

Strategies of Reprimand in Spoken Jordanian Arabic: A Sociopragmatic Study

Amal Naji Al-Khawaldeh*

Deanship of Scientific Research, The University of Jordan, Jordan

Ghaleb Rabab'ah

Department of Foreign Languages, University of Sharjah, UAE
Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Jordan, Jordan

Received on: 28-7-2022

Accepted on: 26-10-2022

Abstract

This study presents an exploration of reprimand strategies in Spoken Jordanian Arabic (SJA). It also explores how gender influences the use of these strategies. The data were collected from 100 Jordanian native speakers of Arabic using a DCT. The mixed method analysis revealed that the participants employed *bald on record*, *positive politeness strategies*, *negative politeness*, *off record*, and *not doing the face-threatening act (FTA)* strategies for expressing reprimand in SJA. It was found that the participants exhibited a preference for *bald on record* expressions to make reprimands. The results also showed that female participants employed various strategies when reprimanding in different situations compared to males who reprimanded directly irrespective of the domain of language use. In spite of the apparent inclination to go on record when reprimanding, the participants were found to be aware of the importance of employing positive and negative politeness strategies when performing this speech act.

Keywords: Face-Threatening acts; Politeness; Reprimand; Speech act; Pragmatics.

1. Introduction

Language is a means of communication, which people use to achieve specific goals. Studying language usage or language in context is termed as pragmatics (Levinson 1983). Pragmatics is devoted to exploring language use in social. It, as indicated by Capone (2010), determines the merging of specific linguistic forms and functions to realize an intention. Therefore, its primary focus is on understanding the intended meaning of the speakers, along with the contextual meaning (Verschuere 1999).

Speech acts hold a crucial role in language as they are intimately linked to human interactive behavior. Interlocutors produce and comprehend communicative acts, such as reprimand, which is observed frequently in everyday communication. It is considered as negative feedback directed to the addressee. Thus, it is generally regarded as an impolite and intruding behavior on the part of the addressee. For the purpose of this study, we adopted Vanderveken's (1990) definition of reprimand. Vanderveken (1990) identifies reprimand as the act of accusing, while incorporating personal disapproval

© 2024 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.16.2.4>

* Corresponding Author: a_khawaldeh@ju.edu.jo

for the transgression, at this pointed person. He went ahead to put that the issuing of reprimands is usually exercised in an act of authority, either genuinely from moral authority or perceived. It should be noted that reprimand is different from the speech act of criticizing in that the former is usually directed from a more authoritative person to a less authoritative one while criticism is concerned with identifying the faults or negative aspects.

In pragmatics, reprimand often symbolizes the illocutionary forces of showing disapproval or dissatisfaction because of discovering faults with, blaming or accusing the addressees' words, actions, choices and products for which they may be held accountable (Tuan and Hsu 2009, 70). Reprimand is used in order to influence the addressee's future actions for the better of his/her own benefit as perceived by the speaker (S), or to communicate the speaker's displeasure with or abhorrent feeling concerning what the addressee has done, but without indicating that it has unwelcomed consequences for the speakers. Accordingly, it is intrinsically impolite since it is driven by a speaker's deep-down purpose of attacking and/or enfeebling the addressee's sense of respect and confidence (Haverkate 1988).

So far, research conducted on communicative acts highlighted the importance of studying them because they are culturally laden. People in general abide by some sociocultural rules when they communicate using their mother tongue or a foreign language. People coming from different cultures have different perceptions about the polite ways of expressing reprimand. Thus, it is important to understand this communicative act in order to encourage and sustain successful communication because the unawareness of cross-cultural differences in the production of communicative acts could lead to misjudgment, which may result in miscommunication or communication breakdown.

The communicative acts of reprimand are assumed to be inherently impolite due to the fact that it is normally impolite since it showcases the speaker attacking or undermining the hearer's face or self-esteem (Haverkate 1988). Therefore, reprimand may be classified under a face-threatening act, as it goes against the hearer being correct or reasonable about the issue at stake (Brown and Levinson 1987). The speakers, therefore, should be very cautious about the cultural context and at the right time in passing reprimands that have no effect on their face or the hearer's face.

This study aims to examine the linguistic strategies that Jordanian Arabic speakers use to express reprimand. It also endeavors to find the impact of gender on strategy use and frequency of reprimand expressions in Spoken Jordanian Arabic. In more specific terms, the research seeks to address the following inquiries:

1. What are the strategies of reprimand that Jordanian Arabic speakers use to express reprimand?
2. Are there any differences in the type and frequency of reprimand expressions due to gender?

A motivating force to study reprimand in particular is that the review of the literature shows that it is under-researched compared to other communicative acts, such as requesting, apologizing, complimenting and thanking despite its significance. Little attention has been paid to the study of reprimand and none has been conducted on Arabic in the Jordanian context. It is expected that this study will make a substantial contribution to knowledge by enriching the growing body of intra-cultural research, specifically that which is imbedded in terms of the speech act theory. Moreover, investigating the expression of such a

sensitive and significant speech act in Jordan is much needed as Jordan is a very reserved and collective society. A collective society is where people from birth onwards are united into strongly interconnected in-groups trying, throughout their lifetime, to protect unquestioning loyalty (Hofstede 1991, 102). Thus, expressing reprimand might endanger establishing and maintaining on-going social reciprocity and good relationships between interlocutors, which is very important and cherished in this type of society.

2. Literature review

2.1 Brown and Levinson's (1987) Theory of Politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness is a strategic device speakers employ with the intention to accomplish certain goals. This signifies that politeness is merely a “redressive action taken to counterbalance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts” (Kasper 1990, 194). Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory is established on the basis of two concepts (i.e., rationality and face) that all interlocutors are expected to consider “face” as the “public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself...thus can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction” (Brown and Levinson, *ibid*: 61). Brown and Levinson assume that people in general cooperate to maintain face in interaction based on the mutual vulnerability of face. Face is persistently at risk, as Brown and Levinson assume, because any kind of linguistic action (i.e., FTA) is viewed as posing a certain threat to the interlocutor's face. They also assume that most speech acts such as compliments, requests, and thanking intrinsically threaten either the hearer's or the speaker's face-wants. Brown and Levinson (*ibid*: 312) argue that face consists of two related concepts; positive face refers to “the want of every member to be desirable to at least some others” whereas negative face refers to the “want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others”.

Brown and Levinson (1987) classified politeness strategies into five categories, bald-on record, off-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and not doing FAA. *Bald on record* strategies are the expressions that the speakers utter directly and clearly without softening the act, but they are not so threatening to the addressee's face. They are generally employed in a very close-social relationship situations, such as requests that occur between friends. On the other hand, *off-record* strategies are the expressions that the speakers utter indirectly to allow the addressee to determine the intended meaning of the spoken utterance. *Positive politeness* strategies are the utterances the speaker uses to lessen the effect of the FTA, and indicate more intimate relationship between the speakers; whereas *negative politeness* strategies are the utterances the speaker uses to save the addressee's face by showing respect and distance. Finally, *not doing FTA* as when some speakers choose not to utter or do anything.

