

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The present study aims primarily at investigating the sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics of the speech act of apology among the three groups of participants: 40 JL2Ss, 40 JNESs and 40 ENSs. Three instruments are used to collect the data from the participants: 1-Discourse Completion Test, 2-Scaled Response Questionnaire and 3-semi-structured interviews. To answer the research questions posed in this study, different statistical tests are employed including: 1-One way ANOVA, Tukey honest significant differences (HSD) post hoc analysis and frequency. Semi-structured interview data are analysed qualitatively. The present chapter reports the analysis of the results with reference to the research questions formulated in Chapter One. It concludes with a summary of the results obtained from the three aforesaid instruments.

4.1 THE PERCEPTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES BY JL2Ss, JNESs AND ENSs.

4.1.1 Similarities and differences in the perception of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs.

4.1.1.1 RQ1.a. What are the similarities and differences in the perception of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs in terms of context-internal variables below?

1. The assessment of the severity of the offence
2. The assessment of the possibility of the speaker apology
3. The assessment of difficulty of the apology by the speaker
4. The assessment of the likelihood of apology acceptance

To answer RQ1.a data collected via SRQ were analysed.

TABLE 4.1: Groups perception on contextual variables

	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df	F	Sig
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Contextual variables							(Error)		
Severity	3.31	0.77	3.38	0.71	4.07	0.53	2(33)	4.63	0.017*T
Possibility	4.44	0.52	4.09	0.57	4.82	0.31	2(33)	6.829	0.003*T
Difficulty	2.39	0.81	2.32	0.76	1.82	0.53	1(33)	2.257	0.121
Likelihood	4.16	0.68	4.78	0.40	2.98	0.42	1(33)	3.6749	0.000*T

*Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. T indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer. *p < 0.05*

Table 4.1 illustrates the similarities and differences among the three groups regarding their perception of the four context-internal variables mentioned above. Results of this table were accomplished using one-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons statistical tests.

Results indicate that there are significant mean differences among the three groups regarding their perception of the severity of the offence, possibility of apology and likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party variables. As for difficulty of apology, significant difference is not found among groups.

Regarding severity of the offence, Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the significant difference exists between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group ($F_{2} = 4.63, p = 0.017$). That is, both Jordanian groups of participants rated the severity of offence significantly lower than ENSs did. Similarly, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that there is a significant difference between both Jordanian groups of participants and ENSs group in the assessment of possibility of apology variable ($F_{2} = 6.829, p = 0.003$). That is, because both Jordanian groups of participants rated this variable significantly lower than ENSs did.

On the other hand, the three groups assigned low rating to the difficulty of apology by the offender i.e. JL2Ss $M = 2.39$, JNESs $M = 2.32$, and ENSs $M = 1.82$. As shown in Table 4.1 above, both Jordanian groups assigned low rating for this variable but relatively higher than the ENSs' rating, however, this difference is not significant.

The main difference between Jordanian and British cultures is in the cultural perception of the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party. Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups' ratings for this variable is significantly higher than ENSs ratings ($F1= 3.6749$, $p= 0.000$). This indicates that Jordanians under all offensive situations expect their apologies to be accepted by their offended parties. The following RQ1.b addresses in detail the influence of the context-external variables of social power and social distance on the perception of the four context-internal variables mentioned earlier.

4.1.2 The influence of context-external social variables: (a) social power (high, equal, and low); and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) on JL2Ss' perception of the context-internal variables compared to that of JNESs and ENSs

4.1. 2.1 RQ1.b How do the context-external social variables: (a) social power (high, equal, and low) ; and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) influence JL2Ss' perception of the context-internal variables compared to that of JNESs and ENSs?

To answer RQ1.b data collected via SRQ were analysed.

Analysis of variance ANOVA and Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons analysis were performed to determine whether there are significant differences between the JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs groups in their assessment of the four context-internal variables. To analyse this research question, the responses of each group of participants i.e. JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs are divided into five categories.

These categories represent different social power and social distance levels. For example, Category 1 (High social power) (+P + D) consists of situations 1 and 9; 1- Professor promised to return a student term paper but he did not and 9- Customer called the waitress to change the order. Category 2 (Low social power) (-P + D) consists of situations 2 and 3; 2- Student forgot to return the book he borrowed from his professor and 3- Employer forgot an important appointment with boss for the second time. Category 3 (Equal social power) (=P - D) consists of situations 4, 8 and 12; 4- You forgot an appointment with friend for the second time, 8- You accidentally spilled an oil in your neighbour car and 12- You said something that annoyed your colleague.

Category 4 (Familiar) (-P - D) consists of situations 5 and 7; 5- Father promised to take his kid for shopping but he did not do that and 7- You accidentally broke the lights of your intimate [close] boss car. Category 5 (Unfamiliar) (=P +D) consists of situations 10, 11 and 6; 10- You accidentally bumped into a passenger toe which made him spill all his package on the floor, 11- You accidentally bumped into passenger toe which disturbed him a bit and 6- You accidentally hit another driver car while parking your car.

The following results explain how the three groups of participants with different social power and social distance categories assessed the four context-internal variables. One-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD post hoc statistical tests were used in the data analysis.

1. The Assessment of the severity of the offence

TABLE 4.2: Means and standard deviation to Severity of the offence contextual variable

Categories	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(Error)	F	Sig
Social power									
Category 1 High	2.61	0.96	2.83	1.00	3.38	0.48	2 (116)	8.626	0.000*T
Category 2 Equal	3.19	0.50	3.30	0.42	4.15	0.16	2 (117)	70.952	0.000*T
Category 3 Low	4.01	0.43	4.02	0.00	3.90	0.20	2 (117)	1.714	0.185
Social distance									
Category4 Familiar	2.06	0.30	2.32	0.40	3.81	0.24	2 (117)	341.30	0.000*
Category5Unfamila	4.15	0.33	4.12	0.33	4.75	0.14	2 (117)	63.587	0.032*T

*Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. T indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer. * $p < 0.05$.*

Table 4.2 above illustrates the influence of context-external social variables: (a) social power (high, equal, and low); and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) on the perception of the severity of the offence by the three groups of participants.

The role of social power in communication involves the ability of the interlocutors to recognize each other's social position (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Holmes, 1995; Leech, 1983). One-way ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among the three groups in Category1 ($F_{2, 116}=8.626$, $p = 0.000$), whereas Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs group. This indicates that the Jordanians who have high social power did not perceive the offence as very severe when it is committed against people with low social power. Negative

sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category since there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESSs, and there is significant difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs.

In Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=70.952, p = 0.000$) which indicates a negative sociopragmatic transfer since the assessment of both Jordanian groups is similar to each other but different from ENSs assessment. By contrast, in Category 3 analysis showed that there is no significant difference and sociopragmatic transfer among the three groups despite the fact that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence higher than ENSs group ($F_{2, 117}=1.714, p = 0.185$).

The results of ANOVA showed that there are significant mean differences in Category 4 and Category 5. Post hoc pair comparisons revealed that significant mean differences are found between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group in category 4. As it is noticed in Category 4, both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=341.320, p = 0.000$). However, sociopragmatic transfer did not occur since the rating of JL2Ss is different from the rating of JNESSs. Likewise, in Category 5 both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=63.587, p = 0.032$). As a result, negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is because there is no significant mean difference between both Jordanian groups, but there is a significant mean difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group.

2. The assessment of the possibility of the offender apology

TABLE 4.3: Means and standard deviation to the Possibility of apology contextual variable

Categories	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(Error)	F	Sig
Social power									
Category 1 High	3.80	0.24	3.17	0.31	4.42	0.28	2(117)	198.236	0.000*
Category 2 Equal	3.17	0.48	3.58	0.47	3.91	0.30	2(117)	29.406	0.000*
Category 3 Low	4.91	0.19	4.96	0.13	4.93	0.16	2(117)	0.980	0.379
Social distance									
Category 4 Familiar	4.15	0.23	4.13	0.23	4.81	0.29	2(117)	92.447	0.000*T
Category 5 Unfamiliar	4.12	0.16	4.07	0.15	4.79	0.22	2(117)	183.688	0.000*T

*Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. T indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer * $p < 0.05$*

Table 4.3 above illustrates the influence of context-external social variables: (a) social power (higher, equal, and low); and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) on the perception of the possibility of apology by the three groups of participants.

One-way ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among groups in Category 1 and Category 2. Post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. In category 1, JL2Ss assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than JNESs did. Moreover, JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=198.236, p = 0.000$). Similar to Category 1, in Category 2 post hoc pair

comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other.

JL2Ss assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than JNESs did. Moreover, JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=29.406, p = 0.000$). With regard to Category 3, the three groups showed agreement in their assessment of possibility of apology. That is because no statistically significant differences were found in any of the three groups ($F_{2, 117}=0.980, p = 0.379$). This indicates an inter-language and cross-cultural similarity between both cultures. Negative sociopragmatic transfer did not occur in Categories 1, 2 and 3.

In Category 4 and Category 5, significant mean differences were observed between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group in both categories. Specifically, in Category 4 significant mean difference was found between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group. Both Jordanian groups assessed their possibility to apologize for their familiar interlocutors significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=92.447, p = 0.000$). Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category since both Jordanian groups assessed the apology possibility significantly lower than ENSs did. Similarly, in Category 5, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups significantly assessed the possibility to apologize lower than ENSs did. ($F_{2, 117}=183.688, p = 0.000$) which indicate an influence of L1 and pragmatic transfer.

3. The assessment of difficulty of the apology by the offender

TABLE 4.4: Means and standard deviation to the Difficulty of Apology contextual variable

Variable									
Categories	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
Social power	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(Error)	F	Sig
Category 1 High	2.98	0.08	3.08	0.19	2.19	0.27	2(117)	244.978	0.000*T
Category 2 Equal	3.17	0.16	3.00	0.00	2.21	0.20	2(117)	440.875	0.000*
Category 3 Low	1.00	0.00	1.02	0.15	2.02	0.00	2(117)	1579.500	0.000*T
Social distance									
Category4 Familiar	2.21	0.25	2.11	0.23	1.46	0.13	2(117)	147.872	0.000*T
Category5Unfamiliar	2.27	0.12	2.13	0.16	1.35	0.15	2(117)	428.897	0.000*

*Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. T indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer * $p < 0.05$*

Table 4.4 above illustrates the influence of context-external social variables: (a) social power (high, equal, and low) and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) on the perception of the difficulty of apology by the three groups of participants.

One-way ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among the three groups in Category1, ($F_{2, 117}=244.978, p = 0.000$). Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly higher than ENSs group did. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian group and ENSs. In Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have

significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the difficulty of apology significantly higher than JNESs did. And JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=440.875, p = 0.000$).

In Category 3 post hoc pair comparisons results show that there are significant differences among the three groups, ($F_{2, 117}=1579.500, p = 0.000$). Both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly lower than ENSs group did. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is a significant difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs.

In Category 4 post hoc pair comparisons revealed that there are significant differences among the three groups, ($F_{2, 117}=1579.500, p = 0.000$). Both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly higher than ENSs group did. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs. However, in Category 5, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the difficulty of apology significantly higher than JNESs did and JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=428.897, p = 0.000$).

4. The assessment of the likelihood of apology acceptance

TABLE 4.5: Means and standard deviation to the Likelihood of apology acceptance contextual variable

Categories	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
Social power	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(Error)	F	Sig
Category 1 High	4.83	0.40	5.00	0.00	3.04	0.24	2(117)	647.382	0.000*
Category 2 Equal	4.12	0.16	4.13	0.16	3.03	0.20	2(117)	497.728	0.000*T
Category 3 Low	3.11	0.66	3.50	0.00	3.01	0.07	2(117)	18.324	0.000*
Social distance									
Category 4 Familiar	4.79	0.24	4.78	0.25	3.19	0.66	2(117)	180.842	0.000*T
Category5 Unfamiliar	3.75	0.14	3.75	0.15	2.63	0.20	2(117)	575.834	0.000*T

*Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. T indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer * $p < 0.05$*

Table 4.5 above illustrates the influence of context-external social variables: (a) social power (high, equal, and low) and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) on the perception of likelihood of apology acceptance variable by the three groups of participants.

