

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Tlemcen



Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English
Section of English

**Language Attitudes Towards the Algerian Dialects: The
Dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia.**

Dissertation submitted to the department of English as a partial fulfilment
of the requirements for Master's degree in language studies

Presented by

Ms. Nor El Houda Rahou

Supervised by

Dr. Fatma Kherbache

Board of Examiners

Dr. Benguedda Amina

MCA

President

Dr. Kherbache Fatma

MCA

Supervisor

Dr. Belhadj-Tahar Kamila

MCB

Examiner

Academic Year: 2023 – 2024

DECLARATION

Declaration of Originality

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which has been accepted for the qualification of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution. I also certify that the present work contains no plagiarism and is the result of my own investigation, except where otherwise stated.

Miss:

Date:

DEDICATION

To me, myself and I

With all gratitude, to my beloved parents Soumia B. And Nasreddine Rahou

To my three sisters Yousra, Chaima and Radia, special thanks to them and for their patience handling my mood swings during this journey

To my girls and all my friends, thank you for the good memories and for the laughs throughout the past five years

Special thanks to my beautiful girl and my high school friend Nor El Houda Meliani

Thanks to my cousins Karim and Bouazza for their help with my practical side of the research specifically the audio-recording part

To all my teachers who left a mark in me, thank you so much

To my family

And last but not least, my garden will always bloom because no matter what, after every winter comes spring and after every storm comes a [Blue Sky](#)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would love to express my sincere gratitude for my supervisor Dr. Fatma Kherbache, for her support, guidance, advice, and for her efforts to bring out the best of me. This research work would never reach this level of decency without her attention to details.

I would also love to thank the members of the jury Dr. Benguedda Amina and Dr. Belhadj Kamila for taking their precious time to review and evaluate this work.

Special thanks and gratefulness for all of my teachers at the department of English of Tlemcen University, for their guidance and their shared knowledge throughout the years.

Also, thanks to all the respondents who took time to answer my questions.

Finally, Special thanks to my secondary school English teacher Mr. Yaala who made me fall in love with English even more.

ABSTRACT

The present research work is an attempt to analyze the language attitudes Algerians hold towards the dialects of the neighbouring speech communities of Tlemcen and Maghnia. The purpose is to explore how can speech variation have a significant impact on people's perceptions towards the speakers' themselves and their characters as well. Additionally, this research aims to investigate whether males and females rate, judge or react differently on speakers of different dialects. To achieve the research goals, a mixed method approach was adopted. Thus, the investigation has been accomplished using three research instruments including the interview, audio-recording and a questionnaire. The main results suggest that attitudes towards the dialect of Tlemcen and the dialect of Maghnia are influenced by both the personality traits attributed to speakers and the gender of the listeners. Tlemcen dialect is associated with power traits, while Maghnia dialect is associated with solidarity traits. Also, Female participants showed a greater sensitivity to dialect differences across all traits compared to male participants. Additionally, a significant portion of participants felt a stronger connection to their own dialect and viewed the Tlemcen dialect as more prestigious. These findings highlight the complex and multifaceted nature of language attitudes within the Algerian community, reflecting how social and personal factors shape perceptions of linguistic varieties.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration.....	I
Dedication.....	II
Acknowledgments.....	III
Abstract.....	IV
Table of Contents.....	V
List of Tables.....	VIII
Transcription and Transliteration.....	IX
List of Abbreviations.....	XI
General Introduction.....	1
1 CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Introduction to language attitudes	4
1.2.1 Attitudes.....	4
1.2.2 Language Attitudes.....	5
1.3 Language ideologies.....	8
1.4 Social Stereotypes	8
1.5 Main approaches to the study of Language attitudes	10
1.5.1 The societal treatment approach.....	11
1.5.2 The direct approach	12
1.5.3 The Indirect approach or the MGT.....	13
1.5.3.1 Strengths.....	14
1.5.3.2 Weaknesses	15
1.6 The linguistic situation in Algeria.....	16
1.6.1 Modern Standard Arabic	17
1.6.2 Algerian Arabic	17
1.6.3 Berber	18
1.6.4 French	19
1.7 Language Vs Dialect	19
1.8 The speech of Tlemcen.....	20
1.9 The speech of Maghnia	21
1.10 Conclusion.....	23

2	CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY, DATA ANALYSIS, INTREPRETATION AND DISCUSSION	24
2.1	Introduction	24
2.2	Methodology	24
2.3	Research Design	24
2.4	Data Collection.....	25
2.4.1	Procedures:	25
2.4.2	Steps:	26
2.5	Research Approaches	26
2.5.1	Quantitative Approach:.....	27
2.5.2	Qualitative Approach:.....	27
2.6	Research Instruments	28
2.6.1	Audio-recording tool:	28
2.6.2	Questionnaire:.....	28
2.6.3	Interview:.....	29
2.7	Participants and The Speakers.....	30
2.7.1	Speakers:.....	30
2.7.2	Raters:	30
2.7.3	Interviewees:.....	31
2.8	Phonological and Lexical Variation.....	31
2.8.1	Phonological Variation:.....	31
2.8.2	Lexical Variation:	31
2.9	The Analysis of Data.....	32
2.9.1	Analysis of the Questionnaire	32
2.9.1.1	Part One of the Questionnaire	32
2.9.1.2	Part Two of the Questionnaire	32
2.9.1.3	Part Three of the Questionnaire	35
2.9.2	Analysis of the Interviews	38
2.9.2.1	Part One of the Interview: First Impressions	38
2.9.2.2	Part Two of the Interview: Personal Preferences.....	38
2.10	Interpretation and Discussion of the Results.....	39
2.10.1	Interpretation of the Questionnaire.....	39
2.10.1.1	Solidarity and Power.....	40

2.10.1.2	Males and Females rate differently.....	41
2.10.1.3	Personal Preferences	41
2.10.2	Interpretation of the Interview	42
2.10.2.1	Part One: First Impression	42
2.10.2.2	Part Two: Personal Preferences	43
2.10.3	Discussion of the Results and Conclusion.....	43
	General Conclusion.....	46
	Bibliography.....	48
	Appendices.....	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Gender and Age Group of the Raters.....	30
Table 2.2: Interviewees by Age and Gender.....	31
Table 2.3: Phonological Variation.....	31
Table 2.4: Lexical Variation.....	31
Table 2.5: Descriptive Statistics for the Different Attitudes Towards Speakers of Tlemcen and Maghnia.....	33
Table 2.6: Descriptive Statistics for the Female Raters.....	34
Table 2.7: Descriptive Statistics for the Male Raters.....	35
Table 2.8: Distribution of Participants' Feeling of Connection Based on Dialect.....	35
Table 2.9: Participants' Choice of a Prestigious Dialect.....	36
Table 2.10: Word Preferences of Tlemcen Dialect.....	36
Table 2.11: Disliked words in Tlemcen Dialect.....	37
Table 2.12: Disliked Words in Maghnia Dialect.....	37
Table 2.13: Word Preferences of Maghnia Dialect.....	37

TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLITERATION

Arabic Script	IPA symbol	Symbols used in IVAr
Consonants		
أ - الهمزة	ʔ	2
ب	b	b
ت	t	t
ث	θ	th
ج	ʒ	j
ح	ħ	H
خ	x	x
د	d	d
ذ	ð	dh
ر	r	r
ز	z	z
س	s	s
ش	ʃ	sh
ص	ʃ	sh
ض	ʒ	ʒ
ط	tʰ	T
ظ	dʰ, zʰ	DH, Z
ع	ʕ	ʕ
غ	ɣ	gh
ف	f	f
ق	q	q
ك	k	k
گ	g	g
ل	l	l
م	m	m
ن	n	n
هـ	h	h
و	w	w
ي	j	y
v	v	v

