

A Cross-Cultural Differences In Advice-Giving Strategies Among Jordanian And British Speakers

Yousef Zrekat¹, Maha Alanazi², Ali Lababneh³

Abstract

Advice-giving means offering guidance or recommendations offered with regard to prudent future action. The individuals vary in their methods of offering advice. Such differences might be attributed to the cultural differences. Therefore, the present study aims to investigate the cross-cultural differences in advice-giving strategies among Jordanian and British speakers. It aims to examine the types of advice-giving strategies employed by Jordanian speakers and British speakers. It investigates the effect of gender, and social power and distance (=, +) on advice-giving among Jordanian speakers and British speakers. The study further seeks to identify the degree of politeness among the Jordanian speakers and British speakers in offering advice. To this end, a total of (60) participants are divided into two groups; (30) Jordanian speakers and (30) British speakers. Each group consists of (15) males and (15) females. To analyze the data, Hinkel's (1997) taxonomy of advice-giving strategies, direct, indirect, and hedge as well as Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory are used. Hinkel multiple choice questionnaire consists of (8) situations; (4) of them pertained to advice-giving for peer, whereas (4) of them pertained to advice-giving for instructors. As for giving advice for peers, the findings reveal that Jordanian speakers used direct advice-giving strategies, while British speaker used indirect advice-giving strategies. As for advice giving for instructors, British speakers used more indirect giving strategies than Jordanian speakers, whereas Jordanian speakers used more hedge advice giving strategies than British speakers. The advice-giving strategies, whether indirect or hedge fall under politeness strategies. Regarding the gender differences in using advice-giving strategies, the results show that Jordanian male speakers were inclined towards using direct advice giving strategies more than females. The finding reveal that females used indirect, hedge, and polite

¹ Faculty of Language Studies, Arab Open University, Saudi Arabia, y.zrekat@arabou.edu.sa

² Department of English Language and Literature, College of Sciences and Humanities Studies in Alafraj, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in Alkhurj, ms.alanazi@psau.edu.sa

³ Department of English Language and Literature, College of Sciences and Humanities Studies in Alafraj, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in Alkhurj, a.lababneh@psau.edu.sa

advice-giving strategies, while males used direct and impolite advice-giving strategies. The study recommends investigating advice-giving among other cultures such as between Asian speakers and Jordanian speakers.

Keywords: cross-cultural, advice-giving strategies, Hinkel (1997), Brown and Levinson (1987), gender, politeness.

1. Introduction

Cross-cultural differences refer to the cultural and linguistic differences among languages in using speech acts. In this regard, Hosni (2020) indicates that there are cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences in using the speech act among two languages. Searle et al. (1980) indicated that "the notion of a speech act is fairly well understood. The theory of speech acts starts with the assumption that the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating, etc." (vii). Speech acts, in fact, are associated with human behavior, and thus play an important role in language (Searle, 1979; Austin, 1962). It is noteworthy that Austin (1962) indicated that utterances enforce speakers to perform a specific speech act. Accordingly, a speech act resembles a word that performs a particular function, whether compliments, apologies, agreement, disagreement, or advice.

The present study seeks to investigate the speech act of advice, it means the act of telling a person the best issues that he/she can do (Searle, 1969). By offering advice, the speaker is suggesting the best matters for the hearer to do, while the hearer has the complete freedom to either listen or reject the advice (Hattab, 2021). Advice is considered as a means of establishing social harmony and good relationships (Hosni, 2020). Several studies (Rader, Larrick, and Soll, 2017; Feng, and Guntzviller, 2016) define advice as recommendations concerning the methods of handling a situation. According to Schaerer et al. (2018), advice is sought to affect the behavior of the advisee. The advisers feel that they are influencing, which improves their sense of power.

It is worth noting that advice is a type of speech act that reflects the degree of politeness and/or impoliteness among those who give it. Within this context, the concept of politeness should be articulated. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 70) divided speech actions into various types based on the individual's self-image, or "face." Positive politeness or face is the listener's positive self-image, which consists of methods such as seeking cooperation, avoiding disagreement, joking, and remaining positive. Negative politeness is "orientated mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) H[hearer]'s negative face, his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination"

Offering advice is not only confined to religious speeches and sermons but also it encompasses all aspects of human interaction. It is further regarded as one of the primary activities among family members and friends. It is further regarded as a cardinal aspect in academic fields between instructors and learners (Hattab, 2021). There are different strategies that can be used to offer advice that are classified into direct advice and indirect advice (Locher & Limberg, 2012). There are different views regarding the speech act of advice and the degree of politeness. To elaborate, Hinkel (1994) indicates that offering advice can be considered as face saving because it expresses solidarity with advice seekers.

It is worth mentioning that offering advice in particular situations are associated with pragmatics. According to LoCastro (2003), pragmatics means the meaning created by speaker and hearer in their joint interactions. The concept of interactional competence is of a paramount importance in pragmatics studies i.e., interactional competence is considered as an integral part of pragmatic competence (Ren, 2018). As Young (2011) put it forward, pragmatics articulates the correlation between the aspects of talk selected by the respondents as well as the social context in which they are used. A key aspect of pragmatics is speech acts. In this regard, Sifianou (2012) points out that pragmatic language connects speech acts to a particular context to form the meaning. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, a speech act is considered as an utterance that plays a significant role in communication. It includes real-life interactions and requires not only knowledge of the language but also an appropriate use of that language within a given culture. When we make an apology, greeting, request, complaint, invitation, compliment, refusal, or advice we are performing speech acts.