2.2 Research on the speech act of reprimand

Research on speech act realization underlines the significance of studying cross-cultural, intra-cultural and inter-cultural pragmatic variations. In view of its social sensitivity compared to other communicative acts, reprimand has not been extensively examined. Research has revealed that reprimand is a universal and culture-specific communicative act García (1996). García (1996, 696) analyzed the responses of 20 male and female Peruvians when reprimanding or being reprimanded. The analysis of the

role-play data revealed that when reprimanding, both males and females favored solidarity over deferential politeness strategies, and expressions threatening the face of the other. Males were found to be far more confrontational, authoritative and in challenge mode than their female counterparts who were more likely to show more concern for the interlocutor by trying to strike a balance between their confrontation and an admission of responsibility. Moreover, older participants and upper middle-class participants were found more forceful and imposing. When reacting to a reprimand, they choose deferential strategies more than solidarity politeness strategies.

García (2004) explored reprimands and responses to reprimands in Argentinean Spanish (AS) focusing on gender differences. Data collected through two role-play scenarios revealed that the participants tended to use bald on record strategies and positive politeness when reprimanding. Males tended to use bald on record strategies in particular and females showed a tendency to use positive politeness strategies. Females also employed slightly more supporting moves to alleviate and intensify when reprimanding. Males in general preferred coercion strategies and females preferred cooperative strategies. The participants inclined to threaten their addressee's positive and negative face equally and preserve their own authority and freedom of action. They did show less gender differences when responding to a reprimand. Generally, the participants favored to threaten their own negative and positive face versus their interlocutor's positive or negative face. In a similar study, García (2009) examined regional pragmatic variation in Spanish by Peruvians, Venezuelans, and Argentineans when expressing reprimand building on Spencer-Oatey (2002) rapport management framework. The role-play scenarios revealed that the three groups preferred their contentment of their transactional wants. However, some differences appeared among the three groups concerning their behavioral anticipations and respect/threat to their own and/or the addressees' identity face. Peruvians were observed to exert pressure on the receiver, underlining the power disparity between participants. They typically preferred an independent stance, showing little concern for protecting or challenging their own identity. On the other hand, Venezuelans and Argentineans exhibited a preference for interconnected self-perceptions, showing a keen interest in maintaining their identity.

The subject of reprimand in the discourse of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners has garnered interest among researchers. For instance, Ahmadian and Vahid Dastjerdi (2010) carried out a practical study investigating the responses and attitudes towards reprimand among Americans and Iranians. They used a politeness-rating questionnaire and open role-play situations as their research methods. The study's outcomes highlighted cultural differences, suggesting the need for appropriate instruction for Iranian EFL learners. Similarly, Allami and Samimi (2014) investigated the responses to reprimand among intermediate and advanced EFL learners. The study showed that intermediate learners desired to keep their privacy intact and also expressed disapproval toward limitations and control, while intermediate EFL learners were more concerned about expressing empathy, involvement and respect, overstepping their advanced colleagues who showed more cost-benefit considerations. In another study, Samimi and Khoramrooz (2017) explored the behavior of native Persian speakers and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in response to reprimands. They used an Interactive Discourse

Strategies of Reprimand in Spoken Jordanian Arabic: A Sociopragmatic Study

Completion Task (IDCT) including six binary situations, along with Emotion Likert-Scales (e.g., the anger, responsibility, fairness and selfishness). The results showed that native Persian speakers adopt a rapport-threatening viewpoint, claiming autonomy and violating principles of association and involvement. However, they also demonstrated rapport-enhancing tendencies by considering cost-benefit aspects. In contrast, EFL learners asserted autonomy and transgressed principles of respect and involvement. They also showed more regard for the addressee's identity face compared to native Persian speakers.

Cultural differences in the speech act of reprimand have been identified. For instance, Tuan and Hsu (2009) examined the sequential construction used by native Mandarin Chinese speakers in Taiwan and American English speakers in their first language responses to reprimands in institutional settings. The results showed that the responses had special realization patterns that could be ascribed to the social power inconsistency between the speakers. It was also found that the conversational behavior of the Americans was very likely because of nature and proposition of the topic. Americans were expected to be blunt and direct, and so were apt to use solidarity politeness strategies. However, Americans were inclined to challenge upfront and then reinforce the disagreement increasingly, whereas the Chinese living in Taiwan considered and observed the rules in the hierarchical politeness system when responding to reprimand. In other words, when they spoke “downward”, they used aggravated disagreements in their rejoinders, such as the sequencing of contradiction and self-defense so as to defend and preserve their own face.

Dozie (2019) conducted a study examining how Igbo native speakers perceive the act of reprimand in English conversations. The research used a Discourse Completion Task showcasing ten English scenarios, which were shared across seven Nigerian universities. The study's findings suggested that Igbo culture takes into account context, social status, and social distance when choosing specific strategies for reprimand. The research concluded that speech acts are inherently tied to culture, emphasizing the importance of integrating pragmatics into language teaching. In a recent research, Al-Shemmary (2020) conducted a study examining Iraqi EFL undergraduates' usage and ability to identify and construct the speech act of reprimand in English. Fifty senior students from the Department of English at the University of Kufa participated in a practical test. The study found that a majority of Iraqi EFL learners experience challenges in the usage of reprimanding language, with a great tendency to employ other associated speech acts.

To conclude, the literature review has shown that previous studies examined the use of reprimand in different cultural contexts to find the impact of gender, or social status on the use of reprimand. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, however, none of the studies has explored this speech act in Arabic language, and more specifically in Spoken Jordanian Arabic. Thus, this study aims to fill in this research gap in the intra-cultural pragmatic research area by focusing on Spoken Jordanian Arabic rather than standard language in order to recognize real aspects of Jordanians' intra-cultural interactional styles and reflect on their cultural norms and values. Consequently, this study will contribute to the expanding collection of pragmatic research on Jordanian Arabic. It will also help decrease potential communication

misinterpretations during intra-cultural and intercultural situations between Jordanians and others while expressing reprimand.

3. Methodology

3.1 Study sample

The study sample consisted of 100 participants (50 males and 50 females), aged between 18 and 30 years. All participants were English Language and Literature students at the University of Jordan. Convenience sampling was used to collect the participants' responses to a DCT designed by the researchers. The participants had a good command of English, as they were senior BA English majors.

3.2 Data collection instrument

The Discourse Completion Task (DCT), adapted from Ahmadian and Vahid Dastjerdi (2010), was employed to collect data. See Appendix. The DCT was distributed to a sample of 100 university students after their class time (50 males and 50 females); they were asked to fill out their personal details section as well as their responses in Spoken Jordanian Arabic to ten situations in five domains, namely work, home, university, public places, and friendship.

3.3 Data Analysis

The data collected was analyzed for the sake of creating a classification of all participants' reprimanding strategies. Descriptive statistics (i.e., frequencies and percentages) were used to find the most frequently used strategies used to express reprimand in SJA; they were tabulated according to gender and social domain. A qualitative analysis was then performed to consolidate the quantitative findings. The reprimand expressions were analyzed in terms of strategy type and politeness orientation (Brown and Levinson 1987) and classified the actions that mitigate FTA into Bald on-record, off record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and not doing the FTAs. Based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) and Garcia's (1996) classifications of strategies of reprimand, the researchers devised a new classification. Table 1 shows the classification of the reprimanding strategies used in the data produced in SJA and illustrated with examples.

