: Same or Different? *Journal of Pragmatics, 11,* 131-146.

Brown, P. , & Levinson, S. (2014). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. *The Discourse Reader*. Ed. Adam Jaworski, Ed. Nikolas Coupland. 299-311.

Chafe, W., & Tannen, D. (1987). The Relation Between Written and Spoken Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 16*(1), 387-407.

Culpeper, J. (2011). Politeness and impoliteness in interaction. Retrieved from htpp:/www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/events/alevel-ling/docs/EngLang_ALevel_teacher_Culpeper.pdf.

Davies, M. (2007). Corpus linguistics beyond the word corpus research from phrase to discourse. *Language and Computers – Studies in Practical Linguistics*, *60,* 73-85.

Doerge, F (2006). Illocutionary Acts: Austin's account and what Searle made out of it.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. (2003). Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in American English and Latin American Spanish. *Multilingua*, *22*(3), 225-255.

Goffman, E. (2014). On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. *The Discourse Reader*. Ed. Adam Jaworski, Ed. Nikolas Coupland. 299-311.

González-Cruz, M. (2012). Apologizing in Spanish. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (lPrA) Pragmatics, 22*(4), 543-565.

Kampf, Z. (2009). Public (non)-apologies: The discourse of minimizing responsibility. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(11).

King, J. (2012). Early Modern Spanish request modifications as politeness strategies: Implications for the study of registrar. In Lucía Fernández-Amaya et al. (Eds.), New Perspectives on (Im)politeness and Interpersonal Communication: Adcances in

Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis series. 138-156. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Maíz-Arévalo, C. (2013). "Just click 'Like'": Computer-mediated responses to Spanish compliments. *Journal of Pragmatics, 51,* 47-67.

Mast, G.J. (2015). Review of Battistella, Edwin L. Sorry about that: the language of public apology. *The Christian Century, 132*(1), 40-42.

Mohammed, H.N., & Abbas, N. F. (2015). Pragmatics of Impoliteness and Rudeness. *American International Journal of Social Science, 4*(6), 195-205.

Mulamba, K. (2011). The Use of Illocutionary Force Indiciating Devices in the Performance of the Speech Act of Apology by Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association, 44*(1), 83-104.

O'Halloran, K. L. (2011). Multimodal Discourse Analysis. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Discourse Analysis.* Ed. Ken Hyland, Ed. Brian Paltridge. 120-137.

Olshtain, Elite, 1989. Apologies across languages. In: Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., Kasper, G. (Eds.), Cross- Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Ablex, New Jersey, pp. 155–173.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classificiation of Illocutionary Acts. *Cambridge University Press*, *5*(1), 1-23.

Voinov, V. (2012). Review of: Impolitness: Using language to cause offence, by Jonathan Culpeper. *SIL Electronic Book Reviews,* 1-7

Wagner, Lisa . 2004. "Positive- and Negative-Politeness Strategies: Apologizing in the Speech Community of Cuernavaca, Mexico". International Communication Studies XIII-1. 19–27.

VITA

Adam Logan Majors, a native of Allen, Texas, received his Bachelor's Degree in Spanish from Oklahoma State University (OSU). He was accepted into the LSU College of Humanities and Social Sciences majoring in Hispanic Studies with a concentration in Linguistics. While acting as a Teaching Assistant, he has taught at LSU and worked to promote both the foreign languages department and benefits of studying foreign languages to his students. He anticipates graduating with his Master's degree in May 2017.