

**The Role of Pragmatic Transfer on L2 Speech Acts  
Production:  
A Comparative Study of Iraqi FL Learners'  
Performance in both Iraqi and American Apologies**

**Ban Ahmed Hamoodi  
Teaching Assistant  
Mosul Technical Institute**

**ABSTRACT**

Contrastive studies in interlanguage pragmatics investigating cross-cultural differences of many speech act realizations have highlighted the existence of pragmatic transfer (PT) during second language (L2) learners' process of acquiring these speech acts. The speech act of apology, in particular, has much been researched since L2 learners face greater difficulties and risk of miscommunication in apologizing. Hence, to empirically examine and prove the role of PT in L2 apology performance, a qualitative and quantitative study have been conducted on 24 Iraqi foreign language (FL) learners of English. Two Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs), viz. one in Arabic and another in English containing 11 identical situations respectively, have been manifested. The data collected were coded and then analyzed on Excel 0.7 program to find answers to the four questions being raised by the present study. The results elicited revealed that PT, in both its instances, really exists due to both speech act universality and metapragmatic cultural-specific. Besides, most of the participants' apologies in English were a mere literal translation of their corresponding Arabic apologies. This, in

---

---

turn, denoted the role of negative PT on one hand, and the lack of the L2 metapragmatic knowledge especially the case with the low proficiency group, on the other. Nevertheless, high proficiency participants outperformed in their L2 apology performance their corresponding low proficiency group because of their L2 linguistic repertoire.

---

**Keyword:** Indirect speech acts, pragmatic transfer, pragmatic failure, speech act of apology, metapragmatic competence.

---

**Introduction:**

It is only recently that communicative competence has become the focus of L2<sup>1</sup> teaching and has gained a great attention of L2 research. As it is suggested by Hymes (1972), and as it is proved empirically, a native speaker (NS) of any language needs not only the knowledge of linguistic rules but also the functional and social rules of language use to be communicatively and appropriately competent. Thus, in the process of acquiring his first language (L1), a NS also acquires the rules of use and how to select the appropriate speech act linguistically and sociolinguistically when getting involved in any interaction. However, the case is different and more complicated when he learns his L2. Therefore, speech acts have empirically been regarded by many scholars (Wolfson, 1989; Harlow, 1990; Schmidt & Richard, 1980) as a stumbling block in the process L2 acquisition.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the present study, the abbreviation L2 refers to both L2 and FL.

As it is suggested in many recent literature; viz. (Blumkulka & Olshtain, 1984; Kasper, 1990; Beebe et al., 1990; Koike, 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993), L2 learners face difficulties both in the perception and production of L2 speech acts. Therefore, they frequently break the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic norms and consequently face embarrassment of miscommunication. Anecdotal evidence has shown that many L2 learners came away from interactions with NSs quite certain that they (i.e. L2 learners) have used the "right words" but their intentions and motives have been misjudged. Thus, in order to fill the gap of their failure to use the right structure and the social rules governing the speech acts in use, NNSs refer back to their L1 norms and as a result produce a rude and brusque production. This miscommunication is due to a phenomenon known as PT.

#### **Pragmatic Transfer :**

As Gass & Selinker (1999 cited in Ghawi, 1993: 39) claim, language transfer is a real and central phenomenon that must be taken into account in the L2 acquisition process . Besides, contrastive analysis have believed that L1 interferes with L2 learning. However, transfer studies have not addressed pragmatic issues but only recently; consequently, a basic research question in the past three decades has concentrated on how L1 sociopragmatic competence affects the process of L2 learning. Kasper (1992; 207) consider PT to refer to “the influence exerted by learners’ pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 in their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information”. She subsumes research in this field under a sub-

---

---

discipline called “interlanguage pragmatics” which she & Dahl (1991: 216) define as “the NNSs’ comprehension and production of speech acts, and how their L2 related speech act knowledge is acquired”.

Many Research has shown that in their process of L2 acquisition, L2 learners regularly perform speech acts, such as request, apologies, refusals, etc., in accordance with the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic norms of their native language. In addition, they claim that where the L1 and the L2 are different, there would be interference and “**negative transfer**”, since L2 learners would face difficulties in their acquisition; whereas, where these languages are similar, there would be “**positive transfer**”, since there are no errors committed, and this, in turn, would definitely accelerate L2 learning (Franch, 1998: 6). However, PT could be consciously or unconsciously committed. Consciously, L2 learners may sometimes guess when producing a speech act because they haven’t learnt or have forgotten its proper usage. Unconsciously, they may fail to realize that the structure and rules of the two languages in question are different. Numerous interlanguage pragmatic studies have thus been cross-culturally conducted on various speech acts especially on apology, the speech act in question in the present study.

### **The Speech Act of Apology :**

Apology is one of the most commonly used speech acts in daily interactions. It has an element of indebtedness as its common feature; therefore, it is considered an expressive speech act associated with social goals to maintain harmony between the

speaker and the hearer. It normally happens when social norms have been violated regardless whether or not the offence is real or potential (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; 20). Accordingly, this offence, Trosborg (1994 cited in Maros, 2006 :3) says, requires an utterance so as to set things right. As other kinds of speech acts, apology is actually manifested through a set of routinized patterns or strategies typically used by any NS of a certain language. Cohen & Olshtain (1981: 119-125) and Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein (1989) identify five possible strategies for making this speech act in interactions as follows :

**1) An Expression of apology [regret] with or without an intensifier (very, really, terribly, etc.):** the S (i.e. apologizer) uses an expression containing a verb, such as ‘excuse me’, ‘I’m sorry’ expressing his regret; ‘forgive me’ requesting forgiveness or ‘I apologize’ offering his apology in utterances as follows:

**“Please, forgive me/ I’m sorry/ excuse me/ I apologize for my mistake”**

It is worth noting that in American English, ‘I apologize’ is found more in writing than in oral languages. Besides, the expression of apology can be intensified by adding ‘intensifiers’, such as "really" or "very": e.g. "I'm very/really sorry" whenever the speaker feels the injury of the offence committed (Carla, N.D: 1). However, in American English, the term "really" implies more regret, while "very" implies more etiquette (Cohen et. al., 1986: 66-67).

**2) An explanation/excuse for the offence [excuse]:** the apologizer here tries, through this strategy, to describe the reason that forced him to commit the offence. This kind of strategy is usually used, as

an indirect way of apologizing, so as to set things right, for example:

**"I'm sorry. I got late because my cycle got punctured", "I'm sorry. The bus was late.", "Sorry. I didn't mean to hurt. I didn't know just how it happened".**

3) **An offer of repair [repair]** : the apologizer may provide some bits of amendment or payment for the damage or offence resulting from his mistake or wrong doing; for example, if someone is late for an appointment with a friend or a boss, he would apologize saying::

**"How can I make it up to you, Why don't I buy you lunch on Friday?", "Would you be willing to reschedule the meeting?", "Oh, I forgot today is your birthday! Don't be angry, I'll take you out for a grand dinner tomorrow."**

4) **A promise of non-recurrence [promise]**: here, the apologizer commits himself to not having the mistake happen again. However, this strategy is situation-specific and less frequent than other strategies, such as:

**"It won't be repeated again".**

5) **Acknowledgement/Acceptance of Responsibility** : the apologizer here recognizes and admits his fault in causing the offence or infraction. However, such recognition or acknowledgement of fault depends on the degree or the intensity of the offence. The highest level of intensity is an acceptance of the blame [**blame oneself**], such as **"I'm really sorry. Sure, it was my fault"** or **"Please, forgive me for having hurt you"**. At some lower level, the apologizer would give a sort of [**self- deficiency**] expression, such as **"I was a bit confused"; "I didn't see you"** or **"You are alright?"**. At a still lower level, the apologizer might

---

---

give an expression of [**lack of intention**], such as "**I didn't mean to**" or "**You shouldn't**". Still lower would be an implicit expression of responsibility, such as "**I was sure I had given you the right direction**". Finally, the apologizer might deny the responsibility of the offence [**deny**], such as "**It wasn't my fault**", or even might blame the hearer [**blame hearer**] for the offence committed, such as "**It's your own fault**" (Carla, N.D: 2).

