

## The impact of Social Variables of the choice of Linguistic Variables in Conversation of Al.Hussainya Speech Community

Inst. Mustafa Talib Mutashar

General Directorate of Education/ Karbala

[mt90iraq@gmail.com](mailto:mt90iraq@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study examines the linguistic differences between Standard Arabic and Al-Hussaiyya conversations in the city of Kerbala. The social variables in this study, such as age, gender, social status, educational attainment, and the speakers' cultural background, are dependent on the region's geographic location. The study also addresses the circumstances and current state of these factors among the local populace.

This study attempts to quantify the impact and examine the relationship between the regional variable with linguistic variances and the social variables (gender, age, and education).

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate, as clearly as possible, how social relations can be described using the "network idea" that Milroy & Milroy (1978) created. The researcher in our study makes the assumption that women like to use the high prestige in the city center. This might be because they don't interact much with the locals in the town. As a result, compared to males who engage in more coherent social networks, they are more conservative.

The current study aims to explore the linguistic diversity in Al.Hussaiyya. Urban and rural areas are its two main foci. It also emphasizes both high and poor status. There are 48 informants in total. There are twenty-four for men and twenty-four for women. There are two age groups, with 24 people in each group. The age range of the first group is 20–40, while the second is 41–60. There are two categories when it comes to education. Both educated and uneducated people make up this group. Each one has twenty-four in it. Lastly, there are two types of regional variation: urban and rural .

The four linguistic factors (/ʔa/, /al/, /q/, and /ġ/) and the social variables (gender, age, education, and area) are the only ones that are the focus of this inquiry.

**Key words:** Variation, Social variables, Regional variables, urban, rural

## الملخص في اللغة العربية

يتناول هذا البحث الاختلافات اللغوية في محادثة الحسينية في مدينة كربلاء مقارنة باللغة العربية الفصحى. تتناول هذه الدراسة المتغيرات الاجتماعية اعتماداً على الموقع الجغرافي للمنطقة والعوامل الاجتماعية المؤثرة في استخدام هذه المتغيرات مثل العمر والجنس والطبقة الاجتماعية والخلفية التعليمية والثقافية للمتحدثين. كما تناولت الدراسة المواقف ، فضلاً عن حالة هذه المتغيرات بين سكان المنطقة.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى قياس الأثر والتحقق من ارتباط المتغيرات الاجتماعية (الجنس والعمر والتعليم) والمتغيرات الإقليمية مع المتغيرات اللغوية. تهدف ايضاً إلى إظهار أكبر قدر ممكن من الوضوح ، كيف يمكن استخدام "مفهوم الشبكة الاجتماعية" الذي طوره (Milroy 1978 & Milroy) كأداة لوصف العلاقات الاجتماعية. وبدلاً من ذلك ، فإن الهدف من البحث هو تقديم وصف واضح للتنوع الاجتماعي اللغوي المنهجي الملحوظ في الحسينية.

في دراستنا ، نفترض أنه في وسط المدينة ، تفضل النساء استخدام المكانة العالية. قد يكون هذا بسبب حقيقة أن اتصالهم قليل مع سكان المدينة. لذلك ، فهم أكثر تحفظاً من الرجال الذين يشاركون في شبكات اجتماعية أكثر تماسكاً.

يركز العمل الحالي على تقصي التباين اللغوي في الحسينية. وهي تركز على مجالين: حضري وريفي. كما أنه يركز على المكانة العالية والمنخفضة. عدد العينة المستخدمة هي ثمانية وأربعون. وتتكون من أربعة وعشرين للذكور وأربعة وعشرين للإناث. يتكون العمر من مجموعتين ، كل مجموعة تتكون من أربعة وعشرين. المجموعة الأولى تتراوح بين 20-40 والثانية تتراوح بين 41-60. بالنسبة للتعليم يتكون من مجموعتين. تتألف من المتعلمين وغير المتعلمين. كل واحد يتكون من أربعة وعشرين. أخيراً ، يتكون التباين الإقليمي من المناطق الحضرية والريفية.

