

**PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA**  
**MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**



**UNIVERSITY OF ABOU BEKR BELKAID - TLEMCEEN**  
**FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

***DIALECT ACCOMMODATION IN HYBRID FAMILIES***  
***CASE STUDY: TLEMCEEN SPEECH COMMUNITY***

**Dissertation submitted to the department of English as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of *Master* in Language Studies**

**PRESENTED BY:**

**Miss. Fatiha DJELIL**

**SUPERVISED BY:**

**Supervisor: Dr. Amine BELMEKKI**

**Co-supervisor: Ms. Khadidja HAMMOUDI**

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS:**

<b>Dr. Fatma KHERBACHE</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>University of Tlemcen</b>
<b>Prof. Amine BELMEKKI</b>	<b>Supervisor</b>	<b>University of Tlemcen</b>
<b>Ms. Khadidja HAMMOUDI</b>	<b>Co-supervisor</b>	<b>University of Tlemcen</b>
<b>Dr. Fatima Zahra ADDER</b>	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>University of Tlemcen</b>

**Academic Year: 2019/2020**

## **Dedication**

*I dedicate this work to my beloved father and mother for their support, encouragement and patience.*

*I would like to extend my thanks to my amazing sister Ibtissem and my brothers Zoheyr and Zakaria who helped me a lot in keeping my spirit up.*

*To my sweetheart my grand-mother Aaicha, my aunt Zolikha, her daughter Meriem, my uncles and to all the member of my family.*

*I also dedicate this work to my teacher and supervisor Prof. Amine BELMEKKI for his support with his inspirational words, encouragement and help during all my period of learning in the English department. Thanks a lot sir you are as a grand brother for me.*

*To my dearest close friends: Oussama, Sihem, Farah, Meriem, and to all my colleagues who encouraged me till the last moment.*

*To the memory of my dearest grand brother, friend "Mansour Djelti"*

Fatiha

## **Acknowledgements**

I owe a special debt of gratitude and sincere thanks to my teacher and supervisor Professor BELMAKKI Amine and my co-supervisor Miss HAMMOUDI Khadidja for their engaging help, encouragement and support, insightful comments and suggestions, without them and their guidance this work could not see the light.

Special thanks go to the board of examiners for accepting to devote some of their time to read and evaluate this humble work.

I would also like to express my appreciation to all the teacher of the department of English especially Prof. A. BELMAKKI, Dr. N. NEGADI, Prof. Z. DENDANE, Dr. T. DJENANE, from whom we have learnt a lot.

My great thanks go to the families for their kindness, accepting to give me their time and provided much-needed feedback to achieve this research.

## **Abstract**

The current research work is an attempt to analyse the linguistic situation and the linguistic behaviour of hybrid families in which wives and husbands are from different regions; rural and urban in Tlemcen speech community. The main purposes of this piece of research is firstly examining the linguistic variation and change via the existence of dialect accommodation among two kinds of families UWRH and RWUH. It sheds light to describe the linguistic features that witnessed change, mainly the phonological, the morphological and the lexical. In addition to that this study sought to show which gender category adjust speech more. In order to provide valid and reliable data, two research instruments: interview and observation were used for collecting data which confirmed the hypotheses. The results revealed that the geographical place, setting, period of marriage and tradition norms are factors that lead to dialect accommodation among hybrid families in Tlemcen speech community.

# TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>Dedication .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Contents.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>List of abbreviations.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of maps.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>GENERAL INRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>01</b>
<b>Chapter One: Definition of the key concepts</b>	
<b>1.Introduction.....</b>	<b>06</b>
<b>1.2 Sociolinguistics and dialectology.....</b>	<b>06</b>
<b>1.2.1 Dialectology .....</b>	<b>06</b>
<b>1.2.2 Sociolinguistics .....</b>	<b>08</b>
<b>1.3 Language.....</b>	<b>09</b>
<b>1.4 Dialect.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.4.1 Regional dialect.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.4.2 Social dialect .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.5 Rural and Urban dialect.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.6. Accent definition and its variation.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.7 Speech Community definition.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>1.8 Speech Accommodation theory.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1.8.1 Convergence and Divergence.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>1.9 Gender and Age.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>1.10 Conclusion.....</b>	<b>17</b>

## **Chapter two: Methodology, Data collection**

<b>2.1</b>	Introduction.....	<b>20</b>
<b>2.2</b>	Tlemcen speech community description .....	<b>20</b>
<b>2.3</b>	Research objectives .....	<b>22</b>
<b>2.4</b>	Research approaches .....	<b>23</b>
<b>2.4.1</b>	Qualitative approach .....	<b>23</b>
<b>2.4.2</b>	Quantitative approach .....	<b>23</b>
<b>2.5</b>	Sample.....	<b>24</b>
<b>2.6</b>	Research instrument .....	<b>25</b>
<b>2.6.1</b>	Interview .....	<b>25</b>
<b>2.6.2</b>	Observation .....	<b>25</b>
<b>2.7</b>	Data analysis .....	<b>26</b>
<b>2.7.1</b>	Interview analysis .....	<b>26</b>
<b>2.7.2</b>	Observation analysis.....	<b>38</b>
<b>2.8</b>	Data interpretation and discussion of the main finding .....	<b>39</b>
<b>2.9</b>	recommendation and suggestion for further research .....	<b>41</b>
<b>2.10</b>	Conclusion .....	<b>41</b>
	GENERAL CONCLUSION .....	<b>42</b>
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	<b>45</b>
	APPENDICES .....	<b>49</b>
	APPENDIX ‘A’: interview .....	<b>50</b>
	APPENDIX ‘B’: observation checklist .....	<b>52</b>
	SUMMARY .....	<b>53</b>

## List of tables

<b>Table2.1:</b> Age of UWRH and RWUH families .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Table2.2:</b> period of marriage of UWRH and RWUH families.....	<b>24</b>
<b>Table2.3:</b> Attitudes of UWRH and RWUH towards hybrid marriage .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Table2.4:</b> the view of UWRH and RWUH on the effectiveness of origin differences on communication .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Table2.5:</b> UWRH impression on origin / dialect differences.....	<b>28</b>
<b>Table2.6:</b> RWUH impression on origin/ dialect differences.....	<b>28</b>
<b>Table2.7:</b> Accommodation in correlation with gender power .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Table2.8:</b> the realization and the percentages of the standard variable /q/ among UWRH and RWUH families .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Table2.9:</b> the realization and the percentages of the standard interdental fricative /θ/ and /ð/ among UWRH and RWUH families .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Table2.10:</b> the accommodation and the percentages of the word ‘his room’ among UWRH families .....	<b>34</b>
<b>Table2.11:</b> the realization and the percentages of the word ‘his room’ among RWUH families .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Table2.12:</b> the realization and the percentages of lexical items among UWRH and RWUH families .....	<b>37</b>

## **List of abbreviations**

**UWRH:** Urban Wife /Rural Husband.

**RWUH:** Rural Wife /Urban Husband.

**RR:** rural

**UR:** urban

**S.P:** speech community

**DA:** Dialect Accommodation.

## **List of maps**

2.1 the geographical location of Tlemcen speech community ..... **21**



# **GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

## **General Introduction**

Communication as an essential part of social relations is built on language and act since it strengthens human rise. Accordingly, language is one of the most powerful mediums of communication in any speech community. It has been attracting the interest of many researchers and linguists who used various methods to study its complexity. There is no doubt that people use language for different objectives such as to fulfil their needs, share information and to express ideas, feelings and so forth; however, this usage differs from one individual to another, from region to region and from situation to another according to several factors. In fact, in the same family, one may find members like parents who are from different regions or origins using distinct local varieties of the same language which makes them linguistically as hybrid families.

Both sociolinguistics and social psychology made a great progress in investigating language accommodation which describes how people adjust their language and communicative patterns to those of others. The present research attempts to examine the existence of dialect accommodation in hybrid families in which parents come from different regions or origins and use the two low different varieties: urban and rural dialects of Tlemcen speech. This research also aims at knowing which category of gender changes their speech more by diverging or converging in order to maximize or minimize the differences between them. Therefore, this research work endeavours to acquire the linguistic items that they accommodate of the two varieties. The following question can be raised:

1. Is there a “dialect accommodation” in families whose parents come from different origins and to which directions does accommodation occur?
2. Which gender accommodates more to the other (male/female)?
3. What are the linguistic items that are much more influenced by the process of dialect contact and accommodation in those families?

In order to find reliable answers to these questions, three hypotheses are formulated, as follow:

1. Yes, accommodation is prominent in the speech of those families.

2. Females change their speech more than males do.
3. The linguistic items that witness the change are: phonological, morphological, lexical.

