2018-07-01

Backward Transfer of Apology Strategies from Japanese to English: Do English L1 Speakers Use Japanese-Style Apologies When Speaking English?

Candice April Flowers
Brigham Young University

Backward Transfer of Apology Strategies from Japanese to English:

Do English L1 Speakers Use Japanese-Style Apologies

When Speaking English?

Candice April Mary Flowers

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Dan P. Dewey, Chair
Steve J. Moody
Jennifer Bown
Shinsuke Tsuchiya

Department of Linguistics and English Language

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

Backward Transfer of Apology Strategies from Japanese to English:
Do English L1 Speakers Use Japanese-Style Apologies
When Speaking English?

Candice April Mary Flowers
Department of Linguistics and English Language, BYU
Master of Arts

When learning a second language, there are elements of a learner's native language that can transfer and are exhibited during production in the second language. This can extend not only to the way things are said but even to gestures that are language- and speech-act-specific. However, there is evidence that the same can occur backwards, that is to say that elements of a second language can be exhibited during production of one's native language (Pavlenko and Jarvis, 2002).

This study focuses on English L1 learners of Japanese who have spent significant time both in country and learning the language to see if they exhibit Japanese tendencies when performing apologies in their native English. Comparisons between those with no Japanese experience were made with those who had extensive Japanese experience. Through video recordings of 45 participants engaging in six apology-induced scenarios (non-Japanese, n=24; Japanese, n=21), the participants showed that backward transfer occurs with repetition of IFIDs and nonverbal cues. Further research through different methods can be more telling.

Keywords: pragmatics, backward transfer, apologies, nonverbal cues, Japanese, L1, L2, transfer

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank so many wonderful people who helped me along this journey. First, I'd like to thank my chair, Dr. Dan Dewey for his guidance, patience, and unwavering support throughout this whole process. A special thanks goes to my other committee members who provided invaluable insights and support as well, Dr. Jennifer Bown, Dr. Steve Moody, and Dr. Shinsuke Tsuchiya.

To my wonderful friends Elena, John, Ksenia, Brett, and Natalie, I thank you for helping me make it through graduate school and for your friendship.

To my dear coworkers, thank you for putting up with my crazy school schedule and helping me by encouraging me and checking in on me to make sure I got things done.

Lastly, to my family. Their unending support and love provided me with the greatest strength to accomplish this paper. I'm thankful for their encouragement of my pursuits.

Table of Contents

Index of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Transfer of specific elements, namely speech acts, from one language into a second language (L2) is an area of linguistics that has become more widely studied (Pavlenko and Jarvis, 2002; Cook, 2003). Those who have learned a second language themselves can attest to having said or done something in the second language that comes from their native or first language. A prevalent way to look at how transfer occurs is to look at language use itself. Researchers have looked at specific speech acts such as requests (Su, 2010; Kanik, 2011), refusals (Tavakoli and Shirinbaksh, 2014; Moody, 2011), compliments (Cao, 2016) and apologies (Valkova, 2014; Chang, 2010) since their use can differ from one culture to the next.

Researchers studying second language acquisition have often looked at relationships between the first language (L1) and a second language (L2). Specifically, they look at unidirectional transfer of elements from a native L1 into the learned L2 (Brown and Gullberg, 2008; Su, 2012; and Tavakoli and Shirinbakhsh, 2014). However, these researchers also mention that not enough research has been done to show that transfer can be bidirectional.

Previous research has shown that backward transfer can occur (Sugimoto, 1998a; Ewert and Bromberek-Dyzman, 2008; Kondo, 1997). More exposure to a second language influences the native language upon returning to the native environment (Shardakova, 2005; Sato, 2012; Warga and Schölmberger 2007). The extent to which one engages in a second language environment (i.e. cultural exposure) --including how one learned the second language-- also affects the potential transfer of verbal and nonverbal elements (Kharkhurin, 2008).

To look at backwards transfer, it is important to pick a specific speech act to use as a medium in helping to see if backward transfer can occur. For the purposes of the present paper, this study focuses on apologies.

An apology is usually expected to be given after some sort of social breakdown--or the violation of social norm-- has occurred. The term 'apology' is defined differently according to what exactly is being studied. For this study, the definition given by Goffman (1971) is used. He states that apologies restore social harmony between two parties after a social breakdown has occurred and they are used to admit responsibility, express remorse, and ask forgiveness (Park and Guan, 2009). Apologies range in severity based on what type of violation has occurred (Cohen and Olshtain, 1985; Deutschmann, 2003). As an example, there is a difference between how one apologizes for accidentally bumping into someone on the street versus saying something offensive to someone (Lieske, 2010; Butler, 2001). Social status of the person(s) involved can also impact the type of apology given, as in Japanese where *sumimasen* is more likely to be used with those of similar or lower status versus *moushiwake arimasen* for those of higher status (Matsumoto, 1988). These were also taken into consideration while examining the data.

The purpose of this paper is to add to the growing amount of research done on pragmatics and pragmatic acquisition in a second language but, more specifically, apology strategies in a second language. This study will contribute more information on backward transfer of speech acts. It also helps to highlight the relationship between culture and apology (Park and Guan, 2009). Japanese apology strategies vary from English in more than just language; nonverbal cues can vary as well (Brown, 2008; Jungheim, 2004). There is also status to consider since it plays key role in interactions between interlocutors. The interlocutor ethnicity affects the way apologies are given due to their interactions with the Japanese. There is an influence, or transfer, of apology strategies between one's second learned language and their native first language. This influence will be exhibited in the way the interlocutors exhibit apology strategies. When

engaging in English, elements of Japanese apology strategies will be used by those speakers who have learned Japanese and spent considerable time in Japan.

Research Questions

The research questions to be answered are:

1.) Among L2 learners of Japanese, what aspects of Japanese apology strategies, if any, are transferred back into the L1 when performing apologies in English?

2.) How do the variables of recency of return, time spent in country, the interlocutor's ethnicity, and cultural exposure (e.g. interactions with locals, time spent studying/using language, etc.) affect this performance in English?

3.) Are some domains, such as body language or degree of politeness, more vulnerable to transfer than others, such as word choice?

This study observed L2 Japanese learners engaging in their native English to determine what kind of influence learning Japanese and living in Japan for a minimum of 18 months has on apology strategies in English. Comparing the responses of these L2 Japanese learners with the responses of native English speakers with no experience with Japanese will help in establishing and highlighting those differences in the performance of apologies, thus determining that an L2 does influence an L1. These responses are divided into seven sections: Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID); Upgraders; Downgraders; Offer of Repair; Verbal Redress; Repetition of IFIDs; and Nonverbal Cues (Bergman and Kasper, 1993; Kondo, 1997; and Brown, 2008). These are discussed more fully in the review of literature.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

In this literature review, I examine literature in the following areas related to this study of transfer: the speech act of apology; American and Japanese apology strategies; L1-L2 transfer; L2-L1 transfer (backward transfer); cross-cultural differences of speech acts; effects of time spent in country; and nonverbal communication.

The Speech Act of Apology

Given that this study involves apology transfer, it is important to clarify the nature of apologies. Apologies tend to be post-event acts that occur when a violation of a social norm has occurred (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984). One of three preconditions of apology must exist for an apology to take place:

a.   S [Speaker] did X [some action] or abstained from doing X (or is about to do it).
b.   X is perceived by S only, by H [Hearer] only, by both S and H, or by a third party as a breach of a   social norm.
c.   X is perceived by at least one of the parties involved as offending, harming, or affecting H in some way.
(Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984: p. 206)

It is important for an interlocutor to realize that one of these preconditions exist and do his/her best to reinstate the social norm between the various parties involved.

In addition to understanding when an apology is expected, it is important to discuss the types of apology. There are five categories of apology given by various researchers (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984; Bergman and Kasper, 1993; Valkova, 2013). Those categories are found in Table 1:

Category	Definition
IFID	Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (e.g. "I'm sorry"and "I apologize") formulaic and typical expressions used in apologies; explicit expression

Upgrader	Terms used to enforce the apology (e.g. "very," "terribly," "really"; includes taking on responsibility ("That was my fault") self-blame ("That was inconsiderate of me"), lack of intent ("I didn't mean to"), and admission of fact ("I forgot the book")
Downgrader	Utterances that include excuses ("I got a flat tire"), justifications, claiming ignorance ("I didn't realize that would happen") and reducing the severity ("It's not that bad")
Offer of Repair	Speaker offers to remedy damage done to interlocutor by offering to take care of any damage or repay the interlocutor
Verbal Redress	Speaker shows concern for the interlocutor ("Are you okay?"), offer to pacify the interlocutor ("Would you like some candy?") and promise of forbearance ("It won't happen again")

Table 1: Apology Categories. Utterances in () are quoted directly from the participants of this study.

These categories may be used more than once and they may be used in conjunction with each other during an utterance.

