Iraqi EFL Learners´ Ability in Using Apology

Alaa Mohamed Jabir
University of Thi-Qar
College of Education
Department of English

Abstract

In the last two decades, many studies have been conducted to investigate speech act performance in general, and apology speech act in particular. The study of speech acts can provide us with better understanding and new insights into the interdependence of linguistic forms and socio cultural context. The objective of this paper is to investigate how the performance of learners of English differs in their performance in realize an apology speech act. Therefore, the study aimed at answering the following questions:
1. What are the apology expressions used in the given situations by Iraqi EFL students in the Department of English ?
2. How do students in Thi-Qar university respond apologetically in the given situations?
3. What apology strategies do they use?

The following hypotheses are posed in this study :
1.The students lack the recognition and production ability of using apology strategies but the students' performance in the recognition part is still better than their performance in the production part of the test.
2. The students tend to use certain formulaic expressive such as sorry, pardon rather than use grammatical structure.
3. Females tend to use particular types of linguistic forms rather than males in expressing apology. They use long sentences and expression to express apology. Males and females use more than one strategy in the same situation.

This study aims at finding the common apology expressions used by students in different situations. The fundamental goals behind the present study are to evaluate the third year subjects' at the college of Education University of Thi-Qar mastery of speech act of apology and to know whether they are able to produce the proper form of apology. In addition to examine how far the subjects are capable of recognizing and producing apology.

The Participants of the study consists of 30 students in the Department of English language at Thi-Qar University. They are between 19 and 25. To achieve the aims of research, the following procedures are adopted: presenting a theoretical survey of apology and its strategies ,its forms in English and shed light on its syntactic structure of apology.

The practical part involves a test. The apology instrument used consisted of ten situations which the subjects responded to apologetically. The situations were prepared, typed and given to the subjects in a session, then collectedand the second part consisted of ten questions used to measure the syntactic ability of the students. The second part is concerned on evaluating the production aspect of the students. The researcher got benefit from the situations used by Selo (2004). In the present study the model adopted is that of Cohen and Olshtain (1981: 113–134) and Olshtain and Cohen (1983: 22–23).

الخلاصة

في العقدين الماضيين ، تم إجراء العديد من الدراسات للتحقيق في أداء صيغ الكلام بشكل عام ، وصيغة خطاب الاعتذار بشكل خاص. يمكن أن تزودنا دراسة أفعال الكلام بفهم أفضل ورؤى جديدة حول الترابط بين الأشكال اللغوية والسياق الاجتماعي الثقافي. الهدف من هذا البحث هو التحقيق في كيفية اختلاف أداء متعلمي اللغة

الإنجليزية في أدائهم في فهم صيغة الاعتذار. لذلك هدفت الدراسة إلى الإجابة عن الأسئلة التالية:

١- ما هي عبارات الاعتذار التي استخدمها العراقيون طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في مواقف معينة؟

٢- كيف يتجاوب طلبة جامعة ذي قار اعتذاريا في حالات معينة؟

3. ما هي استراتيجيات الاعتذار التي يستخدمونها؟

تم طرح الفرضيات التالية في هذه الدراسة :

١- يفتقر الطلاب إلى القدرة على التقدير والإنتاج لاستخدام استراتيجيات الاعتذار ولكن أداء الطلاب في جزء الفهم لا يزال أفضل من أدائهم في الجزء الإنتاجي من الاختبار.

٢- يميل الطلاب إلى استخدام بعض التعبيرات الصيغية مثل آسف ،

او عفوا بدلاً من استخدام القواعد النحوية .

٣- تميل الإناث إلى استخدام أنواع معينة من الأشكال اللغوية بدلاً من الذكور في التعبير عن الاعتذار. يستخدمون الجمل الطويلة والتعبير للتعبير عن الاعتذار. يستخدم الذكور والإناث أكثر من استراتيجية واحدة في نفس الموقف.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى إيجاد عبارات الاعتذار الشائعة التي يستخدمها الطلاب في المواقف المختلفة. الأهداف الأساسية من وراء هذه الدراسة هي تقييم مواضيع إتقان خطاب صيغة الاعتذار لطلبة السنة الثالثة في كلية التربية جامعة ذي قار ومعرفة ما إذا كانوا قادرين على تقديم الشكل المناسب للاعتذار. بالإضافة إلى فحص مدى قدرة الأشخاص على فهم وتقديم الاعتذار.

يتكون المشاركون في الدراسة من ٣٠ طالب وطالبة في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة ذي قار.

تتراوح أعمارهم بين ١٩ و ٢٥ عامًا. لتحقيق أهداف البحث ، تم اعتماد الإجراءات التالية: تقديم مسح نظري للاعتذار واستراتيجياته ، وأشكاله باللغة الإنجليزية ، وإلقاء الضوء على هيكله النحوي للاعتذار.

Introduction1-

Apologizing is one of the speech acts, so it is important to shed light on the speech act theory and its classifications .As is name suggests, Speech Act Theory treats an utterance as an act performed by a speaker in a context with respect to an addressee (Traguott and Pratt,1980:229) . Therefore, the idea behind any speech act is that people perform various types of acts in their communication. In this sense, "speech act theory describes the power of language: the power to make the world rather than to mirror it" (Taylor, 1987:357)

There have been two approaches in classifying speech act : One, following Austin, in principally a lexical classification of illocutionary force of performative verbs (i.e. verbs that denote that kind of speech act). Austin (1962:111-18) isolates three basic senses in which to say something is to do something , and hence three kinds of acts are simultaneously performed :I .e. utterances and said to perform three types of act: a

locutionary act, an illocutionary act ,and a perlocutionary act.

