
Gender and Reprimands in an Academic Circle: Evidence from an Iraqi EFL Context.

Nassier A. G. Al-Zubaidi (PhD)

Department of English, College of Arts

University of Baghdad,

Baghdad, Iraq.

Email: nassieralzubaidi@gmail.com

Abstract

The study examines the pragmatic strategies of reprimanding behavior by Iraqi EFL male and female university learners and identifies the politeness strategies preferred by each gender. A discourse-completion task is utilized to elicit written responses from 40 Iraqi EFL participants divided equally into 20 males and 20 females. Results reveal that both Iraqi EFL male and female participants opt for solidarity politeness over deferential politeness thereby reflecting their preference for being authoritative while maintaining friendliness. As for supportive moves, they use mitigators and aggravators to ameliorate and intensify respectively the head acts of reprimands. They prefer aggravators over mitigators in their reprimands. Though the two gender groups of Iraqi EFL participants use the same strategy types of head acts and supportive moves in their reprimands, they differ in the frequency of occurrence of particular strategy types. Finally, a number of conclusions and pedagogical implications are presented.

Keywords: Reprimands, solidarity, deference, mitigators, & aggravators.

1. Introduction

Interlanguage pragmatics is a subfield of interlanguage studies belonging to both the domain of second language acquisition and pragmatics. It examines the way nonnative speakers or L2 learners comprehend and produce a given speech act in a target language, and investigates how their pragmatic competence develops over time (Schauer, 2009, p.15). Ample research has reported that nonnative speakers may acquire considerable grammatical knowledge of the target language norms but still fail to communicate effectively in certain contexts due to their lack of pragmatic knowledge of the target norms (Cohen, 1996; Bardovi- Harling, 1999; Allami & Samimi, 2014). Such pragmatic deficiency or failure can be more serious than the grammatical one since it can result in rudeness, unfriendliness or racial prejudice (Blum-Kulka, et al. 1989, p. 6). For nonnative speakers, pragmatic competence is crucial to communicate

effectively and appropriately with native speakers. The acquisition of pragmatic competence takes a longer time for nonnative speakers compared to grammatical competence (Salgado, 2011). Since the concept of pragmatic competence is originally proposed by Bachman in the 1990s of the last century, more research in the field of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) has been concerned about how nonnative speakers or L2 learners pragmatically deviate from native speakers' pragmatic norms due to either pragmatic transfer (Kasper, 1992) or cultural-specific norms (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993).

Kasper and Schmit (1996) claim that EFL learners might have some problems with producing and comprehending speech acts though they have the same amount of strategies at their disposal. Reprimands are considered inherently impolite and intruding on the part of the hearer. They have a high potential of threatening the hearer's face; they are assumed to be impolite in nature as "it is performed by the speakers with the intrinsic purpose of attacking or undermining the hearer's face" (Haverkate, 1988, p. 394). The act threatens the hearer's positive-face want for the speaker indicates that "the hearer is wrong-doing or misguided or unreasonable about some issue" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 66).

Among several empirical investigations of different speech acts, reprimands are underresearched from an interlanguage pragmatics perspective. After a thorough scrutinization, no empirical research examining the speech act of reprimands as used by Arabic-speaking learners of English in an EFL context does exist. The present study examines the pragmatic strategies of reprimanding behavior by male and female Iraqi learners of English, and identifies their preferred politeness strategies within the context examined. It dedicates itself to provide a possible explanation of how gender relates to the choice of reprimanding strategies.

2. Theoretical background

Reprimanding is frequently observed in daily interactions along with reproaching, insulting, rebuking, criticizing, threats and accusations. In the pragmatics study of conflict talk, reprimands often depict the illocutionary forces of blaming or condemning the hearer's actions for which s/he may be held responsible. It is performed to influence the hearer's future actions for his/her own benefit, or to communicate speaker's dissatisfaction with what the hearer has done but without implying that what the hearer has done has undesirable consequences for the speaker (Wierzbicka, 1987, p. 139). For the purpose of this study, Vanderveken's (1990) conception of reprimands is adopted. Vanderveken defines reprimanding as a

communicative illocutionary act of the assertive type. It is “an accusation with the special mode of achievement of adding personal displeasure as a punishment for the wrong doing. Generally, this reprimand comes out of a position of authority, although this may be a presumed sense of moral authority” (1990, p.179).