To reject or confirmed the above hypotheses, a case study is collected from families wherein parents are from different origins and regions (urban /rural) of Tlemcen speech community.

Regarding the structure, the present research work is divided into two chapters. The first chapter deals with the literature review which provides the definitions of the main concepts that are related to the topic and to the area of research. The second one is a space to analyse, discuss and present the sample of informants and their categorization according to origin, age, gender, and region. It also mentions the research tools and methods for collecting data which are later analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. At the end, the interpretation of the main findings and results is presented in order to answer the research questions about which factors leads to this accommodation in these families.

***Chapter ONE:***  
***Definition of Main Concepts***

## **Chapter one**

### **DEFINITION OF THE MAIN CONCEPTS**

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Dialectology and sociolinguistics

1.2.1 Dialectology

1.2.2 Sociolinguistics

1.3 Language definition

1.4 Dialect definition

1.4.1 Regional dialect

1.4.2 Social dialect

1.5 Urban and rural dialect

1.6 Accent definition

1.7 Speech community definition

1.8 communication accommodation theory

1.81. convergence and divergence

1.9 age and gender

1.10. Conclusion

## **1.1 Introduction:**

Sociolinguistics is the only field that gives language its real place and role in society when it attempts to describe language in an objective manner by focusing on the spoken usage among people in a particular social context. Also, sociolinguists were interested to study language change in different social situations and how people change and adopt speech from one region to another or even in the same family members as in the hybrid families. As they sought to explain the factors or the motives that lead to dialect accommodation and change.

In this chapter the researcher attempts to provide some definitions of the main concepts that are in relation to sociolinguistics and concerning to the topic that is under investigation.

## **1.2 Sociolinguistics and dialectology**

### **1.2.1 Dialectology:**

Dialectology is considered as the first and the oldest discipline that its primary focus is to work in term of approach to field work and analysis. Its effective beginning has been in Europe after 1850. The idea of studying dialect and varieties came about in the second half of the 19th century, from this respect Trudgill and Chambers (1998 :13-15) argue that until the mid to late ninetieth century there was a very little evidence of a serious coherent and systematic endeavour to formally study dialect by scholars and researchers. Indeed, Dialectology is the pioneer study that tries to deal consistently with language variation where researcher focus especially in its lexical and structural components. It is usually associated with the discovery of non-standard variation patterns at the intersection of language usage and human geography whether socially. Crystal (1999:87) defined dialectology as “the study of dialect, especially regional dialects”. From its serious period of investigation dialectology passed through two different events: traditional dialectology is mainly interested to examine geographic

distribution of language variation especially in rural areas (which were considered to be the source of varieties that were more traditional than those found in urban areas) among Norms, an acronym for non-mobile, older, rural, males (which viewed as likely to produce more conservative dialects). Furthermore, the traditional dialectologists were generally interested at producing dialect maps and linguistics Atlases. Chambers and Trudgill (2003:45) state:

All dialects are both regional and social, all speakers have a social background as well as regional location, and in their speech they often identify themselves not only as natives or inhabitants of a particular place, but also as a members of a particular social class, age, group, ethnic background, or others social characteristics.

From the 1960 onwards dialectology faced many criticisms from other disciplines concerning mainly the way and the methods used in collecting data. the main one was the limitation of informant who were old, rural and male, and Also, its solely focused on non-standard language (dialect) in isolated areas. The second one was towards the method used by using single word elicitation technique via one instrument that is questionnaire which according to other disciplines as modern dialectology is considered as unreliable techniques which cannot provide a really accurate account of how people used language.

In contrast, modern dialectology (urban dialectology) had turn its attention to study language in connection with society. It tends to include all what traditional dialectology was excluding during its investigation. Modern dialectologists increase their work by taking into consideration all categories of people (young old males females Educated and non-educated ones) and social groups (class, ethnicity). Additionally, it has usually been associated with variation and change that occurs in standard language in large cities (urban areas) and also within the speech of individual by examine how the speaker used different dialects form in its speech through a quantitative analysis.

This shift in interest from the isolated areas to the large ones are consequently led to the birth of sociolinguistics which links between dialectology, i.e., the study dialects and social factors such as gender, age, education, origin, residence, etc. which are said to explain dialect use and change.

## **1.2.2 SOCIOLINGUISTICS:**

Language and society are un-separable two sides existed for one purpose which is creating and maintaining social relationships among people (Spolsky, 1998: 3). Sociolinguistics is a term that is formed from two words sociology and linguistics as Paolliti (2011, 1) claim:

‘Sociolinguistics’ and ‘language and society’ are terms that are often used interchangeably to refer to an interdisciplinary field of research in which linguistics and sociology, and other human sciences, join together to study verbal and other human conducts.

From this definition we can conclude that sociolinguistics is a discipline that combines between sociology and linguistics. Furthermore, its roots are to be found in traditional dialectology. The common link between the two disciplines is their interest with language variation, one with social level and the other geographically. Thus, sociolinguistics is concerned with the examining the use of language in a given social context and how it affects and is affected by several factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion etc... (Trudgill, 2000) state that: “sociolinguistics is the study of the effect of any and all aspects of society, including cultural norms, expectations, and context on the way language is used”.

More precisely, its attempts to explain how language differs or varies from one context to another across geographical borders and how people in one context communicate with people in other contexts or even among speakers of the same speech community and observe the change that occurs. (Gumpers, 2006: 10) Actually, each person has their own way of speaking that characterize them from others. Besides, Holmes (2001:1) writes:

Examining the way people use language in different social context provides a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationships in a community, and the way people signal aspects of their social identity through their language.

The main aim of sociolinguistics is to answer the following questions: who speaks, what language, to whom, and on what occasion? Wardhaugh (2006:5) argued that:



... an asocial linguistics is scarcely worthwhile and that meaningful insights into language can be gained only if such matters as use and variation are included as part of the data which must be explained in a comprehensive theory of language; such a theory of language must have something to say about the uses of language.

William Labov who is considered as the pioneer researcher in sociolinguistics, provides a strong support to the study of language in relation to society when he claims that: “Every linguist recognizes that language is a social fact, but not everyone puts an equal emphasis on that fact” (1972:261). From this view he believes in the fact that many interesting findings will be missed in the study of language without references to the context which it used.

### **1.3 Language:**

Language takes a great attention by several linguists and researcher to study its nature and its role in human life. The term language is derived from Latin *lingua* which means tongue and the French term *longue*. For many people, Language is considered as a natural habit as walking and waking up. However, scientifically and socially is thing that play a central role in human relationships. Once people come to define language or to give it a meaningful sense, the first and the simplest idea that come in their minds is that language is a human source that differentiate them from other creatures used to communicate and exchange knowledge and information, As Sapir state (1921:10) “language is primarily human and non-human instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols”. In the same stream of thought Jespersen (1919:12) says, “language is a set of human habits, the purpose of which is to give expression to thoughts and feelings”.

On the other side, some linguists said that language is a really complicated phenomenon that until today there is no definite answer, defining a language is really a challengeable task. So, each linguist tries to provide a definition according to his beliefs and experiences.

Some of them said that language is the most salient elements in human life; it is used to attain a variety of social and cultural background. Simultaneously, they claim that language called social phenomenon because it has relevance only in a social setting,

in addition to that it reflects the culture of its user and at the same time, it is influenced and shaped by it.

Furthermore, most languages are characterized by a standard form, high status based especially on its written forms, from this respect Goodenough (1981:5) defines language as:

A set of standard and organizing principles for a proper speech behaviour, the standard comparing every known human language may be seen as ordered into several systems on levels of organization: the phonological, morphology, syntactic, semantic, symbolic.

Hudson (1996:32) claim that language is “a variety called a language contain more items than one called a dialect” he means that language is a complex system and contain a number of linguistic items and categories which it is broader and large phenomenon than dialect.

#### **1.4 DIALECT**

Dialect take a very important place in linguistic and becomes crucial for communication between people of the same community. Separation of modern society into numerous social groups due to several factors such as cultural, political, economic ... leads to the unavoidable development of language differences. Wolfram, Carolyn, Christian (1999: 22) state that: “When groups are physically or socially separated in some ways, Language differences can be expected”.

Since every language has contained certain categories, every person pronounces words differently according to the living place, tradition, social norms that govern this community. Originally the word dialects come from the ancient Greek dialektos “discourse, language, dialect”. Bantam (2006) provide a simple definition of dialect which state: “a particular form of a language which is peculiar to a specific region or social group.” Also, Crystal (1980:110) define dialect as: “a regionally or socially distinctive variety of a language, identified by a set of words and grammatical structure”.