Vowels		
ا	æ	ɑ:
ي	i:, eɪ	i:, e:
و	u:, oɪ	u:, o:
أَ قحمة	ɑ	ɑ
إِ كسرة	i	i
أُ ضمة	u	u

Source: Adopted from

<https://reshare.ukdataservice.ac.uk/852878/15/transliteration.pdf>

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

MGT Matched-Guise Technique

MSA Modern Standard Arabic

CA Classical Arabic

AA Algerian Arabic

SYR Numerus Syrorum

SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

ANOVA Analysis of Variance

F Female

M Male

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

Since the early 1930s, researchers in both behavioural and social sciences showed interest in language attitudes which became a fundamental aspect in the fields of sociology, psychology, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics. Sociolinguists and linguists have long carried numerous studies pointing out that language variations hold social meanings and that language cannot be separated from its social context. Hence, language variation can initiate different attitudinal reactions, or even social advantage or disadvantage. Individuals form attitudes to all levels of the language including: spelling, pronunciation, words, grammar, accents, dialects and languages.

The Algerian speech community exhibits a complex linguistic figure that resulted from political and historical events. Algeria, originally a Berber community, experienced long-term colonization by Romans, Byzantines, Arabs, Spanish, Ottomans and eventually by the French. Such great events caused a massive language contact that shaped the linguistic system of Algeria which became a multilingual speech community where Arabic-speaking Algerians represent the majority. Arabic in its standard form – labelled by Ferguson (1959) as the High variety– was officialised since the independence from France in 1962, and used only for “Higher” and formal contexts (media, religious speech, education, administrations), while dialectal forms of Arabic – the “Low” varieties– represent the real mother tongue of most Algerians. The tight relationship between language and the social identity forces the individuals to react to language either positively or negatively. It often takes only few moments to form an impression on the speaker’s personality, hence, to categorize them as “in-group” or “outgroup” members.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to explore language attitudes towards the dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia in western Algeria, and find any potential gender-based variations in attitudes.

Hence, this research aims to provide answers for the following questions:

1. What are language attitudes people in the West of Algeria hold towards the dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia?

General Introduction

2. Do males and females have the same attitudes towards the two dialects?

The above questions led to formulate the following hypotheses:

1. People are most likely to hold positive attitudes towards the dialect of Tlemcen and perceive it as prestigious. On the other hand, the dialect of Maghnia is seen as less prestigious.
2. It is possible that individuals of different genders tend to evaluate and assess others based on their spoken language variation.

In order to answer the questions above, the researcher attempts to design an explanatory case study research collecting both qualitative and quantitative data relying on both a questionnaire in which respondents from the west of Algeria (specifically the inhabitants of the Wilaya of Tlemcen) are asked to listen to recordings of both speakers from Tlemcen and Maghnia, then answer the questions, and also interviews, where respondents are interviewed to collect qualitative data. The results will be analysed on the basis of a mixed method approach.

In order to conduct the case study research, this work will be split into two interconnected chapters. The first chapter will include a review of the literature on attitudes and the theoretical background concerning the issue, aiming to provide a general understanding on language attitudes, both in general and in relation to the Algerian community. The second chapter will be devoted to the research design, methodology, a detailed description of the data collection process, and the research instruments. It will also include the analysis and interpretation of the collected data, seeking answers to the research questions by confirming or rejecting the research hypotheses, and will conclude with the research results.

**CHAPTER ONE:
LITERATURE REVIEW**

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

Most researchers agree that the investigation of attitudes towards spoken, written and signed languages are of great importance. This field of study receives attention from sociolinguists in particular who introduced the significance of investigating language attitudes. A wide range of topics can be covered by the study of language attitudes, and the rationale for investigating this field varies depending on the specific area of focus. The main focus of the current study is to investigate attitudes towards the dialects of both Tlemcen and Maghnia.

This chapter begins first with a review about the nature of attitudes in general without specifically focusing on whether it relates to language or not. That is because the comprehension of language attitudes requires initial understanding of attitudes as a concept, including the main frameworks that explored attitudes: Behaviourism and Mentalism. The current chapter will put emphasis on the complex interplay between language attitudes, language ideologies, and social stereotypes, since language attitudes reflect societal norms and values, and also play a significant role to the construction of language hierarchies. This chapter will also deal with the main methodological approaches that researchers follow in order to investigate attitudes towards language variation including: the societal treatment approach, the direct approach and the indirect approach (the matched-guise technique). At the end, this chapter will turn its focus to explain the complex linguistic situation in Algeria, then in the towns of Tlemcen and Maghnia, and also mention the main linguistic features that belong to each town, in addition to a brief explanation about the difference between ‘language’ and ‘dialect’.

1.2 Introduction to language attitudes

Language attitudes explore people's explicit views on language, including features and stereotypes. Researchers seek to uncover the roots of these attitudes, whether in specific linguistic forms or broader categories like regional dialects. These studies unveil differences within and between communities, shedding light on how social group memberships shape attitudes. Distinguishing between attitudes towards language varieties and the groups associated with them poses a challenge in this research.

1.2.1 Attitudes

Research about attitudes can be done within two frameworks: Behaviourism and Mentalism. Initially, in behaviourism, attitudes were considered to be situated within the individual's behavioural response to various stimuli. Later on, however, it turned out that behaviour is not likely to be consistent from a context to another, Ajzen (1988:45 as cited by Ruth Kircher; 2022) puts that: 'very particular instance of human action is [...] determined by a unique set of factors. Any change in circumstances be it ever so slight, might produce a different reaction'. Thus, when it comes to a person's behaviour in a given situation, attitudes are not the only influencing factors but the context, the setting and the targets are to be counted as well. Also, when someone reacts or behaves in a certain way in a particular situation, that does not mean he/she will behave in the same way again. This leads to a major problem since the behaviour's instances are rather unreliable for indicating attitudes. Hence, the behaviourist framework was dropped and the new mentalist approach was adopted, and according to this framework, the individuals' behaviours are rather influenced by attitudes instead of being fully determined by them.

One of the classic definitions about attitudes is by Allport (1935 as cited by Garrett et al. 2003) who explains it as: "a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related." Thus, according to Allport, attitudes refer to a situation where the individual is mentally bound by his formal experiences that affect his response towards all objects and situations he encounters. Ajzen (1988:4) defines attitudes as "a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object,

Chapter One: Literature Review

person, institution, or event.” Attitudes in general, refers to a variety of beliefs and behaviours held by individuals towards a certain object, person, or event. Such attitudes are formed by multiple factors like personal experience, social background, education, and observation etc. Oppenheim (1982), in his definition of attitudes, refers to the various outcomes used by people during the process of inferring others’ attitudes. He defines attitudes as: **“A construct, an abstraction which cannot be directly apprehended. It is an inner component of mental life which expresses itself, directly or indirectly, through such more obvious processes as stereotypes, beliefs, verbal statements or reactions, ideas and opinions, selective recall, anger or satisfaction or some other emotion and in various other aspects of behaviour.”** (Oppenheim, 1982:39)

