

A Sociolinguistics Perspective of Interrogative Forms in English, Standard Arabic and Jordanian Dialects

Natheer Mohammad Ahmad Al-Omari

School of Language, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Pulau, Malaysia

Manjet Kaur Mehar Singh

School of Language, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Pulau, Malaysia

Abstract—This paper aims to investigate some forms of interrogatives in Standard Arabic (SA), two Jordanian Arabic dialects (JAD): urban Jordanian Arabic (UJA) and rural Jordanian Arabic (RJA), and their impact on the Jordanian people's use of English Interrogative forms. It also examines how SA, and the two JAD are similar and different based on their forms and uses of interrogatives. Further, this study analyzes how each interrogative form is used in different classifications and contexts. The descriptive approach is used to describe the impact of SA, UJA and RJA on the use of English interrogative forms in social contexts. The study concludes that JADs share some interrogative forms and that some of them hold multiple meanings or usages. It also confirms that SA and its Jordanian dialects, UJA and RJA, to some extent, impact the Jordanian people's use of English interrogative forms.

Index Terms—dialect, Jordanian Arabic, sociolinguistics, Standard Arabic, English

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the common functions of language is represented in asking questions to get information (Joshi, 2014; Umami, 2015; Siemund, 2017; Gupta, 2018; Mahfud, 2021). This function is linguistically termed as interrogation (Ohl, 2007). In this respect, each language has its unique interrogative particles and forms which are different from the particles of other languages (Alqasem, 2017). Such differences may occur at the level of dialects pertaining to the same language. Interestingly, the differences in interrogative particles and forms, which are parts of larger differences in the languages' linguistic systems, may affect the form of interrogation in the second or foreign language.

The interrogative sentences in English require serious changes in the sentence (Glotkina, 2022). They have a grammatical structure that implies changes in verbs that are influenced by the form of time (Syarifa, 2019). Moreover, the English interrogative sentences always begin with an auxiliary verb or To Be and Wh-word (Handayani, 2017; Khawas, 2021; Ahmed & Kumar, 2022; Natal et al., 2022). Contrastingly, Arabic interrogative sentences resort to 'Merge' because it does not have auxiliary inversion (Fakih & Al-Dera, 2014) and, like English interrogative sentences, they are introduced by an interrogative particle (Fischer, 2013). The term 'merge' denotes n syntactic objects (SOs) already formed, and constructs from them a new SO (Chomsky, 2007, p. 137).

This paper is motivated by the assumption that the forms and particles of interrogation in SA and JDs; UJA and RJA impact the Jordanian people's use of interrogative forms in English. Therefore, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the most frequently used interrogative forms and particles in Urban Jordanian Arabic?
2. What are the most frequently used interrogative forms and particles in Rural Jordanian Arabic?
3. Do the interrogative forms and particles used in Urban Jordanian Arabic differ from those in the Standard Arabic?
4. Do the interrogative forms and particles used in Rural Jordanian Arabic differ from those in the Standard Arabic?
5. Do the interrogative forms and particles used in Urban Jordanian Arabic and Rural Jordanian Arabic affect the Jordanian people's use of English interrogative forms?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Theoretical Background

Trudgill (1995) defined Standard English as "the variety of English which is usually used in print, and which is normally taught in schools and to non-native speakers learning the language. It is also the variety which normally spoken by educated people and used in news broadcasts and other similar situations" (pp. 5–6).

The language that speakers use in the community they live in pertains to their language identity. The term identity is defined as the linguistic construction of membership in one or more social groups or categories. This study's main

concern is how speakers of the subject area form wh-questions, which are considered part of their dialect identity. This study examines forms of wh-questions in two dialects (rural and urban), as these are the only existing dialects in the study region.

Arabic is a language with a wide range of variants. Among these (SA) is the only written form that is standardized, regulated, taught in school, and used in written communication. Meanwhile, its spoken forms are extensive, which include Jordanian Arabic (JA), Syrian Arabic, and Egyptian Arabic (EA) among others. Speakers mainly use these regional dialects in day-to-day spoken communication.

It is important to introduce interrogatives in Arabic and English. Linguists agree that interrogatives refer to the idea that the questioner seeks information on something that they are not familiar with, and that the addressee is expected to provide the speaker with such information. Arabic and English linguists have provided several definitions of interrogatives. For Arabic linguists, an interrogative is [a] request which aims to know about something that is not known by using a particular particle. In addition, Al-Sioty, with reference to Al-Anbarri's writings, defines a "question" as "a demand for an answer using a specific particle" and asserts that each question consists of four essential parts which are: the questioner, the interrogative instrument whether a particle or a noun, the subject (the topic) that the questioner wants to know about and finally the addressee" (Issam, 2006, pp. 352–353).

On the other hand, interrogatives in English are "used to express lack of information on a specific point and it usually requests the listener to supply this information verbally" (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, p. 386). Moreover, Beard (2000) defined "questions" as "utterances which require information and opinions that the questioner does not know" (p. 98). While many other definitions of interrogatives exist, they all share the abovementioned ideas.

This study examines the relation between society and language to promote a better understanding of the nature and structure of language and the way its functions interact socially. This research also helps linguists determine similarities and differences among Jordanian dialects, which would enable linguists to apply them to other sociolinguistic fields. It also facilitates an understanding of these kinds of wh-questions among ordinary people, whether they are foreigners or citizens from other areas in Jordan.

Specifically, this study examines the impact of SA and its Jordanian dialects; UJA and RJA, if any, on the use of English interrogative forms. In doing so, a discussion of the similarities and differences between SA, JAD (urban and rural) and English is provided by highlighting 36 different examples of interrogative forms as spoken by the selected sample members. The researcher conducts a qualitative analysis of these examples by comparing them to one another.

