



## Influence of social power on perception of speech act of apology by Jordanian second language speakers

Bilal Ayed Al-Khaza'leh<sup>a\*</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>*Islamic Sciences University of Malaysia, Bandar Baru Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia*

### APA Citation:

Al-Khaza'leh, B.A. (2018). Influence of social power on perception of speech act of apology by Jordanian second language speakers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(1), 211-229

Submission Date: 22/07/2016

Acceptance Date: 25/07/2018

### Abstract

The present study aimed at investigating the influence of social power, as a social hierarchy, on perception of speech act of apology by 40 Jordanian second language speakers (JL2Ss) compared to that of 40 Jordanian non-English speakers, those whose English proficiency is low (JNESs) and 40 English native speakers (ENSs). Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and Scaled Response Questionnaire (SRQ) were used to elicit data from the three groups of participants. For data analysis, one way ANOVA, post hoc pair comparisons statistical tests were employed. Similarities and differences between Jordanian Arabic and British English cultures were detected. Social power found to have an impact on Jordanian participants perception significantly higher than ENSs. Moreover, significant mean differences among the three groups regarding their perception of the four context-internal variables were also found. Further, results showed that although JL2Ss are highly proficient in English they still lack the required sociopragmatic competence which consequently led to negative sociopragmatic transfer. The study concludes with some pedagogical implications, findings could benefit EFL course designers and teachers to develop EFL curricula in Jordan which may remedy the JL2Ss lack of pragmatic knowledge of the target language and reduce pragmatic failure across cultures.

© 2018 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

*Keywords:* Social power; perception; DCT; SRQ; pragmatic transfer

### 1. Introduction

Investigating cross-cultural differences could provide a comprehensive view about the speakers' perception of apology due its variations from one culture to another. Recently, the tendencies for cultural studies have got a considerable attention as maintaining a successful relation among interlocutors is of paramount significance in cross-cultural communication (Kousar, 2015; Lin, 2013; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin, 2014). The study of speech as a cultural phenomenon has shown that different communities vary in their production and interpretation of linguistic behavior (Ahar & Eslami-Rasekh, 2011; Bella, 2014; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Ifantidou, 2014; Olshtain, & Cohen, 1990). Among these cultural variations, social power plays a pivotal role in determining a specific linguistic behavior (Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Beebe & Zhang-Waring, 2001; Kasper, 1992; Wolfson, 1989). The lack of pragmatic knowledge might lead to what is called a

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: + 00962792552379  
E-mail address: bilalkaza83@gmail.com

pragmatic failure which refers to the inability to understand the speaker's intended meaning, consequently operates as a barrier to the success of cross cultural communication (Luo & Gao, 2011; Nureddeen, 2008; Trosborg, 1995; Thomas, 1983). People's perception of the social variables is a culturally specific thus the pragmatic researchers should include the assessment and perception check for the social variables i.e. social power, social distance, obligation etc due to the fact that different sociocultural groups have different norms and perception regarding these contextual variables (Brown & Levinson 1987).

It is undoubtedly very essential for any second language speakers (L2Ss henceforth) to achieve the required pragmatic knowledge of that second language and be pragmatically competent so as to avoid pragmatic transfer refers to "the influence exerted by learner's pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 on their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information" (Kasper, 1992 p. 207) and pragmatic failure. There is a pressing need for improving the pragmatic awareness of L2Ss to avoid pragmatic failure and to achieve the appropriate polite behavior (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Sobh, 2013; Banikalef & Maros, 2013; Bardovi-Harlig et al, 2015; Blum-Kulka, 1982; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Hussein & Hammouri, 1998; Ifantidou, 2014; Trosborg, 2010).

According to Leech (1983) pragmatics is divided into sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies; sociopragmatics refers to the sociological interface of pragmatics and social perceptions underlying participants' interpretations which differ from one speech community to another. Pragmalinguistics on other hand refers to the knowledge of forms and strategies to convey particular speech acts i.e. the linguistic resources (including strategies such as direct, indirect and hedging) to convey communicative acts and performing pragmatic functions. Hence, investigating these perceptive differences might give the opportunity to the L2Ss to achieve the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies. Each speech community has its own assessment of the contextual variables such as the social power, distance, severity of the offence, obligations, degree of imposition and others (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Olshtain, 1989; Kasper, 1992; Takahashi, 1996). The present study investigates the influence of social power, which is a context-external variable proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), on the perception of apology realization by Jordanian second language speakers (JL2Ss henceforth).

