A pragmatic study of Illoctionary Speech Acts of Apology for Iraqi EFL Learners

Asst. lecturer: Aswan Jalal Abbas

University of Diyala

College of Basic Education

A pragmatic study of Illocutionary speech acts of apology for Iraqi EFL Learners.

Asst. Lecturer : Aswan Jalal Abbas

University of Diyala: College of Basic Education

Email: gsxm.10@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Apology is a social act. Its aim is to keep harmony between the speaker and hearer. The choice for apology is due to its popularity as a study of speech act and being an illocutionary force so common to take place in daily context. To perform the act of apologizing ,the offender who recognizes the need to apologize should employ certain strategies of apology. The aim of this study is to investigate the act of apologizing through classifying the types and percentages of the strategies used in performing the speech act of apologizing by Iraqi EFL learners .The study also attempts at pointing out the breakdowns committed in using these strategies. The data are collected by a Discourse Completion Test that had 10 apology situations. The sample of the study is randomly chosen from the fourth year EFL students of the college of Basic Education, University of Diyala for the academic year 2014-2015.The test is presented to 40 participants of Iraqi EFL learners. In the analysis of the data ,all responses are categorized according to Olshtains (1989)apology speech act set. The result of this study indicates that Iraqi EFL learners lack knowledge for most of the strategies of apology.

Keywords: EFL learners; apology speech acts; apology strategies; Discourse completion test.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study is a forward step towards a pragmatic perspective for speech acts with a particular reference to apology. Therefore, language learners need to possess pragmatic competence in order to avoid breakdowns and misunderstandings in communication. Thus, it is an attempt to state one of the ways of using language. The aim of this study is to investigate the act of apologizing through shedding light on the strategies used by Iraqi EFL learners. This study based on 40 written responses collected depending on 10 apology situations. The data and analyses show that to be competent in a language ,a speaker has to know the suitable way of expressing oneself in that language. As a result, If the speakers intention is recognized by the hearer ,the act of communication can be successful.

2. Theoretical Background of Speech Acts

2.1 Pragmatics of Speech Act

For a communication to be successful, a speaker of language, in addition to his linguistic knowledge(rules of grammar and word images),must acquire extra-linguistic or non-linguistic knowledge about the world, as it plays a significant role in the production and understanding of a certain utterance. It is always obvious that an utterance only makes sense in its suitable context as containing all the necessary conditions required for the successful issuance of this utterance .The issues-of language use ,speakers communicative competence and his choice of linguistic forms, hearers interpretation of a piece of language, and the relationship between the speaker and hearer-are all discussed within the scope of pragmatics.

The first definition of pragmatics was proposed by Morris(1938:29).He defined it as "the relation of signs to their users". A year later, Carnap (1939:4) attempted to translate Morris's definition into practical terms. He identified the investigations which take into consideration "the action ,state and environment of man who speaks or hears a linguistic sign" as pragmatics (Akmajian et al.,2001:361).

The study of meaning within pragmatic field seems to be interesting and effective, as it involves aspects of meaning which are not solely derived from the meanings of the words and phrases used in sentences, but rather from those aspects of meaning that are attributed to the manipulation of a certain linguistic form by a speaker in an appropriate situation. The former type of meaning is referred to as the linguistic meaning and the latter the intended meaning-the meaning that a speaker wishes to convey(Yule,1996:127).

2.2 What is a Speech Act?

Austin J.L. (1911-1960) was the first philosopher who referred to the many functions performed by utterances as part of interpersonal communication .In particular, he mentioned that many utterances do not communicate information, but are equivalent to actions. When someone says 'I apologize…', or 'I promise…', the utterance immediately conveys a new psychological or social reality .An apology occupies place when someone apologizes, and not before.

That is ,to say is to perform .Therefore ,Austin called these utterances performatives, seeing them as very different from statements that convey information(constatives).In particular ,performatives are not true or false. If **A** says 'I am sorry, I don't mean', **B** cannot then say 'that's not true'.(Crystal,1987:121).

