



Analysis of complaining strategies on services offered to Facebook users on Zain Jordan

Isra' Hassounch^{a 1} , Aseel Zibin^b 

^a The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

^b The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

APA Citation:

Hassounch, I., & Zibin, A. (2021). Analysis of Complaining Strategies on Services Offered to Facebook Users on Zain Jordan. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 2), 1141-1159.

Submission Date: 22/9/2020

Acceptance Date: 21/01/2021

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the complaining strategies used by Facebook users on Zain Facebook page (Zain Jordan). It also aims to identify the most and least frequent strategies used by Facebook users and to examine the similarities and differences between complaining strategies found on Zain Jordan and those found in other studies in terms of types of strategies used and the linguistic features of the language. To this end, the researchers built a specialized corpus. The corpus was manually annotated to include pragmatic information on the types of complaining strategies used on Zain Jordan. The data were analyzed based on Olshtain and Weinbach (1993). In addition, 6 new strategies were identified by the researchers in a pilot study and were added to the adopted taxonomy. The results show that there are 10 complaining strategies used by Facebook users on Zain Jordan. The results also demonstrate that the majority of complaining strategies used on Zain Jordan were direct, which was attributed to the lack of face-to-face interaction and the anonymity provided by Facebook. Moreover, complaining strategies on Facebook have their own linguistic features. The study concludes with recommendations for further research.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Pragmatics; corpus; speech acts; CMC; social media

1. Introduction

Amongst the most famous websites used by a huge number of people every day is Facebook. This website does not only allow people to exchange messages, videos, pictures, among other things and join various groups and pages for different purposes, but it also enables companies, e.g. Zain (a telecommunication company in Jordan), to sell their products through service groups and Facebook pages. When people read online advertisements and buy such products, they may complement them or complaining about them based on their experiences. In this respect, Searle (1969) argues that speaking a language entails performing speech acts. By performing a speech act, people produce certain actions, such as thanking, requesting, apologizing and complaining. This study aims to examine the speech act of complaining, more specifically the complaining strategies used by Facebook users on Zain Facebook page (Zain Jordan). This company was chosen since it is one of the most famous telecommunication

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: a.zabin@ju.edu.jo

companies in Jordan. It also aims to explore the similarities and differences between complaining strategies found on Zain Jordan and those found in other studies pertaining to types of strategies used and the linguistic features of the language employed to convey the complaint. Despite the fact that complaining strategies have been examined in other contexts, e.g. those elicited through Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs), no study has been conducted to investigate whether these strategies differ when used on social media, e.g. Facebook. As such this study can further our understanding of the language used on cyber space to communicate pragmatic functions, such as complaining and, by extension, advance our understanding of cyber language.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. Theoretical framework

In pragmatics, a speech act is performed by a speaker through saying or making an utterance, so we use utterances to perform actions (Austin, 1975: 375). A group of verbs have been identified as performative verbs, since they perform a certain action such as warning, e.g. “I warn you to tell him” (Austin *ibid*). Such speech acts could be communicated either directly or indirect (Yule, 1996: 54-55). We use direct speech acts, when we do mean what we say or when there is a direct relationship between an utterance and its communicative function (Yule, 1996: 54), such as “Who washed his car” an interrogative sentence. The second type is indirect speech acts in which speakers intend something different from the literal meaning of what we say (Yule, 1996: 55). In this type, there is no relationship between the utterance and its communicative function, e.g. “to bring a plate” that has the literal meaning of bringing an empty plate, but in reality it means to bring food to the party (Paltridge, 2006: 57). The reasons behind using indirect speech acts are to give the speaker a chance to deny or change what he/she said and to let the hearer interprets the speech act the way he/she likes (Brown and Levenson cited in Levinson, 1987: 274).

The current study focuses on one type of speech acts that can be communicated either directly or indirectly, namely, complaining. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggested that complaining as a speech act reveals that the speaker has a negative evaluation of some actions done by the hearer. Olshtain and Weinbach (1993) argued that the speaker shows annoyance in expressing any complaints as a result of his/her dissatisfaction towards a certain action. In complaints, the speaker (complainer) expresses his annoyance towards an offensive act made by the hearer (complainee) (Olshtain and Weinbach, 1993). Complaints are related to positive Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) since the speaker in positive FTAs does not care about the hearer’s feelings and wants. In positive FTAs, the hearer’s face is threatened by stating or marking the negative feeling of the speaker towards the positive face of the hearer. Olshtain and Weinbach (1993: 112) also developed a taxonomy of complaining strategies based on the framework of Searle (1975). The two researchers developed Searle’s (1976) taxonomy (i.e. representatives, commissives, directives, expressives, and declaratives) and added five other patterns pertaining to complaining speech acts as follows:

1. Below the level of reproach e.g. “Don’t worry about it, there is no real damage.”
2. Expression of annoyance, e.g. “This is really an unacceptable behavior.”
3. Explicit complaint, e.g. “You should not have postponed such an operation.”
4. Accusation and warning, e.g. “You ruined my car.”
5. Immediate threat, e.g. “I am not moving one inch before you change my appointment.”

Olshtain and Weinbach’s (1993) work is adopted as the main framework in this study to analyze the collected data and to identify the complaining strategies used by Facebook users on “Zain Jordan” page.

Having discussed the adopted theoretical framework, the next section reviews some comparative studies on complaining strategies cross-culturally.

1.1.2. Comparative studies on complaining strategies across cultures

Several studies have been conducted to compare complaining strategies across cultures (e.g. Boxer, 1993; Olshtain and Weinbach, 1993; Trosborg, 1995; Du, 1995; Murphy and Neu, 1996; Hartley, 1998; Chang, 2001; Zhang, 2001; Zhoumin, 2011; Eslami-Rasekh, 2004; Farnia, Buchheit, and Salim, 2010; Chen, Chen and Chang, 2011; Eslamirasekh, Sereshti and Mehraban, 2012; Abdolrezapour, Dabaghi, and Kassaian, 2012; Bayat, 2013; Ekmekçi, 2015; Masjedi and Paramasivam, 2018).