Interlanguage pragmatic studies of speech acts have revealed that even high English proficiency second language speakers face problems in applying speech acts and have insufficient pragmatic competence while interacting with native speakers of the target language (Abdulrahman, 2012; Al-Issa, 1998; Arghamiri & Sadighi, 2013; Banikalef & Maros, 2013; Chen, 1993; Cohen & Olshtain, 1981; Farashaiyan & Hua, 2011; Tabatabaei & Farnia, 2015). Thus, for the purpose of the present study, proficient JL2Ss are recruited. According to Kinginger and Farrell (2004), the L2Ss' awareness of the social concepts underlying linguistic choice is a key phase in the development of pragmatic competence. In addition, the relationship between sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies is an interwoven one, as such any exploration of pragmatic variability should address the pragmalinguistic forms and patterns along with the sociopragmatic values of the L2Ss (Chang, 2011; Ifantidou, 2014; McNamara, 2006; Roever, 2010). As such this study tries to fill a gap left uninvestigated in Jordanian context which is the perception of apology by JL2Ss.

### *1.1. Literature review*

Among the speech acts that people engage in daily life situations, apology is frequently used and much researched since it functions as a remedial for restoring and maintaining harmony between the speaker and the hearer (Aydin, 2013; Al-Zumor, 2011; Jebahi, 2010; Kousar, 2015; Trosborg, 2010). Olshtain (1989) defines an apology as "a speech act which is intended to provide support for the

hearer who was actually or potentially mal-affected by a violation” (p. 165). Good amount of research in the realm of speech acts has paid much attention on investigating the speech act of apology within a variety of languages and cultures (Al-Ali & Alawneh, 2010; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1989; Ji, 2008; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Nureddeen, 2008; Taguchi, 2009; Trosborg, 1995). Bergman and Kasper (1993) by means of SRQ and DCT investigated Thai and American English speakers’ perceptions of a committed offense and the choice of apology strategies within a variety of contexts. Findings revealed significant differences between the two groups in rating of some context-internal variables i.e. severity of offence, likelihood to apologize and others. Moreover, 50% of the differences between the two groups were attributed to the pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. Furthermore, the results showed that when the speaker is closer to the interlocutor, the offender accepts more responsibility for the offensive act. The study shed light on the sociopragmatic competence of apology by Thai L2Ss compared with ENSs.

In line with Bergman and Kasper’s (1993) study, Maeshiba et al. (1996) investigated the Japanese apologetic behavior and whether there is relation between pragmatic transfer and English proficiency. Four groups participated in the study; 30 Japanese native speakers, 30 English native speakers, 30 Japanese EFL (intermediate) and 30 Japanese EFL (advanced). The four groups responded to the DCT and results indicated that the intermediate group transferred their apology behavior from Japanese to English more than the advanced group. As a consequence, the study suggests that Japanese EFL should be pragmatically instructed regardless of their target language proficiency. In the same vein, Kashkouli and Eslamirasekh, (2013) investigated the Persians and Armenians assessment of context-internal variables by means of SRQ and DCT. Results showed that Armenians rated the severity of the offence variable higher than Persian rating. Moreover, Armenians were more like western in their formality of their behavior in which social status and social distance of the offended party did not influence their apology production while Persians were more influenced by these factors.

Furthermore, Hou, (2006) investigated the Chinese sociopragmatic competence of speech act of apology by means of DCT and SRQ. The sample of the study contains three groups, 60 Chinese L2Ss and 60 American NSs and 60 Chinese NSs. Variables investigated include severity of the offence, the possibility of you apologizing, difficulty of the apology for the speaker and the likelihood of the apology accepted by the hearer. Findings of the study revealed some similarities between Chinese and American in perception of the variables and this was attributed to the universality of speech act of apology. However, significant cultural differences were found in which the Chinese rated the offences as more severe and apology more difficult which demonstrated the eastern politeness.

Regarding the speech act of apology research in Jordanian context, there are some studies conducted in this field. Most of these studies investigated only pragmalinguistic competence that is they investigated only the similarities and differences between JNESs and ENSs. For instance, Al Adaileh (2007) investigated the politeness orientations regarding the speech act of apology between JNESs and ENSs by means of DCT. Findings revealed that ENSs were more inclined to use IFIDs more than JNESs did and both groups were likely to employ the expression of regret sub-strategy specifically “I’m sorry.” Moreover, findings revealed that Jordanian culture is inclined to be positive politeness culture i.e. the Jordanian respondents opted to use indirect apology strategies to save their positive face, while British culture is considered as a negative politeness i.e. the English respondents used more direct apology strategies IFIDs.

