| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Navigating Conflict and Dialogue: A Conceptual Exploration of Power, Politeness, and Pragmatics in Student-Professor Disagreements in Jordan

Areej Mohammad Mahmoud Al-Hawamdeh[1], Salaam M. Alhawamdeh[2], Rose Fowler Al-Hawamdeh[3], Natheer Mohammad Ahmad Al-Omari[4], Mouad Mohammed Al-Natour[5]✉, Haitham M.K AlYousef[6] and Abdul Raheem Mohammad Al Jaraedah[7]

[1256]Department of English Language and Literature, Jerash University, Jordan

[3]Department of Languages, School of Social and Basic Sciences, Hussein Technical University, Amman, Jordan

[4]Ministry of Education, Jordan

[7]Department of Arabic language and literature, Jerash university, Jerash Jordan

Corresponding Author: Mouad Mohammed Al-Natour, **E-mail**: msgmouad@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

Disagreement is intrinsic to human interaction, particularly within academic environments where diverse perspectives often arise between students and professors. The expression of disagreement is significantly influenced by cultural, social, and institutional contexts. This study investigates disagreement strategies employed by Jordanian students and their professors during classroom interactions at Jerash University in Jordan. Employing a qualitative research design, this study combines direct observation and semi-structured interviews to explore the strategies used by both students and professors. The participants include English and translation students and their professors, selected to represent varied academic experiences. Two primary hypotheses are tested: first, that students and professors share common disagreement strategies; and second, that professors, due to their higher status, employ different strategies compared to students. This research aims to identify these strategies and uncover the motivations behind their use. The findings are expected to provide insights into how power dynamics, cultural norms, and social roles influence disagreement management in the academic environment. The study's results could significantly enhance the understanding of communication practices in Jordanian higher education, offering practical applications for improving classroom dynamics and fostering more effective communication. Furthermore, the findings may serve as a basis for future research on politeness strategies and their implications in cross-cultural academic settings.

| KEYWORDS

Disagreement Strategies, Classroom Interaction, Jordanian Students/Professors, Power Dynamics, Cultural Norms

1. Introduction

Disagreement is an inevitable part of human communication, particularly in academic environments where differing opinions, ideas, and perspectives are often expressed. As a speech act, disagreement serves as a way for interactants to communicate dissatisfaction or to challenge others' viewpoints. Such expressions are vital for the academic discourse. In the context of higher education, such disagreements are not only necessary for intellectual growth but also act as key moments where students and professors engage in critical discussions, negotiations of power, and the assertion of individual perspectives. However, the strategies used to express disagreement vary significantly, shaped by factors such as power dynamics, cultural expectations, and the relationship between the interlocutors. Therefore, understanding these strategies becomes paramount for fostering constructive academic environments.

In academic settings, the way disagreement is articulated can impact not only the outcome of a conversation but also the overall quality of communication between students and professors. Effective communication is essential for a positive learning environment. When students disagree with professors, the power structure inherently at play often influences how disagreement is framed—either by mitigating or softening the disagreement to preserve face or by using more direct forms to demonstrate the strength of their opposition. On the other hand, professors may employ more authoritative or strong disagreement strategies to maintain control of the classroom and assert their expertise. Understanding these strategies is crucial for enhancing communication within academic environments and ensuring that disagreements contribute to productive dialogue rather than conflict. This balance is key to a healthy academic exchange.

While previous studies have investigated the linguistic aspects of disagreement across various cultures and contexts, research specifically focusing on the reasons behind the selection of particular disagreement strategies, especially in Jordanian academic settings, remains scarce. This gap in research highlights the need for more context-specific studies. Most of the existing literature has examined the frequency and preference of disagreement strategies used by Jordanian students, often quantitatively, without delving into the underlying motivations for these choices. These studies, though insightful, do not fully explore the reasons why Jordanians choose certain strategies over others—an aspect that is particularly important for understanding the broader cultural and pragmatic factors that influence communication in this context. A deeper understanding of these motivations can provide valuable insights into cultural communication norms.

This study addresses this gap by investigating the explicit and implicit motivations behind the disagreement strategies used by Jordanian students and their professors at Jerash University. By focusing on these motivations, the research seeks to uncover how cultural, social, and institutional factors shape the ways in which disagreements are expressed and managed in the classroom. The goal is to provide a more nuanced view of these interactions. Furthermore, the study aims to explore how power dynamics, social relationships, and the role of politeness influence the choice of disagreement strategies. By conducting a qualitative analysis that combines both observational data and semi-structured interviews, this research provides a more comprehensive understanding of how these strategies are used in practice, revealing the complexities of disagreement within this specific context.