The change of language and the diversity of dialects through the entire world is similar to every change that happen in the environment. Dialect change from the formal to informal form in many linguistic levels: phonological, morphological, syntax, grammatically in this respect Romaine (2000:19) state

“Dialect is a variety of language or a system of communication which varies from other dialects of the same language simultaneously or at least three levels of organization, pronunciation, grammar or syntax and vocabulary”.

Since dialect is considering as one of the norms that characterized the region from others like Tlemcen dialect that has its own features. A dialect spoken by individual is called idiolect, which everyone has his own way of speaking or pronouncing even in the same family member.

To sum up, the main trouble that sociolinguistics was faced is to find an exact definition of dialects, it is regarded as a sub-division or a variety of language which is generally associated with low status and has no official prestige like black English vernacular and has no written form. Hence, the size and the prestige are the essential differentiation between language and dialect when ibid state that ... a language is larger than dialect.

#### **1.4.1 Regional dialects:**

If we travel from village to village from place to place and examine dialects spoken especially in rural areas, we will notice linguistic differences which distinguish one direction from another. Therefore, we can define regional dialects as varieties of a language which are spoken in different geographical arears. Chambers and Trudgil (1998: 21) defined dialect geography as follows: “dialect geography is disarmingly simple: it seeks to provide an empirical basis for conclusion about the linguistic variety that occurs in a certain locale.”

The essential cause of regional dialects is the geographic barriers as natural barriers (hills, rivers) which can strongly affect the dialect of groups of people, every dialectal feature has its own boundary line, called an isogloss. Wardhaught (2006:45) pointed out that “dialect geography is the term used to describe attempts made to map

the distribution of various linguistics features so as to show their geographical provenance”

All speakers in the world have a regional setting that identify them as a resident of a particular region, as well as they have a social background that characterizes them as members of social norms.

### **1.4.2 Social dialects:**

Social dialect was the main focus of study in modern dialectology when they turn their attention from rural to urban areas (large cities) where the linguistics variants are so complex. Social dialects are also called sociolect, P. Trudgill (2003:122) define this term concisely as: “a variety or lect which is thought of as being related to its speaker’s social background rather geographical background”

According to Wilkon (1989: 88) who was the first to use the concept of sociolect in polish sociolinguistics literature, sociolects are: “language varieties related to such social group as: class, community, and professional groups”. There are many factors that affect social variation of language use in a particular social group of the speaker such as education, occupation, income level, education, religion, social class, age, gender. Wardhaught (2006 :49) claim:

The term dialect can also be used to describe differences in speech associated with various social group or classes .....social dialects originate among social groups and are related to as variety of factors, the principle ones apparently beings class, religion, and ethnicity.

### **1.5 Urban and Rural dialects:**

People over the world live differently, speak and think and behave differently due to the division of speech community into many separated groups or region; rural and urban areas. When you said rural or Bedouin you mean agriculture and farms, nature and the place where conservative people found .... In this respect, Jonthan claims that: “Bedouin dialect features’ are more conservative than rural dialect features”. The rural living, they mostly live a simple life interesting in agriculture, farming keeping their

asserts and their language and their way of speaking which they use their own linguistic features the Bedouin or the rural dialects are special by his pronunciation, words structure, vocabulary.

In contrast, the urban areas are considering as the most complex and influence societies that change due to several factors such as rural displacement, globalization. urban people also use different linguistic items, phonological, morphological features and sentences structure, the urban language is always seen as the higher and the prestigious in this respect, Samaria (1997:7) stated that the urban language excited through many years to be the mirror of high and proper literature.

In Arabic World the most famous features that distinguish between the two dialect groups is phonological level. The phonetic distinction is in the pronunciation of the consonants /q/, which is voiced in Bedouin as /g/ but voiceless in sedentary dialects and pronounce it as /q/ and the glottal stop /ʔ/ for example in the word /qaal/ which means he said realized as /gal / in rural regions as Maghnia and it is produced in urban groups as /ʔal / in Tlemcen speech community among natives' people and that makes each group has a special accent.

### **1.6 Accent meaning:**

Everyone has an accent that characterize and identify him from others. The term accent has several meanings but in speaking is the description of aspects of pronunciation which identify where an individual speaker is from socially or regionally. Thus, accent is considering as badge for social identity, Marriam - Webster dictionary provide a simple definition (2016) state an accent is: “a distinctive manner of expression: such as: a way of speaking typical of a group of people and especially of the natives or residents of a region”. or “an individual distinctive or characteristic inflection, tone, or choice of words”

In fact, sociolinguistics considers accents as the key that felicitate the examination of social identity and change.

### **1.7 Speech community definition:**

Speech community does not take less importance than language represents since language is the possession of individual and society, person's speech can give an idea of a person's background in a way of where they come from and which population group and culture they are belong to. Webster's new world college dictionary defined speech community as follow: "is all the people speaking a particular language or dialect, whether in single geographical area or dispersed throughout various regions". Speech community is one of the fertile fields of research in sociolinguistics, it has been always the focus and the major objective of the study, since the main focus of sociolinguistics was to study language variation and change and that's can only occur in large population setting. So, the speech community spark the interest of many linguists who provide various definition of this concept and do not agree about the exact meaning. First we can start with the definition of general linguistics which claim that Speech community is all people who speak a single language and so share notions of what's same or different in phonology or grammar. Changjuan Zhan (2013:1), this would have concerned any group of people wherever they might be. Then, for specific linguists, according to Morgan (2003:1) claims that the term speech community does not concern only on groups that share the same code/ language. Through time in (2016:1) he states that:

Speech communities are groups that share values and attitudes about language use, varieties and practices. These communities develop through prolonged interaction among those who operate within these shared and recognized beliefs and value systems regarding forms and styles of communication.

In same stream of thought Romaine (1994:22) said that the speech community is a group who shared the same social norms rather than limited the concept on language system and boundaries.

For other linguists like Labov (1972:120,121) speech community is shaped of members who share the same norms. This idea is better clear from his speech as follow:

The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms: these norms may be observed in overt types of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage.

Hence, speech community is one of the foundational formulations of the relationship between social aggregates and language.

## **1.8 COMMUNICATION ACCOMODATION THEORY**

Each person is aware that his /her style of speech change in the twinkling of an eye, depending on a wide range of variables such as the setting, the topic of discourse, the person that are interacting with and so on. Consequently, people or speakers accommodate to others by adjusting their communicational behaviour, verbal patterns, gestures etc... in order to reach mutual intelligibility and to facilitate or complicate the social communication. This approach is rooted in social psychological approach to social linguistics originally known as speech accommodation theory.

This approach was developed in the 1970s by Howard Giles and Coupland to explore and describes how people adjust or shift their language, dialects and communication patterns, gestures to those of group or person that they want to be familiar with or On the other side, to emphasize on the social distance people just do the opposite they namely try to underline differences from the listeners in accordance to their attitude or believes and situations. In this respect Hamers and Blanc (2000:242) report that:

a model of speech accommodation which focuses on the underlying social cognitive processes mediating between the individual s perception of the communication situation and his communicative behaviour.

This theory sought to explain and understand the reason and the factors or the motives that pushed people to change their manner of communication and behaviour of others when having a discourse and some of the social consequences arising from them. Speech accommodation theory can be observed easily in all types of interpersonal communication and may shape several forms in all the linguistics levels example

pronunciation, lexical items to serve many purposes such as showing concern for the speakers and positive attitude towards the interlocutors.

This theory represented two accommodating strategies that people use to help them to adopt their speech to achieve social goals such as decrease and increase social distance which are convergence and divergence process.

### **1.8.1 CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE:**

Speakers make linguistic adjustment to the audience, changing either towards (converging) or away (diverging) from the speech of the interlocutors according to their desire to achieve either solidarity and mutual intelligibility or social distance.

#### **a- Convergence**

Convergence strategy happen simply when a speaker wants to belong and integrate certain groups by adjusting his way of speaking and behaviour in order to be like the other interlocutor and reduce differences. Beebe and Giles (1984:8) state:

People will attempt to converge linguistically towards the speech (desire their social approval and the perceived costs of so acting are proportionally lower than the rewards anticipants; and /or (b) desire a high level of communication efficiency, and (c) social norms are not perceived to dictate alternative speech strategies.