B. Related Works

Wahba (1984) examined wh-questions in EA, arguing that wh-operators in EA may occur in two positions: nonargument (initial position) or argument (in situ position). The descriptive approach is used and, conducting the study from a government and binding perspective (Chomsky, 1981), the researcher found that wh-questions are derived from movement, while relative clauses and topicalized constructions show no movement at all.

According to Farghal (1986), medieval Arab grammarians have investigated all matters related to the description of Arabic syntax. Farghal discussed the different transformational aspects of Arabic. No independent work has been conducted on the syntax of wh-questions until it filled this gap in Arabic syntax research by performing a major study that analyzes wh-questions and their implications for current linguistic theory. The findings revealed that while wh-elements cannot be moved to the left of topics in matrix topic-comment structures, they can undergo movements to the left of topics in embedded topic-comment structures.

Gharaibeh (1999) argued that the particle is the head of the kernel sentence since it assumes initial position. The descriptive method is used, and the findings revealed that the particle's lexical properties ensure that it projects on the structure of kernel sentences. It is the syntactic head because it reverts and restricts the aspect of the tense and is also the semantic head because it identifies the sentence's style. An interrogative sentence gains meaning from the particle, which is absent in other sentence components. The particle usually changes the structural case ending of the predicate and sometimes the subject to indicate the new meaning and tense.

Through a contrastive study, Almomani (2006) examined the syntactic, lexical, and semantic aspects of interrogative sentences in SA and English. The descriptive method was used, and the results showed that the transformational aspects of interrogative sentences between Arabic and English are illustrated through major transformational processes such as topicalization, expansion, and deletion.

Katanani (2002) analyzed the intonation form and function of interrogation in English as well as the Yazour accent in Palestine. The descriptive method was used, and the results revealed that speakers use the rising tone in yes/no questions and echo questions (whether yes/no questions or wh-questions, and miš questions). Meanwhile, speakers use the falling tone in neutral wh-questions and incomplete questions.

In an Arabic study, Alfarhan (2005) investigated interrogatives in Kufr-Soom, a rural town north of Irbid, Jordan, and discussed how interrogation is expressed not with the use of interrogative particles or nouns but with intonation (without using *hal* and *?alhamza*) considering the example *abuuk haan?* Or *haan abuuk?* (Is your father here?). He then introduced some interrogative particles in that rural dialect: *miin* (who); *šuu*, *ešuu* or *?eeš* (what, when asking about humans and nonhumans); *leeš* or *laweeš* (why); *ameet* (when); *wcen* (where); *mneen* (from where); *la-ween* (to where); *čeef* (how); *?akam* or *gaddeeš* (how many or how much, respectively); and *?ayya* (which).

Al-Momani and Al-Saidat (2010) explored the syntax of wh-phrases in JA, which showed a clear optional movement of the wh-phrase either to the initial position or leaving it in situ. The movement in the latter case is linked to the presence of the particle *illi.*, meaning ‘who’. The findings reflected that the wh-questions in JA are driven by focus which is embodied in the form of an intonational morpheme.

Al-Shorafat (2013) examined the syntax of wh-questions in SA within the most recent framework advocated by Chomsky (1998, 1999, 2001, 2005, 2007). Chomsky called this latest version the phrase-based theory of syntax. Al-Shorafat found that wh-questions in SA, which is an example of a non-Indo-European language, could be addressed in a principled fashion within the phrase-based approach. The analysis concentrated on the derivation of wh-questions mainly in the unmarked word order (VSO) in SA. The findings reflected that agreement and movement do obey the principles of the phase theory and that this theory not only accounts for well-formed sentences but ill-formed sentences as well.

Yassin (2013) studied wh-movement in JA and EA and found that wh-phrases move in JA but remain in situ in most cases in EA. The descriptive method was used, and the results provided phonological evidence of edge marking in the two dialects, concluding that wh-phrases move to [SPEC CP], and, as a result, JA is anticipated to be marked as left edges of XPs. Contrastingly, the results revealed that epenthesis and vowel reduction mark right edges of XPs in EA. These findings strongly support Richards’s (2006) proposal.

Moustafa (2017) examined the interrogative function in classical Arabic and similarities/differences in the syntactic characteristics of interrogatives between modern SA and classical Arabic. Adopting a qualitative method of analysis, the researcher collected data from newspapers (modern SA) and the Quran (classical Arabic). This study explored four interrogatives (*hal* /, / *kayf* /, /*?ayn* /, / *mata*) and determined the interrogative function in classical Arabic. It also observed shared structures of syntax that are employed in classical and modern SA. Meanwhile, other structures are used only in modern SA and classical Arabic. The results reflected that there are syntactic structures used in both classical Arabic and modern standard Arabic and other structures that are limited to Classical Arabic only or Modern Standard Arabic only.

The above studies elaborated on the concept of interrogation in both English and Arabic or in a single JA dialect. The present research is distinguished from these studies as it attempts to add something new to this domain by presenting a comparison of interrogatives between modern standard Arabic and two varieties of JA: rural Jordanian Arabic (RJA) and urban Jordanian Arabic (UJA).

III. METHODS

This study is qualitative, and the participants and sites were purposefully selected (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Holmes and Hazen (2014) identified several social factors in the inception of sociolinguistics, which include age, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Eckert (2000) stated that ethnography is a search for local classifications (p. 69). A good example of an ethnographic study that uses local classification is Norma Mendoza Denton’s research involving students at a Latino high school in California (2008).

According to Eckert (2012), the ethnography approach in sociolinguistics uses interviews to collect data. Holmes and Hazen (2014) argued that social and external factors are important in analyzing data. They identified speaker groups based on several factors, which are considered the starting point in determining sample size. Because all studies face resource and time limitations, the participant sample is also limited; the more participants interviewed, the better.

The study population included Jordanians living in the northern district of Jordan (Irbid City). The sample consisted of 36 individuals from two different speech communities with different ages, genders, and educational backgrounds. Irbid City was chosen because the researcher has relatives and friends in the selected areas, which will facilitate the process of collecting the required data on the rural dialect, particularly in Dairyousef Village (north of Irbid).