This research is significant because it will contribute to a deeper understanding of the pragmatic functions of disagreement in Jordanian academic discourse, especially in terms of how power and politeness strategies are employed. By exploring the reasons behind the use of these strategies, the study will also provide valuable insights for educators and researchers interested in enhancing communication in academic environments. Additionally, the findings could offer practical applications for improving teacher-student interactions and promoting a more respectful and effective academic dialogue. Building upon this foundational understanding, the subsequent literature review will delve into existing research on disagreement strategies, power dynamics in academic settings, and cultural influences on communication, thereby contextualizing the present study within the broader scholarly landscape.

2. Literature Review

This section presents two key components: a review of past studies and the analytical framework. The review of past studies will explore prior research in the fields of speech act theory and disagreement. By examining these studies, we aim to provide a comprehensive overview of the existing literature and identify gaps that this research seeks to address. The analytical framework will elucidate the theoretical underpinnings, and the specific model employed to analyze the data collected for this research. This framework will serve as a lens through which we interpret the data, allowing for a systematic and rigorous examination of the research questions.

2.1 Past Studies

Over the past few decades, the speech act of disagreement has been extensively studied across various languages and cultural contexts, with researchers examining it from a range of perspectives, similar to other speech acts such as refusal, requesting, and apologizing. Much of this research has focused on understanding the taxonomies of disagreement strategies employed in different societies. These studies often seek to identify the specific linguistic and pragmatic devices used to express disagreement, as well as the cultural norms that govern their use. One such study by Alzahrani (2023) explores the influence of power distance and gender on the disagreement strategies of speakers of Saudi Colloquial Arabic, particularly in same-gender and cross-gender interactions. The study reveals two primary patterns: first, when there is minimal power distance between interlocutors, or when the speaker holds a higher power position, gender played a significant role in shaping the choice of disagreement strategies. This finding suggests that power dynamics and social hierarchies influence the way individuals express disagreement, with gender acting as an additional layer of complexity. It highlights the need to consider multiple social factors when analyzing disagreement strategies.

In a related context, Bakry (2015) investigates how Egyptian undergraduate students used disagreement strategies within the framework of politeness theory, particularly in interactions with individuals of differing power status in EFL classrooms. The study demonstrates that students employed a variety of positive and negative politeness strategies to soften their disagreements when addressing higher-power figures, such as professors. However, when engaging in discussions with peers or regarding the teacher's language input, students often resorted to aggravated disagreement strategies, showcasing the role of power relations in determining the degree of directness in their responses. This underscores the importance of politeness in academic settings, where students must navigate power dynamics while expressing their opinions. To further appreciate the significance of these dynamics, it is useful to consider how broader cultural and institutional factors come into play.

The speech act of disagreement has been a focal point in pragmatics research, especially in the context of varying cultural, social, and institutional factors. Disagreement, as a communicative act, not only conveys opposition but also reflects the complexities of power dynamics, politeness strategies, and facework, particularly in academic settings. These dynamics are especially significant in Jordan, where both students and professors engage in negotiation of meaning and authority during classroom interactions. Thus, understanding the nuances of these interactions necessitates a thorough examination of existing literature. To explore how disagreement is framed in such interactions, it is essential to review existing literature on the cultural, linguistic, and contextual factors influencing disagreement strategies. This examination lays the groundwork for understanding how these factors specifically influence the expression of disagreement in Jordanian academic settings.

A considerable amount of research has highlighted the cultural influences on disagreement strategies. For example, Al-Natour et al.'s **(**2025, p. 43-52) refusal strategies within management communication**,** highlighting how politeness strategies function to mitigate face-threatening acts, including disagreements, in hierarchical environments. They find that managers often employ indirectness to soften refusals, a strategy that also applies to the classroom context. In academic settings, professors, as higher-status individuals, may similarly use mitigating strategies to handle disagreement without threatening the social face of students. This comparison with management communication helps us understand the negotiation of power and authority in academic environments. Consequently, drawing parallels between managerial and academic settings can illuminate the subtle ways in which disagreement is managed across different hierarchical structures.

This concept of managing power dynamics extends beyond managerial contexts and into educational settings. The power dynamics of the professor-student relationship play a crucial role in shaping disagreement strategies. Al-Yousef et al. (2025, p. 124-136) explore intercultural dynamics of persuasion in Jordanian academic discourse**.** Their study emphasizes the importance of persuasion in achieving agreement, where students often use softening tactics when disagreeing with professors to maintain rapport and avoid confrontation. This behavior aligns with positive politeness strategies, where students minimize the threat of disagreement by aligning themselves with the professor's authority. Understanding these strategies is key to examining how students balance disagreement with the necessity of respecting their professors' expertise. Building on this, it's important to consider how politeness strategies intersect with power dynamics to influence the expression of disagreement.