Through speech act analysis, we study the effect of utterances on the behavior of speaker and hearer, using a threefold distinction. First ,we recognize the bare fact that a communicative act takes place: The locutionary act. Secondly, we look at the act that is performed as a result of the speaker making an utterance –the cases where 'saying=doing', such as promising, apologizing, welcoming, and warning: These ,known as illocutionary acts, are the core of any theory of speech acts. Thirdly, we look at the particular effect the speakers utterance has on the listener, who may feel amused ,persuaded ,warned ,etc., as a consequence: The bringing about of such effects is known as a perlocutionary act.

It is important to consider that the illocutionary force of an utterance and its perlocutionary effect may not coincide. If I warn you against a particular course of action ,you may or may not interest my warning.(Ibid).

2.3 Speech Act Components

Austin,J.(1962) In his book" How to Do Things with Words", had the main insight that an utterance can be used to perform an act. Thus, he was the first philosopher who claimed that in uttering a sentence ,we can do things as well as say things.(Before Austin, philosophers held that sentences were used simply to say things.)For example, if you say to a friend after a fight *I'm sorry for the way I acted,* you are not just saying something but also apologizing. Similarly, if you say to someone who is leaving your office *Please close the door*, you are not just saying something but also making a request. Finally ,if you say to your boss *Ill come in on Saturday to finish the Katznelson Project*, you're not just saying something but you're also making a commitment.

In such case, each speech event(or **speech act**) has at least two aspects to it: **a locutionary act**(i.e., the act of saying something) and **an illocutionary act** (i.e., the act of doing something).(Parker&Riley,2005:12-13).Realizing that all utterances include a saying as well as a doing element has led Austin (1962:121) to decide that the issuance of an utterance is ,in fact ,the production of three kinds of acts.

a. Locutionary acts: They are nearly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference. To illustrate the meaning of this type of acts, one might appeal to Austin's example of a man who just witnessed a locutionary speech act and might describe it as follows:

He said to me "shoot her" meaning by

"shoot" shoot and referring by "her" to

her.

Thus ,these acts include all the acts required for the making of speech ,e.g. uttering sounds and constructing propositions.

b. Illocutionary acts: These are conventional social acts recognized as such by both speaker and hearer. They take place in means of uttering something, e.g. making a statement ,issuing a command or request, christening a ship ,etc. To illustrate the meaning of this type of acts through Austin's example, the same man who witnessed the above 'locutionary act' might describe the concomitant illocutionary act as follows:

He urged(or advised, ordered, etc.)me

to shoot her.

Accordingly, Bach and Harnish(1979:15)suggest that the illocutionary speech act is communicatively successful only if the hearer recognizes the speakers illocutionary intention. These intentions are essentially communicative because the fulfillment of illocutionary intentions consists in hearers understanding. Not only are such intentions reflexive. Their fulfillment consists in their recognition.

In this way, the issue of illocutionary acts is sometimes quite complicated because one and the same utterance can have more illocutionary forces(meanings)depending on the Illocutionary force indicating devices(IFIDs) the context, the conventions and other factors. Consider these two examples:

_ It was entirely my fault.

This simple declarative sentence in the form of statement can be interpreted in at least two ways. It can be either understood literally as a statement in which the speaker tells the hearer that he had a fault, or it can be taken as an indirect apology to accept the blame. Thus, the sentence has two illocutionary forces.

_The door is there.

As in the previous example, this one states that the declarative sentence in the form of statement can be interpreted too in at least two ways. It can be either understood literally as a reply to the question 'where is the way out?' or possibly 'where is the door?' or it can be taken as an indirect request to ask somebody to leave. The sentence has thus two illocutionary forces which, even if they are different, have a common proposition(content).The former case is called a direct speech act, the latter an indirect speech act. It depends on the speaker

and on the contextual situation which one he will choose to convey in his speech.

c. Perlocutionary acts: Austin(1962:122)adds that this kind of acts refers to the effects of the utterance on the listener, i.e. the change in the mind or behavior of the listener as a result of producing locutions and illocutions. The resulting consequences or effects might be intended or unintended. For example, by arguing, one may persuade or convince someone ,by warning her/him one may scare or alarm her/him ,etc. To continue with Austin's example, the same man who witnessed the preceding 'locutionary' and 'illocutionary' acts might describe the resulting 'perlocution' as follows:

He persuaded me to shoot her.