In one study, Ekmekçi (2015) studied the differences regarding the production of refusals and complaints between Turkish native and non-native instructors. The participants were six native and fifteen non-native instructors working at a state university in Turkey. A written DCT representing daily conversations was used to collect the data. The results showed that non-native instructors' utterances were vague and inappropriate in terms of quality compared with those of native instructors. In addition, their responses also revealed that they were more detailed than native instructors. Both native and non-native instructors used similar complaints components; direct complaint, request, explanation of purpose, and justification, but there was one difference, namely, non-native instructors used offensive language in their complaints.

In another recent study, Masjedi and Paramasivam (2018) investigated the structure and strategies of complaint. In addition, they examined the politeness strategies used by Iranian learners in communication with other nationalities in the academic context of a university. The data were collected via an open-ended DCT questionnaire representing daily conversations answered by 50 Iranian postgraduate learners in the academic context of a university. A pragmatic approach was used within discourse analysis to analyze the data. The findings revealed that Iranians use many strategies and structures flexibly in various complaint-provoking situations. The findings showed that as far as their culture is concerned, Iranians are indirect as well as use negative politeness to reduce the face threatening act of complaining. However, they can be direct in their manner if the situation demands it. In addition to these cross-cultural studies, complaining strategies have also been examined in the Jordanian context as discussed in the following section.

1.1.3. Complaining in the Jordanian Context

In relation to the Jordanian context, Al-Omari (2008) conducted a study to compare complaining strategies used by Jordanian Arabic speakers and American English speakers. The study also investigated the differences and similarities between the two groups in terms of length, complexity, and level of directness in relation to complaints. The data were collected through a written DCT representing spoken language. The results demonstrated that Jordanian Arabic and American English speakers used similar strategies with some differences. Joking and demanding justification strategies occurred only in the corpus of Americans. They also tended to be more direct in complaints. Jordanian Arabic speakers used regret, while American speakers did not use it and they use reprimand, mentioning the offensive act, sentencing, adverse criticism of the hearer, placing blame, suggesting alternatives, implication, and future action strategies more than Americans. On the other hand, Americans used request and avoidance more than Jordanians. Both group of speakers used accusation strategy with no significant differences. The results also showed that there were not any differences between males and females as far as their complaining strategies are concerned as opposed to the American English speakers. The results revealed that females used mentioning the offensive act, future actions, request, suggesting alternatives and sentencing more than males, who used threat and implication more than females. In terms of length and complexity, American speakers used a higher number of utterances than Jordanians, while Jordanians

used more complex utterances than Americans. Finally, both groups used combined strategies in one response.

Al-Momani, Badarneh and Migdadi (2012) studied complaints and complaint responses in interactions between Jordanian citizens and the hosts of a live two-hour radio phone in a Jordanian radio program about complaints of a public nature. The results indicated that callers attempted to build solidarity with the hosts in order to take care of their complaints and increase their chances of having a remedial action for their complaints. The data also showed that there was often a rapport building between callers and the hosts through using praising remarks and informal address forms. The hosts attempted, in responding to the complaints, to negotiate solidarity with the callers by encouraging them to speak freely using empathic remarks and promising to transfer the problems of the callers to the authorities.

Recently, Al-Khawaldeh (2016) compared the linguistic expressions of complaining by Jordanian native speakers of Arabic and those by native speakers of English. In the study, she compared the number and types of politeness strategies used by both groups. The data were collected through a DCT reflecting natural exchange then analyzed. The results revealed that eleven complaining strategies were used by both groups. They were annoyance, direct threat, accusation, prayer, advice, irony, rejoinder that shows no disapproval, exclamation, request for repair, and request for explanation. They were statistically different in the use of the linguistic expression of complaints, i.e. opting out and prayer.

Al-Shorman (2016) investigated and compared complaining strategies used by Saudi-Arabic and Jordanian-Arabic speakers. A written DCT reflecting face-to-face interaction was prepared and distributed to 150 male participants randomly selected from the governorates of Irbid and Riyadh Universities. The results indicated that both groups were similar as far as using complaining strategies are concerned. They used calmness and rationality, offensive act, opting-out, and direct complaint. The results also revealed that there were some differences between the two groups in relation to “The person/thing students complain from” variable.

Drawing on the above literature, to date, it seems that several research papers have addressed complaining strategies. Most of them tackled complaints in ordinary conversations, cross-cultural, and intra-language speech act realizations of complaining (see Al-Khawaldeh, 2016; Al-Shorman, 2016). However, these studies have not discussed complaints in the context of social media. In this study, the researchers study the speech act of complaining as used by Facebook users. Since this study focuses on language communicated online, the following section reviews some studies that examined the linguistic features of Arabic Computer-Mediated Communication (henceforth CMC).

1.1.4. Linguistic features of CMC (Computer Mediated Communication)

Several studies have been conducted about linguistic features of CMC (e.g. Palfreyman and Khalil, 2003; Al-Sa’di and Hamdan, 2005; Bianchi, 2012; Hamdan, 2012).

For instance, Hamdan (2012) studied the linguistic and textual features of Arabic CMC. The data were collected from a public chat room (www.kalamngy.com) and private instant messages taken from Windows Live Messenger. The findings revealed that Arabic CMC has its own linguistic features, such as the use of new form of spelling, e.g. symbols, letters, and punctuation marks, and the use of short and simple sentences and word truncations in order to make the conversation short and fast. In addition, taboo words, typos and unconventional spelling and punctuation marks are used frequently. Code switching between English and Arabic or between Roman script and Arabic script is also used as well as the use of nicknames to mark oneself among others, especially in public sessions where there are many people who have the same first name. Moreover, Arabic CMC is characterized by its high use of emoticon instead of the use of paralinguistic items, the use of interjections, such as mmm, and oh, and the use of different font types, styles and sizes.