It is clearly stated in the opening of Oppenheim’s definition that attitude is a psychological construct. However, constructs cannot be noticed directly. Thus, it is crucial for people to rely on their own ability to infer these attitudes. As Allport (1935:806) explains: “the individual would be somehow confused without the guiding attitudes. They need some kind of perception before making any sort of reaction or reflex. Attitudes are what determine for the individuals what are they going to see, hear, think, or will do.” Attitudes have a selective influence on how information is processed favouring ideas that align with the pre-existing beliefs. M. Sherif (1967) suggests that these attitudes are both socially-structured and socially-structuring, viewing them as a significant part of what the person learns and forms through the process of human socialization. He puts it as: **“When we talk about attitudes, we are talking about what a person has learned in the process of becoming a member of a family, a member of a group, and of society that makes him [sic] react to his social world in a consistent and characteristic way, instead of a transitory and haphazard way.”** M. Sherif (1967:2)

1.2.2 Language Attitudes

Because linguistic attitudes have the potential to impact not just a speaker's identity but also their behaviour, they have been a subject of interest for several social psychology researchers over the years. However, language attitudes—the term coined to describe people's opinions on a language or dialect and its connotations—was not officially studied by linguists until 1960s, when Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, and Fillebaum began publishing studies on the subject. Based on the previous understanding

Chapter One: Literature Review

of attitudes in general, *language attitudes* hence, can be defined as a set of beliefs, and behaviours towards different language varieties and their speakers'. Human communication is achieved through the use of language which is also a potent social force that accomplishes way much more than only transmit information, for example it shows it speakers' both personal and social characteristics.

The speaker's speech patterns, language variation, vocabulary, dialect or accent, etc. can play the role of markers that urge the listeners to form judgements over that speaker's personality, looks, character, even their social status and so on. Baker (1992) defines language attitudes as views about "language groups, a language itself, its features, uses, cultural variety which may be restoration, preservation, decay or death." He underlined that attitudes towards a language might affect the choice of whether people preserve it and pass it on to next generations, or whether they let it fade away. While Ryan et al. (1982) defined language attitudes as "any affective, cognitive or behavioural index of evaluative reactions towards different language varieties or speakers." Such definition emphasized the evaluative character of language attitudes and their influence on language perception, usage and social interaction. For Obiols (2002) on the other hand, attitudes play the role of a bridge that stands between an opinion and a behaviour.

Kircher (2022) referred to Ryan et al.'s classic definition of language attitudes, saying it "only makes reference to attitudes towards entire varieties (i.e. languages, dialects, accents)", he adds that "there is an increasing amount of research on people's opinions towards specific language aspects such as quotatives (Buchstaller 2006), vocal fry (e.g. Yuasa 2010), code-switching (Dewaele and Wei 2014), forms of address (Moyna and Loureiro-Rodríguez 2017), and multilingualism (Kircher et al. 2022). These topics are all part of language attitudes."

Ruth Kircher (2022) when he defined language attitudes, he referred to the necessity of involving the language users which is justified because of the tight connection between language and social identity (Tajfel and Turner 1986). This social identity is shaped by the individual's self-concept that is related to their social membership including: age, gender, cultural background, etc. Each person belongs to different social

Chapter One: Literature Review

groups and have different social identities according to these groups. What is worth noting as mentioned by Tajfel and Turner (1986) is that not all the differences found between social groups hold evaluative importance, and the significance of each differences in fact vary across the various groups. However, extensive research has consistently recognized language as a crucial symbol of social identity, representing "an emblem of group membership" in language communities worldwide.

Consequently, the social meaning of the language influences people's attitudes on the different language varieties and their users. Zipp (2022) referred to Appel and Mysken (1984) who argued that language attitudes are mainly social attitudes, as individuals evaluate a 'language' based on the social status of its users. When meeting new people, individuals tend to use language cues to indicate their social groups and the stereotypes associated to these indicated groups. Hence, attitudes towards a certain language variety reflect attitudes towards its speakers, this association is supported by two cognitive processes: categorization and stereotypes. These processes of categorization and stereotyping hold a significant role in the process of shaping language attitudes (Dragojevic and Giles 2016; Lambert 1967; Ryan 1983; Dragojevic et al. 2018). The importance of language as a means of expressing social identity is evident in the fact that it can serve as a critical and potentially a primary marker of an individual's social group membership.

According to Laura Zipp and Ruth Kircher (2022), the attitudes held by others towards languages are in fact influenced by how they perceive the speakers of the language instead of the quality of the language itself. Meaning that attitudes are shaped by the social status and the prestige associated with the language within a certain speech community. Giles' experiments confirmed the assumption that language attitudes are more about societal norms and personal preferences instead of just only inherent values. These attitudes change by the change in status and prestige of the language users, in addition to the societal and cultural developments. Hence, language attitudes are capable of evolving over time since people change the way they socially identify themselves.

Language usage variation holds significant social implications that can evoke various reactions in terms of language attitudes and social advantages or disadvantages.

Chapter One: Literature Review

Even though people may believe that there are multiple ways to express their opinions in their own language, they are still able to hold attitudes towards the different aspects of language. This encompasses languages as a whole, dialects, accents, words, grammar, spelling, and even the speed at which a speaker communicates, whether it is fast or slow, can prompt listeners to react, (Garret, 2010). For instance, Attitudes toward languages are influenced by standardization, which is tied to ideologies of correctness and uniformity. For example, the way minority languages are perceived is impacted by the standard language ideology, hence impacting their survival and it shapes the attitudes towards in-migrant languages as well.

1.3 Language ideologies

Fishman, Labov and Meyrowitz are some of the famous names in the field of sociolinguistics who delved into the concept of language ideologies that includes: nationalism, nativism, and standard language ideology. They argued that these ideologies play a crucial role in the shaping of individual's attitudes towards language varieties. The nationalist ideology considers the language as a symbol for national identity and unity, and this often leads to marginalization of minority varieties. While the nativist ideology favours native speakers over others, and this frequently results in the discrimination of non-natives despite their level of proficiency. Additionally, standard language ideology places emphasis on language purity and prestige, thereby marginalizing non-standard varieties. Recognizing these language ideologies is essential for a comprehensive understanding of language attitudes dynamics. These ideologies shed light on how language varieties are perceived, valued, and judged in societies, leading to linguistic discrimination, marginalization, and inequality.

1.4 Social Stereotypes

Garrett (2010) writes that **“Cognitive processes in language attitudes are influenced by individual and collective functions resulting from stereotyping in social group relations.”** Social categorization forms the basis of such stereotyping, involving the division of the world into social groups and the classification of individuals based on shared characteristics of a specific group (Smith and Mackie 2000: 160). Consequently, what can be understood is that cognitive processes, as well as social interactions and

Chapter One: Literature Review

stereotypes shape language attitudes, as social categorization holds significance in grouping individuals based on their shared characteristics. Garrett adds that these groups can vary widely, including people from specific countries, regions, or cities, individuals who drive certain types of cars, cyclists, used-car dealers, academics, individuals of particular ethnicities, males and females, and even those with specific names. Social classification often highlights commonalities among groups and distinctions between them, which in turn promotes the formation of stereotypes. Stereotypes can encompass a wide range of traits, including perceived reliability, abilities, work ethic, hobbies, professions, emotional inclinations, and even physical features such as stature, some groups may be looked down upon while others are admired, with labels used to describe them often reflecting these attitudes. Therefore, stereotypes can be either positive or negative, indicating that while stereotyping is considered a cognitive process, it is not completely devoid of emotional influence.

