

'Tengo bien harto esperando en la línea': Complaint Strategies by Second-Generation
Mexican-American Bilinguals

by

Maria Elias

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2013 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Barbara Lafford, Co-Chair
Carmen García Fernández, Co-Chair
Álvaro Cerrón-Palomino

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2013

ABSTRACT

Complaints, characterized by LaForest (2002), are expressions “of dissatisfaction addressed by an individual A to an individual B concerning behavior on the part of B that A feels is unsatisfactory,” (p. 1596) have been studied in the language of English speakers since the 1980’s (Boxer, 1993a; 1993b; 1996; House & Kasper, 1981; Murphy & Neu, 1996; Trenchs, 1995; Vázquez, 2011; Wolfe & Powell, 2006). However, only a few studies on Spanish-language complaints have been carried out (Bolívar, 2002a; Márquez Reiter, 2005; Pinto & Raschio, 2008).

Due to the lack of studies analyzing complaints among second generation Mexican-American Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States, role-plays were collected from 21 participants, ten males and eleven females, who interacted with a female interlocutor. The data was analyzed using Spencer-Oatey’s (2005) Rapport Management in order to gain a better understanding of this population’s politeness strategies used in complaining both in Spanish and English. In addition to acting out the role-plays, the participants were asked to fill out a *Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire* (LEAP-Q), in order to assess language proficiency. Upon completion of the role-plays, the participants completed a post role-play questionnaire, which evaluated their impressions of the interactions. The strategies used in the complaints included, but were not limited to: complaining/accusing, reason/explanation/ justification, threatening, suggesting/requesting/commanding, and providing information. The results showed that for the Spanish complaints the participants preferred the use of reason/explanation/justification, while they preferred suggesting/requesting/commanding in the English complaints. In addition, in both situations the participants chose to respect

the association principle, however, this result was not statistically significant. With respect to face sensitivities, the participants chose to enhance the interlocutor's identity face in both the English and Spanish. It is concluded that these participants do not demonstrate a transfer of strategies from one language to another. Furthermore, no significant gender differences were observed. Moreover, the participants show a tendency toward positive politeness, which falls in line with other Hispanic cultures such as Cubans, Spaniards, Argentines, Uruguayans, Peruvians, and Venezuelans. Although this study adds to the literature of Spanish in the U.S. pragmatics, further study of this population is needed.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my loving grandparents, Gilberto and Barbarita Martinez.

They came to this country to give our family a better life and this project is a result of that.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must acknowledge and thank many people who made this entire process possible. First off, I would like to thank the participants who willingly chose to be a part of this study. I could not have done it without them.

I would also like to thank my family for their constant "échale ganas." My success is our success and one day it will all make sense.

Many thanks to my committee, Dr. Carmen García, Dr. Barbara Lafford, and Dr. Álvaro Cerrón-Palomino. Dr. García, thank you for opening my eyes to the world of pragmatics, I will be forever thankful. To Dr. Lafford and Álvaro, thank you for your constant support, helping me refine my skills, and seeing my potential. The three of you have helped mold me into the linguist and researcher that I now am.

I must also acknowledge the efforts of several people who gladly took the time to help me through the data collection and writing process. My sincere thanks go to Carly Henderson, Melissa Negrón, Aaron Carriere, and Mariana César. I owe you guys one! Also, many thanks to Jeremy Block, who walked the dangerous streets of Tallahassee to help me put my references together. A special thanks to Malena Manuel, who helped revise this thesis. You done improved my grammar!

Lastly, to my loving friends, Isabella Calderon, Melissa Martinez, Jackie Myers, Vanessa Fonseca, and several others. Thank you for always believing in me through the happy times, the sad times, and the crazy fun times. Thanks for always lending me your shoulder, ears, and hearts. I know I'm crazy, but that's why we are friends!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Theoretical Framework.....	4
Politeness Theory	4
Bilingualism	6
Literature Review	7
What are complaints?.....	7
Complaints in English.....	8
Complaints in Spanish	14
Pragmatic Studies on Spanish in the U.S.....	18
Justification of Study	22
Research Questions.....	23
3 METHODOLOGY	24
Subjects	24
Tasks.....	25
Data Analysis	29
4 DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS	30
5 RESULTS	38
Behaviorial Expectations	39

CHAPTER	Page
Spanish Complaints	39
English Complaints	43
Face Sensitivities.....	47
Spanish Complaints	48
English Complaints	49
Qualitative Results	51
Spanish Complaints	52
English Complaints	52
Summary of Results	53
Spanish Complaints	54
English Complaints	56
6 DISCUSSION	58
7 CONCLUSIONS	62
Summary of Results	62
General Conclusions	64
Limitations	65
Future Research.....	66
REFERENCES	68
APPENDIX	
A IRB APPROVAL	81
B POST ROLE-PLAY QUESTIONNAIRE	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Strategies Used in Making a Complaint in Spanish:	
	Behavioral Expectations	40
2.	Strategies Used in Making a Complaint in English:	
	Behavioral Expectations	43
3.	Identity Face: Spanish Complaints	49
4.	Identity Face: English Complaints	50

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Currently, the United States has over 50 million Hispanics residing in the country (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, & Albert, 2011), yet when it comes to the study of pragmatics of this population, little research has been done. The number of pragmatic studies on Spanish spoken of the United States is not as extensive as those studies done on Mexican Spanish (Bravo, 1998; Curc6, 1998; 2007; Curc6 & De Fina, 1993; 2002; Covarrubias, 2000; Farr, 2000; F6lix-Brasdefer, 2005; 2006; 2009; Koike, 1998; Quaglia, 1996; Schradder-Kniffki, 2007; Wagner, 1999), Spain Spanish (Arnaiz Abad, 1992; Ballesteros Mart6n, 2001; Chodorowska Pilch, 1997; Curc6, 1998; Curc6 & De Fina, 2002; D6az P6rez, 1999; Hern6ndez Flores, 2003; Le Pair, 1996; Lorenzo-Dus, 2001; M6rquez Reiter, 2002; Moreno, 2002; 2003; Placencia, 1998; Valeiras Viso, 2002; V6zquez-Orta, 1995), Ecuadorian Spanish (Albor, 1973; Bustamante-L6pez & Ni6o-Murcia, 1995; Cervone, 1999; Espinosa Apolo, 2000; Haboud, 1998; Hurley, 1995; Kany, 1951; Placencia, 1992; 1994; 1996; 1997; 1998; 2001; 2005), Argentinean Spanish (Alba-Juez, 2000; Boretti, 1991; 1999; Carranza, 1997; Cordisco, 2003; Ferrer, 2003; Garc6a, 2003; 2007; Granato, 2003; Kaul de Marlangeon, 1995; M6ccero, 2003; Noblia, 2001; Piatti, 2003; Rigatuso, 1999; 2000; 2002; 2003; S6nchez Lanza, 2003; Weber de Kurlat, 1941) Venezuelan Spanish (6lvez, 2002; 2003; 6lvez & Barros, 2001; Bol6var, 2001a; 2001b; 2001c; 2002a; 2003b; 2003; Edstrom, 2004; Erlich, 2003; Garc6a, 1999; 2002; 2003; 2004; Nieto y Otero, 2003) or Peruvian Spanish (De los Heros Diez Canseco, 2001; Garc6a, 1992; 1993; 1996; 2004; Sol6, 1970). There is no doubt that this void needs to be filled with further investigations that analyze the Spanish that US Spanish-English

bilingual speakers use on a daily basis. This paper seeks to analyze the pragmatic strategies used by one of these many US Spanish-speaking populations. In light of the growth of the Hispanic population in the United States, a 3.8% increase from 2000 to 2010 (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, & Albert, 2011), there should be a greater variety of studies that analyze the pragmatics of this diverse population.

Speech acts studies already carried out on this population include: requests (Arellano, 2000; García & Leone, 1984; Pinto & Raschio, 2007; Valdés, 1981; Walters, 1979; Zentella, 1997), compliment responses (Valdés & Pino, 1981; Yañez, 1990), leave-takings (García, 1981), and advice giving and suggesting (Youmans, 2001). However, to this day there is only one study that analyzes the pragmatic strategies used by this population when making a complaint. Therefore, the current study will add to the body of knowledge of research on Spanish pragmatics in the United States and shed light on the issue.

Complaints are a speech act that have been studied in English since the early 1980's among native speakers of English (Boxer, 1993a; 1993b; 1996; House & Kasper, 1981; Murphy & Neu, 1996; Trenchs, 1995; Vázquez, 2011; Wolfe & Powell, 2006) as well as foreign language learners of English (Morrow, 1995; Murphy & Neu, 1996; Nakabachi, 1996; Trenchs, 1995). In addition to studies on English complaints, complaints have been studied in a wide variety of other languages such as Hebrew (Olshtain & Weinback, 1987), German (House & Kasper, 1981), Japanese (Inoue, 1982; Kumagai, 2004), and Chinese (Arent, 1996; Du, 1995). Nonetheless, complaints, though studied in numerous languages, are not frequently studied in Spanish (Bolívar, 2002a; Curcó & De Fina, 2002; Giddens, 1981; Márquez Reiter, 2005; Pinto & Raschio, 2008;

Placencia, 2000). However, no studies to date have investigated how US bilingual Spanish-English speakers complain in those two languages. This study investigates the strategies that US Spanish-English bilingual speakers use in making a complaint and also analyzes any cross-linguistic influence that may occur, thus gaining a better understanding of the pragmatics of this important Spanish-speaking population.

This paper outlines the theoretical framework that is used to analyze the data collected, i.e., Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management framework, while drawing on various bilingualism theories in order to better understand this bilingual population. Subsequently, the paper outlines previous studies on complaints in both English and Spanish to provide a baseline of comparison for the data collected in both languages in this study. Next, this paper analyzes the complaint data collected from bilingual Spanish-English speakers, categorizing the various strategies employed by the participants according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) behavioral expectations, i.e., whether they fall into the equity principle or the association principle. The results are analyzed according to whether the strategies enhance or threaten the face of the interlocutor. Afterward, the data is related to the previous studies discussed in the literature review in order to see if the results of this study agree with those of prior studies. The final section of this paper draws conclusions, discusses any limitations that may have affected the results of this study, and suggests topics for future research.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Framework

Politeness theory. The majority of works investigating speech acts have used the model proposed by Brown & Levinson (1987), however; this model has received much criticism such as its inability to be applied to languages other than English, especially non-western languages. In addition, the model has been criticized for focusing on the individual and not the social group (Blum-Kulka, 1992; Sifianou, 1992; Wierzbicka, 1991). Other criticisms have included: pessimistic view of interaction (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1997; Mao, 1994; Nwoye, 1992; Schmidt, 1980), failure to note contextual factors and societal norms (Blum-Kulka, 1992), focus on strategic uses of language (Ide, 1989; Ide et al., 1992), and failure of accounting for impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996; Culpeper, Bousfield, & Wichmann, 2003). Also, Brown and Levinson's (1987) model did not account for various extra-linguistic factors, such as body language.

In contrast, Spencer-Oatey's (2005) model not only takes into account "face saving strategies in the presence of FTAs," (Placencia & Garcia, 2007, p.13) but also takes into account social relationships through the use of various components such as behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional goals. Spencer-Oatey defines behavioral expectations as the behaviors that the people within a society find to be appropriate according to the norms of the society. Behavioral expectations are divided into three different components: *prescribed*, *permitted*, and *proscribed behavior*. *Prescribed behavior* is obligatory behavior, *permitted behavior* is socially accepted behavior, and *proscribed behavior* is socially forbidden behavior. In addition to the

different types of behaviors, in this model there exist different domains within the conventions. These domains are the *illocutionary domain* (function of the speech act), *discourse domain* (structure of the interaction), *stylistic domain* (the style of the conversation, tone, syntax, or address forms), and the *non-verbal domain* (the non-verbal aspects such as gestures or body language).

In addition, Spencer – Oatey (2005) states that the behavioral expectations can be a result of *interactional principles*, which are categorized into two subordinate principles, i.e., the *equity principle* and the *association principle*. The equity principle is comprised of three components, *cost-benefit considerations* (the belief that people should not be exploited or taken advantage of), *fairness-reciprocity* (the belief that costs and benefits should be fair and in balance), and *autonomy-control* (the belief that people should not be controlled or imposed upon). The association principle also has three components: *involvement* (the idea that people should have appropriate amounts of interaction with others), *empathy* (the idea that people’s feelings and interests should be taken into account), and *respect* (the idea that people should show certain levels of respect to others).

Aside from the behavioral expectations, Spencer-Oatey (2005) distinguishes between *respectability face* and *identity face*. *Respectability face* refers to the prestige or honor that a person or social group attempts to claim. *Respectability face* is a composite measure that reflects different attributes such as biographical (age, sex), relational (marriage ties), social status indicators (education, occupation), formal title/position/rank, personal reputation (moral or amoral) and integrity. In contrast, *identity face* is the “positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he

has taken during a particular contact,” (Goffman, 1967, p.5). *Identity face* reflects the “people’s social values, specific social attributes, and specific social encounters/ interactions,” (Spencer-Oater, 2005, p.103). Spencer-Oatey (2005) also includes “claims to social group membership,” (p. 103) to her definition of *identity face*.

The last component of Spencer-Oatey’s (2005) *rapport management* model is *interactional goals*. These goals can either be *transactional* or *relational*. A *transactional goal* seeks to achieve a specific task, such as making a business deal. A *relational goal* seeks to maintain an effective relationship, such as maintaining a friendship or exerting control. In some cases these goals are interrelated because you need to reach a relational goal in order to achieve a transactional goal, such as befriending a CEO of a company so that he will sign an account with your firm.

Bilingualism. The term bilingualism has a wide range of definitions depending on the degree of bilingualism. Edwards (2004) goes as far to say that all adults are bilingual because “who does not know at least a few words in languages other than the maternal variety,” (pp. 7). Nevertheless, terms such as: *balanced bilingual*, *passive bilingualism*, and *productive bilingualism*¹, have been coined to describe the degree of understanding of two languages. In this study, the term bilingual will be more closely associated with the definition of a *balanced bilingual*, that is to say a person who has roughly the same level of proficiency in both languages (Edwards, 2004).