As for socio-pragmatics, such a concept consists of two words; the former is socio, which means social, and pragmatics. Leech (1983) indicates that socio-pragmatics is associated with the social notions underpinning respondents' interpretation and performance of linguistic action. Socio-pragmatics encompasses sets of sensual parameters that regulate the social appropriateness of natural language use among speakers (Hamoudi, 2021). The strategies used in socio-pragmatic rely on cultural and social considerations that are required for understanding any type of discourse or speech act; distance; the nature of power relations; gendered language use; and politeness issues (Malmir and Derakhshan, 2020).

In the current study, the impact of gender, culture, power relations, and distance among the Jordanian and British participants in offering advice are examined to identify the advice strategies and degree of politeness between Jordanian speakers and British speakers.

Statement of the Problem

It is widely acknowledged that addressing people with higher power and distance differs from addressing those with lower power and

distance. Besides, gender variable that falls under socio-pragmatics differ when producing speech advice. Therefore, the ability to offer advice-giving is governed by socio-pragmatic variables. In addition, giving advice vary from culture to culture i.e., offering advice in Arabic might have positive connotations, whereas offering advice in English might have negative connotations such as intervention (Al-Shboul and Maros, 2012).

After a thorough reading of the literature, the study found that the majority of Jordanian speakers are unable to differentiate between socio-pragmatic aspects. Such matters are attributed to the pragmatic failure of the speakers. According to Almahameed and Al-Ajalein (2019), pragmatic failure is attributed to paralinguistic failure, i.e., lack of linguistic competence, pragmatic transfer, and socio-cultural differences. To overcome this problem, the Jordanian people should have a solid pragmatic competence to differentiate between such socio-pragmatic variables. To support this claim, Farnia and Sattar (2014) suggest that advice can be an illuminating source of information on the socio-cultural values of a society and presents essential insights into the social conventions that exist among cultures.

Therefore, the present study is needed to investigate the socio-pragmatic effects of advice-giving, such as gender, culture, and social power and distance. Offering advice among Jordanian and British participants is investigated. In fact, a closer examination of the literature shows that a dearth of research has been conducted on the socio-pragmatics of advice giving in Jordan between Jordanian and British participants. Therefore, the present study seeks to fill this gap in literature by examining the impact of gender, culture, social power and distance on offering advice among Jordanian and British participants as well as the degree of politeness among them.

Questions of the Study

The present study seeks to answer the following queries:

- 1- What are the types of advice-giving strategies employed by Jordanian speakers and British speakers?
- 2- What is the effect of gender and social power and distance (=, +, -) on advice-giving among Jordanian speakers and British speakers?
- 3- What is the degree of politeness among the Jordanian speakers and British speakers in offering advice?

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

- 1- To investigate the types of advice-giving strategies employed by Jordanian speakers and British speakers.
- 2- To examine the effect of gender, and social power and distance (=, +) on advice-giving among Jordanian speakers and British speakers.
- 3- To articulate the degree of politeness among the Jordanian speakers and British speakers in offering advice.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is gleaned from the fact that it is one of the few studies (Al-Shboul, Maros, and Yasin, 2012; Farnia and Abdul Sattar, 2014; 민수정, 2018; Cebotaroş, 2019) that investigates the correlation between socio-pragmatics variables such as gender, social power, and status with advice giving between the Jordanian speakers and British speakers. This helps in unravelling the pragmatic competence of addressing people with social power and status. Besides, the study identifies the degree of politeness among Jordanian speakers and British speakers in offering advice. This study is significant for other researchers and linguists who are interested in similar topics under investigation. The significance in the present study lies in articulating the directness and/or indirectness between Jordanian and British speakers. It further unravels the degree of politeness between them. Such differences are significant in articulating the cultural differences between the two countries. This study adds to the body on knowledge in unravelling the cultural differences in offering advice among Jordanian speakers and British speakers.

Theoretical Framework

The study adopts two theories, namely, Hinkel's (1997) taxonomy of advice and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. To begin with, Hinkel classified advice strategies into three categories, namely, direct, indirect, and hedge, as indicated in Table (1) below:

Table (1): Hinkel's (1997) Taxonomy of Advice Strategies			
No.	Advice Strategies	Definition	Example
1-	Direct Advice Strategies	Such type of advice strategy is considered direct and strong advice because it enforces the addressee to change his/ her current situation by using imperative and 'should' the modal verb.	1). You should lose your weight.
2-	Indirect Advice Strategies	Such type of advice strategy is considered indirect and weak advice because the speaker gives advice in an implicit manner without giving	1). There is a traffic jam here, it is preferable if you play football in the playground.

		hedge or explicit advice. In addition, such type of advice strategies might contain more than one illocutionary force.		
3-	Hedge Advice Strategies	The speaker in such type of advice strategies resort to hedging devices to reduce the relevance of the proposition and the commitment to the truth, such as using the following hedging devices, 'I believe', 'I think', 'it seemed that', and 'it appeared'.	1). I think that you do not exert much efforts in studying.	

