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Title: Analysis of the Variation of the Voiceless Uvular Stop [q] in the Speech of the Druze of the Shouf Region

This study examined the variation in the use of the voiceless uvular stop [q] in the speech of Lebanese Druze of the Shouf region. It investigated age and gender related differences in the use of [q] and its variant [ʔ], and explored the attitudes of the speakers towards the use of [q], a linguistic stereotype of the dialect of that region. Previous research showed that older speakers prefer the use of [q], whereas, younger speakers prefer the use of [ʔ] (Abd-el-Jawad, 1987 & Sallar, 1980). It was also found that younger women favor the use of [ʔ] more frequently than younger men (Abd-el-Jawad, 1987). The participants in this study were 60 speakers: both males and females of 4 different age groups: 18-20, 21-25, 50-65, and 66-85 years old. Data were collected through tape recorded interviews as well as using an attitude questionnaire, and were later analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

Results revealed that younger speakers whose ages range between 18-25 years old preferred the use of [ʔ], while older speakers whose ages range between 50-85 years old favored the use of [q]. Younger women used [q] more frequently than their male counterparts, while both older men and women preferred the use of [q]. In addition, the study showed that linguistic attitudes and behavior were positively correlated. The speakers who had more positive attitudes towards the Shouf dialect used [q] more frequently than those with less favorable attitudes.

The results as well as previous literature on the topic indicated that there were different factors that might be contributing to the difference in the use of [q] among speakers of different age and gender. These factors included social mobility, avoidance of being stereotyped, conservatism, urbanization, and attitude towards the dialect.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The Shouf region is a Lebanese rural area situated north-east of Beirut. It consists of various villages whose inhabitants have different religious beliefs including the Druze, Christians, Sawsis, and Shiias. This study focused on the speech of Druze because its goal was to examine the use of the phonological variant [q], a linguistic stereotype of the dialect of the Druze. A linguistic stereotype is a linguistic feature that is widely recognized and is very often the subject of dialect performance (Meyerhoff, 2006). Lebanese rural Druze and Christians use [q] (Fleisch, 1974 cited in Haert, 1997), but since [q] is a linguistic stereotype of the dialect of Druze, people directly describe [q] users as Druze. Its use became an association between language and Druze identity of the speakers. Media played a significant role in establishing [q] as a stereotype; the Lebanese sitcoms have always used [q] instead of the dominant Lebanese Arabic [ʕ] when the speakers are Druze.  

Description of the Speech Community

Traditionally most Druze in the Shouf region worked in the field of building, agriculture, and farming. The lexical items used by some of the older speakers reflect the kind of work that they performed. For instance, the older speakers’ repertoire is rich
with words such as *baileen* (wood), *mdaud* (wood for building roofs), *dalreen* (clay), *hawarab* (clay), *luur* (hay which is sieved), and *dhaqf* (rocks) which reflect their work in the field of building. The use of words such as *moxadat* (small space in the wall used as a pantry), *namlich* (cupboard), *swiq* (very soft bourgol), *taroufi* (stones for grinding crops), *birik* (instrument for ploughing land), and *biqsi* (container for storing oil) shows their work in the field of agriculture and farming.

Over the years, people moved to the city and its suburbs to have better opportunities for education and work. And urbanization positively affected the Shouf region which consequently witnessed an increase in literacy and in the number of schools as well as universities. In addition to that, tourism and ecotourism has become a source of income during summertime when tourists attend Beit-el-Diene festivals and visit the Shouf Nature Reserve. This change in lifestyle might be reflected in the linguistic repertoire of young adults in comparison to older speakers. The urban phonological variants, such as [ʔ], are used, and the vocabulary used by the younger speakers witnesses the infiltration of urban lexical items, such as the use of the word *tal’ul* (belonging to; for).

The Linguistic Variant [q]

The Modern Standard Arabic variable /q/ has six realizations depending on the domestic origin of the speaker. In the Levant area /q/ is realized as [q], [k], [K*], [g], [l] and [ʔ]. The variable /q/ is realized as [q], [k], [K*] and [ʔ] in Lebanon in which [k], [K*] and [ʔ] are the urban variants and [q] is the rural variant. In Syria, [q] and [g] are
rural while [?] is the urban variant. In Jordan, [g] is Bedouin, [k] is rural Palestinian, and [?] is an urban Palestinian variant introduced by immigrant Palestinians to Jordan (Sallam, 1980). In Egypt, [q] is educated, [?] is urban, and [g] is rural (Sallam, 1980).

Haeri (1997) confirmed Sallam’s classification for Egypt when she noted that the use of [q] was restricted to those engaged in religious and scholarly studies in Egypt. Their use of [q] remained in the texts that they wrote and read as well as in some of their conversations. While for the speakers who are outside the reading-writing elite, [q] was only used in the recitation of Quran and was heard in sermons and public speeches. In the Shouf region, speakers are using the [q] and [?] variants after a period at which [q] was the dominant linguistic variant.

The Linguistic Features of the Shouf Dialect

The Shouf dialect is a rural dialect distinguished by the use of the /aw/ and /ay/ diphthongs as in the words laww (color), hawn (here), and yawm (day) as well as rayt (oil), bayt (house), and ya rayt (hope that). These diphthongs differentiate the Shouf dialect from the urban dialect which has the corresponding variants /a/ and /e/.

According to Abu-Haidar (1979), speakers of other rural Lebanese dialects such as that of Baskinta, a town in Maten situated in Northern Lebanon, also use these diphthongs. The Shouf dialect is characterized by the phonological process imeala, which is the change of /a/ to /e/, such as in words emra (I) and xeel (uncle). The change of the /a/ sound to /i/, such as in the words jabil (mountain) and awsid (black) is another characteristic of the Shouf dialect. On the terms of morpho-syntactic features, negation is formed by the addition of the negative particle ma at the beginning of the verb and the
negative sh marker at its end; for instance, ma shifsuch (I did not see him) and ma kensack (we were not). The negative particle mish is also used; for example, mish raaych (I am not going) and mish mahsait (I don’t feel happy).

This study aimed to explore the use of [q] in the repertoire of Druze of the Shouf region, more specifically, the role of age, gender, urbanization, education, and attitudes toward the Shouf dialect in influencing the use of [q] or [?] is investigated.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Language variation studies examine the difference in the frequency of use of certain linguistic features and highlight the relationship between sociocultural conditions of the speakers and their linguistic behavior. The following literature review sheds light on sociolinguistic studies done to investigate language variation, mainly in the Arabic sociolinguistics field. The influence of age, gender, education and attitudes on linguistic variation is discussed.

Linguistic Varieties in the Arabic Speaking Countries

In the Arabic speaking countries, sociolinguists talk about 4 linguistic varieties: Classical Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, Educated Spoken Arabic, and the regional varieties of each Arabic country, i.e. the colloquial. The Classical Arabic is the language of the Quran and old poetry. Its modernized version is Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), which is used in formal education and is the language of newspapers and magazines. This variety is rarely used in everyday conversations, and when used it is a source of ridicule because its users are considered weird and are laughed at (Glaeri, 1997). Despite of not being used in everyday speech, MSA is considered as a marker of Arab identity and a symbol of Arab nationalism (Sulieman, 2003). In addition to Classical Arabic and MSA, some sociolinguists, such as Sallam (1980), claimed that Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA), which is an intermediate variety between MSA and colloquial, is a full-
fledged variety used in the conversations of educated speakers. However, Haeri (1997) strongly argued against treating ESA as a separate variety because she assumed that the speech of educated speakers is always influenced by the learned varieties; for instance, there is no variety called "Educated Spoken English". There are also the regional varieties, such as Lebanese Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, as well as Syrian Arabic, and each colloquial has its own prestige variety.

The Complex Notion of a Prestige Variety

The notion of prestige is complex in both Western and Arabic sociolinguistics. There is no consensus whether the standard or the colloquial varieties are the prestige varieties. Trudgill (1972) talked about two kinds of prestige: overt and covert prestige. Overt prestige is the prestige associated with a variant that people are highly aware of and which is related to the speech of higher-class speakers (Meyerhoff, 2009). For instance, women’s use of the velar nasal variant [ŋ], a realization of the suffix -ing, in Norwich, is considered as overt prestige. Women believe that this variant is a Standard English variant which is used by upper class speakers. Covert prestige refers to the hidden or covert positive evaluation of a variant. In the same study which is mentioned above, Trudgill noted that men’s use of the alveolar variant [s] is associated with covert prestige. The variant [ŋ] is used by the working class, thus, it has the connotations of roughness, toughness, and masculinity which are valued by men (Trudgill, 1972). The debate about which is the prestige variety continues in Western sociolinguistics. Eckert (2000) noted that prestige is a matter of point of view and may be differently assigned in speech communities.
In Arabic sociolinguistics the dichotomy between covert and overt prestige had not been raised. There was no consensus as to which variety is the prestige variety. Some sociolinguists considered that MSA is the prestigious variety. For instance, Bukir (1986) conducted his study in Basra assuming that MSA was the prestige variety because its use showed higher educational achievement. He examined the linguistic behavior of 20 university students, 10 men and 10 women, across one age group (20-22 years old). The first variable studied was the realization of the phonological variable (k) which has two variants: the standard variant [k] and the Iraqi colloquial variant [f]. The second variable examined was a morphological variable, specifically the realization of the passive verb, which has two variables: the standard form CuCiC (kutib) and the Iraqi colloquial form nCiCaC (nkitah). The third variable studied was a syntactic variable, in particular the usage or dropping of the MSA complementizer /'an/ in everyday speech. Conversations were tape recorded as the participants were discussing cultural and social issues in mixed gender groups. The results revealed that there was a significant difference in the use of MSA variants for the three variables in men’s and women’s speech. Table 1 shows the percentage of the variants realized in both men’s and women’s speech.
Table 1

The Distribution of MSA and Colloquial Variants in the Speech of Men and Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distribution of the (k) variable</th>
<th>Distribution of the passive variable</th>
<th>Distribution of the /yan/ variable</th>
<th>Dropping /yan/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[kj]</td>
<td>CClC</td>
<td>nClCatC</td>
<td>/yan/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that educated young men used the MSA variants more often than educated young women. Bakir offered an explanation to describe the observed gender differentiation. He claimed that since men handled public situations and communicated with the outside world, they needed to meet the requirements of the outside world settings (topic, place, and interlocutors). These settings required a degree of formality which was met by the usage of MSA variants.

Other studies were carried out to find whether men or women are more prestigious conscious. Abu-Haidar (1989) conducted a study in Baghdad in which she tape recorded the linguistic repertoire of 50 Baghdadi men and women, 25 of each sex group, and whose ages range from 26-41 years old. Abu-Haidar believed that in Baghdad, the prestige variety was the MSA variety. The variables studied by Abu-Haidar were the realization of the passive forms of words such as yuqal (it is being said) as well as sujin (he is imprisoned) and their colloquial variants yuquhun (they say) and syijin (they imprisoned him), the adverb lamman (when) and its colloquial variant min (when), the adjective saghir (small/masculine) as well as sghirra and their colloquial variants zaghiyyir and zghayyyra. The results revealed that women used MSA variants
more frequently than men. Table 2 shows the average index score for both men and women.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA passive form usage</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA adverb usage</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA adjective usage</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since women were found using MSA more than colloquial variants, Abu-Haidar noted that women are more prestigious conscious than men. She explained that the reason behind women’s use of prestigious linguistic features was their work outside their homes which gave them the chance to be in contact with MSA.

Both Bakir and Abu-Haidar explained women’s linguistic behavior as being affected by social and cultural factors. They adopted the public/private dichotomy which assumed that as women have closer contact with the public, in other words, when women work outside their homes, they are in contact with the MSA, thus they use it more in their speech.

However, Ibrahim (1984) argued against equating prestige with the MSA because it does not serve as a prestige variety in informal conversations. He assumed that the urban variety is the prestige variety because the city serves as a cultural frame of reference. Haeri (1997) studied the alternation between the use of MSA [q] and
colloquial [?] in relation to the social class of the speakers. She found out that Egyptian upper class speakers were not the highest users of [a] because they attended private schools, mostly missionary Catholic schools, whose medium of instruction was foreign languages. When Hauri asked the participants in her study if they preferred Sammiya, fuShHa, or both. Sixty eight percent of the speakers said that they favor Sammiya to fuShHa, 11% prefer fuShHa, and 10% liked both. Sammiya is praised because it is soft, easy, Egyptian, full of life, and full of humor. On the other hand, fuShHa is praised because it is correct, powerful, and beautiful. But at the same time it is described as heavy, lacks humor and carries the tone of pretense and affectedness. Hauri also asked the participants about their opinion towards the Cairene and other Egyptian dialects. They praised the Cairene dialect since that it was softer and more beautiful than other dialects in Egypt.

Some sociolinguists claimed that MSA is the prestige variety, but some speakers prefer the use of Sammiya in their every day speech.

The Influence of Age and Gender on Linguistic Behavior

The relationship between language variation and social factors such as age and gender has always been a topic of interest for sociolinguistics. The influence of gender on the linguistic behavior of the speaker is studied in relation to other social factors, such as social class or age. This section provides a review of studies which examined the relationship between gender and age and their influence on language variation since age is considered one of the overriding social categories related to language change.

Abd-el-Jawad (1987) conducted a study to explore cross-dialectal variation in
the linguistic repertoire of Nablus speakers. He examined the use of [q], the Nablus variant, and [ʔ], a prestigious urban variant used in the cities of Amman and Irbid. The speech of 24 participants was tape recorded as they were having daily conversations in order to elicit spontaneous speech. The researcher did not specify the exact ages of speakers; he classified them only as old and young age speakers. The results showed that the age of the speakers played a role in influencing the speakers' use of [q]. The following table shows the difference in the use of [q] among men and women in two age groups.

Table 3

The Distribution of the Percentage of [q] Usage by Gender and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born and live in Nablus</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in but moved from Nablus</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that both old men and women living in Nablus used [q] more frequently than their young counterparts. They scored a mean percentage of 100% and 40% of [q] while their young counterparts scored a mean percentage of 25% and 5% respectively. Similarly, old speakers who left Nablus used [q] more often than young speakers. There was also gender variation in the use of [q] across the two age groups. Old men used [q] more frequently than old women (100% vs. 40%); likewise, young men used [q] more frequently than young women. Ahd-el-Jawad illustrated that
Nabulis switched from [q] to [ʔ] to avoid the stereotyped features that mark them as Nabulis and because of their desire to associate with the urbanites. Using the low scores of the younger and female speakers as evidence, he generalized that there was dialect change in Nablus in which the local variant [q] was disappearing and being replaced by the variant [ʔ].

