تقصي ظاهرة التوبيخ لدى الدارسين العراقيين للغة الانكليزية كلغة اجنبية

سعيد مهدي عبدالرحيم

مديرية تربية النجف

الاستاذ الدكتور حميد حسون بجية

جامعة بابل- كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

Investigating Iraqi EFL University Learners' Use of the Speech Act of Reprimand

Saeed Mahdi Abdulraheem
Directorate of Education in Najaf
Email: saeedfaizepanjetani@gmail.com
Prof. Hameed Hassoon (PhD)
University of Babylon - College of Education for Human Sciences
Email: almasudi1@yahoo.com

<u>Abstract</u>

This study is concerned with revealing Iraqi EFL learners' use of the speech act of reprimand. It is composed of four sections, the first of which is dedicated to give an introduction about the study such as the problem, the aims and the hypotheses, the second is to present a theoretical survey about the speech act in question, the third is about collecting and analyzing data, and the fourth section is concerned with the conclusions.

A two-part test consisting of 20 situations in each is designed to measure PhD and MA learners' recognition and production of reprimand. On the recognition level, a model by Garcia (2004) is used, while on the production level, their performance is compared to the performance of four native English speakers.

<u>**Key words**</u>: (reprimand, EFL learners' use, native speakers' use, reprimanding, reprimanding act)

<u>المستخلص</u>

تُعنى هـذه الدراسـةُ باسـتخدام الطلبـةَ العـراقيينَ الـذينَ يتعلمـونَ اللغـة الانجليزيـةَ بوصفها لغةً أجنبية إنشاء كلام التأنيب. تتكون هذه الدراسة من أربع أجزاء، أولها مكرس لإعطاء مقدمة عن هذه الدراسة مثل المشكلة والأهـداف والفرضيات. يقـدم الجـزء الثـاني نظرة عن الجزء النظري المتعلق بفعـل الكلام المذكور آنفا. الجزء الثالث متعلق بجمع وتحليل البيانـات. يحتـوي الجـزء الرابـع علـى نتـائج البحث.

تم تصـميم اسـتبيان متكـون مـن جـزأين، يتكـون كـل جـزء منـه مـن ٢٠ موقفـا وذلـك لغـرض قيـاس مقـدرة طلبـة الـدكتوراه والماجسـتير علـى إدراك وإنتـاج التأنيـب. في المستوى الإنتاجي، استخدم موديل كارسيا (٢٠٠٤) بينمـا في المسـتوى الإنتـاجي مقارنـة أدائهـم مـع أداء أربعـة مـن متكلمـي اللغـة الانكليزية الأصليين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: (التوبيخ، ظاهرة التوبيخ، دارسي اللغة الانكليزية، اللغة الانكليزية كلغة اجنبية)

Section One
Introduction

1.1. The Problem

It has been claimed that the distinctions among some of the speech acts are not clear cut, that is, they are interrelated since they are realized in the same or similar linguistic forms or expressions. This is because certain factors such as the context and the intention of the speaker play a major role in identifying the speech act in question. One of these problematic speech acts, Weirzbicka (1987: 432) says, is that of reprimand which correlates with a number of speech acts such as rebuke, reproach and insult. This is due to the fact that they are expressed in similar expressions or formulae. She also says that these speech acts are assertive and central to language use because they are the tools by which the addresser can say how things are by presenting his beliefs. Garcia (2004: 347) indicates that performing the speech act of reprimand seems to be challenging even for the native speakers who often pre-plan on how to reprimand. Thus, the nature of this speech act is complicated.

Accordingly, this speech act may cause many problems for foreign language learners because of its complicated nature and its overlap with other speech acts and because certain contextual factors have to be taken into consideration when producing or comprehending it. As far as Iraqi learners of English are concerned, their performance of the speech act of reprimand, at both the production and recognition levels, has not been empirically dealt with in detail, that is, we are unaware of their abilities in this concern. Hence, this study addresses the following questions:

1. Do Iraqi university learners of English have the ability to distinguish the speech act of reprimand from other related speech acts when they are realized by similar expressions or formulae, and to what extent?

