



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

Judges' perspectives on the use of modern standard Arabic versus vernacular in court proceedings

Majd Almanasra^{1*} , Abdullah Alkhseilat², Ahmad S Haider³, Hamzeh Abu Issa³, Saad Meqdad³, Mohammad Nasr Khater³

¹United Arab Emirates University, Al Ain

²Amman Arab University, Jordan

³Applied Science Private University, Jordan

*Correspondence: dr.manasra@uaeu.ac.ae

ABSTRACT

The choice of language in courts greatly aids in facilitating clarity, accessibility and actual legitimacy of court action. Generally, in Arabic-speaking countries, MSA is thought to be the standard formal language of law, while vernacular Arabic is the everyday spoken colloquial variety. The current study examines judges' attitudes regarding the choice between the MSA and vernacular Arabic in court in terms of clarity and comprehensibility, formality, accessibility for the litigants, and regulatory issues. A well-designed 20-item questionnaire was distributed among 300 judges of different ranks (First Instance, Appeal, and Supreme/High Courts) operating in different geographical settings (urban, rural, and mixed) in Jordan. The results demonstrated that judges preferred MSA, strongly linking it with clarity, consistency, and authority in court, while vernacular Arabic was believed to help litigants and low educational background individuals understand the court procedures better. It is recommended that MSA should continue to be the language of record in order not to compromise institutional legitimacy, while it advocates the limited conscious use of vernacular Arabic during oral hearings in a way promoting fairness and encouraging participation.

KEYWORDS: courtroom, judicial perspectives, vernacular, standard language

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 6, Issue 4, 2025

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 11 September 2025

Accepted: 01 November 2025

Published: 27 November 2025

HOW TO CITE

Almanasra, M., Alkhseilat, A., Haider, A. S., Abu Issa, H., Meqdad, S., & Khater, M. N. (2025). Judges' perspectives on the use of modern standard Arabic versus vernacular in court proceedings. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/9vb1qg73>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2025 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

Language is one of the basic pillars of the legal system; it is a communication means, but also a way of conferring legitimacy, emphasizing authority, and assuring equality, at least in theory (Fairclough, 2013). The question of what language form is adopted in the courts is, therefore possibly not a matter of choice, but a choice directly reflected in the image of justice and the legitimacy of the judiciary itself (Conley, O'Barr, & Riner, 2022; Marmor, 2014).

Studies across the region similarly emphasize the significance of language choice in formal contexts (Al-Dhuhli, Alkindi, & Al-Taani, 2022; Ammari & Al-Ahmad, 2023; Fraihat, 2024; Ja'afreh, 2023; Khatatbah & Ashour, 2024; Masoud, 2025; Meqdad, Al-Bayyari, & Al-Taher, 2023; Naib, 2025). In the Arab context, the phenomenon of diglossia takes place, with MSA coexisting with a multitude of vernacular dialects (Ferguson, 1959). MSA is the variety used in formal settings, while vernacular is the language of day-to-day life that takes the discourse closer to the general public and facilitates understanding and participation (Ghassan & Haider, 2025).

As per the law, this duality creates a basic challenge in the courts: whether or not the standard variety is to be sanctioned as the language of law and legitimacy, or, in a few cases, use of vernacularism be further found proper to enhance clarity and accessibility of proceedings by litigants (Goswami, 2022; Rickford & King, 2016). Some may say the use of MSA gives prestige to the courts and sustains accuracy and consistency, while others will contend that vernacularism could serve more effectively in enabling less educated people to follow the proceedings of trials and participate fruitfully in them. (Alhendi & Baniamer, 2020) This is the dialectic between formality and the ease of understanding made possible through language. It is not purely a linguistic issue but, judicial par excellence, the issue of language within the judiciary. (Alhasan, 2025)

In fact, the above study on the general issue is largely topical because there are no concerted efforts by the existing literature to investigate how judges perceive the use of classical and vernacular language in the courtroom. The importance of this study is that it further sheds light on a very sensitive aspect of justice-in the language in which litigants and their grievances are presented to effect change in understanding, participation, and public trust in the judicial institution.