It is important to add here that in their study, Cohen et al (1986) find out that the expression of apology with or without intensifiers is considered the '**apology proper**'; i.e. the plain strategy without any additional strategies. The other four strategies, they state, can come before or after this '**apology proper**' as additional strategies to constitute an apology semantic formula. Additionally, they argue that an '**interjective**', such as "Oh", "Ah" can also be figured out as a new apology strategy since "Oh" can be used by itself to express an apology statement.

Something noteworthy here is that though the five major semantic strategies of apology are shared by all NSs across cultures; the preference of one or a combination of some is situationally- or even culturally-specific (Isitfçi, 2009: 18). Besides, there are certain factors that affect the way of making up apology expression in any language. These factors includes 1)the intensity of the act (offence), 2)the familiarity with the person being apologized to, 3)the place where the action happens, 4)the authority each interlocutor has upon another and 5)the relative sex and age factors (ibid).

Finally, as for the type of the semantic formulas used, Frescura (1993 cited in Maros, 2006: 3) distinguishes between two categories of apology semantic formulas, namely 1)a "**hearer-supportive**

**formula”** and 2)a **“self-supportive formula”**. As for the former, it is used when the apologizer chooses to save the face of the hearer by admitting his own guilt, recognizing the hearer's right or offering some compensations. The latter occurs when the speaker chooses to support his own face by providing an excuse for the offence, denying the guilt, or even appealing to the hearer's leniency.

### **Related Studies on Apologies :**

A large number of contrastive studies focusing on the forms and discourse between American NSs and non-NSs (NNS) have been conducted on apologies. Most of the studies have indicated the existence of PT from the L1 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic background to both the L2 perception and production. Being the case, they have highlighted the need for specific focus on the teaching of such speech act.

In comparing the use of apologies in Hebrew and English, Olshtain & Cohen (1983) carried out a study with 44 college subjects. They found that NNSs deviated from the NS's patterned norms because of transfer, on one hand, and of the lack of L2 proficiency, on another.

Linnell et al. (N.D) examined apologies of 20 NNSs of English against 20 NSs of English through eight verbal DCT designed by Olshtain & Cohen (1983). They detected no significant differences between the two groups of participants in six situations. However, their study found out that the NSs' norms of explicit apologies, as well as acknowledgement intensifiers were found undersupplied by the NNSs in two other situations. They thus stressed the existence of PT.

Erçetin (1995 cited in Tunçel, 1999: 49) carried out a study on apology used by Turkish English FL learners. She found out that her participants exhibited transfer in their L2 responses influenced by their native language.

Maros (2006) studied the production of apology in English by adult Malay speakers in Malaysia. She found out that despite years of exposure to English language, the participants' production revealed influences of the Malay socio-cultural rules. This finding, she concluded, revealed the evidence of transfer.

Concentrating on thanking and apology L2 performance, Husain & Wahid (2008) studies 30 English L2 undergraduate students of Hindustani to examine the role of transfer on making these two speech acts. The results revealed that English L2 students speaking Hindi/Urdu did not face any serious problem in expressing both their thanks and apologies in English; however, whatever problems they faced relied mostly on the lack of adequate command on the L2 vocabularies and structures.

Istifçi (2009) also investigated the act of apology made by Turkish English FL learners from two different levels of English proficiency. The results of her study revealed that the L1 influenced their L2 use of apology especially the intermediate level subjects. This, Istifçi concluded, was due to PT from their native Turkish norms on their English production.

It is worth noting finally that investigating the PT made by the Arab FL learners of English was done by Ghawi (1993) through employing a closed role-play instrument. The findings of this study suggested that the L1 sociopragmatic norms were sometimes transferred to the L2 norms. Ghawi attributed the extent of PT of

certain apology sets to the learners' perception of the universality or the language-specificity of the speech act of apology.

With all of these above mentioned related literature findings on apology, one would wonder how this type of speech act is manifested by NSs of other unstudied Arabic speech communities, such as Iraq, and to what extent do the L1 apology statements resemble or differ from the L2 apology statements. Therefore, the present study has decided to tackle this effort.

**Aims of the Study :**

Relying on Cohen & Olshtain's (1981) model of apology strategies and other related abovementioned literature, the present study aims to investigate the role of PT on the Iraqis' American apology performance. The study, therefore, attempts to find answers to the following questions :

- 1:** To what extent do speech acts and social estimations universality, on the one hand, and culture-specific, on another, play a role in the similarities and differences between Iraqi and American apologies ?
- 2:** Do Iraqi L2 selection of apology strategies and semantic formulas resemble or differ from their corresponding L1 apologies used in typical situations?
- 3:** To what extent does PT play a role in constructing Iraqis' L2 apology production ?
- 4:** Do high proficiency Iraqi FL learners of English outperform low proficiency Iraqi FL learners in their L2 apologies, and thus approximating the American native-like production ?

In an attempt to answer these previous questions, the present study assumes the following hypotheses :

**1:** There are similarities and differences between Iraqi and American apologies done in typical situations due to both speech acts and social norms universality for the formers, and to language and cultural-specificities for the latters.

**2:** Iraqi FL learners' American apologies are certainly influenced by their Iraqi metapragmatic norms both in perception and production being unaware of the L2 pragmatic aspects.

**3:** PT does exist in both of its instances, viz positive and negative transfers when Iraqi FL learners of English manifest their American apologies.

**4:** High proficiency Iraqi FL learners outperform in their American apologies their corresponding low proficiency Iraqi FL learners due only to their L2 linguistic repertoire.

**Methodology :**

**Participants :**

The participants for the present study were 24 Iraqi FL learners of English. They were 1<sup>st</sup> year college students studying in the Department of English Language at the college of Arts in the University of Mosul. They were 17 males and 7 females. Their ages ranged between 19-24 years old. Thus, the mean age was 21.5. Their L2 is English and they were all intermediate level FL learners. They had studied English for about 8-10 years on the regular education-system at primary and secondary schools. Most of the participants' mother tongue was Arabic, while few of them was Kurdish and Turkish. The participants were intentionally selected from intermediate levels of L2 instruction. This is because intermediate-level seems to be the most likely level of proficiency

where one can expect both transfer of the L1 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic rules and accommodation to L2 rules.

It is worth noting that no NSs have been found for the present study; therefore, to have authentic baseline responses to rely on in the comparison between Iraqi and American apologies, the researcher has made use of prior studies NSs' responses, such as Isitfçi's (2009); Ghawi's (1993) and Linnell et al.'s (N.D), to cut the way short in eliciting the American apology semantic formulas.

