

# Responding to the Speech Act of Reprimand by Iraqi EFL University Students

Muayad Mingher Al-Shemmery<sup>a</sup>, Asim Abood Zbar<sup>b</sup>, Hisham Adnan AlMumar<sup>c</sup>, <sup>a</sup>College of Engineering / University of Babylon / Babylon City/ Iraq, <sup>b</sup>Mustaqbal University College / Babylon City/ Iraq, <sup>c</sup>Department of Regional Planning/ College of Physical Planning/ University of Kufa/ An Najaf City/ Iraq, Email: <sup>a</sup>[alshemmery-m@yahoo.com](mailto:alshemmery-m@yahoo.com), <sup>b</sup>[asimabood54@gmail.com](mailto:asimabood54@gmail.com), <sup>c</sup>[hushama.jasim@uokufa.edu.iq](mailto:hushama.jasim@uokufa.edu.iq)

This paper focuses on how the speech act of reprimand is used by Iraqi EFL undergraduates through certain conceptual underpinnings. It also attempts to look into the ability of Iraqi English students in recognizing and producing the speech act of reprimand on the one hand, and to determine the errors made by the students and their stems on the other. Fifty fourth year students from the Department of English, College of Arts at the University of Kufa participated in an empirical test during the academic year (2017-2018). The study showed that most Iraqi EFL learners face serious difficulties in using reprimand. Further, they show a great tendency to use other correlated speech acts. This could be observed in the number of correct versus incorrect responses in both tasks undertaken by the student participants.

**Key words:** *Reprimand, Admonition, Assertive, Reproof.*

## Introduction

Speech acts are utterances that serve many functions in communication. Speech acts are performed when somebody makes an apology, warning, command, suggestion, invitation, prohibition, or refusal. It is claimed that the distinction among some of these speech acts is indistinct. That is, they come into a mutual relationship as they could be recognized by the same expressions or formulas. One of these complicated speech acts is “reprimand,” which correlates with a number of speech acts such as rebuke, reproach, and insult (Weirzbicka, 1987). Resultantly, this kind of speech act may be difficult for Iraqi learners of English, because of its intricate nature and its overlap with other speech acts.

## Speech Act Theory: An Overview

Crystal (2008) defines speech act theory as a theory that analyses the role of words in relation to the behaviour of their users in communication. It involves the ways in which words are used not only to provide information but also to achieve certain actions by utterances called speech acts. These speech acts might be requests, invitations, promise and so on. In any event, the action performed by producing an utterance consists of these three acts. The first is a locutionary act which is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression, i.e., what was said. However, the second is known as illocutionary act, which is what was meant. Of course, an utterance isn't created without an intention to have an effect on the addressee. This dimension is known as a perlocutionary act which is what happened as a result (Yule, 1996). Searle (1979), according to their function, categorised these acts into five groups. The five divisions are representatives, directives, expressives, commissives, and declarations.

**Assertives / Representatives:** They commit the addressor to something being the truth: e.g., suggesting, concluding, and so on.

**Directives:** They attempt to make the hearer perform an action: i.e., express what the speaker wants. This includes demanding, requesting, and so on.

**Commissives:** They commit the addressor to act something in the future: e.g., promising, planning, etc.

**Expressives:** They express the speaker's feelings about the situation: e.g., thanking, welcoming, etc.

**Declarations:** They act to change the state of the world in their uttering, e.g., declaring, naming, etc.

For the speech acts to be successfully performed, certain felicity conditions have to be fulfilled. As Austin (1962) claims that these conditions are the environment and roles of participants recognized by all groups, the action must be totally achieved and the persons have the right intent (cited in Cutting, 2002). Searle (1971) grouped them like this:

- **Propositional conditions:** They set restrictions on what can be expressed in the proposition of a sentence.
- **Preparatory conditions:** They are connected with whether the person performing the act must have the right or authority to do so.

- Sincerity conditions: They involve beliefs, intentions, and desires of the speaker to be sincere.
- Essential conditions: They are related to whether the addressor has an intention that the utterance is performed upon by the addressee.