The locutionary act is the act of "saying something in the normal senese, i.e. a   locutionary act " is roughly equivalent to 'meaning' in traditional sense " in that it produces an understandable utterance.

The illocutionary act is the act that is performed through the medium of language "such as informing , ordering, warning,undertaking…utterances which have a certain (conventional) force" .A perlocutionary act goes beyond the illocutionary act based on the speaker's possible intention or design of electing consequential effects upon the feeling , thoughts , or actions of the audience . Thus , perlocutionary acts are what we bring about or achieve by saying something ,such as convincing,persuading,deterring and even,say,surprising or misleading. (See Finch, 2000: 108). Austin's taxonomy reads as follows:

1-Verdictives : are those verbs which are identified by the giving of a   verdict, e.g .assess, evaluate , estimate .
2- Exercitives : are those verbs which represent the exercising of powers rights or influence, e . g .offer , resign, advise, etc

3. Commissives : : are those verbs which commit the speaker to some

future course of action, e , g , promise, vow , consent ,etc.

4-. Expositives : : are those verbs which used in the acts of exposition , e ,g ,correct , monition ,remark ,etc.

5- Behabitives : are those verbs which are related to attitudes and social behavior, e ,g ,welcome ,praise ,congratulate ,criticize.

The other, following Searle is principally a classification of act .Searle(1975:344-49) mentions four differences between speech act that can serve as bases for classification to establish five classes of speech acts:

1-Illocutionary point: For instances, a request attempts to get Hearer to do something; assertive is a representation of how something is; a promise is the undertaking of obligation that speaker does something

2-Direction of fit between the words uttered and the world they relate to: e g ., statement have a world – to-world fit because truth value is assigned on the basis of whether or not the words describe things as they are in the world spoken of; requests have a world – to-world fit because the world must be changed to fulfill Speaker's request.

3- The expressed psychological state : e .g ., a statement that proposition expresses Speaker's belief that P; a promise expresses Speaker's intention to do something ; a request expresses Speaker's desire that Hearer should do something.

4-Propositional content: e. g., Hearer to do A (I .e . perform some act) for request ; speaker to do A for a promise.

As for the five classes of speech acts, Searle (1975:357-69) distinguishesthe following:

1-Assertives (representatives) have a truth value, show words-to world fit, and express Speaker's belief that propositional content of the utterance is true .Examples are :assert, report, suggest, etc. 2- Directives are attempts to get Hearer to do something, therefore they show world to word fit, and express Speaker's wish or desire that Hearer does A Examples are: command, request, and prohibition.

3-Commissives commit speaker to some future course of action, so they show world to word fit, and Speaker expresses the intention the speaker does A Examples are: promise, swear, threaten, etc.

4-Expressives express Speaker's attitude to a certain state of affairs specified (if at all) in the propositional content (e. g., the bolded portion of apologizing for stepping on your toe). There is no direction of fit; a variety of different psychological states; and propositional content must be related to Speaker or Hearer. Examples are congratulate, thank, apologize…etc

5-Declarations bring about correspondence between the propositional content and the world- to- words. Searle notes no psychological states for declarations. Examples are: name, declare, marry … etc.

2. 1 Speech Act of Apologies

The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to "set things right" (Olshtain, 1983:235). As Marquez-Reiter (2000: 44) states an apology is a "compensatory action for an offense committed by the speaker which has affected the hearer. According to Bataineh&Bataineh (2006:1903) apologies fall under expressive speech acts in which speakers attempt to indicate theirstate or attitude. They add that in order for an apology to have aneffect,it should reflect true feelings. As Searle (1979) states a

persoapologizes for doing A expresses regret at having done A so the apology act can take place only if the speaker believes that some act A has been performed prior to the time of speaking and that this act A resulted in an infraction which affected another person who is now deserving an apology (Olshtain, 1989: 235).

Goffman (1971:89) views apologies as remedial interchanges serving to re-establish social harmony after a real or virtual offence or in Olshtain and Cohen terms whether the offence is real or potential (1983: 20). Apology is a communicative act in the production of which an apologiser has to act politely, both in the vernacular sense and in the more technical sense of paying attention to the addressee's face wants (Brown and Levinson, 1978 :55 and Brown and Levinson, 1987: 77).   For Holmes (1995: 155) apology is a speech act that is intended to remedy the offense for which the apologizer takes responsibility and, as a result, to rebalance social relations between interlocutors.
The apology act is classified by linguists according to various criteria. Divisions are based on external factors such as object of regret or the situation. For Goffman (1971:122), however, at a certain level, apology is a class in itself within a broader category: what he calls remedial work. For him,the remediation can be carried

out via one of three devices: accounts, requests and apologies. The common usage for an account is an excuse or an explanation, in an attempt to transfer responsibility to a third party. Strategies used to do so include not admitting commission of the act, claiming ignorance of the effects of the act and claiming impaired competence. Requests consist of "asking license of a potentially offended person to engage in what could be considered a violation of his rights" .

