

References

1. Blum-kulka, S. House, J. kasper (eds). To appear. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics-Requests and Apologies*, Norwood.NJ:Ablex (im Druckyin Print).
2. Fraser, B. (1980). "On Apologizing". In F. Coulmas (ed.) *Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton*, 259-271.
3. Olshtain, E. and Cohen, A. D. (1983). "Apology: a speech act set". In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds). *Sociolinguistics and language Aquisition*. Rowley; Newbury House, 18-35.
4. Schmidt, Richard W. and Jack C. Richards. (1980). "Speech Acts and Second Leanguage Larning." *Applied Linguistics* 1(2): 129-157.
5. Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press
6. Vollmer, Helmut J. and Elite Olshtain. "The Language of Apologies in German". To appear in Blum-Kulka, ' S. House, J . kasper. (eds) . *Cross-cultural Pragmatics-Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex (im Druckyin Print).

12. Soldier ✕ Officer
Sorry for being late in carrying out an order.
13. student ✕ librarian
Sorry for not returning a book on due date.
14. son ✕ father
Sorry for his failure in his examinations.
- C. High/Low
15. teacher ✕ student
Sorry for not being able to postpone an exam.
16. manager ✕ employee
Sorry for refusing a request by the employee .
17. Police officer ✕ a Prisoner's brother
Sorry for not allowing him to visit the prisoner.
18. girl's father ✕ suitor
Sorry for not accepting his proposal.
19. father ✕ son
Sorry for not allowing him to go on a picnic.
20. person ✕ beggar
Sorry for not giving him some money.
21. mother ✕ daughter
Sorry for not buying a new dress for her.

Appendix

The English Translation of the questionnaire:

The Situations: How do you apologize in the following situations:

A. Equal/Equal

1. young girl ✕ young man
Her refusal of a gift given by him..
 2. friend ✕ friend
Losing his friend's book.
 3. relative ✕ relative
Sorry for being unable to stay for a long time.
 4. lawyer ✕ client
Sorry for not being able to advocate him or her.
 5. patient ✕ nurse
Sorry for calling her many times within a short time-
 6. host ✕ guest
Sorry for spilling a cup of tea on the guest's suit-
 7. neighbour ✕ neighbour
Sorry for disclosing her neighbour's secret unintentionally.
- ### B. Low/High
8. Student ✕ teacher
Sorry for being late in attending the lecture.
 9. Waiter ✕ customer
Sorry for keeping him waiting so long.
 10. child ✕ mother
Sorry for breaking dishes.
 11. engineer ✕ manager
Sorry for not attending a meeting-

3.5 *Severity of the Offence*: The severity of the infraction determines the choice of apology strategy. So, if the offence is severe, the offender is obliged to apologise sincerely. The infractions cover many cases, e.g., social violation, rule breaking, personal injury, slip of tongue, causing slight inconvenience to another etc. (Fraser 1980:267). Therefore some cases require apologies only while others require, in addition responsibility accompanied by accounts and explanation. So, apologies have different costs and the cost should be suitable as a remedy for the offence done otherwise the harmony cannot be restored easily unless the payment suffices the offence occurred.

4. Summary

The study ends up with some findings which may be taken into consideration in designing a syllabus or writing a textbook for non-native speakers of Arabic. The important findings are that the most significant main strategies for expressing apology are: AR, R, E, OR, PF and B. The subcategories of apology are: Mi, CH, Ob, RA, and RF. These strategies have been analysed at three levels according to the relations among the interactants. The three levels are: E/E, L/H and H/L. The study also embodies the use of IA intensifiers such as: 'kulis' 'jidan), 'hawa:ya, 'kaθi:r' and 'kaθi:ran' in enforcing apology. Finally, the study sums up with the use of courtesy and oath expressions in apology constructions. The study does not claim that it covers the whole subject since the area of speech act is fresh and virgin especially in IA and there are many speech acts which have not been investigated.

3.3 *Status* : This factor has played a noteworthy effect on the choice of apology strategies. To help the reader understand the social relations among the interactants in the study, the researchers classified the relations into three main categories (i.e., E/E' L/H, H/L). It has been found that equals relatively speaking' apologize less since their familiarity does not require formality and many apologies on the part of apologizers. As for apologizers of LL' they apologize more and they very often combine many strategies to satisfy the apologizees and to feel at ease because they are either afraid of being criticized or given sack or a rebuke. So, self-humiliation and dispraise of one's self is a high price given by Sp to restore harmony with a H, whereas Sps of HL apologize less and they tend to give very brief response since expectation of apology on the part of Hs of LL decreases if the apologizers are of HL (The reader may see the tables to have a clear picture about the influence of status on apology choice).

It has also been found that educated people apologize more than uneducated people since apology becomes a personal habit in their daily life.

3.4 *Situation* : This factor refers to the nature of setting in which the offence takes place. It ranges from the formal to the intimate. The significant finding is that the more formal the situation is, the longer and more elaborate the apology is. There is an overlapping between familiarity and setting since familiarity too ranges from formality where two persons who have never been introduced to each other to intimacy where the two persons may share the same home. The interaction between people unfamiliar with each other tends to be limited to formal situations. Therefore as the degree of familiarity increases between the interactants, the need to provide elaborate apologies decreases (Fraser 1980:268).

