

The Effect of Gender and Status on the Apology Strategies Used by American Native Speakers of English and Iraqi EFL University Students

Ahmed Mohammed Ali Abdul-Ameer Abu Humeid
College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon,
mail: ahmedbabylonian@gmail.com

Abstract

In fact, apology varies from one language to another. Thus, teachers and EFL learners must discern the similarities and the differences between their native language and the target one because what is deemed right in one language may not be considered right in the other. No study is conducted to compare apology strategies of Iraqi EFL university students along with that of the American native speakers of English in terms of gender and status. Therefore, the present study will explore these issues in order to clarify them. As such, a discourse completion test has been designed and applied to Iraqi EFL university students and Americans native speakers of English. The results show that Iraqi EFL male learners use more strategies with people of higher level, while the American males use more strategies with people of lower position. Moreover, unlike the Americans, Iraqi females use more apology strategies than Iraqi males.

Key words: speech acts, apology strategies, Americans, Iraqi EFL learners, gender, status

1. Introduction

Teachers of English as a foreign language or a second language encounter difficulties in teaching communicative competence of the target language. Teaching grammar and vocabulary is not enough because the learners are required to have information in pragmatic and cultural competence (Demeter 2000). Additionally, teachers and learners must be aware of the similarities and differences between the source and the target languages as well as the cultures of the two languages. The problem of this study is that apology varies from one language to another, viz. sometimes what is right in one culture may not be deemed right in another. Thus, EFL students may commit mistakes when they apologize or use inappropriate apology strategies. Actually, this work aims to compare the apology strategies used by American native speakers of English and Iraqi EFL university students. It is going to demonstrate these strategies in terms of gender and status. There are several questions the given study intends to answer: 1) What are apology strategies that Iraqi EFL university students and American native speakers employ?; 2) Are there differences between the males and the females of both subjects on the matter of apology?; 3) Are there differences between the Americans and Iraqi EFL university students in their apology responses under the influence of status?; and 4) Do Iraqi EFL university students resort to interlingual transfer when they apologize in English?

2. Speech Acts

Utterances do not only contain words and grammar but they also convey actions. The term "speech act" is used to describe an action such as requesting, promising, apologizing, refusing, questioning, and informing (Yule 2006). For example, if someone says "*I'll be there at six*", the utterance conveys the speech act of promising (ibid.).

Allan (1996) divides speech acts into three major types: (a) locutionary act, which is represented in the act of saying an utterance; (b) illocutionary act, which is the recognition of the speaker's utterance, or as Searle (1979) puts it, they are attempts made by the speaker to make the hearer do something. For instance, stating a fact or opinion, confirming or denying something, giving advice or permission, requesting, asking, ordering, promising, offering, greeting, thanking, etc.; (c) perlocutionary act, which is the act done by the hearer that is produced by means of saying something, for example the act of closing the door is a perlocutionary act for the locutionary act "*Close the door.*" (Richards & Schmidt 2002: 315).

In fact, speech acts are classified in various ways. There is no best classification for them but scholars divide them according to their own findings.

3. Politeness

Politeness is one of the concepts that is related directly to speech acts. Brown & Levinson (1987) and Lakoff (1973) (cited in Demeter 2000) consider politeness to be a universal concept that exists in all languages. As to Lakoff, politeness has three major universal rules: "Don't impose, give options, and be friendly" (cited in Demeter 2000: 12). He indicates that only in the way the sequence in which they occur may differ from one language to another.

In this regard, Brown & Levinson (1987) state that the 'negative face' refers to one's desire for his actions not to be stopped by anyone while the 'positive face' refers to the situation when people expect that their desires are accepted and preferred by others. Thus, all the speech acts are intended not to threaten the speakers or interlocutors' face so as to maintain a good relationship with each other.

As claimed by Demeter (2000) and many researchers who investigate on speech acts, they are culture specific and not universal. In fact, further studies are required in order to conduct a better integrated conception of speech acts.

4 Definition

As a matter of fact, each type of speech acts has been studied carefully by scholars. As such, apology has also been examined to clarify its categories and strategies, how it is delivered and how it is perceived in different languages. Hence, it is defined differently. In addition, its types vary and sometimes overlap in the different studies done to investigate it.

It is generally known that apology is a "compensatory action to an offense in the doing of which the speaker was casually involved and which is costly to H [hearer]" (Bergman and Kasper 1993: 82). By 'costly' is meant that it is face-threatening or there will even be a severe misunderstanding. Direct apology is represented by expressions like '*I apologize*' and '*I'm sorry*'. But there are other indirect apology strategies that represent a mild apology for simple routine offensive actions like sneezing, coughing, interrupting, etc. The offender uses other expressions and verbs like regret, forgive, pardon, justification/explanation, etc. (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984).

Additionally, Olshtain & Cohen (1983) see that apology is performed when social norms are broken and it is meant to re-establish social relationships. Essentially, cultures differ from one to another. For this reason, the degree of offense varies accordingly. As such apologies differ following the culture that they occur in. An action that may be deemed as offensive and needs apology in one culture may not require an apology in another one. Therefore, the degrees of the infraction and of the apology show a discrepancy according to the culture that they occur in and the conventions of the society (ibid.). For example, in the American society men do not kiss each other in greetings, while in the Arabic one doing that is something normal and preferable. As such when one does not stick to these specifics, offense occurs.

Owen (1983) in addition to Goffman (1967); Holmes (1990); Edmondson (1981); Leech (1983); Trosborg (1987) and Nureddeen (2008) state that the apology is a remedy for an offense to maintain the harmony between the two parties. According to them, apology shows the speakers responsibility and is done to preserve the equilibrium between the speaker and the hearer. As a consequence, apologies are different from other speech acts like thanking, congratulating (Trosborg 1995). In fact, Demeter (2000) claims that Owen's definition among others apply only to direct apologies. On the other hand, Bataineh & Bataineh (2006) state that an apology is an expressive speech act and to be accepted, it should reflect true feelings of remorse, sorrow and regret for what he or she had done.

Brown & Levinson (1987) see an apology as a negative politeness strategy and that it is a face-threatening act because it destroys speakers' positive demands. In the meantime, it is a face saving for the hearer who was potentially affected by violation (Olshtain 1989; Edmondson *et al.* 1984 cited in Alfattah 2010). But still an apology should be done in a paper way according to the culture it occurs in so as to be successful (Holmes 1990).

On the other hand, Leech (1983) classifies apologies as positive politeness speech act strategies while other scholars like Holmes (1990) refers to them as both positive and negative politeness strategies. Holmes (ibid.) adds that the definition of apology also includes the apology that one makes for the offender's wrong behaviour.

5 Apology Strategies

For an apology to be successful, the wrong doer should follow various 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 are to be employed.

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 apology is given by Goffman (1971). He proposes two sorts of apology: *ritual* 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).

6 Previous Studies

This section deals with some of the studies that tackle apology strategies. It is divided into two parts. The first part is concerned with apology strategies in English and other languages, whilst the second one deals apology strategies in the Arabic society.