Sallam (1980) examined the relationship between age as well as gender and the realization of (q) variants: [q], [ʔ], [k], and [g]. He conducted his study to explore the process of phonetic adjustment in conversations between Arabs of different Arab nationalities (11 Egyptians, 9 Palestinian, 7 Syrians, 7 Jordanians, and 6 Lebanese). The participants included men as well as women of different origins (rural, urban, and Bedouin), and their ages ranged from 17-70 years old. He studied the realization of (q) in the speech of 3 adult age groups: 20-35, 35-50 and 50-75. The analysis of tape recorded conversations revealed a gradual increase in the use of [q] in the speech of younger (20-35 years old) and middle aged (35-50 years old) which was then followed by a slight decrease in the speech of the older speakers (50-75 years old). The younger speakers switched between the urban [ʔ] and the educated [q], the middle aged speakers had the highest frequency of [q], and the older speakers used [q] the least frequently. Sallam explained that as speakers advanced in age, they used their local phonological variant because they aimed to show greater pride in their regional origins. Sallam also studied the relationship between the realization of [q] and gender. He found out that women used [ʔ] more often and [q] less often than men. The mean percentage of [ʔ] usage was 54% in women’s speech and 28% in men’s. Besides, the mean percentage of [q] usage was 44% in women’s speech and 65% in men’s. The only explanation that he
Nabulis switched from [q] to [ʔ] to avoid the stereotyped features that mark them as Nabulis and because of their desire to associate with the urbanites. Using the low scores of the younger and female speakers as evidence, he generalized that there was dialect change in Nablus in which the local variant [q] was disappearing and being replaced by the variant [ʔ].

Sallam (1980) examined the relationship between age as well as gender and the realization of (q) variants: [q], [ʔ], [k], and [g]. He conducted his study to explore the process of phonetic adjustment in conversations between Arabs of different Arab nationalities (11 Egyptians, 9 Palestinians, 7 Syrians, 7 Jordanians, and 6 Lebanese). The participants included men as well as women of different origins (rural, urban, and Bedouins), and their ages ranged from 17-70 years old. He studied the realization of (q) in the speech of 3 adult age groups: 20-35, 35-50 and 50-75. The analysis of tape recorded conversations revealed a gradual increase in the use of [q] in the speech of younger (20-35 years old) and middle aged (35-50 years old) which was then followed by a slight decrease in the speech of the older speakers (50-75 years old). The younger speakers switched between the urban [ʔ] and the educated [q], the middle aged speakers had the highest frequency of [q], and the older speakers used [q] the least frequently. Sallam explained that as speakers advanced in age, they used their local phonological variant because they aimed to show greater pride in their regional origins. Sallam also studied the relationship between the realization of [ʔ] and gender. He found out that women used [ʔ] more often and [q] less often than men. The mean percentage of [ʔ] usage was 54% in women’s speech and 28% in men’s. Besides, the mean percentage of [q] usage was 44% in women’s speech and 65% in men’s. The only explanation that he
offered for elucidating this finding was that there were more women than men in the sample. The following table shows the distribution of [ʔ] and [q] usage levels for both men and women of different Arab nationalities.

Table 4

*The Distribution of [ʔ] and [q] in the Speech of both Men and Women in Sallam’s Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean percentage of [ʔ] usage</th>
<th>Mean percentage of [q] usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daher’s study (1997) also examined the relationship between (q) realization and gender. He conducted his study in Damascus, Syria in which he investigated the realization of (q) as well as other linguistic variables (θ), (ð), (sy), and (aw) in the speech of Damascenc speakers. The linguistic variants of (q) are [q] and [ʔ], of (θ) are [θ], [s], [l] such as in the word:

*θawr (bull), sawr or lawr, of (θ) are [θ] and [z] such as in chamb (guilt) and tanb,

of the diphthong (sy) are /si/ and /ci/ such as in bayr and beet, and that of (aw) are /aw/ and /u/ such as in lawr (color) and loon. The conversations of 40 speakers divided equally between men and women were tape recorded and studied. The study revealed that women used the colloquial variants more than men, in particular women used [ʔ]

---

1 The mean percentage of [ʔ] and [q] usage doesn’t total 100% because the speakers also used [k] and [q].
more than men. The results of a computer analysis showed that the probability of [q] usage for men was 0.6 while it was 0.41 for women. Daher explained the reasons behind the difference in women's and men's use of [q]. Being a rural variant in Syria, women avoided using [q] in order to distance themselves from being associated with the rural speech. He added that men favored [q] because it was associated with masculinity, without giving further details about how masculinity was associated with the use of [q].

In another study in which he focused on the use of [q] in Damascene speech, Daher (1998) used the data obtained from the previously discussed study (1997) to explore whether there was gender differentiation in three different age groups. The results shown in table 5 revealed that there was little gender differentiation in the probability figures of [q] usage for each age group.

Table 5

The Probability and Frequency of [q] Usage for both Men and Women Across 3 Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 Years</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39 Years</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-70 Years</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The studies mentioned so far revealed that women's linguistic preferences were different from men's. Women favored the use of [?] while men preferred the use of [q].
The age of the speakers also affected their linguistic choice. Younger speakers preferred the use of [?] more than older speakers. Eisskovits (1998) showed that the linguistic behavior of speakers, in particular that of women, changed as they grew older. She studied the realization of different grammatical variables in the speech of female Australian adolescents. Based on her observations, she noticed that as females grew up, they abandoned the use of non-standard forms and modified their speech to "women’s language" which was the prestige standard language. Eisskovits inferred that as girls grew up, they conformed to social norms and modified their speech in line with external prestige norms.

Urbanization and its Effects on the Linguistic Behavior of a Speaker

In addition to age and gender, the above mentioned studies highlighted the importance of factors such as urbanization, education and occupation. Abd-el-Jawad’s study revealed that geographical mobility of the speakers to the city influenced their linguistic behavior. As Nablusi speakers moved to Amman and Irbid, they abandoned the use of their linguistic stereotype; the [q] variant was replaced by [ʔ]. Old men who lived in Nablus scored a mean percentage of 100% of [q] usage, while their counterparts who left Nablus scored a mean percentage of 50%. Young men who lived in Nablus scored a mean percentage of 20%, while their counterparts who left Nablus scored 20%. Geographical mobility to the city played a role in modifying the speakers’ use of [q]. They abandon their linguistic stereotype in order to avoid ridicule (Abd-el-Jawad, 1987). A study done by Nichols (1998) also showed that geographical mobility influenced linguistic behavior. The study explored the influence of age and gender on the realization of Gullah linguistic features which are the features of a pidgin based on
both English and West African languages spoken in coastal South Carolina. The difference in the use of the Standard English and their Gullah variants in the speech of old mainland men and women (65-90 years old) was examined. The results showed that old women were the heaviest users of Gullah because they were confined to their region due to their work in domestic and agricultural work. However, old men used Standard English variants because they were geographically mobile to the town due to their work in unskilled labor or factory jobs. The researcher also examined the linguistic behavior of island women and men of age groups: 65-90, 30-50 and 15-25 years old. The results showed that women of all age groups used the prestigious Standard English variants more than their male counterparts since they were more geographically mobile.2

According to Eckert (1989 & 2000), engagement in the activities done in the city influenced the linguistic behavior of a speaker. She carried out a study in the suburban Detroit high school to examine the relationship between the realization of urban phonological variants in the speech of two social groups: the burnouts, a group of students oriented to the urban environment, had networks in the urban area and participated in the activities done in the city; and the Jocks, who centered their lives around their school and its activities. The study examined the realization of (oh), the rounding and raising of standard /u/ in words such as “mother”, “butter”, and “supper”, which were heard more frequently in the urban centers than in the suburbs. The study revealed that the burnouts used and propagated the urban sounds since they

2 Labov (1972) examined the realization of two diphthongs /ay/ and /au/ such as in the words “time” and “house”. These variables were subjected to variation in the speech of the Vineyarders and could be centralized. The adolescents who were planning to stay on the island used the centralized vowels, which were the linguistic markers of the Vineyarders, while those who planned to leave the island used the Standard English variants.
sought a direction connection to the urban center; however, the Jocks were less motivated to adopt the urban variants. The speakers used the variants that helped them in constructing their identity.

The Influence of Education on the Linguistic Behavior of a Speaker

As a speaker becomes more educated, he/she may adopt or abandon certain linguistic variants. Sallan’s study (1980) demonstrated the influence of education on the linguistic behavior of a speaker. He examined the variation in the use of /q/ in the speech of educated Arabs. He found out that as the speakers’ level of education increased, [q] was used more frequently than the regional variants [g], [k], and [ʔ].

Daher (1998) also examined the influence of education on the usage of the [q] and [ʔ]. He chose participants from 3 educational levels: elementary school education (ES), high school education (HS), and university education (BA). His results showed that as the level of education of the speaker increased, the usage of [q] increased since the variant [q] is used in formal education. The following table shows the probability of [q] usage across 3 educational levels.

Table 6:
The Probability of [q] Usage in 3 Different Educational Level Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[q] Realization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, a study conducted by Haeri (1997) showed similar results as Sallam's. Her study explored the realization of /q/ and its variants [q] and [ʔ] in the speech of Cairene dialect speakers. She tape recorded interviews with speakers belonging to different educational levels. Then, she calculated the [q] index which corresponded to the total number of lexical items uttered with /q/ in 45 minutes. The number of words uttered with [q] was divided by the total number of words with etymological /q/ and then multiplied by 1000. Table 7 shows the variation in the use of [q] index across 3 educational levels in Haeri's study.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[q] Index Score Across 3 Educational Levels</th>
<th>[q] index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Triggering Stylistic Variation

The studies discussed so far revealed that some speakers did not use [q], [ʔ], [k] and [g] consistently in their speech. They switched between these variants. In Abd-el-Jawad's study, young men who lived in Nablus use 25% of [q]; this indicates that they switched between [q] and [ʔ].

Stylistic variation reflects the speaker's ability to adjust the frequency of using
particular linguistic variants in particular social contexts (Chambers, 2005). Early sociolinguistic studies explored stylistic variation and claimed that the reason behind it was the speakers' switching between formal and informal style. However, recent studies emphasized that a range of factors influenced the speaker's linguistic choice. It was due to factors external to the speaker, such as audience and topic, as well as factors internal to the speaker, such as the purpose of the speaker (Schilling-Estes, 2002).

Labov (1972) conducted a study to explore the realization of the postvocalic /r/ which was either present or dropped from New Yorkers' speech. He defined stylistic variation as variation in the usage level of standard and vernacular variants as the speaker shifted between careful/formal and casual speech styles. The two types of speech styles: formal and casual were triggered by the amount of attention paid. For instance, reading a passage and a list of minimal pairs triggered careful speech while recalling childhood memories and dangerous accidents led to casual speech. Sallam (1980) studied the realization of the variants of /q/ in relation to the speech style used by the participants. He elicited two speech styles: formal and informal speech style by tape recording one hour of conversation between educated speakers who never met before. He considered the speech elicited in the first thirty minutes of the interview as formal speech because the interlocutors didn't know one another. In the second half of the interview, the interlocutors were acquainted with one another, and their speech was informal. Results showed that when the style was very formal, the speakers used the features of MSA, such as [q], in the conversations. However, when the style was informal, the speakers shifted to local linguistic variants of /q/.

Even though Labov's model was the spark to stylistic variation studies, it was criticized because the definition of style according to formality of the situation was
unidimensional. There were factors other than the amount of attention paid to the speech which triggered switching from one style to the other.

Giles and Powesland (1997) highlighted the influence of the addressee on the speech patterns used by the speaker. They proposed a theory called Accommodation Theory which noted that speakers tend to shift towards or away from the addressee’s speech in order to win their approval. Their model was later developed by Bell who called his model the Audience Model. According to this model, speakers have an audience in mind and design their speech to suit that audience. Bell (1984) claimed that variation in one’s speech is negotiated by the addressee, the topic of discussion, the setting of the conversation, social context and personal goals. To illustrate his model, he cited studies done by other researchers. He referred to Douglas-Cowie’s study (1978) which investigated the realization of 6 linguistic variables in Norwich, an Irish village. The study revealed that speakers shifted more frequently to the standard English variants when the addressee was an English stranger than with a fellow villager. In addition, Bell cited Blom’s and Gumperz’s study (1972), conducted in Hernesberget, Norway, as an illustration of how the entry of outsiders to a local group triggered local speakers to shift from their dialect to standard speech. To exemplify the idea that the topic of discussion led to stylistic shift, Bell cited Coupland’s (1981) study which examined the realization of intervocalic voicing in the speech of an assistant in a travel agency as she discussed different topics with the same addressee. Furthermore, the social status of the addressee played a role in triggering speakers to style-shift. Bell (2002) conducted a study to examine stylistic shifting in the language of announcers of the radio news in New Zealand. He examined style shifts in the use of a phonological variant in the news read by the same announcers in two stations whose audience
differed in terms of social status. It was found out that the announcers shifted between intervocalic voiceless /v/ and voiced /d/ (such in the word write versus ride) to suit the audience who differed in social class. The announcers used the standard voiceless /t/ more frequently in the news heard on the station viewed by high social status speakers. This shows that the variant used was related to the audience who received it. In addition to the speaker's response to external factors, stylistic variation is used by the speakers to serve certain internal purposes and personal goals. Coupland (1985, 2001 as cited in Schiffrin-Estes 2002) showed how a Cardiff radio announcer used various stylistic resources to achieve different purposes and establish different types of joking keys. The announcer used the Cardiff dialect when talking about Cardiff-related themes and switched to the standard variety to accomplish organizational tasks, such as announcing upcoming events on the show. Moreover, he used his dialect variety to poke fun at himself when he stumbled over his words and switched to the American accent to imitate mockingly the American radio programs.

A few Arabic sociolinguistic studies investigated triggers of stylistic shifting. Saltam (1980), whose study has been mentioned before, explored stylistic shifting in the conversations of Arabs of different nationalities. He noted that educated speakers style shifted from the educated variant [k] to the local linguistic variants: [k], [g], or [?] in order to declare linguistic loyalty to their colloquial. Speakers used their local variants as a sign of friendliness with the interlocutors. Holos (1983) shed lights on stylistic variation which helped the speaker to distance himself from linguistic stereotypes and avoid ridicule. His study examined the linguistic behavior of 72 speakers who belonged to two social groups in Bahrain: Sunnis and Shiites. The population was divided roughly between males and females whose ages ranged from 17 to 70 years old. The topics of
discussion in the interviews were about the old Bahraini social customs, religious festivals, and changes that Bahrain was undergoing. Table 8 shows the phonological variables examined in Holes' study.