Fraser (1980:266) also found that it was difficult to have a reasonable foundation in spite of collecting several hundred examples of apology through different techniques, e.g., personal experience, participant observation, role playing and reports by friends. Here is a brief account of some factors: which influence the use of apology in IA:

3.1 Sex: It has been found that sex plays a great role in the choice of apology strategy' for example, women mostly use 'ʔa:sifa, (sorry) while men mostly use 'ʔa9tadir' (apologize). Moreover, it has been clear that women use apology expressions and pay attention to apology as a social convention more than men since women are more sensitive to social criticism. This is in agreement with the popular stereotype and contrary to what Fraser (1980:269) stated (i.e., he did not find women offering more apologies than men do).

3.2 Age: It seems to be a logical fact that adults and old people take great care of apology since there is a strong correlation between age and sociolinguistic competence proficiency. Children need time to be familiar with apology expressions. This is the reason why many respondents have responses to situation No. 10 such as: a child would not apologize, a child would escape, a child would keep quiet, a child would kiss his/her mother's hand as an apology, so a child can make use of some paralinguistic things as a compensation strategy. Moreover, some respondents claim that if the apologizee is a child there is no need for sincere apology or admitting responsibility except giving some false promises or white lies. It has also been noticed that a child rarely admits responsibility but he either denies being responsible for it or blames a third party (i.e. somebody or something).

60. 'ʔalʔafu nase:t ʔalkita:b in u sa:lalla ʔarajaʔu ba:cir:.'

(S13/43)

- (Sorry. I forgot to bring the book. I will give it back to you tomorrow).

It has also been found that the respondents usually apologize in formal situations while they rarely apologize in some cases where there is a kind of familiarity and intimacy between Sps and Hs, e.g.

61. 'yalla'/ um ʔali:', ma:naru:h? qa:bal ra:h ʔanba:t he:na.'

(S3/6) informal situation)

(Let's go, "Ali's mother." "We are not going to stay here. Are we?")

62. 'ʔa:sif jidan liʔadam hudu:r ʔalijtima:ʔ wa ʔaʔtadir liʔan-nahu sa:r ʔindi:duru:f ta:riʔa.' (S11/13) (formal situation)

Sorry for being unable to attend the meeting because I had unexpected problems).

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the English word 'sorry', which is used to express regret and apology, occurred many times in the corpus.

3: Sociolinguistic Variables Influencing Apology Choice:

This part aims at examining how certain social factors determine the adoption of one strategy rather than another in a given situation. However, the major interest in examining the use of apologies was not to find out the significant influence of some social factors on the choice of apology strategies such as the nature and the severity of the offence, the situation, the familiarity between the interactants, the sex, the status and education of them. This reason explains why the researchers do not provide any statistical support for the influence of all the social factors since it requires extensive data.

52. Boy: 'ma:taru:h tasugul miθil baqiyat ?anna:s.' (S20/57)
(Go and find a job just like other people).
53. Boy: 'ma:taru:h! ?anta ?agna min 9indi:!' (S20/85)
(Get lost! you are richer than me).
54. Boy: '?ani: tahal 9alya ?assadaqa!' (S20/93)
(I am the one where the favour should go).
55. Girl: '?al9afu 9amo: sadigni: ma: sa:yfa xurda.' (S20/65)
(Sorry, "uncle", believe me I don't have change).
56. Girl: '?a9tadir, walla ma: 9indi: saraf.' (S20/96)
(Sorry. Believe me, I haven't got any change).

h₁tas also beenticed that many respondents use 'Oath expressions' in IA such as 'wallah (By God) or by using 'bisarafi:' (upon my word). But, they were very common in some responses of the informants while they were very rare in others'. This implies that it is a personal habit. The percentage of using 'oath expressions' is 11.17% out of the potential possibilities' e.g.

57. '?ibni: wallah !al-9adi:m ?albint maxtu-ba li ?ibn 9amha min zama:n.' (S18/43)
(“Son” I swear the girl has been engaged to her cousin already).
58. '?a9tadir ?usta:d walla ?asaya:ra 9atlat....' (S8/37)
(Sorry, Sir. Believe me the car would not work).

The purpose of using them is to make the Hs sure of the sincerity of the apologies on the part of Sps. On the other hand' some apologies were accompanied by the expression 'in sa: ?allah' (if God wishes) which stands for open future .

(i. e., it depends on the circumstances)' e.g.

59. 'habi:bi: ?a:s f bass In sa: ?alla ?usbu:9 ?ajja:y ?astagi:lak (S19/19).
(Sorry, honey. I hope I will buy one next week).

It has also been found that respondents use courtesy expressions (approximately 10.38% out of the potential possibilities) in their apologetic structures' e.g .

49. 'xaya walla ma:ʔadri: ʔasso: n tal9at ʔalhica:ya min halgi:, 9e:ni: ʔatto:ba ba9ad hamarra.' (S7/48)

(Dear, I swear I didn't mean it . It was a slip of tongue . I promise not to repeat it.)