Existing literature has primarily looked at language in education, media, and sociolinguistic situations, but has left out much attention to language in the judiciary (Al-Dhuhli et al., 2022; Ammari & Al-Ahmad, 2023; Fraihat, 2024; Ja'afreh, 2023; Meqdad et al., 2023). Where courtroom language has been studied, most of the focus has been on other areas (Angermeyer, 2005; Berk-Seligson, 2022; Weld-Ali, Obeidat, & Haider, 2023). This thus remains vacant in understanding how a judge perceives the way MSA as opposed to vernacular Arabic has on the clarity of legal arguments, accessibility of proceedings, dignity of the court, and need for and levels of formal regulation as a key decision maker in legal processes. Filling this gap will be crucial for the policy discourse around language planning within the judiciary. (Alhendi & Baniamer, 2024)

This study seeks to explore the perspectives of judges on the use of MSA and vernacular Arabic in court proceedings through the following guiding questions:

1. What is the judge's opinion about the use of MSA as compared with vernacular Arabic in terms of clarity, comprehension, formality, and accessibility in offices?
2. Are judges really interested in regulating or making policies about language choice in courts?

2. Literature Review

Law has been conceptualized as a culturally and socially constituted sign-system, where language not only transmits meaning but also constitutes legal realities and reflects social inequalities (Anne, Matulewska, & Cheng, 2020; Matulewska & Wagner, 2023; Wagner & Matulewska, 2020). In particular, the "third space" of communication in law (Matulewska & Wagner, 2021) is highly relevant in diglossic Arabic-speaking courts, where judges switch between MSA and vernacular speech. Such a process presupposes interpretive and semiotic mediation techniques at work, in which every linguistic choice has both legal and cultural entailments (Wagner & Gemar, 2014; Khater et al., 2025)

Legal discourse is renowned for being complex (Bhatia, Candlin, & Engberg, 2008; Cheng & Danesi, 2019; Goźdź-Roszkowski, 2021). The issue of language cannot be separated from the organizational and

political dimensions. (Alhendi, 2024) Most Arab countries have constitutions stating that MSA is the official language of the courts; however, reality shows the strong presence of vernacularism in oral arguments. (Jaradat & Al-Taher, 2021)

Some scholars have conceptualized law as a culturally and socially constituted sign system in which the functioning of language is not only to convey issues of meaning but rather to create legal realities and articulate social inequalities (Anne et al., 2020; Matulewska & Wagner, 2023; Wagner & Matulewska, 2020) .

The “third space” communication practice in law (Matulewska & Wagner, 2021) finds particular relevance in diglossia-ridden Arabic-speaking courts, where judges vacillate between MSA and its vernacular speech. The interpretive and semiotic mediation techniques used bring together a highly complicated process, where every choice of language has legal implications and cultural salience (Wagner & Gemar, 2014).

Legal discourse is known for its complexity (Bhatia et al., 2008; Cheng & Danesi, 2019; Goźdz-Roszkowski, 2021). The administration of the legal system is closely conjoined with the political and social realities. Many Arab countries say that MSA is the official language of the courts, but in practice, a long tradition of vernacularism in oral pleadings reigns over the courts. (Al-Taher, 2019)

The Arabic-speaking world is known for diglossia; Ferguson (1959) stated that there is “high” variety of MSA for education, religion, law, and prestige, but “low” varieties of vernacular Arabic exist for daily communication (Haider & Hussein, 2022). This diglossic situation is particularly relevant in courtroom parlance, or in any other situation when the most visible contrast between formal state and public access appears (Al-Kahtany, 1997). The judges may prefer MSA, which makes it seem that the formal ground is clearer, more neutral, and more authoritative; thus, which makes it possible to keep apparently equivalently legitimate and consistent practices of the judiciary. Conversely, a vernacular Arabic is considered more authentic, immediate, and accessible to ordinary speakers, hence making it a very useful instrument for achieving comprehension among litigants with different educational backgrounds (Agbaakin, 2024).

In terms of courtroom language, it is not a neutral medium but rather a site for the enactment and reinforcement of power relations (Johnson & Coulthard, 2010). The linguistic distance between MSA and the everyday speech of litigants may, in fact, perpetuate communicative inequality to the detriment of those who are not familiar with the formal register of law (Eades, 2010). It shows the contradiction in the legal system between legal formalism and accessibility: MSA offers stability, authority, and documentation, whereas colloquial Arabic promotes fairness and inclusivity-stability during oral hearings. (Alhendi & Baniamer, 2022)

Judges’ opinions regarding the use of MSA compared to written vernacular Arabic cannot be interpreted in isolation; instead, they have to be understood within the broader sociolinguistic dynamics of Arabic diglossia and the ideological hierarchies referencing varieties of language, as well as the requirements for legal discourse to speak with authority while remaining accessible. (Meqdad & Abu Issa 2024).

