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Abstract

Nedromi speakers, especially the new generation, tend to correct some mistakes that they believe are stigmatised features in their speech and thus they try to shift to Modern Standard Arabic. This research paper aims at examining the impact of education on language use, which highlights the sociolinguistic variable, mainly that of education and age, and how it may affect the linguistic behaviour in Arabic. A Nedroma speech community is the sample population. This study emphasises phonological, morphological and lexical levels of analysis, trying to make use of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Such an analysis is viewed to help us understand some of the reasons behind such a change in linguistic behaviours essentially motivated by the influence of education. The results show that the choice of certain linguistic features by the individual is determined by the speaker’s age category, his level of education and, most importantly, his attitude towards certain linguistic characteristics.
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1. Introduction

Language is viewed as one of the powerful mediums of communication in any speech community (Ellis, 2019). It has attracted the attention of many language scholars, who have adopted and adapted various approaches and methods for investigating the complexity and particularity of this natural phenomenon. There is no doubt that language varies from one country to another, also within the same country where some local varieties can co-exist, and even among individuals. It could also happen that some may have a variety of linguistic ways to express the same thing (Martínez, 2018). This fact is explained by sociolinguists as language variability and language variation. The study of sociolinguistic variation has emerged since the 1960s partly as a result of inadequate methods in earlier approaches to the study of dialects, and partly as a reaction to Chomsky’s linguistic theory which has neglected the study of language in its social context (Allan, 2020).

Language variation, as a revealing area of interest, has been a matter of hot debate and discussions among a lot of sociolinguists at many levels, but it was Labov (1972) who carried out such kind of studies as he focused in his study on the relationship which may be set up between the social structure and linguistic structure. The social variables are the speaker’s age, gender and level of education and the linguistic variables are phonological, morphological and lexical.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. Sociolinguistics and language development

Prior to the advent of sociolinguistics, language was studied in ‘abstraction from society in which it operates’ (Lyons, 1995, p. 221), as treated by De Saussure (1916) and Chomsky (2014). These two scholars were interested in the study of language as a homogeneous system; their main aim was to display a set of rules which govern the appropriate use of language. Chomsky (1965) made a distinction between ‘competence’ and ‘performance’. This distinction was in part inspired by De Saussure’s contrast between ‘langue’ and ‘parole’. In this context, competence describes the knowledge, mostly unconscious, that a native speaker has of the principles which allow for the use of a particular language.

Performance, instead, is the implementation of that knowledge in acts of speaking. However, it seems that focus on linguistic competence has almost shadowed and put aside performance. It was dismissed as a free variation not worthy of scientific research. Chomsky (2014) noted that when speaking, people often make linguistic errors; he argued that these errors in linguistic performance were irrelevant to the study of linguistic competence, and thus linguists can study an idealised version of the language.

Yet, the complexity of language lies not only in the linguistic system itself as characterised by Chomsky (2014), but also results from the reality of language as used in various forms and contexts to convey and communicate information, thoughts, emotions and feelings, or even intentions as well (Bonvillain, 2019). This has much to do nowadays with indicating the interlocutors’ social background and geographical belonging. This idea pushed subject specialists to investigate the idea of language variability and, therefore, the research issue of linguistic differences became, as Hymes (2018) put it, the relationship between language and society; he wrote that the purpose of sociolinguistics is to answer the following questions: Who speaks what language to whom and on what occasion?

Labov (1972, p. 261) is considered a pioneer researcher in studying the language of society. He points out that, ‘Every linguist recognises that language is a social fact, but not everyone puts an
equal emphasis on that fact’. His work, which consisted of the study of sociolinguistic variation in New York City, affected scholars with an interest in social variation. Many interesting facts would be missed in the study of language abstracted from its context of use. Hudson says, in this respect, that ‘... to study speech without reference to the society which uses it, is to exclude the possibility of finding social explanations for the structures that are used’ (as cited in Mouhoubi, 1997).

