European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies
ISSN: 2559 - 7914
ISSN-L: 2559 - 7914
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/lit

DOI: 10.46827/ejlll.v10i1.672 Volume 10 | Issue 1 | 2026

THE PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF THE DMS *MʕLISH*, *BASĪṬA*, AND *BIHIMMISH* IN JORDANIAN SPOKEN ARABIC

Shahid Barjes Abu Hashish[1], Aseel Alshbeekat[2i]
[1]Department of English Language & Literature,
Isra University,
Amman, Jordan
[2]Department of Translation,
Isra University,
Amman, Jordan

Abstract:
This study adopts a discourse theory approach to examine the pragmatic functions of the discourse markers (DMs) Basīṭa, Mʕlish, and Bihimmish in Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA). The current research implements a mixed-methods approach. The researcher compiled a list of scenarios that feature Basīṭa, Mʕlish, and Bihimmish, highlighting the prevalence of these expressions and their contexts within Jordanian society. Subsequently, the researcher identified the pragmatic functions of each marker in every scenario. A panel of jurors validated the selected functions and suggested minor modifications to both the scenarios and their functions. Within the quantitative analysis framework, the researcher employs statistical methods using SPSS to calculate frequencies, means, standard deviations, and gender-based differences. Regarding gender differences, the findings reveal statistically significant disparities between males and females in their use of Basīṭa, Mʕlish, and Bihimmish and their variants. The results indicate that females prefer emotional and supportive discourse, highlighting politeness, encouragement, and reassurance. Moreover, males lean towards assertive and structured discourse, focusing on power dynamics, indifference, and directness. Data were collected through questionnaires that included 62 selected scenarios. The analysis shows that Basīṭa has seventeen pragmatic functions, with the most frequently used functions being making a threat and providing reassurance. Mʕlish encompasses twenty-two pragmatic functions, the most common of which include granting permission and offering reassurance. Bihimmish exhibits sixteen pragmatic functions; the most common functions among speakers are encouraging and acknowledging an apology.

Keywords: DM, Jordanian spoken Arabic, pragmatic functions, *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish*

[i]Correspondence: email shahidabuhshish@gmail.com, aseel.shbeekat@iu.edu.jo

ملخص: تعتمد هذه الدراسة المنهج النظري للخطاب في تحليل الوظائف التداولية لمحددات الخطاب بهمش ، معلش ، بسيطة ، العربية المحكية الأردنية. وتم اعتماد منهج البحث المختلط (الكمي والنوعي) لتقديم رؤية شاملة تجمع بين التحليل الوصفي والإحصائي. في البداية، قام الباحث بإعداد مجموعة من السيناريوهات التي يظهر فيها استخدام هذه المحددات الخطابية بشكل شائع، بما يعكس انتشارها وسياقات استعمالها في المجتمع الأردني. وتم تحليل كل سيناريو لتحديد الوظائف التداولية المرتبطة بكل محدد خطابي.

ولضمان صدق الأداة البحثية، تم عرض السيناريوهات والوظائف المقترحة على لجنة من المحكمين المتخصصين الذين قدموا ملاحظاتهم واقترحوا تعديلات طفيفة على السيناريوهات وتفسيراتها. كما أُجري التحليل الكمي باستخدام برنامج SPSS لحساب التكرارات والمتوسطات الحسابية والانحرافات المعيارية، إضافة إلى دراسة الفروق المرتبطة بالنوع الاجتماعي.

وأظهرت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين الذكور والإناث في استخدامهم لمحددات الخطاب بهمش ، معلش ، بسيطة ومتغيراتها. حيث تميل الإناث إلى استخدام خطاب عاطفي داعم يركز على الأدب والتشجيع والتطمين، في حين يميل الذكور إلى استخدام خطاب أكثر حزمًا وتنظيمًا، يتميز بالتأكيد على علاقات القوة واللامبالاة والمباشرة.

وقد جُمعت البيانات من خلال استبانة اشتملت على (62) سيناريو مختار بعناية. وأظهر التحليل أن *بسيطة* تؤدي سبع عشرة وظيفة تداولية، كان أكثرها شيوعًا التعبير عن التهديد وتقديم الطمأنة. كما تبين أن *معلش* تؤدي اثنتين وعشرين وظيفة تداولية، أبرزها منح الإذن وتقديم الطمأنة. أما *بهمش* فتؤدي ست عشرة وظيفة تداولية، وكان أكثرها شيوعًا التشجيع والاعتراف بالاعتذار.

الكلمات المفتاحية: محددات الخطاب، الأردنية المحكية، الوظائف البراغماتية، بسيطة،معلش،بهمش

1. Introduction

Discourse markers (DMs) have been a research focus for many scholars over the past thirty years under various names (Fraser, 1990). This illustrates that researchers investigate DMs using multiple names and that scholars lack consensus regarding what constitutes a DM, with interpretations varying based on theoretical orientation (coherence, pragmatics, semantics, processing).

Some view the term broadly Schiffrin (1987), while others adopt a narrower, more functionally defined approach (Fraser (1999), Blakemore (2002)). For instance, Schiffrin (1987) examines DMs as broad and imprecise categories, encompassing interjections ("oh, now") and non-verbal expressions, with a focus on coherence. Simultaneously, Fraser (1990, 1999, 2006) explores DMs as more constrained devices, emphasizing expressions that indicate a semantic relationship between messages in discourse. Blakemore (2002) interprets DMs as markers conveying procedural meaning (how to process an utterance) rather than conceptual content.

Hyland defines DMs as "*a self-reflective linguistic expression referring to the evolving text, the writer, and the imagined readers of that text*" (2004, p. 133). Society widely uses DMs to enhance conversational cohesion and clarify the speaker's intentions. These markers also help speakers facilitate and manage interactions more effectively (Al Rousan, 2020).

Moreover, DMs play various roles in organizing the relationship between speakers and listeners (Crible, 2017). It serves as a key element in shaping daily conversation by reflecting the speaker's intention and managing the pace of discourse.

This study explores the pragmatic functions of the commonly used DMs *Mʕlish*, *Basīṭa*, and *Bihimmish* in Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA), which have primarily remained unexplored in academic research based on gender classification.

The primary objectives of this study are the following:

1) To identify and classify the pragmatic functions of the DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* based on their assumed illocutionary functions in JSA.
2) To assess whether significant gender-based differences exist in interpreting these functions using quantitative statistical analysis via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) method.
3) To understand non-Arab learners' Knowledge.

This study seeks answers to the following research questions:

1) What are the pragmatic functions of the DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* based on their assumed illocutionary functions in Jordanian-spoken Arabic?
2) To what extent does gender affect the use of DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish?*

2. Literature Review

The research by Al-Qudah (2024) analyzed the pragmatic function of the DM *Mayyit*, which translates to "Dead" in JSA. The study aims to explain DM *Mayyit's* usage across different social and linguistic situations while investigating its proposed meaning and pragmatic function that extends past its basic interpretation. The study used a contextual pragmatic analysis approach, combining discourse analysis and semantic theory. The researcher collected data from 72 Jordanian university students at Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, who provided examples of the term *Mayyit* in different conversational contexts. The researcher used the qualitative approach to analyze the pragmatic function and meaning of the DM *Mayyit*. The study demonstrated sixteen pragmatic functions for the DM *Mayyit*, highlighting its diverse usage in JSA. The DM often expresses extreme emotions such as hunger, exhaustion, and desire, reflecting the speaker's intense feelings. The results showed that DM *Mayyit* is typically defined negatively and is an integral part of Jordan's culture and society. It also showed how speakers express their feelings and judgments. This study is significant in the field of research as it provides empirical evidence on how linguistic expressions can have different meanings in various contexts.

Majali and Thenibat (2024). The study explores the pragmatic functions and contextual meanings of *halal and haram* in JSA. The study examines how these expressions extend beyond their religious connotations, and they function as DMs in everyday conversations. Furthermore, the study examines how context, speaker intentions, and sociocultural norms influence participants' interpretations of oral interactions. The study is grounded on a mixed qualitative and quantitative approach based on discourse and pragmatic analysis. The dataset consisted of 50 conversational scripts, each containing either *halal or haram* content, which were rated by 50 native speakers of Jordanian Arabic (25 males and 25 females, aged 30–50). Participants rated the acceptability and contextual appropriateness of each script using a 5-point Likert scale. The study considered speaker intentions, cultural norms, and situational context to determine the polysemy of the two terms. The study identifies nine pragmatic *halal* functions and eleven *haram* functions, highlighting their multifunctionality in Jordanian Arabic discourse. Understanding these DMs depends on the speaker's tone and the conversation context, significantly influencing the perception of meaning. The study highlights the challenges of translating direct messages into Modern Standard Arabic or other languages, as literal translations often fail to convey

cultural meanings accurately. The study provides evidence of Arabic speakers' use of multifunctional expressions, which helps understand cultural and pragmatic nuances in the translation process. It also enhances understanding of cross-cultural communication and sociolinguistics, focusing on how these terms are used in Jordan to construct meaning and shape social identities. This study forms an essential foundation for future sociolinguistics and discourse analysis research.

