

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the present study is to investigate the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic of the speech act of apology among the three groups of participants: JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs and to investigate the negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. This chapter discusses the findings and reports the conclusion derived from the study. Thus, it begins with a discussion of the findings i.e. a brief review of the findings based on research questions put forward by the study. The results are discussed with reference to the literature on the speech act of apology. Then the contributions of the study, its implications and limitations are reported. Finally, suggestions for future research and summary are presented.

5.1. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This next section discusses the results of the research questions 1.a, 1.b, 1.c, and 1.d of the study.

5.1.1 THE PERCEPTION OF APOLOGY STRATEGIES BY JL2Ss, JNESs AND ENSs

5.1.1.1 Similarities and differences in the perception of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs in terms of the four context-internal variables.

RQ.1.a is formulated to investigate the similarities and differences among the JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs groups of participants in the perception of apology.

According to Koester and Lustig (2010), and Spencer-Oatey (2012), to understand the values and behaviours of a specific speech community, the underlying assumptions of this speech community should be investigated since these underlying assumptions determine how the members of the speech community perceive, think and feel. Therefore, investigating the overall similarities and differences between Jordanian and English cultures sheds light on these cultural differences, perceptive attitudes and values that each culture possesses.

As for the similarities, the three groups of participants show agreement in their lower assessment to the difficulty of apology by the offender. This indicates that there is a cross-cultural and sociopragmatic agreement between Jordanian and English cultures; both cultures members shared almost the same conceptual values and perception since they clearly expressed their tendency to apologize once the offence occurs. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in all variables except difficulty of apology which is found to be agreed-upon variable by both Jordanian and English cultures.

In terms of differences, both Jordanian groups assessed severity of the offence and possibility of apology variables almost similar to each other and significantly lower than ENSs assessment. This reflects a variation by Jordanian participants regarding their perception of the severity of the offence under different offensive situations whereas ENSs consider the offence as very severe under all offensive situations.

Furthermore, significant differences among groups occurred concerning the likelihood of apology acceptance variable, that is, both Jordanian groups assessed this variable almost similar to each other and significantly higher than ENSs assessment. This might be due to the nature of Jordanian culture as a collectivist culture that is highly concerned about the role of the group more than the role of the individual (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013). However, this is not the case for ENSs who assigned low rating for their apology to be accepted and did not highly expect apology acceptance from their offended parties.

ENSs' responses might demonstrate the individual orientation of English society whereas Jordanians responses might show the collectivist orientation of Jordanian society. This collectivism and individualism dichotomy is widely adopted in investigating the similarities and differences in cross-cultural communications. Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (1991) comment that: "Individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-group relations (p.51)". This claim is further supported by Peetz (2010) who explains

that the members of collectivist cultures are highly concerned about the cooperation with the other members of the group, by contrast, in individual cultures the attitudes of the members are self-referential more than group referential.

To sum up, the similarities and differences between the two cultures, which reflect the common belief of distinctive cultural traits, are found. This is based on the findings revealed that there are significant mean differences among the three groups regarding their perception of the four context-internal variables. These cultural similarities and differences demonstrate that each culture has its own perceptive norms that differentiate it from the other cultures.

5.1.2.1 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

RQ.1.b is formulated to investigate the influence of social power and social distance categories on the three groups' assessment of the four context-internal variables.

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the people's perception of the social variables is a culturally specific. For Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2014), the pragmatic researchers should include the assessment and perception check for the social variables i.e. social power and social distance since different sociocultural groups have different conceptualization and perception regarding these variables. Thus, investigating these perceptive differences might give the opportunity to the L2Ss to achieve the sociopragmatic competence (perception) i.e. the knowledge of the relationships between communicative actions and social power and social distance,

which consequently leads to appropriate linguistic behaviour. Moreover, Harlow (1990) explains that sociopragmatic competence implies the speaker's knowledge about how to vary speech act strategies according to the social variables involved in the communication event.

Concerning severity of the offence, significant mean differences among the three groups occurred in Category 1, Category 2, Category 4 and Category 5. In these four categories both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs. In contrast, in Category 3 there is agreement among the groups by giving high severity assessment. This might indicate that the Jordanians are so sensitive to hierarchical power more than ENSs. That is, both Jordanian groups of participants rated the offence as not severe when it is committed against their low, equal and familiar interlocutors while ENSs rated the offence as severe in all social categories. Findings on Category 2 might show the nature of individuality of the western culture (Bella, 2014; Hall, 1976; Lyuh, 1992; Triandis, Brislin & Hui, 1988; Wagner & Roebuck, 2010) which gives more concern to the independency of the individuals.