Reprimands are contextually sensitive to social factors such as gender, age, status and distance to preserve politeness resources. In this respect, previous research shows that males and females prefer different politeness strategies when performing various communicative acts (Garcia, 1993). Mills (2000) reports that linguistic politeness seems to be influenced by the perceived norms and assumptions between men and women. That is, the differing ways men and women approach interactions determines distinguishable gender-related frames of participation and consequently the different strategies they use (Garcia, 1996). Likewise, Tannen (1994) maintains that “research on gender and language has consistently found male speakers to be competitive and more likely to engage in conflict and females to be cooperative and more likely to avoid conflict” (p.179). The study data will help confirm or deny if this assumption holds true for the Iraqi EFL context examined here.

Research on reprimands can be categorized into two main directions, namely, cross-cultural pragmatics and interlanguage pragmatics. Reprimands have been investigated in different languages and cultures such as Peruvian Spanish (Garcia, 1996), Peruvian and Venezuelan Spanish (Garcia, 2004), Italian (Frescura, 2006), Peruvian, Venezuelan and Argentinean (Garcia, 2009), and Persian and American (Ahmadian & Eslami-Rasekh, 2011). On the other hand, reprimands have been examined in the performance of ESL/EFL learners from different linguistic backgrounds such as, Indonesian EFL learners (Mardhatilla, 2014) and Iranian EFL learners (Ahmadian & Dastjerdi, 2010; Allamia & Samimib, 2014). The present study adds more to the body of research findings available via exploring a new EFL context not examined before (i.e., Iraqi EFL learning context). This study is the first attempt at examining the interlanguage pragmatics of Iraqi male and female learners of English when reprimanding.

3. Research questions

Taking into account the contributions and findings of previous research, the present study is devoted to address the following research questions;

1. How do Iraqi EFL university learners produce the speech act of reprimanding in terms of head acts?

2. How do Iraqi EFL university learners produce the speech act of reprimanding in terms of supportive moves?
3. What are the preferred politeness strategies of reprimanding that male and female Iraqi EFL university learners tend to use?

4. Research methodology

4.1 Participants

The participants of this study are 40 Iraqi EFL university students (20 males and 20 females) who all are native speakers of Iraqi Arabic, ranging in age from 18 to 22 years. All participants are undergraduate learners of English as a foreign language at the Faculty of Arts in Baghdad University. They had been learning English in a formal schooling context for approximately twelve years. The data are collected during the academic year 2015-2016. To reduce the possible effects of earlier experience in the target-language community, the participants chosen have no previous experience living in or visiting an English-speaking country.

Study participants are requested to fill in a background information survey to ensure that the two gender groups are homogeneous as much as possible in terms of age, participants number, major background, study level, etc. In this way, the comparability of the two groups can be achieved and any detected differences could not be attributed to variables other than those being studied. The participants are informed that their participation in this study is completely voluntary and their responses remain confidential.

4.2 Instrument

The data are collected quantitatively by means of a written discourse completion task (henceforth, DCT) in an open-ended format (See Appendix 1). To elicit reprimands, the DCT consists of four scenarios which are presented in English. The task explores the redressive actions the speakers might take when their interlocutors are of different social statuses and distances. In this way, the reprimanding strategies used by each gender can be uncovered. It is worthy to note that the scenarios of the DCT had been used and piloted in Ahmadian and Eslami-Rasek's (2011) study of reprimands by Iranian EFL learners.

The DCT has been administered in two separate sittings while the researcher is present. To avoid the influence of time limitation, there is no time limit for the participants to complete the tasks. Participants are also encouraged to ask for any clarification concerning the instructions or items of the task.

