FAWWAZ AL-ABED AL-HAQ,
REEMA SALAH AL-HAYEK*

GENDER IN ARABIC. FROM A LANGUAGE PLANNING PERSPECTIVE

INTRODUCTION: LANGUAGE PLANNING

Language Planning refers to the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level (Jernudd, Das Gupta 1971). The goal of language planning is to offer solutions to linguistic and non-linguistic problems in both developed and developing countries. These problems are related to the status, corpus, and acquisition of language.

G. Ferguson (2006, pp. 3–9) states that language planning has been criticized from Marxist, post-structural and critical sociolinguistic perspectives. Firstly, it has been accused of serving the interests and agendas of dominant elites while passing itself off as an ideologically neutral, objective enterprise, and of embracing a discourse of technical rationality'. Secondly, language planning has been criticized for being wedded to, and for projecting, traditional European notions of the nation state, in which citizens are unified around a common standard language. This vision propagates the view that multilingualism is problematic. Thirdly, language planning views language as an instrument that can be corrected, regulated, purified and reformed; that is, it treats languages as natural, discrete entities.

Despite the aforementioned criticisms, language planning has recently witnessed a palpable resurgence for the following possible reasons:

1 – The collapse of Communism in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the ending of the Cold War.
2 – The re-emergence of small nations and regional languages within the old established European nation states.
3 – Globalization where the colonizing languages dominate the colonized ones, that is, the imposition of one language upon others whether it is wanted or not.

* **Fawwaz Al-Abed Al-Haq** is professor of English and Linguistics at Yarmouk University in Irbid, Jordan. **Reema Salah Al-Hayek** is a Ph. D. candidate in linguistics at West Sidney University, Australia, which is affiliated with Al-Albayt University, Mafraq, Jordan.

DACOROMANIA, serie nouă, XVII, 2012, nr. 2, p. 245–264

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

4 – The construction of supranational political communities such as the European Union.

Such changes have widened the scope and dimensions of language planning. The processes of language standardization, codification and dissemination of the standard so strongly associated with the nation building projects attending decolonization, while still significant, are no longer quite so central and have been joined by other issues such as language revitalization, minority language rights, globalization and the spread of English, the preservation of linguistic diversity, and bilingual education.

G. Ferguson (2006, p. 13) concludes by stating that language planning is a resurgent academic discipline revived by the policy challenges of late twentieth- and early twenty-first century global developments: globalization, migration, resurgent nationalisms, language endangerment, the global spread of English, new states and failing states.

After the Second World War, and into the 1960s, the world witnessed the end of colonization in many parts around the world. Furthermore, the paradigm of „development" was introduced in such a way that experts from all over the world were invited to contribute to developing and modernizing societies in the Third World. The challenge was picked up by sociolinguists in the 1960s and 1970s, and from then on, the term „Language Planning" (henceforth LP) stood for a particular body of studies and literature (Blommaert 1996, p. 199). A geographical and socio-historical bias in the Third World has continued until now; for example, multi-lingualism is a problem, not because it would be an unworkable situation for administrative and educational practice, but for political reasons. Hence, a lack of interest, resources, or political importance may have been what caused the grand projects in the Third World nations to virtually disappear during the 1980s. Whatever the reason, enthusiasm for LP as an academic subject has faded in the wake of the collapse of state systems and economies in the Third World (*ibidem*, pp. 203–204).

Thus, LP has witnessed numerous transitional stages. It flourished in the 1960s and 1970s, diminished in the 1980s, and revived in the 1990s (*ibidem*, p. 199). However, A. Al-Masaeid (2005, p. 13) states that LP became a sharply salient issue when sociolinguists began to pay more attention to speech forms and problems and began working to solve such problems.

ARABIC LANGUAGE PLANNING (ARABIZATION)

Standard Arabic, *fuSĥa*, the ancestor of Modern Standard Arabic, can be traced back to the pre-Islamic era, or *jahiliyyah*. With the advent of Islam early in the seventh century AD, it gained a more prestigious status since it was the language of the Holy Quran. Following this, it quickly developed to become the political and administrative language of the expanding Islamic empire (El-Mouloudi 1986, p. 45).

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

During the process of empire-building, Arabic came in contact with many languages with a great literary heritage and, after a period of adjustment and adaptation to the influences of non-Arabic cultures and languages, the *fuSĥa* surged forward to become the full-fledged language of the Empire and an instrument of thought *par excellence* (Chejne, cited in El-Mouloudi 1986, p. 54).

However, continuous contact and communication with other cultures affected the purity of the *fuSĥa* through misuse and faulty speech, a phenomenon referred to earlier as *laĥn.* To combat this linguistic problem, many Muslim local governments supported and sponsored the codification of Arabic, as a result of which Arabic grammar *(naĥw)* emerged. To preserve the integrity of the *fuSĥa*, many Arab linguists and Arabists relied on the codification process on the available resources of what they considered pure Arabic texts such as the Holy Quran, the Prophetic Tradition, or *Ĥadyth*, pre-Islamic poetry, and the dialects of eloquent Bedouin tribes. Among the most famous Arab linguists to study the different disciplines of the Arabic language—including grammar (*naĥw*), exegesis (*tafsyr*), jurisprudence (*fiqh*), lexicography (*ᶜilm al lughah*) and rhetoric (*balaghah*)—were Ibn al-'Ala (d. 772 AD), Abu al-Aswad ad-Du'aly, al-Khalyl (d. 791 AD), Sybawayh (d. 735 AD) and Yunus Ibn Ĥabyb (d. 798 AD) (El-Mouloudi 1986, p. 556).