This study investigated 36 examples taken from different speech communities in Jordan (rural and urban). These examples were collected through qualitative unstructured interviews that each involved six to eight participants and were tape-recorded. The data obtained were interrogative particles and sentences in the two studied dialects, while data on SA interrogation were gathered from well-known grammar books.

Milroy and Gordon (2003, pp. 28–29) and Tagliamonte (2006, p. 31) stated that large samples are not necessary and suggested a minimum of two participants per cell. Therefore, the researcher had at least two participants per cell and a maximum of 15 participants per cell.

The researcher obtained the necessary data by inquiring about how the participants ask questions about a certain thing, person, time, place, reason, number, price, and others. After recording the interrogative sentences, they produced in their own dialects, the researcher asked them to say the same interrogative sentences in English. As a result, several interrogative structures were formed, for instance:

UJA: *miin yalli kasar hayel-kaaseh?*

RJA: *man kasara haaḏi-lkaaseh?*

SA: *man kasara haadāl-ka?as?*

E: “Who broke this glass?”

The researcher collected the examples and transferred them to their SA counterparts which he produced. The examples were classified according to the interrogative particles used to form them and the speech community from

which the examples were collected. Then, the study conducted a descriptive analysis of the interrogative particles in SA and JAD by discussing their structural and functional differences. Furthermore, the study examined the differences and similarities between the two dialects themselves and some other Arabic dialects.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

The analysis of data revealed that the speakers of UJA used the interrogative particles ‘?eeš / Šuu’ which means ‘Maa / maadaa’ in SA and ‘what’ in English, ‘Keef/kiif’ which means ‘Kayfa’ in SA and ‘how’ in English, ‘miin’ which is pronounced as ‘man’ in SA and ‘who’ in English. They also used ‘min ween/mneen/min feen’ which means ‘min ?ayna (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘from where’ in English, ‘la-ween/ween’ which is pronounced as ‘?ilaa ?aynaa (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘to where’ in English. Furthermore, the participants used the particle ‘min ?eeš/ min šuu’ which means ‘Mim maa (min maadaa) (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘From what/ Of what’ in English, ‘Min miin’ which carries the meaning of ‘Mim man (min man) (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘from whom’ in English, ‘Laweeš/ Leeš/ La?eeš/ 9šaan šuu/ 9šaan eeš/ Mišaanšuu/ Mišaan?eeš/ Leeh/ Laweeh/ Lašuu’ which means ‘limaadaa (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘why’ in English, ‘B?eeš/ bšuu’ which carries the meaning of ‘Bima(aḍa) (preposition + particle) in SA and ‘Of what/ By what/ In what’ in English, ‘9a(la)-?eeš/ 9a(la)-šuu’ which means ‘9ala ma(aḍaa) (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘on what’ in English, and ‘9an šuu/ 9an?eeš’ which means ‘9amma (9an maadaa (preposition + particle)’ and ‘about what’ in English.

It is also revealed that the speakers of RJA used the interrogative particles ‘Šuu’ which means ‘Maa/maadaa’ in SA and ‘what’ in English, ‘Šloon/ Ćeef’ which means ‘Kayfa’ in SA and ‘how’ in English, ‘Miin/Man’ which is pronounced as ‘man’ in SA and ‘who’ in English. They also used ‘min ween/mneen’ which means ‘min? ayna (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘from where’ in English, ‘la-ween/ween’ which is pronounced as ‘?ilaa?aynaa (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘to where’ in English. Furthermore, the participants used the particle ‘min šuu/mineeš’ which means ‘Mimmaa (min maadaa) (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘From what/Of what’ in English, ‘Min miin/ min man’ which carries the meaning of ‘Mimman (min man) (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘from whom’ in English, ‘Laweeš/ Leeš’ which means ‘limaadaa (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘why’ in English, ‘Bšuu/ Beeš’ which carries the meaning of ‘Bima(aḍa) (preposition + particle) in SA and ‘Of what/ By what/ In what’ in English, ‘9a(la)-šuu’ which means ‘9ala ma(aḍaa) (preposition + particle)’ in SA and ‘on what’ in English, and ‘9an šuu’ which means ‘9amma (9an maadaa (preposition + particle)’ and ‘about what’ in English. Table 1 below shows interrogative particles in SA, UJA, RJA and English as used by the participants.

TABLE 1
INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES IN SA, UJA, RJA AND ENGLISH AS USED BY THE PARTICIPANTS

E	SA	UJA	RJA
1. What	<i>Maa</i> <i>maadaa</i>	<i>?eeš</i> <i>šuu</i>	<i>šuu</i>
2. How	<i>Kayfa</i>	<i>Keef</i> <i>Kiif</i>	<i>šloon</i> <i>čeeš</i>
3. Who	<i>Man</i>	<i>Miin</i>	<i>Miin</i> <i>Man</i>
4. From where	<i>min?ayna</i> (preposition + particle)	<i>min ween</i> <i>mneen</i> <i>min feen</i>	<i>min ween</i> <i>mneen</i>
5. To where	<i>?ilaa?aynaa</i> (preposition + particle)	<i>la-ween</i> <i>ween</i>	<i>la-ween</i> <i>ween</i>
6. From what Of what	<i>Mimmaa</i> (<i>min maadaa</i>) (preposition + particle)	<i>min?eeš</i> <i>min šuu</i>	<i>min šuu</i> <i>mineeš</i>
7. From whom	<i>Mimman</i> (<i>min man</i>) (preposition + particle)	<i>Min miin</i>	<i>Min miin</i> <i>min man</i>
8. Why	<i>limaađaa</i> (preposition + particle)	<i>Laweeš</i> <i>Leeš</i> <i>La?eeš</i> <i>9šaan šuu</i> <i>9šaan eeš</i> <i>Mišaanšuu</i> <i>Mišaan?eeš</i> <i>Leeh</i> <i>Laweeh</i> <i>Lašuu</i>	<i>Laweeš</i> <i>Leeš</i>
9. Of what By what In what	<i>Bima(ađa)</i> (preposition + particle)	<i>B?eeš</i> <i>Bšuu</i>	<i>Bšuu</i> <i>Beeš</i>
10. On what	<i>9ala ma(ađaa)</i> (preposition + particle)	<i>9a(la)-?eeš</i> <i>9a(la)-šuu</i>	<i>9a(la)-šuu</i>
11. About what	<i>9amma (9an</i> <i>maadaa</i> (preposition + particle)	<i>9an šuu</i> <i>9an?eeš</i>	<i>9an šuu</i> <i>9an šuu</i>