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 300 judges who presided over different courts in Jordan and was targeted from April to June 2024. The questionnaires targeted judges from courts of different hierarchies, which are the First Instance, Appeal, and Supreme/High Court, besides considering geographical contexts-urban, rural, and mixed, and with different years of judicial experience. According to the age group participants, the participants were below 35 years and above 65 years, with male and female judges presenting. The sample size is purposely diverse to have a spectrum of views from all judicial ranks and corners of the country. Participation was voluntary, and each respondent filled out the questionnaire anonymously.

3.2 Survey Instrument and Structure

The questionnaire aims to gather judges’ opinions on the use of MSA and vernacular Arabic in the courtroom. The questionnaire contained two different types. Part I: Demographic Information contained details of participants, such as age, gender, year of judicial experience, court level of operation, and geographical location of the court. Part II: Main Constructs comprised 20 items under five dimensions, namely Language Usage in Court (Items 1-3), Perceived Clarity and Comprehension (Items 4-6), Perceptions of Courtroom Formality (Items 7-11), Perceived Accessibility for Litigants (Items 12-16), and Regulation and Policy Orientation (Items 17-20).

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

The survey was carried out from April to June 2024 by means of a structured questionnaire sent electronically via email and in hard copy. Judicial councils and court administrators assisted in the distribution through their official channels. The instrument had then been pretested for clarity and contextual relevance among judges (n=15) before final administration. Some minor changes were made in the wording and ordering of some items according to the feedback provided.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

Demographic variables with frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations are used descriptively to summarize the results of the questionnaire items. Likewise, constructs were determined by Cronbach's alpha concerning reliability and internal consistency. Internal consistency for each construct has also been measured in the application of Cronbach's Alpha, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha for Each Construct (Cronbach, 1951)

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α
Language Usage in Court	1–3	0.74
Perceived Clarity and Comprehension	4–6	0.77
Perceptions of Courtroom Formality	7–11	0.81
Perceived Accessibility for Litigants	12–16	0.79
Regulation and Policy Orientation	17–20	0.76

Table 1 further illustrates that the reliability analysis indicated good levels of internal consistency for all five constructs; that is, they have Cronbach's alpha scores ranging from .74 to .81. According to accepted benchmarks in social science research, values over .70 indicate satisfactory levels of reliability, while values over .80 provide evidence of high internal consistency. The construct Courtroom Perceptions of Formality produced the best reliability (.81), indicating that it has particularly coherent sets of items. The other constructs, including Language Usage in Court ($\alpha = .74$), Perceived Clarity and Comprehension ($\alpha = .77$), Perceived Accessibility for Litigants ($\alpha = .79$), and Regulation and Policy Orientation ($\alpha = .76$), were also within the acceptable range. These results further affirm that the instrument is indeed internally reliable and thus feasible for further statistical analysis on judges' perspectives.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

The ethical principles indicated in the Declaration of Helsinki were followed throughout the research process. This study was reviewed and approved by the IRB of The Applied Science Private University in Jordan (Approval Code: FOAH 11/2024, in effect from 20/02/2025). Judges were informed about the purpose of the study and reassured that confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained, and they were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without facing any repercussions. Consent was obtained from the judges digitally and on paper before the study commenced. After completing the research, all data were saved for academic purposes only.

3.6 Hypotheses

- **H1:** Judges who consider vernacular Arabic as undermining courtroom formality (Items 7-11) will in all likelihood rally support for regulation on MSA use (Items 17-20).
- **H2:** Judges who view MSA as enhancing clarity and comprehension (Items 4–6) will also report stronger agreement that it reinforces the dignity and professionalism of judicial proceedings (Items 7–11).
- **H3:** Judges who believe vernacular Arabic improves accessibility for litigants (Items 12–16) will be less likely to support strict regulations prohibiting its use in court (Items 17–20).
- **H4:** Judges with more years of judicial experience (Demographic Item 3) will be more likely to associate MSA with courtroom dignity and authority (Items 7–11) compared to less experienced judges.
- **H5:** Judges serving in urban courts (Demographic Item 5) will be more likely to support regulations enforcing the use of MSA (Items 17–20) than judges serving in rural courts.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, we will present the results of the study and discuss some broader implications arising therefrom. The discussion is organized as follows: (1) the demographic profile of the sample of MSA judges, (2) descriptive overview of the responses to the questionnaires organized by construct, and (3) test of the proposed hypotheses with inferential statistics. The aim is to examine judges' perspectives regarding the roles of MSA and vernacular Arabic in the courtroom in relation to clarity, formality, accessibility, and regulatory policy.