#### **b- Divergence**

Divergence is simply the opposite of convergence strategy. Divergence is a method of avoiding contact by insisting on dissimilarities between the interlocutors at the level of individual or groups, under the following conditions:

[when speakers] (a) define the encounter in intergroup terms and desire positive in group identity, or (b) wish to dissociate personally from another in an inter individual encounter, or (c) wish to bring another's speech behaviour to a personally acceptable level. (Beebe and Giles 1984:8).

## **1.9 Age and gender**

gender is considered as an important social factor that affect language use. sociolinguistics field becomes more interesting on language and gender as they proved



in most societies especially in collecting data Holmes et al (2003:01) states: “language and gender is vibrant area of research and theory development within the largest study of language and society”

Gender plays a great role in language change, especially when the speech of men differs in certain respects from women’s speech. Women as opposed to men are likely use more standard variety as the French language in their speech which characterized as a prestigious, high status in contrary to men. Labov in study found that:

Within each social class group, and across each stylistic context studied, their female informants tended to use more prestige or high status language feature, and their male informants more vernacular language features. (ibid:218).

Language change over time and changes with generations. Interestingly, Age also play a crucial role in variation change which each generation of speakers modifies its linguistics behaviour at a particular stage of life. Sociolinguists argued on the idea that the young people sound and behave and live differently from adults. Sankoff says about that: “speakers might be changing various aspects of their language over the course of their lives”. (quoted in: Carmen fought,2004:121)

### **1.10. Conclusion:**

The objective of sociolinguistics is to explain and examine how People s speech change over time due to several factors for many purposes. In this chapter, we can conclude that the researcher tries to highlight the main definition of sociolinguistic concepts that are related to the topic that are under studying. Also, it mentions the differences between the two low dialects rural and urban of Tlemcen speech community.

***Chapter Two:  
Research Design and Data  
Collection Procedures***

**Chapter Two**

**Research Design and Data Collection Procedures**

**2.1 Introduction**

**2.2 Tlemcen speech community description**

**2.3 Research objectives**

**2.4 Research approaches**

**2.4.1 Qualitative approach**

**2.4.2 Quantitative approach**

**2.5 Sample**

**2.6 Research instrument**

**2.6.1 Interview**

**2.6.2 Observation**

**2.7 Data analysis**

**2.7.1 Interview analysis**

**2.7.2 Observation analysis**

**2.8 Data interpretation and discussion of the main finding**

**2.9 recommendation and suggestion for further research**

**2.10 Conclusion**

## **2.1 Introduction:**

Nowadays, people's speech strongly changes for many purposes so that to suit many situations and groups. Tlemcen speech community is a site of dialect or accent diversity due to the diversity of cultures, traditions and regions since this social context is divided into two main regions; urban and rural. Likewise, Tlemcen citizens who live in different regions speak in different ways by the fact that each region has its particular dialects which have separate own feature. The primary goal in this chapter is analysing information gathered from hybrid families in which parents belong to the two different regions and speaking the two local varieties by examining and testing the existence of dialect accommodation and which linguistic level is more affected among them, then sought to discover the main reasons and motives that lead to this change among this kind of families.

In this chapter, the researcher tends to describe the methods used to collect the data for the present study. The research method implemented is essentially a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches by using two different research instruments. These are mainly a sociolinguistic interview and participant observation.

## **2.2 Tlemcen speech community description:**

Tlemcen town is one of the ancient, rich, strategic regions in Algeria. This city is located in north western Algeria with a population of 945,525 at the previous census. It is the second largest city in the north west, situated exactly at about 500km from the capital Algiers and close to the Moroccan borders of about 100km and approximately 60km away from the Mediterranean Sea. The neighbouring towns is Oran 145km, Sidi Bel Abbes 97 km. It is composed of 21 daïra; bordered by Maghnia then Remchi in the west and Mansourah in the north. Besides, it is characterized by its mild climate due to being an inland area and the diversity of culture makes it an attractive city for visitors. Furthermore, Tlemcen has an international airport in the nearby town of Zenata. This map shows and clarifies the strategic location of Tlemcen city.



### **2.1. Tlemcen Geographical Map**

Originally, Tlemcen name originates according to some theories derived from the Berber words *Thala Imsan*, which can mean “the dry spring” or “the fountain lions”.

Historically, during the Romans rules Tlemcen was founded as a military outpost in the 4<sup>th</sup> century CE, at which time it was known as Pomaria and served as the center of the Roman Catholic church. In the later eight centuries and ninth century, the city became a kingdom of Banu Ifran of the kharijite sufri. Then, in 1082 the Almoravid leader Yusuf ibn Tashfin founded the city of “Encampment” which merged with the existing settlement, called now Agadir and since then became known as Tlemcen (tilimsan). So, during centuries Tlemcen witnessed several kingdom and rules as Alhomad rule and the Zayyanid kingdom then Ottoman rule in 1554 when the Ottomans

were fighting a naval war against the Spaniards across Mediterranean, and the kingdom of Tlemcen became another vassal of the sultan in Constantinople. then by the beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> centuries under the French colonialism, Tlemcen was a vacation spot and retreat for French settlers in Algeria.

Tlemcen city is distinguished from other Algerian towns in terms of dialect by the fact that Algeria is rich linguistically. Since, Tlemcen dialect has its own features in grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary. Dendane (2013:1) states: “Tlemcen speech, variety of Arabic, has long distinguished itself from other Algerian Arabic dialects by number a linguistic feature”.

The most relevant linguistic features of Tlemcen dialect lie basically on the phonetic realization of an oversize of phonemes and morphemes such as most of the suffixes and some of the lexical items. Beginning with the famous classical Arabic phoneme /q/ as voiceless which vary from rural to urban speech, respectively as follow: it is particularly pronounced as a glottal stop /ʔ/ by sedentary native people called as “*hodor*”, then moving from urban to rural in which is realised as the voiced velar /g/ by the Arab (nomads). In addition to the difference use of verb “to come” in the two dialect as /ædzɪ/ vs /rwah/. Finally, the morphological level, Tlemcen speech community characterized by the use of suffixes “u” like in the objective pronoun /ʔutlu/ which means I said to him.

### **2.3 Research objectives:**

This research aims to describe and discover the linguistic situation of hybrid families living in Tlemcen speech community wherein the parents are from two different regions “rural and urban”. Mainly, its objective is to explore the existence of dialect accommodation in their speech with analysing the gender, i.e., who adjusts their speech more and who tends to be influenced by the other side and to what direction change goes. In addition, the investigator attempts to know which linguistic levels are more affected and witnessing change in the couple’s speech at the phonological, morphological, and lexical levels. Finally, this research leads to discover the main

factors and reasons that make people change their speech style when they interact and communicate with each other.

## **2.4 Research approaches:**

To provide sufficient data, the researcher mixed between qualitative and quantitative data. Therefore, there will be a small description to the different approaches used by the investigator in the current research.

### **2.4.1 Qualitative research:**

Qualitative approach is concerned primarily with human act and behaviour, the social context within which this later live. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1999:2) that qualitative methods are multiple methods which involve studying events through interviews... etc. From this regard they state:

Qualitative research is multimethod in focus, involving an interpretative, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their naturalistic settings, [...] qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials- case study, personal experience, interpretative, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional and visual texts.

**As quoted by Murray Thomas (idem)**

### **2.4.2 Quantitative research:**

Quantitative approach is a method that deals with counting the amount and frequency of responses, the main purpose of quantitative analysis necessitates numeric information in the shape of variables, it tends to give general description of the phenomenon. King, Keohane and Verba (1994:3-4) State that:

Quantitative research users' numbers and statistical methods. It tends to be based on numerical measurements of specific aspects of phenomenon; it seeks measurements and analyses that are easily replicable by other researchers.

**2.5 Sample**

One of the essential hardest steps in any research investigation is in fact choosing an appropriate sample especially this kind of sample that are selected in this research. We can define sampling as a statistical process of selecting a subset of a population of interest for purposes of making observation and statistical inferences about that population. The research work is based on a sample population of 10 families from Tlemcen speech community called hybrid families who came from different origins and regions (rural and urban). These categories of families are divided into two groups: five families in which the husbands are from rural areas and the wives are from urban areas and the rest five families couple's origin are the reverse of the first ones, i.e., males are urban and females are urban. In addition to that, the members of these ten families are from different age they are between 20 and 76 years, also they have different educational level and different periods of marriage from 1 years to 50 years.

