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Apologies have long been considered an important social action in many languages for dealing with frictions of everyday interaction and restoring interpersonal harmony in response to an offense. Although there has been an increasing amount of research on apologies in non-Western languages, little research involves children. Japan is an interesting case in which to examine apologies. In particular, Japan has been called a “culture of apology” in the sense that speakers often ‘apologize’ (ayamaru) in a wide range of communicative contexts. This article examines children’s socialization to a culture of apology as evidenced by a large corpus of audiovisual recordings made over the last decade in households, playgrounds, and a preschool in Japan. In particular, it examines ways Japanese caregivers (e.g. parents, preschool teachers) use the expressions Gomen ne and Gomen-nasai ([I’m/We’re] sorry) when addressing third parties, including not only other people (e.g. children’s peers) but also a range of entities in the surround (e.g. animals, supernatural objects, objects in the environment such as a stone), and ways they prompt children to say these expressions to such third parties. This analysis suggests that apology situations are an important site through which children are socialized to empathy and relationships in the social world. It also examines ways children use these expressions when addressing peers and inanimate objects, and ways they prompt others including peers (and even on occasion adults) to say them. These findings suggest that while children deploy strategies in ways that reflect the socialization process, they also deploy them in ways that construct this process in creative ways.
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1. Introduction

In societies across the globe, speakers deploy a wide range of communicative practices in order to help ease the frictions of everyday social encounters. Important among these is apology. Apology has roots in many religious, historical, and cultural traditions (Smith 2008), and as a topic of research it has attracted attention across various fields including psychology, linguistics, sociology, and philosophy. Here, apology is examined in naturally occurring interaction as a ‘reactive’ social action (Coulmas 1981:71), addressed to a recipient for an offense committed by the self or a member of one's social group. While apology has been identified by researchers in many languages, it varies widely across societies, including what speakers treat as an ‘apologizable offense’ (Tavuchis 1991:25).

Japan has been called a ‘culture of apology’ (Sugimoto 2002:357) in that speakers often ‘apologize’ (ayamaru)\(^1\) for themselves and others in a wide range of contexts. The language has several formulaic expressions of ‘explicit apology’ (Robinson 2004) (e.g. Gomen and Gomen-nasai ‘[I’m/We’re] sorry’, Warui ‘[I’m] bad’, Sumimasen ‘Sorry/Excuse [me]’, Shitsuree shimasu ‘Excuse the rudeness’, Mooshiwake arimasen ‘There is no excuse’, Owabi mooshiagemasu ‘[I/we] apologize’). The choice of expression depends on a number of variables such as the relationship between the parties, setting, and type and severity of the offense. Such expressions of apology are absent a grammatical subject, so the apologizer may be interpreted as first or third person, and singular or plural, depending on the context. As in some other communities such as Native American (Smith 2008:126),\(^2\) in Japan speakers may apologize not only to other human actors but also, as will be shown here, to various addressees in the environmental, material, and spiritual worlds. Thus, learning to say expressions of apology in Japanese implicates children’s linguistic, social, and moral development in various ways. Although the use of expressions of apology has been widely explored in relation to adults in various languages (e.g. Holmes 1990 on English; Ide 1998 on Japanese; Kampf 2009 on Hebrew; Meyerhoff 1999 on Bislama; Nureddeen 2008 on Arabic; Obeng 1999 on Akan; Shariati and Chamani 2010 on Persian; Wouk 2006 on Indonesian), their socialization and use involving children has been much less explored (but see Ely and Gleason 2006 on English; Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2007 on Hebrew).

This article examines children’s socialization to apology in Japanese. In particular, it analyzes ways caregivers: (i) ‘frame’ (Goffman 1974; Tannen 1993) particular incidents, situations, and actions as an apologizable offense, (ii) address and prompt children to address the formulaic expressions Gomen ne and Gomen-nasai (ne)\(^3\) to a range of third parties (e.g. children’s peers, plants, animals, spirits), and (iii) on occasion respond for these third parties by speaking for them. While Gomen ne and Gomen-nasai (ne) have traditionally been considered casual
and polite speech styles respectively, here they are examined as indexes of socio-cultural meanings, including affect and relationships. The article also analyzes ways children use expressions of apology when addressing others such as peers and inanimate objects, and when prompting peers, and sometimes even adults, to say them. These findings suggest that while children deploy expressions of apology in ways that reflect the socialization process, they also deploy them in creative ways, shedding light on children's understanding of self and face. The remainder of this article consists of three sections and a summary and conclusion. Section 2 discusses the theoretical framework of language socialization and relevant research on apology. Section 3 outlines the data and setting. Section 4 analyzes caregiver socialization of children to expressions of apology, and children's use of these expressions and their socialization of others to say them. The final section summarizes the findings and concludes the article by relating the findings to self, face, and language socialization.

2. Background

2.1 Language socialization

The socialization to apology is viewed here as a process of 'language socialization' (e.g. Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986) – a theory of language learning and cultural learning that examines ways children (and other novices) acquire 'culturally specific subjectivities' (Kulick and Schieffelin 2004: 351). While caregivers play a central role in socialization, children are viewed not merely as recipients but as agents who socialize others including caregivers and peers (e.g. Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007). Socialization occurs within 'participation frameworks' (Goffman 1981) in which children are positioned, and position themselves and others, in a range of interactional roles, including speaker, addressee, and overhearer (de León 1998). Through such roles, children come to understand and use language as an 'index' (Silverstein 1976) of socio-cultural meanings such as 'identity' and 'stance' (Ochs 1996), which are discussed here.