Table 1: Reprimanding Strategies in Spoke Jordanian Arabic

The Reprimanding Strategy	Example	Translation
<i>* Bald On Record Strategies</i>		
1. Accusing/Admonishing warning/threatening	رسبوك اكيد في الامتحان لمحاولتك للغش	For sure, they failed you because you tried to cheat.
2. Claiming authority	من مباشر هذا أمر رئيسك	This is a direct order from your superior.
3. Presenting facts and evidence	واضح تأخيرك كل يوم عن الدوام شو تفسيرك لهذا الشيء	It is obvious that you come late every day. How do you explain this?
4. Rejecting any explanation or request	لا تضيف ولا كلمة زيادة	Don't say any extra word.

Strategies of Reprimand in Spoken Jordanian Arabic: A Sociopragmatic Study

The Reprimanding Strategy	Example	Translation
<i>Positive Politeness Strategies (PPS)</i>		
1. Expressing gratitude	انا ممتن لك بس بدي أوضح شغلة	I'm grateful to you, but I want to make clear one thing.
2. Presupposing, raising or claiming common ground	محنا بالهوا سوا	We are in the same situation.
3. Requesting cooperation	تعال خلينا نتعاون ونخلصهم	Come on! let us cooperate and finish them.
4. Requesting information or reasons	بس فهمني ليش عملت هيك	Just tell me, why did you do that?
5. Statement of obligation and/or expected statement of obligation and/or expected behavior	لازم تلتزم بقوانين الشركة	You must comply with the rules of the company.
6. Giving advice/Recommending change of behavior.	كون بمكتبك ع الوقت بالزبط	Be in your office on time!
7. Moralization	خلق عظيم عدم تجريح الآخرين	It is a great manner not to hurt others.
8. Noticing, or conserving for the hearer's goods, wants, and needs Giving respect to the hearer's goods, sympathy, understanding and cooperation.	انا متساهل معك كثير عشان صرفك	I am very lenient with you because of your circumstances.
<i>Negative Politeness Strategies</i>		
1. Indicating reluctance to offend/ Minimizing the imposition	والله انا متردد احكي معك بالموضوع	I am reluctant to talk with you about this issue.
2. Apologizing	بعذر اذا انا حكيت بوقت غير مناسب	I apologize if this time is inconvenient.
<i>Off Record Strategies (ORS)</i>		
1. Giving hints/Being conventionally indirect	حكيت الي عندي وفهمك كفاية	I said what I know, and I think you are smart enough to get my point.
2. Being ironic	مفكر حاله رئيس الجامعة	He thinks that he is the university president.
<i>Not doing the FTA (No FTA)</i>		
	انا شو دخلي، وليش أوجع راسي	It is not my business. Why should I bother myself?

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Strategies of reprimand in Jordanian Spoken Arabic by the DCT instrument

The analysis revealed that several politeness strategies were used, and that the relationship between the speakers and the seriousness of the face-threatening act influences the speakers' use of different politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987) in order to alleviate face threat to the hearer. These strategies include bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record and Not doing the face threatening act. Table 2 presents the strategies and the percentages of politeness strategies used by the participants.

Table 2: The Frequencies and Percentages of the Major Reprimand Strategies

Reprimand Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
Bald On Record Strategies	512	48%
Positive Politeness Strategies	430	40%
Negative Politeness Strategies	67	6%
Off Record Strategies (ORS)	15	1%
Not Doing the FTA	49	5%
Total	1073	100%

The overall distribution of reprimanding strategies used by Jordanian participants indicated a preference for *bald on-record* and *positive politeness* strategies over other categories. As the table demonstrates, a total of 1073 reprimand instances were found in the data. The most frequently used strategy was *bald on record*, which recorded 512 (48%), followed by the *positive politeness* (430 instances), accounting for 40%. The participants' use of *positive politeness* strategies indicate that they were trying not to threaten the interlocutor's positive face, i.e., they cared for his/her desires and self-image. Another significant finding shown in Table 2 is that the least used strategies were *negative politeness*, *off record*, and *not doing an FTA*, which recorded 6%, 1% and 5%, respectively. Their minimal use of *negative politeness* strategies indicates the speakers' intention to reduce imposition on the hearer.

4.2 Strategies of reprimand across situations

The analysis results, presented in Table 3, of the politeness strategies employed to express reprimand, indicated that the usage of these strategies varied across different social situations and domains.

Table 3: The frequencies of reprimanding strategies across all social situations

	<i>Home domain</i>	<i>University domain</i>	<i>Work domain</i>	<i>Public places domain</i>	<i>Friendship domain</i>	Total
Bald on Record	135	28	64	87	198	512
Positive Politeness	50	113	164	23	80	430
Negative Politeness	9	23	17	13	5	67
Off Record	3	2	2	3	5	15
Not Doing the FTA	4	22	14	7	2	49
Total	201	188	261	133	290	1073

Table 3 shows that friendship domain and home domain yielded the highest frequency in *bald on-record* politeness strategies (198 and 135, respectively), while the university domain registered the lowest frequency (28). However, it is noticed that in *positive politeness*, *negative politeness* and *Not doing an FTA* the participants registered more strategies in both work and university domains than all the other domains. Another distinctive feature in Table 6 is that *off record* politeness was the least used in the five domains under investigation.

4.3 Strategies of reprimand based on gender

The analysis has shown that male and female Jordanian speakers of Arabic differed in their use of the various types of politeness strategies they resorted to when reprimanding. Table (4) presents the frequencies and percentages for each sub-strategy.

Table 4: Frequencies of Reprimanding Sub-strategies by Jordanians according to gender (Males and Females)

Reprimand Strategies	Males		Females	
	Frequency	Percentages	Frequency	Percentages
Bald On-record strategies				
1. Accusing/Admonishing warning/threatening	237	82%	182	82%
2. Claiming authority	11	4%	6	3%
3. Presenting facts and evidence	37	13%	33	15%
4. Rejecting explanation/accusation or request	4	1%	2	1%
Total	289	100%	223	100%
Positive Politeness Strategies (PPS)				
1. Expressing gratitude	2	1%	4	2%
2. Presupposing, raising or claiming common ground	3	2%	3	1%
3. Requesting cooperation	86	46%	127	52%
4. Requesting information or reasons	43	23%	41	17%
5. Statement of obligation and/or expected statement of obligation and/or expected behavior	3	2%	6	2%
6. Giving advice/Recommending change of behavior.	41	22%	54	22%
7. Moralization	3	2%	2	1%
8. Noticing, or conserving for the hearer's goods, wants, and needs	7	4%	5	2%
9. Giving respect to the hearer's goods, understanding and cooperation.				
Total	188	100%	242	100%
Negative Politeness Strategies (NPS)				
1. Indicating reluctance to offend/Minimizing the imposition	11	55%	34	72%
2. Apologizing	9	45%	13	28%
Total	20	100%	47	100%
Off Record Strategies (ORS)				
1. Giving hints/Being conventionally indirect	2	29%	3	8%
2. Being ironic	5	71%	5	13%
Total	7	100%	8	100%
Not doing the FTA (No FTA)	18	100%	31	100%
Overall Total	522		551	100%

Table (4) shows that Jordanian females employed more strategies of reprimanding than males, 551 and 522, respectively. As shown in Table (4), males tended to employ more *bald on-record* strategies than their female counterparts (289 and 223), whereas females tended to use *more positive politeness* (242 and 188), *negative politeness* (47 and 20), *off-record* (8 and 7) and *Not doing the FTA* (31 and 18). This means that females tended to be more indirect than their male counterparts when expressing reprimand either through employing *positive politeness* or *negative politeness* or *not doing the FTA*. In other words,

males appeared to be far more forceful, confrontational and authoritative than their female counterparts who tended to show more concern for the addressee. Finding that males used more direct strategies than females support previous research that gender has a significant impact on the expressions of reprimand as it is a social construction that attributes to the linguistic behavior of both men and women (García 1996).