Table 8
The MSA Variants and their Sunni and Shiia Variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Sunni variant</th>
<th>Shiia variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[ɛ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/θ/</td>
<td>[θ]</td>
<td>[θ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
<td>[d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>[u̯]</td>
<td>[u̯]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holes noted that the Sunnis were the powerful and dominant social group in Bahrain, and their dialect was the prestige dialect. The results of the study showed that despite being educated, literate Sunnis used their variants more frequently than the corresponding MSA variants when having a conversation with the researcher. For instance, they rarely changed the pronunciation of the word ḥayal (man) to the MSA lexical item ḥayal. However, Shiia speakers switched from their variants, even when their variants are MSA, to the stereotypical features of the Sunni dialect. They switched, for example, from the Shiia (+MSA) variant ḥayal to the variant ḥayal. Sunnis literates
were far more likely to preserve their nonstandard variants than the Shia literates. Holes explained this behavior in terms of linguistic security of the dominant social group; he noted that educated Sunnis could talk dialectally in situations such as the interview with the researcher without being afraid of stigma. However, Shia speakers had linguistic insecurity; they tended to use linguistic resources to distance themselves from their linguistic stereotypes and avoid ridicule. Holes also mentioned that in case of interdialectical contact, speakers might drop their local features which were close to MSA and adopted prestigious variants but maintained their linguistic features when talking to their coreligionists since language is a marker of group identity and a boundary-setter between the in-group (ourselves) and the out-group (others). Another case of dialectal shifting illustrated by Holes revealed that Shia speakers who worked but did not live in the capital city, switched to their original dialect in domestic contexts with their family and neighbors because using the Sunni dialect variety at home was considered as a deliberate distancing tactic. Holes (1995) mentioned that when immigrant Palestinians spoke to Jordanian authority figures in Amman, they abstained from using their own phonological variants and used instead those of the Jordanians. Speakers explained their linguistic choice in terms of empathy and solidarity with Jordanians; however, Holes noted that it might be due to political and social reasons.¹

Lexical and Phonological Analysis for /q/ Realization

The literature discussed so far shed light on extralinguistic factors which instigated speakers to style shift. There are also linguistic factors which trigger speakers

¹ Fleisch (1974 cited in Haeri 1997) mentioned that Lebanese Christians who were from a village in the Shouf region called Baje avoided using [q] outside their homes because it might expose them to laughter and ridicule.
to switch between the linguistic variants of a certain variable. The phonetic environment and the nature of some lexical items govern the distribution of [q] and its variants. Words such as “Qushira” (Cairo) and “Quran” cannot be realized as [ʔ] in colloquial (Sallam, 1980 and Haeri, 1997); [q] never changes to [ʔ]. Sallam (1980), whose study had been previously mentioned, discussed thoroughly phonological conditioning and the linguistic constraints that applied to the realization of /q/ in both formal and informal style. The variable /q/ could be only realized as [q] in words containing [-n,ʔ] such as the word “qaudone” (existing), “iqaʔilq” (barrier), “iqaʔbq” (suitable), and “Ilqaz” (recitation). Besides, words with the final adverbial -an (mutilation), such as in the words “Itlaqan” (never) or “qafan” (definitely), necessitated the use of [q]; one exception to the rule was the word “iqrihan” (nearly, approximately) that was either realized with [ʔ] or [g] in the informal style. In addition to that, Sallam highlighted the linguistic constraints on the realization of /q/ in the educated speech. He mentioned that the relative or comparative adjectives formed on the pattern ?aCqa such as the word “Iaqqa” (superior), ?aCaCC such as the word “Iaqall” (less), YaCCaC such as “Iaqqab” (neuter) were realized as [q] in the educated speech.

The frequency of occurrence of lexical items also influenced the speakers’ linguistic choice. According to Daher (1998), low frequency words were more likely to retain [ə], while high frequency words were realized with [ʔ]. Words with specialized meaning, such as technical words, are low frequency words which were more likely to be realized with [q]. For instance, words from the field of sciences such as the words “kromusumaat ‘imlaqa” (large chromosomes) and “Iaqa haaariya” (heat energy)
were more frequently realized with [q] (Sallam, 1980). The high frequency words which were frequently used in everyday speech such as wasit (time) and qabil (before) were realized with [ʔ] (Daher, 1998). In a nutshell, variation in the use of linguistic variants is triggered by extralinguistic as well as linguistic factors.

Attitudes Towards Language Variation

Attitudes of the speakers towards a linguistic variety could trigger them to use or avoid using that linguistic variety. Research on language and attitudes has been accumulating since 1970s, and it has been studied through straightforward questionnaires, interview surveys, and matched guise studies employing semantic differential scale. Attitudes have three components: feelings (affective element), thoughts (cognitive element), and predispositions to act (behavioral element). In other words, a person has beliefs about something, reacts towards it in an emotional way, and is assumed to act on this basis (Edwards, 1982).

Early sociolinguistic studies explored the relationship between linguistic attitudes and behavior. Labov (1972) studied variation in the use of Standard English and local variants in the speech of participants from Martha’s Vineyard. His results showed that centralization, which was a linguistic feature Martha’s Vineyard speech, was used much less frequent among locals who disliked living on the island and wished to live elsewhere. Labov revealed that there was a relationship between linguistic attitudes and behavior. Sawalhe conducted studies to explore the relationship between attitudes and behavior in Arabic speaking countries. He carried out a study in Yarmouk University in Irbid, Jordan with 223 university students: 115 males and 108 females to examine the attitudes of Palestinians and Jordanians towards regional and social
variants. He tape recorded a speaker saying one sentence each time with a different variant of (q): [q] which is a MSA feature, [g] which is a Jordanian feature, [k] which is a rural Palestinian feature and [ʔ] which is a new urban linguistic variant introduced by Palestinian migrants to Jordan. The participants listened to these utterances and were asked to fill in a questionnaire that elicited judgments toward users of these variants. The results revealed that [ʔ] users were assigned a high social class and the [q] users were associated with professions, such as university professor or school teacher (cited in Haeri 1997). Based on the preliminary study which was mentioned above, Sawaie (1994) carried out another study in an attempt to study deeply the nature of variation and its cultural conceptualization. He collected his data through a Lickert scale questionnaire which included "reaction"-eliciting (or judgment) statements. The study included 325 male and female participants from two cities in Jordan: Amman and Irbid. Attitudes about the elegance of a linguistic variety, masculinity and femininity associated with a linguistic variant, pride in a linguistic variety, affinity for a linguistic variety (feeling of closeness to the speaker), survivability of a dialect, and transmission of dialects to one's children were being investigated. The study revealed that the MSA feature [q] was the favored variant regardless of the background of the participants. In addition to that, the nationality shaped their attitudes toward the linguistic variety/variant being evaluated. It was the "linguistic affiliation" that drove Jordanians to judge [q] as an elegant variant and Palestinians to rate the [k] variant as the most elegant variant. In addition to that, the domicile of the participant (whether form a rural or urban origin) influenced the linguistic attitudes of the participants. For instance, villagers identified with and exhibited feelings of affinity with [q] users more often than [ʔ] or [k] users. The sex of the participants also affected their attitudes toward a
linguistic variant. For instance, women viewed [?] as more pride evoking than other variants. In this study, Sawaie also examined the issue of MSA versus dialectal varieties. He elicited the participants' attitudes regarding the appropriateness of linguistic varieties to particular domains of use. All of the participants agreed that [g] was the most appropriate variant to be used in formal situations such as lecturing and news reporting. Jordanians viewed their linguistic variant [g] as more appropriate than [k] and [?] to be used in formal situations. Palestinians also viewed [g] to be more appropriate than their linguistic variant [k] in formal situations because of its spread and importance. The nationality, domicile origin, and gender of the participants played a role in shaping the attitudes of a participant towards a linguistic variety. Some studies showed that this relationship between language attitudes and behavior is complex. Various studies illustrated that positive attitudes towards a linguistic variety was accompanied by the use of that variety; other studies revealed that speakers might have a positive attitude towards a variety but didn't use it or speakers might have negative attitudes but believed that speaking it was important (Ladegaard, 2000). Bakir (1986), whose study was previously discussed, showed that speakers had a positive attitude towards a variety but didn't use it in everyday speech. He attempted to examine whether both sexes had the same evaluative judgments towards MSA variants and their colloquial equivalent linguistic forms. The participants were asked to judge pairs of expressions containing the standard variant /k/, CuCiC passive verb form, and ?an/ complementizer versus the corresponding colloquial variants (discussed above). Results revealed that participants of both sexes believed that MSA variants indicated higher levels of education and higher social status. Despite considering MSA variants as better forms, women used the colloquial forms more frequently in their speech and associated
MSA variants with men's language. Seventy percent of the young women believed that it was mostly men who use MSA variants. Of the remaining 30%, 20% said that women used these variants more than men because they wanted to show their higher social class, and 10% said that both men and women used them. Ladegaard (2000) studied the relationship between attitude and behavior in language. He examined if a speaker who expressed positive attitudes towards a local variety in a verbal guise attitude experiment and in an attitude questionnaire would also use this variety in everyday speech more than a speaker who expressed less positive or even negative attitudes towards this variety. He tape recorded the speech of adolescent males and females and compared the index scores of their linguistic behavior with their assessment of in-group members in a verbal guise attitude experiment and to their attitudes concerning language usage in a questionnaire. The verbal guise attitude questionnaire which preceded the attitude questionnaire elicited attitudes to various non-standard varieties of Danish, including the participants' regional vernaculars, and to Standard Danish. It asked subjects to evaluate five female speakers on a 5-point scale on four dimensions of status and competence (intelligence, education, leadership, social status), four dimensions of social attractiveness and personal integrity (reliability, friendliness, helpfulness, sense of humor), and four dimensions of linguistic attractiveness (articulation, communicative efficiency, aesthetic quality, correctness). The analysis of the results showed that there was no correlation between the speaker's linguistic score (the score for non-standardness) and their evaluation of the speaker of the local vernacular. The verbal guise questionnaire was followed by an attitude questionnaire distributed only for rural participants. This questionnaire contained closed and open-ended questions in which the participants answered questions about language use and preferences, experiences with
code-switching and beliefs about standard Danish and vernacular. The comparison between responses from the attitude questionnaire and linguistic behavior showed a clear relationship between attitudes and linguistic behavior. The participants who expressed a positive attitude to the local varieties used these varieties more than those who had negative attitudes, or were reserved in their attitude towards the local varieties. Ladegard concluded that the nature of the verbal guise (VG) experiment was responsible for the lack of a significant correlation between VG responses and linguistic behavior. However, the attitude questionnaire showed that the speakers who had more positive attitudes towards the vernacular features and used them more than in their speech. So, he claimed that the linguistic behavior can be predicted from their linguistic attitudes.

There are some Arabic sociolinguistic studies which investigated speakers’ attitudes towards language varieties available to them. However, most of the studies focused on the speakers’ attitude towards Arabic versus colloquial and foreign languages. One of the studies about attitudes in Arabic sociolinguistics was that of El-Dash and Tucker’s (1975, cited in Haeri, 1997) which was carried out in Cairo to examine participants’ attitude toward five varieties: MSA, Colloquial Arabic, British, American, and Egyptian English. The matched guise technique was used to elicit the judges’ attitudes who were from four different educational levels: grade school children, high school students, public university students, and students of American University in Cairo. The judges had to listen to the recordings and then rated the speakers on four personality traits: intelligence, likeability, religiousness, and leadership. Speakers using the MSA were rated the highest on all four traits. However, speakers thought that MSA was less suitable for use than any other variety; while Colloquial Arabic was the most
appropriate variety for use at everyday speech. Besides, Herholz (1979, cited in Haeri 1997) conducted a study to explore Cairene’s attitudes towards “Arabic Vernacular”. The speech of Syrians, Libyans, Saudis, and Egyptian Arabic was recorded. Eighty Egyptians who were professionals, university students and high school students served as judges. These judges rated the speakers of their Cairene vernacular most favorably in terms of truthfulness, intelligence, faithfulness, principles, respectability, good reputation, and cooperation.

The linguistic repertoire of a speaker is influenced by different social factors such as age, gender, geographical mobility, level of education, the addressee who is being talked to, topic of discussion, personal goals, and linguistic attitudes. The general pattern is that young speakers as well as women prefer the use of prestige variants, knowing that the prestige variants are a matter of point of view and are differently assigned in speech communities. In addition, geographical mobility affects the linguistic behavior of the speaker allowing him/her to adopt the linguistic variants used in the region that he/she moves to. The level of education also affects the use of particular variants, but sometimes when a variant is a linguistic stereotype educated speakers avoid using it. Speakers might adopt a linguistic variant, use it consistently in their speech, and sometimes might shift to it depending on extralinguistic factors such as: the addressee, topic of discussion, setting of a conversation, and personal goals as well as on linguistic constraints. Finally, linguistic attitudes might shape the behavior of the speaker. In other words, when speakers have a positive attitude towards a linguistic variety, they tend to use it. But sometimes the attitudes do not correspond to linguistic behavior. Speakers might have positive attitudes towards a variety but prefer not to use it, or they might have negative attitudes but tend to use since it benefits him/her.
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CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the variation in the use of [q] in the repertoire of the Shouf Druze with emphasis on the relation of this variation to the variables of age and gender. The participants included both females and males whose age groups range from 18-25 and 50-85 years old. These age groups were further divided into the following subgroups: 18-20, 21-25, 50-65 and 66-85 years old since significant age-related linguistic patterns were revealed as the range of age groups was narrowed down into smaller scales. In addition to age and gender, the influence of geographical mobility of the young speakers to the city and its effect on the realization of [q] in their speech were also examined. Younger speakers’ duration of stay in the city was categorized into three groups. There are participants who have been living for 10 years or more in the city, others who have been there for four years or less, and those who used to live in the city but moved to settle back in the Shouf region. Besides, this study explored the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers toward their dialect and their linguistic stereotype [q] by means of an attitude questionnaire. This research also examined the correlation between linguistic attitudes and behavior.

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. How does the use of [q] vary across the speech of the following age groups: 18-20, 21-25, 50-65 and 66-85 years?

2. What are the possible triggers for the variation in the use of [q] across the different age groups?
3. Is the diminishing use of [q] in the speech of Shouf dialect speakers an age-grading process?

4. Does urbanization influence the use of [q] within the younger age group?

5. Does the gender of the speaker influence his/her usage level of [q]?

6. What are the socio-cultural factors that trigger men and women to use different levels of [q]?

7. What is the percentage of style shifting in the linguistic repertoire of Shouf dialect speakers?

8. What is the context of occurrence of style shifting?

9. What are the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards the closeness of the Shouf dialect to faStHa?

10. What are the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards the aesthetic value of the Shouf dialect?

11. What are the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards [q] usage and social status of the speaker?

12. What are the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards the domains of use of the Shouf dialect?

13. What is the future of the use of [q] in the Shouf dialect?

14. What are the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards the relationship between the use of [q] and Shouf identity?

15. Is there a correlation between the attitudes toward the linguistic variant [q] and its actual use in speech?

The motivation behind this study was to examine whether [q] is still a favored phonological variant to be used by the Druze speakers, especially under the influence
of urbanization and media which are leading to the spread of the use of [q]. Another aim of conducting this study was to shed light whether the Druze community is and will continue using [q] even though many areas in Lebanon had dropped it from their speech and replaced it by the phonological variant [ʔ]. Finally, the study aimed at exploring whether the use of a phonological variant that is considered a marker of identity will be affected by extralinguistic factors such as age, gender, and linguistic attitudes.

The preliminary goal of this study was to examine the difference in the realization of [q] in the speech of younger and older age groups. However, the data collected revealed the importance of narrowing down these age groups into four subgroups (18-20, 21-25, 50-65 and 66-85 years old) since this helped in examining whether the variation in the use of [q] in the Shouf region was a linguistic change or an age-grading process. In addition to age differences, gender differentiated linguistic patterns were also investigated in this study. The speech of both females and males was tape recorded and studied.

The relationship between language attitudes and linguistic behavior was also explored in this study, and the importance of this investigation was to find out if the speakers' positive attitude towards their dialect and in particular towards [q] instigate them to use [q]. This research attempted to reveal whether there was a correlation between attitudes and linguistic behavior, or whether the speakers' a positive attitude towards [q] is a form of linguistic loyalty.