**Table 2.1 Age of UWRH and RWUH families**

<b>AGE</b>	<b>20 to 30</b>	<b>40 to 50</b>	<b>50 to 60</b>	<b>60 to 70</b>
UWRH families	1	1	2	1
RWUH families	3	1	0	1

**Table 2.2 Period of marriage of UWRH and RWUH families**

<b>Period</b>	<b>1 to 10years</b>	<b>10 to 20</b>	<b>20 to 30</b>	<b>30 to 50</b>
UWRH families	1	1	1	2
RWUH families	3	1	0	1

In the current study, the researcher went out to five families and the rest five families they were contacted via social media; Facebook and WhatsApp because of



corona virus pandemic to gather information to analyse the linguistic situation with testing the existence of dialect accommodation among these families.

## **2.6 Research instruments:**

In order to attain reliable data, the researcher followed a methodology which primarily aims at gathering quantitative and qualitative data. For this purpose, two different tools namely; interview and observation are employed to confirm or reject the hypothesis of the existence of dialect accommodation in hybrid families of Tlemcen speech community.

### **2.6.1 Interview:**

Interview is one of the most important methods after questionnaire for the data collection, it is a face to face conversation between the investigator and the informants in order to collect a specific data to answer the research question. Though this tool has been widely used in sociolinguistics research to analyse casual speech. Burns (1997:329) defines an interview as “a verbal interchange, often face to face, though the telephone may be used, in which an interviewer tries to elicit information, beliefs or opinions from another person”.

There are three types of interview; structured, semi-structured, unstructured interview and each type has its characteristic. In the first type, the questions should be planned and prepared in advance in which the interviewer is required to respect their order when discussing them with the informants. The second kind which is the semi structured also requires the preparation of questions but gives the interviewer the liberty and the ability to change their order or even add or omit some questions. the last type which is unstructured or informal interview is a general argumentation make the informant in a comfortable situation which gives him the possibility to express his point of view freely.

### **2.6.2 Observation:**

Observation is another crucial tool for data collection in sociolinguistics and all the social science. From this respect it was define by Dewalt and Dewalt (2011:1) as follows:

[...] participant observation is a method in which a researcher takes part in the daily activities, rituals, inter-actions, and events of a group of people as one of the means of learning the explicit and tacit aspects of their routines and their culture.

Observation method helps the researcher to be part of the group studied. Also, this technique provided the researcher with significant linguistic information about the local varieties and the social information about the participants. In fact, observation is one of the qualitative methods where “the researcher gathers information in most unobtrusive fashion by simply watching the subject interact, preferably without their knowledge” as it is mentioned by Danker and Hunter (2012:61).

## **2.7 Data analysis:**

To valid the exactness of research findings, the researcher mixed between two methods; interview and observation which gather both qualitative and quantitative data.

### **2.7.1 Interview analysis:**

As it is mentioned above, this method has been conducted among ten hybrid families of Tlemcen speech community, we divided them into two categories:

- **The first category**

Five families: the wives are from urban areas and the husbands are from rural areas; Nedroma, Znata, Remchi, Ghazawat, Ouchba they are under the acronym UWRH families

- **The second category**

Five families: the wives are from rural areas; Bni- snous, Znata, Henaya, Nedroma and the husbands are from urban areas they are under the acronym RWUH Families

### **Question 01: How do you find hybrid marriage?**

The aim of this question is to know the point of view of the two categories through their experience about this kind of marriage. So, as it is mentioned in the table below the majority of both family members (UWRH AND RWUH) claim that was really hard at the first period not just in linguistic side rather in other social and communicative sides but through time they got it. So they show their positive attitudes just one husband of RWUH family shows a negative attitude towards this marriage because of others reasons.

**Table 2.3: Attitudes of UWRH and RWUH families towards hybrid marriage**

<b>Family \ Attitude</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
UWRH Family	10	0	50% 00%
RWUH Family	9	1	45% 5%

**Question n°2: From your experience do you think families that are coming from different origin or region can affect communication? Would you agree? If yes, why?**

This question aimed at knowing if these families face some difficulties which affect communication and may leads to the misunderstanding.

**Table 2.4 the view of UWRH RWUH on the effectiveness of origin differences on communication.**

<b>Frequencies \ view</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
UWRH Family members	9	1
RWUH Family members	10	0
Percentages	45% 50%	5% 00%

As it is mentioned in the table above, the majority of the interviewees of both families show their strong agreement to the question. They all declare that there are some differences and they face some difficulties in terms of tradition and linguistic variation

that may affect communication since each region; rural and urban has its own features, they supported their answers by giving some examples in terms of accents and behaviour, the way of thinking in addition to the diversity of vocabulary like in the word eggs rural people say /bid/ or / baid/ unlike urban people who use the variation /wlad jdad / and that can lead to pragma linguistic failure. In addition, to some words or taboo words that are acceptable by one individual or in a community but prohibited in the other for example in the words [ndi: r] “I do” and [nta: ʃu] “his own” for instance, are regarded as taboo words and have some negative connotations by Tlemcen urban speakers and are replaced by terms including: [naʃməl] and [djalu], whereas it is normally spoken by rural speakers. In this respect, many wives of the two families claim that has been acquired by their husband family to change some words and replaced it to their terms.

- **Do you consider it as positive or negative?**

**Table 2.5 UWRH impression on origin / dialect differences**

<b>UWRH FAMILIES</b>	<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
<b>MALE</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25%</b> <b>00%</b>
<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b> <b>20%</b>

**Table 2.6 RWUH impression on origin/ dialect differences**

<b>RWUH FAMILIES</b>	<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>Percentages</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
<b>MALE</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10%</b>

As both tables reveal that the majority of UWRH family wives and husbands show their positive opinion and their acceptance of the other differences according to their experience and situations, just one wife shows her negative attitude and response that is positive or negative according to the husband behaviour and his family member’s mentality. In other hand, for RWUH families the data analysis show that couples from

one family viewed it as a negative factor lead to break down communication and many other problems.

**Question n°3: how do you feel when you don't understand each other?**

The question aimed at revealing the impact of misunderstanding situation on the participants and it is different from one individual to another.

According to the response of the informants, we may say that the majority of waves in both families show their positive affect, they showed their ability to learn the other side dialect, tradition, behaviour, culture .... To accommodate their speech and integrate themselves like the others side, just two waves from RWUH and one from UWRH families who have negative feelings, they felt themselves confused, neglected, uncomfortable and embarrassed. All these negative reactions can be explained by the feeling of non-belonging. In the case of husbands, they felt nothing and they consider it as a normal situation could happen between couple's in all kind of marriage since marriage is a fundamental pattern for male and female relationships and each one complete the other as they say.

**Question n°4: how do you face the lack of mutual intelligibility? Did you try to change your speech to reduce dissimilarities?**

The communicative medium in both kinds of families especially women support the idea of modifying their speech to sound like their husbands and their families in terms of accent, vocabulary and to converge themselves to minimize differences in order to felicitate communication and strength their relationships with their husband's and their family members, they are always asking for explanation. However, for men the majority of them in the two families clarify that they do not change their speech to preserve their belonging since men speech in Tlemcen speech community comparatively are the same in rural and urban regions rather than women speech and if they converge they do it unconsciously. Also, they link with their tradition and culture that women

(wife) in our tradition are obliged to follow their husband family especially ‘mother in law’ in everything; speech, behaviour, food, even the way of living.

**Question n° 5: who adjust his speech more to sounds like the other? (power of gender)**

This question attempts to know which gender in each family converge his speech more to others and which gender affected and influenced the other more. As it is mention in the table, women are mostly who tend to change their speech rather than men exception to a few words in which the degree of convergence is really weak in both families UWRH and RWUH. The results can be explained according to a psychological side which husbands in both families saw convergence to waves speech is an indicator of lack confidence on their personality and they consider this habit as a self-cancelling for them.

**Table 2. 7 Accommodation in correlation with gender**

Accommodation	Adjust		No adjust	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Families</b>				
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>UWRH</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Percentages</b>	<b>00%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>00%</b>
<b>RWUH</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Percentages</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5%</b>

**Question n°6: do you think that your speech has changed since you have come to live with your family or in this (village or city).**

This question is an attempt to know the impact of geographical place and family members on the speech of the two couples especially women’s since they are the category who change their living place when they get married in our society. The results

reveal that eight women from the two kind of families especially four women’s who have long period of marriage notice that their speech change gradually and unintentionally through time and they support the argument that the geographical place, period of marriage and the family environments play a crucial role in affecting speech. However, some rural and urban waves they keep some words from their local speech including the glottal stop /ʔ/ and the variant /g/.

**Question n°7: which linguistic features do you accommodate more when you try to converge your speech with the other side and according to which situation and context?**

The purpose of this question is to reveal the linguistic levels that are influenced and change more when the couples accommodate their speech of each other, and we are emphasize in this question in which original forms in their speech are avoided and which new forms are adopted. So, we tend to analyse the two families separately.

