¿QUÉ::? ¿CÓMO QUE TE VAS A CASAR? CONGRATULATIONS AND RAPPORT MANAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF PERUVIAN SPANISH SPEAKERS

Carmen García

Abstract

Using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management theoretical framework, this article examines Peruvian Spanish-speakers' behavioral expectations, types of face respected/threatened and interactional wants when congratulating. Analysis shows that participants' interactional wants were mainly relational; they exhibited a rapport-maintenance orientation using strategies that, although apparently violating the equity principle, relfected their interdependent self-construals (Markus and Kitayama 1991). Along the same lines, participants enhanced their own identity and respectability face, and in doing so, also enhanced the interlocutor's respectability face by making her the beneficiary of their concern for her. Although gender differences were found, these were not statistically significant.

Keywords: Peruvian Spanish; Speech acts; Congratulating; Rapport-management.

1. Introduction

According to Norrick

> […] acts of congratulating […] simply allow the speaker to share in
> the experience and feelings of the addressee. In this altruistic sense
> congratulating is a cordial gesture which strengthens ties between
> individuals and makes life more pleasant (1978: 286).

Although sharing good news might bring forth a variety of responses from the interlocutor, among them congratulating, responses will be in line with the interlocutor's cultural group's construals of self (Markus and Kitayama 1991) which, in turn, will influence his/her rapport management preferences. According to these, he/she will observe prescribed/permitted/proscribed behavior and will decide to maintain/enhance/challenge both his/her own and the interlocutor's respectability and identity face wants (i.e. "the prestige, honor or 'good name' that a person or social group holds and claims within a broader community..[and] the positive social values that [people] associate with their various self-aspects" (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 102).
        Using open role-play interactions and Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach to analyze the data, we aim to study to what extent issuing congratulations reflects Peruvians' self construals and rapport management preferences and thus contribute empirically to the body of research on Peruvian Spanish speakers' preferred communication patterns in a situation exhibiting low social distance, and low

power differential among interlocutors. For the purpose of this study, following Vanderveken (1990), we categorize congratulating as a communicative illocutionary act of the expressive type. Vanderveken (219) defines it as follows:

> To congratulate is to express happiness for some good fortune (preparatory condition) that has come the way of the hearer.

To date no studies have been done on congratulating by Spanish speakers, but the performance of other expressive speech acts such as thanking by Peninsular Spanish speakers (Hickey 2005; de Pablos Ortega 2006), complimenting by Argentineans and Peninsular Spanish speakers (Alba Juez 2000) and Uruguayans (Achugar 2001, 2002), responding to compliments by Mexican Americans (Valdés and Pino 1981), and by Peninsular Spanish speakers (Lorenzo-Dus 2001) has been researched. We will review these studies here to provide a background to compare/contrast Peruvian Spanish speakers' performance of congratulating, an expressive speech act. We will also present a summary of other studies done on the realization of face enhancing acts (Hernández-Flores 2004a; Albelda 2004, 2005; Bernal 2005) occurring in naturally occurring conversations and interviews, where speakers praise, compliment, express gratitude and reward the interlocutor, i.e. perform expressive speech acts. Moreover, we will present an overview of studies on Peruvian Spanish speakers so as to see the similarities and/or differences between their performance in congratulating and other speech acts (refusing invitations (García 1992), requesting and responding to a requests for a service (García 1993), reprimanding and responding to a reprimand (García 1996), blaming (García forthcoming a), condoling (García forthcoming b), and in doing small talk (de los Heros 2008) to see how congratulating fits into their overall rules of interaction.

2. The study of expressive speech acts in Spanish

Based on field notes taken as participant and observer of natural interactions, Hickey (2005) studied how Peninsular Spanish speakers thank the interlocutor upon receiving different types of gifts or favors. His findings showed that Peninsular Spanish speakers did not deem necessary to express gratitude for gifts or favors received by a person doing his/her job. In addition, when they expressed gratitude they did not exclusively use formulaic expressions, but rather a variety of statements that qualify as expressions of gratitude. His conclusions ratify findings that Peninsular Spanish speakers observe a preference for positive politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987) in thanking manifested in their "effusiveness, personal enthusiasm, admiration and praise of others" (329).

With the purpose of studying the difference between Peninsular Spanish speakers and English speakers' performance of thanking in Spanish and using these results to design teaching materials that would help students develop pragmatic competence in Spanish, De Pablos Ortega (2006) collected data using role play and two mini-dialogues. The first mini-dialogue illustrated the offering of a gift and the response it elicited; the second, a compliment and the response it received. These mini-dialogues were followed by a questionnaire to which participants had to react stating the (in)appropriateness of the response. His results confirmed Hickey's (cf. 2004) in that they showed that Peninsular Spanish speakers' expression of satisfaction and enthusiasm upon receiving a gift, without the use of a formulaic expression of gratitude,

was considered appropriate by Peninsular Spanish speakers. In addition, De Pablos Ortega points out, that the lack of expression of gratitude upon receiving a compliment was not considered appropriate.

Using casual conversations between friends and family members in Argentina and Spain, Alba Juez (2000) studied the use of irony to offer praise in Spanish. She concluded that by using irony both cultural groups use positive and negative politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987) simultaneously, praising and criticizing the interlocutor at the same time.

Compiling her corpus of compliments (*piropos*) from anthologies and interviews to men from the southern cone of South America, and using a systemic-functional approach (Halliday [1985] 1994) for analysis, Achugar (2001, 2002) interviewed Uruguayan women to study how they perceived different types of *piropos*. Her results showed a difference in perception directly linked to women's age (older women tended to perceive them as polite while younger women as insulting), the society they live in and the changing roles of men and women in society.

Valdés and Pino (1981) analyzed compliment responses among English-speaking monolinguals, Spanish-speaking monolinguals, and bilingual Mexican-Americans using field notes of naturally occurring conversations. Their findings show that the three groups responded to compliments by accepting or rejecting them, but always avoiding self-praise. In addition, monolingual Spanish speakers and bilinguals accepted the compliment using a question and request for repetition or expansion, something English-speaking monolinguals did not do. The bilingual group adopted patterns from both groups, demonstrating a greater variety of acceptance patterns.

In her study of compliment responses by British English and Peninsular Spanish speaking university students, Lorenzo-Dus (2001) used a Discourse Completion Test. Participants were to respond to situations exhibiting different levels of power and social distance between participants and included a variety of topics (appearance, skills/work, personality, and possessions). The analysis revealed that Peninsular Spanish speakers used humor and irony in their responses and ironic upgraders (specially males). Furthermore, speakers, similarly to Valdés and Pino's subjects, tended to request repetition of the response and avoided self-praising their natural talents and intelligence.

In addition to the studies mentioned above that report the realization of expressive speech acts, it is worth noting here other studies based on naturally occurring conversations where the use of expressive speech acts was observed and classified as face-enhancement acts. It is for this reason that we deem appropriate to include their findings here.