Quantitative analysis was used to calculate the average of the use of [q], the percentage of style shifting, and percentage of agreement and disagreement about the items in the linguistic attitude questionnaire. Qualitative analysis was used to identify the context of occurrence of stylistic shifting.
Participants

The participants who took part in this study were selected to represent a judgment sample. The speakers were chosen on the basis of three predetermined social variables: domestic origin, age, and gender. In other words, the population sample was chosen to include male and female Druze Shouf dialect speakers who are stereotyped by other Lebanese as [q] users and who belong to the four age groups: 18-20, 21-25, 50-65 and 66-85 years old. Sixty speakers participated in the study and were divided equally between younger (18-25 years old) and older (50-85 years old) age groups. There were 30 speakers who belong to the younger age group, 15 women and 15 men, as well as 30 speakers, 15 women and 15 men, who belong to the older age group. As mentioned before, the younger age group was further divided into two subgroups: 18-20 and 21-25 year old speakers and the older age group was also divided into two subgroups: 50-65 and 66-85 year old speakers. The following table shows the distribution of the participants by age and gender.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some demographic information about the participants was elicited from the biographical section of the questionnaire. Appendix D includes description of the exact age of the speakers, the duration of their residence in the city, their level of education, and their major.

Field Technique

The fieldwork for this research was conducted during the period of May-November 2007. Interviews with older speakers took place in the Shouf region; however, the interviews with the younger speakers were carried out in the Shouf region and in Beirut. In order to divert their attention from the phonological variants used especially the "qaf" sound, the speakers were told that the purpose of this research was to study Shouf customs.

The general topic of the interview was about the Shouf region and the questions were about the Shouf lifestyle: cultural elements of the Shouf region such as traditions and customs, equal rights of men and women, political orientation of Shouf dialect speakers, comparison between the mode of life in the city and that in the village and which way of living they prefer. Moreover, the participants were asked questions related to some incidents that happened with them at school and about the activities that they did in their leisure time. On the other hand, the interviews with older speakers focused on the comparison between the old and the modern way of living in the Shouf region. For further information about the interview refer to Appendix I.

The permission of the speakers to be tape recorded was obtained before the onset of the interview. Each interview lasted for thirty minutes and this duration yielded a representative sample of the repertoire of each participant. The first five minutes of
each interview were disregarded because at the beginning of the interview, the speakers would be conscious about their linguistic behavior, but afterwards they would be more involved and their linguistic repertoire would be more natural (Labov, 1972).

The Interview and Data Analysis

A pilot study was conducted before doing this research in order to find out the best method to elicit the corpus of speech to be studied. The topics discussed by Labov and modeled by other researchers were used as triggers for discussion with the Shouf dialect speakers. Participants were asked about life threatening accidents, fights they had been in, favorite TV programs and movies in addition to their future plans after graduation. However, these questions were fruitless since the participants considered them personal questions and wondered about the reason behind asking such questions. Moreover, some participants disliked sharing personal information with the researcher on the tape recorder. Another set of questions which would make the speakers more comfortable and motivated them to participate in the interview were prepared. The best topic of discussion was about the Shouf lifestyle and customs. Many speakers were interested in this topic and wanted to contribute to a project which introduced others to the Shouf region. So, an alternative set of questions was constructed and a semi-structured interview was conducted based on these questions.

One-on-one tape-recorded conversational interviews were carried out in which each interview lasted about 30 minutes. This method of interview proved to be better than group discussion because in the pilot study it was found out that when participants were sharing their stories in a group conversation, some dominated the conversations whereas others did not participate or barely participated.
After conducting the interviews, the tape recordings were transcribed and analyzed. Then, the occurrences of the linguistic variants [q] were counted and quantified in order to examine the difference in the use of [q] among women and men across the four different age groups. To calculate the percentage of words used by each speaker, the following procedure was used. First, the lexical items pronounced with [q] words produced with its variant [ʔ] were recorded for each speaker; every word was counted even if it occurred twice. The total number of [q] words used was then divided by the total number of words with etymological [q] that the speaker used. This number was then multiplied by 100. For instance, for a speaker who used 7 words with [q] and 82 words with the variant [ʔ], the percentage of the use of [q] was calculated as follows:

\[
\frac{7 \times 100}{89} = 7.86\%
\]

For the ease of reading the graphs that were constructed to show the relationship between age, gender, and use of [q], the percentages of the use of [q] were organized into 5 categories:

- 0-20% of [q]
- 20-40% of [q]
- 40-60% of [q]
- 60-80% of [q]
- 80-100% of [q]

In addition to that, the repertoire of speakers who were found to be style shifting was transcribed. Examples which highlight the instances of style shifting and the factors that trigger it were provided in the study. The Arabic utterances were transcribed using
both the IPA symbols and Romanized letters. For further information about the guide of transcription refer to Appendix II. These interviews were quantitatively analyzed to discuss the factors that might contribute to the differences in the use of [q] as well as qualitatively analyzed to discuss the instance of occurrence of style shifting.

The Questionnaire and Data Analysis

At the end of each interview, the speakers were told that they had to fill in a questionnaire that examined their attitudes toward the Shouf dialect. This questionnaire was modeled after Sawaie’s (1994) which explored the attitudes of speakers toward the different Jordanian and Palestinian dialects. Two versions of the questionnaire were constructed: an English and Arabic version. The English version was distributed to younger speakers, while the Arabic version was distributed to young speakers who were French educated and for older speakers. The questionnaire consisted of open and closed-ended response items. The open-ended items elicited biographical information about the participants regarding their gender, age, current place of residence, and whether they had lived in the city. On the other hand, the closed-ended response items elicited the attitude of the participants toward the dialect; these included 18 items in the form of a 4-point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree). The questionnaire raised several questions such as the closeness of the Shouf dialect to the fiṣḥa, the aesthetic value of the [q] sound, the social impression created by the use of this linguistic stereotype: does it show that the speaker is educated? Does it reveal that the speaker belongs to a high or low social status? Moreover, the questionnaire elicited attitudes toward the relationship between using a dialect and regional identity, pride in one’s identity, and the future of the usage of “qaf”. The participants were asked to
indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the 18 statements, using the rating below:

For the following positively worded statements: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, and 18, the following rating was used:

Strongly agree (4)
Agree (3)
Disagree (2)
Strongly disagree (1)

For the negatively worded statements, the scale was reversed:

Strongly agree (1)
Agree (2)
Disagree (3)
Strongly disagree (4)

Prior to their participation in the survey, an IRB consent form was signed by the participants in order to guarantee that their rights were respected. For further information about the questionnaire refer to Appendix III.

Analysis of the Questionnaire

Descriptive statistics for the attitude questionnaire were calculated by using the SPSS program. The frequencies of the ratings of each statement were calculated, and then bar graphs were constructed. These bar graphs showed the percentage of speakers who strongly agree, agree, strongly disagree, and disagree about each item of the questionnaire. The values of strongly agree and agree as well as strongly disagree and disagree were merged together when being reported in the results lumped together.
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Then, the tape recorded speech and the answers on the questionnaire were used to investigate whether there was a correlation between the use of [q] and attitudes towards the dialect. The percentage of the use of [q] for each speaker was correlated to the mean attitude scored on the questionnaire using the SPSS program. The Pearson-product moment was used to calculate the correlation.

Calculation of the Mean Attitude

As mentioned before, the questionnaire included both positively and negatively worded items and the rating of these statements differed. The most positive attitude was reflected by the maximum positivity which had the value of 72. This value was the sum of the 12 positively worded items multiplied by 4 (the value of Strongly Agree) and the 6 negatively worded items multiplied by 4 (the value of the item Strongly Disagree). So, the most positive attitude was: (12x4) + (6x4) = 72.

On the other hand, the most negative attitude towards the Shouf dialect had the value of 18. It was the sum of the 12 positively worded items multiplied by 1 (the value of Strongly Disagree) and the 6 negatively worded items multiplied by 1 (the value of Strongly Agree). So, the most negative attitude was: (12x1) + (6x1) = 18.

The calculation of mean attitude for each speaker:

The numbers of points were summed up according to the answers of the participants. The scores were then divided by 18 (which was the number of statements in the attitude questionnaire). The mean attitude score for each speaker ranged from 4-1 (which was from the most positive to the most negative attitude).
Limitations

The present study used qualitative analysis to examine the influence of the factors: age, gender, and attitudes on the use of [q]. However, qualitative analysis could not lead to a strong correlation between the factors studied and the differences in the linguistic behavior observed.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study. It reveals the difference in the use of [q] in the repertoire of the four different age groups: 18-20, 21-25, 50-65, and 66-85 year old speakers. It shows the difference between men’s and women’s use of [q]. In addition to that, a qualitative and quantitative analysis of style shifting is presented in this chapter. Moreover, the attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards their dialect and their linguistic stereotype "qaf", and the relationship found between linguistic attitudes and linguistic behavior are also presented.

By using the SPSS program, graphs illustrating the difference in the usage level of [q] among age and gender groups and those demonstrating the distribution of the speakers’ attitudes towards their dialect are drawn.

The Use of [q] Across Age Groups

The differences in the usage level of [q] across different age groups is studied and analyzed. After listening to the tape recordings, the percentage of [q] used by each speaker was calculated, and then the mean percentage of [q] used by each age group was computed. Graph (1) illustrates the mean percentage of [q] usage for each age group.
Figure 1. The Use of "qay" in Four Age Groups.

This graph demonstrates that in the 18-20 year old group, the mean percentage of [q] usage is 11.69%, which is the lowest score among all other age groups. However, the usage level of [q] increases in the speech of the 21-25 year old speakers and reaches the value of 66.59%. The usage level of [q] increases until it attains its highest mean value 92.42% in the speech of the 50-65 year old speakers. Then, a slight decrease in [q] usage is observed in the speech of the eldest age group in which the mean attains the value of 91.39%.

Differences in the Use of [q] in the Speech of Women and Men

In addition to examining age-related differences in the use of [q], gender
related differences are also explored. Graph (2) illustrates [q] usage in the linguistic behavior of both women and men.

![Graph showing percentage of [q] usage by gender](image)

**Figure 2.** Comparing the use of "[q]" between Women and Men.

This graph reveals that there is slight difference in the realization of [q] in the linguistic repertoire of women and men. The mean percentage of [q] usage is 62.5% in women’s speech while it is 61.2% in men’s speech. The percentages are quite similar, which might indicate the absence of gender differences in [q] usage in the repertoire of Shouf dialect speakers; however, further examination of men's and women's linguistic behavior across different age groups reveals that there is a difference in the linguistic behavior within each group.

**Gender Differentiation Across Age Groups**

As mentioned above, there is a difference in the level of [q] usage across gender
within age groups. Table 10 as well as graph (3) depict gender differentiation within the four age groups.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>66-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>82.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Comparing "qaf" Usage of Women and Men in Four Age Groups.
Table 10 and graph (3) show that in the 18-20 year old age group, women use [q] more than men. The mean percentage of [q] usage is 15.2% for women and 9.2% for men. The usage level of [q] increases for both women and men in the 21-25 year old age group, and women are also found to use [q] more frequently than men. Women’s mean score is 71.4%, while men’s mean score is 58.2%. In the 50-65 year old age group, the pattern of gender differentiation is reversed; men are found to be using more [q] than women. The mean percentage of [q] usage is 84.9% for women and 100% for men. Similarly, in the 60-85 year old age group men’s average use of [q] is 100% while women attain the average score of 82.78%.

Stylistic Shifting

The speakers' linguistic repertoire exhibits a variation in the usage level of [q]. Some of the participants prefer the use of the phonological variant [ʔ], others favor [q], and several speakers shift between [q] and [ʔ]. The tape recorded interviews show that there is a difference in the token value of shifting to [q]. Table 11 displays the percentage of [q] usage in the repertoire of participants and sheds light on the value of style shifting in the speech of the participants.
Table 10 and graph (3) show that in the 18-20 year old age group, women use [q] more than men. The mean percentage of [q] usage is 15.2% for women and 9.2% for men. The usage level of [q] increases for both women and men in the 21-25 year old age group, and women are also found to use [q] more frequently than men. Women's mean score is 71.4%, while men's mean score is 58.2%. In the 50-65 year old age group, the pattern of gender differentiation is reversed; men are found to be using more [q] than women. The mean percentage of [q] usage is 84.9% for women and 100% for men. Similarly, in the 66-85 year old age group men's average use of [q] is 100% while women attain the average score of 82.78%.

Stylistic Shifting

The speakers' linguistic repertoire exhibits a variation in the usage level of [q]. Some of the participants prefer the use of the phonological variant [ʔ], others favor [q], and several speakers shift between [q] and [ʔ]. The tape recorded interviews show that there is a difference in the use of these shifts in [q]. Table 11 displays the percentage of [q] usage in the repertoire of participants and sheds light on the value of style shifting in the speech of the participants.
Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of [q] usage (%)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that the value of stylistic shifting to [q] varies in the speech of the participants. Various speakers style shift to [q] less frequently than the others. There are 14 participants whose score of style shifting to [q] ranges between 1-20%. This value indicates that the speakers are using few [q] words, and that their repertoire is dominated by the use of [7] variant. In other words, these speakers rarely shifted to [q]. The value of stylistic shifting towards [q] increases, and that is evident in the speech of 2 participants whose score of stylistic shifting ranges between 21-40% and 2 other participants whose score ranges between 41-60%. In addition to that, some participants style shift more frequently to [q], and their repertoire is rich in [q] utterances. There are 2 speakers whose value of stylistic shifting ranges between 61-80% and 2 other speakers whose score is 81-99%. Besides, table (2) reveals that 8 participants use only
[?] and never style shift to [q] as well as 32 speakers who use only [q] and never style shift to [?]. Appendix V shows the exact percentage of [q] usage and the frequency of speakers who scored that percentage. In addition to that, the results revealed in Appendix IV indicate that the young speakers style shift more frequently than seniors who do rarely shift. Only two old women are found to switch to [?]. The percentage of [q] scored in their speech is 45% (for speaker no. 37) and 9.09% (for speaker no. 40). Besides, there is only one man (speaker no. 52), out of the 15 old men participating in this study, who style shifted towards [?]. However appendix IV mentions that his score of [q] usage is 100% because during the tape recorded interview no instances of [?] were recorded; however, when the tape recorder was off, the man switched from [q] to [?] while interacting with his customers.

Attitudes Toward "qaf"

The attitudes of Shouf dialect speakers towards their dialect and its stereotypical sound [q] are examined in this study. And the influence of linguistic attitudes on linguistic behavior, in particular on the use of [q], is also explored. The results of the attitude questionnaire are discussed in the following section.