- **URBAN FAMILIES**

**1- The phonological variables:**

The phonological variables subject to linguistic accommodation in the two targeted dialect urban verses rural and vice versa.

1-the standard variable /q/ has two variants: urban /ʔ/ articulated by urban waves[UW] and rural /g/ and / q/ and /k/ articulated by rural husbands [RH].

So, while accounting the number of tokens for the variants [q]and [ʔ] and [g], [k] we choose those words where variation in the use of the four variants is possible, such as: [qa: l] vs [ʔa: l] vs [ga: l] vs [ka: l], [qalb] vs [ʔalb] vs [qalb] vs [kalb].

**Table 2. 8 the realization of the standard variable /q/ among UWRH and RWUH families.**

The realization	From rural to urban			From urban to rural			The percentages
	/q/ →/ʔ/	/g/→/ ʔ/	/k/→ /ʔ/	/ʔ/→/q/	/ʔ/→/g/	/ʔ/→/k/	

UWRH Families	Urban Wife	0	0	0	2	2	1	00% 25%
	Rural husband	0	0	0	0	0	0	00% 00%
RWUH Families	Rural wife	2	2	0	0	0	0	20% 00%
	Urban husband	0	0	0	2	2	0	00% 20%

- **UWRH FAMILIES**

The statistical data displayed in the table show the realization of the standard variable /q/ among waves and husbands in UWRH families, urban waves especially older women who have long period of marriage showed an accommodation to /g/ and /k/ and /q/ at the proportion of 25% with the maintenance of their original /ʔ/. However, rural husbands did not accommodate to the urban variants /ʔ/ which they considered as feminine and they show their strong maintenance of their native /g/ /q/ /k/.

- **RWUH FAMILIES**

As it is clarified in the table above, four rural waves who has long period of marriage show its adaptation of the glottal stop /ʔ/ and which is articulated by their urban husband members but not husbands since they mostly avoided to use it in their speech than urban women do because it characterizes as a sign of feminine. So they prefer to use the phoneme /q/. the rest rural waves show their strongly maintenance to their native phenomenon /q/ /g/.

2-the standard interdental fricative /θ/ has variant: voiceless dental stop [t] which is found in both rural and urban speech and [t] which characterises urban speech. In addition to the standard interdental fricative [θ] has the variant [d] that is produced by



both urban and rural speech. So, in order to examine the existence of these variants we select the word “**snow**” /əæɪz/ and “**Fly**” /ɸubaba/.

**Table2.9 the use and the realization and the percentages of the standard interdental fricative /θ/ and /ɸ/ among UWRH and RWUH families.**

		/θ/		percentages	/ɸ/		percentages
The realization		RR to UR	UR to RR		UR to RR	RR to UR	
		/θ/→/t/	/t/→/θ/		/ɸ/→/d/	/d/→/ɸ/	
UWRH FAMILIES	UW	5	0	25%	5	0	25%
				00%			00%
	RH	5	0	25%	4	1	20%
				00%			5%
RWUH FAMILIES	RW	4	1	20%	4	1	20%
				5%			5%
	UH	5	0	25%	5	0	25%
				00%			00%

- **UWRH FAMILIES**

As it is illustrated in the figure above, the standard interdental fricative [θ] and [ɸ] are totally absent among urban women they used [t] and [d] in their speech. instead, for rural husbands show their strong adaptation to the stops [t], [d] which are used: [t] for [θ], [d] for [ɸ] for example in the word [θaldʒ] which realised as [təldʒ].

- **RWUH FAMILIES**

In the case of the standard interdental fricative /θ/ and //ɸ/, all the participants; rural waves and urban husbands showed their strong used to the variants /t/ and /d/ in their speech. So, RWUH families especially rural waves showed a complete used and

accommodation to these variants example in the word /□ubaba/ which pronounced like /dəbana/and not /□əbana/.

## 2 -The morphological variable

The variable [u], [ah], [a]

The masculine pronoun [hu] realized as [u] among urban waves and as [ah], [a] among rural husbands in Tlemcen speech community.

**Table 2.10** the accommodation of the words “his room” among UWRH families

Word	Gloss	Realization		Urban Wife	Rural Husband	Percentages
		Rural →urban	Urban →rural			
Baita hu	His room	URBAN Speech	/ bitu /→/ bitu /	1	0	5%
			/			00%
			/bitu /→/bitah/	3	0	15%
					00%	
			/bitu/→/ bita/	1	0	5%
					00%	
		RURAL Speech	/bitah /→/bitah /	0	5	00%
						25%
			/bitah /→/bitu/	0	0	00%
						00%
	/bitah/ →/bita/	0	0	00%		
				00%		

- **UWRH FAMILIES**

As it is illustrated in the table above, urban wives in UWRH families have adopted the morphological variant [ah] and show the preference for the use of the non-native [ah] with their husband family rather their original feature [u] to avoid negative comments and achieve solidarity. Also, one urban wife accommodated the variant of their husband family [a] which they are from Nedroma and since the linguistic feature [ah] is original in the rural speech / region, rural husbands show their completely maintenance to their native feature and they scored 25%.

- **RWUH FAMILIES**

The variable /ah / and /u/

The result in the table below, reveals that the most rural wives keep their native variant /ah / just two rural wives who has long period of marriage about 49 years accommodate to the urban variant /u/. However, for urban husbands they are often use the rural variant /ah/ in their speech because it seems to be associated with toughness and manliness like the phonological variant /g/, just one husband who keep his local variant /u/and he scored 5%.

**Table 2.11 the realization of the word ‘his room’ among RWUH families.**

The word	The gloss	The realization	Rural Wife	Urban Husband	Percentages	
		Rural speech	/ bitah/ →/	3	0	15%
		→urban speech	/bitah/			00%
			/bitah/→/bitu/	2	0	20%
		Urban speech	/bitu/→/ bitah/	0	4	20%

		→rural speech				00%
			/bitu/ →/ bita/	0	0	00%
						00%
			/bitu/→/bitu/	0	1	00%
						5%

### 3-lexical variable

The use of CA pronoun /ʔanta/ ‘you’ and the words all, come her, where The lexical items [ntina] or [tina] [nta] and [kæmal], [ʔædʒi], [Fæjan] these lexical items distinguish urban speech from rural speech which characterised by the items [nta] [ga:ʃ], [arwah], [wi:n] in Tlemcen speech community. So we request the informants of UWRH families how this CA pronoun /ʔanta/ and the other words are realised.

- **UWRH Families**

As it is show in the table below, the result reveal that lexical items are much more influenced by the process of dialect contact and accommodation in these families especially among waves which strongly replaced their native items to their husband’s speech like in the words /ʔarwah/ ‘come here’ and /nta/ ‘you’. In contrast to them, rural husbands show the absence of accommodation among them and express their strongly maintenance of their local lexical items.

- **RWUH Families**

We may say that the researcher finds The same result that are found in UWRH Families since the result mention the strong maintenance of lexical items among urban husband’s exception of some words that are used in both rural and urban regions especially among young generation. In contrast to rural waves who shows a strong adaptation of non-native lexical items. The result can be explained according to cultural and traditional norms.

Table 2.12 the realization of lexical items among UWRH and RWUH families

Gloss	Realization	UWRH Families		Percentages	RWUH Families		
		Urban waves	Rural husbands		Rural wave	Urban husbands	Percentages
you	/tina/	2	0	10%	4	2	20%
	/ntina/			00%			10%
	/nta/	3	5	15%	1	3	5%
All				25%			15%
	/kæmal/	3	0	15%	3	2	15%
				00%			10%
	/ga:ʃ/	2	5	10%	2	3	10%
Come her				25%			15%
	/ʔædʒi/	2	0	10%	2	4	10%
				00%			20%
/where/	/arwah/	3	5	15%	3	1	15%
				25%			5%
	/fæjan/	3	1	15%	3	4	15%
				5%			20%
	/wi:n/	2	4	10%	2	1	10%
				20%			5%

**Question n°8: According to you what are the factors that leads to this accommodation and change?**

This question aims to know if the couples in the two kind families are aware and conscious about the factor and the reasons that leads them to change and adopts the speech of each other. The majority of them especially waves claim that the geographical place “setting”, traditional norm and the mentality of members, the period of marriage are factors that play a crucial role in changing and accommodating consciously and unconsciously through time in order to facilitate communication and strength relationships, avoiding problems and misunderstanding that leads to breakdown communication between the couples and their family members.