6.1 Studies on English and other languages

What is considered to be the most efficient development in speech acts is the Cross- Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (henceforth CCSARP) which is conducted by Blum-Kulka *et al.* (1989), and Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984). The scholars suggest five strategies: *Illocutionary force indicating device* (henceforth *IFID*) such as (*I am sorry*), *taking on responsibility*, *explanation or account of what happened*, *offering to repair the offending act*, and *promise of forbearance*. Olshtain & Cohen (1983) propose in addition to the sorts of apology illustrated above two other categories: *a denial of the need to apologize* and *a denial of responsibility*, while Demeter (2000) includes another strategy that is *postponing an apology*.

Since Owen (1983) looks at apology as a remedial move, he claims three explicit apology kinds. Consistent with the expressions used in the utterance i.e., he classifies them into: utterances that contained the word *apologize* or any of the other forms derived from it; ones that carry the word *sorry*, and one that starts with *I'm afraid* plus sentence. Furthermore, he suggests seven types of apologies that he calls "primary remedial moves", namely: *assert imbalance or short difference*, *assert that an offense has occurred*, *express attitude towards offense*, *request restoration of balance*, *give an account*, *repair the damage*, and *provide compensation* (ibid.:169).

Holmes (1990) tries to reorganize the patterns of apology given by Olshtain & Cohen (1983). She believes that these types of apology need to be comprehended in a better way. Furthermore, she (p. 167) adds other categories like *accept blame*, *express self-deficiency*, *recognize hearer as entitled to an apology*, and *express lack of intent*.

In addition to IFID, taking responsibility, giving an account of the reason, offering repair, Bergman & Kasper (1993) label the following types: *intensified IFID* such as "*I'm terribly sorry*", *minimizing the effects of severity of the action*, e.g., "*I'm only few minutes late*", and *verbal redress which is similar to minimizing*, e.g., "*I hope you didn't wait long*" (Demeter 2000: 19-20).

A classification that has different terminology is introduced by (Kerbrat-Orecchioni: 1999, cited in Alfattah 2010). They present what they call explicit (direct) and implicit apology which refers to any of the other indirect ways that might include an explicit apology + an implicit one (which is known as "complex apology") (Alfattah 2010: 228). Also, a compound type is added by (Obeng 1999, cited in Alfattah 2010). It comprises implicit apology + implicit apology.

Most recent studies discover more strategies than the above mentioned studies. Furthermore, the researcher thinks that Iraqi EFL university students will use more strategies and combination of strategies, but the Americans are expected to employ more strategies than he Iraqis.

6.2 Studies on the Arabic and the Arabic Society

Actually, several studies have been done on apology in the Arab world. Rizk (1997) makes a study on apology strategies used by Egyptian, Saudi, Jordanian, Palestinian, Tunisian, Moroccan, Syrian, Libyan, and Yemeni EFL learners of English. He finds that native speakers and non-native speakers of English use similar strategies in apologizing. By contrast, he concludes that Arabs do not apologize to children and they offer food as compensation, a way that is unacceptable by the native speakers of English.

Sinan (2004) investigates the use of apology strategies by Arab learners of English as a second language in India. The results reveal that Arab use variation in the selection of IFID like *sorry*, *forgive me*, *pardon me*, *accept my apology*, and *pleading for understanding*. The reason is that they believe that saying *sorry* is not enough to restore the relationship with the interlocutor. Their religious beliefs, concepts and values result in deviations in the learners' language from that of the native speakers of English. The Arab interactants even use multiple IFID in certain context to show sincerity of the apology. Similar to Sinan's results (2004), Alfattah (2010) discovers that Yemeni EFL learners of English use IFIDs especially the expression of regret, followed by one of the other strategies. It is anticipated that Iraqi EFL university students will resort to interlingual transfer and will use multiple IFIDs because they are not competent enough to speak English and they feel that using multiple IFIDs is more sincere in apology.

A single study that examines the use of apology by the Jordanian two sexes is done by Bataineh & Bataineh (2005). The study is based on another study by Sugimoto conducted in 1997 on Japanese and American apology strategies. The outcomes illustrate that the male and female respondents use the main strategies of statement of remorse, accounts, compensation, promise of not to repeat the offense, and reparation. Also, the findings reveal that the male and female respondents differ in the order of primary strategies they use. In addition, female respondents prefer non-apology strategies that are used so as to avoid the discussion of offense, while the male respondents use such strategies veer towards blaming the victim. It is predicted that there are differences between the two sexes in apology owing to the differences between them.

An interesting study is made by Muhammed (2006) who studies apology strategies used by Sudanese. She tests forty eight Sudanese learners of English and fifty three Sudanese whose major is not English. The findings demonstrate that: (1) Both groups use the same strategies in apology, (2) similar age, education, and cultural background result in analogous responses, (3) the choice of apology strategy is affected by social status more than social distance, (4) the degree of offense affects slightly the strategy used, (5) the Sudanese learners of English tend to use short apologies and this stresses the fact that they cannot express themselves well in English, and (6) there were no differences between males and females.

Some researchers study apology in novels, like Jibreen (2002) who investigates complaining thanking and apologizing in some English novels in the nineteenth century. She concludes that 226 instances of apology are used in these novels and they are explicit only. Another example is Handayai's (2010) who studies the kind of apology patterns and expressions used in the novel *Where Love was Lost*. The researcher finds twenty nine apology expressions which are divided into two types direct and indirect. Some of them are simple, while others are complex in addition to eight apology strategies

To my simple knowledge no study is conducted to compare apology strategies of Iraqi EFL university students along with that of the American native speakers of English in terms of gender and status. Accordingly, the present study will explore these issues in order to clarify them.

7 Subjects

The questionnaire is given to twenty Iraqi EFL university students (i.e. ten males and ten females) at the third year, Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon. The rate of their ages is between 20 to 21. The reason behind their choice is that they are at advanced stage and they have studied this subject earlier.

Furthermore, the researcher makes an online survey on the Google documents of his account with the aid of Zac Smith who is the student editor at the linguistlist.com. Then, he posts the following link along with a letter to the mailing list of the linguistlist.com. Also, he emails many Americans on the facebook.com. After many endeavours, he scarcely gets eight Americans (viz. four males and four females) who respond to his questionnaire. The average of their age is between 18 to 63. This is the link to his survey:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/viewform?formkey=dEJqc0tsalRhcV9zZHIOUzhKSEZEWVE6MQ>

8 Questionnaire

The subjects are given a Discourse Completion Test (henceforth DCT) which is a modified version of Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984). The questionnaire consists of twelve situations. The first four situations illustrate how the subjects

apologize to people of higher status, whilst the second four ones show how they apologize to people of equal grade to them. Finally, the third four situations are intended to demonstrate how the subjects apologize to people of lower rank.

The situations of the DCT are taken from Hussein & Al Hammouri (1998), Demeter (2000), and Bataineh & Bataineh (2005). Some of the situations have been modified so as to clarify them to the students.