In addition to the degree of bilingualism, various studies (Bergman, 1976; Genesee, 2000; Goodz, 1986; 1989; Lindholm & Pandilla, 1978; Meisel, 2004; Muysken,

¹ Edwards (2004) defines a *balanced bilingual* as a person who has mastered the same level of proficiency in both languages. He also defines *passive bilingualism* as the ability to understand speech and written text in the language, while *productive bilingualism* refers to the ability to not only understand speech and written texts, but also the ability to produce the language.

2004; Pye, 1986; Redlinger & Park, 1980; Swain, 1972; Volterra & Taeschner, 1978) have discussed the linguistic system that bilinguals possess. It was once believed that language was a unitary system (Swain, 1972; Volterra & Taeschner, 1978); however, more recent studies (Bergman, 1976; Genese, 2000; Goodz, 1986; 1989; Lindholm & Pandilla, 1978; Meisel, 2004; Pye, 1986; Redlinger & Park, 1980) allude to the fact that bilingual speakers have two different linguistic systems. Evidence from these studies have shown that bilingual children initially do not make a distinction between the two language systems but with time, the children develop distinctive systems and are able to maneuver within one language better.

Literature Review

What are complaints? A complaint is an expression “of dissatisfaction addressed by an individual A to an individual B, concerning behavior on the part of B that A feels is unsatisfactory,” (LaForest, 2002, p.1596). Moreover, this speech act is what Brown and Levinson (1987) would consider face-threatening because of the potential damage to the positive face² of the interlocutor upon making the complaint. Márquez Reiter (2005) would go as far to argue that a complaint also damages the positive and negative face of the person making the complaint because they do not wish to be seen as a “whiner,” given the context of the complaint. Nevertheless, different forms of complaints also exist depending on the expression of the complaint. A direct complaint explicitly expresses dissatisfaction to the interlocutor while an indirect complaint is expressed implicitly. This also depends on the context, whether the complainer has some sort of relationship with

² Brown & Levinson (1987) define positive face as the “want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others,” (p.62). They also negative face as the “want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others” (p.62).

the offender or if that person is a complete stranger to the complainer. These factors ultimately have an effect on the directness of the complaint.

Complaints in English. Complaints in English have been widely studied since the 1980's. One such study was carried out by Wolfe & Powell (2006), which analyzed the gender differences in the number of complaints made by men and women. The study video recorded three groups of three American students, each on two separate occasions as the groups worked collaboratively on a group project for a class. The complaints were coded according to whether they were targeted or untargeted (direct vs. indirect), the function of the complaint, and the focus of the complaint. The results showed that there were no significant differences in the number of complaints made by women vs. men. In addition, there were no differences between the use of targeted and untargeted complaints by each gender. Also, the results indicated that males used complaints to project superiority and excuse behaviors or actions while women used complaints as a way to indirectly request some sort of remedial action. The study concluded that women use complaints as an indirect way to influence others' actions.

The limitations of this study include the small number of participants, as it is difficult to make generalizations regarding the population as a whole when the study had only nine participants. The study also only looked at complaints in a semi-formal setting, i.e., students discussing a group project in class. It would be beneficial to analyze these gender differences in different contexts in order to see how men and women behave when using different levels of formality.

Another such study is one by Trenchs (1995), where she analyzed the strategies used by native English speakers, native Catalan speakers, and EFL Catalan speakers. This

study utilized written discourse completion tests (DCTs) and surveyed 67 people (20 Americans, 20 native Catalan speakers, and 26 EFL Catalan speakers). Trenchs (1995) aimed to analyze the semantic formulae the participants would use in complaint situations, in which situations would the native speakers remain silent, and she wanted to determine if there was any pragmatic transfer in the EFL Catalan speakers. With respect to the native English speakers, Trenchs (1995) found that in intimate situations both men and women used the following semantic formulae: opener, remedy, and justification. In some cases the speakers would follow the justification with an expression of gratitude. In situations where there was more social distance, such as a noisy neighbor, Trenchs (1995) found some gender differences; all the men stated they would confront the neighbor directly while the women stated they would either talk to the neighbor the next day, call the neighbor, bang on the wall, or call the police. In terms of the semantic formulae, the native English speakers had an opener, a remedy, the adjunct *please*, and a justification. The women English speakers would follow the justification with an act statement. Finally, in situations with further social distance such as a noisy movie-goer, the native male English speakers chose to be more verbal than the native female English speakers. Although this study analyzed complaints given by three distinct groups, it provided an overview of the strategies and semantic formulas that native English speakers would use in making a complaint in three different social distances. The study did have some drawbacks, such as the unequal number of male and female participants. In addition, the study utilized a written DCT, according to Félix-Brasdefer (2003) role-plays not only show higher frequencies of strategies in comparison to written DCTs, but role-plays also allow for an entire conversation to be observed. Just as well, Trenchs (1995) does not

provide sufficient examples when discussing her results. The inclusion of the examples in the study would have assisted in better understanding the results of the study.

In addition to the previously mentioned studies, Boxer (1993a) studied the complaint strategies used by native English speakers and non-native English speakers whose native language was Japanese. The data for the native speakers of English consisted of 533 indirect complaint exchanges within 426 sequences by 295 interlocutors, 195 women and 100 men. The data was audio recorded in various locations, such as homes, restaurants and student lounges or classrooms, as well as field notes by the researcher. In addition to this data collection, Boxer (1993a) recorded conversations with native speakers of English and focused on the social functions of the indirect complaints as well as interviews focusing on the norms of the community studied. The data from the native English speakers showed that commiseration³ was the most used strategy. The other strategies used by these participants were joking/teasing, non-substantive reply, question, advice/lecture, and contradiction. In the data from the non-native speakers, commiseration was also the most widely strategy. Boxer (1993a) concludes that with respect to the native English speakers, indirect complaints function as solidarity building.

In addition, Boxer (1993b) utilized the same data from Boxer (1993a) however this study focused on social distance within indirect complaints. The study used Wolfson's *Bulge theory of social distance*, which states that most solidarity-establishing behaviors will occur among equals, such as friends or acquaintances. Boxer (1993b)

³ Boxer (1993a) defines commiseration with the following example:

A: My husband is in Greece this week, so I'm packing myself. Most of it is books and manuscripts.

B: Oh, that's the worst!

A: I told him that after this move I'm never moving again.

B: That's what I said after our last one. It's tiring.

categorized indirect complaints into three different types: *self*, *other*, and *situation* (which were further divided into *personal* focus and *impersonal* focus). The results showed that in regards to the *Bulge* theory, indirect complaints are always skewed towards, i.e. has a bias for, strangers in *self* and *impersonal situation* complaints and towards intimates in *other* and *personal situation* complaints. With regards to responses of commiseration, *Bulge* was skewed towards strangers. Boxer (1993b) concludes that commiserating is skewed towards strangers because commiseration tends to be used as a conversation opener, thus creating a temporary bond or a relationship with a stranger.

Boxer (1996) utilized the ethnographic interviews previously reported in Boxer (1993a). The purpose of the ethnographic interviews was to better understand the social cultural norms of the community in order to get a better understanding of complaints. Boxer (1996) reported on the findings from the second set of ethnographic interviews, which was more of an open-ended conversation in comparison with the first set of ethnographic interviews, which were close-ended and did not allow for much flexibility. A total of ten interviews were performed by acquaintances of the researcher. Boxer (1996) reported on the following eight topics: perceptions of direct and indirect complaining, perceptions of indirect complaint responses, social distance, gender, ethnicity, indirect complaints as conversational openers, troubles-telling and the academic community, and the negative image of complaining. Some of the conclusions that Boxer (1996) drew were that indirect complaints are a positive activity and an important part of “small talk.” Although both genders participated in complaints, women received more indirect complaints. Boxer (1996) concluded that this might occur because of the perceived supportive nature of women. In addition, with respect to ethnicity, the

participants concluded that the Jewish community tended to complain more than any other ethnicity. Moreover, the world of academia is prone to complaints, which Boxer (1996) noted could be due to the willingness to debate within this community. While Boxer (1996) did not utilize any quantitative data, the information and conclusions drawn from these ethnographic interviews allow for a better understanding of indirect complaints within North American English.

House and Kasper (1981) studied complaints and requests in both German and English in order to assess the different norms within the two cultures. The study used a total of 48 conversations, 24 in English and 24 in German and revealed that the Germans speakers were more direct than the English speakers when complaining. In addition, the native English speakers tended to use upgraders with their complaints, which the authors interpret as the English speaker's way of compensating for their lack of being more direct. House and Kasper (1981) concluded that the level of directness in both cultures worked within those cultures; however, if a German speaker were to use his or her direct strategies within the English speaker's culture, then the German speaker may be seen as impolite.

Moreover, Murphy and Neu (1996) studied complaint production by 14 American males and 14 Korean males in English. The study consisted of three components where the situation dealt with the participants discussing their grade with their professor. The American males tape recorded their responses to the situation, the Korean males tape recorded their responses in English, and finally 27 American males were asked to judge the production of the non-native speakers of English based on aggressiveness, respectfulness, credibility, appropriateness, and differences in approach. The results

showed significant differences in the production of complaints between the native speakers and the non-native speakers of English. All the native English speakers produced a complaint while only three of the non-native speakers produced a complaint in their role-play with a “professor” over their grade. The other eleven speakers produced a criticism. Within the complaints produced by the English native speakers the following semantic formulae were found: explanation of purpose, complaint, justification, and candidate solution: request. Within this formula the English native speakers used the following strategies: acceptance of partial responsibility, depersonalization of the problem, use of questions, use of mitigators, and use of the pronoun “we.” Some of the limitations of this study included the small number of participants and use of oral discourse completion test. Kasper (1999) demonstrated that role-plays were a better approximation of spoken discourse. In addition, the study only looked at one type of complaint, student to professor. It would be beneficial to analyze complaints from various degrees of social distance and power in order to see the difference in strategies. Nevertheless, the study provided valuable information in the study of English complaints by both native and non-native speakers of English.

A more recent study of English complaints is a study by Vázquez (2011), where she analyzed a total of 100 online complaints from the website *TripAdvisor*. The results demonstrated that about a third of the complaints included a positive review in conjunction with a negative one. Also, the complaints occurred along with other speech acts such as, advice or recommendations. Vázquez (2011) also noted that although these complaints would be considered indirect, there were cases of direct complaints in the form of addressing the hotel or its employees directly. Moreover, about a third of the

complaints mentioned that their expectations were not met by the hotel. In addition, out of the 100 complaints recorded, only one-fifth made an explicit reference to making a complaint. Nevertheless, although Vázquez (2011) is one of the only studies that addresses online complaints, the study only focused on one website and one genre, hotel reviews. Also, the study only looked at 100 complaints, which is a small number of complaints considering the feasibility of gathering more complaints from websites. This study was effective in documenting this type of complaint and may be considered a starting point for further research.

Complaints in Spanish. As previously stated, complaints have not been widely studied in Spanish. However, Bolívar's (2002a) study is one of the few that has analyzed complaints in Spanish. The study surveyed fifty Venezuelan university females ages 18-25, who were asked to complete a written discourse completion task (DCT) in complaint scenarios. The tasks ranged from the private sphere, a friend failing to fill the gas tank after promising to do so when borrowing the car, to the public sphere, finding a stranger's dog going to the bathroom at the entrance of the participant's home. The women's responses were analyzed and classified into three types of strategies, alerters, directives, and evaluators. The results showed that there were many factors, e.g., social arena, distance, effect, motive, and severity of the offense, which influenced the results of the study. In the private sphere (breaking a promise), the most frequent strategy was a warning followed by personal evaluation of the offender. There were no requests for repair of the offense used by the participants in this situation. However, in the public sphere (a stranger's dog using your lawn as its bathroom) a request for repair of the offense was the most common strategy used. Other strategies included alerters and moral

instruction. However, Bolívar's study looked at the strategies used in making a complaint it failed to come to a conclusion on where Venezuelan woman stand in terms of a politeness culture. It also only utilized responses by women; it would have been beneficial to include responses by Venezuelan men in order to get a more complete accurate understanding of the pragmatics of complaints in Venezuela. Furthermore, the study utilized a written DCT; it would be extremely beneficial to gather naturally occurring data as well as role-plays in order to fully understand the strategies used in speech act of complaints. Bolívar's study is an excellent starting point for the study of complaints in Spanish but more research is needed.

Another study that focused on Spanish complaints is Márquez Reiter's (2005) study on complaint calls to a caregiver service company in Uruguayan Spanish. The focus of this study was on the *desahogo* or venting of the customers to the operator or employee of the caregiver service company. The study analyzed 15 authentic telephone calls recorded by one of the largest companies in Uruguay. The results showed that the pragmatic strategies used reflected Uruguayan socio-cultural reality in which *desahogo* is socially accepted behavior. This pragmatic strategy also functioned as a verbal means in which the participants express their frustration about the situation even though the situation could not be fixed. Aside from *desahogo* the participants used a wide variety of strategies to form their complaints: mention of urgency, reiterate claim, express ridicule, express disagreement, accuse company of fault, issue threats, and seek solidarity. Márquez Reiter was very effective in presenting the different strategies used by the population; however, her main focus was on one particular strategy, *desahogo*. It would have been beneficial to evaluate the acceptability of the other strategies in order to

evaluate which strategies are culturally acceptable and which are not. Despite some shortcomings, this study constitutes an excellent starting point for the exploration of the use of complaint strategies in the current study.

In addition, Curcó and De Fina (2002) studied responses to a variety of speech acts including complaints. 115 Mexican university students and 134 Spanish (Spain) university students were surveyed using two different questionnaires that tested social distance and the perception of politeness. The participants were given a series of situations and were asked to rate them on a five-point scale. In addition, the participants were asked to rate the politeness of imperatives. The results showed that the responses to a complaint were statistically significant in relation to the level of imposition.

Furthermore, in regards to the assessment of the imperatives, the Mexican participants found the use of the imperative to be less polite than the Spanish participants had found it. One of the drawbacks to this study is that it addresses the responses to speech acts, which (though beneficial), does not tell how the two cultures would make a complaint. Also the use of a questionnaire does not reflect how subjects would respond in more naturalistic contexts. The study points to interesting differences between the cultures in Mexico and Spain; however, further studies on complaints in Spanish need to be done.