Politeness and the notion of "face" are important aspects of apologies. Brown and Levinson (1987) discuss face and positive politeness. Face is the public image people put forth. This face is something that can be threatened by the actions of others. They discuss how it is in the best interest of everyone to help maintain each other's face and their wants. How face is maintained between people can vary from culture to culture, something further discussed below. Brown and Levinson also discuss positive politeness. Positive politeness is based on "the positive self-image that he claims for himself." (1987:133). Some strategies involved in positive politeness are: seeking agreement; avoiding disagreement; making offers and promises; and being optimistic. When a person's face is threatened through some action by the speaker, the speaker may employ one of these strategies to restore the face of the hearer.

There are face-threatening actions done by individuals that would require an apology of some sort to be performed. There are five types of apologies that can be given with the

possibility of multiple types used in one utterance. Maintaining face and being polite are important aspects of apologies as well in maintaining the relationship with the hearer.

American and Japanese Apology Strategies

Differences between American and Japanese apology strategies are discussed next. The notions of politeness and 'face' (discussed above) and differences between cultures are also discussed to show how and why the apology strategies differ between American English speakers and Japanese speakers.

One researcher studied the universal linguistic politeness theory and the notion of 'face' as put forth by Brown and Levinson (1987) by examining Japanese and their "politeness phenomena" (Matsumoto, 1988). Face is defined as the perception a person puts forth to others or a "public self-image" (1988:404). Matsumoto highlights Brown and Levinson's ideas of positive and negative politeness. Maintaining 'face' is important to the Japanese. They do not put themselves first but rather are more concerned with their relation to the group and to be accepted of others within the group. As Matsumoto (1988:421-422): puts it:

> In Japanese, it is crucial for a speaker to perceive the social context, such as the kind of situation or setting s/he is in (at work, in a conference, in the course of discussing a certain topic, etc.), what kind of social relation s/he has with other participants in the communication, the social status, the position in the conversation, etc., and to show recognition of that social context.

In other words, there are many factors that affect the performance of an apology and the Japanese perceive these differences and perform the apology accordingly.

Apology styles between Japanese and English were examined by Barnlund and Yoshioka (1990). They conducted interviews with 40 Japanese learners of English and 40 American

learners of Japanese ages 18-24. They were asked to give a full account of a recent incident where an apology was made to them and an incident where they gave an apology. They found that the Japanese exchanged apologies with their closest friends and acquaintances the most, followed by their superiors, then their family members and strangers. Their apologies tended to be more extreme and direct. The Japanese were more likely to use compensation, or offer of repair, as a form of apology. The Americans also exchanged most often with close friends, followed by family members, equally with acquaintances and superiors, and rarely with strangers. Their apologies were less extreme and direct. Americans tended to use explanation as a form of apology. Overall, the researchers conclude that to Japanese, apologies are a tactic used mostly to repair or restore a relationship to where it was prior to the offense, whereas to Americans they mostly improve a relationship.

Continuing to discuss the cultural differences between L1 Americans English speakers and L1 Japanese speakers, Sugimoto (1998a; 1995) explored more closely these differences and how these affect apology strategies. She discusses 5 factors that contribute to the worldwide conception that Japanese tend to be more apologetic than Americans. The first is the use of *sumimasen* ("excuse me" or "I'm sorry") by L1 Japanese speakers. *Sumimasen* can be used for both thanks and apology but it is more frequently used when apologizing, something L1 American English speakers do not use as frequently. The second factor is the cultural perceptions of the language or how cultural practice reflects in one's language. For example, Japanese tend to castigate themselves and insist that the offense will never occur again and offer to repair any damage done. This self-castigation conveys a "selfless surrender image" (Sugimoto, 1995:83). Conversely, Americans tend to avoid self-castigation due to the potential for embarrassment of both interlocutors. The third factor is tolerance of repetition during the utterance. The Japanese

use repetition to convey the depth of their apology. Japanese apologies in general tend to be more formal and longer due to formulaic expressions, such as "*sumimasen*," "it (the indebtedness felt by the speaker) will never end," "*gomen[nasai]*," which is translated as "please forgive me," and "*moushiwakenai,*" "I have no excuse", which conveys a deeper sense of remorse or "*sunao-na*" ("sincerity") (Sugimoto, 1995) and the use of repetition of words whereas Americans strive to be more original in their word choice in that they avoid formulaic expressions, and avoid repetition in their apologies. The fourth factor is the interference of conversation in the L2. In other words, when Japanese engage in English, they tend to exhibit aspects of their L1 or rely on the few strategies of apology use they learned in the L2. So their L1 interferes with their L2 conversation. Japanese learners of English are typically taught limited apology strategies and are thus forced to rely on these limited phrases or resort to what they would do in Japanese, namely repetition and "other 'profuse' message features…" (1998:75). The fifth factor is various accounts or excuses used in American apology. American apologies tend to give accounts to defend themselves and the outcome of their actions. To the Japanese, these appear to be non-apologies and lead them to think that Americans do not apologize or know how to appropriately apologize. Giving of an account or excuse is not widely used and is perceived as rude.

Overall, Japanese apologies tend to be politer in that they show concern for the other party through castigating themselves, repeating phrases to ensure politeness, and are also longer. American apologies are still polite but on a lesser scale, involve an account or excuse, and are shorter and to the point. Differences in cultures and how offences are perceived account for these differences in apology strategies. This study is interested to see if these Japanese strategies are transferred when Japanese learners engage in English.

L1-L2 Transfer

Transfer of speech acts such as requests and apologies are a well-documented aspect of pragmatics. Studies pertaining to L1-L2 transfer show that transfer does occur (Abrams, 2013; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Takahashi, 1996).

Pragmatic transfer of refusals was studied by Ikoma and Shimura (1994). Specifically, they investigated refusals performed by American learners of Japanese in Japanese to determine if American-style refusals would be evident in their Japanese. Ikoma and Shimura classified the types of transfer into two types: transfer which can cause misunderstanding or pragmatic failure and that which does not. With a discourse completion test, they found that transfer does indeed occur. In Japanese, *kekkou desu* is a common phrase used in refusals and it essentially means "no, thank you" but is used in specific instances. For example, and according to their findings, the Japanese usually use *kekkou desu* followed by an excuse whereas the American learners simply use *kekkou desu* without an excuse, which sounds impolite to the Japanese. *Kekkou desu* also tends to be used as a formal expression with those of higher-status or an unfamiliar person and the American learners use it in informal settings with friends.

Suggestions are made about L2 instruction and having teachers take a student's L1 into consideration when teaching the L2 are made by Sparks, et al. (2009). They looked at the relationships between a first and second language and followed students over a 10-year period from first grade to about tenth grade. Fifty-four students in total participated with the students taking 2 years of either Spanish, French, or German. All students were monolingual English speakers with English being the language of their home background. The researchers measured L1 achievement five times during the study and placed participants into three proficiency categories based on L2 proficiency (high, average, or low). They determined that L1 plays a role

in the learning of an L2. L1 skills, including literacy, and L2 aptitude are strong indicators of L2 proficiency. This tells us that L1 and L2 continue to have long-term connections that affect L2 learning several years after learning an L1. Overall, this shows the influence an L1 can have on an L2 in the bigger picture, and not on just specific elements.

The influence an L1 has on an L2 is important in gauging the success a student has in learning an L2. Specific speech acts such as requests, apologies, and compliments can be affected by the learner's L1. Understanding this relationship helps in understanding the possibility of transfer occurring, or the relationship between two languages, from an L2 to an L1.

L2-L1 Transfer (Backward Transfer)

The largest component of this study is to establish the existence of backward transfer. An L1 can have an influence on an L2 and, under the right conditions, an L2 can influence an L1. Through looking at pragmatic behaviors, such as refusals (Ewert and Bromberek-Dyzman, 2008; Tavakoli and Shirinbakhsh, 2014) and apologies (Kondo, 1997) performed in the L2 and comparing to an L1, a pattern of transfer emerges. The following discusses research that shows the influence an L2 can have on an L1 and what conditions contribute to this influence.

The variables of amount of exposure and proficiency affect the degree of transfer of speech acts. The amount of exposure, particularly exposure via time in country, in the L2 plays a role in how semantic formulas are realized when engaging in the L1 (Ewert and Bromberek-Dyzman, 2008). Proficiency also affects the degree of transfer where increased proficiency leads to more items being transferred (Tavakoli and Shirinbakhsh, 2014). Kondo (1997) found that upon returning from America after spending a year there, Japanese speakers tended to exhibit American-like apologies in that the speakers and their apologies were less direct and provided

excuses. These studies are relevant to this study because they establish the existence of backward transfer and show the importance of proficiency and exposure through time spent in country to this phenomenon.

Cross-cultural Differences in Performance of Speech Acts

Another important aspect to discuss is cross-cultural differences. It is important to realize that there are no true universals when it comes to speech acts because different cultures will call for different actions to be taken depending on several things such as the nature of the event and the people involved (Pizziconi, 2007).