4.1 Sample Characteristics

The final sample consisted of 300 judges from different courts in Jordan (Table 2). Judges from both First Instance (Trial Courts) and Appeal Courts and the Supreme/High Court were included in the population; the sample included representatives from both urban and rural regions.

Table 2. Demographic Summary of Participants (N = 300)

Variable	Category	Count	Percentage (%)
Age	Under 35	36	12.00%
	35–44	72	24.00%
	45–54	84	28.00%
	55–64	69	23.00%
	65 and above	39	13.00%
Gender	Male	210	70.00%
	Female	84	28.00%
	Prefer not to say	6	2.00%
Judicial Experience	Less than 5 years	27	9.00%
	5–10 years	63	21.00%
	11–20 years	96	32.00%
	More than 20 years	114	38.00%
Court Level	First Instance (Trial)	135	45.00%
	Appeal Court	99	33.00%
	Supreme/High Court	66	22.00%
Geographical Location	Urban	162	54.00%
	Rural	81	27.00%
	Mixed	57	19.00%

As pointed out in Table 2, 65% of participants were aged between 35 and 64 years and were categorized as mid-career and senior judges with lots of years in professional practice. This by itself means that 70% of judges would be male, 28% female, and only 2% would decline to say what gender they belong to. The years of judicial experience indicate that most judges have accumulated up to, with at least 38% reporting above 20 years, another indicator for significant professional experience covered in the sample.

First Instance Courts contributed nearly half of the participants at 45%, followed by the Appeal Courts at 33% and then by the Supreme/High Court at 22%. In distribution by area, 54% of the sample were urban courts; 27% were rural; 19%, mixed jurisdictions. With this even representation, one may now certify that the study is generalizable enough to rely on this fact to lend a strong basis for analyzing judges' perspectives on language use in court processes.

4.2 Analysis of the Questionnaire's Items

The organization of the items into the five construct areas is provided in Table 3: (1) Language Use in Court, (2) Perceived Clarity and Comprehension, (3) Perceptions of Formality in Court, (4) Perceived Accessibility of Court for Litigants, and (5) Regulation and Policy Orientation.

Table 3. Questionnaire Item Responses by Construct (N = 300)

Construct	No.	Questionnaire Item	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
Language Usage in Court	1	In my court, Modern Standard Arabic is the main language used by lawyers during sessions.	82	10	8
	2	Switching between Modern Standard Arabic and vernacular Arabic during court sessions is common.	69.3	15	15.7
	3	Judicial rulings written in Modern Standard Arabic are more authoritative than those expressed in vernacular Arabic.	87.7	8.3	4
Perceived Clarity & Comprehension	4	The use of vernacular Arabic can sometimes obscure key legal concepts.	76	12.3	11.7
	5	Court participants understand legal procedures more clearly when Modern Standard Arabic is used.	81.3	11.7	7
	6	Switching from Modern Standard Arabic to vernacular during proceedings can create inconsistency in comprehension.	72.7	14	13.3
Perceptions of Courtroom Formality	7	The use of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) reflects the dignity of judicial proceedings.	85	9	6
	8	When vernacular Arabic is used in court, it undermines the formal nature of the proceedings.	78.7	12	9.3
	9	Modern Standard Arabic maintains the professional image of the courtroom.	83.3	10	6.7
	10	Using vernacular Arabic in court makes the proceedings feel less serious or official.	74	13.7	12.3
	11	The consistent use of Modern Standard Arabic reinforces respect for judicial authority.	88.3	7.3	4.4
Perceived Accessibility for Litigants	12	Using vernacular Arabic in court allows litigants with lower education levels to participate more effectively.	71	14.3	14.7
	13	Relying exclusively on Modern Standard Arabic can disadvantage litigants unfamiliar with formal legal language.	68	16.7	15.3
	14	Language choice in court influences whether litigants feel they are being treated fairly.	73.3	15	11.7
	15	Proceedings conducted in vernacular Arabic help reduce misunderstandings between judges and litigants.	66.7	17	16.3
	16	Exclusive reliance on Modern Standard Arabic can create a sense of distance between the judiciary and ordinary citizens.	70.3	14	15.7
Regulation & Policy Orientation	17	Language choice in court should be left to judges' discretion rather than mandated by policy.	62.7	18.3	19
	18	Establishing a regulation that enforces the use of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) would ensure greater consistency.	74.3	13.7	12
	19	Strict regulations on courtroom language are unnecessary because flexibility is important.	59	20	21
	20	National policy should explicitly prohibit the use of vernacular Arabic in judicial rulings.	71	15.3	13.7