The findings also showed that repetition of words and letters are used to emphasize things, express surprise or fill a gap. Arabic script was mostly used in public sessions, while in private ones, the Roman

script is the adopted one. The reason for reviewing these studies on Arabic CMC is that since in this study data were collected from the comments of people on Zain Jordan, it is hypothesized that people use certain linguistic features in their comments which are different from the normal spoken and written language. Therefore, the linguistic features of Arabic CMC are compared with the linguistic features of the comments of this study, on the one hand, and with normal spoken and written language, on the other.

1.2. Research questions

Drawing on the above literature, this study aims to examine the use of complaining strategies by Facebook users on posts that offer Zain services. It also aims to identify the most and least frequent strategies used by Facebook users. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What are the types of complaining strategies used by Facebook users in relation to services offered by Zain on its official Facebook page?
- 2) What are the most and least frequently used complaining strategies by Facebook users?
- 3) Are there any similarities and/or differences between the complaining strategies found in previous studies and those used on Facebook?
- 4) What are the linguistic features of the expressions used to convey complaints on Facebook?

The following section discusses the methods adopted in the current study.

2. Methodology

2.1. Corpora

There are mainly two types of corpora: general corpora (e.g. The Corpus of Contemporary American English COCA) and specialized corpora (McEnery et al., 2006). In this study, a specialized corpus that is designed to examine a particular type of text or genre was chosen since this study is centred on complaining strategies on Zain Jordan (cf. Zibin, 2018). Specialized corpora can be searched either using corpus software or sometimes manually by hand. Researchers usually use corpus software as it enables the analysis of large-sized corpora. However, for small-sized corpora and in cases where no previous research has been done on the target topic, manual analysis of corpora, which is referred to as the corpus-driven approach, can be used to analyze the data (Deignan, 2008; Zibin, 2018). In this approach, the researcher reads and analyzes all the data he/she collected manually without the help of software. The advantage of using this approach is that it can provide the researcher with a clearer picture of the data he/she is interested in rather than testing pre-conceived notions, which could be inaccurate, on the entire corpus using software (Zibin, 2018). This study adopts a corpus-driven approach where the researchers analyze their entire collected corpus manually. The following section provides a description of the data collection procedure.

2.2. Data collection procedure

The data were collected from different posts on Zain Facebook official page related to the services the company offers to Facebook users. This page is called “Zain Jordan” and is dedicated to Facebook users’ advertisements, complaints, enquires, among other things. The population of the current study included all those who commented on Zain services on its official Facebook page since its establishment on 29th, June, 2010 to present. A sample was collected from the population of data found on Zain Jordan from September 2017 to January 2019. The fact that the researchers have accounts on Facebook made the data collection easier. The data were collected randomly using simple-random sampling whereby all the comments on the page regarding a particular Zain’s service were collected without excluding any (see

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2007). Once the researchers finished collecting data on a particular service, they moved on to another service and collected the data through copying and pasting the comments onto a word document file. The researchers collected a corpus of approximately 46,000 words which contains 1976 comments in order to obtain a good understanding of the complaining strategies used on Facebook.

Even though the data of this study were collected from a Jordanian Zain page, the Jordanian nationality was not included as a variable since it is very difficult to identify whether someone is Jordanian or not, and there are many users of this page who use its services and live in Jordan but have different nationalities. Note also that since Zain Jordan is public and can be accessed by anyone, no consent forms were required. However, the identity of the commenters was anonymised.

2.3. Data analysis

2.3.1. Corpus annotation

Corpus annotation is the process of adding linguistic information about a text in a corpus to clarify things and add value to it (Leech, 1993; Wynne, 2005: 25). The information can be of different natures, such as semantic, prosodic, lexical, discourse, pragmatic, and stylistic annotation (Wynne, 2005: 25). Since the researchers analyzed their corpus manually, they used pragmatic annotation to facilitate data analysis. Specifically, pragmatic annotation includes the information about the kinds of speech act that occur in a dialogue (Wynne, 2005: 26). For the purposes of the current study, the researchers manually annotated the entire corpus pragmatically by reading all the comments and giving them different labels that indicate the complaining strategy used by complainers on Facebook. This process took for 5-6 hours per day for five days to annotate 1976 comments. The researchers wrote the complaining strategies manually under each comment, e.g. joking, immediate threat, etc. The annotation process has made the quantitative analysis smoother, since it was easy to calculate the frequency and percentage of each complaining strategy in the corpus.

2.3.2. Pilot study

Due to the lack of studies on complaining strategies on Facebook, in general, and on mobile services in particular, the researchers conducted a pilot study to obtain preliminary results concerning these strategies (cf. Zibin, 2018). In particular, we collected 8460 words which contained around 300 comments (May 2018 to October 2018) from different comments on services offered by Zain on Zain Jordan page and classified the comments into different strategies according to Olshtain and Weinbach (1993). The data were also analyzed manually since the sample was manageable. The preliminary results of the pilot study showed that the main strategies used are: explicit complaint (26.9 %) and expression of annoyance or disapproval (25.4%) The data analysis also revealed new strategies used by the sample on Zain services, namely: demanding explanation (14.4%) request (8.9%), joking (8.7%), Future action (4 %), and comparison with previous experiences (2.5%), complaining with negative advice (.1 %). These results show that joking or humor is among the complaining strategies used on Facebook (cf. Bayat, 2013). These strategies were added to the framework of Olshtain and Weinbach (1993) and adopted in annotating the rest of the corpus.