One-way ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among the three groups in all categories. In Category 1, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. Nevertheless, both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=647.3828$, $p = 0.000$). In Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs group did ($F_{2, 117}=497.628$, p

= 0.000). Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian group and ENSs.

In Category 3, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly lower than JNESs did while JNESs assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=18.324, p = 0.000$).

In Category 4, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs group did ($F_{2, 117}=180.842, p = 0.000$). Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group.

Similarly, with regard to Category 5, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs group did ($F_{2, 117}=575.834, p = 0.000$). Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category i.e. while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian group and ENSs.

The following RQ 1.c addresses the negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in JL2S's perception of the contextual variables.

4.1.3 The negative pragmatic transfer in the perception of apology by JL2Ss compared to that of JNESs and ENSs

4.1.3.1 RQ.1.c Is there negative pragmatic transfer in the perception of apology by JL2Ss compared to that of JNESs and ENSs?

To answer RQ1.c data collected via SRQ were analysed.

It is noteworthy to recall the concept of negative pragmatic transfer. Firstly, Kasper (1992) explains that pragmatic transfer in interlanguage pragmatics is identified as the influence exerted by the learners' pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 in their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information. Moreover, Kasper proposes two kinds of transfer: sociopragmatic transfer and pragmalinguistic transfer.

In this analysis the focus is placed on negative sociopragmatic transfer which is operative when the social perceptions underlying language users' interpretation and performance of linguistic action in L2 are influenced by their assessment of subjectively equivalent L1 contexts. Thus, in the current analysis, negative sociopragmatic transfer is operational if there is statistically significant difference between JNESs and ENSs groups and between the JL2Ss and ENSs groups and no statistically significant difference between JNESs and JL2Ss groups.

The following are the instances of negative sociopragmatic transfer based on the analysis of overall contextual variables:

TABLE 4.6: ANOVA results for negative sociopragmatic transfer based on overall contextual variables

Groups	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
Variables	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(Error)	F	Sig
Severity	3.31	0.77	3.38	0.71	4.07	0.53	2(33)	4.63	0.017*T
Possibility	4.44	0.52	4.09	0.57	4.82	0.31	2(33)	6.829	0.003*T
Likelihood	4.16	0.68	4.78	0.40	2.98	0.42	1(33)	3.6749	0.000*T

*Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. T indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer. *p < 0.05*

Table 4.6 above illustrates the variables that experienced negative sociopragmatic transfer in the three groups' overall responses. The results of one-way ANOVA showed that there are significant differences among groups. Post hoc pair comparisons revealed that there are significant mean differences between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group in three context-internal variables out of four. Difficulty of apology variable did not experience negative sociopragmatic transfer, thus, it is excluded from this analysis. Regarding severity of the offence, a significant difference was found ($F_{2, 33}=4.637, p = 0.001$) between both Jordanian groups and ENSs and no significant difference was found between both Jordanian groups. This significant difference indicates a negative socio-pragmatic transfer and L1 influence. As for possibility of apology, significant difference was found ($F_{2, 33}=4.637, p = 0.001$) between both Jordanian groups JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs and no significant difference was found between both Jordanian groups. Concerning likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party, JL2Ss and JNESs' ratings for this variable were higher than ENSs and the difference was statistically significant. ($P= 0.000$). Negative

sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this variable since significant difference was found between JL2Ss and ENSs and no significant difference found between JL2Ss and JNESs. Negative sociopragmatic transfer for all social power and distance categories is also investigated as illustrated in the following Table:

TABLE 4.7: ANOVA's results for negative sociopragmatic transfer based on social power and social distance categories

Categories		JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
Severity		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Error	F	Sig
Category 1	High	2.61	0.96	2.83	1.00	3.38	0.48	2(116)	8.626	0.000*T
Category 2	Equal	3.19	0.50	3.30	0.42	4.15	0.16	2(117)	70.952	0.000*T
Category 5	Unfamiliar	4.15	0.33	4.12	0.33	4.75	0.14	2(117)	63.587	0.032*T
Possibility										
Category 4	Familiar	4.15	0.23	4.13	0.23	4.81	0.29	2(117)	92.447	0.000*T
Category 5	Unfamiliar	4.12	0.16	4.07	0.15	4.79	0.22	2(117)	183.688	0.000*T
Difficulty										
Category 1	High	2.98	0.08	3.08	0.19	2.19	0.27	2(117)	244.978	0.000*T
Category 3	Low	1.00	0.00	1.02	0.15	2.02	0.00	2(117)	1579.500	0.000*T
Category 4	Familiar	2.21	0.25	2.11	0.23	1.46	0.13	2(117)	147.872	0.000*T
Likelihood										
Category 2	Equal	4.12	0.16	4.13	0.16	3.03	0.20	2(117)	497.728	0.000*T
Category 4	Familiar	4.79	0.24	4.78	0.25	3.19	0.66	2(117)	180.842	0.000*T
Category 5	Unfamiliar	3.75	0.14	3.75	0.15	2.63	0.20	2(117)	575.834	0.000*T

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers. **T** indicates the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer. * $p < 0.05$

Table 4.7 above illustrates the categories that experience negative sociopragmatic transfer by the three groups of participants in all context-internal variables. Instances of negative sociopragmatic transfer were found in all four context-internal variables of the study but not in all social categories. Only the categories that experienced negative sociopragmatic transfer are included in Table 4.7 above, while the categories that did not experience negative sociopragmatic transfer are not included since they are irrelevant to this analysis.

One-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons results showed that there are significant mean differences among the three groups. Regarding severity of the offence, negative sociopragmatic transfer was found in three out of five categories which are Category 1, Category 2 and Category 5. As for Category 1, Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly ($F_{2, 116}=8.626, p=0.000$) lower than ENSs group.

Similarly, in Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly ($F_{2, 117}=70.952, p=0.000$) lower than ENSs did. Likewise, in Category 5 post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did ($F_{2, 117}=63.587, p=0.032$).

As for the possibility of apology by the offender, negative sociopragmatic transfer was found in two out of five categories which are Category 4 and Category 5.

As for Category 4 Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that significant

mean differences were observed between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group in both categories. Specifically, both Jordanian groups assessed their possibility to apologize significantly lower than ENSs did ($F 2, 117=92.447, p = 0.000$). Similarly, in Category 5, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups significantly assessed the possibility to apologize lower than ENSs did. ($F 2, 117=183.688, p = 0.000$) which indicate an influence of L1 and pragmatic transfer.

Regarding the difficulty of apology by the offender, negative sociopragmatic transfer was found in three out of five categories which are Category 1, Category 3 and Category 4. As for Category 1, Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly ($F 2, 117=244.978, p = 0.000$) higher than ENSs group did. In Category 3 post hoc pair comparisons results revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly ($F 2, 117=1579.500, p = 0.000$) lower than ENSs group did. In Category 4 post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly ($F 2, 117=1579.500, p = 0.000$) higher than ENSs group did.

As for the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party, negative sociopragmatic transfer was found in three out of five categories which are Category 2, Category 4 and Category 5. In Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly ($F 2, 117=497.628, p = 0.000$) higher than ENSs group did.

In Category 4, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly ($F(2, 117) = 180.842, p = 0.000$) higher than ENSs group did. In Category 5, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly ($F(2, 117) = 575.834, p = 0.000$) higher than ENSs group did.

JL2Ss' justifications on their rating of the context-internal variables are reported in the following section.

4.1. 4 The JL2Ss' justifications for their perception rating given by them

4.1.4.1 RQ1.d What are JL2Ss' justifications for their perception rating given by them?

To answer RQ1.d data collected via semi-structured interviews were analysed

The findings presented in this section are based on data gathered from interviews with nine of the 40 JL2Ss (justification in Chapter 3 section 3.3.3). The high and low ratings almost exist in all the 12 DCT situations where 1 represents the lowest rating and 5 represent the highest rating. Since the questionnaire is long and participants could not devote time to all 12 situations, only five DCT situations were chosen to be analysed so as to understand participants' justifications about their high and low ratings.

The selection of situations is based on the five social power and social distance categorical levels, that is, one situation from each category (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010).

The categories and situations chosen are illustrated in the following Table.

TABLE 4.8: The DCT situations chosen for the interviews

Categories	Apologizer social power (P) and social distance (D)	Situations
1	High social power (+P + D)	1-Professor promised to return a student term paper but he did not.
2	Equal social power (=P -D)	4-You forgot an appointment with friend for the second time.
3	Low social power (-P + D)	2-Student forgot to return the book he borrowed from his professor.
4	Familiar (-P - D)	5-Father promised to take his kid for shopping but he did not do that.
5	Unfamiliar (=P + D)	6- While backing up to park, you hit another car and damaged its rear.

As such, thematic analysis used to identify the common ideas based on the interviewees' responses. This thematic analysis according to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) aims to identify common ideas from the data. The goal of this analysis is to capture all the main points, especially as they relate to the questions raised.

SRQ data revealed that most of the high and low ratings occurred in two context-internal variables which are: the severity of the offence and the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party. As for the other variables, the ratings varied across all the DCT situations. Nine JL2Ss were interviewed and they were coded as A1 to A9 and the situations were coded as S1 to S5. The interviews showed that the reasons provided by JL2Ss for their perception ratings were due to the perception of the context-internal variables in light of social power and social distance

in addition to their cultural background. The following are the two context-internal variables experienced the highest and the lowest ratings by the interviewees.

4.1.4.1 The severity of the offence

Five of the nine participants interviewed assigned low rating to the severity of the offence in Situation 1: (+p) (A professor promised to return student term paper but he did not do that) whereas the other four participants assigned medium rating which is number 3 in the SRQ Likert scale. When those five participants were asked about their reasons for giving this low rating, they confirmed that there is a social power between the interlocutors. As such, their responses were based on their perception of the hierarchical power between them as professors and their interlocutors as students. The excerpts provided below are examples of the interviewees' responses regarding their low ratings.

A1 explained:

I don't think that the offence is very severe because he is a student and it is normal for me to behave this way.

(A1 S1, interview).

A2 explained:

Everyone is expected to forget and this is something normal, a student should never get offended and should not expect an apology from his professor because it is just a matter of forgetfulness.

(A2 S1, interview)

A3 explained:

I don't find it a very important situation; teachers are always busy with their

duties, so they should be excused by their students.

(A3 S1, interview)

Four of nine participants assigned high rating to the severity of the offence in Situation 2: (-P) (a student borrowed professor's book, and promised to return that day, but forget to bring it) whereas the other five participants assigned medium rating which is number 3 in the SRQ Likert scale. When those four participants were asked about their reasons for giving this high rating, they all confirmed that there is a social power between the interlocutors. As such, their responses were based on their perception of the hierarchical power between them as students and their interlocutors as professors. The excerpts provided below are examples of the interviewees' responses regarding their high ratings

A3 explained:

The offence is very severe for me because he is my professor and it is very embarrassing for me and show carelessness and disrespect if I did not fulfil my promise.

(A3, S2, interview)

A4 explained:

It is very impolite to do such a thing, and the offence is very severe for me and I should apologize profusely and undertake not to do it again. Apology in this case is to show respect to my teacher.

(A4, S2, interview)

A5 explained:

I found it a very difficult situation for me, we used to respect our teachers and follow their advices, especially respecting time.