Males and females resorted to different types of politeness by employing different reprimanding strategies in light of what is socially expected in terms of their linguistic behavior. This result implies that females used a variety of strategies to reprimand in diverse situations compared to their male counterparts who reprimanded directly regardless of their addressees. It also signifies that females seem to be more cautious of their addressees' sensitivity and their social familiarity. Therefore, they are not disinclined to reprimand directly. Instead, they employed *more positive* and *negative politeness* strategies to protect their sensitivity because *bald on record* strategies have the potency to offend their interlocutors' feelings. In contrast, their higher usage of *bald on record* indicates that males tended to exhibit an accusatory tone noticeable in their preference of employing accusing, warning and threatening, claim of authority and presentation of facts. This might help them emphasize their dominance. This finding is in line with Wardaugh's (2021) finding that males and females' communicative patterns vary because they play different roles in their societies. This means that they are expected to behave according to different assigned characteristics which in turn enables them to set aside/distinct their femininity and masculinity. This finding also supports Garcia's (1996) conclusion that men tend to choose coercion strategies and women tend to choose cooperative strategies as women are more conscious of the sensitivity of the addressees and the importance of being polite to them. This finding also supports Mills' (2003) claim that the perceived norms amongst males and females besides gender stereotyping and assumptions seem to influence the assessment and interpretations of interactions.

4.4 Sub-strategies of reprimand used in Spoken Jordanian Arabic

In the following sections, these major strategies and their sub-strategies are discussed in detail with some illustrative examples taken from the data.

4.4.1 Bald on-record strategies

As previously mentioned, *bald on-record* was the most frequently used strategy among all with 512 instances, accounting for 48% of the total number of strategy use. The frequencies and percentages of *bald on record* sub-strategies are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Frequencies and percentages of Bald on-record sub-strategies

Bald on-record strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1. Accusing/ warning/ Admonishing /threatening	419	82%
3. Presenting facts and evidence	70	14%
2. Claiming authority	17	3%
4. Rejecting any explanation or request	6	1%
5. Total	512	100%

Table 5 shows that *Accusing/Admonishing /threatening* strategy was the most used reprimand strategy in Spoken Jordanian Arabic with a frequency of 419, accounting for (82%) of the total number of

instances. This was followed by *presenting facts and evidence strategy*, which registered 70 instances, accounting for 14%, then *claiming authority* with a frequency of 17. The table also shows that *rejecting any explanation or request* was the least used strategy by the Jordanians. In the following subsections, we will discuss these subcategories with some illustrative examples from the data.

Accusing/Admonishing

Some speakers use warnings or threats or state punishments, which means that they express themselves in harsher words to indicate duties or obligations. The data revealed that *accusing and admonishing* strategy was used with a high frequency (419), accounting for 82% of the total number of instances. In response to situation one (work domain), for example, the data has shown that some participants used expressions of accusation of being unfair and oppressive because of taking a bribe like as in examples 1-3.

1. اِنَّتِهْ غَيْرَ حَقَّائِي ? *intah yajra haqa:ni* (You are unfair)
2. مَا لَكَ حَقَّ تَوَخَّدَ أَشْيِي *ma:lak haqq twxið ?afi* (You have no right to take what does not belong to you.)
3. اِنَّتِهْ رَحْ تَظَلُّكْ دَائِمًا ظَالِمًا (You will always be an oppressor and unfair to others)

Presenting facts and evidence

To reprimand, speakers frequently present factual information to the hearers concerning their behavior. Table 5 shows that this strategy was the second frequently used strategy. In response to situation one (work domain), for example, the data has shown that some participants used some facts and evidence against taking a bribe to reprimand the bribed. Expressions used were like threatening the bribed with law or evidence from our prophet's sayings. See 4-5 below:

4. أَنْتَ عَارَفَ قَانُونِ الشُّغْلِ عَنَّا كَيْفَ بَعَاقِبِ عِ أَخَذَ الرِّشْوَةَ. *?anta ?a:rif qa:nu:na a:l?u?ul ?anna: kajfa bi?a:qib ?a ?axði a:lrafwat* (You know OUR work regulations and instructions concerning how the bribed is punished.)
5. لَعَنَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الرَّاشِيَّ وَالْمُرْتَشِيَّ. *la?ana rasulu a:llahi s?alla: a:llahu ?alajhi wasallam a:lra:fi: wa-?al-murtafi:* (The Messenger of Allah cursed the one who bribes and the one who takes a bribe.)

This implies that if one provides evidence or trustworthy source like what Prophet Mohammed said or the country law, he/she will find logical reason to reprimand. Participants in this study often soften their reprimands by providing explanations and justifications for their given perspective. Providing additional information and reasons could help them establish good avenues of negotiation, thus support shared lines of understanding the justification of the behavior. Asserting the position of power is often done by threatening the addressee's freedom of action and the solidarity of the relationship.

Claiming authority

The third most frequently used *bald on-record* strategy was *claiming authority* that was used with a frequency of 17 and a percentage of 3%. In this strategy, authority refers to power and responsibility,

which the others admit. In response to situation 2 (Friendship domain) in which one of the friends left his friend's room messy, the respondents produced utterances as in 6-7.

6. شُو هَالْفَوْضَى إِلَيَّ بِالْغُرْفِ fu: ha:lfawd'a: ?illi: bi-?al-?uraf (What a mess have you made!!)

7. لَازِمٌ تَرْجِعُ الْغُرْفَةَ لِصَاحِبِهَا زِي مَا سَلَمَكَ يَاها. la:zim tirǧaʕ ?al-?urfat lis'a:hibha: zaij ma: sallamak ja:ha:
(You have to leave the room as the owner leave it to you.).

As can be seen, the participants used this strategy in order to emphasize the power of the reprimander and to remind the reprimandee of his/her duties though they are of equal status.

Rejecting any explanation or request

The participants used *rejecting any explanation or request strategy* when they did not want to open any further negotiation and reflect their desire to stop the discussion, especially if the reprimandee did not give up easily. This strategy was the least used strategy with a frequency of six. To illustrate, in response to situation 1 (home domain) the respondents who played the role of the mother produced utterances to discipline her child to stop playing with matches as in examples 8-9.

8. أَعْذَارُكَ مِشْ مَقْبُولَةٌ ?aʕða:rak miʃ maqbu:lat (Your excuses are rejected.)

9. هَذِهِ آخِرُ مَرَّةٍ أَشُوفُكَ مَاسِكِ عُلْبَةِ الْكِبْرِيتِ . إنتَهَى الْكَلَامُ ، هَذِهِ آخِرُ مَرَّةٍ أَشُوفُكَ مَاسِكِ عُلْبَةِ الْكِبْرِيتِ .
?intaha: a:lkala:m . haðihi ?a:xir marrat ?afu:fak ma:sik
?ulbati ?al-kibri:t (The conversation is over. It is the last time to see you holding a matchbox).

4.4.2 Positive politeness strategies

The findings indicated that Jordanians employed a range of positive politeness strategies to convey reprimand. Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage of these positive politeness strategies used in Spoken Jordanian Arabic.

