

A study of Apology Strategies in English: A case study on Jordanian and Asian Undergraduate Students at Zarqa University

Ibrahim Fathi Huwari

Department of English Language and Literature, College of Arts
Zarqa University, Jordan

Abstract

This study investigates the similarities and differences of the speech act of apology in English between Jordanian EFL learners (English as a Foreign Learners) and Asian undergraduate students at Zarqa University (ZU). It aims to understand the culture difference between Jordanian and the Asian speech communities that both learners utilize when confronting apology situations. The researcher used an interview technique to gather the data. Data collected using a modified version of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) developed by Sugimoto (1997). Subjects of the study included six Jordanian undergraduate students and six Asian undergraduate students. There were 10 situations used in the study developed by Sugimoto's (1997). The findings in this study introduced the similarities and differences of the apologizing strategies used by Jordanian undergraduate students and Asian undergraduate students. It found that the most frequently apology strategies used among the Jordanian and the Asian participants were account, and compensation. It shows also gratitude is less used among Asian participants when apologize by equal and lower status person. In regarding to that, the findings of this study are expected to be used in intercultural comparisons studies. This research hopes that tutors should be aware of their own culture and the cultures of their students to make this cultural training more successful. Learners should learn apologizing strategies in such a way to capture their semantics meaning as well as pragmatic use in order to employ them appropriately.

Key words: apology, apologizing strategies, discourse completion task, Asian ESL learners and Jordanian EFL learners, speech act

Cite as: Huwari, I. F. (2018) A study of Apology Strategies in English: A case study on Jordanian and Asian Undergraduate Students at Zarqa University. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (1). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no1.24>

1. Introduction

Communication breakdowns can happen when we communicate with people from different language backgrounds or cultures. Damen (1998) claims that miscommunication of the intercultural is due to the difference of the value system that underline each speaker's culture group. Such difference reflects in speech acts. Austin (1962) explains speech acts as "acts performed by utterances such as giving orders, making promises or expressing regrets" (p. 2). They can be directed or undirected utterances that serve a function in communication. To communicate is to express certain behaviours, and the kinds of speech act which being performed correspond to the kinds of behaviour being expressed. For instance, apology expresses regret.

Apology is quite important because it may guide us to understand individual's everyday communication (Alfattah, 2010). Apologizing needs an action to set things between the apologizer and the recipient of the apology as well as understand the reactions of the apologizers. Faces reactions is also important in apologizing to show the support or threatened. It can be a motivating fact for an individual to offer an apology. Speakers need, power relationship and social distance are related to the use of apologies (Wouk, 2006).

In this study, Sugimoto's (1997) ten strategies were used as guideline because the researcher believes that these are the most suitable strategies for EFL learners in general, and specifically in Jordanian cultural context which are: the statement of remorse, accounts, damage, compensation, promise not to repeat offense, assessment of responsibility, contextualization, self-castigation, and gratitude.

The number of Asian students who study in Jordan are increased (Mohe, 2016). This, because of this reason, the research is going to fulfill this gap to highlight the strategies of apologies. The results of this study is useful to discover the apologies strategies among Jordanian and Asian students which are differ in their cultures, as well as helping the policy makers to focus on international students in Jordan in term of apology. At the same time, it explains to the Asian students about the Jordanian strategies of apologizing to increase their understanding of the cultural view.

Studies on apology strategies discussed in Western languages such as (Goody, 1978; Coulmas, 1981; Holmes, 1989; Trosborg, 1995; and Lazare, 2006). While, very few studies was done in the Arabic context such as (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Hussein & Hammouri, 1998; Nureddeen, 2008) in which few studies have been done on both Arabian and Asian context. In their academic environment, Arab EFL students encounter a problem in using the speech act of apology especially when communicating in the target language either at formal or informal levels. In addition to that, the estimation of the subjects to the social context and the degree of offence is not taken into consideration when studying the speech act of apology in the Arabic context. This calls for a study to fill this gap in literature to understand the expression of apology among Jordanian EFL students and Asian students at ZU.

2. Past Studies

Apology is a part of language relationships. Very few studies discuss the difference between Jordanian and other cultures like Malaysia. In this reviewed, the studies below found the

comparison between Jordanian and American apologies. For example, Hussein and Hammouri (1998) discuss the similarities and differences between Americans and Jordanian apology. The participants were 50 male Jordanian students and 50 female students at Yarmouk University, while the American students were 40 participants. The findings of the study found that Jordanian speakers were more varied than Americans do. It shows that Jordanian students used 12 strategies and American used seven strategies. In this research, the writer discovered the similarities and differences of using apology strategies among Jordanian and other nation.