Studies on disagreement strategies across different linguistic and cultural contexts offer valuable insights into the complexities of this speech act. For instance, Bavarsad et al. (2015) investigate how young male and female Persian speakers' express disagreement. Their findings revealed that while both genders consider the power status of their interlocutors and employ appropriate strategies, females tend to be more cautious and utilize different strategies compared to males. Similarly, Jaafar & Ageli (2022) highlight the politeness strategies used by university EFL learners when expressing disagreement, comparing them to American native speakers. Their research indicates that EFL learners often rely on a fixed set of politeness strategies, whereas native speakers adapt their strategies based on situational needs. This discrepancy underscores a pragmatic gap between native and non-native speakers in navigating disagreement, emphasizing the influence of cultural and contextual factors on these interactions. Given these findings, understanding the specific strategies employed by Jordanian students in academic settings becomes particularly relevant. Investigating whether Jordanian students, as non-native speakers, exhibit similar patterns or distinct approaches when disagreeing with professors can provide valuable insights into the nuances of non-native speaker communication in academic contexts.

Moreover, Behnam and Niroomand (2011) investigate the ways power relations influence politeness strategies in disagreement. Their findings revealed that students' level of language proficiency significantly impacted the frequency and type of disagreement strategies they used, with more proficient speakers employing more nuanced politeness strategies to maintain face. This emphasizes the critical role that language proficiency and power status play in shaping disagreement in academic settings, with higher proficiency enabling students to use more complex forms of disagreement without losing face. It underscores the need to consider linguistic competence as a key factor in understanding how students navigate potentially face-threatening interactions.

The influence of cultural and religious factors on mitigating disagreement is further highlighted in Khammari's (2021) study of Tunisian Arabic. The research illustrates how speakers use religious fillers, such as "billehi" or "brabbi" (for God's sake), to soften their disagreements. This exemplifies the cultural diversity in the use of mitigating devices across languages and regions, demonstrating how cultural and religious norms can significantly affect disagreement strategies. While Jordanian students may not employ religious phrases in the same manner, their cultural context similarly shapes their use of indirectness and politeness in academic disagreement. In a related study, Al-Natour, M et al. (2025) examine congratulation strategies in graduation notebooks at Jerash University, revealing the use of congratulatory statements, happiness clauses, compliments, good wishes, and gift-giving. Consequently, a thorough understanding of the specific cultural and religious nuances within the Jordanian context is essential for a comprehensive analysis of disagreement strategies, as these nuances likely influence communication patterns in academic settings.

Furthermore, Al-Yousef et al. (2025, pp.69-84) provide a comprehensive machine translation (MT) literature review and empirical investigation that analyzed the quality of translated scholarly abstracts from Finnish to English, particularly focusing on domain-specific academic papers. Their study sheds light on the challenges of machine translation in the academic field, offering an empirical evaluation of translation effectiveness in the context of scholarly writing. The research explores advancements in machine translation technologies, examining the general patterns and methodologies in the transfer and output phases of the translation process, which are critical in ensuring accurate translations. This work contributes to the broader discussion of communication strategies in academia, highlighting the technological interventions that impact both the expression of ideas and the way disagreement is communicated in translated texts.

Almutairi's (2021) study on Saudi Twitter users' disagreements offers another important angle by examining the differences in aggravated and mitigated disagreement strategies. Her study finds that most disagreements on Twitter are aggravated, while a smaller proportion were mitigated. This distinction between aggravated and mitigated disagreements is essential for understanding the broader spectrum of disagreement strategies. It highlights that, while some contexts (such as social media) may encourage more direct confrontation, academic settings—like those explored in the current study—may encourage more mitigated and face-saving approaches. This implies that the choice between aggravated and mitigated strategies is heavily influenced by the situational context.

Similar to this, Al Ghamdi's (2023) investigation into Saudi EFL teachers also explores the politeness strategies employed in disagreements, particularly in online interactions. She finds that Saudi EFL teachers often employ aggravated disagreements, similar to American ESL teachers, though they used a broader range of positive and negative politeness strategies to soften face-threatening acts. The variation in politeness strategies between different cultures highlights the importance of understanding local norms when analyzing disagreement in Jordanian academic discourse. Thus, a nuanced understanding of these variations is crucial for interpreting disagreement strategies in specific cultural contexts.