Identity refers to all aspects of social personae (e.g. gender, ethnicity, roles) (Ochs 1996). It is examined here in terms of relationships, particularly ways of 'relating' to others (Arundale 2011). According to Arundale (2006: 201) a relationship “is defined concretely with respect to two particular persons, and is a single dyadic phenomenon, not the sum of two separate monadic phenomena.” Relationships may be ‘explicitly invoked’ through the use of person reference terms (e.g. older sibling, neighbor) (Pomerantz and Mandelbaum 2005), and other linguistic resources. As in other societies (Enfield 2009), in Japan individuals are viewed in
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terms of relationships. Scholars have traditionally discussed relationships in terms of a vertical axis, including hierarchy (e.g. status, rank), and a horizontal axis, including ‘in-group’ (uchi) and ‘out-group’ (soto) (e.g. Bachnik and Quinn 1994; Nakane 1972). What is less discussed is that relationships are constructed not only with other human actors but also with a range of sentient and non-sentient entities (e.g. Allison 2004; Kretschmer 2000). As Duranti (2009: 206) points out, in any society the social world can be “made of people, animals, food, artifacts, things of nature, and, at times, spirits or other kinds of supernatural beings.” This is relevant in Japan in which Shinto (the indigenous spirituality) and Buddhism (adopted from Korea and China) have contributed to a view of the social world as an interrelated web of relationships among humans, nature, and the material and spiritual worlds. As will be shown here, children are socialized to various types of relationships through the use of expressions of apology and the stances that co-occur with them.

Stance refers to displayed attitudes and evaluations of people, objects, ideas, and the like, and is constructed with others in interaction (e.g. Jaffe 2009; Stivers 2008). It involves “positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects” (Du Bois 2007: 163). Here, stance is examined in terms of ‘affective stance’, which includes “mood, attitude, feeling and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern” (Ochs 1996: 410). It is indexed through a range of language resources (e.g. words, prosody, particles) (Ochs and Schieffelin 1989) and thus is an important dimension in constructing relationships and relating to others. In particular, ‘empathy’ (omoiyari) (e.g. Lebra 1976), which will refer to a deep positive connection with others, including the ability to understand and predict their desires, needs, and feelings, is an important feature of Japanese interaction (e.g. Hayashi 1996). Recently, empathy has received a good deal of attention in the mass media in Japan. In particular, social commentators and laypersons (e.g. letters to the editor) cite social problems such as teenage bullying and crime as reflecting a lack of empathy. Their lamentations signal a broader ‘moral panic’ (Cohen 1972) that youth are becoming less other-oriented. Be that as it may, caregivers in the home (Clancy 1985, 1986) and preschool (Hayashi et al. 2009; Lewis 1995) expend a good deal of effort in socializing children to empathy. For instance, Clancy (1985: 499) found that Japanese mothers attribute desires to third party adults in the form of quoted speech in order to “train their children to anticipate the unspoken wishes of others.” Hayashi et al. (2009) observed that preschool teachers attribute feelings of loneliness to inanimate objects (e.g. ‘Poor Mister Carrot … Don’t you think he feels lonely [that he is the only one left on the plate]?’) in order to get children to carry out actions vis-à-vis these objects (e.g. eating the carrot). The present analysis suggests that expressions of apology are an important language resource in socializing children.
to empathy, and one that children become able to use on their own as an index of empathy.

2.2 Apology

The use of expressions of apology is a particularly relevant context for examining socialization to relationships and affect. In terms of relationships, previous research has discussed apology as a speech act in managing ‘face’, or public image. Goffman (1967: 5) defines face as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact.” In this sense, apology is a ‘remedy’ in managing face concerns. In building on this notion of face, Brown and Levinson (B and L) (1987: 61) propose two kinds of face wants: (a) ‘negative face’: “the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition,” and (b) ‘positive face’: “the positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.” From their perspective, apology is a ‘negative politeness strategy’ that displays an understanding of an addressee’s negative face wants. B and L have been critiqued (e.g. Arundale 2010; Eelen 2001; Matsumoto 1989) particularly in relation to their conceptualization of face as individual face concerns. In some societies such as Japan, people frequently shift between individual and group face concerns (e.g. Bachnik 1992). Moreover, Arundale (2006: 194) argues that in any society, face is ‘a relational and an interactional phenomenon’ in that it is constructed between two or more parties in a communicative context. The position here it that face is related to both the individual and group, and, in either case, it is relational and constructed in interaction with others through affect.

In terms of affect, previous research has characterized apology as an ‘affective speech act’ (Ochs and Schieffelin 1989). In many languages, apology co-occurs with various language resources that specify and ‘intensify’ affect (Labov 1984). For instance, in the Japanese expressions of apology Gomen ne and Gomen-nasai (ne),4 gomen is an ‘affect word’ (Clancy 1999) that specifies affect; ne is a pragmatic particle that seeks affective ‘alignment’ with the addressee (Tanaka 2000). Also, in the latter expression, Gomen-nasai, -nasai is a ‘polite’ imperative marker (Iwasaki 2002), which will be analyzed here as an index of heightened affective stance. These expressions may co-occur with repetition, as an affect intensifier. In particular, it has been pointed out that Japanese speakers are urged to repeat an expression of apology one or more times as a display of sunao-sa, meaning ‘humbleness’, ‘obedience’, ‘deference’, or ‘selfless surrender’ (Sugimoto 1998: 257). The present analysis sheds light on ways such language resources co-occur with
expressions of apology, and ways children are socialized to use these resources as an index of affective stance, particularly empathy.

3. Data and setting

The analysis is based upon a large corpus of audiovisual recordings (over 200 hours) collected in Japanese households, neighborhoods, and a preschool over a five-year period (2003-08). Most of the corpus (148 hours) consists of 11 families with a two-year old child residing in urban areas in Osaka and Kyoto. Five of these families have an older child (4-9 years old). The children were recorded as they interacted with family members, peers, and others in and around the home. The remainder of the corpus (57 hours) consists of a group of fourteen children (2–5 years old) and their female teachers in a private preschool (referred to here as Akebono) in an urban area near Tokyo. Several of the children are speakers of Japanese as a second language (L2). All of the children were recorded as they interacted with teachers and peers inside the center and outside on the playground.