9 Data Analysis

In this section, the responses of the participants are analyzed. The first part of this section deals with the analysis of the Iraqi EFL university students' responses at different situations, while the second part is concerned with the analysis of the Americans' apology strategies used in the questionnaire.

9.1 Analyzing the Iraqi EFL University Students Responses

It is clear from tables (1-6) that the Iraqi subjects use fourteen categories in all of the situations. Furthermore, the categories that are used heavily are illustrated. Also, the categories that are used by males only are shown as well as those that are used by females only. The following are categories that are used by the Iraqi EFL university students along with some instances:

- 1- IFID: e.g. *'I'm sorry for being late.'*
- 2- Addressing term: e.g. *'Dad', 'Sir'*
- 3- Justification/explanation: e.g. *'There was a traffic jam.'*
- 4- Promise of non-recurrence: *'I'll never do it again.'*
- 5- Intensified IFID: e.g. *'I'm so sorry for that.'*
- 6- Interjection: e.g. *'Oh', 'well'*
- 7- Showing embarrassment: e.g. *'I feel ashamed to say I have forgotten to wash it.'*
- 8- Negative responsibility: e.g. *'It is not my fault.'*
- 9- Offer of repair/compensation: e.g. *'I will buy one for you.'*
- 10- Self-deficiency: e.g. *'I cannot give up smoking.'*
- 11- Asking victim not to be angry: e.g. *'Don't be angry father.'*
- 12- Acknowledgement of responsibility: e.g. *'It is my mistake.'*
- 13- Rhetorical question: e.g. *'What can I do?'*
- 14- Pleading for understanding: e.g. *'Please, dad, forgive me.'*

Table 1. Iraqi EFL University Male Students' Performance with People of Higher Status

Category	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	5	50%	8	80%	9	90%	8	80%
Addressing term	4	40%	1	10%	1	10%	4	40%
Justification/explanation	5	50%	1	10%	2	20%	6	60%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	3	30%	6	60%	-	-
offer of repair/compensation	4	40%	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID	6	60%	2	20%	2	20%	2	20%
Pleading for understanding	-	-	1	10%	1	10%	3	30%
Interjection	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Showing embarrassment	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Negative responsibility	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Asking victim not to be angry	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Total	25	27.5%	18	19.8%	21	23%	27	29.7%

Table 2. Iraqi EFL University Female Students' Performance with People of Higher Status

Category	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	7	70%	8	80%	8	80%	9	90%
Addressing term	4	40%	3	30%	3	30%	3	30%
Justification/explanation	4	40%	-	-	1	10%	7	70%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	5	50%	9	90%	-	-
Offer of repair/compensation	4	40%	-	-	-	-	3	30%
Intensified IFID	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	2	20%
Pleading for understanding	-	-	1	10%	-	-	5	50%
Interjection	1	10%	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Asking victim not to be angry	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	20%
Total	23	23.7%	20	20.6%	22	22.7%	32	33%

9.1.1 Situations (1, 2, 3, and 4)

It is clear from table (1) and table (2) that the males use 12 categories, while the females use 9 categories of apology.

The strategies that are used heavily by the males are *IFID*, *promise of non-recurrence*, *intensified IFID*, and *justification/explanation*. On the other hand, the females use the following categories heavily: *IFID*, *justification/explanation*, *promise of non-recurrence*, and *pleading for understanding*.

Table 3. Iraqi EFL University Male Students' Performance with People of Equal Status

Category	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	8	80%	9	90%	3	30%	8	80%
Addressing term	-	-	1	10%	1	10%	-	-
Justification/explanation	1	10%	3	30%	-	-	1	10%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	30%
Offer of repair/compensation	8	80%	1	10%	2	20%	-	-
Intensified IFID	3	30%	1	10%	5	50%	1	10%
Pleading for understanding	2	20%	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Interjection	-	-	-	-	2	20%	-	-
Showing embarrassment	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Negative responsibility	-	-	-	-	2	20%	5	50%
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	20%
Asking victim not to be angry	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	-	-	2	20%	-	-
Rhetorical question	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Total	23	29.5%	15	19.2%	17	21.8%	23	29.5%

Table 4. Iraqi EFL University Female Students' Performance with People of Equal Status

Category	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	9	90%	7	70%	10	10%	7	70%
Addressing term	1	10%	-	-	1	10%	2	20%
Justification/explanation	2	20%	4	40%	-	-	1	10%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	60%
Offer of repair/compensation	5	50%	3	30%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	3	30%	2	20%
Pleading for understanding	2	20%	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Interjection	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Negative responsibility	4	40%	4	40%	3	30%	-	-
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	10%	5	50%
Asking victim not to be angry	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Pleading for understanding	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Total	24	27.6%	21	24.1%	18	20.7%	24	27.6%

9.1.2 Situations (5, 6, 7, and 8)

There are fourteen categories that are used by males, whereas thirteen categories are used by females. The strategies that are used heavily by males are: *IFID*, *offer repair/compensation*, *intensified IFID*. On the other hand, the strategies that are used greatly by females are: *IFID*, *offering of repair/compensation*, *self-deficiency*, and *promise of non-recurrence*.

Table 5. Iraqi EFL University Male Students' Performance with People of Lower Status

Category	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	7	70%	8	80%	7	70%	7	70%
Addressing term	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Justification/explanation	2	20%	5	50%	2	20%	8	80%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Offer of repair/compensation	3	30%	6	60%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID	4	40%	1	10%	2	20%	4	40%
Pleading for understanding	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Negative responsibility	2	20%	1	10%	2	20%	-	-
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	-	-	1	10%	1	10%
Total	20	25.3%	22	27.8%	16	20.3%	21	26.6%

Table 6. Iraqi EFL University Female Students' Performance with People of Lower Status

Category	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	8	80%	6	60%	8	80%	8	80%
Addressing term	1	10%	0		2	20%	-	-
Justification/explanation	5	50%	7	70%	5	50%	8	80%
Promise of non-recurrence	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Offer of repair/compensation	3	30%	5	50%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID	3	30%	-	-	2	20%	1	10%
Pleading for understanding	4	40%	1	10%	1	10%	-	-
Interjection	1	10%	2	20%	-	-	1	10%
Negative responsibility	3	30%	2	20%	-	-	2	20%
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	2	20%	2	20%
Acknowledgement of responsibility	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	30	31.6%	23	24.2%	20	21%	22	23.2%

9.1.3 Situations (9, 10, 11, and 12)

Males and females use 11 categories in these four situations. Both of them employ the following strategies greatly: *IFID*, *justification/explanation*, and *offering repair/compensation*.