2. What type of strategies are used by the learners to realize such act?

1.2 Aims of the Study

The study aims at:

1. Investigating the ability of MA and PhD Iraqi EFL university learners in using the speech act of reprimand on the one hand and, on the other, to distinguish it from other related speech acts when they are realized by similar forms or expressions.

2. Finding out the most common strategies employed by the learners to issue this speech act.

3. Investigating the influence of the contextual factors as well as the realizations in recognizing and issuing reprimand and differentiating it from other related speech acts.

1.3 Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that:

1. Iraqi MA and PhD learners will be more influenced by the linguistic realizations of the speech act of reprimand than by the contextual factors governing the choice of those realizations when distinguishing reprimand from other related speech acts.

2. They face serious difficulties in recognizing the speech act of reprimand and misinterpret it with other relevant speech acts at the recognition level particularly rebuke, insult, reproof, reproach, abuse, admonition and scold.

3. They tend to use certain strategies to express reprimand than others.

4. PhD learners are better than MA learners at all strategies of reprimand whether in recognition or production.

1.4 The Procedures

The procedures adopted in this study are the following:

1. Presenting a theoretical survey of the relevant literature on reprimand differentiating it from other related speech acts.

2. A model is adopted out of the theoretical survey for the analysis of the speech act strategies.

3. A sample of Iraqi EFL learners is involved in the form of a two-part test to collect data about their recognition of reprimand as well as the strategies adopted by them.

1.5. The Limits

The study will be restricted to the speech act of reprimand. The sample of the study will be limited to university MA and PhD learners. They are chosen because they are supposed to be advanced learners of English and they are acquainted with such speech act more than BA students.

1.6. The Value

It is hoped that this study will be of value to those interested in studying the pragmatic performance of EFL university learners. It is also

hoped that the conclusions and recommendations will have pedagogical value for the syllabus designers since they draw attention to weak and strong areas of the students' performance.

Section Two
Theoretical Survey

2.1 Introduction

2.2.   Definitions and Characteristics

Mullholand (1991: 201) defines reprimand as "to offer formally an adverse judgment to another about a serious matter." He also explains that a reprimand is a "formal or official" speech act in which the addresser declares or reveals a negative judgment about the addresser. This process is usually done in face to face interaction, but occasionally by other means of communication because it is considered one of the most face-threatening acts since it requires the interlocutor to refrain acting in a particular way. When this act is done efficiently, it can cause humiliation or resentment to the addressee.

Vanderveken (1990: 169) identifies the reprimand as one of the assertive verbs. He (Ibid: 179) defines reprimand as an accusation with the special mode of achievement of adding personal displeasure as a punishment for the wrongdoing which is done by the addresser. This act generally comes out of a person who has a high position of authority and this is a feature of the mode of achievement, although this may a presumed sense of moral authority.

Wierzbicka (1987: 139) points out that *reprimanding* cannot be done in a neutral, totally emotionless tone. Instead, it requires either a frown or some extra-segmental equivalent of a frown. This frown indicates the displeasure caused by the thought of what the addressee has done.

2.3.   Felicity Conditions

Mulholand (1991: 201) says that there are two kinds of conditions that must be met in order for a reprimand to be made. The first is on the addresser's part and the second is on the addressee's part.