4.3 Coding scheme and analytic procedures

A categorization coding model is developed, based on Garcia's (2004) taxonomy of reprimanding strategies, for the semantic classification of reprimanding behaviors. Garcia's (2004) coding scheme is originally based on Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) categorization of head acts and supportive moves, Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness, and Scollon and Scollon's (1986) politeness system. According to Garcia's (2004), the semantic coding for categorizing the speech act of reprimand behaviors is built around three supercategories of head acts and two supercategories of supportive moves. Head acts are the "the minimal units which can realize a given speech act; they are the canonical core of the speech act". Supportive moves, on the other hand, are external to the head act, which modify its impact by either aggravating or mitigating its force" (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989, p. 276). Following Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness framework, both the head acts and supportive moves of reprimands can be further categorized in terms of politeness strategies. Reprimands can be categorized into bald on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness strategies. Bald on record strategies (henceforth, BORS) are used "whenever a speaker wants to do a face-threatening act with maximum efficiency more than s/he wants to satisfy the hearer's face" (p. 95). Positive politeness strategies (henceforth, PPS) imply camaraderie and in-group membership between speakers. They are "representative of the normal linguistic behavior between intimates, where interest and approval of each other's personality are routinely exchanged" (ibid.).

Contrarily, negative politeness strategies (henceforth, NPS) express respect; they "perform the function of minimizing the imposition on the hearer" (1987, p.129). Closely related to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness framework is Scollon and Scollon's (1986) politeness model. Scollon and Scollon (1986) group bald on record and positive politeness strategies into "a solidarity politeness system because of their emphasis on the commonality between the speaker and the hearer", and negative politeness strategies into a deference politeness system because they embody "formality and respect" (p. 167 cited in Garcia, 1996, p. 665-666). Thus, for data coding, the well-defined analytic scheme identified above is used for classifying and analyzing the head acts and supportive moves of English reprimands as employed by Iraqi EFL learners. Table 1 below presents the overall coding scheme of the head acts of reprimands;

Table 1: The semantic coding taxonomy of the head acts of reprimands.

Scollon & Scollon's (1986) politeness system	Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness system	Garcia's (2004) head acts of reprimanding strategies
Solidarity politeness system (SPS)	Bald on record strategies (BORS)	Accusing/ admonishing/ warning/ threatening; claiming authority; rejecting accusation/ explanation/ request; presenting facts; expressing disagreement; rejecting accusation.
	Positive politeness strategies (PPS)	Accepting excuse/explanation; accepting suggestion/ reprimands/ threat; claiming common ground; moralizing; self-defense; requesting cooperation; requesting information; offering cooperation; promising forbearance.
Deference politeness system (DPS)	Negative politeness strategies (NPS)	Indicate reluctance to offend/fire; admitting responsibility; grounder; apologizing; expressing gratitude

The coding scheme of supportive moves of reprimands is displayed in Table 2 below;

Table 2: The semantic coding taxonomy of the supportive moves of reprimands.

Types of supportive moves	Garcia's (2004) supportive moves of reprimanding strategies
Mitigators (MS)	Preparators, grounders, requesting confirmation, mitigating accusation, disclaiming responsibility.

Aggravators (AS)	Requesting justification, expressing dissatisfaction, expressing distrust, expressing concern, claiming evidence.
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The written data obtained from the DCT are analyzed by means of content analysis. Content analysis is primarily a kind of a quantitative research method with the coding of into explicit categories and then counting the codes and describing results in statistics (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005, p.15). Written DCT responses are coded into a set of semantic units. A semantic unit is the smallest, most complete unit of semantic information that can stand alone and be understood by itself, and can fulfill a communicative function (Cheng, 2005, p. 39). After that, the data are processed and statistically computed, then the outcomes of male and female Iraqi university learners of English are compared and contrasted.

5. Results and discussion

To answer the research questions set forth above, the recurrent types of head acts, supportive moves and the politeness strategies used by male and female subjects are quantitatively identified based on the aforementioned coding scheme. It is noted that Iraqi EFL male and female participants do not use reprimanding head acts only once in their written responses but rather multiple reprimanding head acts are used throughout their written interaction. The effect of using these multiple-headed reprimands is "to increase their strength and create added pressure on their interlocutors" (Garcia, 1996, p. 669). Moreover, when there are multiple head acts, there is no specific order for the occurrence of reprimanding head acts.