The attempt of changing stereotypes is often a challenging task as there are some previous research that suggests that attempting to suppress stereotypes can actually result in a stronger influence of those stereotypes at a later stage (Wegener 1989; Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, and Jetten 1994). Also, there is 'The Contact Hypothesis' which proposes social mixing and interaction with members of opposing groups (outgroups) as a means to change negative stereotypes, may not always yield significant effects. For instance, males and females, despite having frequent contact, still exhibit distinct social groups. Moreover, when people make friends with those from a different group, they might still be seen as unusual, keeping the negative stereotypes alive. In order for contact to effectively alter group stereotypes, certain conditions must be met. It is necessary to repeatedly experience instances that contradict the stereotype across a large number of group members. Despite these inconsistencies, it is crucial to perceive these members as standard representatives of their groups instead of mere exceptions. (Smith and Mackie 2000). Overall, while the contact hypothesis can be a valuable tool in promoting understanding and reducing prejudice between groups, it is important to recognize its limitations and the need for additional strategies and interventions to address complex and deeply rooted stereotypes, since the contact must be positive and meaningful, allowing for genuine interactions and the opportunity to learn about each

Chapter One: Literature Review

other's perspectives and experiences. It is quite necessary to have some kind of equality when it comes to status between the groups in contact since the imbalances of power can influence the effectiveness of the interaction in an unwanted way, hence, just being in the presence of other individuals from different social groups may not be sufficient to break down the stereotypes. Furthermore, the contact hypothesis is not always consistent when the aim is to successfully alter or break down stereotypes, especially when they are firmly rooted or reinforced by societal norms.

In the domain of language attitudes, the language varieties and the different styles can evoke and elicit certain perceptions on the speakers as well as their association with particular social groups. These beliefs are frequently shaped and influenced by language ideologies which can lead into stereotypical assumptions about shared characteristics among the members of the group. At the individual level, social categorization can help impose a structured and multifaceted social environment. While at the intergroup level, stereotypes are crucial for distinguishing the multiple different social groups allowing preservation of favourable distinctions between one's own group (in-group), and other relevant outgroups. They create and uphold group ideologies that justify and defend the relationships between different groups, as well as dictate how members of outgroups should be evaluated and treated. Consequently, these attitudes and beliefs can have implications for interpersonal behaviour. (Garrett, 2010:33)

1.5 Main approaches to the study of Language attitudes

Many researchers and authors agree on the identification of three broad methods or approaches to use in order to conduct a study on language attitudes, these are: the analysis of the societal treatment of language, direct methods of attitudes elicitation, and indirect methods of attitude elicitation. Garrett et al. (2003) write: “**approaches to researching language attitudes are usually grouped under three broad headings (...): *the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties (...), direct approach; and indirect approach* (sometimes referred to as the ‘*speaker evaluation paradigm*’, or ‘*the matched-guise technique*’ by Lambert et al., 1960).” With no doubt, each one of these approaches has its own points of strengths and weaknesses which are to be discussed in this chapter.**

1.5.1 The societal treatment approach

According to Garrett, Coupland and Angie Williams (2003: 15), even though the societal treatment approach is considered to be a crucial source to understand the status and stereotypes associated with language varieties, it is still somehow ignored and rather overlooked when dealing with language attitudes research. This approach is looked at in terms of the 'treatment' that language variations receive, this includes observational, participant observation and ethnographic studies, or the examination and analysis of various sources in the public domain. For instance, research may focus on government and educational language-policy documents regarding the use of different languages in schools, job advertisements specifying the need for Anglophone and Francophone bilinguals in Montreal, the portrayal of dialects by characters in novels, media representations through foreign languages in advertisements in Japan and Switzerland, variations in English usage in various forms of literature, and the depiction of women in different contexts. Even though many studies in this area are considered to be qualitative, some of them also comprise formal sampling techniques and supply descriptive statistics. Despite the limited discussion in the literature on language attitudes regarding studies utilizing this method, it is not necessarily due to a lack of such research.

It is more probable that there is a significant amount of attitudinal data in numerous ethnographic studies that are not adequately examined in mainstream accounts. Many language attitudes researchers, particularly those in the social psychological tradition, view societal treatment research as too informal. They believe that it primarily serves as a preliminary step for more rigorous sociolinguistic and social psychological studies. This research has the ability to provide convergent validity to data obtained from direct or indirect methods. According to Knops and van Hout (1988), this approach may be suitable in situations where time and space constraints prevent direct access to respondents, or when respondents can only be accessed under unnatural conditions. It is important to note that the abundance of work in discourse analysis and text analysis operates under the assumption that this work is distinct from these other approaches. (Garrett, Coupland and Angie Williams, 2003: 16).

1.5.2 The direct approach

Garret et al. (2003: 24) argue that the sense of 'obtrusiveness' highly influences any research that follows the direct approach, in addition to the fact that attitudes are asked to be provided by the respondents themselves. This direct method of investigating language is highly featured by intrusiveness and it also relies on gathering attitudinal information directly from the informants. One crucial issue is to be mentioned concerning this approach is related to whether people's words on their attitudes and their actions in real situations can both show the same identical underlying tendencies (Knops and van Hout, 1988: 7). If this issue can be resolved, it is possible to directly measure language attitudes through interviews and/or questionnaires that focus on specific language aspects. The study of Labov (1966) is considered to be an early and well-known illustration for such studies, where he conducted interviews where he asked participants from New York city to indicate the pronunciation they favoured between two options and choose which one they believed is appropriate. In relation to the procedures for gathering data, a crucial aspect of the direct approach revolves around the choice of whether to employ data collection techniques based on informal communication, commonly known as 'word-of-mouth', or employing techniques that involve written responses. These two distinct approaches are broadly categorized as per the terminology adopted by Henerson et al. (1987).

When dealing with the "word of mouth" methodologies, Henerson et al. (1987: 24) classify "interviews, surveys, and polls." They define a poll as a simple tally, where participants are presented with a limited set of choices, such as "do you think MORE or LESS French should be taught in secondary schools?" This particular technique, which relies on informal communication, is rarely employed in language attitudes research, and therefore, it is not given further consideration. Henerson et al. differentiate "interviews" from "surveys" by asserting that the latter constitutes a "highly structured interview" that does not necessarily require face-to-face interaction (e.g., it can be conducted over the phone). Yet, for the purposes of this study, both interviews and surveys are to be considered as interviews and as word-of-mouth procedures in contrast, Henerson et al. employ a 'written-response' methodology that encompasses the use of 'questionnaires and attitude-rating scales'. In this context, there is no differentiation

Chapter One: Literature Review

made between attitude-rating scales and questionnaires as they are considered interconnected in language attitudes research. Nevertheless, Henerson et al. mention informal written records, such as logs, journals, and diaries, as a separate set of methods. Even though, these sources lack the notion of structure, they are still capable of offering valuable attitudinal data in direct approach studies, and therefore, they are also included in this chapter. For example, questionnaires may sometimes include prompts that require short essay-type accounts or other forms of qualitative data. (Garrett, Coupland and Angie Williams, 2003).

1.5.3 The Indirect approach or the MGT

Using occasionally misleading methods compared to direct questioning is what distinguishes the indirect approach. In the field of attitudes research, three main strategies fall under this category (Dawes and Smith, 1985). These strategies include observing individuals without their knowledge of being observed, examining aspects of their behaviour that are assumed to be beyond their control, and successfully deceiving participants by making them believe that the researcher is investigating something unrelated to their attitudes. The ethical concerns associated with such deception are typically addressed through debriefing, which involves informing research participants about the purpose, procedures, and scientific significance of the study, as well as addressing any inquiries they may have (Smith and Mackie, 2000: 52).