### **2.7.2 Observation analysis:**

During the research investigation, the researcher observed that dialect accommodation and language variation appears in different contexts and situations among hybrid families and this can be explained to the underlying assumption reported in Hudson (1998:78), that the choice of language “varies from domain to domain, and that domains are congruent combination of a particular kind of speaker and addressee, in a particular kind of place, talking about a particular kind of topic”. In interviewing with UWRH families, the researcher observed that four urban waves they are really proud of their local TA speech but in their first period of marriage change their speech in term of phonological, morphological lexical features to rural features especially when they are with their rural husband family in traditional family events like wedding, “Thara” etc..... for example, in [ʔədʒi nʔullək ħal ħadʒa], ‘Come, I will tell you one thing’ they prefer to avoid linguistic feature that characterize Tlemcen speech especially the production of the glottal stop [ʔ] and accommodate to rural speech by saying [ʔarwaḥ nguulək waħdəl ħaza] to avoid negative comments.

However, when they interact with relative and intimate TA friends they unconsciously, spontaneously use their TA speech. For rural husbands they are proud of sticking to their native rural features and if they accommodate they will do it consciously with strong aware in a way of joking with their waves in order to gain attention .... Therefore, they regarded the TA Speech as effeminate speech associated with female only. In other hand, during our observation in the case of RWUH families, we conclude

that three rural wives are obliged to accommodate their speech to their urban husband's speech in the phonological, morphological, lexical level for instance in the words ['wafɪta] 'what', [χuʝa] 'my brother', [jdi: r] 'do', [qe:s] 'throw' they replaced by TA terms; [ʔæsəm], [χɑ:j], [jaʃməl], [ʔərmi] in order to be well integrated in the environment of the urban society and this can be explained according to social, personal, psychological reasons. In the case of urban husbands, the majority of them become spontaneous to switch to rural speech and unconsciously use [g] especially outside with friends. However, they keep their local features with relatives and family members in term of accent, way of speaking.... According to one husband this can be explained in term of achieving solidarity with family and society.

## **2.8 Discussion and interpretation of the main results**

Every person has a unique and a special speech style that identify his belonging, since each region has a special variant. Moreover, Tlemcen speech community is rich linguistically, this large town divided into two main regions; urban like Tlemcen town and rural like Remchi, Zenata, Nedroma... the speech can change when people from the two regions come into contact depends on many situations and factors. Our investigation in this research was to answer the research questions which are about the existence of dialect accommodation among hybrid families and at what linguistic level and which gender adjust his speech more. Therefore, the researcher attempts to reject or confirm hypotheses which summarized as followed:

- Yes, accommodation is prominent in the speech of those families.
- Females change their speech and accommodate more than male do
- The linguistic items that witnessed the change are; phonological, morphological, lexical.

The result of research instruments used in this research indicated that the majority of both families confirmed the first hypotheses that dialect accommodation is existed in their daily communication especially among families who has long period of marriage. According to the finding, women in this study are significantly much more to

accommodation than non-accommodation, they have shown tendency to adopt new forms from their husband's speech with the maintenance of their native variant. Additionally, they have demonstrated an openness to change in the way of living and behaving. In contrast, the result reveals that the majority of men have shown a strong conservatism in term of linguistic and behaviour with weak adaptation of target variation. Therefore, the second hypothesis is confirmed.

Furthermore, the noticeable findings illustrate that the linguistics features that witnessed change especially among waves are the phonological, morphological, lexical items. Thus, we can say that the last hypothesis confirmation is obtained.

This chapter introduced the main factors and motivations that are responsible for dialect accommodation between couples in the two categories of families.

- **Geographical place “setting”**

Moving to other place to live is one of the main factors that leads to linguistic change and variation. In this research, waves [ urban, rural] who change their environment and place to live with their husband family state that the setting plays a crucial role in affecting and changing their dialect in term of accent, pronunciation, lexis etc. ... especially when interacting with their family members and other people of the community to avoid comment and strength relationship.

- **Period of marriage**

The researcher discovers that the long period of marriage in this kind of families affect strongly their way of speaking and this applies specially to waves. Families (UWRH and RWUH) whose marriage lasts more than 30 and 40 years their dialect, accent change completely through time consciously and non-consciously in many linguistic level rather than families whose marriage is less than 10 years.

- **Traditional norms**

Traditional norms in Algerian society is one of the social norms that has a great impact on social relationships especially in the case of Tlemcenian marriage. traditional



norms impose the wife to follow her husband family in their way of living, speaking, behaving etc....

### **2.9 Suggestion and recommendation for further research:**

During this investigation, the researcher observed that this investigation has no limit which can leads to other research about the linguistic situation of the hybrid families and their children. For example: what is the code [dialect] choice of children in hybrid families especially in both UWRH and UHRW families or the diversity of origin of parents can affect the language choice of children.

### **2.10 Conclusion:**

This chapter is devoted to statistical analysis and interpretation of the main finding about the dialect accommodation in hybrid families in Tlemcen speech community. Also, the researcher aims to clarify the research tools used for the investigation. This chapter included the analysis of the data collection and the discussion of the main finding. To conclude, the investigator provided some suggestions and recommendations for further research.

*General*  
*Conclusion*

## **General conclusion**

Everything is changeable, nothing stays fixed in the world. Language changes and varies from one person to another, from region to region and even within the same family from situation to situation. It has been discussed that people have an innate ability to adjust and accommodate their communication in various ways in interaction with others. Sociolinguists and dialectologists were the first researcher who attempted to study this situation of change.

This case study has investigated two kinds of hybrid families where couples come from different regions; rural and urban under the acronyms UWRH and RWUH families in Tlemcen speech community. This paper mainly sought to examine the existence of dialect accommodation among these families and at what linguistic level; phonological, morphological, lexical. In addition, it carries to see which gender adjust his speech style and at what direction, the factors and the motives that lead to this linguistic situation among the couples of each family.

To explore the issues mentioned above, the researcher analysed and interpreted the case study in a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The essential purpose was to answer the research questions presented previously.

This research was divided into two main chapters. The first part was devoted to the theoretical overview of sociolinguistics. It introduced the definitions of the main concepts related to topic under investigation like dialectology and sociolinguistics as well as language accommodation theory. The second chapter deals with the practical part by analysing the linguistic situation of hybrid families.

This investigation undertook a study under hybrid family's in Tlemcen speech community. The researcher moves outside to the home of only five families and for the rest five families, she contact them and interviewing them via social media; Facebook and WhatsApp because of corona virus pandemic. Second chapter tries to present the basic steps of the case study. It sought to describe the situation, research instruments used, and analysing data through qualitative and quantitative approaches. The researcher selected two research instruments including; interview and observation which were

oriented to these families to uncover dialect accommodation, at what linguistic levels and to know the factors that leads to this linguistic outcome.

Findings demonstrate that dialect accommodation is existing among hybrid families especially waves they adjust their speech style and adopt some variants than husband do in the two kind of families; UWRH and RWUH in many linguistic levels; phonological, morphological, lexical.

Further finding reveals that the reason behind the existence of dialect accommodation in these families is geographical place, period of marriage, traditional norms which plays a great role in affecting language use and leads to this change.

Finally, this research work can open the door to further research for example; what is the code choice of children in hybrid families or how can the diversity of parents affect the language choice of children.

# ***BIBLIOGRAPHY***

## **Bibliography:**

- Ball, M, J. (2005). *Clinical Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell publishing Ltd.
- Chambers, John, K. & Trudgill, P. (1998). *Dialectology*. Cambridge: University Press.
- .(2003). *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- .(2004). *Dialectology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Chambers, J.K and Natalie Schilling. (2013). *The Handbook of language Variation and Change*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Wiley-Blackwell publishing Ltd.
- Dendane, Z. (2007). *Sociolinguistic Variation and Attitudes towards language behaviour. Tlemcen Speech Community, an Algerian Context*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Dendane, Z. (2013). The stigmatisation of the glottal stop in Tlemcen speech community: An indicator of dialect shift. *International journal of linguistics and literature (IJLL)*. Vol 2. 1-10.
- Gary, k. Robert, O. Keohane & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton university press.
- Gumperz, John, J (ed) (1983). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge university press.
- Giles, H. & Ogay, T. (2007). *Communication Accommodation Theory*. California university, Santa Barbara. In. B.B. Whaley & W. Samter (Eds), *Explaining communication: contemporary theories and exemplars* (pp.293-310).
- Giles, H. (2016). *Communication Accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities across Contexts*. Cambridge university press.
- Hudson, R.A. (1996) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge university press.

