要　旨

The Realization of the Apology Speech Act
in English by Japanese Speakers :
Cross-Cultural Differences, Pragmatic Transfer,
and Pedagogical Implications

阿部　　瞳

The notion of "communicative competence" was first introduced by Hymes (1972). He maintained that speaker's knowledge of grammar is not sufficient for communicating appropriately in different situations with different interlocutors. His concept of communicative competence included not only the concept of usage and grammaticality but also the both grammar and sociocultural knowledge.

One of the important aspect of communicative competence is pragmatic competence. According to Wolfson (1989), pragmatic competence involves the ability to comprehend and produce socially appropriate language functions in discourse as well as linguistic or grammatical knowledge. Pragmatics is the study of communicative action in its sociocultural context. Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983) divided pragmatics into two components : pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Specifically, pragmalinguistics involves the study of linguistic means that convey illocutionary force and politeness values. Sociopragmatics, in turn, is related to socially appropriate linguistic behavior in relation to different local, cultural and social conditions. Interlanguage pragmatics is the study of non-native speakers' use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language. Previous studies in interlanguage pragmatics (Kasper & Rose, 1999 ; Cohen, 1996 ; Eliss, 1994 ; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993) have shown that differences and similarities exist in how to carry out communicative actions between language learners and native speakers of target languages.

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) defined "pragmatic transfer" as transfer of first

language (L1) sociocultural communicative competence in performing L2 speech acts or any other aspect of L2 conversation, where the speaker is trying to achieve a particular function of language. Pragmatic transfer can be either positive, which is considered evidence of sociocultural and pragmatic universality among languages, or negative, which shows inappropriate transfer of L1 linguistic norms into L2.

Thomas (1983) defined the term "pragmatic failure", which occurs where speech act strategies are in appropriately transferred from the L1 to L2. She identified two kinds of pragmatic failure : pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. She pointed out that "pragmalinguistic failure occurs when the pragmatic force mapped by the speaker onto a given utterance is systematically different from most frequently assigned to it by native speakers of the target language, or when conversational strategies are inappropriately transferred from the speaker's mother tongue to the target language" (p. 99). Sociopragmatic failure results from different cultural norms and pragmatic principles that govern linguistic behaviors in different cultures. Since speakers with different cultural backgrounds have different understandings of the appropriateness of linguistic behavior, there may be barriers to effective communication. As she pointed out, different cultures have different ways of thinking, rules of speaking, social values and place different relative weights on the pragmatic principles, and these cross-culturally different assessments of social parameters have negatively affected language users' linguistic choices, which finally result in sociopragmatic failure.

Speech acts are one of the key areas of linguistic pragmatics. Although the existence of speech acts is universal, the frequency and contents are culture-specific. Speech acts reflect the fundamental cultural values and social norms of a target language and demonstrate the rules of language use in a speech community. This study focused on the speech act of apology. An apology is the speech act that is insulting someone, or physically hurting another person unintentionally, seem to be universally accepted situations which call for an apology, yet different degrees of severity of the action, or different circumstances related to the behavior which results in the need to apologize, might call for different types of apologies and different intensities of such apologies in different cultures (Olshtain, 1983). The function of apology is to restore and maintain harmony between a speaker and hearer. People expect to

apologize when they think that they have violated social norms (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). Apologizing is not an easy matter in one's own language, and having to do it in a second or foreign language is even more complicated. That is why studying the way people apologize in different languages is important in order to understand the complexities of language.

Various apology pragmatic studies in many different languages in comparison with English have been carried out : Hebrew (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983 ; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985), Japanese (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990 ; Sugimoto, 1995), Jordanian Arabic (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006), Korean (Jung, 2004 ; Yang, 2002), and Venezuelan Spanish (Garcia, 1989). These studies showed learners' L2 proficiency and their native language's socio-cultural norms affect their use of apology strategies. Comparing American and Japanese styles of apology, Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990) found that "saying directly 'I'm sorry' was the most popular form of apology in both Japan and the U. S. In American apology, explaining the situation was the second most common choice, while doing something for the other person was the second most popular strategy used in Japanese apology. Sugimoto (1995) found that Japanese generated messages with more strategies than did Americans in their apology. More Americans than Japanese included accounts in their apology, while Japanese were more likely than Americans to employ strategies such as statement of remorse, reparation, compensation, promise not to repeat the same offense, and request for forgiveness.

In addition, findings of those studies showed contextual factors such as severity of offense, social status and social distance, and formal or private relationships influence speakers' choice of apology strategies. The more severe the offense, the more types of strategies were included in apology messages. Moreover, while both Americans and Japanese adjusted their apologies to the severity of offense, they seemed to differ in their preferred forms for different levels of severity (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990).

Despite these findings, more studies are needed to investigate cross-cultural and linguistic understanding of speech act of apologies. The investigation of the Japanese speech act of apology is important. When socio-cultural rules in the native language (L1) differ from those in the second language (L2), the learners' transferring of their cultural norms to the target culture of the L2 often causes misunderstanding or offense, resulting in communica-

tion breakdown (Wolfson, 1989). For language learners, mastering the correct use of L2 speech acts is important in acquiring L2 pragmatic competence.

The aims of this study were to investigate the differences and similarities between native and non-native realization of apology strategies in English and the existence of pragmatic transfer by Japanese EFL learners when making apologies. Specifically, the following research objectives were developed : 1) what apology strategies are frequently used by Japanese speakers in English and in Japanese, and by Americans in English ; 2) how Japanese junior high and high school English textbooks teach Japanese students to make apologies in English ; 3) how Americans evaluate Japanese apologies in English.