As for Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, it is divided into both positive politeness and negative politeness as indicated in Table (2) below:

Table (2): Politeness Theory Brown and Levinson (1987)			
No.	Types of Politeness Theory	Definition	Example
1-	Positive Politeness	Positive politeness or face is the listener's positive self-image which consists of methods such as seeking cooperation, avoiding disagreement, joking, and remaining positive.	Please do not repeat this again?
2-	Negative Politeness	It is "orientated mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) H[hearer]'s negative face, his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-	I warned you a lot about him, but you do not listen to me.

		determination" (p. 70). It involves techniques including being straightforward, questioning, hedging, apologizing, and impersonalizing the sender and receiver.	
--	--	---	--

2. Literature Review

Al-Shboul, Maros, and Yasin (2012) investigated the speech act of advice-giving from cross-cultural perspectives. The study compared the speech acts of advice between American English native speakers and Jordanian learners of English. The sample consisted of 40 male speakers who were divided equally into two groups; the first group encompassed 20 Jordanian speakers, while the second group encompassed 20 American speakers. The study adopted Hinkel's (1997) Multiple Choice Questionnaire for collecting data. Eight situations existed in the questionnaire. The participants were required to give advice to their peers (equal power and distance) and to their instructors (higher power and distance). The speakers were required to choose one of the multiple choice questions for each situation. The multiple choice questions consisted of four answers, namely, direct advice, indirect advice, and hedge advice, while the fourth answer was an explicit choice of advice. The findings showed that the perceptions of social power and distance among both groups were similar, i.e., both of them were aware of social power and distance in addressing their peers and instructor. However, there are slight differences between them. To elaborate, Jordanian speakers opted for direct and hedged advice as an appropriate option to be employed in offering advice to their peers and instructors. However, American speakers opted for indirect advice strategies. The study concluded that speech acts mirror the cultural values and norms of the speakers. The study concluded that cultural differences might lead to communication breakdown or misunderstanding.

Farnia and Abdul Sattar (2014) carried out a study on advice strategies in English by Malay University speakers. The study took place at Universiti Sains Malaysia in Malaysia. The study sought to examine the realization of speech acts of advice among Malay speakers in terms of social power and distance; i.e., it aimed to identify how Malay speakers give advice to their peers (equal power) and to their instructor (higher power). Thirty Malay speakers were included in the study, with 22 males and 18 females. Both a multiple-choice questionnaire and an open-ended questionnaire in the form of a Discourse Completion Task were used to collect the data. In the study,

Hinkel's (1997) theory of advice was adopted. The findings showed that speakers' responses varied among the two instruments. The study also found that Malay speakers lack pragmatic competence. Regarding the preferred type of advice strategy, the study showed that Malay speakers were more inclined towards using indirect advice strategy to maintain a good relationship with the interlocutor and to save their face.

민수정 (2018) investigated the speech act of offering advice among Korean second language learners of English with English native speakers. Besides, the pragmatic transfer from first-language Korean while offering advice in second-language English. The study further investigated the realization of direct and indirect advice among Korean second language learners and its correlation with speakers' proficiency. The results revealed that Korean second language learners of English' use of indirect advice differed from English native speakers. The findings also showed that both Korean second language learners and native English speakers were inclined toward utilizing similar strategies for their advice-giving strategies.

Cebotaroş (2019) examined teaching advice language in an English Foreign Language (EFL) classroom in Anglo culture. The study sought to raise the speakers' awareness concerning the function of such a speech act. The study indicated that there are three types of advice, namely, indirect, conventionally indirect, and direct. To clarify, the indirect consists of hints. As for conventionally indirect, it contains conditional probability and a specific formula. However, the direct contains the imperative, the negative imperative, the declarative, and the performative. The research highlighted cultural differences in advice-giving in Romanian and English. Therefore, the speakers should have a solid background in English culture in order to be able to comprehend the interplay between language and culture. The study suggested six strategies to raise the pragmatic awareness of the speakers. First, the addressee should be identified. Second, the frequency of giving advice should be determined. Third, the time for giving advice should be pinpointed. Fourth, the manner of offering advice in one's native language should be determined. Fifth, the frequency of asking others for advice and for whom should be identified. Sixth, the person's feelings when he/she offers advice to others when they do not follow his/her advice. The study concluded that communicative failures might occur in cross-cultural communication due to the inappropriate use of language.

Hosni (2020) investigated the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences in using advice-giving strategies between Egyptian Arabic (EA) and American English (AE). The study sought to examine the impact of distance, power, and advice strategies among EA and AE. To attain the aim of the study, two instruments were used, namely, a Multiple Choice Questionnaire (MCQ) and a role play task. The study found that culture is strongly associated with the realization and

performance of the speech act of advice-giving by both EA and AE speakers. The study deduced that the realization of advice varied among the participants. To elaborate, AE speakers perceive it as an overbearing and intrusive act, whereas EA speakers perceive it as a means of providing assistance and as an expression of friendliness. The study concluded that Americans are considered individualistic, whereas Arabs are considered group oriented and collectivistic. In addition, caution is taken into consideration when offering advice to Americans.

2.1 Gap in Literature

So far, few studies have articulated the cross-cultural and socio pragmatic differences in advice giving (Al-Shboul, Maros, and Yasin, 2012; Farnia and Abdul Sattar, 2014; 민수정, 2018; Cebotaroş, 2019). To date, no study has addressed the advice giving between Jordanian speakers and British speakers. The above-mentioned failed to address in much detail the impact of gender power and distance in advice giving among the participants and the degree of politeness among them. Therefore, the present study is an attempt to bridge this gap in literature.

3. Methodology

3.1 Study Design

The data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. To elaborate, the frequencies of advice-giving strategies according to Hinkel (1997) were analyzed quantitatively. Then the researcher analyzed the data qualitatively according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. As a result, a mixed method approach was used in this study. According to Creswell (2014), the mixed-methods research design provides a stronger understanding of the problem by means of implementing two approaches. The present study used a mixed-method research design incorporating both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The researcher used both of them to achieve a better understanding of the purpose of the research.