Kebabi and Al-Khanji (2024) investigated the various pragmatic functions of the DM *Saha* in Algerian-spoken Arabic, highlighting its contextual meanings and usage in daily interactions. The primary objective of this study was to investigate the pragmatic functions of the DM *Saha* in Algerian-spoken Arabic and to identify the different meanings and communicative roles of *Saha* in various conversational contexts, with a focus on its dependence on intonation and situational factors. The study employs a qualitative discourse analysis approach to analyze naturalistic conversations among Algerian students at the University of Jordan, concentrating on the use of DM *Saha* in different social settings. The study identifies 14 pragmatic functions of *Saha* in Algerian Arabic discourse, where it is used to express gratitude, greetings, approval, and congratulations and plays a role in defusing criticism. The study also suggests that *Saha* can express sarcasm and reflect changes in conversational tone. The results highlight the impact of intonation and context on the interpretation of the DM, underscoring the challenges associated with translating it into Modern Standard Arabic and other languages. This study contributes to the understanding of linguistic variety in Arabic dialects and offers essential insights for translation studies and intercultural communication, enhancing personal interaction and cultural identity.

Al Rousan and Sharar (2024) examined the pragmatic functions of the DM *Basīṭa* in JSA and explored its translatability into English. The study employed a qualitative discourse analysis approach, collecting data from 70 face-to-face conversations with 162 native speakers of Jordanian Arabic, aged 18 to 60, from diverse educational and occupational backgrounds. The conversations were video-recorded and transcribed, allowing for a detailed analysis of intonation, body language, and speaker intentions. Searle's speech act theory was used to analyze the pragmatic functions of the DM *Basīṭa*. The study identified 12 distinct pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa*, highlighting its multifaceted nature and sociocultural significance in Jordanian Arabic discourse. The study emphasizes the contextual nature of *Basīṭa*, as its meaning changes depending on the speaker's tone of voice, intention, and non-verbal cues. The results indicate that dynamic equivalence is more effective than literal translation, as word-for-word translations often fail to capture the whole pragmatic essence of *Basīṭa*, highlighting the importance of cultural and contextual awareness in translation practice.

DMs are widely recognized as crucial tools for structuring spoken interaction and conveying speaker stance; their pragmatic functions, however, remain underexamined in JSA, particularly from a gender-based perspective. Previous studies have focused primarily on individual markers—such as *Walak*, *tayyib*, or *yaʕni*—often analyzing their semantic roles or discourse structure without systematically exploring how speakers interpret these markers pragmatically in context. While the study by Rabab'ah, Al-Yasin, and Yagi (2022) investigated gender differences in the use of *Walak*, it was limited to a single discourse marker. It did not

encompass a broader range of functions or additional markers. Moreover, few studies in Arabic pragmatics have employed a mixed-methods approach that combines scenario-based qualitative analysis with quantitative statistical validation. This leaves a significant gap in understanding how multiple DMs function pragmatically across genders in context-rich interactions. The present study addresses this gap by examining the DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish*, offering a nuanced, function-based classification grounded in Schiffrin's (1987) discourse theory.

3. Methodology

This research aims to explore the pragmatic functions using Schiffrin's (1987) discourse theory as the theoretical framework. This theory examines how language shapes the formation of meanings, identities, and ideologies. The research capitalizes on a corpus of 62 scenarios extracted from daily conversations within Jordanian culture, reflecting the influence of these DMs in shaping everyday language between speakers.

A mixed-methods approach was chosen based on the nature of the research questions, which focused on identifying and analyzing the qualitative functions and quantitative perceptions of the DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish*. The mixed-methods approach enables the researcher to leverage the depth of qualitative analysis, while quantitative statistical analysis also validates patterns and trends using SPSS. Merging both methods ensures a more robust and triangulated understanding of the data.

The researcher used a convenience sample in this study, which involves selecting participants who are readily available and willing to participate. The researcher selected male and female university students who were accessible within the academic setting and met the criteria for linguistic and demographic relevance to the study. This sampling method was chosen for its practical advantages, including ease of access, time efficiency, and suitability for exploratory research in socio-pragmatics function. Since the aim of the study was not to generalize findings to the entire population but rather to explore pragmatic interpretations in naturalistic settings, convenience sampling was considered appropriate for obtaining focused, context-specific insights. In accordance with standard research ethics, the researcher informed all participants about the study's purpose and the voluntary nature of their participation. Prior to involvement, each individual received a written informed consent form detailing their rights. Participants signed the consent form before answering the questionnaire, thereby confirming their voluntary agreement to join the study. Anonymity was preserved throughout the research, and no personally identifiable information was gathered. The data collected were utilized exclusively for academic purposes, and confidentiality was rigorously maintained in the reporting and storage of all responses. The participants were forty students from Isra University, divided into two groups by gender: twenty males and twenty females. All selected participants were between 18 and 24 years old and were native speakers of Jordanian Arabic. They volunteered to participate in this study after the researcher approached them in the university's hallways and cafeterias, explaining the purpose of the research and asking if they were willing to participate.

The researcher employed two primary research tools to ensure the study's objectives were met and the research questions were answered (Scenario-Based Questionnaire). The main instrument used for data collection was a scenario-based questionnaire designed for this study. The researcher constructed 62 authentic and culturally relevant scenarios, 20 for each *Basīṭa,* 20 for each *Bihimmish*, and 22 for *Mʕlish,* based on naturalistic dialogues in JSA. Each scenario embedded a DM in a conversational context and was paired with a proposed pragmatic function (sarcasm, reassurance, threat, doubt). Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the identified function using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree). Linguistic experts reviewed the questionnaire to ensure content validity.

For the quantitative component, the researcher used SPSS to perform descriptive statistical analysis, including means, standard deviations, percentages, and ranking of participants' responses. The tool enables researchers to analyze gender-based differences in interpreting each DM function. SPSS adds a layer of empirical rigor, supporting the validation of the proposed pragmatic functions across different demographic groups.

These tools facilitated a mixed-methods investigation by enabling the qualitative interpretation of pragmatic meaning and the quantitative assessment of participant agreement, as per Schiffrin's discourse theoretical framework.

3.1 Reliability Statistics

The instrument's stability was assessed to determine the extent to which the items contributed to measuring the intended trait. This was achieved using the internal consistency method (Cronbach's Alpha), applied to a pilot sample of 29 participants, distinct from the main study sample. Stability coefficients were calculated for the three dimensions and the overall instrument. The results in the following Table 1 indicate the stability for each dimension and the total.

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the instruments

Pragmatic function domains	**Cronbach's Alpha coefficients**
Basīṭa	0.55
Mʕlish	0.78
Bihimmish	0.56
The pragmatic function	0.85

The coefficients appear suitable for the current study; the coefficient for the instrument is 0.85, and for the three domains, it is (0.55), (0.78), and (0.56), so there are no amendments required for the items.

3.1.1 Instrument Key

The instrument was rated on a 5-point Likert scale to identify the pragmatic functions of the DMs *Mʕlish, Basīṭa,* and *Bihimmish* in JSA.

Table 2: The 5-point Likert scale

Response	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Indeterminate	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

The range is calculated as:

Range = (Strongly Agree − Strongly Disagree) = (5 - 1) = 4

The length of each category is determined by:

Length of category = Range Number / Categories = 4 / 3 = 1.33

Based on this, the pragmatic functions of the DMs are categorized as follows:

1) Items with a mean from (1.00) to less than (2.33) are considered Low.
2) Items with a mean from (2.33) to less than (3.66) are considered Moderate.
3) Items with a mean from (3.66) to (5.00) are considered High.

3.2 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework for this study employs a mixed-methods approach. The data were collected using questionnaires involving 62 selected scenarios. The study adopts Schiffrin's (1987) discourse theory, emphasizing the role of discourse markers (DMs) in organizing spoken interaction and guiding interpretation. The researcher analyzed each DM under investigation through the lens of pragmatic functions, including turn-taking, topic management, and speaker attitude. Quantitatively, the framework includes statistical analysis through SPSS to determine frequencies, means, standard deviations, and gender-based differences. The researcher also summarized the participants' performance on various pragmatic functions, including both males and females. Data from the questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS, focusing on means, standard deviations, percentages, and ranking. Gender-based analysis was also conducted to investigate whether male and female respondents differ in their evaluation of the pragmatic functions of the markers. This component adds a sociolinguistic dimension to the study, contributing to understanding how gendered communication patterns in Jordanian society may shape pragmatic interpretation. Qualitatively, the pragmatic intent behind each DM is examined through participant responses. The mixed-methods approach offers a dual lens through which the data are interpreted: one that captures the nuance and depth of discourse analysis, and another that enables empirical validation through statistical analysis.

