

Bi-directional Transfer in Chinese EFL Learners' Apologizing Behavior*

I-Ru Su

National Tsing Hua University

The present study investigated the apologizing behavior of Chinese EFL learners in their first language (L1) and second language (L2) to address the issue of bi-directional language transfer (from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1) in foreign language learning. Data were collected via the instrument of a written discourse completion test. Traces of cross-linguistic influence from both directions were found. As regards L1 influence on the L2, when apologizing in the L2, the intermediate EFL learners were more status-sensitive than the English native controls in their apology realizations. The advanced EFL learners were more prone to acknowledge responsibility to strangers and offer more repairs to acquaintances than the English native controls. Effects of the L2 on the L1 were less noticeable than from the other direction and were mainly observed in the advanced EFL learners. The advanced EFL learners did not vary their apology realization patterns according to the interlocutor's relative power as Chinese native controls did when apologizing in the L1. Taken together, these results show that cross-linguistic influence can occur bi-directionally at the pragmatic level in foreign language learners.

Key words: bi-directional language transfer, speech act of apology, foreign language learning

1. Introduction

Language transfer (or cross-linguistic influence) in adult second language learning has generally been understood to mean the influence of learners' first language (L1) on their learning or use of the second language (L2), and a wealth of research has indeed shown that learners carry their L1 habits into L2 use (e.g., Odlin 1989, Gass & Selinker 1992). An interesting but rarely investigated issue is whether learners' knowledge of an L2 would also affect their competence and use of the L1, that is, if cross-linguistic influence occurs in the reverse direction. The issue of reverse transfer has received little attention in the past most likely because it has been assumed that once a speaker's L1 system has matured, his or her L1 competence is no longer subject to change (e.g., MacWhinney 1997, cited in Pavlenko & Jarvis 2002). However, some studies have shown that L2 users' knowledge and use of their native language are distinguishable from monolinguals' as a result of frequent contact with their L2 (Major 1992, Waas 1996, Latomaa 1998). Thus, the picture of language transfer would not be complete if one considers transfer only from one direction. As Selinker (1969:68) noted in his classic paper on transfer, "one would eventually wish

* Work reported in this paper is part of the results of a research project sponsored by the National Science Council of Taiwan (NSC 94-2411-H-007-017).

to include in a comprehensive and explanatory theory of language transfer...the phenomenon of influence upon the native language by a foreign language.” In recent years, some researchers of second language acquisition have started paying attention to the bi-directional interaction of the two language systems in adult second language users (e.g., Su 2001, 2010, Pavlenko & Jarvis 2002, Cenoz 2003).

Pavlenko & Jarvis (2002), for example, examined the oral narratives of Russian speakers of English in their two languages. One of the areas where they found bi-directional transfer involved linguistic framing with reference to emotions. Pavlenko & Jarvis (2002) found their Russian subjects, while narrating in L2 English, transferred the way of referring to emotional states from L1 to L2 by making use of a VERB + NOUN (e.g., *She had some personal emotions.*) instead of a COPULA + ADJECTIVE construction (e.g., *She was upset.*), which is more characteristic of English. At the same time, the participants also evidenced transfer from L2 to L1 in their narratives in L1 Russian; for instance, in the use of the Russian verb *vygliadet* (‘to look’, meaning appearance), some of the Russian subjects produced VERB + CLAUSE construction, which is more common in English (e.g., *She looked as if she were angry.*) than in Russian with respect to this particular verb.

Su (2001) investigated bi-directional transfer of sentence processing strategies among L2 learners of Chinese and English with different levels of proficiency. Her results showed that L2 learners of all proficiency levels carried their L1 strategies over to L2 processing, and at the same time learners with higher proficiency applied their L2 strategies in processing the L1. Moreover, the advanced learners seemed to have merged the Chinese and English processing strategies and applied the combined strategies in processing both languages. Su’s findings suggested that L2 proficiency plays a role in the interaction patterns of L2 learners’ two languages. Chen (2006) looked at the information sequencing in the L1 and L2 writing of Chinese ESL learners. Forward transfer from L1 to L2 was observed in the Chinese ESL learners’ writing at the discourse level, and backward transfer from L2 to L1 was evident at the sentence level. Chen’s study also indicated that transfer patterns vary as a function of proficiency; forward transfer decreases as L2 proficiency increases, whereas there was no linear relationship between backward transfer and L2 proficiency. It is interesting to note that while Su (2001) found her advanced L2 learners had merged the sentence processing strategies of their L1 and L2, the advanced L2 subjects in Chen (2006) differentiated the rhetoric patterns when writing in their two languages. These research findings together suggest that the interrelation between L2 learners’ two language systems may vary across different levels of language organization (cf. Cook 2003).

Evidence for bi-directional cross-linguistic influence has also been reported in other linguistic areas such as speech production (Flege 1987), pragmatic performance (Blum-Kulka 1990, Cenoz 2003), narrative structure and rhetoric (Stavans 2003), and writing rhetoric (Kubota 1998). These studies have shown that cross-linguistic influence can simultaneously work both ways, from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1, and that L2 users' knowledge and use of their two languages may be distinct from those of monolinguals. This finding attests to the multi-competence view of bilingualism and second language acquisition, which proposes that people who know more than one language have a distinct compound state of mind which is not equivalent to two monolingual states (Cook 1992). The research implication of this finding, as contended by Cook (2003), is that if L2 users are unique in their own right, the interest of second language acquisition research should lie in characterizing the multi-competence of L2 users rather than focusing on their deficiencies compared with native speakers.

In response to Cook's call for more research on discovering the characteristics of L2 users/learners, the present study was undertaken to explore the two-way interaction of pragmatic systems in foreign language learners of English with a focus on the speech act of apology. It is noted that most research on bi-directional transfer is concerned with immigrants or second language learners, who have been immersed in the natural L2 environment for a certain period of time and interact with native speakers on a daily basis. Relatively fewer studies have been conducted to see how the L1 and the L2 interact with each other in the minds of foreign language learners, who have learned the target language in a non-native environment and do not have frequent contact with the target language. We wonder whether the language learning/use context plays a role in how language learners' two languages are interrelated. The present study was designed to probe foreign language learners' apologizing behavior in their L1 and L2, and aims to provide more data to enhance our understanding of bi-directional interaction between the two languages in the foreign language learner.

2. Transfer in speech act performance

Investigations into L2 learners' acquiring pragmatic competence have looked at speech act performance in request, apology, thanking, refusal, complaint, compliment (e.g., Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz 1990, Trosborg 1995, Nakabachi 1996). While there is a large body of research on L1 influence on L2 speech act performance, investigations into L2 influence or bi-directional interference are scarce. Valdés & Pino (1981), Blum-Kulka (1990), Cenoz (2003), and Su (2010) are the few studies

which have addressed the issue of bi-directional transfer of pragmatic competences. Valdés & Pino (1981) compared the compliment responses of Mexican-American bilinguals to those used by monolinguals of American English and Latin-American Spanish. They found the bilinguals had merged the compliment response sets of their two languages and behaved differently from monolinguals. In a study of requesting behavior of American immigrants in Israel who were fluent in their L1 (English) and L2 (Hebrew), Blum-Kulka (1990) also found convergence of requesting repertoires in her bilingual subjects. Cenoz (2003) investigated the requesting behavior in fluent Spanish-English bilinguals studying at the University of the Basque Country who received all their instruction in English, and observed that they made requests in their L1 and L2 in essentially the same way.

Su (2010) looked at the requesting behavior of Chinese EFL learners in their two languages to see if bi-directional transfer also occurred in foreign language learners. Both forward and backward transfer was found; Chinese EFL learners used conventionally indirect strategies significantly less often than English native speakers in making English requests, but more often than Chinese native speakers when requesting in Chinese. Moreover, they showed a differentiated pattern of requesting behavior in their two languages; they were more direct when making requests in Chinese than in English. The latter finding is in contrast to the previous studies which evidenced convergence of the two pragmatic systems of L2 users who resided in the native language environment and had extensive contact with the L2. Su contended that the language learning/use context constitutes an important factor in the two-way interaction of L2 users' two pragmatic systems; the native language environment may foster the integration of the two languages of bilinguals more than the foreign language environment. While the use of L1 is predominant in the foreign language environment, code-switching is often seen among L2 users residing in the native language environment; convergence of pragmatic repertoires may be the result of saving energy in processing so that L2 users do not have to switch back and forth between the norms of their two pragmatic systems.