50 '9e:ni: um 9ali: ʔahna laxawa:t walli: sa:r insa: ʔalla ma: yitkarar.' (S7/15).

(The things happened would not be repeated).

51. 'habi:bi:, 9e:ni:ʔa9durni:.' (S9/41)

(Dear' "my eyes"' forgive me).

52. The use of courtesy expressions aims at lessening the severity and the seriousness of the offence. Moreover, it has been noticed that it is a personal habit, for instance, one of the students used 9e :ni:' (my eyes) ten times in his corpus.

The most common compliment items are: '9e:ni:' (my eye); 'habi:bi:' (my love); 'habi:bti:' (my beloved); 9azi:zi (for masculine), '9azi:zti:' (for feminine) (my darling); ʔaxi: or ʔaxu:ya (my brother); ʔuxti: (my sister). Some other respondents use the 'superlative degree' form in expressing compliment, for example, 'ʔanta ʔahsan wa:hid 9idna....' (you are the best one....); 'ʔanta ʔakθar wa:hid na9tamad 9ale: . (You are the most reliable one). etc.

It has also been found that women use more courtesy expressions than men, moreover, some respondents claim that women consider apology' as a kind of polite and social customary action whereas men seem to be rough sometimes and they don't consider apology as an indispensable technique in all the situations, e.g.

(I am so sorry and ready to pay you for the book or get you a new one. Believe me I don't know how I lost it. However, I repeat my regret.)

The degree of intensification is correlated with the degree of severity and the relationship between Sps and Hs, e.g.

46. 'narfa9 ?azzahma, ba:cir 9indi: ?asga:l.' (S3/10)

(Excuse me, I must go. Tomorrow I will be tied up).

47. 'ma:ʔagdar ?asso:n ?a9abbar 9an i9tida:ri, ?a :sif jidan kita:bak da:9.ʔaw9adak ?astari:lak ge:ru.' (S2/10)

(I cannot express my regret I am so sorry for losing the book. I promise I will buy you one).

48. 'Oh! ?a:ni: kulis ?a: sfa sabahan:k bicca: y da: yxa halyo:m badil hadu. mak hatta nagsilha (S6/10).

(I am terribly sorry for spilling the tea. I am not myself today. Take off your clothes in order to clean them).

It has been found in examples (44 and 45 %) that intensification can be achieved via multiple apology strategies, i.e. 'a combination of more than one strategy, for example 'combining responsibility, offer of repair, reason, justification, comment, explanation' regret, etc.

The purpose of intensification is to establish harmony and balance between Sps and Hs especially if the offence has seriously influenced the relationship between them. So, the degree of infraction is the marker of the type and degree of the intensification required.

Table No. 6
The Use of Apology Intensifiers in Iraqi Arabic

kulis	jidan	hawa:ya	kaθi:r	ka0i:ran	others
2%	4.71%	0.09%	0%	0.28%	0.19%

form in SA. The lowest percentage is that of 'kaθi:r' (0%). It is colloquial while 'kaθi:ran' is formal. 'kulis' is colloquial too. 'hawa:ya' is also colloquial and it is common in some parts of Iraq.

Some respondents claim that the use of intensifiers is a type of artificiality and exaggeration on the part of the Sps while others claim that it is a kind of compliment. It has been found that the respondents use the intensifiers before or after the apology lexical items and it seems that using them before apology expressions is stylistically more effective. Here are some examples of the use of intensifiers:

41. '?a:sif jidan u musta9id ?aji:b lak wa:hid ?abmaka:na.'
(S2/4)
(I am so sorry and ready to get you another one).
42. 'muta?asif kaθi:r kaθi:r bass sadig ka:n 9inidi: ?amtiha:n-a:t.'
(S13/25)
(I m awfully sorry. Believe me I had examinations).
43. '?a:ni: muta?sif kulis li?annahu ca:nat 9indi: duru:f ta:ri?a.'
(S11/43)
(I am terribly sorry. I had unexpected circumstances).
44. '9afwan walla ma:?adri: ?asso:n waga9 min i:di:' su:ci:'
?a:ni: inza9 ?assitra xali: ngsalak' inkasar ?assar.
(S6/25) (multiple apology)
(Sorry. I swear I don't know how it dropped. It is my fault. Take off your jacket and let me clean it for you).
45. '?a:sifa jidan u musta9ida ?adfa9lak θaman ?alkita:b ?aw
?astari:lak wa:hid ge:ru. θiqga ma:?a9ruf ?aslo:n ta:9 mini:
9ala ?ayat ha:l ?akarir i9tida:ri.' (S2/7) (multiple apology)

As for Ob, the percentages are (0.71%) for E/E, 0% for L/H, and (0.86%) for H/L, e.g.

38. 'ʔana ʔa:sif u la:zim ʔaʔtidarlak....' (S2/64)
(Sorry, I must apologize to you).

The highest percentage of RA is that of E/E (3.43%) and the lowest one is that of H/L (0.71%). RA means the request of Sps from Hs to accept their apologies, e.g.