In a similar manner, Bataineh and Bataineh (2008) investigated the similarities and differences between JNESs from different majors of study from Yarmouk University and University of Science and Technology in Jordan and ENSs from Indiana University in the United States of America. DCT and another test designed by the researcher herself were the study instruments. Findings showed that JNESs used significant apology strategies more than ENSs did. These strategies include (1) statement

of remorse, (2) strategy of promising not to repeat the offense, (3) invoking Allah's (God's) name, and (4) the use of proverbs. On the other hand, ENSs used more compensation, and tended to blame others as well as themselves when trying to apologize for the committed offense. The study also compared between males and females in both cultures and found that JNESs males and females used different apology strategies. JNESs males used more statement of remorse strategies while JNESs females used less non-apology strategies and assigned the blame on themselves more than on others. ENSs females tended to apologize more than males and used statement of remorse more than male did. More recently, Banikalef and Maros (2013) conducted a study to investigate apology strategies by JL2Ss at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM henceforth), Malaysia. DCT and semi-structured interviews were employed. Findings revealed that JL2Ss used mostly IFIDs specifically when expressing regret, such as I'm sorry which was the most frequently used strategy. Further, the results indicated that JL2Ss used some additional expressions not included in model that was adopted from Olshtain and Cohen (1983). These new apology strategies include; arrogance and ignorance, blame something else and swearing to Allah.

The above discussed apology studies in Jordanian context investigated only the similarities and differences in speech act of apology between JNESs and ENSs in the production level i.e. pragmalinguistic competence and neglected the sociopragmatic competence which is the perception level. Thus, this study investigates the perception of apology by JL2S who have different social power levels in order to understand their perceptive attitudes that make them produce specific patterns of apology strategies (Al-Momani, 2007; Al-Shboul, 2013; Rababah, 2003). The current study aims to answer the following research question:

RQ1. How does the context external social variable of social power (high, equal, and low) influence JL2Ss perception of apology realization compared to that of JNESs and ENSs?

## *1.2. Problem statement*

In Jordanian Arabic context, researchers such as Al-Momani, (2009), Al-Shboul (2013), Al-Adaileh (2007) and Bataineh (2008) indicated that research concerning Jordanian L2Ss pragmatic competence is scarce and thus, what is known about Jordanian L2Ss pragmatic competence is very limited. This problem has been observed by many researchers who affirmed that Jordanians lack the necessary pragmatic competence which consequently hinder them from communicating efficiently in the target language (Al-Khresheh, 2010; Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Bataineh & Aljamal, 2014). There is a lack of studies that deals with the difficulties that JL2Ss encounter when performing speech acts including apology in English. This study is in line with the argument that learning a language is not merely acquiring a simple understanding of grammar of the target language, rather learners must be able to use the language beyond the classroom as well and in variety of situations where politeness and tact help to sooth tension and open door for successful cross-cultural communication i.e. pragmatic competence (Ayden, 2013; Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2010; Ifantidou, 2014). Speech acts research in Jordanian context revealed that even JL2Ss who have high English proficiency still lack the pragmatic competency (Al-Momani, 2007; Al-Shboul, 2012; Rababah, 2003). Thus, this particular study focuses on proficient JL2Ss. Previous Jordanian speech act of apology research have primarily addressed the similarities and differences between Jordanian and English native speakers cultures without paying much attention to the perception and the attitudes of the JL2Ss that influence their linguistic production. To the best of researcher knowledge, this might be the first attempt to address the influence of social power variable on the perception of apology realization in Jordanian context by high English proficient JL2Ss. Jordanian non-English speakers (JNESs henceforth) and English native speakers (ENSs henceforth) served as the baseline groups (for comparison purposes) while JL2Ss served as interlanguage group.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

According to Ellis (1994) and Kasper and Dahl (1991a) and Selinker, (1972) the investigation of L2Ss pragmatic abilities would usually involve three groups, that is, second language speakers (L2Ss) groups 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 participants responses in ILP speech act realization studies seem to cluster around specific subcategories, at least 30 subjects 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; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Lin, 2014; Maeshiba et al., 1996; Morkus, 2009; Nakhle, Naghavi & Razavi, 2014). To this end, three groups of participants participated in the study as explained below.

#### 2.1.1 Jordanian second language speakers at UKM (40 JL2Ss)

This group of participants consists of 40 Jordanian postgraduate students from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, UKM since there was an influx of Jordanians pursuing their higher studies at this institution (Al-Shboul, 2013; Banikalef & Maros, 2013). In addition, 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 English Proficiency Placement Test (EPPT) at UKM or have passed their Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) with more than 550 in paper test and 79 in TOEFL internet based test or have achieved band 6.5 and above for their International English Language Testing System (IELTS).