Attitudes Toward the Proximity of the Shouf Dialect to "fuSHA"

The first statement of the attitude questionnaire elicits the participants' attitudes towards the closeness of the Shouf dialect to fuSHA. The attitudes toward this statement are illustrated in graph (4) which reveals that 80% agree and 20% disagree that "qaf"
makes the Shouf dialect closest to $\text{fusHa}$. In order to examine the validity of the answers on this question, another statement (item 13) addresses the same issue but is negatively worded. The statement asks whether the use of "qaf" does not make the Shouf dialect close to $\text{fusHa}$. The answers reveal that speakers are consistent in their answers since the percentage of speakers who agree about item (1) is almost equal to those who disagree about item (13). Graph (S) shows that 81% of the speakers disagree and 19% agree that "qaf" does not make the Shouf dialect closest to $\text{fusHa}$.

![Graph](image)

*Figure 4. Using "qaf" Makes the Shouf Dialect Closest to $\text{fusHa}$*
Figure 5. Using "qaf" Does not Make Shouf Dialect Close to fuSHa.

The attitude towards the correctness of the Shouf dialect is addressed in the second statement of the questionnaire. This statement examines the participants' opinions towards the role that "qaf" plays in allowing the Shouf dialect to be close to fuSHa thus allowing it to sound more correct than other Lebanese dialects. The answers on this statement is depicted in graph 6 which shows that 36% agree and 14% disagree that "qaf" makes the Shouf dialect more correct than other Lebanese dialects.
Figure 6. Using "qaf" Makes the Shouf Dialect More Correct than Other Lebanese Dialects.

**Attitude Toward the Aesthetic Value of the Shouf Dialect**

The attitude of the speakers towards the aesthetic value of their dialect is investigated by the set of items: 3, 5, and 18 of the questionnaire. Item (3) is negatively worded and asks if the use of "qaf" does not sound beautiful in one's speech. The answers for this item are presented in graph (7) which reveals that 75% of the speakers disagree and 25% agree that "qaf" does not sound beautiful in the speech.
Figure 7. The Use of “q-of” Does not Sound Beautiful.

Item (13) explores whether the participants like how the [q] variant sounds even though they do not use it. The distribution of opinions about this item is represented in graph (8) which shows that 79% of the speakers agree and 21% disagree about this statement.
Graph (9) shows the distribution of answers on item five which explores if the use of "qaf" makes the Shouf dialect sound more beautiful than the other Lebanese dialects. The answers are as follows: 65% agree and 35% disagree.
If we compare the mean attitude of the answers of statements 2 and 5, we notice that the mean attitude of statement 2 is 3.22 while that of statement 5 is 2.94. This shows that Shouf dialect speakers believe that “qaf” makes Shouf dialect more correct but not more beautiful than other Lebanese dialects.

The participants' opinions whether “qaf” is an old or trendy sound are explored in statements 8 and 12. Graph (10) shows that 45% agree and 55% disagree that “qaf” is an old fashioned sound. On the other hand, graph (11) shows that 28% agree and 72% disagree that “qaf” is trendy.

Figure 10. The Use of “qaf” is Old Fashioned.
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Figure 11. The Use of "qaf" is Trendy.

Attitudes Toward the Shouf Dialect and its Social Status

Statements 4 and 9 explore the participants' attitudes toward the relationship between using "qaf" and social status. The answers on item (4) which are illustrated in Graph (12) reveal that 97% disagree and 3% agree that the use of "qaf" indicates that the speaker belongs to a low social class. Some participants considered this question offensive, and this could be the reason why the majority of the speakers chose to disagree about it. The relationship between social status and "qaf" use is reiterated in statement 9, however, this statement asks the participants whether the usage of "qaf" indicates that the speaker belongs to a high social class. Graph (13) reveals that 28% of the speakers agree on this statement since they consider that some affluent people in Lebanon might use "qaf" in their speech regardless of their native dialect. However, 72% disagree because they believe that there are many speakers from the Shouf region who use "qaf" even though they belong to a high social class.
Graph (14) represents the answers on statement 10 which elicits the participants' attitudes towards the relationship between "qaf" and high levels of education. The
opinions toward this statement are as follows: 70% disagree and 30% agree. The speakers interpreted and discussed the reasons why they agreed that "qaf" indicates a high level of education. They noted that there are many Lebanese intellectuals and educated people who use "qaf" even if it is not a linguistic feature of their native dialect. On the other hand, speakers who disagreed about this aspect interpreted their attitude by saying that they believe that many Shouf dialect speakers use "qaf"; yet they are uneducated.
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*Figure 14. Using "qaf" Indicates a High Level of Education.*

*Attitudes Toward the Domains of Use of the Shouf Dialect*

The participants' attitudes regarding the domains of use of the Shouf dialect are explored through statements 6 and 7. These questions aim to explore whether the usage of "qaf" qualifies the Shouf dialect to be used in media and in which domains: in politics? or in Lebanese TV series? Item 6 elicits speakers' opinions whether the use of "qaf" makes the Shouf dialect suitable for news and political speech. The answers on this item are illustrated in Graph 15 which shows that 90% agree of the speakers and
10% disagree. Besides, graph (16) corresponds to item 7 which asks about the appropriateness of using the Shouf dialect in Lebanese TV series. The graph shows that 60% of the speakers disagree and 40% agree.

Figure 15. The Use of "qaf" Makes the Shouf Dialect Suitable for News and Political Speech.
Figure 16. The Use of "qaf" Makes the Shouf Dialect Suitable for the Lebanese TV Series.

The Future of the "qaf" Sound in the Shouf Dialect

Statements 11, 15 and 17 of the questionnaire explore the future of the stereotypical linguistic feature "qaf". These statements examine whether [q] will survive and be used by the future generations of the Shouf dialect speakers. The answers on statement 11, which elicits the participants' attitudes whether the Shouf dialect speaker should continue using [q] after being educated, reveal that 70% of the speakers agree and 30% disagree. Statement 15 explores if the speakers should stop using "qaf" after being educated, and graph (18) shows that 5% agree and 95% disagree about abandoning the usage of "qaf" after education. Many of the participants commented that educated speakers should not stop using "qaf", yet they can accommodate to the linguistic environment that they are found in.
Figure 17. After Being Educated, the Speaker Should Continue Using “qaf”.

Figure 18. After Being Educated, the Speaker Should Stop Using “qaf”.

The answers on statement 17 are presented in graph (19) which shows that 67% of the speakers agree and 33% disagree that participants should pass “qaf” to their
The Dialect and Pride in One’s Regional Identity

Figure 19. Passing “qaf” to Children.

Statement 14 elicits the attitudes of the participants towards the association between “qaf” usage and regional identity. Graph 20 represents their attitudes toward this statement and shows that 77% of the speakers agree and 23% disagree that “qaf” usage expresses their Shouf identity.
Statement 16 asks about the pride in one's identity. It inquires if using "qaf" makes these speakers proud of themselves and of their Shouf identity. Graph 21 reveals that 72% of the speakers agree and 28% disagree.
Correlation between Attitude and "qaf" Usage

After examining the attitudes of the speakers towards the items in the questionnaire, the mean attitude for each speaker is calculated and then correlated with the speaker's percentage of "qaf" usage. Refer to Appendix IV for further information about the mean attitude and the percentage of [q] usage for each speaker. As table 12 shows the Pearson correlation coefficient has the value of 0.487, and this value shows that there is a correlation between attitudes toward the Shouf dialect and the usage of "qaf". Speakers who score a low mean attitude do not use qaf or use it in very low percentages. For instance, a speaker whose attitude mean is 2.17 score 17.24% of "qaf" usage of; while those of 3.5 and 3.7 mean attitude score use only "qaf" (100% [q]) in their repertoire.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Score</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>.487(**)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;qaf&quot; usage</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.487(**)</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The results show that as the speakers advance in age, the usage level of [q] increases in their repertoire. The lowest percentage of [q] was scored by the 18-20 year old speakers, and this percentage increases for the 21-35, 50-65 and 66-85 year old speakers. Moreover, the results reveal that there is gender differentiation in the usage of [q] among the younger age groups. Younger women (18-20 and 21-25 years old) are found to use [q] more frequently than younger men. It was also found that the degree of style shifting between [q] and [ʔ] varies between one speaker and the other. Some speakers shift to [q] more frequently or less frequently than others, and that is the reason why the speakers are classified into 4 ranges according to the value of their shifting to [q]. In addition to that, the influence of psychological factors, in particular the attitude of speakers toward their dialect, on the use of [q] is revealed. The results show that some speakers have positive attitude towards their dialect, while others have negative attitude. A correlation is also found between the linguistic attitudes of Shooft dialect speakers and their linguistic behavior.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Language Variation Across Different Age Groups

The results of the present study revealed that older speakers used [q] more frequently than younger speakers. One of the factors contributing to this difference could be geographical mobility, which is an aspect of urbanization. Older speakers were and continue to be less geographically mobile than younger speakers. Thirty years ago, when the 50 year old participants were in their twenties, commuting to Beirut and intermingling with different sects who have diverse linguistic markers was difficult due to the Lebanese civil war. Furthermore, the 66-85 year old speakers reported that it was difficult for them to visit Beirut frequently as the old days due to the scarcity of cars and buses that transported them to the city. Only few years ago the transportation networks which linked the rural areas with urban centers were developed. The network of highways that connected the Shouf region to the city, its suburbs, and to other regions in Lebanon was constructed. This allowed people to commute to the city faster and easier than it used to be. The difficulty to move to the city and be in contact with the city mode of life as well as with speakers of different dialects was reflected in the speech of older Shouf dialect speakers who scored high frequencies of [q].

On the other hand, younger speakers used [q] less frequently. This could be due to their increased geographical mobility. Increased geographical mobility might lead speakers to adopt [ʔ]. Abed-el-iswad (1987) similarly showed that the older speakers use [q] more frequently than younger speakers. He also showed that the geographical
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mobility of the speakers who left Nablus and moved to Amman and Irbid contributed to their decreased use of [q] and increased use of [ʔ]. Likewise, Nichols (1998) revealed that the speakers who stayed on the mainland used the local linguistic variants more frequently than the speakers who moved to the town, while the speakers who were in contact with the town used the Standard English variants more frequently due to their geographical mobility.

Another factor that could be contributing to age differentiation in the use of [q] in the speech of Shouf Druze is stereotyping. Younger speakers, who were more conscious of their self image than older speakers, might be avoiding the use of [q] because it is a linguistic stereotype. They abandon its use to distance themselves from being rural. This finding is line with Aied-el-Jawad (1987) who examined the use of the Nabulsi stereotypică feature [q]. He similarly found out that younger speakers avoided using [q] and used it less frequently than old speakers because it is a linguistic stereotype.

In addition to the factors of geographical mobility and stereotyping, the curriculum and the level of education might be another factors contributing to the use of [q] by Shouf Druze. The eldest age group whose age range between 66-85 years old reported during the interviews that in the old days, teachers put emphasis on the usage of MSA sounds. Students were not allowed to use the colloquial variants of MSA sounds. Two old ladies said that they were punished each time they used [ʔ] instead of [q]. This curriculum’s emphasis on the use of [ʔ] and other MSA sounds instead of their colloquial variants might explain the reason why older speakers’ repertoire in this study was rich with MSA sounds, while the younger speakers’ repertoire was rich with the Lebanese colloquial variants. Older speakers used MSA [ʔ] in addition to its dialectal
variants [d] and [zd], MSA [θ] along with its dialectal variants [t] and [s]. The following examples illustrate their use of MSA sounds:

(1) yajibru ri'it qaneefiro nrawwaSa yahwehu nathalor hedh1 hawwara aw d-dal'yeen
w tiksh 1a l-lahh

"They used to dissolve, for example, sand, dip in it a sharp spine from porcupines and write with it on the board.

Example (1) illustrates how an old women (73 years old) used the MSA linguistic variant [θ] in her speech as she was explaining how they used to write on the board in old days. Examples (2) and (3) illustrate the use of the linguistic variant [θ] by an old woman (70 years old) who was talking about the way they used to live in the past.

(2) nitshab kθur bas ra'siyetna mircotha jθ harb w jθ infyzarant

"We used to get very tired, but our mood was better. There was neither war nor explosions."

(3) keen fi tiin kθur, nostah hattiin w nxali la fitii.

"There were plenty of figs, we used to dry them and keep some for the winter."

Example (4) illustrates the use of [θ] instead of [θ].

(4) I xaraf falat minni w toli' jurkud 1a likram.

"The sheep escaped and started running in the valleys."

Older speakers use [θ] more frequently than younger speakers even though their educational system was not well developed in comparison to nowadays schooling and they attained lower level of education in comparison to younger speakers. Since [θ] is a MSA, it is expected that its use is frequent in the speech of educated participants.
However, the results of this study revealed that increased level of education did not lead to an increased use of [q]. The older speakers were the least educated; however, they used the highest levels of [q]. While the young speakers who were the most educated avoided using [q]. These findings were different from Daher’s (1998) which showed that as the level of education of speakers increased, the use of [q] increased. BA educated speakers used [q] more frequently than High School educated speakers who also used [q] more frequently than Elementary School educated speakers. But [q] is considered a stereotype of Druze speech, and according to the conclusions reached out by Holes (1983) educated speakers avoided linguistic stereotypes even when they were MSA variants. The educated Shiiia speaker avoided using their linguistic variants (that are MSA variants), such as [z] as well as [x] and replaced them with the Sunni dialect variants [y] and [q] (+MSA) in order to avoid being ridiculed or laughed at. Similarly, in the present study the younger educated Druze speakers avoided using [q] (+MSA) since it is a linguistic stereotype and used [ʔ] instead.

Language Variation between Younger Subgroups

Younger speakers whose ages range from 18-20 years old scored 11.69% of [q] usage, which was the lowest mean percentage of [q] attained by speakers participating in this study. Then, the percentage of [q] increased until it attained a mean percentage of 66.95% in the speech of 21-25 year old participants. This increase of [q] usage attained its maximum score (92.42%) in the repertoire of the 50-65 year old speakers, which was then followed by an insignificant decrease (91.39%) in the speech of the 66-85 years old age group. The percentage of [q] usage in the speech of older subgroups was almost the same, but there was a difference among younger subgroups. The important pattern
noticed was the significant difference in the usage of [q] between the 15-20 and the 21-25 year old speakers. The mean percentage of [q] usage was 11.69% for the 18-20 year old speakers, while it was 66.59% for the 21-25 year old speakers. At the age of 18-20 years old, Shouf dialect speakers started moving or would have moved to the city to enroll in universities to attain their degrees. As they moved to the city, this group started adopting the [?] variant. Speakers of this age group were pursuing their education; consequently, they favored the use of [?] since it helped them create a better self image, an urban rather than a rural image, and thus helped them acquire social mobility. In an attempt to explain the reasons behind younger speakers' tendency to use [?], the social status of this variant will be briefly discussed. Based on the sociolinguistic literature, the [?] variant is an urban dialect feature which is socially prestigious in Lebanon (Ibrahim, 1988). It is used by educated Lebanese speakers (Sallam, 1980), in media, and most surprisingly by the reporters in the news bulletins (Al-Batal, 2002). The usage of [?] is also considered as a sign of urbanization as well as modernization in Lebanon (Sallam, 1980). All these factors accord [?] with a prestige value. According to Kroch (1978) a prestige dialect is used by the elite in professions such as academia, law, business management and the mass media. So the prestige allocated to the [?] variant attracts the Shouf dialect speakers to use it due to the benefits that it might bring to its users especially in allowing them to look as educated, high social status, urbanized and modernized speakers.