Finally, there is one study that has analyzed complaint strategies by Spanish heritage speakers in the United States. Pinto & Raschio (2008) studied complaints in 21 heritage speakers, 40 native English speakers, and 22 native Spanish speakers through the use of a written DCT. The study analyzed the semantic formulas used by the three groups, the use of downgraders, the use of upgraders, and the number of words per complaint in three different complaint situations regarding: a roommate's loud music, a

friend's failure to return borrowed money, and a restaurant's delay in serving a sandwich. The results showed that the native Spanish speakers used more openers, for example "Hey Julie," in comparison to the heritage speakers and the native English speakers. In addition, the native English speakers and heritage speakers used more justification of speaker as a strategy, for example "I need the money to pay my bills." The authors note that this could be due to the mitigating effect of the strategy, which diminishes the impact of the complaint. Moreover, the authors note that the heritage speakers are more similar to the native English speakers in their use of semantic formulas. With regards to the use of downgraders, there was a significant difference between the heritage speakers and native English speakers. The heritage speakers had a preference towards no use of downgraders while the native English speakers had a preference towards use of one downgrader. With respect to the use of upgraders, Pinto & Raschio (2008) found no significant differences between the three groups. In addition, the word count per complaint was found to be significant between heritage speakers and native Spanish speakers. The results showed that heritage speakers on average used more words per complaint than the native Spanish speakers. Additionally, Pinto & Raschio (2008) examined more in depth the complaints made by the heritage speakers and concluded that subjectivizers (*"quisiera saber si me podrias pagar el dinero que te presté hace algunos días"*) and consultative devices (*"piensas que me lo puedes pagar pronto por favor"*) are used to mitigate the complaints and they noted the lack of English borrowings in the complaints, which the authors conclude could be for a variety of reasons, such as the nature of the instrument used in the study. Pinto & Raschio (2008) conclude that the heritage speakers in this study have their "unique intercultural style" due to the contact

that they have with both English and Spanish. Nevertheless, the study by Pinto and Raschio had its drawbacks, such as the use of a written DCT to gather data. It has been proven that role-plays are a more valid instrument when analyzing Spanish. In addition, this study did not have equal number of participants in each group, thus it is difficult to make comparisons between the three groups. Lastly, the complaint situations analyzed complaints in different social distances. This is an important aspect because we cannot know if the results are due to language interference or if it is due to the various degrees of social distance in the situations.

Pragmatic Studies on Spanish in the United States. The following section will briefly outline some of the pragmatic studies that have been done on Spanish in the United States. Since there is only one study on complaints that assess the Spanish found in the United States, it is necessary to point out some of the studies that have been done in order to get a better picture and understanding of the population that will be studied.

Requests are the most widely studied speech act in Spanish. Within the Spanish in the U.S. there have been six studies (Arellano, 2000; García & Leone, 1984; Pinto & Raschio, 2007; Valdés, 1981; Walters, 1979; Zentella, 1997) that have analyzed requests. Walters (1979) was the first to study requests. His study analyzed 32 Spanish-English bilingual children, mostly Puerto Ricans, and concluded that the children were more polite in Spanish than English. García & Leone (1984) analyzed the use of directives in two second-generation Mexican-American bilingual children. This study concluded that the children used more direct imperatives in Spanish with other children and used more indirect strategies with adults. Valdés (1981) investigated the use of code-switching to aggravate or mitigate a request in the spontaneous speech of Mexican-American bilingual

university students. The study concluded that code-switching was used to either aggravate or mitigate the situation. Zantella (1997) carried out a similar study with Puerto Rican children in New York City and found similar results to Valdés (1981). Arellano (2000) utilized written DCTs in order to examine the request strategies of 100 Mexican-American farm workers. The study showed that authority and level of imposition affected the strategy that was used. Also, responses that included mitigation were significantly more frequently chosen than responses with no mitigation. Finally, Pinto & Raschio (2007) used a written DCT with heritage bilingual speakers, native English speakers, and native Spanish speakers. The results showed that the heritage speakers were more similar to the native English speakers with respect to the level of directness. Also, in regards to the number of downgraders, the heritage speakers differentiated themselves from the Spanish and English monolingual groups, falling somewhere in-between the two monolingual groups. One of the major drawbacks of these studies is the lack of consistency in the theoretical framework, i.e. no use of politeness theories. This study utilizes Spencer –Oatey’s (2005) rapport management framework in order to assess the strategies used by the participants; however, the lack of studies utilizing a politeness theory makes it difficult to draw conclusions from these previous studies. In addition, the more recent studies of Arellano (2000) and Pinto & Raschino (2007) utilized written DCT’s which according to Félix-Brasdefer (2003) are not as valid of a tool in comparison to role-plays when used to study Spanish. However, the studies also failed to mention how the participants were assessed on their level of proficiency in both languages. This is an important factor because the level of proficiencies of the participants has a direct effect on the results of the studies.

Compliment responses are the second most studied speech act in the Spanish of the U.S. Valdés & Pino (1981) studied a corpus of spontaneous speech of bilingual speakers in social gatherings. The study compared the data from the bilinguals to both monolingual English speakers and monolingual Spanish speakers from Mexico and found both Spanish and English patterns in the bilingual speech. Valdés & Pino (1981) also noted that code-switching was a widely used compliment strategy by the bilingual speakers. Yañez (1990) analyzed 46 compliment responses in the spontaneous speech of Chicano women in family and church gatherings. The study showed that the speakers always responded to the compliment in the language in which the compliment was given. Also, the structure of the responses was more similar to the monolingual English speakers. It would have been beneficial to also study the strategies used by the participants in making the compliments. Both of these studies focused only on the responses to the compliments; however, a study of the compliments would have given a better picture into the speech act. In addition, Valdés & Pino (1981) did not mention the number of compliment responses that were used in the study, so it is difficult to comprehend if the number of compliment responses is large enough to make generalizations about the community studied. Yañez (1990) mentions the number of compliment responses, however, the number is small and is not sufficient to make generalizations about all Chicano women. Finally, a major drawback of both of these studies is that they fail to mention if language proficiency of the participants was measured. This aspect is important because it would help contextualize the studies and give a better understanding of how the speech act functions in the populations that were studied.

García (1981) studied leave-takings in a five-minute conversation between three generations of Mexican-Americans at a family celebration. The study showed that there was a four-step process when performing a leave-taking. The first step was to announce the intention of leaving. The second step was to gather personal belongings and departing family members. The third step was to joke and plan the next gathering and the fourth step was the expression of terminal exchanges and closings. García (1981) notes that this formula is pertinent to this Mexican-American family and the results would be different if the study focused on a monolingual Spanish speaking family in Mexico or even an English monolingual family. One of the drawbacks of this study is the size of the data used to analyze leave-takings. The data only consisted of a five-minute conversation with one family, so this formula cannot be generalized to all Mexican-American families in California. It would have been beneficial to study a larger sample of leave-takings in order to accurately conclude the formula used in performing a leave-taking. It would have also been beneficial to find studies or gather data by monolingual English and monolingual Spanish speakers, so that the results from this study could have been compared and thus, see if the formula used is closer to the formula used by Spanish speakers or English speakers.

Youmans (2001) examined the use of modals in the spontaneous speech of low working class Chicano women and two middle-class Anglo graduate students. The analysis focused on the use of modal auxiliaries (can, could), lexical verbs (you know, I think), and an adverb (maybe). Youmans (2001) concluded that the Anglo participants preferred negative politeness strategies while the Chicanos preferred to use positive politeness strategies. One of the major drawbacks of this study is the lack of control of

social class in the study. The Chicano women were of low working class while the Anglo women were of middle class. This difference could have affected the results because the language used during the conversations could have been altered by the Chicano women due to the social class differences. It would have been beneficial to control social class because then the results could be attributed to the actual politeness culture and not social class differences.

The studies mentioned in this section give a better understanding on the population that will form a part of this study. They demonstrate the types of strategies the participants prefer to use in various speech acts and give a better understand on the population. Some of the major drawbacks of these studies include the lack of politeness theories used to draw conclusions. In addition, most of these studies have failed to note whether or not the language proficiencies of the participants were assessed. This aspect is important because without it, it is difficult to assess whether the results are due to the level of Spanish proficiency of these participants.

Justification of study

As shown in the review of literature, to date, there are few studies on complaints in Spanish. There is also only one complaint strategy study done on the Spanish in the United States. Moreover, no study exists comparing the complaint strategies used in both English and Spanish bilingual speakers of the U.S. when speaking both languages. The pragmatic studies done on Spanish in the U.S. do not come to a conclusion regarding the politeness culture of which these speakers form a part. This is due to the fact that none of the studies utilize a politeness theory to discuss their findings or draw conclusions based on these theories. Therefore, this study aims to complement prior studies on complaints

and on Spanish in the US and form a part of the literature of Hispanic pragmatics and complaints in English and Spanish.

Research Questions

The following three questions will be addressed in the study.

1. What strategies are used in making a complaint in Spanish and English among Spanish-English U.S. bilinguals?
2. To what extent do complaint strategies differ in second-generation Spanish-English U.S. bilinguals when making a complaint in Spanish vs. English?
3. Do the strategies differ between males and female second-generation Spanish-English U.S. bilinguals when making complaints in Spanish and English?
4. Is there any cross-linguistic transfer in the strategies used by second-generation Spanish-English U.S. bilinguals in making complaints?

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Twenty-one participants were recruited for this study, ten males and eleven women. The participants were second-generation, Mexican–American bilinguals who have at least one parent born in Mexico who immigrated to the United States after the age of eleven. This criterion has been set because it would be assumed that Spanish is used in the home; thus, the participant may carry out the role-play comfortably or without worry concerning their Spanish proficiency. The participants average age was 21.6 years, the male participant average age was 22.4 while the female participant average age was 20.7. All the participants were university students at a large American university in the Southwest. Anyone who did not fit the specification of second-generation, Mexican–American bilingual was eliminated from the study. Also, any participant who rated their speaking and listening proficiency in Spanish or English on the *Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire* (LEAP-Q) as less than “good” was eliminated due to the fact that the purpose of the study is to compare the strategies this population uses in making a complaint in both English and Spanish and we did not want the participants language proficiency to affect the role-plays.

The participants interacted with a female interlocutor, or fixed person. This person did not change throughout the course of the study in order to keep a consistency in the study. The interlocutor was also a second-generation Mexican-American bilingual. She met the same criteria as the participants and also filled out Leap-Q. The interlocutor

had a speaking and listening proficiency of “excellent” in both languages so that her language proficiency did not greatly affect the results of the study.

Tasks

Role-plays were used in this study about complaints. The role-plays were recorded using an audio recorder on a university campus in Arizona in September 2012. The recordings took place in various quiet rooms on campus as to eliminate any outside noise. Once the participant arrived to the predetermined location, he or she was handed a role-play situation. The interlocutor, or fixed person, was also handed the role-play scenario; however, the interlocutor and participants did not receive the same set of instructions. Aside from the piece of paper that the participants received, they were told to have as natural of a conversation possible within the bounds of the role-play. No further details were given to the participants in order to not influence the results of the study. Each participant acted out a role-play with the interlocutor, calling for a complaint in English as well as in Spanish. Example:

Complaint situation in English (participant). You are at the library studying for an exam and the person sitting next to you is talking very loudly on the phone and you cannot concentrate. Talk to him/her.

Complaint situation in English (interlocutor). You are in the library studying when your friend calls you. Someone sitting next to you comes to talk to you.

Respond to what he/she says.

Complaint situation in Spanish (participant). *Usted lleva 10 minutos esperando en la cola para pagar sus compras en la tienda. De pronto una persona corta la cola y se pone delante de usted. Hable con él/ella.* (You have been waiting in line at the store to pay for your things for 10 minutes. Suddenly, you see someone in front of you cut in line. Talk with him/her.)

Complaint situation in Spanish (interlocutor). *Usted acaba de ponerse en la cola para pagar sus compras en la tienda. Otro/a cliente viene a hablarle. Hable con él/ella.* (You have just gotten in line at the store to pay for your things. Another customer comes to talk to you. Speak with him/her.)

Distractor situations were used along with the situations pertinent to this study, so that the participants did not figure out the purpose of the study.

Distractor situation (advice: participant). *Recientemente usted y su novio/a han estado peleando. Usted sospecha que él/ella lo/la está engañando. Usted sale a tomar un café con su mejor amigo/a. Hable con él/ella sobre la situación.* (Recently you and your boyfriend/girlfriend have been fighting. You suspect that he/she is cheating on you. You go out to have a coffee with your best friend. Talk to him/her about the situation.)

Distractor situation (advice: interlocutor). *Usted sale a tomar un café con su mejor amigo/a. Él/ella sospecha que su novio/a lo/la está engañado y habla con usted. Hable con él/ella sobre la situación.* (You go out to have a coffee with your

best friend. He/she suspects that his/her boyfriend/girlfriend is cheating on them and they speak with you. Talk to him/her about the situation.)

Distractor situation (refusal of invitation: participant). You run into a friend whom you have not seen in a long time. He/she is having a party this Saturday and invites you. You cannot go.

Distractor situation (refusal of invitation: interlocutor). You run into a friend whom you have not seen in a long time. You are having a party this Saturday. Invite him/her to the party.

Only the role-plays in which the participants are to make a complaint in Spanish or in English were analyzed for this study. The participants also filled out LEAP-Q (Marian et al., 2007), which gathered the participants demographic information along with gathering information on their self-assessed proficiency in both Spanish and English. The assessment of speaking, reading, and understanding spoken language proficiencies are based on a scale from 0 to 10. The numbers are related to a level of proficiency where 0 correlates to a “none” proficiency and 10 correlates to an educated native speaker proficiency. The other possible levels of proficiency are: very low, low, fair, slightly less than adequate, adequate, slightly more than adequate, good, very good, and excellent. As mentioned previously, any participant that self evaluated their speaking and listening abilities as less than "good" was automatically eliminated from the study.

LEAP – Q has been tested in two separate studies in order to assess its validity and the results from multiple regression and correlations analyses have proved that LEAP-Q is an effect and valid tool in assessing the language proficiencies of bilinguals. The results of the two different studies showed that self-reported reading proficiency was a better predictor of L1 performance while self-reported speaking proficiency was a better predictor of L2 performance (Marian et al., 2007).