Su's (2010) study presents interesting findings regarding bi-directional transfer of pragmatic competences in foreign language learners. However, that study involved only one speech act (i.e., request). More research examining different speech acts are needed so that we can better characterize the bi-directional interaction of pragmatic competences between the languages spoken by the foreign language learner. The present study was undertaken to further probe the issue by examining Chinese EFL learners' performance of another speech act—apology.

Cross-cultural research has shown that L1 speakers of different languages employ a similar set of main strategies when apologizing (Cohen & Olshtain 1981,

Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984, Olshtain 1989, Chamani & Zareipur 2010). These strategies include direct expressions of apology (*I'm sorry.*), acknowledging responsibility, providing explanations, offering repairs and verbal redress (such as expressing concern for the offended party and offering promises of forbearance). Among these common strategies, making explicit apologies and assuming responsibility are the essential components of apology and are used in remedy of most offences, while providing explanations and offering repairs and verbal redress are optional and context-dependent (Olshtain 1989, Bergman & Kasper 1993).

Previous research has also reported that speakers' apologizing behavior may be affected by social or contextual factors, such as gender, relative power and social distance between the interlocutors, and severity of the offense (Holmes 1989, Olshtain 1989, Barnlund & Yoshioka 1990, Bergman & Kasper 1993, Shih 2006). Although speakers of different languages adopt similar sets of main apology strategies, they may react differently to social or contextual factors. For instance, in American and Thai apologizing, social power did not influence the offender's selection of strategy (Bergman & Kasper 1993), whereas Japanese and Chinese offenders varied their apology realizations according to the interlocutor's relative status (Barnlund & Yoshioka 1990, Tsai 2002).

With respect to interlanguage apology, studies have shown that L2 learners have access to the same set of apology strategies as native speakers and their strategy use is also sensitive to social factors; however, the frequency with which apology strategies are selected may deviate from native norms in a comparable situation, and L2 learners may react to social factors differently from native speakers. In Cohen & Olshtain (1981), for example, Hebrew learners of English utilized the same semantic formulas as English native speakers, but they were less likely to take on responsibilities or offer repairs and did not intensify their expressions of regret as much as English native speakers did. Language proficiency has also been shown to play a role in the differences between native and nonnative pragmatic performance. For instance, Trosborg (1987) noted that Danish learners of English at the intermediate level provided significantly fewer explanations than English native speakers, but this result could not be attributed to L1 influence because there was no difference in the frequency of this strategy between the Danish and English native speakers in the study. She suggested that lack of linguistic facility may account for the infrequent use of this strategy by less proficient learners.

In Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper & Ross's study (1995) on Japanese ESL learners' interlanguage apology, they found a pervasive effect of positive transfer (i.e., learners adopted the strategy usage which is shared between their L1 and L2 in L2 apology, resulting in appropriate behavior in the L2), whereas negative transfer (i.e.,

learners employed L1-specific strategy usage in L2 apology, resulting in inappropriate behavior in the L2) occurred infrequently; they also found that intermediate learners exhibited more instances of negative transfer than advanced learners. Most of the negative transfer instances occurred in contexts where there was a power difference between the interlocutors. While Americans did not vary their use of routine apology formulas or intensifiers (*I'm very sorry.*) according to the offender's status, Japanese ESL learners adopted fewer apology formulas and intensifiers when the power relation between the interlocutors was high to low than low to high. This contrast in power difference is consistent with Barnlund & Yoshioka's (1990) observation that Japanese are more status-sensitive in their choice of apology strategy than Americans.

3. A cross-cultural comparison of apologizing behavior in English and Chinese

To probe the issue of bi-directionality of language transfer in speech act performance, the present study selected Chinese EFL learners as test subjects. Previous research has indicated that there are similarities and differences in English and Chinese apologies. Native speakers of English and Chinese adopt a similar set of main strategies when apologizing (Olshtain 1989, Tsai 2002). However, they differ in their strategy use in response to certain social contexts. It has been shown that Chinese speakers employed more elaborated strategies when apologizing to a superior than to an inferior (Tsai 2002), whereas English speakers did not vary their strategy use according to the interlocutor's relative status (Barnlund & Yoshioka 1990, Bergman & Kasper 1993).

The fact that Chinese speakers are status-sensitive in their apologizing behavior while English speakers are not, or less so, was also observed in Barnlund & Yoshioka's (1990) study of apology in American and Japanese cultures, and this phenomenon can be explained in terms of cultural differences. Compared to most Western cultures, many Asian cultures place more emphasis on relational hierarchies within the family and society. Some studies have indicated that Asians are more polite when carrying out face-threatening acts (FTAs), such as requests, with people of higher power than with people of lower power, whereas Westerners do not differentiate their strategy use according to the interlocutors' relative power (Lee-Wang 1994, Su 2010). Apologies are a kind of strategy that is used by a speaker to eliminate or mitigate the impact of an act that has damaged the hearer's face (Brown & Levinson 1987). More polite strategies are adopted by the speaker if the FTA is deemed serious. According to Brown and Levinson, power relations between interlocutors influence the perceived seriousness of an FTA. Given that Asians value relational hierarchies within the family and society more than Westerners, perhaps

they consider the damage on the face of the hearer who is of higher status to be a more serious FTA than Westerners do and thus adopt more elaborated apology strategies to mitigate the impact of an offensive act.

Given the differences in the apology realizations between English and Chinese, the present study attempted to address the following questions: (a) To what extent does Chinese EFL learners' L1 influence their apologizing performance in their L2? (b) To what extent does Chinese EFL learners' knowledge of the L2 in turn influence their apologizing behavior in the L1? (c) How do the transfer patterns in Chinese EFL learners' apologizing behavior vary as a function of proficiency?

4. The present study

4.1 Subjects

A total of 120 college students participated in this study. They were the same participants in Su (2010). They comprised four groups: English and Chinese native controls and Chinese EFL learners at the intermediate and advanced levels. There were thirty participants in each group, and each had an equal number of males and females. English and Chinese native controls provided the baseline data against which the EFL subjects' data were compared to identify possible cross-linguistic influence in both directions. English native controls were American college students who were recruited from a university in the United States. They were Caucasians who did not know Chinese and were not fluent in any other L2. Chinese native controls were recruited from Taiwan. It is, however, almost impossible to find Taiwan college students who do not know English at all, as English is a mandatory subject in Taiwan's secondary education and students study English for at least six years before they attend college. One solution to this problem was to find EFL learners with minimal proficiency in English in order to minimize the influence of English on their use of Chinese. Therefore, a TOFEL test (paper version) was administered to the Chinese subjects and each of them was assigned to one of the following groups according to his/her score: control (around 350), intermediate (around 470), and advanced (above 600)¹.

4.2 Instruments and procedures

Data were collected through the instrument of written discourse completion tests (DCTs). The questionnaire contained 15 situations, including 6 offense situations and

¹ The cut-off scores were arbitrarily set. The decision was made with an intention to enlarge the gap of English proficiency among the different Chinese groups so that possible differences among groups in their apologizing behavior could be observed.

9 request scenarios. Two different kinds of social situations were included in the test in order to prevent the subjects from answering mechanically, and to collect more data on EFL learners' speech act performance. The analysis in the present study pertained only to the subjects' apology performance in the 6 offense situations. The offense situations varied according to two social factors: status and distance. The variable of social status was categorized into three levels: high (the apologizer has a higher status than the apologizee), equal (the apologizer has an equal status to the apologizee), and low (the apologizer has a lower status than the apologizee). The variable of social distance varied on two levels: acquaintance (the interactants knew each other) and stranger (the interactants had never met before).