For many centuries, and under the rule of the Turkish Ottoman empire, Arab culture witnessed very little creative activity. Even the great literary and scholarly heritage of the Arabs was either permanently lost or inaccessible to them (Hodgson, cited in El-Mouloudi 1986, p. 70). As late as the eighteenth century, the politically subjugated Arabs were isolated from the rapidly developing world of modernity, although some Arabs were increasingly in touch with many rising Western cultures through their prosperous commercial activities (*ibidem*, pp. 70–76). In order to meet the challenge of Western civilization, Arabs established Arabic journalism, which served as an effective tool to express and address problems of modernization.

Arabic was a means of change in the early decades of the nineteenth century when individual translators, journalists and writers started laying the foundation of the modern Arab renaissance. Due to the great impact of Western culture and the advent of Arab nationalism, language reform and LP became the primary objectives for Arab policy makers in the twentieth century.

Furthermore, Arabs saw the need to create official scientific institutions and agencies that could support the process of modernization. Arabic LP agencies now include *al-Majmaᶜ al-ᶜilmy al-ᶜaraby* in Damascus, *Majmaᶜ al-Lughah al-ᶜarabyyah* in Cairo, *L'Institut d'Etudes et de Recherches pour Arabisation* in Rabat, and The Bureau for Coordination of Arabization in the Arab World (*ibidem*, pp. 70–76). Another agency is *Majmaᶜ al lughah al ᶜarabyyah al urduny*.

A. El-Mouloudi (1986, p. 121) defines Arabization in its general sense as „the cultivation and extensive use of Arabic as the language of Arabs, and their official means of oral and written communication". He also talks about Arabization in its most restrictive sense as „the assimilation and integration of foreign scientific

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

and technical terminology by means of borrowing or translation [...]". A. Al-Oliemat (1998, pp. 16–22) states that the aim of Arabization is to replace foreign language, culture and thought with those of the Arabs. El-Khafaifi (cited in Al-Oliemat 1998, p. 19) maintains that Arabization possesses two distinct meanings. Grammarians have used this term to designate borrowing whereby foreign words are incorporated into the language. The second meaning of the term refers to the utilization of all word-formation procedures to modernize and enrich the Arabic language and make it capable of communication, instruction, and all forms of intellectual exchange in different fields and on various levels.

F. Al-Abed Al-Haq (1986, p. 27) defines Arabization as „the process of making Arabic the medium of instruction in the science faculties in Jordan." A. Al-Oliemat (1998, pp. 20–23) distinguishes between three main dimensions of Arabization: corpus Arabization, status Arabization and acquisition Arabization. Corpus Arabization is an old tradition dating back to the pre-Islamic period, at which time it was a matter of borrowing and translation. A more precise definition of corpus Arabization offered by F. Al-Abed Al-Haq (1998, p. 59) is the „purely linguistic issues of Arabization. It includes activities such as coining new terms, reforming spelling and adopting new scientific symbols."

As for status Arabization, it refers to restoring the Arabic language as the official national language of the Arabs. F. Al-Abed Al-Haq (*ibidem*, p. 59) explains that it is „mainly concerned with the recognition by government, government authorized agencies, authoritative bodies and individuals of the significance or position of Arabic or Arabization in relation to other languages." The third dimension is acquisition Arabization, which refers to the „teaching–learning process, Arabic language spread, and adoption of Arabization" (*ibidem*, p. 60).

GENDER IN ARABIC

Al-Shaikh Bahā' Al-Dyn Al-Naĥĥas (cited in Al-Anbary 1970, p. 37) claims that were originally two Arabic lexicons, one for females and another for males. Later came a period when there were three grammatical markers for feminine gender: *alif mamdwdah*, *al ta? al marbwt'ah,* and *al alif al-maqSwrah*. An example of the use of the *ta' marbut'ah* is seen in the words *ᶜamilah* (a female worker) and *ᶜamil* (a male worker). The feminine lexicon was then combined with the marker for emphasis, as in *ᶜarys* (bridegroom) and *ᶜarwsah* (bride).

Ibn Al-Anbary (1970, p. 63) defines terms of feminine gender (*al-mu?nnaθ*) as any item that has a feminine marker figuratively or phonetically; moreover, it is of two types, namely, real and unreal. The markers for feminine gender in Arabic are *al alif a- mamdudah, al alif al-maqSurah* and *al ta' al-marbwt'ah* (*ibidem*, p. 63). I. Barakat (1988, p. 46) states that feminine gender in Arabic is of two types: ***ĥ****aqyqy* (real) and *ghair* ***ĥ****aqyqy* (unreal). The real category is divided into two types,

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

both of which refer to a female. The first one has a feminine marker such as *imra?ah* (woman), *ĥubla* (pregnant) and *samrā*'? (a dark female). The second type, which does not have a marker for feminine gender, includes words like *ĥāmil* (pregnant), *ᶜanis* (spinister) and *t' āmith* (menstruating). Such nouns have to do with feminine affairs. On the other hand, the unreal feminine gender is divided into three types. The first one, which refers to males, has a feminine marker, such as *ĥamzat*. Secondly, many broken plural nouns, such as *darahim* (the plural of dirham, an Arabic currency) (non-systematic plural nouns) are considered feminine. Thirdly, there are examples of inanimate referents with a feminine meaning such as *ĥarb* (war), which does not have a feminine marker, and *naᶜmā*' (affluence) which has *alif mamdwdah* as a marker for feminine gender.




Figure 1. Gender dicision in Arabic Feminine Gender.

Gender is the social elaboration of biological sex (Eckert, McConnel-Ginnet 2003, p. 10). As a secondary grammatical category which includes gender, tense and number, gender adds nothing to the meaning of an inanimate noun since it is not vital for the proper functioning of any language (Ibrahim 1973, pp. 24–25). However, the grammatical importance of gender referring to females, males and inanimate objects, and the linguistic confusion caused by the use of the masculine gender to refer to females, have led many linguists to study gender.