Several studies have been done on the apologies strategies such as (Al-Hami, 1993; Alfattah, 2010; Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Banikalef & Marlyna, 2013; Uгла & Zainol Abidin, 2016; Maros, 2006; Tun Nur Hamizahbt & Paramasivam, 2013; Thasanee, 1998; Wouk, 2006). However, very few studies have discussed both the similarities and differences between Jordanian and Asian participants' on the apologize strategies. Thus, these types of studies are useful to recognize the cross-cultural features in term of apology. For example, studies on Arabic context investigate the apology strategies used by both nations Arab learners of English and native speakers of English.

In the Arab context, a study was done by Alfattah (2010) investigates the apology strategies among 314 Yemeni EFL Arab university students based on the pragmatic point of view. The researcher used questionnaire to collect his data which is a modified version of 'Discourse Completion Tests. The findings of the study showed that Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) strategy was the most frequent used among the participants. Even though this study investigated the strategies but it didn't compare it with the way Asian response. This study will highlight on both ways of responses, Jordanian as well as Asians.

Uгла & Zainol Abidin (2016) conduct another study on the strategies of apology used by Iraqi EFL students. Mixed method used in this research, which was questionnaire and interview students in both universities (Al-Yarmouk University College and University of Diyala). The researchers collected their data from 55 Iraqi EFL students using DCTQ as well as interviewing 12 students. This study discovers that Iraqi EFL learners use different apology strategies. The participants were aware of using adequate apology forms to meet the requirements of specific situations. This study is significant, and the researchers suggest to do other research to compare between Arab learners and other nations.

In the Jordanian context, a researcher from Jordan investigated the Jordanian apologies. Bataineh & Bataineh, (2006) used a questionnaire based on Sugimoto's (1997) to investigate the apology strategies. The sample was 100 university students. They found that both gender "male and female" Jordanian EFL university students used the primary strategies such as the statement of remorse, accounts, compensation, promise not to repeat offense, and reparation. The respondents used non-apology strategies such as blaming victim and brushing off the incident as unnecessary to exonerate them from blame. The findings revealed that both gender differed used the primary strategies. In addition, female respondents chose the non-apology strategies that moved towards avoiding the discussion of offense while male respondents used those which moved towards blaming the victim. This study will shed some light on difference and the similarities of using apology strategies among Jordanian and Asian students.

Another study done by Banikalef & Marlyna (2013) focus on the relationship between the social beliefs and the realization of apologies among 40 Jordanian EFL male graduate students studying in Malaysia. The researchers use A DCT and a semi-structured interview to collect data. The researchers apply Cohen and Olshtain's (1981) models of apologies. The results of the study show the most strategies used which were Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) and accepting responsibility. The researchers have also found new strategies such as being arrogant and ignorant, blaming someone/something else, or swearing. The researchers have also found that selecting an apology strategy affected by social determinants more than social distance.

On other side, an example of Asian society, a study done by Tun Nur Hamizahbt & Paramasivam (2013). The researchers investigate the most frequent strategies used of apologies. The respondents of this study were twenty students. The researchers use a DCT questionnaire of six situations to collect the data. The findings of the study showed that three main strategies were used which are expression of apology, explanations or reasons for the offence and offers, and repairs.

In Asian context, a study done by Thasanee (1998) investigates the apology strategies among Thai speakers to discover the relationship between these strategies and offense weightiness. The participants were 50 Thai speakers from different occupational backgrounds. The researcher used Discourse Completion Test. The researcher found five strategies among Thai students which are explicit expression, accepting blames, giving excuses, offering repairs, and efforts to please the addressee.

To conclude, the researcher has noted that there are a lot of research on apology strategies among the Western languages, while on the other hand, Arab context have not been fully studied. EFL Arab learners showed previously a problem in using the apology of speech act in both formal and informal situation. This leads the researcher to try to fill this gap in the literature to understand the expression of apology among Jordanian EFL students.

3. Research Questions

The following question guided this study: What are the similarities and the differences in the apology strategies employed by Jordanian and Asian undergraduate students?