On the other hand, in Jordanian culture, assigning lower rating for this offence might indicate the nature of collectivist culture which considers the person as a part of a group and thus did not consider the offence as having high influence on the other offended parties. Further, in Category 3, both Jordanian groups as well as ENSs rated the offence as high severe when it is committed against their high social power interlocutors. However, Jordanians perceive the offence as more severe than ENSs.

The results regarding ENSs insensitivity toward social power lends support to

previous research which found that, in English culture, informal relationship prevails between the low social power interlocutor such as a student and the high social power interlocutors such as a teacher (Bousfield, 2008).

Regarding the social distance categories, Category 4 and Category 5 significant mean differences are found between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), and Leech (1983), social distance is considered as one of the main variables that determines interlocutors' politeness behaviour. It refers to the consideration of the interlocutors' relation to one another in a particular situation as well as how well they know each other, which is the degree of intimacy between interlocutors.

In the present study, social distance is taken to represent the degree of familiarity between the interlocutors. As it is noticed in Category 4, both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did. This might indicate that for Jordanians the offence is not so severe when it is committed against their familiar interlocutors. Oppositely, ENSs consider the offence as very severe when it is committed against their familiar interlocutors. Negative sociopragmatic transfer did not occur in this category since JL2Ss assessed this variable significantly lower than JNESs did. However, there is a significant mean difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs group.

Likewise, in Category 5 the three groups of participants assigned high rating to the severity of the offence. Nevertheless, both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did. This shows that the three

groups of participants consider the offence as very severe when it is committed against unfamiliar interlocutors. However, ENSs considered the offence more severe than both Jordanian groups. This shows that ENSs are not so influenced by the hierarchical power of their offended parties compared to Jordanians counterparts. As a result, negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category.

As for possibility of the offender apology, significant difference occurred in Category 1 and Category 2. In Category 1, JL2Ss assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than JNESs did while JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than ENSs did. This might show some sociopragmatic development toward English native culture; this is due to the fact that JL2Ss show their possibility to apologize for their low social power interlocutors significantly higher than JNESs did. Consequently, no pragmatic transfer has occurred in this category. By contrast, in Category 2 both Jordanian groups rated the possibility of apology significantly lower than ENSs rating. These assessments might show that Jordanians are less sensitive toward the offence when it is committed against their equal social power interlocutors compared to ENSs.

This is in line with Al-Adaileh's (2007) study of Jordanian Arabic apology; Al-Adaileh (2007) reported that apologies are not extensively exchanged between those who have equal social power such as friends or neighbours especially when they have strongly-tied relationship. Extensive apologies in this case may formalize the relationship. Conversely, ENSs showed high possibility to apologize for their equal social power interlocutors which might confirm the individuality of English culture

(Wagner & Roebuck, 2010). Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category.

In Category 3, the three groups appear to be in agreement by rating this variable as high and no significant difference occurred. In contrast, significant differences and negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in Category 4 and Category 5. In these two categories, both Jordanian groups assigned lower possibility to apologize to their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors than ENSs.

With regard to the difficulty of apology by the offender, significant differences among the three groups occurred in all social categories. In Category 1 significant difference and pragmatic transfer occurred since both Jordanian groups rated the difficulty significantly higher than ENSs rating. In Category 2, JL2Ss rated the difficulty of apology significantly higher than JNESSs but both of them rated difficulty higher than ENSs rating as a consequence no pragmatic transfer occurred. This shows that it is difficult for Jordanians to apologize for their low and equal social power interlocutors but for ENSs it is not difficult. 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 JNESSs did but both of them rated it significantly higher than ENSs. Jordanians perceived the offence as normal when it is committed especially against their familiar interlocutors. As such, they believe that it is difficult for them to

apologize for their familiar interlocutors since this might formalize the relationship (Al-Shboul, 2013).

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. This could be considered as a sociopragmatic development by JL2Ss. 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 higher 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. Based on the aforementioned responses, all Jordanian groups of participants believe that the other offended parties should accept the apology of the offenders. This is because they all assessed this variable significantly higher than ENSs did. This might be due to the nature of Jordanian culture which is considered as a collectivist culture. Jordanians expect return politeness from their offended parties by accepting the apology. In contrast, ENSs do not show expectations for their apology to be accepted even after they produce the apology expressions.