Fraser's (1981:260) characterization of an apology is two-dimensional; firstly, he perceives an apology in terms of what is assumed "to be the beliefs held by the person apologizing"; secondly, "what must actually be conveyed for an apology to come off". . An apology is "a type of speech act Austin (1962) claimed could be performed by invoking the appropriate formula under the appropriate circumstances" (ibid :261).

2.2 Apology Strategies

Apology types are different mostly according to their semantic formula. Some of them are wide, while others are very broad. In fact, there are no fixed categories for apologies even some of them differ across culture. They are

classified as they are defined and since there is no agreement on the definition of apology, there is diversity in classifying the ways followed in performing an apology. Brief accounts of the most important classifications given by scholars and adopted by many researchers in the recent years are presented in this section. Fraser (1981) (cited in Alfattah 2010) identifies five factors that determine the apology strategy used by the apologizer. They are:

1. The nature of infraction. It refers to the type of social damage that happened, such as stepping on one's foot , smashing one's property , or even insulting someone.
2. The severity of the infraction.The more serious the offense is, the more complex the choices of apologizing strategies.
3. The situation in which the infraction occurs. It is related to the formality and intimacy of the situation.
4. The relative familiarity between the interactants .Different apology strategies are used according to whether the one offended is a close friend, a relative, a stranger, etc.
5. The sex of the interactants Cordella (1991) (cited in Handayani 2010) claims that the context or culture affects the apology way used by men and women. In some cultures women apologize more than men, whilst in others the reverse occurs.

Similarly, (Holmes 1993, cited in Demeter 2000) points out that women use apology more than men. Another variable that has an effect on the response to an apology is the length of the apology. Some apologies must be longer than others because some people use short apologies while long ones are required (Edmundson 1992). The problem is that no study has been conducted to show the exact length of an apology in order to determine whether the apology is accepted or not. Another affecting thing in apologizing is the sincerity of the apologizer (ibid.). An interesting classification of apologyis given by Goffman (1971). He proposes two sorts of apology: *rituall*and *substantive*. By *ritual* apology, he means those apologies that are linked to routines and or offenses that are the apologizer is not responsible for. The latter is done when the speaker is responsible for an offense and s/he wants to restore the relationship with the hearer (Fraser, 1981, cited in Alfattah 2010).

According to Olshtain and Cohen (1983) if the offender accepts the responsibility for the offense committed, s/he mayselect five possible strategies to apologize, which are as follow

1. An expression of apology
A. An expression of regret, e.g.1. I'm sorry (mote?asefa)
B. An offer of apology´, e.g.2. I apologize (?oðiri/ma?zeratmixaˆm)

C. A request for forgiveness, e.g.3. forgive me (saamihni)
2. An explanation or account of the situation, e.g.4. The bus was late (ðibustahkar).
3. An acknowledgement of responsibility
A. Accepting the blame, e.g.5.It was my fault (inahukaanataqsire).
B. Expressing self-deficiency, e.g.6. I was confused (kuntumurtabik).
C. Recognizing the other person as deserving apology, e.g.6. you are right (anta ?alahaq).
D. Expressing lack of intent, e.g.7. I didn't mean to (lam aqsud).
4. An offer of repair, e.g.8. I'll help you get up (sawfausa?idaktanhadh).
5. A promise of forbearance, e.g.9. It won't happen again (sawfalanyahduθ maraudhra).

However, if the offender rejects the need to apologize, s/he may not react at all; yet where s/he has a verbal reaction, it can be:
1. A denial of the need to apologize, e.g.10. There was no need for you to get insulted
2. A denial of responsibility
A. Not accepting the blame, e.g.11. it wasn't my fault.
B. Blaming the other participant, e.g.12. it's your own fault.

2.3Elements of an Apology:
A successful apology includes each of these four elements:
1. Accepting personal responsibility; acknowledge the specific offense and the pain it

caused and clearly take personal anduncondtional <u>responsibility</u> for the offense. Acknowledge directly to each of the injured parties your role in causing the damage and their suffering (ibid)

2.Showing Remorse; humbly and sincerely describe the painful regret you feel for committing the offense. Look backward to express yourregret. Then demonstrate forbearance by looking forward to describe the lessons you have learned and the changes you have made to ensure nothing like it will ever happen again.

3.Offering an explanation; honestly, <u>candidly</u>, and simply describe why the offense happened. If it was inexcusable, simply say so .

4.Making reparations; fully repair the <u>loss</u> if that is possible, otherwise ask: "Is there anything I can do to make this up to you?"

3. The Syntactic Structure of Apology

Geoff Pullum's classic post "<u>Pete Rose and sorry statements of the third kind</u>"(2004) cited in Liberman (2008:1) offered taxonomy of apologies, based on a pairing of syntactic structures and communicative content: The word sorry is used in three ways.

First, sorry can be used with a complement having the form of what The Cambridge Grammar calls a content clause:
(1) I'm sorry that the political situation in the Holy Land is still mired in violence, because I wanted to go to Bethlehem at Christmas.
 If I utter (13) I am not apologizing; I have never caused or defended any of the violence in the Middle East. It's not my fault. I just regret that the situation persists. This use can constitute an apology (as Jonathan Wright reminded me when he read the first version of this post), but only when the content clause subject is first person as well: I'm sorry I hit you is an apology, but I'm sorry you were hit is not, so watch for that subject (ibid).