39. 'rijaʔan iqbal iʔtida:ri: u ʔawʔadak baʔad ma: ʔakarirha.
(S12/80)

(Please accept my apologies. I promise not to do it again)

RF refers to request of SPs from Hs to forgive them. The highest percentage is that of L/H (4%) while the lowest one is that of H/L (0.85%), e.g.

40. arju:k tagfari:li: ha:di: ʔalmarra waʔinsa: ʔalla baʔad ma:
tatkarar.' (S7/63).
(please forgive me this time. I will not do it again)

Table No. 5

The Use of Apology Subcategories at Three Levels

Subcategories	E/E	L/H	H/L
Mi	2.29%	0.28%	1.7%
CH	2.974%	0.43%	2.43%
Ob	0.1%	0%	0.86%
RA	3.43%	1.86%	0.71%
RF	2.36%	1%	0.85%

Table No.6 shows the use of some lexical items which function as intensifiers but intensification can also be achieved through the use of multiple strategies, the most common intensifiers in IA are kulis 2%, hawa: ya 0.09% jidan 4.71% kaθi:r 0%, kaθ:ran 0.28%, others like lilga:ya and ʔasadi:d. 0.19%. The most common one is 'jidan which is a standard

H/L (34%) whereas the lowest percentage is that of L/H (10.43) which implies that people of HL apologize less than those of LL and those of EL.

Table No. 4
The Adoption of Main Apology Strategies at
three Levels

Strategies	E/E	L/H	H/L
AR	64.29%	70.79%	43.29%
Res	7.79%	5.71%	15.86%
E	46.64%	53.93%	50.7%
OR	10.71%	2%	3.29%
PF	2.43%	11.71%	8.43%
B	2.29%	10.57%	0.57%
None	13.71%	10.43%	34%

Table No. 5 gives the reader a picture about the use of subcategories of apology (i.g., Mi, CH, Ob, RA, and RF) at three levels, i.e., E/E, L/H and H/L. The percentages of Mi are 2.29%, 0.28% and 1.7% for E/E, L/H and H/L respectively. Minimization means to belittle something and lessen the severity of the offence and that it does not deserve apologization, e.g.

36. '? a9tidar, sa:yil ham! kulha kita:b u da:9.' (S2/52)

(Sorry. Forget about it. It is only a book which has been lost).

As for CH, the highest percentage is that of E/E (2.74%) which means that Sps of E/E employ this strategy more than other Sps. The lowest percentage is that of L/H (0.43%), e.g.

37. '?a:sif 9ala ?aliz9a:j,bass ma:fi: alyad min hi:la.' (S17/42)

(Sorry to bother you but I cannot help it).

whereas the apologizers of HL are expected to offer less apologies. The percentage of E/E is moderate. The percentages of Res are (7.19%), (5.71%) and (15.86%) for E/E, L/H and H/L respectively. The lowest percentage is that of L/H, which shows that people of LL avoid being responsible for something which may create extra problems for them whereas people of the other two levels are less afraid. As for E, the highest percentage is that of LH (53.93%) which gives the impression that people of L/H give more explanation than those of the other two levels (i.e. E/E 46.64% and H/L 50.70%) because such people want to justify their offence or to restore the harmony with the Hs. For strategy No. 4, OR, the highest percentage is that of E/E (10.71%) whereas the other percentages are 2% for L/H and 3.29% for H/L. It is not easy to give justification because the Ss are different. As for PF, the percentages of E/E, L/H and H/L are (2.43%), (11.71%) and (8.43%) respectively. Again it seems difficult to give logical reasons for the variation since the Ss are not the same. The percentages of B are (2.29%), (10.57%) and (0.57%) for E/E, L/H and H/L respectively. The lowest percentage is that of H/L which means that the people of this level rarely blame others for any inconvenience or offence because they are powerful and influential whereas the highest percentage is that of L/H which indicates that the people of LL mostly blame a third party (somebody or something) for any violation of social acts since they are afraid of being responsible for a damage or offence' e.g.

34. 'ba:ba mu: su:ci:,?al?ustad y iclubni: 9ada: wa.' (S14/54)
 (Father, it is not my fault. The teacher is always picking on me).

35. 'walla mu: ?a:ni, hauwa waga9 min ha:lu .' (S10/32) .
 (I swear it is not me. It dropped by accident) .

As for the last strategy, the highest percentage is that of

The lowest percentage is that of S17 (16%) which means that the police never neglect apologies as a social etiquette in dealing with people in custody' e.g.

339 'gatlak ?azziya:ra hasa9 mamu:9a ya9ni: mamnu:9a'(S19/16)

(I said.vistits are not allowed now).

As for the average percentages of AR' Res, E,OR , PF,B and 'None' they are 43.29%, 5.86%, 50.7%, 3.29 %, 8.43 % 0.57% and 34 % respectively. The highest average is that of B and the lowest average is that of B.

Table No. 3
The Adoption of Apology Strategies By
Higher/Lower Ranks

Strategies	S15	S16	S17	S18	S19	S20	S21	Average
AR	65%	58%	74%	44%	26%	20%	18%	43.29%
Res	0%	3%	33%	3%	2%	0%	0%	5.86%
E	54%	42%	43%	86%	59%	37%	32%	50.7 %
OR	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	8%	13%	3.29%
PF	4%	1%	1%	0%	1%	25%	27%	8.43%
B	0%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0.57%
None	24%	32%	16%	21%	51%	45%	50%	34%

Table No. 4 gives the reader an idea about the average percentages of using main apology strategies at the three different levels, i.e., E/E, L/H, and H/L.