Finally, There are many utterances with the purpose to effect the hearer in some way or other, some convey the information directly, others are more careful or polite and they use indirectness to transmit the message.

2.4 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Directives is a term has been used by the philosophical-linguists, the British Austin, J. (1962)and the American J.R.Searle(1972),to refer to a classificatory set of speech acts and speech act verbs. The illocutionary point of which is to direct someone to do something ,i.e., to cause something to happen or to be done almost out of the normal course of events; otherwise, it represents the speakers interference. Such acts are said to have a world-to-word direction of fit where a want, wish, or desire is to be expressed, and where the proposition expressed is a future act always done by the hearer(Mey,993:164).An example of such a kind of speech acts is order, command, request ,apologizing , recommend, etc.

Verchueren (1979) in Mey (1993:132) classifies speech acts classifiers into two main categories: 'lumpers', those who put them into smaller groups, and 'splitters', those who divide them into some larger categories. It is often noticed that almost all such classifications are put forward to account for direct speech acts, especially these with explicit speech act verbs.

Generally ,there is not that serious problem in the identification and the classification of direct directives, such as imperatives(Lyons,1977:5),in comparison with those of indirect directives. The source of difficulty in the interpretation of indirect speech acts consists in their very nature. The speech act performed in the utterance of a sentence is in general a "function of the meaning of that sentence"(Searle,1962:17).This meaning does not in all cases uniquely determine what speech act or acts are performed in a given utterance. For a speaker may mean more than what he actually says, but it is always possible for persons to say, in principle, exactly what they mean-this is the principle of Expressibility. This gives rise to one kind or another of ambiguity because some loss of match, whether intended or not, between the form of the utterance and its meaning.

In this aspect, Searle (1979:81) in his classification of speech   acts, pointed out that Expressives are speech acts that express "the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content."In other words ,they express the speakers psychological state: apologizing, pleasure, pain, likes, dislike or sorrow, as clearly shown in the examples:

– I am so sorry.

_ Congratulations!

They have no direction of fit in which a wide range of feelings and attitudes can be expressed through the propositional content. This class comprises verbs such as apologize, thank, congratulate ,welcome etc.

2.5 Significance of Indirect Speech Acts

From a pragmatic point of view , indirect speech acts have been believed to be not just by accident plentiful (Levinson,1983:2). They are in some cases far more numerous than direct speech acts. In fact some languages ,like English ,disprefer imperatives in orders and requests despite their status as the typical expressions of the speech act of order and request. Levinson(1983:264)remarks that most usage of request is indirect ,whereas imperatives are rarely used to command or request.

Indirectness, as is stated by Leech(1983:108) is a widely used conversational strategy. People tend to use indirect speech acts mainly in connection with politeness since they thus reduce the unpleasant message contained in apology, requests and orders for instance. Therefore, the following utterance is often employed.

_ I ll Pay for the cleaning

This example may refer that this utterance is just statement. But in fact ,The speaker may attempt to repair or pay for the damage resulted from his/her infraction. In other words ,it reflects implicit apologizing. Therefore, this simple declarative sentence in the form of statement can be interpreted or taken as an **indirect apology**. Ardissono, L.(2006) claims that sometimes direct addresses may even appear impolite as in 'would you lend me some money?' and 'Lend me some money!'The latter variant would be absolutely unacceptable in some contexts.

However, politeness is not the only motivation for indirectness. People also use indirect strategies when they want to make their speech more interesting ,when they want to reach goals different from their partners or when they want to increase the force of the message communicated(Thomas,1995:143).