3.2 Sample of the Study

The sample consisted of 60 participants; (30) Jordanian speakers (JS) and (30) British speakers (BS) who participated in this study. The participants were divided into two groups. The first group included 30 Jordanian speakers, 15 men and 15 women. The second group consisted of 30 British speakers, 15 males and 15 females. The first group (JS) was selected from University of Jordan Speakers, while the second group (BS) was selected from British teachers teaching at International schools in Amman. The sample was selected from Amman, Jordan. The rationale behind choosing this city in particular is attributed to the fact that such contains JS and BS. Therefore, it

facilitated the collection of the data. The participants' age ranged between 20 and 40 years. The characteristics of the sample are illustrated in Table (3):

Table (3)

Jordanian Speaker		British Speakers		Total
No.	30	No.	30	60
Gender		Gender		
Male	Female	Male	Female	
15	15	15	15	
Age		Age		
20-40		20-40		

3.3 Instrument of the Study

The instrument that was used in this study is a Multiple Choice Questionnaire by Hinkel (1997). Such a questionnaire contains eight situations that investigate the participants' use of advice strategies, such as direct, indirect, and hedge advice. The study used this instrument and made some modifications and improvements to it. The study added four new situations to the instrument to yield more comprehensive data.

3.4 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

According to Burns and Grove (2001), validity stands for a measure of the falsity or truth of the obtained data by using the research tool. The study adopted Hinkel's (1997) multiple choice questionnaire that consisted of eight situations, which is valid and reliable. In respect of the other four situations that were developed by the researcher, they were given to a jury of experts, including professors, at the University of Jordan in the English Language and Literature department in order to detect the accuracy, clarity, validity, and appropriateness of the instrument. After that, the final version of the instrument was adopted in terms of their recommendations.

3.5 Data Collection

The study adopted Hinkel's (199) multiple-choice questionnaire of advice strategies. The questionnaire contains eight situations. Four of them required the speakers to offer advice to those with equal power, i.e., friends, while four of them required them to offer advice to those with higher power, i.e., instructors. The topics of the imaginary situations revolve around working in the library, bookstore, taking difficult courses, a car breaking down, repair shop, restaurant, and the department office. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the participants who were required to choose the most suitable answer out of the four multiple-choice questions in the form of A, B, C, and D. To elaborate, "A" stands for direct advice. "B" stands for hedge advice. "C" stands for "indirect advice," while "D" stands for nothing. The adopted questionnaire by Hinkel (1997) and the developed questionnaire by the researcher examined the types of advice strategies (Hinkel, 1997) and the degree of politeness (Brown

and Levinson, 1987) among the JS and BS. After distributing the questionnaire to the participants, the researcher divided the answers provided by JS, the answers collected from BS to examine the impact of language, culture as well as social power and distance on advice-giving strategies among the participants. Besides, the study divided the answers collected from males and those collected from females to investigate the impact of the gender variable on offering advice.

3.6 Data Analysis

The researcher calculated the frequency of advice strategies produced by the participants quantitatively by gathering their numbers and percentages according to Hinkel's (1997) taxonomy of advice strategies, namely, direct, hedge, and indirect advice. After that, the collected data from the participants were analyzed qualitatively according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory, namely, positive politeness and negative politeness.

3.7 Variables of the Study

-Independent Variables: advice-giving strategies offered by the participants.

-Dependent Variables: language and culture, gender, social power and distance, the types of advice strategies (direct, hedge, and indirect), and the degree of politeness.

4. Findings

This section presents the findings of the study regarding advice-giving between JSs and BSs. It further answers the research questions drawing upon Hinkel (1997) taxonomy of advice giving and Brown and Levinson (1987) theory of politeness.

RQ1: What are the types of advice-giving strategies employed by Jordanian speakers and British speakers?

To answer the first research question, the study adopted Hinkel (1997) Multiple Choice Questionnaire (MCQ) and distributed it to (30) JSs and (30) BSs. The answers collected from the participants were analyzed according to Hinkel (1997) taxonomy of advice giving as illustrated in Table 4 below:

Table 4 Advice-Giving Strategies between JSs and BSs regarding Hinkel's (1997) adopted version of MCQ

No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
	Peer	Examples				
	Acquaintance					

	(= power and distance)					
1.	Unreliable car	2	JSs (18) BSs (5)	JSs (7) BSs (16)	JSs (4) BSs (7)	JSs (1) BSs (2)
2.	Academic course	3	JSs (20) BSs (7)	JSs (5) BSs (13)	JSs (3) BSs (10)	JSs (2) BSs (0)
3.	Repair shop	5	JSs (21) BSs (10)	JSs (8) BSs (14)	JSs (1) BSs (5)	JSs (0) BSs (1)
4.	Library	7	JSs (17) BSs (10)	JSs (5) BSs (12)	JSs (8) BSs (8)	JSs (0) BSs (0)
Total			JSs (76) BSs (32)	JSs (25) BSs (55)	JSs (16) BSs (30)	JSs (3) BSs (3)
Instructor (+ higher power and distance)						
No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
		Examples				
5.	Library	1	JSs (5) BSs (4)	JSs (15) BSs (18)	JSs (10) BSs (8)	JSs (0) BSs (0)