5.1.3.1 The negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in JL2Ss' perception of the contextual variables

RQ.1.c is formulated to investigate whether negative pragmatic transfer occurred or not.

Findings reveal that negative sociopragmatic pragmatic transfer occurred frequently from L1 to L2 in most of Jordanian groups' responses. JL2Ss and JNESs demonstrate a culturally specific perception of the context-internal variables. 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 sociopragmatic transfer did not occur in difficulty of apology variable since the three groups have an agreement in the perception of this variable.

Regarding the 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.

This negative sociopragmatic transfer might occur due to the fact that Jordanians are still influenced by their L1 cultural specificity even though they have higher English proficiency. This suggests that the L2 pedagogy that aim to provide the L2Ss with the needed sociopragmatic knowledge is inevitable and may result in

achieving the L2 required pragmatic development. Research in Jordanian speech acts realm (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013) found that negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in JL2Ss responses which consequently led to potential pragmatic failure. JL2Ss committed negative sociopragmatic transfer, which implies that they still did not acquire the needed pragmatic knowledge in spite of their high proficiency in English. Hence, pragmatic instruction is required to overcome the L1 transfer and avoid the pragmatic failure (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015; Ifantidou, 2014; Tabatabaei & Farnia, 2015).

5.1.4.1 The JL2Ss' justifications for their perception rating given by them
RQ.1.d is formulated to investigate the JL2Ss' justification about their perception rating given by them.

Regarding interviews results, findings indicated that most of the high and low ratings occur in two context-internal variables which are: the severity of the offence and the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party. The results showed 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. Besides, JL2Ss rated the likelihood of apology acceptance as high in almost all DCT situations.

Additionally, all of the interviewees commented that they expect their other offended parties to accept their apology because the offenders already showed politeness so the offended parties should accept the apology and show return politeness as well. These findings confirm the classification of Jordanian culture as

hierarchical which is influenced by social power and social distance. On contrast, English culture 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-Shboul, 2013; Banikalef & Maros, 2013; Beeb et al., 1990; Wagner & Roebuck, 2010).

This next section discusses the results of the research questions 2.a, 2.b, 2.c, and 2.d of the study.

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

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

RQ.2.a is formulated to investigate the similarities and differences in the production of apology strategies by the three groups of participants.

In terms of similarities, findings show that the three groups of participants have similar tendency of not using some sub-strategies which are: 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, the three groups of participants show similarities in the frequencies of usage of some sub-strategies which are: explicit self-blame, which is a sub-strategy of taking on responsibility strategy and promise of forbearance. The similarities in the use of these strategies indicate that there are cross-cultural similarities between Jordanian and English cultures.

In terms of differences findings show that 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. According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), intensification refers to the use of adverbial e.g. terribly, very, extremely. The most used intensifier by the three groups of participants was the form “very”. It is notable that ENSs used these intensified IFIDs significantly more than both Jordanian groups as a result, negative pragmalinguistic transfer occurred in all of these sub-strategies.

Ogiermann (2009) found in her apology study that English native speakers and Polish tended to use intensifiers more often than Russian respondents did and the most popular intensifiers used by ENSs were “really” followed by “very” and “terribly.” Using intensifiers might be due to the severity of the offence as perceived by ENSs. In addition, both Jordanian groups employed explicit explanation significantly higher than ENSs did which is considered as a positive politeness strategy used to save the offenders positive faces. Explanation is considered as an indirect apology strategy and defined by Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) researchers (1989) as a self-justification which involves explaining the source of the offence committed by the offender.

Further, lack of intent, concern for the hearer and offer of repair are significantly used by both Jordanian groups higher than ENSs did. 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 is

also used by the three groups when emotional damage is concerned that is, because damage includes physical and emotional offences.

The other significant differences include the following strategies 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. As it is clear, Jordanians use these positive politeness strategies such as offer of repair and concern for the hearer to minimize the threat on the hearers' positive faces and make them feel relaxed and feel as one of the group.

Regarding the additional expressions used by the three groups of participants in addition to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model, the expression Inshallah, (If God wills) is used only by Jordanian participants. This stems from the Muslim nature of Jordanian culture. As mentioned earlier, Nydell (2005) explains that Islam plays a vital role in Muslims' attitudes. These attitudes stems from the idea that everyone believes in God 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 in Muslims daily life conversations.

