

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The present study is an attempt to investigate the speech act of apology among three groups of participants: JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs. The objectives of the study are to investigate the sociopragmatic (perception) and pragmalinguistic (production) of speech act of apology by the three groups, in addition to investigate the pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. Section 3.1 explains the research approach, Section 3.2 provides information about the participants of the study, including their backgrounds, rational for choosing them and sample size. Section 3.3 discusses the research instruments: SRQ, DCT including the rational for choosing these instruments, questionnaires development, pilot study and semi-structured interview. Section 3.4 discusses the data collection procedures. Section 3.5 discusses data analysis procedures, and Section 3.6 is the summary of the chapter.

3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

This study is mixed methods research since it involves the quantitative and qualitative data collection tools. According to Creswell (2012), mixed methods research is conducted by collecting data using a quantitative survey instrument and followed up with interviews with a few individuals who participated in the survey to gain details about their survey responses (the individuals were those who agreed to participate in the interview). Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007) add that mixed methods research is a type of research in which the researcher combines the elements of quantitative and qualitative research approaches for the purpose of getting in depth understanding and achieving the research objectives. This study adopts an explanatory sequential mixed method design. This design is comprised of two research phases: quantitative and qualitative (Creswell, 2013). The first phase is concerned with the collection and analysis of data gathered quantitatively via SRQ and DCT which has the priority for addressing the study's objectives. This first phase is followed by the subsequent collection and analysis of data gathered qualitatively via semi-structured interview so as to help explain the quantitative results.

3.2 PARTICIPANTS

According to Ellis (1994), Kasper and Dahl (1991) and Selinker (1972), the investigation of L2Ss pragmatic abilities would usually involve three groups: second language speakers (L2Ss) group and the two baseline groups which are the native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs). Collecting these three sets of data allows the researcher to clearly determine the extent of performance differences by

L2Ss as compared to the NSs, and also to determine the level of pragmatic transfer from first language (L1) to second language (L2) by L2Ss.

Moreover, Kasper and Dahl (1991) suggest that because the responses of the participants in ILP speech act studies seem to cluster around specific subcategories, at least 30 participants for each group who respond to the DCT is a sufficient sample to answer most ILP speech act realization questions (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2014; Lin, 2014; Lin, 2008; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Maeshiba et al., 1996; Lee, 1999; Morkus, 2009; Yaghoobi, 2002; Nakhle et al., 2014).

To this end, three groups of participants participated in the study. The first group of participants involves 40 Jordanian second language speakers (JL2Ss) who were doing postgraduate studies at various academic fields at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). The other two groups are the baseline or control groups for inter-language and further cross-cultural comparison purposes which include 40 English native speakers (ENSs) for the English baseline data and 40 Jordanian non English speakers (JNESs) for the Jordanian Arabic baseline data. The baseline groups are used for comparison purposes, that is, in order to find out whether there is any evidence of pragmatic transfer in the apology behaviours of the JL2Ss group, the JL2Ss apology responses were compared to those of the baseline groups.

The JL2Ss and JNESs samples of the study were chosen on the basis of purposive sampling from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Malaysia. There was sufficient number of Jordanian graduate students at the time of the study in Malaysia as compared to Jordanian undergraduate students. Yee and Mokhtar (2013) explain

that the number of international students enrolled in Malaysian higher institutions has increased rapidly in the last few years and still increasing from different international countries. Further, According to the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education (2011), the number of Jordanian postgraduate students pursuing their higher educations in public universities is 573 students and is in dynamic increase. Thus, Malaysia has a good number of Jordanian graduate students who could be a representative sample to achieve the objectives of the present study.

Moreover, according to Al-Shboul (2013), and Banikalef and Maros (2013), there is a big ratio of those Jordanian postgraduate students pursuing their higher studies at UKM. Further, the samples of the present study were purposefully chosen from this institution since they vary in their English proficiency levels based on EPPT results. The sample of the study is assumed to be a rich sample to provide the required data to achieve the study objectives. These samples include the postgraduate students who are proficient in English i.e. JL2Ss. The study is interested in investigating their pragmatic competence and whether they commit negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. Whereas postgraduate students who had low English proficiency were used as baseline group for inter-language and cross-cultural comparison.

Regarding ENSs, they were also purposefully chosen from British Council in Amman, Jordan, because first they showed their willingness to participate in the study and they are all native English speakers and from United Kingdom and all of them were lecturers in this centre. It is argued that the samples that are purposefully chosen could provide more rich data than the random individuals with reference to the purpose of the study (Ryan & Bernard, 2002). As such, in the case of this study, ENSs

samples provided very rich data that shed light on the nature of English speech act of apology behaviour.