The following sections discuss each English interrogative particle along with their correspondents in SA and its colloquial JA correspondents (urban and rural). The discussion will include references to interrogatives in other Arabic dialects. It will also provide an analysis of the points of difference between SA and its dialects; UJA and RJA, on the one hand, and English language on the other. The focus will be made on the impact of SA and its dialects; UJA and RJA on the way English interrogative sentences are formed.

B. Discussion

(a). The Particle What

This particle, which is used to ask about an object or a nonhuman, is equivalent to the SA interrogative particles *maa* and *maadaa*. The speakers of UJA and RJA use the particles *šuu* or *?eeš* to carry the same meaning of the English *what* and the SA *maa* and *maadaa*. Here, it is urging to distinguish between the SA *maa* and *maadaa* since the two particles carry the same meaning. In this respect, Farghal (1986) argued that when the copula-deletion rule takes effect, the SA question-word *maadaa* is converted to *maa* via lexical rule to meet the following lexical entries in Arabic grammar.

1a. *maadaa(-V)*

1b. *maa(-N)*

One may perceive that *maa* is often followed by a noun or pronoun and *maadaa* by a verb whereas JAD particles follow no certain lexical rule and can be succeeded by a noun or verb.

Moreover, *maa* and *maadaa* are rendered as *šuu* or *?eeš* in UJA as explained by the following examples:

1) UJA: *šuu/?eeš 9alaa?it yalli btihih bilmauduu9?*

SA: *maa 9alaaqatu maataquulu bilmauduu9i?*

E: "What is the relation between the subject and what you say?"

On the other hand, the English particle *what* is often followed by an auxiliary verb, e.g., *is*, *are*, *can*, etc. Since Arabic has no auxiliary verbs, some participants tended to say, "What is the relation between the subject and what you say?".

Therefore, this point of difference between SA and English causes the participants to omit the auxiliary verb 'is' even though the interrogative sentence still achieves its communicative purpose.

2) UJA: *šuu/?eeš biddak tis?alni?*

SA: *maađaa turiidu? an tas?alani?*

E: "What do you want to ask me?"

It is noted that SA and its Jordanian dialects have no auxiliary verbs. This is why a few participants did not use the auxiliary verbs 'is' and 'do'. Instead of saying "What is the relation between the subject and what you say?" most of the participants say, "What the relation between the subject and what you say?". Furthermore, the participants committed the same error when they say, "What you want to ask me?", instead of saying "What do you want to ask me?".

In UJA, the speakers use the interrogative particles ?eeš and 'šuu'. In this respect, šuu is used more frequently than šuu. On the other hand, the SA *maa* and *maada*, which means 'what' are rendered as šuu as shown below:

3) RJA: *šuu haaĐ?*

SA: *maa haađa?*

E: "What is this?"

We notice several similarities between UJA and RJA in their use of šuu.

In Baghdadi dialect, as shown by McCarthy and Raffouli (1964), one can observe shared interrogative particles with JAD. Gulf Arabic, according to Qafisheh (1977), uses the interrogative particle šuu, which is like UJA and RJA. In Egypt (McGuirk, 1986), the used particle is ?eeš, which differs on the surface from ?iš in UJA. Urban Hijazi Arabic (Sieny, 1978) uses ?eeš, a particle that is close to ?iš in UJA. Bedouins over the coast of Egypt (Matar, 1981) share the particle ?eeš with UJA.

(b). The Particle How

This particle is used when inquiring about how an individual performs an action. It is equivalent to *Kayfa* in SA, *šloon* in RJA and *kiif* in UJA. Examples from the participants' speech are listed below:

4) UJA: *keef Halleet-?is-su? aal?*

SA: *kayfa Halalta-s-su?aal?*

E: "How did you answer the question?"

The interrogative sentences uttered by several participants reflected the impact of their SA as well as their JAD on the interrogative form they produced. The auxiliary verb 'did' is omitted and the morpheme of pastness '-ed' is added to the verb 'answer'. The interrogative sentence they produced is "How you answered the question?". This evidently shows the impact of the participants' mother tongue which has no auxiliary verbs. Furthermore, the Arabic verb *Halalta* is used in its past form, while its English equivalent, in such an interrogative sentence, should be written in its infinitive form 'answer' since the morpheme of pastness is indicated by the auxiliary verb 'did'.

Kayfa matches with *šloon* or *čeef* in RJA, as illustrated by examples (5) and (6) below:

5) RJA: *šloon tusta9 mal?*

SA: *kayfa tusta9 mal?*

E: "How is it used?"

6) RJA: *čeef ibti9 malih alTabxah?*

SA: *kayfa taTbuxiina haađa at-ta9aam?*

E: "How do you make this food?"

According to Meshkorow (1972), the interrogative particle *kiif* is used by UJA speakers, and *šloon* is widespread in RJA. Gulf Arabic (Qafisheh, 1977) uses *šloon* and *čeef*, which are the same as the RJA particles, and *keef*, which is the same as the UJA particle. Palestinians, according to Shahin (1999), use *čiif*. The particle *kayfa* matches with *izzay* in Egyptian dialect, which is completely different from those used in JAD.