Table 7. The Most Frequently Used Categories by Iraqi EFL University Students According to Status in the Whole Questionnaire

Category	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	12	60%	16	80%	17	85%	17	85%
Justification/explanation	9	45%	1	5%	3	15%	13	65%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	8	40%	15	75%	-	-
Intensified IFID	9	45%	5	25%	3	15%	4	20%
Pleading for understanding	-	-	2	10%	1	5%	8	40%
Category	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	17	85%	16	80%	13	65%	15	75%
Offer of repair/compensation	13	65%	4	20%	2	10%	-	-
Intensified IFID	3	15%	1	5%	8	40%	3	15%
Negative responsibility	4	20%	4	20%	5	25%	5	25%
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	5%	7	35%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	45%
Category	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	15	75%	14	70%	15	75%	15	75%
Justification/explanation	7	35%	12	60%	7	35%	16	80%

Offer of repair/compensation	6	30%	11	55%	-	-	-	-
------------------------------	---	-----	----	-----	---	---	---	---

Table (7) exhibits that the category *IFID* is used with all ranks (i.e. higher, equal, and lower). This means that the *IFID* is the most frequently used category in apology by the Iraqis. Although *justification/explanation* is used with the higher status and lower one, it is not frequently used with the equal status because the Iraqi EFL learners feel that there is no need to give justification/explanation with this status. *Promise of non-recurrence* is not used repeatedly with lower status because they feel that they are superior to the people of this status. As for, *intensified IFID* is used heavily with higher status and equal one, but it is not used recurrently with lower status people. This reflects sincerity and respect to people of higher and equal status. *Pleading for understanding* is used heavily by females to individuals of higher status. *Offer of repair/compensation* is used greatly with individuals of equal and lower statuses and this reflects the fact that Iraqi EFL university students respect even people who are inferior to them. Lastly, *negative responsibility* and *self-deficiency* are used greatly with people of equal status because they feel free when they interact with people of this status.

Table 8. Iraqi EFL University Male Students' Performance in the Whole Questionnaire

Higher Status			Equal Status			Lower Status		
Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%
1	25	27.5%	5	23	29.5%	9	20	25.3%
2	18	19.8%	6	15	19.2%	10	22	27.8%
3	21	23%	7	17	21.8%	11	16	20.3%
4	27	29.7%	8	23	29.5%	12	21	26.6%
Total	91	36.7%	78		31.5%	79		31.8%

Table 9. Iraqi EFL University Female Students' Performance in the Whole Questionnaire

Higher Status			Equal Status			Lower Status		
Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%
1	23	23.7%	5	24	27.6%	9	30	31.6%
2	20	20.6%	6	21	24.1%	10	23	24.2%
3	22	22.7%	7	18	20.7%	11	20	21%
4	32	33%	8	24	27.6%	12	22	23.2%
Total	97	34.8%	87		31.1%	95		34.1%

With regard to status, there are no big differences among the three statuses in the Iraqi EFL males and females responses. The males employ the greatest number of strategies with people of higher level (36.7%) and the least categories are used with people of equal rank (31.5%). Similarly, the females use the highest number of strategies with people of higher position (34.8%) and they use the lowest strategies with individuals of equal rank (31.1%).

Table 10. The Performance of Iraqi EFL Learners Males and Females in the Entire Questionnaire

Situations	Iraqi EFL Male Learners Performance in the Whole Questionnaire		Iraqi EFL Female Learners Performance in the Whole Questionnaire	
	No	%	No	%
(1, 2, 3, and 4)	91	36.7%	97	34.8%
(5, 6, 7, and 8)	78	31.5%	87	31.1%
(9, 10, 11, and 12)	79	31.8%	95	34.1%
Total	248	47%	279	53%

It is obvious from the table above that there are slight differences between males and females performance in the entire questionnaire. The final result is that Iraqi EFL female learners use more apology strategies (279, 53%) than Iraqi EFL male learners (248, 47%).

Table 11. Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Male Learners with People of Higher Rank

Categories	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID+ addressing term+ justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID	2	20%	3	30%	2	20%	3	30%
IFID+ justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	3	30%	1	10%
IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	10%	3	30%	-	-
Pleading for understanding+ addressing term+ IFID+ offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID+ addressing term+ justification/explanation+ offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	10%	1	10%	-	-
Intensified IFID+ offer of repair/compensation	2	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection+ IFID	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID+ pleading for understanding+ promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Showing embarrassment+ justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID+ addressing term+ negative responsibility	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID+ justification/explanation	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
IFID+ addressing term+ pleading for understanding+ intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID+ addressing term	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pleading for understanding+ addressing term+ IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID+ negative responsibility	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + addressing term+ justification/explanation+ pleading for understanding +IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 12. Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Female Learners with People of Higher Rank

Categories	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
IFID	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	-	-
IFID+ justification/explanation	2	20%	-	-	-	-	2	20%
IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	-	-	3	30%	5	50%	-	-
Intensified IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	10%	1	10%	-	-
Interjection+ IFID	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + addressing term+ justification/explanation+ pleading for understanding +IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + justification/explanation +pleading for understanding	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID+ addressing + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID +addressing term + justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + addressing term	1	10%	3	30%	-	-	-	-
IFID + addressing term + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	2	20%	-	-
Pleading for understanding + addressing term + justification/ explanation+ intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID+ addressing term + justification/explanation+ pleading for understanding+ asking victim not to be angry	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID + pleading for understanding +IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID+ addressing term+ offering repair	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection + IFID+ offering repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Pleading for understanding+ IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Justification/explanation + pleading for understanding + asking victim not to be angry + offering repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID+ justification/explanation + offering repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID+ justification/explanation + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
IFID+ addressing term + justification/explanation+ IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%

Table 13. Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Male Learners with People of Equal Rank

Categories	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
IFID	3	30%	5	50%	2	20%	1	10%
IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Pleading for understanding + asking victim not be angry + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection + acknowledgement of responsibility + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	5	50%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	3	30%	-	-
IFID + addressing term	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Showing embarrassment + IFID + pleading for understanding	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID +addressing term + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Negative responsibility + rhetorical question + IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Justification/explanation +offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility	-	-	-	-	1	10%	1	10%
Negative responsibility + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Justification/explanation + IFID	-	-	2	20%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	1	10%
IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + negative responsibility	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Interjection + acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
IFID + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%

Table 14. Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Female Learners with People of Equal Rank

Categories	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
IFID	1	10%	3	30%	1	10%	-	-
IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	20%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	2	20%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID +addressing term + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + negative responsibility	1	10%	-	-	2	20%	-	-
Justification/explanation + IFID	-	-	2	20%	-	-	-	-
IFID + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Promise of non-recurrence + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation + justification/explanation	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility + justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + pleading for understanding	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Intensified IFID + addressing term + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Pleading for understanding + pleading for understanding + justification/explanation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Pleading for understanding + IFID + intensified IFID + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Intensified IFID + addressing term	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Pleading for understanding + IFID + negative responsibility	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	-	-
Pleading for understanding + negative responsibility	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Pleading for understanding + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Interjection + addressing term + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
IFID + self-deficiency+ pleading for understanding + IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Negative responsibility + pleading for understanding + asking victim not to be angry	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Pleading for understanding + IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Negative responsibility + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility + offer	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-

of repair/compensation						%		
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Table 15. Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Male Learners with People of Lower Rank