(A4, S2, interview)

Further, four of the interviewees assigned low rating to the severity of the offence in situation 4: (= P) (forgetting a meeting with a friend for a second time) whereas the other five participants assigned medium rating which is number 3 in the SRQ Likert scale. When those four participants were asked about their reasons for giving this low rating, they all confirmed that there is no formal treatment among friends and it is normal if something wrong happens since the friends must tolerate and understand each other's situations. This might explain the reasons behind the low assessment of the offence severity among equal social power interlocutors i.e. friends. The excerpts given below are examples of the interviewees' responses regarding their low ratings

A5 explained:

Because he is my friend and I am sure that he would understand my situation, and don't be angry with me. There is no need to apologize for my friend for every offence; this in fact will make my friend run away from me so in order to maintain my normal relation with my friends I should not apologize.

(A5, S4, interview)

A6 explained:

Friends rarely apologize to each other, in the case of forgetting meeting with friend maybe it needs slight apology, because I think apology depends on the severity of the offence. Friends might apologize to each other on the severe offences only.

(A6, S4, interview)

Five interviewees assigned lowest rating to the severity of the offence in situation 5: (Familiar) (You forgot to bring your kids for shopping as you promised) whereas the

other four participants assigned medium rating which is number 3 in the SRQ Likert scale. When those five participants were asked about their reasons for giving this low rating, they all confirmed on the familiarity of the relation between family members in which there is no formal relation among them especially between family members. The following excerpts are examples of the interviewees' responses regarding their lowest ratings

A7 explained:

I do not feel that there is problem, because my kid can wait for the next time and he/she must understand my situations that I forgot to bring him/her to shopping. Apology in this case might be understood by the son as a parent' weakness

(A7, S5, interview)

A8 explained:

I think the offence is not severe because parents can explain the reasons that prevented them from taking son shopping without showing explicit apology. Apology in this case is not appropriate and sons should not expect their parents to apologize for them.

(A8, S5, interview)

Seven of those interviewed assigned highest rating to the severity of the offence in situation 6: (Unfamiliar), (While backing up to park, you hit another car and damaged its rear) whereas the other two participants assigned medium rating which is number 3 in the SRQ Likert scale. When those seven participants were asked about their reasons for giving this high rating they all confirmed that it is their mistake and they

must apologize for the other offended persons. The excerpts provided below are examples of the interviewees' responses regarding their highest ratings

A1 explained:

Yes the offence is severe specially because it is my mistake and I must apologize to that person and undertake to fix any damage done to his/her car.

(A1, S6, interview)

A3 explained:

Of course it is high severe offence because I don't know this person personally and I must be embarrassed for doing such harm to him.

(A3, S6, interview)

A2 explained:

I would strongly apologize and show my readiness to fix all the damage done by me, and also I would offer to take him hospital if he is injured.

(A2, S6,

interview)

The results of severity of the offence show that the JL2Ss' ratings are mainly based on their perception of the hierarchical power and on the level of the familiarity between the offender and the offended parties. JL2Ss consider the offence as severe when it is committed against their high social power interlocutors thus it require a strong apology. Conversely, they do not consider the offence as severe when it is committed against their low social power interlocutors. Further, they also consider the offence as not severe when it is committed against their familiar interlocutors but more severe when it is committed against their unfamiliar interlocutors.

4.1.4.2 The likelihood of apology acceptance

By the same token, all of the nine JL2Ss interviewees rated the likelihood of apology acceptance as high in all of the five situations. When asked about their reasons for giving such a high rating, they confirmed that they expected their other offended parties to accept their apology since they already showed politeness by expressing apology to their offended parties, as a consequence, the offended parties should accept the apology and show return politeness as well. The excerpts provided below are examples of the interviewees' responses regarding their high ratings

A1 explained:

The student must accept my apology because this might be for his own benefit. The professor might need much time to work on the term paper and give the student the necessary and accurate feedback.

(A1, S1, interview)

A7 explained:

As professor I should accept the student apology that is because maybe the student has real excuse for not being able to bring the book back in the specific time. However, the student should have put notice so he/she can remember the time of returning the book.

(A7, S1, interview)

A4 explained:

I think the other person will accept my apology because if I do not care about him I will not apologize so when I apologize I expect the other to accept my apology.

(A4, S2, interview)

Based on interviews, JL2Ss were influenced by their deeply rooted cultural values. These cultural values are based on the differentiation between different hierarchical values when apologizing to others. Results revealed that JL2Ss are strongly influenced by the context-external variables of social power and social distance, which confirmed that the classification of Jordanian culture as hierarchical (which is influenced by social power and social distance). English culture, on the other hand, is depicted as a horizontal culture which is influenced more by social distance and less by social power (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shbol, 2013; Beeb et al, 1996).

Moreover, when all nine participants were asked about their reasons and justifications for giving high rating for the likelihood of apology acceptance variable, they explained that they expect the other offended persons to accept their apology because it is normal in the Arabic and in Jordanian culture in particular. The participants' lowest and highest ratings were based mainly on their perception of the contextual variables and their cultural backgrounds. In other words, the Jordanians perceived the context-internal variables in light of social power and social distance context-external variables.

The following section explains the results of the second research question regarding the production of apology strategies by the three groups

4.2 THE PRODUCTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES BY JL2Ss, JNESs AND ENSs.

4.2.1 Similarities and differences in the production of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs.

4.2.1.1 RQ2.a. What are the similarities and differences in the production of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs?

To answer RQ2.a data collected via DCT were analysed.

The overall apology strategies elicited from the three groups of participants were calculated according to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model. The apology strategies employed by each group of participants were calculated based on the frequencies and percentages of each strategy in each group. That is, the number of the apology strategies or semantic formulas was calculated by counting the total number of occurrences of each apology strategies by each group in all 12 situations. In order to find out the frequency and percentage of a specific apology strategy, the number of a specific apology strategy was divided by the total number of all apology strategies in a specific group then multiplied by 100. For example, the semantic formula an expression of regret “I’m sorry” was used 275 times by JL2Ss group, this number was divided by the total number of semantic formulas used by JL2Ss group and then the result multiplied by 100, for example, $(275 \div 1072 = 0.25 \times 100\% = 25.65\%)$ consequently the percentage of this semantic formula used by JL2Ss was achieved.

TABLE 4.9: The overall frequencies and percentages of the apology strategies employed by the three groups

Apology Strategies	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		TOTAL
A. IFID: direct	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1- An expression of regret.	275	25.65	222	21.87	450	33.01	947
2- A request for forgiveness and accepting the apology.	20	1.86	12	1.18	117	8.58%	149
3- An offer of apology.	100	9.32	94	9.26	60	4.40	254
B. Intensifiers +IFID	74	6.90	80	7.88%	342	25.09%	496
Indirect							
C. Explanation							
Explicit explanation	265	24.72	268	26.40%	127	9.31%	640
Implicit explanation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
D. Taking on responsibility							
Explicit self-blame	64	5.97%	59	5.81%	77	5.64%	300
Lack of intent	14	1.30	11	1.08%	5	0.36%	30
Expression of self-deficiency	12	1.11	6	0.59%	0	0%	18

Expression of embarrassment	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Self-dispraise	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Justify hearer	2	0.18%	4	0.39%	0	0%	0
Refusal to acknowledge guilt.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Denial of responsibility	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Blame the hearer	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Pretend to be offended	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
E. Concern for the hearer	80	7.46%	87	8.57%	6	0.44%	173
F. Offer of repair	130	12.12%	134	13.20%	125	9.17%	389
G. Promise of Forbearance	33	3.07%	29	2.85%	42	3.08%	104
NEW EXPRESSIONS							
Invoking Allah name	2	0.18%	3	0.29%	0	0%	5
Requiring the offended party not to be angry	0	0%	4	0.39%	0	0%	4
Define relationship.	5	0.46%	2	0.19%	0	0%	7
4- I'm afraid + sentence	0	0%	0	0%	7	0.51%	7
Total	1074	100%	1015	100%	1363	100%	3450

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers.

RQ2.a investigates the similarities and differences in the production of speech act of apology among the JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs.

The analysis starts by identifying the produced apology semantic formulas (apology strategy) by each group. The semantic formula presents an apology strategy such as “*offer of repair*” or “*concern for the hearer*”. All the apology strategies elicited from the JL2Ss participants are 1072, JNESs 1015 and ENSs 1363 respectively. The most commonly used strategies by the three groups of participants are IFIDs particularly, the expression of regret i.e. “*I’m sorry* or *sorry*” in all 12 DCT offensive situations. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) define this strategy as formulaic, routinized expressions in which the speaker’s apology is made explicit and direct.

IFIDs include three sub-strategies: an expression of regret “*I’m sorry*”, a request for forgiveness and accepting the apology, “*please forgive me*” and an offer of apology, “*I apologize*”. Table 4.9 above shows that the English and Jordanian participants exhibited significant differences in the use of IFIDs direct strategies; both Jordanian groups did not turn to IFIDs as frequently as ENSs did. According to Olshtain and Cohen (1983), IFIDs are considered as direct apology strategies, thus it is clear from the above-mentioned results that ENSs prefer to apologize directly more than JL2Ss and JNESs groups.

Among the IFIDs sub-strategies, the expression of regret “*I’m sorry*” was the most frequently used strategy by all the three groups of participants. However, it was used more frequently by ENSs group 33.01% than the other two Jordanian groups;

JL2Ss, 25.65% and JNESs 21.87% respectively. The second frequently used sub-strategy by the three groups was an offer of apology, “*I apologize*” as in the following frequencies; JL2Ss 9.32 %, JNESs 9.26% and ENSs 4.40%. The least used sub-strategy by the three groups was the request for forgiveness and accepting the apology “*please forgive me/please accept my apology*”. This sub-strategy was used by the three groups as follows: JL2Ss 1.95%, JNESs 1.18 % and ENSs 7.11 %. However, both Jordanian groups used the strategy *arjo al matherah* (Arabic: ارجو المعذره) which literally means I hope you forgive me.

Concerning intensifiers +IFID, some participants opted to use intensification markers along with IFIDs to intensify their apology. The force of apology depends not only on the choice of an apology strategy but also on the number and type of strategies used. Further, intensification refers to the use of adverbial e.g. terribly, very, extremely (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). These intensification markers have been employed by the three groups of participants in following percentages; JL2Ss 6.90%, JNESs 7.88% and ENSs 25.09%. It is notable that ENSs used these intensified IFIDs significantly more than both Jordanian groups. For example, Situation 6 ENS1 (e.g. “I’m very sorry for what happened, as I had my mind somewhere else I apologize, and would like to fix this with the insurance, so you can have your rear fixed”), and for Situation 12 ENS2 (e.g. “I am very sorry, but none of the things I said was meant as personal, nor directed at you or anyone else”).

The explanation or account apology strategy has two sub-strategies: explicit and implicit. Significant differences were observed between Jordanian and English cultures, that is, both Jordanian groups used explicit explanation more frequently than

the ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 24.72%, JNESs 26.40% and ENSs 9.31% which indicates that Jordanians prefer giving explanation to justify the offence more than ENSs did.

As for taking on responsibility strategy, it is used when the offender admits his/her responsibility for the offence. The offender declares responsibility through selecting from a number of sub-strategies: explicit self-blame, lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency, expression of embarrassment, self-dispraise, justify hearer, refusal to acknowledge guilt, denial of responsibility, blame the hearer and pretend to be offended. All the three groups used explicit self-blame sub-strategy in almost same frequency i.e. JL2Ss 5.97%, JNESs 5.81% and ENSs 5.64%, while lack of intent employed by the three groups with different frequencies i.e. JL2Ss 5.97%, JNESs 1.30% and ENSs 0.36.