4. Analysis

4.1 Caregivers socializing children

This section examines Japanese caregiver use of expressions of apology as a site for socializing children to affect and relationships. In particular, it analyzes sequences surrounding the use of the expressions *Gomen ne* and *Gomen-nasai (ne)*. These expressions were chosen for analysis because they are by far the most frequent expressions of apology in the corpus. As shown in Table 1, caregivers produced a total of 127 tokens of *Gomen ne* and *Gomen-nasai (ne)* (80 in families, 47 in preschool). Based on these data, caregivers use *Gomen ne* and *Gomen-nasai (ne)* in a ratio of about 3:1, which can attributed to the use of these expressions as indexes of affect and relationships, particularly affective closeness (*Gomen ne*) and affective distance (*Gomen-nasai*) respectively. That is, during the recording sessions, certain recipients of apology (e.g. family members, peers, pets) are normally treated with affective closeness by caregivers and children; in contrast, other recipients (e.g. strangers, wild animals, supernatural figures) are usually treated with affective distance. Caregivers also on occasion use *Gomen-nasai* as an index of heightened affective stance, such as in responding to children’s purposeful and/or severe offenses (e.g. pushing a peer to the ground).
Framing, empathy, and relationships

In sequences in which they utter expressions of apology, caregivers socialize children to empathy. In particular, they use a range of language resources in framing particular incidents, situations, and actions as an apologizable offense, and they address (or prompt children to address, as in Section 4.1.2) the expressions Gomen ne and Gomen-nasai (ne) to a range of third parties. For instance, in (1) from the family data, a mother addresses an expression of apology to the family pet that had bitten the older brother. Here, the mother and her two children, Hiro⁶ (male, 5;7 [5 years and 7 months]) and Eri (female, 2;8) have taken their (female) hamster (named Nana) out of its cage to play with it and feed it a snack. (Originally the mother was hesitant to take it out of its cage, but eventually succumbed to the children’s wishes). After several minutes, the hamster bites Hiro on the hand. When he puts the hamster back into its cage, his mother addresses him (lines 1 and 5) and then the hamster (line 7) (Transcription conventions and interlinear gloss abbreviations appear in the appendix):

(1) Family data: dining room floor (Kyoto, 7/11/2003, 4:19pm)
1 Mom:  
Nana moo o-uchi ni kaeri-ta-katta n da yo.  
name already rh-home DAT return-DES-PST SE COP PP  
'It's that Nana had already wanted to go home.'
2 Hiro:  
(          ) ((puts food in hamster’s cage))
3  
(2.2)
4 Nana:  
((enters small house inside cage))
5 Mom:  
Hora, tsukare-te-ta n da yo:.  
look tired-TE-PST SE COP PP  
'Look, it’s that she was tired.'
6  
(0.4)
7 Mom:  
→ Nana gomen ne, tsukare-te-ru noni.  
Nana sorry PP tired-TE-ASP even.though  
'Nana, (we're) sorry, even though you were tired.'

In this example the mother addresses the children by referring to the hamster’s desires (line 1: 'It’s that Nana had already wanted to go home’), and then, when

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>All data</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gomen ne</td>
<td>92 (72.4%)</td>
<td>56 (70.0%)</td>
<td>36 (76.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomen-nasai</td>
<td>35 (27.6%)</td>
<td>24 (30.0%)</td>
<td>11 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127 (100%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the hamster enters the small house-like structure inside its cage (line 4), she refers to its feelings (line 5: ‘Look, it’s that she was tired’). In these two utterances, the mother provides the children with an imagined explanation or ‘account’ (e.g. Sterponi 2003) (using the sentence extender \textit{n ‘it’s that X’} in lines 1 and 5, see Iwasaki 1985; Cook 1990) as to why the hamster bit the child. In these ways, she frames the incident (i.e. hamster biting the older brother on the hand) as one in which \textit{they} have offended the hamster, and in the process encourages the children to understand the hamster’s actions in relation to its desires and feelings. While speakers in some other communities talk to their pets (e.g. Roberts 2004; Tannen 2004), here addressing an expression of apology to a pet is a site for socializing children to empathy and relationships. In particular, in uttering the apology (line 7: ‘Nana, (we’re) sorry, even though you were tired.’), the mother uses the hamster’s name (‘Nana’) and the expression of apology \textit{Gomen ne} as an index of affective closeness, and repeats the reference to the hamster’s feelings (‘even though you were tired’) as an index of empathy. Although it is the mother who utters the apology, the apology can be heard as uttered on behalf of the group (i.e. mother and children).

In (2) from the preschool, a teacher also uses various language resources – both prior to and after uttering an expression of apology – in framing a situation as an apologizable offense. At the time the class was taking a walk around the neighborhood and had briefly stopped to look at some wild ducks and egrets in a pond, one of the children asked aloud if they had any bread (presumably to feed the ducks, as they sometimes do) (Child-1: \textit{Pan wa? ‘What about bread?’}). In response, a teacher addresses the group of children (line 1) and then the ducks (line 2) as follows:

(2) Preschool data: neighborhood pond (12/19/2007, 10:46am)
1 Teacher: \rightarrow \textit{Kyoo wa pan ga nai no.} ((addressing children))
\hspace{1cm} today TOP bread NOM have.NEG PP
\hspace{1cm} ‘Today we have no bread.’
2 Teacher: \rightarrow \textit{GOMEN-NASAI NE, KAMO-SA::N.} ((addressing ducks))
\hspace{1cm} sorry-IMP PP duck-AH
\hspace{1cm} ‘(We’re) sorry Mr./Ms. Duck.’
3 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} (0.5)
4 Teacher: \rightarrow \textit{Ne::::.} ((addressing children))
\hspace{1cm} PP
\hspace{1cm} ‘Aren’t we?’
5 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} (1.0)
Child-1:  
"Kamo-san."

Teacher:  
"Ne::::::.

Teacher:  
"Mata kondo [name of location] demo mo-tte ko-yoo ne, again next time or bring-te come-vol pp pan ne::::::.

Teacher:  
"Let's bring some bread to [name of location] again next time, okay."

(0.4)

Child-2:  
"(     )."

Teacher:  
"Ne::::::.

Teacher:  
"Hai, ja i-koo, kyoo wa. yes well go-vol today top 'Yes, well then, let's go for today.'

Teacher:  
"Ne::.

Teacher:  
"Moo pan ga kyoo wa nai desu kara::.
no.more bread nom today top have.neg cop.ah since 'Since there is no bread today.'