3.3 Corpus Selection and Data Collection

The researcher collected the data for this study through a purpose-built corpus of 20 scenarios for each *Basīṭa* and *Bihimmish* and 22 scenarios for *Mʕlish*, totaling 62 pragmatic situations based

on her exposure to these expressions and her understanding of their contexts in Jordanian society. The researcher designed these scenarios to reflect natural, conversational exchanges between speakers in Jordanian Arabic. The researcher identified the pragmatic function performed by each DM in each scenario. These identified pragmatic functions were submitted to a panel of jurors from various universities for validation and verification. The jurors were three linguists in the Department of Language and Literature whose native language is JSA. The researcher asked them to assess the scenarios and evaluate the accuracy of the proposed pragmatic functions associated with *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* in each scenario. Most of their judgments aligned with those of the researcher. However, they noted that some functions were unsuitable for the contexts, suggesting more appropriate replacements. The researcher coordinated all scenarios in the form of a questionnaire to be tested by 40 university students (20 males and 20 females) who were native speakers of JSA and were aged between 18 – 24. The questionnaire presented the suggested scenarios and the pragmatic function associated with each scenario. Each scenario was followed by a Likert-scale item, allowing participants to rate the suggested pragmatic function on a five-point scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." The questionnaire was distributed to student participants who are native speakers of Jordanian Arabic, ensuring that the data reflect authentic, pragmatic interpretations.

4. Data Analysis

The analysis of the collected data followed a mixed-method approach. The quantitative data were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to calculate descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, percentages, and rankings. These measurements were used to identify the dominant pragmatic functions of each DM and to detect gender-based differences in perception. The qualitative analysis was based on Schiffrin's (1987) discourse theory, which enables the researcher to examine how speakers manage conversations rather than what individual sentences mean or intend. Thus, discourse is better for analyzing how context shapes communication, especially in naturally occurring talk. Participants' interpretations were examined in the qualitative phase to infer how DMs function within the broader pragmatic context. The qualitative data, drawn from Discourse scenarios, was analyzed thematically using the Discourse approach. The framework focused on identifying the use of the DMs' pragmatic functions in various contexts. It categorized them into themes (to make a threat, to provide reassurance, Providing Consolation, Permission, Showing Disappointment, Showing Courtesy, Expressing mitigation, Expressing Irony, Disapproval or rebuke, Understanding, Indirect criticism, Questioning, Expressing Indifference, Non-participation, Providing Reassurance, Offering assistance, downplay the significance of the situation, Forgiveness or overlooking, get over an awkward situation, to encourage, Execute an Order (indirect way), The person is not to blame, apology, Criticize), and interpreted through the lens of Discourse Theory to investigate the social meanings embedded in the language. This two-pronged analysis provides a holistic understanding of how DMs operate within Jordanian-spoken Arabic, offering insights into usage frequency and contextual function.

To achieve the objectives of the current study and answer this question, the researcher extracted the Means and standard deviations, as well as the percentages and ranks, for the Pragmatic Functions of the DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* in Jordanian Spoken Arabic.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis

Table 3 shows the results.

Table 3: The frequency of *Basīṭa* item for male and female participants.

N	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
1	Making a Threat	4.53	0.91	90.5	1	High
2	Providing Reassurance	4.50	0.55	90.0	2	High
3	Expressing Irony	4.15	0.92	83.0	11	High
4	Providing Consolation	4.18	0.90	83.5	10	High
5	Showing Courtesy	4.33	0.69	86.5	6	High
6	Representing Insufficiency	3.83	0.87	76.5	17	High
7	Expressing Mitigation	4.25	0.67	85.0	7	High
8	Indicating Simplicity	4.10	0.98	82.0	13	High
9	Showing Disappointment	3.95	1.01	79.0	16	High
10	Offering Assistance	4.05	1.15	81.0	14	High
11	Serving as a Filler Marker	3.65	1.00	73.0	18	Moderate
12	Downplay the Significance of the Situation or Problem	4.20	0.91	84.0	9	High
13	Humble and Inexpensive	4.25	0.98	85.0	7	High
14	Easy to Understand and Clear	4.40	0.71	88.0	4	High
15	Naïve and Innocent	3.15	1.44	63.0	20	Moderate
16	Accept the Apology	4.35	0.66	87.0	5	High
17	Expressing Indifference	4.48	0.55	89.5	3	High
18	Expressing Mitigation	4.00	0.88	80.0	15	High
19	Downplay the Significance of the Situation or Problem	4.13	1.07	82.5	12	High
20	Accept the Apology	3.20	1.22	64.0	19	Moderate
	The Pragmatic Functions of *Basīṭa*	**4.08**	**0.90**	**81.7**		**High**

Table 3 illustrates the Means, standard deviations, and percentages associated with the pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa.* The function Making a Threat Item (1) ranks highest, with a Mean of (4.53) with a standard deviation of (0.91) and a percentage of (90.5%), with an extent high. Following closely, "Providing Reassurance" Item (2) occupies the second rank, with a Mean of (4.50), a standard deviation of (0.55), and a percentage of (90.0%), with an extent high. On the other end of the spectrum, "Naïve and Innocent" Item (15) is positioned last, with a Mean of (3.15) with a standard deviation of (1.44) and a percentage of (63.0%) with an extent of moderate. Just above it, "Accepting the Apology" Item (20) is ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.20) with a standard deviation (1.22, and a percentage of (64.0%), with a moderate extent. At the same time, the mean of The Pragmatic Functions of (Basīṭa) is (4.08) with a standard deviation (of 0.90) and a percentage of (81.0%), with an extent of high.

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks for the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish* in JSA.

Table 4: The frequency of *Mʕlish* items for both male and female participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
21	Consolation	4.30	0.69	86.0	4	High
22	Permission	4.48	0.55	89.5	1	High
23	Disappointment	3.98	0.73	79.5	16	High
24	Courtesy	4.03	0.97	80.5	15	High
25	Expressing Mitigation	3.95	1.01	79.0	18	High
26	Irony	3.93	1.19	78.5	19	High
27	Disapproval or Rebuke	4.18	0.96	83.5	12	High
28	Understanding	4.25	0.74	85.0	9	High
29	Indirect Criticism	4.13	0.88	82.5	13	High
30	Questioning	3.98	1.00	79.5	16	High
31	Indifference	3.83	1.01	76.5	20	High
32	Non-Participation	4.20	0.91	84.0	10	High
33	Providing Reassurance	4.45	0.64	89.0	2	High
34	Offering Assistance	4.13	0.99	82.5	13	High
35	downplay the Significance of the Situation	3.83	1.17	76.5	20	High
36	Forgiveness or Overlooking	4.20	0.76	84.0	10	High
37	Get over an Awkward Situation	3.80	1.09	76.0	22	High
38	To Encourage	4.28	0.93	85.5	6	High
39	Execute an Order in an Indirect Way	4.30	0.82	86.0	4	High
40	The person is not to Blame	4.28	0.68	85.5	6	High
41	Apology	4.43	0.59	88.5	3	High
42	Criticize	4.28	0.99	85.5	6	High
	The Pragmatic Functions of *Mʕlish*	**4.14**	**0.88**	**82.9**		**High**

Table 4 illustrates the Means standard deviations and percentages associated with the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish*. The function "Permission" Item (22) ranks highest, with a mean of (4.48), standard deviation (0.55), and a percentage of (89.5%), with an extent high. Following closely, "Providing Reassurance" Item (33) occupies the second rank, with a mean of (4.45) with a standard deviation (0.64) and a percentage of (89.0%) with an extent high. On the other end, "get over an awkward situation." Item (37) is positioned last, with a mean of (3.80) with a standard deviation (1.09) and a percentage of (76.0%) with an extent high. Just above it, "Indifference" and "downplay the significance of the situation" Items (31 and 35) are ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.83) with standard deviation (1.01 and 1.17) and a percentage of (76.5%) with extent high. At the same time, the mean of The Pragmatic Functions of *Mʕlish* is (4.14) with a standard deviation of (0.88) and a percentage of (82.9%), with extent high.

Table 5 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks for the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish* in JSA.