According to Maros, Stapa and Yasin (2012), the acceptance of the international students to UKM is based on their scores of the standardized English language Tests i.e. Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) minimum score 550 or International English Language Testing System (IELTS) with a minimum band 6.5. However, a large number of those international students are conditionally accepted without these scores, instead they are required to sit for a locally based exam, i.e. the English Proficiency and Placement Test (EPPT), which is designed by a team of experts in language testing in UKM. The test consists of evaluation of the four proficiency skills which are: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The accumulated scores are given in sets of bands, between Band 1 (lowest) to Band 5 (highest). Students scoring Bands 1 and 2 are considered an incompetent in English and are required to enrol in the English Language Proficiency Course at UKM for two semesters. The students who achieve band 3 and above are considered as competent in English and are able to pursue their study immediately. Therefore, Jordanian postgraduate students' proficiency levels are determined by the results of TOEFL and IELTS, or EPPT by UKM.

Consequently, the samples of this study included the Jordanian postgraduate students at UKM divided into two groups. The low proficiency group are those who achieved band 2 and below in EPPT and they answered the DCT and SRQ in Arabic since they have low proficiency in English i.e. the purpose of distributing the

questionnaire to them was to analyse their ratings and how they responded to the situations, not their language. The other group consists of those who achieved band 4 and above who are considered good or very good in English proficiency. These students answered the DCT and SRQ in English. More details are explained below:

3.2.1 Jordanian second language speakers at UKM (40 JL2Ss)

This group of participants consists of 40 Jordanian postgraduate students. As mentioned earlier, there was an influx of Jordanians pursuing their higher studies at UKM (Al-Shboul, 2013; Banikalef & Maros, 2013). Also during the time of data collection there was a generous pool of Jordanian postgraduate students who could be approached to participate in this study. The participants' ages range from 25-40 and all of them are native speakers of Arabic. Purposive sampling was used in the selection of the participants of this group. These students are considered as competent in English since all of them have achieved band 4 and above in their EPPT or have passed their TOEFL with more than 550 or have achieved band 6.5 and above for their IELTS. They were selected for the purpose of investigating their pragmatic competence and whether they commit negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. The participants of this group were all male since there were no Jordanian females available at UKM during the time of the study. The participants of this group answered the English version of the study questionnaire due to their high proficiency in English.

3.2.2 Jordanian non English speakers at UKM (40 JNESs)

This group of respondents consists of 40 Jordanian postgraduate students. The participants' ages range from 25-40 and all of them are native speakers of Arabic. Purposive sampling was used in the selection of the participants of this group. These students are considered as having low proficiency in English since all of them achieved band 2 and below in EPPT, and none of them have passed either TOEFL or IELTS. JNESs were one of the baseline groups i.e. were selected for the purpose of inter-language and cross-cultural comparisons. All of the participants of this group were also males since there were no Jordanian females available at UKM during the time of the study. The participants of this group answered the Arabic version of the study questionnaire due to their low proficiency in English. The study questionnaire was translated into Arabic by the researcher who is an Arabic native speaker, and translation was checked by two Jordanian English language lecturers to ensure the accuracy.

3.2.3 English native speakers at British Council (40 ENSs)

This group of respondents consists of 40 English language lecturers in British council located in Amman capital of Jordan. The participants' ages range from 25-50 and all of them are native speakers of English. Purposive sampling was used in the selection of participants in this group since all of the participants are lecturers in this centre and have at least Master degrees in Education and English Language Studies from United Kingdom. The data provided by this group served as baseline data for inter-language and further cross-cultural comparisons.

3.3 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The data of the present study were elicited via discourse completion test (DCT) and scaled response questionnaire (SRQ), followed by semi-structured interviews.

3.3.1 Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

DCT consist of different contextual situations followed by a blank where a respondent has to provide his/her response of the particular speech act under investigation i.e. to find out the production competency of the respondents. According to Kasper and Dahl (1991), DCT that was first developed by Blum-Kulka (1982) is the most popular data collection method in speech act research. It is mostly a written questionnaire that provides a brief description of a certain situation, followed by incomplete short dialogue filled by the respondents (they state what they believe they would say in the real situation).

For this particular study, 12 situations were put forward in the questionnaire in order to elicit the needed pragmalinguistic competence from the three groups of participants. Based on previous speech act literature, to include more than 12 situations would be considered too much/inconvenient for the respondents to respond to (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). The 12 DCT situations were adapted from Al-Adaileh's (2007) study of apology (see Appendix A).