**Instrument:**

In order to collect the data for the present study, two DCTs, viz. one in English and the other contains the same situations translated into Arabic, have been implemented (see Appendix A for both DCTs). Both of the two DCTs consist of the same situations designed to be categorized by the status of the interlocutors and the severity of the offence committed to elicit the apology responses. The framework of the two tests have been adapted from DCTs used in prior literature, such as Cohen & Olshtain's (1981); Ghawi's (1993); Maros' (2006); Isitfçi's (2005); Linnell et al.'s (N.D), all of which have made use of the same 11 situations for collecting apology responses. For more clarification of the DCTs' situations, see Table (1) below:

**Table (1): Explanations of the Present Study DCTs' Apology Situations.**

<b>DCT Sits.</b>	<b>Apologizee's status relative to apologizer's</b>	<b>Interlocutors involved</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
#1	equal-status	an employee vs. an employee	insulting someone at a meeting
#2	higher-status	an employee vs. a boss	forgetting a meeting with a boss
#3	equal-distance	a friend vs. a friend	forgetting a get-together with a friend
#4	lower-distance	a father vs. a son	forgetting a date with a son
#5	equal-distance	a young man vs. a young man	denting a someone's car
#6	higher-distance	a young man vs. an elder woman	pumping into a lady hurting her
#7	higher-distance	a young man vs. an elder woman	pumping into a lady shaking her a bit
#8	higher-distance	a young man vs. an elder woman	pumping into a lady her fault
#9	equal-distance	a friend vs. a friend	pumping into a friend scalding his arm
#10	higher-distance	a son vs. a mother	forgetting a mother's order
#11	higher-distance	a servant vs. a house-lady	breaking a vase while cleaning

It is worth mentioning that at the top of the two DCTs there was a short personal background questionnaire. This questionnaire was set in order to collect information about the name, gender, age, nationality of the participants and their average English scores at the final year in secondary schools. The last information was intentionally done so as to decide the proficiency level of the participants. Accordingly, they were divided into two proficiency level groups: high proficiency group (i.e. 7 participants), and low proficiency group (i.e.17 participants) .

**Procedures :**

The participants were given the two DCTs in Arabic and in English at the same time during their usual class hours by their regular core course teacher who gave them some introductory remarks about the nature of the tests at hand. They were first asked to fill in the DCT in Arabic and then the DCT in English. Something noteworthy here is that the participants were directed to behave the way they used to in their daily interactions, and thus to write down the first thing that came into their minds regarding both the situation and the apologize involved. Besides, they were also asked to write down all of their personal information needed that were mentioned previously.

**Data Analysis :**

All of the 24 participants' responses in the two DCTs had separately been analyzed and codified by the researcher herself according to the five apology semantic sets discussed before. Since these sets are the most widely comprehensive apology taxonomies used upto date, caution was carefully taken lest there would be any

case of overlapping or deviation in the codifying scheme among the responses' sets analyzed. Then, these analyzed sets for each participant's response in the two DCTs were arranged into regular semantic formulas respectively. It is worth noting that since the researcher could not gain authentic American NSs' responses for the English DCT proposed, she found out that replicating relatively prior studies DCTs' situations and consequently their semantic formulas deduced would definitely give a shortcut for the present study to rely on in the comparison. Having finished the codifying procedures, the codified data were entered into a database file designed on Excel 0.7 program to be analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. As for the former analysis, it involved examining the order of the semantic formulas manipulated especially in the English responses. The latter analysis, in turn, investigated the frequency count percentage of each strategy and the overall occurrence percentages of the strategies used in the semantic formulas manipulated by all the participants.

### **Results and Discussion :**

In order to find answers to the present study's questions, the study finds it important to handle each situations alone and discuss it as follows:

#### **❖ Sit.<sup>1</sup> # 1: "Insulting someone at a meeting " :**

American NSs, according to Ghawi (1993: 43), demonstrate a higher rate of apology and responsibilities for insulting offence. However, apology strategies, such as "repair" and "promise" seem

---

<sup>1</sup> Sit. is an abbreviation of the word "situation".

---

---

inappropriate for apologizing to a person who misunderstandingly feels insulted at a meeting; nor, furthermore, do business colleagues in American culture, Linnell et al. (N.D: 40) argue, redress such insult by offering to have dinner. Accordingly, American NSs thus tend, Ghawi (1993) and Linnell et al (ibid) conclude, to use the following apology semantic formula: **[(interjective) + regret + lack of intention + regret]**, such as follows :

**"Oh, I'm sorry if you took offence. I meant nothing personal by it. I was just referring in general, it wasn't referred to you or anyone else here. It's just a general remark. I'm sorry if you took offence".**

When analyzing the 24 participant's responses in both Arabic and English DCTs, they similarly revealed higher percentages in the use of both "regret" and "lack of intention" strategies; viz. 96% vs. 92% for "regret", and 113%<sup>1</sup> vs. 100% for "lack of intention" respectively as Table (2) in Appendix B illustrates. It is worth noting that the similarities in the use of these two strategies between the two cultures indicate that both Iraqi and American cultures seem to share some similar metapragmatic apology estimations in regards to such situation. Thus, the similarity in the percentages calculated for both strategies respectively in the two DCTs was an outcome of PT, and more particularly of 'positive transfer' since the L2 response simulated American responses. In other words the semantic formulas deduced from both DCTs tended to be identical,

---

<sup>1</sup> A percentage exceeding 100% means that all the participants made use of such strategy. Besides, there were participants who made twice or even three times a use of such strategy in a given response.

viz. [interjective+ regret+ lack of intention]. The following excerpts taken from the L1 and the L2 participants' responses illustrate these findings:

**“I am sorry, I didn't mean that”, “Sorry, I didn't mean to offend / insult you”, “Sorry, I didn't mean you by my speak<sup>1</sup> at all.”**

“انا اعتذر لكني لم اقصد اهانتك ” ، “انا اسف لم اكن اقصد ذلك ” ، “اسف لم اقصدك في كلامي ابداً”

**❖ Sit. # 2, # 3 and # 4: “forgetting a meeting with a boss; forgetting a get-together meeting with a friend; and forgetting to take a son shopping”:**

On apologizing to such situations, American NSs utilize, according to Ghawi (1993: 44), Linnell et al (N.D : 40) and Istifiçi (2009: 19), a high percentage of apology through the use of “regret”, “acknowledgment of responsibility” represented by “self-deficiency”, and “excuse” strategies. These three strategies, according to Ghawi (ibid), get increased with the increase of the formality of the situation or between the interlocutors involved. In turn, the use of “promise” and “repair” only get increased when apologizing to a son.

When analyzing the data collected and encoded for these situations, the responses in both Arabic and English DCTs revealed an eminent focus on the same previously mentioned four strategies. In other words, an amazing finding obtained when examining Table (3) in Appendix B was that there was either an absolute or an

<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy that the participants' grammatical errors have been retained.