The main significant differences between the three groups of participants concerning these sub-strategies are in the use of expression of self-deficiency i.e. JL2Ss 1.11%, JNESs 0.59% and ENSs 0.0% and justify hearer i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.39% and ENSs 0.0% sub-strategies. These two sub-strategies used only by both Jordanian groups, and were not used by ENSs group. The sole usage of these sub-strategies by both Jordanian groups might indicate a cultural specificity and L1 influence. However, for the rest of sub-strategies, both cultures showed agreement since none of them used any of these sub-strategies which indicate cultural similarities between both Jordanian and English cultures.

Likewise, another significant difference between Jordanian and English culture was regarding the production of concern for the hearer apology strategy. This strategy

was used by both Jordanian groups significantly higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 7.46%, JNESs 8.57% and ENSs, 0.44%. It is observed that both Jordanian groups opted to use this strategy in almost equal distribution which indicates that JL2Ss are still influenced by their cultural values.

Offer of repair apology strategy is assumed to be a situation-specific as explained by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), which is used when physical damage is involved. However, this strategy was also used by the three groups when emotional damage is concerned because damage includes physical and emotional offences. Both Jordanian groups used this strategy relatively higher than ENSs did i.e., JL2Ss 12.12%, JNESs 13.20% and ENSs 9.17%. For example, Situation 6 JL2S 1 (e.g. “I am so sorry, I really didn’t notice your car, i’ll afford all the expenses”), and for Situation 8 JL2S 2, (e.g. “it’s my mistake. I am sorry, let’s got to wash it”). As for promise of forbearance strategy “*It won’t happen again*”, the three groups of participants used this strategy in almost same frequency i.e. JL2Ss 3.07%, JNESs 2.85%, and ENSs 3.08%.

In addition to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model, the analysis of the data revealed additional expressions used by the three groups of participants. Three expressions used by Jordanian participants only, and one expression used by ENSs. The expressions used by both Jordanian groups include: invoking Allah name, for example, Situation 2 JL2S1 (e.g. “I am terribly sorry doctor, I forget to bring it, I promise you inshallah to bring it as soon as possible”). The other expression is requiring the offended party not to be angry, for example Situation 6 JNES1 (e.g. “don’t get so angry let’s settle the problem”), (Arabic: طول بالك يا رجل خلىنا

"نحل المشكلة"). The third expression is defining relationship, for example, Situation 12 JL2S 1, (e.g. "No dear. I didn't mean anybody. If you felt that, so, I am sorry"). Situation 2 JL2S2 (e.g. "I`am very very sorry doctor, I really forget to bring it with me today").

On other hand, only the ENSs used the expression I am afraid + sentence, which is language specific since it was used only by ENSs group. For example, Situation 9 ENS 1, (e.g. "I`m afraid I have to change the order"). This specific usage of this expression by ENSs supports the claim that each language has its own conventional expressions (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1983). The next RQ analyses in detail the influence of social power and social distance context-external variables on the production of apology strategies among the three targeted groups.

4.2.2. Influence of social power and social distance in JL2Ss' production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs.

4.2.2.1 RQ 2.b. How do the context-external social variables: (a) social power (high, equal, and low); and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) influence JL2Ss' production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs?

To answer RQ2.b data collected via DCT were analysed.

- i) Influence of social power in JL2Ss' production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) and Holmes (1991), the role of social power in communication involves the interlocutors' ability to recognize each other's social position so that the speaker can behave appropriately with the interlocutors belong to different cultural backgrounds.

In the present study, social power variable is divided into three categories or levels. The first category includes those who have high social power and how they interact with the low social power interlocutors (H-L). The second category includes those who have equal social power and how they interact with the equal social power interlocutors (E-E). The third category includes those who have low social power and how they interact with those who have high social power interlocutors (L-H). Table 4.10 below explains the number and the percentages of the apology strategies by the three social power categories.

TABLE 4.10: The number and the percentages of the apology strategies by the three social power categories

Apology strategies	Social power categories	JL2Ss	JNESs	ENSs
An expression of regret	H-L	33 (3.07%)	20 (1.97%)	93 (6.82%)
	E-E	40 (3.73%)	37 (3.64%)	105(7.70%)
	L-H	102 (9.51%)	65 (6.40%)	122 (8.95%)
Request for forgiveness	H-L	0(0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	21(1.53%)
	E-E	4 (0.37%)	5(0.49%)	10 (0.73%)
	L-H	6(0.55%)	7(0.68%)	37(2.71%)
Offer of apology	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5(0.36%)
	E-E	25 (2.33%)	23(2.26%)	8(0.58%)
	L-H	35 (3.26%)	31(3.05%)	12(0.88%)

	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	20(1.46%)
Intensifiers +IFID	E-E	20 (1.86%)	23(2.26%)	112(8.21%)
	L-H	34 (3.17%)	37(3.64%)	130(9.53%)
	H-L	23 (2.14%)	20 (1.97%)	30 (2.20%)
Explicit explanation	E-E	52 (4.94%)	43 (4.23%)	30 (2.20%)
	L-H	83 (7.74%)	95 (9.35%)	27 (1.98%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	30 (2.20%)
Explicit self-blame	E-E	30 (2.79%)	15 (1.47%)	20 (1.46%)
	L-H	28 (2.61%)	29 (2.85%)	33 (2.42%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.07%)
Lack of intent	E-E	7(0.65%)	5 (0.49%)	1(0.07%)
	L-H	3(0.27%)	3 (0.29%)	1 (0.07%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Expression of self-deficiency	E-E	4(0.37%)	2 (0.19%)	0 (0.0%)
	L-H	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Justify hearer	E-E	1(0.09%)	2(0.19%)	0 (0.0%)
	L-H	1(0.09%)	2(0.19%)	0 (0.0%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Concern for the hearer	E-E	30 (2.79%)	40 (3.94%)	1(0.07%)

	L-H	28 (2.61%)	27 (2.66%)	2 (0.14%)
	H-L	2(0.18%)	5(0.49%)	3(0.22%)
Offer of repair	E-E	60 (5.59%)	71 (6.99%)	30(2.20%)
	L-H	48 (4.47%)	30 (2.95%)	22(1.61%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Promise of Forbearance	E-E	10(0.93%)	8 (0.78%)	16(1.17%)
	L-H	20(1.86%)	15(1.47%)	10 (1.32%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Invoking Allah name	E-E	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
	L-H	2(0.18%)	3(0.29%)	0 (0.0%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Define relationship	E-E	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)
	L-H	3(0.27%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2(0.14%)
I'm afraid + sentence	E-E	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	L-H	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2(0.14%)

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers, H-L= High to low, E-E=Equal to equal, L-H=Low to high.

According to Table 4.10 above, an expression of regret “*I’m sorry/ sorry*” is the highest IFIDs sub-strategy used by the three groups of participants in all social power categories. However, ENSs used this sub-strategy higher than both Jordanian groups

did which indicate that ENSs preferred to apologize directly and explicitly. Looking closely within the social categories, it is observed that both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power used expression of regret significantly lower than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 3.07%, JNESs 1.97% and ENSs 6.82%.

This shows that Jordanian with high power opted not to use direct apology with those low power offended parties, and they tended to confirm their power and save their positive faces by not apologizing directly and explicitly. By contrast, ENSs who have high social power preferred to apologize directly and explicitly. For example, Situation 9 ENS 4 (e.g. “Sorry I know this is annoying but I really would like to change my order—can you find out if is that is possible? I can explain to the manager if you need me to”), and Situation 1 ENS 5 (e.g. “I’m really sorry, I ran out of time to do this, but I promise I’ll do it as a priority now”).

Moreover, both Jordanian groups of participants who have equal social power used this sub-strategy significantly less than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 3.73%, JNESs 3.64% and ENSs 7.70%. This might indicate that Jordanians do not feel it is necessary to express apology strategies when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors. By contrast, JL2Ss and ENSs who have low social power used this sub-strategy significantly higher than JNESs when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 9.51%, JNESs 6.40% and ENSs 9.85%.

Conversely, a request for forgiveness and accepting the apology sub-strategy, “*please forgive me*”, “*please accept my apology*,” was the least sub-strategy used by the three groups in all social power categories. While none of Jordanians who have

high social power used this expression, it was used only by ENSs who have high social power i.e. JL2Ss 0.0%, JNESs 0.0% and ENSs 1.53%. Both Jordanian groups of participants used it less than ENSs did with equal social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.37%, JNESs 0.49% and ENSs 0.73%. For low social power, both Jordanian groups of participants used this expression with very low percentage with their high social power interlocutors as compared to ENSs who used it significantly higher than both Jordanian groups did i.e. JL2Ss 0.55%, JNESs 0.68% and ENSs 2.71%.

An offer of apology, "*I apologize*" sub-strategy was not used by both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power but was used only by ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 0.0%, JNESs 0.0% and ENSs 0.36%. Both Jordanian groups of participants who have equal social power used this sub-strategy significantly more than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 2.33%, JNESs 2.26% and ENSs 0.58%. Similarly, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used this sub-strategy significantly more than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 3.26%, JNESs 3.05% and ENSs 0.88%.

In terms of intensifiers + IFIDs, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) explain that intensifiers are used to intensify the apology and reduce the severity of the offence on the offended party. These intensifiers such as, *very*, *terribly* and *so* and others were used by the three groups of participants in all social power categories except for JL2Ss and JNESs participants who have high social power i.e. JL2Ss 0.0%, JNESs 0.0% and ENSs 1.46%. Since IFIDs were frequently used by ENSs, intensifiers were also accompanied with these IFIDs by ENSs significantly higher than both Jordanian groups. As shown in Table 4.10 earlier, both Jordanian groups of participants who

have equal social power used intensifiers with their equal social power interlocutors significantly less than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 1.86%, JNESs 2.26% and ENSs 8.21%.

Similarly, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used intensifiers with their higher social power interlocutors significantly less than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 3.17% JNESs 3.64% and ENSs 9.53%. It seems that the influence of social power is evident in the distribution of these intensifiers, that is, none of Jordanian high social power participants used these intensifiers which indicates that they do not feel there is a need to intensify their apologies when they apologize for their low social power offended parties. Further, Jordanians who have equal social power did not intensify their apologies as frequently as ENSs did. This might be to the close relation between the interlocutors. Conversely, Jordanians who have low social power intensified their apologies when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors.

With regard to explicit explanation sub-strategy, it was used by all the three groups of participants yet with different frequencies. This sub-strategy may be employed by the offenders in order to minimize the blame assigned to them and help them be excused by the offended parties (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). JL2Ss and ENSs who have high social power employed this sub-strategy higher than JNESs when apologizing to their low social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 2.14% JNESs 1.97% and ENSs 2.20%. Both Jordanian groups of participants with equal social power used this sub-strategy higher than ENSs when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors i.e., JL2Ss 4.94% JNESs 4.23% and ENSs 2.20%. Further, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used this sub-strategy

higher than ENSs when apologizing to their high social power i.e. JL2Ss 7.74%, JNESs 9.35% and ENSs 1.98%. This might show that the Jordanian have a trend to give more explanation to their offended parties as a vessel to be excused. In spite of all of these differences, none of the three groups of participants used the implicit explanation sub-strategy which might be conceived as a cross-cultural agreement.

Regarding taking on responsibility apology strategy, and although it has ten sub-strategies, both Jordanian groups of participants tended to use only four sub-strategies which are: explicit self-blame, lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency and justify the hearer. By contrast, ENSs used only explicit self-blame "*It is my fault/my mistake*" and lack of intent "*I didn't mean it*" sub-strategies. As shown in Table 4.9 above, the most frequently used sub-strategy by the three groups was explicit self-blame followed by lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency and the least utilized one was justify the hearer.