Al-Adaileh's (2007) adopted apology DCT situations were piloted by the researcher of this study and slight modifications were done afterwards. In the case of this study, both groups of JL2Ss and ENSs responded to the English version of DCT since they are considered proficient in English while the JNESs responded to the Arabic version of the DCT since they are considered as low proficient in English based on their EPPT results at UKM.

DCT was used to find out the similarities and differences between the three groups apology strategies and to investigate the effect of the context-external variables i.e. social power and social distance on respondents' apology production. These two variables are considered as the most critical factors influence the speech acts production (Al-Issa, 1998; Brown & Levinson, 1987). Further, these two variables represent the relationship between the speakers who is the apologizer i.e. the respondents, and the hearer who receives the apology in each group of situations.

The two variables vary in their strength i.e. social power (High, Equal, Low) and social distance (Familiar, Unfamiliar). These 12 DCT situations are divided into five social categories based on a systematic variation of the social power (P) and social distance (D) (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013). These categories are illustrated in the following table.

TABLE 3.1: classifications of the DCT situations

Category	Apologizer social power (P) and social distance(D)	Situations
1	(+P + D)	1-Professor promised to return a student term paper but he did not. 9-Customer called the waitress to change the order.
2	(-P + D)	2- Student forgot to return the book he borrowed from his professor. 3-Employer forgot an important appointment with boss for the second time.
3	(=P -D)	4-You forgot an appointment with friend for the second time. 8-You accidentally spilled oil in your neighbour car. 12-You said something that annoyed your colleague.
4	(-P - D)	5-Father promised to take his kid for shopping but he did not do that. 7-You accidentally broke the lights of your intimate [close] boss car.
5	(=P + D)	10- You accidentally bumped into a passenger toe which made him spill his entire package on the floor. 11- You accidentally bumped into passenger toe which disturbed him a bit. 6-You accidentally hit another driver car while parking your car.

Note: P= social power, D= social distance.

These categories represent different social power and social distances which are the context-external variables influence the respondents' perception of the context-internal variables.

- 1- (+P + D) indicates that the apologizer in this situation has higher power over the listener who receives the apology such as in the first situation where the

apologizer is a university professor and the listener is a student, also social distance between the interlocutors is high.

- 2- (-P + D) indicates that the apologizer has less power over the listener and the distance is high between them.
- 3- (=P -D) indicates that there is a balance in power between the interlocutors and lack of social distance such as friends in the same class.
- 4- (-P - D) indicates that the apologizer has no power over the listener and also there is no social distance between them.
- 5- (=P + D) indicates that the social power between the interlocutors is equal but there is social distance between them.

3.3.2 Scaled Response Questionnaire (SRQ)

For the purpose of this study, the SRQ is adapted from Bergman and Kasper's (1993) study of apology which was used to elicit the sociopragmatic perception of the American and Thai respondents. Based on the pilot study for the English and Arabic SRQ versions (see pilot study discussion page 103), the researcher slightly modified Bergman and Kasper original SRQ questionnaire. Based on a discussion session with the Jordanian pilot study participants, the researcher changed the 'offender' face loss' variable into the difficulty of apology by the offender variable which was found to be easier to be understood by them.

The SRQ that was distributed includes four context-internal variables that were rated in a five point rating scale by the respondents in which 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest. The four context-internal variables are:

1. The severity of the offence by the offender
2. The possibility of the apology by the offender
3. The difficulty of apology by the offender and
4. The likelihood of apology acceptance by the offender (See Appendix B).

These four context-internal variables were used to examine the JL2Ss perception of speech act of apology over the two context-external variables which are social power and social distance between the interlocutors. In other words, if the apologizer has high social power and his/her interlocutor has low social power, the SRQ was used to measure the way of how the high social power apologizer perceives and rates these above mentioned variables. The English version of SRQ was translated into Arabic by the researcher who is a native Arabic speaker and answered by JNESs (the baseline group that responded to the Arabic version of the SRQ).

SRQ is placed below each DCT scenario to extract the participants' perception about their context-internal variables as shown in the following example:

Situation 1 DCT

You are a university professor and you promised to return the student's term paper that day but you didn't finish reading it. Student: "I hope you are happy with it."

SRQ

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1-Severity of the offence is | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |
| 2-The possibility of you apologizing is | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |
| 3- Difficulty of the apology for me is | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |
| 4- Likelihood of the apology acceptance is | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |

You apologize by saying:

DCT response.....