Al-Anbary (1970, p. 37) states that Semitic languages used to have two lexicons, one for males and one for females. For example, *faras* (filly, mare) is used for a female horse and *ĥisan* (male-stallion) is used for a male. He claims that there is no mental relationship between the lexicon itself and the inanimate

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

referent's being male or female (*ibidem*, p. 40). For example, Arabic considers „the sun" (*al-shams*) female and „the moon" (*al-qamar*) male, but French does the opposite. In Modern Standard Arabic, many nouns switch to the feminine gender when they are pluralized (Frank, Anshen 1988, p. 70). Amayra (1993, p. 20) says that Arabic deals with the plural of irrational referents as it does with singular female ones: *(hadhiih jibāl, tilka jimāl),* these are mountains, those are camels. I. Amayra (1993, p. 29) claims that whether things are considered to be masculine or feminine depends on the native speakers' conceptualizations of these things. For example, something whose shape and features are associated with femininity might be dealt with as a female referent. Likewise, something whose shape or features are associated with masculinity might be dealt with as a masculine referent. R. Al-Hayek (2006, p. 2) holds that such an irrational relationship between a word and its gender may be attributed to the cultural heritage and thought of each nation. Furthermore, this irrational relationship may be one of the most important problems in the issue of gender, because there are no basic rules to rely on in naming such things, i.e., referents which lack the biological sexual organs of males and females.

GENDER CHARACTERISTICS IN ARABIC

ANDROCENTRISM

Women's working outside the home in many societies has resulted in a situation where gender enters into morphology because of the existence of processes that transform a noun referring to a male human being into its female counterpart (Eckert, McConnel-Ginnet 2003, p. 68). Yet, despite the importance of women's position in the world, the basic worldview is still androcentric, that is, male-oriented (Mills 1998, p. 203).

Androcentric generics are masculine forms referring to both females and males, such as mankind, man, his and him. Other examples are weatherman, fireman, newsman (Cooper 1989, pp. 14–21). (One notes, however, that in modern English parlance, these terms have been replaced with neutral terms such as meteorologist, firefighter, reporter, etc.) Thus, the creation and popularization of a new agreed-upon word or phrase requires cooperation between official and non-official institutions. For example, the Arabic word *al-nā'ib*, or member of Parliament, refers to a male. Consequently, speakers of Arabic may add one of the feminine markers—the most appropriate of which in this case is *al tā' al-marbuṭah*—in order to form its feminine counterpart. The new word is *al nā'ibah*, or female member of Parliament. This formation process may lead to a problem relating to the use of words which could refer to a female human, but which could also convey an undesired meaning (the word *na'ibah*, for example, also bears the same meaning as the word *muSybah*, or calamity).

However, many dictionaries of Arabic show that Arabic contains polysemous words. Hence, the word *al nā'ibah* might refer either to a female parliamentarian or to a calamity. The context will reveal which meaning is intended. Further evidence

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

that Arabic has polysemous words is the definition of *al muʃtarik* by Al- Bazdawy (in Saleh 1984, p. 134). Here, it should be noted that speakers of Arabic may use masculine titles to address females in an ironic or deliberately ambiguous sense. For this reason, the next step in the word-creation process is assigned to official and unofficial institutions. For such a word to spread, it should be used in school and college curricula, mass-media, television, newspapers and magazines. Actually, the use of a new word in the Arabic vernacular in daily conversations indicates public acceptance of it. However, many masculine titles which are used to refer to females, such as military titles, have nothing to do with public rejection or acceptance. See chart below:

Examples of Military Ranks in Arabic

Military titles in the British Army	***Military titles in the Jordanian Army***
Lieutenant	Mulāzim
Captain	Naqyb
Major	Rā?id
Lieutenant colonel	Muqaddam
Colonel	ʻaqyd
Brigadier	ʻamyd
Major general	Liwā?
Lieutenant General	Faryq
Field Marshal	muʃyr

The translation into English is quoted from (Hornby 1995, p. 1410).

These ranks, or titles, in both languages are used to refer to females and males at the same time. It is not permissible to feminize these titles.

SIGNIFICANCE OF GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ARABIC

One of the Arabic major works on gender is *Al-lughah wa ikhtilāf al jinsayn* by A. Omar (1996). In this work Omar presents the social factors that govern a language considering gender and the classifications of gender; moreover, he seeks to highlight the problem of neutral and androcentric language. He then introduces the phonetic, stylistic and syntactic features of each gender.

Claiming that Arabic is a neutral language and providing many pieces of evidence, A. Omar (1996, pp. 64–68) defends his mother tongue. First, he notes that the Qur'anic use of masculine and feminine follows this model:

1. Beginning with the most important

> *„The woman and man guilty of adultery or fornication, flog each of them with a hundred stripes"* (Holy Qur'an 24, p. 2) (Ali 2003, p. 349).

2. The word (the) Messengers is always masculine. In the Holy Quran this is frequently preceded by verbs that refer to females.

> *„Indeed it was the truth that the messengers of our Lord brought unto us"* (Holy Quran, 43, 7) (*ibidem*, p. 154).

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

There are twenty-six Qur'anic verses that refer to femininity, but only seven which refer to masculinity.

3. The word „angels" is used with feminine verbs with a constant caution that they are not females.

> *„Those who believe not in the Hereafter name the angels with female names"* (Holy Quran, 53, 27) (*ibidem*, p. 549).

> *„And they make the angels, who are the slaves of the Beneficent, females. Did they witness their creation? Their testimony will be recorded and they will be questioned"* (Holy Quran, 43:19).