Analyzing naturally occurring conversations between relatives and friends in Salamanca, Spain, and using both her own notions of politeness developed in a previous work (Hernández-Flores 2002) and Bravo's (1999) categories of autonomy and affiliation, Hernández-Flores (2004a) highlights the notion of face enhancement politeness occurring in non threatening situations. In her study, the author asserts that "face enhancement [is to be considered] a function of politeness instead of … a feature that certain acts can present. Moreover, face enhancement... is not understood as having a redress function because this is not the only function of politeness…" (271). The author states that face enhancement is not limited to the occurrence of certain speech acts like compliments, expression of gratitude, rewards, etc., but that instead it has a broader function that involves both the cultural and situational context, the interactional structure or paralinguistic elements (279)

Similarly to Hernández-Flores' studies reported above but this time using spontaneous conversations and interviews of Peninsular Spanish speakers included in the Briz and Val.Es.Co. (2002) corpora for her analysis, Albelda (2004, 2005) reports the occurrence of compliments, praises, rewards, expressions of gratitude, expressions of agreement, positive assessment of what was said or suggested by the interlocutor, and laughter with an enhancement value; she classifies these as realizations of positive face enhancement politeness (*cortesía valorizante*) (2004: 118) which, the author states, occur to strengthen the affective bond existing among interlocutors, to maintain their good relationship and to favor group affiliation (Almelda 2004: 130-131).

Bernal (2005) also used the Briz and Val.Es.Co. (2002) corpora in her analysis and classifies certain speech acts occurring in the data as polite, impolite and antipolite acts. It is to these last two ones that we will refer here because of their direct relation to expressive acts. Among the impolite acts, Bernal mentions the occurrence of insults which, in certain contexts, intend to destroy the interlocutor's face and as a consequence, quoting Goffman (1967), bring about "ritual disequilibrium" in the relationship (386). At the other end of the continuum, Bernal mentions the occurrence of face enhancing acts such as disagreeing with the interlocutor's self-criticism (382) which works as an indirect compliment towards her. Likewise, she found direct compliments and compliments to the interlocutor's possessions and categorized them all as reflections of positive face enhancing politeness, which she claims, are very frequent in familiar situations in the Peninsular Spanish culture (382).

Results from these studies, although obtained using different methodologies and different cultural groups, point towards a preference for positive politeness strategies among the different Spanish-speaking groups shown in their desire for the creation of involvement with the interlocutor and their disregard for what might be perceived by other cultural groups as violations of the interlocutor's freedom of action (as would be apparent in their expression of indebtedness, for example), not because they are disrespectful or uncaring, but, on the contrary, they favor the expression of involvement and camaraderie, i.e. "the gift without the guilt" (Hickey 2004: 329).

Now a review of findings of different studies on Peruvians' performance of different speech acts will help us contextualize their congratulating within what we know about their preferred norms of interaction.

3. The study of the performance of different speech acts by Peruvian Spanish speakers

Using Brown and Levinson's (1987) theoretical framework to study refusals to invitations, García (1992) found that male and female participants went through two clearly defined stages: invitation-response and insistence-response. While participants preferred deference politeness strategies in the first stage of the interaction signaling respect, in the second they favored solidarity politeness strategies signaling camaraderie. When responding to the insistence, females tended to accept despite that the instructions they had received indicated they were not to accept, whereas males tended to refuse.

 García (1993) studied request for a service and responses to such a request using Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) head act and supportive moves categories and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model. Her results showed that Peruvians used a variety of

strategies ranging from impositives to conventional and nonconventional indirect. However, their preference for conventional indirectness reflected their tendency for deference strategies, thus avoiding direct imposition. When responding to a request, though, participants preferred solidarity over deference politeness strategies; comparison of gender participation showed that females were more solidarious than males.

Drawing again on Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness, Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) head act and supportive moves categories and Bateson's (1972) notion of frames of participation, García (1996) studied the communicative style of Peruvians when reprimanding and responding to a reprimand. When reprimanding, both men and women participating in a role-play situation, were found to prefer solidarity politeness, but there were gender differences: males were more authoritative than females in their choice of head acts and supportive moves. For head acts, males chose strategies emphasizing their authority rather than their respect for the addressee's needs to be approved of and not impeded. Females, on the other hand chose head acts emphasizing both about the same. In their supportive moves, males chose aggravators over mitigators reflecting once more their desire to impose and assert their power asymmetry; females, on the other hand, used both types of supportive moves. García pointed out that these differences reflected their different frames of participation: 'this is boss' for males and 'this is friend' for females. When responding to a reprimand, both males and females preferred deference politeness strategies, but some gender differences were again found. Males preferred more confrontational strategies than females reflecting once more different frames of participation, 'this is challenge' for males vs. 'this is acceptance' for females.

In her study of blaming, García (forthcoming a) studied participation in an asymmetrical situation where the –P interlocutor was assumed to have made a theft. Using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport-management theoretical framework, García found that when blaming, Peruvians preferred to exert their authority-control over the situation, violated the interlocutor's identity face wants, and exhibited both transactional and relational wants (the first ones, "[aim] at achieving a "concrete' task" [and the second ones] at effective relationship management" (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 107). These relational wants, however, were mostly directed towards exerting control, although when finishing the interaction, participants became less unyielding.

Again, using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport-management framework, in her study of the expression of condolence, García (forthcoming b) found that participants exhibited a rapport-enhancing orientation using a series of strategies expressing respect towards the equity and the association principles (people's right to be treated fairly and not imposed upon; and, people's right to associate with others). In addition, her findings showed that some male participants saw fit to violate the respect component of the association principle (i.e. "the belief that people should show appropriate amounts of respectfulness for others" (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 100)) by criticizing the deceased, and the autonomy-control component of the equity principle (i.e. "the belief that people should not be unduly controlled or imposed upon" (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 100) by giving advice and presenting business information. These apparent violations were interpreted as permitted behavior within a culture that favors interdependent self-construals or 'relatedness'. Participants' interactional wants were notably relational, both maintaining and enhancing in-group harmony. Gender differences were only observed in females'

preference for the expression of empathy to a higher degree than males, who, in turn, emphasized the respect component to a higher degree than females.

In addition to studies of speech act realization, we find it useful to present results of a study on small talk by Peruvian Spanish female speakers to help us expand our view of this cultural group's norms of interaction.

Studying small talk in two types of hair salons in Lima, a traditional one and a modern one, de los Heros and Montes (2008) show that small talk, associated with positive politeness strategies, is more liable to come up in traditional contexts where customers and service providers have a close relationship which they are interested to maintain; in the more modern contexts where such close relationship does not exist, customers and service providers choose not to engage in small talk as much, but rather prefer to foster and maintain their privacy and protect their own social space.

These results, recast in Spencer-Oatey's terms (2005), lead us to infer that Peruvians' and the other Hispanic groups' behavioral expectations and (dis)respect for the interlocutor's (and their own) respectability and identity face vary not only among themselves, but vary in different contexts. In interactions where they are in a –Power position (as in the case of responding to a reprimand (cf. García 1996)), they respect the equity and association principles and prefer to be deferential and respect the addressee's identity and respectability face. This is also the case when interacting with people outside their in-group, as in modern hair salons (cf. de los Heros and Montes 2008), and when in a symmetrical power position, where the interlocutor's identity and respectability face might be threatened (as in refusing an invitation (cf. García 1992) or making a request (cf. García 1993)). But, when they hold a + Power position (as in reprimanding (cf. García 1996) and blaming (cf. García forthcoming a)), the emphasis on autonomy-control prevails and the interlocutor's identity face is threatened. This behavioral expectation changes where there is no danger of threatening the interlocutor's identity face (as Hernández-Flores (2004a) and Albelda (2005) point out), but on the contrary, there is an opportunity of enhancing it (as in responding to insistence (cf. García 1992) or accepting a request (cf. García 1993); enhancing the interlocutor's face also occurs in other cultural groups in the performance of other expressive acts or in naturally occurring conversations as reported above[1], such as in complimenting in Argentinean Spanish (Alba-Juez 2000), responding to a compliment in Mexican American Spanish (Valdés and Pino 1981) and in Peninsular Spanish (Lorenzo-Dus 2001), thanking, complimenting, praising, offering rewards, expressing agreement, offering positive assessment of what was said or suggested by the interlocutor, and laughter with an enhancement value, in Peninsular Spanish (Hickey 2004; Hernández-Flores 2004a; Albelda 2004, 2005; Bernal 2005) where the emphasis on closeness rises and blooms.