The DCT scenario is mentioned first then followed by the SRQ context-internal variables. This version of SRQ was translated into Arabic by the researcher, who is a native speaker of Arabic. Accuracy of translation was then checked by two Jordanian English lecturers. DCT and SRQ were distributed and answered in English by JL2Ss and ENSs and answered in Arabic by JNESSs.

To conclude, it could be said that speech acts and pragmatic competence could be assessed by many ways, the decision to choose the appropriate method depends on the research questions. Jucker (2009) explains that there is no ideal research method for speech act and pragmatic competence investigation and there is no method better than all others. Therefore, it is found that these two instruments are suitable for conducting this research and for achieving the research objectives. Consequently, for the purpose of this study, Al-Adaileh's (2007) 12 situations of DCT used in his apology study were adapted to investigate the pragmalinguistic competence, and Bergman and Kasper (1993) SRQ context-internal variables were adapted to investigate the sociopragmatic competence of the three groups of participants.

Thus, these two instruments were combined together in one questionnaire which was answered by the three groups of participants. Each situation consists of two parts: the SRQ first and the DCT which includes the apology production next (see Appendix C, the English version of the study questionnaire and Appendix D, the Arabic version of the study questionnaire).

3.3.3 Semi-structured Interviews

According to Longhurst (2003), semi-structured interview is preferable more than structured and unstructured interviews. Semi-structured interview has some degree of flexibility in the ways issues are addressed by the interviewees. Semi-structured interview has some predetermined questions to be asked for the respondents (See Appendix E). For this particular study, the JL2Ss were invited to participate in semi-structured interviews by asking them whether they would like to participate in the interview or not. Those who approved to be interviewed marked yes in the specified blank and provided their phone numbers or e-mails to be contacted later by the researcher.

Creswell (2012) explains that the number of interview samples varies from one qualitative study to another. He adds that it is better to purposively select a few, rather than many individuals to study and to be interviewed so as to provide an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon i.e. because of the need to report details about each individual; the larger number of participants can become unwieldy and result in superficial perspectives. Moreover, collecting qualitative data and analysing it takes considerable time. Creswell (2011) explains that to understand particular phenomenon five to twenty five interviewees is a sufficient number and could achieve sufficient explanation about a particular phenomenon.

Moreover, Creswell (2013) and Patton (1990) add that a purposive sampling which is common in investigating specific phenomena is usually used to help the researcher understand the problem and the research questions. Therefore, in the

interview sessions, the nine JL2Ss interviewees were asked to justify their questionnaire answers i.e. their high or low rating given and the reasons behind the pragmatic transfer. Further, the interview tried to find out whether contextual variables i.e. social power and social distance has influenced the participants responses or not (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Shboul, 2013; Banekalef & Maros, 2013).

3.3.4 Pilot Study

Although the adopted SRQ has been piloted by Bergman and Kasper (1993) and the adopted DCT has been piloted by Al-Adaileh (2007) before for reliability and validity, a pilot study was conducted with a group of participants similar to the actual participants of the questionnaire to ensure the reliability and validity of this study questionnaire and interview questions. There were four main purposes of the pilot study (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Lin, 2008; Taguchi, 2013; Thijittang, 2010):

- 1- To determine the familiarity of the situations for the participants.
- 2- To ensure that all situations are clear and comprehensible by the respondents.
- 3- To ensure that the situations are successful in yielding the targeted apology speech act and not any other speech act.
- 4- To estimate the time required to finish all situations.

For this particular study, six participants excluding those who participated in the main study were chosen to participate in the pilot study. These participants were two ENSs, two JNESs and two JL2Ss. The participants provided some comments that led to

slight improvement and called for the need of slight modification on the early versions of DCT and SRQ. For JL2Ss and JNEs the researcher received their comments and suggestions through direct discussion with them and they commented that the DCT situations are long but clear. Regarding ENSs responses, they commented that all the situations are clear. It should be noted that the original DCT situations adopted from Al-Adaileh were very lengthy and included more details. Therefore, for the purpose of the study some DCT situations were modified to make sure that the situations clear, precise and did not demand much time on the participants.

For example the JNEs and JL2Ss pilot study participants commented that the following DCT situation, which was adopted from Al-Adaileh apology study, was very lengthy.

Situation 10 (The adopted situation)

You are on a bus with a child. There are plenty of seats on the bus but there are not any for two people together. You ask a passenger who is sitting on his own on a two seater to change seats with you so that you can sit next to the child. When he stands up to change seats, you accidentally bump into him, step on his toes and finally cause him to spill his packages all over the floor. It is clearly your fault and you want to apologize profusely.