6.	Bookshop	4	JSs (4) BSs (5)	JSs (15) BSs (16)	JSs (11) BSs (9)	JSs (0) BSs (0)
7.	Restaurant	6	JSs (7) BSs (8)	JSs (14) BSs (15)	JSs (9) BSs (7)	JSs (0) BSs (0)
8.	Illness	8	JSs (1) BSs (8)	JSs (17) BSs (16)	JSs (12) BSs (6)	JSs (0) BSs (0)
Total			JSs (17) BSs (25)	JSs (61) BSs (65)	JSs (42) BSs (30)	JSs (0) BSs (0)

A closer inspection of Table 4.1 above shows that there are differences in offering advice between JSs and BSs. As shown in the above Table, the advice situations are divided into two sections; the first one is pertained to advice-giving for peers in which there is equal and power and distance between the speaker and the hearer. The results revealed that the percentage of direct strategies was higher among JSs with the percentage (76%) compared to BSs with the percentage (32%). However, the proportion of indirect advice strategies was higher among BSs with the proportion (55%) compared to JSs with the percentage (25%). In addition, BSs were inclined towards using hedge advice strategies compared to JSs with the percentage (30) and (16), respectively. Remarkably, the proportion of no advice for Jordanian and BSs equally amounted for (3%). Thus it can be argued that JSs used more direct strategies (76%) in the situations that entail offering advice for their peers, while BSs used more indirect advice giving strategies.

As for the situations that entail offering advice to the instructions who have higher power and social distance, both JSs and BSs were inclined towards using indirect advice strategies, which suggests their pragmatic competence. However, BSs used indirect advice giving strategies with the percentage (65%) more than JSs (61%). Followed by hedge advice strategies that occupied the second rank by the participants. However, JSs used hedge advice more frequently than BSs with the percentage (42%) and (30%), respectively. Subsequent by direct advice giving strategies that amounted to (25%) among BSs, while accounted for (17%) among JSs.

RQ2: What is the effect of gender on advice-giving among Jordanian speakers and British speakers?

To answer the second research question, the study adopted Hinkel (1997) Multiple Choice Questionnaire (MCQ) and distributed it to (30) JSs and (30) BSs. The answers collected from the participants were analyzed according to Hinkel (1997) taxonomy of advice giving and according to the gender differences. To facilitate the classification of the data. The researcher classified the advice-giving strategies used by Jordanian male speakers as illustrated in Table 5 below:

Table 5 Advice-Giving Strategies for Male Jordanian Speakers according to Hinkel's (1997) adopted version of MCQ

No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
	Peer Acquaintance (= power and distance)	Examples				
1.	Unreliable car	2	11	3	1	0
2.	Academic course	3	15	2	0	0
3.	Repair shop	5	11	3	0	0
4.	Library	7	10	1	3	0
Total			47	9	4	0
No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
	Instructor (+ higher power and distance)	Examples				
5.	Library	1	4	5	2	0
6.	Bookshop	4	3	4	6	0
7.	Restaurant	6	5	5	4	0
8.	Illness	8	1	7	5	0
Total			13	21	17	0

As indicated in Table (7) above regarding advice giving strategies for male Jordanian speakers for their peers who have equal power and distance. The majority of male JSs provided direct advice strategies with the percentage (47%). Followed by indirect advice-giving strategies that accounted for (9%). Subsequent by hedge advice giving strategies that amounted to (4%). Regarding offering advice for their instructors male JSs were more inclined towards using indirect advice-giving strategies that accounted for (21%). The second frequently used advice-giving strategies by the participants was hedge that amounted to (17%). Only (13%) provided direct advice strategies for their instructors. To summarize, the use of direct advice-giving strategies upon offering advice for their peers and indirect advice-giving strategies upon offering advice for their instructors entails the pragmatic competence of the male JSs.

The following section presents the advice-giving strategies for Jordanian female speakers as indicated in Table 6:

Table 6 Advice-Giving Strategies among Female Jordanian Speakers according to Hinkel's (1997) adopted version of MCQ

No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
	Peer Acquaintance (= power and distance)	Examples				
1.	Unreliable car	2	7	4	3	1
2.	Academic course	3	5	3	3	2
3.	Repair shop	5	10	5	1	0
4.	Library	7	7	4	5	0
Total			29	16	12	3
Instructor (+ higher power and distance)						
No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
		Examples				
5.	Library	1	1	10	8	0
6.	Bookshop	4	1	11	5	0
7.	Restaurant	6	2	9	5	0
8.	Illness	8	0	10	7	0
Total			4	40	25	0

As shown in Table 7 regarding the advice-giving strategies among Jordanian female speakers, the Table is divided into two sections; the first one consists of 4 situations concerning offering advice to peer acquaintance, whereas the second one consists of 4 situations concerning offering advice to instructors. Regarding peer

acquaintance situations, the majority of the speakers (29%) used direct advice strategies, followed by indirect advice strategies that accounted for (16%). Hedge advice strategies was the third commonly used among Jordanian female speakers. Only (3%) provided no advice strategies.

Concerning instructor situations, the majority of Jordanian female speakers advocated being indirect more than being direct, the use of the indirect advice strategies occupied the first rank with the percentage (40%), followed by hedge advice strategies that amounted to (25%). Only (4%) Jordanian female speakers used direct advice strategies. To conclude, the participants used direct advice strategies more frequently than indirect advice strategies when addressing peers. Besides, they used more indirect advice strategies more than direct advice giving strategies denote the pragmatic competence of the participants.