Teacher:  
"Kawai soo da kara ne.

Teacher:  
"Since they are pitiable, right?"

After saying to the children that they have no bread today (line 1), the teacher turns toward the ducks and calls out an apology to them (line 2: GOMEN-NASAI NE, KAMO-SA::N ‘[We’re] sorry, Mr./Ms. Duck’). In uttering the apology, the teacher uses the expression Gomen-nasai ne as an index of affective distance, and follows this with the addressee term Kamo-san (‘Mr./Ms. Duck’) using the honorific suffix -san as an index of respect. Similarly to the use of addressee honorifics in Japanese (Cook 1997), here the teacher’s use of GOMEN-NASAI (NE) also indexes her ‘on-stage’ persona as it is uttered in front of the group of children. The
teacher also uses various language resources, including a loud voice and vowel elongation, as an index of heightened affective stance. Similarly to (1) above, even though it is the teacher who utters the expression of apology, this expression can be heard as uttered on behalf of the group (i.e. teachers and children). Following the apology, the teacher turns to address the children again by repeating the particle *ne* (line 4: Ne::: ‘Aren’t we?’), which encourages them to ‘align’ with this stance (Tanaka 2000). At least one child displays alignment by repeating the addressee term (line 6: ‘Kamo-san’), which suggests he feels empathy towards the ducks. As the group of teachers and children are getting ready to leave the area, the same teacher addresses the children again, this time by making an assessment of the ducks using the affect word *kawaii* ‘pitiable’ (line 18: ‘Since they are pitiable, right?’), which conveys the notion ‘(We) feel sorry for them’ (Clancy 1986:233).

In these ways, the teacher, using pre- and post-apology, frames a situation (i.e. having no bread to feed the ducks) as an apologizable offense, and in the process encourages the children to feel empathy toward the ducks.

### 4.1.2 Relationships and responsibility

Sequences of interaction in which caregivers use expressions of apology are also a characteristic occasion for socializing children to relationships and responsibility. Previous research points out that an apology may function as a social action that ‘acknowledge[s] responsibility’ for an offense (Govier and Verwoerd 2002:29), and thus is important in constructing relationships and relating to others. Although in a traditional Western sense, responsibility is often located in the individual, in many non-Western societies responsibility (for an utterance, action, etc.) is often distributed among members of a social group (cf. Hill and Irvine 1993). In Japan, caregivers socialize children to expressions of apology in relation to both individual and group responsibility. In particular, they use strategies such as ‘prompting’ (e.g. Burdelski 2009; Demuth 1986; Schieffelin 1990) in order to encourage children to say an expression of apology for an offense committed by the self (as in (3) below) or a member of the group (as in (4) below). Yet, even in prompting children in relation to individual responsibility, caregivers often encourage them to understand an offense in terms of various kinds of relationships. For instance, in (3), a mother and her two children, Taku (male, 4;1) and Shin (male, 1;11), and the children’s aunt (mother’s sister) are at a neighborhood public park in which there is a shrine with a ‘fox’ (*kitsune*) statue standing on top of a pedestal at the front entrance gate. When Taku says he wants to ‘ride the fox’ (*Kitsune no koko noritai*), his aunt tells him it is ‘not possible’ (*Norehen*), and he responds by kicking towards the fox, albeit in a playful way. Nevertheless, the aunt sanctions him for this action:
(3) Family data: neighborhood park/shrine (Kyoto, 12/15/2005, 12:09pm)

1 Aunt:  
   Akan [de] ke-ttara.
   no.good PP kick-COND
   'It's no good if you kick.'

2 Mom:  
   [A:]
   ah
   'Ah.'

3 Aunt:  
   N honmani bacchi atan de, anta.
   mm really curse hit PP you
   'Mm, you'll really be cursed.'

4 Mom:  
   Honma ya de. Honmanni bacchi [atan de.]
   really COP PP really curse hit PP
   'Really. You'll really be cursed.'

5 Aunt:  
   [Doo su]ru? ((takes Taku by hand))
   how do
   'What will you do?'

6 Aunt:  
   ➔ Gomen-nasai yu-tto-kii. ((gestures towards statue))
   sorry-IMP say-ASP-IMP
   'Say, “I’m sorry” to the fox.'

7 Taku:  
   ➔ Gomen-nasai. ((bows head, smiles towards statue))
   sorry-IMP
   'I’m sorry.'

8

9 Aunt:  
   [U::n.
   mm
   'Mm::'

10 Mom:  
   [U::n. ((nods head))
   mm
   'Mm::'

11 Aunt:  
   h::

12

13 Mom:  
   ➔ [Un] ii yo tte yuu-te-haru wa, kitto.
   mm good PP QUOT say-TE-RH PP surely
   'Mm, surely it's saying, “It's okay”.'

14 Shin:  
   [Ke-]

15

16 Mom:  
   Sonnan shi-tara akan de.
   like.that do-COND no.good PP
   'If you do something like that, it's no good.'

17

All rights reserved
18 Mom: Na.
PM 'Right.'
19 (0.8)
20 Shin: [Manman-chan]
fox-DIM 'Fox-chan.'
21 Mom: → [Taku-chan] no o-uchi no chikaku mamo-tte kure-ta-ha n
name-DIM LK RH-home LK near protect-TE give-ASP-RH SE ya kara.
cop since 'Since it's protecting the area near Taku's home.'
22 (0.2)
23 Mom: → zu::to kono manman-chan ga.
continuously this fox-DIM NOM 'all the time, this fox-chan is.'

Here, the aunt frames Taku's action as an apologizable offense in relation to individual responsibility. In particular, she sanctions him for his actions in an ostensibly moral way (line 1: 'it's no good if you kick'), and then tells him he will be 'cursed' (line 3), which reflects the animistic belief in Shinto that certain objects – especially religious ones – are endowed with a spirit, and by treating them poorly “the spirit might be offended and even curse the human” (Kretschmer 2000:384). The aunt then prompts Taku to say Gomen-nasai to the statue (line 6: Gomen-nasai yuttokii ‘Say, “I'm sorry” [to the fox]’), in order to encourage him to acknowledge responsibility for the offense to the addressee.