Study 1 indicated the apology strategies which used by Japanese in English and in Japanese, and Americans in English. The data were collected by means of a discourse completion test (DCT) which was scenarios that call for specific speech acts are presented to participants in written form. Participants responded in writing what they think they would actually say under the situations described in the scenarios. DCT would have weakness in terms of naturalistic way of gathering data, however it is still useful method in the field because it allows the collection of a large amount of data which reduces bias. Participants of this study were Doshisha Women's College students, 76 in English and 62 in Japanese, and 45 native-English speaking Americans. An English version and a Japanese version of a Discourse Completion Test were used to collect data from three groups. By comparing them, the results showed the differences and similarities between native and non-native realization of apology strategies in English and the existence of pragmatic transfer by Japanese EFL learners when making apologies.

The findings showed that the most often used strategies were direct expression of apologies both Japanese participants and American participants in English. Japanese speakers of English used the most formulaic expressions, for example, "sorry" or "I'm sorry". Americans used intensified expression of apology more frequently than Japanese. Japanese EFL learners need to understand that a very severe offense will require intensifiers and they should be appropriate for the situation. Japanese tended to use expressions of requesting forgiveness much more frequently than Americans, which sounded more formal for the situations when a speaker communicate with a close friend. They also used expressions such as

"Excuse me," and "I beg your pardon" in order to make it appropriately as in "I'm sorry."
Language proficiency was an important factor in pragmatic transfer. In addition, American
participants more frequently used acknowledgment of responsibility as indirect expression of
apologies than Japanese participant did. It is obvious that acquiring native English speakers'
preferred indirect expression of apology strategies helps Japanese English learners to smooth
communication in English.

Americans used a wide variety of combinations for apology strategies in comparison with
Japanese. Japanese 685 responses included 276 patterns of apology combinations. On the
other hand, American 439 responses included 244 patterns of apology combinations. The
more severe the offense was perceived to be by the speaker, the more number of categories
used in combinations of apology in both groups. The use of the explicit expression of apol-
ogy and intensified expression of apology were more observed as well. The frequency of in-
tensified expression of apologies was higher than in other situations of not-severe.

Both Japanese participants and American participants responded similarly using offer of
repair in the case of the situations in which the speakers considered that they needed to of-
fer a way to make up for. In those situations, both Japanese and Americans provided similar
specific offer, such as paying for the damage. Participants of both groups considered that
they needed to offer a way to make up for such consequences in order to maintain their re-
lationships.

Study 1 also compared the apology strategies by Japanese speakers in English and in
Japanese to find transfer from Japanese into English. Especially, the tendency to use the
strategy of expression of apology, concern for the interlocutor, and specific offer of repair
might indicate transfer of sociocultural norms when communicating in a second language.
In terms of specific offer of repair and concern for the interlocutor, the findings showed that
expressions which Japanese English speakers used in Japanese and in English were very
similar. It was obvious that Japanese EFL learners' choice of apology strategies in English
are influenced by their L1. It is necessary for Japanese EFL learners to acquire the linguistic
and pragmatic knowledge to make appropriate apologies in English.

Study 2 investigated how junior high school and high school English textbooks teach
making apologies in English to Japanese speakers. More apologies were found in the main

conversational sentences than in the book notes of the junior high school English textbooks. Same numbers of apologies were found in the main conversational sentences and book notes of the high school English textbooks.

There were limited variation of apology strategy in both junior high school and high school English textbooks. "Expression of apology ＋ explanation", "Expression of apology ＋ statement of the situation", and "Expression of apology" were commonly used in those textbooks. The use of intensifiers were rarely taught in Japanese EFL textbooks. These set patterns may be influential to students' knowledge about apologies. The responses of the DCT provided evidence that Japanese participants in English included a small repertoire of apology patterns in comparison with those of Americans.

The results of this study indicated the need for the Japanese junior high school and high school English textbooks to include more apology expressions in the conversational sentences. More various patterns of apology expressions help students to get knowledge of apology speech act in English. To communicate effectively, second language learners must acquire the sociocultural strategies used by native speakers of a target language as well as their vocabulary.

Study 3 presented the result of qualitative data analysis. This study investigated how native-English speaking Americans regard apologies with their socio-cultural norms and how they evaluate Japanese apologies in English. Participants of this study were 7 American native English speakers who were students in the Japanese Studies Program (JSP) at Doshisha Women's College.

Apology was also important for American English speakers and they viewed English apology and Japanese apology as social speech acts which serve a function in communication. They valued an apology in maintaining harmony and repair of offenses.

For the two sociolinguistic variables ; social distance and severity of offense, the findings from the data supported the findings from previous studies and the DCT data. Most of the American participants agreed that different relationship types have an effect on the apologies they produce. They varied apology strategies to match with the relationship, such as distant, neutral, and close. In addition, Americans used different apology patterns in relation to severity of offense : The more severe the offense was, the more possible expression of

apology would be accompanied by other indirect apology strategies such as acknowledgment of responsibility and offer of repair. These results demonstrated that the choice of apology strategies of American English speakers is determined by social variation such as social distance and also type of offense.

American participants evaluated Japanese apologies in English as appropriate on the whole. However, some were judged as too much, and others were judged as not sufficient according to the situations. It seemed better to adjust apology strategy to the situation accompanying the strategy such as explanation or offer of repair to make an apology. These results indicated that Japanese EFL learners need to understand clearly in selecting apology strategies appropriately for different contexts.

Comparing the similarities and differences of Japanese apologies in English and in Japanese and American apologies in English can improve Japanese EFL learners' communication skills in English. The findings of this study provide insight into the functions of apologies produced by Japanese and Americans and which promote better understanding of crosscultural speech act of apology. In addition, it is my hope that the results will be useful to teachers and materials developers by providing insight into the problems that Japanese students have in their realization of apologies.