English and Chinese versions of the questionnaire were created; both versions contained the same scenarios. The DCTs used in the study contained the following offense situations:

- S1 Exam papers:* The teacher promised to give back students' exam papers in class, but then informs the students that he/she has not finished grading them.
- S2 Job interview:* The manager scheduled a job interview with an applicant, but the manager was 20 minutes late because s/he received a phone call before the interview.
- S3 Watch movie:* The person planned to watch a movie with a friend, but s/he was late; the movie had started before s/he arrived.
- S4 Car incident:* The person accidentally backed into someone's car.
- S5 Return book:* The student promised to return the book s/he had borrowed from a professor, but s/he forgot to bring it.
- S6 Coffee spill:* The waiter/waitress spilled some coffee on a customer's jacket.

An example of an offense situation is given below:

You are the manager of a company. Today you have scheduled a job interview with an applicant. But before the interview, you received a phone call and thus are 20 minutes later for the interview. When you see the applicant, what would you say to him/her?

You say, " _____ "

The experiment was divided into two sessions, one in English and the other in Chinese. English and Chinese native controls completed only one session in their respective native language. The two groups of EFL subjects completed the two sessions on different days two weeks apart. The order of the administration of English and Chinese tests was counterbalanced within each L2 group.

4.3 Data analysis

Subjects' apology realizations were coded and classified into five major strategies based on the coding scheme of the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). Explanations and examples of each of these strategies are given below:

- (1) Direct apology: The speaker expresses an explicit apology with formulaic, routinized expressions such as *I'm sorry*, *Excuse me*, *duibuqi* 'Excuse me,' *buhaoyisi* 'I'm sorry,' *baoqian* 'I'm sorry.'
- (2) Taking on responsibility: The speaker admits the offense, including self-blame (*It's all my fault*; *shi wo bu xiaoxin* 'I wasn't careful enough. '), lack of intent (*I accidentally left the book in my car*; *wo bushi guyide* 'I didn't do it on purpose. '), admission of fact (*I haven't corrected the exam papers yet*; *wo jintian wanji ba shu dailai* 'I forgot to bring the book today. ').
- (3) Explanation: The speaker gives an explanation or account of the situation in order to mitigate his/her guilt. (*I got an unexpected phone call and lost track of time*; *youyu laoshi zhejitian hen mang*, *suoyi meiyou gaiwan* 'Because teacher (I) was busy lately, (I) haven't finished grading (all the exam papers) yet. ').
- (4) Offer of repair: The speaker offers to remedy damage inflicted on the offended party by specific compensation for the offense (*I'll return the book as soon as possible*; *zhecide dianyinpiao wo qing* 'The movie ticket is on me. ').
- (5) Verbal redress²: The speaker expresses concern for the offended party (*Are you OK?*; *ni youmeiyou tangdao* 'Did you get burned?'), or promises of forbearance (*I promise it won't happen again*; *wo xiaci hui gaijing*, *buhui zai chidaole* 'I'll improve next time, won't be late again. ').

Two independent raters coded the data. To calculate interrater reliability for the two independent raters, a subset (50%) of the data was compared; agreement was 95%. After the two raters coded all the data, their coding results were compared and consensus was reached when there was disagreement.

When calculating the number of strategies used in each apology response, we counted the occurrence of a certain strategy once even if it appeared more than once in the same response. Therefore, the maximum number of strategies used in each apology realization is five. Independent *t*-tests were first carried out to see if there were differences in the frequency usage of apology strategies between English and

² In Blum-Kulka et al.'s CCSARP, showing concern for the offended party and offering promises of forbearance are coded as separate strategies, but in the present study they were conflated as one strategy—verbal redress.

Chinese native controls. A one-way ANOVA was then conducted to compare the apology strategy use among the native speakers and the EFL learners. Finally, a series of *t*-tests (paired samples) was conducted within each group of EFL subjects to compare their performance in English and Chinese to see if these L2 learners exhibited different apologizing behavior in their two languages. The significance value was set at 0.05.

5. Results and discussion

5.1 English and Chinese native speakers’ apologizing behavior

Overall the English and Chinese native speakers did not differ significantly in the average number of apology strategies used in each response (1.89 vs. 2.16), or in the frequencies of use of individual apology strategies. Table 1 presents the distributions of the five major apology strategies across all situations in the two control groups. As we can see, both groups of native controls had the same preference order for the selection of apology strategies, with direct apologies and taking on responsibility being adopted much more often than the other strategies.

Table 1. Distribution of apology strategies by English and Chinese native speakers (%)

	ENSs	CNSs	<i>t</i> -test	p
Direct apology	44	37	1.94	n.s.
Taking on responsibility	27	29	1.49	n.s.
Offer of repair	13	15	1.16	n.s.
Explanation	10	9	0.37	n.s.
Verbal redress	4	6	1.71	n.s.
Other	2	4	--	--

Note: The category “other” includes opting out (denying responsibility) and evasive strategies (minimizing the degree of offense), which did not count as apology strategies in this study.

Although English native speakers (ENSs) and Chinese native speakers (CNSs) did not vary in the average number of apology strategies provided in each response or in the frequency usage of each main strategy, they differed in the overall apology realization patterns in relation to the social factor of status. Table 2 lists both groups’ mean numbers of strategies used in different social contexts. As shown, while ENSs employed a similar number of apology strategies across social power conditions, CNSs used more strategies as the addressee’s status increased. That is, CNSs were status-sensitive in their apologizing behavior; they elaborated on their apology realizations and thus were more polite as they apologized to addressees of higher

status. One-way ANOVA analysis confirmed this observation; no statistical significance was found in the ENSs' strategy use across power relations ($F = 0.77$, *n.s.*), but a significant difference was found in CNSs' ($F = 10.51$, $p = .000$). Independent *t*-test analysis also indicated that CNSs employed significantly more strategies than their English counterparts when the offended party was of higher social status ($t = 4.07$, $p = .000$). These findings are in line with previous studies on English and Chinese apologies (Barnlund & Yoshioka 1990, Tsai 2002).

Table 2. Average number of strategies in relation to social variables in the control groups

	ENSs		CNSs		<i>t</i> -test	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Social Status						
High	3.70	1.37	3.20	1.30	1.45	<i>n.s.</i>
Equal	3.97	1.19	4.03	1.35	-0.20	<i>n.s.</i>
Low	3.60	0.97	4.67	1.06	-4.07	.000
<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 0.77$ <i>n.s.</i>		$F = 10.51$ $p = .000$			
Social Distance						
Acquaintance	5.77	1.61	6.07	1.55	-0.73	<i>n.s.</i>
Stranger	5.47	1.76	5.80	1.58	-0.77	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>t</i> -test	$t = 0.83$ <i>n.s.</i>		$t = 0.79$ <i>n.s.</i>			

Note: The maximum number in each category of status is 10 (5 major strategies \times 2 situations); the maximum number in each category of distance is 15 (5 major strategies \times 3 situations).

English and Chinese native controls' apologizing behavior was further scrutinized by examining the frequency of each major apology strategy in response to the social parameters of status and distance. One-way ANOVA and *t*-tests were conducted to see if the subjects' use of individual strategies varied according to the status and distance conditions, respectively, and the results are given in Appendix 1. In general, both groups of native speakers exhibited little difference in their use of individual strategies in relation to the two social factors, except for the selection of direct apologies. While ENSs adopted explicit apology formulas to a similar extent regardless of the offended party's status ($F = 2.13$, *n.s.*), CNSs used significantly fewer direct apologies when apologizing to an addressee of lower status than to one of equal or higher status ($F = 21.56$, $p = .00$). *T*-test analysis further showed that CNSs adopted significantly fewer explicit apology formulas than ENSs when apologizing to an inferior ($t = 3.33$, $p = .002$).