### **Speech Act of Reprimand**

As it is a turn of conviction, it is usually done in face to face interaction between interlocutors or by other ways of communication as it is sometimes regarded as one of the most threatening acts because it requires the addressee to stop acting in a particular way. If this act is done efficiently, it will humiliate the addressee (Haverkate, 1988).

Mullholand (1991) defines reprimand as a speech act that is used to offer formally an adverse judgment to another person about a serious issue. He also says that a reprimand is a "formal or official" speech act, in which the speaker declares or reveals a negative judgment about the hearer. As one of the assertive verbs, a reprimand is defined by Vanderveken (1990) as an act of accusing someone who has done something wrong. The accusation is conducted in a particular way that expresses dissatisfaction for the addressee's illegal or dishonest behaviour. Generally, this act comes out of a person in authority. Reprimand means to reprove, reproach, or criticize somebody negatively for very bad behaviour. It implies a formal rebuke issued by a superior (person in authority), or an official or official body: reprimanded by the judge and warned of a possible charge of contempt of court (<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/reprimand>). Roger (2002) points out that this type of speech act is largely performed by a person in a high position. His definition for reprimand refers to issuing a clear verbal statement of displeasure on the hearer's part regarding improper behaviour. It most commonly takes the form of telling the hearer what he/she has been doing or what he/she should be doing in an annoying way or an angry tone of voice. Reprimand is more effective and less likely to cause disaffection when issued more privately.

### ***Felicity Conditions of Reprimand***

Felicity conditions of reprimand are general agreements that addressors and addressees use as a code to produce and recognize actions. Speakers use these conditions for actions as a tool for converting their actions into sentences with a particular linguistic structure that speakers utter (i.e., they produce the appropriate utterance unit). Hearers, in turn, use the same set of felicity conditions for actions as a device for decoding the speaker's actions from the linguistic structure of the sentences the speaker produced (i.e. from the speaker's utterance units) (<https://www.thoughtco.com/felicity-conditions-speech-1690855>).

Mulholand (1991) announces two essential conditions that should be met when reprimands are given. The first one is on the speaker's side and the second one is on the addressee's side.

### ***On the Speaker's Side***

As reported by Mulholand (1991), for a reprimand to be made, the following conditions are crucially found on the speaker's side:

(i) Owing to the fact that reprimanding is an official act, the speaker must have some authority over the hearer. This might be because of his/ her superior position or by the other parties involved. Occasionally, the person to be reprimanded gives permission to another to perform the act, saying:

‘You have the right to be annoyed with me over this.’

(ii) The speaker should be able to take the moral ground in the matter. If the speaker has at other times been wrong on the same matter, then the hearer is entitled to feel angry at the unfairness of the act.

(iii) The speaker must be knowledgeable about the issues involved in the reprimand. If the details he knows are faulty, for instance, if another person is reprimanded wrongly, then the speaker is justifiably criticized, and the relationship involved is severely destroyed.

(iv) The reprimand should be acceptable to others who are witnessing. If the wrong people are present, it makes it even worse for the hearer to have them see his / her humiliation. In addition, most people may be unwilling to observe the act, and if they are obliged to do so they may soften the reprimand so as to reduce their own embarrassment, thus spoiling its effect.

### ***On the Hearer's Side***

Mulholand (1991) states that for the hearer to accept a reprimand as reasonable, the following conditions should be met:

(i) The hearer must see the speaker as an acceptable person to perform the act.

(ii) The hearer must have done something deserving of a reprimand, and some evidence of this must be present.

(iii) The misbehaviour for which the hearer is to be reprimanded must have happened recently. For instance, a reprimand could be quite acceptable in a meeting for something done in a past meeting even if the meetings happen once a year.

### ***Reprimand Group***

Wierzbicka (1987) identifies a group of speech acts, which she names as part of the "reprimand group". They are reprimand, rebuke, reproof, admonition, reproach, scolding, insult. These terms are related to one another in some of their characteristics.