It is observed that none of both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power used any sub-strategies of this apology strategy when they apologize to their low social power interlocutors. As for explicit self-blame sub-strategy, both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power did not use it when apologizing to their low social power interlocutors since it might hurt their positive faces but ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 0.0% JNESs 0.0% and ENSs 2.20%, while JNESs and ENSs used this sub-strategy less than JL2Ss when interacting with their equal social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 2.79% JNESs 1.47% and ENSs 1.46%.

Both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used it higher than ENSs when interacting with their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 2.61% JNESs 2.85% and ENSs 2.42%. Regarding Lack of intent sub-strategy, both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power did not use it when interacting with their low social power interlocutors but ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 0.0% JNESs 0.0% and ENSs 0.07%. By contrast, Both Jordanian groups of participants with equal social power used it higher than ENSs when interacting with their equal social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.65% JNESs 0.49% and ENSs 0.07%. Similarly, Both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used it higher than ENSs when interacting with their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.27% JNESs 0.29% and ENSs 0.07%.

As for expression of self-deficiency sub-strategy, none of the three groups of participants who have high and low social power used it, but it was used only by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors and was not used by ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 0.37% JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 0.0%. This sub-strategy is used to intensify the apology expression and show the apologizer sincere intent to restore the social equilibrium and save his/her positive face. Likewise, Justify hearer sub-strategy was used only by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their equal i.e. JL2Ss 0.09% JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 0.0%, and high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.09% JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 0.0%, and was not used by ENSs. Besides, none of the three groups of participants who have high social power used it.

Concern for the hearer strategy is used to show sympathy and lessen the severity of the offence on the offended party (Blum-Kulka, 1989). As shown in Table 4.10 earlier, this strategy was of low incidence in the three groups of participants. It is observed that none of the three groups of participants who have high social power used this apology strategy which might be conceived as a cross-cultural agreement between Jordanian and British cultures. However, it was used by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors higher than ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 2.79% JNESs 3.94% and ENSs 0.07%. For example, Situation 12 JL2S 1 (e.g. "I hope you don't feel offended by what I said").

Likewise, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used this strategy higher than ENSs when interacting with their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 2.61% JNESs 2.66% and ENSs 0.14%. For example, Situation 2 JL2S 2 (e.g. "I hope I did not upset you professor"). This strategy might be used frequently by Jordanian groups to restore and fix the relationship between interlocutors especially when the offender is of equal or low social power. Conversely, ENSs with low and equal social power preferred to use an expression of regret without following it by concern for the hearer for example, Situation 12 ENS 6 (e.g. "pardon me").

Regarding an offer of repair strategy, it is assumed to be a situation specific occurs when physical and emotional offences take place (Blum-Kulka, 1989). As it is noticed, the most frequently used offer of repair strategies were by equal and low social power interlocutors. Further, JNESs who have high social power used this strategy higher than JL2Ss and ENSs groups i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.49% and

ENSs 0.22%. Both Jordanian groups of participants who have equal social power used this strategy significantly higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 5.59%, JNESs 6.99% and ENSs 2.20%. For example, Situation 4 JL2S 1, (e.g. “oh sorry dear but I had a situation before, later we go somewhere ok”), and Situation 4 ENS 1 (e.g. I am sorry I forgot to turn up today – I expect you are fed up with me. When can we meet – I’ll buy you a drink!”).

Also both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used this strategy more than ENSs did when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 4.47%, JNESs 2.95% and ENSs 1.61%. For example, Situation 2 JL2S 2, (e.g. “oh I’m so sorry prof, I really forgot to bring it today, shall I go and bring it now?”).

As for promise of forbearance apology strategy, it is resorted to for saving the offender positive face and the offended party negative face. This strategy is considered as a situation specific, that is, it occurs with the situation that make the offender feels so guilty about the offence and he/she wants to confirm not to repeat the offence in the future by using the promising expression. The three groups of participants who have high social power did not use this strategy, yet it was used by other social power interlocutors. Both Jordanian groups who have equal social power used this strategy significantly lower than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 0.93%, JNESs 0.78% and ENSs 1.17%. For example, Situation 4 JL2S 1 (e.g. “I will not miss any meetings again”).

However, both Jordanian groups who have low social power opted to use promise of forbearance strategy significantly higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 1.86%, JNESs 1.47% and ENSs 1.32%. For example, Situation 2 JL2S 2, (e.g. “I’m so sorry dear Prof. I forgot to bring the book with me. I put it on the table to take in the morning but I was in hurry to attend the class on time. Sorry again, I promise to bring it tomorrow.”), and Situation 3 ENS 1, (e.g. “I am sorry I forget the meeting today because of [x]. I realize this is the 2nd time I have done this and I will ensure it does not happen again”).

As mentioned earlier, in addition to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model, the analysis of the data revealed additional expressions used by the three groups of participants. Three expressions used by Jordanian participants only while one expression used by ENSs. Regarding the distribution of these expressions by the three social power categories, it is noticed that invoking Allah name expression was used only by both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power and never used by ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.29% and ENSs 0.0%. For example, Situation 2 JL2S 2, (e.g. “I am very sorry Dr. Honestly, I have forgotten that. Tomorrow Insyallah I will bring it.”).

As for defining relationship expression, it was used by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 0.0%. For example, Situation 4 JL2S 2 (e.g. “I’m sorry my dear. I forgot our meeting today also. I didn’t set the alarm. If you text me for reminding sure I will come. Sorry again”). Moreover, it was used by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their high social power

interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.09%, JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 0.0%. For example, Situation 2 JL2S 3 (e.g. “I’m so sorry my dear Dr but I really forgot to bring the book back”).

Regarding the expression I am afraid + sentence, it was used only by ENSs group in high and low social power categories, for example, Situation 2 ENS 2, (e.g. “I’m afraid I forgot to bring your book back”). According to Table 4.10 earlier, the influence of social power is evident on the responses of both Jordanian groups and no clear influence to the social power on the responses of ENSs. As such, Jordanians have much concern about high social power more than ENSs. That is, Jordanians who have high social power refrained from offending their positive faces by not apologizing directly to their low power interlocutors but they employed some other indirect strategies such as explanation and offer of repair. (More discussion is in the sub-sequence chapter 5)

The next section explains the influence of social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) categories by the three group participants

ii) Influence of social distance in JL2Ss’ production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs.

iii)

TABLE 4.11: The number and the percentages of the apology strategies by the two social distance categories

Apology strategies	Social power categories	JL2Ss	JNESs	ENSs
An expression of regret	Familiar	30 (2.79%)	28 (2.75%)	70 (5.13%)
	Unfamiliar	70 (6.52%)	80(7.88%)	60 (4.40%)
Request for forgiveness	Familiar	0. (0. 0%)	2 (0. 19%)	17 (1.24%)
	Unfamiliar	1(0.09%)	5 (0.49%)	13 (0.95%)

Offer of apology	Familiar	0(0.0%)	1(0.09%)	15 (1.10%)
	Unfamiliar	19 (1.77%)	24 (2.36%)	39 (2.86%)
Intensifiers +IFID	Familiar	7 (0.68%)	5 (0.49%)	30 (2.20%)
	Unfamiliar	13 (1.21%)	15 (1.47%)	50 (3.66%)
Explicit explanation	Familiar	70 (6.52%)	84 (8.27%)	27 (1.98%)
	Unfamiliar	28 (2.61%)	44 (4.33%)	23 (1.68%)
Explicit self-blame	Familiar	2(0.18%)	5 (0.49%)	10 (0.73%)
	Unfamiliar	4 (0.37%)	10 (0.98%)	14 (1.02%)
Lack of intent	Familiar	2 (0.18%)	1 (0.09%)	1(0.07%)
	Unfamiliar	2 (0.18%)	2 (0.19%)	2 (0.14%)
Expression of self-deficiency	Familiar	1(0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)
	Unfamiliar	2 (0.18%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)
Justify hearer	Familiar	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	Unfamiliar	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.19%)	0 (0.0%)
Concern for the hearer	Familiar	7 (0.68%)	8 (0.78%)	1 (0.07%)
	Unfamiliar	15 (1.39%)	12 (1.18%)	2 (0.14%)
Offer of repair	Familiar	8(0.74%)	18 (1.77%)	29 (2.12%)
	Unfamiliar	12 (1.11%)	10 (0.98%)	41 (3.00%)
Promise of Forbearance	Familiar	1(0.09%)	2 (0.19%)	6 (0.44%)

	Unfamiliar	2(0.18%)	4 (0.37%)	2 (0.14%)
Requiring the offended party not to be angry	Familiar	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
	Unfamiliar	0(0.0%)	1 (0.09%)	0(0.0%)
Define relationship	Familiar	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
	Unfamiliar	0(0.0%)	1 (0.09%)	0(0.0%)
I'm afraid + sentence	Familiar	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	3 (0.22%)
	Unfamiliar	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers.

Similar to social power addressed earlier in Table 4.10, social distance is also considered as an significant context-external variable as explained by Brown and Levinson (1987) that influences the speech act production. Additionally, social distance is used as an indicator to measure the nature of FTAs and the nature of apology strategy used by the interlocutors, whether they are close to each other such as friends or distant from each other such as strangers. In this study, the social distance variable used is divided into two categories: either familiar interlocutor or unfamiliar interlocutor. The analysis investigates how the offender produces apology strategy when apologizing for the familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors.

As it is shown in Table 4.11 earlier, IFIDs were the most frequently used apology strategies by the three groups with the highest frequency by ENSs. An

“expression of regret” sub-strategy was the most frequently employed sub-strategy by the three groups. However, significant difference is observed between both Jordanian groups and ENSs regarding usage of this sub-strategy. That is, both Jordanian groups used expression of regret significantly lower than ENSs with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 2.79%, JNESs 2.75% and ENSs 5.13%. As for unfamiliar interlocutors, both Jordanian groups used expression of regret significantly higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 6.52%, JNESs 7.88% and ENSs 4.40%.

Regarding the request for forgiveness and offer of apology sub-strategies, also a clear difference is noticeable between both Jordanian groups and ENSs. Both Jordanian groups used request for forgiveness significantly lower than ENSs with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.0%, JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 1.24% and with unfamiliar interlocutors as well i.e. JL2Ss 0.09% JNESs 0.49% and ENSs 0.95%. As for offer of apology sub-strategy, it was also used by both Jordanian groups significantly lower than ENSs with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.0% JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 1.10% and with unfamiliar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 1.77% JNESs 2.36% and ENSs 2.86%.

Regarding using Intensifiers +IFIDs, it is observed that the usage of these intensifiers increases with the increasing of social distance between interlocutors. These intensifiers were used by three groups of participants with different frequencies. Both Jordanian groups used intensifiers significantly less than ENSs did with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.68%, JNESs 0.49% and ENSs 2.20% and with unfamiliar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 1.21%, JNESs 1.47% and ENSs 3.66%. For example, Situation 10 ENS 3, (“e.g. I am very, very sorry – my fault completely. Here, let me

help you!”). Consequently, social distance is found to influence the usage of IFIDs by Jordanians more than ENSs. Both Jordanian groups used intensifiers frequently less than ENSs did especially with their familiar social distance interlocutors.

The second most frequently used apology strategy by the three groups of participants was an explicit explanation, which is a sub-strategy of explanation or account apology strategy. The results revealed that both Jordanian groups used this sub-strategy significantly higher than ENSs did with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 6.52%, JNESs 8.27% and ENSs 1.98%. For example, Situation 7 JL2S 1 (e.g. “I’m sorry manager I have to tell you that I had an accident in your car because there was jam so I did not notice that there was car coming from the other side”) and with unfamiliar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 2.61% JNESs 4.33% and ENSs 1.68%. Jordanians opted to use lengthy explanation to minimize the severity of the offence when it occurs. By contrast, ENSs used offer of repair instead of giving lengthy explanation.