In a pattern observed in these data, here when the child repeats the expression of apology to the statue in line 7, his mother responds for the fox, using reported speech (line 13: ‘Mm, surely it’s saying “It’s okay”’). This kind of reported speech is a strategy in socializing children to a relationship between the child and offended party. In particular, here in the reported speech frame (‘it’s saying’), the mother uses the referent honorific suffix haru (Kansai dialect) as an index of respect towards the statue, and in the quoted portion she uses the non-honorific (plain form) expression Ii yo (“It’s okay”) as an index of affective closeness. Similarly to other research on responses to apology, the quotation functions as an acceptance of the apology and as an expression of ‘forgiveness’ (e.g. Griswold 2007; Kampf 2008). In this way, the mother’s response indexes a relationship between Taku and the fox statue through the completion of an ‘adjacency pair’ (e.g. Schegloff 2007; also Arundale 2010). Towards the end of this excerpt, the mother encourages Taku to understand a relationship between the fox and a larger social group. In particular, she explains that the fox (to whom she is referring, using the diminutive suffix
-chan to index affective closeness) is ‘protecting the area near Taku’s home all the time’ (lines 21 and 23), thereby indexing a relationship between the fox and the community in which the child is a member.

In addition to prompting children in relation to individual responsibility, Japanese caregivers prompt older children to say an expression of apology for an offense committed by younger siblings. For instance, in (4) a younger sibling Shin (male, 1;11), had accidentally bumped into the face of a playmate Sao (female, 2;1) as they were coming into the house from outside. As Sao begins to cry, Shin’s mother sanctions Shin and then prompts him several times to say Gomen ne to Sao. When Shin says the expression to his mother (instead of to Sao), his mother addresses the expression to Sao for him and then turns towards the older brother Taku (4;11) and prompts him to apologize to Sao ‘in place of’ Shin as in line 1:

(4) Family data: household entrance (Kyoto, 10/16/2004, 5:42pm)
1 Mom: → Taku-chan, kawarini na, gomen ne tte yu-ttoi-te age-te.
   Taku-DIM in.place.of PP sorry PP QUOT say-ASP-TE give-TE
   ‘Taku-chan say (to Sao), “(I’m/we’re) sorry” in place of (Shin).’
2 (0.3)
3 Taku: → Gomen ne.
   sorry PP
   ‘(I’m/we’re) sorry.’
4 Mom: → Shin-chan hashi-tte gomen ne tte.
   Shin-DIM run-TE sorry PP QUOT
   ‘Say, “(I’m/we’re) sorry that Shin-chan ran”.
5 Taku: → Shin-chan hashi-tte gomen ne.
   Shin-DIM run-TE sorry PP
   ‘(I’m/we’re) sorry that Shin-chan ran.’

In comparison to other research in which caregivers speak for children (Burdelski 2011; de León 1998), here a mother prompts an older sibling to speak for a younger sibling (line 1: “Taku-chan say [to Sao], “[I’m/we’re] sorry” in place of [Shin].”). In Japan, older siblings typically have a high status, and this status comes with certain duties to younger ones such as providing them with a model of appropriate behavior and language to imitate (Hendry 1986). Here, by prompting the older sibling to say an expression of apology, the mother socializes him to use language to index the older sibling-younger sibling relationship. Such prompting also socializes him to the broader communicative practice in Japanese society of apologizing on behalf of other members of one’s social group (cf. Okumura and Li Wei 2000).

In this example, the mother also socializes the older sibling to use language resources in relation to other affective and discursive features of apologies. In
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particular, when Taku says the expression of apology to Sao, his mother prompts him to repeat it, this time adding the explanation 'that Shin-chan ran' (line 4: *Shin-chan hashi-tte gomen ne tte* 'Say, "[I'm/we're] sorry that Shin-chan ran"'). This prompt socializes him to repeat the expression of apology as an index of affect (cf. Sugimoto 1998), in this case to display empathy towards the addressee and help soothe her pain. It also socializes him to provide an explanation to the addressee as to why the offense occurred, which has been observed to be an important discursive feature of apologies in Japanese (Okumura and Li Wei 2000). Yet (despite the fact that Shin did not actually run just before the accident), this explanation further functions as a social action to another addressee, namely as a directive to Shin (who is an observer) to not run and thus to be more careful of actions that can lead to accidentally harming others. In these ways, Japanese caregivers socialize children to expressions of apology within multiple participation frameworks.

4.2 Children’s apology and socialization of others

What are some of the outcomes of the process of socialization examined above? This section addresses the question by analyzing children’s spontaneous use of expressions of apology in addressing others and in prompting others to say them.

As shown in Table 2, children in the family and preschool data produced a total of 72 tokens of *Gomen ne* and *Gomen-nasai* (40 in families, 32 in preschool). Based on these data, they use *Gomen ne* about three times more often than *Gomen-nasai*, a ratio similar to that of caregivers as discussed earlier in relation to Table 1. Upon further analysis, children use the majority of these expressions (43 tokens, or 59.7%) following a prompt (e.g. as in (3) line 7 above), some children as early as 1;11. In what is the focus of the following analysis, children use the remainder of these expressions spontaneously (29 tokens, or 40.3%) in response to their own accidental offenses (16 of 29 tokens) (as in Example (5) below), some children as early as 2;2, and in prompting peers (as in (7) below), and on occasion adults (as in (6) below), to say them (13 of 29 tokens), some children as early as 3;0. Children use *Gomen ne* as an index of affective closeness, and they use *Gomen-nasai* as an index of affective distance and heightened affective stance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>All data</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Gomen (ne)</em></td>
<td>56 (77.8%)</td>
<td>30 (75.0%)</td>
<td>26 (81.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gomen-nasai</em></td>
<td>16 (22.2%)</td>
<td>10 (25.0%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2.1 Apologizing to others