4- Methodology

4.1 Research design

This study is a qualitative case study to enable the researcher to understand the strategies of apology used By Jordanian and Asian students at ZU. A qualitative research methodology used for the following reasons: (1) To explore a problem which is little known and (2) To give a detailed understanding of a central problem (Creswell, 2005). A very limited number of studies on apologizing studies have been done on Jordanian and Asian students. In fact, a contrastive study between Jordanian and Asian students are very few. The researcher adopted purposeful sampling which refers to "those cases from which one learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research" (Patton, 1990, p.169). This study used purposeful sampling strategy to "intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon" (Creswell 2005, p: 204). In this study, the central phenomena were apologizing strategies.

Homogeneous sampling used in this study which means that “the researcher purposefully samples individuals or sites based on membership in a subgroup that has defining characteristics” (Creswell, 2005, p. 208). The site of this study is Jordanian and Asian students at ZU.

4.2 Participants

In this study, the subjects were known as participants. The participants consisted of six Jordanian undergraduate students and six Asian undergraduate students. The participants were doing their bachelor degree in various majors such as Islamic, Arabic and English studies at Zarqa University. The researcher was interesting to discover the similarities and the differences in the apology strategies among both Jordanian and Asian students because the researcher obtained his master and PhD degrees from Asian universities. Then the researcher tries to do his research at this particular university "Zarqa University" because he is a lecturer at that university and he becomes close with Asian students. The researcher chose only 6 participants from Asian and Jordanian students those who are studying in Zarqa University in Jordan. The Asian students were from different countries such as 4 students from Thailand, 1 student from Malaysia and 1 student from China.

4.3 Data Collection

In this study, the researcher collected his data on the 1st semester in 2016-2017. Data collected by using an adapted Discourse Completion Task and interviews. The Discourse Completion Task (DCT) is an open-ended questionnaire developed by Sugimoto (1997). It consists of 10 situations, which require an apology. However, in this study the researcher posed the 10 situations verbally to the participants in order to get their responses. Besides the adapted DCT, the researcher used a semi-structured interview to seek the apologizing strategies used by them. Semi-structured interview involves the preparation of an interview as a guide, which serves as a guide to the questions, or issues that explore during an interview. The researcher had also probed questions to the participants during the interview. Probing used to get the participants to explain their actions in responding to the ten situations.

4.4 Data analysis

The data analyzed by using coding to get the similarities and differences of the types of strategy used by the participants. According to Creswell, (2005, p:237), the coding process is "to make sense out of the text data, divide it into text or image segments, label the segments with code, examine codes for overlap and redundancy, and collapse these codes into broad themes".

The researcher followed few steps in analyzing the data. First, the researcher had to rewind the tapes several times while transcribing the data. The researcher wrote word by word used by the participants when responding to ten situations. Then the researcher coded the data into different types of apology strategy employed by the participants in relation to the ten situations. Next, the researcher grouped similar types of strategy employed by the participants and also grouped the different types of strategy employed by them. The researcher repeated the same process for the two groups of student.

To check the internal validity of this study the researcher used member checks. The researcher took two transcribed data to two participants to confirm or disconfirm any themes or

patterns that emerged from the data. Interviews for this study took place at the faculty for both Asian and Jordanian students. Then the data read to develop categories, and to find themes and patterns; these categories developed into subcategories. Coding used for each category and subcategory. The frequency count on the units was done to observe any patterns that might develop from the data.

5. Findings and Discussion

This following discussion presented an analysis of the apologizing strategies used by Jordanian undergraduate students and Asian undergraduate students at ZU. The analysis of data presents the distribution of the subjects' responses to the apologizing strategies that used. Sugimoto's (1997) strategies used as the basis of the analysis. Percentages used to explain the occurrences of apology strategies employed followed by citing the exact words on utterances made by the participants to show examples. The following question guided this study: What are the similarities and the differences in the apology strategies employed by Jordanian undergraduate students and Asian undergraduate students?

5.1. Apology strategies used by Jordanian undergraduate participants

Tables 1 and 2 display information on strategies that were employed the situations posed, total number of strategies employed in relation to the 10 situations and the percentages.

Table 1. Apology Strategies Used by Jordanian Undergraduate Participants

	Strategy										Situations	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	Percentage
Account	4	4	3	1	4	1	2	1	1	6	27	45%
Compensation	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	3	-	8	13.33%
Reparation	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	5	8.33%
Assessment of responsibilities												
Positive	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	5	8.33%
Negative	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	3.33%
Self-castigation	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	5	8.33%
Blaming Victim	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	3.34%
Showing lack of intent to do harm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	3.33%
Asking victim not to be angry.	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%

Brushing off incident as not-important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1.67%
Denial	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%
Statement of remorse	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%

Interviews are shown in Appendix A.