---

---

approximate similarity in the frequency count percentages scored in both DCTs for the four aforementioned strategies relevant to these situations. In other words, “regret” strategy, for instance, accounted 108% and 104% in both Sits.#2 and #3, and scored 92% vs. 88% in Sit.#4 in both DCTs respectively. As for “self deficiency” strategy, its percentages obtained showed an absolute similarity of 54% in Sit.#3, and 54% vs. 67% in Sit.#2 as well as 33% vs. 29% in Sit.#4 respectively in both DCTs. Focusing on “excuse” strategy, furthermore, Table (3) also reveals approximate identical percentages scored; viz. 79% vs.75% for Sit.#2; 79% vs. 83% for Sit.#3 and 58% vs. 63% for Sit.#4 in both DCTs respectively. The same can also be said when regarding the “promise” strategy in both Sits.#3 and #4 which scored 8% and 58% respectively in the two DCTs and 13% vs. 4% in Sit.#5. This similarity in the concentration on those four previously mentioned strategies; viz. ‘regret’, ‘self deficiency’, ‘excuse’ and ‘promise’, in the two DCTs’ responses definitely suggested the universality of both speech acts and social estimation concepts that could accelerates L2 metapragmatic acquisition. However, the absolute and approximate similarity between these strategies percentages scored in each situation was actually attributed to PT especially with the lack of L2 pragmatic mastery. The second finding deduced can also be confirmed when beholding other strategies that seemingly would be inappropriate in such American situation context, namely “promise” in Sit.#3 (8%) and “honorifics” in Sits.#2 (17%), #3 (3%) and #4 (8%). The excerpts below greatly indicate that the participants’ English responses were mere literal translations of their identical Arabic responses as follows :

**Sit. # 2:**

**“I am sorry Boss. I didn’t come to the meeting. I was really busy of my mother’s sickness.”,**

"أنا آسف يارئيسي. لم احضر الاجتماع لاني كنت مشغولا مع والدي"

**Sit.#3:**

**“I’m sorry, the hard exam made me forget seeing you.”,**

"انا اسف، الامتحان الصعب أنساني ان أراك"

**Sit. #4:**

**“Sorry son, I couldn’t come and take you shopping. I am busy”.**

"آسف ياولدي. لم اقدر ان احضر لآخذك للسوق لأنني مشغول"

One interesting finding was that the use of “honorifics”, such as "ياولدي/ ياصديقي العزيز", which displays the modesty and kindness tradition in the Iraqi cultural norms were also transferred to the English responses, such as “son /my dear friend”. Another interesting finding, furthermore, was that high proficiency participants made responses that seemingly approximated the American native-like performance. This was, in fact, due to their linguistic repertoire that helped them to do so. The following extracts illustrate this finding :

**Sit. #2: “I am so sorry. I completely forgot the meeting for I had a terrible car accident”.**

**Sit. # 3: “I don’t know how could this happen. I just found out that I am so tired and must have some rest”.**

**Sit. # 4: “I am sorry dear, but you know how much I am busy. I’ll take you next time to the market”.**

---

---

❖ **Sit. #5: “Backing on someone’s car and causing damage”:**

On responding to such situation, American NSs employ an apology semantic formula containing the following: [**regret intensified + (excuse) + self-deficiency/ blame oneself + repair**], such as follows:

**“Oh, I am really sorry. It is my fault. I’ll pay your damage”;**

**“I’m sorry. I know it is my fault. I am in a hurry to get to class. I’ll be willing to cover all the repair”.**

When examining Table (4) in Appendix B, the data showed that the participants’ responses consisting of “regret”, “self-deficiency”, “repair”, “excuse” and “blame oneself” were approximately identical in both DCTs; viz. 104% vs. 100% respectively for “regret” of which 45% were intensified, such as “I am so/ terribly sorry”; 43% vs. 54% for “self-deficiency”; 48% vs. 33% for “repair”; 22% vs. 13% for “excuse” and 9% vs. 8% for “blame oneself” strategies. The table also reveals that in both DCTs, the participants employed a wide variety of strategies in approximately the same percentages. This, actually, also indicates the existence of positive PT which could certainly accelerate L2 apology mastery if pragmatically wisely directed. The following excerpts from both DCTs’ responses reveal these findings:

**“I am sorry for denting the door of your car”;** **“I am sorry, I am not attention<sup>1</sup>”;** **“I am sorry. I was a little nervous.”,**

"أنا آسف لتشويه باب سيارتك، جدا آسف"؛ "أنا آسف لم أكن متنبهاً"؛ "أنا اعتذر، كنت متوتراً قليلاً"

---

<sup>1</sup> Errors were retained.

It is noteworthy, moreover, to say that the severity of the offence in this situation has forced the participants to utilize “intensifiers” such as “so/very/ terribly” preceding the “regret” strategy such as “I am so/ very/ terribly sorry”. It also forced them to utilize multi-strategies and to acknowledge their responsibilities for the offence committed. This was shown by either the strategy of “self-deficiency” or “blame oneself”. These, in turn, were transferred into their English responses. However, high proficiency group also manifested L2 apologies better than their corresponding low proficiency group to sound nearly American native-like. The following excerpts illustrate these results :

**“I am so sorry. I didn’t watch your car. God, I am ready for any fixing.”; “I am sorry. I couldn’t see that clearly because I forgot to readjust my car’s mirror.”; “I am so sorry. I didn’t see what is behind me. I am sorry. I’ll fix it to you and wish you accept it from me.”**

**❖ Sits. # 6, # 7, # 8 and #9: bumping into a lady and hurting her; bumping into a lady and shaking her up a bit; bumping into a lady- her fault ; bumping into a friend scalding his arm “:**

The four strategies used for “bumping into someone” were deliberately meant to elicit a continuum of apology responses, as Ghawi (1993: 45) made, depending on the severity of the offence. Thus, Sits. #6, #7, and # 9 suggest that the fault is on the apologizer; while the fault is, on the contrary, on the apologizee in Sit. #8. On the other hand, the gravity of the offence committed in both Sits. #6 and #9 is physically and materially greater than that in Sits.#7 and #8 both of which, in turn, respectively require less or even no apology at all. According to Ghawi (ibid); Linnel et al (N.D: 41-42);

---

---

Istifiçi (2009: 19-20), American NSs express their apologies in such context utilizing “regret” strategy intensified in such highly percentage in all of the four situations. The use of responsibility strategies manifested by “lack of intention”, such as “I didn’t mean that/to”; “self-deficiency” such as, “I didn’t see you” and “blame oneself”, such as “It is my fault” and “I am to blame”, seem to increase as the severity of the offence gets increased as well. Similarly, “repair” strategy seems to be influenced by the gravity of the offence. However, “excuse” strategy which appears to be a basic apology strategy in the first five situations was rarely used in these present four situations. It is worth noting, furthermore, that “interjective”, such as “Oh” and “Ah”, is also found in American NS’s responses for these current situations; this is because, and as mentioned before, this strategy also conveys an apology message in such context. In sum, Americans prefer the following semantic formulas for the a aforementioned four situations just as follows :