The second evidence that Arabic is neutral is that it still has words which are originally feminine, with the masculine words being branches of these original ones. For example, we have θ*a*^{c}*lab* (a female vixen), Đ*abi*^{c} (a female hyena) and ^{c}*aqrab* (a female scorpion) which are feminine words and θ*u*^{c}*lubān* (a male fox), Đ*aba*^{c}*ān* (a male hyena) and ^{c}*uqrubān* (a male scorpion) which are masculine. The third piece of evidence is the derivation of the verbal noun, or *al-maSdar al Sinā*^{c}*y* in Arabic, which has a feminine form, such as *ĥurryyah* (freedom), *al waťanyyah* (nationalism) and *al musawah* (equality). Finally, although there are feminine words that have negative connotations, such as *muSybah* (ordeal), *baghĐa'* (hatred) and *khiyanah* (treachery), there are also masculine words with negative connotations. These include, for example, *bukhl* (parsimony), *mawt* (death), (hunger) and *faqr* (poverty). On the other hand, there are many feminine words with positive connotations—*jannah* (paradise), *qadāsah* (sanctity), ť*ahārah* (purification), *maharah* (proficiency), *muruwah* (a sense of honor), *shafā*^{c}*ah* (mediation) and *ma*^{c}*rifah* (knowledge).

Another Arabic source for such evidence is *Majallat Majma*^{c} *al lughah al* ^{c}*arabyyah al'urduny*. One of the articles in this periodical is Al- Samirra'y's (1985) *Fy at ta'nyth wa al tadhkyr*. The author introduces many morphological conjugations *(awzān Sarfyyah)* that are used to refer to and/or describe females without using the three markers of feminine gender. Examples from his article are listed in the table below:

Table 1
Example of *Feminine Adjectives without Feminine Gender Markers*

Morphological Conjugations	***Examples***
Mifcāl	Micť ār
Mufcil	murĐic
Fācil	Cānis

I. Barhoom (1998) introduces other morphological conjugations such as those found in the following table:

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

Table 2
Other Examples of *Feminine Adjectives without Using the Markers of Feminine Gender*

Morphological Conjugations	***Examples***
Facwl	Zalwm
Facyl	Qatyl
Mifcyl	Micṭyr

Elsewhere, in his book *al-luhgah wa al Jins: ĥafryyāt fy al ðukwrah wa al ?unwθah*, I. Barhoom (2002, p. 31) discusses the effect of many social factors on linguistic behavior. He claims that the society itself divides words among men and women and that characteristics associated with women, such as uncreativity and independence, result from social attitudes (Barhoom 2002, pp. 158–163). Barhoom presents many adjectives which describe women but which lack feminine gender markers, such as *Imra'ah mihzāq, ra?wd, jamad, hurʃuf, buhtur, razān, nawar, khalyq*.

Surprisingly, many adjectives which describe men have feminine gender markers. These include *Rajul hawhā?, hilbājah, fazzāᶜah, Sakhkhābah, huz?ah,* and *ghuÐbah* (*ibidem*, pp. 168–171), as well as *rajul ᶜallamah, rawiyah, riᶜdydah, khalyfah, humazah* (Al'Aqtash 1998, pp. 321–325).

Moreover, there are many adjectives which are used to refer to and/or describe both sexes: *sadyq* (friend), *raswl* (messenger), *faras* (mare), *Sabwr* (patient), and Ð*ayf* (guest) (Ibn Al-Anbary 1978, pp. 107–137); another is *ᶜaqym* (barren) (Barhoom 1998, p. 224). Many things might be described using either feminine or masculine nouns. We have, for example, *ᶜasal* (honey), ťaryq (road), *sabyl* (road), *lisān* (tongue), *rwĥ* (soul), *Sirāť* (way), *sulĥufāh* (turtle), *firdaws* (paradise), *fa's* (axe) and *falak* (orbit) (Barhoom 1998, pp. 214–227).

Furthermore, there are many feminine words which are used without marks of identification, such as; ?*um atān (*she-donkey)*, faras* (she-horse) and *ᶜanz* (she-goat). I. Amayra (2003, p. 24) states that many feminine nouns are created by adding *al-ta? al- marbwťah*) to their masculine counterparts. An example would be the use of *himār* and *himārah* instead of using the word that refers to the she donkey, namely, *?um atān*. M. Barakat (2000, pp. 333–334) mentions many titles which refer to women, such as *afandy* (sir) and *khānum* (lady), which have no feminine marker. It is worth noting, however, that nowadays *afandy* is used to address only males.

FUNCTION OF GRAMMATICAL MARKERS

Discussing the phenomenon of masculine titles used with feminine markers, Al Aqtash (1998, p. 339) presents the functions of the grammatical marker (*al ta' al-marbwťah*) as follows:

1. To distinguish between:

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

a) masculine and feminine adjectives; *karym* (a generous man) and *karymah* (a generous woman).
b) individual things and their genera; *baqarah* (she-cow) and *baqar* (cattle).
c) masculine and feminine sex; *rajul* (a man) and *rajulah* (a woman).
d) masculine and feminine adjectives related to females; *murÐiᶜ* and *murÐiᶜah* (lactating).
e) Numbers from three to ten; θ*ala*θ*ah* (three).

2. To indicate:

a) the singularity of a verbal noun*: mytah* (death).
b) a thing done only once :*ghadwah* (having a lunch).
c) femininity in form: *qaryah* (village).
d) The addition of letters in feminine words, e.g., *nāqah* (she-camel).