Glavan (2024) explores how Moldovans manage political disputes in close relationships, utilizing communication accommodation theory, relational turbulence theory, and concepts of dialogue, debate, and intimate distance. The study emphasizes reducing controversial differences through communicative actions and constructive solutions, highlighting the importance of family bonds and how individuals navigate political disagreements to maintain close relationships. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for managing conflicts within personal relationships.

In contrast, Parker (2024) proposes an approach called 'adversarial cooperation,' drawing on 'adversarial collaboration' from the sciences and 'antagonistic cooperation' from the humanities. This highlights the potential for collaboration even amidst disagreement. Furthermore, Rahmani et al. (2025) find that mobile-based dynamic assessment can effectively enhance learners' pragmatic competence in performing disagreement speech acts, particularly through a sociocultural informed approach that incorporates tailored incremental feedback, which may have practical applications in digital language education environments. Such methods offer innovative ways to improve communication skills.

Lee (2024) hypothesizes that speech acts can serve as a fundamental device of (im)politeness, potentially outweighing the significant contribution of honorifics, including speech levels. Specifically, the study argues that agreeing with interlocutors and paying them compliments are closely related to the realization and perception of politeness in Korean speech. This study also explores how several factors, including addressee, modality, speech level, and speech acts, are complicatedly but distinctly involved in Korean speakers' perceptions of (im)politeness. While the results confirm the impact of honorifics and 'negative face' on the speakers' assessment of (im)politeness, they also indicated that positive politeness together with negative politeness

needs to be more actively included in the discussion regarding how (im)politeness is perceived in actual speech practices. These findings underscore the complexity of politeness in communication. Meanwhile, Liang's study (2024) contributes to a deeper understanding of ELF users' pragmatic and emotive capability to participate in the online social argumentative practice of affective stance-taking.

Rizzi et al. (2024) investigates a probabilistic semantic approach to identifying disagreement-related textual constituents in hateful content. Identifying such content is crucial for moderating online discussions. Lindahl (2024) finds that disagreement is often not because of annotation errors or mistakes but due to the possibility of multiple possible interpretations, specifically over boundaries, label or existence of argumentation. Understanding the sources of disagreement can help to improve communication and reduce misunderstandings. Maqableh et al. (2025) investigate the use of positive politeness strategies in requests made by Jordanian and Omani students within an academic context, anticipating the uncovering of both differences and similarities in the positive politeness strategies employed by the two groups while also investigating the influence of culture on their request patterns. Such research highlights the importance of cultural context in communication.

Further expanding on politeness strategies, Akkawi et al. (2025) explores negative politeness strategies in requests among Jordanian and Omani students, offering insights into how these strategies can be adapted for different social contexts. The research finds that, while students in both countries favored similar negative politeness strategies, the context and relationship between the speaker and the addressee determine the specific linguistic strategies employed. These findings are crucial for understanding how students manage disagreement in academic settings, as students may employ similar negative politeness strategies to mitigate the impact of their disagreement with professors. Therefore, the strategic use of negative politeness is a key mechanism in managing potential conflict and maintaining social harmony in academic interactions. Al-Natour et al. (2025) examined the diverse refusal strategies Jordanian students utilize to explore the cultural and linguistic factors influencing their choices. The anticipated results include the identification of the significant influence of linguistic and cultural factors on the forms of refusal strategies employed by the students.

Al-Yousef et al. (2025) explore persuasive strategies in Jordanian academic discourse, utilizing Aristotle's rhetorical triangle of ethos, logos, and pathos. Their research emphasizes the strategic use of persuasion as a way of navigating disagreements. By understanding these strategies, students can enhance their ability to both express disagreement and maintain academic respect and authority. This highlights the complex interplay of rhetoric, culture, and power dynamics in shaping how disagreement is expressed in Jordanian academic contexts. Recognizing these persuasive elements provides a more holistic view of academic interactions, where disagreement is not merely a clash of opinions but also a strategic communication event. Almahasees, Z. et al. (2025) scrutinized the problems and strategies involved in the translation of legal terms from English into Arabic and vice versa, whether in relation to international accords or agreements. The study revealed that the largest problem is related to the absence of most equivalents in legal expressions – especially hose containing culturally related contexts. Functional equivalence, consultation with legalists, and the use of explanatory footnotes are the most frequent means to ensure legal accuracy.