Categories	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
IFID + interjection	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation	1	10%	3	30%	1	10%	3	30%
Offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	2	20%	3	30%	-	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
IFID + intensified IFID	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID	-	-	1	10%	5	50%	2	20%
IFID + negative responsibility	1	10%	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + negative responsibility	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	3	30%
IFID + negative responsibility + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
IFID + addressing term + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Intensified IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-
Pleading for understanding + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 16. Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Female Learners with People of Lower Rank

Categories	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
IFID + justification/explanation	1	10%	1	10%	4	40%	4	40%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-
IFID	-	-	1	10%	2	20%	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%
Intensified IFID + negative responsibility	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID +	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%

justification/explanation									
IFID + addressing term + justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Negative responsibility + promise of non-recurrence	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	10%	1	10%	
Self-deficiency + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%	
IFID + pleading for understanding + justification/explanation	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-	
Negative responsibility + justification/explanation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	1	10%	
Intensified IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID + justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	
IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-	
Intensified IFID + addressing term + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-	
IFID + acknowledgement of responsibility	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Interjection + negative responsibility + justification/explanation	-	-	1	10%	-	-	-	-	
Pleading for understanding + IFID + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	10%	-	-	
Justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	2	20%	-	-	-	-	
IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID + justification/explanation	1	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Interjection + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	10%	1	10%	-	-	-	-	
Interjection + IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10%	

Tables (11-16) elucidate that Iraqi EFL learners have different sets of strategies in apology but sometimes they share the same formulae. Besides, each EFL learner has used more than one formula. Here are some of the formulae that they use heavily: *IFID+ justification/explanation*, *IFID*, *IFID+ offer of repair/compensation*, *IFID+ Promise of non-recurrence*, and *IFID+ addressing term*.

It is obvious from the subject's responses that they mostly tend to use short answers (viz. they employ one, two or three strategies) and this can be proved by tables (11-16) in which the total number of the long formulae (viz. they employ more than three strategies) is (17,12.9%), whilst the total number of short formulae is (115, 87.1%). This shows the fact that Iraqi EFL learners have difficulties to express themselves well in English.

Table 17. The Most Frequent Apology Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL University Students (Males and Females)

Categories	Frequency	%
IFID	41	18.1%
IFID+ offer of repair/compensation	19	8.4%
IFID+ justification/explanation	18	7.9%
IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	15	6.6%
IFID+ negative responsibility	9	3.9%
Intensified IFID+ justification/ explanation	7	3.09%
Intensified IFID+ promise of non-recurrence	5	2.2%
Intensified IFID	5	2.2%
IFID+ addressing term + promise of non-recurrence	3	1.3%

Interjection + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	3	1.3%
IFID+ addressing term+ justification/explanation	3	1.3%
Justification/explanation+ offer of repair	3	1.3%
Intensified IFID+ negative responsibility	3	1.3%
Intensified IFID+ offer of repair	2	0.8%
Interjection + IFID	2	0.8%
Intensified IFID + addressing term	2	0.8%
Showing embarrassment + justification/explanation	2	0.8%
Intensified IFID + addressing term + justification/explanation	2	0.8%
IFID + pleading for understanding +IFID	2	0.8%
Intensified IFID + addressing term + offer of repair	2	0.8%
Pleading for understanding + IFID + promise of non-recurrence	2	0.8%
IFID + self-deficiency	2	0.8%
IFID + negative responsibility + justification/explanation	2	0.8%
IFID + negative responsibility + offer of repair/compensation	2	0.8%
Intensified IFID + pleading for understanding + IFID	2	0.8%
Offer of repair/compensation	2	0.8%
Intensified IFID + addressing term + justification/explanation + pleading for understanding + IFID	2	0.8%
IFID + pleading for understanding + justification/explanation	2	0.8%

Table (17) illustrates that Iraqi EFL university students (males and females) share some of the strategies. *IFID*, *IFID+ offer of repair/compensation*, *IFID+ justification/explanation*, *IFID+ promise of non-recurrence*, *IFID+ negative responsibility*, *intensified IFID+ justification/ explanation*, *intensified IFID+ promise of non-recurrence*, and *intensified IFID* are the most frequent strategies employed by them.

9.2 Analyzing the American Responses

The American participants employ thirty three strategies. The following are the categories that they employ when they apologize along with some examples:

1. Acknowledgement of Responsibility: e.g. *'This is my mistake.'*
2. Addressing Term: e.g. *'Sir', 'Hun.', 'Dear'*
3. Alternative: e.g. *'May be we can take the machine to a specialist shop...?Or do you have a back-up copy?'*
4. Avoidance: e.g. *'I wouldn't apologize for this.'*
5. Changing the subject: e.g. *'So today we will talk about...'*
6. Command: e.g. *'Look'*
7. Conditional promise of non-recurrence: e.g. *'Next time, just bug me about it and I'll get it back to you right away.'*
8. Criticism: e.g. *'You talked for ages... you didn't give me a chance to join in.'*
9. Expression of concern: e.g. *'I hope you didn't need this in the meantime.'*
10. Expression of Embarrassment: e.g. *'I feel like an idiot. Jeez that sucks man.'*
11. Greeting: e.g. *'Hi...'*
12. IFID: e.g. *'Sorry about that.'*
13. Intensified IFID: e.g. *'I'm really really sorry.', 'I'm extremely sorry.'*
14. Interjection: e.g. *'So uh....', 'oh', 'whoop', 'well'*
15. Introduction: e.g. *'I was out in the rain yesterday with your umbrella, it was really windy, and...well, the truth of the matter is...'*
16. Introduction in question form: e.g. *'Do you remember that book on American literature you lent me a while back?'*
17. Invitation: e.g. *'This weekend, we can go hang out at the mall.'*
18. Justification/explanation: e.g. *'It must be allergy season...'*
19. Laughing the incident off: e.g. *'I probably won't cough up a lung, haha!'*
20. Minimizing the degree of offense: e.g. *'Well at least I made it, better than no clothes eh?'*
21. Negative ability: e.g. *'I'm afraid I won't be able to return...'*
22. Negative responsibility: e.g. *'I have absolutely no idea how it happened, but I...'*
23. Offer of repair/compensation: e.g. *'Can I purchase another copy for you?'*

24. Pleading for understanding: e.g. *'Please, excuse my attire'*
25. Pretending that the offense did not occur: e.g. *'Run to my desk and pretended that never happened.'*
26. Principle: e.g. *'Work must come first.'*
27. Promise of non-recurrence: e.g. *'I promise to make extra efforts so this doesn't happen again in the future.'*
28. Proverbial expression: e.g. *'You know my mother always says that I'll be late to my own funeral.'*
29. Question: e.g. *'How's that sound?'*
30. Request: e.g. *'Please, stop bugging me.'*
31. Self-deficiency: e.g. *'I just can't quit...that is just how I am.'*
32. Thank: e.g. *'Thank you for reminding me.'*
33. Wish: e.g. *'I hope it doesn't break too.'*