In the field of language attitudes, the matched-guise technique (MGT), which was pioneered by Lambert and his colleagues in Canada during the late 1950s is commonly associated with the indirect approach, although it may not align perfectly with the categories proposed by Dawes and Smith. One key distinction lies in the fact that in many matched-guise studies, participants are required to provide responses, typically by completing attitude-rating scales on questionnaires, making it more of an elicitation task. Additionally, participants are usually aware that their attitudes are under scrutiny in these studies. However, the main feature of the matched-guise technique is deceiving the participants who think that the researcher is studying different attitudes instead of the ones actually being investigated, thereby, justifying its categorization as an indirect approach.

Chapter One: Literature Review

In matched-guise studies, respondents are typically asked to listen to an audiotape recording where only one speaker reads the same text for multiple times, with each iteration differing in only one aspect. If for example the study focuses on regional or social linguistic variation, then the texts will be read in multiple dialects for example with the other factors remaining constant like speech rates or pauses, etc. The respondents, in this case, are misled into believing that they are listening to multiple speakers, when in fact it is the same speaker adopting different 'guises'. This deception is assumed to persist throughout the evaluation task. After listening to each speaker, the respondents are instructed to pause and complete attitude-rating scales. Consequently, attitude-rating questionnaires are employed in these studies, and the listeners are aware that their task involves rating attitudes, although they believe they are evaluating different individuals rather than dialects. Numerous studies have been carried out since the 1960s utilizing the MGT to investigate language attitudes.

It can be argued that within the realm of social psychology and to a significant extent in sociolinguistics, the MGT has emerged as the prevailing approach. However, despite its various advantages, this approach has not been immune to criticism, particularly regarding its detached portrayal of language varieties and its potential overdependence on attitude-rating scales. (Garrett, Coupland and Angie Williams, 2003).

1.5.3.1 Strengths

When it comes to strengths, Kircher (2022: 188) referred to Garrett et al. (2003) saying that the MGT is frequently praised for its ability to facilitate the extraction of opinions in an indirect and confidential manner, hence, participants' responses are more unlikely to be influenced by social desirability bias when compared to those obtained through direct methods like interviews or questionnaires. In terms of design, the MGT has another advantage since it allows the researcher to have control on the voice variable, which is significant as the studied linguistic varieties are produced by the same person (Giles and Billings 2008: 190). It must be noted as well that the replication of the MGT in diverse multilingual, multidialectal and multicultural contexts allows researchers to compare findings and identify similar attitudinal patterns in different communities (Garrett et al. 2003). Extensive research on attitudes has identified two

Chapter One: Literature Review

main dimensions, status and solidarity, used to evaluate linguistic varieties (Giles and Billings 2008: 190). The consistent use of these dimensions, often with dynamism, in language attitude studies has improved researchers' understanding of language variation and use (Giles and Billings 2008: 190).

1.5.3.2 Weaknesses

On the other hand, and although the MGT has shown its benefits, it is still subject to criticism. Garrett (2010) mentioned the existence of a significant issue, stating that when participants listen to a sequence of recordings that contain various linguistic varieties and linguistics styles, it makes these styles much more noticeable than they would naturally appear in everyday interactions. According to Kircher (2022: 188) this means that it could lead participants to focus more on the linguistic traits when evaluating voices based on personal characteristics, in comparison to real-life circumstances where they also take into consideration other cues. Another limitation to consider is the possibility of participants misidentifying the varieties they are rating. If the researcher does not include into the experiment a question that addresses this issue, then there is no guarantee that the respondents have identifies the evaluated linguistics varieties correctly.

Kircher also referred to an additional concern which pertains to the lack of authenticity in the style of the stimuli. The reason behind this is because recordings are often produced by having people read written passages, in this case, natural spoken language cannot be fully obtained. Similarly, caution must be exercised when utilizing a MGT (Multidimensional Scaling of Group Tasks) in diglossic settings. In such cases, participants' ratings may not necessarily reflect their attitudes towards the linguistic variety itself, but rather its appropriateness within a specific context. For instance, their ratings may differ depending on whether the language is being used for leaving a voicemail or reading a newspaper article. (Fishman and Agheyisi, 1970).

In order to address the validity concerns arising from the MGT, it is advisable to employ a mixed-methods approach that integrates the MGT with direct data collection techniques like questionnaires or interviews.

1.6 The linguistic situation in Algeria

Nadia Shalaby (2021:3) says that “... **what is today considered Arabic has always been in contact with other languages, whether indigenous or superposed, and that this contact has influenced all the language varieties involved in a range of ways. It likewise acknowledges characterized by both unity and diversity, the price a language pays for having wide currency**”. In other words, the current Arabic language has not always been this way, but it rather encountered a huge change over history, and that is because it has always been in contact with various language varieties, such interactions impacted the Arabic language resulting in multiple versions, dialects or variations of Arabic language just like any other global language that possesses unity and diversity, which is the case in the Algerian speech community.

“The linguistic situation is so intricate that the Algerians speak two minutes in French, thirty seconds in Arabic then one minute in French and so on. Sometimes the two languages are mixed to such a point that the result is a bizarre unintelligent language”, Mouhadjer N. (2002). The linguistic situation in Algeria is quite complex, and it has been constantly changing and developing throughout the years due to the various socio-cultural, historical, ideological and political factors. Dendane (2007) states that: “**it is undeniable that, as a consequence of the diverse events that the country has gone through, the Algerian society has acquired a distinctive identity.**” The French colonization indeed marked a huge impact on the linguistic situation in Algeria, especially with the implemented French policy back then which imposed a complete assimilation in various sectors: education, administrations, government, and business. However, despite the great effort of resistance against colonialism, the French language and culture had significantly impacted the Algerians this ‘led to a sort of dual identity’, Dendane (2007). Consequently, bilingualism, code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing became common within the Algerian speech community which is nowadays characterized by both ‘diglossic’ and ‘multilingual’ phenomenon because of the co-existence of Algerian Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, Berber, and French.

1.6.1 Modern Standard Arabic

The Arabic language, like many other global languages, incorporates several variants with only one specific variant that holds the higher status for being used in formal contexts across the Arab world, while the other variants hold much less status and prestige being used for informal contexts. Such distinction between a language and a dialect significantly reflects the state of power and dominance of one group or ideology over another. However, Arabic's linguistic situation is unique due to the significant differences between standard Arabic and its dialects, as well as the fact that standard Arabic is not the native language of any Arab individual.

In Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), known as *Al Fusha* as well, serves as the High variety and the prestigious form for communication since it used in formal contexts like the media, education, administrations, literary compositions and also as a means of instruction. “Modern Standard Arabic (MSA, العربية الفصحى/ فصحى العصر) is the official language of the Arab World. MSA is the primary language of the media and education. MSA is syntactically, morphologically and phonologically based on Classical Arabic (CA, العربية الفصحى التراث/ فصحى التراث), the language of the Qur’an (Islam’s Holy Book). Lexically, however, MSA is much more modern. MSA is primarily written not spoken”, Nizar Y. Habash, 2010.

As it was already mentioned before, Algeria witnessed a very long period of French colonialism where the Arab personality was denied and suppressed. Thus, with independence much effort was made in order to regain the Arabic identity and the Arabic language which was declared as the official and national language of the country and this gave it the ‘high’ status it holds today, as it is used in media, education, press and so on. However, it has to be mentioned that (MSA) in Algeria is not the mother tongue, but it is a language learned in schools. Also, even with the great efforts of the Arabization policy in Algeria, the French language was and is still used in various fields including: higher education, science, administration, etc.