In his work, Labov (2019) opposed all those who ignore the heterogeneity of language and consider it as a set of grammatically correct sentences. Labov (2019) insisted on tackling language use (performance) and language heterogeneity, i.e., variability. For him, linguistic theory must involve not only the formal linguistic structure but also every social function that is related to language in one way or another. Many factors affect language use; these might be social class, geographical location, ethnicity, age, gender, education etc. Sociolinguistics often come across as either too restricting to social categories, such as class, gender, style and geography (the external factors), or too restricting to linguistic categories, such as systems and rate of change (the structural factors).

Language carries information on the speaker’s identity and reveals, for example, his or her group membership (social class) and this is what is known as language variation according to the user, i.e., language which reveals the speaker’s place of origin, gender, age, social class, ethnicity etc. Hence, it sounds necessary and interesting to examine the most influential paradigms influencing the way people speak (Lee & Su, 2019).

Language variation tends often to explain the relationship between variables and social factors (Labov, 2019). The researcher has tried to give a clear picture about the field; one of the most major contributions of sociolinguistic studies is that language variation is not random. In their investigation, sociolinguists have tried to examine the frequencies of each linguistic feature to determine the correlations between dependent (linguistic) and independent (social) variables, and to what extent these latter variables determine our use of language.

1.1.2. Sociolinguistic situation in Algeria: a brief background account

Algeria is considered a complex multilingual country, a complexity that lies in the presence of three languages. The existence of which is due to many factors, i.e., historical, sociocultural and political ones. For a long time, Algeria was regarded to be an interest of many invaders mentioned, for instance, the French settlement, the Spanish, the Turkish etc. All have left certainly a great impact on its linguistic situation.

**Classical Arabic:** It was based primarily on the language of the western Hijazi tribe of Quraysh, the language of pre-Islamic poetic koiné. It is the variety which is chosen by God to be the language of the holy book, the Quran; and for fear that the Quran would be read with bad pronunciation, Arabic was codified in the 8th and 9th centuries during the Abbasid era by Arab grammarians. Therefore, it became the language that unified all the Arab countries from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf. It is the liturgical language of Islam. Thus, Arabic gained special importance with the advent of Islam, and as Islam spread, so did Arabic. Watson (2007) says in this respect that ‘the rise and expansion of Islam was not only a religious and hence cultural conquest but also a linguistic conquest’.

**Modern Standard Arabic:** It is a modern version or variant of classical Arabic. It is different from classical Arabic in that it has included a large number of lexical items and technical words; however, the morphological and the syntax have remained unchanged. Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is not acquired as a mother tongue, but rather it is learned as a second language at schools. It is used in situations calling for great formality, i.e., associates with media and school enterprise, and used for purposes of written communication; but it can be also used for formal spoken communication as it is understood in all Arabic-speaking regions. The emergence of MSA goes back to the 19th century
with the rise of nationalism; its central premise is that the people of the Arab world from the Atlantic Ocean to the Arabian Sea constitute one nation bound together by a common language; their primary aim is the end of western influence in the Arab world (Alwy, Taher, & AboAltaheen, 2020). **Algerian Arabic:** Every Arab country has its unique dialect that differs from standard Arabic in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar (Mouleme & Belouahem, 2020). Spoken Arabic is the mother tongue of the majority of native Arabic speakers. Every language has its dialectal varieties. Arabic in general and Algerian Arabic, in particular, has several varieties. Algerian Arabic is used in the form of a wide range of mutually intelligible geographical dialects restricted to informal contexts used spontaneously by the Algerian speakers to communicate. Algerian dialects can be classified into two main groups: sedentary dialects and Bedouin dialects. The invasions that Algeria witnessed are considered the turning point in its history at all levels: cultural, social, religious and linguistic. In the 7th century, Islam and the Arabic language were introduced to Algeria. It was Arabised during two different periods. The first one started with the Muslim invasions who introduced Arabic and Islam to the indigenous inhabitants, the Berber. Those Arabs brought with them a sedentary or urban type of Arabic. The second period began in the 11th century with the Arab settlers Banu Hilal who were considered at that time as a nomadic population. They brought to the area a Bedouin or rural dialect with specific characteristics different from those of sedentary dialects. The distinction between the two types of dialects lies in the realisation of some phonological, morphological and lexical features. To have a complete image of the linguistic situation in Algeria, it is necessary to throw light on the most striking event that left a great impact on the Algerian society; it is the French colonisation of the territory.