**Sit #6 : [(interjective) + regret + lack of intention/ self-deficiency + blame self+ repair]**

**Sit # 7 : [(interjective) + regret + self deficiency + lack of intention + repair]**

**Sit # 8 : [(interjective) + regret + self–deficiency]**

**Sit # 9 : [(interjective) + regret intensified + lack of intention + repair]**

On analyzing the participants’ responses in the two DCTs for these four situations, Table (5) shows that there was much focus on “regret” manifested in about 125% vs. 117% in Sit.#6 and 129% vs. 128% in Sit.#7. However, the percentages were lowered in Sit.# 8 to score 108% respectively and 100% vs. 104% in Sit.#9 . As for “lack

of intention” strategy, the responses recorded 42% vs. 38% in Sit. #6 and 38% vs. 33% in Sit.#7 . However, the percentages for this strategy were lowered in Sit.#9 to record only 25% respectively and only 13% respectively in Sit. #8. The decrease in the percentages recorded for the “lack of intention” especially in Sit.#8 was definitely due to the fact that the apologizer is not the source or even the cause of the offence. As for “self deficiency” strategy, the occurrence percentage was at its highest score in Sit.#7 to record 50% vs. 42% in the two DCTs, but at its lowest in both Sits.#8 and #9 to record 17% respectively and 13% vs. 8%. Another strategy focused on in these four situations was “repair” which also recorded its highest occurrences in Sit.#9 scoring 79% vs. 75% respectively and Sit. #6 scoring 58% vs. 50% respectively in both DCTs. This greatness in the percentages calculated was actually attributed to the greatness of both offence and harm committed by the apologizer on the behalf of the apologizee. However, the occurrences in Sit.#7 and more particularly in Sit.#8, viz. 8% vs. 4%, respectively were quite due to either the slightness of the offence committed in the former situation or the real embedded source of the offence committed which is the apologizee himself in the latter situation. Another strategy detected was “blame onself” which was quite seen in both Sit.#6 (4% vs. 17%) and Sit.#9 (8% vs.13%) in both DCTs respectively. However, its occurrences in both Sit. #7 and Sit.#8 were very slightly recorded, viz. 4% respectively in both DCTs for both situations. This was also due to the same reasons previously mentioned. On the contrary, because the real source of the offence is the apologizee, and consequently in an attempt to save both faces, the participants made use of “blame hearer” strategy in Sit. #8 to

---

---

record 33% vs. 99% respectively. It is worth saying, furthermore, that the responses in both DCTs recorded the occurrences of “interjective” strategy, such as “Oh”, “Ah” and “honorifics”, such as “mum”, “madam” for the English and "سيدتي" , "امي" for the Arabic tests, both of which are considered mitigators of the offence in all of the four situations and thus were seemingly produced spontaneously and not artificially. These two strategies which occur very often in American rules of speech were also used by the participants in both DCTs. Their appearance in the participants’ L2 responses could be either learnt or transferred or even due to the concept of speech acts universality.

Finally, the approximate similarities in the occurrence of each strategy in both responses were thus quite due to the role of negative PT. In other words, on comparing the responses for each participant in the two DCTs, it was quite obvious that most of their English responses were no more than literal translations of their corresponding Arabic performance. The following extracts taken from some participants’ responses illustrate this finding as follows :

**Sit. #6:**

**“Sorry madam, I didn’t watch you carefully. Are you O.K ?”**

"اسف سيدتي، لم انتبه لك ، هل انت بخير؟"

**Sit. #7:**

**“I am sorry. In fact, I don’t mean that”.**

"انا اعتذر في الحقيقة لم اقصد ذلك"

**Sit. #8:**

**“I am extremely sorry. Are you O.K.?”**

"انا جدا اسف هل انت بخير؟"

**Sit. #9:**

**“Oh, my God . I ‘m very sorry. Let me take you to the hospital”.**

"يا الهي، انا متأسف جدا. دعني اخذك الى المستشفى"

❖ **Sit. # 10 : “forgetting a mother’s order”**

When apologizing to a mother for a disorder and disobedience committed, American NSs would utilize the following formula: [regret+promise] preceded most often by “honorifics”, such as follows:

**“I’m sorry mama. It’ll never happen again/ it won’t be repeated again”.**

On viewing Table (6) in Appendix B, the responses of both DCTs had approximately scored identical occurrence percentages of “regret” in about 104% respectively, “excuse” in about 104% for the Arabic vs. 108% for the English responses, but “self deficiency” in about 33% vs. 29% respectively and “honorifics” in about 54% vs. 58% respectively. However, the use of “repair” and “promise” strategies recorded very slight percentages, viz. 17% vs. 8% for the former, and 13% vs. 17% respectively for the latter strategy in both DCTs.

Thus, the semantic formula deduced from these two responses sets was as follows: [regret+self-deficiency+excuse]. This means that, unlike American who focus on (repair) and (promise), Iraqis prefer to use “excuse” strategy to justify their faults, and “self-deficiency” to save their mothers’ faces. Accordingly, the deviation of the L2 responses from the American norms in such situation was

---

---

certainly due to the effect of negative PT. This is because the participants had no other choice but referring back to their Iraqi metapragmatic estimations. However, with their L2 linguistic mastery, high proficiency participants outperformed their corresponding group to utter some American native-like linguistic productions. The following excerpts illustrate these findings :

**“I am sorry mum for leaving my room untidy. I got up late and I had to get to the college in time“,**

"اسف امي لترك غرفتي غير مرتبة. انا استيقظت متأخراً وكان علي ان اذهب الى الكلية في الوقت المحدد"

**“I am sorry my dear mother. I was in a hurry so I forgot to clean the room”.**

"اسف يا امي العزيزة، كنت على عجلة من امري فنسيت تنظيف الغرفة"

❖ **Sit # 11 : “breaking a vase while cleaning”**

For breaking a vase or something while cleaning, Americans apologize using [**interjective + regret+ blame oneself + repair**] (Yamagashira, 2001: 272). On regarding the participants responses in both DCTs, Table (7) in Appendix B shows that the participants made repeated use of “regret” in their responses to score 117% vs. 125% respectively in both of the Arabic and English DCTs. In addition, they used “repair” to score, 46% vs. 42%; “lack of intention” to score 42% vs. 29% and “self- deficiency” to record 21% vs. 25% respectively in the two DCTs. Besides, the table also shows some slight occurrences of "interjective" (i.e. 22% vs. 38%) and “honorifics” recording 21% vs. 25% respectively. Thus, the identical semantic formula deduced for the two DCTs, viz. [**regret+ self-deficiency + lack of intention + repair**] denoted the role of negative PT that hinders L2 communication. The following extracts

taken from certain participants' corresponding responses confirm these results :

**“I am sorry madam. I didn't mean it. I am ready to discount the damage from my salary”.**

"انا اسف جدا، لم اقصد هذا، وانا مستعد لخصم هذا من راتبي"

**“I am so sorry, let me clean the place and buy you a new one”**

"انا اسف جدا، دعيني انظف المكان واشتري لك واحدة اخرى"

The absolute similarities between each corresponding responses revealed that the participants'L2 responses were no more than complete literal (word by word) translations of their L1 production. Besides, the neat selection of appropriate linguistic vocabularies , particularly for high proficiency group, was also due to their L2 linguistic mastery.

#### **Overall Frequency Count & Percentages of Strategies Across Situations:**

Following Olshtain & Cohen's (1983) example of summarizing the average use of each strategy across the situations, the present study replicated this method so as to provide a clearer picture of the comparison between the participants' two responses in the L1 and L2 performance. This method was done to further investigating the instance of PT, on the one hand, and to see what strategies were mostly used and relied upon in Iraqi apologies that were transferred to the English performance, on the other, to make the comparison between the two cultures more empirically confirmed.