Table 6: Frequencies and percentages of Positive Politeness Strategies in Spoken Jordanian Arabic

Positive Politeness Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
Requesting Cooperation	213	50%
Giving Advice/Recommending Change of Behavior.	95	22%
Requesting Information or Reasons	84	20%
Noticing, or Conserving for the Hearer's Goods, Wants, and Needs, Understanding and Cooperation.	12	3%
Statement Of Obligation and/or Expected Statement of Obligation and/or Expected Behavior	9	2%
Expressing Gratitude	6	1%
Presupposing, Raising or Claiming Common Ground	6	1%
Moralization	5	1%
Total	430	100%

It is clearly manifested in Table 6 that the most used strategy was *requesting cooperation* with a frequency of 213 followed by *giving advice/recommending change of behavior* (95), and *requesting information or reason* (84). The least used strategies were *statement of obligation and/or expected statement of obligation and/or expected behavior* (9), *expressing gratitude* (6), and *presupposing, raising*

or *claiming common ground*, and *moralization* (5). In the following subsections, we will discuss these subcategories with some illustrative examples from the data.

Requesting cooperation

One of the basics of human interaction is the combination of cooperation and understanding. The data revealed that *requesting cooperation* was the most frequently used strategy, which recorded 213 instances, accounting for 50%. This strategy was used in some situations to ensure the cooperation of the reprimandee as shown in the participant's response to the second situation (University domain) as seen in examples 10-11.

10. لازم تتعاوني معي مثل ما أنا متعاون معك وأعطيتك دفترتي *la:zim tku:ni: kθi:r mitʕa:wnit maʕi: miθl ma: ʔana: mitʕa:win maʕaka waʔuʕtʕajtak daftari:* (You should be very cooperative with me as I did with you and gave you my book)
11. طب تعالي خلينا نتعاون ونندور ع الدفتر بالمكان إالي كنت فيه بلكي لقيناه *tʕab taʕa:li: xalli:na: nitʕa:wan wandawwir ʕa ʔal-daftar bi-ʔal-maka:ni ʔilli: kunt fi:h balki: laqi:na:h* (Okay, come, let us cooperate and search for the notebook in the place where you were in order to find it)

The reprimander is a university student whose colleague borrowed her notebook, and lost it. It is obvious from the examples that the respondents were trying to request the cooperation of the addressee. This situation repeatedly occurs between students as peer relationships at university can facilitate or be an obstacle to learning. The findings of the present research has shown that most of the respondents to the situations resorted to requesting cooperation strategy because they did not want to damage the relationship with their friends and peers by using expressions as “لازم تتعاوني معي مثل ما أنا متعاون معك” (You should be as cooperative as I am!), “خلينا نتعاون ونندور على الدفتر” (Let's cooperate and search for the notebook!). As shown in example 10, the reprimander was asking for reciprocity.

Giving advice/recommending change of behavior

This strategy is a way of relating personal opinions, guidance, recommendations about particular situations in some context to others. The data revealed that some DCT respondents preferred to use giving recommendations or advice to their interlocutors to cause a change in their behavior. *Giving advice/recommending change of behavior* was the second most frequently used positive politeness strategy with a frequency of 95, accounting for 22%. In response to second situation (University domain), for example, the participants used some expressions as in 12 and 13.

12. لازم ترسي كويس وما تطنشي ولا محاضرة *li-ʔzim tudrusi: kwajjis wama: ttʕanʕi: wala: muha:dʕarat* (You should study very hard and don't miss any class)
13. أنصحك تحضري لأنه هذه رح تكون أهم محاضرة *tihdʕari: liʔannuh haðihi rah taku:n ʔahamm muha:dʕarat ʔansʕahik* (I advise you to attend because it will be the most important lecture)

The respondents used expressions of advice to their classmate who skipped classes at the university to have breakfast at the university restaurant. The reprimander knew that the professor would discuss the exam questions; therefore, she resorted to advice giving. She told her that she should study hard and attend classes, which are important because her teacher might discuss the exam questions. In general,

Jordanians preferred to use this strategy in some situations when they wanted to put some pressure on the reprimandee to do or refrain from doing an action using words like *li-ʔzim tudrusi*: (You should study), which was very common in the participants' responses.

Requesting information and reasons

The use of expressing facts and requesting information and reasons strategy indicates that the reprimander wants to back and logically support his reprimanding as this shows that there is evidence that derives voicing reprimands as shown in the following examples taken from the data. In the home domain, for example, the respondents were asked to express reprimand to his brother who deleted important folders on his laptop.

14. *mumkin tbajjinli: li:f ʕamalt hajk fu:q ma:*

ʔaʕtʕajtak ʔaldʒiha:z haðaft malaffa:ti (Despite giving you my laptop, you deleted my files, Could you please explain why you did that?)

15. *fu: ʔilli: xalla:k tiblaf billi: ma:lak fi:h wajn*

tʕa:r ʔal-malaf ʔal-mxazzan hawn (Why did you get involved in someone else's business? Where is the saved file?)

As shown in the examples (14 and 15), the speaker tried to find a good reason for reprimanding his brother by asking about the reasons and motives for deleting the important files. He accused him of not being cautious and asked for justifications and reasons by saying / *fu: ʔilli: xalla:k tiblaf billi: ma:lak fi:h* / (Why did you get involved in someone else's business?).

Noticing or conserving for the hearer's goods, wants

This strategy ranked fourth in terms of usage, with a frequency of 13 occurrences. A speaker may cater to the listener's positive face wants by meeting some of their desires, suggesting that the speaker is aware of some of the listener's needs and wishes to satisfy them. This can be seen in several responses given in the first situation within the public domain. Refer to examples 16 and 17 for more detail.

16. *ʔna: baʕrif mada: ha:ɖtak*

ʔinnak tdaxxin ha:lsi:ɖga:rat bas mumkin tʔaxxiha: lama: ninzil min ʔalba:s (I know you need to smoke, but can you delay it till we get off the bus?)

17. *ʔna: ʕa:rif ʔinnuh kθi:r dʕaru:ri:*

ʕindak ʔinnuh tdaxxin bas batmanna: ʔinnak titʕfi: siɖga:ra (I know that is necessary for you to smoke, just I wish you would put out your cigarette.)

The participant reprimander was in a bus, and the passenger sitting in front of her was smoking. She could not stand the smell. The analysis showed that the participants preferred to express reprimand using *noticing, or conserving for the hearer's goods strategy*. In this situation, the participants preferred to show more concern for the addressee's face by saying / *ʔna: baʕrif mada: ha:ɖtak ʔinnak tdaxxin* / (I know how much your need to smoke the cigarette...). In general, this outcome suggests that she took

notice of aspects of hearer's condition that he wanted her to notice and approve; hence, she asked him to cooperate with her and put the cigarette out to assert or imply knowledge of his wants.

Statement of obligation and/or expected statement of obligation and/or expected behavior

This strategy represents the importance of considering that every individual in a social interaction must identify a set of rights and responsibilities, which govern how he or she is meant to behave. This strategy occurred six times as shown in some expressions in response to the second situation (Work domain).