In the two colloquial Jordanian dialects that have been studied, one can inquire about someone's health by using *kayfa* (*keef* and *kiif*) followed by *haluk*, *wad9uk*, or? *umuurak*, or the particle can be used with a suffixed pronoun in UJA and RJA.

The following examples show *kayfa* followed by a masculine or feminine singular pronoun in the two dialects of the studied districts:

SA: *kayfa haluka?*

7) UJA: *keefak? / keefik? / kiifak? / kiifik?*

8) RJA: a. *keefak? / čeefič?*

b. *šloonak? / šloonič?*

E: "How are you?"

(c). The Particle Who

The English particle *Who*, which is used to ask about a person, is pronounced as "Man" in SA and is followed by a noun or a verb. *Man* in SA is replaced by *miin* in UJA and *miin* or *man* in RJA as shown in examples (9) and (10):

9) UJA: *miin yalli kasar hayel-kaaseh?*

RJA: *man kasara haaĐi-lkaaseah?*

SA: *man kasara haađal-ka?as?*

E: "Who broke this glass?"

10) RJA: *miin/man ?ija 9alihda9iš?*

SA: *man ja?a-s-saa9ata-al-Hadiata 9ašrata?*

E: "Who came at eleven o'clock?"

The participants are aware of the correct interrogative forms of asking about the doer of an action. They use the correct syntactic order of this interrogative form. Here, it is worth highlighting the similarity between UJA, RJA, SA and English. The interrogative sentence in example number 9 above, which functions as a question about the doer of breaking of the glass, has the same word order, without adding new lexical items. That is, the English interrogative particle "who" is equivalent to *miinyalli* 'man' and *man* in UJA, RJA and SA respectively. Furthermore, the interrogative sentence in example number 10 above, which functions as a question about the doer of coming at eleven o'clock, has the same word order, without adding new lexical items. That is, the English interrogative particle "who" is equivalent to *miin/man* and it is followed by *?ija*, which means 'came' in English and *ja?a* in SA.

Notably, both UJA and RJA use the same interrogative particle *miin*. RJA is also observed to use the SA interrogative particle *man*, which may have infiltrated this dialect through its speakers' education.

Examples (11) and (12) below show that when the colloquial particle *man* in RJA is attached to the subjective pronouns *hwaa* (he) and *hiya* (she), it becomes *mannu* and *manni* or remains *man-hu* or *man-hi* and, when attached to *hum* (they (mas. pl.)) and *hunna* (they (fem. pl.)), it becomes *miin hum* or *miinhumma* and *miinhin* or *miinhinnih*, respectively.

11) RJA: *man-hu/ mannu / miinhuhaad?*

SA: *man haada?*

E: "Who is he?"

12) RJA: *man-hi / manni/ ?il-lantatak hallera?*

SA: *man ?allati ?a9Tatak haađ-ad-diinar?*

E: "Who (fem.) gave you this dinar?"

The English particle *who*, as it is evident in the above examples, does not account for masculinity and femininity. It is different from its Arabic equivalents; *man* in SA, *man-hi / manni*, *man-hu/ mannu* in RJA and UJA. Moreover, *man* is used in three positions: as a subject (*who*), as an object (*whom*), or as a possessive pronoun (*whose*). This is illustrated in some UJA examples below:

13) UJA: *miin Darab miin?*

SA: *man Daraba man?*

E: "Who hit whom?"

14) UJA: *9urs miin? elyoom?*

SA: *9ursu man?alyawma?*

E: "Whose wedding is it today?"

The Arabic equivalent for the English *who* is *man* and it assumes the above mentioned three positions in RJA, but the pronunciation differs. Some areas in the Arab world share interrogative particles with UJA and RJA. For instance, *miin* is used in Egyptian (Mitchell, 1956), urban Hijazi (Sieny, 1978), and Syrian (Meshkorow, 1972).

In RJA, *man* is used by Bedouins over the coast of Egypt (Matar, 1981) and in the Gulf Arabic (McCarthy & Raffouli, 1964).

(d). *The Preposition Plus Particle From Where:*

The English interrogative form *from where* that includes preposition plus particle means *Min? Aynaa* in SA. Its SA, UJA and RJA equivalents are followed by a noun, verb, or preposition. UJA uses the particles *min ween*, *min feen*, or *mneen* to replace the SA correspondent, as shown in example (15):

15) UJA: *min ween/ min feen/ mneen? Ištareeti fustaanik?*

SA: *min? ayna-š-tarayti fustanaki?*

E: "From where you bought your dress?"

The RJA equivalents for the English particle *from where* are *min ween* and *mneen*, which match with the SA interrogative particle *min?ayna*, as the following example shows:

16) RJA: *min ween/mneen ištariit-ilxaatim?*

SA: *min? ayna-štarayta-lxaatem?*

E: "From where you bought the ring?"

One would notice that *min ween* and *mneen* are common particles used in JAD. These particles may also be shared with other dialects, as *mneen* is used in Egypt (Mitchell, 1956), Syria (Meshkorow, 1972), and Palestine (Shahin, 1999); *min ween* is used in Gulf Arabic (Qafisheh, 1977) and *min feen* is used in urban Hijazi (Sieny, 1978). Much significantly, the JAD equivalents for the English preposition plus particle *from where* occur in the same position in the sentence structure. This is evident in the above listed sentences which show that the RJA *min ween/mneen*, the SA *min ?ayna* and the English form *where* come initially in the interrogative sentences.

(e). *The Particle Plus Preposition Where to:*

The English particle plus preposition *where to*, which is the equivalent of *?ilaa? aynaa* in SA, is used when asking about a place someone is going to. It corresponds to *la-ween* or *la-feen* in UJA and *la-ween* in RJA. The following examples illustrate these uses:

17) UJA: *la-ween/la-feen biddak truuh?*

SA: *?ilaa ?ayna sataḏhabu?*

E: "Where do you want to go?"