Gender differences in the management of rapport were found in the Peruvian data, with females being more respectful than males of the autonomy-control and the

---

[1] Although behavioral expectations might be different within the different cultural groups mentioned above, and although intralingual Spanish pragmatic variation occurs at the regional, subregional and situational level as well as between speaking groups of different social classes, age and gender (Placencia 1994, 1998; Márquez Reiter 2002; Márquez Reiter and Placencia 2004; Murillo 2005; García 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2008), the fact that some similarities may occur between different Spanish-speaking groups, as the use of face enhancement, in the performance of some speech acts or in naturally-occurring conversations, cannot be denied.

fairness-reciprocity components of the equity principle (as in requesting (cf. García 1993), reprimanding (cf. García 1996).

4. Theoretical framework

To analyze our data, we use Spencer-Oatey's (2000, 2005) rapport management approach. According to Spencer-Oatey (2005) the success or lack of success in human interaction depends on people's behavioral expectations, face sensitivities and interactional wants.

Behavioral expectations are based on what people judge to be socially appropriate – i.e. what they believe is prescribed, permitted or proscribed behavior (97) - and this assessment is based on contextually-based conventions, norms and protocols which vary according to the communicative activity and setting and the type of relationship subjects have (99). Conventions, however, exist across a range of domains: the illocutionary domain, which deals with the performance of different speech acts; the discourse domain concerned with the "content and structure of an interchange including topic choice, and the organization and sequencing of information"; the participation domain which considers "the procedural aspects of an interchange", such as turn-taking, overlaps, pauses, listener's responses; the stylistic domain which considers choice of tone, address forms, honorifics, for example; the *nonverbal* domain which considers aspects as gestures, eye contact, proxemics (99). For the purpose of this study, given the space constraints, we will concentrate on the illocutionary and discourse domains.

Behavioral expectations, according to Spencer-Oatey, also result from contextually-dependent interactional principles: the equity principle, i.e. people's right to be treated fairly and not imposed upon; and, the association principle, i.e. people's right to associate with others. The equity principle, in turn, has three components: cost-benefit, fairness-reciprocity and autonomy-control. The association principle has three components as well: involvement, empathy and respect (100).

Spencer-Oatey (2005) distinguishes then between respectability face and identity face. Respectability face, as mentioned above, is "the prestige, honor or 'good name' that a person or social group holds and claims within a broader community" (102) and "reflects attributes such as biographical variables, relational attributes, social status indicators, formal title/position/rank, personal reputation and integrity (103). Identity face, on the other hand, is based on Goffman's (1967: 5) concept of face, defined as being "based on the positive social values that [people] associate with their various self-aspects." These may include bodily features and control, possessions and belongings, performance/skills, social behavior and verbal behavior (104). Spencer-Oatey also includes people's "claims to social group membership" as part of identity face.

Interactional wants, the third component in Spencer-Oatey rapport management model, can be either transactional or relational. Transactional wants are task oriented and relational goals aim at "effective relationship management" (2005: 107). Spencer-Oatey argues that both goals might be interconnected since the success of a transactional goal might depend on the management of a relational goal.

5. Method

Data was collected in Lima, Perú in 2006 using subjects in an open role-play scenario. Open role-play was selected because it allows the persons involved to carry out complete interactions and to have maximum control over their conversational interchange (Scarcella 1979: 277). Furthermore, it allows "the course and outcome of the interaction [to be] jointly and contingently produced by the participants, on the basis of prompts specifying the initial situational context" (Kasper 2008: 289). It is important to point out here that although discourse could have been collected from subjects participating in naturally occurring social interactions, this would have been extremely difficult here because we are interested in studying a specific type of interaction in the same context. As Hill et al. (1986: 353), quoted in Blum-Kulka (1989: 13), point out "the virtue of authenticity in naturally occurring speech must be weighed against its reflection of speaker's sociolinguistic adaptations to very specific situations." The validity of open role-plays in pragmatic research is also recognized by Félix-Brasdefer (2003) who states that they "represent an approximation of spoken discourse, as they show high indices of pragmatic features… [and] allow the researcher to control social variables, such as power and distance, sex, level of education…" (253).

5.1. Subjects

Subjects included twenty adult subjects from Lima, Perú, 10 males and 10 females; all were native Spanish speakers. The average age was 32 for males and 33 for females. The group was diverse in terms of education (ranging from holding a high school diploma to a graduate degree) and occupation (including teachers, journalists, salespersons, technicians, tourist guides, homemakers and university students). The interlocutor was a 55 year-old female librarian, someone participants did not know. Hence, participants represent a continuum from middle to upper middle class. All participants filled out a consent form before agreeing to participate in the study, but they were not remunerated.

5.2. Tasks[2]

The subjects and interlocutor were first told they would be presented with a given situation and that they were to engage in a regular, natural conversation which would be audio-taped. Subjects were separately given their instructions.
Subjects were told:

---

[2] It is important to highlight here that this particular topic for the open role-play was chosen because it represents a type of commonly occurring interaction, one where there is disclosure of personal information,   within the cultural context examined here, and consequently participants would have experience in dealing with similar situations. In addition, it lent itself to elicit a rich variety of responses ranging from congratulations to criticisms and advice. Attention was also given to ensure interaction between a younger and an older participant (the interlocutor and the subject) to study the strategies that would be used or not as a reaction to the news.

Ud. está en casa de sus padres cuando uno de sus vecinos a quien Ud. no había visto en mucho tiempo viene de visita. Ella les dice que después de haber estado viuda muchos años, ha encontrado a la persona ideal para compartir el resto de su vida y se va a casar pronto. Ud. está muy feliz por ella y le habla.

You are in your parents' house when one of your neighbors to whom you have not seen in a while comes to visit. She tells you that after having been a widow for many years she has found the ideal person to share the rest of her life and is getting married soon. You are very happy for her and talk to her.

The interlocutor, on the other hand, was told the following;

Ud. ha estado viuda por un largo tiempo y ha encontrado a la persona ideal para compartir el resto de su vida. Ud. está visitando a sus vecinos y comparte la buena noticia con ellos. El/la hijo(-a) de sus vecinos que está presente se le acerca y le habla. Ud. le contesta.

…
You have been a widow for a long time and have found the ideal person to share the rest of your life. You are visiting your neighbors and share the good news with them, Your neighbor's son/daughter is there, approaches you and talks to you. You respond.

After receiving the instructions, each subject and interlocutor improvised their conversation.

5.3. Data analysis

After all role-plays were completed and taped, interactions were transcribed using conventions designed by Jefferson (1986: ix-xvi). (See Appendix A). Interactions were then characterized in terms of the recurrent types of strategies used and how they reflected participants' behavioral expectations, the types of face they respected/threatened and their interactional wants. In the classification of strategies we found useful to use some of Blum-Kulka et al's (1989) terminology, namely grounders. Immediately after the open role-play, the subjects answered a written questionnaire about their perception of the interaction as a whole, the interlocutor's and their own participation, and the level of politeness they perceived during the interaction. The answers they provided helped the analyst determine if the subjects' participation was socially appropriate within the communicative activity they were involved in, the setting and the type of relationship they had with the interlocutor as described in the situation. A written questionnaire was chosen in lieu of verbal reports because, similarly to the latter, they "increase the credibility of role-play data, as the subjects' social perceptions of the speech act appear to complement the role-play data (Félix-Brasdefer 2003: 253)." In addition, it provides participants with valuable privacy and freedom to provide their candid feedback. (See Appendix B).