تركز الدراسة فقط بالمتغيرات اللغوية الأربعة ( /ال/ و /اه/ و /ق/ و /غ/) والمتغيرات الاجتماعية للجنس والعمر والتعليم والمنطقة.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** تنوع اللغوي، المتغيرات الاجتماعية ، المتغيرات الإقليمية، الحضر ، الريف

## 1. Introduction

Language variance is, in fact, influenced by a broad range of social and geographic characteristics. Many regions and populations consequently speak various dialects." In some cultures, a person's pronunciation can give away both their origin and social standing (Abercrombie, 1973: 8). This variety unquestionably pertains to the language of Al-Hussaiya, which is peculiar due to its geographic location. It is therefore very likely that the language variant that is used there will have particular socio-regional characteristics.

The socio-regional differences seen in Al. Hussaiyya are not random; rather, they follow specific phonological norms that are influenced by the context and a number of associated social characteristics, including sex, age, and educational attainment.

## **2. Background of the Study**

Wardough (2006: 245) (2006: 245) In the quantitative investigation of phonological variance, the speaker's gender identity has revealed as one of the more significant social variables. However, neither sex nor even factors that reflect sound change in motion are uniformly affected by it. This is true because sex is a complicated social activity rather than an action that is immediately tied to language. The relationships between sex and linguistic characteristics are just a reflection of how gender affects linguistic behavior—the intricate social construction of gender one must go to this construction for explanations of such relationships.

In order to study the influence of sex on variation, sociolinguists typically approach gender as an oppositional category (male/female) and look for linguistic distinctions between male and female speakers. The impacts of gender on linguistic behavior might, however, manifest themselves in disparities within sex groups since gender differences imply orientation differences to other social categories.

According to Allen, K., et al. (2010: 78), "There are significant disparities between the signing of men and women. In contrast, gender variations in BSL are negligible and almost never go beyond stylistic variance. But much like with English speakers, men and women have different lexicons and conversational styles. For instance, Coates and Sutton-Spence (2001) discovered that in their examination of conversations in deaf same-sex friendship groups, young males talk about sports, particularly football, whereas young women talk about their families and the lives, loves, and actions of celebrities.

When language and social variation shift toward a form more frequently heard in the speech of those perceived to have greater social standing, we are dealing with overt prestige, or status that is generally accepted as "better" or "more positively viewed in the broader society." But there are other occurrences as well, including concealed prestige. A speech style's "hidden" value could help to explain why certain

populations do not exhibit style-shifting to the same extent as other groups. For example, one would wonder why, in contrast to speakers from the lower middle class, many lower working class speakers do not significantly change from their informal to cautious speaking style.

One possible explanation is that people value the traits that make them unique members of their social group and, as a result, do not alter them to become traits associated with other social groups. They might give upward mobility—sounding like those above them—less weight than group cohesiveness, or the ability to sound like those around them. Among younger speakers of the middle class, several grammar and phonetic characteristics that are more commonly associated with the speech of lower-status groups (I ain't doin' nuttin' instead of I'm not doing anything) are usually associated with hidden prestige (Yule; 2010: 257).

## 2.1 Social Variables

People utilize language to communicate their needs, desires, and emotions in social contexts. Sociolinguistics is the study of language in its social context, as opposed to linguistics, which is concerned with the study of language without taking into account the social setting in which it is utilized (Labov, 1972: 183-4). The situational context affects the right use of language forms, claims Milroy (1987: 37). Stated differently, this link indicates the speaker's ability to produce the right language forms in a variety of situational contexts and, consequently, the variety of linguistic repertoire the speaker possesses.

Numerous factors influencing the decision to choose one of the variants were the subject of the research of linguistic variety. These variables comprise non-contextual elements like age, sex, education, and some indicators of the speaker's socioeconomic status, as well as contextual elements made up of different linguistic context components like the variable's systematic and phonological environment and the discourse function of the utterance containing it (Sankoff, 1978: 245-6).