**French:** Although the French language has no official status in Algeria today, it is so widespread that you can hear it everywhere in the country. During the French colonisation of Algeria, France used all the means to eliminate the Arabic language and replace it with French as the official language and Arabic as a foreign one. Their main aim and policy were to exclude Arabic from any official use or educational practice. The French controlled Algeria through a policy of cultural imperialism and suppression of the Algerian cultural identity. Just after the independence, and as a reaction to the French cultural and linguistic imperialism, the Algerian government launched a policy of linguistic Arabisation, in an attempt to promote MSA and to restore a new national identity and personality. Politicians claim that Algeria’s sole official language is Arabic. However, there is more than MSA in the Algerian sociolinguistic map as a result of the numerous conquests from different cultures and identities. It can be asserted that the French invasion was the most important factor influencing the Algerian linguistic landscape, that today, after almost five decades since the departure of the colonists; it continues to play an important role in both spoken and written domains. French is widely used in urban cities, as French is considered and believed to be a prestigious variety. French is also used in scientific and business university courses, regarded as the language of science and technology. Even after independence, French continued to be used for about 10 years in education to teach all subjects (Arabic was taught as a second language). However, the process of Arabisation started to be applied in 1971 (Bouherar, 2021). Soon, French started to be taught as a second language. At first, the ministry decided to teach the French language as a subject from the fourth year of the primary level. However, recently it began to be taught from the third year, almost as early as children are taught MSA.

**Berber:** The first language of North Africans was Berber. According to some historians, the indigenous people of the area were the Berbers who lived there for more than 4,000 years. The introduction of the Arabic language by the Arab invaders in the mid-7th century was a great event as Islam and Arabic were introduced to North Africa in general and Algeria in particular. Algeria today defines itself as part of the Arabic and Muslim world and states that Arabic is the national and official language of the country. However, despite the profound impact of the introduction of Islam and Arabic in the country, some areas maintained their Berber vernaculars and continue to be used. The major Berber varieties are Kabylian, spoken in the Kabylie mountains; the Kabyles represent the
largest group of Berber; the Chaoui in the Aures range and the Mzabi in the south. The Berber language represents a minority in Algeria as it is only spoken by about 15% of the Algerian population. It has been recognised as a national language by a constitutional amendment since May 2002 due to strong social demand for that, and there is still a demand from Berbers to assert their existence as a distinct ethnic group (Kossmann, Vossen & Dimmendaal, 2020).

In Algeria, the national and official language is Arabic. The Arabic language is one of the great languages in the world as regards the richness of its vocabulary. It belongs to the Semitic subgroup of the Afro-Asiatic group of world languages. It is the native tongue of more than 200 million people worldwide, and the official language of more than 20 countries in a region stretching from western Asia to the north of Africa. In pre-Islamic times, Arabic was spoken mainly in the Arabian Peninsula, where it was the medium of a great tradition of poetry, and with the rise of Islam, it extended north into the Levant, east into Iraq and went into the north of Africa due to the Islamic conquests in the mid-7th century and later.

1.2. Purpose of the study

This research paper aims at examining the impact of education on language use, which highlights the sociolinguistic variable, mainly that of education and age, and how it may affect the linguistic behaviour in Arabic. The problem issue of this research work is summarised around the following research question: What makes Nedromi speakers change some of their linguistic behaviours and express a negative attitude towards such a variation? In this respect, it is hypothesised that after receiving formal school education, the new generation of Nedroma Arabic speakers considers some of their local linguistic features as being stigmatised and express the poor linguistic level of formality.