Second, sorry can be used with a preposition phrase headed by for with a complement noun phrase denoting a sentient creature:
(14) I'm sorry for that poor little kitten, which seems to have figured out
how to climb up a tree without having any idea how to get down.
(15). I am not apologizing; I never suggested to the stupid kitten that it should climb fifty feet up into a beech tree. I'm just expressingsympathy, as a fellow mammal, for its present plight.

And third, sorry can be used with a preposition phrase headed by for where the preposition has as its

complement a subjectless gerund-participial clause or a noun phrase denoting an act:

(16) a. I'm sorry for doing what I did; I behaved like an utter pig, and you have a right to be angry.

(17) b. I'm sorry for my actions last night; I should never have acted that way and I want you to forgive me. Only this third kind of use canconstitute an apology, as opposed to a statement of regret about the truth of a proposition or a statement of sympathy for a fellow creature

.

Geoff (cited in Liberman,2008:2) uses the word *regret* rather than *sorry*, so that the syntactic side of Geoff's taxonomy needs to be adjusted a bit — but not much, since what she says is of the form "I regret that <sentence>". But the sentential complement of *regret* in her statement continues in a curious way:
(18)"I regret that if my referencing that moment of trauma … was in any way offensive."

This isn't a well-formed sentence. It appears to result from blending a sentence using *regret* with one using *sorry*:
(19)"I regret that my referencing that moment of trauma … was in any way offensive".
(20)"I'm sorry if my referencing that moment of trauma … was in any way offensive."

"If" pattern is a syntactic structure that Geoff didn't include in his taxonomy. It might be a form of the conditional "If my referencing … was in any way offensive, (then) I'm sorry", with the apodosis put in front of the protasis. Or maybe *sorry* has developed an if-complement, as in structures like "I wonder if …" or "I don't know if … ". In any case, (21) "If my remarks were in any way offensive, I'm sorry" is even weaker than (22) "I'm sorry that my remarks were in any way offensive", since it doesn't even grant that it's a fact that the remarks were in any way offensive. We should also note that being sorry for causing offense is itself a rather weak form of sorriness, since it doesn't necessarily imply being sorry for the actions or words that caused the offense. It's perfectly appropriate to take a stance like (23) "I'm sorry for offending you, but what I said was true and had to be said." Lenug(2004:1) in the following table shows the different use of the words apology, apologise, apologises, apologetic and apologies.

Table (2) The Syntactic Use of the Word Apology

Word	Part of Speech	Examples
Apology	singular noun	Re: Apology for Late Delivery of Order #
Apologies	plural noun	Please accept our apologies for the late delivery of this order.
apologise / apologize (The British spelling uses 's', and the American, 'z'.)	Verb	"I apologise." "I forgive you." I apologise for the late delivery of Order #12345. I would like to apologise for the late delivery of Order #12345. I am writing to apologise for the late delivery of Order #12345.
apologises / apologizes	third person verb	She never apologises to her boyfriend for being late.
apologised / apologized	past tense verb	The official apologised for his mistakes and offered his resignation.
have / has apologised / apologized	present perfect verb	He has apologised and has been forgiven.
am / is / are / was / were apologising / apologizing	continuous verb	He was apologising for forgetting his speech when he realised that he was in the wrong room.
apologising / apologizing	Gerund	Apologising for things that are not your fault is a business skill.
Apologetic	Adjective	The complaining customer was very apologetic when he discovered that the battery was inserted the wrong way round.

An apology can also be internally modified by means of various strategies that either emphasize or soften the violation of the offense.
These strategies include modality markers such as ('possibly', 'perhaps'), hedges ('kind/sort of', 'somehow'), mental state predicates ('I suppose', 'I think', 'I believe'), or intensifiers ('I'm so/ very /really/ awfully/ terribly sorry'). Although these intensifiers can be used interchangeably, there actually is a difference in American English between "very" and "really," with "really" implying more regret and "very" more etiquette. Thus, if you want to offer an apology to an American friend which you want to sound sincere it is better for you to say, "I'm really sorry. Are you O.K.?"
instead of just "I'm very sorry" (Cohen, Olshtain, & Rosenstein

1986:66-67). Another intensifier which is used only in written apologies is the adverb extremely: I was extremely sorry that I was unable to get to your father's funeral.Not only could an intensifier play an important role, but even an interjection like "Oh!" could have an important role. In fact, there could be times when a well-placed "Oh!" and an offer of repair could take the place of an expression of apology in American English: e.g., "Oh! Here, let me help get something on that burn and clean up the mess," as opposed to, "I'm very sorry that I bumped into you." In response to an apology English communicators emphasize the insignificance of the damage or inconvenience caused and assure the addressee that the balance of the relationship is restored (Aijmer 1996: 90).