The focus of the study of linguistic diversity was on several factors that influence the choice between the varieties. Contextual and non-contextual factors are among them. A variable's context consists of the discourse function of the speech that contains it,

as well as different elements of its systematic and phonological environment. Non-contextual characteristics include age, gender, education, and some indices that indicate the speaker's socioeconomic standing (Sankoff, 1978: 245-6).

Giglioli (1972: 217) asserts that a variety of social characteristics, such as age, sex, and education, have an impact on and differentiate speakers' linguistic behavior. Because of this, each social variable has several linguistic characteristics from the other social factors that enable observational separation. Social class differences "may hinder a language trait from spreading throughout a population. age, race, religion, or other elements," according to Trudgill (1974:35). Therefore, these essential components dictate how the speakers' linguistic characteristics are used.

### **2.1.1 Sex**

One social aspect that explains the speaker's linguistic characteristics is their sex. Although it appears that men and women speak different languages, they actually speak various dialects of the same language. Men and women differ linguistically in a few noticeable ways. When speaking about people from the same social background, female speakers favor using more formal forms than male speakers. Compared to men, women talk about their personal sentiments more often. Women frequently share personal stories about themselves that resonate with other women. Men don't typically want to discuss personal matters. Yule (2010: 223)

### **2.1.2 Age**

Another social factor that influences the language variance is the speaker's age. This pattern of sociolinguistic diversity serves as a signpost for the ongoing evolution of language (Chambers & Trudgill, 1980: 89). The speaker's age plays a significant impact in linguistic change, as is evident. various generations employ various languages, which subsequent generations find strange or ambiguous. This is the primary cause of linguistic change. In general, younger individuals use a variety of verbal expressions that older people would not comprehend, and vice versa (Wardhaugh, 2006: 196).

### **2.1.3 Education**

One important socioeconomic component that has an impact on linguistic variety is education. Compared to educated persons, the speakers who drop out of school early use a variety of language forms. Based on Yule (2010), pp. 206-7, these characteristics show the social backgrounds of the two types of speakers. There is a relationship between this and other social variables. It ought to consider the speaker's age and gender. On the one hand, for example, we should consider the speaker in addition to their educational background.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Social Variables**

The study aims to examine the relationship between the linguistic and social characteristics, specifically focusing on gender, age, and education. **3.1.1 Sex**

Both men and women among the Al-Hussaiyya community in Kerbala utilize these socio-regional variations, but in somewhat different ways. The most prevalent difference between men and women in western society is that women tend to communicate in a way that is more in keeping with the prestige standard Aitchison (1992 : 116). The same is true for young women, particularly those attending universities, who frequently shun different kinds of life in other towns and cities as well as occasionally in Al-Hussaiyya. They wish to demonstrate that they are more intelligent and of a higher status than males. Men, on the other hand, usually still use these variations everywhere with pride as a representation of their individuality, morality, and culture. Women exhibit higher values for favored variants than men do, indicating a preference for forms with greater social status. These are the distinctions between men and women. (Wardough, 2006, p. 199)

#### **3.1.2 Age**

Similar to people in neighboring communities, the people of Al-Hussaiyya speak distinct socio-regional dialects. An examination of the correlation between age and ethnic group in Boston revealed that older Italians and Jews of all ages were related to how people pronounced the letter "o." Perhaps because they thought it strange, the younger, largely well-educated members of the Jewish community had abandoned it (Aitchison 1992:114.)



In contrast to the younger generation, the elderly population in Al-Hussaiyya uses the variant [ġ] (i.e., غ) rather than [q] (i.e., ق) in a variety of contexts since it is the most frequent trait among the local populace, particularly the elderly.

### 3.1.3 Education

Residents of Al-Hussaiyya with varying educational backgrounds employ various socio-regional variations based on their educational attainment

The extremely uncommon highly educated individuals in Al-Hussaiyya refrain from using the increasingly widespread version [q] in place of /ġ/ because they believe it to be a distinctively uncivilized symbol. Conversely, some, particularly the general public, use all the variations freely and with pride since they view them as essential components of their uniqueness and culture.