In their attempts to respond to the 10 situations given in the interview, Jordanian undergraduate participants used the following apology strategies:

5.1.1 Analysis of Apology Strategies Used by Jordanian Participants

1. **Accounts**. Refer to the wrongdoer or the participant telling about what has happened (Sugimoto, 1997). Accounts were the most frequently strategy mentioned by Jordanian participants. 45% of the situations (n=27), Jordanian participants used accounts in response to all situations, as shown in the following example:

I'll explain it to the tutor.

I'll give them the reason why I came late.

2. **Compensation**. Means that the wrongdoer or participant offers to replace the damaged object or pay for it (Sugimoto, 1997). It was the second most frequently strategy mentioned by the participants. 13.33% of the situations (n=8), Jordanian participants used compensation in response to items 1, 2, 6,7 and 9. the participants produced utterances such as:

I broke your umbrella and will buy you a new one.

I broke your, I pod so I will buy you a new one.

3. **Reparation** means that the participant tries to repair the damage he/she has affected on others (Sugimoto, 1997). Reparation was the third most frequently used strategy mentioned by the participants In 8.33% of the situations (n=5), specifically situations 4 and 8, some Jordanian participants promised to repair the injury done, examples of utterances used by the participants are:

I will rewrite the paper for you.

I will try to repair your umbrella.

4. **Assessment of responsibility** means that the participant attempts to describe his or her role and responsibility (Sugimoto, 1997). In this strategy, assessment of responsibility could be divided into two types as suggested by Bataineh & Bataianeh (2006)

- Positive assessment of responsibility: it refers to the participant's admission of having committing the act in questions. In 8.33% of the situations (n=5) in response to situations 4, 5, 6 and 7, Jordanian participants expressed their responsibility in those situations. For example:

I will buy new CDs for them if I lost it.

- Negative assessment of responsibility: it refers to the participant's denial of being responsible for acting in questions. In 3.33% of the situations (n=2), Jordanian participants denied any responsibility or blamed others for the deed. Examples of responses to situation 5, and 7.

It was an accident your paper got erased.

5. **Self-Castigation.** Refers to the wrongdoer or participant claims responsibility for what has happened and is being hard on himself or herself (Sugimoto, 1997). In 8.33% of the situations (n=5), Jordanian participants resorted to self-castigation in which the participant criticized his or her own behavior, in as situations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9. For example:

It's my fault; I forget to give you your homework.

6. **Showing lack of intent on harm doing.** It refers to the participants who feel denying their intention to harm the offended (Batianeh & Batianeh, 2006). 3.33% of the situations (n=2), Jordanian participants like to deny their intent on harming the victim in response to situation 8. For example:

I did not mean to do that with your Ipod.

7. **Brushing off incident as unimportant.** Refers to the participants to ask the offended to forget the incident since whatever happened was not worth the attention it was getting (Batianeh & Batianeh 2006). 1.67% of the situations (n=1), Jordanian participants asked the victim to forget the incident in situations 6 and 9. For example

Don't make it so hard, it's nothing.

8. **Asking victim not to be angry.** Refers to that the wrongdoer or participant asked the offended not to be angry (Batianeh & Batianeh, 2006). In table, only one Jordanian participant asked the victim not to be angry. 1.67% of the situations (n=1) this strategy was used in situation 4. For example:

Please, don't be mad I don't return it for you.

9. **Blaming victim.** It refers to the participants who blamed the offended for what happened (Batianeh & Batianeh, 2006). The table above shows us the response to situations 3, 6 and 7, in which the Jordanian participants blamed the victim for what happened. The percentage of this strategy is 3.34% of the situations (n=2) as exemplified in expressions such as:

You should wake me up as I told you.

10. **Denial.** Refers to the participant who denied being responsible for something damaged or broken (Batianeh & Batianeh, 2006). The table above has shown us that the Jordanian participants don't use denial strategy in common. In response to situation 3, only one Jordanian participant denied what he did. So this result marked the lowest percentage, 1.67%, as shown in table 1. For example:

It's not my fault because you didn't speak clearly.