He: "Ow! My goodness"!

You:

.....

Therefore it was modified by the researcher into the following:

Situation 10 (The adapted situation)

You accidentally bumped into passenger, and stepped on his toes and finally cause him to spill his packages all over the floor. It is clearly your fault and you want to apologize profusely.

He: "Ow! My goodness"!

You:

Regarding SRQ variables, as mentioned earlier (See appendix B) the variable “the offender face loss” was replaced by the “difficulty of apology by the offender” variable since the previous one was vague and not clear for the participants. For example the JNEs and JL2Ss pilot study participants commented that the following SRQ situation, which was adopted from Bergman and Kasper (1993) apology study, was vague and not clear.

DCT

You are a university professor and you promised to return the student's term paper that day but you didn't finish reading it. Student: "I hope you are happy with it."

SRQ

1-Severity of the offence is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

2-The possibility of you apologizing is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

3- *The offender face loss is* high 5 4 3 2 1 low

4- Likelihood of the apology accepted is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

You apologize by saying:

DCT response.....

Therefore it was modified by the researcher into the following:

DCT

You are a university professor and you promised to return the student's term paper that day but you didn't finish reading it. Student: "I hope you are happy with it."

SRQ

1-Severity of the offence is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

2-The possibility of you apologizing is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

3- Difficulty of apology for the offender is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

4- Likelihood of the apology accepted is high 5 4 3 2 1 low

You apologize by saying:

DCT response.....

The two JL2Ss who participated in the pilot study were also asked to answer the main questions of semi-structured interview (See Appendix E) and they explained that the questions are clear to them.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The three groups of participants were invited to respond to the questionnaire. The data collection procedures were as follows:

3.4.1 Collection of data from 40 JL2Ss

First of all, the researcher emailed the respondents and asked them kindly to participate in this study after explaining to them the purpose of the study. Secondly, upon receiving the respondents' agreement and consent to participate in the study via email, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents after piloting the main version and ensuring that it is feasible and clear via email. Finally, the completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher via email as well.

3.4.2 Collection of data from 40 JNESs

First of all, the researcher emailed the respondents and asked them kindly to participate in this study after explaining to them the purpose of the study. Secondly,

upon receiving the respondents' agreement and consent to participate in the study via email, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents after piloting the main version and ensuring that it is feasible and clear via email. Finally, the completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher via email as well. This group of participants responded to the Arabic version of the questionnaire.

3.4.3 Collection of data from 40 ENSs

First of all, the researcher emailed the British Council coordinator and asked him kindly that he needs to distribute the questionnaire on the English native speakers' staff after explaining to him the purpose of the study. Secondly, upon receiving the coordinator consent, the researcher emailed a copy of the questionnaire to the coordinator and he distributed the questionnaire to the centre staff via email. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents after piloting the main version and ensuring that it is feasible and clear. Finally, the completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher via email as well. The responses by the respondents of this group were used as a baseline data for inter-language comparison.

3.4.4 Collection of data from 9 JL2Ss interviewees

Participants were invited to participate in the interview by the researcher, only nine JL2Ss volunteers showed their willingness to respond to the interview questions. Creswell (2011) and Merriam (1995) state that an interview is necessary when invisible data such as behaviours, feeling, thoughts, and intensions cannot be observed

directly. Therefore, interviews were used to obtain these invisible data. Semi-structured interviews are suited to working with small samples and are useful for studying specific situations as a way of supplementing other data collection methods, it may be sufficient to conduct only a few interviews with key informants from the study community (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2006). With reference to this particular study, only four participants were interviewed face to face while the other five were interviewed via email.

As explained earlier, the JL2Ss who agreed to be interviewed were contacted by the researcher and the researcher and JL2Ss arranged for suitable time and venue for the interviews. Those who had the highest and lowest ratings and transferred expressions from their L1 such as invoking Allah name were interviewed so as to find out the reasons for their ratings and for their production of such these expressions and thus gained the invisible information that was not possible to achieve quantitatively. The interviewees were asked to read their copies of completed questionnaires for a few minutes. This is done so that the interviewees reread/revisit the situations and their responses (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Khawaldeh & Žegarac, 2013; Al-Shboul, 2013; Chen, 1996; Savic, 2014; Taguchi, 2011; Yaghoobi, 2002).

The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed by the researcher then transcriptions were analysed based on thematic analysis to identify the interviewees' justifications of their questionnaire responses. As for the email interviews, the researcher attached the interview questions in the interviewees questionnaires copies and then he returned these copies to the interviewees and they were asked to answer the interview questions and return the questionnaire copies again to the researcher.