2.4.   On the Addresser's Part

The following conditions are essentially present on the addressee's part for a reprimand to be issued:

   a. Due to the fact that reprimanding is an official act, the addresser must have some sort of authority over the addressee. This might be by virtue of the addresser's hierarchical position or it might be

given in a certain situation by particular members. The authorization is sometimes given to the addresser to perform the act by the person to be reprimanded by, for example, saying (You have the right to be annoyed with me over this).

b. The behaviour of the addresser should be fault-free; the addresser must be able to take the moral ground in the matter. If the addresser has been faulty on similar or the same matter at other times, the addressee is entitled to feel angry at the injustice of the act.

c. The addresser must know all the issues involved in the reprimand. If the details he knows are wrong or the whole reprimand (for example, if the reprimand is addressed to wrong person), then this could be a clear justification for the addresser to be criticized and the relationship involved could be severely damaged.

d. The reprimand must be acceptable to any person who is witnessing the act. If the wrong people are present when reprimanding, it makes it even worse for the addressee to have them see his or her humiliation. Furthermore, most of the people may be unwilling to see the act, and if they are forced to do so, they may try to soften the reprimand in order to reduce their own awkwardness, thus spoiling its effect.   (Ibid)

2.4.1. On the Addressee's Part

The following conditions should be met in order for the addressee to see the reprimand as acceptable and proper:

a. The addressee must see the reprimander as an acceptable person to perform the act.

b. The addressee must have done something bad deserving of a reprimand and some evidence must be available.

e. The wrongdoing for which the addressee is to be reprimanded must have been done in a fairly recent time. There are no exact limitations for such things. For example, a reprimand could be quite reasonable in a meeting for something done in a previous meeting even if the meetings take place once a year, but a reprimand for something done six months previously when the addresser and the addressee meet every day, could be seen as unreasonable, unless something bad has just been discovered or was extremely serious and has had continuing repercussions into the present (Ibid: 202).

2.5. Reprimand from the Semantic Viewpoint

Wierzbicka (1987:139) says that in reprimanding the addresser expresses a negative judgment about an action of the addressee. Furthermore, reprimanding has a presumption that the addressee should know the reason that makes his action was "bad". She also gives the meaning of reprimand as follows:

I say: you have done something bad
I think you should that people of your kind
shouldn't do such things
I assume you should understand that I am
someone who can say this to you
I say this because I want to cause you not to do
such things
I assume you understand that people of your kind
shouldn't do things that I say I don't want them to
do
I want you to feel something bad because of what
I say

From the quotation above, the *reprimanding* person is an official and hierarchical character. They are accounted of not only by referring to the personal authority "*I assume you should understand that I am someone who can say this to you*", but also to the category of people to whom the addressee belongs "*I think you should that people of your kind shouldn't do such things*". Referring to the category of people is what depersonalizes *reprimand* and gives an indication to the hierarchical relationship between the addresser (an individual) and the addressee (a member of a class of subordinates). This hierarchical relationship links *reprimand* with *order* which is expressed more explicitly through the component "*I assume you understand that people of your kind shouldn't do things that I say I don't want them to do*". Nevertheless, this component is less general and less personal than the assumption of the superior authority inherent in *order* which says "*I assume you have to do what I say I want you to do*". This is because the authority of the addresser in *reprimand* is restricted to one domain which is the official or public domain (Ibid: 139-40).

2.6. Garcia's Model of Reprimanding

Garcia (2004) investigates the speech act of reprimand by exploring the preferred communication patterns of addressers. To be more specific,

Adab Al-Kufa Journal
No. 49 / P2
Muharram 1443 / Sep 2021

ISSN Print 1994 – 8999
ISSN Online 2664-469X

مجلة آداب الكوفة
العدد :٤٩/ ج٢
محرم ١٤٤٣ هـ/ايلول ٢٠٢١م

she analyzes the strategies used by males and females when reprimanding and responding to reprimands, identifies the politeness strategies and attempts to reveal the underlying perspectives that constitute their culture concerning the context examined. This model is based on Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) categorization of head acts and supportive moves, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness (Reiter and Placencia, 2004: 232).