Aside from naturally occurring data, role-plays are an excellent method to collect data. Both Kasper (1999) and Félix-Brasdefer (2003) have attested to the validity of role-plays. Félix-Brasdefer (2003) states when compared to written DCT's, role-plays are a more valid instrument when studying Spanish. Naturally occurring data would be the best option; however, given the nature of the study it would be difficult to capture enough complaint scenarios in natural speech to carry out this study.

In addition to the role-plays and LEAP-Q, the participants filled out a post role-play questionnaire. In the questionnaire the participants expressed their impression of the interaction as well as assessed their participation and the participation of the interlocutor throughout the interaction. The participants filled out a separate questionnaire for each role-play in which they interacted. Félix-Brasdefer (2003) has attested to the use of post questionnaires, and has stated that the use of questionnaires aide in the validity of the role-plays. Kasper (2000) has also demonstrated the validity of written questionnaires and has stated that the use of them is way to triangulate the data collection methods. The written questionnaire that was used in this study is an adapted version of the written questionnaire used by García (2009).

Data Analysis

The role-plays were transcribed utilizing the conventions designed by Jefferson (1986, pp. ix-xvi). The data was coded and analyzed according to the strategies used by the participants in the role-plays. Each strategy was categorized according to whether it enhanced or undermined the equity principle or the association principle (Spencer-Oatey's [2005] model). They were also categorized according to whether they enhance or undermine the interlocutor's identity face (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). Since the role-plays were done in both Spanish and English each strategy was coded and analyzed according to the language in which the role-play was performed. The frequency of each strategy from the role-plays will be shown as a percentage of the total strategies.

A proportions test and difference in proportions test were used to test the validity of the data, which is set at two different levels, .05 (95%) or at .01 (99%). According to Kachigan (1986: 184-185), "[t]ypically, we set $\alpha = .05$ or $\alpha = .01$, so that if the hypothesis H_0 is in fact true, we will erroneously reject it only 1 time in 20, or 1 time in 100, respectively... the value of $Z = 1.96$ [is] needed to discredit the null hypothesis at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance... For a significance level $\alpha = .01$, a value of Z greater than 2.58 is needed..." The strategies were also compared to see if there are any similarities or differences in the strategies used in each language and if a transfer of strategies from one language to another occurred.

Chapter 4

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

While making a complaint the participants used a variety of strategies to carry out the role-play. The following strategies were used by the participants in complaining in Spanish, English, or both: opener, providing information, reason/explanation/justification, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, complaining/accusing, expressing gratitude, granting permission to stay, requesting information, moralizing, negative evaluation, offering solution, preparator, expressing satisfaction, apologizing, promising to cooperate, expressing understanding, lack of intent to offend/impose, request for understanding, threatening, and sarcasm.

The following sections illustrate examples of each strategy used by the participants. The following abbreviations were used: *M1* and *M10* for the male participants, *F4* and *F12* for the females participants, and *I* was used for the interlocutor that participated in the role-plays.

1. Opener - The participants utilized this strategy in both languages. This strategy was almost always the first strategy used and was used to grab the interlocutor's attention.

F2 **Excuse me**, I am trying to study. Can you talk outside?

2. Providing Information - This strategy was used in both languages and gave information to the interlocutor about the situation that was occurring. In many instances this strategy occurred prior to the participants complaining to the interlocutor.

I Excuse me I'm on the phone.

F4 **We're in a library.** Can you please be quiet? I'm actually trying to do my work.

3. Preparator - This strategy was only used in the English complaint. A couple of the participants decided to warn the interlocutor of the approaching complaint.

F1 umm:: excuse me **umm sorry to bother you**, but um::: I'm studying for an exam that I have tomorrow: and I came down here so I could concentrate and can you like↑ tone it down a little please?

I I'm just, it's a really important call↑. It will be really quick.

4. Reason/Explanation/ Justification - The participants used this strategy in both Spanish and English. The participants found it necessary to explain to the interlocutor why they were complaining or requesting that the interlocutor take some sort of action.

I Excuse me I'm on the phone.

F4 We're in a library. Can you please be quiet? **I'm actually trying to do my work.**

5. Accepting Excuse/Explanation/Justification - Used in both languages, a few of the participants accepted the excuse, explanation, or justification that the interlocutor gave for committing the offense.

I I've been here just as long as you.

M2 **Well, I mean, it's ok**, I mean you can finish the phone call, but I would really appreciate it if you could just maybe take your other phone calls outside 'cause it's inappropriate when we're all studying.

6. Suggesting/Requesting/Commanding - Used in both languages, all of the participants either suggested, requested, or commanded that the interlocutor remedy the situation.

I Well, it's just a quick phone call and I need to keep studying after I am done.

M3 **ok, well maybe you should study outside and talk outside at the same time.** =

7. Rejecting Excuse/Explanation/Justification/Solution - Used in both Spanish and English, some the participants rejected the excuse, explanation, justification, or solution that the interlocutor gave.

I I don't know you. What if you take↑ something?

F1 **I'm not going to take anything!** I mean, just, well take all your stuff like we're trying to study.

8. Complaining/Accusing - Used in both languages, almost all of the participants either directly complained or accused the interlocutor of the offense she had committed.

I I thought I was whispering.

M6 Well you thought wrong. Stop, **you're really really loud**. If you're not going to be quieter, then I think you should move somewhere else, 'cause I'm really trying hard to study.

9. Expressing Gratitude - Used in both languages, some of the participants opted to thank the interlocutor at the end of the interaction for resolving the wrongdoing.

M2 Well, I mean, it's ok, I mean you can finish the phone call, but I would really appreciate it if you could just maybe take your other phone calls outside 'cause it's inappropriate when we're all studying.

I Alright, I'll do that.

M2 **Thanks.**

10. Granting Permission to Stay - Used only in the Spanish role-play, the participants allowed the interlocutor to stay in the line in front of them despite the fact that the interlocutor had cut him/her.

I *Usted tiene como muchas ↑ cosas y yo no más como unas dos. (0.2) Será muy rápido.* (You have a lot of things and I only have two. It will be really quick.)

F1 *Bueno, ya pues si pregunta, bueno si pregunta, **sí ya pásale**, al cabo no más tiene dos cosas, pero para la otra vez tenga respeto y ya que hay gente esperando también.* (Well, since you are asking, if you ask, **it's fine go ahead**, you only have two things anyways, but next time be respectful since there are people waiting as well.)

11. Requesting Information - Used in both Spanish and English, some of the participants requested additional information or clarification from the interlocutor.

I Well the phone call is going to be real quick.

M5 **How quick?**

I Ah::: I should be done in a couple minutes.

12. Moralizing - Used in both languages, a couple of the participants decided to utilize the "general moral maxims" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 288) in order to assert the expected behavior in the given context.

I Uh, I thought I was being quiet.

M2 Ye::ah:: I mean I'm sure you can notice everyone else around you is you know, **i-it's really inappropriate and** I feel you should uh maybe take the phone call outside.

13. Negative Evaluation - Only in Spanish, a few of the participants negatively evaluated the actions of the interlocutor for in cutting the line.

I *Pero ya se ya se va acabar la línea.* (But the line is about to end.)

F4 *No::: pero es que también no es justo, no sea no sea cruel.* (No::: but it's also not fair, don't be cruel.)

14. Offering Solution - Used in both languages, a few of the participants offered a solution to the offense that the interlocutor committed in order to resolve the matter.

I But all my stuff is right here.

M5 **I'll take care of it. Go ahead. Or go to the restroom, don't worry.**

I Well I don't really know you.

15. Expressing Satisfaction - This strategy was used only one female participant in English. The participant expressed content after the interlocutor ended the conversation on the phone.

I = Well my friend pretty much just hung up on me, so =

F1 = **Good!** =

I = happy?

F1 **Yes, I am very happy.**

16. Apologizing - This strategy was only used in the English complaint. The participants chose to apologize to the interlocutor about their complaint. This strategy was used after the participants had either directly complained to the interlocutor, or after suggesting that the interlocutor do something to fix the problem.

I But I don't really know you. So I don't want to leave my stuff with you.

M5 Oh, well, here at the library they have the policy that you can't talk on the phone and I really need to do this. **I'm really sorry to tell you this.** I hope I am not being rude, but I really need to concentrate on this.

I Alright I will just hang up.

17. Promising to Cooperate - Used only in English by the male participants. In this strategy the male participants assured the interlocutor that they would care for her belongs so that she could step away and finish her phone call.

I = I have all my stuff around here.

M10 I'll watch it, I'll watch it for you, **you don't have to worry about that.** =

I = I don't know you.

18. Expressing Understanding - This strategy was only used by the two male participants in the English role-play. The participants expressed understanding of the interlocutor's reason for talking on the phone.

I This is just an important phone call. (0.5)

M10 **Totally understandable**, do you mind if you take it outside? So that I can cram for this exam I have. =

I = I have all my stuff around here.

19. Lack of Intent to Offend/Impose - This strategy was used by two participants in the English complaint. The participants did not wish to be rude towards the interlocutor after complaining.

F6 I know, but it's been (0.2) about ten minutes and it's kind of rude cause I am trying to study. **I don't mean to be rude.**

I Has it really be ten minutes? I didn't know that. [I'm sorry]

20. Request for Understanding - One female participant requested understanding from the interlocutor in the English role play.

I Well, if it's an emergency why would I go outside? I mean I can just talk here and be done with it.

F2 I really need to study for this exam. **Please understand me.**

I Well there is other tables you can go to. I mean I'm not I'm not shouting.

21. Threatening - Some of the participants threatened the interlocutor with further action in the English complaint after she refused to get off the phone.

M10 Alright then, point well taken, if you could please grab your stuff and go outside and talk, **or I can have a librarian come and ask you to do that.**

I The phone like the phone call is almost over.

M10 Ok, (1.0) **if if you don't leave, I'm gonna get a librarian and to come (0.3) ask ↑ you to leave.**

22. Sarcasm - One of the male participants in the English complaint was sarcastic towards the interlocutor after she did not accept the request that the participant had given her.

M12 Yo, excuse me, (0.5) do you mind (0.5) talking a little lower there on your phone?

I I thought I was whispering.

M12 **I don't know (0.3) it might be a whisper to Jesus, but I can hear it. (0.5)**

Chapter 5

RESULTS

In forming a complaint in both Spanish and English the participants used a wide variety of strategies. These strategies include: opener, providing information, requesting information, reason/explanation/justification, granting permission to stay, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, suggesting/requesting/commanding, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, moralizing, offering solution, promising to cooperate, expressing understanding, apologizing, preparator, sarcasm, threatening, request for understanding, request for understanding, and expressing satisfaction. Opener, providing information, requesting information, and promising to cooperate were classified as respecting the involvement component because they showed that the participants wanted to engage in "activities" with the interlocutor. Expressing understanding and apologizing respected the empathy component because they demonstrate tolerance from the participants towards the interlocutor. Reason/explanation/ justification, lack of intent to offend/impose, granting permission to stay, and preparator were categorized as observing the respect component of the association principle because they demonstrate the participants regard for the interlocutor. Reason/explanation/justification offered a motive for the complaint, lack of intent to offend/impose and granting permission to stay demonstrated regard for the interlocutor. Meanwhile, preparators warn/prepare the interlocutor of the approaching complaint. Request for understanding violated the empathy component of the association principle because in asking for compassion, the participant reveals that the interlocutor has not taken into consideration the feelings/emotions of the participant.

Sarcasm violated the respect component because it demonstrated disregard for the interlocutor. Expressing satisfaction, accepting excuse/explanation/justification and expressing gratitude respected fairness-reciprocity because these strategies demonstrated the participants' willingness to maintain balance in the situation, despite the fact that the interlocutor had caused a grievance. Rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution violated fairness-reciprocity within the equity principle because it did not maintain equilibrium between the participants and interlocutor. The participant did not accept the interlocutor's reasoning for cutting in line, which creates an unbalanced situation because the interlocutor has caused the participant to be continuously unsatisfied. Lastly, suggesting/requesting/commanding, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, moralizing, threatening, and offering solution violated the autonomy-control of the equity principle because in using these strategies the participants imposed upon the free will of the interlocutor.

Behavioral Expectations

Spanish Complaints. In making a complaint in Spanish the participants used a wide variety of strategies, which include: opener, providing information, requesting information, reason/explanation/ granting permission to stay, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, suggesting/requesting/commanding, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, moralizing, and offering solution. The complaint strategies were sorted as either respecting or violating the three components of both the equity and association principles according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach.

Table 1 demonstrates the quantitative data for the strategies used in making a complaint in Spanish.

Table 1. Strategies Used in Making a Complaint in Spanish: Behavioral Expectations

A. Respecting Association Principle (RAP)						
	Males		Females		Total	
<i>1. Involvement component</i>	n	%	n	%	n	%
a. Opener	6	7	12	13	18	10
b. Providing Information	10	11	15	16	25	14
c. Requesting Information	21	24	2	2	23	13
<i>Subtotal</i>	37	43	29	31	66	36
<i>2. Empathy Component</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>3. Respect Component</i>						
a. Reason/Explanation/Justification	10	12	23	24	33	18
b. Granting permission to Stay	5	6	2	2	7	4
<i>Subtotal</i>	15	17	25	27	40	22
Total Strategies RAP	47	54	52	55	99	55
B. Violating Association Principle (VAP)						
<i>1. Involvement Component</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>2. Empathy Component</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>3. Respect Component</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Strategies VAP	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. Respecting Equity Principle (REP)						
<i>1. Cost-Benefit</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>2. Fairness-Reciprocity</i>						
a. Accepting Excuse/Explanation/Justification	3	3	5	5	8	4
b. Expressing Gratitude	1	1	5	5	6	3
<i>Subtotal</i>	4	4	10	11	14	8
<i>3. Autonomy-Control</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Strategies REP	4	4	10	11	14	8
D. Violating Equity Principle (VEP)						
<i>1. Cost-Benefit</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>2. Fairness-Reciprocity</i>						
a. Rejecting Excuse/Explanation/Justification/Solution	5	6	4	4	9	5

<i>Subtotal</i>	5	6	4	4	9	5
<i>3. Autonomy-Control</i>						
a. Suggesting/Requesting/Commanding	6	7	9	10	15	8
b. Complaining/Accusing	12	14	7	7	19	10
c. Negative Evaluation	3	3	6	6	9	5
d. Moralizing	4	5	4	4	8	4
c. Offering Solution	1	1	0	0	1	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	26	30	26	28	52	29
<i>Total Strategies VEP</i>	31	46	30	32	61	34
Total of all strategies RAP, VAP,REP,VEP	87	100	94	100	181	100

As shown in Table 1, the participants chose to either respect the association principle, respect the equity principle, and/or violate the equity principle. The male participants used a total of 87 strategies while the female participants used a total of 94 strategies. Overall, the participants utilized 181 strategies in complaining in Spanish. The most widely used strategy by the participants while complaining in Spanish was reason/explanation/justification, using it 18% of the time. This was statistically significant at the 99% level ($Z=8.61$). The male participants preferred to request information 24% of the time. This preference was statistically significant at the 99% level ($Z=4.85$). On the other hand, the female participants favored the use of reason/explanation/justification, using it 24% of the time. This was also significant at the 99% level ($Z=5.04$). Given the fact that the male and female participants chose to use different strategies in making a complaint, a difference in proportions test was done in order to determine if this difference was statistically significant. The statistical analysis concluded that this difference was not significant.

