The Use of Apology Strategies by Iraqi EFL Learners

Set by

Asst.Lecturer.Saadiya Wudaa Al-Quraishy

University of Al-Qadissiya

College of Education

2011

Abstract

Apology is an expressive illocutionary act. It is a social act, the goal of which is to maintain harmony between the speaker and hearer. To perform the act of 'apologizing', the offender who perceives the need to apologize should employ certain strategies of apology: opting out, evasive strategies, direct strategies and indirect ones.

This study aims at categorizing the types and percentages of the strategies used in performing the speech act of 'apologizing' by Iraqi EFL learners of English as a foreign language. It also attempts at pointing out the breakdowns committed in using these strategies. To this end, the discourse completion test was practiced to twenty-five participants of Iraqi EFL learners of English as a foreign language. The findings after analyzing their responses reveal that Iraqi EFL learners of English as a foreign language lack knowledge for most of the strategies of apology .

1. Apology in English

1.1 Definition of Apology

The word 'apology' derives from the Greek root 'logos', meaning 'speech' or 'word'. Though originally associated with a formal justification, defense or explanation, apology also refers to remarks made following an injury, whether intentional or unintentional (Cohen,1999:72). In this respect, an apolgy is defined as "an explanation offered to a person affected by one's action that no offense was intended, coupled with the expression of regret for any that may have been given; or, a frank acknowledgment of the offense with expression of regret for it, by way of reparation." (Garcia, 1989:44).

The typical expression of an apology is done by the words, 'I'm sorry'. However, the words 'I'm sorry' can have many possible interpretations for a listener as well as a speaker. The difference of meaning results in three elements in an apology (i) admitting one's fault, (ii) expressing regret for the injurious action, and (iii) expressing sympathy for the other's injury(Cohen,1999:77).

Apologies fall under expressive speech acts in which speakers attempt to indicate their state or attitude. In order for an apolgy to have an effect , it should reflect true feelings.One cannot effectively apologize to another unless one portrays honest feelings of sorrow and regret for whatever one has done"(Bataineh&Bataineh,2006: 33).

"Apology is defined as primarily social act , carrying effective meaning" (Holmes, 1990: 170).It is a convivial speech act, the goal of which concides with the social goal of maintaining harmony between the speaker and hearer when social norms have been violated whether the offense is real or potential

(Olshtain and Cohen, 1993:54).Apologies have the effect of paying a debt, thus compensating the victim for the harm done by the offense (Searle, 1969: 11) . Thus, apologies can be considered as a kind of remedial work which involves splitting of the speaker's self into two parts, the one guilty for having offended the addressee, the other aligning himself/herself with the addressee and with the violated norm (Lakoff,2001:161).In other words, apology can be defined as a "compensatory action for an offense committed by the speaker which has affected the hearer"(Reiter,2000: 44).

Olshtain and Weinbach (1993:195) view an admission of fault and responsibility as essential components of the apology when the interlocutor's behaviour violates a social norm.When an action or utterance (or the lack of either one) has resulted in offense, the offender needs to apologize.As a consequence one deals with two parties: an apologizer and a recipient of apology; the act depends on whether the person who caused the infraction percieves himself/herself as an apologizer.The act of 'apologizing' requires an action or an utterance which is intended to set things right.

Brown and Levinson (1987:66) regard apologies as "negative politeness strategies" in that they convey respect, deference, and distance rather than friendliness and involvement. In performing an apolgy, the speaker acknowledges the addressee's face-want not to be offended. 'Apologizing' is a face threatening act for the speaker and a face-saving act for the addressee.

1.2 Apology as a Face-Saving Act

Apologies are offered to express regret for having offended someone.As such, they imply cost to the speaker and support for the hearer.Apologies typically occur post-event to restore harmony when an offense has been committed,but it is also face-saving with regard to a protective orientattion towards saving one's own face(Goffman,1972:190).If a person has been hurt, inconvenienced, or violated in some way or other, his/her face must be restored and an apology is called for.The culpable person must let the offended person know that he/she is sorry for what he/she has done, so the act is highly hearer-supportive and often self-demeaning (Edmondson,1981:45).In this respect, apology involves a threat to the speaker, but it is possible for the offender to save face by justifying or explaining the reason(s) for his/her failure.