18) RJA: *la-ween haabtruuh?*

SA: *?ilaa ?aynaa turiidu?an taḏhab?*

E: "Where do you want to go?"

It is obvious that the English interrogative form of *where to* is separated by other lexical items, as is the case in the above examples, and this syntactic structure is different from that of Arabic and its Jordanian dialects. The Arabic version of *where to* is *?ilaa?ayna*, while the two dialects use the particle *la-ween*. Some participants followed this rule and applied it to English when they said, "Where to do you want to go?"

It is important to know that the particle *ween*, without the preposition *?ilaa*, also functions like *la-ween*, as in examples (19) and (20).

19) UJA: *ween/feen biddak truuh?*

20) RJA: *ween biddak truuh?*

SA: *?ilaa ?aynaa turiidu ?an taḏhab?*

E: "Where do you want to go?"

Syrian (Meshkorow, 1972) and Palestinian dialects (Shahin, 1999) share the same particle (*la-ween*) with the two Jordanian dialects.

(f). *The Preposition Plus Particle From What or of What:*

The preposition plus particle from what or of what carries the meaning of the SA interrogative particle *maḏāa*, which is attached to the preposition *min*. It is pronounced *mimmaa* to mean "from what" or "of what." It corresponds to *min?eeš* or *min šuu* in UJA and *min šuu* or *mineeš* in RJA. Here are some examples:

21) UJA: *min eeš maḡmuul hada-?akil?*

SA: *mimmaa suniḡa haḏa at-taḡaam?*

E: "What is this food made of?"

22) UJA: *min šuu msaawiyih hal-kaḡkaat?*

SA: *mimmaa sanaḡti haadīhil-kaḡkaat?*

E: "From what did you make these cookies?"

23) RJA: *min šuu biṭkawwan?*

SA: *mimmaa yatakawwan?*

E: "What does it consist of?"

24) RJA: *mineeš sawweetuh?*

SA: *mimmaa sanaḡtahu?*

E: "What did you make it of?"

UJA and RJA use the same particle *min šuu*.

(g). *The Preposition Plus Particle From Whom:*

The preposition plus particle from whom is articulated in SA as *mimman*. It consists of the preposition *min* accompanying the interrogative particle *man*, and it is articulated as *mimman* according to the assimilation rule and means "from whom." *Mimman* in SA matches with *min miin* in UJA and *min miin* or *min man* in RJA as in examples (25), (26), and (27).

25) UJA: *min miin hada-l-iktaab?*

SA: *mimman haadā-l-kitaab?*

E: "From whom is this book?"

26) RJA: *min miin hazzee tuunaat?*

SA: *mimman haadā az-zaituunu?*

E: "From whom are these olives?"

27) RJA: *min man jibta-Ṭoomaat?*

SA: *mimman ?aḤDart a-Ṭawma?*

E: "From whom did you bring the garlic?"

It is worth noting that the SA and JADs equivalents for the English preposition plus particle from whom occur in the same position in the sentence structure. This is noticed in the above listed sentences which show that the RJA *min man*, the SA *mimman* and the English *from whom* come initially in the interrogative sentences. Urban Hijazi (Sieny, 1978) uses the same *min miin* particle as UJA and RJA. In Baghdad (McCarthy and Raffouli, 1964), people use the particle *mimmen*, which is completely different from JAD.

(h). *The Preposition Plus Particle Why or What for:*

The preposition plus particle *why* or *what for* means *Limaada* in SA, which consists of the preposition *li-* and *-maada* to mean “why” or “what for”. It is used to ask about the reason for something. *Limaada* in SA corresponds to *leeš*, *la?eeš*, *9saan šuu*, *9saan?eeš*, *mišaanšuu*, *mišaan?eeš*, *leeh*, *laweeh*, *laweeš*, or *la šuu* in UJA and to *laweeš* or *lees* in RJA. This is shown in the examples below.

28) UJA: *lees ruHit?*

SA: *limaađaa đahabta?*

E: “Why did you go?”

29) UJA: *laweeh btaakol bsor9a?*

SA: *limaađaa ta?kulu bisur9a?*

E: “Why do you eat fast?”

30) RJA: *leeš/laweeš ba9dna haan?*

SA: *limaađaa ma zilnahuna?*

E: “Why are we still here?”

Significantly, the SA and JADs equivalents for the English preposition plus particle *what for* or *why* occur in the same position in the sentence structure. This is noticed in the above listed examples which show that the RJA *leeš/laweeš*, the SA *limaađaa* and the English *what for* or *why* come initially in the interrogative sentences. The JAD share the particle *leeš*, which is also used among Palestinian (Shahin, 1999), Syrian (Meshkorow, 1972), urban Hijazi (Sieny, 1978), and Gulf people (Qafisheh, 1977).

(i). *The Preposition Plus Particle by What, in What, or of What:*

The preposition plus particle *by what*, *in what*, or *of what* corresponds to *bimaađaa* in SA, *b?eeš* and *bšuu* in UJA and *beeš* or *bšuu* in RJA. Observe the following examples:

31) UJA: *bšuu/b?eeš ?ijeet?*

32) RJA: *beeš/bšuu ?ijeet?*

SA: *bimaađaa ?atayta?*

E: “By what did you come?”

UJA and RJA use the same particle *bšuu*.

(j). *The Preposition Plus Particle on What/Why:*

The preposition plus particle *on what/why* corresponds to the SA *maadaa* which is attached to the preposition *9ala*. Notably, *9ala maadaa* in SA matches with *9a(la)?eeš* or *9a(la) šuu* in UJA and *9a(la) šuu* in RJA as in following examples:

33) UJA: *9a(la)?eeš / 9a(la)šuu b9dik bitHibiih?*

34) RJA: *9a(la) šuu ba9dič bitHibiih?*

SA: *9ala maadaa ma zilti tuHibiinahu?*

E: “On what/why do you (fem. sg.) still love him?”