Al-Natour, M. et al. (2024) aims to identify the exact meaning of politeness in silence among Jordanian EFL students. their research explored that the professors and their students employed the silence strategy for various purposes. On the one hand, Professor silence was used to stop interruptions, unacceptable answers, and unaccepted behaviors. Almahasees, Z et al. (2023). study aims at identifying the main discursive strategies used by His Majesty King Abdullah II in addressing Jordanians during COVID-19. The study concluded that the King used nomination, prediction, argumentation, perspectivization and intensification, and mitigation strategies in appeasing Jordanians and conveying his directives to the government regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

The insights gained from the studies reviewed above serve as the foundation for the analytical framework used in this study. By drawing on Maíz-Arévalo's framework, which classifies disagreement strategies into strong and mitigated categories, the research will build on the understanding of how these strategies manifest in the context of Jordanian student-professor interactions. This analytical approach will allow us to dissect not only the forms of disagreement but also the underlying motivations behind their usage, influenced by cultural norms, power structures, and social expectations. Consequently, the framework will facilitate a deeper analysis of how students and professors negotiate disagreements, considering the intricate web of social and cultural factors at play.

In the next section, the study elaborates on this framework and its application to the data collected from Jerash University, providing a comprehensive tool for analyzing the disagreement strategies employed by both students and professors. This will

enable a systematic investigation into the nuances of disagreement, shedding light on the specific strategies and underlying motivations prevalent in this academic environment.

2.2 Analytical Framework

To understand the disagreement strategies employed by Jordanian students and professors at Jerash University, this study adopts Maíz-Arévalo's (2014) framework for analyzing disagreement strategies. This framework is well-suited for the purpose of this study, as it provides a clear structure for distinguishing between strong (direct) and mitigated (indirect) strategies, while also offering a detailed understanding of how politeness and power dynamics influence the way disagreement is expressed in academic discourse. The framework's focus on both direct and indirect strategies allows for a nuanced analysis of communicative behaviors, acknowledging the social complexities inherent in academic interactions.

Maíz-Arévalo classifies disagreement strategies into two broad categories:

- **Strong Disagreement Strategies**: These are characterized by a lack of mitigation. They include bare negative forms (e.g., "No," "Of course not"), performative negations (e.g., "I disagree"), blunt statements of the opposite (e.g., "That's wrong"), insults and negative judgments (e.g., "You're mistaken"), suggestions or counterproposals (e.g., "Maybe we could try something different"), and explanations (e.g., "Here's why I think this is wrong"). These strategies can be perceived as confrontational and may require careful navigation in academic settings to avoid damaging interpersonal relationships. The directness of these strategies reflects a potentially lower concern for face-saving.
- **Mitigated Disagreement Strategies**: These strategies involve the use of language that softens the impact of disagreement and aims to preserve the face of the hearer. These include token agreements (e.g., "I see your point, but..."), hedges (e.g., "I think," "It seems"), requests for clarification (e.g., "Could you clarify that?"), expressions of regret (e.g., "I'm sorry, but I disagree"), and prefacing positive remarks (e.g., "I appreciate your view, but..."). These strategies prioritize maintaining positive relationships and minimizing potential conflict, reflecting a higher degree of pragmatic awareness.

Table 1. Maíz-Arévalo (2014, p. 209) Disagreement strategies

NO.	Strong Disagreement	NO.	Mitigated Disagreement
1	Use of bare negative forms (e.g., "no," "no way," "of course not")	1	Token agreement (e.g., "yeah . . . but")
2	Use of the performative "I disagree"	2	Use of hedges (e.g., "I guess," "it seems," "I do not really know," etc.)
3	Use of the performative negation "I don't agree" or "I can't agree"	3	Requests for clarification (e.g., "maybe I didn't understand, could you explain it more clearly?")
4	Blunt statement of the opposite	4	Expressions of regret (e.g., "I'm sorry but I don't agree with you . . ."
5	Use of insults and negative judgments (e.g., "you are a moron"	5	Use of prefacing positive remarks towards the addressee (e.g., "that's a very good analysis")
		6	Suggestions (e.g., "How about doing it in a slightly different way?")
		7	Giving explanations

This framework is particularly relevant for the current study because it offers a structured way of identifying and analyzing the different types of disagreement strategies that may be employed by both students and professors in an academic setting. By categorizing these strategies, researchers can gain insights into the communicative norms within the university, shedding light on the preferred modes of interaction and potential sources of miscommunication. Furthermore, the framework allows for a comparative analysis of strategy use across different academic contexts and participant groups.

2.3 Application of the Framework

In this study, disagreement strategies are analyzed based on observational data and semi-structured interviews with students and professors. Using Maíz-Arévalo's framework, the researcher will first identify the types of disagreement strategies used in both formal (e.g., student-professor interactions) and informal (e.g., peer-to-peer discussions) settings. Each instance of disagreement will be classified into one of the two broad categories—strong or mitigated—and further analyzed based on the

context in which it occurs. This classification will involve careful attention to linguistic cues and contextual factors, allowing for a detailed understanding of how disagreement is expressed in different academic settings.