The potential apologizer may find himself/herself in a position of "inner conflict".In recieving a compliant ,he/she must accept that his/her bahaviour indicates a denial of the social standing of the complainer.The apologizer's response has,therefore, a twofold aim:he/she must placate the complainer to restore social harmony and she/he must restore his/her own social status.A conflict between these two aims is likely to arise.Consequently, a complaint is not always followed by an apology.In turn, the recipient of an apology may or may not have been complaining.Thus, although the acts complaint/apology resemble an adjacent pair, one may occur without the other (ibid.).

In addition , there is the possibility that the person who has caused this infraction may not percieve him/herself as guilty.He/she may not feel the need to apologize, or he/she choose to deny his/her responsibility. A number of factors are likely to influence his/her behaviour.His /her own perception of the degree of the severity of the offence is often decisive, but he/she may also take into consideration the

recipient's point of view,his/her perception of the degree of offense, the extent of the expected reprimand, etc.Other influential factors are the age, familiarity, and social status of the two participants(Cohen,1999:75).

1.3 Types of Offense

The offense or "object of regret" is what obligates an apology(Coulmas, 1981:71). It is argued that the nature and severity of an offense strongly affect the form of the subsequent apology. For example, stepping on someone's toe will most probably result in a different apology than knocking someone over and breaking his/her leg (Deutschmann,2003:265).Wolfson, Marmor and Jones(1989:178-179) list the following kinds of social obligation, which when broken, result in apologies:

1.The obligation to keep a social or work-related commitment or agreement.
2.The obligation to respect the property of others.
3.The obligation not to cause damage or discomfort to others.

Holmes(1990:178) and Aijmer(1996:164) provided a different taxonomy. They (ibid.) classify offenses into six major types: 'inconvenience', 'space', 'talk', 'time', 'possessions' and 'social gaffes'. In this study, the offenses were categorized according to the comprehensive framework provided by Deutschmann (2003:266) that was developed based on Holmes (1990:178) and Aijmer (1996:164).It included the following categories:

1. Accidents: Damage to property, hurting someone unintentionally, bumping into a person, unintentionally being in the way.
2. Mistakes and misunderstandings: Misunderstanding someone, mistakes.

3. Breach of expectations : Declining offers , declining requests , forgetting agreements, not keeping agreements, inability to fulfill expectations, personal shortcomings

4. Lack of consideration: Interruptions, overlooking a person, not paying attention, forgetting a name , being late , leaving inappropriately, causing inconvenience, taking something without permission, taboo offenses, hurting someone's feelings unintentionally.

5. Talk offenses : Slips of the tongue , digressions, hesitations , corrections , being unclear, forgetting to mention something.

6. Social gaffes : Coughing, burping , sneezing , clearing the throat , laughing loudly unintentionally, flatulence.

8. Hearing offenses: Not hearing, not understanding, not believing one's ears

9. Offenses involving breach of consensus : Disagreeing or contradicting, reprimanding, refusing, denying, retaliating, insisting , challenging.

1.4 Strategies of Apology

To perform the act of 'apologizing', the offender who perceives the need to apologize should employ certain strategies of apology. These strategies of apologizing are intended to maintain the relationship and at least reduce the offense to the offended.One of the most influential views on the classification of apologies is Goffman's (1972:192), in which he (ibid.) distinguishes two types of compensations: substantive and ritual. Following this distinction, Fraser(1981: 265) provides two motivations associated with substantive and ritualistic apologies; in substantive apology, the speaker wants to remedy the damage or harm caused by the offense while the ritual apolgy may be produced as a kind of habit associated with certain routines or when the respondent is not responsible for the offense . Another classification of apology is proposed by Al-Zumor

(2003:102), to classify apology strategies in two main ways: act of 'apology' and act of justification for wrongdoing. The first, which is an explicit apology, is the primary component while the second, which is an implicit apology, is a secondary one. Accordingly, apologies are either explicit (e.g. forgive me, and I'm sorry), implicit (use of one of the other strategies or complex (explicit apology+ implicit apology). However, Nureddeen(2008: 282) adds a compound apology (implicit apology + implicit apology), which can be seen as a fourth type of apology within the same paradigm. People usually apologize by means of semantically different types of expressions; therefore, apology strategies are often described according to their semantic formulae.