3. Apology in English

3.1 Definition of Apology

Apology is a word derived 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 way, an apology is defined as "an explanation offered to a person affected by ones 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'.

An apology will be required when the speaker has committed some behavior that has proved 'costly' to the hearer (Ellis,2012:73).As a an expressive illocutionary act, an apology is defined as "a speech act addressed to Vs face –needs to remedy an offence for which A takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between A and V(where A is the apologist, and V is the victim or person offended"(Holmes,1989:201). As a result, the speaker should admit responsibility for and employ strategies to demonstrate appropriate apologetic behavior.

3.2 The Speech Act of Apology

In order to perform speech acts, the speaker in language intends to offer an apology ,request ,greeting ,complaint ,compliment ,or refusal .In such situations, speech acts are utterances for communication with the interlocutor. A speech act can be formed of single word such as "Sorry", or multiple words or sentences such as "it was my fault," or "I'm sorry, I forgot your birthday". Austin(1975)and Searle(1969) were forefathers of speech act theory. They were influenced by Saussure(1959) who demonstrated to the difference between "language" and "parole" and Chomsky's (1965) theory of competence and performance to define a theory of action. Austin (1975)focused on performative utterance in his book, How to Do Things with Words, because he believed that we perform actions by utterances. On the other hand ,Searle(1969:93)claimed that "talking is performing acts according to rules".

In addition, Blum-Kulka et al.(1993:67) also considered that "apology as a speech act intends to compensate for the offence or violation the speaker brings about which might end up with a friction between the speaker and the hearer."However ,the apologizer who tends to verbally apologize for the violation needs to humiliate her/himself to an extent which accept the type and impression of the offence accepting the responsibility for reconciliation .In this way ,an apology can serve the speaker as a face threatening act and for the victim as face saving act.
According to the relationship between apology and politeness, Brown and Levinson (1978:79)argued that "politeness strategies intend mainly to save the addressees' face". They presented the concept of face in their model of politeness theory as a self-image and defined face threatening speech acts according to some parameters like the speaker, the

hearer, and the type of face. Based on their politeness theory, positive face which is a tendency to be liked by others is kept safe with a friendly behavior(positive politeness),while a negative face is protected by a manner that avoids impeding(negative politeness).Therefore, people use positive and negative politeness strategies to decrease the face-threat.so far, numerous researchers have discussed this theory in their intercultural studies.

In this respect, Holmes(1990:156)believes that the speech act of apology is interrelated to politeness and its objective as a social act is to save positive relations between speaker and hearer. Apology will be considered a sign and act of politeness from speakers side which demonstrates her/his concern about such a relation and its maintenance between her/himself and the victim.

4. The Model

To perform the act of apologizing, the offender who recognize 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. Classification of apology strategies, which is followed by the researcher, is proposed by Olshtain(1989:171) .He shows that apology can be performed in different ways by using: IFIDs, explanation or account, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer …etc. . This model has shown its universality because it has been successfully tested on several languages. It shows that apologizers generally use a limited number of verbal strategies. The model followed in this study is presented below:

1.Illocutionary force indicating devices(IFIDs)

_an expression of regret, I'm sorry.

_a request for forgiveness and accepting the apology, e.g.,
  Please forgive me/please accept my apology.

2.Explanation or account: any external mitigating circumstances
  ,"objective" reasons for the violation ,e.g.,

i. Explicit: The traffic was terrible.

ii: Implicit: traffic is always so heavy in the morning.

3.Taking on responsibility

a. Explicit self-blame, e.g., it is my fault/my mistake.

b. Lack of intent, e.g., I didn't mean it.

c. Expression of self-deficiency. e.g., I was confused /I didn't
  see you /forgot.

d. Expression of embarrassment ,e.g. ,I feel awful about it.

e. Self –dispraise, e.g., I'm such a dimwit!

f. Justify hearer ,e.g., you're right to be angry.

g. Refusal to acknowledge guilt.