The interviewees' justifications were analysed in order to find out the themes or the patterns across the interviewees responses. These themes could be words or phrases repeated by the interviewees that reflect their reasons for using such phrases and giving such ratings.

Sample of the interview questions with regard to the sociopragmatic (perception) level:

- a. For Situation, you rated the severity of the offence as low, so why did you give this rating?

Sample of the interview regarding the production level:

- a. For Situation..... You used..... expression, so what made you use this expression when apologizing?

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

This section explains the procedures employed by the researcher for analysing the data achieved from the three groups of participants.

3.5.1 SRQ related data analysis

In this study, separate one-way ANOVAs and Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons were used to achieve the following research objectives and the corresponding research questions (RQ):

1.a. To investigate 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

Corresponding RQ to 1a,

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

1.b. To investigate how the context external social variables: (a) social power (higher, equal, and lower) ; and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) influence JL2Ss perception of the context-internal variables compared to that of JNESs and ENSs.

Corresponding RQ to 1b,

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

To investigate whether there is negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in the perception.

Corresponding RQ to 1.c,

RQ 1.c Is there negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in the perception of speech act of apology with reference to the external contextual variables?

One-way ANOVAs were used since they were considered as the most appropriate statistical techniques for examining the significance of group differences for one continuous dependent variable and one discrete independent variable (Huberty & Morris, 1989; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Thus, in the case of this study, so as to find out whether there were significant group differences for a particular dependent variable and the influence of independent variables towards the dependent variable, separate one way ANOVAs were used, whereas in order to find out where the significant differences exactly occur, Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons tests were used. The independent variables in this study are; the social power and social distance, while the dependent variables are; 1- the severity of the offence 2-the possibility of the speaker apology 3- the difficulty of the apology by the speaker 4- the likelihood of the apology acceptance by the listener.

Below is the discussion on how the data collections via SRQ were analysed. Research questions such as RQ1a, RQ1b and RQ1.c are related to SRQ.

RQ1a. What are the similarities and differences in the perception of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs in terms of the context-internal variables below?

- i. The assessment of the severity of the offence
- ii. The assessment of the possibility of the speaker apology

- iii. The assessment of difficulty of the apology by the speaker
- iv. The assessment of the likelihood of apology acceptance

One-way ANOVAs were performed on the SRQ data to investigate the three groups' overall similarities and differences regarding their perception of the following variables, 1-Severity of the offence, 2-the possibility of apologizing by the offender, 3-the difficulty of apologizing by the offender and 4- the likelihood of apology acceptance by the listener. One-way ANOVA is reported in ILP literature to be the most appropriate statistical test to determine whether there are any significant differences between the means of three or more independent groups or not (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Chen, 2006; Lin, 2014; Nakhle et al., 2014). Since significant differences were found between groups, Tukey (HSD) post hoc analysis were performed to compare differences between all pairs of means so as to find out where exactly the significant difference lies between groups. Alpha was set at $p < 0.05$

RQ1b. How do the context external social variables; (a) social power (higher, equal, and lower); and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) influence JL2Ss perception of speech act of apology compared to that of JNESs and ENSs?

To analyse this research question, the responses of each group of respondents i.e. JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs were divided into five categories. These categories represent different social power and social distance levels as shown below:

Category 1 (High social power) (+P + D) which consists of Situations1 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 (Equal social power) ($=P - D$) which 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, 12-You said something that annoyed your colleague.

Category 3 (Low social power) ($-P + D$) which consists of Situations 2 and 3; 2- Student forgot to return the book he borrowed from his professor 3-Employer forgot an important appointment with boss for the second time.

Category 4(Familiar) ($-P - D$) which consists of Situations 5 and 7; 5-Father promised to take his kid for shopping but he did not do that 7-You accidentally broke the lights of your intimate boss car.

Category 5 (Unfamiliar) ($=P + D$) which 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 6-You accidentally hit another driver car while parking your car.

The analysis was conducted on the bases of these categories, that is, the researcher looked into how each category respondents assessed each one of the context-internal variables by using one-way ANOVAs. For example, the Category 1 of JL2Ss who have high social power rated the severity of the offence $M= 2.61$ whereas the same category JL2Ss rated the possibility of the offender apology $M= 3.80$. Hence, the analysis of these categories found an influence for the social power and social distance on the assessment of the four context-internal variables (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Lin, 2008).

RQ.1.c. Is there negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in JL2S's perception of the contextual variables?