2. Materials and methods

In terms of research method and design, both quantitative and qualitative approaches are used to analyse and interpret the collected linguistic data of the selected sample population across different age categories and levels of education in the Nedroma speech community. The language variety under investigation in this research work is spoken in the area called Nedroma. It is one of the seven districts of Tiemcen, Algeria, and shares with it some linguistic features.

2.1. Data collection instrument

The research collected data using observation. The methodology involved in this research work is the Labovian method. Linguistic variables whether phonological, morphological or lexical are to be studied quantitatively concerning the social variables of the Nedroma speech community in which the researcher has found that age has a relationship with language accommodation. The level of education also has an impact on language variation in the speech community of Nedroma. Our evidence of this language behaviour comes from the researcher’s observation of the phenomenon, and to reach this fact, relevant data has been collected.

This research work aims to describe and analyse the linguistic features characterising Nedroma, and how some of these linguistic features are dropped by a category of the community. In showing this, the researcher will try to correlate linguistic features with social variables, and try to show the impact of education, in addition to age, on language variation and even change, as some characteristics are dropped in the speech community of Nedroma.

2.2. Participants

The participants involved in this research work are all from Nedroma. The data were collected in primary, middle and secondary schools, in addition to some participants, who we have
met in the street or their homes. The research is based on a sample population of 120 informants of different ages (between 5 and 85 years) and different levels of education.

3. **Results**

3.1. **Samples of some linguistic variables**

Nedroma, which is situated in the north of Tlemcen, was constructed by Abdel Moumen Ben Ali, the founder of ‘El Dawla el Mowahidiya’ in 1160 (555 Hegira). The area was previously populated by the Berber tribes and was called at that time ‘Fellaoucen’, like the mountain adjacent to it. The town was considered the capital of the Trara region; the latter had specific linguistic features. However, later on, and due to many factors like social mobility and the process of Arabisation, some of these linguistic features had changed.

3.2. **NA phonological variables**

3.2.1. **The variable (q)**

The /q/ sound is the linguistic feature characterising the speech community of Nedroma. And through the examination of some words containing the word [qalli], ‘he said to me’, the data showed the use of this variable by all the informants of the variety. The percentage of the 120 examined speakers is 100%, which shows the maintenance of this sound among speakers.

3.2.2. **The variable (q)**

Among the variables that have been our focus in this research is the sound [q] as a realisation of the CA phoneme /q/. Although [q]: [q] is a characteristic feature of Nedromi speech, our observations have revealed that most Nedromi citizens, especially those of the city, say that [q] is normally used in words having /q/ particularly in initial and final position, for instance, /rab/: ‘he bits’ and /bja/: ‘white’. However, these words are indeed realised with [q] and we suppose that the speakers do not acknowledge the realisation of [q] as characterising Nedromi speakers, and we suppose that these people may unconsciously avoid the stigmatised feature as there is a negative attitude towards the devoicing of [q]. In addition, education today has made people more conscious of the fact and speakers try to avoid [q]. This change of the phonetic system is reflected through the quantitative results, as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 5–15</th>
<th>Age 16–25</th>
<th>Age 26–59</th>
<th>Age 60–85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that age plays a vital role in the varying articulation of [q] and [q]. The use of [q] is highly scored in the first two categories of age compared with the last two categories, while the use of [q] is highly scored in the last category and decreases in the other categories, as shown in Figure 1.
The researcher noticed that even older females of the city use the voiceless stop [ʈ] and it has spread even among younger women and little girls as these acquire their linguistic features from their mothers. On the other hand, as the researcher went back to the questionnaires, she observed that young, educated girls realise that [ʈ] is a mistake and try to switch to [ɖ], as in MSA we say for instance /mariiʔa/ and not /mariiʔa/ (‘ill’: feminine singular). Among educated speakers, this sound has nearly disappeared, while uneducated middle-aged and elder women are more likely to use it. One could therefore say that education plays a significant role in the use of the voiced emphatic [ɖ] instead of its counterpart [ʈ]. Through this investigation, we can conclude by saying that, thanks to education, the tendency of using the sound [ʈ] is increasing, while the use of the sound [ɖ] is declining.