## 3.2 Linguistic Variables used in Al.Hussaiya

Regardless of the sociological factors previously indicated, Al.Hussaiyya people use a lot of unusual versions. This renders an odd visitor to the District incapable of differentiating between the rich and the poor, the intelligent and the ignorant, and so forth. Certain phonological criteria dictate the usage of these variations to denote various roles and in various situations. The association between the social variables—gender, age, education, region, and language variables—forms the basis of the analysis. Following a distribution analysis between linguistic and social characteristics, the following findings emerged:

### 3.2.1 The /ʔa/ variable

/ʔa/ is another variable in this community that merits investigation. The majority of Al.Hussaiyya speakers in rural areas use the first variation of this variable, [ʔa], and speakers in cities use the second variant, [al], as a sound marker. As a result, we may determine whether the speaker is from the former or later dialect using this variable. Male Al.Hussaiyyas utilized the [al] variety more frequently than female Al.Hussaiyyas, who favored using the [ʔa] variant. The educated among the Al-Hussaiyya tended to employ the [al] variant, while the uneducated favored the [ʔa] variant. Table 1 provides some instances of this language variance.

**Table (1): [ʔa] and [al] variants:**

Al.Hussaiya City	Al.Hussaiyya Rural	Meaning
/ala'lmi/	/ʔaa'lmi/	scientific
/almushkila/	/ʔamushkila/	problem
/almarkaz/	/ʔamarkaz/	The centre

The data associated to this variable were subjected to the t-test, which produced the following results:

The mean value of the /ʔa/ variable is (0.16) for the illiterate male informants in group (1), while the mean value of the /al/ variant is (8.33). P is equal to (0.004). This is a noteworthy distinction. The mean value of the /ʔa/ variant is (2.83) for the illiterate male informants in the same group, while the mean value of the /al/ variant is (12.5). This is a noteworthy distinction.

While the educated female informants of group (1) used the /ʔa/ variant with a mean value of (0.00), they used the /al/ variant with a mean value of (11.33). P is equal to (0.000). There is a noticeable difference. In contrast to the /al/ version, which has a mean value of 7.50, the uneducated female informants in the same group utilize the /ʔa/ variant with a mean of 5.83. P is equal to 0.45.

The educated male informants in group (2) have a mean value of (0.66) for the /ʔa/ variant and (27.50) for the /al/ variant. P is equal to (0.009). There is a P value below (P 0.05). There is a noticeable difference. In contrast to the /al/ version, which has a mean value of (15.50), the uneducated male informants in the same sample utilize the /ʔa/ variety on average (7.83). P is equal to (0.005). There is a noticeable difference. Group (2)'s educated female informants used the /ʔa/ variant on average (2.83), while group (2)'s use of the /al/ variant on average (12.16). P is equal to (0.001). There is a noticeable difference. The group's uneducated female informants used a mean of 9.16 for the /ʔa/ variant, while the group's mean for the /al/ variety is (13.16). P is equal to (0.03). see table below:



**Table (2): The use of Gender, Age and Education on the choice of [ʔa] and [al] variable:**

Variant	E	Mean Value	U	Mean Value
[ʔa]	ME1	0.16	MU1	2.83
	ME2	0.66	MU2	7.83
	FE1	0	FU1	5.83
	FE2	2.83	FU2	9.16
	ME1	8.33	MU1	12.5
	ME2	27.5	MU2	15.5
[al]	FE1	11.03	FU1	7.4
	FE2	12.06	FU2	13.06

Al.Hussaiyya city has an average usage of (0.000) for the /ʔa/ variant and (5.68) for the /al/ variant. The P value was (0.000). There is a discernible distinction. In Al.Hussaiyya rural, the average number of people using the /ʔa/ variant is (23.62), while the average number of people using the /al/ variant is (3.81). The P value was (0.000). There is a discernible distinction. Therefore, we can draw the conclusion that individuals in Al.Hussaiyya's rural areas prefer to use the sound /ʔa/ rather than /al/.