One paper was written on how different languages (Hungarian, Polish, and English) use different apology strategies (Suszczyńska, 1999). This research discussed the importance of cross-cultural analysis in the speech act of apologizing in a deeper and more detailed manner. Suszczynska posits that it is important in helping others to understand different cultural values and assumptions. She points out how much culture plays a part in the performance of speech acts. There were significant differences between English, Hungarian, and Polish. "Distance" can be created or destroyed depending on which strategy is employed and how it is employed. She discovered using a discourse completion test that expressing regret is a way that English speakers use to avoid creating distance between them and the offended party whereas in both Hungarian and Polish, expressing regret is a sign of "hostility and alienation" (as quoted from Wierzbicka, 1985: 156 in Suszczyńska, 1999). This is a key point because it shows, that while it might be okay to perform an apology in one culture it does not mean the type of apology is universal and generally accepted and could end up making the situation worse.

A widely known paper written by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) discusses a study they performed with other researchers in examining each language group (discussed below) using a cross-cultural analysis of speech act realization patterns specifically targeting requests and apologies. This analysis compared native and non-native--native speakers of each language listed and learners of each language listed with various L1s-- similarities and differences of each language they studied (Australian, American, and British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian). There were 400 monolingual participants in each of the 8 language groups. Half were native speakers of the language and half were learners of the language. The goal of the study was to determine variability in three ways: situational; cross-cultural; and individual. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain placed special emphasis on native versus non-native strategies. The data they collected suggests that, while there may be some universality among strategies for requests and apologies, there is also a strong indication for cross-cultural variability in the realization patterns. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain use the example that if an American and an Israeli are late to a meeting, it is considered a more serious offence in the American culture than in the Israeli culture to be late, thus, the American would feel more obligated to apologize and would do so profusely versus the Israeli who would not feel such an obligation. In terms of apologies, they found that the most significant factor for a speaker to offer an apology is the degree of violation. The researchers state that this study is by no means exhaustive but that any further research would help to deepen the understanding of these strategies, as used by native and non-native speakers.

The performance of apologies varies across cultures. What is considered appropriate and acceptable in one culture will not be the case in another or it will come across as funny sounding or odd. For example, as mentioned above, American apologies usually consist of excuses

whereas Japanese apologies do not, so when Americans perform apologies in Japanese and use excuses, it sounds rude to the Japanese.

Effects of Time Spent in Country

Cultural exposure resulting from spending time in the target country contributes to overall communicative competence, including pragmatics (Shiri, 2015; Kinginger, 2011). For this study, cultural exposure is defined by the amount of time spent using the L2 with locals and studying the language. It can also influence the native language of the learner in the way they perform speech acts. The effects of time spent in the country of a target language are discussed to establish that there is an effect and how this influences pragmatic competence.

A comparison of American students who have learned Russian with Russian native speakers in the performance of apologies (n=131; American=90 and Russian=41) was conducted by Shardakova (2005). The purpose was to examine the role of interlanguage pragmatics in learning how to distinguish the L1 American English learners of Russian from monolingual Russian native speakers through their use of apologies. She looked at the effects of L2 proficiency and cultural exposure in the target language had on apology strategies. Proficiency was determined by outcomes of various linguistic tests including an OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview). Cultural exposure was determined by the completion of a study abroad for a summer, a semester, or a year-long stay. Shardakova took gender into account establishing, for example, how Russian females tend to use intensifiers more often than Russian men, something that is a cultural expectation. Based on gender, she found that both female and male learners of Russian made use of intensifiers equally. She also discovered that proficiency and cultural exposure had a "crucial" effect on apology strategies, meaning the participants exhibited the target language

native speaker norms, especially in the use of IFIDs and offer of repair. Exposure in and of itself had the most effect but it was the combination of the two that was the most significant main effect on the use of apologies in the learned language.

The effects of a short-term study abroad program has on communicative competence in Japanese university students learning English was examined by Sato (2012). Sato studied whether Japanese students (n=24) in a short term (3-4 months long) English study abroad program performed speech acts more appropriately than those who have not participated in a study abroad program. The students were assessed by TOEFL scores and ranged from pre-intermediate to intermediate. TOEFL is a test that measures the proficiency of English as a foreign language in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Sato concluded that there was a significant difference between pre- and post-program performance of pragmatics with the students who scored lower on pre-program tests showing the most improvement, particularly in fluency, coherence, and vocabulary. This study shows that studying abroad, even short stays, can influence communicative competence, both linguistic and non-linguistic, in a second language.

Though time in country does contribute to pragmatic development, findings in some research suggest that not all change moves toward the L2 norm. The apologetic realizations that develop during a ten-month study abroad of Austrian learners of French in Montreal were observed by Warga and Schölmberger (2007). They observed seven Austrian learners of French and compared their results to twenty Quebecois French native speakers and seventeen native Austrian German speakers speaking L2 French. One difference with their study from other studies was the measurement every two months of the participants' pragmatic development of apologies before, during, and after the study abroad. They found the following: 1) excuse was most widely used, as opposed to the illocutionary force indicating device (IFID) which was most

prominently used in previous studies; 2) exposure to the target language does contribute to pragmalinguistic (or the understanding of an utterance based on context instead of actual words used) development, typically including greater use of target language norms, such as the decrease in use of justification (or explanation); 3) not all changes move toward the target language norm—for example, non-natives tended to overuse the upgraders *très* ('very') and *vraiment* ('really'). This can be due to the influence of the L1 of the learners and of L2 learner behavior; 4) change occurs in a non-linear fashion instead of the expected linear fashion.

In looking at perceptions of apology between L1 Chinese and L1 English speakers, Hou (2006) studied how these perceptions vary between people of different social and ethnic backgrounds. Cultural exposure played a role in how apologies were given between the Chinese and English speakers. The L1 Chinese learners of English were put into two groups; low exposure to English and high exposure to English. Hou found that the low exposure L1 Chinese groups were more likely to apologize to an American person than those in the high exposure groups. In relation to the current study, Hou's (2006) study shows that ethnicity can play a role in the realization of apologies.

Spending time in country is important to overall pragmatic development. Though not all changes tend to move toward the native norm, the changes that do occur can come close to it. The influence of one language on another is a bidirectional relationship which is strengthened by spending time in the country of one's second, learned language. The amount of time spent in country is an important aspect of this study in determining if backward transfer indeed occurs.

Nonverbal Communication

Nonverbal cues play a role in communication in addition to verbal cues, sometimes being relied on as the sole form of communication (Kitao and Kitao, 1987). Nonverbal cues can be used to reinforce an apology (Park and Guan, 2009). An important aspect of this study is nonverbal communication and seeing how it is transferred from one language into another. There needs to be more research done, especially in backward transfer of nonverbal cues, but there is research to suggest that transference of nonverbal cues occurs (So, 2010).

A study of English monolinguals, English-Spanish late bilinguals, and French-English late bilinguals examined their use of gestures and their transferability (Pika et al., 2006). Their goal was to discover if gestures can be cross-linguistically transferred from one language into another. It is suggested, based on their findings, that English is a low-frequency gesture language, especially when compared to high-frequency gesture languages such as Italian, Spanish, or Chinese. The participants watched a cartoon and then were asked to retell the cartoon. Their findings were that the bilinguals gestured significantly more than the English monolinguals, which led to the conclusion "that knowledge of a high frequency gesture language affects the gesture rate in a low-frequency gesture language" (2006:319). However, So (2010) compared English monolingual speakers (n=10) with Chinese monolingual speakers (n=10) and Chinese-English bilinguals (n=10) and found that American English speakers gestured more than their Chinese counterparts. So (2010) states that this is most likely due to the Confucianism ideals that are prevalent in Chinese culture, so the results are inconclusive regarding gesture being transferred.

A study performed by Park and Guan (2009) looked at both verbal and nonverbal cues of apologies performed in both the U.S. and China. Two groups of participants (Group 1: n=250;

100 L1 American English and 150 L1 Chinese speakers. Group 2: n=317; 183 Americans and 134 Chinese) were asked to provide their responses to various situations via a questionnaire with a Likert scale. Park and Guan looked at apologies used with in-group people, such as a friend and out-group people, such as strangers. Their results not only showed how they would respond but also "how they perceived the need to apologize." (2009:72), referring to whether the participant felt that an apology was needed after an offense was committed based on the severity of the offense. They found that the Chinese tended to use more nonverbal cues than their American counterparts. In both cultures, nonverbal behaviors seem to complement or even replace verbal apologies. They also found that when it came to interacting with either in-group or out-group people, the Chinese tended to exhibit differences in how they interacted with each group. For example, the Chinese tended to state a simple apology more frequently with out-group members than in-group members whereas Americans made apologies more with in-group members. They also tended to state a simple apology along with concern for an in-group member, whereas Americans did not show as much concern.