Another classification of apology strategies, which is followed by the researcher, is proposed by Wolfson and Judd (1983:22), Owen(1983:53), Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984:206) Trosborg, (1985:377-390) Holmes (1990:180), and Cohen(1999:79).They (ibid.) show that apology can be performed in different ways by using: opting out strategies, evasive strategies, direct strategies(the formulaic, routinized forms of apology) and indirect ones. These strategies of apology are also known as semantic formulas. An explanation in detail of each semantic formula is presented as follows:

1.4.1 Opting Out.

This strategy is used if the complainee or an apologizer denies the responsibility because that person feels not guilty(Trosborg,1985: 377).

1.4.1.1. Explicit Denial of Responsibility.

Explicitly, the complainee denies all of complainer's statements and doesn't take a responsibility, for example:

(1)I know nothing about it (ibid.).

1.4.1.2. Implicit Denial of Responsibility

The complainee may try to evade responsibility by ignoring the complainer's statements .For example:

   (2) I don't think that's my fault (Holmes,1990:181) .

1.4.1.3. Justification.

The complainee gives some arguments to give certainty that he/she cannot be blamed. For example:

   (3) I've already finished my job yesterday, so there's no reason I could be

      blamed about this (ibid.).

1.4.1.4. Blaming Someone Else.

In real, the complainee blames someone else such as a third party or the complainer, for example:

   (4) It wasn't me, may be you do it by yourself in purpose (Trosborg,1985:387) .

1.4.1.5. Attacking the Complainer.

The complainee attacks the complainer seriously, especially when the complainer lacks the defense .For example:

   (5) I'm warning you! You can't blame me for this trouble(ibid.).

1.4.2. Evasive Strategies

1.4.2.1. Minimizing the Degree of Offense

The complainee commits his/her responsibility, but he/she tries to minimize his fault by giving some arguments, querying preconditions, and blaming someone else. Blaming someone else here is different from the strategy at (1.4.1.4). Here, the complainee admits responsibility and the complainer is just a third party(Wolfon and Judd,1983:22).

1.4.2.1.1 Minimizing.

(6) Oh, what does that matter? that's nothing (Owen,1983:53).

1.4.2.1.2 Querying Preconditions.

In the following example ,in responding to the complainer who says "You don't love me ".The complainee apologizes by saying:

(7) What is love then? (ibid.).

1.4.2.1.3 Blaming Someone else.

(8) I believe another person also responsible to this problem (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain ,1984:207).

1.4.3. Direct Apologies

It is the most direct realization of apology which can be done by an explicit illocutionary force indicating device, henceforth(IFID). In this formula, an apology is performed by the offender directly. The offender uses an apology verb such as 'apologize', 'be sorry', 'forgive', 'excuse', or 'pardon'(Wolfson and Judd,1983:22).

1.4.3.1 An Expression of Regret.

(9) I am sorry. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984:207)

1.4.3.2. An Offer of Apology.

(10) I apologize.

(11) We apologize for the late departure of the London train (ibid.).

1.4.3.3 A Request for Forgiveness.

(12) Excuse me.

(13) Please forgive me.

(14) pardon me (Cohen,1999:79).

1.4.4 Intensification

The force of apology depends not only on the choice of an apology strategy but also on the number and type of strategies used .An apology that consists of an IFID only does not have the apologetic power of another that contains an IFID and an intensification marker. Blum- Kulka and Olshtain (1984:208) admit that intensification refers to the use of adverbial (e.g terribly, very, extremely etc) and repetition of IFID. For example:

(15) I am very sorry

(16) am sorry, please forgive me.

1.4.5. Indirect Apologies

1.4.5.1. An Acknowledgement of Responsibility.

The speaker or the offender will choose an acknowledgement or account of responsibility only when he/she realizes to be responsible for the offense. This formula consists of six substrategies ; they can be described as follow:

1.4.5.1.1. Accepting the Blame.

(17) It was entirely my fault.