As displayed in Table 3 below, the total number of head acts of reprimanding behaviour produced by Iraqi EFL participants is (393). When comparing Iraqi male and female participants, it can be easily observed that the overall number of solidarity and deference politeness strategies altogether reveals that males employ fewer strategies than females (171/43.51% vs. 222/56.49%). This finding might indicate that Iraqi females' reprimands are strong enough unlike males' ones, and females leave less room for negotiation. It is evident that the use of head acts of reprimands by each gender indicates that Iraqi EFL male and female participants employ a variety of head acts when reprimanding. Generally, the statistical results reveal that both Iraqi female and male participants favorably incline towards solidarity politeness strategies over deference strategies (320/81.43 % for SPS vs. 73/18.57 for DPS). Though there are variations between the two genders, both Iraqi male and female participants generally show a marked preference for using solidarity

strategies (i.e., BORS & PPS) over deference strategies (i.e., NPS). This indicates that they prefer cordiality and harmony over power deference asymmetries with their interlocutors. That is, they prefer reprimanding strategies that "threaten their own face wants rather than their interlocutors, and their negative rather than positive face wants. And this, in turn, reflects a preference for being authoritative while maintaining friendliness (Garcia, 1996, p.663). As far as gender differentials are concerned, Iraqi females (197/61.56) use more solidarity politeness strategies than males (123/38.44) in their reprimands. Contrarily, Iraqi males (48/65.75%) use more deference politeness strategies than females (25/34.25%) when reprimanding. The opposite preference for both genders might be attributed to their politeness system preferences of their native language in that Iraqi EFL females show a preference for threatening the interlocutor's positive face, whereas males tend to show a preference for threatening the interlocutor's negative face. Tables 3 and 4 below show the statistical distribution of these strategies in terms of raw frequencies and percentages to expose if there are significant statistical differences between genders.

Table 3: The distribution of the head acts of reprimands.

Head acts of reprimands			Male No. & %	Femal e No. & %	Total No. & %
Solidarity politenes	Bald on record strategie s (BORS)	1. Accusing/admonishing/warning	15 39.48	23 60.52	38 18.81
		2. Claiming authority	11 39.29	17 60.71	28 13.86
		3. Presenting facts	19 40.43	28 59.57	47 23.26
		4. Rejecting explanation/accusation/request.	7 70	8 30	10 4.95
		5. Recommending change of behavior	12 38.95	۲۰ 62.5	۳۲ 15.84
		6. Statement of obligation/expected behavior	۱۰ 47.62	۱۱ 52.38	21 10.39
		7. Expressing dissatisfaction	16 61.54	5 38.46	26 12.87
		Total: BORS	۹۰ 44.55	۱۱۲ 55.45	۲۰۲ 51.39

s system (SPS)	Positive politeness strategies (PPS)	8. Accepting excuse/explanation	୦ 22.73	୧୪ 77.27	22 100
		9. Claiming common ground	୧ ୧	୧ 100	9
		10.Requesting cooperation	୧୦ 27.3	୪୪ 72.97	37 100
		11. Requesting information	୦ 29.42	୧୪ 70.58	17 100
		12. Offering cooperation	୧୪ 39.40	୪୦ 60.60	33 100
		Total: PPS	୪୪ 27.96	85 72.04	118 30.02
Total: BORS & PPS			123 38.44	197 61.56	320 81.43
Deference politeness system (DPS)	Negative politeness strategies (NPS)	1. Expressing gratitude	22 70.96	9 29.4	31 100
		2.Indicating reluctance to offend	15 68.18	7 31.82	22 100
		3. Apologizing	9 45	11 55	20 100
Total: NPS			48 65.75	25 34.25	73 18.57
Total: BORS, PPS&NPS			171 43.51	222 56.49	393 100

Though the two groups of Iraqi EFL male and female participants use the same strategy types of head acts when reprimanding, they differ significantly in the frequency of occurrence of particular strategy types. More specifically, bald on record strategies rank first with a (202/51.39), followed by positive politeness strategies with a (118/30.02), and finally negative politeness strategies rank third with a (73/18.57). The overriding use of bald on record strategies might reflect the Iraqi's socio-cultural set of attitudes, beliefs, conventions and values where social status or power is highly appreciated among them. In this respect, Spencer-Oatey (2000, p. 4) remarks that in an asymmetrical relationship, the person holding power prefers to assert his/her own authority at the expense of his interlocutor's self-image. Also, s/he presents him/herself as not likable, to emphasize his/her power and unapproachability.