- Holmes, J. (2012) (4<sup>th</sup> ed). An introduction to sociolinguistics. Longman: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Kherbache, F. (2017). A Sociolinguistic Study of Dialect Contact and Accommodation in Beni- Snous. Doctorate thesis. Tlemcen university. Tlemcen
- Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). Research Methodology and Techniques. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. New Delhi: New Age International (p) Ltd.
- Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- O' Leary, Z. (2004). The Essential Guide to Doing Research. London: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M.Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.
- Peter, A. Frans, H and Paul, K. (2005). Dialect change: convergence and divergence in European languages. Cambridge university press.
- Romaine, S. (2001). 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Language in society: An Introduction to sociolinguistics. Oxford university press.
- Sapir, E. (1921). Language: introduction to the study of speech. New York: Harcourt brace.
- Wardhaught, R. (2006). An introduction to sociolinguistics. London: Blackwell.
- Wolfram, W. Temple Adger, C & Christian, D. (1999). Dialects in Schools and Communities. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Yule, G. (2006). The study of language, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

## Webography:

-Changjuan, Z. (2013). Speech Community and SLA. Journal of language and teaching and research, vol 4, No 6, pp. 1327-1331. Academic publisher. In

<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/speech-community-and-SLA-Zhan>.

-Hudson, R. A (1996). Language and dialectology. In <http://www.squidoo.com/languageanddialect.html>. Accessed on:02/04/2020.

-Ozlam, A. (2015). Introduction. Accommodation Theory and language teaching. (Giles,1973). In

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/29195705AccommodationTheory>

(15/02/2020).

-Morgan, M. (2004). What are speech communities? . Cambridge University. In

Press<http://assets.cambridge.org/97811070/23505/>(23/03/2020).

-Merriam Webster world. Accent definitions. In

<https://meriamwebster.com/dictionary/accent>. (08/05/2020)

-Patrick, P. L. (1999). The Speech Community: Some definitions. In

<https://www.cousehero.com/file/41668709/Speech-Community-Some-Definitions.pdf/>

( 23/03/2020).

-Paoletti, I. (2011). Sociolinguistics. Sociopedia.isa. Universidade nova de lisboa.portugal.<https://www.coursehero.com/file/32171704/Sociolinguistics.pdf/>.

-Wieling, M. Nerbonne, J. Baayen, RH. (2011). Quantitative Social Dialectology: Explaining Linguistic Variation Geographically and Socially. PLoS ONE 6(9): e23613.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0023613. In

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=101371/journal.pone.0023613>.

(13/05/2020).



# *Appendixes*

Appendix 'A'

# INTERVIEW

• Respondent's information

AGE	Gender	Residence	Origin	Place of birth	Native dialect	Period of marriage

• **INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

1. HOW DO YOU FIND HYBRID MARRIAGE?

.....  
.....

2. From your experience do you think families that are coming from different origin or region can affect communication? Which means face some difficulties

-would you argue? If yes, why?

.....  
.....

- Do you consider it as positive or negative?

.....  
.....

3. How do you feel when you don't understand each other?

.....  
.....

4. How do you face the lack of mutual intelligibility? Did you try to change your speech to reduce dissimilarities?

.....  
.....

5. Who adjust his speech more to sound like the other? (power of gender)

- Can you provide examples

.....  
.....

6. Do you think that your speech has changed since you have come to live with your family or in this (village or city)?

Very little                       somewhat                       to a great extent

- How it changes?

.....  
.....

7. Which linguistic features do you accommodate more when you try to converge your speech with the other side and according to which contexts or situations?

.....  
.....

❖ According to the phonological level:

- How does these variable realized in your situation (from rural to urban or from urban to rural)?

1- the variable /q/

[g] [q] [ʔ]

-how do you pronounce the word: heart, he said to me?

.....  
.....

2- the standard interdental fricative /θ/ and / ð /.

[t] [d]

-how does the word: Snow and fly, pronounce according to you?

.....  
.....

❖ According to the morphological level:

1- The variable /ah/ /u/ /ə/

-How do you pronounce the words like < his room> according to your situation?

.....  
.....

❖ According to lexical level:

1-how does these words realized in your situation: you, come, he wanted, what, take off, he does, all.

.....  
.....

8. According to you what are the factors that leads to this accommodation and change?

-Is It Geographical or Cultural, Traditional, level of Education, period of marriage, mentality of members .....?

.....  
.....  
.....

Appendix 'B'

**OBSERVATION CHECKLIST**

❖ **INFORMATION :**

- **CONTEXT :**
- **PLACE :**
- **TOPIC :**

❖ **PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND :**

-GENDER  MALE  FEMALE

-ORIGIN  RURAL  URBAN

-HOME VARIETY: Reality  Context:

• **LINGUISTIC VARIATION:**

-YES  -NO

EXAMPLE.....  
.....

• **PHONOLOGY:**

-YES  -NO

EXAMPLE.....  
.....

• **MORPHOLOGY:**

-YES  -NO

EXAMPLE.....  
.....

• **LEXIS:**

-YES  -NO

EXAMPLE.....  
.....

• **SENTENCE:**

-YES  -NO

EXAMPLE.....  
.....

• **INTONATION:**

-YES  -NO

EXAMPLE.....  
.....

• **ATTITUDE OF PARTICIPANTS TOWARDS THEIR DIALECT:**

-PROUD  -EMBARRASSED

## المخلص:

الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو تسليط الضوء حول مسألة إمكانية وجود ظاهرة التكيف اللهجي والتعديل اللغوي عند العائلات المختلطة المتكونة من زوجات وأزواج ذو الأصول والمناطق المتفرقة: الريفية والحضرية التابعة لولاية تلمسان، كما تسعى إلى تحليل النتائج اللغوية الظاهرة في كلام الأسر المختلطة المتكونة من نوعين: / زح زر/ و/ زرزح /. كما تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد النوع الذكر والأنثى الأكثر تعديلا وتغييرا لخطابه وإلى أي اتجاه. ومن هذا المنطلق، تفحص هذه الدراسة التغير اللغوي الذي يحدث في خطاب الأسر من خلال عملية التعديل اللغوي، الهدف الرئيسي هو إبراز أي الصيغة الجديدة المكتسبة وأي الصيغة المحلية / الأصلية المتخلي عنها من الجانب السوسيو لغوي خاصة: الفونولوجي، المورفولوجي، المفردات المعجمية ومن خلال ذلك يتم الكشف على العوامل والدوافع المؤدية إلى هذا التغير اللغوي في خطاب الأسر المختلطة.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** التكيف اللهجي – الأسر المختلطة – الزوجات والأزواج – الريف والحضر – الجنس – الاكتساب / التخلي الفونولوجي / المورفولوجي / المعجمي – التغير اللغوي

## Résumé :

Le but de cette recherche sociolinguistique est de faire la lumière sur l'existence du phénomène de l'accommodement dialectique parmi/chez les familles hybrides dont les vagues et les maris qui sont de différentes origine et regions ; urbaines et rurales dans la communauté vocale de Tlemcen et analyser les conséquences linguistiques dans le discours de deux types des familles hybrides ; UFRM et RMUF familles. Alors qu'il cherchait à décrire quel genre d'homme / femme ajustent et changent son discours de plus en plus et dans quelle direction. Egalement, cette étude examine la variation linguistique et le changement qui se produit dans le discours de ces familles à travers du processus d'adaptation linguistique, l'objectif est de savoir quel nouveau formulaire est adopté et quel formulaire local/original est réduit en termes de trois niveaux linguistiques ; phonologique, morphologique, lexical et découvrir les principaux facteurs et motifs qui mènent au changement linguistique dans le discours de ces familles.

**Les mots clé :** l'accommodement dialectique - les familles hybrides – les vagues / les maris - urbaine / rural régions – genre –phonologique / morphologique / lexical adaptation /réduction – le changement linguistique

## Summary:

The purpose of this sociolinguistics research is to shed light on the existence of the phenomenon of dialect accommodation among hybrid families which waves and husbands are from different origins and regions; urban and rural in Tlemcen speech community and analyse it linguistic consequences in the speech of two kind of hybrid families; UWRH and RWUH families. As it sought to describe which gender male/ female adjust his speech more and at what direction. Also, this study examines the linguistic variation and change that occurs in the speech of these families through the process of linguistic accommodation, the objective is to find out which new forms are adopted and which local / original forms are reduced in terms of the three linguistic levels; phonological, morphological, lexical and discover the main factors and motives that leads to the linguistic change in these families' speech.

**Key words:** Dialect accommodation – hybrid families – waves / husbands - urban / rural regions- gender –phonological / morphological / lexical adaptation / reduction- linguistic change.