Regarding taking on responsibility apology strategy, and although it has ten sub-strategies, both Jordanian groups of participants tended to use only four sub-strategies. These sub-strategies are: explicit self-blame, lack of intent, expression of self-deficiency and Justify the hearer. On contrary, ENSs used only explicit self-blame and lack of intent sub-strategies. The main difference between the three groups of participants in the use of this apology strategy was in the explicit self-blame. That is, both Jordanian groups used this sub-strategy significantly lower than ENSs did with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.49% and ENSs 0.73%, and with unfamiliar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.37% JNESs 0.98% and ENSs 1.02%.

It is implied that ENSs have the tendency to accept the blame by the offended parties either familiar or unfamiliar more than both Jordanian groups. As for Justify the hearer strategy, it was used only by both Jordanian groups with unfamiliar interlocutors and was not used by ENSs group i.e. JL2Ss 0.09% JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 0.0%. For example, Situation 10 JL2S 1 (“e.g. opss, I am very sorry it is my fault you are right to be angry”).

Regarding concern for the hearer strategy, it was frequently used by both Jordanian groups more than ENSs did. Both Jordanian groups of participants used this strategy with their familiar interlocutors more than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 0.68% JNESs 0.78% and ENSs 0.07%. For example, Situation 7 JL2S 1 (e.g. “I’m sorry for this but I will fix the damage and I hope you don’t feel upset”). Likewise, both Jordanian groups of participants used concern for the hearer strategy with their unfamiliar interlocutors more than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 1.39%, JNESs 1.18% and ENSs 0.14%. For example, Situation 10 JL2S 2, (e.g. “Oh, so sorry I wasn’t paying attention to the way. Are you ok” What can I do for you?).

As explained earlier, the offer of repair strategy is used when physical or emotional damage is done to the offended party. Both Jordanian groups used this strategy significantly less than ENSs with their familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.74%, JNESs 1.77% and ENSs 2.12% and with unfamiliar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 1.11% JNESs 0.98% and ENSs 3.00%. For example, Situation 5 JL2S 1 (e.g. “I’m sorry son I will take you shopping tomorrow”).

As for promise of forbearance strategy, it was of low incidence by the three groups of participants. It is used to reduce the severity influence on the offender. ENSs used this strategy relatively higher than both Jordanian groups with familiar interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.09% JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 0.44%. For example, Situation 5 ENS 2 (e.g. sorry and I know I promised and let you down. I will make sure this won't happen again. Can we go X instead"?). However, with unfamiliar interlocutors, both Jordanian groups used this strategy relatively higher than ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.37% and ENSs 0.14%. For example, Situation 5 JL2S 3 (e.g. "I'm sorry son I promise this won't happen again").

As mentioned earlier, in addition to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model, the analysis of the data revealed new expressions used by the three groups of participants. Regarding the distribution of these expressions by the familiar and unfamiliar categories, it is noticed that requiring the offended party not to be angry expression was used only by JNESs with unfamiliar interlocutors and was not used by the other two groups i.e. JLESs 0.0%, JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 0.0%. Likewise, define relationship was used only by JNESs with unfamiliar interlocutors and was not used by the other two groups i.e. JL2Ss 0.0%, JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 0.0%. For example, Situation 6 JNES 1 (e.g. "I'm sorry just relax dear I will fix everything").

The use of the expression I am afraid + sentence is language specific since it was used only by ENSs with familiar interlocutors i.e. JLESs 0.0%, JNESs 0.0% and ENSs 0.07%, This specific usage of this expression by ENSs supports the claim that each language has its own conventional expressions (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1983).

For example, Situation 7 ENS 3, (e.g. “I am afraid I have to tell you that I had an accident in your car on the way back from airport”).

The analysis of this section revealed that there is a general trend for Jordanians to vary their apology production based on social distance among the interlocutors. Further, Jordanians used more apology strategies with unfamiliar interlocutors than familiar ones. Moreover, results showed that social distance has no influence on the percentages of apology strategies produced by ENSs, that is, they did not vary their apology productions based on social distance between interlocutors while Jordanians did. The next section explains the negative pragmatic transfer in the apology production.

4.2.3. RQ 2.c. the negative pragmatic transfer in the production of apology by JL2Ss’ production compared to that of JNESSs and ENSs.

4.2.3.1 RQ 2.c. Is there negative pragmatic transfer in the production of apology by JL2Ss, compared to that of JNESSs and ENSs?

To answer RQ2.c data collected via DCT were analysed.

It is noteworthy to recall the concept of negative pragmalinguistic transfer. Firstly, Kasper (1992) explains that pragmatic transfer in interlanguage pragmatics is identified as the influence exerted by the learners’ pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 in their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information. Moreover, Kasper proposes two kinds of transfer: sociopragmatic transfer and pragmalinguistic transfer. Negative pragmalinguistic

transfer is operative if JL2Ss differ from ENSs with regard to their production of apology in any aspect, and if these differences reflect the native norms given by JNESs.

The results of data analysis found seven major patterns indicating native language influence and negative pragmalinguistic transfer. These patterns are illustrated in Table 4.12 below.

Table 4.12: Patterns of negative pragmalinguistic transfer

Patterns	Explanations
1. JL2Ss>JNESs<ENSs	JL2Ss and JNESs used the semantic formula higher than ENSs
2. JL2Ss≈JNESs>ENSs	JL2Ss and JNESs used the semantic formula almost same frequency and higher than ENSs
3. JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs	JL2Ss and JNESs used the semantic formula lesser than ENSs
4. JL2Ss<JNESs>ENSs	JL2Ss and JNESs used the semantic formula higher than ENSs
5. JL2Ss>JNESs>ENSs	JL2Ss and JNESs used the semantic formula higher than ENSs
6. JL2Ss & JNESs YES ENSs NO	JL2Ss and JNESs used the semantic formula but ENSs did not
7. JL2Ss & JNESs NO ENSs YES	JL2Ss and JNESs did not use the semantic formula but ENSs did

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers.

Evidences of negative pragmalinguistic transfer occurred in two cases: the first case is in the frequency of the semantic formulas, that is, when both Jordanian groups of participants employ the semantic formulas either higher than ENSs or less than ENSs.

The second case is in the selection of the semantic formulas, that is, when both Jordanian groups of participants employ semantic formulas that are not employed by ENSs. First of all, the instances of negative pragmalinguistic transfer in overall

apology strategies will be discussed. Then, the instances of negative pragmalinguistic transfer in social power and social distance categories will be discussed.

TABLE 4.13: Negative pragmalinguistic transfer instances in the overall apology strategies

Apologies Strategies	JL2Ss	%	JNESs	%	ENSs	%	Patterns
Direct	No	%	No	%	No	%	
An expression of regret.	275	25.65	222	21.87	45	33.01	JL2S>JNES<ENS
A request for forgiveness	20	1.86	12	1.18	11	8.58	JL2S>JNES<ENS
An offer of apology.	100	9.32	94	9.26	60	4.40	JL2S≈JNES>ENS
Intensifiers +IFID	74	6.90	80	7.88	342	25.09	JL2S<JNES<ENS
Indirect							
Explanation, account	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Explicit explanation	265	24.72	268	26.40	12	9.31	JL2S<JNES>ENS
Taking on responsibility							
2.1 Lack of intent	14	1.30	11	1.08	5	0.36	JL2S>JNES>ENS
2.2 Expression of self-deficiency	12	1.11	6	0.59	0	0	JL2SJNES YES ENS NO
2.3 Justify hearer	2	0.18	5	0.39	0	0.	JL2SJNES YES ENS NO
Concern for the hearer	80	7.46	87	8.57	4	0.44	JL2S<JNES>ENS
Offer of repair	130	12.12	134	13.20	125	9.17	JL2S<JNES>ENS
Promise of Forbearance	33	3.07	29	2.85	42	3.08	NO PT
NEW EXPRESSIONS							
Invoking Allah name	2	0.18	3	0.29	0	0	JL2S, JNES YES ENS NO
Define relationship	3	0.27	2	0.9	0	0	JL2S, JNES YES ENS NO

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers.

Table 4.13 above illustrates the frequency and the patterns of negative pragmalinguistic transfer found in the three groups' responses. Based on Table 4.13 above, negative transfer was found in almost all the semantic formulas. The results revealed that negative pragmatic transfer occurred in all the IFIDs sub-strategies among the three groups of participants.

This is due to the tendency of ENSs of using explicit or direct apology strategies frequently more than both Jordanian groups did. Both Jordanian groups used the IFIDs sub-strategies significantly less frequently than ENSs. Expression of regret was used by both Jordanian groups of participants significantly more than ENSs i.e. JL2Ss, 25.65%, JNESs 21.87% and ENSs 33.01%. An offer of apology was used by both Jordanian groups of participants significantly more than ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 9.32 %, JNESs 9.26% and ENSs 4.40%.

The least used sub-strategy by the three groups was the request for forgiveness and accepting the apology. This sub-strategy was used by both Jordanian groups of participants significantly less than ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 1.95%, JNESs 1.18 % and ENSs 7.11 %. As for intensifiers +IFID, both Jordanian groups of participants used intensifiers significantly less than ENSs with all IFIDs sub-strategies i.e. JL2Ss 6.90%, JNESs 7.88% and ENSs 25.09%.

Both Jordanian groups used explicit explanation more frequently than the ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 24.72%, JNESs 26.40% and ENSs 9.31% which indicates that Jordanians prefer giving explanation to justify the offence more than ENSs did. Both Jordanian groups of participants significantly used lack of intent sub-strategy higher

than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 5.97%, JNESs 1.30% and ENSs 0.36. However, both Jordanian groups of participants used expression of self-deficiency while ENSs did not i.e. JL2Ss 1.11%, JNESs 0.59% and ENSs 0.0%. Similarly, both Jordanian groups of participants used justify the hearer sub-strategy while ENSs did not i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.39% and ENSs 0.0%. These two sub-strategies used only by both Jordanian groups, and were not used by ENSs group. Concern for the hearer strategy was used by both Jordanian groups significantly higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 7.46%, JNESs 8.57% and ENSs, 0.44%. Similarly, Both Jordanian groups used offer of repair strategy relatively higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 12.12%, JNESs 13.20% and ENSs 9.17%.

As mentioned earlier, the second evidence of negative pragmalinguistic transfer occurrence is in the selection of the semantic formulas, that is, when both Jordanian groups of participants employ semantic formulas that are not employed by ENSs. Data analysis revealed two additional expressions transferred from Jordanian Arabic culture while using English. These expressions are: invoking Allah name “inshallah” i.e. JL2S 0.18%, JNESs 0.29% and ENSs 0. % and defining relationship “Dr”, “my dear” etc i.e. JL2S 0.27%, JNESs 0.19% and ENSs 0. %.

Further, these two expressions used only by Jordanian participants and were not used by ENSs. The instances of negative pragmalinguistic transfer were also analysed based on participants’ social power and social distance categories.

These instances are illustrated in the Table 4.14 and Table 4.15 respectively below.