Table 5: The frequency of *Bihimmish* item for both male and female participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
43	Indifference	4.33	0.76	86.5	6	High
44	Ask for Permission	4.43	0.78	88.5	3	High
45	Expressing mitigation	4.23	0.70	84.5	10	High
46	Request	4.05	1.11	81.0	15	High
47	It Doesn't Matter	3.88	1.16	77.5	18	High
48	Consolation	4.25	0.93	85.0	8	High
49	It is Okay	4.35	0.83	87.0	5	High
50	Frustrated	4.03	1.23	80.5	16	High
51	Ignore	4.38	0.77	87.5	4	High
52	Downplay the Significance of the Situation	4.23	0.83	84.5	10	High
53	Non-Participation	4.15	1.08	83.0	14	High
54	Showing Courtesy	4.20	0.85	84.0	12	High
55	Acknowledge the Apology	4.45	0.64	89.0	2	High
56	Making a Threat	4.30	0.85	86.0	7	High
57	To Encourage	4.55	0.68	91.0	1	High
58	Showing Disappointment	3.98	0.89	79.5	17	High
59	It's Okay	3.65	1.21	73.0	19	Moderate
60	Expressing Mitigation	4.18	0.84	83.5	13	High
61	Request	4.25	0.71	85.0	8	High
	The Pragmatic Functions of *Bihimmish*	**4.20**	**0.89**	**83.0**		**High**

Table 5 illustrates the Means, standard deviations and percentages associated with the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish*. The function "To encourage" Item (57) ranks highest, with a mean of (4.55), a standard deviation of (0.68), and a percentage of (91.0%), with an extent high. Following closely, "Acknowledge the apology" Item (55) occupies the second rank, with a Mean of (4.45) with a standard deviation of (0.64) and a percentage of (89.0%), with extent high. On the other end of the spectrum, "it is okay." Item (59) is positioned last, with a Mean of (3.65) with a standard deviation of (1.21) and a percentage of (73.0%) with moderate extent. Just above it, "it does not matter." Item (47) is ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.88), with a standard deviation (1.16), and a percentage of (77.5%), with extent high. At the same time, the mean of The Pragmatic Functions of *Bihimmish* is (4.20) with a standard deviation (0.89) and a percentage of (83.0%), which is a high extent.

Table 6 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks for the pragmatic functions of Basīṭa in Jordanian Spoken Arabic.

Table 6: Means, standard deviations, percentages, and ranks for each Basīṭa item for female participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
1	Making a Threat	4.80	0.41	96.0	1	High
2	Providing Reassurance	4.60	0.50	92.0	2	High
3	Expressing Irony	4.10	0.79	82.0	10	High
4	Providing Consolation	3.90	1.07	78.0	15	High
5	Showing Courtesy	4.20	0.62	84.0	7	High
6	Representing Insufficiency	3.65	0.88	73.0	17	Moderate
7	Expressing Mitigation	4.15	0.67	83.0	8	High
8	Indicating Simplicity	4.10	1.17	82.0	10	High
9	Showing Disappointment	3.95	1.00	79.0	14	High
10	Offering Assistance	4.35	1.23	87.0	4	High
11	Serving as a Filler Marker	3.55	1.05	71.0	18	Moderate
12	Downplay the Significance of the Situation or Problem	4.15	0.81	83.0	8	High
13	humble and Inexpensive	4.10	1.07	82.0	10	High
14	Easy to Understand and Clear	4.35	0.59	87.0	4	High
15	Naïve and Innocent	3.20	1.54	64.0	19	Moderate
16	Accept the Apology	4.35	0.49	87.0	4	High
17	Expressing Indifference	4.40	0.50	88.0	3	High
18	Expressing Mitigation	4.10	0.72	82.0	10	High
19	Downplay the Significance of the Situation or Problem	3.75	1.12	75.0	16	High
20	Accept the Apology	2.50	1.05	50.0	20	Moderate
	The pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa*	**4.01**	**0.86**	**80.3**		**High**

Table 6 illustrates the means, standard deviations, and percentages for the female participants related to the pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa.* The function "Making a Threat" Item (1) ranks highest, with a mean of (4.80), a standard deviation (0.41, and a percentage of (96.0%), indicating a high extent. Following closely, "Providing Reassurance" Item (2) occupies the second rank, with a mean of (4.60), a standard deviation of (0.50), and a percentage of (92.0%), with extent high. On the other end of the spectrum, "Accept the apology" Item (20) is positioned last, with a mean of (2.50) with a standard deviation of (1.05) and a percentage of (50.0%), with an extent of moderate. Just above it, "Naïve and innocent" Item (15) is ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.20), a standard deviation of (1.54), and a percentage of (64.0%) with an extent of moderate. At the same time, the mean of the pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa* is (4.01) with a standard deviation (0.86) and a percentage of (80.3%), with a high extent.

Table 7 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks of the female participants for the Pragmatic Functions of *Mʕlish* in JSA.

Table 7: The frequency of *Mʕlish* item for female participants

N	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
21	Consolation	4.15	0.67	83.0	12	High
22	Permission	4.65	0.49	93.0	1	High
23	Disappointment	4.15	0.49	83.0	12	High
24	Courtesy	4.05	0.94	81.0	16	High
25	Expressing Mitigation	4.15	0.75	83.0	12	High
26	Irony	4.05	1.05	81.0	16	High
27	Disapproval or Rebuke	4.25	0.91	85.0	10	High
28	Understanding	4.35	0.59	87.0	10	High
29	Indirect Criticism	4.05	0.94	81.0	16	High
30	Questioning	3.90	1.02	78.0	20	High
31	Indifference	4.05	0.89	81.0	16	High
32	Non-participation	4.45	0.60	89.0	4	High
33	Providing Reassurance	4.45	0.60	89.0	4	High
34	Offering Assistance	4.50	0.61	90.0	3	High
35	Downplay the Significance of the Situation	3.80	1.28	76.0	21	High
36	Forgiveness or Overlooking	4.40	0.50	88.0	8	High
37	Get Over an Awkward Situation	3.80	1.15	76.0	21	High
38	To Encourage	4.45	0.69	89.0	4	High
39	Execute an Order in an Indirect Way	4.55	0.69	91.0	2	High
40	The Person is not to Blame	4.15	0.67	83.0	12	High
41	Apology	4.45	0.69	89.0	4	High
42	Criticize	4.25	0.85	85.0	10	High
	The Pragmatic Functions *Mʕlish*	**4.23**	**0.78**	**84.6**		**High**

Table 7 illustrates the mean, standard deviations, and percentages for the female participants associated with the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish*. The function "Permission" Item (22) ranks highest, with a mean of (4.65), a standard deviation (0.49), and a percentage of (93.0%), with a high extent. Following closely, "Execute an Order indirect way" Item (39) occupies the second rank, with a Mean of (4.55) with a standard deviation (0.69) and a percentage of (91.0%), with extent high. On the other end of the spectrum, "downplay the significance of the situation" and "get over an awkward situation" Items (35 and 37), respectively, are positioned last, with a Mean of (3.80) and a standard deviation (1.28 and 1.15) and a percentage of (76.0%) with extent moderate. Just above it, "Questioning" Item (30) is ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.90), a standard deviation of (1.02) and a percentage of (78.0%), with an extent of moderate. At the same time, the mean of The Pragmatic Functions of *Mʕlish* is (4.23) with a standard deviation (0.78) and a percentage of (84.6%), with a high extent.

Table 8 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks of the female participants for the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish* in JSA.

Table 8: The frequency of *Bihimmish* item for female participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
43	Indifference	4.45	0.60	89.0	4	High
44	Ask for Permission	4.60	0.60	92.0	2	High
45	Expressing Mitigation	4.30	0.57	86.0	8	High
46	Request	3.85	1.31	77.0	17	High
47	It Doesn't Matter	4.00	1.12	80.0	16	High
48	Consolation	4.10	1.02	82.0	14	High
49	It is Okay	4.35	0.59	87.0	5	High
50	Frustrated	4.10	1.41	82.0	14	High
51	Ignore	4.55	0.60	91.0	3	High
52	Downplay the Significance of the Situation	4.35	0.75	87.0	5	High
53	Non-participation	4.25	0.85	85.0	12	High
54	Showing Courtesy	4.30	0.57	86.0	8	High
55	Acknowledge the Apology	4.30	0.66	86.0	10	High
56	Making a Threat	4.50	0.76	90.0	4	High
57	To Encourage	4.65	0.49	93.0	1	High
58	Showing Disappointment	3.65	1.04	73.0	18	Moderate
59	It's Okay	3.15	1.31	63.0	19	Moderate
60	Expressing Mitigation	4.25	0.64	85.0	12	High
61	Could You	4.35	0.59	87.0	5	High
	The Pragmatic Functions *Bihimmish*	**4.21**	**0.81**	**84.3**		**High**

Table 8 illustrates the mean, standard deviations, and percentages for the female participants associated with the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish*. The function "to encourage" item (57) ranks highest, with a mean of (4.65), a standard deviation of (0.49), and a percentage of (93.0%), with an extent high. Following closely, "Ask for permission" Item (44) occupies the second rank, with a Mean of (4.60) with a standard deviation of (0.60) and a percentage of (92.0%), with an extent high. On the other end of the spectrum, "it is okay." Item (59) is positioned last, with a Mean of (3.15) with a standard deviation of (1.31) and a percentage of (63.0%) with a moderate extent. Just above it, "Showing Disappointment" Item (58) is ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.65), a standard deviation of (1.04), and a percentage of (73.0%) with an extent of moderate. At the same time, the mean of the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish* is (4.21) with a standard deviation (0.81) and a percentage of (84.3%), with a high extent.