By the same token, Banikhalef and Maros (2013) found also that Jordanians used religious expression to intensify their apology; they used swearing by God which is considered as significant device in the social life of Arabic context in general and Jordanian Arabic in particular. These expressions are deeply rooted in Jordanians cultural and religious beliefs. These religious expressions found as well in other Arabic studies, for example Eshreteh (2014) found that Palestinian Arabs have the

tendency to use religious expressions such as for god sake and inshallah to enhance the solidarity and cooperation with their interlocutors.

Second, using define relationship terms such as dear, brother and prof seem to be for showing sympathy and show warm relation with the interlocutors (Al-Momani, 2007; Wagner & Roebuck, 2010). According to Brown and Levinson (1978), using in-groups address terms such as calling a person in his/her first name and employing endearment such as dear, darling, sir etc is to emphasis the solidarity and friendliness between the speaker and the hearer. Third, requiring the offended party not to be angry was used by only JNESs and was not used by JL2Ss which might show JL2Ss pragmatic development.

Employing such these expressions by Jordanian speakers might not be pragmatically appropriate while interacting with ENSs since these expressions are transferred from L1 and used in the context of L2. As for the additional expression used by only ENSs, which is I am afraid + sentence, is a language specific since it is used only by ENSs group. This specific usage of this expression by ENSs supports the claim that each language has its own conventional expressions (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1983). The sole usage of these strategies by both Jordanian groups might indicate a cultural specificity and L1 influence. However, for the rest of sub-strategies, both cultures show agreement since none of the three groups of participants used any of these sub-strategies which indicate cultural similarities between both Jordanian and English cultures (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Bataineh, 2008).

5. 1. 2.2. Influence of social power and social distance in JL2Ss' production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs.

RQ.2.b is formulated to investigate the influence of social power and social distance on JL2Ss' production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs

Finding revealed that the influence of social power is evident in the responses of both Jordanian groups and no clear influence to the social power in the responses of ENSs. As such, it is apparent that Jordanians have much concern about high social power more than ENSs. That is, Jordanians who have high social power refrain 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. This might be due to its great threat on their positive faces which is the speaker self-image (Bella, 2014; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ogiemann, 2009).

Moreover, Jordanians who have low social power used more apology strategies while apologizing to their high social power interlocutors. Findings of this section confirm also the overwhelming use of IFIDs and intensifiers by ENSs significantly higher than Jordanians with both familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors. This might indicate that Jordanians consider the offence taken against their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors as not severe; as a consequence, it does not require an intensified explicit apology. This might be due the tendency of Jordanians to consider the others as in-group members despite the fact they are unfamiliar to the offenders (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Bataineh, 2008; Hussein & Hammouri, 1998). Conversely, ENSs consider the offence as severe even if it is taken against their familiar interlocutors.

Further, Jordanians opted to use lengthy explanation to minimize the severity of the

offence when it occurs. By contrast, ENSs prefer to use offer of repair instead of giving lengthy explanation.

Concern for the hearer, offer of repair and promise of forbearance strategies are frequently used by both Jordanian groups when apologizing to their equal and high social power interlocutors. By contrast, they are used by ENSs more than Jordanian participants when apologizing to their familiar and unfamiliar interlocutors. This might show that Jordanians are much influenced by social power while ENSs are more influenced by social distance. Jebahi (2011) explains that since an apology is a face-threatening act, the offender tries to humble him/herself and lessen the severity of the offence on the offended interlocutors by using offer of repair as an explicit remedy form of apology. Whereas Goffman (1967) considers offer of repair as a corrective move employed by the offender to fix the offence done and restore the social harmony among interlocutors. Further, requiring the offended party not to be angry and define relationship expressions are used by JNESS with unfamiliar interlocutors and are not used by JL2Ss or ENSs.

By the same token, Jordanians used apology strategies with their unfamiliar interlocutors more than familiar ones which indicates that social distance has an influence on the Jordanian apology productions. In addition, Jordanians consider the offence as not severe when it is committed against their familiar interlocutors since they are considered among the same social group. Unfamiliar interlocutors also are treated by Jordanians as close ones but with some cautions. These findings are in line with Al-Adaileh (2007) apology study results who found that Jordanians are more

influenced by social power when they apologize to their interlocutors more often than English speakers do.

5.1.3.2 The negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in the production of speech act of apology

RQ.2.c is formulated to investigate whether negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 occurs in the production of speech act of apology.