4.2.1 Language Usage in Court (Items 1–3)

The results of this construct patently indicate judges' trends in making MSA the leading language in their judicial proceedings. 82% of the judges (item 1) stated that MSA is the major language used by lawyers in hearing's courtroom; thus, it is indicative of a stability for MSA as the standard language in courts. Nevertheless, 69.3% (item 2) confirmed the general switch between MSA and vernacular during hearings, proving that it is nothing

but pure flexibility allowing to adjust according to how pleadings are framed. Item 3 had consensus rate on top at 87.7%, with judges being of the opinion that most authoritative and credible judgments are those in MSA as opposed to those expressed in vernacular terms. Therefore, it is apparent that judges consider MSA as the language of legitimacy in judicial prestige, while vernacularism still holds oral practice for regulated interaction within the session.

4.2.2 Perceived Clarity and Comprehension (Items 4–6)

The responses clearly evince a strong preference for clarity in MSA. This is exemplified in Item 4, wherein, out of the 76%, judges seemed to believe that vernacular Arabic is able to hide legal concepts and that precision is an area of concern. Likewise, 81.3% of respondents believed in Item 5 that MSA is better understood by all participants in court proceedings, or clarity and universality of its acceptability. Also, 72.7% agreed in Item 6 assuming that switching up again and again between varieties during proceedings creates inconsistency, leading us to comprehend the problems of mixing codes in a legal setup that is so complicated.

4.2.3 Perceptions of Courtroom Formality (Items 7–11)

Formality was one of the most strongly endorsed constructs. In item 7, 85% of judges were of the opinion that MSA reflected the dignity of judicial proceedings, while item 9 (83.3%) dwelt on the role of MSA in preserving the professional image of the courtroom. This item received the most emphatic support 11, where 88.3% of judges attested that such usage of MSA promotes respect for judicial authority. Judges equally expressed concerns about colloquial usage: Item 8 (78.7%) affirmed that it diminishes formality while Item 10 (74%) agreed that it makes proceedings appear less serious or official. All these major findings then directly tie the courtroom authority and dignity to the use of MSA.

4.2.4 Perceived Accessibility for Litigants (Items 12–16)

Some of the judges recognized the contribution of vernacular Arabic in terms of access. Item 12 shows that 71% believe that the vernacular Arabic would allow less-academically inclined people involved in litigation to participate better. Similar, item 15 (66.7%) shows judges' perception of vernacular Arabic as one of the means that can help reduce misunderstandings between litigants and judges. Meanwhile, there were also some concerns regarding MSA exclusivity: Item 13 said (68%) reliance on MSA would put at disadvantage litigants, who are unfamiliar with the high language, while Item 16 (70.3%) suggested social distance created between the judiciary and citizens. Importantly included in item 14 (73.3%) is perhaps the most compelling linking argument concerning language choice to whether litigants feel treated fairly or not: "The language in which the proceedings are conducted influences how litigants perceive the courts as fair or unfair."

4.2.5 Regulation and Policy Orientation (Items 17–20)

Some judges spoke in favor of a regulation of language whereas some judges gave contrary opinions. On Item 18, 74.3% affirmed that regulation enforcing MSA would make things more consistent, whereas on Item 20, 71% supported a national policy explicitly prohibiting vernacular Arabic in judicial rulings. The respondents were overwhelmingly supportive of flexibility: Item 17 had a 62.7% level of support for leaving the language choice to the discretion of judges, while Item 19, at a 59% level, contrary to any stringent form of regulation, favored flexible regulation of judicial practice. All these findings reflect the delicate balance: with one end of the scale weighing toward MSA being treated as the formal model, the other end aims to ensure freedom of professional discretion in the language to be used.