Table 18. American Males' Performance with People of Higher Level

Category	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	3	75%
Addressing Term	2	50%	2	50%	-	-	-	-
Justification/explanation	-	-	2	50%	1	25%	3	75%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	25%	3	75%	-	-
offer of repair/compensation	4	100%	-	-	-	-	4	100%
Intensified IFID	3	75%	-	-	1	25%	1	25%
Negative responsibility	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Pretending that the offense did not occur	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Interjection	4	100%	-	-	1	25%	2	50%
Principle	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility	4	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Laughing the incident off	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Proverbial expression	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Greeting	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Introduction	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Introduction in question form	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	19	35.85%	7	13.21%	14	26.42%	13	24.52%

Table 19. American Females' Performance with People of Higher Level

Category	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	-	-	4	100%	1	25%	4	100%
Addressing term	-	-	3	75%	-	-	2	50%
Justification/explanation	2	50%	4	100%	2	50%	4	100%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	25%	3	75%	-	-
offer of repair/compensation	3	75%	-	-	1	25%	2	50%
Intensified IFID	4	100%	-	-	4	100%	-	-
Criticism	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Command	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-

Interjection	-	-	1	25%	-	-	1	25%
Negative responsibility	-	-	2	50%	-	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	-	-
Alternative	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	11	20.8%	17	32.1%	12	22.6%	13	24.5%

9.2.1 Situations (1, 2, 3, and 4)

Tables (18 and 19) show that American Males use sixteen categories whereas the American females employ twelve categories with people of higher status.

American males use the following strategies heavily: *IFID*, *justification/explanation*, *promise of non-recurrence*, *offer of repair/compensation*, *intensified IFID*, *interjection*, and *acknowledgement of responsibility*. In addition to the above mentioned strategies, the American females use *addressing term* greatly.

Table 20. American Males' Performance with People of Equal Level

Category	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	3	75%	2	50%	1	25%	2	50%
Addressing term	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Justification/explanation	4	100%	2	50%	-	-	-	-
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Conditional promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
offer of repair/compensation	3	75%	-	-	3	75%	-	-
Intensified IFID	-	-	1	25%	3	75%	-	-
Interjection	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	-	-
Negative responsibility	-	-	-	-	2	50%	-	-
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	25%	3	75%
Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	1	25%	1	25%	-	-
Concern about the interlocutor's feeling	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Wish	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Introduction in question form	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expression of embarrassment	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Invitation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Question	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avoidance	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Introduction	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Principle	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Total	15	31.9%	10	21.3%	14	29.8%	8	17%

Table 21. American Females' Performance with People of Equal Level

Category	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	1	25%	4	100%	-	-	3	75%
Justification/explanation	2	50%	2	50%	1	25%	2	50%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50%
offer of repair/compensation	2	50%	-	-	3	75%	-	-
Intensified IFID	1	25%	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Interjection	1	25%	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Showing embarrassment	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Negative responsibility	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Asking victim not to be angry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	-	-	2	50%	-	-
Alternative	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Introduction	2	50%	-	-	2	50%	-	-
Thank	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Changing the subject	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Request	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Total	9	23.7%	9	23.7%	11	28.9%	9	23.7%

9.2.1 Situations (5, 6, 7, and 8)

American Males employ twenty categories, whereas the American females employ fourteen categories with people of equal status.

IFID, *justification/explanations*, *offer of repair/compensation*, *intensified IFID*, and *self-deficiency* are used by American males so frequently. On the other hand, the females use only *IFID* and *offer of repair/compensation* greatly.

Table 22. American Males' Performance with People of Lower Level

Category	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	3	75%	3	75%	4	100%	2	50%
Addressing term	1	25%	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Justification/explanation/	1	25%	3	75%	2	50%	4	100%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	2	50%	-	-
offer of repair/compensation	4	100%	3	75%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%
Showing embarrassment	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Negative responsibility	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pleading for understanding	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Self-deficiency	2	50%	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Minimizing the degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%

of offense								
Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	1	25%	-	-	1	25%
Expression of concern	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Laughing the incident off	-	-	-	-	2	50%	1	25%
Changing the subject	-	-	1	25%	-	-	1	25%
Thank	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Question	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Total	15	26.8%	14	25%	14	25%	13	23.2%

Table 23. American Females' Performance with People of Lower Level

Category	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	1	25%	3	75%	2	50%	1	25%
Addressing term	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Justification/explanation	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	3	75%
Pleading for understanding	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
offer of repair/compensation	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Intensified IFID	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
Interjection	3	75%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%
Avoiding apology	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%
Acknowledgement of responsibility	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Negative ability	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0%	0
Changing the subject	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0%	0
Total	14	34.1%	13	31.7%	7	17.1%	7	17.1%

9.2.3 Situations (9, 10, 11, and 12)

Again men use more strategies with people of lower rank. They use eighteen categories, whilst the women use eleven strategies only.

The most frequently used strategies by males with people of lower position are *IFID*, *justification/explanation*, and *offer of repair/compensation*, while the women use, in addition to the strategies use by men greatly, *intensified IFID*, and *interjection*.

Table 24. The Most Frequently Used Categories by the Americans according to Status

Category	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	1	12.5%	6	75%	2	25%	7	87.5%
Justification/explanation	2	25%	6	75%	3	37.5%	7	87.5%
Promise of non-recurrence	-	-	2	25%	6	75%	-	-
Intensified IFID	7	87.5%	-	-	5	62.5%	1	12.5%
Offer of repair/compensation	7	87.5%	-	-	1	12.5%	6	75%
interjection	4	50%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	3	37.5%
Acknowledgement of responsibility	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	-	-
Addressing term	2	25%	5	62.5%	-	-	2	25%

Category	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	4	50%	6	75%	1	12.5%	5	62.5%
Offer of repair/compensation	5	62.5%	-	-	6	75%	-	-
Intensified IFID	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	4	50%	-	-
Justification/explanation	6	75%	4	50%	1	12.5%	2	25%
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	12.5%	3	37.5%
Category	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
IFID	4	50%	6	75%	6	75%	3	37.5%
Intensified IFID	4	50%	-	-	-	-	1	12.5%
Interjection	5	62.5%	2	25%	3	37.5%	2	25%
Justification/explanation	1	12.5%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	7	87.5%
Offer of repair/compensation	8	100%	7	87.5%	-	-	-	-

The strategies *IFID*, *intensified IFID*, *justification/explanation*, and *offer of repair/compensation* are employed widely with all statuses (i.e. higher, equal, and lower) viz. they are the most frequently used categories in apology by the Americans. Although, *interjection* is used with the higher status and the lower one, it is not frequently used with the equal status because the Americans feel less embarrassed and they act more freely with this status. *Promise of non-recurrence*, *addressing term* and *acknowledgement of responsibility* are used recurrently with higher rank because these formulae reveal sincerity and respect to people of higher level. *Self-deficiency* is used greatly with individuals of equal status owing to intimacy and they do not feel embarrassed to show their deficiency to their close people.