4. Methodology

The above review of the studies done on the speech act of apology shows that a study on this particular speech act as produced by students of English may vaguely exist in the map of this area of study.The purpose of my paper is to explore the features of Arab apologies in English and is also supposed to provide us with a view of the performance of the act of apologizing

4.1 Subjects

Thirty subjects participated in this study.The subjects were undergraduate students enrolled in the English Department .They are between the ages of 19 and 25. The students are the third stage in the College of Education for Humanities ,in the Department of English. They are chosen randomly. A test is designed to measure the recognition and production level of the subjects.Ten situations were prepared, typed and given to students who were asked to respond apologetically. The subjects were asked to respond, in written, to a discourse completion questionnaireconsistingof ten situations calling for apology speech act. Ten questions were also specifically designed to reveal the subjects use of syntactic formulae when apologizing and how these formulas vary among subjects. The production side of the test sheds lights on which suitable forms of apologies which can be used and in which occasion.The advantage to use DCQ is that subjects feel free to express themselves without any kind of intervention by the researcher. It was noticed that, the subjects feel embarrassed when using role-playing technique. Collecting data based on naturally occurring situations is a very time consuming task. The ten situations are common in life and could happen to the subjects and do not require them to assume different roles or personalities.
.

4.2 The model

In the present study the model adopted is that of Cohen and Olshtain (1981: 113–134) and Olshtain and Cohen (1983: 22–23). This model has been chosen because it has been developed out of empirical observations. This model has also shown its universality because it has been successfully tested on several languages (Olshtain, 1989). It shows that apologizers generally use a limited number of verbal strategies. However, the variation in the choice and linguistic realizations across the Arabic and English languages as representing entirely different cultures.

4. 3 Data Collection Procedure

The test is divided into two parts. The first part is that ten situations were prepared, typed and given to students who were asked to respond apologetically. Their responses were collected and analyzed to find out the most common expressions and strategies they use. In the second part, the subjects are asked ten questions to elicit the suitable syntactic structure or formulaic expression of apology for each occasion. DCT was applied to EFL subjects in their usual class hours by their usual core course teachers and they were instructed to write the first thing that came into their minds regarding the situation they were in and the person they were interacting. In the analysis of the data, all responses were categorized according to Olshtain's and Cohen(1983) apology speech act set. According to their categorization, the responses of subjects in this study are analyzed according to different apology strategies:

1. Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs)/Statements of Remorse An Illocutionary Force Indication Device (IFIDs), sometimes alsoreferred to as a statement of remorse, a pre-formulated, or apology, is one of the most common forms of indicating regret (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989, p. 20). The most common examples of IFIDs are "I'm sorry", "Excuse me", and "Pardon me".
a. an expression of regret (e. g.(24)I'm sorry)
b. an offer of apology (e.g(.25) I apologize)
c. a request for forgiveness (e.g.(26) excuse me, forgive me)

2. An offer of repair/redress (REPR)
The apology strategy of compensation/reparation gives the apologizer an opportunity to repair the situation by offering some type of compensation. Examples of compensation/reparation were found frequently in question four of the DCT where subjects offered to replace the professor's lost book, i.e. (27) "I'm sorry I lost

your book, please let me get you a new one" .e.g.(28)I'll pay for your damage)

3. An explanation of an account (EXPL)
Suszczynska (1999) highlights well the specifics of an explanation or account in that "Any external mitigating circumstances, 'objective' reasons for the violation,e.g. Thetraffic was terrible" (p.1056) constitutes an account or explanation. In the data presented below, responses have been coded as an explanation/account if the reasons remain objective, meaning the fault does not lie with the speaker because the event was out of the speaker's control. An example of explanation/accounts from the data collected is, (29) "I came late because of the traffic jam". e.g. (30) My daughter was ill, I took her to hospital).

of the

speaker's

4. Acknowledging responsibility for the offense (RESP)
When using acknowledgement of responsibility as a strategy, the speaker is using a face-threatening act to express their belief in the necessity of an apology by overly admitting their relationship with the act (Blum-Kulka, House&Kasper, 1989) e.g. (31).It's my fault). Suszczynska (1999) clearly defines the different aspects of acknowledging

responsibility within an apology:

a. "Explicit self-blame, e.g.(32) It is my fault/my mistake"
b."Lack of intent, e.g.(33) I didn't mean it"
c."Expression of self-deficiency,e.g.(34) I was confused/I didn't see you"
d. "Expression of embarrassment, e.g.(35) I feel awful about it"
e. "Self-dispraise, e.g. (36) I'm such a dimwit!"
f. "Justify hearer, e.g. (37) you're right to be angry" (p. 1065)
(38) "I am sorry I lost your book. I will buy a replacement for you" These aspects of the acknowledgement of responsibility strategy show a transition from simply expressing remorse for the occurrence to admitting there is fault.

5. A promise of forbearance (FORB)
By using the strategy of promising not to repeat the offense, subjects explicitly stated that the event would not occur again in a future time, i.e. "Please forgive my forgetfulness, it will never happen again!". e.g. (39) I'll never forget it again)
As Tunçel (ibid.) states the above list did not cover all the responses of his subjects, so he added some other categories into the list such as:
1. Deny (denial of fault or offense) e.g. (40).I did not cause the accident

You parked your car on my way!)

2. Blame (putting blame on the hearer) e.g.(41)Why didn't you remind
   me?)

3. Health (asking the state of health) e.g.(42) Are you all right? I can take
   you to hospital)

4. Exclamation (EXL!) (expressing surprise) e.g. (43) Oh!)

5. Request e.g. (44) Can I use it for two days?)

The responses of 30 subjects were counted and categorized according to the above criteria in the coding tables for each situation. The frequency and percentage of syntactic formulas were calculated. In some situations, there were some combinations such as IFID+EXPL, REPR+RESP (see Appendix B for coding).