11. **Statement of remorse.** Refers to the wrongdoer or participant who acknowledges that he or she has done something wrong (Sugimoto, 1997). It is the lowest percentage in apology strategies, Jordanian participants used 1.67%. Examples are:

It is my mistake and I will try to repair this mistake with lecturer.

I feel guilty about what I have done with your paper.

5.2. Apology strategies used by Asian undergraduate participants

In their attempts to respond to the situations, Asian undergraduate respondents used the following apology strategies:

Table 2. Apology Strategies Used by Asian Undergraduate Participants

	Strategy										Situations	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	Percentage
Account	1	-	3	3	6	2	2	1	1	4	23	38.33%
Compensation	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	10	16.66%
Brushing off incident as not-important	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	8	13.33%
Reparation	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	3	-	-	6	10%
Blaming victim	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	5%
Assessment of responsibilities												
Positive	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	3	5%
Negative	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%
Self-castigation	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	3.33%
Statement of remorse	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%
Offending victim	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1.67%
Denial	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.67%

In their attempts to respond to the 10 situations given in the interview, Asian participants used the following apology strategies:

5.2.1 Analysis of Apology Strategies Used by Asian Participants

1. **Accounts.** The most common strategy used by Asian undergraduate students is the account strategy to account for what has been done. 38.33% of the situations (n=23), Asian participants used accounts in response to all situations, as in the following example:

I forgot your homework and I'm going to explain it to the lecturer.

2. **Compensation.** It was the second common strategy used by Asian participants. 16.67% of the situations (n=10), Asian participants used compensation in responses to situations 1, 2, 9 and 10. Examples of which are listed below.

I broke your umbrella and will buy you a new one.

I am sorry, I can not go but still I'm going to pay for the ticket.

3. Brushing off incident as unimportant. It is a common strategy used by Asian students. 13.33% of the situations (n=8), Asian participants asked the victim to forget the incident in situations 2, 3, 4,5,6,7 and 8. For example:

I met friend accident he or she need me more than the others more than the meeting more than the members of this meeting group

4. Reparation. In 10% of the situations (n=6), in response to situations 4, 6 and 8, some Asian participants promised to repair the injury done, as in the following example:

I'm sorry, I'm going to try and retrieve it Which I deleted it accidentally, I'm going to retrieve the document for you or I'm going to redo the document for you.

5. Blaming victim. The Asian participants used this strategy in some situations. In response to situations 1, 3, and 9, Asian participants blamed the victim for what had happened in 5% of the situations (n=3), using expressions such as:

I don't care I say that, that is not my fault because you are the person who. You didn't call me you didn't remind me remind me

6. Assessment of responsibility.

- Positive assessment of responsibility. In 5% of the situations (n=3) in response to situations 7 and 8, Asian participants expressed their responsibility in those situations. For example:

I would say that it was not supposed to happen like that. I believed it was miscommunication and I'm sure next time I'll be more understandable so that will be no more miscommunication, yea.

- Negative assessment of responsibility. In 1.67% of the situations (n=1), Asian participants denied any responsibility or blamed others for the misdeed. Examples to situation 7 are:

It was an accident your paper got erased.

I say that you are a press liar, aha because you should have come but because you are full enough to give me a good message then that's it. The reason for we fail to meet

7. Self-Castigation. 3.33% of the situations (n=3), Asian participants resorted to self-castigation in which the participants criticized his behavior in situations 6 and 8, such as:

I'm really sorry, it is very bad and because this some thing you erased you cannot get back and I will feel very, very guilty. And I have to really say I'm really sorry.

8. Statement of remorse. The Asian participants expressed their remorse to what had happened in 3.33% of the situations (n=3); situations 2,3 and 4. For example:

I'm very sorry, some how that I had failed to return his or her paper because something happened and I really apologize so I say I'm sorry.