Findings revealed that pragmatic transfer occurs frequently from L1 to L2 in most of Jordanian groups' responses. As given in Chapter 4, the negative pragmalinguistic transfer in the apology productions is found in two forms: the frequency of apology usage and the selection of apology strategies. JL2Ss clearly show a deviation from the native language speakers' formulaic expressions. From inter-language pragmatic perspective, this deviation is due to the influence of the L1 as well as the little exposure to the pragmatic knowledge. JL2Ss assigned different degrees to the severity of the offence based on social power and social distance variations. Both Jordanian groups are found to use less apology strategies than ENSs in overall responses and in all social power and social distance categories.

Furthermore, 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. This pragmalinguistic transfer indicates that JL2Ss are still influenced by their L1 cultural norms when apologizing in English despite their high English proficiency. These findings confirm the claims by some researchers (Arsie, 2012; Al-Shboul, 2013;

Bardovi-Harlige, 2010; Bataineh, 2014) that even the L2Ss are highly proficient in English this does not mean that they are pragmatically proficient which necessitates the pragmatic instruction.

5.1.4.2 JL2Ss' justifications for their apology production given by them

RQ.2.d was formulated to investigate reasons caused pragmalinguistic transfer by JL2Ss collected by semi-structured interviews.

The selection of the semantic formulas is another indication of the occurrence of the pragmalinguistic transfer in JL2Ss' responses. 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* when 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.

Similarly, Banikhalef and Maros (2013) found also that Jordanians used religious expressions to intensify their apology such as swearing by god which is considered as significant device in the Muslims social life. These expressions are deeply rooted in Jordanians cultural and religious beliefs. Furthermore, Al-Shboul (2013) found that JL2Ss used some religious expressions when they refuse such as *May Allah bless you*, *God will* and *All praise to God*. The use of these expressions according to the researcher was due to the religion of the participants which is Islam.

Moreover, in Arabic context, using the religious expressions existed as well, for example Eshreteh (2014) found the Palestinian Arabic had a tendency to use religious expressions such as for god sake and inshallah to enhance the solidarity and cooperation with their interlocutors.

5.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.2.1 Theoretical Implications

5.2.1.1 Implications to Speech Acts of apology theory, Politeness theory and Individualism-Collectivism theory

This study is considered as a cross-cultural and inter-language pragmatic research since it investigates the cross-cultural similarities and differences between Jordanian and English cultures in the speech act of apology and investigates the JL2Ss' sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic apology competence. Previous Jordanian speech act of apology research were mostly cross-cultural due to their focus only on investigating the similarities and differences in the production of apology strategies between Jordanian and English native speakers. Therefore, this study is an attempt to fill that gap by investigating both the sociopragmatic (perception) and pragmalinguistic (production) of speech act of apology by JL2Ss to shed light on their inter-language pragmatic competence.

The findings of this study might contribute to the existing knowledge about how the speech behaviour of apology is realized by Jordanian and English societies.

Findings also might contribute to the language universality and culture-specificity debate since the present study finds that both universality and culture-specificity coexisted in the speech act of apology in terms of perception of the context-internal variables as well as the context-external variables of social power and social distance. Besides, it investigates the degree of imposition context-external variable by means of the four SRQ context-internal variables by Bergman and Kasper (1993). Bergman and Kasper (1993) explain that these internal variables function as the degree of imposition variable proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Imposition refers to somebody's time, money, space, energy, face wants. Thus, the assessment of these internal variables reflects the level of impositions of the offence on the offender.

Further, the present study has expanded the scope of speech act of apology in Jordanian context by investigating both the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies in order to increase the awareness of both cultures members regarding the cultural differences and increase the ability of JL2Ss to produce the most appropriate apology strategies when apologizing in English. As a consequence, this could contribute to the universal existing knowledge regarding the inter-language and cross-cultural speech act of apology.

The study is based on three significant theories: speech acts theory, Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), politeness theory Brown and Levinson (1987) and individualism-collectivism theory (Hofstede, Hofstede & Mankov, 1991).

Speech acts is considered as one of the most influential theories in the field of linguistic pragmatics. The framework of this theory is based mainly on the theory of

illocutionary acts which is originally introduced by Austin (1962). Austin believes that language is not just used for saying things, but rather for doing things. He views it as saying something as doing things such as making request, paying compliments, apology and others.