2.3.3. Qualitative analysis

To analyze the corpus qualitatively, the researchers used the strategies of the adopted framework of Olshtain and Weinbach (1993: 112) to annotate the comments in the corpus. The researchers discovered six new complaining strategies which were added to the adopted framework. For objectivity purposes, the new strategies were examined by two other linguists to be validated. After classifying the comments into different strategies, the strategies were further sub-classified into direct and indirect strategies in order to compare the results of this study with the results of the other studies; most of the researchers

have classified the strategies into direct and indirect strategies in their previous studies. The framework adopted in the current study consists of the following strategies:

1. Below level of reproach
2. Expression of annoyance or disapproval
3. Explicit complaint
4. Accusation and warning
5. Immediate threat

The new strategies are the following:

1. Demanding justification
2. Joking
3. Future action
4. Comparison with previous experiences
5. Complaining with negative advice
6. Request

2.3.4. Statistical analysis

The process of manual annotation has made the quantitative analysis easier. The data were analyzed quantitatively whereby the frequency of each complaining strategy (annotated in the corpus) as used by Facebook users was calculated per 46,000 words. Thus, both the number and percentage of each complaining strategy were obtained. Then, in order to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between these strategies, a chi-square test was used to calculate the p value and thus determine whether the differences between the strategies were statistically significant. This test is normally used to give an evidence of an association or no association between categorical variables, but it does not provide the effect of any association (Pandis, 2016). This test was chosen since it is appropriate to find statistically significant differences between complaining strategies used among Facebook users.

3. Results

3.1. Qualitative analysis of complaining strategies on Zain Jordan

1. Below level of reproach

In this strategy, complainers do not mention the offensive act at all and do not focus on the complainees while complaining. It is not used at all by Facebook users since it does not reflect their annoyance.

2. Expression of annoyance or disapproval

The complainer expresses his annoyance to the unacceptable action performed by the complainees. The complainer does not specify the offensive act explicitly, such as:

1) *?aswa? /abakeh /ala ?itla:q*

The worst network on ever

‘Absolutely the worst network ever!’

3. Explicit complaint

In this strategy, the complainer explicitly states the Socially Unacceptable Act (SUA) to the addressee, such as:

2) *n-nit* *bixlas bsurfa* *ma: bikammil* *?isbu:ʕi:n*
 the-Internet ending quickly not continue.it two.weeks

‘The Internet data finishes quickly; it does not last for two weeks.’

4. Accusation and warning

This strategy is considered a complaint if the complainer decides to use it as an open-face threatening act. The complainer also chooses a penalty against the complaine. Moreover, accusation takes place when someone accuses another of doing something wrong and warns the addressee of a potential penalty, such as:

3) *t-tahdi:θ xarrab* *kul fi: ʕindi:...* *wu ma: bididi:*
 the-update damaged every thing have.I... and not want

tatbi:q *l-fi:s* *ʕattalifu:n*
 application the-face on-phone

‘The update damaged everything on my mobile...I don’t want to download your Facebook application on my mobile’.

The researchers noticed that accusation is used without warning, unlike, the adopted framework of Olshtain and Weinbach (1993).

5. Immediate threat

This strategy occurs when the complainer chooses to confront and attack the complaine openy. It sometimes includes curses or direct insults. Warning differs from threat since the former is implicit and does not show a serious action; it is just a chat or slipslop, such as:

4) *bididi* *hal ʔaw* *s-subih baru:h* *ʔaradziʕ*
 want.I solution or the-morning going.I returning
r-rawtar la?inu *lyu:m* *ʕtari:t-uh* *wu ma: ʕtayal*
 the-router because today bought.I-it and not working

‘I want a solution now or in the morning, I am going to return the router since I bought it today and it does not work’.

The above strategies were adopted from the framework of Olshtain and Weinbach (1993: 112). Based on the results of the pilot study, we added 11 new strategies to the adopted framework. We noticed that Facebook users use more complaining strategies than the strategies suggested by Olshtain and Weinbach (1993). The new strategies are illustrated below:

6. Demanding justification

This strategy is used when the complainer demands a justification for something that happened to him/her because of someone. This strategy usually starts with mentioning or clarifying a problem, then the complainer asks for a justification, such as:

5)	<i>mumkin</i>	<i>ʔaʕraf</i>	<i>li:f</i>	<i>n-nit</i>	<i>ma: biftayil</i>	<i>ya:</i>
	possible	know.I	why	the-internet	not working	VOC
	<i>ʕarikit</i>	<i>zi:n</i>	<i>4 ʔayya:m</i>	<i>ʔilu</i>	<i>batiʕ</i>	<i>kθi:r</i>
	company	Zein	4 days	still	slow	very

“Could I know why the Internet does not work and why has it been very slow for four days, Zain?”

7. Future action

This strategy indicates the future action of the complainer since he/she is unsatisfied with a certain action done by someone, such as:

6)	<i>rah</i>	<i>ʔayayyir</i>	<i>l-xat</i>	<i>laʔin-kum</i>
	will	change.I	the-sim	because-you
	<i>ħaramiyyi n-nit</i>	<i>4 gi:ga ma:</i>	<i>bikaffi: ʔisbu:ʕi:n</i>	
	thieves	the-internet	4 gigas	not enough two.weeks

‘I will switch to another company since you are thieves. 4Gs are not enough for two weeks.’

8. Joking

This strategy is characterized by saying something funny whether to make people laugh or to send a message to someone implicitly. Some users employed metaphors and irony in their jokes suggesting that hearers do not have to take the literal meaning of the word/expression since if they do, the meaning will sound strange. Hearers should guess what is behind the words, such as:

7)	<i>ʔittamman-u:</i>	<i>n-nit</i>	<i>sulħafa wu</i>	<i>ma:</i>	<i>biftaħ... la:</i>
	Relax-you	the-internet	turtle	and	not open.it no
	<i>da:ʕi:</i>	<i>li-l-qalaq</i>			
	need	for-the-worry			

‘Rest assured the Internet is moving at a turtle’s pace and it does not work...don’t be worried’.

In the above example, *nnit sulħafa wu ma: biftaħ* ‘the Internet is moving at a turtle’s pace and it does not work’ is used to indicate that the Internet speed was slow.

9. Comparison with previous experiences

In this strategy, the complainer states his/her opinion towards something negatively through establishing a comparison between the current situation and some past experiences, such as:

8)	<i>ka:nat</i>	<i>ʔaħsan</i>	<i>ʕabaki</i>	<i>wu sa:rat</i>
	was.it	best	network	and became

<i>l-ʔaswaʔ</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>bi-dʒada:ra</i>
the-worst	and	with-competence

‘It was the best network but now it is sadly the worst ...’.