1.4.5.1.2. Expressing Self-Deficiency.

(18) I was confused.

(19)I did not see you (Owen,1983: 55).

1.4.5.1.3 Recognizing the Other Person as Deserving Apology.

(20) You're right to blame me.

1.4.5.1.4 Expressing the Lack of Intent.

(21) I didn't mean to.

1.4.5.1.5 Admitting the Offence .

(22)I admit , I forgot the meeting (Trosborg,1985:388).

1.4.5.1.6.Implicit Acknowledgement.

(23)I can see your point;perhaps I should not have done it(Blum-Kulka and Olshtain ,1984: 208).

1.4.5.2. An Explanation or Account of the Situation.

An explanation or account is an expression that gives an account of the cause of the offense.A complainee may try to mitigate his/her guilt by giving an explanation or account of the situation, for example, when a person is coming late for a meeting,he/ she may say:

(23)The bus was delayed.

Or

(24)I am sorry, there was a traffic jam (Woflson and Judd,1983:22).

1.4.5.3. An Offer of Repair.

Speakers may attempt to repair or pay for the damage resulted from his/her infraction.'Repair' may be offered in its literal sense or as an offer to pay for the damage. In situations in which actual repair is not possible (not wanted,etc.), the apologizer may offer some kind of 'compensatory' action or 'tribute' to the complainer.Examples (25) and (26) show repair and compensation respectively:

(25)I'll pay for the cleaning.

(26) You can borrow my dress instead (Wolfson and Judd,1983:22).

1.4.5.4. A promise of Forbearance.

When 'apologizing', the speaker takes responsibility by expressing regret and he/she will be expected to behave in a consistent fashion and not to repeat the act for which she/he has just apologized for .In this respect , apologies seem to be related not only to future behaviour , an apologizer can promise either never to perform the offence in question again , or to improve his/her behaviour in a number of ways.Such responses are often signaled by the performative verb 'promise', for example:

(27)It won't happen again , I promise.

(28)I'm sorry for coming late, it won't happen again (Holmes,1990:182).

1.4.5.5.Concern for the Hearer.

In order to pacify a complainer, the complainee may express concern for his/her well-being, his/her conditions,etc.,for example:

(29) Are you ok.?(ibid.)

2.Methodology

2.1 Introduction

In this study ,the researcher tries to investigate the apology strategies as used by Iraqi EFL learners of English as a foreign language. The study aims firstly at finding the frequency of the usage of these strategies and secondly at specifying the types of breakdowns committed in using apology.

2.2 Sample

The participants in this study are (25) of third year students at the University of Al-Qadissiya, College of Education, Department of English.

2.3 Test Design

Discourse completion test, which is sometimes referred to as a production questionnaire or dialogue completion test, is usually employed in cross-cultural pragmatics, especially in interlanguage pragmatics. This instrument was originally developed by Blum-Kulka(1982:83) for comparing the speech act realization patterns of native speakers and learners. In the present study, the test consists of ten incomplete discourse situations that represent different types of offenses proposed by Deutschmann (2003:266)(see 1.3).The situations were in written form so that the Iraqi EFL learners could give their responses without difficulties. Using discourse completion test can enable the researcher to obtain sufficient data in a relatively short period of time and can help learners to express themselves without any kind of intervention by the researcher.

2.4 Data Analysis

After collecting the data, the participants' responses were identified and analyzed to find out the types and percentages of apology strategies used.

The participants have provided a total of (226) responses .As table(1) shows, the participants used (IFID) in high percentages which account for (100%). Iraqi EFL learners seem to express remorse using either one expression of (IFID)(28.3%), by a combination of two (IFID) expressions(10.1%), by one expression of (IFID) combined by one or more intensifiers(7.5%) or by combining an expression of (IFID) by one or more of indirect strategies(53.9%). It seems that the participants believe that apologies should consist of this expression as a compulsory component accompanied by any one of the other strategies. Other semantic formulas like opting out and evasive strategies cannot be seen in the data, Iraqi EFL learners lack the knowledge of these strategies.