---

---

Accordingly, when calculating the overall occurrences of each strategy in the whole 11 situations in each DCT, Table (8) in Appendix B reveals that the participants tended to use “regret” strategy with more high frequency twice or even three times in their given responses to similarly scoring 284 vs. 282 occurrences respectively in the Arabic and English responses. These excessive occurrences formed about 38% respectively out of the whole strategies occurrence percentages. The other strategies having more frequency count over the remaining other strategies were “excuse” (i.e. 89 vs. 88 occurrences) forming 12% respectively; “self-deficiency” (i.e. 84 vs. 88) forming 14% vs. 12% respectively; “lack of intention” (i.e. 75 vs. 66) forming 10% vs. 9% respectively and “repair” (i.e. 70 vs. 59) forming 9% vs. 8% respectively in both the Arabic and English DCTs out of the whole strategies occurrence percentages. Accordingly, the most apology semantic formula seemingly relied upon by most of the participants was **[regret+ self-deficiency + excuse]**.

#### **Face-Saving Apology Semantic Formulas’ Type :**

It is important to finally note that the mood of the apology semantic formulas, viz. whether self- or hearer-supportive oriented, deduced from the responses were situation/ context-specific. In other words, the kind of apology supportive orientation, viz. whether saving the apologizer’s face “self-supportive”, or saving the apologizee’s face “hearer- supportive”, seemingly depends on certain factors, namely : the severity or the triviality of the offence committed, the real source of the offence (whether the apologizer or the apologizee), the real intention of the apologizer, especially when the offence is out of control and the degree of formality of the

situation and the degree of familiarity between both the apologizer and the apologizee. Accordingly, Sit.#1 is 100%, highly self-supportive, as Table (9) below reveals, since the apologizer has no real intention of the offence.

**Table (9): Apology Supportive Semantic Formulas the Two DCTs.**

Apology Supportive Semantic Formulas						
Sit.#	Arabic Supportive Semantic Formulas %			English Supportive Semantic Formulas %		
	hearer-supportive	self-supportive	mixed-supportive	hearer-supportive	self-supportive	mixed-supportive
1	0	100	0	0	100	0
2	29	54	17	25	63	13
3	29	46	25	17	58	25
4	46	29	25	46	29	25
5	58	25	17	58	33	8
6	58	21	21	58	29	13
7	63	29	8	63	29	8
8	63	29	8	63	33	4
9	75	8	17	79	8	13
10	17	46	38	17	50	33
11	54	25	21	63	21	17

Other slightly more self-supportive were Sits.#2, #3 and #10 scoring 54 frequency count for the former, and 46 respectively for the latter. All of these three situations depict the offence committed as out of control. On the contrary, Sit.#9 was highly hearer-supportive scoring 75 occurrences since the participants felt that the offence was very crucial; besides, the apologizee was an intimate

friend. Thus, it is wise, according to them, to save the latter's face so as to set things right. As for other hearer- supportive situations, Sits.#7 and #8 respectively scored 63 occurrences; Sits.#5 and #6 respectively scored 58 frequency count and Sit.#11 scored 54 frequency count. All these situations were highly hearer-supportive apology expressions. This is because the participants felt of the severity of the offence committed, though it was seemingly out of control or they seemingly had no real intention to .

Something noteworthy here is that the present study has discovered another orientation wisely to be called a "hearer-self supportive" or a "mixed-supportive orientation". In other words, in an attempt to set things right, the participants jointly tried to save both their faces and those of the apologizees'. This finding can apparently be seen in Sit.#10 which also scored 38 mixed-supportive orientation occurrences. Such case was maintained through the mixed use of "self-deficiency" strategy, such as "**I forgot to clean my room**" to save the apologizee's face (i.e. the mother), on the one hand , or the "lack of intention" strategy, such as "**I didn't mean to**", as well as the "excuse" strategy, such as "**I have to hurry up for exam**" to save their own faces, on another. This mixed- supportive apology method can also be perceived in both Sits.#3 and #4 scoring 25 occurrences respectively as the abovementioned Table (9) reveals.

**Conclusions :**

The present study strongly believes that PT is a natural phenomenon in interlanguage pragmatics and it is generalized across different target languages. Hence, hypotheses #3 and #4 regarding the existence of L1 metapragmatic transfer into the L2 perception and production by the Iraqi FL learners of English was strongly confirmed in the light of the aforementioned results obtained. This can be seen in both instances of transfer, namely positive and negative transfers.

In spite of the universality of speech acts and some context estimations especially regarding social status and the degree of severity of the act itself, most speech acts metapragmatic performance is culture-specific. Thus, though both Iraqis and Americans seemingly rely mostly on “regret” and “repair”, Iraqis highly appear to utilize “regret”, “excuse” and “self-deficiency” strategies to express their apologies. Accordingly, hypothesis #1 regarding the similarities and differences between the two cultures in apology was also strongly met. However, in spite of these differences, they do not seriously hinder the participants’ L2 abilities in estimating the 11 situations on the spot to perform their L2 apologies. Consequently, PT from the L1 to the L2 should not always be seen as a negative phenomenon. This is simply because it does not always result in unintelligibility or embarrassment .

Another finding of the present study was that high proficiency level participants outperformed in their L2 apologies the low proficiency participants. This can certainly be attributed to the formers’ L2 grammatical and vocabularies repertoire to produce some American native-like production. Thus, hypothesis #4 was

---

---

also very strongly confirmed in the positive sense and thus goes in line with prior related studies. It is noteworthy, however, that in spite of this fact, the participants were not always successful in their L2 apologies. Though this failure can be primarily attributed to their grammatical and linguistic limitations, it is greatly attributed to their L2 metapragmatic deficiency. This, therefore, demands that L2 teachers should make L2 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of speech acts salient in FL classrooms.

A positive finding of the present study, however, was that the majority of the participants had made use of additional strategies in given responses to complement their apologies, but very rare had used single apology formulas. This can be seen in prolonged semantic formulas containing a combination of “regret”, “self-deficiency”, “excuse” and “repair” strategies. However, a considerable number of participants performed their “regret” such as “I’m sorry”; "انا اسف" without intensifiers, such as “very/so/really” in English, and their corresponding Arabic expressions, viz. "كثيرا/جدا", which can also be said for “interjectives”. This finding was obvious in most responses unless the participants felt of the severity of the offence, or that they were the real source of the offence committed, such as in Sits.#5 and #10. Finally, the participants were very keen to save either their faces, the apologizee’s face, or theirs both depending on the condition of the situation at hand; thus, employing the three types of apology supportive orientation methods, namely “hearer-supportive, “self-supportive” or “mixed-supportive”.

**Pedagogical Implications :**

As for the pedagogical implications, the present study greatly stresses the importance of integrating culture into L2 classroom instruction. This is simply because, and as the results obtained indicated, the teaching of English in Iraqi classrooms are still grammar-based. In other words, if functional and communicative competence is a major goal of L2 learning, then L2 learners should not only understand the L2 linguistic aspects, but also the metapragmatic aspects of using them appropriately. Thus, L2 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic norms of speech acts should be greatly highlighted in classrooms. Though this acquisition would take many years to have L2 native-like production, the use of video, films and simulations would definitely accelerate it.

**Bibliography**

1. Bou Franch, P. (1998). On Pragmatic Transfer. *Studies in English Language and Linguistics* 0: 5-20.
2. Carla, (N.D). American Apologies. Available at : <http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/apologies/american.htm/>
3. Cohen, A.D. & Olshtain, E. (1981). "Developing a measure of sociocultural competence : The case of Apology". *Language Learning* . 311 : 113- 134.
4. Cohen, A.D., Olshtain, E. & Rosenstein, D.S. (1986). "Advanced EFL apologies what remained to be learned ?". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 62: 51- 74.
5. Ghawi, Mohammed (1993). Pragmatic Transfer in Arabic Learners of English. *Two Talk*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring, pp. 39-52.