Reprimand is similar to reproof, rebuke, reproach in expressing a negative attitude to an action related to the addressee (Wierzbicka, 1987). Regarding its force, reprimand and rebuke are unlikely to be done "gently". The reprimanding person does not have to show his anger towards the addressee because the bad action done by the addressee does not have to be present or very recent. Conversely, in rebuke, the rebuking person is angry and annoyed with the addressee because he sees the bad action as something current, not as something past (Wierzbicka, 1987). The feelings expressed by the addresser involve displeasure in reprimands, and anger in rebukes. Another similar quality of among reprimand, rebuke, and reproach is that the addresser in all these acts wants to annoy the addressee too. This means that it is to be a sort of punishment. Thus, there are two purposes for reprimand. The first is disciplinary, like that of rebuke and unlike that of reproof, and the second, like that of rebuke and reproof, is corrective (Wierzbicka, 1987).

Austin (1970) remarks that reprimand differs from insult in that it has a performative verb, while insult does not have one. Thus, one is likely to say, "I reprimand you," but "I insult you" is not possible. Santa Cruz (2008) agrees with Austin's view in that reprimand not only differs from insult in having the performative verb, but also from censure in the same way. Moreover, insult mostly should include saying bad words. The most important difference between them is that the addresser could not reprimand addressee by speaking about another person, whereas the addresser could insult the addressee by saying bad words about a person that relates to the addressee.

The other speech act on the list is a reproof, which seems to refer to some norm of behaviour that the addressee can be expected to be familiar with. However, reprimand can be unexpected. Therefore, reproof is quite likely to be expected with the recognition of one's misdeeds (Wierzbicka, 1987). As to reproach, it sounds as if it refers to some standard of action which the addresser shares with the addressee. Thus, "you deceived me Jimmy" makes a good reproach, but not a reprimand, rebuke or reproof. Contrary to reprimand, the reproaching individual is resentfully affected by the bad action done by the addressee. One other difference between reprimand and reproach is that the reprimanding person must be in a position higher than that of the addressee, whereas the reproaching person need not. That is, reproach is not a kind of punishment (Wierzbicka, 1987).

Scolding is another technique of the discipline which differs from reprimand in the sense that the former expresses harsh or angry disapproval and it implies a parent-child or teacher-pupil style. This means that adults do not normally scold one another, but when they do that, the addressers try to treat addressees like children by attributing some child characteristics to them (Wierzbicka, 1987). One of the speech acts that are closely related to reprimand is that of admonition. Admonition is having common qualities to reprimand but bears a lesser degree of harshness and criticism. Both are meant as remedial and constructive in nature (Weeks, 2004). One salient difference between them is that admonition does not seem to be intended as a kind of punishment in contrast to reprimand. Hence, one would probably say, "she deserves a reprimand," than, "she deserves an admonition". Rather, one would tend to say, "she ought to be admonished" (Wierzbicka, 1987).

The last difference is that the addresser in admonition does not have to be in a higher position like that in reprimand. He only assumes that he has the right to correct the addressee's behaviour (Wierzbicka, 1987).

### ***Intonation and Reprimand***

Many linguists generally refer to the significance of the intonation in characterizing the meaning of single words and utterances. For example, Searle (1969) suggests the idea that the speaker's intention stating devices that the intonation pattern is one of these devices. Huddleston (1988) regards prosody (including intonation) as one of the special factors contributing to the overriding of the initial assignment of the illocutionary act. Nilesen (2000) offers several devices by which one can elicit the meaning of an utterance focusing on the significant role of prosody in this respect. Brine (2001) supports Nilesen's viewpoint by saying that the addressor's intent is not only conveyed by the words someone utters but also by other things such as prosody. Cook (2003) argues that the tone of voice is one of the contextual factors which might be involved in interpreting the utterance. It makes it easier for the hearer to understand what a speaker would like to convey. Roach (2000) declares that there is an attitudinal function, i.e., intonation enables the speakers to express emotions, feelings, and attitudes, and the same sentence can be understood in different ways. It might, for example, be labelled "angry", "happy", "grateful", "bored" and so on. Accordingly, it can be understood that intonation's attitudinal function is important to distinguish reprimand from other speech acts.