A proportion test was used to test the statistical significance in the use of different strategies by participants in general. When comparing the strategies used by

males and females, however, a difference of proportion test was used. These tests establish two different levels of validity, at .05 (95%) or at .01 (99%). According to Kachigan (1986: 184-185), "[t]ypically, we set   α = .05 or α = 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 α = .05 level of significance … For a significance level α = 01, a value of z greater than 2.58 is needed..." (165).

6. Description and analysis

During the interaction subjects used a variety of strategies which we infer responded to the behavioral expectations of their cultural group within the context of this situation. They first responded to the good news expressing emotions (surprise/disbelief) and continued by requesting ample information about the groom (identity/origin/place/
length of acquaintance/personality/background/moral quality/financial security), the date/place of the wedding, future living arrangements, claiming lack of knowledge and asking to meet him for approval. These strategies amounted to 25% of the total amount of strategies used. Participants followed their intense inquiry with an argumentative stage questioning the interlocutor's decision, rejecting her arguments, questioning her feelings, questioning the quality of the relationship, giving advice, expressing uncertainty and pessimism, and providing grounders (reasons, explanations and justifications) for their argument. These amounted to 35% of the total strategies used in their response to the good news. Finally, 40% of the strategies were devoted to end the interaction where they expressed approval/acceptance, happiness for the interlocutor, well-wishing, congratulating her, hinting desire to be invited, and accepting the invitation.

The following provides samples of the different strategies used in the interaction. Participants are identified using the following abbreviations: PM or PF where P stands for Peruvian; M and F for male and female respectively. Bold font is used to highlight the strategy being illustrated.

First Stage: Inquiring
1. Expressing surprise/disbelief. Participants' first reaction to the news received was expressing surprise or disbelief at what they were hearing.

(1)

Interlocutor	*Qué bueno. Bueno, como habrás escuchado (0.2)*
	'That's good. Well, as you must have heard' (0.2)
	bueno, estabas acá presente pero, me voy a casar.
	'well, you were here but, I am going to get married'
PM7	**↑*Qué::? cómo que te vas a casar?***
	'**↑Wha::t? what's that that you are going to get married?**'
Interlocutor	*Sí, me voy a casar.*
	'Yes, I am going to get married.'

2. Inquiring about the fiancée (identity/origin/place/length of acquaintance/personality/ background/moral quality/financial security). Participants expressed interest in knowing all the details about the fiancée by asking numerous questions about him.

(2)

PF8	*Qué bien.* **Y, cuéntame, realmente esta persona llena todas** 'That's good. **And, tell me, does this person really fulfill all'** ***tus expectativas?*** '**your expectations**?'
Interlocutor	*Yo creo que es un buen hombre y que, y que puede acompañarme* 'I think he is a good man and that, and that he can stay with me' *pues el resto de años que me quedan no?, y es una persona sincera,* 'well, the rest of the years I have left no?, and he is a sincere person,' *amable, trabajadora (0.2)* 'kind, hard working' (0.2)
PF8	***Y hace cuánto tiempo la conoces a esa persona?*** **'And how long has it been since you know that person?'**
Interlocutor	*Hace más de cinco años.* 'It's been more than five years.'
PF8	*Hace más de cinco años?* **está relacionada con tu trabajo la persona** 'It has been more than five years? **is this person related to your job?'** ***ésta?***
Interlocutor	*Eh, sí, bueno, es un pariente de una persona de mi trabajo.* 'Uh, yes, well, he is a relative of a person at work.'
PM8	*Ajá,* **significa que conoces bien su origen?** 'Ok, **does it mean that you know his background well?'**
Interlocutor	*Sí, claro.* 'Yes, of course.'

3. Inquiring about the date and place of the wedding. In addition to inquiring about the fiancée, participants were also interested in the date and place of the wedding.

(3)

PM6	***Y cuándo es el matrimonio?*** **'And when is the wedding?'**
Interlocutor	*Eh, en un mes.* 'Uh, in a month.'
PM6	***Aquí en Lima?*** **'Here in Lima?'**
Interlocutor	*Sí, acá.* 'Yes, here.'

4. Claiming lack of knowledge. Some participants expressed their lack of knowledge of the upcoming event.

(4)

PM9	*Ah mira, pero qué bien. Y qué tal, cómo, cómo - hace cuánto están ustedes*

'Oh well, that's very good. And how come, how, how – how long you'
realmente ya como pareja?
'have really been a couple?'

Interlocutor	*Ah, como tres años casi.*
	'Ah, like three years almost.'
PM9	*Como tres años **y nadie sabía!** bueno* (0.2)
	'Like three years a**nd nobody know**! well'(0.2)
Interlocutor	*No, sí sabían pero* (0.3)
	'no, they did know but' (0.3)
PM9	***mis papás sabían pero nunca me contaron nada.***
	'my parents knew but they never told me anything.'

5. Asking to meet groom for approval. Participants verbalized their interest in meeting their friend's fiancée in order to approve of him.

(5)

PF4	*Qué bueno! y quién es? **lo vas a traer para que***
	'**That's good! and who is he? **are you going to bring him to'**
	lo presentes, para darle el visto bueno?
	'i**ntroduce him, to approve of him**?'
Interlocutor	*sí sí, claro, yo: este:, tus papás lo conocen porque yo*
	'yes yes, of course, I: u:h, your parents know him because I'
	ya lo he traído acá a una reunión que ellos hicieron, pero tú no viniste.
	'have already brought him here to a gathering they had, but you did not come.'

Second stage: Arguing

6. Questioning interlocutor's feelings. Some participants deemed it appropriate to question their friend's feelings for her fiancée.

(6)

Interlocutor	*él no tiene plata ni nada de eso como para casarme por*
	'he does not have money or any of the sort as to marry him out of'
	interés, sino que:: no sé, siento que, que debo casarme.
	'interest, but tha::t I don't know, I feel that, that I have to get married.'
PM3	***Estás enamorada?***
	'Are you in love?'
Interlocutor	*Sí (0.2)*
	'Yes' (0.2)
PM3	***Crees tú en el amor?***
	'Do you believe in love?'
Interlocutor	*Sí (0.2)*
	'Yes' (0.2)
PM3	***Qué es el amor para ti?***
	'What is love for you'?
Interlocutor	*Eh, no sé, es algo inexplicable, no te lo podría decir ahorita.*
	'Uh, I don't know, it is something I can't explain, I couldn't tell you right now.'
PM3	***Si no sabes entonces cómo te vas a casar?***

'if you don't know how come you are getting married'?

7. Questioning quality of relationship. Participants also saw appropriate to inquire about the quality of the relationship between their friend and her fiancée, and between him and her children.

(7)

PM10	***Y qué tal es la relación entre tú y él?***
	'And how is the relationship between you and him?'
Interlocutor	*Mmm, muy buena, muy buena. La verdad estoy hace más de dos*
	'Mmm. very good, very good. The truth is I am more than two'
	años con él, pero nos conocemos desde hace mucho tiempo y, y él
	'years with him, but we know each other for a long time, and, and he'
	también conoció a mi esposo y sabe por todo lo que he pasado pues,
	'also knew my husband and knows everything I have gone through,'
	siento que lo conozco de toda la vida.
	'I feel I have known him all my life'
PM 10	***Y qué tal se lleva con tus hijos?***
	'And how does he get along with your children?'