In addition to identifying the types of strategies, the study will also examine the motivations behind the use of these strategies. This will be done by exploring the underlying factors that influence the choice of disagreement strategy, such as power relations, cultural norms, and the social distance between the interlocutors. Understanding these motivations is crucial for interpreting the observed patterns of disagreement. For example, when students disagree with professors, they are likely to use more mitigated strategies to preserve their face and maintain a respectful relationship with their professors. Conversely, in peer-to-peer interactions, students may feel less need to mitigate their disagreements and might opt for more strong strategies. This variation highlights the dynamic nature of disagreement strategies and underscores the importance of considering the social context in which they are employed. Furthermore, the study will consider how individual personalities and communication styles might also influence the selection of disagreement strategies.

2.4 Power Dynamics and Politeness Theory
To further analyze the motivations behind the disagreement strategies, this study also incorporates elements of Politeness Theory. According to Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), speakers use politeness strategies to manage the face needs of both them and their interlocutors. There are two types of faces that are going to be investigated within the disagreement of the students and their professors:

- **Positive face**, which refers to the desire to be liked and admired.
- **Negative face**, which refers to the desire to be free from imposition.

In the context of disagreement, individuals typically use positive politeness strategies (such as mitigation and hedging) to maintain a positive face, particularly when addressing superiors or authority figures like professors. On the other hand, negative politeness strategies (such as apologies and indirectness) are employed to minimize the impact of a disagreement and avoid imposing on others. Power dynamics play a crucial role in determining the use of these strategies. For example, professors, as higher-status individuals, may opt for more strong strategies (e.g., blunt negations) when disagreeing with students, whereas students may use more mitigated strategies to avoid conflict and show deference. The interplay between power and politeness helps to shape the communicative landscape of academic interactions, influencing how disagreements are expressed and managed.

Thus, politeness strategies will be used as a complementary lens through which to interpret the use of disagreement strategies within different social contexts at Jerash University. By integrating Politeness Theory with the analysis of disagreement strategies, the study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence communication patterns in academic settings. This approach allows for a nuanced exploration of how individuals navigate potentially face-threatening situations while maintaining social harmony and achieving their communicative goals. Additionally, considering cultural variations in politeness norms will further enrich the analysis.

2.5 Analytical Approach
The analysis will be conducted in the following stages:

1. **Identification and Classification:** Disagreement strategies will be identified from the interviews and observations and classified into strong or mitigated categories using Maíz-Arévalo's framework. This initial stage will involve a systematic review of the collected data to identify instances of disagreement and categorize them based on the criteria defined in the framework.
2. **Contextual Analysis:** The context in which each disagreement occurs (e.g., professor-student, student-student, or informal/formal settings) will be considered to understand the influence of social relationships and power dynamics on the choice of strategy. Understanding the contextual factors is crucial for interpreting the motivations behind the selected disagreement strategies.
3. **Motivation Analysis:** The motivations for using a particular strategy will be explored by analyzing interview responses and observational data. Factors such as cultural norms, social distance, and the academic hierarchy will be examined to understand why students and professors choose specific disagreement strategies. This stage will delve into the underlying reasons and intentions behind the use of certain strategies.

The use of this analytical framework will allow for a thorough understanding of the ways in which disagreement is negotiated in Jordanian academic contexts, while also providing insights into the broader cultural and institutional factors that shape these interactions. By systematically analyzing the identified disagreement strategies within their specific contexts and exploring the motivations behind their use, this study aims to contribute valuable knowledge to the field of intercultural communication and academic discourse. This comprehensive approach will provide a nuanced perspective on the dynamics of disagreement in Jordanian academia, offering insights that can inform pedagogical practices and promote more effective communication strategies. Furthermore, the findings may also shed light on the influence of cultural values and social structures on communication patterns in higher education.

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Collection

The data for this study will be collected qualitatively using observation and semi-structured interview instruments. The data will be collected from the English and translation students and their English professors who are at Jerash university. Five procedures are going to be followed to collect the data from the respondents. Firstly, getting the permission letter from the head of English department and translation to collect the data. Secondly, identifying a suitable time and venue with the professors to attend their lectures to observe their interaction with their students. Thirdly, identifying the time and venue to make interviews with the professors and their students. Fourthly, recoding the students and their professors' responses. Fifthly, Transcribing the data related to the objectives of the research and observe their disagreement strategies. Sixthly, classify the disagreement strategies that occur in their responses to the two types of strategies as proposed by Maíz-Arévalo (2014, p. 209). Seventhly, extract the examples to be analyzed to reveal the results.