_Denial of responsibility ,e.g., it wasn't my fault.

_Blame the hearer, e.g., it's your own fault.

_Pretend to be offended ,e.g. I'm the one to be offended.

4.Concern for the hearer ,e.g., I hope I didn't upset you/Are you
  all right?

5.Offer of repair ,e.g. I ll pay for the damage.

6.Promise of Forbearance, e.g., it won't happen again.

These strategies have been presented in the study according to their high frequency of occurrence in the data.

5. Methodology

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. The researcher used a Discourse Completion Test to determine how well you apologize when you face embarrassing situations in your life.

5.1 Sample

The participants in this study are(40)of fourth year students at the University of Diyala, College of Basic Education, Department of English.

5.2 Instrument

It is an important to mention the data of this study was collected through method based on questionnaire which is modified version of Discourse Completion Test. According to this type of questionnaire, the researcher could get large numbers of respondents and statically control for variables and analyze the data. The researcher designed questionnaire to analyze apology strategies used by Iraqi EFL learners .The questionnaire consisted of ten situations. For each situation, subjects were instructed to fill in with what they would say in each of the Ten contexts. The respondents were asked to put themselves in real situations and to suppose that in each situation they would ,in fact ,say something .They were asked to

write down what they would say. The researcher prepared the questionnaire in the first semester of the academic year 2014- 2015.

6. The Analysis of Situations

Situation 1 The Table 1 reveals, the most common formula used by subjects was the of IFIDs(e.g. I'm sorry).This formula accounted for 55% of the data. While the formula IFIDs +REPR was 10%.The percent of IFIDs +CONC is 17,5%.The subjects used IFIDs +RESP 12,5%.The percent was the same for both of IFIDs+ RESP+REPR and IFIDs +RESP+CONC that is 2,5%.

Situation 2 The Table 2 points out that the higher percent was IFIDs 62,5% whereas CONC and IFID+RESP was 2,5%.according to the formula of IFIDs +CONC ,the percent was 5%.Some subjects used IFIDs+ EXPL 27%.

Situation 3 As in Table 3,the higher percent used by subjects was IFIDs+ RESP 52%.Some preferred the formula IFIDs 27,5%.The use of IFIDs +FORB and IFIDs +EXPL was the same 5%.In addition ,the less percent was 2,5% for 4 formulas(IFIDs +REPR, IFIDs+ REPR+EXPL,IFIDs +REPR, and RESP).

Situation 4 The Table indicates the single IFIDs formula was employed by 19 subjects i.e. 47,5%. Others preferred to use IFIDs +EXPL 37,5%.IFIDs+FORB were employed by only 2 subjects 5%.Other formulas were used individually by the subjects such as IFIDs +CONC, IFIDs+ RESP, IFIDs+ RESP+ EXPL, and IFIDs+ EXPL 2,5%.

Situation 5 As Table reveals, the subjects employed a less variety of strategies .The most commonly used category by the subjects was IFIDs 67,5%.Some used IFIDs+ RESP 27,5%.

RESP and IFIDs +EXPL were employed individually and the percent was 2,5%.

Situation 6 Table 6 indicates a variety of strategies. In terms of IFIDs,24 subjects used this formula 60%.Others preferred to use RESP 12,5%.While other subjects preferred IFIDs+ RESP 15%.IFIDs+REPR was used by 3 subjects only 7,5%.The last Strategies used by subjects are IFIDs+ EXPL and FORB which referred to the same percent 2,5%.

Situation 7 The table 7 reveals that IFIDs+ RESP were the most commonly used categories by the subjects 47,5%.while the percent for both of IFIDs and RESP is the same 22,5%.IFIDs +EXPL were used by 2 subjects 5% and only 1 subject used CONC 2,5%.

