

	Jordan	Palestine	Other Arab Country	Any of Above	Missing
/q/	151 67.7 %	40 17.9 %	13 5.8 %	17 7.6 %	2 .9 %
/?/	62 27.8 %	51 22.9 %	89 39.9 %	19 8.5 %	2 .9 %
/g/	182 81.6 %	19 8.5 %	8 3.6 %	11 4.9 %	3 1.3 %
/k/	6 2.7 %	215 96.4 %	0	1 .4 %	1 .4 %

TABLE 5 A
Speaker is from (a) Jordan (East bank) (b) Palestine (West Bank)
(c) Other Arab country

Language speakers tend to associate one particular sound with a particular region or country in, at least, two cases. Of the four speakers on tape, [k] was decidedly believed to represent a Palestinian speech form (see Table 5A above). 215 (96.4%) identified the [k] speaker as Palestinian. Similarly, 182 (81.6%) assigned [g] to Jordan. These findings are of interest and reflect the actual linguistic reality in those regions. [k] is peculiar to some central Palestinian regions and is not attested among indigenous Jordanians. [g] tends to be predominantly a feature of speech in southern parts of Syria, as well as Jordan and some regions in (but not the whole of) Palestine.

[?] and /q/, however, present a more complex situation. 89 (39.9%) rated [?] to be peculiar to other Arab countries compared to 62 (27.8%) who assigned it to Jordan and 51 (22.9%) to Palestine. While the perceived association of [?] to Jordan and Palestine is close and in both instances [?] tends to be associated with cities such as Amman or Jerusalem it is apparent that [?] is identified highly with other regional dialects.

With regard to /q/, it is difficult to explain 151 (67.7%) responses to Jordan versus 40 (17.9%) to Palestine, especially since that /q/ tends to be an educated rather than regional feature. In other Arabic-speaking areas, /q/ is used dialectally as in the Duruze dialects of Syria and Lebanon and in Palmyra and other regions in Syria. To the best of

the author's knowledge, no Jordanian dialect makes use of /q/. However, some local areas in Palestine such as upper Galilee and the city of Nablus make use of /q/ dialectally.

Herbolich (1979) reports that the Egyptian subjects in his study were, by and large, able to correctly identify speakers of Egyptian Arabic. However, these speakers failed to identify the nationality of non-Egyptian speakers in either of the two guises that they spoke : (1) their native vernacular guise and (2) the Egyptian vernacular guise, which these speakers attempted to emulate. El-Dash and Tucker (1975), on the other hand, report that 70 % of the subjects in their experiment correctly identified the nationality of speakers of Arabic, when speaking either Classical or colloquial.

3. Aesthetics of speech sounds :

Aesthetically, how do speakers view the « standard » in opposition to the other varieties ?

The IT elicited reactions concerning the beauty (Arabic *jamiila*, « beautiful », « pretty ») of the four varieties ; the degree of pretention (Arabic *taDhaahur*) and affectation, and the degree of effeminacy (Arabic ? *unuutha*), revealed by the four sentences in the experiment. (See Tables 6, 7, and 8, respectively as well as the DT results in Table 4).

	Village	City	Desert Bedouin Settlement	Any of the Preceding	Refugee Camp	Missing Information
/q/	71 31.8 %	127 57.0 %	7 3.1 %	13 5.8 %	0.	5 2.2 %
/ʔ/	8 3.6 %	214 96.0 %	1 .4 %			0
/g/	148 66.4 %	6 2.7 %	53 23.8 %	16 7.2 %		0
/k/	181 81.2 %	14 6.3 %	5 2.2 %	11 4.9 %	4 1.8 %	8 3.6 %

Table 5
Speaker is from (a) village (b) city (c) bedouin settlement

The figures in Table 5 indicate that the subjects are able to identify a particular sound with the specific area where that sound is prevalent in the speech of that area's population. Thus, 222 (99.6%) positively rated [ʔ] as a sound whose provenance is the city. [g] is identified with village speakers as well as desert and nomadic groups: 154 (69.1%) rated [g] as peculiar to village and 53 (23.8%) to bedouin settlements. Similarly 195 (87.5%) identified [k] with the Palestinian village.

Two more points stand out: first, 127 (57.0%) assigned /q/ to the city and 71 (31.8%) to the village. The high city rating is not surprising because cities tend to be the education centers. Since /q/ reveals a high education level (Table 2), it is perceived that there are more educated people in the city, hence the relative high rating of the city as far as /q/ is concerned. On the other hand, the somewhat high village rating is likely to be indicative of current changes taking place in the village. More and more villagers attend schools and graduate from universities. Consequently, the /q/ speaker is likely to be an educated villager and this is reflected in the quoted figure. In other words, /q/ does not seem to be as identifiable regionally as the case is with the regional [k] and [g]. /q/ is viewed as a relatively

locale-free education marker.

Secondly, the [k] was rated as peculiar to the village with negligible figures assigned to other locales. In the Irbid area (Jordan) there exist at least three Palestinian refugee camps, some of which have developed in a village-like settlement with all Palestinian populations. Why does the refugee camp category get only 4 (1.8%) responses? Is it because the respondents did not include any university students coming from these refugee camps? Or are there other reasons? The answers to this problem lie, in the author's view, in the fact that while [k] is viewed definitely as Palestinian (96.4%) (see Table 5A below), people would ascribe this sound to the rural areas in Palestine, i.e. to the village. A second reason could be in the fact that some of these camps grew into permanent villages and the subjects view these camps as villages. Thirdly, the questionnaire failed to include the refugee camp category. However, once this was brought to the author's attention in the first run of the experiment, in the next run, the author verbally asked the subjects to add the refugee camp category on their questionnaires. The low rates indicate that either the subjects ignored this fact or they interpreted refugee camps to mean villages.