Politeness theory attempts to explain how and why people in different cultures establish, maintain, or support social relations through language. Politeness theory was developed on the basis of speech acts theory. Therefore, it is argued that any discussion of speech act investigation demands the notion of politeness (Al-Shboul & Maros 2013; Bella, 2014; Kitao, 2014; Kousar, 2015; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Gilks, 2010; Goffman, 1967). Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness theory is adopted in this study for its impact as the most influential theory for investigating politeness in human interaction (Al- Adailleh, 2007; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Alfattah, 2010; Al-Issa, 1998; Aydin, 2013; Shardakova, 2005; Thijittang, 2010).

Brown and Levinson (1987) based their politeness theory on Goffman's (1967) notion of face which assumes that certain kinds of acts are intrinsically Face Threatening Acts. The face, based on this theory, is divided into negative face and positive face; Negative face is the need of the person not to be interrupted and to have his personal space and freedom. Hearer negative face is threatened if he is told to do something, to have opinion about something or if he is spoken to in a way that threatens his/her integrity. If these occur then the hearer negative face is threatened. Positive face is the need of person to be accepted by others and to feel as one of the group. Hearer positive face is threatened if the other participants in the conversation

show differing views and critical and if the speaker does not agree with the listener (see Chapter 2 for further discussion). Brown and Levinson (1987) consider an apology as FTAs which damages the apologizer positive face and save the hearer negative face.

In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that apologies are intrinsically negative politeness strategies that they convey respect, deference, and distance rather than friendliness and involvement. This claim is not supported by this study, that is, Jordanians used positive politeness strategies to minimize the threat on the hearer positive face and to make the offended party feel as part of the group such as concern for the hearer, offer of repair, justify the hearer. They also used solidarity terms such as dear, Dr, my friend, and my cousin to show friendliness toward others.

However, it is noticed that Jordanians employed explicit explanation, which is considered as negative politeness strategy, more often than ENSs. This might show that Jordanians try to save their own faces by not apologizing directly to the offended parties and also save their hearer positive faces by making them feel relaxed after hearing more explanation for the reasons made them do the offences. Explanations in this case might be used to emphasize common ground between the offender and the offended party, thus serving positive politeness considerations (Bella, 2014).

As for ENSs' responses, it was found that they preferred negative politeness strategies which are used to satisfy the hearer negative face by not invading in his/her territory and not considering him/her as part of the group. These strategies include, the heavy use of the IFIDs, acknowledging the responsibility and also explanation.

Consequently, the results of this study do not confirm Brown and Levinson's (1978) claim of the universality of their theory. Brown and Levinson (1978) claim that negative politeness is universally preferred approach to face work by stating that "it is safer to assume that hearer prefers his peace and self-determination more than he prefers your expressions of regard, unless are certain to contrary" (p. 74).

Politeness theory is found to be culture specific as explained by Olshtain and Cohen (1983) who point out that apology is a culture-sensitive speech act set of semantic formulae or strategies. Jordanians are found to prefer positive politeness strategy, that is, they refrain from giving direct apology strategies especially with the in-group or familiar members since the members of same community do not prefer to apologize for every single offence but only for serious offences. Furthermore, Jordanians prefer to give offer of repair over verbalizing the apology whereas ENSs apologized even for less serious offences and even among people belonging to the same level of social power or familiar to each other. On other hand, English is considered as an individual and negative politeness culture since its members prefer the autonomy and privacy. Thus, the common use of I am sorry by English offenders seem to build a distance between the offender and the offended party.

As for individualism-collectivism theory, findings revealed that Jordanian culture is a collectivist culture which is highly concerned about the role of the group more than the role of the individual (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013). However, this is not the case for ENSs who assigned low rating for their apology to be accepted and did not highly expect apology acceptance from their offended parties.

ENSs' responses might demonstrate the individual orientation of English society whereas Jordanians' responses might show the collectivist orientation of Jordanian society. According to Hofstede et al., (1991) in Individualist cultures the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family, while in Collectivist cultures people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-group relations. This claim is further supported by Peetz (2010) who explains that the members of collectivist cultures are highly concerned about the cooperation with the other members of the group, by contrast, in individual cultures the attitudes of the members are self-referential more than group referential.

5.2.1.2 Implications for Pragmatic Transfer Theory

Kasper (1992) defines pragmatic transfer as “the influence exerted by learner’ pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 on their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information” (p. 207). As previously mentioned, pragmatic transfer is one of the linguistic phenomena that influence the L2Ss’ pragmatic competence because it might lead to L2 pragmatic failure and cultural misunderstanding as well as misjudgement.