Comparing ENSs' and CNSs' usage of individual strategies across power conditions, we also noted that CNSs acknowledged responsibility ($t = -3.05$, $p = .003$) and expressed verbal redress ($t = -3.69$, $p = .000$) significantly more often than ENSs

did when the offended party had higher power (see Appendix 1). With respect to the factor of social distance, CNSs were more prone to acknowledge responsibility to strangers ($t = -2.09, p = .04$) and to offer more repairs ($t = -2.48, p = .02$) and verbal redress ($t = -2.69, p = .01$) to acquaintances than ENSs. However, the occurrences of verbal redress were so few that the differences between the two groups may be due to chance.

To summarize, English and Chinese native controls shared a similar preference order for the selection of apology strategies and displayed similar frequencies of use of individual apology strategies. Moreover, there was little variation in their use of each main strategy in relation to the social factors examined, except for the strategy of direct apologies. Nonetheless, we found that CNSs' overall apology realization patterns were more sensitive to the interlocutor's relative social status than ENSs'; Chinese native speakers used more elaborated apology strategies or combinations of strategies and thus were more polite when expressing apologies to a superior.

5.2 Chinese EFL learners' apologizing behavior in L2 English

Now we turn to Chinese EFL learners. First, we look at their apology performance in L2 English and see how they differed from the English native controls in their apology realizations.

In terms of the average number of strategies used in each response, no significant difference was found between the intermediate group and the ENSs (1.77 vs. 1.89) or between the advanced group and the ENSs (2.07 vs. 1.89). However, a significant difference was found between the two learner groups (1.77 vs. 2.07). This difference can be explained in terms of linguistic facility; the advanced learners simply were more linguistically capable of elaborating on apology realizations than the intermediate learners.

Table 3 presents the frequency usage of each main strategy in EFL learners' apology realizations in comparison with ENSs'. As shown, neither group of learners deviated from the ENSs, except for providing explanations. The intermediate learners provided significantly fewer explanations to mitigate their offenses than the ENSs and the advanced learners (ENSs: 10%; intermediate EFL: 4%; advanced EFL: 10%). This phenomenon was also observed in Trosborg's (1987) study of Danish learners of English. In the present study, as well as in Trosborg's, the under-use of providing accounts could not be attributed to L1 influence because in both studies there was no difference between the L1 and L2 native controls in this regard. The ability to account adequately for an offensive act is likely to require higher-level linguistic ability, and

we can expect that less proficient learners may provide fewer accounts and justifications as a result of their limited ability.

Table 3. Distribution of apology strategies in the English test (%)

	ENSs	Inter EFL	Adv EFL	F	p
Direct apology	44	45	38	0.92	n.s.
Taking on responsibility	27	27	30	2.88	n.s.
Offer of repair	13	16	17	1.80	n.s.
Explanation	10 ^a	4 ^b	10 ^a	14.04	.000
Verbal redress	4	4	6	0.93	n.s.
Other	2	4	1	--	--

Note: Numbers with different alphabet letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test. For example, the intermediate EFL learners' frequency of use of explanation differs significantly from that of ENSs and the advanced EFL learners, but the latter two groups do not differ from each other.

Non-native subjects' overall strategy use in relation to the two social factors was further examined and compared to that of ENSs (Table 4). Statistical analyses indicated that the intermediate learners were sensitive to power in their apology responses, while the advanced learners and the ENSs were not; none of the groups reacted to the factor of distance. As shown in Table 4, the intermediate learners employed far fewer strategies when apologizing to inferiors than to equals and superiors. The fact that the intermediate group made their apology responses contingent on the direction of the status relationship could be a result of L1 transfer. The CNSs have been shown to vary their apology realization patterns according to their interlocutors' relative social status, whereas ENSs did not (Table 2). On the other hand, the fact that the advanced group adopted a similar number of strategies across status conditions suggests that they may have become more acculturated and have picked up the egalitarian target usage in this respect.

Table 4. Average number of strategies in relation to social variables in the English test

	ENSSs		Inter EFL		Adv EFL		ANVOA	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Social Status								
High	3.70	1.37	3.10	1.56	3.73	1.17	2.01	n.s.
Equal	3.97	1.19	3.70	0.95	4.03	1.27	0.71	n.s.
Low	3.60	0.97	3.83	1.05	4.17	0.87	2.59	n.s.
<i>ANOVA</i>	<i>F = 0.77 n.s.</i>		<i>F = 3.08 p = .05</i>		<i>F = 1.18 n.s.</i>			
Social Distance								
Acquaintance	5.77	1.61	5.60	1.63	6.23	1.45	1.32	n.s.
Stranger	5.47 ^a	1.76	5.00 ^b	1.93	6.17 ^a	1.05	3.92	.02
<i>t-test</i>	<i>t = 0.84 n.s.</i>		<i>t = 1.89 n.s.</i>		<i>t = 0.25 n.s.</i>			

Note: Numbers with different letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test. The maximum number in each category of status is 10 (5 major strategies \times 2 situations for each category); the maximum number in each category of distance is 15 (5 major strategies \times 3 situations for each category).

With respect to the frequency of each apology strategy in response to status and distance, overall there was little difference among the EFL learner groups and ENSs (see Appendix 2). What is noteworthy, however, is that, while ENSs’ use of explicit apology formulas did not vary according to status relations ($F = 2.13, n.s.$), the intermediate ($F = 4.10 p = .02$) and advanced ($F = 10.41 p = .00$) learners did react to the status factor; more specifically, both groups of learners appeared to use significantly fewer direct apologies with people of lower status (intermediate EFL: 70%; advanced EFL: 65%) than with people of higher status (intermediate EFL: 89%; advanced EFL: 79%).

Recall that CNSs were more status-sensitive than ENSs in their use of direct apologies, and so these results can be an indication of L1 influence. To illustrate, responses representative of the four groups of subjects given in “Exam Papers” and “Return Book”, two situations with contrasting power relations, are provided below. In “Exam Papers” the power relation is high (the teacher) to low (the students), whereas in “Return Book”, the power relation is low (the student) to high (the professor). Direct expressions of apology are underlined.

(6) English native speaker

(Exam Papers): I’m sorry class, but I was not able to finish correcting all of the exams today. However, I will get them back to you by the next class.

(Return Book): I’m sorry but I forgot to bring your book today. Is it okay if I bring it next class? Sorry!

(7) Chinese native speaker

(Exam Papers)

Youyu wo haimei gai wan kaojuan, suoyi xia-tang ke zai fa.
because I haven't mark finish exam so next-CL class ZAI give
'Because I have not finished marking the exams, (I) will give them back in the next class.'

(Return Book)

Jiaoshou duibuqi, wo wangji ba nide shu dailai le, zhengshi buhaoyisi,
professor sorry I forget BA your book bring LE really sorry
mingtian wo yiding hui dailai huan ni de.
tomorrow I definitely will bring return you DE
'Professor, sorry. I forgot to bring your book. I'm really sorry. Tomorrow I'll be sure to return (it) to you.'

(8) Intermediate EFL learner

(Exam Papers): Because I'm so busy recently, so I'll give you the paper next week.

(Return Book): Professor, I'm sorry I forgot to bring your book. I will return it tomorrow.

(9) Advanced EFL learner

(Exam Papers): Class, the test result is not ready yet. Please wait for one more week.

(Return Book): Professor, I'm sorry for not returning the book you lent me to you today. I'll bring it to you tomorrow, I promise. Sorry again.

As we can see from the examples, both the intermediate and advanced learners employed more direct apologies, as did CNSs, when apologizing to a superior than to an inferior, which is an indication of L1 transfer. Moreover, the advanced EFL learners were more prone to acknowledge responsibility to strangers and offer more repairs to acquaintances than ENSs did (see Appendix 2). This is also an indication of L1 influence, as CNSs have been shown to diverge from ENSs in these aspects. It is interesting to note that the advanced learners seemed to have experienced more negative transfer from the L1 than the intermediate learners, a phenomenon which is contrary to our expectation. Given that more proficient learners are supposedly more acculturated than less proficient learners, the former are expected to conform more to the native norm and exhibit less L1 transfer than the latter. Previous research on interlanguage apology has noted that advanced learners are more capable of positively transferring their L1 strategies in L2 apologizing than lower-level learners, since advanced learners have better linguistic abilities (Trosborg 1987, Maeshiba et al. 1995, Shih 2006). In light of the findings of the present study, it is probably fair to say that advanced learners are also more likely than less proficient learners to negatively

transfer their L1 apologizing behavior to their L2 because they have better linguistic facility and can translate apology strategies from the L1 to the L2. A similar finding was also reported by Takahashi & Beebe (1993) in their investigation of Japanese ESL learners' correcting behavior in English.