It is quite obvious from table (1) below that the use of the combination (IFID)+ one or more of indirect strategies is frequently used in the data. This strategy accounts for(53.9%) of all the strategies used.

Table(1) Frequencies of the Overall Strategies of Apology

N	strategy	Frequency	percentage	
1	IFID	64	28.3%	
2	Intensification			
a	a. IFID+IFID	23	10.1%	17.6%
b	b. IFID+ Intensifier	17	7.5%	
3	IFID+ indirect strategies	122	53.9%	

Out of the (122) responses which elicited a combination of (IFID) + indirect strategies, there are eleven combinations:

IFID+ account,IFID+offer ,IFID+account+offer,IFID+account+promise, IFID+ Promise,IFID+concern+offer,IFID+responsibility,IFID+responsibility+account, IFID+responsibility+ concern+ offer, IFID+ concern and IFID + responsibility+ promise. Table (2),illustrates the frequencies and percentages of the combination:

Table (2)Frequencies of the Combination of IFID+ Indirect Strategies.

N	Strategy	frequencies	Percentages
1	IFID+account	42	34.4%
2	IFID+offer	22	18.03%
3	IFID+account+offer	16	13.1%
4	IFID+account+promise	9	7.3%
5	IFID+promise	7	5.7%
6	IFID+concern+offer	6	4.9%
7	IFID+responsibility	5	4.09%
8	IFID+responsibility+account	5	4.09%
9	IFID+responsibility+concern+offer	4	3.2%
10	IFID+concern	4	3.2%
11	IFID+responsibility+promise	2	1.6%

It is obvious from table(2) above that Iraqi EFL learners never used the indirect strategies of apology as single strategies. In order to mitigate the offense, Iraqi EFL learners tend to combine IFID+ one , two, three or may be four indirect strategies Table (3) below shows that the indirect strategies of account and offer are the most frequent strategies used within the combinations.These strategies account

for (59.01%) and (39.3%) respectively of all the indirect strategies used. However , the remaining indirect strategies:promise ,responsibility, and concern account for(14.7%), (13.1%) and (11.4%) respectively.

Table(3) Frequencies of the Indirect Strategies

N	Indirect strategy	Frequency	percentage
1	account	72	59.01%
2	offer	48	39.3%
3	promise	18	14.7%
4	responsibility	16	13.1%
5	concern	14	11.4%

Here are some examples of Iraqi EFL learners use of the overall apology strategies in the data:

1.Expression of IFID.

(1) I'm sorry for this.

(2) I apologize.

(3) Excuse me for not going with you.

2.Intensification.

a.IFID+Intensifier.

(4)I'm so sorry.

(5)I'm really sorry.

(6)Please, accept my deep apology.

b.IFID+IFID.

(7)I am sorry. Excuse me.

(8)I am sorry. I am sorry.

(9)I apologize. Please forgive me.

3. IFID+ Indirect Strategies.

a. IFID+ Account .

(10)Forgive me ,please .I can't accompany you because I have an exam.

(11)Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot to tell you about postponing the party.

(12)I apologize for being late. The car had a flat tire.

b.IFID+Offer.

(13) I'm sorry .I'll write my homewok tomorrow.

(14)Oh, forgive me .I'll take you to the hospital.

(15)Please, pardon me. I'll buy a camera instead .

c. IFID+Responsibility.

(16)Forgive me. I didn't mean to break your camera.

(17)I am sorry .I didn't see you.

(18)I apologize to you .It is my mistake.

d. IFID+Concern+Offer.

(19)I am sorry. Are you fine? I'll take you to hospital for check up.

(20)Oh, forgive me. Are you ok.? Please, let me help you.

(21)Forgive me. I wish I didn't hurt you. Let me give you a lift home.

e. IFID+Promise.

(22)Sorry for forgetting the meeting. I promise, it won't happen again.

(23)pardon me, please. I promise to go with you to the cinema next week.

(24)I am sorry. I'll do my best to be on time next lecture.

f. IFID+Responsibility+Account.

(25)Excuse me. I know it is wrong not to write the homework, but I was busy
    with my mother who was sick.