18. رشوة ما تاخذ رشوة *hða: fuɣul wia:lmafru:d^s tindɣizuh bidu:n ma: ta:xuð rafwat*
(*This is work, and you are supposed to accomplish it without taking a bribe*)

19. واجب علينا إنه نحترم النظام في الشركة هون. *wa:dɣib ʕalajna: ʔinnuh nihtarim ʔalnið^ʕa:m fi: ʔal-ʕarikat hawn*
(*We ought to respect the company bylaws*)

The reprimander saw someone coming to his office in order to follow up his paperwork. His colleague exploited the situation and took a bribe in order to accelerate the process. The purpose of this strategy is to specify obligations. The reprimander in this situation attempted to reach recognition of the obligations that would determine what he could expect from the addressee. It conveyed the hearer's obligation to carry out the action instead of taking a bribe to do that job for him. The use of words like / *hða: fuɣul wia:lmafru:d^s tindɣizuh bidu:n ma: ta:xuð rafwat* / (This is work and you are supposed to accomplish it without taking a bribe!) and / *wa:dɣib ʕalajna: ʔinnuh nihtarim ʔalnið^ʕa:m fi: ʔal-ʕarikat hawn* / (We ought to respect the company bylaws) indicate that it is obligatory for the hearer.

Expressing gratitude

Expressing gratitude is considered very important in most cultures since it is commonly used in everyday interaction and has a significant social value. This strategy was used six times in most formal situations prefacing their utterance as:

20. بداية شكرا لك كثير على الإنجاز إليي تقدمه في العمل. وبس بتمنى منك إنك ما تتأخر عَ الدوام. *bida:jatan fuɣran lak kθi:r ʕala: ʔalʔindɣa:z ʔilli: tqadmuh fi: ʔal-ʕamal wbas batmanna: minnak ʔinnak ma: titʔaxxar ʕa ʔaldawa:m*
(*In beginning, thank you very much for your achievements at work and only I wish that you don't come late to work*).

21. أنا ممنون إلك إذا التزمت بساعات العمل الرسمي. *ʔana: mamnu:n ʔilak ʔiða: ʔal-tazamt bsa:ʕa:ti ʔal-ʕamali ʔal-rasmi*
(*I am grateful to you if you commit to the working hours*).

Examples (20) and (21) were used in response to second situation of the work domain. The respondent was asked to monitor the employees' attendance. He noticed that one of his colleagues often came late. The results of the analysis indicate that the respondents preferred to express appreciation and positive feeling at first to strengthen the bonds with the addressee. After that, they stated their reprimanding remarks. As noticed, the respondent in example 19, used / *bida:jatan fuɣran lak kθi:r* / (At the beginning, thank you very much...) and in example 20, / *ʔana: mamnu:n ʔilak* / (I am grateful to

you...) to express their gratitude and appreciation before reprimanding to soften the tone of the reprimanding expressions that follow.

Presupposing, raising or claiming common ground

Presupposition registered only six instances. In their response to the second scenario in the public place's domain, the respondents claimed a common ground as stating that both belong to the same group with common needs, interests, goals and values, as shown in the following examples:

22. إحنّا الإثنین صار لنا ساعة نستنی مو إنتَ لحالك *?ihna: ?al-?iθnajn sʕa:r lana: sa:ʕat nistanna: mu: ?inta*

laħa:lak (Both of us were waiting for an hour. You are not the only one)

23. أنا مثلي مثلك صار لي ساعة واقف *?na: miθli: miθlak sʕa:r li: sa:ʕat wa:qif (I am just as you, waiting for an*

hour.)

In this scenario, the respondent had to wait in a long line in the bus station, but while he was standing in line, someone tried to cut in line. As shown in the examples, the addresser claimed a common ground by saying that he/she was also waiting in the line for an hour, and that he was not supposed to cut the line using expressions like *?ihna: ?al-?iθnajn sʕa:r lana: sa:ʕat nistanna / (Both of us were waiting for an hour)*, and *?na: miθli: miθlak / (I am just like you!)*. Using this strategy to remind the addressee that the interlocutors are in the same situation and try to emphasize that they share specific wants and goals with the addressee, expecting that they will share the same point of view.

Moralization

The least used strategy is *moralization* where morals are perceived as standards of behavior. These are the principles related to what is right and what is wrong, which are shared by members of a certain society. This strategy was represented in the data in some expressions as:

24. من حسن الأخلاق إنه الواحد يصدق بمواعيده *min ħusni ?al?axla:q ?innuh ?al-wa:ħid jusʕduq bimawa:ʕi:duh*

(It is a good manner, to keep up your meeting dates)

25. البداً يحكي إنه نحترم الوقت وما نكذب *?al-mabda? jħki: ?innuh niħtarim ?al-waqt wama: nikðib (The moral*

states that we should abide by what we said and don't lie.)

The respondent had an appointment with her friend and she was waiting for 30 minutes. It was not the first time for her friend to come late. As known, friendship is a relationship of shared care between people. Here the respondent was annoyed and wanted to convince her friend that punctuality is crucial and indicates the person's reliability. She resorted to this strategy to emphasize that it is important to make punctuality one of the core values by using expressions like *min ħusni ?al?axla:q ?innuh ?al-wa:ħid jusʕduq bimawa:ʕi:duh (It is of a good manner to keep up your meeting dates)*.

4.4.3 Negative Politeness Strategies

Table 7: Frequencies and Percentages of Negative Politeness Strategies (NPS)

Negative Politeness Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1. Indicating reluctance to offend/minimizing the imposition	45	67%
2. Apologizing	22	33%
Total	67	100%

Table 7 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of negative politeness strategies used by Jordanian Arabic speakers. Two negative politeness strategies were observed in the respondents' production, namely *indicating reluctance to offend/minimizing the imposition* (67%) and *apologizing* (33%). These strategies help the speaker to keep away from offending his/her reprimandee and to rationalize their acts of reprimanding. These two strategies are discussed below.

Indicating reluctance to offend/minimizing the imposition

This strategy implies that the speaker feels no power to reprimand and convince the addressee to change his/her behavior. Due to such reasons and maybe others, the respondents in the present study tended to be unwilling and hesitant to voice reprimand. This strategy registered 45 instances, accounting for 67%. Some expressions given in response to the second situation of the friendship domain are:

26. لا تفهمها إنه أنا ما بدِّي أضغط عليك ترتب الغرفة بس من الأصل لازم تضل الغرفة نظيفة. *La tfahhimha: ?innuh ?na:*

biddi: ?ad?yat? ?alajk li-? trattib ?al-yurfat bas min ?al-?as?il li-?zim td'al ?al-yurfit nð'i:fit (Do not take it as I am imposing on you to tidy the room. It should be clean in the first place.)

27. أنا ما أحملك جميلة إنه إنت ساكن عندي. *?na: ma: ?a?amlak d?mi:lit ?innuh ?inta sa:kin ?indi: (I am not doing you a favor of letting you stay in my house.)*

Example (26) and (27) were responses given to the second situation in the friendship domain. A friend stayed in his friend's room to study for a final exam, and when he came back he found that his room was mess. *Minimizing the imposition* was employed by the respondents in order to evade any danger of deterring their relationship since expressing reprimand might endanger maintaining on-going good relationships between interlocutors. In this situation, the potential to threat to face was great; therefore, the speaker made the decision to choose *?na: ma: ?a?amlak d?mi:lit / (I am not indebted to you for...)* *indicating reluctance to offend/minimizing the imposition strategy* because FTAs cannot be avoided sometimes. However, the speaker took the risk of being misunderstood and not being able to communicate the FTA.