Actually, the researchers see some oddity in items 1.d. and 2.d. Al Aqtash presents another example, which is *ᶜajwz* (an old man) and *ᶜajwzah* (an old woman), since it is well known that decrepitude is not related only to females. The example mentioned in 2.d is not accurate, since Arabic does not have the word *naq* for he-camel. Hence, it is incorrect to say that using *al-ta' al-marb*wt'*ah* represents an increase in the letters in a feminine word, since the suffix mentioned is original to this word. In addition, the researchers have not found any source that deals with an analysis of titles into their components or features. For example,

Chief – *al ra'ys*	Fatinah -Fatinah
+ human	+ human
± adult	± adult
+ male	- male

Here, the title (*al ra'ys)*, which is masculine, is used to refer to a female. Therefore, such a phrase goes against the truth condition of semantics, since the title, which is the linguistic element, indicates that the employee is male whereas the referent, which is the object, is female. To solve such a problem, speakers of Arabic and English may use one of the methods of creating of new words. In Arabic, the suitable suffix to be added is *al-ta' al-marb*wt'*ah*. The new word is *al ra'ysah* (a female chief). Speakers of English may use more than one method to feminize the word *chief*. One of them is to add an identifier: a female chief or a woman chief. A second method is using the term „chief person", which is neutral (± male). However, all these titles have to be socially motivated, and not only linguistically (Al-Hayek 2006, p. 47).

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

This study has to do mainly with the practical use of titles, and its main purpose is to state whether it is socially and/or linguistically acceptable to use

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

masculine titles to address females. The researchers believe that this will help in solving the misunderstandings caused by the linguistic issue of addressing females using masculine titles. In addition, the researchers aim through this study to ascertain to what extent speakers of Arabic are aware of the incongruence involved in using masculine titles to address females. Furthermore, the study aims to determine to what extent speakers of Arabic are willing to use feminine titles appropriately, and their attitudes towards women working outside the home in Jordan.

In an attempt to solve the problem of addressing females using masculine titles, one may use LP as a paradigm of analysis. Haugen (cited in Cooper 1989, p. 34) states that „if a linguistic situation for any reason is felt to be unsatisfactory, there is room for a program of Language Planning." LP refers to „deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes" (*ibidem*, p. 45). In addition, Cooper mentions three categories of LP. Firstly, he discusses Status Planning, which refers to deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community's languages. Secondly, we have Corpus Planning, which is the creation of new forms, the modification of old ones, or the selection from alternative forms in a spoken or written code. Lastly, we have Acquisition Planning, which holds that for a term or a language to be maintained, it should be accepted and therefore used by the majority of its speakers (*ibidem*, pp. 99–163).

In their study of the phenomenon of addressing females with masculine titles, the researchers used LP to investigate attitudes toward this phenomenon via Status Planning. Moreover, the researchers used Corpus Planning in relation to the adoption of new feminine titles, such as *ᶜaynah,* which are not used nowadays. At this point, the researchers adopted Cooper's proposition of adoption, which refers to the degree to which the planned communicative innovation has been accepted in respect to LP (*ibidem*, pp. 61–62):

Awareness. Potential adopters can identify an innovation or its *absence*.

Evaluation. Potential adopters form a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the personal usefulness of the innovation.

Proficiency. The adopter uses the planned innovation appropriately.

Knowledge implies the ability to use the innovation with the right person at the right time and right place as defined by norms of communicative appropriateness.

Usage. Whereas knowledge refers to the ability to use an innovation, usage refers to the actual frequency with which the innovation is used. One can describe usage in terms of absolute as well as relative frequencies, i.e., how often the innovation is used for a given purpose in a given context as well as how frequently it is used compared to other alternatives available to the adopter.

The researchers asked their respondents some questions to find out whether they were aware of the inappropriateness of using masculine titles to address females. Moreover, considering the second and the third propositions of adoption (Evaluation and Proficiency), they formulated many questions to investigate

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

respondents' evaluation and proficiency. Adopting Cooper's proposition of adoption in respect to LP, the researchers applied Status and Corpus Planning to achieve the aims of the study.

METHODS

The informants' sample consisted of 370 respondents. The sample consisted of employees in the Jordanian Parliament, three banks, three public universities and three public hospitals in three cities in Jordan: Amman, Irbid and Mafraq. The total number of female respondents was 161 (43.5%), while the number of male respondents came to 209 (56.5%). Among the entire sample, 43.8% were 20–30 years old, 32.4% were 31–40 years old and 23.8% were over 40 years old. Moreover, 85.1% were university graduates and 14.9% held Master's Degrees; 70.3% were from urban environments, and 29.7% were from rural areas. Furthermore, 16.8% of the sample were working in banks, 39.5% in hospitals, 15.9% in the Parliament and 27.8% in universities.

The researchers developed a two-part questionnaire. The first part elicits five personal and demographic variables for comparison purposes: sex, age, education, residence and place of occupation. The second part consists of 26 items which cover three dimensions. Respondents' awareness of the incongruence of masculine titles used to address females is dealt with in items 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 23, 25, and 26; respondents' willingness to use feminine titles appropriately is dealt with in items 3, 5, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 24; while respondents' attitude towards women working outside the home is treated by items 1, 2, 6, 16, and 20. After the development of the Arabic version of the questionnaire, 370 copies of the questionnaire were distributed among informants and retrieved in two weeks in order to analyze them in accordance with the adopted theoretical frameworks.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. Results related to the first question: To what extent are speakers of Arabic aware of the inappropriateness of masculine titles for female employees?