A developing L2, including gestures, can have an influence on an L1 (Brown, 2008). Brown looked at the gestures of monolingual English living in the USA (n=11) and Japanese speakers living in Japan (n=11) and compared them to native Japanese speakers with knowledge of English living in both Japan (n=15) and the USA (n=13) with intermediate proficiency in English. Brown controlled for cultural exposure and found that the native Japanese speakers with intermediate English proficiency tended to use those strategies employed by the monolingual English speakers more than their monolingual Japanese counterparts, such as using only one hand and using gestures lateral to the body (2008; 271). The participants were asked to retell a scene from a cartoon in English and Brown was specifically looking at the gestures used by the

participants. Brown found that there is some evidence for bidirectionality in the relationship between two languages, specifically their pragmatics, in the multilingual mind.

A paper written by Kitao and Kitao (1987) discusses the importance the Japanese place on nonverbal communication. They discuss a brief history of Japan and how the culture came to become more reliant on nonverbal communication than verbal communication. They state that bowing plays a very important role in Japanese culture but that the rules are complex for foreigners to master. But generally, "the Japanese bow when greeting, when making a request, when apologizing…" (1987:16). Bowing is so ingrained in the Japanese that there are instances of Japanese people bowing even when talking on the telephone (Kitao and Kitao, 1987; Jorden and Noda; 1987).

Overall, nonverbal communication can be as important as verbal communication. People with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds perceive nonverbal aspects of communication differently. As shown above, the Chinese and Japanese cultures rely, sometimes exclusively, on nonverbal communication to help communicate. The Japanese rely on nonverbal communication to emphasize the verbal aspects of a conversation, particularly bowing.

Summary of Review

This review brought out several key points relevant to this study. One key point is the existence of both transfer from L1 to L2 and backward transfer from L2 to L1. There are many reasons for transfer to occur but the reasons discussed here include spending an extended amount of time in country and differences in the realization of speech acts (e.g., use of excuse in American English and repetition in Japanese). This paper addresses this point in comparing how those with Japanese experience perform apologies versus those with no Japanese experience.

Another key point is that nonverbal cues and several types of apologies are transferred. Bowing is an ingrained part of the Japanese culture that bowing is used in almost any kind of interaction. The use of IFIDs is the most widely used apology category but they are performed differently depending on the language and culture. This paper will address this topic by observing the participants performing apologies in English and seeing if and when they use nonverbal cues. It also discusses those apologies typically seen in both the American and Japanese cultures and how both groups of participants realize these apologies.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Apologies that are given in English by native speakers of English who have spent a minimum of 18 months in Japan were examined. These apologies were compared to those who are also native English speakers but have no experience with Japanese. Important variables that were considered include: time spent in country; elapsed time since returning from Japan; the ethnicity of the person or interlocutor to whom an apology is given; and amount of cultural experience (e.g. interactions with locals, time spent studying/using language, etc.). These factors will be discussed in detail below.

As mentioned before, the following questions were investigated in this study:

1. Among L2 learners of Japanese, what aspects of Japanese apology strategies, if any, are transferred back into the L1 when performing apologies in English?

2. How do the variables of recency of return, time spent in country, interlocutor ethnicity, and amount of cultural exposure affect this performance?

3. Are some domains, such as body language or degree of politeness, more vulnerable to transfer than others, such as word choice?

Study Design

The design of the study is based on other studies performed in looking at apology realizations (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984; Bergman and Kasper, 1993) The goal is to determine if backward transfer of apology strategies occurs from L2 Japanese in L1 English speakers while conversing in English.

Participants

Participants consisted of college-age students between the ages of 17 and 25 who were attending Brigham Young University. There were 45 students divided into two groups. Except for three participants, all were English L1 speakers. The first group consisted of students with very little or no exposure to Japanese who did not spend 18 or more months in Japan and served as a control group to compare the results with the second group. They will be referred to as the non-Japanese experience group or NJEs. The other group were speakers of L1 English and L2 Japanese who have spent a minimum of 18 months in Japan. They will be referred to as the Japanese experience group or JEs. There were 24 in the first group (NJEs) and 21 in the second group (JEs). The majority were Caucasian (43) but other races included Asian (7), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (1), and Latino/Hispanic (2). A few counted themselves as belonging to more than one race. The following table (Table 2) shows the distribution of gender between JEs and NJEs.

	Males	Females
Japanese Experience (JE)	12	9
Non-Japanese Experience (NJE)	8	17

Table 2: Male-Female Distribution

All but two participants in the NJE group have learned a second language, with some learning more than one of the following languages: Russian (10); Spanish (11); French (6); German (2); Portuguese (2); Chinese (2); and Kiribati (1). The participants self-assessed their proficiency in these languages by stating that they were at the very least an intermediate level in their respective languages.

The JE group consisted of students who had extensive knowledge of Japanese and spent a minimum of 18 months in Japan. The following table (Table 3) shows the distribution of their experience. All JEs had served an LDS mission for a period between 18 and 24 months. Each additional reason added to their Japanese exposure and cultural experiences in Japan.

Reason for being in Japan	LDS Mission	Military	Internship	Study Abroad	Family Trip	Grew up In Japan	Work
Number of Participants	21	3	2	2	5	1	1

Table 3: Distribution of reasons for being in Japan
*LDS=The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints

All participants were recruited from linguistics and foreign language classes at Brigham Young University on a strictly voluntary basis. The linguistics courses were lower undergraduate courses in the 100 and 200 levels. The language classes were Russian (through a member of my thesis committee) and upper division (300 level) Japanese courses (through another member of my thesis committee). Recruitment either occurred in person by attending the class with permission from the professor and sending a sign-up sheet around the room or it occurred through a mass email sent out by the professors of various classes through which the students could sign up via a Google Doc. All participants were rewarded with a $10 campus gift card upon completion of testing. After analyzing the data, some participants' data were not included due to some performing the role-play in another language (Japanese and Russian) and due to loss of the video recording of their performance by the researcher.

Instruments

The first instrument used was the discourse completion task or DCT. A DCT is a widely used test to determine pragmatic competence and usage (Ewert and Bromberek-Dyzman, 2008;

Warga and Schölmberger, 2007; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984; Kondo, 1997). A DCT usually asks the participant to write out a response to a series of pragmatic situations given or to fill in blanks to complete each situation. For this DCT, each participant was asked to look at a picture of a person and/or place and read the text or listen to a recording of the text that described a situation/scenario which occurred with the person shown in the picture on the screen.

Six scenarios were given where an apology could be socially expected. Pictures of the person the research participant would apologize to (the interlocutor) were shown corresponding with each scenario. Participants then answered by performing, out loud, their reactions according to how they would handle the situation if it were real. Participants were asked to stand and face the interlocutors (photos) as they gave their apologies, and this was video recorded. The pictures consisted of all males (to control for interlocutor gender) of varying ages to match the scenarios and ethnicity (Asian or non-Asian) given.

Two sets of PowerPoint presentations, Set A and Set B, were used to provide some variation and to see how the first picture would influence subsequent apologies. These sets were presented in what is known as a counterbalance procedure where they were given on alternating days (Set A was given Day 1, Set B was given Day 2, Set A on Day 3, etc.) to different participants over the course of eight days of testing: 23 participants were presented Set A while 22 were presented Set B. Each set consisted of the same six scenarios; however, the pictures were different across sets. For Set A, the first picture was of a Japanese male child with the following picture a Caucasian American male, then the next being Japanese and so on, alternating between Japanese and Caucasian images. Set B was opposite, with the first picture being of a Caucasian child followed by a Japanese male, followed then by a Caucasian male and so on. This was done to assess the effects of the ethnicity of the interlocutor --half were Japanese

and half Caucasian American-- had on their performance. The two alternating sets were used so that age and scenario would not be confounded with ethnicity.

      Six scenarios were used and were chosen to help promote the use of nonverbal cues and to provide a wider range of types of interlocutors. The following tables shows the list of scenarios:

Scenario #	Scenario
1	You are riding on the subway but you are forced to stand. When the subway car starts slowing down, you lose your balance and accidentally bump into the leg of a child passenger who is sitting down. He starts crying. -Child-6-9 years-Stranger/Low Status
2	You are riding your bike down an alleyway with lots of doorways. A person suddenly comes out one of the doors carrying a bunch of stuff as you are passing by and you startle them causing them to drop what they are carrying. - Adult-25-35 years-Stranger/Similar to Higher Status
3	You are working on a project with a fellow student. You are meeting for the last time before presenting in class the next day. You are about 20 minutes late for your meeting and you only have the room for a total of one hour. Your partner is not very happy with you. -Adult-18-25 years-Peer/Fellow Student/Similiar Status
4	You borrowed a book from a professor at the beginning of the semester. The end of the semester is coming up and your professor asked you to return the book you borrowed at a meeting you scheduled with them. Upon arriving to the meeting, you discover that you have left the book at home. -Adult-40-60 years-Professor/Older/Higher Status
5	You borrowed a DVD from one of your friends and accidentally broke it. When -- they ask for it back, you explain what has happened. They are not happy. -Adult-18-25 years-Peer/Friend/Similar Status
6	You have placed a shopping bag on the luggage rack of a crowded bus. When the bus brakes, the bag falls down and hits another passenger. -Adult-40-70 years-Stranger/Older/Similar to Higher Status

Table 4: List of Scenarios Used in Research

Three scenarios (Scenarios 1, 2 and 5) were made-up by the researcher with two of them

(startling someone in an alleyway while riding a bike [2] and bumping into someone on the

subway [1]) being instances that could occur in Japan and the broken DVD scenario (5) being something that could happen to anybody. The other three scenarios (Scenarios 3, 4, and 6) were scenarios given in Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). Scenarios 3 and 4 were chosen because they are likely situations that the target audience has experienced or could potentially experience as students. Scenario 6 was chosen partially because that scenario has happened to the researcher and because it is plausible in countries, such as Japan, where buses are a major mode of transportation.