As for BORS, Iraqi males and females employ a set of strategy types to reprimand including accusing/ admonishing/ warning/

threatening; claiming authority; presenting facts; rejecting accusation/explanation/ request; recommending change of behavior; statement of obligation/ expected behavior; and expressing dissatisfaction. The overall occurrences of BORS types are 202 (51.39%) with 112 (55.45%) for females and 90 (44.55%) for males. Iraqi EFL female participants employ relatively more head acts of reprimanding strategies compared to male participants. This entails most subcategories of BORS with the exception of expressing dissatisfaction subcategory. By and large, BORS are employed for coercing interlocutors and engaging in conflict. The following are a sample of illustrative examples extracted from the study data;

1. If you do it again, you'll fail this course! (*Threatening*)
2. You have to come earlier! Isn't it? (*Claiming authority*)
3. I noticed that you are constantly returning books late! You keep failing to stick to the borrowing schedule! (*Presenting facts*)
4. Don't do it again! (*Recommending change of behavior*)
5. You know I don't like doing this! (*Expressing dissatisfaction*)
6. Don't make noise in here please! You need to keep quiet! (*Statement of obligation/expected behavior*)

As to PPS, both Iraqi EFL male and female groups employ a variety of positive politeness strategies to reprimand. The strategies used include; accepting excuse/explanation; claiming common ground; requesting cooperation; requesting information; and offering cooperation. The total occurrences of PPS types are 118 (30.02%) with a 33 (27.96%) for males and 85 (72.04%) for females. As with BORS, more PPS of reprimands are used by Iraqi EFL females than by males. That is, female participants outperform males in terms of frequencies of categories of PPS. This can be interpreted as Iraqi females show more solidarity with their interlocutors than their male counterparts preferring to win their consent to be cooperative and more likely to avoid conflict (Tannen, 1994, p. 40). Below are sample selected examples from the study data;

7. Well, I understand your exceptional case! (*Accepting excuse*)
8. It happens to all of us, I guess! (*Claiming common ground*)
9. The necessary thing I want is to respect time, please! (*Requesting cooperation*)
10. Is there any problem here? (*Requesting information*)

As far as NPS types are concerned, Iraqi EFL male and female participants use a variety of negative politeness strategies to reprimand. The head act strategies of reprimanding take one of the following forms; expressing gratitude; indicating reluctance to offend; and apologizing. Comparing both genders, the overall frequency of negative politeness strategies of reprimanding is 73

(18.57%) divided into 48 (65.75%) for male participants distributed among the three categories and 25 (34.25%) for female participants. Unlike BORS and PPS, Iraqi male participants employ more head acts of reprimanding strategies than females do. This finding goes in line with Wardaugh's (2006) claim that "women are psychologically predisposed to be involved with one another and tend to be supportive and non-competitive compared to men" (p.326). The following are samples of participants' responses;

11. Thank you so much for listening and understanding! (*Expressing gratitude*)

12. I don't want to kick you out! (*Indicating reluctance to offend*)

13. I'm so sorry for doing that! (*Apologizing*)

Generally, it has been observed that Iraqi females are relatively more verbose than males when reprimanding in that they employ 222 (56.49%) reprimanding strategies while males employ 171 (43.51%) strategies. This statistical result runs contrary to Garcia's (2004) research findings. She has reported that Argentinean males are more verbose than females in reprimanding. The contradicted results could be attributed to the difference in the context examined including the participants' linguistic background and instrumentation.