2.6.1. Strategies

When reprimanding, addressers use a lot of strategies which are then categorized on Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies. Reiter and Placencia (2004: 237) mention that addressers, who are in the position of authority which gives them the right to reprimand, do not go through clearly defined stages when they present their reprimand. In fact, their whole participation is considered as a constant reprimand where they present their reprimand, then responded to their interlocutor's reaction and finally finish the encounter. All the strategies mentioned in this model are illustrated through examples and almost all the examples are based on one situation in which the reprimander is the boss of a company and the reprimanded is an employee whose bad behaviour is arriving late. Addressers use a variety of head acts strategy types to reprimand. All of these strategies are taken from one source which is Garcia (2004: 236-242). These are encoded in Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies as follows:

Table1.
Strategies of Reprimanding

Brown and Levinson's Strategies	Reprimanding Strategies
Bald on record→	Warning/ Threatening; Claiming authority; Rejecting accusation/ explanation/request; Presenting facts;
Positive politeness strategies Claim common ground→	Accepting excuse/explanation; Claiming common ground; Moralizing;
Convey that addresser and addressee are cooperators→	Requesting cooperation; Requesting information; Offering cooperation
Negative politeness strategies Communicate addresser's want to not impinge on addressee→	Indicate reluctance to impinge; Expressing gratitude

This chapter tries to investigate Iraqi EFL postgraduate learners' performance in using the speech act of reprimand at both the recognition and production levels. This investigation also involves their abilities to distinguish the speech act of reprimand from other related speech acts. In addition, there will be an assessment of the learners' use of the strategies of expressing the speech act of reprimand at the production level, and this assessment will be done in relation to what NESs respond in given situations. The chapter starts with describing the methods used in collecting and analyzing data. After that, the learners' performance is analyzed and discussed as an attempt to come out with findings that are related to the aims and hypotheses of this study.

3.1. Data Collection

3.1.1. Subjects

The subjects involved in this study are forty EFL postgraduate students. Thirty of them are MA students and the rest are PhD students. They are randomly chosen from the Departments of English, (College of Education of University of Babylon/ College of Arts- College of Languages- College of Education for Women University of Baghdad). At this level, the age of the subjects ranges between 24-26. They are native speakers of Iraqi Arabic. The reason behind choosing MA and PhD students to be the sample of this study is that they study pragmatics, more specifically speech acts, in the course in which they are engaged since the current speech act is difficult for undergraduate students who have not studied pragmatics. Thus, they are considered advanced learners.

Besides, a control group represented by four NESs is formed. The subjects of this group are professors in engineering in a British company in Najaf and range in age between (42-48). They all speak BBC accent. However, their role is limited to Part 2 of the test.

3.1.2. The Test

The test consists of two questions, the first of which is designed to test the learners' recognition ability, whereas the second is designed to test their production ability. The test consists of forty situations divided equally on both questions. The recognition test takes the form of multiple choice items in which the subjects are required to choose the correct choice from a variety of options.

The second question of the test, which is the production test, is designed to elicit information about the production abilities of the

Adab Al-Kufa Journal
No. 49 / P2
Muharram 1443 / Sep 2021

ISSN Print 1994 – 8999
ISSN Online 2664-469X

مجلة آداب الكوفة
العدد : ٤٩ / ج٢
محرم ١٤٤٣ هـ / ايلول ٢٠٢١م

learners. This question requires them to issue the speech act of reprimand according to certain contextual factors.

3.2. Methods of Analysis
3.2.1. Analysis of Part One

Part 1 of the test can be described as an objective one since its scoring scheme neither depends on the personal opinion of the subject himself / herself, nor on the subjective judgment of the scorer.

To ensure an objective scoring of the test, a scoring scheme has been adopted. Each participant, in part 1, is required to choose only one correct option where each correct answer is given 5 marks. The total is 100 marks.

In order to measure the central tendency of the subjects, the mean score has been adopted as a statistical device.

In addition to the scoring scheme which is mentioned in Table 9, a rating scale of the learners' performance at part 1 has been adopted. This scale is based on Al-Hindawy's (1999: 136) modified version of Caroll's (1980: 134) scale.