Situation 8 Table 8 demonstrates that the high responses were employed through the formula IFIDs+ EXPL 50%. While other responses used IFIDs 25%.Some subjects used IFIDs+ RESP 12,5%.few subjects preferred to use IFIDs +CONC 5%.The percent of EXPL, IFIDs+ RESP+ EXPL, and FORB were the same 2,5%.

Situation 9 Table 9 states that the high percent used by the subjects was IFIDs +EXPL 47,5%.the second one was by using the formula IFIDs 35%. Number of subjects preferred to use IFIDs+RESP10%.The percent of EXPL, IFID+ RESP+ EXPL ,and IFIDs +CONC equal the same that is 2,5%.

Situation 10 Table 10 shows that the high frequency used by subjects was IFIDs+ EXPL 45% ,while others preferred the formula IFIDs 30%. Only 6 subjects used IFIDs+ RESP and the percent was 10%. At last ,they used EXPL, RESP+EXPL and the percent was the same i.e. 5%.

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the analysis of data ,some conclusions have been drawn as follows:

1.Most of Iraqi EFL learners lack the semantic knowledge for most of the apology strategies. This lack does not assist them in recognizing the speech act of apology suitably in the given situations. However, they will be forced to face difficulties in communicating apologies effectively and then lead them to fail.

2.The reason behind the breakdowns committed by Iraqi EFL learners was a result of their dependence on their mother-tongue in analyzing situations that require for apologies. Therefore, the first language can be said to have an influence on the subjects use of apologies.

3.In some situations, it was seen that most subjects used certain formulas, such as IFIDs, more than other ones.

REFERENCES

Akmajian A. et al.(2001)<u>Linguistics:An Introduction to Language and communication</u>. Cambridge: Massachusetts. Institute of Technology.

Ardissono L., G.Boella and L.Lesmo. Politeness and speech Acts. 10 January 2006.< http://www.di.unito.it/~guido/um-workshop/>

Austin,J.L.(1962)<u>How to Do things with Words</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

………….(1975)<u>How to Do things with Words</u>. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bach Kent,Robert M.Harnish.(1979)<u>Linguistic communication and speech acts</u>. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Blum-Kulka et al.(1993).<u>Interlanguage Pragmatics</u>. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown,P.,Levinson,S.,(1978) <u>Universals in Language usage: Politeness phenomena</u>. In: Goody, E.N.(Ed.),Questions and politeness: Strategies in social Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carnap, R.(1939).<u>Foundations of logic and mathematics, International encyclopedia of unified science</u>. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.

Chomsky(1965)<u>Aspects of the Theory of syntax</u>. Cambridge, Mass: Mit press.

Cohen,J.R.(1999) <u>Advising clients to apologize</u>. California: California University.

Crystal,David(1987)<u>The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language</u>. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.

Ellis,R.(2012) <u>The study of second Language acquisition</u>. USA. Oxford University Press.

Garcia,C.(1989) <u>Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers.</u>Multilingua.

Holmes,J. (1989).<u>Sex differences and apologies: one aspect of communicative competence.</u> Applied linguistics. USA.

…………..(1990).<u>Apologies in New Zealand English. Language in society</u>. USA.

Levinson,S.(1983)<u>Pragmatics.</u> Cambridge:CambridgeUniversity Press.

Lyons,J (1977)<u>Semantics</u>. Volume 2.London:Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mey,J.(1993)<u>Pragmatics</u>. Oxford: Black well publishers.

Morris,C.H.(1938)<u>Foundation of the theory of signs</u>. In International Encyclopedia of Unified science,Vol,2,No.1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Olshtain,Elite,(1989) <u>Apologies Across Languages</u>.In :Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House and Gabriel kasper (Eds)1989, Cross-cultural Pragmatics,Norwood,NJ.Albex.

Parker,Riley (2005)<u>Linguistics for Non-Linguists</u>. U.S.A.

Saussure, Ferdinand de(1959):<u>Course in General Linguistics</u>. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: philosophical library[course de linguistique generale. publie par Charles Bally et Allbert Sechehaye. Avec la collaboration de Albert riedlinger. Lausanne &paris: payot].