Upon closer analysis, the participants as a whole chose more strategies that respected the association principle than either violating the association principle, respecting the equity principle, or violating the equity principle. Of the total number of

strategies, 55% of the strategies fell under respecting the association principle; however, this was not statistically significant ($Z=1.35$). In analyzing the gender factor and whether they chose to violate or respect the two principles, both the men and women chose to respect the association principle; nevertheless, this was not statistically significant ($Z=.75$ and $Z=.97$, respectively).

Moreover, within the equity principle the participants chose to violate the principle over respecting it, 34 % of the strategies fell into this category. This result was statistically significant at the 99% level with a Z-value of 4.31. Both the males and females individually chose to violate the equity principle rather than respect it at 46% and 32% respectively. Nonetheless, only the female's result was significant with a Z-value of 4.3 (significant at the 99% level).

In addition, within the association principle, the participants as a whole chose to respect the involvement component 36% of the time in comparison to the other components such as empathy (0%) and respect (22%). This result is statistically significant at the 99% level ($Z=3.77$). Furthermore, both males and females elected to utilize strategies that respected the involvement component of the association principle, but only the female participants result was statistically significant ($Z=3.69$, 99% level).

Additionally, in the equity principle the participants as a whole chose to use more strategies that violated the autonomy-control of the equity principle over strategies that violated the cost-benefit and fairness-reciprocity components. This result was significant at the 99% level ($Z=5.65$). It resulted that both the men and women who participated in the role-plays chose to violate the autonomy-control component of the equity principle.

Both of these results were statistically significant at the 99% level with a Z-value of 3.49 for the women and 3.73 for the men.

It can be seen that the participants chose a wide variety of strategies when making a complaint in Spanish. As a whole, they chose to provide a reason/explanation/justification which observed the respect component of the association principle. In addition, within the association principle the participants utilized more strategies that respected the involvement component. These results demonstrate that the participants are concerned with demonstrating solidarity to the interlocutor, which helps to establish/maintain a relationship with her. In the following section, the strategies used in making a complaint in English will be discussed.

English Complaints. The strategies used in making a complaint in Spanish have already been discussed. Similar to the Spanish complaints, the participants used a wide variety of strategies to carry out a complaint in English. They include: opener, providing information, reason/explanation/justification, preparator, expressing satisfaction, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing understanding, expressing gratitude, apologizing, requesting information, moralizing, promising to cooperate, suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, complaining/accusing, request for understanding, threatening, offering solution, and sarcasm. It should be noted that many of the strategies that appeared in the Spanish complaints also appeared in the English complaints; however, a wider variety appeared in the English role-plays.

Table 2 shows the quantitative data for the strategies used in making a complaint in English.

Table 2. Strategies Used in Making a Complaint in English: Behavioral Expectations

A. Respecting Association Principle (RAP)						
	Males		Females		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<i>1. Involvement component</i>						
a. Opener	10	9	9	8	19	8
b. Providing Information	12	10	7	6	19	8
c. Requesting Information	1	1	0	0	1	1
d. Promising to Cooperate	3	3	0	0	3	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	26	23	16	14	42	18
<i>2. Empathy Component</i>						
a. Expressing Understanding	2	2	0	0	2	1
b. Apologizing	2	2	4	3	6	3
<i>Subtotal</i>	4	3	4	3	8	3
<i>3. Respect Component</i>						
a. Reason/Explanation/Justification	23	20	31	26	54	23
b. Preparator	3	3	3	3	6	3
a. Lack of Intent to Offend/Impose	1	1	1	1	2	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	27	23	35	30	62	27
Total Strategies RAP	57	50	55	47	112	48
B. Violating Association Principle (VAP)						
<i>1. Involvement Component</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>2. Empathy Component</i>						
a. Request for Understanding	0	0	1	1	1	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	1	1	1	1
<i>3. Respect Component</i>						
a. Sarcasm	2	2	0	0	2	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	2	2	0	0	2	1
Total Strategies VAP	2	2	1	1	3	1
C. Respecting Equity Principle (REP)						
<i>1. Cost-Benefit</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>2. Fairness-Reciprocity</i>						
a. Expressing Satisfaction	0	0	2	2	2	1
b. Accepting Excuse/Explanation/Justification	7	6	4	3	11	5
c. Expressing Gratitude	4	3	5	4	9	4
<i>Subtotal</i>	11	10	11	9	22	9
<i>3. Autonomy-Control</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Strategies REP	11	10	11	9	22	9
D. Violating Equity Principle (VEP)						
<i>1. Cost-Benefit</i>						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0

<i>2. Fairness-Reciprocity</i>						
a. Rejecting Excuse/Explanation/Justification/Solution	2	2	5	4	7	3
<i>Subtotal</i>	2	2	5	4	7	3
<i>3. Autonomy-Control</i>						
a. Suggesting/Requesting/Commanding	32	28	32	27	64	27
b. Complaining/Accusing	5	4	12	10	17	7
c. Threatening	3	3	2	2	5	2
d. Moralizing	2	2	0	0	2	1
e. Offering Solution	1	2	0	0	1	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	43	37	46	40	89	38
<i>Total Strategies VEP</i>	45	39	51	43	96	41
Total of all strategies RAP, VAP,REP,VEP	115	100	118	100	233	100

As seen in Table 2, the participants chose either to respect the association principle, violate the association principle, respect the equity principle, or violate the equity principle. Overall, the participants used a total of 233 strategies while making a complaint in English. The male participants used a total of 115 strategies, while the female participants employed a total of 118 strategies. In the English role-plays the most widely used strategy was suggesting/requesting/commanding. It was used 27% of the time. Coincidentally, this was also the most used strategy for both the male and female participants (28% and 27% respectively). Upon completion of a proportions test, all of these results were statistically significant at the 99% level.

The participants as a whole chose to respect the association principle over violating the association principle, respecting the equity principle, or violating the equity principle, 48% of the overall strategies respected the association principal. In addition, both the male and female participants chose to use strategies that respected the association principle. Nevertheless, these results were not statistically significant according the proportions test.

Of the three components within the association principle, the participants chose to observe the respect component of the association principle versus the involvement component or the empathy component. Of the total number of strategies, 27 % of the strategies respected the respect component. Within the men, 23% respected the respect component and 30% of the women respected the respect component. The overall result was not significant, but a closer look at the male and female results were both statistically significant at the 99% level, Z-value 5.79 and 4.35 respectively.

With respect of the equity principle, the participants made use of strategies that violated the equity principle. Forty-one percent of all the strategies violated the equity principle. Within the male and females strategies, both genders employed strategies that violated the equity principle; 39 % for the male participants and 43% for female participants. The women's results were the only results that were not significant. The men's results were significant at the 95% level with a Z-value of 2.36, while the overall results were significant at the 99% ($Z=2.75$).

Lastly, upon closer examination of the equity principle, the participants chose to violate the autonomy-control of the principle over cost-benefit and fairness-reciprocity. Thirty-eight percent of the total strategies were categorized as violating autonomy-control. The men violated autonomy-control 37% of the time and women 40% of the time. All these results were statistically significant according to the proportions test. However, the female participant results were significant at the 95% level ($Z=2.17$) while the male participant and overall results were significant at the 99% level, Z value of 2.79 and 3.66 respectively.

Similarly to what was observed in the Spanish complaint situation, the participants chose a wide variety of strategies to carry out their complaining in English. The participants as a whole suggested/requested/commanded more in comparison to the other strategies used. This strategy violated autonomy-control which is part of the equity principle. Furthermore, the participants preferred to violate the equity principle than to respect it. With respect to the association principle, the participants chose to observe the respect principle. In addition, although not statistically significant, the participants demonstrated a tendency to respect the association principle over any of the other options; violate the association principle, respect the equity principle and/or violate the equity principle. These results still show a concern by the participants to form/maintain a relationship with the interlocutor, though it does not seem as strong in comparison to the Spanish role-play because the participants chose a strategy that imposed upon the free will of the interlocutor as opposed to showing respect.

Face Sensitivities

The participants chose to both enhance and challenge the identity face of the interlocutor. Opener, providing information, reason/explanation/justification, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, granting permission to stay, requesting information, moralizing, preparator, expressing satisfaction, expressing understanding, promising to cooperate, and lack of intent to offend/impose enhanced the interlocutor's identity face because they illustrate the participants willingness to form a membership with the interlocutor. By forming part of the interlocutor's group, the participants soften the offense of their complaint to the interlocutor. Suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/ justification/solution,

complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, offering solution, request for understanding, threatening, and sarcasm challenged the identity face of the interlocutor because the strategies caused a distance between the interlocutor and the participants. Unlike the other strategies, these illustrate how the participants control or maintain power throughout the interaction, thus making it clear that the participant is completely unsatisfied by the interlocutor and the grievance that they have caused.

Spanish Complaints. While complaining in Spanish, the participants chose to both enhance and challenge identity face of the interlocutor. Opener, providing information, reason/explanation/justification, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, granting permission to stay, requesting information, and moralizing were categorized as enhancing the interlocutor's identity face. On the other hand, suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, and offering a solution challenged the identity face of the interlocutor. Table 3 shows the distribution of the strategies according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) identity face.

Table 3. Identity Face: Spanish Complaints

A. Enhancing Interlocutor's Identity Face (EIIF)	Males		Females		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
a. Opener	6	7	12	13	18	10
b. Providing Information	10	11	15	16	25	14
c. Reason/explanation/justification	10	12	23	24	33	18
d. Accepting Excuse/Explanation/Justification	3	3	5	5	8	4
e. Expressing Gratitude	1	1	5	5	6	3
f. Granting Permission to Stay	5	6	2	2	7	4
g. Requesting Information	21	24	2	2	23	13
h. Moralizing	4	5	4	4	8	4
Total Strategies EIIF	60	69	68	72	128	71
B. Challenging Interlocutor's Identity Face (CIIF)						
a. Suggesting/requesting/commanding	6	7	9	10	15	8
b. Rejecting Excuse/Explanation/Justification/Solution	5	6	4	4	9	5
c. Complaining/Accusing	12	14	7	7	19	10
d. Negative Evaluation	3	3	6	6	9	5
e. Offering Solution	1	1	0	0	1	1
Total Strategies CIIF	27	31	26	28	54	30
Total of all Strategies EIIF & CIIF	87	100	94	100	181	100

As seen in Table 3, a total of 128 strategies enhanced the identity face of the interlocutor, while 54 strategies challenged the interlocutor's face. This result was statistically significant at the 99% level ($Z = 5.65$). In addition, both the men and women also chose to enhance the interlocutor's identity face, 69% and 72% respectively. These results were also statistically significant at the 99% level. In employing strategies that enhance the identity face of the interlocutor, the participants demonstrate their willingness to form part of the in-group with the interlocutor.

English Complaints. Just like the Spanish complaints, the participants chose to both enhance and challenge the identity face of the interlocutor. Opener, providing

information, reason/explanation/justification, preparator, expressing satisfaction, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing understanding, expressing gratitude, apologizing, requesting information, moralizing, promising to cooperate, and lack of intent to offend/impose enhanced the interlocutor's identity face. Suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, complaining/accusing, request for understanding, threatening, offering solution, and sarcasm challenged the identity face of the interlocutor. Table 4 shows the distribution of the strategies.

Table 4. Identity Face: English Complaints

A. Enhancing Identity Interlocutor's Identity Face (EIIF)						
	Males		Females		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
a. Opener	10	9	9	8	19	8
b. Providing Information	12	10	7	6	19	8
c. Reason/Explanation/Justification	23	20	31	26	54	23
d. Preparator	3	3	3	3	6	3
e. Expressing Satisfaction	0	0	2	2	2	1
f. Accepting Excuse/Explanation/Justification	7	6	4	3	11	5
e. Expressing Understanding	2	2	0	0	2	1
f. Expressing Gratitude	4	3	5	4	9	4
g. Apologizing	2	2	4	3	6	3
h. Requesting Information	1	1	0	0	1	1
i. Moralizing	2	2	0	0	2	1
j. Promising to Cooperate	3	3	0	0	3	1
k. Lack of Intent to Offend/Impose	1	1	1	1	2	1
Total Strategies EIIF	70	61	66	56	136	58
B. Challenging Interlocutor's Identity Face (CIIF)						
a. Suggesting/Requesting/Commanding	32	28	32	27	64	27
b. Rejecting Excuse/Explanation/Justification/Solution	2	2	5	4	7	3
c. Complaining/Accusing	5	4	12	10	17	7
d. Request for Understanding	0	0	1	1	1	1
e. Threatening	3	3	2	2	5	2

f. Offering Solution	1	2	0	0	1	1
g. Sarcasm	2	2	0	0	2	1
<i>Total Strategies CIIF</i>	45	39	52	44	97	42
Total of all Strategies EIIF & CIIF	115	100	118	100	233	100

As shown in Table 4, the majority of the participants chose to enhance the identity face of the interlocutor. Of the total number of strategies used to make a complaint in English, 58% of them enhanced the identity face of the interlocutor. This result is significant at the 95% level ($Z=2.44$). The male participants enhanced the interlocutor's identity face 61% of the time, while women did so 56% of the time. The men's use of strategies that enhanced the identity face the interlocutor was statistically significant at the 95% level ($Z=2.14$). However, the women's results were not significant, Z-value 1.30. Similar to the Spanish complaints, the participants opted to form part of the interlocutor's group membership, which helped lessen the severity of the complaint to the interlocutor.