The following section presents the advice-giving by male British speakers as indicated in Table 7 below:

Table 7 Advice-Giving Strategies for Male British Speakers according to Hinkel's (1997) adopted version of MCQ

No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
	Peer Acquaintance (= power and distance)	Examples				
1.	Unreliable car	2	3	6	3	0
2.	Academic course	3	4	2	2	0
3.	Repair shop	5	8	5	1	0
4.	Library	7	7	4	2	0
Total			22	17	8	0
Instructor (+ higher power and distance)						
No.	Situations	Appendix	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
		Examples				
5.	Library	1	3	8	4	0
6.	Bookshop	4	4	7	3	0

7.	Restaurant	6	6	4	2	0
8.	Illness	8	5	5	1	0
Total			18	24	10	0

As shown in Table 7 regarding advice giving strategies used by male British speakers, the majority of BSs used direct advice giving strategies upon giving advice for their peers with the percentage (22%), followed by indirect advice giving strategies that accounted for (17%), subsequent by hedge advice giving strategies that amounted to (8%). As for the situations that entail giving advice for their instructors, the majority of BSs used indirect advice giving strategies with the proportion of (24%). Followed by direct advice giving strategies that accounted for (18%). Subsequent by hedge advice giving strategies that amounted to (10%).

The following section presents the advice-giving strategies for female British speaker as indicated in Table 8:

Table 8 Advice-Giving Strategies for Female British Speakers according to Hinkel's (1997) adopted version of MCQ

No.	Situations	Appendix Examples	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
	Peer Acquaintance (= power and distance)					
1.	Unreliable car	2	2	10	4	2
2.	Academic course	3	3	11	8	0
3.	Repair shop	5	2	9	4	1
4.	Library	7	3	8	6	0
Total			10	38	22	3
Instructor (+ higher power and distance)						
No.	Situations	Appendix Examples	Direct	Indirect	Hedge	Nothing
5.	Library	1	1	10	4	0
6.	Bookshop	4	1	9	6	0
7.	Restaurant	6	2	11	5	0
8.	Illness	8	3	11	5	0
Total			7	41	20	0

As shown in Table 8 regarding advice giving strategies used by female British speakers, the majority of female BSs used indirect advice giving strategies upon giving advice for their peers with the percentage (38%), followed by hedge advice giving strategies that accounted for (22%), subsequent by direct advice giving strategies that amounted to (10%).

As for the situations that entail giving advice for their instructors, the majority of female BSs used indirect advice giving strategies with the proportion of (41%). Followed by hedge advice giving strategies that accounted for (20%). Subsequent by direct advice giving strategies that amounted to (7%).

RQ3: What is the degree of politeness among the Jordanian speakers and British speakers in offering advice?

Table 9 The Degree of Politeness among Jordanian Speakers

No.	Positive Politeness (Indirect +hedge)	Negative Politeness (Direct)
Peers	41%	76%
Instructors	103%	17%

To answer the first part of the third research question regarding the degree of politeness among JSs both males and females, the percentage of indirect and hedge advice giving strategies were calculated to identify the percentage of positive politeness in both peers' and instructors' situations, the results revealed that positive politeness among JSs in giving advice for their peers amounted to (41%), whereas the positive politeness among JSs in giving advice for their instructors accounted for (103%). On the other hand, the percentage of negative politeness was achieved by calculating the percentage of direct advice giving strategies in both peers' and instructors' situations among JSs that accounted for (76%) and (17%), respectively.

Table 10 The Degree of Politeness among British Speakers

No.	Positive Politeness (Indirect+ hedge)	Negative Politeness (Direct)
Peers	85%	32%
Instructors	95%	25%

To answer the second part of the third research question regarding the degree of politeness among BSs both males and females, the percentage of indirect and hedge advice giving strategies were calculated to identify the percentage of positive politeness in both peers' and instructors' situations, the results revealed that positive politeness among BSs in giving advice for their peers amounted to (85%), whereas the positive politeness among BSs in giving advice for their instructors accounted for (95%). On the other hand, the percentage of negative politeness was achieved by calculating the percentage of direct advice giving strategies among BSs in both peers' and instructors' situations that accounted for (32%) and (25%), respectively.

4.1 Discussion and Conclusion

4.1.1 The Types of Advice Giving Strategies Employed by JSs and BSs

The findings of the study regarding the cross-cultural in advice giving between JSs and BSs showed that there are cultural differences between them in offering advice. As for giving advice for their peers,

JSs were more inclined to use direct strategies compared to BSs who were inclined towards using indirect strategies. To elaborate, JSs used more direct strategies for situations of repair shop, academic course, unreliable car, and library, respectively. By contrast, BSs used more direct strategies for situations of library, repair shop, academic course, respectively, more than the situation of unreliable car. As for indirect advice giving strategies, JSs used indirect strategies for situations of repair shop, academic course, unreliable car, respectively, more than library situation. Obviously, BSs used more indirect advice giving strategies for situations of unreliable care, academic course, repair shop, and library, respectively. Regarding hedge advice strategies, both JSs and BSs used hedge advice equally for the situation of library. On the other hand, BSs used more hedge advice for the situations of unreliable car, followed by academic course. However, the least commonly used hedge advice strategies by BSs was for the repair shop situation. In respect of using hedge advice by JSs, they used hedge advice for library, unreliable car, academic course, and repair shop, respectively. To summarize the findings of advice giving for peer situations, JSs used more direct advice giving strategies, while BSs used more indirect and hedge advice giving strategies. The reason behind JSs inclination towards using direct advice giving strategies when offering advice for their peers might be attributed to the fact that in Jordanian culture when there is an equal power and distance between the speaker and the hearer, there is no need to use indirect or hedges to make their conversation smooth, flexible, and moderate. This finding is consistent with Al-Shboul, Maros, and Yasin (2012) regarding the tendency of Jordanian speakers towards using direct advice giving strategies with peer acquaintance. On the other hand, BSs tended to use indirect and hedge advice to avoid face threatening act and to save the face of the interlocutor.