**Table (3): The use of regional on the choice of [ʔa] and [al] Variables:**

Variant	City	mean value	Rural	Mean value
/ʔa/	Al.hussaiya	0.00	Al.hussaiya	24.51
/al/	Al.hussaiya	5.58	Al.hussaiya	3.73

### 3.2.2 The /q / variable

Another important component is the /q/ sound, which has two variables: [ġ] and [q]. Although [q] is typically seen in urban areas, [ġ] is a characteristic of ordinary speech that is used by all.

**Table (4): [q] and [ġ] variants**

Al.hussaiya City	Al.hussaiya Rural	Meanings
/qalaam/	/ ġalam/	pen
/burtuqaal/	/bartagal/	Orange
/qindaraa/	/ ġandara/	Shoes

The results of applying the t-test on the data associated with this variable are as follows:

The educated male informants in group (1) have a mean value of 1.50 for the /q/ variant and 2.83 for the /ġ / variant. P is equal to (0.2). It is not a big difference. While the uneducated male informants in the same group used the /q/ variant with a mean value of (0.66), the /ġ / variant had a mean value of (5.50). P is equal to (0.006). There is a noticeable difference. As a result, we may conclude that both educated and uneducated men preferred to use /ġ/ over /q/ since it is a colloquial sound that is used in everyday speech by everybody.

Among the educated female informants in group (1), the mean value of the /q/ variation use is 3.50, whereas the mean value of the /ġ / variant use is 1.16. P is equal to (0.03). There is a noticeable difference. Within the same group, the illiterate female informants used a mean of 1.66 for the /q/ variety, whereas the mean for the /ġ / version was 2.33. P is equal to (0.08). It is not a big difference. Therefore, we can conclude that educated women tended to favor the more localized forms of the city center over those of the villages.

The educated male informants in group (2) had a mean value of (1.16) for the /q/ variant and (4.16) for the /ġ/ variant. P is equal to (0.018). There is a P value below (P 0.05). There is a noticeable difference. In the same group of uneducated male informants, the mean value of the /q/ variation use is 0.50, while the mean value of the /ġ / variant use is 7.50. P is equal to (0.000). There is a noticeable difference.

Thus, we can conclude that men without formal education tended to select /ğ / over /q/.

While the educated female informants in group (2) used the /q/ variant on average of 2.83, they used the /ğ / version on average of 2.50. P is equal to (0.6). It is not a big difference. Within the same group, the illiterate female informants used a mean of 1.66 for the /q/ variety, whereas the mean of 3.66 for the /ğ / version. P is equal to (0.002). There is a noticeable difference.

**Table (5): The impact of social vraibles (i.e Gender, Age and Education on the choice of [q ] and [ğ ] variants:**

Variable	E	Mean Value	U	Mean Value
[q]	EM1	1.5	UM1	0.66
	EM2	1.16	UM2	0.5
	EF1	3.5	UF1	1.16
	EF2	2.83	UF2	1.16
[ğ]	EM1	2.83	UM1	5.5
	EM2	4.16	UM2	7.5
	EF1	1.16	UF1	2.33
	EF2	2.5	UF2	3.66

In Al-Hussaiyya city, the average usage of the /q/ variant is (1.62), whereas the average use of the /ğ / version is (3.12). P is equal to (0.01). There is a noticeable difference. In Hussainia rural, the average usage of the /q/ variant is (0.37), while the average use of the /ğ / version is (5.00). (0.000) was the P value. There is a noticeable difference. That is to say, people in Al.Hussaiyya use the sound /q/, and people in Al.Hussaiyya rural prefer to use the sound /ğ /.