4.3 Testing the Hypotheses

This section describes the inferential statistical analysis results, used to provide an evaluation of five core hypotheses approached toward studying judges' opinions with regard to courtroom language-the choice of MSA versus vernacular Arabic-as these relate to considerations of clarity, formality, accessibility, regulatory preferences, and demographic factors.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested using Pearson correlation to examine associations between paired constructs (Table 4).

Table 4. Pearson Correlation Results for H1, H2, and H3

Hypothesis	Variables Compared	r	p-value	Significant
H1	Courtroom formality (Items 7–11) vs. Regulatory orientation (Items 17–20)	0.42	0.001	✓ Yes
H2	Clarity & comprehension (Items 4–6) vs. Courtroom formality (Items 7–11)	0.47	0.001	✓ Yes
H3	Accessibility for litigants (Items 12–16) vs. Regulatory orientation (Items 17–20)	–0.38	0.002	✓ Yes

For H1, the basis of correlation ($r = 0.42$, $p = 0.001$) indicates that judges who viewed vernacular Arabic as undermining of formality (Items 7–11) were also likely to support regulations enforcing the use of MSA (Items 17–20). This indicates that some concerns regarding the dignity and authority of the courtroom are rather directly providing fuel to support the language standardization policies.

H2 suggested that judges who see that MSA enhances clarity and comprehension (Items 4–6) should also agree to a greater extent that it reinforces courtroom dignity (Items 7–11). The positive correlation ($r = 0.47$, $p = 0.001$) strongly supports this assertion because it highlights how clarity and formality mutually reinforce dimensions of judicial language preference.

For H3, the negative correlation ($r = -0.38$, $p = 0.002$) affirms that judges who stressed the accessibility advantages of vernacular Arabic (Items 12–16) were reducing their support for strict prohibitions against its use (Items 17–20). This finding serves to highlight the inherent tension between inclusivity for litigants, and a conventional court linguistic uniformity.

H4 tested whether the judges' identification of MSA with courtroom dignity and authority varied depending on their experience as judges. A one-way ANOVA was carried out with years of judicial experience serving as an independent variable and courtroom formality scores (Items 7–11) serving as a dependent variable.

Table 5. Judicial Experience vs. Courtroom Formality

Grouping Variable	Dependent Variable	F-value	p-value	Significant
Judicial Experience	Courtroom formality score	5.13	0.002	✓ Yes

The ANOVA results show statistically significant differences in perceptions of formality across levels of experience ($F = 5.13$, $p = 0.002$). Post-hoc comparisons indicate that judges with more than two decades of experience display stronger agreement on MSA as reflecting dignity and authority of the courtroom as compared to those judging below five years of experience. This indicates that having spent a number of years on the job would create stronger alignment by judges with the MSA and its symbolic prestige of judicial proceedings.

Hypothesis 5 addressed whether judges in urban courts were more likely to support the imposition of MSA than judges serving in rural courts. An independent samples t-test was conducted in this regard (see Table 6).

Table 6. Urban vs. Rural Judges (Regulatory Orientation, Items 17–20)

Group	Mean Score	t-value	p-value	Significant
Urban courts	3.71	2.98	0.003	✓ Yes
Rural courts	3.45			

There are inference differences ($t = 2.98$, $p = 0.003$). Judges from cities reported stronger support for regulatory enforcement of MSA compared to judges from rural areas. The findings suggest judges who reside in urban areas may have more structured types of legal practices including an increased level of formality which they tend to expect.

5. Conclusion

Language in courts is more than just a means of communication between people; it is also the very foundation of law, justice, and prestige in the institutions of the judiciary (Ervo, 2016; O'barr, 2014; Philips, 1998; Roszkowski & Pontrandolfo, 2021). It's one out of many options that wed judges consider because of its holding ideals in precision, clarity, and consistency, thus bringing seriousness and official authority into this survey of 300 judges from different levels and geographical locales. The same judges recognized the real-life functions of vernaculars to bring all litigants along to meaningful participation, even those who are less well educated or familiar with

professional jargon in the legal arena. Sometimes even space creates conflict: wants formal prestige, in the other hand requires inclusiveness and fair treatment. Hence, the balanced policy approach would provide for MSA in documentation with limited exceptions for vernacular in oral procedures in promoting her values of fairness and participation. It is not much about language but about justice itself, balancing formality and accessibility, basically.