Qualitative Results

In addition to performing the role-plays with the interlocutor, the participants filled out a post role-play questionnaire after completing each role-play. The questionnaire (See Appendix B) asked the participants about their general impressions of the interaction and if their participation reflected how they would act in a real-life situation. They were also asked to assess the interlocutor's reaction and their own participation. They were also asked if there was anything that they didn't say in the role-play, if there was anything that interlocutor said that bothered them, and lastly if they had any additional comments. In the following section, the results of this questionnaire will be discussed according to the language of the complaint.

Spanish Complaints. As previously stated, the participants were asked to complete a post role-play questionnaire. Overall, the general impressions of the participants were positive. A few of the participants commented that the situation went as they had expected. With respect to the question regarding if the participants participation reflected a real-life situation, almost all of the participants stated that it did. Only four female participants felt that their participation did not reflect how they would have behaved in a real-life situation. After interpreting the interlocutor's reaction, the participants felt that the interaction was strong, polite, and normal as opposed to weak, polite, and brief. When asked to assess their own performance, the participants felt that it was strong, polite, and normal. It is very interesting that the participants felt that both their interaction and the interlocutor's reaction were polite. It was anticipated that the participants would have assessed both as rude, since complaining is a face threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987). A few of the participants would have said something differently to the interlocutor, such as, "go back to where you were!" Also, some of the participants were bothered by a few of the responses that the interlocutor had given. For example, two of the female participants were bothered by the fact that the interlocutor justified cutting in line because she had fewer items than the participants. One of the male participants was bothered by the interlocutor's refusal to move. Lastly, one of the participants felt that their behavior during the role-play was mean; while another felt that the interlocutor gave up too easily.

English Complaints. The results of the post role-play questionnaire for the English complaints were slightly different than the ones in Spanish. In the English situation, the participants were generally positive towards their initial impressions. A few

participants mentioned having experienced a similar situation before. In addition, all but three participants, one male and two females, stated that their participation reflected how they would act in a real-life situation. Moreover, the participants felt that both the interlocutor's reaction and their participation were strong, rude, and normal. This result is slightly different than the Spanish complaints because in this specific role-play, the participants felt that the interaction was rude while in the Spanish role-play, it was polite. It was anticipated that the participants would assess both of the situations as rude, but as it can be seen, that was not the case. When asked if the participants did not mention something in the role-play, a few of them stated that they would have liked to have told the interlocutor to leave. Lastly, some of the participants were bothered by what the interlocutor had said to them. For example, one of the female participants did not like that the interlocutor could not trust her with her belongings. Another female participant did not like that the interlocutor told her to move if her phone conversation was bothering her.

The post role-play questionnaire was a key component to the role-plays that the participants acted out. They provided us with an additional understanding of how the participants interpreted the interlocutor and whether or not their participation accurately reflected how they would have behaved in a real-life situation. Lastly, the questionnaire also allowed the participants to mention anything that they didn't say in the interactions and give a reason as to why they did not do so.

Summary of Results

While forming a complaint in both Spanish and English, the participants used a wide variety of strategies. These strategies included: an opener, providing information,

requesting information, reason/explanation/justification, granting permission to stay, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, suggesting/requesting/commanding, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, moralizing, offering solution, promising to cooperate, expressing understanding, apologizing, preparator, sarcasm, threatening, request for understanding, request for understanding, and expressing satisfaction. These strategies were categorized according to whether they violated or respected either the association principle or equity principle in Spener-Oatey's (2005) behavioral expectations. The strategies were also analyzed according to if they enhanced or challenged the identity face of the interlocutor. The following section summarizes the findings of this study.

Spanish Complaints. The participants used a wide variety of strategies while forming a complaint in Spanish. They used an opener, providing information, requesting information, reason/explanation/ granting permission to stay, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, suggesting/requesting/commanding, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, moralizing, and offering solution were the strategies used by both the male and female participants. The participants utilized a total of 181 strategies when making a complaint in Spanish. The most widely used strategy was reason/explanation/justification, which was significant. The male participants chose to request more information and the female participants chose to use more reason/explanation/justification. These results were statistically significant within their respective groups. Due to the fact that the male and females participants chose different strategies, a

difference in proportions test was performed and concluded that this difference was not significant.

In addition, the participants chose strategies that respected the association principle versus strategies that either violated the association principle, respected the equity principle, or violated the equity principle; however, this result was not statistically significant. A similar result was found upon a gender analysis.

Nonetheless, the participants chose to violate the equity principle over respecting it; this finding was statistically significant. Upon taking a closer look at gender, both the males and females chose to violate the equity principle, but only the women's result was significant.

Furthermore, the participants within each principle chose to either respect or violate one of the components. Within the association principle the participants as a whole chose to respect the involvement component. This result was statistically significant. A gender analysis revealed that only the females' choice to respect the involvement component was statistically significant. With respect to the equity principle, the participants employed more strategies that violated the autonomy-control of the equity principle. Again, this result was statistically significant. In addition, both males and females chose to violate the autonomy-control; again, this result was significant.

With regard to the interlocutor's identity face, the participants chose to both challenge and enhance the face of the interlocutor. As a whole, the participants preferred to enhance the interlocutor's identity face, which was significant. In addition, both the men and women elected to enhance the interlocutor's identity face, which was statistically significant.

The following section will summarize the findings for the English complaints:

English Complaints. As with the Spanish complaints, the participants utilized a wide variety of strategies even though there was some variation from those used in the Spanish role-play. The following strategies were used: an opener, providing information, reason/explanation/justification, preparator, expressing satisfaction, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing understanding, expressing gratitude, apologizing, requesting information, moralizing, promising to cooperate, suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, complaining/accusing, request for understanding, threatening, offering solution, and sarcasm. The results for this role-play will be discussed in the section below.

Overall, the participants chose either to respect the association principle, violate the association principle, respect the equity principle, or violate the equity principle. As a whole, the participants used a total of 233 strategies while making a complaint in English. The most used strategy was suggesting/requesting/commanding. Coincidentally, this strategy was also the most used among both the men and women. All three of these results were statistically significant.

Of the strategies used in the role-plays, the participants chose to respect the association principle over, violating the association principle, respecting the equity principle, and violating the equity principle. This also occurred among both male and female participants. Nevertheless, these results were not statistically significant.

Of the three components within the association principle, the participants preferred to observe the respect component. The men and women also individually chose

to respect the respect component. Only the individual men and women results were significant.

With respect to the equity principle, the participants preferred to violate the equity principle, which was statistically significant. Additionally, both men and women chose to violate the equity principle, but only the men's result was significant. Furthermore, the participants used more strategies that violated the autonomy-control within the equity principle. The same was true for both men and women individually. All three results were significant.

Lastly, the participants opted to both enhance and challenge the identity face of the interlocutor while complaining in English. As a whole, the participants preferred to enhance the identity face of the interlocutor. Both the male and female participants elected to enhance the interlocutor's identity face. The only result that was not significant was the women's choice to enhance the interlocutor's identity face. The other two results were significant.

Chapter 6

DISCUSSION

As it was previously mentioned, few studies have analyzed the act of complaining, more specifically, complaint strategies in Spanish. This study is the first of its kind in that it analyzes the strategies used by participants while complaining in two languages, Spanish and English. Pinto & Raschio (2008) analyzed the techniques used in Spanish complaint strategies by heritage speakers, but the study utilized written DCT's, while the present study utilized role-plays. Pinto & Raschio (2008) found that the native Spanish speakers used more openers in the situations; the present study did not notice a difference in the use of openers in English versus Spanish. Openers were used 8% of the time in English and 10% of the time in Spanish. As seen in the study by Trenchs (1995), openers were a widely used strategy by the participants, appearing in nearly all of the role-plays.

Unlike Bolívar (2002), request for repair was not the most widely used strategy in the Spanish role-plays. Reason/explanation/justification was the most used technique in the Spanish complaints. However, looking at the English complaint situation, suggesting/requesting/commanding was the most used strategy. This strategy is similar to Bolívar's requests for repair because in suggesting/requesting/commanding, the participants asked that the interlocutor to remedy the problem.

In their study, Wolfe & Powell (2006) did not find any gender differences in the number of complaints made by men and women. This conclusion is also true for this study. There was no significant gender difference in the strategies employed by the participants in making a complaint in both Spanish and English. Overall, men and women

acted in the same manner while making a complaint. It was observed in the Spanish role-play that the male and female participants used different strategies more often, i.e. the men used more requesting information, while the women used more reason/explanation/justification. However upon further examination, a difference in proportions test showed that this difference was insignificant.

After carefully analyzing the strategies used in both languages, it was noted that the participants chose to use different strategies in Spanish than in English. Spanish used more reason/explanation/justification while English used more suggesting/requesting/commanding. Upon completion of a difference in proportions test to determine if the use of different strategies in the two languages was statistically significant, it was concluded that there was a significant difference in the use of overall strategies in the two languages. This difference was significant at the 95% level ($Z = 2.21$). In suggesting/requesting/commanding, which violated autonomy-control within the equity principle, the participants were more concerned with the interlocutor fixing the grievance that they had caused in the English complaint situation. In doing so, the participants imposed upon the free will of the interlocutor. Meanwhile in the Spanish complaints, the participants chose to explain the reason for their complaining. This strategy observed the respect component of the association principle, meaning that the participants were more concerned with demonstrating respect toward the interlocutor in Spanish. In showing more respect to the interlocutor, the participants demonstrated solidarity toward the interlocutor, thus diminishing the severity of this face-threatening act. This finding agrees with the participants' assessment of his or her own personal interaction in the post role-play questionnaire. The participants stated that their interaction in English was rude, while

their interaction in Spanish was polite. This notion is supported in the use of different strategies within the two languages.

It was also found that the participants observed different components of the association principle. The participants respected the involvement component in Spanish, while they observed the respect component in English. Upon completing a difference in proportions test, it was concluded that the male participants' respect of different components was significant at the 99% level ($Z=3.03$). In addition, the overall use of different components in Spanish and English was significant at the 95% level ($Z=1.96$). Although both of the components are centered around the notion of maintaining a relationship with the interlocutor, by respecting the involvement component in the Spanish role-play, the participants were more concerned with forming an in-group membership with the interlocutor. This contrasts with the English role-play in which the participants did not show as much interest in engaging with the interlocutor. Despite the fact that the strategies used in both languages lend themselves to building solidarity, it can be concluded that the Spanish complaint strategies are more solidarity building than the English complaint strategies. This conclusion falls in line with other studies on Spanish speech acts, where it has been found that Spanish speakers have a preference toward positive politeness (Bravo, 2001, 2004; García, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Haverkate, 2004; Hernández Flores, 2004; Márquez Reiter, 1997; 2000; Ruzickova, 1998).

In addition, the participants chose to enhance the interlocutor's identity face in both the Spanish and English role-plays. This means that despite the fact that interlocutor had wronged the participant by either cutting him/her in line or disturbing his/her study time, the participants still maintained high regard for the interlocutor's social self worth.

Furthermore, in enhancing the face of the interlocutor, the participants continue to claim group membership with the interlocutor, which, in turn, leads to more solidarity building throughout these face-threatening acts. Although these situations may be considered as "rude," the participants are able to navigate through the situation and claim group membership with the interlocutor, thus lessening the "rude" effect.

Lastly, in her 1993 study on indirect complaining, Boxer concluded that the English speakers utilized indirect complaints as a way to build solidarity with the interlocutor. The results of this study offer a similar finding to that of Boxer (1993a). In choosing to enhance the interlocutor's identity face in a very face-threatening situation and showing a tendency toward respecting the association principle, the participants demonstrated their attempt to build a relationship with the interlocutor, which in turn builds solidarity in the situation. In addition, it can be seen that while the participants chose to respect the involvement component in the Spanish complaint and did not chose to respect the same component in the English complaint situation, the Spanish role-play was more capable of building a strong solidarity. This was due to the fact that the participants were highly concerned with engaging in activities with the interlocutor, as opposed to the English complaint situation where the participants were concerned with demonstrating respect toward the interlocutor.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS

This study analyzed the complaint-giving strategies of second-generation Mexican-American bilinguals in Arizona using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. This section will address some general conclusions regarding complaint strategies among bilinguals, as well as address how their tendencies relate to the English and Spanish speaking communities of the world.

Summary of Results

This study sought to answer important questions that existed regarding the strategies employed in making a complaint in Spanish and English. It also strived to figure out if there were any differences in the strategies used in each role-play, if there were any gender differences, and, lastly, if there was any transfer of strategies from one language to another. The answers to the research questions will be discussed below.

The first question sought to identify the strategies utilized by the participants in making a complaint in English and Spanish. The following strategies were used in the Spanish role-play: an opener, providing information, requesting information, reason/explanation/granting permission to stay, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing gratitude, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, suggesting/requesting/commanding, complaining/accusing, negative evaluation, moralizing, and offering solution. The English strategies were as follows: an opener, providing information, reason/explanation/justification, preparator, expressing satisfaction, accepting excuse/explanation/justification, expressing understanding, expressing gratitude, apologizing, requesting information, moralizing, promising to

cooperate, suggesting/requesting/commanding, rejecting excuse/explanation/justification/solution, complaining/accusing, request for understanding, threatening, offering solution, and sarcasm. As demonstrated, the participants used a wide variety of strategies when complaining in both Spanish and English. Although there was some variation in the strategies employed, many of them were utilized in both languages.

The second research question investigated how different the complaint strategies were from one language to another. As a whole, the Spanish role-plays favored the use of reason/explanation/justification, while the English role-plays favored the use of suggesting/requesting/commanding. Upon completion of a series of difference in proportions tests, it was determined that this difference was statistically significant at the 95% level, thus it can be concluded that the participants preferred to employ different strategies when carrying out a complaint in English and Spanish.