As for advice giving for instructors, BSs used more indirect giving strategies than JSs. To clarify, BSs were more indirect in situations for library, bookshop, illness, and restaurant. On the other hand, JSs used more indirect for illness situation more than BSs. As for direct advice giving strategies, BSs used more direct advice giving strategies than JSs in illness, restaurant, and book shop situations, while JSs used more direct advice giving strategies than BSs in library situation. Regarding hedge advice giving strategies, JSs used more hedge advice giving strategies than BSs, particularly in illness, bookshop, library, and restaurant situations, respectively. By contrast, BSs used more hedge advice giving strategies in bookshop situation, while they rarely used hedge advice giving strategies in illness situation. To summarize the findings regarding advice giving for instructors, BSs used more indirect and direct advice giving strategies than JSs. On the other hand, JSs used more hedge advice giving strategies than BSs. However, both of them used indirect and hedge which fall under politeness. In fact, the social power and distance between the speaker and the hearer affect the use of advice giving strategies. To clarify, the speakers tend to

soften the advice-giving strategies because they are addressing their interlocutors in which there is higher power and distance. Therefore, they used indirect and hedge advice-giving strategies to sound polite. This result concord with Holmes (1992) that the major factors that affect the use of advice strategies are both social power and distance. This section (4.1.1) constitutes an answer to the first research question.

4.1.2 The Effect of Gender on Advice-Giving among Jordanian Speakers and British Speakers

The findings of advice-giving for peers revealed that Jordanian male speakers were inclined towards using direct advice giving strategies more than females. To elaborate, they used more direct strategies in academic course, repair shop, unreliable car, and library, respectively. On the other hand, Jordanian female speakers used indirect advice giving strategies in repair shop, library, unreliable car, and academic course, respectively. Interestingly, Jordanian female speakers were inclined to use indirect advice giving strategies than males. To elaborate, Jordanian females were indirect in repair shop, unreliable car, library, and academic course situation. By contrast, Jordanian males were indirect in unreliable car, repair shop, academic course, and library situations. As for hedge advice giving strategies, Jordanian females used more hedge advice strategies in library, academic course, unreliable car, and repair shop, respectively, compared to Jordanian males who used hedge only in library and unreliable car situations. To summarize, both Jordanian males and females used direct advice-giving strategies the most. However, Jordanian males used more direct than Jordanian females. Besides, Jordanian females used more indirect and hedge advice giving strategies than Jordanian males.

Regarding the advice-giving strategies used by male British speakers in offering advice for their peers, they used direct strategies the most in repair shop, library, academic course, and unreliable car situations. Subsequent by indirect strategies as in unreliable car, repair shop, library, and academic course situations. Followed by hedge strategies as in unreliable car, academic course, library, and repair shop situations. In respect of offering advice for instructors, British male speakers used indirect strategies in library, bookshop, illness, and restaurant situations. Followed by direct advice giving strategies as in restaurant, illness, bookshop, and library situations. Subsequent by hedge advice giving strategies as in library, bookshop, restaurant, and illness situations.

As for advice-giving strategies used by female British speakers in situations that entail giving advice for peers; they used indirect giving strategies in academic course, unreliable car, repair shop, and library. Followed by hedge advice giving strategies in situations academic course, library, repair shop, and unreliable car. Subsequent by direct advice giving strategies in situations academic course, library, repair

shop, and unreliable car. Two of them preferred to offer no advice for unreliable car, while one of them offered no advice for library situation.

With regard to the situations that suggest offering advice for instructors, British female speakers were more inclined towards using indirect giving strategies in the following situations, namely, restaurant, illness, library, and bookshop. Followed by hedge advice giving strategies in the following situations, such as bookshop, restaurant, illness, and library. Subsequent by direct advice giving strategies for the following situations; including, illness, restaurant, bookshop, and library. To conclude, British male speakers used the following advice giving strategies, namely, indirect, direct, and hedge strategies, respectively. In contrast, British female speaker used the following advice giving strategies, namely, indirect, hedge, and direct strategies, respectively.

As a consequence, females whether British or Jordanian speakers used more indirect giving strategies compared to male speakers. The reason behind that might be attributed to the fact that women use unassertive speech forms due to their inferior and powerless position in society (Lakoff, 1975). The findings of the present study concurs with Ayhan (2020) concerning women's tendency towards using mitigated and hedge devices more than males. This section (4.1.2) constitutes an answer to the second research question.

4.1.3 The Degree of Politeness among the Jordanian Speakers and British Speakers in Offering Advice

The findings showed that BSs tend to use positive politeness strategies in giving advice to their peers more than JSs. The reason behind that could be due to minimize the threat to the listener's negative face. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness entails seeking cooperation and avoiding disagreement.