Wierzbicka (1987), for example, remarks that reprimand is rendered into another speech act if it is said in a different way. In other words, a reprimand is said with displeasure, but it will be reproof if it is said mildly.

### ***The Impact of Reprimand***

Occasionally, the outcome of reprimand may leave a serious scar in the addressee and, therefore, it may create a hindrance to developing the progress of interpersonal relations between the addresser and the addressee. As a result, the purpose of reprimand goes away from its real purpose, which is a corrective one, to an opposite purpose. In such situations, in which reprimands are public they produce destructive results and reprimanders often wish that they would not deliver that reprimand because of its outcome (Handin and Mancuso, 2001). As for a behavioural and motivational viewpoint, reprimands can be given in different forms in which they could give an encouraging outcome, that is, the addressees are motivated and encouraged rather than panicked (Gillespie, 2005).

### ***How to Make a Reprimand a Positive Experience***

The strategy by which reprimands have convenient results represents distinct stages of the reprimand process (Mello, 1996). The first stage involves stating the problem for the addressee. In discussing the problem, the reprimander should be specific. That is to say, he should focus his discussion on specific behaviours or matters that create the problem rather than unspecific ones (Mello, 1996). Alan (2003) states that the problem which the reprimander raises for discussion should be clear to the addressee. That is, what the addressee has broken, for example, and his misbehaviour should be precisely and explicitly stated. The second stage is letting the reprimandee recognize how his misbehaviour has negative effects. This can be done by explaining his bad behaviour to the reprimandee. In so doing, the reprimander makes the reprimandee understand that he has the right to reprimand (Alan, 2003). The third step is giving the reprimandee a chance to respond. Failing to give him that opportunity is regarded as a big mistake (Pfiffner et al., 1985).

However, giving a chance for a reprimandee to respond has certain useful purposes. The most important purpose is making the reprimandee aware of the circumstances which he was not aware of. Another essential purpose is to allow the exchange to be in a collegial manner, and not one-sided (Mello, 1996). The last step of the reprimanding process, which is often ignored, performs the important function and guarantees that the reprimander's message has been received and understood by the reprimandee. In this stage, the two sides of the exchange should come to agree on the solution or behaviour to be followed by the reprimandee. This may involve making remedial work for future behaviour. The solution may involve making the actions or behaviours of the reprimandee as specific as possible within the agreement between them on any dates or deadlines for performance as well as how the progress is to be measured (Mello, 1996).

## **Research Questions**

- 1- Can Iraqi students distinguish the intended speech act whether reprimand or other related ones conveyed by a sentence when choices are given?
- 2- Do most Iraqi learners face difficulty in using the speech act of reprimand or not?

## **Methods**

### ***Participants***

The population study is fifty Iraqi EFL undergraduate students. Thirty-six of them are females and the rest are males. The random sample includes subjects whose major is English. They are senior students at the Department of English, College of Arts, the University of Kufa for the academic year 2018–2019, so they are regarded as advanced candidates. At this level, the age of the subjects range from 22-24, who share the same scientific background (Rogers, 2002).

### ***Instrument***

Traditionally, a due test is a technique or a method or a tool that can be considered as a form of assessment to measure the learners' knowledge or their ability to meet some basic requirements, which are reliability and validity. According to Ingram (1968), a test is only valuable if it measures precisely (i.e., Reliability) what the examiner wants it to measure (i.e., Validity). Validity of the test is guaranteed by exposing the test to a jury. The method adopted to estimate the reliability of the present study is Kurder- Richardson.

To act in accordance with what has been mentioned, the test is designed to reveal the ability of university students to master the speech act of reprimand. The test under the study consists of two questions. The first one is constructed to measure the students' ability at recognizing the level of reprimand. It includes ten situations. The students are asked to tick the correct speech act. The second question is designed to measure their proficiency at the production level. In question 2, the students are supplied with ten situations and asked to respond to each one. (See Appendix 1).