6. *Intensifiers*

The use of intensifiers in the apology do just that, they intensify, or make stronger an individual's apology usually through an addition of a word, most commonly "very", "really", and "so". An example ofintensifier used in an apology would be, "I am very sorry". The use of "seriously", "fucking", and "super" were found within the data collected and possibly suggest the acceptance of new intensifiers in speech acts today. For example, some students used "I am seriously so sorry" Taking this into account, an apology that consists of an IFID only (I'm

sorry) does not have the apologetic power of another that contains an IFID and an intensification marker (I'm deeply sorry); therefore, in this study intensification is treated as a separate apology strategy. Alongside the use of adverbials (e.g. very) with the IFID and the repetition of the IFID, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) classified 'concern for the hearer' and use of more than one strategy as intensification. Using multiple strategies as an intention of intensification is dependent on the type of strategies used. In this study intensification refers only to the use of adverbials (e.g., terribly, very, extremely, etc.) and repetition of IFID e.g.(55) *I'm sorry. Please forgive me*.) These examples clearly indicate the speaker's explicit intention of intensification: a. (I am very sorry).b. (sorry, excuse me).

4.4 Finding and Analysis

This section presents the findings and discussion according to the situation and apology expressions used. As table (3) reveals the most common formula used by both male and female subjects was the use of IFID strategy, e.g. I'm sorry , sorry for being late, accept my pology).This formula accounted for 93% of the data for both subjects. Another common formula was (Acknowledgement of responsibility) accounted 70% for both subjects e.g. I was unable to return it on time . I'll not borrow

Iraqi EFL Learners´ Ability in Using Apology

another CD , I didn't know how it happened. It is seen that IFID categories accounted for most of the data. A promise of forbearance was also employed by the subjects.The percentage 50% for both groups. The subjects responded in one or two words to some situations , such as in the first situation which is being late for the lecture or in the second situation which is keeping some one waiting for a long time , the subjects find enough to use one or two words because the situation does not need more than that to convince the apologizee ,for example, sorry ,very sorry . Intensification Markers: "very", "terribly", "so", really". Frequency

of the occurrence showed that learners under instruction of apology speech act gained a sufficient knowledge of appropriate intensification needed in English apologizing. However , students who were not aware of the appropriate degree of intensification tended to use " very sorry " and "really reallysorry","forgive me " or" so sorry"more often and sometimes in contexts where this realization was not appropriate .The following table shows the distribution of the apology strategies across the data. *Table 4: Distribution of the Apology Strategies Used Across Situations*

Apology Strategies Used	Females Number	Males Number	Total Number	%
IFIDs	15	13	28	0.93
Intensifier	7	7	14	0.46
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	10	11	21	0.70
Explanation / Accounts	6	7	13	0.43
Compensation/Reparation	7	9	16	0.53
Promise not to Repeat offense	9	6	15	0.50

Throughout analysis, it is founded that the most repeated sequence in apology is as follows: Statement of remorse (regret) + reparation + compensation This means that this speech act set or semantic formula is the most used one among both males and females. The most common formula used by both male and female subjects was the use of IFID strategy,e.g.I'm sorry , sorry for being late, accept my pology). The following tables (5) and (6) explain the performance of the subjects on both parts recognition and production. The tables point that the Iraqi EFL subjects do not master the recognition as well as the production of the speech act of

apology. . As a result the students ignore the grammatical structure and forms in which the word apology can occur.

Table (5) The Subjects' apology Recognition

Items No.	Correct Responses	Percentage	Incorrect Responses	Percentage
1	14	0.46	16	0.53
2	12	0.4	18	0.6
3	15	0.5	15	0.5
4	7	0.23	23	0.76
5	11	0.36	19	0.63
6	9	0.3	21	0.7
7	10	0.33	20	0.66
8	8	0.26	22	0.73
9	12	0.4	18	0.6
10	8	0.26	22	0.73

Table (6)The Subjects' Apology Production

Items No.	Correct Responses	Percentage	Incorrect Responses	Percentage
1	4	0.13	26	0.86
2	11	0.36	19	0.63
3	10	0.33	20	0.66
4	6	0.2	24	0.8
5	10	0.33	20	0.66
6	5	0.16	20	0.66
7	6	0.2	24	0.8
8	5	0.16	20	0.66
9	4	0.56	13	0.43
10	14	0.46	16	0.53

The following tables(7) and (8) explain the females and males performance on recognition and production parts of the test.

Table (7)Males Subjects' Apology Recognition

Items No.	Correct Responses	Percentage	Incorrect Responses	Percentage
1	3	0.2	12	0.8
2	4	0.26	11	0.73
3	5	0.33	10	0.66
4	6	0.4	9	0.6
5	1	0.06	14	0.93

6	2	0.13	13	0.86
7	3	0.2	12	0.8
8	6	0.4	9	0.6
9	5	0.33	10	0.66
10	6	0.4	9	0.6

Table (8) Females Subjects' Apology Recognition

Items No.	Correct Responses	Percentage	Incorrect Responses	Percentage
1	6	0.4	9	0.6
2	8	0.53	7	0.46
3	3	0.2	12	0.8
4	9	0.6	6	0.4
5	7	0.46	8	0.53
6	5	0.33	10	0.66
7	3	0.2	12	0.8
8	9	0.6	6	0.4
9	10	0.66	5	0.33
10	6	0.4	9	0.6