Looking closely to supportive moves, Table 4 below presents the distribution of the supportive moves accompanying the head acts of reprimands by both genders. It is found that Iraqi EFL participants use a variety of supportive moves accompanying the head acts of reprimands. Supportive moves are used either to mitigate or to aggravate the strength of the head acts of reprimands. In the present data, mitigators include: preparators; grounders; requesting confirmation; mitigating accusation; and disclaiming responsibility. Aggravators, on the other hand, take the following forms; requesting justification; expressing dissatisfaction/lack of interest; expressing distrust; expressing concern; and claiming evidence.

Table 4: The distribution of the supportive moves of reprimands.

Supportive moves of reprimands		Male No. & %	Female No. & %	Total No. & %
Aggravato rs (AS)	1. Requesting justification	26 63.42	15 36.58	41 100
	2. Expressing dissatisfaction/ lack of interest	4 30.77	9 69.23	13 100
	3. Expressing distrust	11 60.11	7 39.89	18 100

	4. Expressing concern	22 61.12	14 38.88	36 100
	5. Claiming evidence	20 52.78	17 47.22	37 100
	Total: AS	83 57.25	62 42.75	145 59.42
Mitigators (MS)	1. Preparators	15 55.56	12 44.44	27 100
	2. Grounders	4 15.39	22 84.61	26 100
	3. Requesting confirmation	2 16.76	10 83.33	12 100
	4. Mitigating accusation	7 40.44	16 69.56	23 100
	5. Disclaiming responsibility	3 23.28	8 72.72	11 100
	Total: MS	31 31.32	68 68.68	99 40.58
	Total: AS & MS	114 46.72%	130 53.27%	244 100%

As demonstrated in Table 4, the overall distribution of supportive moves of reprimanding used by Iraqi EFL participants is (244) divided into 114 (46.72%) supportive moves for males and 130 (53.27%) supportive moves for females in favor of females. Both Iraqi male and female participants employ aggravators (145/59.42%) more frequent than mitigators (99/40.58%). The statistical finding indicates that Iraqi EFL participants use supportive moves to intensify and boost their reprimands more often than to ameliorate them. In this way, Iraqi participants threaten their interlocutor's positive face since the speaker does not care about the addressee's wants, feelings or interests. In other words, the speaker doesn't want or care about the hearer's wants (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 66). The same finding has been reported in Garcia (1996, p.675).

As far as gender differentials are concerned, Iraqi EFL male and female participants show marked variations in terms of the frequency of supportive moves used. The statistical results in Table 4 can be read as follows; males employ more aggravators (83/57.25%) than females (62/42.75%) while females employ more mitigators (68/68.68%) than males (31/31.32) to support the head acts of their reprimands. This can be inferred as that male participants tend to intensify their reprimands slightly more often than to mitigate them, while female participants prefer the opposite tendency. All in all,

males tend to use an accusatory tone with their interlocutors realized in their use of request for justification and evidence claiming to emphasize their power superiority. Such aggravating strategies are potentially intended to threaten interlocutors' needs to be respected. Females, on the other hand, tend not to claim authority, and their use reflects a balance in the relationship with their interlocutors. In this respect, Garcia (1996) propounds that her Peruvian Spanish male and female speakers follow the same pragmatic patterns of supportive moves like the one identified here.

It is worthy to note that the total frequency of head acts is higher than that of supportive moves (393 vs. 244). The higher incidence of head acts over supportive moves indicates that reprimands produced by Iraqi EFL participants are multi-headed and as such, stronger. This means that reprimands are realized by more than one head act. Below are selected illustrative examples of supportive moves from the participants' data;

14. I have something to tell you about. (*Preparators*)
15. Sticking to time is very significant for us here. (*Grounders*)
16. Is that ok with you? (*Requesting confirmation*)
17. Frankly speaking, I'm not sure about! (*Mitigating accusation*)
18. What are the reasons behind your exam failure? (*Requesting justification*)
19. You know, it's your problem! (*Expressing lack of interest*)
20. I can't count on you from now on! (*Expressing distrust*)
21. Some people told me about you and your commitment. (*Claiming evidence*)