Table (4)
Assessment Scale of Learner's Recognition Ability (Al-Hindawy's, 1999: 136, Modified Version)

Band	Learner's recognition ability
90 – 100	Expert user. Accurately understands English system.
80 – 89	Very good user. Often approaches bilingual competence.
70 – 79	Good user. Would cope in most situations in English.
60 – 69	Competent user. Can cope well with most situations but will have occasional misunderstandings.
50 – 59	Modest user. Manages in general to communicate but often has inaccurate understandings.
40 – 49	Marginal user. Is not easy to communicate with.
30 – 39	Extremely limited user. Receptive skills do not allow continuous communication.
20 – 29	Intermittent user. Understanding occurs only sporadically.
0 - 19	Non-user. Uncertain recognition of which type of language is being used.

3.2.2. Analysis of Part Two

The model of strategies of the speech act of reprimand in Chapter Two (2.10) is used for analyzing the type of strategies adopted by the subjects and NESs. The performance of the learners is then compared with the performance of the NESs after rendering the results into percentages. All the types of analyses are carried out in terms of the three parameters: status, social distance and solidarity of power.

3.3. Data Analysis
3.3.1. Part One: Subject's Recognition of the Speech Act of Reprimand

The following table shows the subjects' performance on the three strategies:

Table (20)
Subjects' Success Percentages Concerning BORSs, PPSs and NPSs

Main Strategy	PhD Performance	MA Performance	Overall Subjects' Performance
BORSs	30%	23%	25%
PPSs	36.6%	29.4%	31.2%
NPSs	25%	21.6%	22.5%

3.3.2 Part 2: Analysis of the Strategies Speech Act of Reprimand

The data obtained by Part Two situations of the test reveal that a wide range of strategies is employed by the learners in their attempts to issue the speech act of reprimand. Subjects tend to use specific types of strategies than others. The data elicited by the test signals some sort of difference between the subjects' and the NESs' performance, not only in types of the utterances used but also in terms of their frequencies.

The situations requiring the subjects to issue the speech act of reprimand in Part Two of the test (See Appendix) are designed to fall into three types in terms of the factors of **solidarity, status** and **distance.** These three types can be described as follows:

A. The speaker talks to a familiar inferior with whom s/he has a solidary power relationship.

B. The speaker talks to a familiar inferior with whom s/he has a non-solidary power relationship.

C. The speaker talks to an unfamiliar inferior with whom s/he has a non-solidary power relationship.

The following is the findings about the subjects' performance on the three types of situation:

A. Concerning the NES's performance, it is divided equally on BORSs and PPSs where each type gains (50%). PhD learners' performance is that (60%) have used PPSs while (40%) have used BORSs. The performance of the MA learners shows that they manipulated all the three strategies, but in different percentages, where BORSs'

Adab Al-Kufa Journal
No. 49 / P2
Muharram 1443 / Sep 2021

ISSN Print 1994 – 8999
ISSN Online 2664-469X

مجلة آداب الكوفة
العدد : ٤٩/ ج٢
محرم ١٤٤٣ هـ/ ايلول ٢٠٢١م

percentage is (40%) and (50% and 10%) for PPSs and NPSs respectively.

B. NESs' performance shows that most of them have used BORSs. The percentages of their performance are (70%, 20% and 10%) for BORSs, PPSs and NPSs respectively. The percentages of the PhD learners' performance are (60%, 35% and 15%) for BORSs, PPSs and NPSs respectively, while the percentages of the MA learners (70%, 20% and 10%) for BORSs, PPSs and NPSs respectively.

C. The NESs' performance in this type shows that (85%) have use BORSs and (15%) have used PPSs. The performance of the PhD learners displays that (60%) have used BORSs and (40%) have used PPSs, while that of the MA shows that (80%) have used BORSs, (15%) have used PPS and only (5%) have used NPSs.

Section Four

4.1. Conclusions

4.1.1. Learners' Performance at Part 1 of the Test

Several conclusions are introduced here to illustrate Iraqi EFL postgraduate informants' performance at this level:

1. Both learner types (PhD and MA) tend to associate certain utterance strengths to certain speech acts, a strategy used to identify the speech act of reprimand from other related ones.