TABLE 4.14: Negative pragmlinguistic transfer based on social power categories

Apology strategies	Social power categories	JL2Ss	JNESs	ENSs	Patterns
An expression of regret	H-L	33 (3.07%)	20 (1.97%)	93 (6.82%)	JL2S>JNESs<ENS
	E-E	40 (3.73%)	37 (3.64%)	105(7.70%)	JL2Ss~JNESs<ENSs
	L-H	102 (9.51%)	65 (6.40%)	122(8.95%)	NO PT
Request for forgiveness	H-L	0(0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	21(1.53%)	JL2Ss & JNESs no vs. ENSs yes
	E-E	4 (0.37%)	5(0.49%)	10 (0.73%)	JL2S<JNESs<ENS
	L-H	6(0.55%)	7(0.68%)	37(2.71%)	JL2S<JNESs>ENS
Offer of apology	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5(0.36%)	JL2Ss & JNESs no vs. ENSs yes
	E-E	25 (2.33%)	23(2.26%)	8(0.58%)	JL2Ss ~JNESs<ENSs
	L-H	35 (3.26%)	31(3.05%)	12(0.88%)	JL2S>JNESs>ENS
Intensifiers +IFID	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	20(1.46%)	JL2Ss & JNESs no vs. ENSs yes
	E-E	20 (1.86%)	23(2.26%)	112(8.21%)	JL2S<JNESs<ENS
	L-H	34 (3.17%)	37(3.64%)	130(9.53%)	JL2S<JNESs<ENS
Explicit explanation	H-L	23 (2.14%)	20 (1.97%)	30 (2.20%)	JL2S>JNESs<ENS
	E-E	52 (4.94%)	43 (4.23%)	30 (2.20%)	JL2S>JNESs>ENS
	L-H	83 (7.74%)	95 (9.35%)	27 (1.98%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENS
Explicit self-blame	H-L	0 (0 0%)	0 (0 0%)	30 (2.20%)	JL2Ss & JNESs no vs. ENSs yes

	E-E	30 (2.79%)	15 (1.47%)	20 (1.46%)	JL2S>JNESs ≈ ENSs
	L-H	28 (2.61%)	29 (2.85%)	33 (2.42%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENS
Lack of intent					JL2Ss & JNESs no vs. ENSs yes
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.07%)	
	E-E	7(0.65%)	5 (0.49%)	1(0.07%)	JL2S>JNESs>ENS
	L-H	3(0.27%)	3 (0.29%)	1 (0.07%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENS
Expression of self-deficiency	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	NO PT
					JL2Ss & JNESs yes vs. ENSs no
	E-E	4(0.37%)	2 (0.19%)	0 (0.0%)	
	L-H	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	NO PT
Justify hearer	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	NO PT
					JL2Ss & JNESs yes vs. ENSs no
	E-E	1(0.09%)	2(0.19%)	0 (0.0%)	
	L-H	1(0.09%)	2(0.19%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss & JNESs yes vs. ENSs no
Concern for the hearer					NO PT
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
	E-E	30 (2.79%)	40 (3.94%)	1(0.07%)	JL2S<JNESs>ENS
	L-H	28 (2.61%)	27 (2.66%)	2 (0.14%)	JL2Ss ≈ JNES>ENSs
Offer of repair	H-L	2(0.18%)	5(0.49%)	3(0.22%)	NO PT
	E-E	60 (5.59%)	71 (6.99%)	30(2.20%)	JL2S<JNESs>ENS
	L-H	48 (4.47%)	30 (2.95%)	22(1.61%)	JL2S>JNESs>ENS
Promise of					NO PT
Forbearance	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
	E-E	10(0.93%)	8 (0.78%)	16(1.17%)	JL2S>JNESs>ENS
	L-H	20(1.86%)	15(1.47%)	10 (1.32%)	JL2S>JNESs>EN
New expressions					
Invoking Allah					NO PT

name Define relationship	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
	E-E	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	NO PT
	L-H	2(0.18%)	3(0.29%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss & JNESs yes vs. ENSs no
	H-L	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	NO PT
	E-E	2 (0.18%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss & JNESs yes vs. ENSs no
	L-H	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss & JNESs yes vs. ENSs no

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers, H-L= High to low, E-E=Equal to equal, L-H=Low to high, NO PT= No pragmatic transfer.

Table 4.14 illustrates in detail the patterns of negative pragmalinguistic transfer based on social power categories. Both Jordanian groups used the IFIDs sub-strategies significantly less frequently than ENSs in all social power categories. As such, negative pragmalinguistic transfer is found in all social power categories except for an offer of apology sub-strategy. Both Jordanian groups used the offer of apology sub-strategy (*I apologize*) frequently more than ENSs did with equal and low social power interlocutors.

In terms of intensifiers + IFIDs they were used by the three groups of participants in all social power categories except for JL2Ss and JNESs participants who have high social power. These intensifiers + IFIDs were frequently used by both Jordanian groups in all social power categories frequently lower than ENSs group which indicate L1 influence and negative pragmalinguistic transfer.

With regard to explicit explanation sub-strategy, it was used by all the three groups of participants with different frequencies. JL2Ss and ENSs who have high social power used this sub-strategy higher than JNESs when interacting with their low social power interlocutors. Moreover, it was used by both Jordanian groups who have equal and low social power frequently higher than ENSs did.

As for explicit self-blame sub-strategy, both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power did not use it when apologizing to their low social power interlocutors but ENSs did. Besides, JNESs and ENSs used this sub-strategy less than JL2Ss when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors. Further, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used this sub-strategy higher than ENSs when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors.

Regarding Lack of intent sub-strategy, both Jordanian groups of participants who have high social power did not use it when apologizing to their low social power interlocutors but ENSs did. By contrast, Both Jordanian groups of participants who have equal social power used it higher than ENSs when apologizing to with their equal social power interlocutors. Similarly, Both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used it higher than ENSs when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors. As for expression of self-deficiency sub-strategy, it was used only by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors and was not used by ENSs. Thus, negative pragmalinguistic transfer occurred in this category only.

For concern for the hearer strategy, it is observed that none of the three groups of participants who have high social power used this apology strategy which might be conceived as a cross-cultural agreement between Jordanian and British cultures. Thus negative pragmatic transfer did not occur in this pattern. However, it was used by both Jordanian groups of participants when apologizing to their equal social power interlocutors higher than ENSs. Likewise, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used it higher than ENSs when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors.

Regarding an offer of repair strategy, JNESs who have high social power used this strategy higher than JL2Ss and ENSs groups i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.49% and ENSs 0.22%. Thus negative pragmatic transfer did not occur in this pattern. Both Jordanian groups of participants who have equal social power used this strategy significantly higher than ENSs did. Moreover, both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power used this strategy more than ENSs did when apologizing to their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 4.47%, JNESs 2.95% and ENSs 1.61%.

Turning to promise of forbearance apology strategy, the three groups of participants who have high social power did not use this strategy. Thus negative pragmatic transfer did not occur in this pattern, yet it was used by other social power interlocutors. Both Jordanian groups with equal social power used this strategy significantly lower than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 0.93%, JNESs 0.78% and ENSs 1.17%. However, both Jordanian groups who have low social power opted to use this strategy significantly higher than ENSs did i.e. JL2Ss 1.86%, JNESs 1.47% and ENSs 1.32%.

Regarding the distribution of the additional expressions transferred from Jordanian Arabic culture, it is noticed that invoking Allah name expression was used only by both Jordanian groups of participants who have low social power and never used by ENSs i.e. JL2Ss 0.18%, JNESs 0.29% and ENSs 0.0%. As for define relationship expression, it was used only by both Jordanian groups of participants when interacting with their equal social power interlocutors i.e. JLESs 0.18%, JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 0.0% and when interacting with their high social power interlocutors i.e. JL2Ss 0.09%, JNESs 0.09% and ENSs 0.0%.

The following are the instances of negative pragmalinguistic transfer based on social distance categories i.e. familiar and unfamiliar.

TABLE 4.15: Negative pragmalinguistic transfer based on social distance categories

Apology strategies	Social power categories	JL2Ss	JNESs	ENSs	Patterns
An expression of regret	Familiar	30 (2.79%)	28 (2.75%)	70 (5.13%)	JL2Ss≈JNESs<ENSs
	Unfamiliar	70 (6.52%)	80(7.88%)	60 (4.40%)	JL2S<JNESs>ENS
Request for forgiveness	Familiar	0. (0. 0%)	2 (0. 19%)	17 (1.24%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs
	Unfamiliar	1(0.09%)	5 (0.49%)	13 (0.95%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs
Offer of apology	Familiar	0(0. 0%)	1(0.09%)	15 (1.10%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs
	Unfamiliar	19 (1.77%)	24 (2.36%)	39 (2.86%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs

Intensifiers

+IFID	Familiar	7 (0.68%)	5 (0.49%)	30 (2.20%)	JL2Ss>JNESs<ENSs
	Unfamiliar	13 (1.21%)	15 (1.47%)	50 (3.66%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs

Explicit

explanation	Familiar	70 (6.52%)	84 (8.27%)	27 (1.98%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENSs
	Unfamiliar	28 (2.61%)	44 (4.33%)	23 (1.68%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENSs

Explicit self-

blame	Familiar	2(0.18%)	5 (0.49%)	10 (0.73%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs
	Unfamiliar	4 (0.37%)	10 (0.98%)	14 (1.02%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs

Lack of intent

	Familiar	2 (0.18%)	1 (0.09%)	1(0.07%)	JL2Ss>JNESs>ENSs
	Unfamiliar	2(0.18%)	2 (0.19%)	2 (0.14%)	JL2Ss≈JNESs>ENSs

Expression of
self-deficiency

	Familiar	1(0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss &JNESs yes vs. ENSs no
	Unfamiliar	2 (0.18%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss &JNESs yes vs. ENSs no

Justify hearer

	Familiar	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	NO PT
	Unfamiliar	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.19%)	0 (0.0%)	JL2Ss &JNESs yes vs. ENSs no

Concern for the
hearer

	Familiar	7 (0.68%)	8 (0.78%)	1 (0.07%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENSs
	Unfamiliar	15 (1.39%)	12 (1.18%)	2 (0.14%)	JL2Ss>JNESs>ENSs

Offer of repair

	Familiar	8(0.74%)	18 (1.77%)	29 (2.12%)	JL2Ss<JNESs<ENSs
	Unfamiliar	12 (1.11%)	10 (0.98%)	41 (3.00%)	JL2Ss>JNESs<ENSs

Promise of Forbearance	Familiar	1(0.09%)	2 (0.19%)	6 (0.44%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENSs
	Unfamiliar	2(0.18%)	4 (0.37%)	2 (0.14%)	JL2Ss<JNESs>ENSs
Requiring the offended party not to be angry	Familiar	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	NO PT
	Unfamiliar	0(0.0%)	1 (0.09%)	0(0.0%)	NO PT
Define relationship	Familiar	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	NO PT
	Unfamiliar	0(0.0%)	1 (0.09%)	0(0.0%)	NO PT

Note: JL2Ss= Jordanian second language speakers, JNESs= Jordanian non English speakers, ENSs= English native speakers, NO PT= No pragmatic transfer.

Table 4.15 above illustrates the patterns of negative pragmalinguistic transfer based on two social distance categories; familiar and unfamiliar. Results revealed that negative pragmalinguistic transfer occurred in all IFIDs sub-strategies in familiar and unfamiliar categories. That is, both Jordanian groups used IFIDs frequently less than ENSs did with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors. However, both Jordanian groups utilized an expression of regret sub-strategy with their unfamiliar interlocutors frequently higher than ENSs did. Similarly, both Jordanian groups used intensifiers +IFIDs significantly less than ENSs did with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors.

The second most frequently used apology strategy by the three groups of participants was an explicit explanation, which is a sub-strategy of explanation or account apology strategy. The results revealed that both Jordanian groups used this

sub-strategy significantly higher than ENSs did with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors.

As for explicit self-blame sub-strategy, it was used by both Jordanian groups significantly lower than ENSs did with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors. By contrast, lack of intent sub-strategy was used by both Jordanian groups significantly higher than ENSs did with their familiar as well as their unfamiliar interlocutors.