Apologizing

Olshtain (1989) describes an apology as a speech act intended to comfort the listener who has genuinely or potentially been affected by a violation. The use of *apology* implies the reprimanders' desire to keep a desirable relationship between each other. In the data collected, the participants apologized for what they intended to say for example some expressions utilized in the first situation in the university domain as

28. *أسف يا خوي إني أحكيلك هيك بس مرة ثانية ما رح أعيرك شي .* *ʔa:sif ja: xu:j ʔinni: ʔhki:lak hajk. bas marrat*
θa:ni:t ma: raħ ʔaʕi:rak faj (I am sorry to say that, but next time I will not lend you anything)
29. *باعتذر منك باعرف إنه مو وقتته. بس ياريت مرة ثانية ما تطلب مني شي*
baʕtaðir minnak ba:ʕrif ʔinnuh mu: waqtuh bas ja:rajt marrat θa:njit ma: tuʕlub minni: faj (I apologize. I know it isn't the right time, but I wish you didn't ask me again)

These responses were produced by a participant who was put in a situation in which a student lent a colleague his notebook to take the notes of the previous class but he lost it. The data showed that this strategy was employed 22 times by the respondents, indicating their respect for the listener's negative face and their commitment to not infringing upon the addressee's freedom of action. In general, that is why speakers resort to minimizing the threat by using apology, deference, hedges and other strategies, such as expressions of apology / *ʔa:sif* / (sorry) and / *baʕtaðir* / (I apologize.).

4.4.4 Off-record strategies

The off-record strategies found in the data collected are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: The Frequencies and Percentages of Off Record Strategies

Off Record Strategies (ORS)	Frequency	Percentage
Giving hints/Being conventionally indirect	5	33%
Being ironic	10	67%
Total	15	100%

Off-record is a politeness strategy that relies upon implicature. Two off-record strategies were used by the participants, namely *giving hints/being conventionally indirect* and *being ironic* with a frequency of 5 and 10, respectively.

Giving hints/being conventionally indirect

Being conventionally indirect tends to be more polite because the speaker increases the degree of optionality. This strategy implies that the hearer should infer the unseen intended message, and that he/she recognizes an utterance as a hint when it is clear that the speaker does not intentionally convey the literal meaning, as illustrated in examples used in response to the first situation in the university domain.

30. *عمل خير شر تلاقى. فوق ما أنا معطيكى دفترى تروحي تضيعيه*
a:ʕmal xajr ʕar tla:qi: fawq ma: ʔana: maʕri:ki: daftari: tru:hi: tdʕjʕi:h (Do good, you receive bad. Above giving you my notebook, you lost it)
31. *الحق على أصلاً إني أعطيتك دفترى*
ʔal-ħaq ʕalaj ʔasʕlan ʔinni: ʔʕtʕjʕtik daftari: (It is my fault in the first place. I should not have given my notebook to you)

In this situation, one of the colleagues borrowed the notebook from another but he lost it. The reprimand preferred to use *giving hints/being conventionally indirect* strategy to express reprimand like *a:ʕmal xajr ʕar tla:qi:* (Do good, you receive bad), which is obscure in nature and the participant exploited

its opacity while getting the addressee to identify the implicit meaning. Example 30 shows that the reprimander blamed herself for giving her colleague the notebook, which is an indirect strategy that implies blaming her friend for losing the notebook; it is the addressee's responsibility to infer the intended meaning.

Being ironic

Being ironic is a strategy used by a speaker, which is planned to criticize in an off-record way. It is used in some ways to imply the opposite meaning as in these examples.

32. شُكراً لكَ كَثِيرَ عَلَى هَإِلْتِزَامِ بِسَاعَاتِ الْعَمَلِ. *fukran lak kθi:r ʕala: ha:lʔiltizam bsa:ʕa:ti ʔal-ʕamal* (Thank you very much for being punctual.)

33. شَوُ مَفَكَّرُ حَالِكَ مُدِيرِ الشَّرِكَةِ. *fu: mfakkir ha:lak mudi:ri ʔal-ʕarikit* (Do you consider yourself the manager?)

In response to the first situation in the work domain, the participant was asked to monitor the employees' attendance, but he noticed that one of his colleagues was coming late very often. The participant was *ironic*. His motivation to use this strategy was to put his colleague at ease since irony is based on implicature, mutual shared values and background knowledge.

4.4.5 Not doing the FTA

The data revealed that the respondents recorded 49 instances of *Not doing the FTA*, which could be attributed to the participants' intention to avoid confrontation with the addressee. They wanted to avoid being in complex situations. This implies that the speaker felt that he/she had no power to reprimand and convince the addressee to change his/ her behavior as shown in this example:

34. مِش رَإِيحُ أَنَاقَشَكَ بِالمَوْضُوعِ. بَسْ حَاوِلْ تَلْتَزِمْ بِالدَّوَامِ أَكْثَرَ. *mif ra:jih ʔana:qʕak bi-ʔal-mawdʕu:ʕ bas ha:wil tiltazim bi-ʔal-dawa:m ʔakθar* I will not discuss it with you, but try to be more punctual. g

This expression was produced in response to the first situation in the work domain where the participant was asked to monitor the employees' attendance, but he noticed that one of his colleagues was often come late. The participant here preferred to use *not doing FTA* strategy to express reprimand without creating any confrontations with his colleague by saying/ *mif ra:jih ʔana:qʕak* / (I will not discuss it with you.). This implies reprimand, but without face threatening.

5. Conclusion

The present research examined reprimand strategies used in Spoken Jordanian Arabic. It also aimed to determine the influence of gender on the usage of these strategies. The research discovered the participants used a total of 1073 reprimand instances in their responses to the DCT. Upon reviewing the quantity of strategies employed by both groups (males and females), the general results revealed no significant differences. However, taking into consideration the five major categories of strategies of reprimand, the study uncovered variances in how the two groups employed the five major strategies. This

implies that gender has an impact on the use of reprimanding. Another finding was that the domain has an impact on the use of such strategies.

The present study has shown that reprimanding is a very complex communicative act; Jordanians use a range of strategies when reproaching others for unacceptable actions or behavior. The findings indicate that within Jordanian social interaction, there is a preference for *bald on-record* expression of reprimanding to sound more forceful. The *bald on-record* strategies help the speakers create, increase and strengthen added pressure on their reprimandees. These strong expressions to voice reprimands are preferred over considerations of the addressee's face.

Despite the apparent inclination to go on record when reprimanding, it seems that the Jordanian participants were aware of the importance of employing positive and negative politeness strategies. They could account for their preference to threaten and at the same time show an attempt to preserve their own or their addressee's positive and negative face equally. Additionally, the participants showed inclination to use some mitigators (e.g., address terms and hedges) so as to lessen the negative impact of the indirect way of reprimanding, thus saving the addressee's face.

The usage of such strategies (positive and negative strategies) helps the reprimander minimize the force of the reprimanding expression and soften its tone. The high use of expressing facts and requesting information and reasons indicates that the reprimander wants to logically support his reprimanding by expressing proof that derives voicing reprimands. Participants were observed to soften their reprimanding communication by offering reasons and justifications for their reprimands.