2. Their awareness of the contextual factors that govern the speech act of reprimand is questionable.

3. They are almost more influenced by the linguistic realizations than by the contextual factors governing the speech acts.

4. As far as the learners' performance in relation to the use of the strategy (warning & threatening) to express reprimand, their central performance tendency classifies them as "extremely limited users" at "warning" and "intermittent users" at "threatening".

5. The learners' ability to identify the speech act of reprimand expressed by means of "claiming authority" is exaggerated and can be describes, according to the mean score of their responses (27.5%), as "intermittent users".

6. The identification of the speech act of reprimand by the use of the last two BORSs which are "presenting facts" and "rejecting explanation/ request/ accusation" is also unsuccessful and their

Adab Al-Kufa Journal
No. 49 / P2
Muharram 1443 / Sep 2021

ISSN Print 1994 – 8999
ISSN Online 2664-469X

مجلة آداب الكوفة
العدد : ٤٩/ ج٢
محرم ١٤٤٣ هـ/ ايلول ٢٠٢١م

performance is categorized as "intermittent users" for both strategies.

7. Regarding PPSs, the learners' performance in four of them is classified as "extremely limited users". These strategies are: accepting explanation/ excuse, claiming common ground, offering cooperation and moralizing.

8. The only strategy in which the learners are classified as "marginal users" is "requesting cooperation'". Thus, they are considered comparatively successful.

9. As far as their performance regarding the use of "requesting information" to express the speech act of reprimand, their central behaviour tendency classifies them as "non users" at the recognition level.

10. As for NPSs, the learners' ability to identify the speech act of reprimand is classified as "intermittent users" for the two NPSs which are "expressing gratitude" and "reluctance to impinge".

11. PhD learners are better than the MA learners at most of the strategies. However, the MA learners are better than the PhD learners at only three strategies and one substrategy which are "accepting explanation/ excuse", "requesting cooperation", " reluctance to impinge" and "threatening".

12. Both types of subjects are better in recognizing the speech act of reprimand when expressed by PPSs than when expressed by BORSs or NPSs since their success amounts to (31.2%) for PPSs, while it amounts to (25% and 22.5%) for the other two respectively.

4.1.2. Learners' Performance at Part 2 of the Test

The learners' performance at this level as compared with that of NESs leads to the following conclusions:

1. Iraqi EFL learners have displayed insufficient awareness of using all types of strategies in performing the speech act of reprimand in various situations.

2. The learners show greater preference for using "warning & threatening" and "claiming authority" strategies rather than the other types of strategies in most of the situations. They employ the former in (24) situations and the latter in all (25) situations, while the NESs employ the former in (22) situations and the latter in (16) situations.

3. The EFL learners' performance in many situations matches that of the natives' and their choices of the appropriate strategy. Consequently, they show more preference for the strategies used by the natives or employ strategies which are favoured by them. For this reason, their performance can be described as sufficiently appropriate.

4. In Part 2 situations, the learners prefer using BORSs while the natives vary their use of the type of strategy according to the context of situation.

5. Iraqi learners, in Part 2 situations, show similar behaviour to that of the natives by preferring strategies employed by the natives in Type A situations (3), (4) and (17), in Type B situations (5), (11), (12), (14), (18) and (20), and in Type C situations (2), (7) and (13). However, their behaviour in the situations above is sometimes characterized by the absence of the right degree of politeness. In the remaining situations, Iraqi learners favour strategies that are not employed by the natives.

6. In type A and B situations, the performance of both types of learners is similar in the way it approaches that of the natives, but in Type C situations the MA learners are better in approaching the natives' performance.