9. Offending victim. This strategy was not common among the Asian participants. The percentage is very low. 1.67% of the situations (n=1), only one Asian participant employed this strategy in situation number 7. For example:

I say that you are a press liar, aha because you should have come but because you are full enough to give me a good message then that's it. The reason for we fail to meet

10 **Denial**. This strategy was not common among the Asian participants. The percentage is very low. In response to situation 2, only one Asian participant denied what he did. This marked the lowest percentage, 1.67%. For example:

I say that the Ipod already broke; I receive that Ipod not in good condition, that's it. That's what I'm going to say, I'm not going to apologize

Table.3. A Summary of Apology Strategies Used by Jordanian and Asian Undergraduate Students

Strategy	Jordanian		Asian	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Account	27	45%	23	38.33%
Compensation	8	13.33%	10	16.67%
Reparation	5	8.33%	6	10%
Brushing off incident as not important	1	1.67%	8	13.33%
Self-castigation	5	8.33%	3	3.33%
Blaming victim	2	3.34%	3	5%
Assessment of responsibility				
Positive	5	8.33%	3	5%
Negative	3	3.33%	1	1.67%
Showing lack of intent to do harm	2	3.33%	-	-
Statement of remorse	1	1.67%	2	3.33%
Denial	1	1.67%	1	1.67%
Asking victim not to be angry	1	1.67%	-	-
Offending victim	-	-	1	1.67%

The most common used by both Jordanian students (45%) and Asian students (38.33%) are account strategy. The second common strategy by the two groups of participants is compensation, Jordanian participants (13.33%), and while the Asian participants (16.67%). Then the third common strategy used by the Jordanian groups of participants was reparation strategy; Jordanian participants (8.33%), but the Asians' strategy's used as the third one was brushing off incident as not important percentage was (13.33%).

This study is in line with various studies in regarding to the strategies of apology. A study done by Hussein & Hammouri (1998) discovered that Jordanian and American students used varied strategies than American used such as 1) apology expressions (2) explanation or account. (3) responsibility. (4) repair. (5) promise of forbearance. (6) expressing concern for hearers, while this study used almost the same strategies.

This finding seems to support studies done by Al-Hami (1993) on Arab students. There are some strategies used in this study and the same in his study such as offering of repair, account and assessment or acknowledgement of responsibility strategies were used in both studies. Another study was done by Thasanee (1998) was used one of apologizing strategy is the same of this strategy "offering of repair". Also, the results of this study is similar to another study done by Uгла & Zainol Abidin (2016) on Iraqi students.

On the other hand, a study was done by Alfattah (2010) investigates the apology strategies among 314 Yemeni EFL Arab university students based on the pragmatic point of view. Alfattah results show that (IFID) strategy was the most frequent used among the participants. While this study is very different, it shows that the most strategy used by Jordanian and Asian students was account, followed by Compensation.

Various studies such as (Al-Hami, 1993; Alfattah, 2010; Bataineh, and Bataineh, 2006; Banikalef & Marlyna, 2013; Uгла & Zainol Abidin, 2016; Maros, 2006; Tun Nur Hamizahbt & Paramasivam, 2013; Thasanee, 1998; and Wouk, 2006) were in line with the strategies that used by their participants. This study used the same strategies with different percentage. However, there are other studies used different types of apologizing strategies done by the researchers as we have seen that in section two.

6. Conclusion

It found that the most frequently apology strategies used among the Jordanian and the Asian participants were account, and compensation. There are similarities between the ways of apologizing strategies made by Jordanian participants and Asian participants. For example, apology in both cultures is considered to maintain the social equilibrium in the sense that the participant, as being ashamed of what he or she has done, wants or asks to be forgiven by his or her friend. Differences on the other hand, reflect culture-specific and context specific uses, which are governed by the norms and value of speech community. Accordingly, we should be aware of these cultural norms and values and how they operate in different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

7. Implications of the Study

According to Hussein & Hammouri (1998), the main goal of foreign language teaching and learning is to create and develop the learners' communicative competence in their target language.

Moreover, learners' cultural should know other people's culture to avoid communication breakdowns with other speakers.

The fact that strategies of apologize are cultural specific requires a special orientation in the instruction between language. Culture-specific patterns must be taught side by side with vocabulary and other aspects of language. Tutors' awareness and understanding of their own culture and the cultures of their students would inevitably make this cultural training more successful. Learners should learn apologizing strategies in such a way to capture their semantics meaning as well as pragmatic use in order to employ them appropriately

The role of teacher is to provide with appropriate methods of assisting language learners to acquire them. However, when planning for teaching apologizing strategies with their cultural patterns, tutor may follow a sequence such as introducing students to the linguistic strategies, have students interpret them, asks students to develop appropriate ways of responding taking into account the culture situations as well as the possible areas of sociolinguistics interference.

Acknowledgement

This research is funded by the Deanship of Research in Zarqa University, Jordan.