UJA and RJA use the same particle *9a(la)šuu*.

(k). *The Preposition Plus Particle About What:*

The preposition plus particle *about what* corresponds to the Arabic *9an ma* (*ađaa*). Moreover, its equivalents in UJA and RJA are *9an šuu* or *9an?eeš* and *9an šuu* respectively, as in the following examples:

35) UJA: *9an šuu/9an?eeš btiHkii?*

36) RJA: *9an šuu btiHkii?*

SA: *9an ma(ađaa) tataHaddaθiin?*

E: “About what are you (fem. sg.) talking?”

UJA and RJA use the same particle *9an šuu*.

V. CONCLUSION

The data implied in the 36 selected examples was collected through unstructured interviews and tape-recording and were analyzed qualitatively based on the interrogation forms in English and SA. The most important finding is that SA and its Jordanian dialects have no auxiliary verbs. This is why several participants did not use the auxiliary verbs like ‘is’ and ‘do’. In this respect, the interrogative sentences uttered by a few participants reflected the impact of their SA as well as their JAD on the interrogative form they produced. For example, the auxiliary verb ‘did’ is omitted and the morpheme of pastness ‘-ed’ is added to the verbs in case the participants made interrogative sentences.

For all practical purposes, the differences between the forms and uses of interrogatives in English, SA and JADs remain an unexplored area. This study aimed to discuss the extent to which regional variations of Jordanian dialect, which differ according to geographical location, impact the form and use of English interrogatives. It found that colloquial dialects vary not only across countries and towns but even across villages. This research explored how some forms of an interrogative particle are used in English and different varieties of SA and two JA dialects: UJA and RJA. It also examined the differences between SA and JA depending on the forms and uses of interrogative particles. In

addition, this study identified the similarities and differences between JAD and SA. Findings showed that some forms of JAD interrogatives have more than one meaning or usage. Some SA interrogative particles have only one counterpart in JAD, some have two, some have three, and others have more. Some interrogative particles in JAD may share the same particles as those in SA, while others are completely or slightly different. Furthermore, some particles are widespread, while others are slightly used. JAD shares some interrogative particles with each other as well as with some other Arabic dialects. Finally, this study showed that people of a certain area in Jordan, especially females in rural areas, tend to use the particles of other dialects, such as those in urban areas, for purposes of socialization and prestige.

APPENDIX

LIST OF ARABIC PHONETIC SYMBOLS

Arabic Consonants	Symbol	Description
ء	ʔ	Glottalstop
ب	B	Voiced bilabial stop
ت	T	Voiceless dento-alveolar stop
ث	θ	Voiceless interdental fricative
ج	J	Voiced postalveolar affricate
ح	H	Voiceless pharyngeal fricative
خ	X	Voiceless uvular fricative
د	D	Voiced dento-alveolar stop
ذ	ð	Voicedinter-dental fricative
ر	R	Voiced alveo-palatal trill
ز	Z	Voiced alveolar fricative
س	S	Voiceless alveolar fricative
ش	ʃ	Voiceless alveo-palatal fricative
ص	S	Voiceless alveolar emphatic fricative
ض	D	Voiced alveolar emphatic stop
ط	T	Voiceless dento-alveolar emphatic stop
ظ	Ḍ	Voiceless alveolar emphatic fricative
ع	ʕ	Voiced pharyngeal fricative
غ	Y	Voiced uvular fricative
ف	F	Voiceless labio-dental fricative
ق	Q	Voiced uvular stop
ك	K	Voiceless velar stop

CONSONANTS

Arabic Consonants	Symbol	Description
ل	L	Voiced alveolar lateral
م	M	Voiced bilabial nasal
ن	N	Voiced alveolar nasal
ه	H	Voiceless glottal fricative
و	W	Voiced labio-velar glide
ي	Y	Voiced palatal glide
تش	Č	Voiceless palato-alveolar affricate

VOWELS

Short Vowels	Symbol	Description
فتحة	a	Low, front, unrounded
ضمة	u	High, back, rounded
كسرة	i	Front, high, unrounded

LONG VOWELS

Long vowels are indicated by double letters, that is, aa, ii, oo, and ee.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmed, T., & Kumar, F. A. (2022). An Analysis of Intonation Patterns of English Interrogative Sentences Produced by Undergraduate Students in District Mansehra. *Global Language Review*, 7(2), 520-531.
- [2] Alfarhan, E. (1981). *Kfarsoum dialect*. Investigation a. Fakhri Nael Obeidat, Amman, Jordan, Al-Yazuri Scientific House for Publishing and Distribution.
- [3] Almomani, A. A. (2006). *Interrogative sentence between Arabic and English: A contrastive study* [PhD Dissertation, Yarmouk University]. Retrieved August 2, 2023, from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=http://faculty.yu.edu.jo/raslan/Lists/News/Attachm ents/1/cv%2520%25D8%25AF%25D9%2583%25D8%25AA%25D9%2588%25D8%25B1%2520%25D8%25B1%25D8%25B3%25D9%2584%25D8%25A7%25D9%2586.doc&ved=2ahUKEwj0tIWky5GBAxUTTKQEHYTPC9QQFnoECB8QAQ&us g=AOvVaw2FEA9PBYYI1VlsmAPLaNIOL>.
- [4] Al-Momani, M. I., & Al-Saidat, E.M. (2010). The syntax of wh-movement in Jordanian Arabic. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 40(4), 609-628.