Bibliography

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989*).Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Caroll, B.J.(1980).*Testing Communicative Performance*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

Garcia, C. (2004). Coercion and Cooperation. In Márquez Reiter, R. and Placencia, M. E. (eds.), *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish* (pp. 231-64). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Hindawi, Al-, F. (1999). Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of the Speech Acts of Commands and Requests .Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Baghdad, University of Baghdad.

Mullholand, J. (1991). *The Language of Negotiation: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Improving Communication*. New York. Routledge.

Reiter, R. M. and Placencia, M. E. (2004). *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing.

Vanderveken, Daniel. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts: Principles of Language Use*. Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.

Appendix
The Test

This appendix introduces the version of the test which was submitted to the informants. The natives, however, were involved only in part 2 of the same version.

Part One: Recognition of the Speech Act of Reprimand

Read the following situations carefully and choose what you believe to be the intended speech act conveyed by the given utterance:

	Situation	Utterance	Speech Acts
1	A teacher says to his pupil when he finds him chatting with others rather than studying:	You need to concentrate more on your work and spend less time chatting to others.	a. Reproach b. Reproof c. Reprimand d. Rebuke
2	John is a secretary in the Department of English. He has come late and left early for the second time. The head of the department says:	Look, John, I called you because you have been coming late and leaving early and uh: it is expected that you should keep a work schedule, right?	a. Scolding b. Rebuke c. Reprimand d. Reproof
3	A librarian says to his workman when he has seen that the workman is doing his work in the wrong manner:	You are failing to fulfill your responsibilities. As far as the job you should do is concerned, I see that it leaves a lot to be desired.	a. Abuse b. Admonition c. Reproof d. Reprimand
4	An MA student has not prepared a seminar. The professor addresses him:	Well, if you want to stay in the programme, you must bring your seminar next time.	a. Reprimand b. Insult c. Scolding d. Reproach
5	A teacher says to his pupil when the pupil has spoken without raising his hand:	Tom, please put your hand up and wait until I ask you to speak so that everyone gets a fair chance to contribute and we can all hear what is said.	a. Reprimand b. Insult c. Admonition d. Reproach
6	The manager of the railway station tells his employee when he saw a lot of misbehaviours on the part of the employee:	You should worry because uh we have personnel to spare so try to arrive on time, if not, you won't.	a. Rebuke b. Reproof c. Reprimand d. Insult
7	A footballer has got a good chance to score a goal, but he failed to do so. After an explanation of how he failed, the coach says:	You have tried, but that doesn't mean you threw it out.	a. Rebuke b. Abuse c. Admonition d. Reprimand
8	A headmaster says to one of the teachers in his school when the latter has not presented his daily lesson plan in its due time:	So, the only thing we are going to ask from you is that from now on try either to present your daily lesson plan on the specified time or organize yourself in some way.	a. Reproof b. Reprimand c. Scolding d. Insult
9	One of the knights has dropped his weapon when saluting. The king says to him:	What is wrong with you? Was there any problem that...?	a. Reprimand b. Abuse c. Rebuke d. Reproach
10	The boss says to his typist when the latter has not typed the list of names alphabetically:	We would need to review that because you see…. The names of people in your list are not ordered alphabetically. Then, it	a. Admonition b. Reproof c. Scolding d. Reprimand