**Table (6): The effect of regional on the choice of [q] and [ġ] variants:**

Variables	City Centre	Mean value	Rural	Mean value
[q]	Hussainya	2.50	Hussainya	1.28
[ġ]	Hussainya	3.03	Hussainya	6.11

#### 4. Discussion and Result

It is quite evident that the type of variation that the informants have selected is significantly influenced by the speaker's gender. Men and women with education have indicated a preference for the [al] and [q] varieties over the [ʔa] and [ʔ] varieties. The second age group's educated male respondents chose the [al] and [q] varieties, while the uneducated male informants selected the [al], [ʔa], and [ġ] forms. When it comes to social networks, it is easy to understand why the older respondents choose their localized stigmatized variety. Furthermore, educated people of both genders have demonstrated similar linguistic practices; therefore, education has a big impact on the informants, making them choose the conventional alternative. Because of this, educated men and women informants of all ages have used the [al] and [q] versions more often than the [ʔa] and [ġ] ones.

Moreover, the [ʔa] and [ġ] dialects of the local language were preferred by the interviewees from Al.Hussaiyya rural, regardless of their level of education. This may guarantee that any speech community's decision to adopt a new variety will be greatly influenced by the surroundings.

The educated male and female informants in the first age group preferred the [al] and [q] versions over the [ʔa] and [ġ] options. Almost all of the informed sources with education who have the opportunity do so. They could now communicate with others on a regular basis as a result.

the over 45-year-old, illiterate female informants. Both [ʔa], [al], [q], and [ġ] are preferred. They use the rural variety conservatively (e.g., /ʔa/ and /). These older individuals might also learn new variants of the letters "al" and "q." We may infer that having conversations with neighbors or family members, sitting down to sip tea

or coffee, and engaging in varied conversation made it simple for them to practice using the letters "a" and "finding."

Another sociological variable is the area. It was significant for both sexes. We may state that everyone in Al. Hussaiyya town utilized the [a] variant, whilst individuals in Al. Hussaiyya rural prefer to use the [ʔa] and [g] variation.

## 5. Conclusion

The paper reveals the following:

1. Some variable are used more than the variables (i.e. /j/ variable).
2. In Al-Hussaiyya, variation is a sign of prestige for the majority of people, particularly young women.
3. Socio-regional dialect spoken in Al-Hussaiyya is superior to Standard Arabic in general public, educated women, particularly those pursuing higher education, hold the opposite view.
4. Concerning male variation occurs mostly in consonants and rarely in vowel whereas female uses vowels more than consonants.
5. When deciding on the type of variable that the informants utilize, gender is a significant factor. More female informants than male informants make use of the /q/ variation.
7. The informants lacking formal education have not modified their stigmatized version. Their lack of education keeps them from having the opportunity to interact with members of the new society. Thus, the illiterate informants provide us with a compelling defense for the continued stagnation of their language.

## 6. Reference

- Abercrombie, D. (1973) . **Elements of General Phonetics**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Aitchison , J. (1992). **Linguistics**. London :Hodder & Stoughton Ltd
- Allen, K., et.al (2010). The English Language and Linguistics: companion. Macmillan: Palgrave.
- Bloor, M. and Bloor, T. (2007). **The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction**. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Carter , R . ( 1982). **Linguistics and The Teacher**. London : Unwin Brothers Ltd.
- Chamber, J., K. and Trudgill, P. (1980). **Dialectology**. Cambridge: CUP.
- De Saussure, F. (1959). **Course In General Linguistics**. New York : Mc Graw-Hill.
- Fromkin ,V. And Rodman , R. ( 1983 ). **An Introduction to Language**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Giglioli, P. P. (1972). **Language and Social Context**. London:\_Penguin Books
- Hall Jr.,R. A. (1969). **Introductory Linguistics** .Delhi : Shantilal at Jain Shri Jainendra Press.
- Kuiper, K and Allan, W. S. (2004). **An Introduction to English Language: word, sound, and sentence**. Palgrave : Macmillan.
- Labov, W. (1972). **Sociolinguistic Patterns**. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Milroy , J . and L. Milroy ( 1987 ). **Belfast ; Change and Variation in an Urban Vernacular** . in Trudgill ( ed ) , PP.
- Sankoff, D. (1978). **Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods**. New York: Academic Press.
- Schniedewind, W. M. (2001). "Prolegomena for the Sociolinguistics of Classical Hebrew". Journal of Hebrew Scriptures. Canada: National Library of Canada. Available at <http://jihsonline.org>.
- Trudgill, P. (1974). **Sociolinguistics: an introduction**. Penguin Books.
- Wardaugh , A. (2006) . **An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. USA: Blackwell publishing**.
- Yule,George.(2010). **The study of language**. New York :Cambridge University Press.