These scenarios were included because they show a variety of impositions from less severe, such as forgetting a book, to severe such as causing potential bodily harm (See Appendix A for instructions). The scenarios were such that an apology would be expected, but the degree of regret involved would be different and cause different types of apologies to be given (Kramer-Moore and Moore, 2003). In other words, the more severe a situation, the more elaborate an apology is required to be (Darby and Schlenker, 1982 as cited in Aloia, 2009). For instance, some of the scenarios used here seemed to be more severe which may require a more elaborate apology. Scenarios 1, 2, and 6 involve potential physical injury. Also, social distance between the speaker and interlocutor differed. Three interlocutors were more socially distant because they were complete strangers ranging in age from a child to an older gentleman and the others were closer socially because they were a classmate, professor, and a friend.

The second instrument was a demographic survey (see Appendix B). Upon completion of the spoken DCT, participants were asked to fill out the brief survey given via the online Qualtrics survey platform. All students answered questions about their gender, age, ethnicity, and language learning background. A gateway question was then asked about whether they had spent 18 months or more in Japan and, depending on how they answered, they either continued with

the survey or they were finished. If they continued with the survey, they were asked more in-depth questions about their experience with Japanese, time spent in Japan and recentness of their experience in Japan. See Appendix B for survey questions.

Procedures

A few instructions were provided, in English, verbally to the participant on how to navigate the PowerPoint presentation and what was expected of them (See Appendix A). Participants could read each situation on the PowerPoint as well as listen to each situation via a sound recording made by an adult male. Each person had the option to listen to the recording or simply read it aloud or to themselves. Everything was written or spoken in English. Associated with each situation was a picture of a person and how they may look after the situation described took place. The participants were told to act as if the person in the photo were there in real life and behave how they would in the actual situation.

Two small study group rooms were used inside a computer lab on the campus of BYU. Each room had a large monitor for displaying the PowerPoint presentation, which allowed the participants to see a more life-size image of the interlocutor and feel a little more natural. It also caused them to stand which helps to ascertain all gestures the participant may exhibit as they proceed through the scenario.

Data collection took place over the course of eight days. The video camera was situated in front of the monitor to capture both the spoken language and the body language of the participants well. Before beginning the presentation, there was a brief explanation of how to navigate the presentation. I also explained what they were to do and how to navigate the

PowerPoint presentation. After answering any questions they had, I started the recording and left the room to allow participants to feel more comfortable.

Coding Scheme

Nonverbal cues were simply coded. An assignment of a "0" or a "1" was given to determine the absence or presence of the nonverbal cues of bowing and the placing of the hands together in front of their person. The presence of a nonverbal cue was determined by the length of the pose. If they held their hands together for more than two seconds, it was counted as a "1". This was difficult to ascertain sometimes due to how many participants placed their hands together but quickly in a way that suggested they were just uncertain what to do with their hands. The act of bowing was counted when the entire upper body, from the navel/waist up, was bent forward with the neck and head bent forward as well and hands at either side. These two nonverbal cues were chosen because they were the most expressed cues by the participants and tend to be the most used in the Japanese culture (Kitao and Kitao, 1987).

The verbal data were coded into five categories discussed above from Bergman and Kasper (1993) and Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). Those categories are IFID, Upgrader, Downgrader, Offer of Repair, and Verbal Redress. (See page 9 for details of each category.)

The utterances of the participants in each scenario were divided into one of these categories with some using more than one within a scenario. Repetition of IFIDs was also taken into consideration. Anytime an IFID was uttered more than one time within a scenario, it counted as repetition. This includes whether it occurred just after another IFID or occurred later in the utterance. A '0' was assigned if there was no repetition and a '1' was assigned if there was repetition.

Data Analysis

A mixed-model test was run to determine statistical significance. Each group's response was recorded across all scenarios and for each of the apology categories. Nonverbal cues and repetition was also taken into consideration. For the JE group, the scenarios and categories were compared to the variables of time spent in country, recency of return, interlocutor ethnicity, and cultural exposure. The *p*-value is <0.05 for all values. A comparison between scenarios is presented to establish and highlight differences based on the ethnicity and social status of the interlocutor, since they vary from scenario to scenario and if a speaker treats one scenario different from another, this could be based on ethnicity and social status of the interlocutor. This is also used to help in answering what elements are more likely to be transferred based on ethnicity and social status (see research question #3 in Chapter 1).

For each dependent variable, a model with time in country, time since return, and percentage of Japanese usage were used. The final model included any of these variables that were significant plus the scenario factor. The analysis of the nonverbal cues employed a logistic regression. All analyses were performed using SAS, version 9.4.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results of the study. The results are given according to the research questions presented in Chapter 1. The three questions investigated in this study are:

1. Among L2 learners of Japanese, what aspects of Japanese apology strategies, if any, are transferred back into the L1 when performing apologies?

2. How do the variables of recency of return, time spent in country, interlocutor ethnicity, and cultural exposure affect this performance?

3. Are some domains, such as body language or degree of politeness, more vulnerable to transfer than others, such as word choice?

Research question 1: Japanese apology strategies

The first research question asks if there are any Japanese apology strategies that are transferred into L1 English when apologizing and if so, what they are. From the review of literature, some apology strategies were highlighted. The strategies most notably used by the participants in this study included repetition of IFIDs and use of nonverbal cues such as bowing or placing hands together in front of the body.

Repetition of IFIDs. The Japanese tend to repeat an IFID during an interaction. Beckwith and Dewaele (2008) found that native Japanese speakers tended to use repetition more than the native English speakers in their study. In fact, they state that repetition is a rare occurrence in English apologies.

The JE group had an overall mean usage of 0.64 for repetition of IFIDs. Scenario 6 is where the participants were most likely to use repetition of an IFID. Scenarios 4 and 5 are where

they were the least likely to use repetition. Looking at the difference of means between the scenarios did not show any statistical significance of usage. In other words, there was no difference between scenarios so participants did not use repetition in any scenario significantly enough to say they were more likely to use it in one scenario versus another.

The NJE group had an overall mean usage of 0.56. They were most likely to use repetition in Scenario 3 and the least likely to use it in Scenario 4. However, there are no difference between scenarios so there is no statistically significant usage of repetition, neither is repetition more likely to be used in one scenario versus another.

Nonverbal cues. To code the nonverbal cues, the interactions were divided for each scenario into one of two categories: presence or absence of a Japanese-like cue (coded 1 and 0 respectively). The first cue was bowing, where the head, neck, and shoulders moved slightly forward and hands are on the sides of the legs. The second was hand movement, where the palms were brought together out in front of the person. The palms were to stay in front of the person and not go up by the face. The following table (Table 5) shows the distribution of those who exhibited Japanese-like tendencies out of the JE group:

Nonverbal Cue	S.1	S.2	S.3	S.4	S.5	S.6
Bowing	1	1	1	1	1	1
Hands	2	1	2	2	0	5

Table 5: Distribution of Japanese-like tendencies of nonverbal cues

As is shown, scenario 6 is the one that shows the highest number of learners taking a Japanese-like cue in putting their palms together. Only one student, from the JE group, exhibited the bowing motion while apologizing in all scenarios. No participants in the NJE group exhibited Japanese-like tendencies in nonverbal communication.

Summary

The JE group were more likely to use repetition of IFIDs than the NJE group but this was not statistically significant. For nonverbal cues, only a few participants in the JE group performed Japanese-like nonverbal cues and no participants in the NJE group performed Japanese-like cues.

Research question 2: Recency of return, time spent in country, interlocutor ethnicity, and cultural exposure effects

The second question pertains to four variables that can influence the performance of apologies. These variables affect this performance through how the speakers use apology and if there is evidence that backward transfer does occur. The following discussion shows how the participants performed apologies according to each variable. The results in this section pertain to the JE group only since these variables account for experience in Japan and with Japanese.

Recency of return. The variable of recency of return was taken into consideration to help determine if the longer one has been home and away from the environment the likely one is to maintain any habits picked up while in country. The following table (Table 6) shows the number of students according to whether they have been home from Japan for one year and under or over one year:

Time Since Return	Number of Participants
0-12 months	5
13+ months	16

Table 6: Recency of Return

Table 7 shows the mean usage of each apology device, repetition of IFIDs, and nonverbal cues for the JE group based on the variable of recency of return.