6. Conclusions and implications

The preferred communication patterns of reprimands by Iraqi EFL university learners and the effect of gender on reprimanding politeness patterns have been explored in this paper. The analysis reveals that both Iraqi male and female participants use BORS, PPS and NPS as head acts in their reprimands. Iraqi EFL participants prefer solidarity politeness strategies over deference politeness ones. That is, they opt for BORS and PPS (solidarity strategies) over NPS (deference strategies). It can be inferred that both genders show a preference for expressing friendliness to their interlocutors at the expense of their own and their interlocutors' desire of no imposition (Garcia, 1996). They prefer being authoritative while maintaining friendliness. As to supportive moves, they use mitigators to ameliorate the head acts of reprimands and aggravators to intensify them. By and large, they prefer aggravators over mitigators in their reprimands.

Though the two groups of Iraqi EFL male and female participants use the same strategy types of head acts and supportive moves when

reprimanding, they differ in the frequency of occurrence of particular strategy types. More precisely, there are gender differences in the use of head acts and supportive moves of reprimands. Overall, females use more strategies of reprimanding than males. It can reflect that Iraqi females' reprimands are stronger and more intense than males'. Iraqi females use more solidarity politeness strategies than males in their reprimands. Conversely, Iraqi males use more deference politeness strategies than females. As for supportive moves, males employ more aggravators than females while females employ more mitigators than males to support the head acts of their reprimands. This can indicate that males are more interested in conflict and exercising power through coercion, whereas females are more interested in being cooperative and exercising power through cooperation. Still, these results need to be confirmed by further research.

The pedagogical implications of the study have the potential to benefit language teachers, ESL/EFL curriculum and textbook designers. Teachers of English as a foreign or second language can use the findings of this study to anticipate and thus reduce the incidence and situations wherein learners experience cultural and language miscommunication that leads to communication breakdown. Textbook designers can use the study findings to design better materials to incorporate into ESL/EFL curricula, thus remedying the underrepresentation of pragmatic knowledge of a target language in current ESL/EFL textbooks. That is, the findings could inform the teaching of the speech act of reprimanding behavior of Iraqi EFL learners by incorporating L2 pragmatic knowledge into the course programme.

References

- Ahmadian, M. & Eslami-Rasek, A. (2011). "A Comparative Study of Reprimand Strategies: Evidence from Iranian and American Speech Communities". *The Social Science*, 6, (1), 1-7.
- Ahmadian, M. & Dastjerdi, H. (2010). "A Comparative Study of Perception of Politeness of American Reprimands by Iranian EFL Learners and Americans". *The Social Science*, 5, (4), 359-363.
- Allamia, H. & Samimib, F. (2014). "Rapport Management Approach to Reprimand: Intermediate vs. Advanced EFL Learners". *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 220- 224.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). "Exploring the Interlanguage of Interlanguage Pragmatics ". *Language Learning*, 49, 677-713.

-
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
 - Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Cheng, S. (2005). "An Exploratory Cross-Sectional Study of Interlanguage Pragmatic Development of Expressions of Gratitude by Chinese Learners of English". Unpublished PhD dissertation. The University of Iowa.
 - Cohen, A. (1996). "Investigating the Production of Speech Act Sets". In *Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language*. Susan Gass & Jay Neu (eds.), pp. 21-43. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
 - Cohen, A., Olshtain, E. & Rosenstein, D. (1986). "Advanced EFL Apologies: What Remains to be Learned?" *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 62, 51–74.
 - Frescura, M. (2006). "Reacting to a Context Specific Reprimand: A Study of an Italian Speech Community". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2144-2157.
 - Garcia, C. (2009). "Intra-Lingual Pragmatic Variation in the Performance of Reprimanding". *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6, (4), 443-472.
 - Garcia, C. (2004). "Coercion and Cooperation: A Case Study of Argentinean Reprimands and Responses to Reprimands". In *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*. Marquez Reiter & Maria Elena Placencia (eds.), pp. 231-264. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
 - Garcia, C. (1996). "Reprimanding and Responding to a Reprimand: A Case Study of Peruvian Spanish Speakers". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, (5), 663-697.
 - Haverkate, H. (1988). "Toward a Typology of Politeness Strategies". *Multilingua*, 7, 385-409.
 - Hsieh, H. & Shannon, S. (2005). "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis". *Qualitative Health Research*, 15, (9), 1277-1288.
 - Kasper, G. & Schmidt, R. (1996). "Developmental Issues in Interlanguage Pragmatics". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, (2), 149- 169.
 - Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 - Kasper, G. (1992). "Pragmatic Transfer". *Second Language Research*, 8, 203-231.
 - Mardhatilla, A. (2014). "Analysis of Reprimanding Strategies by FIB Students". Unpublished Master Thesis. Indonesian University.