There are also different factors that might be contributing to the increase in the use of [q] in the speech of 21-25 year old speakers. The pressure from urban contacts and the place of residence could be the factors influencing whether the speaker uses a
high frequency of [q] or not. Speakers belonging to this age group were under less pressure from the urban friends because either they were not engaged in activities with urban friends or they went back to live in the Shouf region. In response to an interview question regarding how they spend their leisure time, 2 out of 12 speakers in this age group said that due to the time spent on studying, they were not engaged in activities done in the city. That was reflected in their speech; one of the speakers (speaker number 5 in Appendix IV) scored 63.33% and the other speaker (number 15 in Appendix IV) used 79% of [q]. Besides, 2 out of the 12 speakers had been working and commuting to Beirut for several years, but they went back to live in the Shouf region. Their stay in the Shouf region could have affected their linguistic behavior, leading to an increase in the use of [q]; they only use [q] (100% [q]) in their linguistic repertoire (speaker number 16 and 20). 4 out of the 12 speakers moved to live and work in the Shouf region. Their use of [q] ranged between 70.00% and 88.63%. Finally, 1 out of the 12 speakers had been living in Beirut since childhood, and that was the reason why she scored 3.03% of [q]. The variant [q] gains back its importance as an identity maker at the 21-25 age group and would be used again by speakers after abandoning it in the younger age group (18-20 years old). There were, however, two members (speaker 10 and 21) who were an exception to what we have been recently discussing. The following section will make their cases clear.

The duration of stay in the city, which is another aspect of urbanization, could be a factor contributing to the variation in the use of [q] across younger subgroups. Table 13 shows the distribution of [q] percentages across the 3 groups: participants who had been living for 10 years and more in the city, participants who had been living for four years or less in the city, and participants who lived in the city but
moved back to the Shouf region in addition to those who didn’t live but commuted to Beirut.

Table 13

The Percentage of [a] Usage Across 3 Groups of Speakers whose Duration of Stay in the City Differed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants who had been living for 10 years and more in the city (%)</th>
<th>Participants who had been living for four years or less in the city (%)</th>
<th>Participants who lived in the city but moved back to the Shouf region in addition to those who didn’t live but commuted to Beirut (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 3.33</td>
<td>(2) 17.24</td>
<td>(11) 97.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 5.26</td>
<td>(3) 8.69</td>
<td>(16) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 11.53*</td>
<td>(5) 63.33</td>
<td>(17) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) 0</td>
<td>(7) 14.81</td>
<td>(18) 88.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) 0</td>
<td>(8) 0*</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) 0</td>
<td>(9) 2.27*</td>
<td>(20) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) 0</td>
<td>(10) 0*</td>
<td>(21) 7.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) 3.03%</td>
<td>(13) 40</td>
<td>(30) 0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15) 7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23) 3.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25) 2.94*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26) 4.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27) 10.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29) 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 2.89                                      Average: 24.11                                      Average: 74.23
This table shows that the participants who had been living in the city for 10 years and more scored 2.89%, which is the lowest average percentage of [q]. The group of speakers who had been living for four years or less in the city scored an average percentage of 24.11%. The group who used to live in the city but moved back to the Shouf scored the highest average percentage of [q] usage which was equal to 74.23%. These cases revealed that usage level of [q] increased as the speaker's duration of stay in the city increased. However, there were some exceptions in each group. In the first group, for instance, a speaker scored a mean percentage of 11.53% despite living for more than 10 years in the city. That was due to his continuous contact with the Shouf region. He reported in the interview that he spent every summer and the holidays in the Shouf region. In the second group, there were 6 out of 14 speakers who used [q] less than 4.34% even though they recently moved to the city. One of the participants (speaker 10; Appendix IV) used 0% of [q] since his mother was Russian and found it difficult to produce the /q/ sound; consequently, he was not used [q]. Participants who were living in Shouf region scored the highest percentage of [q] except for two speakers. The first speaker (21; Appendix IV) used 7.36% of [q] because she said that she was used to [?] since her childhood. The other speaker (30; Appendix IV) used 0% and reported that she could not pronounce [q].

The degree of engagement in the activities done in the urban area, a third aspect of urbanization, could be another factor contributing to the difference in the use of [q] across younger subgroups. The interviews with the participants included questions about the activities that they did at their leisure time. Participants who had been living in the city for 10 years or more were well integrated in the urban environment. They attended urban schools, had a network of friends from the city, and participated in
activities done in the city. This engagement in the urban activities might be contributing to their use of the urban variant [q]. On the other hand, the speakers who had been living in the city for 4 years or less or were living in the Shouf, had networks of friends from the city and participated, but not very frequently, in the urban activities. This continuous contact with the Shouf region was playing a role in using [q] in higher percentages. The group with the highest engagement in the life of the city used [q] the least frequently, while those with the lowest orientation to the city used [q] the most frequently. The engagement of these three groups in the urban lifestyle differed, so did their linguistic behavior.

Language Variation between Genders

When the linguistic repertoire of both men and women was compared without taking other social factors into consideration, it was noticed that there was no difference in the usage level of [q]. They used almost the same percentage of [q] instances in their speech: 62.5% in women’s speech and 64.2% in men’s speech. However, when the linguistic behavior was examined across different age groups, the results revealed that the percentage of [q] usage was different for both men and women, especially in the younger age groups. 18-20 year old young women led in using [q]; they scored the percentage of 15.2% while their male counterparts scored 9.2%. 21-25 year old women scored the percentage of 71.4% while their male counterparts scored 58.2%. The factor that could be contributing to younger women’s more frequent use of [q] than men was conservatism towards women. Based on their answers on the questionnaire, the younger participants said that the Shouf community was a conservative community which placed some restraints on young women. Even though women had equal rights and equal
opportunities to learn and work as men, men were given more freedom to have social activities and to build wider circle of social networks. Young women spent their leisure time with family and with friends who are also Druze; while, male counterparts had more opportunities to build wider social networks, i.e., to have connections with friends from different sects. The linguistic behavior of young women whose contacts were within the closed circle of relationships was influenced. They used [q], which was the linguistic feature used by other group members as a sign of group solidarity and home solidarity. Young men showed solidarity with the group of friends that were both from both the city and the village; they switched between [q] and [ʔ] and used [ʔ] more frequently. And-el-Jawad’s finding (1987) showed that younger women used [q] less frequently than younger men. This is not the case in the present study because the factor of conservatism towards young women led them to use the linguistic stereotype of their community. It is also opposite to Daher’s results which showed that women of 3 age groups use [q] less frequently than men.

On the other hand, men in the older age group used approximately the same percentage of [q] as women. The older men who were 50-65 year old used 100% of [q] in their speech, while their female counterparts scored 84.9%. Men whose ages were 66-85 year old score 100%, while their female counterparts scored 82.78%. The majority of older women participating in the study used [q]; however, three of them used [ʔ] thus increasing the average of [q] usage for the older women. One of these women (number 3; Appendix IV) was raised in the city, so she style shifted between [q] and [ʔ]. The other two participants preferred the use of [ʔ] because they had been using it since childhood, and they thought that it was more socially prestigious to use it. There were few factors which might have triggered both older men and women to favor the
use of [q]. They both expressed conservative views about the necessity of keeping the
linguistic marker alive. The majority of older participants made fun of the younger
speakers who changed [q] to [?] and considered it as a fake sign of urbanization and
modernization. This finding is also different from Abd-el-Jawad’s who found out that
older women use less [q] than older men. In this study, both older women and men use
[q] because it is part of their identity, and they believe in the importance of preserving it
for the future generations.

Stylistic Shifting

The majority of speakers (32 out of 60) used the linguistic variant [q], 22
speakers style shifted between [q] and [?] in different percentages, and 8 speakers used
[q]. This shows that the majority of Shouf dialect speakers used [q], and those who
shifted to [?] did not completely abandon [q] with the exception of 8 speakers who used
only [?]. There were some situations and contexts which trigger speakers to shift
between [q] and [?]. Speakers style shifted when quoting a speech, joking, expressing
emotions, distancing oneself from an opinion, asserting one’s identity, accommodating,
and discussing a certain topic, the speaker chose the phonological variant which would
create an impression and influence the addressee. In addition to that, the nature of the
words uttered also played a role in stylistic shifting. For instance, the use of old words
of the Shouf dialect and the use of MSA educated words played a role in determining
the phonological variant used by the speaker. Besides, the frequency of the word also
influenced the speaker’s use of the phonological variants [q] and [?]. Words of higher
frequency were pronounced with [?], while those of lower frequency were pronounced
with [q]. This section discusses the context of occurrence of stylistic shifting and provides examples to illustrate these occurrences. Examples of style shifting are grouped under two categories: “style shifting in order to create an impression on the addressee” and “words that trigger style shifting”.

**Style Shifting in Order to Create an Impression on the Addressee**

**Quotations.** The tape recorded interviews showed that the speakers shifted to the phonological variant used by the person being quoted. The interlocutor used the words and the pronunciation of the quoted speaker because the purpose of the quotation was to convey the effect created by the original words used by the speakers. For instance, examples (1) and (2) show how the speaker switched to the variant [q] in order to communicate the message of the quotation. The message was to show how certain words triggered laughter in a conversation which the speaker was having, and she aimed at leaving an impression on the addressee and creating a funny atmosphere.

1) fa nehna ?enelela eh w re'imin lam ta'lenli, fa w?fit hek b S-Saf w ta'limna baqiquuni yehon, fa nehna ?inno Dahhalna yal word.

* We told her, “You are on a diet!” She stood up in the class and said, “Do you want me to throw them up!” So, we laughed at the word which she used.

2) marra keessat ?ee'iyl hudi tefi? sa kinna ?ee'yiilm ana w y-?e'ha lam miktob yal ajonda fa woslit sa l Francais fi de-oir ma yu?inah yeh fa ta'almi mnain faqnas heida.

* My friend was once sitting next to me, and we were writing in our diaries. She looked at mine and wondered why I have jotted down a homework for the
French class which was not assigned. She asked, “Where did this homework originate from?”

The following example shows how a young man (19 years old) switched from [ʔ] to [q] when quoting his grandmother’s speech.

(3) sitti biḍillī fa badak teekel ya wqorbnī w kemm biḍillī ya taqbera la sitak.

* My Grandma asks me, “What do you want to eat honey?” (Literal translation is not possible for this example).

Not only [ʔ] users switched to [q], but also [q] users switched to [ʔ] when quoting the utterances of [ʔ] users. In the example below, a young man (23 years old) shifted to [ʔ] when he quoted the speech of his friends who were from an urban origin.

(4) fii aShaabna b yeqū min bejrūn la fīnna b yqawla “mīf maṭṭuul mīf maṭṭuul kif sāḥaba fiīla w ahla w sāhla”.

* When our friends, who are from Beirut, visit us, they say, “It is wonderful how they welcomed us.”

Joking. The tape recorded corpus showed that as the speaker aimed to joke, he/she used the variant which conveyed the message of the joke.

Example (5) illustrates how a young man (21 years old) joked about the cultural aspects which he disliked in the Shouf region. He used the word “sanadī”, which was typically used by old people in the Shouf area to indicate friendliness and affection, in order to indicate to the interlocutor that he was joking. Then, he used the word “ṣuqalī”.
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When a young woman (18 years old) was asked about the place where she liked to raise her children, she answered that question jokingly by starting with a MSA word using the [q] variant and then switched to [ʔ].

*In the far future, I will definitely raise my kids in Beirut because I will be working here. If I have enough money, I will build a house in the Shouf area. But it is a dead area where we do not find job opportunities.*

Expression of emotions. The participants in this study chose [q], the linguistic feature of their native dialect to express their feelings: anger, fear, joy, or happiness.

The native dialect might have been chosen because it was intimately related to the speaker. It was the dialect of one's family, grandparents, and childhood friends.

Example (7) illustrates how the speaker style shifted to [q] when she expressed her annoyance at quitting the practicum at the dentist's clinic:

(7) ri'allamat kil fi bas heeli wihi ma fiha hyyi kif b yi'ba\'. bas min mbeiriha mdeyaqah kif tarakit bas xif 1a tiri min i variiiz.
* I learnt every skill in dentistry except for pulling teeth. Since yesterday I have been very annoyed because I quit the practicium, but I was afraid for my varicose leg.

**Distancing oneself from an opinion.** In this study, the participants’ linguistic repertoire revealed that speakers switched between [q] and [ʔ] to distance themselves from an opinion expressed. When a speaker was hesitant about uttering an opinion, which was a negative attitude or a criticism, in front of a stranger or on a tape recorder, he/she style shifted.

Example (8) illustrates how a young man switched between [q] and [ʔ] as he was criticizing and complaining about his neighbor who broke the rules:

(8) anaa jaaari 'inda fayarah kirmee nakaTTiiba la fatti b Sīr qanuniyyeh bi y fasilah, w farti la baladiyyeh b yiskitsii la'annu parabintan.

* My neighbor puts the tree on fire in order to legally cut it for the winter. The municipality police does not say anything because they are relatives

Example (9) also shows that shifting between [q] and [ʔ] was a distancing technique. As the speaker discussed the way people used to live in old times, he used [q]; however, he switched to [ʔ] when the topic of discussion shifted. The speaker style shifted because he was criticizing the political beliefs of the people and the politicians of the Shouf region.

(9)... la'man keemu yeneem bi baydar kinmel i-qameh w xabriyyet, kamen hay ?a vừa bTalit maawwadi, ya raq b tizqal la'man keenm yikklu lay qitaas z-drai...
b yittihlu xat aw tawar San Sadam masirfi, hay yala fiufi hiwi. hala? nihna m nonbositi fiya, kilon heik...
yimkin farili mas'ulini aw fi, yishahlon fi maSihba b fiufu' y farlu ha jabeeb, yifarlu n-nwi l-misfizi mis' yaful li faflir mis' yaful samaki kil yaseem, yafuli
sonnara, yifarlu.

* ....Many old traditions do not exist anymore such as when they used to sleep in
the threshing floor to take care of the wheat and the like. I hope that old days
when people depended on the agricultural sector are restored...
People follow a political movement without knowing about it, and this is wrong.
We are happy about that; however, all people behave this way.
Maybe it is the duty of the people who are in charge of the area or the like to
create some jobs for the young people there. They should provide employment
for the needy people. Rather than giving the people fish, they should teach them
how to fish.

Identity assertion. The tape recorded interviews showed that the speakers style
shifted to their dialectal variants when they needed to assert their identity. The use of
[q] was triggered when the speaker declared and affirmed his/her regional identity.
Example (10) shows how a young man who used [7] consistently style shifted to
[q] when he expressed his satisfaction that he was from the Shouf area:

(10) xkliid aña b Dallini ?itmana ?innen xil?it b fiufu la?innu heidi bi?iti
For sure I feel happy that I am from the Shouf region. I belong to this region, and my traditions are there.

Accommodation. In this study, speakers shifted to [q] in an attempt to accommodate to the addressee. In some interviews when [q] words were used by the researcher, the interviewees style shifted to [q]. Examples (11) and (12) illustrate how the speakers accommodated and switched to [q] as their conversations were interrupted with questions containing [q] utterances.