8. Questioning decision. Participants did not hesitate to question the wisdom of their friend's decision.

(8)

PM8	*Ya mira, no sé, si tú (0.3) ya, mira, te fue mal, murió tu esposo,*
	'ok, see, I don't know if you (0.3) ok, see, it was bad for you, your husband died,'
	tú eres viuda: pero no te sentiste de pronto como:: liberada?
	'you are a wido:w but didn't you feel all of a sudden li::ke liberated?'
	Por qué casarse de nuevo?
	'Why marrying again?'

9. Giving advice. Subjects also advised the friend as to what she had to consider before getting married.

(9)

PM8	***Porque hay que tener mucho cuidado con las personas,***
	'because one has to be very careful with people,'
	porque aparentan que son, son este:: libres, solteros,
	'because they appear that they are, they are u::h free, single,'
	o no se sabe qué tipo de inclinaciones tiene, sus hobbies,
	'or one does not know what type of inclinations he has, his hobbies,'
	tienes que ver bien.
	'you have to see very well.'
Interlocutor	*Sí pues, porque a esta edad uno no sabe en qué líos se pueda meter, pues.*
	'yes, because at this age one does not know in what type of problems one can get into,'

10. Expressing uncertainty/pessimism. After questioning the wisdom of the decision and advising the interlocutor about what she had to do, participants were not very encouraging and instead expressed uncertainty/pessimism about the success of her impending marriage.

(10)

PM1	*Cuántos años has tenido de viuda?*
	'how many years have you been a widow?'
Interlocutor	*Casi ocho años. Y primero he aprendido a superar y ahora*
	'Almost eight years. And first I have learned to overcome and now'
	creo que debo darme una nueva oportunidad.
	'I believe that I have to give myself a new opportunity.'
PM1	***Bueno, igual se puede acabar pero::***
	'Well, all the same it can end bu::t'
Interlocutor	*Sí, uno nunca sabe no?, pero igual no quiero quedarme sola*
	'Yes, one never knows no?, but all the same I don't want to stay alone'
	para toda la vida.
	'all my life.'

11. Rejecting interlocutor's arguments. Part of the argumentative stage was contesting the friend's decision and reasons for getting married.

(11)

Interlocutor	*pero, bueno, la verdad es que yo ya estoy decidida y, y no sé no?.*
	'but, well, the truth is that I have decided and, and I don't know no?,'
	El me lo propuso y yo dije bueno. Además que, ya es para - yo siento
	'He proposed and I said ok. Besides, it is for – I feel'
	que es la persona para estar los últimos años de mi vida, aunque me
	'that he is the person to be with the last years of my life, although'
	hubiera encantado estar con mi esposo, pero tú sabes que él se fue y,
	'I would have loved to be with my husband, but you know he's gone and,'
	y bueno no quiero estar sola.
	'and well I don't want to be alone.'
PM3	***Bueno, nunca vas a estar sola. Tienes amigos, tus amigos te***
	'Well, you are never going to be alone. You have friends, your friends'
	pueden acompañar. No es necesario solamente estar con un hombre (0.2)
	'can keep you company. It is not necessary to be only with a man' (0.2)
Interlocutor	*Sí, pero, pues los amigos son diferentes no? Y::*
	'yes, but, friends are different no? A::nd
PM3	*Bueno, es tu decisión tuya no?, pero yo te aconsejo como varón*
	'Well, it is your decision no?. but I advise you as a man'
	que no des ese paso.
	'not to take that step.'

12. Grounder. Participants mitigated their arguments, advice, opposition using grounders (reasons/explanations/justifications).

(12)

Interlocutor	*Un amigo del trabajo de hace muchos años también (0.3) sí, muy buen amigo.*
	'A friend from work of many years also (0.3) yes, very good friend.'
PM8	*Y dime, te fue bien con el matrimonio anterior?*
	'and tell me, did everything go ok for you in your previous marriage?'
	porque volver a casarse (0.2) no sé, es como una
	'because marrying again (0.2) I don't know, it is a'
	decisión un poco complicada no?
	' kind of a complicated decision no?'
Interlocutor	*Sí::*
	'ye::s'

3rd Stage: Ending the interaction

13. Expressing approval/acceptance. Some participants finally accepted their friend's decision and offered their approval.

(13)

Interlocutor	*Sí sí estuve trabajando un montón de tiempo, y bueno, decidí*
	'yes yes I was working a lot of time, and well, I decided'
	irme de vacaciones para estar un tiempo con mi novio y ahora
	'to go on vacation to be with my boyfriend some time and now'
	ya él va venir.
	'he is going to come.'
PM6	*Qué piña ah, qué piña, **bueno,** ya:: te has:: segura y confiable (0.2)*
	'what bad luck uh, what bad luck, **well,** you ha::ve already::
	sure and with trust' (0.2)
Interlocutor	*Sí, segura, segura:*
	'yes, sure, su:re'
PM6	***Qué bien**, me da mucha alegría y si deseas puedes esperar a*
	'**that's good,** it gives me much happiness and if you want you can wait for
	mis padres, regresarán dentro de una hora, sino das una vuelta.
	'my parents, they will come back in an hour, if not you can come back.'

14. Expressing happiness for interlocutor. Some participants expressed their happiness about their friend's decision.

(14)

PM8	*Tiene plata?*
	'does he have money?'
Interlocutor	*No, no tiene plata.*
	'No, he doesn't have money.'
PM8	*Bueno está bien, **me alegro, me alegro, me alegro.***
	'well that's ok, **I am happy, I am happy, I am happy.**'

15.   Congratulating, Most participants finished the interaction congratulating the friend for getting married.

(15)

PM7   *Qué bueno, me parece perfecto porque yo pienso que una mujer no debe*
'that's good, I think it is perfect because I think a woman should not'
quedarse sola por el resto de su vida así se divorcie, enviude,
'stay alone for the rest of her life even if she gets divorced, becomes a widow,'
o lo que pueda pasar. de verdad me parece muy bien,
'or what might happen. I really think it is very good'
y te felicito que te vayas a volver a casar.
'and I congratulate you that you will get married again.'

16. Well-wishing. Some participants accompanied their congratulating wishing their friend happiness and success

(16)

PM10   *Si tú crees que es el hombre que te va acompañar para el resto de tu vida,*
'if you think he is the man that will stay with you the rest of your life,'
*mira, **te deseo toda la felicidad del mundo no? Y que te vaya bien.***
'see, **I wish you all the happiness in the world no? And I hope everything goes well for you.'**
Interlocutor *Bueno, sí. hay que llamar a tus papás pues, para contarles.*
'Well, yes. We have to call your parents then, to tell them.'

17. Hinting desire to be invited. After approving the friend's decision, participants expressed their desire to be invited to the wedding.

(17)

Interlocutor *Ay, bueno espero que me siga yendo como ahora, todo va muy bien*
'Oh, well I hope everything continues going as it is now, everything is going well'
hasta ahora, por eso hemos decidido casarnos.
'until now, that's why we have decided to get married.'
PM5   *Ay, qué bueno, te felicito, **a ver si me invitas.***
'oh, that's good, congratulations, **see if you invite me.'**
Interlocutor *Claro, claro, vengo a invitarlos a todos.*
'of course, of course, I come to invite you all.'