Table (9) The Males Subjects' Apology Production

Items No.	Correct Responses	Percentage	Incorrect Responses	Percentage
1	1	0.06	14	0.93
2	2	0.13	13	0.86
3	3	0.2	12	0.8
4	3	0.2	12	0.8
5	1	0.06	14	0.93
6	3	0.2	12	0.8
7	1	0.06	14	0.93
8	6	0.4	9	0.6
9	7	0.46	8	0.53
10	2	0.13	13	0.86

Table (10) The Females Subjects' Apology Production

Items No.	Correct Responses	Percentage	Incorrect Responses	Percentage
1	10	0.66	10	0.66
2	8	0.53	7	0.46
3	7	0.46	8	0.53

4	5	0.33	10	0.66
5	4	0.26	11	0.73
6	3	0.2	12	0.8
7	8	0.53	7	0.46
8	3	0.2	12	0.8
9	7	0.46	8	0.53
10	4	0.26	11	0.73

The percentage of males correct answers in the recognition part of the test was (42%) in comparison with the percentage of the females correct answers which equals(35%). While on the production level of the test, the males incorrect answers was higher than the females .The percentage was (56.7%) for females' answers and (45%) for males' answers .The reason behind such difference is that males tend to use stable and short forms to express their apology rather than the grammatical structure and forms.

5 . Conclusion

On the basis of the findings of this study, the paper comes to the following conclusions:
            Generally both males and females mostly used IFID + EXPL (giving explanation, cause, or reason) categories in all situations. For some extents, females are more expressive than males. Both genders also mostly used REPR (*an offer of repair or compensation for the damage*) in some situations. This category was used by both genders as a remedial support (Trosborg,1995)

.Theyconsidered a spoken apology was not sufficient to reestablish their social relationship with the hearer. The result of this paper shows that in many situations both genders have similarity in using apologizing strategies. They employed most similar categories in term of certain situations.

The data collected clearly shows that the use of an IFID is the most common strategy for both male and female. The frequency of this strategy is % 93 in the collected data. "I'm sorry" and "excuse me" werethe most common choice of an IFID; this follows Borkin& Reinhart's (1978) article which discusses the subtle and often confusing social rules for using language. Borkinand Reinhart believe these pre - formulated utterances have different uses: "excuse me" is used immediately following or immediately preceding an event which would be consideredsocially unacceptable (as in bumping into someone); "I'm sorry" is used as remedy to show concern for an unpleasantness which the hearer experienced because of the speaker. Moreover, the Iraqi EFL learners commit many grammatical, punctuation, and spelling mistakes. This is owing to the fact that Iraqi EFL learners cannot express themselves in English effectively and this is

also related to the context of learning and their lack of pragmatic competence. It is worth mentioning that Iraqi EFL learners study apology from a grammatical viewpoint, but they do not study it from a pragmatic one. They are not trained enough to use apology strategies to preserve good relations with the offended people. Additionally, Iraqi EFL learners must be instructed that politeness markers vary from one culture to another. There are significant differences between Iraqi males and females.The females tend to use long answers when they apologize, whereas the males tend to use short ones. The women are less direct and employ elaborated strategies than men who incline to use more concise categories. This reflects the fact that the Iraqi females care more about the feelings of others than males. Conversely, Iraqi females employ more apology strategies than Iraqi males because men in this society can talk and behave more freely than women. Furthermore, women are more reserved and polite than men and this is also related to religious factors as well as social rules and conventions.

Bibliography

Austin, J. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: OUP
Alfattah, M. (2010). "Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University
        Students." University of Mysore, Mysore, India. 0974-8741.
Aijmer, Karin, 1996. *Conversational Routines in English. Convention
        and Creativity*. London: Longman.
Bataineh, R. & R. Bataineh. (2005). *"Apology Strategies of Jordanian

EFL University Students."Journal of Pragmatics 38 (11): 1901-1927.

Beaumont R. (2009).*" Emotional Competency*." by. Explore the Logic
        of Passion .Available at[www.emotionalcompetency.com.httm].
Bergman, M. Kasper,G. (1993).Perception and Performance in
        Native and non-Native apology.
Blum-Kulka, Shoshana,

Borkin,A. and Reinhart,S."Excuse me" and "I'm Sorry". *(1978).*
TESOL *Quarterly , pp. 57 –70*
Brown, P. and Levinson S. (1978). Universals in Language Usag
        Politeness Phenomena. In Esther Goody (ed.), *Questions
and Politeness*, 56-311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brown, P. &Levinson,S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in
        Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cohen,A.D. and Olshtain, E.(1981.Developing a Measure of Socio-
        Cultural Competence: The Case of Apology .Language
        Learning 31 , pp. 113–134.
Cohen,A.and Olshtain,E.*(1985*.Comparing Apologies across Languages.Oxford:Oxford University Press.
Coulmas, F.(1981). "Poison to Your Soul – Thanks and Apologies

        Contrastively Viewed". In: Coulmas, F. (ed.), pp. 69-91.
------------------ (ed.).(1981). *Conversational Routine. Explorations in

Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech.
The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
Demeter, G. (2000). "*A Pragmatic Study of Apology Strategies in*
Romanian." Unpublished MA thesis, Romania: North
University Baia Mare
Deutschmann, M. (2003). *Apologising in British English*. Umeå: Umeå
University.
Edmondson, W. (1981). "On saying you are sorry". In F. Coulmas (ed),
Conversational routine. The Hague: Mouton, 273–288.