#### 2.1.2. Jordanian non-English speakers at UKM (40 JNESs)

This group of respondents consists of 40 Jordanian postgraduate students Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, UKM. 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 for the purpose of inter-language comparisons.

#### 2.1.3. 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 comparisons.

### 2.2. Instruments

The data of the present study were elicited via discourse completion test (DCT) and scaled response questionnaire (SRQ).

### 2.2.1 Discourse completion test (DCT)

DCT consists of different contextual situations that are 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 (1991c), 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). Ellis (1994) explains that a controlled tool such as the DCT allows for large amounts of data to be collected quickly and easily. This claim has been supported by Rose (1992) who adds that DCT has an advantage over natural data (observation data) in that it provides a controlled context for speech acts and can be used to collect large amounts of data quite quickly and help to classify the formulas and strategies that may occur in natural speech (Beebe & Martha and Cummings, 1996).

Despite its widespread popularity, DCT is not immune from criticism. The most popular concern is regarding the validity issue i.e. how representative the DCT data is compared to natural collected data by the participants. It does not actually reflect what the participant would say in the natural settings but what they may think they would say in given situation (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2013; Felix-Brasdefer, 2010; Woodfield, 2012). However, it is argued that DCT still indicates the particular forms and strategies used by the participants of pragmatic studies and thus still valid and utilized in huge body of pragmatic research until now (Daftari & Tavil, 2015; Ellis, 1994; Kousar, 2015; Lin, 2014; Martínez-Flor, 2012; Nakhle et al., 2014).

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) apology is a face threatening act and thus they introduced some parameters to assess the cost of any potential face threatening acts (FTA) such as social power, social distance and the degree of imposition. The present study is concerned to investigate the social power as a face threatening act and its influence on the perception and production of apology by JL2Ss. Social power is defined as “The degree to which the hearer can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) at the expense of the speaker’s plans and self-evaluation” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 77).

In order to elicit the three groups of participants’ perception, 12 DCT situations were put forward in the questionnaire of this study. The 12 DCT situations were adapted from Al-Adaileh’s (2007) study of apology and piloted by the researcher of this study. After piloting slight modifications were done afterwards. Pilot study is explained below in section 2. 3. JL2Ss and ENSs responded to the English version of DCT since they were considered proficient in English while the JNESs responded to the Arabic version of the DCT due to their low English proficiency based on their EPPT results at UKM.

The 12 DCT situations were 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). However, analysis was done for the situations that include the social power situations only. The following Table illustrates the social power DCT situations

**Table 1.** Classifications of the DCT situations

Category	Apologizer social power (P) Categories	Situations
1	(+P + D) High social power	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)	4-You forgot an appointment with friend for the second

	Equal social power	time.
		8-You accidentally spilled oil in your neighbor car.
		12-You said something that annoyed your colleague.
3	(-P + D)	2- Student forgot to return the book he borrowed from his professor.
	Low social power	3-Employer forgot an important appointment with boss for the second time.

Note: P= social power

### 2.2.2. Scaled response questionnaire (SRQ)

Sociopragmatic perception found to have an influence on speech act production, therefore, it is essential to find out how JL2Ss perceive the social variables and how these perceptions are reflected in their output strategies (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Kasper & Dahl, 1991) Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that differences in the participants' perception competence influence their production of a specific speech acts. According to Chen (1996) SRQ serves as a good tool in uncovering the sociocultural rules in the speakers' communicative competence. 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, the researcher slightly modified Bergman and Kasper original SRQ questionnaire. The researcher changed the 'offender' face loss' variable into the difficulty of apology by the offender variable which was found to be easier to understand by the participants after group discussion conducted with them. The SRQ 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 offended party

These four context-internal variables were assessed by JL2Ss with different social power categories. In other words, if the apologizer has high social power and his/her interlocutor has low social power, the SRQ is used to measure the way of how the high social power apologizer perceives and rates these above mentioned variables while communicating with the other interlocutors. 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                                     | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |
| 2-The possibility of you apologizing                          | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |
| 3- Difficulty of the apology                                  | high 5 4 3 2 1 low |
| 4- Likelihood of the apology acceptance by the offended party | 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 then checked by two Jordanian English graduate students. DCT and SRQ were distributed and answered in English by JL2Ss and ENSs and answered in Arabic by JNESs. To investigate the perception of apology by JL2Ss, Al-Adaileh's (2007) 12 DCT adapted situations and Bergman and Kasper (1993) adapted SRQ context-internal variables were combined together in one questionnaire that answered by the three groups of participants. Each situation consists of two parts: the SRQ first and the DCT next. Only the perception part is the concern of this study, thus DCT responses were not included in this analysis.