On the other hand, JSs were more inclined towards using positive politeness in offering advice to their instructors compared to BSs. This could be due to the fact that JSs tend to show respect in offering advice for their instructor where there is higher power and distance. Possibly, JSs are aware of the importance of choosing the appropriate utterance upon offering advice for their instructor, who has higher power and status than the speaker. Brown and Levinson (1987) asserted that there are social variables that affect language use, for instance, social power between speaker and hearer and imposition. As he stated, the weightiness of the speech act will maximize if social variables increase. Brown & the Levinson model of politeness model has been conducted by researchers, pragmatists, linguists in examining and investigating their studies (Chen, 2001).

As for negative politeness, JSs used more negative politeness strategies in offering advice for their peers compared to BSs. Possibly, the cultural differences between JSs and BSs affect the use of advice

giving strategies. It is worth mentioning that giving advice relies primarily on pragmatic competence. According to Yule (2014), pragmatic competence entails the interpretation of the meaning of any utterance in a specific context, which presupposes the speaker's knowledge about social distance and status among hearer and speaker, explicit and implicit knowledge and politeness strategies.

By contrast, BSs used more negative politeness in giving advice to their instructors compared to JSs. This result is commensurate with Al-Khaza'leh, (2018) regarding pragmatic and socio-pragmatic difference in politeness strategies between British and Jordanian cultures. Al-Khaza'leh study concluded the Jordanian speakers prioritize the use of positive politeness, but the British tend to use negative politeness. This section (4.1.3) constitutes an answer to the third research question.

4.2 Implication, Limitation, and Recommendation

In conclusion, this study shows the cross-cultural in offering advice between JSs and BSs. It further shows that advice strategies and degree of politeness vary among cultures. It reveals that there are gender differences in offering advice between males and females in terms of males' inclination towards using direct advice strategies, while females' inclination towards using indirect advice strategies. This study is limited to gender difference, degree of politeness, and cross cultural differences between JSs and BSs. Therefore, the findings of the present study give implications that the pragmatic competence in offering advice differs among culture. It is worth mentioning that the findings of the present study cannot be generalized to other cultures. In the light of the findings of the study, the researcher recommends investigating advice-giving among other cultures such as between Asian speakers and Jordanian speakers to reliably generate robust conclusions about the findings.

The author extends his appreciation to Arab Open University in Saudi Arabia for funding this research through research fund No. (AOURG-2023).

This study is supported via funding from Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University project number (PSAU/2023/1444)

Bibliography

- Al-Shboul, Y., Maros, M., & Yasin, M. S. M. (2012). The appropriateness in advice-giving from a cross-cultural perspective. *Arab World English Journal*, 3(3), 106-122.
- Ayhan, R. (2020). Gender differences in the use of modal adverbs as hedges. *Faculty of Education and Business Studies*.
- Al-Khaza'leh, B. (2018). Influence of social power on perception of speech act of apology by Jordanian second language speakers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(1), 211-229.

- Yule, C. U. (2014). *The statistical study of literary vocabulary*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries*. Revised and expanded edition.
- 민수정. (2018). The Speech Act of Offering Advice in Learner English in Korean Context. *언어과학*, 25(4), 201-219.
- Burns, N., & Groves, K. (2001). *Practice of nursing research*. WB Saunders company Philadelphia.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE publications.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965 Austin 1965 *How to Do Things with Words*.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistic*. UK: Longman.
- Cebotaroş, V. (2018). Teaching the language of advice in EFL classrooms. In *Tradiție și inovare în cercetarea științifică* (pp. 51-56).
- Feng, B., Magen, E. (2016). Relationship closeness predicts unsolicited advice giving in supportive interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33, 751-767.
- Hamoudi, A. (2021). Threads of Socio-pragmatics in Higher Education: Perspectives on Improving EFL Learning and Use. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics-ISSN 2314-3576*, 9(1), 60-69.
- Hattab, H. A. A. (2021). A Stylistic-Pragmatic Investigation of the Speech Act of Advice in Selected Friday Prayer Sermons. *Nasaq*, 8(29).
- Hinkel, E. (1997). Appropriateness of advice: DCT and multiple choice data. *Applied linguistics*, 18 (1), 1-26.
- Hosni, H. R. (2020). Advice giving in Egyptian Arabic and American English: A cross-linguistic, cross-cultural study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 155, 193-212.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Exploration in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Locher, M. A., & Limberg, H. (2012). Introduction to advice in discourse. *Advice in discourse*, 221(1).
- Malmir, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). The socio-pragmatic, lexico-grammatical, and cognitive strategies in L2 pragmatic comprehension: The case of Iranian male vs. female EFL learners. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 1-23.
- Rader, C. A., Larrick, R. P., Soll, J. B. (2017). Advice as social influence: Informational goals and the consequences for accuracy. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11, Article e1239.
- Farnia, M., & Sattar, H. Q. A. (2014). Advice strategies in English by Malay university speakers. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5(3), 426-438.

- Al-Shboul, Y., Maros, M., & Yasin, M. S. M. (2012). The appropriateness in advice-giving from a cross-cultural perspective. *Arab World English Journal*, 3(3), 106-122.
- Ren, W. (2018). Developing L2 pragmatic competence in study abroad contexts. In *The Routledge handbook of study abroad research and practice* (pp. 119-133). Routledge.
- Schaerer, M., Tost, L. P., Huang, L., Gino, F., & Larrick, R. (2018). Advice giving: A subtle pathway to power. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(5), 746-761.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts, in Searle J. R. (ed.) *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 1-29 (originally published in 1975).
- Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech act Theory and Pragmatics* (Vol. 10). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(12), 1554-1564.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426–443). New York, NY: Routledge.