Searle, John R.(1962) Meaning and speech acts. The philosophical Review.JSTOR. The Central Library of MasarykUniversity,Brno.21December2005.<http:www.jstor.org

………………(1969)<u>Speech acts: An Essay in the philosophy of language</u>. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.

………………(1972)<u>What is a speech acts?</u> in Giglioli, p.p.(ed..)"Language and social context" penguin books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England.

…………………(1979)<u>Expression and Meaning</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas,Jenny(1995) <u>Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics</u>. London: Longman Group Limited.

Verchueren, Jef.(1979).<u>What people say they do with words</u>. University of California, Berkeley, ph. D. dissertation.

Yule,G.(1996).<u>Pragmatics</u>. Oxford.Oxford University Press.

Appendix A

A Questionnaire Submitted to the Jury Members(First Version)

Dear Mr./Mrs.

A researcher intends to conduct a study entitled "**A Pragmatic study of illocutionary speech acts of apology for Iraqi EFL learners**". The study aims firstly at finding the frequency of the usage of apology strategies and secondly at specifying the types of breakdowns committed in using apology. Fourth stage(Morning The study is limited to the studies)College of Basic Education /Diyala University during the academic year(2014-2015).

As specialists in the field of linguistics , please check these items and kindly state if they are suitable or not to test the apology strategies for EFL learners. Any addition or modification will be highly regarded.

Thank you

Asst. Lecturer/Aswan Jalal Abbas

Discourse Completion Test

The following situations are common in life and could happen to you. They are as follows:

1. You accidentally hit a well-dressed elderly lady at a supermarket, causing her to spill her packages all over the floor. You hurt her leg too .It is clearly your fault and you want to apologize.

You

say:

2. At a restaurant you change your mind after the food has already been served. You want to apologize and change the order.

You say:

3. You forget a book which you borrowed from your female classmate and you are supposed to return it.

You say:

4. You promised your friend to meet him in a restaurant , but you have arrived late.

You say:

5. You didn't hear someone.

You say:

6. You are a child who has broken someone's window.

You say:

7. Someone is speaking a language you don't know.

You say:

8. You are supposed to meet your friend in front of a café but you are 15 minutes late because you have taken a nap.

You say:

9. You are a college student. You have an appointment with your professor at his office. But you are 15 minutes late because the closest parking place is full.

You say:

10. A friend invites you to his parents' house. You visit them. His mother serves a very sweet cake. You cannot eat it.

You say:

Appendix B

Coding Scheme of Apologies

IFID: Illocutionary Force Indicating Device which includes apology speech act such as "I'm sorry", "Excuse me".

EXPL: giving explanation, cause or reason(the Traffic was terrible).

RESP: taking on responsibility for the offense(e.g. It was my fault).

CONC: concern for the hearer (e.g. Are you all right?/ I hope I didn't upset you).

REPR: an offer of repair or compensation for the damage(e.g. I ll pay for your damage).

FORB: promising for not repeating the action again(e.g. I ll never forget to meet you again).

Table 1.Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 1.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	22	55
IFIDs+REPR	4	10
IFIDs+CONC	7	17,5
IFID+RESP	5	12,5
IFID+RESP+REPR	1	2,5
IFID+RESP +CONC	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 2.Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 2.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	25	62,5
CONC	1	2,5
IFID+EXPL	11	27,5
IFID+CONC	2	5
IFID+RESP	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 3. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 3.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	11	27,5
IFID+FORB	2	5
IFID+REPR	1	2,5
IFID+RESP	21	52,5
IFID+EXPL	2	5
IFID+RESP+EXPL	1	2,5
IFID+REPR	1	2,5
RESP	1	2,5