To recap, effects of the first language on the second were observed in Chinese EFL learners' apology performance in their L2. Like CNSs, the intermediate learners were status-sensitive in their overall apology responses when apologizing in the L2. Although the advanced learners did not vary their English apology realization patterns according to the addressee's relative status, they behaved like CNSs in that they acknowledged responsibility more often than ENSs when the offended party was a stranger and offered more repairs to an acquaintance than ENSs did. In addition to L1 influence, learners' language proficiency also plays a role in the differences observed between nonnative and native apology performance.

5.3 Chinese EFL learners' apologizing behavior in L1 Chinese

Now we turn to Chinese EFL learners' apology performance in their L1 to see if learners transferred their L2 apology behavior into the L1.

Neither group of EFL learners differed from CNSs in the average number of strategies used in each response (CNSs: 2.16, intermediate EFL: 2.02, advanced EFL: 2.06). Also, no difference was found between the learner groups and the control group in the frequency usage of each main strategy (see Table 5). Table 6 presents Chinese EFL learners' strategy use in relation to the social factors in comparison with that of CNSs. The factor of social status appeared to affect the apology responses of CNSs and the intermediate learners, but not the advanced learners'. More specifically, while CNSs and the intermediate learners adopted significantly fewer strategies when apologizing to inferiors than to equals and superiors, the advanced learners made use of a similar number of strategies regardless of the interlocutor's relative status. For the advanced subjects, this can be an indication of L2 influence because the variable of social status did not affect ENSs' overall strategy use, and the advanced subjects have picked up this egalitarian target usage in their L2 apology. They may have carried this L2-specific behavior over to L1 apologizing.

Table 5. Distribution of apology strategies in the Chinese test (%)

	CNSs	Inter EFL	Adv EFL	F	p
Direct apology	37	40	39	1.07	n.s.
Taking on responsibility	29	26	25	0.95	n.s.
Offer of repair	15	16	15	0.14	n.s.
Explanation	9 ^{ab}	8 ^a	12 ^b	3.21	.05
Verbal redress	6	7	7	0.07	n.s.
Other	4	4	3	--	--

Note: Numbers with different alphabet letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test. For the strategy of explanation, the intermediate and advanced groups differed significantly from each other in the frequency of this strategy, but neither of the groups varied from the Chinese control group.

Table 6. Average number of strategies in relation to social variables in the Chinese test

	CNSs		Inter EFL		Adv EFL		ANOVA	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Social Status								
High	3.20	1.30	3.50	1.70	3.87	1.04	1.78	n.s.
Equal	4.03	1.35	4.20	1.21	4.23	1.28	0.21	n.s.
Low	4.67	1.06	4.37	1.03	4.23	1.17	1.25	n.s.
<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 10.5$ $p = .000$		$F = 3.51$ $p = .03$		$F = 0.99$ $n.s.$			
Social Distance								
Acquaintance	6.07	1.55	5.97	1.54	6.00	1.74	0.03	n.s.
Stranger	5.80	1.58	6.17	1.80	6.37	1.69	0.86	n.s.
<i>t-test</i>	$t = 0.79$ $n.s.$		$t = 0.69$ $n.s.$		$t = 1.00$ $n.s.$			

Note: The maximum number in each category of status is 10 (5 major strategies \times 2 situations for each category); the maximum number in each category of distance is 15 (5 major strategies \times 3 situations for each category).

Appendix 3 displays the frequency usage of each apology strategy in the three groups of subjects in relation to status and distance. As can be seen, little difference was observed between the learner groups and the control group with respect to the use of individual strategy in different social contexts. In brief, L2 influence in L1 apology was not as noticeable as the reverse and was mainly observed in the advanced EFL learners.

5.4 Within-group comparisons in English vs. Chinese

Another interesting issue in the bi-directional interaction of L2 learners' two pragmatic systems is whether learners merge or distinguish the two systems. This issue can be addressed by comparing L2 learners' performances in both languages.

Let us begin with the intermediate EFL learners. The intermediate learners used significantly more strategies when redressing offenses in Chinese (2.02) than in English (1.77). They also provided significantly more explanations in Chinese apologies than in English apologies (8% vs. 4%). In addition, as seen in Table 7, the intermediate learners employed significantly more apology strategies in Chinese than in English in half of the social conditions. Overall, it seems the intermediate learners had two separate apologizing repertoires, as there were significant differences in their strategy use in their two languages. Looking back on the apology behavior of the Chinese and English native controls, however, we find this should not be the case. The two groups of native speakers did not significantly differ from each other in the average number of strategies used in each response; nor did they differ in the frequency of providing explanations or in the numbers of strategies used in different social contexts except for one (Tables 1 and 2). A possible explanation for the observed variations in the intermediate EFL learners' apologizing behavior in their two languages is that their linguistic command was not great enough to elaborate on their apology realizations in the L2, and so their apology realizations were shorter in English than in Chinese.

Table 7. Average number of strategies in relation to social variables in English and Chinese tests in the *intermediate* group

	English test		Chinese test		t-test	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Social Status						
High	3.10	1.56	3.50	1.70	1.51	n.s.
Equal	3.70	0.95	4.20	1.21	-2.24	.03
Low	3.83	1.05	4.37	1.03	-2.15	.04
<i>ANOVA</i>	<i>F = 3.08 p = .05</i>		<i>F = 3.51 p = .03</i>			
Social Distance						
Acquaintance	5.60	1.63	5.97	1.54	-1.41	n.s.
Stranger	5.00	1.93	6.17	1.80	-3.34	.002
<i>t-test</i>	<i>t = 1.89 n.s.</i>		<i>t = 0.69 n.s.</i>			

In contrast to the intermediate EFL learners, the advanced EFL learners did not show a differentiated pattern in their apologizing behavior in their two languages. They employed a similar number of apology strategies in their L1 (2.06) and L2 (2.07). There was no difference in the frequency of each main strategy in their two languages. Moreover, there was little variation between their two languages in the apology realization patterns in relation to the social factors (see Table 8). An examination of their frequency usage of individual strategies in response to status and distance also revealed little difference. They seemed to have merged the apologizing

repertoires of English and Chinese and apologized in essentially the same way in their two languages.

Table 8. Average number of strategies in relation to social variables in English and Chinese tests in the advanced group

	English test		Chinese test		t-test	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Social Status						
High	3.73	1.17	3.87	1.04	-0.45	n.s.
Equal	4.03	1.27	4.23	1.28	-0.70	n.s.
Low	4.17	0.87	4.23	1.17	-0.32	n.s.
<i>ANOVA</i>	<i>F = 1.18 n.s.</i>		<i>F = 0.99 n.s.</i>			
Social Distance						
Acquaintance	6.23	1.45	6.00	1.74	-0.66	n.s.
Stranger	6.17	1.05	6.37	1.69	-0.70	n.s.
<i>t-test</i>	<i>t = 0.25 n.s.</i>		<i>t = -1.00 n.s.</i>			

To illustrate, recall that the advanced EFL learners did not vary their Chinese apology responses according to the addressee's relative status as the CNSs did; they have acquired the English egalitarian usage and applied the egalitarian usage in both L1 and L2 apologies. Take "Job Interview" and "Coffee Spill" as examples. The two situations differed in the power relation between the two interlocutors. In "Job Interview", the power relation is high (the manager) to low (the job applicant), whereas in "Coffee Spill" the power relation is low (the waiter) to high (the customer). As we can see in the following examples, the same advanced learner used elaborated apology strategies in both situations in both languages.