Pragmatic transfer is evident in the perception level if there are significant differences between JL2Ss and ENSs groups and JNESs and ENSs group and no significant differences between JL2Ss and JNESs. These significant differences were based on the findings of research questions 1.a. and 1.b

3.5.2. DCT related data analysis

DCT related research objectives and the corresponding research questions are discussed below:

2.a. To investigate the similarities and differences in the production of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs

Corresponding RQ to 2a,

RQ 2.a. What are the similarities and differences in the production of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs?

2.b.To investigate how the context external social variables; (a) social power (higher, equal, and lower) ; and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) influence JL2Ss' production of apology strategies compared to that of JNESs and ENSs.

Corresponding RQ to 2.b,

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

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

Corresponding RQ to 2.c,

RQ. 2.c. Is there negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in the production of speech act of apology?

Below is the discussion on how the data collection via DCT were analysed. Research questions such as RQ.2.a, RQ.2.b, and RQ.2.c are related to DCT.

RQ2a. What are the similarities and differences in the production of apology by JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs?

The overall apology strategies elicited from the three groups of participants were calculated according to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model. This model could be considered as a universal classification model since it has been successfully used and tested on several languages in CCSARP project by Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984).

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 found (Al-Adaileh, 2007; Al-Eryani, 2007; Ahangar, Abdullah & Zeynali, 2015; Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Shboul, 2013; Aydin, 2013; Bella, 2014; Binasfour, 2014; Lin, 2014).

RQ2.b. How do the context external social variables; (a) social power (higher, equal, and lower) ; and (b) social distance (familiar and unfamiliar) influence JL2Ss' production of speech act of apology compared to that of JNESs and ENSs?

To analyse this research question, the responses of each group of respondents i.e. JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs were divided into five categories. These categories represent different social power and social distance levels as shown below:

Category 1 (High social power) (+P + D) which 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 (Equal social power) (=P - D) which 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, 12-You said something that annoyed your colleague.

Category 3 (Low social power) (-P + D) which consists of Situations 2 and 3; 2- Student forgot to return the book he borrowed from his professor 3-Employer forgot an important appointment with boss for the second time.

Category 4 (Familiar) (-P - D) which consists of Situations 5 and 7; 5-Father promised to take his kid for shopping but he did not do that 7-You accidentally broke the lights of your intimate boss car.

Category 5 (Unfamiliar) (=P +D) which 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 6- You accidentally hit another driver car while parking your car.

The analyses were conducted on the bases of these categories, that is, the researcher looked into the percentages of each apology strategies (semantic formula) produced by each category participants and calculated them manually in order to find out the percentages of each apology strategy produced by each category. For example, in Category 1, JL2Ss (high social power apologizes to low social power) used the expression of regret 33 times (3.07%) whereas in Category 3, JL2Ss (low social power apologizes to high social power) used the expression of regret 102 times (9.51%).

Thus, it is noticed that the JL2Ss who have high social power used expression of regret frequently less than JL2Ss who have low social power. This revealed that the participants produced their apology strategies based on their interlocutors social power that is the JL2Ss who have high social power did not use expression of regret frequently while apologizing to their low social power interlocutors whereas JL2Ss who have low social power used expression of regret heavily while apologizing to their high social power interlocutors. This might show that social power plays a significant role in the apology production among the interlocutors. The analysis of the study categories followed the same patterns and found an influence for the social power and social distance on the production of apology strategies by the three groups of participants (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Bella, 2014; Chang, 2011; Kashkouli & Eslamirasekh, 2012; Kousar, 2015; Lin, 2014).

RQ.2.c Is there negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in JL2Ss' production of apology in English?

Negative pragmatic transfer is found if there are any similarities between JL2Ss and JNESs in any feature of apology production by all the five categories, and if these similarities are different from ENSs. For example the findings reveal that JL2Ss used concern for the hearer strategy 80 times (7.46%) and JNESs used concern for the hearer strategy 87 times (8.57%) which showed that JL2Ss used concern for the hearer strategy almost frequently as JNESs. Whereas ENSs used concern for the hearer 4 times only (0.44%).

Thus, based on these percentages it is found that JL2Ss are still influenced with their L1 pragmatic knowledge while apologizing in L2 in spite of their higher English proficiency. This difference is called negative pragmatic transfer. Furthermore, negative transfer is found if JL2Ss transferred any expressions from their L1 and these expressions were not used by ENSs. For example, both Jordanian groups used the name of Allah when apologizing, and ENSs did not use it. These significant differences were based on the findings of research questions 2.a. and 2.b.