- Mills, S. (2000). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salgado, E. (2011). *The Pragmatics of Requests and Apologies: Developmental Patterns of Mexican Students*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing,
- Schauer, G. (2009). *Interlanguage Pragmatic Development*. London: Continuum Publishing.
- Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1986). "Face in Interethnic Communication". In *Language and Communication*. Jack Richards & Ronald Schmidt (eds.), pp. 156-190. New York: Longman.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). "Rapport Management: A Framework for Analysis". In *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk Across Cultures*, Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed.), p. 11- 46. London: Continuum.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.

Appendix (1)

Discourse Completion Task

Instructions: Please read each situation and answer as truthfully as possible. Imagine yourself in each situation as if you were going to answer orally and be as natural as possible! Do not think too much and try to be as spontaneous as possible!

1. Situation One (Low Grade)

Informant A: You are a university student. The grades of one of your exams have been reported recently. Your grade is too much lower than what you expected. You want to talk about your study and say that your professor is wrong. What do you say to him/her?

Informant B: You are a university professor. One of your students talks to you. Respond to him/her.

2. Situation Two (Unfinished Homework)

Informant A: You are a university professor. One of your students does not do his/her homework. This morning you call him/her and talk to him/her. You want to reprimand him. What do you tell him/her?

Informant B: You are a university student. One of your professors talks to you. Respond to him/her.

3. Situation Three (Smoking Cigarette)

Informant A: You are a bus passenger. One of the passengers which is sitting in front of you is smoking cigarette and you cannot tolerate the smelling. How do you reprimand him/her?

Informant B: You are on a bus smoking a cigarette. One of the passengers is talking to you. Respond to him/her.

4. Situation Four (Late Attendance)

Informant A: You have a date with your friend. You have been waiting for 30 min and it is not the first time that he/she comes late. How do you reprimand him/her?

Informant B: You are late again on a date with your friend. Respond to him/her.

الجنس والتأنيب في الوسط الأكاديمي: أدلة من الوسط الأكاديمي العراقي لمتعلمي اللغة

الانكليزية لغة اجنبية

الاستاذ المساعد الدكتور نصير عباس غين الزبيدي

قسم اللغة الانكليزية- كلية الاداب

جامعة بغداد- العراق

المستخلص: تتقصى هذه الدراسة الاساليب التداولية للتأنيب لدى لطلبة العراقيين الجامعيين متعلمي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية من كلا الجنسين (ذكورا واثا) وتحديد الاساليب التداولية التي يفضلها كل منهما. تم اختبار اربعين طالبا مقسمين بالتساوي من كلا الجنسين تحريريا بأستخدام فرض اكمال النص. أظهرت النتائج بأن الطلبة العراقيين من كلا الجنسين يفضلون اسلوب التأزر على التمايز وتفضيل استخدام الالفة والصدقة من دون الاخلال بالسلطة. اما بالنسبة للأضافات التداولية الداعمة فتبين أن المتعلمين العراقيين يستخدمون ادوات تداولية لتلطيف وتشديد تأنيبهم في الوقت نفسه و يفضلون تشديد تأنيبهم على تلطيفه. على الرغم من ان الطلبة العراقيون متعلمي اللغة الانكليزية من كلا الجنسين يستخدمون نفس الاساليب التداولية للتأنيب والاضافات الداعمة لها الا انهم يختلفون في تواتر اعداد الاساليب التداولية. وختاماً تم اقتراح عدد من الاستنتاجات والمضامين التعليمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التأنيب - التأزر - التمايز - ادوات التلطيف - ادوات التشديد