Apology Category	0-12m	13+m
IFID	4.2500	5.4314
UG	2.8611	4.5445
DG	1.1666	2.1259
OR	1.1389	1.9704
VR	2.0834	2.1833
REP	1.3056	1.7926
NV	0.4722	0.6740

Table 7: Average use of apology categories according to Recency of Return.

This shows how those who have been home for a year or more were more likely to use repetition and nonverbal cues than those who more recently returned home. However, the amounts are close enough together that it is difficult to say with certainty that this is the case.

 Time Spent in Country. The participants were asked how long they spent (total time spent in country which includes multiple trips) in Japan. The following table (Table 8) shows the total number of participants for each time increment for time spent in country:

Time Spent in Country	Number of Participants
13-18 months	7
19-24 months	7
25+ months	7

Table 8: Time Spent in Country

 Table 9 shows the means of usage of each apology device, repetition of IFIDs, and nonverbal cues based on the variable Time Spent in Country.

Apology Category	13-18m	19-24m	25+m
IFID	1.9762	1.4286	2.2571
UG	1.4047	1.5143	1.6286
DG	0.7381	0.5238	0.7857
VR	0.8571	0.6667	0.9524
REP	0.7143	0.4286	0.8571
NV	0.0238	0.2381	0.2619

Table 9: Averages of use based on Time Spent in Country

Based on this table, the 25+ group were the most likely to use each device. However, these differences could be random. Time in Japan was the only variable that showed a statistically significant influence on the use of repetition of IFID (F [1, 13] =6.24, p=0.0126).

Interlocutor ethnicity. As mentioned above, a counterbalance procedure was employed each day of the exam. On one day, the pictures started with an Asian interlocutor then alternated with a Caucasian interlocutor. The next day, the pictures began with a Caucasian interlocutor alternating with an Asian interlocutor. The next day, the pictures again began with an Asian interlocutor and so on and so forth. Set A began with the picture of an Asian interlocutor and then scenario 2 had a picture with a Caucasian interlocutor and so on. Set B was the opposite. So, for Set A - Asian, all 3 scenarios (1, 3, and 5) were added together to come up with the totals of usage. Set A - Caucasian means that the totals for scenarios 2, 4, and 6 were added together. The opposite was true for Set B.

It appears that those scenarios (Scenarios 1, 3, and 5) with the Asian interlocutor picture associated with it had less usage of each device than the Caucasian counterparts (Scenarios 2, 4, and 6). This is in line with the findings in Hou (2006). The exception is IFID usage where (other than scenario 6) the IFIDs were used more with Asian interlocutors than the Caucasian

interlocutors. The DG usage shows a similar pattern with participants more likely to use a Downgrader with the Japanese than the Caucasian.

Overall, except for IFID, when the JE participants were looking at a picture of Asian interlocutors, they used more apology devices than when they were looking at Caucasian interlocutors. The NJE participants did not exhibit differences in their use of apology devices between the two types of interlocutors.

Cultural exposure. The amount of cultural exposure was also measured via questions on the questionnaire each participant answered. Only the participants who stated they went to Japan answered these questions. One question asked them what they did to study and come to know the language while in Japan. Participants were able to choose more than one answer and could also insert their own response if there was an option not listed. The response "Study Materials provided by the Church" pertains to materials given to each missionary serving in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. All participants spoke with local, native speakers so that was the most popular method of studying Japanese. Writing was the least popular method of studying or gaining exposure to the language.

Participants were also asked to self-assess roughly what percentage of the day they spent speaking and using Japanese (See Appendix B). The answers ranged from 20 to 100 percent daily use with an average of 69.9%. The following table (Table 10) shows the distribution of percentage of Japanese usage according to time spent in country:

	Low	High	Mean
13-18	50	85	71.1
19-24	30	81	64.9
25+	20	100	77.9

Table 10: Information on percent usage of Japanese in a given day based on time spent in country

The 25+ group reported the highest mean percent usage of Japanese. However, one participant reported only 20% usage in a given day whereas one reported 100%. The participant who reported 100% was born and raised in Japan until 6 years of age and spent considerable time over the course of his life in Japan visiting family and later serving an LDS mission.

The question about how the participants studied Japanese while in Japan was looked at with the variables of recency of return and time spent in country. The following table shows these results:

	Recency of Return	Time Spent in Japan
Chi-Square	17.51	9.59
Degrees of Freedom	30	30
p-value	0.97	1.00

Table 11: How participants studied Japanese while in Japan based on recency of return and time spent in Japan

Based on these numbers, cultural exposure based on how the participants studied Japanese while in Japan and on how recently they returned and time spent in Japan shows no significance. This means that cultural exposure is not a factor that affects the type of apology given.

Summary

In summary, those who have been home for more than one year were more likely to use each apology device, particularly those devices more likely used by the Japanese – repetition of IFIDs and nonverbal cues. As far as those who spent more time in country, those participants who spent more time (25+ months) in country are more likely to exhibit these tendencies and use more apology devices than those who spent less time in country. Also, those who were more culturally exposed to the language and engaged in learning the language while in country were also more likely to exhibit Japanese tendencies.

Research question 3: Domains more vulnerable to transfer

This question pertains to whether there were items that are more likely to be transferred than others, such as body language or degree of politeness versus word choice. The participants in this study did not show that there are certain domains to be transferred than others. There were a few who exhibited some body language typical of Japanese but not enough to say with certainty this is more likely to be transferred versus degree of politeness or word choice. However, the degree of politeness in the interactions showed an increase use, particularly when the speakers were engaging with the professor and with the adult strangers (the man carrying boxes in the alleyway and the stranger on the bus).

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

This chapter presents first, a discussion on the results of this study to answer the three research questions presented in the beginning of the paper. Second, implications of this study are given to establish the usefulness the study has to SLA and pragmatics research. Limitations of this research are then given. Future research is suggested next to encourage more research in this area of study. Finally, this study is concluded with a review of the study and those things gleaned from the results of the study.

Discussion

The results given in Chapter 4 are discussed according to the research questions asked in Chapter 1.

Research Question One: Among L2 learners of Japanese, what aspects of Japanese apology strategies, if any, are transferred back into the L1 when performing apologies in English? While the potential for aspects of Japanese apology strategies to be transferred is relatively high due to the Japanese culture being a high-gesture culture, the results from this study showed very little transference of these strategies. As far as the nonverbal cues are concerned, this study showed no significant transfer of these strategies. As shown in a few of the participants' use of apologies, bowing and hand motions were the most transferred nonverbal apology strategies in those with Japanese experience. However, there were only a few instances and these were not statistically significant, disallowing the conclusion that backward transfer of these elements occurred in this group of students.

The verbal aspects of apology transfer varied. The most widely used were IFIDs and Upgraders. Along with IFIDs, Japanese tend to repeat IFIDs throughout an apology. The Japanese do not like to give excuses while apologizing (Kondo, 1997; Beckwith and Dewaele, 2008), which is part of downgrading, and according to the data, the JEs were less likely to give excuses while apologizing whereas the NJEs were more likely to give excuses.

Research Question Two: How do the variables of Recency of Return, Time Spent in Country, the Interlocutor's Ethnicity, and Cultural Exposure affect this performance in English? There were four variables taken into consideration in relation to how they affect English apology strategies. The variables of recency of return, time spent in country, interlocutor's ethnicity, and cultural exposure were examined to determine if they affected the apology strategies used.

It was hypothesized that the more recently one had returned from a foreign language context, the more likely they were to retain those Japanese-like tendencies when interacting in English settings, including nonverbal cues and verbal realizations. According to the data, this was not necessarily true. Those who had been home between thirteen and eighteen months showed the most Japanese-like tendencies. This indicates that these elements of Japanese-style apology strategies tend to stay with the participant for longer than initially thought. This can also indicate they may still actively engage in Japanese whether through university classes or with Japanese friends and family.

Another hypothesis made was that the longer one spent in the target language country, the more likely they would be to exhibit target language tendencies. Those who spent 25 months or more in Japan used each apology device the most. They especially used IFIDs and Upgraders, which is consistent with what other researchers have found in relation to the effect of time spent

in country (Meier, 1998; Ahangar, et al., 2015). Therefore, the longer one spends time in the target language country, the more likely they are to exhibit that target language's tendencies.

The variable of interlocutor ethnicity was taken into consideration as well. Pictures of both Caucasian and Asian males were shown to each group in an alternating fashion. Overall, each device was used more often with the Asian interlocutors. This implies that the participants felt that more apologies were required when interacting with the Asian interlocutors due to their past interactions with the Japanese people during their time in Japan. This variable affected the outcome of each interaction in the way apologies were given. Participants were less likely to use excuses in their interactions with the Japanese interlocutors and they were more likely to use repetition with them as well.