Total	**40**	**100**

Table 4. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 4.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	19	47,5
IFID+EXPL	15	37,5
IFID+FORB	2	5
IFID+CONC	1	2,5
IFID+RESP	1	2,5
IFID+RESP +EXPL	1	2,5
IFID+EXPL	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 5. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 5.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	27	67,5
RESP	1	2,5
IFID+RESP	11	27,5
IFID+EXPL	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 6. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 6.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	24	60
RESP	5	12,5
IFID+REPR	3	7,5
IFID+EXPL	1	2,5
IFID +RESP	6	15
FORB	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 7. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 7.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	9	22,5
RESP	9	22,5
CONC	1	2,5
IFID+RESP	19	47,5
IFID+EXPL	2	5
Total	40	100

Table 8. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 8.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	10	25
EXPL	1	2,5
IFID+ EXPL	20	50
IFID +RESP +EXPL	1	2,5
IFID+RESP	5	12,5
IFID+CONC	2	5
FORB	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 9. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 9.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	14	35
EXPL	1	2,5
IFID +EXPL	19	47,5
IFID +RESP +EXPL	1	2,5
IFID+RESP	4	10

IFID+CONC	1	2,5
Total	40	100

Table 10. Frequency of the use of semantic formulas in situation 10.

Formulas	No	Percent
IFIDs	12	30
EXPL	2	5
IFID+EXPL	18	45
RESP +EXPL	2	5
IFID+RESP	6	15
Total	40	100

Appendix : C

-The Jury Members

1- Ph.D. Amthal Muhammed Abass: Dialay University /College of Education.

2- Ph. D. Arua Abdulrasul Salman : Dialya University/ College of Education.

3-Ph.D Khalil Asmail : Diyala University/ College of Education.

4-Ph.D . Ali Abdullah :Diyala University/ College of Education.

5-Instructor : Nizar Hussein : Diyala University/ College of Basic Education.

6-Asst. Instructor : Maysaa Ridha : Diyala University/ College of Basic Education.

7-Asst. Instructor: Anaam Ismail : Diyala University/ College of Basic Education.

دراسة تداولية لأفعال الكلام التعبيرية للأعتذار لمتعلمي اللغةالأنكليزية من العراقيين

مدرس مساعد:أسوان جلال عباس

جامعة ديالى: كلية التربية الأساسية

الخلاصة

يعتبرالأعتذار فعل اجتماعي.هدفه هو المحافظة على الانسجام بين المتكلم والمخاطب. سبب أختيار الأعتذار هو شعبيته كدراسة لفعل الكلام وكونه قوة تعبيرية شائعة جدا عندما يحتل مكان ما في السياق اليومي.لأداء فعل الأعتذار ،يعمل المسئ الذي تقع عليه مسؤولية الأعتذار على أستخدام أستراتيجيات معينة.

هدف هذه الدراسة هو البحث عن فعل الأعتذار من خلال تصنيف الأنواع والنسب المئوية للأستراتيجيات المستخدمة في أداء الأعتذار من قبل الطلبة العراقيين المتعلمين للغة الأنكليزية كلغة أجنبية.كما ان هذه الدراسة تحاول الى الأشارة الى بعض الأخفاقات المرتكبة من قبلهم عند أنجازهم لهذه الأستراتيجيات .المعلومات قد تم جمعها عن طريق أختبار أكمال المحادثة الذي تضمن (١٠) حالات للأعتذار. عينة الدراسة أختيرت بشكل عشوائي من طلاب اللغة الأنكليزية في المرحلة الرابعة لكلية التربية الأساسية،جامعة ديالى للسنة الدراسية ٢٠١٤-٢٠١٥.الأختبار يطبق على (٤٠) مشارك من متعلمي اللغة الأنكليزية كلغة أجنبية من العراقيين.عند تحليل المعلومات،تم تصنيف الأجوبة نسبة الى مجموعة أفعال الأعتذار لأولشتاين (١٩٨٩). وكانت نتيجة هذه الدراسة تشير بأن الطلبة العراقيين المتعلمين للغة الأنكليزية كلغة أجنبية تنقصهم المعرفة لأغلب أستراتيجيات الأعتذار.