### Appendix (1)

The sounds /ʔa/ and /al/

Sex = male, age = 20-40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	12	1.5000	4.88969	0.018



/a/	12	10.4167	11.10658	
-----	----	---------	----------	--

Sex = male, age = 41-60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	12	4.2500	13.51178	0.008
	/al/	12	21.5000	15.56511	

Sex = female, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	12	2.9167	10.10363	0.001
	/al/	12	9.4167	5.03548	

Sex = female, age = 41-60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	12	6.0000	16.18641	0.002
	/al/	12	12.6667	8.77324	

Education = educated, sex = male, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	.1667	.40825	0.004
	/al/	6	8.3333	5.46504	

Education = educated, sex = male, age = 41-60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	.6667	1.63299	0.000
	/al/	6	27.5000	18.79096	

Education = educated, sex = female, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	.0000	.00000	0.000
	/al/	6	11.3333	4.58984	

Education = educated, sex = female, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	2.8333	6.94022	0.001
	/al/	6	12.1667	7.88458	

Education = uneducated, sex = male, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	2.8333	6.94022	0.003
	/al/	6	12.5000	15.20197	

Education = uneducated, sex = male, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	7.8333	19.18767	0.005
	/al/	6	15.5000	9.66954	

Education = uneducated, sex = female, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	5.8333	14.28869	0.45
	/al/	6	7.5000	5.08920	

Education = uneducated, sex = female, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	6	9.1667	22.45366	0.03
	/al/	6	13.1667	10.32311	

Region = Hussainyya City

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	16	.0000	.00000	0.000
	/al/	16	5.6875	4.60027	

Region = Hussainyya Rural

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/ʔa/	16	23.6250	22.46442	0.001
	/al/	16	3.8125	1.93972	

## Appendix (2)

The sounds /q/ and / ġ /

Sex = male, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	12	1.0833	1.16450	0.002
	/ ġ /	12	4.1667	2.88675	

Sex = male, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	12	.8333	.71774	0.000
	/ ġ /	12	5.8333	2.82307	

Sex = female, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	12	2.3333	1.92275	0.43
	/ ġ /	12	1.7500	1.21543	

Sex = female, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	12	2.0000	1.41421	0.09
	/ ġ /	12	3.0833	1.44338	

Education = educated, sex = male, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	1.5000	1.37840	0.2
	/ ġ /	6	2.8333	1.83485	

Education = educated, sex = male, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	1.1667	.75277	0.018
	/ ġ /	6	4.1667	2.48328	

Education = educated, sex = female, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	3.5000	2.16795	0.03
	/ ġ /	6	1.1667	.75277	

Education = educated, sex = female, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	2.8333	1.47196	0.6
	/ ġ /	6	2.5000	1.51658	

Education = uneducated, sex = male, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	.6667	.81650	0.006
	/ ġ /	6	5.5000	3.27109	

Education = uneducated, sex = male, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	.5000	.54772	0.000
	/ ġ /	6	7.5000	2.16795	

Education = uneducated, sex = female, age = 20- 40

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	1.1667	.40825	0.08
	/ ġ /	6	2.3333	1.36626	

Education = uneducated, sex = female, age = 41- 60

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	6	1.1667	.75277	0.002
	/ ġ /	6	3.6667	1.21106	

Region = Hussainyya City

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	16	1.6250	1.25831	0.01
	/ ġ /	16	3.1250	1.85742	

Region = Hussainyya Rural

Group Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Text	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
NO	/q/	16	.3750	.61914	0.000
	/ ġ /	16	5.0000	3.81226	