Tables 25. American Males' Performance in the Whole Questionnaire according to Status

Higher Status			Equal Status			Lower Status		
Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%
1	19	35.85%	5	15	31.9%	9	15	26.8%
2	7	13.21%	6	10	21.3%	10	14	25%
3	14	26.42%	7	14	29.8%	11	14	25%
4	13	24.52%	8	8	17%	12	13	23.2%
Total	53	34%	47		30.1%	56		35.9%

Tables 26. American Females' Performance in the Whole Questionnaire according to Status

Higher Status			Equal Status			Lower Status		
Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%	Situation	No	%
1	11	20.8%	5	9	23.7%	9	14	34.1%
2	17	32.1%	6	9	23.7%	10	13	31.7%
3	12	22.6%	7	11	28.9%	11	7	17.1%
4	13	24.5%	8	9	23.7%	12	7	17.1%
Total	53	40.1%	38		28.8%	41		31.1%

As for status, there are no big differences among the three statuses in the American males' responses. The males use the greatest number of strategies with people of lower rank (35.9%) and the least categories are used with the people of equal rank (30.1%). Unlike the males, the females use the highest number of strategies with the people of higher position (40.1%). Similarly, the women use the lowest strategies with individuals of equal rank (28.8%).

Tables 27. American Males' and Females' Performance in the Entire Questionnaire

Situations	American Males performance in the whole test		American Females performance in the whole test	
	No	%	No	%
(1, 2, 3, and 4)	53	34%	53	40.1%
(5, 6, 7, and 8)	47	30.1%	38	28.8%
(9, 10, 11, and 12)	56	35.9%	41	31.1%
Total	156	54.2%	132	45.8%

Table (27) presents that there are significant differences between males and females. As a consequence, American males employ more strategies (156, 54.2%) in apology than American females (132, 45.8%).

Table 28. Apology Strategies Used by American Males with People of Higher Rank

Categories	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Addressing term + acknowledgement of responsibility + intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Introduction in a question form + intensified IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + intensified IFID	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Addressing term + IFID + acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Interjection + addressing term + offer of repair/compensation + acknowledgement of responsibility + offer of repair /compensation+ IFID	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + addressing term	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + acknowledgement of responsibility + offer of repair/compensation + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Laughing the incident off + proverbial explanation + IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Greeting + pretending that the offense does not occur	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Introduction + principle + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Interjection + intensified IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + IFID	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Interjection + offer of repair/compensation + acknowledgement of responsibility	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 29. Apology Strategies Used by American Females with People of Higher Rank

Categories	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Acknowledgement of responsibility+ intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Intensified IFID	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + addressing term + justification/explanation	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Command + acknowledgement of responsibility + criticism	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + addressing term	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility + intensified IFID + detailed explanation + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Intensified IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation + promise of non-recurrence + IFID	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Interjection + IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
IFID + addressing term + offer of repair/compensation + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
IFID + addressing term + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%

Table 30. Apology Strategies Used by American Males with People of Equal Rank

Combinations	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + IFID	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + wish	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Introduction in a question form + justification/explanation + intensified IFID + invitation + offer of repair/compensation + question	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + acknowledgement of	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-

responsibility									
Interjection + IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-
Avoidance	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation + concern about the interlocutor's feeling + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + negative responsibility + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-
Interjection + intensified IFID + expression of embarrassment + interjection + self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-
Introduction + acknowledgement of responsibility + offer of repair/compensation + intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-
Acknowledgement of responsibility + IFID + addressing term	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-
Self-deficiency + IFID + Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-
Self-deficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-
Principle + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-

Table 31. Apology Strategies Used by American Females with People of Equal Rank

Combinations	Situation 5		Situation 6		Situation 7		Situation 8	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Introduction + justification/explanation + interjection	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Introduction + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Justification/explanation + IFID	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + negative responsibility + changing the subject + thank	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID	-	-	2	50%			1	25%
Intensified IFID	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Introduction + acknowledgement of responsibility + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Introduction + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
IFID + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Interjection + justification/explanation + request + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%

IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Table 32. Apology Strategies Used by American Males with People of Lower Rank

Formula	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
IFID+ addressing term+ offer of repair/compensation + justification/explanation+ self-deficiency	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + self-deficiency + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection + IFID + Justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection + IFID + offer of repair/compensation + IFID + self-deficiency	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID +justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + thank	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Offer of repair/compensation + changing the subject	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + IFID	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + Acknowledgement of responsibility	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Intensified IFID + interjection + laughing the incident off	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
IFID + laughing the incident off	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
IFID + showing embarrassment + self-deficiency + justification/explanation + promise of non-recurrence	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation + minimizing the degree of offense	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Interjection + justification/explanation + laughing the incident off	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Interjection + acknowledgement of responsibility + changing the subject	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
IFID +pleading for understanding + justification/explanation + question	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%

Table 33. Apology Strategies Used by American Females with People of Lower Rank

Combinations	Situation 9		Situation 10		Situation 11		Situation 12	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Interjection +addressing term + intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interjection +addressing term + intensified IFID + acknowledgement of responsibility + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Interjection + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Negative ability + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + changing the subject	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Interjection + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	-	-	1	25%	-	-	-	-
Interjection + addressing term + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
IFID	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Interjection + IFID	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Avoiding apology	-	-	-	-	1	25%	1	25%
Pleading for understanding + IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%
IFID + justification/explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%

The total number of short responses (viz. they employ one, two or three strategies is (62, 67.3%), whereas the total number of long responses (viz. they employ more than three strategies) is (30, 32.7%).

Tables (28-33) demonstrate that the American males have a tendency to use long responses unlike the American females. The men use (20, 41.7%) long answers, whilst the women use (10, 22.7%) long ones. Besides, the males use (28, 50.3%) short responses, while the females employ (31, 77.3%) short ones.

Tables 34. The Most Frequent Apology Strategies Used by Americans (Males and Females)

Categories	Frequency	%
IFID + justification/explanation	5	5.4%
IFID + offer of repair/compensation	4	4.3%
IFID	4	4.3%
Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation	3	3.2%
IFID + justification/ explanation + offer of repair/compensation	3	3.2%
Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + IFID	3	3.2%
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	2	2.1%
Intensified IFID	2	2.1%
IFID + acknowledgement of responsibility	2	2.1%
IFID + addressing term	2	2.1%
Avoiding apology	2	2.1%
Interjection + IFID + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation	2	2.1%
Intensified IFID + justification/explanation	2	2.1%
Interjection + IFID + offer of repair/compensation	2	2.1%

Table (34) illustrates that the Americans rarely share the same set of formulae in their apology. The most frequent combinations that are used in the American responses are: *IFID + justification/explanation*, *IFID + offer of repair/compensation*, *IFID*, *Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation*, *IFID + justification/ explanation + offer of repair/compensation*, and *Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + IFID*.

10. Conclusion

Data analysis shows contrastive use of the strategies of apology amongst Iraqi and American respondents. Iraqi EFL learners almost use similar expressions. Their sentences are stilted and lack sincerity because they cannot feel the English language which they use and they are not skillful enough in using it. In comparison with the American native speakers whose responses are more genuine. The Americans use wide range of vocabulary (sometimes even colloquial terms) and their responses are longer than that of the Iraqi EFL learners' counterparts. 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 do not study how to apologize to people of higher, equal or lower status. They are not trained enough to use apology strategies to preserve good relations with the offended people. Moreover, they do not study the sincerity and length of. As a matter of fact, pragmatic competence does not progress naturally and it must be taught and be focused on. Additionally, Iraqi EFL learners must be instructed that politeness markers vary from one culture to another.