The third research question sought to determine if any gender differences existed in the role-plays. In all the findings, there was only one gender difference that occurred in the Spanish interaction. The male participants chose to request more information, while the female participants chose to reason, explain, justify. After completing a difference in proportions test, it was determined that this difference was not statistically significant. Through the rest of the strategies there were no gender differences; thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference between males and females in making a complaint in both Spanish and English.

The fourth and final research question strove to determine if there were any pragmatic transfers of strategies from one language to another. This question arose from the fact that the participants of this study were second-generation, Spanish-English

bilingual speakers who live in a situation where English is the dominant language. It would be anticipated that the English pragmatic strategies would affect the Spanish pragmatic strategies. However, given that the participants preferred the use of different strategies in complaining (reason/explanation/justification for Spanish complaints and suggesting/requesting/commanding for English complaints) one can conclude that with respect to the pragmatic systems of these highly bilingual participants, the speakers maintain two separate pragmatic systems in dealing with the act of complaining.

General Conclusions

As already mentioned, these participants used a wide variety of strategies to carry out a complaint in both Spanish and English. Additionally, they chose to respect the association principle in both languages, violate the equity principle in both, and violate autonomy-control in both languages as well. Also, the participants chose to enhance the interlocutor's identity face in both the English and Spanish role-play. In choosing to enhance the interlocutor's identity face and showing a preference toward respecting the association principle and although not statistically significant, the participants demonstrated their concern for building solidarity with the interlocutor. The participants demonstrated a tendency toward positive politeness, especially in the Spanish role-play due to their choice in respecting the involvement component of the association principle. With the presented results, it is clear that these participants fall in line with other Hispanic cultures, such as Cubans (Ruzickova, 1998), Spaniards (Bravo, 2001, 2004; Haverkate, 2004; Hernández Flores, 1994, 2004), Argentineans (García, 2004a), Uruguayans (Márquez Reiter, 1997; 2000), Peruvians (García, 2002), and Venezuelans (García, 2002).

In comparing the findings of this study to those of previous studies, one would find that the strategy openers were employed by almost all of the participants. This finding agrees with Trenchs (1995), who realized that openers were the most used strategy while complaining. In addition, it is noted that repairing the situation, in this case suggesting/requesting/commanding, was the most used strategy in the English complaint, such as it was found in Bolivar's study (2002). Lastly, Wolfe & Powell (2006) observed that there were no gender differences when complaining. This same result was observed in this study.

There are several conclusions that can be drawn from the results of this present study. Nevertheless, it is important that complaints be continued to be study, particularly in Spanish, so that we can get a better understand of what is occurring in this speech act.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the current study. These included a small sample size (only 21 participants were included in the study) and the fact that only one population was surveyed, i.e., Mexican-American bilinguals. It is difficult to generalize these results to all Spanish speakers in the United States because in this country there exists different Spanish speaking populations. In addition, the data from this study were collected by means of role-plays. It would have been beneficial to have collected naturally occurring data. Although most of the participants stated that throughout the role-plays they acted like they would have in a real-life situation, it is difficult to determine if this is truly how they would have behaved in a natural setting. Collecting naturally occurring data would eliminate this concern. Lastly, another limitation is the lack of monolingual native speaker data to which the bilinguals could be compared.

There are only a few studies (Bolívar, 2002a; Curcó & De Fina, 2002; Márquez Reiter, 2005; Pinto & Raschio, 2008) that have analyzed complaints in Spanish, thus it was difficult to determine if there was any cross-linguistic transfer in the strategies used by the participants. It would be beneficial to include monolingual native speakers in the study in order to obtain a better understanding of the strategies used in making complaints and to be able to draw more valid comparisons and conclusions of the results.

Future Research

As previously stated, few studies exist that analyze the strategies used in making a complaint. In having such a low number of studies, it made it very difficult to draw comparisons and conclusions about the realization of Spanish and English complaints in general. Further research on complaints, including those posted on internet websites, similar to the Vázquez (2011) study, need to be carried out so that a better understanding of the speech act may be obtained. Furthermore, with the increasing use of social media, many people use social media as an outlet for venting their frustration. It would be interesting to study what strategies are used in this area to form a complaint. In addition, further study of both direct and indirect complaints needs to occur. Additionally, the aspect of power and distance needs to be taken into consideration when studying complaints. It would be interesting to assess the varying degrees of both power and distance among the interlocutors in order to see if different strategies are employed to carry out the speech act when those factors vary. Also, as it has already been established, more studies analyzing the pragmatic variation that obtains in different dialectal varieties of Spanish in the United States, as well as different English varieties need to be carried out in order to add to the general knowledge of these dialects. Lastly, further

study of different speech acts in this population is needed in order to get a better understanding this population. As noted earlier, very little research has been done in this dialect, hence the area of pragmatics and Spanish in the U.S. is desperately needed.

REFERENCES

- Alba-Juez, L. (2000). Some discourse strategies used to convey praise and/or positive feelings in Spanish everyday conversation. In H. Campos, E. Herburger, A. Morales-Front, & T.J. Walsh (Eds.), *Hispanic linguistics at the turn of the millennium: Papers from the 3rd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 364-380). Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Albor, H.R. (1973). "Da" + gerundio ¿un quechuisimo? Y otras maneras de atenuar los imperativos. *Hispania*, 56, 316-318.
- Álvarez, A. (2002). Huellas de la cortesía: Las reparaciones en el habla de Mérida. *Delta*, 18, 173-202.
- Álvarez, A. (2003). La atenuación en el habla de Mérida. Paper presented at IV Coloquio Nacional de Análisis del Discurso. Caracas, Venezuela.
- Álvarez, A., & Barros, X. (2001). Sistemas en conflicto: Las formas de tratamiento en la ciudad de Mérida, Venezuela. *Lengua y Habla*, 6, 1-17.
- Arellano, S. (2000). A hierarchy of requests in California Spanish: Are indirectness and mitigation polite? In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and Challenges* (pp. 319-332). Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Arent, R. (1996). Sociopragmatic decisions regarding complaints by Chinese learners and NSs of American English. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 125-147.
- Arnaiz Abad, C. (1992). Hi! ¿Cómo estás? Hacia una pragmática comparativa. *Revista del Departamento de Filología Moderna*, 1(3), 119-130.
- Ballesteros Martín, F.J. (2001). La cortesía española frente a la cortesía inglesa: Estudio pragmalingüístico de las exhortaciones impositivas. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 9, 171-207.
- Bergman, C.R. (1976). Interference vs. independent development in infant bilingualism. In G.D. Keller, R.V. Taeschner, & S. Viera (Eds.), *Bilingualism in the bicentennial and beyond* (pp. 86-95). New York: Bilingual Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. In R. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice* (pp. 255-280). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G., (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Bolívar, A. (2001a). El insulto como estrategia en el dialogue político venezolano. *Oralia*, 4, 47-73.
- Bolívar, A. (2001b). Changes in Venezuelan political dialogue: The role of advertising during electoral campaigns. *Discourse and Society*, 12, 23-46.
- Bolívar, A. (2001c). El personalismo en la democracia venezolana y cambios en el diálogo político. *Revista Iberoamericana de Discurso y Sociedad*, 3, 103-134.
- Bolívar, A. (2002a). Los reclamos como actos de habla en el español de Venezuela. In M. E. Placencia & D. Bravo (Eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español* (pp. 37-53). Munich, Germany: LINCOM Europa.
- Bolívar, A. (2002b). Violencia verbal, violencia física y polarización en el diálogo político venezolano. In L. Molero & A. Franco (Eds.), *El discurso político desde las humanidades y las ciencias sociales* (pp. 125-136). Caracas: Fonacit.
- Bolívar, A. (2003). La descortesía como estrategia política en la democracia venezolana. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 213-226). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Boretti, S. (1991). Formas verbales del voseo: La segunda persona singular del presente de subjuntivo. *Variación lingüística en el español de Rosario* (pp. 109-114). Rosario: Consejo de investigaciones de la Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Argentina.
- Boretti, S. (1999). A propósito de ¿me entendés? en el español de la Argentina. *Oralia*, 2, 139- 154.
- Boxer, D. (1993a). Complaints as positive strategies: What the learner needs to know. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(2), 277-299.
- Boxer, D. (1993b). Speech behavior and social distance: The case of indirect complaints. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 103-125.
- Boxer, D. (1996). Complaints and troubles-telling: Perspectives from ethnographic interviews. In J. Neu & S. Gass (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 217-239). The Hague: Mouton.
- Bravo, D. (1998). Reírse juntos?: Un estudio de las imágenes sociales de hablantes españoles, mexicanos y suecos. In H. Haverkate, G. Mulder, & C. Fraile

- Maldonado (Eds.), *La pragmática del español, recientes desarrollos: Diálogos Hispánicos 22* (pp. 315-364). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bravo, D. (2001). Sobre la cortesía lingüística, estratégica y conversacional en español. *Oralia, 4*, 299-314.
- Bravo, D. (2004). Tensión entre universalidad y relatividad en las teorías de la cortesía. In D. Bravo & A. Briz (Eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español* (pp. 15-37). Barcelona: Ariel.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bustamante-López, I. & Niño-Murcia, M. (1995). Impositive speech acts in northern Andean Spanish: A pragmatic description. *Hispania, 78*(4), 885-897.
- Carranza, I.E. (1997). *Conversación y deixis de discurso*. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina.
- Cervone, E. (1999). Racismo y vida cotidiana: Las tácticas de la defensa étnica. In E. Cervone & F. Rivera (Eds.), *Ecuador racist: Imágenes e identidades* (pp. 137-160). Quito: FLACSO Sede Ecuador.
- Chodorowska-Pilch, M. (1997). On the polite function of ¿me entiendes? in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*, 355-371.
- Cordisco, A. (2003). Afiliación y desafiliación: Contexto sociocultural en el análisis de la interrupción y de sus consecuencias sociales en la interacción. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 149-163). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Covarrubias, P. (2000). *Pronominally speaking: Mexican enactments of 'tú' and 'usted' as interpersonal components of organizational networks of cooperation*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Washington.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25*, 349-367.
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1545-1579.
- Curcó, C. (1998). ¿No me harías un favorcito? Reflexiones en torno a la expresión de la cortesía verbal en el español de México y el español peninsular. In H. Haverkate,

- G. Mulder, & C. Fraile Maldonado (Eds.), *La pragmática del español, recientes desarrollos* (pp. 129- 171). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Curcó, C. (2007). Positive face, group face, and affiliation: An overview of politeness studies on Mexican Spanish. In M. E. Placencia & C. García (Eds.), *Research on politeness in the Spanish-speaking world* (pp. 105-120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Curcó, C., & De Fina, A. (1993). The use of diminutives and imperatives in expressing politeness: The contrast between Castilian and Mexican Spanish. Paper presented at the Fourth International Pragmatics Conference, Kobe, Japan.
- Curcó, C., & De Fina, A. (2002). Modo imperativo, negación, y diminutivos en la expresión de la cortesía en español: El contraste entre México y España. In M. E. Placencia & D. Bravo (Eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español* (pp. 107 - 140). Munich, Germany: LINCOM Europe.
- De los Heros Diez Canseco, S. (2001). *Discurso, identidad y género en el castellano peruano*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Díaz Pérez, J. (1999). Requesting in British English and Peninsular Spanish: A comparative analysis of politeness strategies. In G. Álvarez Benito, J. Fernández, & F. J. Tamayo (Eds.), *Lenguas en contacto*(pp. 171-180). Sevilla: Mergablum.
- Du, J. S. (1995). Performance of face-threatening acts in Chinese: Complaining, giving bad news, and disagreeing. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as a native and target language* (pp. 165-206). Manoa, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Edstrom, A. (2004). Expressions of disagreement by Venezuelans in conversation: Reconsidering the influence of culture. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(8), 1499-1518.
- Edwards, J. (2004). Foundations of bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 7-31). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ennis, S. R., Ríos-Vargas, M., & Albert. N.G. (2011). The Hispanic population: 2010. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>
- Erlich de, F. D. (2003). El discurso político venezolano actual: ¿atenuación o refuerza del conflicto? In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 227- 239). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Espinosa Apolo, M. (2000). *Los mestizos ecuatorianos y las señas de identidad cultural* (editorial). Quito: TRAMASOCIAL Editorial.

- Farr, M. (2000). ¡A mí no me manda nadie! Individualism and identity in Mexican ranchero speech. *Pragmatics*, 10 (1), 61-85.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J.C. (2003). Validity in data collection methods in pragmatics research. In P. Kempchinsky and C. E. Piñeros (Eds.), *Theory, practice, and acquisition. Papers from the 6th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium and the 5th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese* (pp. 239-257). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Mexican requests. In D. Eddington (Ed.), *Selected proceedings of the 7th Hispanic linguistics Symposium* (pp. 66-78). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38 (12), 2158-2187.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2009). El estado de la cuestión sobre el discurso de la (des)cortesía y la imagen social en México: Perspectivas teóricas y metodológicas [State of the art on the discourse of (im)politeness and face in Mexico: Theoretical and methodological perspectives]. In L. Rodríguez Alfano (Ed.), *La (des)cortesía y la imagen social en México: Estudios semióticos-discursivos desde varios enfoques analíticos* (pp. 15-45). Monterrey, México: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León.
- Ferrer, M. C. (2003). El discurso de la cortesía en puestos de atención al público en Argentina. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 315-331). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- García, C. (1992). Refusing an invitation: A case study of Peruvian style. *Hispanic Linguistics*, 5, 207-243.
- García, C. (1993). Making a request for a service and responding: a case study of Peruvian style. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19, 127-152.
- García, C. (1996). Reprimanding and responding to a reprimand: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 663-697.
- García, C. (1999). The three stages of Venezuelan invitations and responses. *Multilingua*, 18(4), 391-433.
- García, C. (2002). La expresión de camaradería y solidaridad: Cómo los Venezolanos solicitan un servicio y responden a la solicitud de un servicio. In M.E. Placencia & D. Bravo (Eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español* (pp. 55-88). Germany: Lincom Europa.