Research indicated that the pragmatic competence of L2Ss would not be concomitant with their language proficiency; specifically, even L2Ss with high language proficiency would still make pragmatic errors (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Bataineh, 2014; Bella, 2014; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Lin, 2014; Robinson, 1992).

Thus, in this study, findings revealed that although JL2Ss are competent in English they still lack the required pragmatic competence. Further, JL2Ss committed negative pragmatic transfer in both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic levels.

The focus on negative pragmatic transfer is to investigate the JL2Ss' pragmatic competence in order to raise their sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies which consequently make them avoid the pragmatic transfer. The findings of the study confirm that pragmatic transfer is a universal phenomenon occurred in various speech act studies. Thus, pragmatic instruction is necessary to equip L2Ss with the required pragmatic competence in order to avoid pragmatic transfer and achieve the pragmatic competence (Bachelor & Hernandez, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig, 2015 et al; Huang, 2015; Ifantidou, 2014; Farahian, 2012).

5.2.2 Research and Methodological Implications

Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that differences in the participants' perception competence influence their production of a specific speech acts. Further, Chang (2011) adds that the relationship between sociopragmatic competence and pragmalinguistic competencies is strong and both levels should be addressed simultaneously. Hence, an investigation of the pragmatic variability should address the pragmalinguistic forms and strategies in relation to the sociopragmatic values and norms of language speakers.

Further, humans' behaviours and attitudes are governed by their perceptions of what is polite and appropriate in certain contexts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Thus,

understanding these cultural perceptions would help to ease the cross-cultural tolerance and communications (Kecskes, 2014; Roever, 2011; Takimoto, 2012; Timpe, 2012). Moreover, it is argued that sociopragmatics is a challenging domain and highly culture specific and in order to decrease instances of pragmatic failure, L2Ss should understand pragmalinguistic as well as sociopragmatic aspects of the target language (Liu, 2007; Schauer, 2009; Trosborg, 2010; Yates 2010). Based on the above discussion, this study investigates the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies of speech act of apology by Jordanian and English cultures.

Triangulation method is used to investigate these two competencies, that is, the researcher employed the DCT to elicit the apology strategies by the participants and SRQ to elicit the perception of those participants toward the four context-internal variables. Further, semi-structured interviews were conducted to give the study participants the chance to justify their DCT and SRQ responses which consequently led to uncover the invisible data that could not be elicited quantitatively.

The results of the semi-structured interviews with nine JL2Ss indicated that their perception of the contextual variables and production of specific expressions were due to their cultural norms and perceptions. Adopting this triangulation method provided very significant insights about the perceptive attitudes and the linguistic behaviour for both Jordanian and English cultures. Further, it explained how the social power and social distance variables influence the three groups of participants' assessments of the context-internal variables.

The DCT and SRQ tools help to understand the relation between the context-external variables of social power and social distance in different levels and the context-internal variables which was not possible to achieve by DCT separately. Further, using these two instruments shed lights on how people of different cultural backgrounds think and behave when encounter with members of other cultures. Last but not least, in cross-cultural level findings revealed that Jordanian perception of politeness is totally different from English ones and in inter-language level JL2Ss were found to be influenced by their L1 and committed negative sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic transfers.

5.2.3 Pedagogical Implications

There are a number of pedagogical implications based on the findings of the present study. The findings of the present study concluded that sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic failures have occurred in the responses of JL2Ss. Thus, findings could benefit EFL course designers and teachers to develop EFL curricula and teaching materials in Jordan to improve the JL2Ss pragmatic knowledge of the target language and reduce pragmatic failure across cultures. This may remedy the lack of pragmatic knowledge of the target language and exposure to other cultures in the existing EFL textbooks, especially the ones used to teaching JL2Ss (Al-Momani, 2009; Bradovi-Harlig et al., 2015; Kasper, 1997; Rose, 1992) and thus, improve JL2Ss pragmatic knowledge and reduce pragmatic failure across cultures.

The study focuses on both perception and production of socially appropriate language, and the use of a variety of elicitation procedures which can also contribute to a better understanding of L2Ss ILP development and pragmatic knowledge which ultimately leads to the development of teaching materials that include pragmatics instruction to increase L2Ss communicative skills and intercultural communications.