Because caring to save each other's face is highly valued and holds significant importance in the Jordanian Arabic culture, the participants in the current study tended to vary their reprimand strategies as well as employ *positive*, *negative*, and sometimes *off record* politeness strategies. Some participants started their interaction by requesting a justification, threatening, and then seeking agreement. Others initiated their reprimanding by presupposing, raising or claiming common ground followed by requesting/offering cooperation followed by incurring debt. The use of *positive*, *negative* and sometimes *off record* politeness strategies, in which speakers could mitigate their expressions of reprimands in order to save the addressee's face, lends support to Brown and Levinson's argument that speech acts are intrinsically face threatening acts. We can conclude that the use of the expression of *not doing the FTAs* is due to the reprimanders' intention to avoid confrontation with the addressee who enjoys high social status; they want to avoid being in complicated situations. According to Beebe and Takahashi (1989, 200) opting out of expressing a speech act could be because speakers refrain from issuing any disagreeable act, as they cannot provide good reasoning.

استراتيجيات التوبيخ المستخدمة في اللهجة الأردنية: دراسة براجماتية اجتماعية

أمل ناجي الخوالدة

عمادة البحث العلمي، الجامعة الأردنية، الأردن

غالب رباحة

قسم اللغات الأجنبية، جامعة الشارقة، الإمارات العربية المتحدة

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، الجامعة الأردنية، الأردن

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى البحث في استراتيجيات التوبيخ المستخدمة في اللهجة الأردنية علاوة على دراسة تأثير الجنس في هذه الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة، جُمعت البيانات من 100 مشارك أردني (50 ذكر و50 أنثى) من الناطقين باللهجة العربية الأردنية باستخدام أداة مهمة إتمام الخطاب (DCT). وقد كشف التحليل النوعي والكمي عن أن الأردنيين يوظفون استراتيجيات مختلفة للتوبيخ بحسب تصنيفات بروان وليفنسون وهي: الاستراتيجية الصريحة واستراتيجيات التأدب الإيجابي، واستراتيجيات التأدب السلبي واستراتيجية التلميح واستراتيجية الصمت. وقد تبين أن الأردنيين يفضلون استخدام الاستراتيجيات الصريحة في التعبير عن التوبيخ وأن الإناث يملن إلى توظيف استراتيجيات متعددة، في حين يميل الذكور إلى التوبيخ بالطريقة المباشرة بغض النظر عن المخاطب، وعلى الرغم من الميل الواضح لاستخدام الاستراتيجيات المباشرة، فإن عينة الدراسة كانت على دراية بأهمية توظيف استراتيجيات التأدب الإيجابية والسلبية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأفعال التي تحط من المقام؛ التأدب؛ التوبيخ؛ أفعال الكلام؛ البراغماتية.

References

- Ahmadian, Mohahammad and Eslami-Rasekh. 2011. A comparative study of reprimand strategies: evidence from Iranian and American speech communities. *The social sciences* 6 (1): 1-7.
- Ahmadian, Mohahammad Javad, and H. Vahid Dastjerdi. 2010 A comparative study of perception of politeness of American reprimands by Iranian EFL learners and Americans. *The Social Sciences* 5 (4): 359-363.
- Allami, Hamid and Fazlolah Samimi 2014. Rapport management approach to reprimand: Intermediate vs. advanced EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98: 220-224.
- Al-Shemmerya, Muayad Mingher, Asim Abood Zbarb, and Hisham Adnan. 2020. Responding to the speech act of reprimand by Iraqi EFL University Students. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change* 11 (7): 695-710.
- Beebe, Leslie, and Takahashi Tomoko. 1989. "Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: Chastisement and Disagreement". In *The dynamic interlanguage*, 199-218: Springer Link.
- Brown, Penelope, and Levinson Stephen. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Capone, Alessandro. 2010. On pragmemes again. Dealing with death. *La Linguistique* 46 (2): 3-21.
- Dozie, Chinonso, and Emeka Otagburuagu. 2019. Linguistic politeness forms in English among Igbo bilinguals in Nigeria: The Case of Reprimand. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* 7 (4): 33-47.
- García, Carmen. 1996. Reprimanding and responding to a reprimand: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (5): 663-697.
- García, Carmen. 2004. "Coercion and cooperation". In Reiter, Rozina and Maria Placencia (eds.) *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*, 123- 231: John Benjamins Publishing.
- García, Carmen. 2009. Intra-lingua pragmatic variation in the performance of reprimanding. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6 (4): 443-472.
- Haverkate, Henk. 1988. Toward a typology of politeness strategies in communicative interaction. *Multilingua* 7 (4): 385-410.
- Hofstede, Geert, Hofstede Jan, and Minkov Minkov. 1991. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,.
- Samimi, Fazlolah, and Jalal Khoramrooz. 2017. Manifesting the reprimanding response behavior of Native Persian speakers and EFL Learners using rapport management approach. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research* 5 (20): 79-93.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2002. Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport-sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (5): 529-545.

Strategies of Reprimand in Spoken Jordanian Arabic: A Sociopragmatic Study

- Tuan Jeanne, and Hsu Helen. (2009). Cultural differences in responding to reprimands in American English and Taiwanese Chinese. *Airiti Library* 5 (2): 65-79.
- Vanderveken, Daniel. 1990. Meaning and speech acts. In *Principles of language use*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999. "Understanding pragmatics". In *Understanding Language Series*. London: Arnold. Painamattomat lähteet
- Wardhaugh, Ronald, and Janet Fuller. 2021. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*: London: John Wiley & Sons.

Appendix A

English version

This Discourse Completion Task (DCT) forms part of a research project overseen by a postgraduate student from the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Jordan. We kindly request your participation in filling out both the personal details section and providing responses to each scenario, emulating real-life conversations. Please also be assured that all information provided will remain confidential and only used for academic research purposes. We greatly appreciate your time and effort. When responding, please do so naturally without overanalyzing your responses. It is important to note that the data collected will solely be used for research purposes.

Home Domain

1. You are a mother of three children. One of them is playing with the matchbox. How would you reprimand him/her?
2. Your brother uses your laptop for a long time and you find that one of the important folders is omitted. How would you reprimand him?

University Domain

1. You are a university student. One of your colleagues borrows your notebook in order to take the notes of the previous lecture that he did not attend but he lost it. What would you say to him/her?
2. As a university student, you have a colleague who is pressuring you to skip your 8 o'clock class to have breakfast at the university's restaurant. Given that you have an exam tomorrow, you recall your professor stating that they will review the exam's topics in today's class. Despite this, your colleague is still insisting on missing the class. How would you reprimand him/her?

Work Domain

1. You see someone come to your office to follow up his/her paperwork and your colleague trying to exploit the situation and take bribe in order to accelerate the process. What would you say to your colleague?
2. You are asked to monitor the employees' commitment to work hours and you notice that one of your colleagues often comes late. How would you reprimand him/her?

Public places Domain

1. You are on a bus and the passenger seated in front of you is smoking. The smell is unbearable for you. What would you say to him/her?
2. You need to spend the weekend with your parents and find yourself at the bus station, waiting in a long queue. After waiting for more than an hour, someone attempts to cut the line right in front of you. What would you say to him/her?

Friendship Domain

1. You have arranged to meet a friend and you have already been waiting for 30 minutes. This is not the first time that they have been late. How would you reprimand him or her?
2. You are visiting your family in Irbid, while your friend requested to use your room in Amman over the weekend for their exam preparation. Upon your return, you find your friend has been careless, leaving your room in a mess. What would you say to him/her?.