(10) English DCT

(Job Interview): Sorry for the wait. I really appreciate your patience. I was trapped by an emergent call. Do you still feel comfortable to have the interview?

(Coffee Spill): Oh, Sir, I'm so sorry! Are you alright? I'm so sorry!

(11) Chinese DCT

(Job Interview):

Duibuqi, jiu den le, shizai tai mang le, gang lai zhiqian jiedao kehu
 sorry long wait LE really too busy LE just come before receive client
 dianhua, yidingde chuli yixia, den zheme jiu, buhui jinzhang ba...
 phone.call must deal.with YIXIA wait so long not nervous BA
 'Sorry for having kept you waiting. (I'm) very busy. (I) just got a call from a client
 and (I) had to take care of that. (You) have been waiting so long, (you) are not
 nervous, (are you)?'

(Coffee Spill):

Duibuqi, duibuqi, you mei you tangdao? Yifu haihao ba?

sorry sorry have not have burn clothes ok BA

Zhenshi hen duibuqi.

really very sorry

‘Sorry, sorry, (did you) get burned? Are (your) clothes OK? (I)’m truly sorry.’

6. Conclusion

The present study investigated Chinese EFL learners’ apology behavior in their L1 and L2 to address the issue of whether cross-linguistic influence in pragmatic competences occurs bi-directionally in foreign language learners. The findings of this study indicate that language transfer can occur bi-directionally in foreign language learners’ apology performance; nonetheless, transfer from L2 to L1 is less noticeable than transfer from the reverse direction and is only evident in learners with a high proficiency level.

Overall, the Chinese EFL learners did not deviate from the L1 and L2 native controls in the frequencies of individual apology strategies or in preference for certain apology strategies. However, traces of cross-linguistic influence from both directions were observed in their overall strategy use in relation to the social factors and in their use of certain strategies in particular social contexts. As regards L1 influence on L2, when apologizing in L2 English, the intermediate EFL learners were more status-sensitive in their overall strategy use than the English native controls, and both intermediate and advanced learners reacted to the factor of social status in their use of direct apologies. Moreover, when apologizing in English, the advanced EFL learners were more prone to acknowledge responsibility to strangers and offered more repairs to acquaintances than the English native controls, as a result of L1 transfer. Effects of the L2 on the L1 were only observed in the advanced EFL learners. When apologizing in the L1, the advanced learners behaved like the English native controls, in that they did not vary their apology realization patterns according to the addressee’s relative social status as did the Chinese native controls; they made use of a similar number of strategies regardless of the social status of the offended person.

The present study has shown that bi-directional cross-linguistic influence can occur at the pragmatic level in foreign language learners, and thus lends support to Su’s (2010) findings. Previous research on pragmatic performance of immigrants evidenced convergence of pragmatic systems in bilinguals (Valdés & Pino 1981, Blum-Kulka 1990). Su (2010), however, showed that foreign language learners had two separate pragmatic repertoires, which differed in some way from that of native

controls. She suggested that the language learning/use context may play a role in the way the two languages of the bilingual are interrelated; the native language environment may facilitate the integration of the two languages of the bilingual more than the foreign language environment, at least at the pragmatic level.

However, while Su (2010) found the Chinese EFL learners differentiated their two pragmatic systems in terms of the requesting repertoires, the present study showed that the advanced EFL learners merged the apology repertoires of their two languages. One possible reason is that English and Chinese share more similarities in apology realizations than in request realizations. Indeed, in our analyses of English and Chinese apologies presented by native speakers, we found they shared a similar preference order for the selection of strategies and displayed similar frequencies of individual strategies. On the other hand, in terms of request performance, English native speakers were found to employ significantly more conventionally indirect strategies than their Chinese counterparts. English conventional indirectives such as *Could you...? Can you...?* are likely to be treated as formulas and explicitly taught in the foreign language classroom, and this may be the reason for the significant differences in the frequency usage of this strategy in the EFL learner's request realizations in their two languages. The results of the present study and Su (2010) together suggest that the patterns of bi-directional interaction between language learners' two pragmatic competences may vary across speech acts as a result of the different degree of similitude in the realizations of a given speech act shared by the learner's two languages and the way in which a given speech act is learned.

The finding of the present study as well as previous studies, showing that language learners' native language can be affected by the learning of an additional language, has implications for the methodology of second language learning research. Given that L2 learners' competence and use of their native language may be different from that of monolingual native speakers, one should avoid using L2 learners to serve as both bilingual subjects and native controls of learners' L1 when conducting investigations on cross-linguistic influences. However, with the frequent contact among nations in this modern world, pure monolinguals, who do not know any second language, are difficult to find. The solution that has been adopted is to abandon the attempt to contrast pure monolinguals with L2 learners or users, instead contrasting minimal versus maximal bilinguals (Cook 2003). For example, in the present study, a language proficiency test was administered to the Chinese subjects to place them in different groups, and the subjects with minimal proficiency of English served as Chinese native controls. In Cenoz's (2003) study of Spanish-English bilinguals' requesting behavior, he divided Spanish subjects into two groups based on the length of time learning English. Spanish native controls comprised college

students who were “non-fluent” in English in that they had learned it only at school for three years before college and had not had further contact with it, whereas L2 subjects were “fluent” in English by virtue of receiving all their college instruction in English.

The present study is not without limitations. First, the present study looked only at the production of apology. Speakers’ assessment of the severity of the offense and the obligation to apologize have also been shown to affect the strategy use (Olshtain 1989, Bergman & Kasper 1993). Future research should also look into speakers’ perception of offense situations and see how their perceptions are reflected in apology realizations. Second, the data was collected by means of DCTs, which present some limitations (Beebe & Cummings 1996). Data collected by DCTs have been found to be shorter and less elaborated than those elicited via oral role plays and authentic interaction, although all these methods yield similar words and expressions (Rintell & Mitchell 1989). More research adopting different instruments is surely needed to see if similar results are obtained. Some spoken corpora have become available in recent years and they provide potential sources of authentic data for researchers to investigate speech act performance.

Appendix 1

Average number of individual strategies in relation to *social status* in the control groups

Strategy	Status	ENSs		CNSs		t-test	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Direct apology	High	1.57	0.63	1.03	0.61	3.33	.002
	Equal	1.83	0.38	1.77	0.43	0.64	n.s.
	Low	1.70	0.47	1.77	0.43	0.58	n.s.
	ANOVA	F = 2.13 n.s.		F = 21.56 p = .00			
Taking on responsibility	High	1.10	0.71	1.23	0.68	0.74	n.s.
	Equal	1.03	0.67	1.10	0.76	0.36	n.s.
	Low	0.93	0.25	1.20	0.41	3.05	.003
	ANOVA	F = 0.62 n.s.		F = 0.36 n.s.			
Offer of repair	High	0.13	0.34	0.03	0.18	1.40	n.s.
	Equal	0.47	0.57	0.60	0.67	0.83	n.s.
	Low	0.9	0.76	1.2	0.66	1.63	n.s.
	ANOVA	F = 13.02 p = .00		F = 32.94 p = .00			
Explanation	High	0.83	0.53	0.93	0.52	0.74	n.s.
	Equal	0.30	0.47	0.27	0.45	0.28	n.s.
	Low	0	0	0	0	--	n.s.
	ANOVA	F = 32.14 p = .00		F = 43.92 p = .00			
Verbal redress	High	0.03	0.18	0	0	1	n.s.
	Equal	0.33	0.48	0.23	0.43	0.85	n.s.
	Low	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	3.69	.000
	ANOVA	F = 2.67 p = .003		F = 12.69 p = .00			

Note: The maximum mean is 2 (there are two situations for each status category).