To ensure the reliability of DCT data analysis, peer review was conducted. Peer review is a process whereby experts in specific domain assess the quality and feasibility of the work of another author in their fields of competence (Lee, 2013). Further, the type of peer review used in this study is open peer review in which the researcher and the reviewers know each other. Besides, this open peer review was found to be a reliable tool to induce and encourage the transparency and impartiality

of reviewing process (Mallard, Lamont & Guetzkow, 2009). Thus, the researcher invited two independent reviewers in order to make sure that the semantic formula analysis was clear and accurate. These two reviewers have good experience in the analysis of speech acts coding schema. Further, they are PhD holders and working currently as university lecturers. These reviewers reviewed some of the DCT data categorization process based in Olshtain and Cohen (1983) apology classification model and agreed with the categorizing apology strategies and sub-strategies with reference to the model, and thus making the categorization of apology strategies reliable.

For example, both reviewers agreed on the categorization of the apology strategies in the following example: Situation 6 JL2S 1 (e.g. “I’m so sorry, I really didn’t notice your car, I’ll afford all the expenses”),

- 1- I am so sorry = IFID +intensifier
- 2- I really did not notice your car = Lack of intent
- 3- I will afford all the expenses = offer of repair

3.5.3. Interview related data analysis

This section explains the semi-structured interviews data analysis procedures. The interviews were conducted with nine JL2Ss on voluntary bases.

The related research objectives and the corresponding research questions are discussed below

- 1.d. To investigate the JL2Ss’ justifications for their perception rating given by them

The corresponding research question to achieve this objective is as follows:

RQ.1.d. What are JL2Ss' justifications for their perception rating given by them?

Thematic analysis was used to analyse the interviewees' responses. Hsieh and Shannon (2005) explained that content or thematic analysis is a research method for the subjective interpretation of the text data through the systematic classification process of identifying themes or patterns. To achieve the interviewees' justifications about perception rating given, they were kindly asked to justify their highest and lowest ratings. Then, the interviewees responses were checked by the researcher and based on these responses major themes were found. The responses revealed that most of the high and low ratings occurred with two context-internal variables which were: the severity of the offence and the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party.

For example, Situation 1 (A professor promised to return student term paper but he did not do that), five interviewees rated the severity of the offence as low. When asked about their reasons for this low rating they explained that the other interlocutor is a student and it is normal for them to see the offence as not severe. As such this rating was based on the status of the professor as high social power individual and the status of student as low social power individual. Based on the interviewees' responses, it was found that the interviewees rated this variable as low based on their perception of social power differences between the professors who have high social power and students who have low social power.

2.d. To investigate the JL2Ss' justifications for their apology production given by them

The corresponding research question to achieve this objective is as follows:

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

To achieve the interviewees' justifications about apology production, the interviewees were kindly asked to justify their use of the additional expressions. Then, the interviewees responses were checked by the researcher and based on these responses major themes were found. Interview results indicated that there were two main reasons that motivated the interviewees to transfer these expressions from their culture. These reasons include: the Jordanian religious orientation and the Jordanian cultural background about hierarchical values. For example, two of the nine interviewees used the religious term (e.g. Inshallah) which was transferred from their native Muslim culture. When asked about their reasons for using this term they explained they are Muslims and it is normal for Muslims to invoke Allah name in their conversation in general. As such, it was found that those interviewees' religious orientation motivated them to use the term Inshallah while apologizing in English.

To ensure the reliability and accuracy of thematic analysis conducted by the researcher, member checks process was used. Creswell (2012) explains that member checks is the process in which the researcher asked one or more participants in the study to check the accuracy of the findings obtained from those participants. Therefore, upon completion of the thematic analysis, the researcher showed the results of his analysis to the interviewees (i.e. Nine JL2Ss interviewees) and asked them about the accuracy of his report. For example, the researcher presented the interviews major themes to the participants to check whether such themes were realistic and accurate and if the interpretations of the data were fair and representative. As such, the

interviewees confirm that the researcher interpretations were accurate and realistic and reflected their responses.

3.6 SUMMARY

For the purpose of the present study, DCT, SRQ and semi-structured interview were used for data collection. The samples of the study comprise of three groups: the first group involved 40 JL2Ss and the other two groups which are 40 JNESs and 40 ENSs were used as baseline groups for inter-language and cross- comparisons purposes. The three groups of participants were chosen on the basis of purposive sampling technique. The questionnaire (combination of SRQ and DCT) was used to measure the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence of speech act of apology among the three participant groups. Finally, this chapter discusses the data collection as data analysis procedures.