### ***Procedure***

A fundamental structure of reprimand was showed, and a test was performed on a sample of university students. The test layout was printed out and organized on the test papers to reduce effort and time. The test was administered at Kufa University in one session. The students were orally informed on how to answer the test items with what is requested from them to help the researchers attain the research purpose. It was then handed out to the admissible population. The test took 30-35 minutes to answer all the items. Finally, the obtainable data

was analysed to find out the reasons behind the students' errors through the results of the test.

## Discussion of the Results

This section presents and discusses the results of the test to show statistically the troublesome errors that the students made in using the speech act of reprimand. An attempt is also made to investigate the probable sources of these errors.

### *Students' Performance of Question 1*

The table below offers the performance of the students at the recognition level in Question 1. As it has been reported in Subjection (5.2), the subjects are asked to choose the correct item. The results took out on each item are in Table (1) below:

### **Students' Responses of Question (1)**

of.No Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided	%
1	40	40	10	10	0	0
2	12	24	38	16	0	0
3	8	16	42	16	0	0
4	26	32	24	38	0	0
5	8	16	42	54	0	0
6	6	12	44	22	0	0
7	50	100	0	20	0	0
8	6	12	44	22	0	0
9	0	0	50	36	0	0
10	20	40	30	34	0	0
Total	176	35.2	324	64.8	0	0

What stands out in this comparison table is that the percentage of their correct responses is 35.2%, whereas the percentage of their incorrect responses is 64.8%. The high rate of the correct responses is 100% in item (7). This rate shows that the students recognize the structure of this item. However, the worst performance is 0% in recognizing item (9). From this rate, we infer that the students do not know how to recognize this item.

### ***Students' Performance of Question 2***

Question 2 demonstrates student performance at the production level. The students are requested to respond to each item as shown. The students' responses on each item are shown in Table (2) below:

#### **Students' Responses of Question (2)**

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided	%
1	32	64	14	28	4	8
2	18	36	26	32	6	12
3	14	28	24	48	12	24
4	16	32	22	44	12	24
5	28	54	14	28	8	16
6	30	60	16	32	4	8
7	14	28	34	68	2	4
8	18	36	24	48	8	16
9	26	52	20	40	4	8
10	22	44	20	4	8	16
Total	218	43.6	214	42.8	68	13.6

In the above comparison table, the percentage of their correct responses is 43.6%, but the percentage of their incorrect responses (including the avoided items) is 56.4%.

The highest response rate of the suitable responses is 64% in item (1). This result shows that the students are accustomed to answering such items, whereas the lowest response rate of the suitable responses is 28% in items (3) and (7). This data offers evidence that the students are not bright enough to respond to the structure of this item. The results of the whole test are demonstrated in Table (3) below, which contains both the recognition and production levels.

#### **Students' Total Performance of Questions (1) and (2)**

Q. No.	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
Q1	176	35.2	324	64.8
Q2	218	43.6	282	56.4
Total	394	78.8	606	121.2

What table (3) above shows is a brief description of the students' total performance in Questions (1) and (2). The highest total rate of the students' correct responses has amounted

to 394, 78, 8 %, which is a lower performance rate than that of their incorrect ones which have amounted to 606, 121.2%. This suggests that the students do not understand how to recognize the intended speech act. This fact answers the first question, so Iraqi EFL students cannot distinguish the intended speech act conveyed by a sentence when choices are given of reprimand or other related ones.

As for the production level, the students failure to produce the speech act of reprimand reflects their shortage in this area since the total number of their incorrect responses has amounted to 282 (56.4%), which is higher than that of their correct ones which have amounted to 218 (43.6%). Such figures give an answer to the second question which reads that such students do not have the ability to issue the speech act of reprimand appropriately.