### 2.3. 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 JNESs 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 JNESs 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, 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 JNESs 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.

*2.4. Data collection procedures*

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

*2.4.1. 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. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents after piloting the main version and ensuring that it is feasible and clear. Secondly, upon receiving the respondents’ agreement and consent to participate in the study via email, the researcher sent the questionnaires to the respondents via email. Finally, the completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher via email as well.

#### 2.4.2. 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. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents after piloting the main version and ensuring that it is feasible and clear. Secondly, upon receiving the respondents' agreement and consent to participate in the study via email, the researcher sent the questionnaire 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.

#### 2.4.3. Collection of data from 40 ENSs

Firstly, the questionnaires were distributed via email to the respondents after piloting it and ensuring that it is feasible and clear. Secondly, the respondents upon finishing answering the questionnaires returned the copies to the researchers via email. The responses by the respondents of this group were used as a baseline data for interlanguage comparison.

### 2.5. Data analysis

To analyse the study research question, the responses of each group of respondents i.e. JL2Ss, JNESs and ENSs were divided into five categories (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Lin, 2008; Taguchi, 2013; Thijittang, 2010):

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.

However, the analysis was done on the social power categories since they are the focus of this study. Hence, the analysis were 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 on the assessment of the four context-internal variables (Al-Momani, 2009; Al-Shboul, 2013; Lin, 2008).

### 3. Results

The following tables illustrate the three groups of participants' assessments of the four context-internal variables of the study. SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was employed to achieve the results.

#### 1. The assessment of the severity of the offence

**Table 2.** Means and standard deviation to the contextual variable Severity of the offence

Contextual Variables	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df (Error)	F	Sig
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Category 1 High	2.61	0.96	2.83	1.00	3.38	0.48	2 (116)	8.626	0.000* T
Category 2 Equal	3.19	0.50	3.30	0.42	4.15	0.16	2 (117)	70.952	0.000* T
Category 3 Low	4.01	0.43	4.02	0.00	3.90	0.20	2 (117)	1.714	0.185

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

Table 2 above illustrates how the three groups of participants with different social power categories perceive the severity of the offence.

One-way ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among the three groups in Category 1, ( $F 2, 116=8.626, p = 0.000$ ). Tukey HSD post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs group. This indicates that the Jordanian with high social power did not perceive the offence as very severe when it is committed against people with low social power. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category since there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, and there is significant difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs.

In Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence significantly lower than ENSs did ( $F 2, 117=70.952, p = 0.000$ ) which indicates a negative sociopragmatic transfer since the assessment of both Jordanian groups is similar to each other but different from ENSs assessment. By contrast, in Category 3 analysis showed that there is no significant difference among the three groups despite the fact that both Jordanian groups assessed the severity of the offence higher than ENSs group ( $F 2, 117=1.714, p = 0.185$ ). Analysis shows that Jordanians consider the offence as not so severe when it is committed against their low and equal social power offended parties, whereas ENSs consider the offence as very severe regardless of their offended parties' social power.

#### 2. The assessment of the possibility of the apology by the offender

**Table 3.** Means and standard deviation to the contextual variable possibility of apology

Contextual Variables	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df (Error)	F	Sig
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Category 1 High	3.80	0.2	3.17	0.31	4.42	0.28	2(117)	198.2	0.000*
		4						36	
Category 2 Equal	3.17	0.4	3.58	0.47	3.91	0.30	2(117)	29.40	0.000*
		8						6	
Category 3 Low	4.91	0.1	4.96	0.13	4.93	0.16	2(117)	0.980	0.379
		9							

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

Regarding possibility of apology by the offender ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among groups in Category 1 and Category 2. Post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. In category 1, JL2Ss assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than JNESs did, whereas JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than ENSs did ( $F 2, 117=198.236, p = 0.000$ ). Similar to Category 1, in Category 2 post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than JNESs did. Moreover, JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly lower than ENSs did ( $F 2, 117=29.406, p = 0.000$ ). With regard to Category 3, the three groups showed agreement in their assessment of possibility of apology. That is because no statistically significant differences were found in any of the three groups ( $F 2, 117=0.980, p = 0.379$ ). This indicates an inter-language and cross-cultural similarity between both cultures. This shows that ENSs are ready to apologize whenever the offence takes place regardless of the social power of their offended parties. Further, Jordanians who have high social power show also their readiness to apologize for their lower and equal social power offended parties but significantly lower than ENSs.