In example (11), a young man (18 years old) (S) was discussing his opinion regarding the place where he planned to raise his children. Then, his style shifted in an attempt to accommodate his speech to that of the researcher (R):

(11) S: Ṭinnu hinni fawy seedjuna bil wa’itit...bheb rabbi wleedi b t-tneyen...b yotaf Sindon xalit min l main cultures.

* They are a little bit ahead of us...I like to raise my children in both the city and village...They will have a mixture of both cultures

R: min s-saqefliin

* from both cultures?

S: eh xalit min s-saqefliin

* yes, a mixture of both cultures.

In example (12), the speaker was discussing the issue of women’s and men’s equal rights in the Shouf region:

(12) S: t-tahafoez Sa S-Salhiyeh aksar, mif bi kil l manautii b i jijaf bas bi mozjama.
* Not in all the villages of the Shouf area but in most of them, there are more restraints on young women.

R: bi biyya'ilin ma bihi b ha fi kiitir

* These restraints are not very evident in Baakline.

S: bi biyya'ilin ? sallum sam tilik yeh [i]nna mi[$] fission biyya'ilin akhtar, semhiilen yejda we akhtar.

* In Baakline? What I am telling you is that they do not have more rights, but they are allowed to practice these rights.

**Topic of discussion.** The topic of the discussion was one of the contexts of occurrence of style shifting. In this study, the topic of discussion was about the Shouf region: its customs, the social relationships between its people, the political commitment of its population, and the characteristics that distinguish it from the city.

These issues might have instigated speakers who used [?] to shift to [q].

The following example illustrates how a speaker used [q] when he was talking about the village. Then, he shifted to [?] when talking about the city and style shifted back to [q] when discussing the village social relationships.

(13) b fujah ba'ed fi sohmezz qa'allih izc b 'adili qul sam'amok qa'llih w ahamma fi l 
[ca]sima[ca]ss [masalan] [i]z[onno b] [alma]r b i bil modon b [ceel][i] [i]z[onno l] xalayyar meqafi

xa'ta'ta' furr alheelu... b heb lamun bi biyya'ilin b ya'semlu na'de'wet

* There is still family solidarity in the Shouf region. The most important thing is the social relationships. For example, when you walk in the cities, you frequently find an old person walking alone... What I like in Baalbek is that they have educational seminars in which people of all ages participate in.

The topic of sectarianism and confessionalism led some speakers to style-shift between [q] and [ʔ] in the following examples, speakers who used the glottal stop [ʔ] style shifted to [q] when the topics of religious fanaticism and confessionalism were raised up.

Example (14) illustrates how a young man who was discussing the cultural aspects which he disliked in Shouf switched to [q] as he argued about the issue of religious fanaticism. The [q] word was used next to the word taʕaSSob dinii (religious fanaticism).

(14) Yilli ma b hebu yemkim ykan bī fwayyet taʕaSSob. Fīt ūndun taʕaSSob maʕlati badi qat taʕaʃob dinii, w i xityariyyeh b yihbu y-kaumu kinni s-solta w kinni l ʕidem.

* I dislike the presence of religious fanaticism in the Shouf region. Old people always like to be the powerful people who are in charge of everything.

In example (15), a young man style shifted as he was discussing the absence of sectarianism in the Lebanese Red Cross.

(15) bi S-Salib l ahrar ma bī Taʕaʃiyyeh bil ʕaqīm. Ana minamiq miį lā hizb siyyest lā ʕamṣiyyeh b ttreį bi l Şemamaiyeh w lühree T-Taʕiyyeh. l bi l b yʕul kasdāf bišid w ma raḥ yShīr bas ʔinno maʕlaq mohić.
* There is no sectarianism in the departments of the Red Cross. I am not a member of a political party but of an organization which calls for secularism and the abolishment of sectarianism. All people say that this is a far-reaching goal which will not be accomplished but is a fair pursuit.

Discussing scientific and medical topics instigated the speaker to shift to [q]. The usage of [q] in technical words helped the speaker to appear educated and knowledgeable about the subject, gave the interlocutor the impression that the speaker was reliable, and made the speech more effective and credible. In example (16), a young woman was reporting on an article which she read about diabetes, she used [q] in words gleaned from the medical field and then switched to [?] in everyday words.

(16) 7̌ťit bi mažal fi 7̌ťir xa7̌ir Sān s-sikāri Sānyed fi b yna2̌if 7a2̌ir ḫolānǐk, 7a lexim xa5̌imlu wīq̌ayeh la s-sikāri. lexim xa5̌imlu test la7̌ fingers la7̌ feelings b 7̌uwa extreme lamun b ySiir fi 7alaqu-7et. 7̌a2̌risf 7imna la r1̌i2̌a la wīq̌ayeh ba7̌da bidun dawa, ȟi awai b. l wīq̌ayeh. 7̌ hakim xullu ni7̌arib ma7̌ik ba7 yolkinn ma tux̌a2̌ b 7a2̌a2̌tit.

* I read something very dangerous about diabetes in the magazine. If you read it, you'll have a gooseflesh. It is about the preventive measures that the diabetic patients should take: they should examine their fingers and test their senses. The article mentions that having lesions between the toes of the patient indicates an extreme case.

My friend's mom is on a preventive treatment of diabetes and not yet on medication. The most important thing is prophylaxis. The doctor told her that we will try but it may fail; however, it was successful.
Words that Trigger Style Shifting

Frequency of the words used. Words which were frequently used in every day speech were more likely to be pronounced with the [ʔ] variant. However, [q] was used in words which were less frequently used in casual speech. In example (17), the speaker was comparing the social relationships between people in old and present time. He used the word taqeerob (affinity) with [q] because it was a low frequency word; however, the word ʔabil (before) was pronounced with [ʔ] since it was a frequently used word in the speech. Similarly, in example (18) the speaker realized the high frequency word waʔit with [ʔ] and switched to [q] in the word mostaqbala.

(17) baʔTal fii taqeerob w iʔsimasyyat mitel ma seen min ʔabil.

* There is no more affinity between people, and the social relationships are weaker than before.

(18) ma ʕindu l wahad l waʔit yaʔmil zaraat kil waahad ʕan yfakir bi mostaqbala.

* You do not have enough time to pay visits. Every person is busy thinking about his/her future.

Example (19) shows how the speaker used the sound [ʔ] in the word waʔit (when) and then switched to [q] in the low frequency word ʕaqubi (punishment).

(19) baddi xaberre fii ʕmelha b 5-Saf waʔit yelna kiis Ya i medrasi w ballajha maʔTit la ʔelo la nhat fi i stink bomb... w ballajha lai kiis w balaf kil 5-Saf yaDlak w Tlaʔma kilna la barra w mDyna kilna taʔakud mDyna ʕaqubi.
* I will tell her about what we have done once at class. We got a stink bomb and began planning to blow it up to the class...it burst and all the class started laughing. We were all expelled out of the class and had a punishment.

Old dialectal words. When the speakers who were participating in this study used old dialectal words, they switched to [q]. These old words were usually used by the old generation of the Shouf dialect speakers. When young or old speakers ([?] users) used these words they switched to [q] because these words and their pronunciation were circulated by the old speakers in their [q] version and adopted by other speakers.

Example (20) shows how a young speaker, who was discussing the social relationship between people in the Shouf region and how they always pay visits to the patients, switched to "qaf" when using an old dialectal word. He uttered the word "istiftåfeidī", which was an old Shouf dialectal word, with [q] variant and then switched to [?] .

(20) l'zaarat la ba5id il ma l'wahaD saxan aw marid istiftåfeidī y'Tahu šil marid. hay ?atimii ?atimii šitir.

* The visits paid for a person when he gets sick. This is a very old word.

In example (21), an old lady was recounting how people used to live at the old times; she switched to [q] as she came across an old word.

(21) yonawhu hau ?uDa w b jari' w bi yhotu qyseet bi y?uladun havid qyseet
hayk mitt 3-sild.

* They mopped the room during the winter, and they put the skins of the animals as carpets.
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MSA educated words. The use of MSA words triggered participants to style shift to [q]. These words were realized with the [q] variant due to different reasons. First, MSA words were used and realized with [q] because they might not have an equivalent lexical item in the casual speech. They might have instead an etymologically different colloquial item. For instance, the word aSdiqaa (friends) can not be realized as aSdi'aa; its dialectal equivalent is aShaab. Secondly, the MSA words were uttered with [q] because they might not have a lexical equivalent in colloquial speech. For instance, the word iqtiSaadi (economical) can not be realized as iitiSaadi due to phonological constraints, and it does not have any lexical equivalent in colloquial speech. So the only lexical item to be used is iqtiSaadi with [q] sound. The third reason behind using MSA educated words and its MSA pronunciation was due to the speaker’s intention to add a level of formality to his/her speech. For instance, the word qii'itmi was realized with [q] rather than [?] because it added a level of formality.

In example (22) a young female recounted how she spent her free time:

(22) naa Sindi aSdiqaa? friends kil wahad hai? la helu mainly SaoHiiyyi.

* I do not have friends since in these days everyone is alone. I spend my time mainly with the family.

In example (23), the speaker was discussing how to improve the economical situation at the Shouf region and how to improve it, and he switched between [q] and [?]:

(23) l mustawa l iqtiSaadi b yihassan badal ma yinfa'u l madieneh bi y Sittu

yinfa'u l maTa'a faaw?
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• The economical standard of the village will improve if instead of helping the city, they help the Shouf region.

In example (24) an old woman compared the economical situation of the Shouf region at the old times versus the present time:

(24) hala? saw? i Sanaal trrayyar Kerry, ba'eden keen I qitiSaad yair I yawm.

• Nowadays the job market changed: moreover, the economy was different than today.

In the following example a young man (21 years old) was talking about the cultural elements which he disliked in the Shouf region:


• What I dislike in the Shouf area is that it lacks constructional development and activities.

R: w qitiSaadiyon?

• And economic-wise?


• The economical situation is very frail.

In example (26), the speaker was recounting an incident which happened with him at school:

(26) marra ḫiṣa ḫiṣeez I qitiSaad, ḫrisna ḥinno Tindo mahal faleefel ḫawadna n ḫaul, “faleefel, faleefel, banna neiṣal faleefel”.

• We knew that the economics teacher has a faleefel restaurant. As he entered the class, we started saying, “faleefel, faleefel, we want to eat faleefel.”
In order to add a level of formality to her speech, the speaker in the following example shifted to [q].

(27) hala? bash is?alik: fa fu qa?imin dubai halian?

*I want to ask you, “How is Dubai progressing?”*

Some of the contexts of occurrence of stylistic shifting discussed in this study intersect with those mentioned by other researchers. Druze Shouf dialect speakers chose their linguistic stereotype [q] in order to make fun of the dialect of their friends. This was evident, for instance, in the speech of a woman who uttered the words fa wifti hek b S-Saf w talmilah baiquuni yehon (she stood up in the class and said, “Do you want me to throw them up!”) and mnain faqas heida (where did this originate from?). Speakers also chose the stereotypical linguistic variant [q] to joke about certain cultural aspects which they do not like in their community. A young man switched to [q] in the word qalqali (gossip) to joke about gossiping which was one of the aspects that he disliked in the Shouf region. Similarly, Coupland (1985, cited in Estes-Schilling 2002) showed that a Cardiff radio announcer shifted his dialect towards the American dialect in order to make fun of American radio announcers and to his dialect variety when he aimed to poke fun at himself.

Speakers in this study switched to [q] to accommodate to stylistic shifting in my speech. Sallam (1980) finding showed that speakers accommodated to the linguistic variants used by the addresses in order to show signs of friendliness. Since I shared the participants the same rural origin, many speakers who used [?] switched to [q] in their conversations. The style shifting to [q] was also an attempt to show in-group membership and solidarity. Suleiman (2004) argued that the language is a marker of group identity, and Holes (1983) pointed out how Shia speakers switched to their
stereotypical linguistic features when talking with coreligionists and distanced themselves from their linguistic stereotypes when talking to Sunnis or people they were unfamiliar with. Douglas and Cowie (1978, cited in Bell 1984) found similar results and explained how speakers from a Norwich village shifted from their dialect to standard variants with an English stranger more than with a fellow villager. The topic of discussion also triggered style-shifting. Talking about the Shouf customs, lifestyle, and social relationships instigated the speaker who used the urban variant [ʔ] to style shift to the rural variant [q]. For instance, when a speaker was discussing aspects of the Shouf region, he used the [q] variant and style shifted to [ʔ] when talking about the city. The discussion of topics such as sciences and medicine led speakers to shift from the use of [ʔ] to [q]. A speaker, for instance, used the MSA [q] to say scientific words, such as waqezeh (prevention) and nasqad (lesions), and switched to [ʔ] in everyday words such as ḥir (I read), ẓāḥī (my friend), and ṣallu (he told her). Likewise, Sallam (1980) showed that the topic of sciences triggered the use of MSA variants.

The speakers switched to [q] in the words that were used less frequently in everyday speech. For instance, the words such as ṭaqqārib (affinity) and mastaqbalu (his future) were pronounced in [q], and the speaker style shifted to [ʔ] in everyday words such as ṭabīl (before) and waqit (time). Daher (1998) and Sallam (1980) found out similar results. Technical words which are low frequency words, such as words “krommiṣamaṣ ṣalāqa’” (large chromosomes) and “Ṭa’aqa ḥarrarıyya” (heat energy) were more frequently realized with [q] (Sallam, 1980), while high frequency words which were frequently used in everyday speech such as waqit (time) and qabil (before)
were realized with [ʔ] (Deber, 1998). The use of the words, by the participants in the present study, such as *iqtiSaud* (economics), *quaʔomi* (exist), and *asdiqaʔ* (friends) led speakers to shift towards [q]. Salam (1989) explained that words with the form [a, ʔ] such as the word *quaʔomi* was subjected to phonological constraint, and this hindered the speaker from using the [ʔ] variant.

Shouf dialect speakers shifted between their dialectal variant [q] and the urban dialectal variant [ʔ] under the influence of different triggers. They also switched between the MSA [q] and the [ʔ]. In addition to the above mentioned occurrences of style shifting, the attitudes of the speakers might also be a trigger for speakers to style shift.

**Attitudes Toward the Dialectal Feature of the Shouf Dialect**

The analysis of the participants' degree of agreement and disagreement about the attitude questionnaire items entailed the following conclusions. The majority of the participants thought that [q] makes the Shouf dialect closest to *jaStla*. They believed that [q] allows the Shouf dialect to be phonologically more correct but not more beautiful than other Lebanese dialects. Their attitudes were roughly equally divided between speakers who agreed and others who disagreed that [q] is an old fashioned sound. But when the question was worded differently, i.e., when the question asked whether [q] is trendy, the highest percentage of speakers disagreed about describing it as trendy. So, the wording of the question in this case could have influenced the attitude of the speakers.
In addition to that, the majority of the speakers disagreed about the relationship between the use of [q] and the speaker’s social status. They disagreed with the statements that asked whether [q] indicates a low or a high social class. Unlike the participants in Sawaie’s study (cited in Haeri, 1997) who associated [q] users with the high social class, it seems that the participants in this study did not believe that the use of [q] is related to the social status of the speaker. In addition to that, the majority of the speakers in this study also disagreed about associating the use of [q] with high levels of education. But speakers, for instance, in Sawaie’s study associated [q] users with professions, such as university professor or school teacher. The reason behind this difference is that in the present study [q] serves as a feature of the dialect in the Shouf region while in Sawaie’s study [q] is a MSA educated feature.