1.6.2 Algerian Arabic

Modern standard Arabic, as mentioned before, is the official language in Algeria, and it is the high variety which is learned in schools and used only in certain fields and

Chapter One: Literature Review

formal settings. Hence, Algerians have another variety as their mother tongue ‘the Algerian Arabic’ also known as ‘Darija’ which is less prestigious and considered as the ‘low’ variety because it is neither standardized or codified. AA is used by most Algerians unlike (MSA) which is common only among the educated, AA speakers use such variety for their everyday communication, but it can also appear in the media as well for example.

Unlike the (MSA) which has a whole complex writing system, Algerian Arabic is only used orally with no writing system. And even if it is written, it takes the writing forms of the Classical Arabic. Also, it is only understood by Algerians and used for online communication mostly, like facebook or others. It must be mentioned that AA itself displays a great number of mutually intelligible varieties that differ from each other regionally, for instance, Western dialects are different from Eastern dialects, and Northern dialects are different from Southern ones and so on.

As a conclusion, it can be stated that this dialectal variety of Arabic is utilized both within and outside of the Algerian households and in the streets for the daily communication. Consequently, significant distinctions exist among the diverse colloquial variations in Algeria.

1.6.3 Berber

Berber or “Tamazight” is considered as one of the fundamental elements that compose the Algerian identity. Berber comes after AA as the second spoken vernacular in Algeria, and it is the mother tongue only for a minority of Algerians. Berber was declared and recognized by the Algerian constitution as a national and official language in 2002. Nevertheless, Berber is included in the curriculum of certain educational institutions, but it is not widely utilized by the majority of Algerians.

Historians declare that Berber is in fact the indigenous language of the original inhabitants of Algeria much more before the Arab expansion which introduced Arabic to Algeria. Algeria is one of the countries in North Africa where this language is spoken this includes Morocco and Tunisia.

1.6.4 French

Dendane (2012:66) says that: **“the Algerian society was deeply impacted by the French language to the point it is impossible to hear a conversation without at least few French words or expressions, thus AA is extremely loaded with French to the extent that this variety was referred to as ‘Franc-Arabic’ by Bouamrane (1998).”** Though the French departed from Algeria many years ago, their language did not. Indeed, the influence of French on the Algerian society as well as on the Algerians’ speech is undeniable, it is rare or rather nearly impossible to engage in a conversation with Algerians without encountering several French words since the Algerian dialect is infused with French lexis.

In Algeria, French does not hold an official status but it is rather recognized as the first foreign language in the country, yet, French plays a significant role in multiple aspects of the everyday life of Algerians including: health centres, education, administration, etc. In Algeria, the French language receives positive attitudes by most of the Algerian who link it to high status, education and prestige.

1.7 Language Vs Dialect

A “language” and a “dialect” are considered to be significant concepts in the field of sociolinguistics due to the common confusion that surrounds their usage. These terms are often perceived as non-technical due to their inherent ambiguity. However, most individuals possess a cognitive conceptualization of the terms ‘language’ and ‘dialect’ and are aware of their distinctions. Sociolinguists have endeavoured to establish criteria for differentiating between the two concepts. Language is a mean for human communication and interaction through the exchange of beliefs, knowledge, and behaviour using systematically accepted signs, sounds, gestures or symbols that convey a shared meaning for a certain group or speech community. Nevertheless, a dialect is a variation of a language that is spoken specific regions that can vary from other variations of the same language. The term 'language' is employed to denote either a singular linguistic standard or a collection of related standards, while 'dialect' refers to one of these standards. This implies, as Hudson (1996:32) asserts, that **“ a language is larger than a dialect.”**

Chapter One: Literature Review

Furthermore, as mentioned by Boucekif A. (2012) a key element for distinguishing between 'language' and 'dialect' lies in the level of prestige related with each. Dialects are often relegated to the status of "**inferior, low-status, and sometimes rural versions of a language**" (Chambers and Trudgill 2004:3), mainly serving as subcategories of a language. However, it is worth noting that in everyday situations, the distinction between language and dialect is a matter of politics more than linguistics. As the saying goes, 'a language is a dialect with an army and a navy' (Chambers and Trudgill 2004:12), showing how strong it is the influence of politics in shaping linguistic classification. Prestige and size are two crucial factors to take into consideration for 'language' and 'dialect' distinction, as argued by Hudson (1996), languages initially hold higher prestige, value, and larger size than dialects. Haugen (1966: 417) underscores the significance of written form, noting that "**it is a significant and probably crucial requirement for a standard language to be written**", leading many to classify standardized forms as languages while unwritten varieties are often labelled as dialects.

Therefore, speaking about the linguistic case in Algeria the CA/MSA is widely perceived as the prestigious language in the country, especially for religious, literary and educational purposes. On the other hand, dialectal Arabic is viewed as the less prestigious variety used by Algerians for their everyday conversations. Yet, sociolinguists have strongly emphasized that despite the social prestige that a standard language gain, it does not hold more functional or linguistic significance than a dialect. Moreover, the attitudes towards non-standard varieties reflect the social structure of society. According to Hudson (1996: 31), the distinction between 'language' and 'dialect' is a cultural phenomenon. He argues that our perception of these terms is shaped by our cultural background.

1.8 The speech of Tlemcen

Tlemcen is situated in the North West of Algeria with about 550 Km from the capital Algiers and 100 Km from the borders of Morocco, and it is surrounded by Oran, Belabbes, and Maghnia. Tlemcen has a rich history because of the various invasions over history. The Amazigh were the first to settle in Tlemcen, and it is said that they are the ones who named it 'Tilimsen' meaning 'the fountains', (Kaid-Slimane Hynd, 2016-

Chapter One: Literature Review

2017). By the 4th c, the Romans ruled Tlemcen under the name of ‘Pomaria’. Following the Arab conquests in the 7th c led by “Okba Bnou Nafie”, the city became a significant centre for a large Christian population. The Zianids, who originated from Morocco, specifically Fes, ruled Tlemcen until the 9th century, when the Almoravid leader Yusuf ibn Tachfine founded the city of Tagrart, which later merged with the settlement and became known as Tlemcen. The Merinids of Fes engaged in conflict with the Zianids and besieged Tlemcen in 1299 by establishing the city of Mansourah, a campaign that continued until 1307.

Under the rule of Almohad in the 12th c, Tlemcen became the capital of the Zianids. In the late 13th c, Tlemcen was besieged and fell allowing the Merinids to rule from Mansourah. And by the 15th c, the Zianids dynasty declined under the Spanish influence. In 1554, Tlemcen became part of the Ottoman Empire due to conflict with Spain. Later on, Tlemcen gained a significant level of autonomy in 1671. By the beginning of the 19th c, Tlemcen became an important administrative centre under French colonial rule in Algeria.

Tlemcen was and is still a good destination for sociolinguistic investigation because of the linguistic situation characterized by a great variation at all the linguistic levels and the unique speech that does not appear in any other parts of Algeria. One of the very special linguistic features of Tlemcen speech is the use of the glottal stop [ʔ] which is the realization of /q/ in CA. In fact, this unique feature makes the inhabitant of Tlemcen easily recognizable among all Algerians. Dendane (2007;175) claimed that: “Tlemcen town has long been regarded as a well-established prestigious centre whose native population was characterized not only by highly conservative social and cultural traits, but also by a number of specific speech habits and linguistic features which are not found anywhere else in Algeria”. In other words, the city of Tlemcen and its inhabitants has always been associated with prestige, traditional and cultural characteristics and the unique speech patterns that seem to be absent in any other region of Algeria.