3.2 Sample of the Study

The sample of the study will be from one of the Jordanian private universities which is Jerash. The professors and the students will be from the English and translation departments. The number of the respondents will be continually collected till reaching saturation. Saturation means the repeated result that occur once the researcher collects more data and there is no new information can be collected Hennink, M., Hutter I., & Bailey, A. (2020). So, the data will be collected till reached saturation then the researcher stopped collecting more data from the respondents.

3.3 Instruments

This research is going to utilize two qualitative instruments to collect the data from the professors and the students which are interview and observation. Interviews will be held in a suitable place in the faculty of Arts at Jerash university and the observation will be collected from the participants in the lectures and within the interviews. The role of the observers is actually to look for the negative cases or exceptions, identify the regular from the irregular activities; find out what is happening and why; look for variation to view the event in its entirety from a variety of viewpoints Musante, K., & DeWalt, B. R. (2010).

Interviews and observations will be collected till the saturation of the data repeatedly occurred. Saturation means the repeated result that occur once the researcher collects more data and there is no new information can be collected Hennink, M., Hutter I., & Bailey, A. (2020). Therefore, the researchers will collect the data till they reach saturation then they stop collecting more data from the participants. The researchers will get the permission from the head of English and translation department to collect the data. After that they will request the respondents to sign on a consent form to participant in this study. They are going to inform them that the data will be used for the purpose of the study and will not be used for any other purposes.

4. Conclusion

Two hypotheses are going to be examined in this research. Firstly, the preferred disagreement strategies for the Jordanian students and their professors. This hypothesis is going to be validated by interviewing the students and their professors to observe their usages to the disagreement strategies. The second hypothesis is going to be investigated is the reasons behind using these disagreement strategies by the Jordanians students and their professors. As this research is conceptual research, there will be an expects result for the hypothesis that are investigated. The following are the expected results for these hypotheses:

1- The professors could use more *Strong Disagreement strategies* than the students because they have a social power over than them. The students will almost use *Mitigated Disagreement strategies* in their interaction even with their classmates except with their close classmates, they may use strong disagreement strategies.
2- The reasons behind using either the *Strong or Mitigated Disagreement strategies* could be related to various factors such as, Jordanian culture, the context of interactions, the interactants, gender and the situation. These factors could influence on their usages for the disagreement strategies and explain the reasons of employing them in their interactions.

These expected results can be validated after conducting the analysis for the data to reach the vital reasons of utilizing the suitable disagreement strategies by the Jordanians student and their professors.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers

References

[1] Akkawi, A., Maqableh, R. I., Zuraigat, I. M. F., Al-Momani, F. A. A., Alomari, N. M., Al-Natour, M. M., & AlYousef, H. M. (2025). Comparative Pragmatic Analysis of Negative Politeness Strategies in Request Employed by Jordanian and Omani Students: A Conceptual Paper. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, *7*(2), 28-33.

[2] Al Ghamdi, R. (2023). *Investigating the use of politeness strategies in expressing disagreements among Saudi EFL teachers on Twitter* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi).

[3] Almahasees, Z., Albudairi, Y., Al-Natour, M., AL-Harahsheh, A., & Mahmoud, S. (2025). Challenges and Strategies in Translating Legal Terms between English and Arabic: A Comparative Study of International Accords and Agreements. In *Forum for Linguistic Studies* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 609-625).

[4] Almahasees1&4, Z., Rayyash, H. A., & Al-Natour, M. (2023). Discursive Strategies Utilized in King Abdullah II's Speeches during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Addressing the Nation. *World*, *13*(7).

[5] Almutairi, S. (2021). Disagreement strategies and (im) politeness in Saudis' twitter communication. *Journal of Languages, Texts, and Society*, *5*, 1-40.

[6] Al-Natour, M. M., Al-Hawamdeh, A. M. M., Alhawamdeh, S. M., Alomari, N. M., & AlYousef, H. M. (2025). Unpacking Cultural and Linguistic Refusal Strategies in Jordanian EFL Discourse: A Conceptual Paper. *Journal of Gender, Culture and Society*, *5*(1), 12-19.

[7] Al-Natour, M. M., Banat, S., & Al-Qawasmeh, S. I. (2024). Politeness Connotations of Silence in the Jordanian EFL Classroom. *British Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 09-14.

[8] Al-Natour, M. M., BaniKlaef, A., Almahasees, Z., Al-Hawamdeh, A. M. M., & Al-Bataineh, K. B. (2025). Congratulation Strategies Employed by Jordanians in an Academic Setting: A Socio-Pragmatic Study. In *Forum for Linguistic Studies* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 432-443).