(26)I am sorry. I didn't mean that, but he said something very funny.

(27)Please, excuse me.I admit my mistake,but I was in hospital with my father.

g. IFID+Account+Offer.

(28)Please ,excuse me. I was in a hurry. Let me help you.

(29)I apologize. My sight is not that good. I'll take you a taxi home.

(30)Oh, I am sorry. I just tried to make it works properly. Anyhow, I'll get you a similar camera instead.

h. IFID+Responsibility+Concern+Offer.

(31)I am sorry, I didn't mean to. Are you upset? I'll buy you a new camera.

(32)Sorry for that. I admit my laziness. I hope you are not angry with me! I'll do my best to write it.

(33)Please accept my apology. I didn't mean it. What do you feel? Let me take you home to get rest.

i. IFID+Account+Promise.

(34)I am sorry. I didn't tell you about the party because I lost your number. I'll take care a thing next

(35)I apologize for being late. I woke up late. I will not repeat it.

(36)I apologize .I thought it to be my book. I promise you to pay attention next time.

j. IFID+Concern

(37)I am sorry, are you hurt?

(38)Oh, sorry for taking your book. Are you angry?

(39)Oh, please , forgive me. I wish you are ok.

k. IFID+Responsibility+Promise.

(40)I am sorry. It is my fault to laugh during the lecture. I'll never repeat it.

(41)I apologize. You have the right to punish me. I promise to be punctual next time.

The types of breakdowns committed by Iraqi EFL learners in using apology strategies might be attributed to negative transfer of their first language. This might lead to pragmalinguistic failure which occurs when the pragmatic force mapped by nonnative speakers onto a given utterance is systematically different from the force most frequently assigned to it by native speakers of the target language , or when

speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from L1 to L2 (Thomas,1993:99).That is ,"pragmatic failure occurs when a learner tries to perform the right speech act but uses the wrong linguistic meaning(i.e deviates with regard to appropriateness of form"(Ellis, 1994:167).Breakdowns attributed to pragmalinguistic failure can be categorized as:

1.The Use of Address Terms

It is perceived as being polite in Iraqi culture to put address terms in one's utterance when speaking to an old person. Since an old lady is much older than the speaker and respectable out of her age according to the Iraqi tradition, that is, respecting the old and loving the young, Iraqi EFL learners use the address terms 'aunt' and 'mom' in (see Appendix I :situation(2)) As a result of directly translating their utterances from Iraqi to English:

(42)I am sorry, mom. Are you fine? I'll help you.

(43)forgive me, aunt.

2.The Use of Religious Concepts.

As a result of the influence of Islamic culture on the patterns of speech of Iraqi EFL learners, responses with religious concepts are noticed in the data. Iraqi EFL learners refer to the will of God in their responses. They believe that no one affects the future or knows what is going except God. Thus, some apologizers promised to offer repair only if God permitted it:

(44) Oh, I am sorry. I'll buy you a new camera, by God's will.

(45) Forgive me, sir .By God's will ,I will bring your book tomorrow.

In order to mitigate the offence and assure that what is said is true, one may swear by God to assure that he/she does not tell lies, for example:

(46) I apologize for being late. I swear by God it was the traffic jam.

(47) Oh, sorry. By God I was very sick.

3.The Use of Compliment.

In order to minimize the offense done , Iraqi EFL learners might pay compliment to the complainer as a remedial strategy ,for example:

(48) I know you are a kind lovely lady, you will excuse me, won't you?

4.The Use of Interrogative Form.

Some Iraqi EFL learners express apology strategies in an interrogative form, for example:

(49)Can you for give me?

(50)I am sorry for breaking your camera .It is my fault. Tell me, what shall I
    do now?

5.The Use of Double Intensifiers.

Iraqi EFL learners transfer their sociopragmatic strategies of intensifiers from their first language to make exaggeration in the context of English language use, for example:

(51) I am very very sorry.

6.Combinations of Indirect Strategies.

Unlike native speakers of English who use a single indirect strategy to mitigate the offense committed, Iraqi EFL learners tend to combine IFID+ one, two, three, or four indirect strategies ,for example:

(52)I am sorry .I didn't mean to, but I was very busy.