Table 1

Means of Items Concerned with the „Awareness Dimension"

No	Item	Mean
4	I feel disapproval when addressing females with masculine titles	3.35
7	I use feminine forms of address when speaking affectionately to my son/younger brother	2.84
8	I feel humiliated if someone addresses me using titles for the other sex	3.52
9	I don't mind giving my son/brother or my daughter/sister neutral names (names that can be used for either sex), e.g., Nour, Nidhal, Fida, Hikmat.	3.28

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

10	I think that addressing females using masculine titles is a linguistic issue.	3.38
11	I think that addressing females using masculine titles (or vice-versa) is a result of other-language influence upon Arabic speakers.	2.88
12	One of the reasons for masculinity dominance in professional titles is that males have more important roles in society than females	2.97
13	One of the reasons for masculinity dominance in professional titles is that males worked outside the home before females did.	3.57
14	I have faced embarrassing situations caused by addressing females using masculine terms.	2.81
15	I feel embarrassed if I address females using masculine titles.	3.18
18	I think that addressing someone using titles for the other sex will make him/her feel humiliated.	3.40
23	I think that masculine titles are more expressive and more powerful than feminine ones.	3.34
25	I think that addressing females using masculine forms has religious and cultural aspects.	3.00
26	I think that addressing females using masculine forms indicates social backwardness.	2.66
Total		3.16

Table 3 shows that the mean scores for the items related to the awareness dimension range from 2.66 to 3.57. The higher mean score (3.57) is for item 13. This indicates respondents' awareness of the fact that a long time ago males took it upon themselves to work outside of the home to gain sustenance for their families. However, they do not believe that the social role of men is more important than that of women. Item 12 (M 2.97) shows that the respondents do not believe that masculine dominance in titles has to do with social importance. Similarly, with a mean score of 3.34, respondents to item 23 do not believe that masculine titles are more powerful than their feminine counterparts. With a mean score of 3.52, respondents reveal their willingness to use professional titles appropriately, to use masculine titles addressing only males, and to use feminine titles to address only females. The lowest mean score (2.66) is for item 26. It reveals respondents' disagreement with the idea that inappropriate use of masculine titles to address females indicates social backwardness.

Furthermore, respondents reveal favorable attitudes in items 4, 14, 15 and 18 (M 3.35, 2.81, 3.18, 3.40; SD 1.22, 1.08, 1.21, and 1.17 respectively). They feel that it is inappropriate to address someone using titles for the other sex. For example, it is inappropriate to address Mr. Salah's wife as *sayyid* (Mr.). It is worth noting that it is inappropriate to address someone by using forms that are unsuitable at the time of speaking; hence, Mr. Salah's wife may feel humiliated if one addresses her as *ānisah* (Miss). Likewise, a single woman may feel the same if one addresses her as *sayyidah* (Mrs.). However, many respondents to item 7 did not think that it is humiliating to address their male children using feminine forms (Mean score 2.84). One of the researchers has observed her aunt addressing her son as *yaĥilwih*, which is feminine in form. This form has one a feminine gender maker, namely, the *ta' marbutah* (ة).

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

In response to items 9 and 10 (M 3.28, 3.38; SD 1.20, and 1.12 respectively), respondents considered that addressing females using masculine titles is a linguistic phenomenon. Hence, it is not a problem for them to give their children uni-sex names such as Nour, Kefah, Feda', and Hikmat. Furthermore, they do not believe that God honors masculinity over femininity (cf. item 25 (M 3.00). Speakers of Arabic are not affected by minority groups in Jordan such as Kurds, Circassians and even Indonesians, who address females using masculine forms of address. For example, they address a female saying *„inta"* (you) which is marked for the masculine gender. This is supported by item 11 (M 2.88).

Overall, respondents were aware of the incongruence of masculine titles when used to address females with feminine employees. The overall mean score of the awareness dimension was 3.16.

b. Results Related to the second question: To what extent are speakers of Arabic willing to use feminine titles appropriately?

Table 2

Means of *Items Concerned with the „Willingness" Dimension*

No	Item	Mean
3	If I were to change official papers, I would substitute the masculine titles used to address females with feminine ones.	3.16
5	I support the feminization of masculine titles to address females.	3.09
17	I think that addressing females using masculine titles is a problem which calls for cooperation between official and unofficial organizations.	3.35
19	There are more important issues to be discussed by the society's elite.	4.00
21	I think that addressing females using feminine titles depends on the public.	3.33
22	I think that addressing females using feminine titles depends on official organizations.	2.96
24	I believe that there should be a feminine lexicon instead of suffixes to indicate femininity.	3.48
	Total	3.33

Table 4 shows the extent of Arabic speakers' willingness to use feminine titles appropriately. The mean scores of this dimension range from 2.96 to 4.00. The highest mean score (4.00) was for item 19; respondents believe that there are more important and urgent issues to be discussed by the society's elite. Most of them claim that it is illogical to discuss such a topic ignoring the war in many Arab countries. (The questionnaire was distributed in the summer of 2006, at which time there was war in Palestine, Iraq and Lebanon).

The lowest mean score (2.96) was for item 22. Item 22 shows that respondents do not believe that the appropriate use of feminine titles can be legislated from above. Rather, they believe that it depends on people's willingness; this is supported by item 21 with a mean score of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 1.04. Respondents believe there should be a separate feminine lexicon instead of feminine markers added to masculine lexicons. For example, they say *baqarah*

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

(she-cow) instead of adding the feminine marker to the masculine counterpart *θawr- θawrah*, which is supported by item 24 (M 3.48).

Item 17, with a mean score of 3.35, indicates that respondents are willing to cooperate with official organizations in order to use feminine titles appropriately, and that if they were in positions of authority, they would encourage and recommend such use (Item 3, with a mean score of 3.16). Finally, item 5, with a mean score of 3.09, confirms that respondents support the feminizaton of masculine titles to address females.

The overall mean score for the willingness dimension was 3.33. This means that respondents are willing to use feminine titles appropriately.

c. Results Related to the Third Question: What are Arabic speakers' attitudes toward women working outside the home in Jordan?

Concerning the third dimension, which deals with attitudes towards females working outside the home with men in Jordan, the researchers used a descriptive statistical analysis to calculate the mean score and standard deviation for each item.