10. Complaining with negative advice

Complainers in this strategy complain about a certain thing through giving negative advice for people in order to avoid it, such as:

- 9) *la: ʔansah ʔahad bi-l-ʔiftira:k maf zi:n*
 not advice.Ianyone to-the-subscription with Zein
mutlaqan laʔinnu xidmit-hum sayyiʔa dziddan
 ever because service-theirs bad very

‘I don’t advice anyone to subscribe with Zain at all since its services are very bad’.

11. Request

This strategy is used when the complainer asks the complainees to do something in a polite or an impolite way, such as:

- 10) *mif gadri:n nitsaffah wala ʔifti:*
 not able.we browse.we no thing
hillulna: hal-gissa ʔalla yirda: ʕali:-kum
 solve.it.you this-case allah bless on-you

‘We are not able to browse anything, solve the issue God bless you’.

This analysis has provided an answer to the first research question. The following section provides an answer to the second research question.

3.2. Quantitative analysis of complaining strategies on Zain Jordan

Table (1) below shows the most and least frequent complaining strategies used among Facebook users on Zain Jordan. It also shows the results of the chi-square test which determines whether the differences between the different strategies were statistically significant.

Table 1. Most and least frequent complaining strategies and chi-square results of the statistical differences between these strategies

No.	Complaining strategies	Number of occurrence	Percent	Chi-square	Df.	(P) Value Sig.
1	Expression of annoyance or disapproval	654	29.7			
2	Explicit Complaint	583	26.5			
3	Demanding explanation	299	13.6			
4	Request	267	12.1	2940.245	9	0.00*
5	Joking	107	4.9			
6	Future action	105	4.8			
7	Accusation and warning	76	3.5			

8	Comparing with previous experiences	51	2.3
9	Immediate threat	38	1.7
10	Complaining with negative advice	19	.9
11	Below the level of reproach	0	.0
Number of complaining		2199	100.0

*($p \leq 0.05$)

Based on Table 1 it is clear that expression of annoyance or disapproval strategy has the highest percentage (29.7%), while complaining with negative advice has the lowest percentage (0.9%). Explicit complaint strategy was the second highest (26.5%), followed by demanding explanation (13.6%), Request (12.1%), joking (4.9%), future action (4.8%), and finally below the level of reproach which was not used at all. The chi-square results show that there was a statistically significant difference between the complaining strategies on Zain Jordan (p value > 0.05) in favor of expression of annoyance or disapproval which obtained the highest percentage of use. Having presented the results, the following section provides a discussion of these results and hence providing answers to the third and fourth research questions.

4. Discussion

Data analysis reveals that the strategies of the adopted framework were all used among Facebook users on Zain Jordan except below level of reproach strategy. In addition, the 6 new complaining strategies identified by the researchers in the pilot study were also found in the collected corpus: demanding justification, joking, future action, comparing with previous experiences, complaining with negative advice and request.

With regard to expression of annoyance or disapproval and explicit complaints which were the most frequent complaining strategies used on Zain Jordan, it can be argued that they are used more than the other strategies since complainers in these two strategies express their annoyance about the offensive act explicitly. Complainers, in expression of annoyance or disapproval strategy, did not specify the offensive act, since they could have many problems with Zain services. In this strategy, complainers sometimes employed insults or taboo words as a way to express their annoyance or disapproval. With respect to demanding justification which was the third most frequently used strategy, it can be argued that it is used on Zain Jordan since this page is created for different purposes, such as discussions and enquires as mentioned on the page's website. Complainers also had mentioned in their comments that their justifications via Zain email or through customer services were ignored; therefore, they used Zain Jordan to demand justifications since it was the easiest way.

Concerning request which was the fourth most frequently used strategy, there are two types of request among the collected comments; polite and impolite (imperative). Polite requests could be used for seeking responses or mitigate what they wanted to say, such as *biddi*: *ʔaʕraf* 'could I know...', whereas the imperative form was employed to show annoyance and dissatisfaction since complainers paid for receiving good services and as such they expect Zain to provide good services for the money they paid, such as *zabttu* 'repair/fix...'. Joking was used as a strategy of complaining even though the complaints expressed dissatisfaction. This might be a characteristic of the Jordanian community to be sarcastic and make jokes about their dissatisfaction about their reality. This is supported by Zibin (2018) who argued that Jordanians may use humor as strategy to rebel against unpleasant situations such as the economic status of their country. Moreover, they might use joking to avoid confrontation and mitigate their

complaints. Future action was used to demonstrate a certain determined action that would affect Zain badly in the future. Some keywords were used highly to reflect this strategy like *ma: raḥ/mif raḥ* ‘I will not...’, and *na:wi*: ‘I intend to...’.

Accusation and warning occur when someone accuses another of doing something wrong and warns the addressee of a potential penalty based on the adopted framework of Olshtain and Weinbach (1993). In this study, we noticed that accusation was used by Facebook users on Zain Jordan without warning which is more implicit than threat. In addition, it does not include religious word or oaths like “Allah” “I swear by Allah” to show seriousness like threat. In comparing with previous experiences, Facebook users showed that a certain service was better in the past based compared to the present based on their experience. The use of this strategy on social media might be to help members of Zain Jordan, especially the new ones, to be aware that Zain was better in the past compared to the present and its reputation is going down as a sign of solidarity. Some keywords were used highly to indicate this strategy like *zama:n ka:nat* ‘In the past, it was...’ and *muqa:ranatan bi* ‘in comparison with...’.