18. Accepting invitation. Participants finished the interaction by accepting the invitation to the wedding.

(18)

Interlocutor   *Sí, bueno, muchas gracias. Te estoy invitando=*
'Yes, well, thank you. I am inviting you'=
PM6   =***Sí, me gustaría.=***

=‘**Yes, I would like that**.’=

Interlocutor =*a la boda.*

=to the wedding.’

PM6 **Ah, encantada, será** *un gusto inmenso estar ahí presente, de todos modos.*

‘**Ah, it is a pleasure**, it will be a great pleasure to be there, any way.’

Table 1 presents quantitative information about the strategies used and illustrated above.

Table 1
Strategies used in congratulating: Behavioral Expectations

Strategies	M		F		Total	
Inquiring	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Expressing surprise/disbelief	6	5	6	7	12	6
2. Identity/origin/place/length of acquaintance/personality/ background/moral quality/financial security	16	13	11	13	27	13
3. Date/place of wedding	4	3	5	6	9	4
4. Future living arrangements	0	0	1	1	1	.5
5. Claiming lack of knowledge	2	2	0	0	2	1
6. Asking to meet fiancé for approval	1	1	1	1	2	1
Subtotal	29	23	24	29	53	25
Arguing						
7. Questioning I's feelings	3	2	3	4	6	3
8. Questioning quality of relationship	2	2	5	6	7	3
9. Questioning decision	10	8	3	4	13	6
10.Giving advice	4	3	2	2	6	3
11. Expressing uncertainty/pessimism	3	2	4	5	7	3
12. Grounder	29	23	6	7	35	17
Subtotal	51	40	23	27	74	35
Ending the interaction						
13. Expressing approval/acceptance	29	23	16	19	35	17
14. Expressing happiness for I	3	2	4	5	7	3
15. Congratulating	7	6	7	8	14	7
16. Well-wishing	5	4	4	5	9	4
17. Hinting desire to be invited	2	2	2	2	4	2
18. Accepting invitation	0	0	4	5	4	2
Subtotal	46	37	37	44	83	40
Total # of strategies	126		84		210	

The illustrations and the quantitative information presented above will help us discern and analyze participants' behavioral expectations, face sensitivities and interactional wants.

6.1. Behavioral expectations

The argument that subjects exhibited culturally-permitted behavior within the context of this situation, is strongly supported here. In fact, participants' responses to the written

questionnaire and results from previous work on Peruvian's performance of different speech acts (see also García 2009, and García manuscript), confirm this. In their answers to the written questionnaire, participants stated that the conversation was very spontaneous and natural; they said they were surprised a friend of the family had made such an important decision without them being aware of the events leading to it; that's why, they said they expressed their desire to know all the details and question the wisdom of her decision.

The incessant inquiry (strategies 1-6) plus the argument about the wisdom of the decision (strategies 7-12) might lead us to infer that there was a "conflictual interpersonal relationship" (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 95) since participants were not respecting the fairness-reciprocity component of the equity principle (expressing surprise/disbelief, claiming lack of knowledge), and, in addition, were claiming autonomy-control over the situation (making direct inquiries about the fiancée, the wedding, requesting to meet him to provide their approval, questioning the interlocutor's feelings, questioning her decision, giving advice, expressing uncertainty/ pessimism and hinting desire to be invited). Following this line of thought then, we can see that in violating the equity principle, participants as a whole violated the autonomy-control component to a higher degree than the fairness-reciprocity component (39% vs. 7%). This implies that in this cultural group the exertion of autonomy-control is an accepted feature within their interdependent self-construal (also seen in García 1996, 1998, Garcia 2009, and Garcia manuscript; and in de los Heros and Montes 2008). Females were stronger than males (44% vs. 36% of their strategies, respectively), but this difference is not significant. Moreover, there was little difference between males' and females' violation of the fairness-reciprocity component (6% vs. 7 %, respectively).

We argue here that these *apparent* violations of the equity principle are expressions of a culture favoring 'relatedness' (Kağitçibaşi 1996) where speakers feel entitled to inquire about personal aspects of their friend's life, voice their own personal opinions, give non requested advice, etc. as a manifestation of their in-group membership, a demonstration of "concern for [what is best for him/her] and [their] willingness to help…" (Bayraktaroğlu 2001: 181), and where they are "supposed to look after [him/her] in exchange of loyalty" (Zeyrek 2001: 49). The recipient of these inquiries, who is also a member of this cultural group, understands this behavior and is gracious in her responses because of her understanding of the existing 'relatedness' between members of her social group who have her best interest at heart. In fact, this is what they stated in their responses to the written questionnaire. The interlocutor said she felt as she had betrayed her friends, or at least her friend's son/daughter, by not having shared the news with him/her before. Interpreting these results in light of Bravo's (1999) affiliation-autonomy dichotomy[3], it might be stated that by sharing such personal news at the very last minute, the interlocutor had violated her affiliation with the group and made an autonomous decision, which was not necessarily received positively by the other members of her group.

This ultimate goal of 'relatedness' is seen in the final stage of the interaction (40% of the strategies used) where after the long inquiry and argument participants respected the association principle expressing their empathy with the interlocutor

---

[3] Autonomy and affiliation are empty categories that are only specified within a specific cultural group. Autonomy refers to how "one is perceived by others as someone different from the group, whereas affiliation is defined as how one perceives oneself and is perceived by others as someone identified with the group" (Hernández-Flores 2004: 267).

(expressing approval/acceptance, expressing happiness for the interlocutor, congratulating, and well-wishing) and their desire for involvement (hinting desire to be invited and accepting invitation). We can say then, that affiliation was reinstated and strengthened.

In respecting the association principle, participants as a whole expressed empathy to a higher degree than involvement (36% vs. 2%). The difference between the expression of empathy over the expression of involvement is highly significant (z = 11.33). These results imply that expression of empathy was of outmost importance, especially to finish the interaction where the maintenance of the friendly bonds needs to be sealed. Both males and females expressed empathy -expressing approval/acceptance, expressing happiness for the interlocutor, congratulating, well-wishing- to a higher degree than involvement – hinting desire to be invited (35% and 37% of their strategies vs. 2% and 2% respectively), but there was no significant difference between them.

These results imply that the close relationship (affiliation) between participants allowed them to openly make personal inquiries and argue with their friend, since they were acting on her behalf, but, after doing this, they did not refrain themselves form expressing their happiness for her. It is only after the permitted inquiry and arguing that, paraphrasing Norris, the speaker allows him/herself "to share in the experience and feelings of the addressee… and [strengthen] the ties" with her.

We now turn to see how the different strategies used reflect participants' respect and/or threat to their own and/or the interlocutor's face sensitivities.

6.2. Face sensitivities

In order to analyze how the strategies used enhance the interlocutor's identity face, those that undermine it, and those that enhance the speaker's identity and respectability face, Table 2 presents quantitative information.