Table 3

Means of Items Concerned with Attitudes Towards Females Working Outside the Home in Jordan

No	Item	Mean
1	I support women working outside the home.	3.54
2	I support women being in positions of authority at work.	3.15
6	I disapprove of females' working in positions of authority.	2.30
16	I don't like females to be employers.	2.82
20	I approve of females' working in positions of authority.	3.27
	Attitudes towards women working outside the home with men in Jordan.	3.02

The overall mean score for this dimension was 3.02. This indicates that respondents accept the idea of females working outside the home with men in Jordan.

CONCLUSION

By conducting this study on female and male employees, the researchers sought to identify the sociolinguistic factors that determine whether females are addressed using masculine titles. The data collected and their statistical analysis revealed that the personal relationship between the female addressee and the person addressing her, whether female or male, determines the titles used. A female supervisor, for instance, states that a male employee may not only refuse to address her using a feminine title, but also use degrading terms when talking to and about her.

Moreover, the researchers found that many employees believe that their employers focus excessively on the way they are addressed. A male employee states that his female supervisor at work requires employees to address her using feminine titles instead of masculine ones.

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

Linguistically speaking, Arabic has no grammatical rule which prevents speakers of Arabic from feminizing masculine titles. However, it is strongly related to the speakers' understanding of their language(s): Claiming that many feminine titles have negative meanings or associations, many females refuse to be addressed using feminized titles. For example, a female judge may refuse to be addressed with the feminine title *qaĐiyah* because its meaning has to do with death (Mas'oud 2002, p. 682). However, this point of view is very narrow given the fact that, as has been noted, there are many words in Arabic that have more than one meaning. Hence, using feminine titles does not necessarily indicate the unwanted connotation of the word; rather, it only does so if the speaker intentionally and explicitly aims to reveal such a negative connotation.

On the other hand, many speakers of Arabic feminize masculine words in their daily talks. Furthermore, aiming to insult a female, many speakers of Arabic may use masculine animal words by adding a marker of feminine gender. For example, they may feminize the word **θ***awr* (bull), which becomes **θ***awrah*. It is worth mentioning here that there are no real referents for such new formed words: there is no **θ***awrah* in the real world; rather, the feminine counterpart of the masculine **θ***awr* is *baqarah* (she-cow).

It requires significant effort and time to change negative attitudes towards women in a society and towards many feminine gendered words in Arabic. Moreover, it may be the responsibility of women to begin trying to make such changes.

Appendix: English Translation of the Questionnaire

Brother/Sister ……

The researcher is doing a thesis study entitled *Gender and Language from a Linguistic Perspective*. This questionnaire aims to investigate attitudes towards the use of masculine forms in addressing females in Jordan.

Place a (7) in the blank which expresses your opinion. This information will be used for scientific research purposes only.

Researchers
Prof. Fawwaz Al-Abed Al-Haq
Reema Salah Al-Hayek

Personal Data:

Sex:* Male* Female
Age:* 20–30* 31–40* 41–more

Educational Level: * BA or less* graduate degree

Place of Residence: * Village* City

Place of Occupation: * Hospital * Bank *University* Parliament*

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

No.	Item	strongly agree	agree	not sure	disagree	strongly disagree
1	I support women working outside the home.					
2	I support women being supervisors in work places.					
3	If I could change official papers, I would substitute the masculine titles used to address females with feminine ones.					
4	I feel disapproval when addressing females using masculine titles.					
5	I support the feminization of masculine titles to address females.					
6	I disapprove of females' occupying positions of authority in work places.					
7	I use feminine forms when speaking affectionately to my son/brother.					
8	I feel humiliated if someone addresses me using titles for the other sex.					
9	I don't mind giving my son/brother or my daughter/sister neutral names (names that can be used for both sexes), e.g. Nour, Nidhal, Fida, Hikmat.					
10	I think that addressing females using masculine titles is a linguistic issue.					
11	I think that addressing females using masculine titles (or vice-versa) is a result of other-language influence upon Arabic speakers.					
12	One of the reasons for masculinity dominance in professional titles is that males have more important roles in society than females.					

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

No.	Item	strongly agree	agree	not sure	disagree	strongly disagree
13	One of the reasons for masculinity dominance in professional titles is that males worked outside the home before females did.					
14	I have faced embarrassing situations caused by addressing females using masculine titles.					
15	I feel embarrassed if I address females using masculine titles.					
16	I don't like females to be supervisors in work places.					
17	I think that addressing females using masculine titles is a problem which calls for cooperation between official and unofficial organizations.					
18	I think that addressing someone using titles for the other sex makes him/her feel humiliated.					
19	There are more important issues to be discussed by the society's elite.					
20	I approve of females' occupying positions of authority in work places.					
21	I think that addressing females using feminine titles depends on the public.					
22	I think that addressing females using feminine titles depends on official organizations.					
23	I think that masculine titles are more expressive and more powerful than feminine ones.					
24	I believe that there should be a feminine lexicon instead of suffixes to indicate femininity.					
25	I think that addressing females using masculine forms has religious and cultural aspects.					
26	I think that addressing females using masculine forms indicates social backwardness.					