7.The use of Long Utterances.

Some Iraqi EFL learners use long utterances to express their apology, for example:

(53) Sorry sir. I'm trying to be honest towards myself more than you! So , it is my fault, but I promise you to do my best if you excuse me as a master of mine.

This confirms what is said by Olshtain (1985: 173) where he admits that the utterance length can function as a potential and intended violation of a native form which might lead to pragmatic failure.

Conclusions

Based on different functions of the speech act of 'apologizing', a broad definition of an apology can be summerized as that an apology is a speech act addressed to the hearer's face-needs and intended to remedy an offense for which the apologizer takes responsibility, and thus to restore good relationship between the apologizer and the hearer. After analyzing the data, the researcher arrived at the following conclusions:

(1) Iraqi EFL learners of English lack the semantic knowledge for most of the apology strategies.

(2) Most of the breakdowns committed by Iraqi EFL learners of English were a result of a negative transfer of the learner's first language .

(3) Most English textbooks lack the explicit instruction of apology strategies.

Bibliography

Aijmer, K.(1996). ***Conversational Routines in English***. London: Longman. http://ojs.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/apolgy/offenses/PDFInterstitial/260/25

Al-Zumor, A.(2003). "Apologies in Arabic and English: An Inter-language and Cross-cultural Study". http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ea/politeness/apologiesinarabicandenglish. Htm.

Bataineh,R.F.&Bataineh,R.F.(2006)." American University Students' Apology Strategies: An Intercultural Analysis of the Effect of Gender. http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr2006/bataineh.htm

Blum-Kulka,S.(1982)."Interlanguage Prragmatics:The Case of Requests ". Noewood,NJ:Ablex. http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/osjcl/Articles/Volume3_2/Blum-kulka-PDF-03-11-07.pdf.

Blum-kulka,S. and Olshtain,E.(1984)."Requests and Apologies: Across –cultural Study of Speech Act Realization" patterns"http://www.utpa.edu/dep/modlang/hipertexo/docs/Hiper1Tojoi.pdf

Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1987). ***Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.http//w3.coh.arizona.edu./aw2/fw2/pdf.

Cohen, J.R.(1999).***Advising Clients to Apologize.*** California: California University press.http://eprints.undip.ac.edu/24677/2/APOLOGY_STRATEGIES_USED_IN_READER.

Coulmas, F. (1981) " Poison to Your Soul:Thanks and Apologies Contrastively Viewed. "http://www.ccsenet.org/teaching/journal/htm.

Deutschmann, M. (2003). ***Apologizing in British English***. Umeå: Umeå University http://www.ddu.utas.edu.au/users/users/22/journal.

Edmondson, W.(1981). "On Saying You're Sorry". The Hague. Mouton. http://www.modinguistics.com/papers/apology/htm.

Ellis,R.(1994).***The Study of Second Language Acquisition***.Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Fraser,B.(1998).***On Apologizing***.The Hague:Mouton.
http://www.pragmatics/edu/edu/teaching/apology.

García, C. (1989). "Apologizing in English: Politeness Strategies Used by Native and Non-native Speakers".http://maj./teaching /appology/journal,

Goffman, E. (1972). ***On face-work: An analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction.***Harmondsworth:Penguin
http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/spch_apologies.html.

Holmes,J.(1990)."Apologies in New Zealand English."

http://www.english.nu.ac.th/librARY/MAEng/2006/MAEng06-IS015.pdf.

Lakoff, R. (2001). ***Nine Ways of Looking at Apologies: the Necessity for Interdisciplinary Thoery and Method in DiscourseAnalysis***. Oxford: Blackwell.http://a-free-english-books.blogspot.com/2008/01/apologizing-and-discourse.html

Nureddeen, F. (2008). "Cross- cultural Pragmatics: Apologies in Sudanese Arabic". http://www.gxnu.edu.cn/Personal/szliu/negative%pragmatictransfer.doc

Olshtain,E.(1985)."Too Many Words:Length of Utterance and Pragmatic Failure".

www.u.arizona.edu/~harnish/papers/published/1985_utterances_pragmatics_and_Speech.