The implications from the findings are very weighty about how they will deliver the judicial policy framework into the training of professionals. First, it opens a precipitate demand for clearer national directions with reference to the standards required of the language as the only official language for judgments and documentation runs, but flexible for vernacular use in oral process interactions where necessary to facilitate process and ensure litigant presence. Besides, judicial training and legal counseling programs would benefit from training how to manage, in a balanced manner, code-switching between accuracy in formal and informal communications and the right understanding and interaction.

It therefore bears the academic basis through which judges in the policies that they propose to develop may subsequently improve the country's legal framework into a more balanced one that elevates MSA towards authentic official language status while at the same time allowing some degree of flexibility for vernacularism where substantially important to substantive justice. It did, therefore, enhance the scientific debate concerning linguistic justice within the Arab world. The research serves as a footstone to other future studies focusing on nexus between language, public trust in judiciary, and satisfaction of litigants.

Declaration

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used ChatGPT in order to translate the manuscript into English as it was originally written in Arabic. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References

- Agbaakin, O.-J. (2024). Diglossia, and: Vernacular. Transition, 136(1), 111-112.
- Al-Dhuhli, R., Alkindi, L., & Al-Taani, W. (2022). Digital Technology and its Role in Achieving Sustainable Development Requirements in Basic Education Schools in the Sultanate of Oman. Jordan Journal of Applied Science Humanities Science Series (JJOAS), 31(1), 43-62. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v31i1.282>
- Al-Kahtany, A. H. (1997). The 'problem' of diglossia in the Arab world: An attitudinal study of modern standard Arabic and the Arabic dialects. al-'Arabiyya, 1-30.
- Ammari, R., & Al-Ahmad, W. (2023). A corpus-based study of English synonyms: Small, little, tiny, and petite. Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series, 36(2), 1-20. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v36i2.542>
- Angermeyer, P. S. (2005). Who is 'you'?: Polite forms of address and ambiguous participant roles in court interpreting. Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 17(2), 203-226.
- Anne, W., Matulewska, A., & Cheng, L. (2020). Law as a culturally constituted sign-system—A space for interpretation. International Journal of Legal Discourse, 5(2), 239-267.
- Berk-Seligson, S. (2022). The bilingual courtroom: Court interpreters in the judicial process: University of Chicago Press.
- Bhatia, V. K., Candlin, C. N., & Engberg, J. (2008). Legal discourse across cultures and systems (Vol. 1): Hong Kong University Press.
- Cheng, L., & Danesi, M. (2019). Exploring legal discourse: A sociosemiotic (re) construction. In (Vol. 29, pp. 279-285): Taylor & Francis.
- Conley, J. M., O'Barr, W. M., & Riner, R. C. (2022). Just words: Law, language, and power: University of Chicago Press.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. psychometrika, 16(3), 297-334. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02310555>
- Eades, D. (2010). Sociolinguistics and the legal process: Multilingual Matters.
- Ervo, L. (2016). Facing people through language use—linguistic tools to make proceedings fair. International Journal of Legal Discourse, 1(2), 277-293.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). Language and Power. London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. WORD, 15(2), 325-340. doi:10.1080/00437956.1959.11659702
- Fraihat, B. (2024). The Effect of Implementing a Remedial Plan Based on Reading Strategies on Improving the Reading Comprehension Achievement of Jordanian EFL Eleventh-Grade Students in the Vocational Stream. Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series, 39(1), 18-26. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v39i1.729>
- Ghassan, H., & Haider, A. S. (2025). Partial Intralingual Subtitling as a Means of Understanding Varieties of the Same Language: A Case Study of Syrian Vernacular and Modern Standard Arabic. Ampersand, 100219. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100219>
- Goswami, S. (2022). An Analysis of Judgments in Vernacular Language. Issue 5 Indian JL & Legal Rsch., 4, 1.
- Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. (2021). Corpus linguistics in legal discourse. International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique, 34(5), 1515-1540.
- Haider, A. S., & Hussein, R. F. (2022). Modern Standard Arabic as a Means of Euphemism: A Case Study of the MSA Intralingual Subtitling of Jinn Series. Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 51(6), 628-643. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2022.2106289>
- Ja'afreh, N. (2023). A pragmatic contrastive analysis of apology strategies in Jordanian arabic and english language. Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series, 37(2), 69-86. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v37i2.601>
- Johnson, A., & Coulthard, M. (2010). Introduction Current debates in forensic linguistics. In The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics (pp. 29-44): Routledge.
- Khatatbah, D., & Ashour, M. (2024). The Role of School Administration in Activating the Use of Information Technology at Schools in Irbid Governorate. Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series 38(2), 121-137. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v38i2.718>
- Marmor, A. (2014). The language of law: OUP Oxford.
- Masoud, S. (2025). Investigating Teachers' Attitudes toward Using Assistive Technology in Teaching Students with Hearing Impairments. Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities, 43(2), 157-171. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v43i2.718>