About the Author:

Dr. Ibrahim Fathi Huwari is an assistant professor of Applied Linguistics at the department of English language and literature at Zarqa University, Jordan. He obtained his postgraduate studies from University Utara Malaysia. His interest are socio-linguistics, psych-linguistics, pragmatics, and apprehension.

References

- Al- Hami, F. (1993). Forms of Apology Used by Jordanian Speakers of EFL: A *Cross- Cultural Study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Jordan.
- Alfattah, M., H., A. (2010). Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University Students. *MJAL* 2(3). 223-249.
- Austin, J., L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. II ed. 1975.
- Banikalef, A. & Marlyna., M (2013). Social beliefs for the realization of the speech acts of apology among Jordanian EFL graduate students. *English Linguistic Research*, 2(1). Pp. 134-145.
- Bataineh, R.F and Bataineh, R.F. (2006). Apology Strategies of Jordanian EFL university students. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(11). 1901-1927.
- Creswell (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 2nd (ed). University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Pearson Education International
- Cohen, E. & Olshtain. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence the case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31 (1). 113-134.
- Coulmas, F. (1981). Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech. Walter de Gruyter.
- Damen, L. 1998. *Cultural learning: The fifth dimension in the language classroom*. Reading,

- MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Goody, E, N. (1978). *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, J (1989). Sex Differences and Apologies: One Aspect of Communicative Competence, *Applied Linguistics*, 10.194- 213.
- Hussein, R.F., & Hammouri, M.T. (1998). Strategies of apology in Jordanian Arabic and American English. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 49. 37-50.
- Lazare, A. (2006). Apology in medical practice: an emerging clinical skill. *JAMA*, 11.
- Maros, M. (2006). Apology in English by Adult Malay Speaker Patterns and Competence. University Kebangsaan Malaysia. *Journal of Language, Society and Culture*. 19.1-19
- Mohe. (2016). The Annual Statistics Report on Higher Education in Jordan for the year 2015-2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.mohe.gov.jo/ar/pages/Statistics.aspx>
- Nureddeen, F, A. (2298). Cross cultural pragmatics: apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 40 (2). Pp. 279-306.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Olshtain, E & Cohen, A.D. (1981). "Apology: a speech act set". In: Nessa Wolfson and E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 18-35.
- Sugimoto, N. (1997). A Japan-U.S. comparison of apology styles. *Journal of Communication*.
- Thasanee, M. (1998). *The Speech Act of Apologizing in Thai*. (<http://www.arts.chula.ac.th/~ling/abs/1998thasanee.htm>)
- Tun Nur Hamizahbt, M. & Paramasivam., M. (2013). Apology Strategies by Malay Learners of English in a Malaysian University. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(10). 1-14
- Trosborg, A. (1995) *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*, 7, Walter de Gruyter.
- Ugla., R., L. & Zainol Abidin., M., J. (2016). A Study of Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL University Students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)* 5(1), pp. 32-38.
- Wouk, F (2006). Strategies of apologizing in Lombok Indonesia. . *Journal of Pragmatics* 2 (2). 277-311

Appendix A 'situations'

Dear Respondent,

The researcher is conducting a study entitled contrastive study into Apology strategies between Jordanian undergraduate students and Asian undergraduate students. You are kindly requested to answer the items of the interview carefully and accurately.

Thank You.
The Researcher

I. General Information:

Major:..... **Nationality:**.....

II. Please respond to these questions as realistically and honestly as possible.

1. You borrowed an umbrella from your best friend, and the wind broke it beyond repair. What do you say?
.....
2. You have made plans to go to a concert with your friends; you could not make it and you still owe them money for the ticket. What would you say to them?
.....
3. You showed up an hour late for a group trip on mid- semester break. What do you say to the students traveling with you?
.....
4. You have borrowed a classmate's homework, submitted yours and failed to return his/hers. What do you say?
.....
5. You didn't show up for a meeting due to a friend's accident. What do you say to the student; who was supposed to meet with you?
.....
6. You borrowed a CD from your roommate and did not return it for three weeks. What do you say to him/her?
.....
7. You failed to meet a friend at the hotel due to miscommunication. What do you say to him/her?
.....
8. You were playing with your friend's computer and erased the important paper s/he had been working on for the past two weeks. What do you say to him/her?
.....
9. You borrowed your brother's/sister's ipod and broke it. What do you say to him/her?
.....
10. You cancelled a club meeting and inconvenienced all the members of the club. What do you say to them?
.....