The table indicates that the highest percentage for AR is that of L/H (70.7% followed by that of E/E (64.29%) . The lowest percentage is that of H/L (43.29%). These percentages give the impression that the apologizers of LL give more apologetic expressions of regret if the apoloigee is of H / L

fact that apologizers want to give false or sincere apologies to the beggar or the daughter to satisfy them, e..

28. 'ʔal ʔafu ʔamo:, ma: sa:yla naθir ʔawʔadak ge:r wakat (S20/37)

(Sorry, "uncle", I have no change. I promise you some other time).

29. 'binti:, ʔawʔadac ʔastri:lac ra:s ʔassahar.' (S21/20)

(Darling, I promise I will get you one by the end of the month)..

As for the last strategy, 'None', the highest percentages are those of S19, S20 and S21 (51% 45% and 50% respectively) The reason is that either because father (S19) and mother (S21) see that there is no reason for apologization because of familiarity or because they think that children do not expect apology from Sps as adults do, e.g.

30. 'xali: hasaʔ, le:s ma:tasbar ge:r wakat,' (S19/16)

(Leave that now, why don't you put it off until some other time).

31. 'hasaʔ wakta, xali:ha ʔala ʔassahar ʔajja:y.' (S12/17)

(It is not the right time for it. Leave it to next month).

This point should be studied cross-culturally in order to find out whether this phenomenon is universal or not. With reference to S20, the respondents claim that people belittle the beggars or because people think that begging is socially unacceptable habit of living or they think there is no need for apology since there is no severe infraction on the part of the H, e.g.

32. 'ma: taru:h:tara dawajitna.' (S20-48)

(Get off. Don't bother me).

(Sorry for the inconvenience but these are legal procedures which should be followed).

25. 'mutaʔasfl:n la:yidal xa:tirkum u ha:y ijra:ʔa:t la : zim ʔanafidha. (S17/17).

(Sorry. I hope you are not upset. These are mere formalities which have to be followed).

As for E, the highest percentage is 86% (S18) which is in the form of explanation of the causes of refusal so as to make the apologizee less annoyed and to make him feel psychologically at ease and to lessen the impact of the refusal on the suitor, e.g.

26. ʔa:sfi:n ʔabni: walla ʔantom xo:s na:s, bass ʔalbinit ba9a-dha ʔazgayra u wara:ha dira:sa wazzawa:j qisma u nasi:b (S18/19).

(Sorry. I swear you are nice people but the girl is 'still too young and she has to continue her studies. Marriage is a matter of luck and lot).

The lowest percentage is 32% (S21) since the apologizer is the mother while the apologizee is the daughter, so their intimate relationship and familiarity does not require formal apologization, e.g.

27. binti: sadag:ni:ma: mare:t bis su:g ʔaw9adac ʔal marra ʔaj ja:ya ʔa:xudac ma9a:ya wa ʔastari:lac.' (S21/22)

(Daughter, believe me I did not go shopping. I promise I will take you with me next time).

The other percentages are normal and range from 37% to 59% for S20 and S19 respectively.

The percentages of the seven situations in relation to OR, PF, and B are approximately null except S20 and S21 for PF only (25% and 27% respectively) which may be due to the

The lowest percentages are those of S20 and S21 (20% and 18% respectively). The other percentages are 58%, 44% and 26% for S16, S18 and S19 respectively, e.g.

18. 'ʔabni: sadagni: ʔabra:s ʔassahar ʔastari:lak wa:hid.'
(S19/1).

(Believe me, son, I will get you one by the end of the month).

19. 'mu:wakta hassa9, la:tsi:ri:n mi0il ʔuxtac ʔantadiri: yiji:
ʔarra:tab u ʔastari:lac ʔas ma:tari:di:n. '(S21/18)

(It is not the right time for it. Don't be like your sister. Wait for the pay day and I will buy whatever you like).

20. 'ru:h ʔalla yinti:k ma:taru:h tastugul ʔa:ni:ga: 9ad 9ala
ʔarringa: t.' (S20/22)

(Go away. God may give you money. Find a job just like other people. I am hard up for money).

21. 'ʔa: ni: ʔari: d wa: hid yinti: ni:, tara dawajatna.' (S20/44)
(I myself need money! I am fed up).

22. 'ʔasso: n mo: da jadi: da, ʔa: ni: tahl 9alaya ʔassadaqa.'
(S 20/52)

(What a craze! I am in need of charity).

23. 'ʔal9afu 9amo: sadiqni: ma: sa: yla xurda.' (S20/17) (Sorry)
"uncle". Believe me I have no change).

It has been noticed from the last four examples that women are less harsh than me towards beggars.

Regarding Res, the percentages were nearly null except S17 (33%) which indicates that police frankly admit being responsible for some acts which are indispensable, e.g.