Table #2
Strategies used in congratulating: Face Sensitivities

Strategies	M		F		Total	
	N	%	n	%	n	%
A. Enhancing Interlocutor's Identity Face						
1. Expressing approval/acceptance	29	23	16	19	45	21
2. Expressing happiness for I	3	2	4	5	7	3
3. Congratulating	7	6	7	8	14	7
4. Well-wishing	5	4	4	5	9	4
5. Hinting desire to be invited	2	2	2	2	4	2
6. Accepting invitation	0	0	4	5	4	2
7. Grounder	29	23	6	7	35	17
Subtotal	75	60	43	51	118	56
B. Undermining Interlocutor's Identity Face						
8. Expressing surprise/disbelief	6	5	6	7	12	6
9. Identity/origin/place/length of acquaintance/personality/ background/moral quality/financial	16	13	11	13	27	13

security						
10. Date/place of wedding	4	3	5	6	9	4
11. Future living arrangements	0	0	1	1	1	.5
12. Claiming lack of knowledge	2	2	0	0	2	1
13. Asking to meet fiancé for approval	1	1	1	1	2	1
14. Questioning I's feelings	3	2	3	4	6	3
15. Questioning quality of relationship	2	2	5	6	7	3
16. Questioning decision	10	8	3	4	13	6
17. Giving advice	4	3	2	2	6	3
18. Expressing uncertainty/pessimism	3	2	4	5	7	3
Subtotal	51	40	41	49	92	44
Total # of strategies	126		84		210	

Table 2 shows that when responding to the good news participants balanced their strategies enhancing and undermining the interlocutor's identity face (56% and 44%, respectively). However, if these last ones are seen as a deep personal interest in the friend's well-being, then it could be asserted that these strategies in fact serve to express involvement, caring, and as such enhance the interlocutor's face. It is argued here that speakers were enhancing: a. their own identity face because by using these strategies they can claim "a positive social value….by the line [the interlocutor will] assume [they have] taken during [this] particular contact" (Goffman 1967: 5, quoted by Spencer-Oatey 2005: 103); b. their own respectability face since they are protecting how they are "judged to have functioned adequately in [society]…" (cf. Spencer-Oatey); and, finally, c. the interlocutor's respectability face by offering their own positive self-values due to her role or good name within the community (cf. Hernández-Flores 2004b). If this was not the case, and if the interlocutor would not have understood this, her responses would have been different (e.g. not providing information, complaining about being questioned, rejecting advice, defying the interlocutor, walking out of the interaction, etc.). As mentioned above, participants' responses in the written questionnaire confirmed this; they indicated that nothing inappropriate happened in the interaction.

Comparing male and female participation, we can observe that there was no significant difference between males' and females' strategies used to enhance the interlocutor's or speakers' identity face and respectability face (60% and 40% vs. 51% and 49%, respectively).

6.3. Interactional wants

Participants' interactional wants were mainly relational – their interest was to assure the interlocutor's well-being. Once this had been established, then they could offer their support and congratulations. The interlocutor, whose linguistic output was not subject of analysis here other than to offer a context from which to evaluate the subjects' participation, seemed to exhibit relational goals as well which were made evident in her use of ratifying the information she had already conveyed (sample 1), responding to inquiries without any complaint (samples 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12), reacting to argument without complaining (samples 4, 5), reacting to advice without rejecting it (sample 9), reacting to the expression of pessimism (samples 10, 11), reacting to well wishing (sample 16), responding affirmatively to the expression of desire to be invited (sample 17), and issuing an invitation (sample 18). Her responses and her retrospective written reports

confirm then that she perceived the interaction as having a relational goal and that she understood that the speaker, as a friend, was showing a sincere concern for her overall well-being and her future.

7. Discussion of findings

Results from the analysis presented above support findings of studies on Peruvian Spanish speakers in non-confrontational interactions (García 1992, 1993, 1998; de los Heros and Montes 2008). It is argued here that the strategies presented and discussed above reflect interdependent self-construals of self within which "[a] premium is placed on emphasizing collective welfare and on showing a sympathetic concern for others" (Marcus and Kitayama 1991: 228), or, as Kağitçibaşi (1998) calls it, a culture of 'relatedness' where establishing, maintaining and enhancing in-group relationships is of outmost importance. It is under this perspective that these strategies, the inquiries and the arguments, as in the case of refusing invitations (cf. García 1992), blaming (García forthcoming a) and expressing condolence (Garcia forthcoming b) are seen not as impingements of the addressee's identity or respectability face, but rather as ways of personal involvement to consolidate and enhance their relationship with the interlocutor the same way Bayraktaroğlu and Sifianou (2001) claim is true for the Turkish and Greek cultures (see also Zeyrek 2001), and Hickey (2004), Hernández Flores (2004a), Albelda (2005), and Bernal (2005) assert occurs in Peninsular Spanish speakers' non-confrontational interactions. That is, this is not a behavior only observed in this data. In perfect synchrony with these behavioral expectations then, participants respect the interlocutor's identity and respectability face which, in turn, reflect positively on their own identity and respectability face since "[t]he assumption is that while promoting the goals of others, one's own goals will be attended to by the person with whom one is interdependent" (Markus and Kitayama 1991: 229).

8. Conclusions

Analysis of the data has shown that subjects as a whole exhibited a rapport-maintenance orientation using strategies that, apparently violated the fairness-reciprocity and autonomy-control components of the equity principle, but observed the respect component of the association principle. It is argued here that the violations might be permitted behavior within the context of this situation exhibiting a close relationship between interlocutors in a culture that favors interdependent self-construals or 'relatedness' as shown by the interlocutor's responses.

As far as participants' respect for their own and the interlocutor's face sensitivities, we can see that participants enhanced their own identity and respectability face, but it is claimed here that faithful to the interdependent self-construals, in doing so, they enhanced the interlocutor's respectability face by making her the beneficiary of their concern for her and well-being at the expense of appearing intruding or even imposing.

Participants' interactional wants were notably relational, both maintaining and finally enhancing in-group harmony.

Gender differences were only observed in females' stronger violation of the autonomy-control component of the equity principle, but this difference was not statistically significant.

The interlocutor's responses in the written questionnaire and all throughout the interaction support the argument that the subjects exhibited permitted behavior, since she did not once complain about her privacy being trespassed, but instead graciously provided the information requested from her and responded to the arguments she was presented with in an understanding that this was done to assure her well-being.

As interesting as these results might be, a caveat is in order. These results cannot be generalized to state they show the preferred behavior of all Peruvian Spanish speakers in a similar situation. Further studies on the realization of different types of expressives by Peruvians of different social classes, age, regions, in different situations and/or participating in naturally occurring conversations will help support or negate our findings here and will help us understand their preferred management of rapport better.

Appendix A: Transcription notation

Transcription markers customarily override punctuation conventions, whence the absence of normal punctuation marks.

The transcription marks used were:

A. Contiguous utterances:

= placed between utterances with no time gap uttered by different speakers or to link different parts of a speaker's utterance that has been carried over to another line because of an interruption.

B. Intervals:

(0.0) placed to measure pause lengths (measured in tenths of a second)

- placed at point of interruption.

C. Characteristics of speech delivery:

.	marks fall in tone
,	marks continuing intonation
?	marks rising intonation
?,	marks weaker rising intonation
!	marks animated tone
↑↓	marks rising and falling shifts in intonation
::	marks lengthened syllable; each : marking one "beat"

Appendix B: **Written questionnaire**

Después de participar en esta situación conteste, por favor, las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Cuál fue su impresión general de como se llevó a cabo la interacción?
2. ¿Qué le pareció la reacción de su interlocutor? Circule la(s) respuesta(-s) que mejor refleje(-n) su opinión.

fuerte-débil   grosera-educada   normal-cortante

3. ¿Cómo podría juzgar su participación? Circule la(-s) respuesta(-s) que mejor refleje(-n) su opinión.

      fuerte-débil   grosera-educada   normal-cortante

4. ¿Hay algo que a Ud. le hubiera gustado decir pero que no dijo? ¿Qué fue eso? ¿Por qué no lo dijo?
5. Hay algo específico que su interlocutor dijo que le molestó? ¿Qué fue eso?
6. ¿Tiene algún otro comentario?