- 
- 
6. Husain, Kausar & Wahid, Rizwana (2008). Thanking and Apologizing in ESL: A study of Hindustani Speakers. *Language in India*, Vol. 8: pp. 1-18.
  7. Istifci, Ilknur (2009). The Use of Apologies by EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 2, No. 3, Spring: pp. 15-24.
  8. Kasper, G. & Dahl, M. (1991). Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13,2 15247.
  9. Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), 203-231.
  10. Linnell, J., Porter, F.L., Stone, H., Chen, Wan-Lai (1992). Can you apologize me? An investigation of speech act. performance among non-native speakers of English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 8 (2), 33-53.
  11. Maros, Marlyna (2006). Apologies in English by Adult Malay Speakers: Patterns and Competence. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*. Issur,19:pp. 1-18.
  12. Olshtain, S., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18–35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
  13. Tuncel, R.(1999). *Speech Act Realizations of Turkish EFL Learners: A Study on Apologizing and Thanking*. Unpublished PHD Dissertation. Eskisehir Universitesi. SBE.
  14. Yamagashira, Hisako (2001). Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese ESL Refusals. *Toso Kagoshima, Japan*, Vol.3: pp.259-275.

**Appendix A**

## The English DCT

<b>Name:-----</b>	<b>Gender:-----</b>
<b>Age:-----</b>	<b>Nationality:-----</b>
<b>Dept.-----</b>	<b>Class:-----</b>
<b>Score average in English:-----</b>	

Answer the following situations apologizing for the offence committed. Respond as much as possible as you would in an actual situation filling in the blanks with your responses after the word "You":

**S1:** You are at a meeting and you say something that one of the participants interprets as a personal insult to him.

**He:** "I feel that your last remark was directed at me and I take offence."

**You:** -----

**S2:** You completely forget a crucial meeting at the office with your boss. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting. Your boss gets on the line and asks:

**Boss :** "What happened to you?"

**You:** -----

**S3:** You forget a get-together with a friend. You dial him to apologize. This is already the second time you've forgotten such a meeting. Your friend asks over the phone:

**Friend:** "What happened to you?"

**You:** -----

---

---

**S4:** You call from work to find out how things are at home and your son reminds you that you forgot to take him shopping, as you had promised, and this is the second time that this has happened. Your son says over the phone:

**Son: "Oh, you forgot again and you promised!"**

**You:** -----

**S5:** Backing out of a parking place, you nm into the side of another car. It was clearly your fault. You dent in the side door slightly. The driver gets out and comes over to you angrily.

**Driver: "Can't you look where you're going? See what you've done!"**

**You:** -----

**S6:** You accidentally bump into a well-dressed elderly lady at an elegant department store causing her to spill her packages all over the floor. You hurt her leg, too. It's clearly your fault and you want to apologize profusely.

**She: "Ow! My Goodness!"**

**You:** -----

**S7:** You bump into an elderly lady at a department store, shaking her up a bit. It's your fault, and you want to apologize.

**She: "Hey, look out!"**

**You:** -----

**S8:** You bump into an elderly lady at a department store. You hardly could have avoided doing so because she was blocking the way. Still, you feel that some kind of apology is in order.

**She: "Oh, my!"**

**You:** -----

**S9:** In a cafeteria, you accidentally bump into a friend who is holding a cup of hot coffee. The coffee spills over your friend scalding his arm and soaking his clothing. Your friend shouts startled:

**He: "Ooooooh, Ouch!"**

**You:** -----

**S10:** Your mother asked you to clean up your bedroom and have everything put at their right places before going to the college. You forgot to do so because you were in a hurry.

**Your mother: " Why haven't you got your room tidy?"**

**S11:** You are a servant at a home doing the usual housework You were cleaning the sitting-room but accidentally, you bump into the table and the china vase fell over and broke."

**Your lady: "Oh, what have you done?"**

**You:**  
-----

#### The Arabic DCT

الاسم:-----	الجنس:-----
العمر:-----	الجنسية:-----
القسم:-----	الصف:-----
المعدل العام في مادة اللغة الانكليزية:-----	

اجب عن الحالات التالية معندراً عن المخالفة التي ارتكبت. ردُّ قَدْرَ المستطاع كما ترد في حياتك اليومية عن هذه الحالات . وأملأ الفراغات برؤدك بعد الكلمة "أنت":

الحالة ١ : في اجتماع كنت تلقي فيه محاضرة ما ذكرت مسألة معينة فسرّها احد المشاركين على أنها إهانة شخصية له بالغم من انك لم تقصد ذلك. تقدم ذلك الشخص ليك قائلاً:  
هو: "أشعرُ بأنّ ملاحظتكِ الأخيرةَ كانتُ موجهةً نحوني وأنا أشعرُ بالإهانة."

أنت:.....

الحالة ٢ : نسيت تماماً اجتماعاً مهماً مع مديرِك في المكتبِ. بعدَ ساعةٍ انقضت اتصلت به عبر الهاتف تكلمه للاعتذار. ولكنّ المشكلة أنّ هذه هي المرة الثانية التي تنسى فيها حضور مثل هذه الاجتماع. رد مديرِك عبر الهاتف قائلاً:

مديرِك: "ماذا حدثَ لك؟"

أنت:.....

الحالة ٣ : نسيت موعداً مع صديقك لذلك اتصلت به تلفونياً للاعتذار منه، علماً بان هذه هي المرة الثانية التي تنسى فيها هذا الموعد. رد صديقك عبر الهاتف قائلاً:  
صديقك: "ماذا حدثَ لك؟"

أنت:.....

الحالة ٤ : اتصلت تلفونياً من عملك بالبيت لترى كيف تجري الأمور هنالك. عندئذ ذكرك ابنك بأنك قد نسيت أن تأخذه معك إلى السوق كما كنت قد وعدته. وهذه هي المرة الثانية التي تنسى فيها أن تأخذه معك. قال ابنك عبر الهاتف:

ابنك: "ها قد نسيت مرة ثانية بالرغم من انك قد وعدتني!"

أنت:.....

الحالة ٥ : وأنت تخرج عربتك من الكراج العمومي لتصطدم بجانب احد العربات الواقفة هنالك. بالحقيقة هو خطأؤك فقد تشوه جانب احد الأبواب بشكل خفيف. عندئذ خرج سائق العربة متوجها نحوك وقائلا بغضب:

السائق: "الم تستطع أن تنظر إلى أين أنت ذاهب؟ انظر ماذا فعلت بعربتي."

أنت:.....

الحالة ٦ : من دون قصد وفي احد محلات الملابس التجارية، اصطدمت بسيدة أنيقة كبيرة بالسن متسببا بجعلها تُسقط حقائبها على الأرض، إضافة إلى أن الاصطدام قد اثر قليلا بساق المرأة وهذا بالحقيقة بسبب خطأؤك. وأردت أن تعتذر منها حين قالت:

السيدة: "اوه! ياالله!"

أنت:.....

الحالة ٧ : في احد محال الملابس التجارية، اصطدمت بسيدة أنيقة كبيرة بالسن فتسبب الحادث بإرباكها وارتجافها نوعا ما. من الواضح انه خطأؤك، لهذا أردت أن تعتذر لها حين قالت:

السيدة: "هيببي! انظر ماذا فعلت!"