24. 'ʔa:sif 9ala ʔaliz9a:j wa la:kin ha:dihi ijra:ʔa:t qa:nu:niya
u la:zim nasawi:ha.' (S17/7)

strategies are most frequently used in IA. The lowest average is that of OR which gives an indication that the situations do not require any offer of repair.

Table No. 2
The Adoption of the Main Apology Strategies
by Lower / Higher Ranks

Strategies	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	Average
AR	97%	83%	41%	79%	80%	73%	44%	70.79%
Res	0%	4%	16%	6%	12%	12%	7%	7.71%
E	65%	63%	20%	46%	41%	68%	74%	53.93%
OR	0%	3%	0%	0%	1%	1%	9%	2%
PF	6%	4%	18%	7%	22%	8%	17%	11.71%
B	4%	4%	32%	6%	6%	6%	18%	46.57%
None	0%	9%	28%	8%	4%	9%	17%	10.43%

Table No. 3 shows that AR and E are not commonly used as in Table 1 and Table 2 since Sps are HL who apologize less and give less explanation. So, apology is less expected if the Sp is of HL (The reader is referred to the discussion of Table 4. As for AR, the highest percentage is 74% for S17 which is unexpected since the apologizer is of HL, e.g.

16 'ʔahna ʔa:sfi:n 9ala ʔaliz9a:j liʔanna wa:jibna yittlab hassi (S16/4).

(Sorry, we have to do this. It is our duty).

This is applicable to S15 (65%) where the interactants are professor and student, e.g.

17. 'ʔa:sif ma:ku taʔji:l lilʔamtha:n illaʔabra:po:t tubi:.' (S10/3)

(Sorry. The examination won't be put off without a medical report)

None are insignificant except S12 (22%) for PF, S10 for PF, B and None (18%, 32% and 28% respectively) and S14 for PF, B and None (17%, 18% and 17% respectively). This can be explained as follows: a child may either blame somebody else as the cause of a wrong act or may not apologize, e.g:

9. 'ʔas ʔalaya mu ʔa:ni: kasarta, ʔuxti: kasrata.' (probably coupled with weeping) (S10/6).
(I have got nothing to do with it. It is not I, who broke it. It is my sister).
10. 'ma:ma mu ʔa:ni: kasarta, huwa maksu:r.' (S10/10)
(Mother: I did not break it. My sister did.)
11. 'ʔalʔafu ma:ma ma: kasarta ʔalqasad.' (S10/11)
(Sorry, Mum, I did not mean to do it).
12. 'huwa waga9, ʔas ʔalaya., (S10/48)
(It dropped. It is not my fault).
13. 'ma:ma ʔalla yixali:c mu bi:di, falat min i:di: u inkasar.' (S10/4)
(Mother, please, it was not my mistake. It dropped by accident).
14. 'ʔas madri:ni: le:s rasabat ge:r had ma:ku.' (S14/20)
(I don't know why. It failed. Ittyisajust hardtlucker) is
15. 'ba:ba ʔa:ni: kulis ʔa:sif, bass mu: su:ci: ʔakl:d ʔal ʔusta: d yitlubni: yitlubni: ʔada:wa. ʔatto: ba ʔa:xar marra. (S14/7)
(I am so sorry Pa. It is not my fault. The teacher is always picking on me. I promise not to do it again).

Concerning the average percentages of AR, Res, E, OR, PF, B and None, they are: 70.79%, 7.71%, 53.93%, 2%, 11.71%, 46.57%, 10.43% respectively. The highest averages are these of AR and E. This again gives the impression that these two

Table (2) shows that the highest percentages are 97%, 83% and 80% for S8, S9 and S12 respectively as far as AR is concerned. The percentages reflect that Sps went to restore harmony with Hs of HL. So, blaming one's self for the occurrence of the offence may make the H feel indebted to the Sp who over-apologized (Volmer & Olshtain To appear:16). Therefore, in S9, the customer is not expected to be less hungry but somewhat less annoyed at the lack of service, e.g.

8. '?a:sif jidan wa ?a9tadir 9an ?atta?xi: r bisabab ?al-izdiha:m' (S9/8).

(I am terribly sorry for being late. It was the traffic).

The lowest percentage is 36% for S10 either because a child can apologize by using linguistic and non-linguistic tools or because a child usually denies being responsible for violating a social offence committed by him or because a child does not acquire the strategy of apology as a speech act too early. This is also applicable to S14 (44%). To explore this area we need children of different ages in order to investigate the approximate time of acquiring apology strategy in IA. But, age is not the only factor because different children acquire it at different times according to the education, socioeconomic background of the parents, etc .

As for E, the highest percentage is 74% for S14 because a child usually gives explanation, false excuses, details and intends to elaborate his response in order to satisfy his father and to make him less angry. The lowest percentage is 20% for S10 which can be explained as follows: many respondents claimed that a child would escape in such cases. The percentages of S8, S9, S11, S12 and S13 are 65%, 63%, 46%, 41% and 69% respectively . The percentages of S8-S14 for OR, PF, B and

tama⁹ on tama⁹ yimna⁹u:n qabu:l ?alhadiya bidu:n muna:saba
(S1/13)

(Sorry. Gifts are socially unacceptable without occasions)

As for OR, the highest percentage is 29% for S2 since the situation requires that, e.g., the loss of a book demands apologies on the part of the apologizers. The other percentages are insignificant and this is applicable to the percentages of PF and B.