Further, the pedagogical implications of this study could be useful for designers of Arabic curricula so that the learners of Arabic as a foreign language might benefit from these implications. Finally, the findings of the study could be argued to shed more light on the cultural differences between Jordanian and English cultures. Thus, the findings are hoped to ease the cross-cultural communications and avoid pragmatic failure.

5.3 LIMITATIONS

The findings of this study should be interpreted in the light of its limitations. The study investigated only the negative pragmatic transfer on both perception and production levels due to its potentials for pragmatic failure. Moreover, the participants of the study were purposefully chosen thereby the findings could not be generalized for all Jordanian and British English speakers. Further, all Jordanian participants were male postgraduate students divided into high English proficiency and low English proficiency. Thus, a more varied population of various educational levels might give different results but this could be confirmed by future studies. Regardless of its limitations, this particular study has revealed valuable insights on apologetic behaviour of the Jordanian Arabic and British English societies.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present study, according to the researcher's best knowledge, is an attempt to investigate the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic of speech act of apology between Jordanian Arabic and British English cultures. Thus, there is certainly a need for more studies to expand the scope of this research. Future pragmatic research could examine a wider range of JL2Ss to understand the factors that influence the speech act of apology perception and production such as age and gender. Future research could examine the JL2Ss at different English proficiency levels i.e. beginners, intermediate and advanced in order to further understand the relationship between the language proficiency and pragmatic competence. In addition, the gender variable was beyond the scope of this study, future researchers could include the gender variable to find out its influence on the perception and production of speech act of apology by Jordanians speakers.

Finally, it should be pointed out that this study gives insights into inter-language speech act of apology in Jordanian context where research is limited in this inter-language area. Thus, further studies would help to clarify the issues raised by this study and provide additional insights into the development of effective Jordanian EFL curriculum.

5.5 SUMMARY

This study is an inter-language and cross-cultural research that aims to investigate the cultural similarities and differences between Jordanian and English cultures, and to

investigate the JL2Ss' sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence in the speech act of apology. Similarities and differences were found between Jordanian and English cultures which confirms the universality and culture specificity of the speech act of apology behaviour.

First, as for the differences in the perception level, findings showed that both Jordanian groups assessed severity of the offence and possibility of apology variables almost similar to each other and significantly lower than ENSs' assessment. Furthermore, both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance variable almost similar to each other and significantly higher than ENSs' assessment. As for the similarities, the three groups of participants showed agreement in their lower assessment of the difficulty of apology by the offender.

ENSs' responses might demonstrate the individual orientation of English society whereas Jordanians' responses might show the collectivist orientation of Jordanian society. In the same vein, Jordanian participants were found to be more influenced by social power and social distance variables which made them assessed the contextual variables significantly different from ENSs' assessment. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in almost all the variables. Second, in the production level findings showed that both Jordanian groups used apology strategies significantly different than ENSs use and transferred some expressions from their L1 when apologizing in L2. Jordanian participants were found to be more influenced by social power and social distance variables which made them produce apology strategies significantly different from ENSs' production. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in almost all the variables.

Furthermore, JL2Ss showed a great deviation from English native culture perceptive attitudes. This might be due to the Jordanians' sensitivity toward social power and social distance variations (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Al-Shboul, 2013) JL2Ss' responses clearly showed sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic failures. Further, negative pragmatic transfers were found in the responses of JL2Ss in both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic levels. That is because the perceptions of the contextual variables were still influenced by the L1 cultural norms and different from English native culture.

Trosborg (2010) explains that it is necessary to investigate not only what is said by whom in a specific situation, but also why language is used the way it is. Thus, it is of paramount importance to investigate both competencies to get a full picture about the JL2Ss' pragmatic competence since the relation between perception and production is an interwoven one (Bardovi-Harlig, 2010; Trosborg, 2010). Furthermore, Chang (2011) asserts that any exploration of pragmatic competence should address the pragmalinguistic forms and strategies in relation to the sociopragmatic values and norms of language speakers. Results revealed that these two competencies are intrinsically related to each other and the JL2Ss' linguistic production was based on their perception of the internal variables. The results of the semi-structured interviews with nine JL2Ss indicated that their perception of the contextual variables and production of specific expressions were due to their cultural perceptions and norms. That is they transferred their L1 cultural perceptions when they assessed the context-internal variables of the study and transferred some expressions from their L1 when apologizing in the target language.