Immediate threat was used as a face threatening act in which complainers wanted to threaten Zain’s face. It reflected aggressiveness and dislike. Swear words were used in this strategy, such as “Allah” “I swear by Allah”. The threat is related to a certain condition, if it is not applied, the threat will be achieved. Examples of keywords used in it were *wa ḥilla*: ‘otherwise...’ and *ḥiza..., ḥana raḥ* ‘If..., I will...’. In complaining with negative advice, members of the same Facebook page feel that they are one community and as such they may feel obligated to advise others before they encounter the same problem as a sign of solidarity. Some common keywords were used, such as: *ma:/la: ansaḥ* ‘I do not advice...’ and *ḥu:ḥkum* ‘be careful...’. Finally, below the level of reproach strategy was not used at all to complain on Zain Jordan since complainers in this strategy do not mention the offensive act entirely and do not focus on the complainees at all in their complaints. Therefore, the complainees may interpret it as an ordinary utterance or a general remark without considering it as a complaint.

In sum, based on data analysis it appears that all the above strategies were direct except for immediate threat and joking, suggesting that Facebook users are generally direct while complaining on social media, e.g. Zain Jordan. This might be due to the lack of face to face interaction between complainers and complainees. Despite the fact that other studies conducted in the Jordanian context revealed that several speech acts produced by Jordanians are generally indirect (see Al-Omari, 2008), the current study showed that complainers on Zain Jordan prefer to use direct complaining strategies on social media. This could be because people may feel freer about their complaints on social media due to the absence of face-to-face confrontation; thus, they may post complaints that they may not use in face-to-face interactions. The anonymity provided by social media, e.g. some users are not truthful about their identity, their gender, their age, their names, etc. may give some users more courage to be bold about their complaints.

In addition, complaining on social media provides more space to the complainers as they are not limited by certain situations like in DCTs; hence, they may use strategies on social media they do not normally use in other contexts. The directness of the complaints on Zain Jordan could be attributed to the fact that the complainers wanted to avoid any misinterpretations of their comments or any ambiguities; thus, they attempted to make their comments as clear and direct as possible. Note also that all comments on Facebook are public, where commenters support and advise each other, feel with each other, express annoyance or disapproval, clarify their complaints, use jokes to make others laugh, show their regret, hopes and future actions, and use emojis to show their feelings instead of real face expressions or to support their comments.

From another perspective, the language used to convey complaining on Facebook has its own linguistic features which have both similarities to and differences from the linguistic features of Arabic CMC used

in spoken and written settings. Sentences used to complain are mostly long based on the work of Al-Sa'di (2003: 122) that suggests any sentence that consists of 8 words or less was considered short while if it is more than 8 words, it was regarded as long. Sentences are also complex based on Al-madani (2011 cited in Hamdam, 2012: 55). Complex constructions are those that contain long sentences, questions, negations, and passive, while simple constructions are short ones that do not include negations, questions or passives.

Arabic CMC used to complain on Zain Jordan is also characterized by improper use or absence of punctuation; data analysis revealed that in the complaining expressions on Zain Jordan, these marks were absent and if they were used, they were employed improperly in the majority of cases (cf. Palfreyman and Khalil, 2003). Examples include questions and exclamation marks, which were usually typed more than once consecutively, e.g. (?????, !!!) to emphasize their function. In addition, three to five dots were typed to show ellipsed elements, to separate sentences, or to indicate pauses or hedges as in spoken language. The most obvious feature of complaining online, as noted, is the use of emojis which were employed to express complainers' feelings instead of paralinguistic language that is used in spoken language. They were used to compensate for the lack of face expressions. Complainers used emojis with other strategies to support their complaints and to clarify their intentions and feelings. The emojis 🤔, 😞, 😡 were usually employed with the strategy of expression of annoyance or disapproval, while 😂, 😏, 😜 were employed to indicate that there was a joke in a certain complaint. It was also observed that 🙄, 😒, 😓, 😠, 😡 were combined several times with explicit complaint to show that there was a real problem and the complainer was unsatisfied and irritated. In addition, 📧, 📧, 📧 were also employed several times with demanding explanation to show that there was a demand for clarifying something which went wrong with Zain's services.

In addition, taboo words are used in some strategies (expression of annoyance or disapproval, demanding justifications, explicit complaint). Formulaic phrases, consecutive dots, informal colloquial Arabic, typos and repetition of letters are all features of Arabic CMC used to complain. It seems that unlike normal written language, complaining expressions on Zain Jordan included many orthographical errors which are not normally found in proper written language. Moreover, abbreviations were not used in the comments on Zain Jordan. This lack of use of abbreviations to complain might be in order to send a clear message to the complainer and avoid any ambiguity, even if they are used to save time and effort by shortening words and reducing them to one or few letters in typing (cf. Dawaghreh, 2011).

A comparison was made to determine the differences and similarities between the linguistic features of the complaining expressions used on Zain Jordan and with the linguistic features of Arabic CMC mentioned in literature review. The comparison revealed that the linguistic features of Arabic CMC used to complain on Facebook are similar to those found in other studies on Arabic CMC in other contexts, e.g. chat rooms. Differences were also detected pertaining to sentence length, complexity, abbreviations, code switching or mixing, deletion of vowel, Latin script and Interjections (cf. Hamdan, 2012). For instance, it was shown that Arabic CMC used to complain does not contain abbreviations, Latin script, and code switching or mixing for clarity purposes and to avoid any misinterpretations on Zain's part.

Finally, another comparison was made between the results of the current study and the results of previous studies on complaining to identify the similarities and differences between them in using complaining strategies and thus provide an answer to the third research question. The comparison revealed that complaining strategies and the directness of using the strategies are different from one language to another as well as in the context in which they are used (spoken, written, social media). Even though there are partial similarities between complaining strategies produced by Facebook users and speakers of different languages in normal speech, such as the use of explicit complaint, demanding justification, accusation and warning, request, joking, threat and expression of annoyance, differences

do exist, e.g. using prayer, rejoinder, exclamation, opting out, calmness and rationality, blame, mitigated complaints and explanation of purpose strategies which are mainly used in spoken contexts.

