	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing Information
/q/	22 9.9 %	106 47.5 %	64 28.7 %	22 9.9 %	3 1.3 %	6 2.7 %
/ʔ/	3 1.3 %	17 7.6 %	62 27.8 %	81 36.3 %	57 25.6 %	3 1.3 %
/g/	3 1.3 %	13 5.8 %	72 32.3 %	83 37.2 %	46 20.6 %	6 2.7 %
/k/	3 1.3 %	13 5.8 %	77 34.5 %	76 34.1 %	49 22.0 %	5 2.2 %

Table 2

Speaker talks in a way that reveals a high level of education

b. The association of a particular linguistic variety with the attainment of a certain educational level can be ascertained by examining table 2.

We notice that the /q/ speaker gets the highest ratings of the four. If the numbers of those agreeing that /q/ exhibits high education level are added together, the total of Strongly Agree and Agree responses would amount to 128 (57.4%) compared to 25 (11.2%) in total disagreement. On the other hand, there is a wide consensus among the respondents that [ʔ], [g] and [k] speakers do not reveal a high education level. Thus the total number of those who strongly disagree and disagree about the high education level of [ʔ] speaker is 138 (61.9%), 129 (57.8%) for the [g] and 125 (56.1%) for the [k] speakers. It is worth mentioning that the number of neu-

tral responses is roughly within the same range for all the four speakers. While the lack of commitment toward [ʔ], [g] and [k] situations could be explained by way of the diglossic situation referred to earlier, it is puzzling to see that 64 (28.7%) responses have not taken any position on /q/ as a marker of high education levels.

Nonetheless, these figures clearly indicate that there is a tangible separation between the standard /q/ on one hand, and on the other hand, the other three nonstandard phonemes, [ʔ], [g] and [k] in conjunction with the level of education that they exhibit on the other. Arab grammarians have historically viewed /q/ as being superior to other regional (or social) varieties.

★ ★ ★

c. The conflicting figures in Table 3 present a serious problem that requires further investigation. The ratings of /q/ as opposed to [ʔ] present a real dilemma with regard to the role that each plays as a social class marker. Note, however, that there is a clear separation between [g] and [k] as markers of high social class on one hand, and /q/ and [ʔ], on the other. Both [g] and [k] are perceived to be low social

markers since their rates are 9 (4.0%) and 16 (7.1%), respectively.

Clearly from Table 3, [ʔ] rates higher than /q/ as the total of positive responses for [ʔ] is 135 (60.5%) compared to 61 (27.3%) for /q/. If /q/ reveals a high education level as was maintained in sections (a) and (b) above, how can we then reconcile the situation

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing Information
/q/	19 8.5 %	42 18.8 %	93 41.7 %	50 22.4 %	12 5.4 %	7 3.1 %
/ʔ/	42 18.8 %	93 41.7 %	55 24.7 %	19 8.5 %	12 5.4 %	2 .9 %
/g/	2 .9 %	7 3.1 %	68 30.5 %	85 38.1 %	56 25.1 %	5 2.2 %
/k/	3 1.3 %	13 5.8 %	96 43.0 %	67 30.0 %	39 17.5 %	5 2.2 %

Table 3
Speaker belongs to a high social class

where /q/ is not clearly marked for high social class ? Is not a high level of education bound up with high social class ? A possible answer to this concerns the role of education in traditional societies. While in developing .societies education tends to help in transforming university graduates financially as well as socially, in traditional societies one is likely to find deep-rooted attitudes toward certain elements of the population. It is the belief of this author that city speakers who generally tend to be [ʔ] speakers in the Jordan-Palestine regions are traditionally viewed culturally superior to country, town or village residents. Since [ʔ] is associated with urban centers, and since urban centers are viewed as culturally superior, this may explain why [ʔ], in this case, receives the highest ratings as a marker of high social class.

We turn now to examine the results obtained in the Direct Test to see if we can find there corroborations of the findings above. We must bear in mind that the DT included basically similar statements to those in the IT, but the subjects were asked to choose the speaker to whom the statement applies. Additionally, the DT was an immediate follow-up of the IT, and new instructions were provided before the speakers were rated. The results for the two statements about which speaker exhibits high education level and high social class are in Table 4 below. 210 (94.2%) rated /q/ as the utterance that

shows the highest level of education. The rates for [ʔ], [g] and [k] are almost negligible, as speakers of these varieties are not viewed as highly educated. On the other hand; 124 (55.6%) said that /q/ suggests high social status. This seems to contradict the figures obtained in Table 3. Evidently, further research is needed to explain this contradiction. However, [ʔ] rates relatively high in the DT with respect to high social status. While 99 (44.4%) in the DT is lower than 135 (60.5%) as in Table 3, it shows that there is some tendency toward viewing [ʔ] as a high social class marker.

The discussion thus far seems to support the claim that speakers of a language tend to view certain linguistic elements, in this case phonological elements, as carriers of some sociological characteristics. The subjects in this experiment are aware, through their ratings of these speakers; that /q/, for example, tends to be restricted in its use to certain domains such as educational settings. This is clear from Table 1 where a high frequency of the /q/ use is designated to university professors and school teachers. Similarly, the use of /q/ is also viewed as a sign of a higher level of education from the other variants of /q/.

In contrast with this, two regional variants of /q/, i.e. [g] and [k] are assigned, through the ratings of the experiment subjects, to speakers representing the lower rung of the social ladder, such as farmers.