### **Error Analysis**

According to Richards and Schmidt (2002), an error is an act of using words, speech acts or grammatical items in such a way that it seems imperfect and indicative of incomplete learning. In the same direction, error analysis is valuable for examining the causes of learner's errors as it is one of its aims. The sources of errors can be categorized into four types: Interlingual interference, Intralingual transfer, Context of learning, and Communication strategies. The first type of error is caused by the interference of the native language whereby the learners tend to use their knowledge of the native language on some linguistic features in the target language. Thus, it sometimes leads to mistakes (Brown, 1987). For instance, some errors happen because the learner translates his/her first native sentence or idiomatic expression into the target language word by word. The second type takes place due to the misuse of a particular rule of the target language. Actually, it is quite opposite of the Interlingual error as it puts the target language into focus (Richards and Schmidt 2002). For instance, some errors occur when the learner applies a grammatical rule in cases where it isn't suitable to apply. The occurrence of the third type of error overlaps the elements of the learning situation: the classroom with its teacher, the inadequacy of our teaching methods, and its materials (Keshavarz, 1999). For instance, the faulty presentation of the elements by the teacher may lead the learner to make such errors or the textbook designer who neglects some aspects. The last type is concerned with the strategies which the learners uses to overcome the problems caused by a lack of linguistic sources in order to convey their intended meaning (Ellis, 2003). For instance, this kind of error is part of approximation, guessing and avoidance. To sum up, in this area, it is a difficult mission to suggest plausible answers as an explanation of the causes of error as there may be more than one plausible answer to identify the source of an error (Bell, 1981). However, the researchers may not find exactly the sources of errors because an error may be imputed to more than one source.

## Conclusion

The main conclusions came to in this section are associated with the student's performance in Questions 1 and 2 of the test. They can be summarized in the following points:

1. The students demonstrate inefficiency at both levels and that is apparent from the low rate of their correct responses, 394, 78.8%, in comparison with that of their incorrect ones, 606. 121, 2. For research question 1, the results indicate that most Iraqi EFL university students struggle to identify the intended speech act whether it is a reprimand or not. As for research question 2, the results reveal that the students lack the ability to issue the speech act of reprimand when a situation is given.

2. The high rate of their incorrect responses in Question (2) shows that the students misunderstand the speech act of reprimand by misusing it with other related speech acts.

3. The analysis of the students' incorrect responses at both performance levels can be assigned to the following most frequent types of error source:

A. Interlingual transfer whereby the students' errors are traced back to the mother tongue influence in producing the speech act of reprimand. This type shows a considerable rate of the students' incompetence in dealing with this subject.

B. The results of error analysis reveal that intralingual overgeneralization, subjects' ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete applications of rules, and false concepts hypothesized play an important factor in creating difficulty for learning.

C. In order to convey their intended meaning, the learners use communication strategies to overcome communication problems. Such strategies are guessing, paraphrasing, and avoidance by which the students tend to remedy the deficiencies between their linguistic efficiency and the situation's requirements. It is the factor with highest effect.

D. The errors made under the context of learning deal with the setting where the target language is learned, e.g., in a classroom context. Some teachers pay little attention to some instructions of teaching approaches or the textbook can lead the learner to make wrong hypotheses about the language. This factor has little effect.

## The Value of the Study

It is hoped that the present study will be valuable for those interested in the field of pragmatics as it sheds some light on the speech act of reprimand. It is also hoped to be useful for syllabus-designers and textbooks writers, English teachers, and researchers to make use of the findings of this study.



## REFERENCES

- Alan, M. (2003). *The Motivated School*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J. (1970). *Philosophical Papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, R. (1981). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. London: Batsford Academic and Education Ltd.
- Brine, S. (2001). *How to Communicate*. [www.scienceforall.com](http://www.scienceforall.com)
- Brown, D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Ltd.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *A Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gillespie, A. A. (2005). *Reprimanding Juveniles and the Right to Due Process*. The Modern Law Review Limited.
- Handin, K. H. and James, C. M. (2001). "Perceptions of the Functions of Reprimand." *Journal of Social Psychology*. Vol. 110, P.43-52. New York / New York University Press.
- Haverkate, H. (1988). Toward a typology of politeness strategies. *Multilingua*, 7(4), 385-409.
- Huddleston, R. (1988). *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ingram, E. (1968). *Attainment and Diagnostic Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (1999). *A Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis*. Tehran: Rahnama Publications.
- Mello, J. A. (1996). *The Fine Art of Reprimand: Using Criticism to Enhance Commitment, Motivation, and Performance*. Employment Relations Today. John Willy and Sons, Inc.