Table 9 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks of the male participants for Pragmatic Functions of *Basīṭa* in JSA.

Table 9: The frequency of *Basīṭa* item for male participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
1	Making a Threat	4.25	1.16	85.0	10	High
2	Providing Reassurance	4.40	0.60	88.0	6	High
3	Expressing Irony	4.20	1.06	84.0	12	High
4	Providing Consolation	4.45	0.60	89.0	3	High
5	Showing Courtesy	4.45	0.76	89.0	3	High
6	Representing Insufficiency	4.00	0.86	80.0	14	High
7	Expressing Mitigation	4.35	0.67	87.0	8	High
8	Indicating Simplicity	4.10	0.79	82.0	13	High
9	Showing Disappointment	3.95	1.05	79.0	15	High
10	Offering Assistance	3.75	1.02	75.0	18	High
11	Serving as a Filler Marker	3.75	0.97	75.0	18	High
12	Downplay the Significance of the Situation or Problem	4.25	1.02	85.0	10	High
13	humble and Inexpensive	4.40	0.88	88.0	6	High
14	Easy to Understand and Clear	4.45	0.83	89.0	3	High
15	Naïve and Innocent	3.10	1.37	62.0	20	Moderate
16	Accept the Apology	4.35	0.81	87.0	8	High
17	Expressing Indifference	4.55	0.60	91.0	1	High
18	Expressing Mitigation	3.90	1.02	78.0	16	High
19	Downplay the Significance of the Situation or Problem	4.50	0.89	90.0	2	High
20	Accept the Apology	3.90	0.97	78.0	16	High
	The Pragmatic Functions *Basīṭa*	**4.15**	**0.90**	**83.1**		**High**

Table 9 illustrates the Means and standard deviations and percentages for the male participants associated with the pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa.* The function "Expressing Indifference" Item (17) ranks highest, with a Mean of (4.55) with a standard deviation (0.60) and a percentage of (91.0%), with extent high. Following closely, "downplay the significance of the situation or problem." Item (19) occupies the second rank, with a Mean of (4.50), a standard deviation (of 0.89), and a percentage of (90.0%), with an extent of high. On the other end of the spectrum, "Naïve and innocent" Item (15) is positioned last, with a Mean of (3.10) with a standard deviation (1.37) and a percentage of (62.0%) with a moderate extent. Just above it, "Offering Assistance" and " Serving as a Filler Marker " Items (10 & 11) are ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.75), with standard deviation (1.02 & 0.97) and a percentage of (75.0%), with extent high. At the same time, the mean of the pragmatic functions of Basīṭa is (4.15) with a standard deviation of (0.90) and a percentage of (83.1%), with a high extent.

Table 10 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks of the male participants for the Pragmatic Functions of *Mʕlish* in JSA.

Table 10: The frequency of *Mʕlish* item for male participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
21	Consolation	4.45	0.69	89.0	1	High
22	Permission	4.30	0.57	86.0	5	High
23	Disappointment	3.80	0.89	76.0	17	High
24	Courtesy	4.00	1.03	80.0	13	High
25	Expressing Mitigation	3.75	1.21	75.0	20	High
26	Irony	3.80	1.32	76.0	17	High
27	Disapproval or Rebuke	4.10	1.02	82.0	9	High
28	Understanding	4.15	0.88	83.0	8	High
29	Indirect Criticism	4.20	0.83	84.0	7	High
30	Questioning	4.05	1.00	81.0	11	High
31	Indifference	3.60	1.10	72.0	22	Moderate
32	Non-participation	3.95	1.10	79.0	15	High
33	Providing Reassurance	4.45	0.69	89.0	1	High
34	Offering Assistance	3.75	1.16	75.0	20	High
35	Downplay the Significance of the Situation	3.85	1.09	77.0	16	High
36	Forgiveness or Overlooking	4.00	0.92	80.0	13	High
37	Get Over an Awkward Situation	3.80	1.06	76.0	17	High
38	To Encourage	4.10	1.12	82.0	9	High
39	Execute an Order in an Indirect Way	4.05	0.89	81.0	11	High
40	The Person is Not to Blame	4.40	0.68	88.0	3	High
41	Apology	4.40	0.50	88.0	3	High
42	Criticize	4.30	1.13	86.0	5	High
	The Pragmatic Functions *Mʕlish*	**4.06**	**0.95**	**81.1**		**High**

Table 10 illustrates the mean, standard deviations, and percentages for the male participants associated with the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish t*he function "Consolation" and "Providing reassurance" Items (21 & 33) rank highest, with a Mean of (4.45) with a standard deviation (of 0.69) and a percentage of (89.0%), with an extent of high. Following closely, "The person is not to blame" and "apology" Items (40 & 41) occupy the second rank, with a Mean of (4.40) with standard deviation (0.68 and 0.50, and a percentage of (88.0%), with extent high. On the other end of the spectrum, "Indifference" Item (31) is positioned last, with a Mean of (3.60) with a standard deviation (1.10) and a percentage of (72.0%) with an extent of moderate. Just above it, "Expressing mitigation" and "Offering assistance" Items (25 & 34) are ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.75), with a standard deviation (1.21 and 1.16) and a percentage of (75.0%), with an extent high. In contrast, the mean of The Pragmatic Functions of (*Mʕlish*) is (4.06) with a standard deviation (0.95) and a percentage of (81.1%), with a high extent.

Table 11 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the ranks of the male participants for the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish* in JSA.

Table 11: The frequency of *Bihimmish* item for male participants

n	Items	Mean	Standard dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
43	Indifference	4.20	0.89	84.0	8	High
44	Ask for permission	4.25	0.91	85.0	6	High
45	Expressing mitigation	4.15	0.81	83.0	10	High
46	Request	4.25	0.85	85.0	6	High
47	It doesn't matter	3.75	1.21	75.0	19	High
48	Consolation	4.40	0.82	88.0	3	High
49	It is okay	4.35	1.04	87.0	4	High
50	Frustrated	3.95	1.05	79.0	18	High
51	Ignore	4.20	0.89	84.0	8	High
52	Downplay the Significance of the Situation	4.10	0.91	82.0	13	High
53	Non-participation	4.05	1.28	81.0	17	High
54	Showing Courtesy	4.10	1.07	82.0	13	High
55	Acknowledge the Apology	4.60	0.60	92.0	1	High
56	Making a Threat	4.10	0.91	82.0	13	High
57	To Encourage	4.45	0.83	89.0	2	High
58	Showing Disappointment	4.30	0.57	86.0	5	High
59	It's Okay	4.15	0.88	83.0	10	High
60	Expressing Mitigation	4.10	1.02	82.0	13	High
61	Could You	4.15	0.81	83.0	10	High
	The Pragmatic Functions *Bihimmish*	**4.19**	**0.91**	**83. 8**		**High**

Table 11 illustrates the mean, standard deviations, and percentages for the male participants associated with the pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish.* Function "Acknowledge the apology" Item (55) ranks highest, with a mean of (4.60), standard deviation (0.60), and a percentage of (92.0%), with a high extent. Following closely, the "to encourage" Item (57) occupies the second rank, with a Mean of (4.45) a standard deviation (of 0.83) and a percentage of (89.0%), an extent great. On the other end of the spectrum, "It does not matter" Item (47) is positioned last, with a Mean of (3.75), a standard deviation (1.21), and a percentage of (75.0%), with an extent high. Just above it, "Frustrated" Item (52) is ranked second to last, with a Mean of (3.95), a standard deviation of (1.05), and a percentage of (79.0%), with extent high. At the same time, the mean of The Pragmatic Functions of *Bihimmish* is (4.19) with a standard deviation (0.91) and a percentage of (83.8%), with extent high.