3.2.3. Consonantal variation [g] and [ʒ]

NA is characterised by the articulation of the CA phoneme /dʒ/ as a back velar [ɡ] in some lexical items, in particular when the word includes either a voiceless fricative [z] or a voiced sibilant [ʒ], as in [ɡəzza:r] and [ɡəbs] (‘Butcher’, ‘plaster’). The data collection shows that Nedromi speakers tend to substitute the sound [ɡ] by [ʒ], especially by the new generation. To examine variation in the use of [ɡ] or [ʒ] we have chosen three words: [ʔaɡ izu]: ‘I feel lazy’; [dʒəbs]: ‘plaster’; and [dʒazza:r]: ‘butcher’. The results show swinging scores from one age group to another. Table 2 summarises the scores of the variable (ʒ) in correlation with age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Scores of the variants [ʒ] and [ɡ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher has summarised the overall scores of the three words in percentage in correlation with age, and it clearly shows the use of the sound [ʒ] by younger speakers, the first category, especially with the word [dƷazzar]. As Table 2 shows, 22 persons (aged between 5 and 15) out of 30 tend to replace the sound [g] by [ʒ]. This is due to education and probably because they have realised the misuse of the variant [g] and corrected it.

Although the first three categories are educated people, the use of [ʒ] remains not as widespread as the use of [g]. In trying to reflect upon this variation onto the speaker’s age, we have produced the scores shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Total number of occurrences (90) of the variants [ʒ] and [g] with percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>[ʒ]</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>[g]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–15%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16–25%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–25%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>26–59%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–59%</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
<td>60–85%</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–85%</td>
<td>08.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Tables 3, it is clearly seen that younger speakers realise the variant [ʒ] more than [g]. There are 46 occurrences of the variant [ʒ], which is 51.11%, and 44 of the variants [g], which is 48.88%. This leads us to conclude that young people are more likely to shift to the MSA form /dƷ/ → [ʒ], and this may be due to education, probably because they have realised the misuse of the variant [g] and corrected it. However, we have found that the three other categories, especially middle-aged speakers, preserve the use of the variant [g], although they are educated people. Moreover, one may notice in these scores, the high percentage (91.11%) of the use of the variant [g] by old speakers compared to 08.88% of the use of the variant [ʒ]. All these results are shown in Figure 2.

3.1. NA Morphological Variables

3.1.1. The object pronoun suffixes {-a}, {-m} vs. {-ha}, {-hm}

While the masculine pronoun {-hu} maintains the [h] sound in many dialects (particularly rural areas) and drops the final vowel, as in [ơrba] (for CA /arabahu/ , ‘He hit him’), [h] is dropped in others (particularly in urban varieties) as in [ơrbu]. The feminine singular pronoun {-ha} (also represented as {-haa}) is preserved with its glottal fricative [h] in most Arabic colloquial
varieties (although the lay vowel [aa] is shortened to [a]). But in NA and some other dialects in the area (as well as in some countries like Syria and Lebanon), [h] is dropped, and [rabha] is realised as [arba]. The same phenomenon occurs with the plural suffix pronoun {hum} and NA speakers usually say [arbam] not only with [h] drop but also a vowel reduction /u/ → [i].

It is worth noting that these object pronouns occur not only with verbs but also with nouns having, in this case, the function of possession as in /bejtahaa/ and /bejtahum/ (her house or room and their house or room), realised in NA [bita] and [bitum]. It can be said that this characteristic, which means the drop of the glottal [h], is specific to the tribe of Trara (Nedroma, Ghazaouet and some other areas like Honaine, Tiemcen and Algeria). However, Nedromi speakers tend to restitute the glottal fricative, which means using the glottal [h]. These linguistic variations are illustrated in Table 4.