---------------------(1992). "Evidence for Native Speaker Notions of
Apologizing and Accepting Apologies in American English."
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
Edmondson, W. & J. House (1981). *Let's Talk and Talk About It.*
Munich: Urban and Schwarzenberg.
Fraser, B. (1990). On Apologizing. In: Coulmas, F(1981). (ed.).
Conversational Routine: Exploration in Standardized Communication
Situations and Prepatterned Speech. The Hague: Mouton, 259–271.
Goffman, E. (1971). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden
City, NY: Doubleday. *Relations in Public.* New York: Harper
---------------- *(1971)*.Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public
Order .Harmondsworth, Penguin
Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in*

Society 19: 155-199. Cambridge :Cambridg University Press.
Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman
.
House, J. & G. Kasper, (1981). "Politeness markers in English and
German". In F. Coulmas (ed.).*Conversational routine: Explorations*
in standardized communication *situations and prepatterned*
speech. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 157-185.
Kasper,G. eds. *Interlanguage Pragmatics.* Oxford: OUP.82-107.
Kasper ,G. and Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). Interlanguage
Pragmatics. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*

Leung, M.(2004) ."The Grammar of Apology". Available at:
[http://www2.elc.polyu.edu.hk/cill/eiw/apologise.htm].
Liberman, L.(2008)." Language and Politics". Available at
[http://languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/%3Fp%3D187].
Márquez, R. (2008). *Intra-Cultural Variation: Explanations in Service*
Calls to two Montevideo Service Providers. Journal of
Politeness Research 4, 1-30.
Ogiermann,E.(2009).*OnApologizing in Negative and Positive Politeness*
Politeness Cultures.
Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Olstain, E. (1983). *"Sociocultural Competence and Language Transfer:*
The Case of Apology". In Gass, S. L. Selinker (Eds.) *Language*
Transfer in Language Learning.
Rowley: Newbury House Publisher

------------ *(1989).*Apologies across languages., in: S. Blum-Kulka, J.

   House, G. Kasper (Eds.), Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and

     Apologies, Advances in Discourse Processes, vol. 31, Ablex,

     Norwood, NJ , pp. 155–173

*Olshtain,E. and Cohen, A.(1993).*Apology: a Speech Act Set . Nessa

Wolfson,Judd Elliot (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and Language

     Acquisition Newbury House, Rowley, pp. 18–36

*Owen,M.(1983).*Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: A Study of

     Language Use in   Social Interaction. New York :OUP.

Searle, J. (1979). Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of

Speech Acts. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Trosborg, A. (1995). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints

     and apologies. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Appendix(1)

Part 1:The situations translated into English

Q1. Imagine yourself in the following situations .How would you apologize in each case?

1. Being late for the lecture.

2. Keeping a friend waiting for a long time.

3. Your professor lent you a book and you lost it.

4. You are a teacher .You promised to return the students' term paper .But you forgot them. One of your students asked you about them.

5. Breaking a dish at home.

6. You borrowed a CD from your roommate and did not return it for three weeks.

7. While you were sitting with your father and his guests, you interrupted him a lot.

   When the guests left, your father blamed you a lot. Apologize

8. You went to your work late for the third time. The manager had warned you several times. Now you are face to face with your manager. Apologize

9. Your father asked you to wash his car, but you forgot. Now he is angry. Apologize.

10. You were playing with your friend's computer and erased the important paper s/he had been working on for the past two weeks. Apologize

Part 2:

This part is used to elicit the   suitable syntactic structure or formulaic expression of apology for each occasion. Ten items are used in this part.

Q2.Choose the correct option for each of the following items :

1. -------------------for issues at the Sound System Exhibition.

(Apology, Apologies, Apologizes)

2. I'm writing to ---------- for the issues you raised about the sound system Exhibition. Thank you for your concern.

(apologizing , apologize ,apologizes)

3.You commented on the on-line registration facility. Please accept my-------------- for the inconvenience facility.

(apologies, apologetic, apology)

4. You mentioned the availability of leaflets. The exhibitors were very --------------- about this and they assure us that they will prepare more next year.

(apologizing, apologetic apologizes)

5. We realize that------------ is not enough, so we enclose 2 VIP tickets for next years' exhibition, and we assure you that these issues will not re-occur.

(Apologizes, apologizing, apology)

6. I must ------------- for being lat.

(apologize, apology, apologizing)

7. Please accept my ------------- for being late.

(apologize

8. Please send my --------------- to the meeting as I shan't be able to attend.

(apology , apologies , apologizes)

9. I am truly ---------yelling at you. I hope that you can find
it in your heart to forgive me

(sorry for , sorry to, sorry   )

10 . "I didn't intend to hurt you, and now all I can do is ask for
your -------------and try not to repeat my same mistake again."

(forgive, forgiveness, forgiving)

Sex: MALE - FEMALE

Appendix (2) List of abbreviations

EXPL: An Explanation or Account of the Situation

FORB: A promise of Forbearance

IFID: Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices

REPR: An Offer of Repair

RESP: An Acknowledgement of Responsibility