- [5] Alqasem, M. F. M. (2017). Wh Question In-Situ and Movement in Najdi Dialect. *International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication*, 5(9), 39-43.
- [6] Al-Shorafat, M. O. (2013). A phase-based account of wh-questions in Standard Arabic. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 1(4), 179-190. <https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2013.010402>
- [7] Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge.
- [8] Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Foris Publications.
- [9] Chomsky, N. (2007). Approaching UG from below. In U. Sauerland, & H-M. Gartner (Eds.), *Interfaces + recursion = Language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*. De Gruyter.
- [10] Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Blackwell Publishing.
- [11] Eckert, P. (2012). Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of variation. *Annals of Anthropology*, 41, 87-100. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-092611-145828>
- [12] Farghal, M. A. (1986). *The syntax of wh-questions and related matters in Arabic* [PhD Thesis, Indiana University], Indiana University Press. Retrieved, August 3, 2023, from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-syntax-of-wh-questions-and-related-matters-in-Farghal/688d14562ca61f3cac619e389d78c5f279faf435>.
- [13] Gharaibeh, H. A. (1999). *The role of the particles of interrogative, negation, condition, and assertion in the syntactic and semantic behavior of the kernel sentences in Arabic* [PhD Dissertation, Yarmouk Univeristy]. Retrieved, August 7, 2023, from <http://repository.yu.edu.jo/bitstream/123456789/5057/1/436824.pdf>.
- [14] Glotkina, A. A. (2022). Forming Interrogative Sentences In English (The Material Based On The Theme "Airline, Airport And Aviation Management"). *Современное педагогическое образование*, (2), 183-187.
- [15] Gupta, S. (2018). *English Grammar & Composition Very Useful for All Competitive Examinations*: Arihant.
- [16] Handayani, M. (2017). Interrogative Sentence Error of Praja Ipdn West Kalimantan Campus in Conversation. *Jurnal Ilmiah Spectral*, 3(2), 012-021.
- [17] Holmes, J., & Hazen, K. (2014). *Research methods in sociolinguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [18] Issam, Abu, G. (2006). *The origins of grammar according to Al-Suyuti, between theory and practice*. Cairo: The Egyptian General Authority.
- [19] Joshi, M. (2014). *English Interrogative Sentences: Common Interrogative Patterns*, Booktango.
- [20] Katanani, E. J. K. (2002). *Intonation of Interrogation of English and the Accent of Yazour in Palestine*. Ph.D degree, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Retrieved, July 24, 2023, from https://library.ju.edu.jo/EN-library/ENlib_Theses.aspx.
- [21] Khawas, Y. (2021). *Negative and Interrogative Transformation in English and Tharu* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of English Education). Retrieved, July 26, 2023, from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/bitstream/123456789/10271/1/Cover%2520page.pdf&ved=2ahUKEWiAqcWT0JGBAxVbUKQEHXe4BfYQFnoECAwQAQ&usq=AOvVaw3ZI2JFh3p00YjLUKB4-8Ig>.
- [22] Mahfud, R. (2021). *English Grammar - RajawaliPers, PT*. RajaGrafindoPersada.
- [23] Matar, A. (1981). *The Bedouin dialect in the north coast of the Arab Republic of Egypt: A linguistic study*, Cairo. Dar Al-Ma'arif.
- [24] McCarthy, R. J., & Raffouli, F. (1964). *Spoken Arabic of Baghdād*. Librairie Orientale.
- [25] McGuirk, R. H. (1986). *Colloquial Arabic of Egypt*. Routledge.
- [26] Meshkorow, E. K. (1972). *Teaching Arabic language for Russians by Syrian dialect*. Moscow.
- [27] Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. J. (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and interpretation*. Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758359>
- [28] Mitchell, T. F. (1956). *An introduction to Egyptian colloquial Arabic*. Clarendon Press.
- [29] Moustafa, E. (2017). *Language variation in classical and modern standard Arabic: The Case of Interrogation*. [Master's Thesis, American University in Cairo] AUC Knowledge Fountain. Retrieved, August 1, 2023, from <https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/1359>.
- [30] Natal, E., Maca, S., & Abeng, A. T. (2022). Interrogative Sentences in Torajanese and English: A Contrastive Study. *Humaniora: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Education*, 2(1), 18-27.
- [31] Ohl, P. (2007). Unselected embedded interrogatives in German and English: S-selection as dependency formation. *Linguistische Berichte*, 212, 403. Retrieved, September 4, 2023, from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Peter-Oehl/publication/237617421_Unselected_Embedded_Interrogatives_in_German_and_English_S-Selection_as_Dependency_Formation_1/links/5811e0c108ae205f8102fab7/Unselected-Embedded-Interrogatives-in-German-and-English-S-Selection-as-Dependency-Formation-1.pdf
- [32] Qafisheh, H. A. (1977). *A short reference grammar of Gulf Arabic*. University of Arizona Press.
- [33] Quirk, R., & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. Dorling Kindersley.
- [34] Richards, N. (2006). *Beyond strength and weakness*. MIT Press.
- [35] Shahin, K. N. (1999). *Palestinian Arabic Texts*. Lincom Europa.
- [36] Siemund, P. (2017). 'Interrogative clauses in English and the social economics of questions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 199, 15-32. DOI 10.1016/j.pragma.2017.07.010.
- [37] Sieny, M. E. (1978). *The syntax of Urban Hijazi Arabic*. University Microfilms International.
- [38] Tagliamonte, S. A. (2006). *Analyzing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801624>
- [39] Trudgill, P. (1995). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Penguin.
- [40] Umami, M. (2015). A Contrastive Analysis of Interrogative Sentences in English and Indonesian. *Register Journal*, 8(2), 151-162.
- [41] Wahba, W. (1984). *Wh-constructions in Egyptian Arabic* [PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois] Urbana Champaign ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- [42] Yassin, A. (2013). Syntax-prosody interface: Wh-movement in Jordanian Arabic. *Studies in the linguistic sciences: Illinois working papers*, 37-52.

Natheer Mohammad Ahmad Al-Omari is a PhD student at School of Language, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau, Malaysia.

Manjet Kaur Mehar Singh is an Associate Professor and Deputy Dean, School of Language, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau, Malaysia.