		would be a matter to check if the problem is yours or the problem is the computer's.	
11	In a company, the employee has arrived late to his work and he has given an excuse. With displeasure, the boss says to him:	Well, well, we understand each other.	a. Reproach b. Reprimand c. Insult d. Rebuke
12	After 30 minutes of waiting in the park, the father says with displeasure to his son:	I understand you, I understand you… It happens to all of us…We get to the subway one day….That we get late or it happens that there is a strike which happens all the time.	a. Admonition b. Scolding c. Reprimand d. Abuse
13	The director says to one of the actors when he has not played his role well:	Well, I think we are going to leave it at that. Let's leave it here……… You know, I don't like this.	a. Reprimand b. Reproach c. Rebuke d. Insult
14	A mother has been talking to her daughter. Meanwhile, she discovers that the daughter is not paying attention to her. The mother says with displeasure:	Well, thank you for listening to me.	a. Insult b. Admonition c. Scolding d. Reprimand
15	On the birthday anniversary of a woman, she says to her husband when he comes without bringing her a gift:	You forgot that this day is my birthday.	a. Reproach b. Reprimand c. Abuse d. Rebuke
16	A man says to his friend after seeing him smoking in the bus:	You babyish men do not obey the law.	a. Admonition b. Scolding c. Insult Reprimand
17	A pupil is teaching his friend and the latter cannot solve a simple equation. The former says to him:	You must have spaghetti for brains.	a. Reprimand b. Reproach c. Abuse d. Reproof
18	A pupil tells his friend after the latter has spoken bad words:	You have got bad parents because they are the ones who taught you to speak such words.	a. Admonition b. Scolding c. Reprimand d. Insult
19	An assistant has not given the exact directions to the explorer. The explorer mildly says to him:	I should have done it myself.	a. Reproof b. Insult c. Rebuke d. Reprimand
20	The soldier has missed the target. The commander angrily says:	Focus on the target.	a. Reprimand b. Insult c. Abuse d. Rebuke

Part Two: Production: Strategies Used for Expressing the Speech Act of Reprimand

Imagine yourself in the following situations. What would you say to reprimand your interlocutor(s)?

1. You are a university professor. One of your students does not complete his homework. This morning, you call him in to discuss the issue. You want to reprimand him.

…………………………………………………………………………

2. You are a bus driver. One of the passengers who is sitting beside you is smoking a cigarette and you cannot tolerate the odour.

…………………………………………………………………………

3. You have been waiting for your son to come and give you a lift for 30 minutes and it is not the first time that he comes late.

…………………………………………………………………………

4. Your son has lied to you about his marks on the exam.

………………………………………………………………

5. You are a company manager and very concerned with the company's finances. Your accountant has forgotten to check the balance of the company.

………………………………………………………………

6. Catherine is a secretary in a software company. You are her boss. You hand her a report. You need the report typed by2.00 p.m. It is 2:00 and she has not completed it yet.

………………………………………………………………

7. A naughty boy that you do not know has broken the window of your car.

………………………………………………………………

8. Your younger brother is supposed to be studying because he has an exam. You enter his room and find him playing video games.

………………………………………………………………

9. You are a doctor. A patient who has been advised by another doctor to stop drinking fizzy drinks. He has come to you and you have found that he has not done so. Thus, he should be reprimanded.

………………………………………………………………

10. You are a mother. You have seen your daughter's room dirty. You want to reprimand her.

………………………………………………………………

11. You are a minister. Your spokesman has delivered a statement without consulting you.

………………………………………………………………

12. You are an employer. You have noticed that your employee is coming late and leaving early.

………………………………………………………………

13. You are a librarian. One of the patrons in the library is talking loudly. You want to reprimand him.

………………………………………………………………

14. You are the owner of a restaurant. The waitress is rude in treating the customers.

………………………………………………………………

15. You are a pilot. You have told the copilot to fly in a certain speed, but he has exceeded this limit. You want to reprimand him.

………………………………………………………………

16. You are the Pope. One of the priests has violated the rules of the church.

………………………………………………………………

17. Your son is always annoying his sister. You want to correct his behaviour by reprimanding him.

Adab Al-Kufa Journal
No. 49 / P2
Muharram 1443 / Sep 2021

ISSN Print 1994 – 8999
ISSN Online 2664-469X

مجلة آداب الكوفة
العدد : ٤٩ / ج٢
محرم ١٤٤٣ هـ / ايلول ٢٠٢١م

18. You are the ship captain. You have found that one of the sailors is not wearing the uniform.

……………………………………………………………………………

19. You are the leader of a group of musicians. One of them has deviated from the note.

……………………………………………………………………………

20. You are a professor. You have found a student cheating in the exam.

……………………………………………………………………………