Table 12 presents the Means and standard deviations, the percentages, and the female and male participants for all the pragmatic functions in JSA.

Table 12: The frequency for all the Pragmatic Functions in JSA for both male and female participants

N	Items	n	Gender	Mean	Standard Dev.	Percentage	Rank	Extent
1	The Pragmatic Functions of *Basīṭa*	20	Female	4.01	0.86	80.3	2	High
		20	Male	4.15	0.90	83.1	1	High
		40	All	4.08	0.90	81.7	-	High
2	The Pragmatic Functions *Mʕlish*	20	Female	4.23	0.78	84.6	1	High
		20	Male	4.06	0.95	81.1	2	High
		40	All	4.14	0.88	82.9	-	High
3	The Pragmatic Functions *Bihimmish*	20	Female	4.21	0.81	84.3	1	High
		20	Male	4.19	0.91	83. 8	2	High
		40	All	4.20	0.89	83.04		High
	All the Pragmatic Functions	20	Female	4.15	0.82	83.1	1	High
		20	Male	4.13	0.92	82.6	2	High
		40	All	4.14	0.89	82.8	-	High

Table 12 illustrates the percentages for the male and female participants associated with all the Pragmatic Functions in Jordanian Spoken Arabic, as follows:

- The pragmatic functions of *Basīṭa* for the male participants rank higher than females, with the difference (2.8%).
- The pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish* for the female participants rank higher than males, with the difference (3.5%).
- The pragmatic functions of *Bihimmish* for the female participants rank higher than males, with the difference (0.5%).
- The pragmatic functions of "All the Pragmatic Functions" for the female participants rank higher than males, with a difference (0.5%).

Q2: How do Jordanians interpret the meaning of these expressions in different contexts?

To address this research question means and standard deviations for the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish*, Basīṭa, and *Bihimmish* in JSA were extracted and disaggregated by gender. The results are presented in Table 14.

Table 13: The frequency of the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish*, *Basīṭa*, and *Bihimmish* in JSA for male and female

The Pragmatic Function	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Basīṭa	Male	20	4.15	0.83	0.16	0.69	38	0.55	0.59
	Female	20	4.01	0.77					
Mʕlish	Male	20	4.06	0.89	0.96	0.33	38	0.70	0.49
	Female	20	4.24	0.70					
Bihimmish	Male	20	4.19	0.87	0.19	0.67	38	0.04	0.96
	Female	20	4.20	0.75					
The pragmatic function	Male	20	4.13	0.86	0.40	0.53	38	0.09	0.93
	Female	20	4.15	0.74					

Table 13 presents the means and standard deviations for male and female participants regarding the pragmatic functions of *Mʕlish*, *Basīṭa*, and *Bihimmish*. The mean of the practical function *Basīṭa* for males is (4.15) (SD=0.83), while for females, it is (4.01) (SD=0.77), resulting in a mean difference of (0.14) favoring males.

For the pragmatic function, *Mʕlish,* the mean for males is (4.06) (SD=0.89), whereas for females, it is (4.24) (SD=0.70), with a mean difference of (0.18) favoring females.

Regarding the pragmatic function, *Bihimmish* the mean for males is (4.19) (SD=0.87), and for females, it is 4.20 (SD=0.75), with a mean difference of (0.01) favoring females.

Overall, the mean of the pragmatic functions for males is 4.13 (SD = 0.86), and for females, it is (4.15) (SD=0.74), with a mean difference of (0.02) in favor of males.

To determine if these differences between males and females in the pragmatic functions are statistically significant, an Independent Samples t-test was conducted. The t-test values are (0.55, 0.70, 0.04, and 0.09), with corresponding p-values of (0.59, 0.49, 0.96, and 0.93). These p-values indicate that the differences are not statistically significant at the ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) level. Therefore, the differences between males and females in the pragmatic functions are insignificant.

The study's findings indicate that the research purposes were successfully fulfilled. The analysis of 62 carefully constructed scenarios identified an extensive array of pragmatic functions associated with the *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* DMs in Jordanian-spoken Arabic. The result of the study reveals that the DM *Basīṭa* came up with 17 pragmatic functions, *Bihimmish* came up with 16 pragmatic functions, and *Mʕlish* came up with 22 pragmatic functions. These functions—ranging from to make a threat, to provide reassurance, Providing Consolation, Permission, Showing Disappointment, Showing Courtesy, Expressing mitigation, Expressing Irony, Disapproval or rebuke, Understanding, Indirect criticism, Questioning, Expressing Indifference, Non-participation, Providing Reassurance, Offering assistance, downplay the significance of the situation, Forgiveness or overlooking, get over an awkward situation, to encourage, Execute an Order (indirect way), The person is not to blame, apology, Criticize)demonstrated the pragmatic richness and contextual flexibility of these markers. The qualitative analysis revealed variations in meaning related to context, supporting Schiffrin's theory that DMs operate on multiple levels of discourse.

The quantitative analysis data extracted from the SPSS analysis also reinforced these qualitative findings, showing clear trends in how native speakers interpreted the function of DMs. Using means, standard deviations, and ranking revealed that certain pragmatic functions were consistently perceived as more salient than others. Furthermore, a gender-based analysis revealed statistically significant differences in interpretation between male and female respondents. Therefore, integrating qualitative and quantitative methods validated the pragmatic functions proposed in each scenario and provided an in-depth examination of the social factors that shape discourse interpretation, thereby meeting all the stated research objectives.

The present qualitative investigation examined the pragmatic functions of three frequently used DMs, *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish,* in JSA, underpinned by Schiffrin's (1987)

discourse approach framework. Analysis of 62 context-rich scenarios revealed that each marker carries a rich repertoire of interactional roles:

Basīṭa performed 17 functions, including making threats, providing reassurance, and expressing irony, as well as serving as a filler and signaling forgiveness. *Mʕlish* demonstrated the most remarkable diversity, with 22 functions, including granting permission, offering indirect criticism, providing consolation, executing orders indirectly, and navigating awkward situations. *Bihimmish* realized 16 functions, most notably asking for permission, acknowledging apologies, encouraging, and downplaying significance.

Across all three markers, five core functions emerged as common qualitative themes: reassurance, consolation, downplaying significance, expressing indifference, offering assistance, and irony and sarcasm. These shared functions underscore the central role of DMs in maintaining interpersonal harmony, managing face-threatening acts, and structuring the flow of casual conversation—precisely the kinds of coherence and interaction management operations that Schiffrin's model predicts. *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* are not semantically empty fillers but multifunctional pragmatic devices. They enable speakers to calibrate emotional intensity, negotiate social distance, and guide hearer interpretation within everyday Jordanian interactions.

The study results reveal essential findings related to the pragmatic functions of the DMs *Basīṭa*, *Mʕlish*, and *Bihimmish* in JSA. First, the analysis confirmed that all three markers are pragmatically multifunctional, fulfilling a diverse range of communicative purposes depending on the situational and contextual factors in which they occur. Among the dataset's most frequently identified pragmatic functions were expressing indifference, downplaying the significance of the situation or problem, making a threat, providing reassurance, consolation, and permission, acknowledging an apology, encouraging, and emphasizing that the person is not to blame. Most participants consistently ranked these functions as contextually appropriate, as evidenced by the high mean scores and strong agreement on the Likert scale. Further, the results revealed a pragmatic gender discrepancy, with marked differences in how male and female participants interpreted specific scenarios. A quantitative analysis showed that the DM *Basīṭa* was most frequently used by males to express indifference (91. 0%) and to downplay the significance of situations (90. 0%), while among females, the most used functions were making a threat (96. 0%) and providing reassurance (92. 0%). For both genders, the widely used functions for the DM *Basīṭa* were making a threat (90. 5%) and providing reassurance (90. 0%). The least used functions by males with the DM *Basīṭa* were naïve and innocent (62. 0%), offering assistance (62. 0%), and serving as a filler marker (62. 0%).

In contrast, among females, the least utilized functions were naïve and innocent (64. 0%) and accepting an apology (50. 0%); for both genders, the least endorsed functions were naïve and innocent (63. 0%) and receiving an apology (64. 0%). Regarding gender differences, the results reveal subtle patterns in the responses of both male and female participants to the pragmatic functions associated with the DM *Basīṭa* and its variants. While no notable statistical differences were observed in the frequency of use between males and females, the types of pragmatic functions that received the highest and lowest agreement varied across genders, suggesting a degree of gendered perception. The overall results showed that making a threat

(90. 5%) and providing reassurance (90. 0%) were the most commonly agreed-upon functions across both genders, while naïve and innocent (63. 0%) and accepting an apology (64. 0%) were the least endorsed. Among female participants, the functions of making a threat (96.0%) and providing reassurance (92.0%) had the highest levels of agreement, indicating that women more frequently recognized *Basīṭa* in emotionally charged or relationally supportive contexts. Conversely, the least endorsed functions for females were accepting an apology (50.0%) and Naïve and innocent (64.0%), suggesting lower acceptability of these interpretations in female discourse norms.