It is found that the highest number of apology strategies used by Iraqi EFL male learners is with people of higher status. This illustrates a transfer of the Iraqi social and cultural norms. On the other hand, the American males use more categories with people of lower rank than with the other two levels, while the American and Iraqi females use more apology classifications with people of higher rank. Both the Iraqi EFL learners and the American native speakers use the least apology categories with individuals of equal positions. Furthermore, the American respondents use many colloquial expressions and interact freer with individuals of equal status.

There are significant differences between American males and females. The males tend to use long answers when they apologize, whereas the females tend to use short ones. The men are less direct and employ elaborated strategies than women who incline to use more concise categories. This reflects the fact that the American males care more about the feelings of others than females. 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.

Actually, the Iraqi EFL learners resort to interlingual transfer in the following two sets of apology strategies: *Intensified IFID + addressing term+ justification/explanation+ pleading for understanding + IFID*, and *IFID+ addressing term+ pleading for understanding+ Intensified IFID* as these strategies are employed by Iraqi native speakers of Iraqi dialect in a study conducted by Altai (2012).

The most frequent set of strategies that are used by Iraqi EFL learners (males and females) are: *IFID, IFID+ offer of repair/compensation, IFID+ justification/explanation, IFID+ promise of non-recurrence, IFID+ negative responsibility, intensified IFID+ justification/ explanation, intensified IFID+ promise of non-recurrence, and intensified IFID*. On the other hand, the most frequently used combinations by the American respondents (males and females) are: *IFID + justification/explanation, IFID + offer of repair/ compensation, IFID, Intensified IFID + offer of repair/compensation, IFID + justification/ explanation + offer of repair/compensation, and Interjection + justification/explanation + offer of repair/compensation + IFID*.

Both Iraqi EFL learners and Americans use *IFID, intensified IFID, and IFID + justification/explanation* greatly. Moreover, Iraqi EFL learners tend to put *IFID* or *intensified IFID*, most of the time, at the beginning of their apologies, whereas the Americans do not always incline to put these expressions at the beginning.

References

- Alfattah, M. (2010). "Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University Students." University of Mysore, Mysore, India. 0974-8741.
- Allan, K. (1996). *Linguistics Meaning*. Vol. II. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Altai, A. (2012). "A Pragmatic and Lexical Analysis of the Effects of Gender and Status on the Apology Strategies Iraqi Native Speakers of Arabic." Unpublished paper.
- Bataineh, R. & R. Bataineh. (2005). "Apology Strategies of Jordanian EFL University Students." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (11): 1901-1927.
- . (2006). "American University Students' Apology Strategies: An Intercultural Analysis of the Effect of Gender." *Journal of Intercultural Communication*. Jordan: Jordan University of Science and Technology, 9: 1404-1634.
- Bergman, M. & Kasper, G. (1993). "Perception and Performance in Native and Nonnative Apology in: Gabriele K. & Shohana B. (Eds.)." *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, 82-117, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Elie, O. (1984). "Requests and Apologies: A Cross-cultural Study of Speech-Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP)." *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 176-213.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, B. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- Demeter, G. (2000). "A Pragmatic Study of Apology Strategies in Romanian." Unpublished MA thesis, Romania: North University Baia Mare.
- Edmondson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Edmundson, R. (1992). "Evidence for Native Speaker Notions of Apologizing and Accepting Apologies in American English." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interactional Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*. New York: Double day Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Handayani, T. (2010). "The Analysis of Apologizing Expressions in the Novel Entitled "Where Love was Lost" by Marilyn Lynch (a socio-pragmatics approach)." Other thesis, UNS. eprints.uns.ac.id/352/1/168760609201009091.pdf
- Holmes, J. (1990). "Apologies in New Zealand English." *Language in Society*, 19 (2), 155-99.
- Hussein, R. & Mamoun H. (1998). "Strategies of Apology in Jordanian Arabic and American English." *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 49: 37-51.
- Jibreen, M. (2002). "A Study of Three Expressive Speech Acts: Complaining, Apologizing, and Thanking in Selected Samples of the English Nineteenth Century Novels." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Baghdad: Baghdad University.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Published by Longman. Inc.
- Muhammed, Hamida. (2006). "The Influence of Some Social Variables on the Choice of Apology Strategies by Sudanese Learners of English." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sudan: University of Kartoum.
- Nureddein, F. (2008). "Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Apology Strategies in Sudanese Arabic." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 279-306
- Olshtain, E. & Andrew C. (1983). "Apology: A Speech Act Set. In: Nessa Wolfson and E. Judd (eds)." *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). "Apologies across Cultures." In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Owen, M. (1983). "Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: A Study of Language Use in Social Interaction." Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Richards, J. & Richard S. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 3rd ed. London: Longman (Pearson Education).
- Rizk, S. (1997). "Apology in English among Arab Non-native Speakers of English." *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 3, 1-27 Ainshams, Cairo, Egypt.
- Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinan, A. (2004). "Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts of Arab EFL University Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yemen: National Information Center.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). "Apology Strategies in Natives/Non-natives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 11(2), 147-167.
- . (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix I

The Test

Imagine yourself in the following situations. How would you apologize in each case? This questionnaire is only for the Americans whose native language is English. Your age should be over sixteen.

Gender:

Age:

- 1- Your professor lent you a book about American literature, and you lost it. Apologize.
- 2- 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.
- 3- 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.
- 4- Your father asked you to wash his car, but you forgot. Now he is angry. Apologize.
- 5- You borrowed an umbrella from your best friend, and the wind broke it beyond repair. Apologize.
- 6- You borrowed a CD from your roommate and did not return it for 3 weeks. Apologize.
- 7- 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.
- 8- You promised your wife/husband that you would stop smoking. But you started smoking again. Apologize.
- 9- You are a headmaster/headmistress of a public school. You were in a hurry and not looking where you were going. So you ran into the school janitor who was carrying a pile of papers. The papers fell down all over the floor. Apologize.
- 10- You are a teacher. You promised to return the students' term papers. But you forgot them. One of your students asked you about them. Apologize.
- 11- You are a doctor with one of your patients in the clinic. While you were speaking, you could not avoid coughing. You coughed again and again. Apologize.
- 12- You are a manger. You went to a party that your employee had made. You were wearing sports clothes because you did not have enough time to change. Apologize.

Biography

Ahmed Abu Humeid was born in Babylon/Iraq in 1982. He completed his BA study in the English Language in the University of Babylon, Babylon/Iraq in 2004. He got ME in methods of teaching English as a foreign language from the University of Babylon, Babylon/Iraq in 2006.

Abu Humeid became an Assistant Lecturer in the University of Babylon in 2007 and a Lecturer in 2010.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