Written complaining strategies in DCTs are different from Facebook users' strategies since the former employ reflecting the results, reporting negligence, reminding the rights, using authoritative expression, rebelling and showing the inaccuracy of the known strategies. In contrast, they are similar in using warning, complaining directly and reflecting the results. Moreover, the comparison revealed that Facebook users were more direct and did not avoid open confrontation compared to complainers in spoken situations due to the lack of face-to-face interaction and the anonymity provided by social media. Facebook users employed combined strategies to increase the effectiveness of their complaints similar to American and Chinese participants in Chen et al.'s (2011) study. The comparison also demonstrated that Facebook users use combined strategies containing some patterns, namely, explicit complaint + emoji, explicit complaint + request, demanding explanation + expression of annoyance or disapproval, expression of annoyance + emoji, and joking + emoji. These combined strategies are possibly employed to increase the effectiveness of the complaint and draw the attention of the complaine. In fact, it was observed that the longer the complaint, the more complaining strategies are used in it.

5. Conclusions

This study investigated the complaining strategies used by Facebook users on Zain Jordan in terms of their frequency, types and linguistic features of the language used. The results showed that there were ten complaining strategies used by these users. The results also revealed that the majority of complaining strategies on Facebook are direct despite the fact that many studies that examined the speech acts produced by Arabs in general and Jordanians in particular have shown that they tend to be indirect. Conversely, Facebook users are direct about their complaints and they do not avoid open confrontation. This was ascribed to the lack of face-to-face interaction and the anonymity provided by Facebook, while most complainers in spoken and written situations mitigate their language, use indirect strategies, and avoid open confrontation. Expression of annoyance or disapproval was the most strategy used by Facebook users, whereas complaining with negative advice was the least one used by them. It was also shown the language used to convey complaining on Facebook has its own linguistic features which have both similarities to and differences from the linguistic features of Arabic CMC used in spoken and written settings. Differences were also detected pertaining to sentence length, complexity, abbreviations, code switching or mixing, deletion of vowel, Latin script and Interjections.

Based on these results, it can be recommended that a study of complaining strategies on Twitter can be conducted since this website has a restriction on the number of characters used in each tweet so this would put restrictions on the syntactic complexity and lexical density of the complaints. Finally, a study of the linguistic features of written complaints such as emails can be done to compare its linguistic features with those of complaints on social media.

6. Ethics Committee Approval

The author(s) confirm(s) that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country (Date of Confirmation: 26.11.2020).

References

Abdolrezapour, P. Dabaghi, A. and Kassaian, Z. (2012). Iranian EFL learners' realization of complaints in American English. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 12(2), 711-725.

- Al-Khawaldeh, N. (2016), A Pragmatic Cross-Cultural Study of Complaints Expressions in Jordan and England. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5 (5), 197-207.
- Al-Omari, S. (2008). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Complaining Strategies in Jordanian Arabic and American English*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Al-Qudah, M. (2001). *Congratulation Patterns on Happy Occasions in Jordan*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Al-Raba'a, B. (2009). *The Generic and Registerial Features of Facebook Apology Messages Written in English and Arabic by Americans and Jordanians*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Al-Sa'di, R. (2003). *An Investigation of Linguistic and Textual Features of "Internet Relay Chat (IRC) and Yahoo Messenger (Y!)" English*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.
- Al-Sa'di, R. and Hamdan, J. (2005). "Synchronous online chat" English: Computer-mediated communication. *World Englishes*, 24 (4), 409-424.
- Al-Shorman, R. (2016). Saudi and Jordanian Undergraduates' Complaining Strategies: A Comparative Intralanguage Educational Linguistic Study. *Arab World English Journal*, 7 (1), 203-228.
- Austen, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words*, (2nd ed). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bayat, N. (2013). A study on the use of speech acts. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 213-221.
- Bianchi, R. M. (2012). "Glocal Arabic online: The case of 3arabizi". *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(4), 483-503.
- Blum-Kulka, S. and Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.
- Boxer, D. (1993). Complaints as positive strategies: What the learner needs to know. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (2), 277-299.
- Brown, P., and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*, (Vol.4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, Y. S., Chen, C. Y. D. and Chang, M. H. (2011). American and Chinese complaints: Strategy use from a cross-cultural perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8 (2), 253–275.
- Dash, N. S. (2015). *Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction*. Unpublished linguistic research, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India.
- Deignan, A. (2008). Corpus linguistics and metaphor. In: Gibbs, R. W. (Ed.) *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. (pp. 280-294), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ekmekçi, E. (2015). Native and non-native English instructors' production of refusals and complaints: a preliminary case study in a state university in Turkey. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 8 (39), 613-621.
- Eslamirasekh, A. Jafari seresht, D. and Mehregan, M. (2012). How do you react to the breakdown after it happens? Do you complain about it?: a contrastive study on the complaint behavior in American English and Persian. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 34-40.

- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. Eslami-Rasekh, A. and Fatahi, A. (2004). The effect of explicit metalinguistic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL.EJ*, 8(2), 1-12.
- Farnia, M. Buchheit, L. and Salim, S. (2010). “I need to talk to you”—A contrastive pragmatic study of speech act of complaint in American English and Malaysian. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 30, 11-23.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava, and David Nachmias. (2007). *Study Guide for Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gibbs Jr, R. W. (Ed.). (2008). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamdan, H. (2012). *The Linguistic and Textual Features of Synchronous Online Chat-Arabic: Computer-Mediated Communication*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.
- Hartley, L. (1998). *A sociolinguistic analysis of face threat and face management in potential complaint situation*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Leech, G. (1993). Corpus annotation schemes. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 8(4), 275-281.
- Masjedi, N. and Paramasivam, S. (2018). Complaint and Politeness Strategies used by Iranian Speakers of English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(4), 38-49.
- McEnery, T. Xiao, R. and Tonio, Y. (2006). *Corpus-Based Language Studies: An Advanced Resource Book*, (1st ed). New York: Routledge.
- Migdadi, F. Al-Momani, K. and Badarneh, M. (2012). Public complaints and complaint responses in calls to a Jordanian radio phone-in program. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(3), 321–341.
- Murphy, B. and Neu, J. (1996). My grade's too low: The speech act set of complaining. *Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language*, 191-216.
- Olshtain, E. and Weinbach, L. (1993). Interlanguage features of the speech act of complaining. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, 22, 108-123.
- Palfreyman, D., and Khalil, M. A. (2003). “a Funky Language for Teenzz to Use:” Representing Gulf Arabic in Instant Messaging. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 9(1). Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2003.tb00355.x>.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*, (2nd ed). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pandis, N. (2016). The chi-square test. *ELSEVIER*, 150 (5), 898-899.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(01), 1-23.
- Searle, J. R. and Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Vol.626). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*, (Vol.7). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wynne, M. (2005). *Developing linguistic corpora: a guide to good practice*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics: Oxford Introductions to Language Study*, (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, D. (2001). *The Speech Act of Complaining: A Cross-Cultural Comparative Study of Chinese and American English Speakers*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Zhoumin, Y. (2011). A Contrastive Study of American and Chinese University Students' Complaining Strategies*. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34 (1), 111-125.