In trying to reflect upon this variation with the speaker’s age, we have produced the scores presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4. Total number of occurrences of the object pronoun suffixes {a}, {m} versus {ha}, {hm}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>/h→Ø{a}, {m}</th>
<th>/h→[h]{ha}, {hm}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Percentages of the object pronoun suffixes {a}, {m} versus {ha}, {hm}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>/h→Ø{a}, {m}</th>
<th>/h→[h]{ha}, {hm}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–15</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>46.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–59</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–85</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are shown in Figure 3 where we explain the use of these morphemes {a}, {m} vs. {ha}, {hm} in correlation with age.

Figure 3. Scores of the object pronoun suffixes {a}, {m} versus {ha}, {hm}
The above-mentioned scores clearly indicate that the local affixes \{a\}, \{m\} occur noticeably more than the other forms \{ha\}, \{hm\}, except for middle-aged speakers who tend to use the glottal [h] more. The results of the occurrences of \{a\}, \{m\} versus \{ha\}, \{hm\} in correlation with age show that young speakers are more likely to use the glottal [h] than elders, and this can be because youngers are more likely to use the standard form than elders, as the glottal [h] stands in MSA.

3.2. NA lexical variables

3.2.1. The use of the CA pronoun /\text{\textit{\textalpha}}\text{\textalpha}/ ‘you’ as [nta], [ntina]

In this investigation, the researcher is also interested in the use of a feature worthy of attention, which is the lexical item [ntina] ‘you’, a singular personal pronoun from MSA pronoun /\text{\textit{\textalpha}}\text{\textalpha}/, which is used to address a male, and /\text{\textit{\textalpha}}\text{\textalpha}/, which is used to address a female. In most AA varieties, just like CA, the two genders are addressed differently: [nta] and [ntaja] vs. [nti] and [ntija]. However, what is specific to NA, and also to Tlemcen’s speech, is the use of the pronoun [ntina] to address both a man and a woman. However, the researcher has found that this item [ntina] is avoided by some Nedromi speakers when addressing a man, as it is regarded as a stigmatised feature, especially when speaking to non-Nedromi speakers. The researcher asked the informants about the use of the pronouns [ntina] and [nta] when addressing a man and she obtained the results shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Scores of the use of the personal pronouns [ntina] and [nta] when addressing a man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>[ntina]</th>
<th>[nta]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–15</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–25</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–59</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–85</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6, we can quickly realise that Nedromi speakers especially middle-aged speakers, are more aware of the fact that the pronoun [ntina] is stigmatised when addressing a man and therefore they avoid it as they feel it is an item used to address a woman. These results are shown in Figure 4 where we explain the use of these pronouns concerning the age of the speaker.

Figure 4. Scores of the use of the personal pronouns [ntina] and [nta] when addressing a man
Nedromi speakers avoid this stigmatised feature not only when speaking to non-Nedromi people, but also with family or in friendly conversations. From such behaviour, it can be said that some Nedromi linguistic items are lost and this can be explained through the degree of stigmatisation of the linguistic item and the speakers’ attitudes.

4. Conclusion

Throughout this current investigation, there was an attempt at examining the social implication of education on the speaker’s linguistic behaviour. It aims at studying the speaker’s intention behind the use of certain linguistic features due to personal motives in addition to psychological matters, and this phenomenon is generally defined as the speaker’s reaction or feeling towards language, which can be either their language variety or the language varieties or languages of others.

Our main fieldwork concern in this paper has been primarily to focalise on the reasons that condition and regulate the youth’s linguistic behaviour, who tend to avoid some Nedromi linguistic features, in particular, the emphatic consonant [ ]. Even though ( ):[] is a characteristic feature of Nedromi speech, our observation has shown that most Nedromi citizens, especially youth, say that [ ] is normally used in words having / /, particularly in initial and final position. It is worth noting that education makes people more conscious of the fact and tries to avoid the devoicing of [ ]. Nedromi speakers tend also to change other linguistic characteristics: (d3): [g], and the use of the glottal [h] when showing possession.

The findings reveal that there is a loss of some of the Nedromi linguistic characteristics most likely because of the negative attitudes towards these variants. Nedromi speakers become more aware of the misuse of some of the variants and try to correct them; hence, the impact of education can be seen on language change in Nedromi Arabic.
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