The last strategy is 'None' where many informants did not give any explicit apology either because the situation is not that significant or the offence is not serious and severe; therefore, the Sps are indifferent about the infraction caused by the offenders. The highest percentage is 28% for S3 which come as a result of being relatives and their familiarity necessitates no formalities and artificiality, e.g.

7. 'yalla ma:nru:h tara ?ita?axarna:.' (S3/49)

(Let's go. We are late).

The table below shows the percentages scored at the seven situations for the major strategies. The highest percentage is that of S1 and the lowest percentage is that of S6.

Table NO. 1
The Use of Apology Strategies at Equal Level

Strategies	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	Average
AR	85%	69%	43%	67%	68%	77%	61%	64.29%
Res	1%	27%	1%	3%	35%	28%	51%	20.79%
E	38%	45%	92%	84%	26%	24%	17%	46.64%
OR	13%	29%	20%	0%	12%	19%	0%	10.71%
PF	2%	20%	0.50%	0%	4%	2%	4%	2.43%
B	4%	6%	1%	0%	1%	4%	2%	2.29%
None	13%	14%	27%	17%	7%	7%	13%	13.71%

2. 'ʔ9duru:na, tara taʔaxarna kaθi:r, 9adna dawa:m min 'as subuh.' (S3/6).

(Sorry. We are too late. Tomorrow is a work day for me).

The percentages of S2, S4, S5 and S6 are normal since the speaker and the hearer (henceforth Sp and H) are approximately equal in the prescribed status given to the subjects beforehand. As for Res, the percentage of S1, S3, and S4 are approximately null whereas the percentages for S2, S6 and S7 are 35%, 23% and 51% respectively. It seems that the type of offence in the last three Ss is deemed necessary by the relevant situation, e.g.

3. 'ʔad danb danbi, law ʔadri: hi:ci tasi:r ma:can hace:t'. (S7/20)

(It is my own fault. If I had known that the conditions would turn like that I would not have said it).

The highest percentages for E are 92% and 84% for S3, and S4 respectively which maybe the result of the fact that apology is not enough to satisfy the H; therefore, the Sps tend to explain and comment, e.g.

4. 'ya:ba nirfa9 ʔaz zahma walaw ʔalga9da hulwa bass ʔaxa:f ba9da:nma: nahassil saya:ra.' (S3/48)

(I am off. It is nice to be with you but I am afraid I will not be able to get a taxi).

5. 'ʔalla: yisturki, la:du:ji:n min ka0rat talaba:ti:, liʔanna ha:lti: ta9ba:na u ma:ku: ʔahad ma9a:ya.' (S5/45)
(Sorry for bothering you. I am tired and there is no one with me).

The percentages of S1, S2, S5, S6 and S7 are relatively low. They are 38%, 45%, 26%, 24% and 17% respectively, e.g.

6. 'ʔa9tadir 9an qabu:l ʔalhadiya liʔanna ʔalʔahal walmuju-

one of the disadvantages of it is that it needs a long period of time. However, The situations of this study were designed in such a manner that the 'role-play' looked like real situations.

2. Analysis and Discussion:

The results presented in the first (3) tables refer to the (7) apology situations for each level and indicate the percentages of usage of each strategy. The percentage in each case represents the number of choices made out of the total number which was potentially possible. Thus, if all 100 respondents would have chosen a certain strategy in all seven situations, there could have been (700) realizations of that strategy, the actual number of realizations is represented as a percentage of this potential total. To make it clear, the following formula is given:

The actual number of choices for each strategy \times 100

700

From examining the data presented in Table (1) we find that the highest percentage for AR appears in situation (henceforth S) 1 (85%), either because the apologizer is female or because the rejection of the gift demands a lot of apologies on the part of the speaker, e.g.

1. 'ʔa:sfa ma:ʔagdar ʔa:xud hadiya bidu:n muna:saba, ʔu9-tabarha wa:sla. (S1/5) (*)

(Sorry there is no occasion for accepting the gift).

The lowest percentage is that of S3 (43%) which may be because the intractants are relatives. So, their familiarity does not require extreme apologization on the part of the apologizer, e.g.

(*) The number on left stands for situation number and the number on right stands for informant number. This applies to all the examples given in the study.

5. A promise of forbearance (PF), e.g., '?aw9adak ba9ad ma: tatkarar(I promise you that this will never happen.again)

6. Blaming a third party (somebody or something) (B) e.g., '?asu:c mu: su:ci: bass.... (It wasn't my fault but it was...)

In most cases, one of the above formulas is sufficient to perform an act of apology, but often two or three of them are used simultaneously and thus express a higher or intensified degree of apology (see below for details).