[9] Al-Yousef, H. A., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2019). On translating Arabic verbal emphasis into English. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies, 3*(3), 68-81. http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol3no3.5

[10] Al-Yousef, H. A., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2019). Translation challenges of Arabic built-in-language repetition into English. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies, 3*(3), 140-150. http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol3no3.10

[11] Al-Yousef, H. M., Al Jaraedah, A. R., Alomari, N. M., Al-Qawasmeh, S. I., & Al-Natour, M. M. (2025). Beyond linguistic gaps: Types of code-switching among Jordanian bilingual speakers. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices, 7*(1), 22-31. https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2025.7.1.3

[12] AlYousef, H. M., Alsaleem, A. A., Alomari, N. M., Al Jaraedah, A. R., Banat, S., & Al-Natour, M. M. (2025). The Intercultural Dynamics of Persuasion: A Translation Studies Perspective on Jordanian Academic Discourse. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *8*(3), 124-136.

[13] AL-Yousef, H.M.K., Alqader, S.A., Abedalqader, R., Jawabreh, O., & Masa'deh, R. (2025). Machine translation (MT) literature review and empirical investigation. In A. Al-Marzouqi, S. Salloum, K. Shaalan, T. Gaber, & R. Masa'deh (Eds.), *Generative AI in creative industries* (Studies in Computational Intelligence, vol. 1208, pp. 143-160). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-89175-5_5

[14] Alzahrani, M. A. M. (2023). The impact of power distance and gender on the choice of disagreement strategies in Saudi Colloquial Arabic. *International Linguistics Research*, *6*(2), p8-p8.

[15] Bakry, H. T. (2015). The interface of politeness strategies and power relations in disagreements among Egyptian students.

[16] Bavarsad, S. S., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Simin, S. (2015). The study of disagreement strategies to suggestions used by Iranian male and female learners. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, *49*, 30-42.

[17] Behnam, B., & Niroomand, M. (2011). An Investigation of Iranian EFL Learners' Use of Politeness Strategies and Power Relations in Disagreement across Different Proficiency Levels. *English language teaching*, *4*(4), 204-220.

[18] Glavan, A. C. (2024). *Agree to Disagree: A Qualitative Study About Shifting from Political Debate to Dialogue in Moldova* (Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente).

[19] Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. Sage.

[20] Holmes, J. (1986). Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. *Anthropological linguistics*, 485-508.

[21] Jaafar, F. A., & Ageli, N. (2022). The Use of Politeness Strategies in the Realization of the Speech act of Disagreement by EFL Learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *5*(11), 19-38.

[22] Kaková, C. (1993). *Negotiation of disagreement by Greeks in conversations and classroom discourse*. Georgetown University.

[23] Khammari, H. (2021). Disagreeing in Tunisian Arabic: A politeness and pragmatic study. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, *2*(3), 46-64.

[24] Lee, N. (2024). Korean speakers' perception of (im) politeness across speech acts of agreement, compliment, disagreement and criticism. *Linguistic Research*, *41*.

[25] Liang, M. Y. (2024) focused on culturally diverse university students' online (dis)agreement with affective expressions in English as a lingua franca (ELF).

[26] Lindahl, A. (2024, May). Disagreement in argumentation annotation. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Perspectivist Approaches to NLP (NLPerspectives)@ LREC-COLING 2024* (pp. 56-66).

[27] Locher, M. A. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication* (No. 12). Walter de Gruyter.

[28] Maíz-Arévalo, C. (2014). Expressing disagreement in English as a lingua franca: Whose pragmatic rules?. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *11*(2), 199-224.

[29] Maqableh, R. I. M., Akkawi, A., Zuraigat, I. M. F., Alomari, N. M., Al-Natour, M. M., & AlYousef, H. M. (2025). Positive Politeness Strategies of Requests as Produced by Jordanian and Omani Students: A Conceptual Comparative Study. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *8*(6), 112-118.

[30] Musante, K., & DeWalt, B. R. (2010). *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers*. Rowman Altamira.

[31] Parker, M. J. (2024). Bioethics and the value of disagreement. *Journal of Medical Ethics*.

[32] Pomerantz, A., Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). Structures of social action. In *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 152-163). Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

[33] Rahmani, P., Ebadi, S., & Eslami, Z. R. (2025). The impact of mobile-mediated dynamic assessment on EFL learners' pragmatic competence: the speech act of disagreement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-43.

[34] Rizzi, G., Astorino, A., Rosso, P., & Fersini, E. (2024). Unraveling disagreement constituents in hateful speech. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval* (pp. 21-29). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

[35] Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *44*(12), 1554-1564.