restricted to specialized functions. Second, code-switching is always present in multilectal speech communities.

The questionnaire :

The subjects for this experiment were each given a copy of the questionnaire in Arabic, which requested (extensive) biographical data and presented two types of reaction-eliciting statements (see Appendices). The first was an Indirect Test (IT) consisting of four identical sets of (judgement) statements about Arabic organized according to the five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Argee, Agree, Neutral, Disagree to Strongly Disagree. These statements pertain to the respondent's own use of language. The second was a direct Test (DT), which involved explicitly naming the dialects based on region(s) where these dialects are predominantly used. For example, subjects were informed that the fourth speaker on tape was employing a Palestinian rural dialect, while the first speaker used the « standard ». The four sentences were presented in the same sequence ('standard', city, Jordanian and Palestinian) each time and without significant interruption. After listening to the four dialects, subjects were asked to judge the speaker of the dialect, by placing an X in the appropriate space.

The Direct Test was designed to find out if the results obtained match those of the Indirect Test, and to determine if, by mentioning the name of the region where a particular dialect is used (i.e. by name of the dialect) the subjects express any sociolinguistic prejudice in favor of their own, or against any other, dialect. Admittedly, once the subjects heard the [k] speaker, for example, they would immediately associate that speaker with some Palestinian dialects [10]. In other words, The Direct Test was a form of a double-check to see if attitudes vary with the actual mention of the dialect name.

The subjects were asked to react to each recorded set of statements pertaining to a given speaker recorded on the tape. The purpose of the experiment, as a study of the language role in society, was only briefly explained to the group of subjects in order not to bias their responses. Then the first taped sentence was played and the subjects were asked to write down their reactions to what they heard by placing an X in the appropriate space on their answer sheet. And so on with the second, the third and the fourth sentences. Next, the Direct Test was presented, and the subjects were expected to record their reactions in the manner described above.

The subjects :

This experiment was conducted on the premises of Yarmouk University in the summer of 1982. The total number of participants was 223, all university students, of whom 115 were male and 108 female. Their academic status ranged from first to fourth year. There was also a small number of 21 non-degree student-teachers who were preparing for a special diploma over the summer months. The majority of the participants were pursuing degrees in the humanities : but some were in the sciences. They were also a mixture of Jordanians and Palestinians representing a cross section of speakers of the three dialects, the [g], [?] and [k].

There are a number of reasons for having chosen this experimental grouping. First, at the practical level, the convenience of having a large population in one place at one time minimizes the problems of recruiting subjects for any experiment. Second, although one can argue that the university community is not a true representation of the population at large, this group of subjects is heterogeneous in terms of social and economic backgrounds, age level, national identification (Jordanian / Palestinian), urban/rural backgrounds, fields of study, etc. These subjects bring in to the university life varied experience shared by all, namely their educational experience. The implication is that this population is sensitized more toward language, and this experiment consequently provides us with perceptions of educated groups.

Results and discussion :

The findings of this study point to the presence of attitudes among Arabic speakers toward the « standard » variety as well as the various dialects used in one Arabic speaking area.

The conclusions suggest following : (1) The « standard » is used primarily by the educated sector of the society. This will be discussed in (1) below. (2) The standard variety is not restricted to a particular country or domicile. These findings will be presented below in (2). (3) The standard is perceived by university students to be aesthetically far more

appealing than, and favored over, regional dialects. this issue will be discussed in (3). (4) The standard is prescribed for use and is viewed more positively than other regional or social varieties, which are perceived to exhibit negative attributes. The results of this study will be presented below in (4).

The results of this study are discussed below as they relate to the various questions, with the discussion of the results following each question or set of related questions.

1. Language variety and education level :

Do Arabic speakers associate the « standard » form of language with a high level of education ? Do speakers actually use one particular variety in preference to others in specialized contexts ?

★ ★ ★

a) Table 1 shows that /q/ is perceived to be used by the teaching professions. For example, 154 (69.1 %) of the total subjects (N = 223) judged the /q/ speaker to be a university professor. Similarly, 110 (49.3 %) thought that the speaker was likely to be a school teacher. These results are not surprising as the « standard » variety tends to be widely used in formal situations such as lecturing in a classroom. Also note the low figures (percentages) for the rest of the professions in the table, and the zero value for occupations such as farmers, construction laborers, etc. This finding then supports the claim that the standard /q/ is highly associated with education and is restricted to specialized functions.

The above situation reveals interesting results when judgements are made about the [ʔ], [g] and [k] varieties. [ʔ] is perceived to be used mainly by secretaries as 82 (36.8 %) judged the [ʔ] speaker to be in a secretarial profession. This can be explained partially by the fact that [ʔ] is generally favored by women and city dwellers as a sign of social and cultural sophistication. 49 (22 %) judged the [ʔ] speaker to be a university professor, followed by physician (46) (20.6 %), merchant 37 (16.6 %) and school teacher 34 (15.2 %).

How can we reconcile the relatively high numbers for university professor and school teacher here when in the previous paragraph these two professional groups were rated high for /q/ ? This situation becomes clearer when we recall the diglossic nature of the Arabic speaking societies. Ferguson (1959) has pointed out this diglossic situation, i.e. a situation in which two linguistic forms exist simultaneously side by side each of which is used for different functions. A teacher or a university professor could be a native [ʔ] speaker, yet he or she would use /q/ in conducting his lectures. The experiment population has heard university professors using both varieties, depending on the situation.

In contrast with the /q/ and [ʔ] sounds, it is of interest to examine the [g] and [k] figures with regard to the professions assigned to their speakers.

It is clear from Table I that jobs generally associated with the lower rungs of the professional ladder get high ratings for [g] and [k]. 121 (54.3 %) judged the [g] speaker to be a farmer, whereas 106 (47.5 %) did the same thing for the [k] speaker. Similarly, 70 (31.4%) said the [g] speaker was a taxidriver contrasted with 55 (24.7%) for the [k] speaker. 48 (21.5%) rated the [g] speaker to be a construction laborer ; 42 (18.8%) a merchant . 64 (28.7%), and 62 (27.8%) made the same judgement for the [k] speaker for those jobs, respectively. One notes that the school teacher category gets close numbers for both [g] and [k] : 42 (18.8%) and 48 (21.5%), respectively. As was pointed out above, the reason for this could be the diglossic nature of the society.