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

**Table 4.** Means and standard deviation to the contextual variable difficulty of apology

Contextual Variables	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df (Error)	F	Sig
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Category 1 High	2.98	0.08	3.08	0.1	2.19	0.27	2(117)	244.97	0.000*
				9				8	T
Category 2 Equal	3.17	0.16	3.00	0.0	2.21	0.20	2(117)	440.87	0.000*
				0				5	
Category 3 Low	1.00	0.00	1.02	0.1	2.02	0.00	2(117)	1579.5	0.000*
				5				00	T

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

As for the difficulty of Apology by the offender one-way ANOVA and post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly higher than ENSs group did in Category1, ( $F 2, 117=244.978, p = 0.000$ ) which indicates that Jordanians who have high social power believe that it is difficult for them to apologize for their low social power offended

parties. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian group and ENSs. In Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the difficulty of apology significantly higher than JNESs did whereas, JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than ENSs did ( $F_{2, 117}=440.875, p = 0.000$ ). In Category 3 post hoc pair comparisons results showed that there are significant differences among the three groups, ( $F_{2, 117}=1579.500, p = 0.000$ ). Both Jordanian groups assessed the difficulty of apology significantly lower than ENSs group did. Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian groups and ENSs.

4. The assessment of the likelihood of apology acceptance

**Table 5.** Means and standard deviation to the contextual variable likelihood of apology acceptance

Contextual Variables	JL2Ss		JNESs		ENSs		df		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(Error)	F	Sig
Category 1 High	4.83	0.40	5.00	0.0	3.04	0.2	2(117)	647.3	0.000*
							4	82	
Category 2 Equal	4.12	0.16	4.13	0.1	3.03	0.2	2(117)	497.7	0.000*
				6			0	28	T
Category 3 Low	3.11	0.66	3.50	0.0	3.01	0.0	2(117)	18.32	0.000*
				0			7	4	

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

For the likelihood of apology acceptance by the offended party one-way ANOVA results showed that there are significant differences among the three groups in all categories. In Category 1, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than JNESs did and JNESs assessed the possibility of apology significantly higher than ENSs did ( $F_{2, 117}=647.3828, p = 0.000$ ). Similarly, in Category 2, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that both Jordanian groups assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs group did ( $F_{2, 117}=497.628, p = 0.000$ ). Negative sociopragmatic transfer occurred in this category. That is, while there is no significant difference between JL2Ss and JNESs, there is significant difference between both Jordanian group and ENSs. In Category 3, post hoc pair comparisons revealed that the three groups have significant mean differences among each other. JL2Ss assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly lower than JNESs did. Moreover, JNESs assessed the likelihood of apology acceptance significantly higher than ENSs did ( $F_{2, 117}=18.324, p = 0.000$ ). This analysis indicates that Jordanians highly expect their apology to be accepted by the offended parties while ENSs do not expect high likelihood for their apologies to be accepted. This might be attributed to the cultural differences in the perception of the contextual variables.

**4. Discussion**

The study revealed that there are some similarities and differences between English and Arabic Jordanian cultures. This reflects the common belief that each culture has its own distinctive cultural traits. This is based on the findings showed 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. Findings revealed that even though the JL2Ss are highly proficient in English they still lack the required sociopragmatic knowledge while apologizing in the target language. Analysis showed that the perception of the contextual variables is a very significant factor affecting the realization of apology strategies by each culture. Firstly, the analysis of perception of the four contextual variables showed that both Jordanian groups assessed these variables significantly lower than ENSs. Moreover, analysis indicated that social power influences the Jordanian participants' perception of the contextual variables more than ENSs. Both Jordanian groups who have high and equal social power consider the offence as not severe when it is committed against their low and equal social power interlocutors respectively. By contrast, ENSs considered the offence as very severe under all offensive situations and thus they produced more apology expressions to the other offended parties. 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.

## 5. Conclusion

In sum, the findings of the present study imply that the perception of apology by JL2Ss is not fully developed from the perspective of the native speaker judges in this study since there are significant differences and negative pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 in both perception levels. This suggests that L2Ss need opportunities to have considerable input of English speech acts and practice those speech acts in order to be pragmatically competent in L2 English.

In the present study, JL2Ss committed negative sociopragmatic transfer while apologizing in English, which implies that they still did not acquire the needed pragmatic knowledge regarding their high proficiency in English, hence, pragmatic instruction is required to overcome the L1 transfer and avoid the pragmatic failure. Findings could benefit EFL course designers and teachers to develop EFL curricula in Jordan that incorporate pragmatic instruction into the teaching and learning materials. 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, 2012; Kasper, 1997; Rose, 1992) and thus, improve JL2Ss pragmatic knowledge and reduce pragmatic failure across cultures.