Average number of individual strategies in relation to social distance in the control groups

Strategy	Distance	ENSs		CNSs		t-test	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Direct apology	Acquaintance	2.33	0.92	1.93	0.87	1.73	n.s.
	Stranger	2.77	0.50	2.63	0.55	0.97	n.s.
		<i>t</i> = 2.36 <i>p</i> = .03		<i>t</i> = 3.75 <i>p</i> = .001			
Taking on responsibility	Acquaintance	2.33	0.84	2.43	0.73	0.49	n.s.
	Stranger	0.73	0.52	1.10	0.80	2.09	.04
		<i>t</i> = 10.77 <i>p</i> = .000		<i>t</i> = 8.65 <i>p</i> = .000			
Offer of repair	Acquaintance	0.63	0.56	1.00	0.59	2.48	.02
	Stranger	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.83	0.15	n.s.
		<i>t</i> = 1.32 n.s.		<i>t</i> = 1.05 n.s.			
Explanation	Acquaintance	0.47	0.57	0.47	0.68	0	n.s.
	Stranger	0.73	0.45	0.67	0.48	0.56	n.s.
		<i>t</i> = 1.77 n.s.		<i>t</i> = 1.24 n.s.			
Verbal redress	Acquaintance	0	0	0.2	0.40	2.69	.01
	Stranger	0.33	0.48	0.57	0.68	1.54	n.s.
		<i>t</i> = 3.81 <i>p</i> = .001		<i>t</i> = 2.26 <i>p</i> = .03			

Note: The maximum mean is 3 (there are three situations for each distance category).

Appendix 2

Average number of individual strategies in relation to social status in the English test

Strategy	Status	ENSs		Inter EFL		Adv EFL		ANOVA	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Direct apology	High	1.57	0.63	1.40	0.81	1.30	0.47	1.29	n.s.
	Equal	1.83	0.38	1.80	0.48	1.83	0.38	0.06	n.s.
	Low	1.70	0.47	1.77	0.43	1.57	0.50	1.42	n.s.
		<i>F</i> = 2.13 n.s.		<i>F</i> = 4.10 <i>p</i> = .02		<i>F</i> = 10.41 <i>p</i> = .00			
Taking on responsibility	High	1.10	0.71	1.20	0.71	1.27	0.78	0.39	n.s.
	Equal	1.03 ^{ab}	0.67	0.80 ^a c	0.66	1.30 ^b	0.65	4.29	.02
	Low	0.93	0.25	0.97	0.67	1.13	0.43	1.48	n.s.
		<i>F</i> = 0.62 n.s.		<i>F</i> = 2.59 n.s.		<i>F</i> = 0.57 n.s.			
Offer of repair	High	0.13	0.34	0.03	0.18	0	0	2.84	n.s.
	Equal	0.47	0.57	0.77	0.63	0.73	0.78	1.82	n.s.
	Low	0.90 ^a	0.76	0.90 ^a	0.71	1.33 ^b	0.61	3.88	.02
		<i>F</i> = 13.02 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>F</i> = 21.03 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>F</i> = 40.79 <i>p</i> = .00			
Explanation	High	0.83 ^a	0.53	0.33 ^b	0.48	0.97 ^a	0.61	11.28	.00 0
	Equal	0.30	0.47	0.07	0.25	0.27	0.45	2.96	n.s.
	Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n.s.
		<i>F</i> = 32.14 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>F</i> = 9.52 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>F</i> = 38.65 <i>p</i> = .00			
Verbal redress	High	0.03	0.18	0.07	0.25	0.17	0.38	1.80	n.s.
	Equal	0.33	0.48	0.20	0.41	0.40	0.50	1.45	n.s.
	Low	0.1	0.3	0.20	0.48	0.13	0.35	0.52	n.s.
		<i>F</i> = 2.67 <i>p</i> = .003		<i>F</i> = 1.15 n.s.		<i>F</i> = 3.72 <i>p</i> = .03			

Note: The maximum mean is 2 (there are two situations for each status category). Numbers with different alphabet letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test.

Average number of individual strategies in relation to *social distance* in the English test

Strategy	Distance	ENSs		Inter EFL		Adv EFL		ANOVA	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Direct apology	Acquaintance	2.33	0.92	2.37	0.89	1.90	0.71	2.84	n.s.
	Stranger	2.77	0.50	2.57	0.68	2.83	0.38	2.02	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	$t = 2.36$ $p = .03$		$t = 1.79$ n.s.		$t = 6.51$ $p = .00$			
Taking on responsibility	Acquaintance	2.33 ^{ab}	0.84	1.90 ^{ac}	0.84	2.37 ^b	0.72	3.14	.05
	Stranger	0.73 ^a	0.52	1.07 ^{ab}	1.01	1.33 ^b	0.76	4.34	.02
	<i>t-test</i>	$t = 10.77$ $p = .00$		$t = 4.63$ $p = .00$		$t = 5.48$ $p = .00$			
Offer of repair	Acquaintance	0.63 ^a	0.56	0.87 ^a	0.73	1.27 ^b	0.64	7.38	.001
	Stranger	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.79	0.77	0.86	0.11	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	$t = 1.32$ n.s.		$t = 0.19$ n.s.		$t = 3.04$ $p = .005$			
Explanation	Acquaintance	0.47	0.57	0.30	0.47	0.53	0.73	1.21	n.s.
	Stranger	0.73 ^a	0.45	0.13 ^b	0.35	0.67 ^a	0.48	17.42	.000
	<i>t-test</i>	$t = 1.77$ n.s.		$t = 1.54$ n.s.		$t = 0.89$ n.s.			
Verbal redress	Acquaintance	0	0	0.1	0.40	0.17	0.46	1.69	n.s.
	Stranger	0.33	0.48	0.37	0.61	0.53	0.73	0.91	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	$t = 3.81$ $p = .001$		$t = 2.11$ $p = .04$		$t = 2.26$ $p = .03$			

Note: The maximum mean is 3 (there are three situations for each distance category). Numbers with different alphabet letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test.

Appendix 3

Average number of individual strategies in relation to *social status* in the Chinese test

Strategy	Status	CNSs		Inter EFL		Adv EFL		ANOVA	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Direct apology	High-low	1.03	0.61	1.20	0.71	1.33	0.55	1.71	n.s.
	Equal	1.77	0.43	1.87	0.35	1.87	0.35	0.71	n.s.
	Low-high	1.77	0.43	1.87	0.35	1.67	0.55	1.49	n.s.
	<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 21.56$ $p = .00$		$F = 17.79$ $p = .00$		$F = 9.11$ $p = .00$			
Taking on responsibility	High-low	1.23	0.68	1.20	0.66	1.00	0.69	1.04	n.s.
	Equal	1.10	0.76	0.90	0.71	1.00	0.69	0.58	n.s.
	Low-high	1.20	0.41	1.10	0.48	1.10	0.48	0.48	n.s.
	<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 0.36$ n.s.		$F = 1.78$ n.s.		$F = 0.25$ n.s.			
Offer of repair	High-low	0.03	0.18	0.13	0.43	0.07	0.25	0.82	n.s.
	Equal	0.60	0.67	0.80	0.80	0.60	0.72	0.74	n.s.
	Low-high	1.20	0.66	0.97	0.72	1.17	0.79	0.91	n.s.
	<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 32.94$ $p = .00$		$F = 12.94$ $p = .00$		$F = 22.42$ $p = .00$			
Explanation	High-low	0.93 ^{ab}	0.52	0.83 ^a	0.59	1.20 ^b	0.48	3.78	.03
	Equal	0.27	0.45	0.17	0.38	0.23	0.43	0.44	n.s.
	Low-high	0	0	0	0	0.03	0.18	1.00	n.s.
	<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 43.92$ $p = .00$		$F = 35.41$ $p = .00$		$F = 77.34$ $p = .00$			
Verbal redress	High-low	0	0	0.03	0.18	0.03	0.18	0.50	n.s.
	Equal	0.23	0.43	0.43	0.50	0.53	0.50	3.02	n.s.
	Low-high	0.50	0.51	0.37	0.67	0.23	0.43	1.80	n.s.
	<i>ANOVA</i>	$F = 12.69$ $p = .00$		$F = 5.63$ $p = .005$		$F = 11.98$ $p = .00$			

Note: The maximum mean is 2 (there are two situations for each status category).