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

REFERENCES

English

Al-Abed Al-Haq 1986 = F. Al-Abed Al-Haq, Arabization in Jordan, in „International Journal of Islamic and Arabic Studies", III, 1986, nr. 2, pp. 27–29.
Al-Abed Al-Haq 1998 = F. Al-Abed Al-Haq, *Toward A Theoretical Framework for the Study of Planning Arabization*, in Shunnaq *et al*. (eds.), 1998.
Al Hayek 2006 = Reema Al Hayek, *Gender and Language from a Language Planning Perspective* Unpublished MA Thesis, 2006, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
Ali 2003 = A. Ali, *The Meaning of the Holy Qur'an: Complete Translation with Selected Notes*, UK, The Islamic Foundation, 2003.
Al-Masaeid 2005 = A. Al-Masaeid, *The Attitudes of Jordanian University Students towards Language Planning in Jordan*, Irbid, Jordan, Yarmouk University, 2005.
Al-Oliemat 1998 = A. Al-Oliemat, *Attitudes of Jordanian Members of Parliament Towards Arabization from a Language Planning Perspective*, Irbid, Jordan, Yarmouk University, 1998.
Blommaert 1996 = J. Blommaert, *Language Planning as a Discourse in Language and Society: The Linguistic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition*, in „Language Problems and Language Planning", XX, 1996, nr. 3, pp. 199–222.
Cooper 1989 = R. Cooper, *Language Planning and Social Change*, Cambridge – New York – Port Chester – Melbourne – Sydney, Cambridge University Press, 1989.
Eckert, McConnell-Ginet 2003 = P. Eckert, S. McConnell-Ginet, *Language and Gender*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
El-Mouloudi 1986 = A. El-Mouloudi, *Arabic Language Planning: The Case of Lexical Modernization*, Faculty of the Graduate School of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1986.
Ferguson 2006 = Gibson Ferguson, *Language Planning and Education*, Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
Frank, Anshen 1983 = F. Frank, F. Anshen, *Language and the Sexes*, Albany State, University of New York Press, 1983.
Hornby 1995 = A. Hornby, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 5th edition, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995.
Ibrahim 1973 = M. Ibrahim, *Grammatical Gender: Its Origin and Development*, The Hague – Paris, Mouton, 1973.
Jernudd, Das Gupta 1971 = B. Jernudd, J. Das Gupta, *Towards a Theory of language Planning*, in Rubin, Jernudd (eds.) 1971.
Mills 1998 = S. Mills, *Feminist Stylistics*, London – New York, Routledge, 1998.
Rubin, Jernudd (eds.) 1971 = Rubin, J. Das Gupta, *Can Language Be Planned*?, Hawaii, The University Press of Hawaii, 1971.
Shunnaq *et al*. (eds.) 1998 = Abdullah Shunnaq, Cay Dollerup, Mohammad Saraireh (eds.), *Issues in Translation*, Jordan, Irbid National University and Jordanian Translators' Association, 1998.

Arabic

The Holy Quran.
Al Anbary, Barakat 1970 = Ibn Al Anbary, Abu Barakat, *Al Bulgha fi al farq bain al mudhakkar w al mu'nnath*, Ramadan Abd al Tawwab, UAE, Dar al Kitab, 1970.
Al Anbari, Bakr 1978 = Ibn Al Anbari, Abu Bakr, *Al mudhakkar w al mu'nnath*, Tareq Abd Awn, Baghdad, Al Ani, 1978.
Al-Aqtash 1998 = A. Al-Aqtash, *Allama wa amthaluha min nu'wt al muthakkar: tawtheeq wa mulahatha fi nitham al biy'a wa ma'na maqta' al ta' fiha*, in „Abhath al Yarmouk", XVI, nr. 204, pp. 319–354.
Al Samara'y 1985 = I. Al Samara'y, *Fi al tadhkeer wal ta'neeth: nathra tareekhya fi hathihi al mas'ala*, in „Majalat majma' al lugha al arabiya al urduni", IX, nr. 28–29, pp. 131–154.
Ammayra 1993 = I. Ammayra, *Dhaherat al ta'neeth bain al lugha al arabiya wal-lughat al sameya: Derasah lughawya ta'selya*, 2nd edition, Amman, Dar Haneen, 1993.

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)

Ammayra 2003 = I. Ammayra, *Derasat lughawya Muqarena: Dhaherat al ta'neeth bain al lugha al arabiya w al lughat al sameya*, Jordan, Dar Wa'el, 2003.
Barakat 1998 = I. Barakat, *Al Ta'neetn fi al lugha al arabiya*, Al-Mansura, Dar al wafa, 1998.
Barakat 2000 = M. Barakat, *Al Alqab wa al wadha'ef al othmanya*, Cairo, Dar ghareeb, [no date].
Barhoom 1998 = I. Barhoom, *Mas'alat al mudhakkar w al mu'nnath fi al lugha w al nahu*, Irbid, Jordan, Yarmouk University, 1998.
Barhoom 2002 = I. Barhoom, *Al lugha w al jins al lughawi: Hafriyat fi al dhukura w al u'nutha*, Amman, Dar al Shurouq, 2002.
Omar 1996 = A. Omar, *Al Lugha w ikhtilaf al jinsayen*, Cairo, Alam al Kutub, 1996.
Saleh 1984 = M. Saleh, *Tafseer al nusous fi al fqh al islami*, 3rd edition, Beirut – Damascus, The Islamic Office, 1984.

Abstract

This sociolinguistic study aims to identify the extent to which speakers of Arabic in Jordan are aware of the incongruence of masculine titles used to address females and their willingness to use feminine titles appropriately. To achieve these goals, the researchers developed and distributed a two-part questionnaire in three cities in Jordan: Amman, Irbid, and Mafraq. The first part includes independent variables (sex, age, educational level, place of residence, and occupation). The second part, which consists of 26 items, is a five–point Lickert scalemeasuring awareness of the incongruence of the masculine titles used to address females, and willingness to use feminine titles appropriately.

Keywords: gender, language planning, professional titles.

Yarmouk University
Irbid, Jordan
fawazm57@gmail.com

216 Cumberland Road
Auburn NSW 2144 Australia
reema_alhayek@yahoo.com

BDD-A1740 © 2012 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:46 UTC)