The findings of this study should be interpreted in light of its limitations. 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 and different gender might give different results but this could be confirmed by future studies. Regardless of its limitations, this particular study has revealed valuable insights concerning the Jordanian sociopragmatic competence in the speech act of apology.

## References

- Al-Adaileh, B. A. M. (2007). The speech act of apology: a linguistic exploration of politeness orientation in British and Jordanian culture. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Leeds. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from [http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/202/1/uk\\_bl\\_ethos\\_446510.pdf](http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/202/1/uk_bl_ethos_446510.pdf).
- Al-Ali, M. N., & Alawneh, R. (2010). Linguistic mitigating devices in American and Jordanian students' requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7(2), 311-339.
- Ahar, V., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2011). The Effect of Social Status and Size of Imposition on the Gratitude Strategies of Persian and English Speakers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 120-128.
- Al-Issa, A. (2003). Sociocultural transfer in L2 speech behaviors: Evidence and motivating factors. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(5), 581-601.
- Al-Khresheh, M. (2010). Interlingual interference in the English language word order structure of Jordanian EFL learners. *European journal of social sciences*, 16(1), 106-113.
- Al-Momani, H. S. (2009). *Caught between two cultures: The realization of requests by Jordanian EFL learners*. (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from <https://dspace.iup.edu/bitstream/handle/2069/176/Husam%20Al-Momani.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Arghamiri, A., & Sadighi, F. (2013). The impact of metalinguistic knowledge and proficiency level on pragmatic competence of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 4(1), 181-192.

- Al-Sobh, M. A. (2013). An Analysis of Apology as a Politeness Strategy Expressed by Jordanian University Students. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(2), 150-154.
- Aydin, M. (2013). Cross cultural Pragmatics: A study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1268&context=etds>
- Al-Zumor, A. W. Q. G. (2011). Apologies in Arabic and English: An inter-language and cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University-Languages and Translation*, 23(1), 19-28.
- Banikalef, A. E. A. A., & Maros, M. (2013). Social Beliefs for the Realization of the Speech Acts of Apology among Jordanian EFL Graduate Students. *English Linguistics Research*, 2(1), 134-145.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2015). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(3), 324-350.
- Beebe, L.-T. Takahashi, & R. Uliss-Weltz.(1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. *On the Development of Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Beebe, L., & Zhang Waring, H. (2001). *Sociopragmatic vs. pragmalinguistic failure: How useful is the distinction*. Paper presented at the annual NYSTESOL Applied Linguistics Winter Conference, New York, NY.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2015). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(3), 324-350.
- Bataineh, R. F., & Aljamal, M. A. (2014). Watch out and beware: differences in the use of warning between American and Jordanian undergraduate students. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 11(1), 87-111.
- Bataineh, R. F., & Bataineh, R. F. (2008). A cross-cultural comparison of apologies by native speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4), 792-821.
- Bella, S. (2014). A contrastive study of apologies performed by Greek native speakers and English learners of Greek as a foreign language. *Pragmatics*, 24(4), 679-713.
- Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. *Interlanguage pragmatics*, 4(1), 82-107.
- Binasfour, H. S. (2014). *Apology strategies: A comparison of Saudi English learners and native speakers of American English*: Unpublished master's thesis, southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 29-59.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 31): Ablex Pub.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns(CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4): Cambridge University Press.

- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2013). Strategies, modification and perspective in native speakers' requests: A comparison of WDCT and naturally occurring requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 53, 21-38.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farashaiyan, A., & Hua, T. K. (2012). A cross-cultural comparative study of gratitude strategies between Iranian and Malaysian postgraduate students. *Asian Social Science*, 8(7), 139-148.
- Hou, Y.-c. (2006). A Cross-cultural Study of the Perception of Apology—Effect of Contextual Factors, Exposure to the Target Language, Interlocutor Ethnicity and Task Language. Unpublished master's thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University, Taiwan.
- Ifantidou, E. (2014). *Pragmatic Competence and Relevance* (Vol. 245): John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jebahi, K. (2011). Tunisian university students' choice of apology strategies in a discourse completion task. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 648-662.
- Ji, S. (2008). What do paragraph divisions indicate in narrative texts? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(10), 1719-1730.
- Kashkouli, Z., & Eslamirasekh, A. (2013). The Effect of Context-External Factors on Context-Internal Factors in Apology Perception: A Case in Iranian Context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1590-1599.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second language research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 13(02), 215-247.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kousar, S. (2015). Politeness Orientation in Social Hierarchies in Urdu. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 3(2), 85-96.
- Lin, M.-F. (2014). An Interlanguage Pragmatic Study on Chinese EFL Learners' Refusal: Perception and Performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3), 642-653.
- Luo, X., & Gao, J. (2011). On Pragmatic Failures in Second Language Learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(3), 283-286.
- Maeshiba, N., & Yoshinaga, N. K. G. and Ross, S.(1996). Transfer and Proficiency in Interlanguage Apologizing. *Speech acts across cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 155-187.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2010). *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (Vol. 26): John Benjamins Publishing.
- McNamara, T. (2006). *Language testing: The social dimension* (Vol. 1): John Wiley & Sons.
- Mirzaei, A., Roohani, A., & Esmaeili, M. (2012). Exploring Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Variability in Speech Act Production of L2 Learners and Native Speakers. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 4(3), 79-102.
- Morkus, N. (2009). *The realization of the speech act of refusal in Egyptian Arabic by American learners of Arabic as a foreign language*. University of South Florida. Retrieved March 17, 2016 from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3113&context=etd>.

- Nakhle, M., Naghavi, M., & Razavi, A. (2014). Complaint Behaviors among Native Speakers of Canadian English, Iranian EFL Learners, and Native Speakers of Persian (Contrastive Pragmatic Study). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1316-1324.
- Nureddeen, F. A. (2008). Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 279-306.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behaviour. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2), 45-65.
- Rababah, G. (2003). Communication and linguistic problems facing Arab learners of English. *Indian journal of applied linguistics*, 29(1), 127-142.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209-232.
- Spencer-Oatey, H., & Franklin, P. (2014). *Intercultural interaction*: Wiley Online Library.
- Tabatabaei, S., & Farnia, M. (2015). Learner's English Proficiency and their Pragmatic Competence of Refusal Speech Acts. *Beyond Words*, 3(1), 53-77.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18(02), 189-223.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- Trosborg, A. (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (Vol. 7): Walter de Gruyter
- Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: sociolinguistics and TESOL*: Newbury House Publishers Cambridge.

## Ürdünlü ikinci dil konuşmacıları tarafından özür dileme söz edimi algısı üzerindeki sosyal gücün etkisi

### Öz

Bu çalışmada sosyal güç olarak, sosyal hiyerarşinin, 40 Ürdünlü İngilizce seviyeleri düşük olan kişi, anadili İngilizce olan 40 kişi (ENSs) , ve 40 Ürdünlü ikinci dil konuşmacısı (JL2S) tarafından özür dileme söz edimi algılanmasına etkilerinin araştırılması amaçlanmıştır. Üç katılımcı grubundan veri elde etmek için Söylem Tamamlama Testi (DCT) ve Ölçekli Yanıt Anketi (SRQ) kullanılmıştır. Veri analizi için tek yönlü ANOVA, post hoc çifti karşılaştırmaları istatistiksel testler kullanıldı. Ürdün Arapçası ve İngiliz İngilizcesi kültürleri arasındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar tespit edildi. Ürdünlü katılımcılar üzerinde sosyal gücün etkisi, ENS'lerden önemli ölçüde daha yüksek bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, üç grup arasında dört iç-iç değişkene ilişkin algılarına ilişkin anlamlı farklılıklar da bulunmuştur. Dahası, sonuçlar, JL2S'lerin İngilizce'de oldukça yetkin olmasına rağmen, yine de sosyo-pragmatik olarak negatif sosyo-pragmatik transfere yol açan gerekli sosyopragmatik yetkinlikten yoksun olduklarını göstermiştir. Çalışma, bazı pedagojik sonuçları, EFL kurs tasarımcılarının ve öğretmenlerinin Ürdün'de EFL müfredatı geliştirmek için fayda sağlayabileceklerini ve bu durumun JL2S'lerin hedef dil ile ilgili pragmatik bilgi eksikliğini giderebilecek ve kültürler arası pragmatik başarısızlığı azaltabileceğini gösterdi.

*Anahtar sözcükler:* Sosyal güç; algı; DCT; SRQ; pragmatik transfer

### **AUTHOR BIODATA**

Dr. Bilal Ayed Al-Khaza'leh is an assistant professor of English linguistics. He achieved his PhD in English linguistics from Islamic Sciences University of Malaysia (USIM), Malaysia, and MA in English linguistics from National University of Malaysia (UKM), Malaysia. His research interests include pragmatics, sociolinguistics, cultural studies as well as second language acquisition.