Olshtain,E.and Cohen,A.D.(1993)."Apology: A speech Act Set". Rowley, Mass: New Bury House. www.using**english**.com/glossary/**apologizing/**html - 20k

Olshtain,E. and Weinbach,L.(1993)."A Study of Speech Act Behaviour Among Native and Non-native Speakers of Hebrew". Amesterdam :John Benjamins. http://www.immi.se/intercultural/non-native/palma.htm

Owen, M. (1983). "Apologies and Remedial Exchanges". New York: Mouton
http://www.elanguage.net/books/index.php/pragmatics/download/download/274/20
8

Reiter,R . (2000). "Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A
Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies". Amsterdam/Philadelphia :John
Benjamins Publishing Company.http://www.tesl-org/ej30/a2/33/html.

Searle, J., R. (1969) .*Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J.(1993).***Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure***.Amesterdam:John Benjamins.

http://www.lit.az/ijar/pdf/ culturejll/3/JLL1993(3-7).pdf.

Trosborg,A.(1985).***Interlanguage Pragmatics : Requests, Complaints ,and
Apologies.***Berlin:Mouton de Gruyter.
http://www.books.yahoo.co.uk/books?isbn=0855533787546***...***

Wolfson,N., Marmor,T., and Jones,S.(1981).***Problems in the Comparison of
Speech Act Across Cultures .***Norwood:NJ.Ablex.
http://www2.hawaii.edu/~gkasper/pdfs/Researchmethods.pdf

Wolfson,N. and Judd,E.(1983).***Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition***.
Rowley, Mass :Newbury House.
http://www.eng.ntnu.edu.tw/download.php?filename=194_e0468e9e.pdf&dir=publ
ish&title=%E5%85

Appendix I

Directions:

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

Situation 1.Your classmate bought a new digital camera. You ask him to let you try it, you carelessly drop it and it breaks.

Situation 2.You were in a hurry and bumped into an old woman. She fell down and was hurt.

Situation 3.You have a meeting with your advisor .After the meeting by mistake you took his book home with you. You don't realize this until you are home. The next day , he asks you if you have seen his book, but you have forgotten to bring it with you today.

Situation 4. Your professor gave you a written homewok. You didn't write it.

Situation 5.You came late for the first lecture.

Situation 6.You forgot to tell your friend Zainab that your graduation party got postponed until the next week. Zainab and her mom came to your house when the party suppose to happen.

Situation 7. Your colleague said something to you during the lecture and you laughed loudly.

Situation 8. You didn't hear what your host told you.

Situation 9. You refused to accompany your friend to the cinema.

Situation 10. You forgot an important meeting with your boss.

الخلاصـــــــــــــــة

يعد الاعتذار أحد أفعـال الكـلام التعبيريـة. إنـه فعـل اجتمـاعي الهـدف منـه هو المحافظـة علـى الانسجام بين المتكلم والمخاطَ◌َ ب. يعمل المُسيىئ الذي تقع عليه مسؤولية الاعتذار علـى استخدام استراتيجيات عديدة مثـل: إنكـار المسؤولية، التملص مـن المسؤولية، إسـتراتيجيات الاعتـذار المباشرة والإستراتيجيات غير المباشرة.

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى بيان الأنواع والنسب المئوية للإستراتيجيات المستخدمة في الاعتذار من قبل الطلبة العراقيين المتعلمين للغة الإنكليزية كلغة أجنبية. كما تهدف إلى الإشارة إلى بعض الإخفاقات المرتكبة من قبلهم عند إنجازهم لهذه الاستراتيجيات. ولأجل تحقيق الأهداف السابقة الذكر، تم استخدام ما يسمى باختبار إكمال المحادثة الذي تم تطبيقـه علـى خمسـة وعشرين طالبـاً وطالبةً من الطلبة العراقيين. وقد بينت النتائج بعد تحليل إجاباتهم بان الطلبة العـراقيين المتعلمين للغة الإنكليزية كلغةٍ أجنبية تنقصهم المعرفة لأغلب إستراتيجيات الاعـتذار.