In contrast, male participants most strongly associated *Basīṭa* with expressing indifference, with a percentage of (91.0%) and downplaying the significance of a situation (90.0%), reflecting a tendency to interpret the marker in more emotionally detached or minimizing contexts. Their least agreed-upon functions were offering assistance and serving as a filler marker (75.0%) and Naïve and Innocent (62.0%), which were also low among females. These patterns indicate that females tended toward supportive and confrontational uses of the DM *Basīṭa*, while males leaned toward dismissive or minimizing interpretations. Thus, although both genders recognize primary pragmatic functions such as threats and reassurance, differences in secondary or less obvious functions reflect a gender-specific pragmatic orientation.

Analyzing gender-based responses to the DM *Mʕlish* and its variants reveals important patterns in how male and female participants interpret its pragmatic functions. Although the study did not report statistically significant differences in overall usage between males and females, the types of functions most strongly endorsed differed between the two groups, suggesting a gendered sensitivity to specific, pragmatic meanings. DM *Mʕlish* presented the most frequently used functions for males were consolation with a percentage of (89.0%), providing reassurance with a percentage of (89.0%), The person is not to blame with a percentage of (88.0%), and apology with a percentage of (88.0%), while among females, the most common functions were permission with a percentage of (93.0%) and Execute an Order indirect way with a percentage of (90.0%), for both genders, males and females were permission with a percentage (of 89.5%) and providing reassurance of (89.0%). In contrast, acknowledging the apology with a percentage of (92.0%), Expressing mitigation with a percentage of (75.0%), indifference with percentage of (75.0%), and Offering assistance with percentage of (75.0%) while females, the least applied function for the DM *Mʕlish* was Get over an awkward situation with a percentage of (76.0%) and downplay the significance of the situation with *a* percentage of (76.0%), and Questioning with a percentage of (78.0%), for both genders, males and females were Get over an awkward situation with a percentage of(76.0%), downplay the significance of the situation with a percentage of (76.5%), and indifference with a percentage of (76.5%). These gender differences show that female participants were more likely to acknowledge indirect authority and social conformity, while male participants focused more on personal reassurance and emotional management. Thus, although both groups generally agreed on the dominant pragmatic roles of *Mʕlish*, the variations in least-accepted functions and the nuanced preferences suggest that gender plays a meaningful role in interpreting specific discourse functions.

The analysis of gender differences in participants' responses to the DM *Bihimmish* and its associated pragmatic functions revealed subtle but meaningful patterns in interpretation. Although the data did not show statistically significant differences in overall agreement between male and female participants, preferences for specific, pragmatic functions showed gender-dependent differences, indicating different communicative perceptions. The DM *Bihimmish* presented Regularly employed functions used by males were acknowledging the apology with a percentage of (92.0%) and encouraging with a percentage of (89.0%). In comparison, females were asked for permission with a percentage of (92.0%) and to encourage with a percentage of (93.0%); for both genders, males and females were to encourage with a percentage of (91.0%) and acknowledge the apology with a percentage of (89.0%). The least functions used by males in the DM *Bihimmish* do not matter, with a percentage of (75.0%) and frustrated with a percentage of (79.0%), while females were Showing Disappointment with a percentage of (73.0%). It is okay with a percentage of (63.0%) for both genders, males and females, where it does not matter with a percentage of (77.5%), and it is okay with a percentage of (73.0%). This suggests that gendered communication norms within Jordanian culture influence pragmatic sensitivity and marker interpretation. Finally, the study underscored the importance of these DMs as discourse management tools, supporting Schiffrin's (1987) view of markers as sequential and relational elements that help speakers organize talk and convey subtle pragmatic meanings. Together, these findings illustrate the integral role of DMs in constructing social meaning in JSA. These findings indicate that while both males and females recognize the encouraging and reconciliatory aspects of *Bihimmish*, females emphasize its role in seeking and granting permission. In contrast, males associate it more with confirming social harmony and downplaying interpersonal conflict.

Based on Schiffrin's (1987) classification of pragmatic functions and statistical analysis of gender differences, clear tendencies emerge in the functions utilized by males and females. Females tended to use emotional and interpersonal functions more frequently, aligning with Schiffrin's coherence and interaction management functions. The pragmatic function of providing reassurance (92.0%) ensures continuity in conversation, permission (93.0%) manages politeness and social interaction, encouragement (93.0%) reinforces positive interaction, acknowledging apologies (92.0%) strengthens social cohesion, expressing consolation (89.0%) supports emotional connection, executing orders indirectly (91.0%) employs politeness strategies, and expressing mitigation (softening statements) manages interaction. These functions suggest that females prioritize social harmony, politeness, and emotional support in discourse. On the other hand, males showed a preference for assertive and structural functions that align with Schiffrin's information structuring and interaction management functions, making threats (96.0%) to express power dynamics, expressing indifference (91.0%) to signal disengagement, downplaying significance (90.0%) to manage conversational flow, providing reassurance (89.0%) to ensure continuity, making apologies (88.0%) to manage social interaction, and indicating that the person is not to blame (88.0%) to mitigate responsibility. These functions suggest that males often employ assertive, directive, and structured discourse strategies, thereby reinforcing their dominance and control during conversations.

In contrast, females tend to prefer emotional and supportive discourse, emphasizing politeness, encouragement, and reassurance. Furthermore, males also tend to lean towards assertive and structured discourse, focusing on power dynamics, indifference, and directness. Notably, making threats (90.5%) was identified as the most commonly employed function by both genders, signaling a shared pragmatic strategy in specific contexts.

When compared to the study by Rabab'ah, Al-Yasin, and Yagi (2022), which also examined gender differences in the use of *Walak*, the results indicate that females are more likely to associate with permission, politeness, and emotional functions. In contrast, males associate it with face-saving, justification, or neutral support. However, this study expands on this insight by demonstrating that these gendered pragmatic orientations extend to other DMs, not just *Walak*. Additionally, this research employed scenario-based validation, allowing for a broader understanding of gender-linked pragmatic sensitivity in JSA.

The findings reinforce that while both genders acknowledge core pragmatic functions (such as encouragement and reassurance), the frequency and emotional interpretation of those functions vary systematically across genders. This study thus confirms, complements, and extends the findings of Rabab'ah, Al-Yasin, and Yagi (2022), offering a more comprehensive view of how gender influences discourse in Jordanian Arabic.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The authors declare no financial, personal, or professional conflicts of interest related to the copyright or publication of this article

About the Author(s)
Shahid Barjes Abu Hashish is an independent researcher. She received her MA degree in English Language & literature from Isra University, Amman, Jordan. Her area of interest includes Discourse analysis, Sociolinguistics, and Semantics.
Aseel Alshbeekat is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Translation, Isra University Amman, Jordan. She received her PhD degree in linguistics from University of Jordan in 2021. Her area of interest includes Pragmatics, Discourse analysis, Translation, Pragmatics, and Historical linguistics.
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7327-8482

References

Al Rousan, R. M. (2015). The use of discourse marker "maʕ nafsak" in Saudi Arabic: A pragmatic perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *7*(3), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v7i3.7669

Al Rousan, R., & Sharar, H. (2024). The pragmatics and translation of the discourse marker basīṭa in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences, 51*(4), 392-403. https://doi.org/10.35516/hum.v51i4.4683

Al Rousan, R., Al Harahsheh, A., & Huwari, F. (2020). The Pragmatic Functions of the Discourse Marker *bas* in Jordanian Spoken Arabic: Evidence from a Corpus. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *10*(1), 130-142. https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2020-0012.

Alazzawie, A. (2014). Yamawwad: A discourse and pragmatic marker in Iraqi Arabic. *World Journal of English Language, 4*(2), 30-39. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v4n2p30.

Al-Ghoweri, H. (2016). Pragmatic functions of adʒalakom'allah (May God elevate you) in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 2*(6), 271–274. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Pragmatic-Functions-of-a%C9%AEalakom%E2%80%99allah-(May-God-you)-Al-Ghoweri/729502e45fb1d23ffd1c9d7527bf4f722a7c619d

Al-Harahsheh, A. M., & Kanakri, M. A. (2013). The pragmatic functions and the translatability of Tayyi in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *US-China Foreign Language, 11*(3), 196–202. Retrieved from https://www.davidpublisher.com/Public/uploads/Contribute/552f782fd345f.pdf

Ali, A. I., & Salih, S. M. (2020). A taxonomy of mitigation devices in the English language. *Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(1), 31-40. https://doi.org/10.14500/kujhss.v3n1y2020.pp31-40.