Children in both the home and preschool begin to say expressions of apology to others (including peers and inanimate objects) in response to accidental offenses. Their use of these expressions, often with other language resources such as repetition and addressee terms, indexes affect and relationships. For instance, in (5) from the preschool, Lan (female, Vietnam, 3;1), an L2 speaker of Japanese, and a peer Shakir (male, Egypt, 2;1), who does not speak in this fragment, are riding on a koala-shaped piece of playground equipment while a teacher pushes it back and forth. When Lan bumps her head on the koala’s head she responds as follows:

(5) Preschool data: neighborhood playground (6/5/2007, 10:30am)
1  Lan:     Itai. (touching her forehead)
             ouch
             ‘Ouch.’
2  Teacher: [Are? Ara.
             hm  oh.my
             ‘Hm? Oh my.’
3  Teacher: Butsuka-cha-tta? .h ((rubs Lan’s head))
             bump.into-ASP-PST
             ‘You regrettably ended up bumping into it?’
4  Teacher: Itai no itai no ton-de-ke:::
             ouch NML ouch NML fly-TE-IMP
             ‘Ouch ouch go away.’
5  Lan:  → Gomen-nasai. ((bows towards koala))
             sorry-IMP
             ‘(I’m) sorry.’
6  Teacher: Arama:::::
             oh.dear
             ‘Oh dear.’
7  Lan:  → Gomen ne. ((bows towards koala))
             sorry PP
             ‘(I’m) sorry.’
8  Teacher: N?
             mm
             ‘Mm?’
9  Teacher: Daijobu da tte. ((rubs koala’s forehead))
             fine COP QUOT
             ‘It says it’s fine.’
10 Teacher: Koara-chan ita-kunai tte.
             koala-DIM hurt-NEG QUOT
             ‘Koala-chan says it doesn’t hurt.’
After saying ‘Ouch’ (line 1), a ‘response cry’ (Goffman 1981:78), Lan turns towards the teacher, who provides her with comfort in verbal and somatic ways (lines 2–4). Following this, Lan turns towards the koala and apologizes to it using the expression *Gomen-nasai*, while bowing her head (line 5). In a pattern also observed among English-speaking children (Ely and Gleason 2006), here Lan apologizes to an inanimate play object. Lan repeats the apology to the koala, this time using the expression *Gomen ne*, while again bowing her head (line 7 and Figure 1). By saying *Gomen-nasai* and *Gomen ne* in sequence, Lan uses repetition as an index of heightened affective stance. Furthermore, in using different expressions of apology, Lan displays an understanding that repetition does not necessarily mean reduplicating the same expression. While both of Lan’s apologies receive a response from the teacher (line 6, lines 8–10), her second one receives a more elaborate response. In particular, similarly to that observed earlier (as in (3) line 13), here the teacher speaks for the koala using reported speech (line 9: *Daijoobu da tte* ‘It says it’s fine’, line 10: *Koala-chan itakunai tte* ‘Koala-chan says it doesn’t hurt’). This use of reported speech aligns with Lan’s spontaneous use of the expressions of apology in indexing affective stance and a relationship between Lan and the koala.

### 4.2.2 Prompting others to apologize

Children also prompt others including peers (as in (7) below) and on occasion even adults (as in (6) below) to say expressions of apology. In these contexts, children deploy these expressions with other language resources, such as addressee/
reference terms and prosody, as indexes of empathy and relationships, and display an understanding of these expressions in terms of individual responsibility. For instance, in (6) from the family data, a mother and her two children, Shin (male, 2;7) and Taku (male, 4;7), are in front of their house playing on the street. When the mother begins to attend to some potted flowers hanging on the fence, a fresh petal from a flower falls to the ground, which is noticed by the older boy (Taku) who goes over towards it in line 1:

(6) Family data: on street in front of house (Kyoto, 4/6/2005, 12:02pm)
1 Taku: O-hana ya. ((alarming tone of voice))
   RH-flower COP
   'A flower.'
2
3 Taku: Konnan na-ccha-tta.
   like.this become-ASP-PST
   'It regrettably ended up becoming like this.'
4
5 Taku: Tore-cha-tta::= ((points towards flower))
   come.off-ASP-PST
   'It regrettably ended up coming off.'
6 Mom: =Soo ya nen.
   right COP PP
   'That's right.'
7 Mom: Tore-te n.
   come.off-ASP SE
   'It's come off.'
8 Mom: Kororin:n tte ochi-cha-tta, hanabira. ((picks up flower petal))
   ssw QUOT fall-ASP-PST flower.petal
   'The flower petal regrettably ended up dropping off,
   (with a sound of) kororin.\textsuperscript{8}
9 Taku: ((gently touches petal in mother’s hand)) (1.2)
10 Mom: [Kirei yaro?
   pretty COP
   'It’s pretty, isn’t it?’
11 Taku: [((gently touches petal in mother’s hand))
12 Mom: Kiiro to murasaki ga issho no hanabira ya de.
   yellow and purple NOM together LK flower.petal COP PP
   'A yellow and purple flower petal.’
13 Shin: Hana (0.3) [hanabira ochi-ta no?
   flower flower.petal fall-PST NML
   'A flower (0.3) a flower petal fell off?’

\textsuperscript{8}
Mom: [(   )]
fal-TE SE SSW QUOT 'Mm, when mommy touched the flower, it fell off in a *pororon*\(^9\) manner.'

Mom: ((touches another flower)) (1.2)
Mom: *Ochi-cha-tti(h)a.*
fall-ASP-PST 'It regrettably ended up falling off.' (0.8)

Taku: → *Moo gomen ne tte o-hana ni yu-tto-kana.*
emp sorry PP QUOT RH-flower DAT say-ASP-IMP 'You have to say, “(I'm) sorry” to the flower.'

Mom: → *Gomen ne.* ((gazes toward flower petal in her hand))
sorry PP '(I'm) sorry.' (2.7)

Mom: → *O-hana gomen ne.*
RH-flower sorry PP '(I'm) sorry, flower.'