Further, expression of self-deficiency and justify the hearer sub-strategies were used only by both Jordanian groups with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors and was not used by ENSs. Regarding concern for the hearer strategy, it was frequently used by both Jordanian groups more than ENSs did. Both Jordanian groups of participants used concern for the hearer strategy with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors more than ENSs did.

As for the offer of repair strategy, both Jordanian groups used this strategy significantly less than ENSs with their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors. As for promise of forbearance strategy, it was used by ENSs relatively higher than both Jordanian groups with familiar interlocutors while with unfamiliar interlocutors, both Jordanian groups used this strategy relatively higher than ENSs.

In terms of the additional expressions; it is noticed that requiring the offended party not to be angry and define relationship were used only by JNESs with unfamiliar interlocutors and were not used by the other two groups. The following RQ2.d explains the JL2Ss' justifications of their apology production.

4.2.4 JL2Ss' justifications for their apology production given by them

4.2.4.1 RQ.2.d. What are JL2Ss' justifications for their apology production given by them?

To answer RQ2.d data collected via semi-structured interviews were analysed.

As aforementioned, evidences of negative pragmalinguistic transfer occurred in two cases: the first case is in the frequency of the semantic formulas, that is, when both Jordanian groups of participants employ the semantic formulas either higher than ENSs or less than ENSs. The second case is in the selection of the semantic formulas, that is, when both Jordanian groups of participants employ semantic formulas that are not employed by ENSs. The DCT results revealed that JL2Ss used additional expressions other than Olshtain and Cohen's (1983) classification model. These expressions were transferred from Jordanian Arabic culture. These expressions include; invoking Allah name and defining relationship. Therefore, the occurrence of these expressions by JL2Ss group and their absence in the ENSs group responses is evidence of pragamalinguistic transfer.

Interview results indicated that there are two main reasons motivated the participants to transfer these expressions from their culture. These reasons include: the Jordanians' religious orientation and the Jordanians' cultural background about hierarchical values. Each of these motivating factors is discussed below.

4.2.4.1 JL2Ss' religious orientation

Two of the nine interviewees used the religious term (e.g. Inshallah). For example, Situation 2 JL2S 2, (e.g. "I am very sorry Dr. Honestly, I have forgotten that. Tomorrow Insyallah I will bring it."). As noticed the DCT results analysis, religious orientation by JL2Ss as Muslims was one of the major reasons that caused pragmalinguistic transfer for those interviewed. The use of the term Inshallah (if God wills) by the responses of JL2Ss was clear in two situations. The data showed this pattern where two of the nine interviewed participants used this expression to intensify their apologies and to give future promise that they will not repeat the offence again. When they asked about the reasons of using such an expression, they emphasized the role of religion (Islam) in their life as Muslim. Thus, Islamic expressions are normally found in Muslims daily conversations such as bismillah (in the name of Allah) which is used before start doing anything such as eating or drinking, and many other activities.

Two interviewees were interviewed via email due to unavailability during the interview time. They were asked 'In Situation 2; (A student forgot to bring his professors book back) When you apologized to your professor, you said Inshallah. Why did you use this expression?'

A1 explained:

I used the expression inshallah because I'm Muslim and it is frequent for Muslims to use this term because everything happens for us is in the hand of Allah.

(A1, S2, interview)

A2 explained:

Saying inshallah by Muslims is very normal, this is our religion and we are taught that Allah is the controller of everything and everything is done by his will.

(A2, S2, interview)

Nydell (2005) explains that the role of Islam in Muslims attitudes stems from the idea that everyone believes in Allah and acknowledges His power that He is the controller of everything and everything depends on His will. This is obvious from the usage of the expression inshallah. Hence, participants' apologies which appeared with religious expressions are reprehensive of their daily speech in Arabic and are evident of pragmatic transfer.

4.2.4.2 The Jordanians' cultural background about hierarchical values

Three of the nine interviewees used define relationship expressions. The production of the define relationship expressions i.e. Dr, Professor and Dear by only both Jordanians groups of participants clearly indicates the specificity of the native Arab cultural norms and attitudes. For example, Situation 2 JL2S 2, (e.g. "I'm so sorry dear Prof. I forgot to bring the book with me. I put it on the table to take in the morning but I was in hurry to attend the class on time. Sorry again, I promise to bring it tomorrow").

According to Wunderle (2006), Arabs are title and rank-conscious than westerners. This is evident through their attempts to emphasize and stress their recognition of the higher social rank of their interlocutors. Therefore, Jordanians'

communication style of stressing on the rank of higher social power was explained by those interviewed as a way to be more polite and show a degree of respect to their interlocutors. Responses given by JL2Ss were used to define the relationship between themselves and their interlocutors. Thus, defining the social status of their interlocutors was fulfilled by referring to the rank of the hearer i.e. doctor, teacher, professor or others. The excerpts provided below are the three interviewees' responses regarding their use of define relationships terms i.e. Dr, Professor and Dear respectively.

A2 explained:

I think it is necessary to use this word "Dr" because I'm talking with my teacher and not with my friend, so in order to show respect and be polite I must use this term otherwise maybe he/she understands me wrong or think I'm impolite.

(A2, S2, interview)

A3 explained:

He is my professor and I think I should call him professor as a kind of respect and to be more polite.

(A3, S2, interview)

A9 explained:

I used the term "dear" in order to show respect and to be polite with my friend especially when I commit an offence against him.

(A9, S4, interview)

The nine interviewees' responses showed their high concern about the social power of their interlocutors. The participants clearly indicated that they vary their apology strategies based on their interlocutors. These findings support the data found in the DCT responses where the participants show a clear variations in their apology production while interacting with different social power interlocutors.

Additionally, it is noticed that JL2Ss used also the solidarity term dear with their friends which might indicate their concern also to maintain their social and polite relation with their interlocutors when the offence takes place. Semi-structured interview findings lend support to the findings from the DCT data. When JL2Ss apologize in English they are sensitive to the hearer's social power and they tend to vary their apology patterns to match the hearer's social power and social distance. Based on the findings, JL2Ss are likely to apologize to a hearer of higher social power with polite and formal forms and JL2Ss prefer to apologize to their familiar and equal social power interlocutors by using simple form of apology.

4.3SUMMARY

This chapter investigated the perception and the production of speech act of apology by three groups of participants. In terms of perceptions, findings revealed that there were significant mean differences among the three groups regarding their perception of three out of four context-internal variables which are: the severity of the offence, the possibility of apology and the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party. As for difficulty of apology variable, significant difference was not found among the three groups. As for the similarities, the three groups were similar in their

perception of the difficulty of apology variable. Further, negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in all variables except difficulty of apology since both Jordanian and English cultures gave low rating to this variable.

Regarding the influence of social power and social distance categories in the three groups' assessment of the four context-internal variables, findings revealed that concerning severity of the offence, significant mean differences and negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in Category 1, Category 2 and Category 5. As for possibility of the offender apology, significant difference occurred in Category 1 and Category 2. As for the difficulty of apology by the offender, in Category 1 significant difference and pragmatic transfer occurred. In Category 2, JL2Ss rated the difficulty of apology significantly higher than JNESs but both of them rated difficulty higher than ENSs rating as a consequence no pragmatic transfer occurred. In Category 3 both Jordanian groups rated the difficulty significantly lower than ENSs thus pragmatic transfer occurred.

By contrast, in Category 4 both Jordanian groups rated difficulty significantly higher than ENSs, thus pragmatic transfer occurred. While in Category 5 significant difference occurred among groups that is JL2Ss rated this difficulty significantly higher than JNESs did but both of them rated it significantly higher than ENSs. As for the likelihood of apology acceptance, in Category 1 JL2Ss rated the likelihood significantly lower than JNESs but both of them rated likelihood lower than ENSs rating. Thus pragmatic transfer did not occur. In Category 2 both Jordanian groups rated likelihood significantly higher than ENSs thus pragmatic transfer occurred.

Category 3 is similar to Category 1 that is JL2Ss rated the likelihood significantly

lower than JNESs but both of them rated likelihood lower than ENSs rating. Thus pragmatic transfer did not occur. As for Category 4 and Category 5, both Jordanian groups rated likelihood significantly higher than ENSs thus pragmatic transfer occurred.

With reference to negative sociopragmatic transfer, findings revealed that pragmatic transfer occurred frequently from L1 to L2 in most of Jordanian groups' responses. In the three groups overall responses, negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in the severity of the offence, the possibility of apology and the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party. However, negative transfer did not occur in difficulty of apology variable since the three groups have an agreement in the perception of this variable. In terms pragmatic transfer in social power and social distance categories, in severity of the offence, pragmatic transfer occurred in Category 1, Category 2 and Category 5 only. As for the possibility of offender apology, pragmatic transfer occurred in Category 4 and Category 5 only. For the difficulty of the apology by the offender, pragmatic transfer occurred in Category 1, Category 3 and Category 4 only. Finally, as for the likelihood of apology acceptance, pragmatic transfer occurred in Category 2, Category 4 and Category 5.

As for the JL2Ss' justification about their perception rating given by them, the interview results showed that the reasons provided by JL2Ss for their perception ratings were due to the perception of the context-internal variables in light of social power and social distance and their cultural background. Furthermore, JL2Ss rated the likelihood of apology acceptance as high in almost all DCT situations.

In terms of production, similarities and differences were found in the three groups responses. For example, the three groups did not use implicit explanation, expression of embarrassment, self-dispraise, justify hearer, refusal to acknowledge guilt, denial of responsibility, blame the hearer and pretend to be offended. Further, they used explicit self-blame and promise of forbearance in same frequency. In terms of differences, ENSs employed IFIDs and intensifiers significantly higher than both Jordanian groups excluding an offer of apology which was used by both Jordanian groups more often than ENSs did. In addition, both Jordanian groups employed explicit explanation significantly higher than ENSs did.

Further, lack of intent, concern for the hearer and offer of repair were significantly used by both Jordanian groups higher than ENSs did. The other significant differences include the following strategies which were used only by Jordanian participants; justify the hearer, Invoking Allah name, requiring the offended party not to be angry, and Define relationship. The expression, I'm afraid + sentence was used only by ENSs. Regarding the influence of social power and social distance on JL2Ss production of apology strategies, findings indicated that social power had an influence on the responses of both Jordanian groups whereas it did not have an influence on the responses of ENSs.

As such, it is apparent that Jordanians had much concern about high social power more than ENSs. That is, Jordanians did not apologizing directly to their low power interlocutors but they employed some other indirect strategies Moreover, IFIDs and intensifiers were used by ENSs significantly higher than Jordanians with both

familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors. Further, it is noticed that requiring the offended party not to be angry and define relationship expressions were used only by JNESSs with unfamiliar interlocutors and were not used by JL2Ss or ENSs.

As for negative pragmalinguistic transfer in the production of apology strategies, findings indicated that pragmatic transfer occurred frequently from L1 to L2 in most of Jordanian groups' responses. Both Jordanian groups are found to use less apology strategies than ENSs in overall responses and in all social power and social distance categories. Further, Jordanian transferred some new expressions from their native culture into English language such as using Allah name and define relationship, in addition to justify the hearer and requiring the offended party not to be angry. Last and not least, regarding reasons caused pragmalinguistic transfer by JL2Ss, interview results revealed two major reasons caused pragmalinguistic transfer by JL2Ss.

These reasons include: the Jordanian religious orientation and the Jordanian cultural background about hierarchical values. The interviewees explained that they used the term Inshallah while they are apologizing in English due to their religious orientation of being Muslims. Moreover, the interviewees who used the define relationship expressions explained that they used these expressions to show politeness and respect to their high social power interlocutors such as professors.