1.9 The speech of Maghnia

Maghnia is a town located in the North West region of Algeria, and is positioned at a distance of 39 Km from Tlemcen 137 Km South-West of Oran, and 580 Km west of

Chapter One: Literature Review

Algiers. Sharing borders with Morocco (Oujda is only 28 Km away from it) makes the town hold strategic importance as a centre for economic, political and cultural exchanges between the two nations. These borders were established by the treaty of “Lalla Maghnia” signed in (1842) between France that occupied Algeria at that time and the Sultan of Morocco Moulay Sharif Abdurrahman. Moreover, the area of the town is about 20 Km² which is considered the largest zone in the department of Tlemcen, after Tlemcen.

Furthermore, this town holds an exceptionally rich history because of the arrival of various people. It's worth the mention that Maghnia was first inhabited by its original residents who then witnessed different conquerors like the Quartzite, Basalt, and the Greek. However, the initial arrivals were the Phoenicians, followed by the Romans who established a station known as "Numerus Syrorum" or "SYR". Additionally, they erected a military encampment fortified with a vast and profound trench, accompanied by square towers. These towers were equipped with four entrances.

The arrival of Muslims to Maghnia represents a key event to the town as they blended in with the locals. Hence, Maghnia became a major settlement, especially for the Romans. These individuals established connections with the Berbers residing in the nearby mountains, who constituted a fifth of the overall population. Interestingly, the indigenous Berbers adopted the nomadic customs of the Arabs. Consequently, Maghnia evolved into a crucial hub for economic and commercial transactions.

In terms of language use, the people of Maghnia utilize Modern Standard Arabic in formal settings like education, while the Maghnia dialect is used in informal contexts such as family conversations. Maghnia dialect developed through the interactions between the Arabs and the Berbers, and it only recently has been influenced by Moroccan varieties and even borrowed French words.

1.10 Conclusion

To conclude, research about language attitudes, whether it is spoken, written, or signed is recognized as crucial by scholars and particularly sociolinguists. The current study aimed at investigating attitudes on the two dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia. In order to gain better understanding on language attitudes, this chapter reviewed the concept of attitudes in general, exploring both behaviourism and mentalism frameworks. It also dealt with the interplay between language attitudes, dialects, language ideologies, and social stereotypes. Language attitudes reflect societal norms and contribute to linguistic hierarchies and power dynamics. The chapter also discussed methodological approaches, including the societal treatment, direct, and indirect approaches. The chapter concluded with a brief explanation of the differences between a language and a dialect as well as an explanation of the linguistic situation in Algeria, focusing on Tlemcen and Maghnia, and highlighting their linguistic features

**CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY, DATA
ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND
DISCUSSION**

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY, DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the methodological framework used in the current investigation of language attitudes towards the dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia. It will outline the research design and the data collection procedures, and will explain the overall approach and the methods used to gather data justifying the choice of research design and providing a comprehensive description of the data collection procedures. And will explain the analysis of the collected data, describe the methods and tools used to process and interpret the data, guaranteeing the alignment with the research objectives to identify patterns and draw meaningful conclusions.

2.2 Methodology

The primary objective of this research is to analyse the language attitudes towards the Tlemcen dialect in contrast to the attitudes towards the dialect of Maghnia. To investigate these language attitudes, the study utilizes the matched-guise technique of the indirect approach. The two distinct dialect groups are compared based on six specific traits: intelligence, kindness, deception, religiousness, ambition, and favourability to work with. A total of 35 participants took part in the online questionnaire, where they provided ratings on a Likert scale in response to two speakers who presented themselves in different guises. Both speakers, a male and a female, were native to Maghnia and had been raised there.

2.3 Research Design

Research design is the method used to conduct academic work. The goal of research is to systematically answer specific questions. Kothari and Garg (2014: 02) emphasized that research aims to uncover hidden truths through scientific methods.

The present study utilizes the matched-guise technique of the indirect approach to investigate language attitudes towards the two dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia. It was decided since the beginning to employ the indirect approach technique due to its capacity to enable the retrieval of opinions indirectly and confidentially. Consequently,

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

the likelihood of participants' responses being influenced by social desirability bias is reduced. People may refrain from expressing their genuine sentiments in order to avoid appearing socially inappropriate, (Garrett, P. Coupland, N. & Williams, A., 2003). The present research employs a mixed method approach in order to study the attitudes people hold in the department of Tlemcen towards the dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia. In this respect, the researcher carries out a case study research design due to the nature of its research inquiries, which necessitates the examination of real-world scenarios, it can be categorized as an exploratory research.

Presented in Arabic, the instructions, the recordings and the questionnaire were conducted online in order to gather as much strata as possible needed for the analysis and ultimately validate or reject the hypotheses put forth earlier.

2.4 Data Collection

2.4.1 Procedures

This section focuses on the procedures and stages involved in collecting data for the current study.

It is crucial for all researchers across various disciplines to gather and analyse data, however this process of collecting information is challenging and complex. O'Leary (2004:150) emphasized the difficulty of obtaining reliable data, highlighting that no single method is inherently superior to another. Therefore, the researcher's objectives as well as the advantages and disadvantages of each approach should be the basis for the choice of data collection methods, as Milroy and Gordon (2003:49) states: "What constitutes "good data" depends on the research objectives, as do the methods for collecting such data".

When studying language practices in specific contexts, researchers must consider not only effective strategies for engaging with individuals and selecting participants, but also the tools and techniques for gathering linguistic data, such as questionnaires and interviews. In this respect, an online questionnaire was constructed in order to gather data about the different attitudes towards the two dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia.

2.4.2 Steps

For the present study which investigates language attitudes towards the dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia, the researcher followed certain steps in order to reach the aimed objectives:

The researcher conducted interviews with representatives from both dialect groups (Tlemcen and Maghnia) to gather linguistic variables. The researcher collected similar answers and those that highlighted dialectal differences. Texts were created by the researcher for each dialect and gender. Using the matched-guise technique, one male and one female were selected to record both dialects as different guises. The texts were designed to focus on the dialects rather than the topics discussed. The recorded audios were inserted in an online questionnaire in order to collect data about attitudes towards these dialects, where respondents were asked to rate each speaker on a Likert scale thinking they were rating four different people, while in fact there was only two persons speaking.

Additional interviews were conducted in order to support the data collection procedures.

2.5 Research Approaches

In order to guarantee the reliability and objectivity of the scientific investigation, researchers must rely on a research methodology that typically combines qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Neuman (2006:85) argues that: “while some researchers believe that qualitative research yields "soft data" like descriptions, impressions, and emotions, and quantitative research produces "hard data" in the form of numbers, statistics, and percentages, it is widely acknowledged that both approaches are crucial when studying a sociolinguistic phenomenon”. The researcher in the current study employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies to ensure the accuracy of the data collected. However, even if both quantitative and qualitative methods are used in this research work, the emphasize is put more on the quantitative one.

2.5.1 Quantitative Approach

The primary objective of quantitative analysis requires the utilization of numerical data in the form of variables that serves as means of assessing any attribute that exhibits variation. Many attributes inherently possess a numerical nature (such as: education period, age and income). In the case of numerical variables, the values assigned to measure the attribute hold significance as they establish and quantify the extent of the attribute's presence.