أنت:.....

الحالة ٨ : في احد محال الملابس التجارية، اصطدمت بسيدة كبيرة بالسن إذ لم تستطع بالكاد تفادي هذا الحادث وذلك لان السيدة كانت واقفة بشكل يسد عليك الطريق للمرور. على الرغم من ذلك شعرت بان الاعتذار لها هو أمر مطلوب وفي محله حين قالت:فتسبب الحادث بإرباكها وارتجافها نوعا ما. من الواضح انه خطأؤك، لهذا أردت أن تعتذر لها حين قالت:

السيدة: "اوہ! ياالله!"

أنت:.....  
الحالة ٩ : في احد مقاهي الجامعة، اصطدمت فجأة بأحد الأصدقاء الذي كان بدوره يحمل كوبا من القهوة الساخنة. وقد أدى الاصطدام المفاجئ إلى جعل القهوة تنسكب على يد صديقك الأمر الذي أدى إلى احمرارها بالإضافة إلى تلف ملابسه. اردت الاعتذار منه عندما قال:

صديقك : "اوہ! اووووووہ!"

أنت:.....  
الحالة ١٠ : طلبت منك والدتك ان تنظف غرفة نومك وترتيبها قبل الخروج منها والذهاب الى الكلية. ولكنك نسيت القيام بذلك حيث انك كنت على عجلة من أمرك. قالت والدتك معاتبه لك:

والدتك: "لماذا لم ترتب غرفتك؟"

أنت:.....  
الحالة ١١ : تعمل في احد البيوت تزاول عمل ترتيب المنزل، وبينما كنت تنظف غرفة الجلوس اصطدمت فجأة بالطاولة هناك الأمر الذي أدى إلى سقوط مزهرية من الخزف الصيني الفاخر على الأرض وكسرها. عندئذ دخلت سيدة المنزل وقالت :

السيدة: "اوہ! ياالله! ماذا فعلت! "

أنت:.....

**Appendix B***Frequency Count Percentages of the Semantic Sets*

Sit.# 1		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
no	semantic sets	Frequency count %	Frequency count %
1	<b>interjective</b>	4	0
2	<b>regret</b>	96	92
3	<b>lack of intention</b>	113	100
4	<b>deny</b>	4	8

Table (2): Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas of Sit.#1 in the Two DCTs.

Sit.# 2		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
no	semantic sets	Frequency count %	Frequency count %
1	<b>Honorifics</b>	17	17
2	<b>regret</b>	108	108
3	<b>self deficiency</b>	54	67
4	<b>repair</b>	8	8
5	<b>promise</b>	13	4
6	<b>excuse</b>	79	75

The Role of Pragmatic Transfer on L2 Speech Acts Production : ...

Ban Ahmed Hamoodi

Sit.# 3		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
1	<b>interjective</b>	4	4
2	<b>regret</b>	104	104
3	<b>self deficiency</b>	54	54
4	<b>repair</b>	8	4
5	<b>promise</b>	8	8
6	<b>excuse</b>	79	83
Sit.# 4		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
1	<b>interjective</b>	8	8
2	<b>regret</b>	92	88
3	<b>self deficiency</b>	33	29
4	<b>repair</b>	4	8
5	<b>promise</b>	58	58
6	<b>excuse</b>	58	63

Table (3): Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas of Sits.#2, #3 and #4 in the Two DCTs.

Sit.# 5		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
no	semantic sets	Frequency count %	Frequency count %
1	<b>regret</b>	104	100
2	<b>blame oneself</b>	9	8
3	<b>lack of intention</b>	35	29
4	<b>self deficiency</b>	43	54
5	<b>repair</b>	48	33
6	<b>excuse</b>	22	13

Table (4): Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas of Sit.#5 in the Two DCTs.

Sit.# 6		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
no	semantic sets	Frequency count %	Frequency count %
1	<b>interjective</b>	29	33
2	<b>honorifics</b>	21	25
3	<b>regret</b>	125	117
4	<b>blame oneself</b>	4	17
5	<b>lack of intention</b>	42	38

6	<b>self deficiency</b>	33	38
7	<b>repair</b>	58	50
8	<b>excuse</b>	8	4
Sit.# 7		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
1	<b>interjective</b>	13	13
2	<b>honorifics</b>	25	21
3	<b>regret</b>	129	125
4	<b>blame hearer</b>	4	4
5	<b>lack of intention</b>	38	33
6	<b>self deficiency</b>	50	42
7	<b>repair</b>	17	13
8	<b>excuse</b>	4	8

Table (5): Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas of Sits.#6, #7, #8 and #9 in the Two DCTs.

Sit.# 8		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
1	<b>interjective</b>	13	13
2	<b>honorifics</b>	8	4
3	<b>regret</b>	108	108
4	<b>blame hearer</b>	33	29
5	<b>lack of intention</b>	13	13
6	<b>self deficiency</b>	17	17

7	<b>repair</b>	8	4
8	<b>excuse</b>	8	8
<b>Sit.# 9</b>		<b>Arabic Semantic Formulas</b>	<b>English Semantic Formulas</b>
1	<b>interjective</b>	42	42
2	<b>honorifics</b>	13	13
3	<b>regret</b>	100	104
4	<b>blame oneself</b>	8	13
5	<b>lack of intention</b>	25	25
6	<b>self deficiency</b>	13	8
7	<b>repair</b>	79	75

Table (6): Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas of Sit.#10 in the Two DCTs.

<b>Sit.# 10</b>		<b>Arabic Semantic Formulas</b>	<b>English Semantic Formulas</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>semantic sets</b>	<b>Frequency count %</b>	<b>Frequency count %</b>
1	<b>honorifics</b>	54	58
2	<b>regret</b>	104	104
3	<b>self deficiency</b>	33	29
4	<b>repair</b>	17	8
5	<b>promise</b>	13	17
6	<b>excuse</b>	104	108

Table (7): Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas of Sit.#11 in the Two DCTs.

Sit.# 11		Arabic Semantic Formulas	English Semantic Formulas
no	semantic sets	Frequency count %	Frequency count %
1	<b>interjective</b>	29	38
2	<b>honorifics</b>	21	25
3	<b>regret</b>	117	125
4	<b>lack of intention</b>	42	29
5	<b>self deficiency</b>	21	25
6	<b>repair</b>	46	42

Table (8): Overall Frequency Count Percentages & Order of the Semantic Formulas in the Two DCTs.

Sit.# no	Semantic Sets	Total Arabic Frequency Count	Total Arabic Frequency percentage	Total English Frequency Count	Total English Frequency percentage
1	<b>interjective</b>	36	5%	38	5%
2	<b>honorifics</b>	55	7%	54	7%
3	<b>regret</b>	284	38%	282	38%
4	<b>blame oneself</b>	18	2%	21	3%
5	<b>blame hearer</b>	9	1%	8	1%
6	<b>blame 3rd</b>	3	0	2	0
7	<b>lack of intention</b>	75	10%	66	9%

Sit.# no	Semantic Sets	Total Arabic Frequency Count	Total Arabic Frequency percentage	Total English Frequency Count	Total English Frequency percentage
8	self deficiency	84	11%	88	12%
9	deny	2	0	3	0
10	repair	70	9%	59	8%
11	promise	24	3%	25	3%
12	excuse	89	12%	88	12%
<b>Total</b>		<b>749</b>	<b>99.00%</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>98.00%</b>