The final variable to examine is cultural exposure. According to the data, cultural exposure is not a factor that affects apology strategies. Though the average usage of Japanese on daily basis was about 69% and most of the participants had exposed themselves to Japanese through speaking with locals, this variable did not contribute to overall usage of Japanese-like apology strategies based on this study's results.

Research Question Three: Are some domains more vulnerable to transfer than others, i.e., body language or degree of politeness than in word choice? The final research question asks which element or elements of an apology is more likely to be transferred from Japanese into English. In this case, those elements include body language, degree of politeness, and word choice. The tendency to be politer in Japanese plays a role here. It was expected that body language may be more transferred than any other aspect however, that was not the case. As was shown, only a handful of participants exhibited nonverbal cues. Bowing was particularly thought

to be the most widely transferred element but only one participant exhibited that element. The interesting thing to note here is that this participant returned from spending 19-24 months in Japan about 13-18 months prior to time of testing. I had hypothesized that the sooner one came home from a mission the more likely she or he would be to exhibit Japanese-like tendencies. This individual, however, seemed to show that tendency despite being home for over a year.

Degree of politeness was one element that was transferred. The Japanese culture is known to be a very polite culture and this is especially seen in the language. Most of the scenarios that involved a professor or a stranger (but not the first scenario with the child who is a stranger) were significantly different enough in that the likelihood of a category to be used more than another was based solely on the social distance. Greater social distance usually calls for a politer approach to language use, especially in giving apologies (Martinez-Flor and Beltrán-Palanques, 2014). This idea of politeness also applies to the degree of imposition on the interlocutor. The greater the imposition, the politer an apology is expected to be. In this study, scenarios 1, 2, and 6 are considered to cause a potentially great imposition in that they may have caused physical harm to the interlocutor, therefore, it was expected that the degree of politeness would be increased. However, this was not always the case, especially among the non-Japanese group.

Implications

One implication is seeing the bilateral effect of transfer between a native and a second language. Through this study, the effects of a second language were seen as participants acted out scenarios in their native language. It is plausible that length of stay in the second language context and recency of return affected their native language. The longer they stayed in Japan

resulted in more Japanese-like tendencies in their English apologies. However, the time since return from Japan varied. While the numbers for those who most recently returned were high for Japanese-like tendencies in apologies, it was the group who had been back in their native language context between 13-18 months ago that had the highest amount of Japanese-like tendencies. Perhaps, this implies that apology strategies learned in the second language context can still be exhibited no matter how long one has been reunited in their native language context. But again, this will depend on length of stay as well. This could also be affected by what they are exposed to after their stay in Japan. The language courses the participants may have taken upon return and friends and/or who are Japanese or have also been exposed to Japanese extensively can also affect apology strategies.

Another implication is that the ethnicity of an interlocutor affects the sort of apology given. Those who had spent time in Japan treated those who looked Asian/Japanese differently than their Caucasian counterparts. They tended to use more Japanese-like apologies in that they did not give excuses, used repetition and showed more politeness, especially for the strangers (except for the child) and the professor, or those who would be considered of a higher status than the speaker. This notion supports the idea that the ethnicity of the interlocutor contributes to transfer of apology strategies.

Limitations

There are some limitations to this study. As with any study, the larger the number of participants, the more representative of the population the results are. This study only had 45 participants. A larger group of participants would have helped with better understanding this phenomenon. Another limitation was the use of a DCT-like test which is not a completely

accurate way to examine speech act realizations. It does not accurately portray natural-like speech (Beebe and Cummings, 1996). Due to the one-sided nature of the study, the participants were unable to exhibit multiple turn exchanges which would have resulted in more natural speech. Different instruments can surely be implemented in helping to determine several aspects of the speech act and perhaps in gathering larger amounts of data. Proficiency was not a factor taken into absolute consideration. An attempt was made to have them self-assess with the level of schooling and learning of Japanese but no proficiency test was given. The scope of this research could not account for potential variabilities due to learning a second language aside from Japanese. Future research may want to account for this variance.

Future Research

Future research in relation to this study could help add to the research. One potential aspect a researcher could take into consideration is to have the participants perform an actual role-play with real-life interlocutors instead of just pictures. Other research could add more scenarios with some more varying degrees of imposition. It would also be prudent to have more Japanese or L2 learners involved that have spent considerable time in different contexts. A longitudinal study could be done where the participants who will be spending a considerable time (more than one year) in Japan or a foreign language context would be tested before and after (and perhaps during) to see how much spending time in a foreign language context can affect their use of apologies. Another study could take more demographic factors into consideration, such as gender of both speakers, age, and social distance (though this last one is discussed at a brief level here) just as Bergman and Kasper (1993) did in their study. It would

also be prudent to perhaps gather data from native speakers of the L2 to establish a better guideline of how the L1 is affected by the L2.

Conclusion

Transfer of speech acts from one language into another is a widely studied phenomenon in linguistics. There are several reasons for transfer to occur. This study found that backward transfer occurs and that there are elements that can be transferred from a learned, second language into a native language. For example, in Japanese, there is a tendency for repetition of IFIDs to occur while apologizing. In this study, those who have learned Japanese and lived in Japan exhibited this tendency when apologizing in English.

The purpose of this study was to test whether backward transfer occurs. Just as a first or native language can affect a second, learned language, a second learned language can influence a native language. This is dependent on the amount of cultural exposure and time spent in the second language country. This study indicates that exposure to a second language and time spent in country has an influence on the transfer of apology strategies from a second language into a native language. Other factors include recency of return and interlocutor ethnicity. The speech act of apology helped in determining ways backward transfer occurs.

Appendix A

Instructions given prior to PowerPoint presentation

When you ready to start, press the spacebar. You will hear the scenario presented to you along with a picture of a person with whom you are to interact. When you finish one scenario, press the spacebar to proceed to the next scenario. If you need to start over, state that you are starting over and play the reading again. Just go with what feels natural. Just act how you would act if you are in that scenario with this person right here, right now. Good luck and thank you!

Verbal Instructions

"You will act as if you are in the situation described and the person pictured is who you are interacting with. I'm not looking for lengthy or elaborate responses. Just respond how you think you'd respond, whatever you would say or do. It can be as long or as short as you'd like it to be."

Consent

Consent to be a Research Subject

_____

Introduction
This research study is being conducted by Candice Flowers, graduate student and Dan Dewey, Ph.D. at Brigham Young University to determine the effects one language has on another language. You were invited to participate because you have experience with higher levels of a second language and have spent a minimum of 18 months in a Japanese-speaking country.

Procedures
If you agree to participate in this research study, the following will occur:

- you will be asked to respond to six scenarios that are described on the screen along with a picture of who you are "interacting" with on a computer for no more than 20 minutes about the effects of a second language on a first language
- your response to the scenarios will be spoken out loud as if you are in the scenario at that moment with those pictured
- the interview will be audio and video recorded to ensure accuracy in reporting your statements and to look at any gestures you may make
- the test will take place in a classroom at a certain time frame given in an email sent to you or it will take place at a time and location convenient for you if the given time frame does not work for you
- total time commitment will be no more than 20 minutes

Risks/Discomforts

There is the potential for the following risks to occur: embarrassment and physical discomfort. You are asked to speak out loud to the computer their responses to the scenarios presented on screen. You will be recorded so that I can see all aspects of your response. This may result in embarrassment at having to act out loud your answers instead of simply writing your responses. You will be sitting at a computer for a period of time, no more than 20 minutes, and this may result in mild discomfort.

Benefits
There will be no direct benefits to you. It is hoped, however, that through your participation researchers may learn about effects of a second language on a first language.

Confidentiality
The research data-namely, the audio and video recordings and all associated data- will be kept on a password protected computer and only the researcher will have access to the data. At the conclusion of the study, all identifying information will be removed and the data will be kept on the researcher's protected computer.

Compensation
There is a $10 campus gift card available to you upon completion of the testing and survey.

Participation
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your class status, grade, or standing with the university.

Questions about the Research
If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Candice Flowers at flowcan2@isu.edu or 208-339-8368 for further information.

Questions about Your Rights as Research Participants
If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant contact IRB Administrator at (801) 422-1461; A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu.

Statement of Consent
I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

Appendix B

Survey Questions

Q1 What is your name? This is strictly to match your video response with this survey.

_____

Q2 What is your gender?

o Male (1)

o Female (2)

Q3 How old are you?

_____

Q4 Choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be:

☐ White (1)

☐ Black or African American (2)

☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (3)

☐ Asian (4)

☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)

☐ Other (6) _____

Q5 Please indicate your native language. If you grew up speaking more than one language, please indicate all languages you used but indicate what you consider your native language first.