Upon noticing the flower petal, Taku displays empathy towards it in verbal and non-verbal ways. In particular, he uses an alarming tone of voice in referring to the flower (line 1: ‘A flower’), and the ‘negative’ aspect marker X-chau, meaning ‘regrettably end up X [=Verb]’ (Suzuki 1999) in commenting on it (line 3: ‘It regrettably ended up becoming like this’; line 5: ‘It regrettably ended up coming off’). In line 1, in referring to the flower he uses the honorific prefix marker o- (*O-hana* [honorable] flower’), which indexes respect towards it. Moreover, when his mother picks up the flower petal and places it in the palm of her hand (line 8), Taku reaches out and gently touches it (lines 9 and 11). After his mother addresses the younger brother Shin by telling him that when she touched the flower, it fell off (line 15), Taku displays an understanding of this as an acknowledgment of responsibility by prompting her to say *Gomen ne* to the flower (line 19, see Figure 2). The mother complies by repeating the expression twice to the flower while holding it in her hand and gazing towards it (lines 20 and 22). This prompt initiated by an older preschool child is consistent with the process of socialization orchestrated by adults as we have seen earlier, and suggests that children acquire the use of expressions of apology to index empathy, relationships, and individual responsibility.
4.2.2.1 Peer interaction: framing, dyadic prompting, and self-face wants. As in some other societies (Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2007), in Japan peer interaction is an important context for socializing apology. In particular, children frame particular actions by peers (e.g. spitting in hair, bumping, or knocking over a constructed toy block structure) as an apologizable offense, and prompt peers to say an expression of apology. In contrast to caregiver prompting, children’s prompting occurs in dyadic frameworks (cf. Schieffelin 1990) in which child-1 prompts child-2 to say an expression of apology back to child-1 for an offense related to child-1’s body or possession. Such prompting encourages child-2 to acknowledge child-1’s “self-face wants” as an index of relationships and relating to each other. Thus, as used here, self-face wants invoke Brown and Levinson’s notion of the desire for a degree of autonomy and social distance, though these wants are relational and interactional, rather than residing in individual minds. Children may attempt to involve adults in such apology situations, and other peers may intervene in order resolve them. For instance, in (7) from the preschool, two girls, Hina (3;1) and Kana (3;3), have been playing with matchbox cars on the floor when Hina lightly rolls a car across Kana’s foot and leg in a playful way. Nevertheless, Kana frames this as an offense by going over to a nearby teacher, and telling her what happened (Kana no ashi o (0.3) naka ni ireta:: ‘She put it on my foot/leg’). In response, the teacher prompts Kana to say Itai yo (’It hurt’) to Hina, which is a statement of feelings that is expected to elicit an apology from Hina, and one that encourages the girls to resolve the problem on their own (cf. Tobin et al. 2009). Yet, when Kana goes back over to Hina, she addresses her in a way different from what the teacher had prompted her to say, as in line 1:
(7) Preschool data: main playroom (7/24/2007, 11:47am)

1  Kana: →  *Hina gomen ne* *shi-te.*
   name sorry PP do-TE
   ‘Hina say, “(I’m) sorry” (to me).’

2  Hina: “Ya *da*” ((looking down, playing with toy car))
   no COP
   ‘No.’

3  (1.7)

4  Kana: *Datte* (0.3) *Hina ga* (2.1) *Hina-chan ga* (waru-)
   since name NOM name-DIM NOM bad
   ‘Since (0.3) Hina (2.1) Hina (ba-).’

5  Kana: *Hina-chan* waru- waru- (0.9) wara- ( ) wara-
   name-DIM bad bad bad bad
   ‘Hina-chan ba- ba- (0.9) ba- ( ) ba-.’

6  Hina: ((playing with toy)) (4.6)

7  Kana: *Wara-* waru-katta kara
   bad bad-pst since
   ‘ba- since Hina was bad.’

8  Kana: →  *gomen ne* *shi-te.*
   sorry PP do-TE
   ‘say, “(I’m) sorry”.’

9  Hina: ((playing with toy)) (2.3)

10 Mao: *Ima ne chotto yooji* *shi-te-ru* kara,
    now PP bit task do-TE-ASP since
    ‘Hina is a little busy now,’

11 Mao: →  *ima chotto gomen-nasai* i-wanai n da yo.
    now bit sorry-IMP say-NEG SE COP PP
    ‘so she won’t say “(I’m) sorry”.

(0.5)

12 Mao: *Ne, Kana.*
    PP name
    ‘Okay, Kana.’

13 Mao: ((goes back to playing))

Instead of saying the expression the teacher had prompted her to say, Kana prompts Hina to say the expression of apology *Gomen ne* (line 1: *Hina gomen ne shite* ‘Hina say “[I’m] sorry [to me]’’). By prompting Hina, Kana encourages her to acknowledge Kana’s self-face wants, in this case a desire to not have a toy matchbox car rolled across her leg. In response, Hina directly refuses (line 2: [*i*] ‘Ya ‘No’), and in doing so refuses to acknowledge Kana’s self-face wants. Kana then provides Hina with a reason to apologize (lines 5 and 7: *Hina-chan…warukatta kara* ‘since
Hina-chan was bad’), which frames Hina’s actions in an ostensibly moral way. When Hina ignores Kana (line 9), a female peer, Mao (2;7), who has recently entered the scene, voluntarily intervenes by providing Kana with a (imagined) explanation as to why Hina will not apologize (lines 10 and 11: *Ima ne chotto yooji shiteru kara, ima chotto gomen-nasai iwanai n da yo* ‘Hina is a little busy now, so she won’t say “[I’m] sorry’’). In this explanation, Mao uses the expression *Gomen-nasai* as an index of heightened affective stance, which may reflect an observable tension between these Kana and Hina. Although this explanation would not likely be offered in apology situations orchestrated by adults, here it is not only offered but also tacitly accepted by Kana who returns to play (line 14), suggesting there is a good deal of creativity in language use in apology situations among peers. Similarly to research on children’s apologies in peer groups in other communities (Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2007), this example suggests that preschool children in Japan may eventually resolve apology situations on their own.