- Matulewska, A., & Wagner, A. (2021). The multiplicity of third space of communication in law. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 34(5), 1225-1243.
- Matulewska, A., & Wagner, A. (2023). Interlingual Legal Communication – Valleys, Hills and Mountains of Social Inequality in Legal Translation and Interpretation. In A. Wagner & A. Matulewska (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Jurilinguistics* (pp. 281–299). United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing House.
- Meqdad, S., Al-Bayyari, M., & Al-Taher, M. (2023). Semantic Disparity between Amr (Command) and Nahy (Negative Command) in the Noble Quran: An Interpretive/Contextual Study. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series*, 36(1), 1-10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v36i1.516>
- Naib, A. (2025). Algerian Viewers' Attitudes toward Taboo Language: A Case Study of Mourad Oudia's Humorous YouTube Content. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series*, 44(1), 167-191. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v44i1.1830>
- O'barr, W. M. (2014). *Linguistic evidence: Language, power, and strategy in the courtroom*: Elsevier.
- Philips, S. U. (1998). *Ideology in the language of judges: How judges practice law, politics, and courtroom control*: Oxford University Press.
- Rickford, J. R., & King, S. (2016). Language and linguistics on trial: Hearing Rachel Jeantel (and other vernacular speakers) in the courtroom and beyond. *Language*, 92(4), 948-988.
- Roszkowski, S. G., & Pontrandolfo, G. (2021). *Law, language and the courtroom: Legal linguistics and the discourse of judges*: Routledge.
- Wagner, A., & Gemar, C. (2014). Decision-making in translation, interpretation, and speech act: Legal semiotic culture-mediation techniques. *Semiotica*., 201(4/1).
- Wagner, A., & Matulewska, A. (2020). Instrumentalization of law as a socially constituted sign-system. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 5(2), 127-130.
- Weld-Ali, E. W., Obeidat, M. M., & Haider, A. S. (2023). Religious and Cultural Expressions in Legal Discourse: Evidence from Interpreting Canadian Courts Hearings from Arabic into English. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 36(6), 2283–2301. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10016-z>
- Alhasan, T.K. (2025). Linguistic Proficiency Disclosures in International Arbitration: Enhancing Fairness and Efficiency. *Int J Semiot Law* 38, 1805–1827.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-025-10261-4>
- Meqdad, S. Abu Issa, H. (2024). Foundations for Drafting an Appeal Petition in Jordanian Courts. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 377–387.
<https://doi.org/10.62271/pjc.16.1.377.387>
- Khater, M. N., Issa, H. A., Meqdad, S. a. A., & Al-Hawawsheh, S. (2025). The Semiotics of Threatening Language in Jordanian Courts: A Forensic-Linguistic Analysis of Criminal Cases from 2023 To 2024. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-025-10338-0>
- Alhendi, N., & Baniamer, A. (2024). Referential gaps between Arabic and English. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1384130>
- Alhendi, N., & Baniamer, A. (2022). Transferring the Moral Rights of Translation to the Heirs between International Conventions and Arab Laws “A Comparative Study.” *Dirasat Human and Social Sciences*, 49(5), 531–541.
<https://doi.org/10.35516/hum.v49i5.3502>
- Alhendi, N. Baniamer, A. Sharkawy, M. (2024). Navigating Gender Rights: An analysis of Arabic Language and Society. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 15(2 Special Issue), 373–385.
- Alhendi, N., & Baniamer, A. (2020). Linguistic Fingerprint between Western and Arabic Judicial Applications. *Dirasat Human and Social Sciences*, 47(4). <https://journals.ju.edu.jo/DirasatHum/article/view/108175>
- Jaradat, A. A., & Al-Taher, M. A. (2021). The evolution of a coordinator from a vocative source: the case of the disjunctive ja: in Jordanian Arabic. *Heliyon*, 7(12), e08505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08505>
- Al-Taher, M. (2019). Google Translate's rendition of Verb-Subject structures in Arabic news reports. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 19(1), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.19.1.11>