☐ English (1)

☐ Spanish (2)

☐ Japanese (3)

☐ Other (please specify) (4) _____

☐ Which do you consider your native language? (5)

_____

Q6 Have you served a mission to Japan or spent a significant amount of time learning Japanese?

o Yes (1)

o No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Have you served a mission to Japan or spent a significant amount of time learning Japanese? = No

Q7 Have you taken or are you currently taking Japanese classes at BYU or elsewhere?

o Yes (1)

o No (2)

Skip To: Q9 If Have you taken or are you currently taking Japanese classes at BYU or elsewhere? = No

 Q8 Which Japanese class or classes have you taken or are currently taking? Please list the levels and/or names of the classes taken and where you they were taken. (Ex. BYU 301 Japanese Reading and Culture)

_____

Q9 How long ago did you return from Japan?

o 0-3 months (1)

o 4-6 months (2)

o 7-12 months (3)

o 13-18 months (4)

o 19-24 months (5)

o 25+ months (6)

Q10 How long did you spend in Japan? Please indicate in months.

o 0-3 months (1)

o 4-6 months (2)

o 7-12 months (3)

o 13-18 months (4)

o 19-24 months (5)

o 25+ months (6)

Q11 While in Japan, what percentage, would you say, did you use Japanese in a given day? [used sliding scale from 0 to 100]

Percent of Day Spent Speaking Japanese (1)	

 Q12 Did you study Japanese prior to going to Japan?

o Yes (1)

o No (2)

Skip To: Q14 If Did you study Japanese prior to going to Japan? = No

Q13 If you studied Japanese prior to going to Japan, how did you learn it? Please select all that apply. If there is another way you learned not listed below, please add it under "Other."

☐ Self-taught (via Rosetta Stone, online tutorials, apps, etc) (1)

☐ Classes in School (2)

☐ Study Abroad (3)

☐ Other (4) _____

Q14 How did you study Japanese while in Japan? (You may choose more than one answer and/or provide your own answer under "Other."

☐ Using a dictionary (1)

☐ Reading (2)

☐ Writing (3)

☐ Study Materials Provided by Church (4)

☐ Speaking with native speakers (5)

☐ Living with native speakers (6)

☐ Other (7) _____

REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. (2013). Say what?! L2 sociopragmatic competence in CMC: Skill transfer and development *CALICO Journal; San Marcos 30*(3): 423-445

Ahangar, A., Sarani, S., Zeynali, S. (2015). Apology speech act realization in Sarawani Balochi: A case study of male university students. *Acta Scientiarum. Language and Culture 37*(2): 157-170

Aloia, L. (2009). I'm sorry about your face: A study of face, politeness, and investment in the context of apology (master's thesis). University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA.

Barnlund, D. and Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations 14*: 193-206

Beckwith, S. and Dewaele, J. (2008). The development of apologies in the Japanese L2 of adult English native speakers. *BISAL 3*: 1-26

Beebe, L.M. and Cummings, M.C. (1996). Natural speech act data vs. written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S.M. Gass and J. Neu (Eds.), Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language (pp. 65-86) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Bergman, M. and Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), Interlanguage pragmatics (pp. 82-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Blum-Kulka, S. and Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics 5*(3): 196-213

Brown, A. (2008). Gesture viewpoint in Japanese and English: Cross-linguistic interactions between two languages in one speaker. *Gesture* 8(2): 256-276

Brown, A. and Gullberg, M. (2008). Bidirectional crosslinguistic influence in L1-L2 encoding of manner in speech and gesture: A study of Japanese speakers of English. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 30*(2): 225-251

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Butler, C.D. (2001). The role of context in the apology speech act: A socio-constructivist analysis of the interpretations of native English-speaking college students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin)

Cao, M. (2016). Backward pragmatic transfer: An empirical study on compliment responses among Chinese EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies 6*(9): 1846-1854

Chang, Y. (2010). 'I no say you say is boring': The development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. *Language Sciences 32*(3): 408-424

Cohen, A and Olshtain, E. (1985). Comparing apologies across languages. In Lado, R., & Jankowsky, K. R. (eds) *Scientific and humanistic dimensions of language: Festschrift for Robert Lado on the occasion of his 70th birthday on May 31, 1985.* (pg. 175-184) Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Cook, V. (Ed.) (2003). *Effects of the Second Language on the First.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters

Darby, B. W., and Schlenker, B.R. (1982). Children's reactions to apologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 43*: 742-753

Deutschmann, M. (2003). *Apologising in British English* (Doctoral Dissertation, Moderna språk)

Ewert, A. and Bromberek-Dyzman, K. (2008). Impossible requests: L2 users' sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic choices in L1 acts of refusals. *Eurosla Yearbook 8*(1): 32-51

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hou, Y. (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, Taiwanx

Ikoma, T. and Shimura, A. (1994). Pragmatic transfer in the speech act of refusal in Japanese as a second language. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 5*(1-2): 105-129

Jorden, E.H. and Noda, M. (1987). *Japanese: The spoken language. Part 1*. Westford, MA; Yale

    University Press

Jungheim, N. (2004). Hand in hand: A comparison of gestures accompanying Japanese native speaker

    and JSL learner refusals. *JALT Journal 26*(2): 127-146

Kanik, M. (2011). The effect of content instruction in L2 on L1 pragmatics. *Research in Language 9*(2):

    93-110

Kasper, G. and Rose, K.R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*,

    19: 81-104

Kharkhurin, A. (2008). The effect of linguistic proficiency, age of second language acquisition,

    And length of exposure to a new cultural environment on bilinguals' divergent thinking.

    Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 11(2): 225-243

Kinginger, C. (2011). Enhancing language learning in study abroad. *Review of Applied Linguistics*

    31: 58-73

Kitao, S.K., and Kitao, K. (1987). Differences in the kinesic codes of Americans and Japanese

Kondo, S. (1997). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English:

    Longitudinal study on interlanguage apologies. *Sophia linguistica 41*:265-284

Kramer-Moore, D. and Moore, M. (2003). Pardon me for breathing: Seven types of apology.

    ETC: A Review of General Semantics 60(2): 160-169

Lieske, C. (2010). Bumping into someone: Japanese students' perceptions and observations.

    ELT Journal 64(2): 194-204

Martinez-Flor, A. and Beltran-Palanques, V. (2014). The role of politeness in apology sequences: how to

    maintain harmony between speakers. *ELIA; Sevilla 14*: 43-66

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese.

    Journal of Pragmatics 12(4): 403-426

Meier, A. (1998). Apologies: What do we know? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics 8*(2):

    215-231

Moody, M. (2011). A study of Turkish and English refusal speech acts with a secondary examination for bi-directional language transferrals (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects. Paper 281

Park, H.S. and Guan, X. (2009). Cross-cultural comparison of verbal and nonverbal strategies of apologizing. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication 2*(1): 66-87

Pavlenko, A and Jarvis, S. (2002). Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics 23*(2): 190-214

Pika, N., Nicoladis, E., and Marentette, P. (2006). A cross-cultural study on the use of gestures: Evidence for cross-linguistic transfer? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 9*(3): 319-327

Pizziconi, B. (2007). The lexical mapping of politeness in British English and Japanese. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2): 207-241

Sato, Y. (2012). Benefits of short-term study abroad experiences: What impact do they have on Japanese EFL learners' oral communicative competence. Conference proceedings. Tokyo:JALT 62-71

Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics 2*(4): 423-451

Shiri, S. (2015). Intercultural communicative competence development during and after language study abroad: Insights from Arabic. *Foreign Language Annals 48*(4): 541-569

So, W. (2010). Cross-cultural transfer in gesture frequency in Chinese-English bilinguals. *Language and Cognitive Processes 25*(10): 1335-1353

Sparks, J., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., Humbach, N. (2009). Long-term crosslinguistic transfer of skills from L1 to L2. *Language Learning 59*(1): 203-243

Su, I. (2010). Transfer of pragmatic competences: A bi-directional perspective. *The Modern Language Journal 94*(1): 87-102

Su, I. (2012). Bidirectional transfer in Chinese EFL learners' apologizing behavior. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics 38*(2): 237-266

Sugimoto, N. (1995). *A Japan-U.S. comparison of apology styles* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA). 9604211

Sugimoto, N. (1998a). "Sorry we apologize so much": Linguistics factors affecting Japanese and U.S. American styles of apology. *Intercultural Communication Studies 8*(1): 71-78

Suszczynska, M. (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish, and Hungarian: Different languages, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics 31*(8): 1053-1065

Taguchi, N. (2011). Proficiency, study-abroad, and pragmatic comprehension. *Language Learning 61*(3): 904-939

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18*(2): 188-224

Tavakoli, M. and Shirinbakhsh, S. (2014). Backward pragmatic transfer: The case of refusals in Persian. *International Journal of Society, Culture, and Language 2*(1): 1-24

Valkova, S. (2013). Speech acts or speech act sets: apologies and compliments. *Linguistica Pragensia 23*(2): 44-57

Valkova, S. (2014). A cross-cultural approach to speech-act-sets: The case of apologies. *Topics in Linguistics 13*(1): http://dx.doi.org.erl.lib.byu.edu/10.2478/topling-2014-0001

Warga, M. and Schölmberger, U. (2007). The acquisition of French apologetic behavior in a study abroad Context. *Interlanguage Pragmatics 4*(2): 221-251