- García, C. (2003). Estudio comparativo del discurso oral de peruanos y venezolanos: Reprendiendo y respondiendo a una reprimenda: Poder y solidaridad. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 257-297). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- García, C. (2004a). Coercion and cooperation: A case study of Argentinean reprimands and responses to reprimands. In R. Márquez Reiter & M.E. Placencia (Eds.), *Current trends in the pragmatics of Spanish* (pp. 231-264). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- García, C. (2004b). Reprendiendo y respondiendo a una reprimenda: Similitudes y diferencias entre peruanos y venezolanos. *Spanish in Context, 1*, 113-147.
- García, C. (2007). “Y bueno pienso que vos podrías dársela”: Estrategias de cortesía utilizadas por participantes argentinos en la solicitud de un servicio profesional. *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Lingüistics, 12*, 153-174.
- García, C. (2009). ¿Qué?: ¿cómo que te vas a casar? Congratulations and rapport management: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Pragmatics, 19*(2), 197-222.
- García, M. E. (1981). Preparing to leave: Interaction at a Mexican-American family gathering. In R. P. Durán (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 195-215). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- García, M. E. & Leone, E. (1984). The use of directives by two Hispanic children: An exploration of communicative competence. *National Center for Bilingual Research Report Series*, no. 25.
- Genesee, F. (2000). Early bilingual language development: one language or two? In L. Wei (Eds.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 327-343). New York: Routledge.
- Giddens, D. (1981). An analysis of the syntax and discourse of oral complaints in Spanish. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to face behavior*. New York: Pantheon.
- Goodz, N.S. (1986). Parental language in bilingual families: A model and some data. Paper presented date at the Third Congress of the World Association of Infant Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Goodz, N.S. (1989). Parental language mixing in bilingual families. *Journal of Infant Mental Health, 10*, 25-44.

- Granato, L. (2003). EL lenguaje de estudiantes universitarios argentinos: Interacción e imagen social. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 164-171). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Haboud, M. (1998). Quichua y castellano en los Andes ecuatorianos. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Haverkate, H. (2004). El análisis de la cortesía comunicativa: Categorización pragmalingüística de la cultura española. In D. Bravo & A. Briz (Eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español* (pp. 55-65). Barcelona: Ariel.
- Hernández Flores, N. (2003). Cortesía y contextos socioculturales en la conversación española de familiares y amigos. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actos del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp.121-128). Stockholm: Stockholm University. Available at www.primercoloquio.edice.org.
- Hernández Flores, N. (2004). La cortesía como la búsqueda del equilibrio de la imagen social. In D. Bravo & A. Briz (Eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español* (pp. 95-108). Barcelona: Ariel.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness in English and German. In F. Coulmans (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 157-185). The Hague: Mouton.
- Hurley, J.K. (1995). Pragmatics in a language contact situation: Verb forms used in requests in Ecuadorian Spanish. *Hispanic Linguistics*, 6/7, 225-264.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of politeness. *Multilingua*, 8, 223-248.
- Ide, S., Mill, B., Carnes, Y., Ogino, T., & Kawasaki, A. (1992). The concept of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese. In R. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice* (pp. 281-297). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Inoue, J. (1982). A discourse analysis of complaints made by Japanese Students. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jefferson, G. (1986). Transcript notation. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social interaction. Studies in conversational analysis* (pp.ix-xvi). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kachigan. S.K. (1986). Statistical Analysis. An Interdisciplinary Introduction to Univariate and Multivariate Methods. New York: Radius Press.

- Kany, C.E. (1951). American –Spanish syntax (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kasper, G. (1999). Data collection in pragmatics research. *University of Hawai'i working papers in ESL*, 18(1), 71-107.
- Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (316-341). London/NY: Continuum.
- Kaul de Marlangeon, S.B. (1995). La fuerza de cortesía-descortesía y sus estrategias en el discurso tanguero de la década del '20. *Revista de la Sociedad Argentina de Lingüística*, 3, 451-464.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1997). A multilevel approach in the study of talk-in-interaction. *Pragmatics*, 7(1), 1-20.
- Koike, D. (1998). La sugerencia en español: Una perspectiva comparativa. In H. Haverkate, G. Mulder, & C. Fraile Maldonado (Eds.), *La pragmática del español: Recientes desarrollos: Diálogos Hispánicos 22* (pp. 211-235). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kumagai, T. (2004). The role of repetition in complaint conversations. In P. Szatrowski (Ed.), *Hidden and open conflict in Japanese conversational interaction* (pp. 199-220). Tokyo: Kurosio.
- LaForest, M. (2002). Scenes of family life: Complaining in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1595-1620.
- Le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish request strategies: A cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Sciences*, 18, 3(4), 651-670.
- Lindholm, K. J. & Padilla, A. M. (1978). Language mixing in bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language*, 5, 327- 335.
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2001). Compliment responses among British and Spanish university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 107-127.
- Mao, L.R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 451-486.
- Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H. K., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The language experience and proficiency questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals and multilinguals. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, 50(4), 940- 967.

- Márquez Reiter, R. (1997). Politeness phenomena in British English and Uruguayan Spanish: The case of requests. *Miscelanea: A Journal of English and American Studies*, 18, 159-167.
- Márquez Reiter, R. (2000). Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Márquez Reiter, R. (2002). A contrastive study of indirectness in Spanish: Evidence from Uruguayan and Peninsular Spanish. *Pragmatics*, 12(2), 135-151.
- Márquez Reiter, R. (2005). Complaint calls to a caregiver service company: The case of desahogo. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(4), 481-513.
- Meisel, J.M. (2004). The bilingual child. In T. K. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 91-113). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Móccero, L. (2003). Las selecciones pronominales como estrategia de cortesía. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 346-354). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Moreno, M.C. (2002). La cortesía verbal en el Siglo de Oro: Los actos de habla directivos: Un estudio de pragmática histórica. In M.T. Echenique & J. Sánchez Méndez (Eds.), *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española* (Vol. I, pp. 1347-1359). Madrid: Gredos.
- Moreno, M.C. (2003). *La cortesía verbal en el español clásico*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.
- Morrow, C. K. (1995). *The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, NY. UMI Microform, UMI Number: 9603629.
- Murphy, B., & Neu, J. (1996). My grade's too low: The speech act set of complaining. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in second language* (pp. 191-216). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Muysken, P. (2004). Two linguistic systems in contact: Grammar, phonology and lexicon. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 147- 168). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nakabachi, K. (1996). Pragmatic transfer in complaints: Strategies of complaining in English and Japanese by Japanese EFL speakers. *JACET Bulletin*, 27, 127-142.

- Nieto y Otero, M.J. (2003). Afectividad y cortesía: Análisis de conversaciones políticas. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 240-256). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Noblia, V. (2001). Más allá de la “netiquette”: La negociación de la cortesía y del español en las chats. *Oralia*, 4, 149-175.
- Nwoye, O. (1992). Linguistic politeness and sociocultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 309-328.
- Olshtain, E., & Weinbach, L. (1987). Complaints: A study of speech act behavior among native and nonnative speakers of Hebrew. In J. Verschueren & M. Bertucelli-Papi (Eds.), *The pragmatic perspective* (pp. 195-208). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Piatti, G. (2003). La elaboración de tests de hábitos sociales para la enseñanza del español como lengua extranjera. In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 203-211). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Pinto, D., & Raschio, R. (2007). A comparative study of requests in heritage speaker Spanish, L1 Spanish, and L1 English. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11, 135-155.
- Pinto, D., & Raschio, R. (2008). *Oye, ¿qué onda con mi dinero?* An analysis of heritage speaker complaints. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2(2), 221-249.
- Placencia, M.E. (1992). Politeness in mediated telephone conversations in Ecuadorian Spanish and British English. *Language Learning Journal*, 6, 80-82.
- Placencia, M.E. (1994). Pragmatics across varieties of Spanish. *Donaire*, 2, 65-78.
- Placencia, M.E. (1996). Politeness in Ecuadorian Spanish. *Multilingua*, 15(1), 13-34.
- Placencia, M.E. (1997). Terms of address in Ecuadorian Spanish. *Hispanic Linguistics*, 9, 165-202.
- Placencia, M.E. (1998). Pragmatic variation: Ecuadorian vs. Peninsular Spanish. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, 2, 71-106.
- Placencia, M.E. (2001). Percepciones y manifestaciones de la (des)cortesía en la atención al público: El caso de una institución pública ecuatoriana. *Oralia*, 4, 177-212.
- Placencia, M.E. (2005). Pragmatic variation in corner store interactions in Quito and Madrid. *Hispania*, 88, 583-598.

- Placencia, M.E., & García, C. (2007). Introduction: Models for the study of (linguistic) (im)politeness. In M.E., Placencia & C. García, (Eds.) *Research on Politeness in the Spanish-speaking World* (pp. 1-17). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pye, C. (1986). One lexicon or two? An alternative interpretation of early bilingual speech. *Journal of Child Language*, 13, 591- 593.
- Quaglia, M.L. (1996). El poder y el deber de la cortesía verbal: Un estudio contrastivo del español y del italiano. *Estudios de Lingüística Aplicada*, 23-24, 264-271.
- Redlinger, W. E. & Park, T. (1980). Language mixing in young bilinguals. *Journal of Child Language*, 3, 337- 352.
- Rigatuso, E.M. (1999). Mi dueño y señor, paisano y amigo: Fórmulas de tratamiento, cortesía y sociedad en el español bonaerense del siglo XIX. Paper presented at XII Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de la América Latina (ALFAL), Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Santiago de Chile.
- Rigatuso, E.M. (2000). “Señora (...) ¿No tenés más chico?” Un aspecto de la pragmática de las fórmulas de tratamiento en español bonaerense. In E. Rojas (Ed.), *Revista Argentina de Lingüística*, 16(Número Especial Dedicado a Semántica y Pragmática), 293–334.
- Rigatuso, E. M. (2002). *Cortesía tratamientos e identidad cultural en encuentros de servicio en español bonaerense*. Bahía Blanca: Secretaría de Comunicación y Cultura, Universidad Nacional del Sur.
- Rigatuso, E.M. (2003). Usos y valores comunicativos de los tratamientos honoríficos en español bonaerense: Visión diacrónica. In Actas del IX Congreso de la Sociedad Argentina de Lingüística, Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba.
- Ruzickova, E. (1998). Cuban facework: Politeness strategies in requests, apologies and compliment responses. Paper presented at the Linguistics Colloquium. Columbus, Ohio.
- Sánchez Lanza, C. (2003). El discurso de la cortesía en puestos de atención al público en la Argentina (instituciones de salud pública y bienestar social). In D. Bravo (Ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio del Programa EDICE* (pp. 332-345). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Schmidt, R. (1980). Review of Esther Goody (Ed.): Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction. *Regional English Language Centre Journal*, 11, 100-114.

- Schradder-Kniffki, M. (2007). Speaking Spanish with Zapotec meaning. In M. E. Placencia & C. García (Eds.), *Research on politeness in the Spanish-speaking world* (pp. 157-174). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Solé, Y. (1970). Correlaciones socio-cultural del uso *tú/vos* y *usted* en la Argentina, Perú y Puerto Rico. *Thesaurus*, 25, 161-195.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 95-119.
- Swain, M. (1972). Bilingualism as a first language. (Unpublished PhD dissertation), University of California, Irvine.
- Trenchs, M. (1995). Pragmatic strategies in Catalan and English complaints: A comparative study of native and EFL speakers. *Language Quarterly*, 33 (3-4), 160-182.
- Valdes, G. (1981). Codeswitching as a deliberate verbal strategy: A microanalysis of direct and indirect requests among bilingual Chicano speakers. In R. P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 95-107). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Valdés, G., & Pino, C. (1981). Muy a tus órdenes: Compliment responses among Mexican-American Bilinguals. *Language in Society*, 10(1), 53-72.
- Valeiras Viso, J.M. (2002). Deja tu mensaje después de la señal: Despedidas y otros elementos de la sección de cierre en mensajes dejados en contestadores automáticos en Madrid y Londres. In M.E. Placencia & D. Bravo (Eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español* (pp. 209-232). Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Vázquez, C. (2011). Complaints online: The case of *TripAdvisor*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1707- 1717.
- Vázquez-Orta, I. (1995). *A contrastive study of politeness phenomena in England and Spain: Applied and interdisciplinary papers*. Paper No. 267. Duisburg: L.A.U.D.
- Volterra, V., & Taeschner, T. (1978). The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language*, 5, 311-326.
- Wagner, L.C. (1999). *Towards a sociopragmatic characterization of apologies in Mexican Spanish*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Ohio State University.

- Walters, J. (1979). Strategies for requesting in Spanish and English: Structural similarities and pragmatic differences. *Language Learning*, 29, 277-293.
- Weber de Kurlat, F. (1941). Fórmulas de cortesía en la lengua de Buenos Aires. *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, XII, 137-192.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wolfe, J., & Powell, E. (2006). Gender and expressions of dissatisfaction: A study of complaining in mixed-gender student work groups. *Women and Language*, 29 (2), 13 – 20.
- Yañez, R. (1990). The complimenting speech act among Chicano women. In J. Bergen (Ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 79-85). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Youmans, M. (2001). Cross cultural differences in politeness epistemic modal use in American English. *Journal of Multicultural Development*, 22 (1), 57- 73
- Zentella, A.C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.

APPENDIX A
IRB APPROVAL

To: Alvaro Cerron-Palomino

From: Mark Roosa, Chair
Soc Beh IRB 

Date: 06/06/2012

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 06/06/2012

IRB Protocol #: 1205007887

Study Title: Pragmatic speech styles of Spanish of the U.S.

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2).

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.

APPENDIX B
POST ROLE-PLAY QUESTIONNAIRE

After participating in this situation please answer the following questions:

1. What was your general impression of how the interaction developed?
2. Does your participation reflect how you would act in a real-life situation?
3. How do you interpret your interlocutor's reaction? Circle the responses that best reflect your opinion.
 - a. Strong or Weak
 - b. Rude or Polite
 - c. Normal or Brief
4. How would you judge your participation? Circle the responses that best reflect your opinion.
 - a. Strong or Weak
 - b. Rude or Polite
 - c. Normal or Brief
5. Is there anything you would have liked to say, but didn't? What was that? Why didn't you say it?
6. Is there anything special that your interlocutor said that bothered you? What was that?
7. Do you have any other comment?