5. **Summary and conclusion**

This article has examined the use of expressions of apology as a site in which children are socialized to affect and relationships in Japan. In particular, the analysis has shown ways that Japanese caregivers (i) frame particular incidents, situations, and actions as an apologizable offense, (ii) address and prompt children to address the expressions *Gomen ne* and *Gomen-nasai (ne)* to a range of third parties, and (iii) on occasion respond for these third parties. Given the moral concern surrounding empathy in Japan, these analyses suggest that expressions of apology and the sequences in which they emerge are an important site of ‘empathy training’ (Clancy 1986:232), and can be a resource and strategy for socializing children to empathy in and around the household and preschool. Caregivers also use various language resources, such as diminutive marker -*chan* and honorific marker -*san*, in referring to, addressing, and responding for an offended party, and in the process socialize children to relationships and how to relate to others.

These findings have implications for understanding face as ‘a relational and an interactional phenomenon’ (Arundale 2006: 194). Face is constructed between self and other in interaction, rather than lodged within individual minds. Further, in Japan, face is linked to relationships between self and various kinds of others, including not only other humans but also entities in the material, natural, and spiritual worlds. While relationships in Japan have traditionally been conceived in relation to in-group and out-group, this dualism is less relevant in these data than the notion that most relationships (e.g. children-pet, deity-community, mother-flower) are some form of in-group to varying degrees. Thus it may be more
productive to consider the use of the expressions *Gomen ne* and *Gomen-nasai* as indexes of affective closeness and distance respectively, indexes which reside on a continuum. While face is linked to affect and relationships, it is also linked to responsibility, particularly in the case of expressions of apology. Japanese caregivers use these expressions to socialize children to the notion of self not only as an ‘independent agent’ who is individually responsible for an offense (Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2007: 12), but also as an *interdependent* agent who may claim responsibility for a member of a group. In these ways, expressions of apology are not only an important communicative practice that children in Japan are eventually expected to produce on their own, but also an important resource and strategy in socializing children to face as a relational and interactional phenomenon.

For their part, children deploy expressions of apology in ways that reflect the socialization process, and also deploy them in creative ways. In particular, children use these expressions with other language resources as indexes of affect, empathy, and relationships. They also use them in relation to individual responsibility and “self-face wants”. For instance, in prompting another child to say an expression of apology, children display a concern with personal desires such as to not be physically touched with a toy. In this way, self-face wants are individual preferences, but are conveyed and negotiated in interaction with other children. Children’s use of prompting is an example of ‘implicit socialization’ (Ochs 1990:291) in the sense that children become able to use it through ‘emergent participation’ (de León 1998), initially as addressees and observers of caregiver prompts. In these ways, children acquire expressions of apology, and the ability to prompt others, by taking on various interactional roles within a multiparty participation framework.

Finally, the findings presented contribute to the theory of language socialization in which children “are viewed not as automatically internalizing others’ views, but as selective and active participants in the process of constructing social worlds” (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986:165). They also build upon this theory by revealing that children use expressions of apology in relation to morality, responsibility, and agency, and deploy language resources and strategies to socialize others in ways that contribute to both continuity and creativity in the socialization process.
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Notes

1. The Japanese verb ayamaru is defined as ‘thinking one did something bad and asking the addressee for forgiveness’ (warukatta to omotte aite ni yurushi o negau) (translation mine). Definition obtained from the Goo on-line dictionary (http://dictionary.goo.ne.jp).

2. Although not widely reported in relation to English, Fraser (1981: 269) suggests that a small number of apologies in his data were addressed to non-human entities. In particular, he writes, “we have one case of a woman apologizing to a tree stump…”

3. In these data, Gomen ne is more common than Gomen, so it is shown without parenthesis, whereas Gomen-nasai is more common than Gomen-nasai ne, so it is shown within parenthesis.

4. Similar to the expression Sumimasen (see Coulmas 1981; Ide 1998), Gomen ne and Gomen-nasai (ne) can also be used in situations of receiving (e.g. a gift, a favor) in order to express appreciation and regret for having inconvenienced the addressee.

5. In several tokens, the expression Gomen ne appeared as Gomen na (Kansai dialect).

6. Names are pseudonyms.

7. More specifically, according to Kinsella (1995: 222), the term kawaii, “derived directly from [the adjective] kawaii [cute, adorable, lovable], means pathetic, poor, and pitiable in a generally negative, if not pleasing, sense.”

8. This ‘sound-symbolic word’ (Hasada 2001) represents the sound of something lightweight falling or rolling. It is more generally a ‘phonomime’ (giongo).

9. In comparison to that in the immediately preceding footnote, this sound-symbolic word represents the manner in which something falls. It is more generally a ‘phenomime’ (gitaigo).
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Appendix

The following transcription conventions are used to indicate interactional phenomena:

[Wo]rd Brackets around word or partial word indicate overlapping talk.
Wo:rd Colon marks phonological lengthening (each colon is approx. 0.1 sec.).
Wo- Hyphen at end indicates sound cutoff.
o-uchi Hyphen in between indicates a morpheme boundary.
((bows)) Non-verbal actions and comments are shown in double parenthesis.
h Period followed by the letter h indicates an in-breath sound.
(h) An h inside a parenthesis indicates breath within a word.
(1.2) Number in parenthesis indicates silence in second/tens of second.
(.) Period in parenthesis indicates a silence of less than 0.2 second.
, Comma marks a falling intonation contour.
? Question mark indicates a rising intonation contour.
(Word) Word in parenthesis indicates transcriber uncertainty of hearing.
( ) Empty parenthesis indicates transcriber unable to hear sounds clearly.
= An equals sign marks latching.
°Word° Circles around an utterance mark reduced volume.
Upper case letters denote ‘increased volume.’
The following interlinear gloss abbreviations are also used:

- AH: Addressee honorific
- ASP: Aspect marker
- COND: Conditional
- COP: Copula
- DAT: Dative marker
- DES: Desiderative marker
- DIM: Diminutive
- EMP: Emphatic marker
- IMP: Imperative
- LK: Linking marker (genitive)
- NEG: Negation marker
- NML: Nominalizer
- NOM: Nominative marker
- PP: Pragmatic particle
- PST: Past tense
- QUOT: Quotative particle
- SE: Sentence extender
- RH: Referent honorific
- SSW: Sound-symbolic word
- TE: te form (clause linker, directive)
- TOP: Topic particle
- VOL: Volitional marker
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