Zibin, A. (2018). The effect of the Arab Spring on the use of metaphor and metonymy in Jordanian economic discourse. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 16(1), 254-298.

Appendix A: Key to transliteration

Symbol	Description	Example
i	high short central vowel unrounded	as in bint ‘girl’
i:	high long central vowel unrounded	as in fi:l ‘elephant’
a	low short central vowel unrounded	as in man ‘who’
a:	low long front vowel unrounded	as in ba:b ‘door’
u	high short back vowel rounded	as in kul ‘all’
u:	high long back vowel rounded	as in fu:l ‘beans’
aj	mid long front unrounded	as in bajt ‘house’
aw	mid long back rounded	as in nawm ‘sleep’
b	voiced bilabial stop	as in bajt ‘house’
t	voiceless alveolar stop	as in tamir ‘dates’
ṭ	emphatic voiceless alveolar stop	as in batta ‘duck’
d	voiced alveolar stop	as in walad ‘boy’
ḏ	emphatic voiced alveolar stop	as in daww ‘light’
k	voiceless velar stop	as in maktab ‘office’
g	voiced velar stop	as in maglab ‘prank’
q	voiceless uvular stop	as in qalam ‘pen’
ʔ	glottal stop	as in ʔasad ‘lion’
m	voiced bilabial nasal	as in ma:t ‘died’
n	voiced alveolar nasal	as in na:r ‘fire’
f	voiceless labiodental fricative	as in fi:l ‘elephant’

v	voiced labiodental fricative	as in nivi:n ‘proper noun’
θ	voiceless interdental fricative	as in θawb ‘dress’
ð	voiced interdental fricative	as in ða:n ‘ear’
ð̤	emphatic voiced interdental fricative	as in ð̤ifr ‘nail’
s	voiceless alveolar fricative	as in sa:ʕa ‘watch’
s̤	emphatic alveolar fricative	as in s̤awt ‘voice’
ʃ	voiceless alveopalatal fricative	as in ʃams ‘sun’
ʒ	voiced alveopalatal fricative	as in urban ‘ʒamal’ camel
x	voiceless uvular fricative	as in ʔaxdar ‘green’
ɣ	voiced uvular fricative	as in ɣazal ‘deer’
ħ	voiceless pharyngeal fricative	as in ħubb ‘love’
ʕ	voiced pharyngeal fricative	as in ʕurs ‘wedding’
h	voiceless glottal fricative	as in hind ‘proper noun’
l	voiced alveolar lateral	as in namil ‘ants’
r	voiced alveolar trill	as in ra:s ‘head’
j	voiced palatal glide	as in majj ‘water’
w	voiced bilabial glide	as in walad ‘boy’

Facebook kullanıcılarına Zain Jordan'da sunulan hizmetler hakkında şikayet stratejilerinin analizi

Öz

Bu çalışma, Facebook kullanıcılarının Zain Facebook sayfasında (Zain Jordan) kullandığı şikayet stratejilerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca Facebook kullanıcıları tarafından en sık ve en az sıklıkla kullanılan stratejileri belirlemeyi ve kullanılan strateji türleri ve dilin dil özellikleri açısından Zain Jordan'da bulunan şikayet stratejileri ile diğer çalışmalarda bulunanlar arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, araştırmacılar özel bir külliyat oluşturdular. Külliyat, Zain Jordan'da kullanılan şikayet etme stratejilerinin türleri hakkında pragmatik bilgileri içerecek şekilde manuel olarak açıklandı. Veriler Olshtain ve Weinbach (1993) temel alınarak analiz edildi. Ek olarak, bir pilot çalışmada araştırmacılar tarafından 6 yeni strateji belirlenmiş ve benimsenen taksonomiye eklenmiştir. Sonuçlar, Facebook kullanıcıları tarafından Zain Jordan'da kullanılan 10 şikayet stratejisi olduğunu gösteriyor. Sonuçlar ayrıca, Zain Jordan'da kullanılan şikayet stratejilerinin çoğunun doğrudan olduğunu da gösteriyor ki bu, yüz yüze etkileşim eksikliğine ve Facebook tarafından sağlanan anonimliğe atfedildi. Dahası, Facebook'ta şikayet etme stratejilerinin kendi dil özellikleri vardır. Çalışma, daha fazla araştırma için önerilerle sona eriyor.

Anahtar sözcükler: Edimbilim; külliyat; konuşma eylemleri; CMC; sosyal medya

AUTHOR BIODATA

Isra' Hassouneh is an English Teacher. She holds an MA degree in Language, Culture and Communication and a BA degree in Applied English from the University of Jordan. She has got several certificates in online and in class teaching methods.

Aseel Zibin is an Assistant Professor of English Language and Linguistics at the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Jordan, Amman/Jordan. She obtained her PhD in Linguistics/Cognitive Semantics from Newcastle University, UK. She is mainly interested in cognitive semantics, pragmatics, discourse analysis and second language acquisition.