Despite the pressure that urbanization puts on the rural dialect, the speakers will probably continue to use [q] after pursuing their education since the highest percentage of speakers agree that [q] should be used even if the speaker is educated. Moreover, [q] will not be lost and will be most likely passed to the future generation because the majority of the speakers thought that [q] should be passed to the younger generation. It was believed that [q] is a marker of their Shouf identity and using it made them proud of their belonging to that region.

The results of the attitude questionnaire might be explaining some of the reasons that lead Druze speakers of the Shouf region to use [q]. Being a MSA sound could be the first possible reason for Druze’s use of [q] because the majority of the speakers believe that [q] marks the Shouf dialect closest to fuSHa and phonologically more correct than other Lebanese dialects. Furthermore, speakers, especially older speakers, pointed out in their interviews that the use of [q] emphasizes their Arab identity. Being
a Druze identity marker could be another reason for the use of [q]. As the questionnaire shows, the majority of Shouf dialect speakers did not believe that [q] is a beautiful or a trendy sound, but they continued to use it and regarded it as a marker that expressed their Shouf identity. So, the other reason why the Shouf dialect speakers could be using [q] is because they associate it with Druze membership. The attitudes show that the Druze did not associate [q] with a social class membership, but they possibly used it because they are Druze.

The linguistic attitudes of the Shouf dialect speakers correlate with their linguistic behavior. The Pearson product of the value 0.487 (significant at 0.01 level) shows that speakers who had positive attitudes toward [q], used this variant, while those with negative attitude avoid using it. Similarly, Ladegaard (2000) showed that linguistic behavior could be predicted from attitudes despite of the many problems that the researcher faces.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

The different aspects of urbanization, such as geographical mobility, duration of the stay in the city and engagement in urban activities, could be threatening the use of the rural dialect [q], but it seems that there are other factors that counter the influence of urbanization. Being an identity marker might be one of the forces in preserving [q] in the Shouf dialect. This linguistic feature signals the Arab, Druze and Shouf identity of the speakers, and this instigates the speakers to keep using it and pass it to future generations. The fluctuation in the levels of using [q] observed in the speech of Druze of the Shouf region might indicate that using [q] is an age grading process; as speakers advance in age, [q] will gain back its importance as an identity marker and will be used in conversations.

The age factor influenced the use of [q]. Its use varied between older and younger speakers, and between the younger subgroup. The different possible reasons that could be triggering the variation in the use of [q] among older and younger speakers were geographical mobility, linguistic stereotyping, and the educational system. Older speakers were less geographically mobile, less prone to be affected by stereotypes, and their educational system emphasized the use of MSA sounds, such as [q]. These factors could be possibly led to an increase in the use of [q]. On the other hand, younger speakers used [?] more frequently than [q] because they were geographically more mobile, tend to distance themselves from being stereotyped, and were attaining high levels of education. These factors could be leading to the decrease in the use of [q].
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especially because in Lebanon the use of [ʔ] is a sign of urbanization, modernization, high level of education, and prestige. There were also differences in the use of [q] across younger subgroups; 18-20 year old speakers used [q] less frequently than the speakers who were 21-25 years old because they moved recently to the city, and using [ʔ] would have helped them create better self image and acquire social mobility. While speakers of the 21-25 year old age group used [q] more frequently possibly because they were under less pressure from their urban contacts or because they moved back to reside in the Shouf region. In addition, the factor of urbanization with its three aspects: geographical mobility, duration of stay in the city, and degree of engagement in the urban activities, was a factor which influenced the speech of the younger subgroup. This variation in the use of [q] between the 4 different age groups could insinuate that this variation is an age grading process rather than a language change. The speakers were usually using [ʔ] as they were younger in age to create better self image, and they used [q] as they advance in age. Gender differentiation was also obvious in the speech of younger speakers. Younger women used [q] more frequently than their male counterparts. Conservatism towards young women could be a contributing factor to this differentiation.

Shouf dialect speakers didn’t seem to be abandoning [q] even though they used [ʔ]. The majority of speakers used [q] consistently, others style shifted and few speakers used always [ʔ]. There were different contexts of occurrence of stylistic shifting. They style shifted when quoting the utterances of a speaker, joking, expressing emotions, distancing oneself from an opinion, asserting one’s identity, accommodating, and discussing a certain topic. The speaker chose the phonological variant which would
create an impression and influence the addressee. The nature of the words uttered also played a role in stylistic shifting. For instance, the use of old words of the Shouf dialect and the use of MSA educated words played a role in determining the phonological variant used by the speaker. Besides, the frequency of the word also influenced the speaker’s use of the phonological variants [q] and [ʔ]. Words of higher frequency were pronounced with [ʔ], while those of lower frequency were pronounced with [q]. The attitude of Shouf dialect speaker might be contributing to their linguistic behavior because the Pearson product showed a positive correlation between attitudes and behaviors. Speakers who have a positive attitude towards the Shouf dialect, especially towards [q], would be using it in their speech. The participants believed that the use of [q] does not social class membership, but it is a faSha (MSA) variant that also expresses their Shouf identity.

This research highlighted the use of [q] in the speech of Druze of the Shouf dialect and its possible future. It was an attempt to reveal if the linguistic stereotype of Druze speech, which is witnessing a variation in the frequency in its use, will be lost under the influence of urbanization or will be maintained due to other factors. One of the rewards of doing this research is that the Observer’s Paradox was avoided (Labov, 1972). The fact that I share the same regional origin with the speakers facilitated the interviews. This contributed to the flow of the conversations especially also that the issues raised for discussion were not personal.

Recommendation for Future Research

The speech of participants of the following age groups: 7-12 years and 30-50 years old can be studied because this will help in depicting a wider picture of the
phonological variation in the use of [q]. Moreover, the same speaker can be tape recorded in two different settings; one of the interviews will be carried out in the village and the other one in the city. This will help the researcher monitor if the setting is contributing to stylistic shifting.
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APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The questions asked in the interview to elicit the realization of “qaf” in the speech of Shouf dialect speakers:

1. What are the cultural elements that you like and dislike in the Shouf region?
2. After you finish your education, how do you think you can serve the Shouf region?
3. In your opinion, do women and men in the Shouf region have equal rights?
4. Do you like to be a member of a political party? Why?
5. Do you think that the social relationships between people nowadays changed from that of old times? And how?
6. Have you wished that you were born and raised in the city?*
7. Do you like to raise your children in the village or in the city? Where do you like to raise your children?
8. How do you spend your leisure time?
9. Do you remember some of the incidents that happened with you at school.
10. Do you know any of the old words that your grandparents use? List some of these words.

The questions which are asked to old speakers:

1. How do these days differ from old days with respect to education/schools, job market, and social relationships?

*The question number 6 is reversed for the participants who lived for a long time in the city. They are asked if they wish that they have been raised up in the village.
APPENDIX II

GUIDE TO TRANSCRIPTIONS OF ARABIC SPEECH

The following phonetic units are used to transcribe the Arabic speech in this study:

Consonants:

q: voiceless uvular plosive
ʔ: glottal plosive
θ: voiceless dental fricative
ð: voiced dental fricative
s: voiceless alveolar fricative
z: voiced alveolar fricative
ʃ: voiceless postalveolar fricative
ʒ: voiced postalveolar fricative
x: voiceless velar fricative
ɣ: voiced velar fricative
h: voiceless pharyngeal fricative
f: voiced pharyngeal fricative
K: velarized plosive

Diacritical markings:

a: fathah
i: kashrh
u: dammah

Diphthongs:

aw
ai
ei

Vowels

aa: long a sound
cce: long a sound that is subjected to imaaala
ii: long i sound
uu: long u sound
Dear participants:

You are invited to participate in a research which aims at studying the Sheaf culture and dialect. Your participation is valuable and will help in conducting a research project which fulfills the requirement for a Master's thesis at AUB.

This is a questionnaire that you are kindly asked to fill out. The tape recorded conversation and the answers of the questionnaire are used only for the purpose of research. Neither names nor the identity of the participants will be revealed.

You are entitled to abstain from participating in this research; however, your participation is deeply appreciated.

Thank you for your cooperation and contribution to the success of this research.

Souha Rimah
English Department
American University of Beirut
sfr01@aub.edu.lb
Please answer the following questions:

Gender:  ____ Female  ____ Male
Age: ______
Please indicate your current place of residence: __________________________
Have you lived in the city?  ____ Yes  ____ No

Please read the following statements. For each of these statements, place a check in the column that best describes your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The usage of [a] (لصمي) makes the Shouf dialect closest to Fusha (لصمي).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The usage of [a] (لصمي) makes the Shouf dialect sound more correct than the other Lebanese dialects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The usage of [a] (لصمي) does not sound beautiful in one's speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The usage of [a] (لصمي) indicates that the speaker belongs to a low social class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The usage of [a] (لصمي) makes the Shouf dialect sound more beautiful than the other Lebanese dialects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The usage of [a] (لصمي) makes the Shouf dialect suitable for news and political speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The usage of [a] (لصمي) makes the Shouf dialect suitable for Lebanese TV series.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The usage of [q] (ق) is old fashioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Using [q] (ق) indicates that the speaker belongs to a high social class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Using [q] (ق) indicates a high level of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>When a person is educated, he/she should continue using [q].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The use of [q] (ق) is trendy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The usage of [q] (ق) does not make the Shouf dialect closest to Fusha (فاشة)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The use of [q] (ق) expresses my Shouf identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>When a person is educated, he/she should stop using [q] (ق) in the speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I will make sure that my children will use [q].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Even if I don’t use [q] in my speech, I like how it sounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
إيكتم معلومات للمشاركوك في البحث، نتيجة لدراسة الاتجاهات الثقافية. إن المشاركون قومية وسوف أوضحنا في إطار هذا البحث المتطلبات لبث شهادة التخصص في اللغة الإنجليزية من الجامعة الأمريكية في بيروت. أو أن أخرى معكم حدثاً مسلحاً. كما أرى عليك أن تذكر الأسئلة المرفقة هذه الورقة. إن الحدث المسجل والأبوية السوفية استخدم فقط خدمة هذا البحث. كما أنه لن يكشف عن اسم أو هوية أي مشارك.

لكم حق الاستغلال عن المشاركة في هذا البحث، لكن لا شك في أن مشاركون سوف تساهيم في إنتاج هذه الدراسة.

شكرًا لتعاونكم ومساهمتكم في إنتاج هذا البحث.

سهيلة بيرمان
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية
الجامعة الأمريكية في بيروت.
sfr01@aub.edu.lb
الرجاء الإجابة على الأسئلة التالية:

الجنس: ___ أنثى ___ ذكر

العمر: ________________

أشر إلى مكان الإقامة الحالية: ________________

هل أقتم في المنزل؟ ___ نعم ___ كلا

إذا ورد الجنس البشري في العمود الذي يبرر من رأيك، فقم بتمييز الإجابة:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>إجراء الاتهام بالـ</th>
<th>لا وافق اطلاقاً</th>
<th>لا وافق بشدة</th>
<th>وافق</th>
<th>وافق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>استخدام القاف بفعل فتحة الشوف الأقرب إلى المقصور.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>استخدام القاف بفعل فتحة الشوف الأصح لموارد بين اللهجات اللبنانية الأخرى.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>استخدام القاف في الحديث غير حضب للسمع.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>استخدام القاف في الحديث يدل على أن الكلام ينتمي إلى طبيعة اجتماعية متنية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>استخدام القاف بفعل فتحة الشوف الأجمل بين اللهجات اللبنانية الأخرى.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>استخدام القاف بفعل فتحة الشوف مناسبة لشربات الأخبار والمناقشات السياسية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا أوافق بشدة</th>
<th>لا أوافق</th>
<th>أوافق</th>
<th>أوافق بشدة</th>
<th>لا أوافق</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>استخدام القاف لجعل حجة الذروف مناسبة للمسلمات البنائية.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>إن استخدام القاف في الحديث ليس عصرياً.</td>
<td>حذر</td>
<td>حذر</td>
<td>حذر</td>
<td>حذر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>استخدام القاف في الحديث يدل على أن الكلمة ينبغي أن يكون للطاعة الاجتماعية</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>يدل على تحصيل علمي عال.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>بعد التحصيل العلمي يجب على الفرد الامتناع عن استخدام القاف.</td>
<td>حذر</td>
<td>حذر</td>
<td>حذر</td>
<td>حذر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>استخدام القاف في الحديث يعبر أمنا شاملا وعصرياً.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>يجعل هذه اللهجات الأقل إلى العلماني.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>يجب أن يحتوي على استخدام القاف لذا ما تدل على التحصيل إلى الذروف.</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
<td>غير ضروري</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>بعد التحصيل العلمي يجب على المتكلمة التوقف عن استخدام القاف.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>استخدام القاف في حديث معياني أكثر نفسي.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>مصفر أحمد على أن يستخدم أولاً القاف.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>بالرغم من عدم استخدام القاف، لا يحق أحب ورفعتي القصري.</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
<td>مهارة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX IV

### DATA ABOUT PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker no</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>% of &quot;qaf&quot; usage</th>
<th>Mean Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Living in the city for 10 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Living in the city for 2 years</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 11 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Living in the city for 4 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 11 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shouf; commuting to the city since 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Living in the city for 4 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Living in the city for 2 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 4 years</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 2 years since childhood</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 10 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Living in the city for 4 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker no.</td>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>% of “qaf” usage</td>
<td>Mean Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shouf; commuting to the city for 7 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in Beirut for 2 years and commuted for 4 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in Beirut for 3 years.</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>88.63</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shouf; commuted to the city for 4 years</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shouf; commuted to the city for 7 years.</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shouf; commuted to the city for 4 years</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Shouf since childhood.</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in Beirut since 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city for 12 years.</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Environmen tal Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city since 3 months.</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in the city since 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Living in the city since childhood</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Living in Beirut since 2 months</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker no.</td>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>% of &quot;qaf&quot; usage</td>
<td>Mean Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 15 years</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Uneducated</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 5 years</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 3 years</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 43 years</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 20 years</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 15 years</td>
<td>1st year University</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker no.</td>
<td>Age (year)</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>% of &quot;qal&quot; usage</td>
<td>Mean Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Shouf; worked in the city</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Shouf; worked in the city</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Shouf; lived in the city for 10 years</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Shouf; works in the city and Shouf</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Shouf, used to live in the city</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Shouf, worked in Kisrwan</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Preliminary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Shouf, lived in the city for 4 years</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Shouf, worked in Beiret</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>69 years old</td>
<td>Shouf, lived in the city</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Shouf</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX V

THE PERCENTAGE OF [æ] USAGE AND THE FREQUENCY OF SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of &quot;ææ&quot; usage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>