Translation
After participating in this situation please answer the following questions:
 1. What was your general impression of how the interaction developed?
 2. How do you interpret your interlocutor's reaction? Circle the response(s) that best reflect your opinion.

      strong-weak   rude-polite   normal-curt

3. How would you judge your participation? Circle the response(s) that best reflect your opinion.

      strong-weak   rude-polite   normal-curt

4. Is there anything you would have liked to say, but didn't? What was that? Why didn't you say it?
5. Is there anything special that your interlocutor said that bothered you? What was that?
 6. Do you have any other comment?

References

Achugar, M. (2001) Piropos as metaphors for gender roles in Spanish speaking cultures. *Pragmatics* 11: 127-37.

Achugar, Mariana (2002) Piropos: Cambios en la valoración del grado de cortesía de una práctica discursiva. In María Elena Placencia & Diana Bravo (eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español.* Munich: Lincom, pp. 175-192.

Alba-Juez, Laura (2000) Some discourse strategies used to convey praise and/or positive feelings in Spanish everyday conversations. 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.* Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 364-380.

Albelda Marco, Marta (2004) Cortesía en diferentes situaciones comunicativas. La conversación colloquial y la entrevista sociológica semiformal. In Diana Bravo & Antonio Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español.* Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 109-134.

Albelda Marco, Marta (2005) El refuerzo de la imagen social en conversaciones coloquiales en español peninsular. In Diana Bravo (ed.), *Estudios de la (des)cortesía en español. Categorías conceptuales y aplicaciones a corpora orales y escritos.* Estocolmo/Buenos Aires: Dunken, pp. 93-118.

Bateson, Gregory (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Bayraktaroğlu, Erin (2001) Advice-giving in Turkish, "Superiority" or "Solidarity". In Erin Bayraktaroğlu & Maria Sifianou (eds.), *Linguistic Politeness across Boundaries. The Case of Greek and Turkish.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Johns Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 177-208.

Bernal, María (2005) Hacia una categorización sociopragmática de la cortesía, la descortesía y la anticortesía. El caso de conversaciones españolas de registro coloquial. In Diana Bravo (ed.), *Estudios de la (des)cortesía en español. Categorías conceptuales y aplicaciones a corpora orales y escritos.* Estocolmo/Buenos Aires: Dunken, pp. 366-398.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, Gabriele Kasper (1989) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Bravo, Diana (1999) ¿Imagen "positiva" vs. imagen 'negativa"? Pragmatic socio-cultural y components de *face. Oralia* 2: 155-184.

Briz Gómez, A. and Grupo Val.Es.Co (1995) *La conversación coloquial (Materiales para su studio). Anejo XVI de Cuadernos de Filología.* Valencia: Universitat de València.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson (1987) *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de los Heros, Susana, and Cecilia Montes (2008) Una primera aproximación al habla de contacto en dos peluquerías limeñas. *Oralia* 11: 169-190.

De Pablos Ortega, Carlos (2006) Análisis sociopragmático del habla expresivo de agradecimiento en español. In Antonio Briz, Antonio Hidalgo, Marta Albelda, Josefa Contreras & Nieves Hernández Flores (eds.), *Actas del III Coloquio Internacional del Programa EDICE.* Valencia: Universidad de Valencia, pp. 685-691.

Félix-Brasdefer, César (2003) Validity in data collection methods in pragmatic research. In Paula Kempchinsky & Carlos-Eduardo Piñeros (eds.), *Theory, Practice and Acquisition.* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 239-257.

García, Carmen (1992) Responses to a request by native and non-native English speakers: Deference vs. camaraderie. *Multilingua* 11.4: 387-406.

García, Carmen (1993) Making a request and responding to it: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 127-152.

García, Carmen (1996) Reprimanding and responding to a reprimand: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 663-697.

García, Carmen (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*. Stockholm: Stockholm University, pp. 257–297

García, Carmen (2004a) Coercion and cooperation: A case study of Argentinean reprimands and responses to reprimands. In R. Márquez Reiter y M.E. Placencia (eds.), *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 231–264.

García, Carmen (2004b) Reprendiendo y respondiendo a una reprimenda: Similitudes y diferencias entre peruanos y venezolanos. *Spanish in Context* 1: 113–147.

García, Carmen (2008) Different realizations of solidarity politeness: Comparing Venezuelan and Argentinean invitations. In K. Schneider & A. Barron (eds.), *Variational Pragmatics* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 269-305.

García, Carmen (2009) The performance of a rapport-challenging act: Blaming. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5: 217-242.

García, Carmen (manuscript) 'Cuente conmigo…' The expression of sympathy by Peruvian Spanish speakers.

Goffman, Erving (1967) On face-work. An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In *Interaction ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. ([1985] 1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2002) *La cortesía en la conversación española de familiars y amigos, la búsqueda del equilibrio entre la imagen del hablante y la imagen del destinatario*. Aalborg: Institut for Sprog og Internationale Kulturstudier vol. 37.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2004a) Politeness as *face enhancement*. An Analysis of Spanish conversations between friends and family. In R. Márquez Reiter & M.E. Placencia (eds.), *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 265- 284.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2004b) La cortesía como la búsqueda del equilibrio de la imagen social. In Diana Bravo & Antonio Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 95-108.

Hickey, L. (2005) Politeness in Spain: Thanks, but no 'thanks.' In L. Hickey & M. Stewart, (eds.), *Politeness in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingua Matters, pp. 317-330.

Jefferson, G. (1986) Transcript notation. In M.J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Interactions. Studies in conversational analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. ix-xvi.

Kachigan, Sam Kash (1986) *Statistical Analysis. An Interdisciplinary Introduction to Univariate and Multivariate Methods*. New York: Radius Press.

Kağitçibaşi, Ciğdem (1996) Cross-cultural psychology and development. In J. Pandey, D. Sinha & D.P.S. Bhawuk (eds.), *Asian Contributions to Cross-cultural Psychology*. New Delhi: Sage, pp. 42-49.

Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2001) Compliment responses among British and Spanish university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 107-127.

Markus, Hazel Rose, and Shinobu Kitayama (1991) Culture and the Self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review* 98.2: 224-253.

Murillo Medrano, Jorge (2005) Significados de la cortesía linguística a partir de la aplicación de un *test* de hábitos sociales en Costa Rica. In Jorge Murillo Medrano (ed.), *Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Programa EDICE. Actos de habla u cortesía en distintas variedades del español: Perspectivas teóricas y metodológicas*, Suecia y Costa Rica, pp. 115-136.

Norrick, N.R. (1978) Expressive illocutionary acts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 2: 277-291.

Scarcella, Robin (1979) On speaking politely in a second language. In Carlos A. Yorio, Kyle Perkins & Jacquelyn Schachter (eds.), Washington, D.C.: *TESOL*, pp. 275-287.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005) (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1: 95-119.

Valdés, Guadalupe, and Cecilia Pino (1981) Muy a tus Órdenes: Compliment responses among Mexican-American bilinguals. *Language in Society* 10: 73-144.

Vanderveken, Daniel (1990) *Meaning and Speech Acts*, vol.1. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Zeyrek, Deniz (2001) Politeness in Turkish and its linguistics manifestations. In Erin Bayrataktaroğlu and Maria Sifianou (eds.), *Linguistic Politeness across Boundaries. The   Case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Johns Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 43-73.