Numbers with different alphabet letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test.

Average number of individual strategies in relation to *social distance* in the Chinese test

Strategy	Distance	CNSs		Inter EFL		Adv EFL		ANOVA	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Direct apology	Acquaintance	1.93	0.87	2.17	0.75	2.00	0.79	0.67	n.s.
	Stranger	2.63	0.55	2.77	0.50	2.87	0.35	1.81	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	<i>t</i> = 3.75 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>t</i> = 4.87 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>t</i> = 6.50 <i>p</i> = .00			
Taking on responsibility	Acquaintance	2.43	0.73	2.13	0.78	2.10	0.88	1.58	n.s.
	Stranger	1.10	0.80	1.07	0.87	1.00	0.87	0.11	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	<i>t</i> = 8.65 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>t</i> = 5.41 <i>p</i> = .00		<i>t</i> = 5.09 <i>p</i> = .00			
Offer of repair	Acquaintance	1.00	0.59	1.00	0.79	1.03	0.76	0.02	n.s.
	Stranger	0.83	0.83	0.97	0.81	0.80	0.92	0.32	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	<i>t</i> = 1.05 n.s.		<i>t</i> = 0.19 n.s.		<i>t</i> = 1.42 n.s.			
Explanation	Acquaintance	0.47	0.68	0.33	0.55	0.63	0.61	1.78	n.s.
	Stranger	0.67	0.48	0.67	0.48	0.83	0.38	1.38	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	<i>t</i> = 1.24 n.s.		<i>t</i> = 2.57 <i>p</i> = .02		<i>t</i> = 1.44 n.s.			
Verbal redress	Acquaintance	0.20	0.40	0.23	0.43	0.07	0.25	1.69	n.s.
	Stranger	0.57	0.68	0.60	0.67	0.77	0.82	0.65	n.s.
	<i>t-test</i>	<i>t</i> = 2.26 <i>p</i> = .03		<i>t</i> = 3.0 <i>p</i> = .005		<i>t</i> = 4.19 <i>p</i> = .00			

Note: The maximum mean is 3 (there are three situations for each distance category). Numbers with different alphabet letters within the same category differ significantly ($p \leq .05$) by the post-hoc Tukey test.

References

- Barnlund, Dean C., and Miho Yoshioka. 1990. Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 14:193-206.
- Beebe, Leslie M., and Martha C. Cummings. 1996. Natural speech act data vs. written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. *Speech Act Across Cultures*, ed. by Susan M. Gass and Joyce Neu, 65-86. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beebe, Leslie M., Tomoko Takahashi, and Robin Uliss-Weltz. 1990. Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*, ed. by Robin C. Scarcella, Elaine S. Andersen, and Stephen D. Krashen, 55-74. New York: Newbury House.
- Bergman, Marc L., and Gabriele Kasper. 1993. Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, ed. by Gabriele Kasper and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, 82-107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1990. You don't touch lettuce with your fingers: Parental politeness in family discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14:259-289.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper. (eds.) 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, and Elite Olshtain. 1984. Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns. *Applied Linguistics* 5:196-213.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2003. The Intercultural Style Hypothesis: L1 and L2 interaction in requesting behavior. *Effects of the Second Language on the First*, ed. by Vivian Cook, 62-80. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Chamani, Fariba, and Parvane Zareipour. 2010. A cross-cultural study of apologies in British English and Persian. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics* 36:133-153.
- Chen, Jyun-gwang F. 2006. Interplay between forward and backward transfer in L2 and L1 writing: The case of Chinese ESL learners in the US. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics* 32:147-196.
- Cohen, Andrew D., and Elite Olshtain. 1981. Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning* 31:113-134.
- Cook, Vivian. 1992. Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning* 42:557-591.
- Cook, Vivian. (ed.) 2003. *Effects of the Second Language on the First*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Flege, James. 1987. The production of "new" and "similar" phones in a foreign language: Evidence for the effect of equivalence classification. *Journal of Phonetics* 15:47-65.
- Gass, Susan M., and Larry Selinker. (eds.) 1992. *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Holmes, Janet. 1989. Sex differences and apologies: One aspect of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics* 10:194-213.
- Kubota, Ryuko. 1998. An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7:69-100.
- Latomaa, Sirkku. 1998. English in contact with "the most difficult language in the world": The linguistic situation of Americans living in Finland. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 135:51-71.
- Lee-Wang, Song-mei. 1994. Imperatives in requests: Direct or impolite—observations from Chinese. *Pragmatics* 4:491-515.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 1997. Second language acquisition and the competition model. *Tutorials in Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, ed. by Annette M. B. de Groot and Judith F. Kroll, 113-141. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Maeshiba, Naoko, Naoko Yoshinaga, Gabriele Kasper, and Steven Ross. 1995. Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. *Speech Acts across*

- Cultures*, ed. by Susan M. Gass and Joyce Neu, 155-187. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Major, Roy C. 1992. Losing English as a first language. *The Modern Language Journal* 76:190-208.
- Nakabachi, Keiichi. 1996. Pragmatic transfer in complaints: Strategies of complaining in English and Japanese by Japanese EFL speakers. *JACET Bulletin* 27:127-142.
- Odlin, Terence. 1989. *Language Transfer*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, Elite. 1989. Apologies across languages. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, ed. by Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper, 155-173. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Pavlenko, Aneta, and Scott Jarvis. 2002. Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics* 23:190-214.
- Rintell, Ellen M., and Candace J. Mitchell. 1989. Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, ed. by Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper, 248-272. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Shih, Hsiang-yi. 2006. An Interlanguage Study of the Speech Act of Apology Made by EFL Learners in Taiwan. Unpublished master thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University, Taiwan.
- Selinker, Larry. 1969. Language transfer. *General Linguistics* 9:67-92.
- Stavans, Anat. 2003. Bilinguals as narrators: A comparison of bilingual and monolingual Hebrew and English narratives. *Narrative Inquiry* 13:151-191.
- Su, I-ru. 2001. Transfer of sentence processing strategies: A comparison of L2 learners of Chinese and English. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 22:83-112.
- Su, I-ru. 2010. Transfer of pragmatic competences: A bi-directional perspective. *The Modern Language Journal* 94:87-102.
- Takahashi, Tomoko, and Leslie M. Beebe. 1993. Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, ed. by Gabriele Kasper and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, 138-157. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tsai, Po-chen. 2002. A Study of the Speech Act of Apology in Chinese. Unpublished master thesis, National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan.
- Trosborg, Anna. 1987. Apology strategies in natives/nonnatives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11:147-167.
- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Valdés, Guadalupe, and Cecilia Pino. 1981. Muy a tus ordenes: Compliment responses among Mexican-American bilinguals. *Language in Society* 10:53-72.

Waas, Margit. 1996. *Language Attrition Downunder: German Speakers in Australia*.
Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

[Received February 17, 2012; revised May 17, 2012; accepted August 15, 2012]

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
National Tsing Hua University
Hsinchu, TAIWAN
I-Ru Su: irusu@mx.nthu.edu.tw

外語習得中語用行為的雙向移轉現象： 以道歉為例

蘇怡如

國立清華大學

本研究探討外語習得中語言雙向移轉現象，也就是外語的學習者其母語與外語如何彼此相互影響，以語用行為中的道歉為測試目標。本實驗的雙語受試者為在台灣學習英語的中級和高級的學習者。研究結果發現雙向語言移轉的現象也會在外語習得的環境中發生。中級英語學習者受中語的影響，其英語的道歉行為比美國人更受到社會地位因素的影響，高級英語學習者則比美國人更傾向於向陌生人承認錯誤，及向熟人提供修復的建議，乞求原諒。反向的語言移轉較不明顯，主要發生在高級學習者上，他們受到英語的影響，其中語的道歉表現不因對方的社會地位而有所不同。本研究結果讓我們對外語學習者其母語與外語的互動有更進一步的瞭解。

關鍵詞：語言移轉、語用行為、道歉、外語習得