The five subformulas involve:

1. A request for forgiveness (RF), e.g., '?agfir li:'. (Excuse me), (please forgive me).

2. A request for acceptance (RA), e.g., 'rija;?an ?aqbil ?i9tida:ri:', (Please accept my apology for....)

3. An obligation to apologize (ob). e.g., 'la : zim ?a9tadir lak'. (I must apologize for.....)

4. A concern for the hearer (CH), e.g., ?a:sif liliz9a:j bas ma:fi: ?al yad min hi:la'. (Sorry for the inconvenience, but I can't help it).

5. A minimization of the offence (Mi), e.g., '?axa:f ?ade:-tak.' (Sorry, if I hurt you).

The interactants were asked: How do you apologize in the following situations? This allowed for a free apology response. As for instructions and descriptions of the relevant situations they were given in the native language of the respondents. Olshtain and Cohen (1983:24,32) stressed the idea of giving the questionnaire in the mother tongue of the informants. One of the advantages of carrying out data collection in this way is that apologies occur less frequently and are more situation-dependent than other speech acts although the best approach in collecting data is the ethnographic approach i.e., the collection of spontaneous speech in natural settings but

as a constant element in the study. All the respondents who acted the «role play» technique are native speakers of Arabic. They are 25 male versus 25 female for each university. Their ages range from 20 to 24. The situations are especially meant to assess the effect of social status of the informants on the choice of apology strategies. The three kinds of relationship used are:

Equal/ Equal (E# E)(The first 7 situations of the Appendix)

Lower / Higher (L# H) (The second 7 situations of the Appendix)

Higher / Lower (H# L) (The third 7 situations of the Appendix)

Following Olshtain's framework (1983) there will be six main strategies and five subcategories comprising the apology speech act set which will serve as a framework for analysing and discussing the data of this study. The main strategies can be represented as follows:

1. Expression of an apology (A) or expressing regret (R) by using one of the apology expressions such as 'ʔa9tidir', 'ʔa:sif', 'ʔal-9afu', 'ʔagfir li:'. Their English counterparts are 'apologize', 'be sorry', 'excuse me', 'forgive me' and 'pardon'.

2. An acknowledgement of responsibility (Res), e.g., 'ʔad danbi danibi:', '...ma:ka:nat maqsu:da'. These are similar to English expressions such as: 'It is my fault', 'I did not see you', 'I did not mean to make that mistake'.

3. An explanation (E) of the situations, e.g., 'ʔal pa: s' 9atal wata?xarna:.' (...the bus was delayed).

4. An offer of repair (OR), e.g., 'rija :ʔan xali:ni ?adfa9lak 9anʔad darar.' (Please let me pay for the damage I have done).

“Speech acts are in essence acts, not sentences, speech acts cannot be equated with utterances, either, for we often perform more than one act (e.g., inform and request within a single utterance) ‘I’m hungry’. Finally, speech acts cannot be equated with the notion of turn as an interactional unit, as it may take several speaker turns to accomplish a single act, or, conversely, several acts maybe performed within a single speaker turn.

Apologies in IA are seen as a kind of remedial work (after Goffman 1971) which aims at recreating a balance between a speaker (apologizer) and a hearer (apologizee) after an offence has been done by the former against the latter in order to make the offensive act an acceptable one and to put things right and to relieve the offender of the moral responsibility. (Schmidt and Richards 1980:129).

The objective of the study is to relate the theoretical description of apology to empirical study involving responses elicited from native speakers of Arabic. The following questions are going to be answered: what is apology? How to apologize? What are the main factors influencing apology strategies? What are the main strategies of expressing apology? What are the apology intensifiers in IA? What is the correlation between severity of the offence and the degree of apology? What are the most common apology expressions in IA?

The data of this study were collected via a sociolinguistic sample of 100 college students from Baghdad and Mosul universities to find out the ways in which apologies are performed in IA, by setting up (21) discourse situations to be used

A Sociolinguistic Study of Apology in Iraqi Arabic

Abstract: This study deals with apology in Iraqi Arabic (henceforth IA) with reference to its definition, how to apologize, the purpose of apologization, the main apology strategies and subcategories used by the respondents, the influence of status relationship between the apologizer and the apologizee on the choice of apology expressions and strategies whether the relation is that of equal/equal or lower/ higher or higher/lower; the use of intensifiers, courtesy and oath expressions ; the impact of some sociolinguistic variables , e.g.,sex, age,status, education,and situation on apology choice ; and the most common semantic formulas and expressions of apology frequently used in IA. The study covers all the pre-mentioned aspects of apology through an analysis and discussion of the data collected from 100 informants.

I. Introduction:

The shift from grammatical competence to communicative competence has reinforced the need for carrying out many sociolinguistic studies which stress on or highlight the shortcomings of the Chomskyan ideal speaker-hearer competence. This paper will focus on one aspect of communicative competence, namely , the apology speech act and consider the extent of speech act theory contribution to our understanding of learning. Speech acts refer to "the acts we perform through speaking, all the things we do when we speak". (Schmidt and Richards 1980:129) . According to Searle (1976), speech acts can be categorized into specific groups based on " illocutionary force" or purpose of the act, e.g., representatives , directives, expressives, declarations, etc. Schmidt and Richards (1980:132) quote Searle (1969) as saying that :



مرکز تحقیقات کامپیوتر علوم اسلامی