Ali, E. A. (2023). The use of discourse markers in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *International Journal of Linguistics, 15*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v15i2.20805

Al-Khalidy, H. O. (2017). The Discourse Analysis and Pragmatic Meanings of Ta:lʕ in Jordanian Spoken Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistics,* 7(4), 22-36. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n4p22

Al-Khawaldeh, A. (2018). Uses of the discourse marker Wallahi in Jordanian spoken Arabic: A pragma-discourse perspective. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Arabic Linguistics* (pp. 97–124). https://doi.org/10.30845/ijhss.v8n6a13

Almossa, A. I. (2023). *Discourse-pragmatic functions of Ya3ni in Najdi Arabic interaction*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 13*(3), 97–124. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1303.04

Alqahtani, A. (2014). *Awareness of the potential threat of cyberterrorism to the national security*. *Journal of Information Security, 5*(4), 137–146. https://doi.org/10.4236/jis.2014.54013

Al-Qudah, M. A. (2024). *The Pragmatic Functions of Using the Expression Mayyit 'Dead' in Jordanian Spoken Arabic*. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 15*(1), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1501.31

Alrabee', B., Alshbeekat, A. A., & Jahamah, A. H. (2023). Use of polite request forms by Jordanian children: Do age and gender have an impact? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 13*(3), 5616. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1303.16

Al-Shishtawi, H. I. (2020). The Pragmatic Functions of 'Mashi' in Modern Arabic Language. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 7*(1), 32-42. Retrieved from https://ijllnet.thebrpi.org/journals/Vol_7_No_1_March_2020/5.pdf

Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://assets.cambridge.org/97805216/40077/sample/9780521640077ws.pdf

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 196–213.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Ablex Publishing. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Cross_cultural_Pragmatics.html?id=vYZrAAAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Mouton de Gruyter. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Pragmatic_Markers_in_English.html?id=CL_TMpaMsdcC&redir_esc=y

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Politeness.html?id=OG7W8yA2XjcC&redir_esc=y

Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Meaning_in_Language.html?id=K6uZlXQYoowC&redir_esc=y

Elshamy, H. M. (2016). *An analysis of the pragmatic functions of idiomatic expressions in the Egyptian novel "Taxi."* [Master's thesis, The American University in Cairo]. AUC Knowledge Fountain. Retrieved from https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/601/

Enright, R. D., & North, J. (1998). *Exploring Forgiveness*. University of Wisconsin Press. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-07529-000

Erten, S. (2014). Teaching Fillers and Students' Filler Usage: A study conducted at ESOGU Preparation School. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, *2*(3), 67–79. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Teaching-Fillers-and-Students%E2%80%99-Filler-Usage%3A-A-at-Erten-Erten/8701ba973978c67d4647e34d5c330891f2834383

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Teaching the negotiation of multi-turn speech acts: Using conversation-analytic tools to teach pragmatics in the FL classroom. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, J. C. Fraser, B. (1990). *Perspectives on politeness*. Journal of Pragmatics, 14(2), 219-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(7), 931–952. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5

Fraser, B. (2006). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(3), 329-346. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/10602919/An_approach_to_discourse_markers).

Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(7), 931-952. Retrieved from https://brill.com/abstract/journals/irp/1/2/article-p293_3.xml

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Anchor Books. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Interaction_Ritual.html?id=qDhd138pPBAC&redir_esc=y

Grainger, K. & Harris, S. (2007). Special Issue: Apologies: Introduction. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *3*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.001

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Studies_in_the_Way_of_Words.html?id=QqtAbk-bs34C&redir_esc=y

Hamdan, J. M., & Abu Rumman, R. (2020). The pragmatic functions of *Yahummalali* in Jordanian-spoken Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures, 12*(3), 327-345.Retrieved from https://journals.yu.edu.jo/jjmll/Issues/vol12no32020/Nom4.pdf

Hamdan, J. M., & Hammouri, D. M. (2012). *The pragmatic functions of the idiomatic expression Yalla in Jordanian spoken Arabic*. *Psycholinguistics*, *31*(2), 137–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40614-023-00373-2

Hussein, M. (2005). *Two accounts of discourse markers in English*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254420148_TWO_ACCOUNTS_OF_DISCOURSE_MARKERS_IN_ENGLISH

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(2), 112–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.02.001

Jeronimus, B. F. (2017). Frustration. Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_815-1

Jones, T., & Smith, L. (2016). Expression by Role-Playing: Teaching Offering and Giving Assistance. *Journal of Language Teaching*, *25*(3), 45–58. doi:10.1016/j.langteach.2016.07.002

Kanakri, M. A., & Al-Harahsheh, A. M. (2013). *The discourse analysis and pragmatics of ʔa:di in Jordanian spoken Arabic*. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 3*(6), 59–63. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n6p59

Kasper, G. (1999). Data collection in pragmatics research. *Pragmatics & Language Learning*, 9, 37–71. Retrieved from https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/items/516d015b-b9f4-42bc-be38-28bd3a23a336

Kebabi, A. A., & Al-Khanji, R. R. (2024). The Pragmatic Functions of the Discourse Marker 'Saha' in Algerian Spoken Arabic. *Jordanian Educational Journal, 9*(2), 63-85. https://doi.org/10.46515/jaes.v9i2.725.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education, Boston, Malakoff, G. (1973). The logic of politeness, or minding your p's and q's. In Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lloveras, L. A., McKeown, C. A., Lichtenberger, S. N., Sellers, T. P., & Vollmer, T. R. (2023). Recommendations regarding the use of the term "ignore" in applied behavior analysis. *Perspectives on Behavior Science, 46*(2), 399–408. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40614-023-00373-2

Louwerse, M. M., & Mitchell, H. H. (2003). Toward a taxonomy of a set of discourse markers in dialog: A theoretical and computational linguistic account. *Discourse Processes, 35*(3), 199–239. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326950DP3503_1

McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Rachal, K. C. (1998). *Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(6), 1586–1603. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.6.1586

McLaughlin, M. L. (1984). *Conversation: How Talk Is Organized*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Conversation.html?id=3GQtAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y

Mehawesh, M. I., & Jaradat, A. A. (2015). Inshallah: Extensive flouting of Grice's maxim of quality. *Asian Social Science, 11*(4), 319–328. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n4p319

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v5i1.158

Morris, C. (1938). *Foundations of the theory of signs*. University of Chicago Press.

Nasir, K. G., & Afrawi, S. A. (2020). *Pragmatic functions of English and Arabic connectives in selected novels*. *International Journal of Linguistics, 12*(2), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v12i2.16681

Neoh, M. J. Y., Teng, J. H., Lee, A., Setoh, P., Mulatti, C., & Esposito, G. (2022). Negative emotional reactions to criticism: Perceived criticism and source affect the extent of hurt and relational distancing. *PLOS ONE, 17*(8). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271869

Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). *Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership*. *Organization Science, 24*(5), 1517–1538. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0795

Rabab'ah, G., Al-Yasin, N., & Yagi, S. (2022). A socio-pragmatic study of gender differences in the use of "Walak" (Woe) and its variants in spoken Jordanian Arabic. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics, 9*(1), 145–164. https://doi.org/10.29038/eejpl.2022.9.1.rab

Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v5i0.2164

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/sequence-organization-in-interaction/276CD30E23D3444114A90E5E2B24D55F

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Discourse_Markers.html?id=hs7J-WqPtPAC&redir_esc=y

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Approaches_to_Discourse.html?id=GEeSFbh6mqwC&redir_esc=y

Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-Presentation and Social Responsibility: The Moderating Role of Morality and Competence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7(*2), 193–209

Searle, J. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*, *5*(1), 1–23. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/4166848

Smith, J. (2008). Expressing Ignorance or Indifference: Modal Implicatures in Bi-directional OT. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(2), 123–145.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK. Retrieved from https://monoskop.org/images/e/e6/Sperber_Dan_Wilson_Deirdre_Relevance_Communica_and_Cognition_2nd_edition_1996.pdf

Traeger, A., O'Hagan, E., Cashin, A., & McAuley, J. (2017). Reassurance for Patients with Non-specific Conditions–a User's Guide. *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy*, *21*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjpt.2016.12.007C

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. Arnold, London. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282016316_Understanding_Pragmatics

Zeelenberg, M., Van Dijk, W., Manstead, A. & van de Pligt, J. (2000). On Bad Decisions and Disconfirmed Expectancies: The Psychology of Regret and Disappointment. *Cognition & Emotion, 14*(4), 521-541. https://doi.org/10.1080/026999300402781