- Mullholand, J. (1991). *The Language of Negotiation: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Improving Communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Nilesen, F. (2000). *An Account on Pragmatics*. [www.scienceforall.com](http://www.scienceforall.com)
- Pfiffner, L. J., O'Leary S. G., Rosen L. A., & Jr. William C. Sanderson. (1985). A Comparison of the Effects of Continuous and Intermittent Response Cost and Reprimands in the Classroom. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*. Vol. 14, No. 4, 348-352. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Roach, P. (2000). *English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, B. (2002). *Teacher Leadership and Behaviour Management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Santa Cruz, J. N. (2008). *Sticks and Stones: The Philosophy of Insult*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1971). *The Philosophy of Language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: A Study in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts: Principles of Language Use*. Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weeks, N. (2004). *Admonition and Curse: The Ancient Near Eastern Treaty/ Covenant Form as a Problem in Inter-Cultural Relationships*. London: T&T Clark International a Continuum imprint.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.

[www.dictionary.com/browse/reprimand](http://www.dictionary.com/browse/reprimand)

[www.thoughtco.com/felicity-conditions-speech-1690855](http://www.thoughtco.com/felicity-conditions-speech-1690855)

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Appendix 1

### The Test

**Q1:** Read the following situations carefully and choose what you think the correct speech act conveyed by the given utterance:

	Situation	Utterance	Speech Acts
1	Shona is a secretary in an office. She has been late twice. The manager says:	Shona, I called you because you left early. It is unexpected that you should not be on time.	a. Scolding b. Reprimand c. Reproof
2	A man says to her wife when he has discovered that she doesn't love him with all her heart :	You deceive me Rosely.	a. Reprimand b. Reproach c. Insult
3	A father talks to his son. However, he discovers that the son does not listen to him. The father says :	We:h, thank you for listening to me.	a. Admonition b. Scolding c. Reprimand
4	A wife says to her husband when he comes without bringing her a present :	You forgot that this day is my birthday.	a. Reproach b. Reprimand c. Rebuke
5	A man tells his friend after seeing him smoking on the bus:	It is babyish that you disobey the rule.	a. Admonition b. Reproof c. Reprimand
6	A postgraduate student does not attend a seminar. The university teacher addresses him:	Well, if you want to remain in our program, you must be present at the seminar next week.	a. Reprimand b. Insult c. Reproach
7	A student tells her friend after she has spoken bad words:	You have bad parents because they taught you to speak such words.	a. Scolding b. Reprimand c. Insult
8	An observer does not give the right directions to the pilot. The pilot slightly says to him:	I should have done it myself.	a. Reproof b. Rebuke c. Reprimand
9	The soldier has missed the target. The officer angrily says to him:	Focus on the target.	a. Reprimand b. Reproof c. Rebuke



10	An employee is 10 minutes late and he gives an excuse. With displeasure, the boss says to him:	Well, well, we understand each other.	a. Admonition b. Reprimand c. Rebuke
----	--	---------------------------------------	--

**Q2:** Suppose you were in the following situations. What would you say to reprimand your addressee?

1. You are a headmaster. One of the teachers has not presented his weekly plan in its due. You want to reprimand him.  
 .....
2. You are a coach. One of your footballers has got a good opportunity to score but he failed.  
 .....
3. You are an administrator. A typist has not typed a handed report in its time.  
 .....
4. Your younger brother has lied to you about his exam results.  
 .....
5. You are a physician. One of the nurses has not provided the patient assistance and support.  
 .....
6. You are a teacher. You find one of your pupils chatting rather than studying.  
 .....
7. You are a student. You are teaching your friend and he cannot answer a simple question.  
 .....
8. You are a librarian. One of the customers is speaking loudly.  
 .....
9. You are the owner of a hotel. The receptionist is rude in treating the customers.  
 .....
10. Your neighbor is naughty and has made too much noise. You want to correct his behavior.  
 .....