With the quantitative approach, the researcher follows a fixed sequence of steps and procedures that are well designed before collecting data, aiming to categorize characteristics, quantify them, develop statistical frameworks in an effort to provide an explanation for the observed phenomena, and generalize the research results. In order to collect numerical data, the researcher mainly uses instruments such as questionnaires. The quantitative data possess greater efficiency and enable the testing of hypotheses; however, they may overlook the inclusion of contextual details. (Hammoudi, K. 2021_2022)

2.5.2 Qualitative Approach

Qualitative research methods have their roots in the techniques used by anthropologists and sociologists to study human behaviour in specific social settings. This approach focuses on understanding human actions within their social environment. A qualitative approach helps the researcher provide detailed descriptions of the studied behaviour, this can help in filling the contextualization gap that the quantitative approach may leave behind. Since the collected data are in the form of words, objects or picture, they tend to be richer, time-consuming and less easy to be generalized. The qualitative approach can make room for creativity, different interpretations, and adaptability as well. Also, since more data is gathered, the research scope and objectives can evolve and adapt. However, when compared to the quantitative methods, the findings gathered through the qualitative ones can be considered as more subjective because they are influenced by the researcher's expertise and perspective. And this subjectivity can have an effect on the way the results are interpreted and the conclusions drawn from the study, as personal biases may be hard to minimize.

2.6 Research Instruments

According to Milroy and Gordon (2003:49), what defines 'good data' are in fact the research objectives, as well as the methods used for collecting such data. Given the primary focus of this section is related to the methodological concerns, it is crucial to take into consideration the appropriate research instruments and tools in order to obtain reliable data for the study at hand. Consequently, the researcher used both a semi-structured interview and a semi-structured questionnaire in order to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. The principle techniques employed for this investigation encompass: audio-recordings, the matched-guise technique and a semi-structured questionnaire, and a semi-structured interview.

2.6.1 Audio-recording tool

Recoding is a crucial method in language variation studies as it primarily focuses on capturing authentic speech patterns. For the current study, the researcher conducted a number of interviews with multiple representatives from the two dialect groups under investigation in order to grasp a number of linguistic variables from both dialects (Tlemcen and Maghnia). Based on the representatives' answers the researcher collected the similar answers and the ones that showed the dialectal differences overtly. Accordingly, the texts that are meant to be recorded were formed by the researcher for each dialect (Tlemcen/Maghnia), and for both genders (male/female). Following the matched-guise technique, only one male and one female were chosen to record both dialects as different guises producing spontaneous speeches/dialects. The texts were similar to make sure the reactions given are on the dialects instead of the topics instead.

2.6.2 Questionnaire

As described by Brown (2001, as cited in Dornyei, 2007: 102), a questionnaire is defined as: **“Any written tool that provides individuals with a series of inquiries or assertions to which they respond by either writing their responses or choosing from predetermined options.”** Questionnaires are advantageous due to their efficiency. They are simple and cost-effective to administer. Researchers can gather information from a large number of participants in various speech communities. The modern version of a postal questionnaire is the e-mail survey, which allows researchers to collect data

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

quickly and easily, George Wenker, in 1876, distributed postal questionnaires to teachers in Germany, asking them to write down sentences in their local dialect. Questionnaire is a frequently utilized tool for gathering data in studies related to language research. It serves as a means of collecting both qualitative and quantitative information by inquiring about the opinions and beliefs of participants regarding the subject of research.

The questionnaire utilized in this work is divided into three parts. The first part tries to take some information about the informants like: their name, their gender, their age, and their place of birth and of residence. While in the second part respondents are urged to make their evaluation on each speaker on a Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The questionnaire, which has been prepared in Arabic, presents respondents with six traits (intelligent, kind, deceiving, religious, ambitious, and a good work partner) and requests them to listen to the recordings and then indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the mentioned traits on a scale for each recording. While the third part is devoted to ask the participants about their personal preferences like: the words they like or hate in both dialects (Tlemcen and Maghnia), do they feel a stronger connection with the speakers of their own dialect or with other dialects' speakers, and whether they think one of the two dialects of Maghnia and Tlemcen is more prestigious than the other or not. The full questionnaire is to be found in English and Arabic in the appendix section.

2.6.3 Interview

Interviews are mainly used to collect data based on the participants' feelings and experiences. Therefore, interviews are seen as important tools for collecting reliable data.

For the sake of getting more in depth understanding on the different language attitudes towards the dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia, six individuals (3 males, and 3 females) were interviewed for this investigation. It must be noted that these interviews were conducted using the local variety (AA) in informal settings like the university, or the streets. These interviews were directed after the collection of data from the questionnaire.

Handwritten notes were taken during some interviews, while the others were tap-recorded. However, all of them were typed and summarized in order to be analysed.

2.7 Participants and The Speakers

For the current study, three categories of participants were involved; those whom were recorded speaking in their native dialect (dialect of Maghnia) and then recorded imitating the other dialect (dialect of Tlemcen) for the stimuli, referred to as ‘speakers’, and those who offered their evaluative responses after hearing the speakers, referred to as ‘raters’. In addition to the interviewees.

2.7.1 Speakers

The researcher relied on her social connections while choosing the participants (speakers). Thus, this study does not compromise a random sample. Only two speakers (one male and one female) from the same region (Maghnia) were chosen for this study since the matched-guise technique’s fundamental concept involves extracting raters' opinions on the personal attributes of speakers by having them listen to a recorded speech. In reality, the speakers, whose voices were tape-recorded and played for the audience, deliver not the identical speech but in fact similar speeches in multiple guises. The texts chosen are similar and include words that are specifically chosen to display certain phonological, lexical variations and differences between the dialects at play (Tlemcen and Maghnia).

2.7.2 Raters

Out of 68 participants, only 35 (15 males, and 20 females) have completed the online questionnaire. The vast majority of the participants falls merely in two age groups, with 20 participants age between 18-25 (57.1 %) and 13 age between 26-30 (37.1%). Table 3.1 gives more details the gender and the age group of the raters.

Gender		Age group	
Males	15 (42.9%)	Less than 18	0
		18-25	20 (57.1%)
Females	20 (57.1%)	26-30	13 (37.1%)
		31-40	2 (5.7%)

Table 2.1 gender and age group of the raters

2.7.3 Interviewees:

Gender		Age group	
Males	3 (50%)	Less than 18	0
		20	2 (33.3%)
Females	3 (50%)	22	3 (50%)
		26	1 (16.6%)

Table 2.2 Interviewees by Age and Gender

2.8 Phonological and Lexical Variation

This section is devoted for the realizations of some speech patterns that were selected to be included within the recorded audios.

2.8.1 Phonological Variation:

/q/ variation:

Words	[q]	[ʔ]
To study	/jeqra/	/jeʔra:
Clean	/nqija/	/nʔijja/

Table 2.3 phonological variation

2.8.2 Lexical Variation:

Words	Tlemcen Speech	Maghnia Speech
To do	/jeʃmel/	/jdir/
Whenever	/fawaʔemma/	/fouqa ʃemma/
To like	/jhob/	/jebyi/
What	/wassem/	/waʃa/
Now	/derweʔ/	/dorka/

Table 2.4 lexical variation

2.9 The Analysis of Data

This section of chapter two will be devoted for the analysis of the data collected, as well as the results interpretation and discussion.

2.9.1 Analysis of the Questionnaire

2.9.1.1 Part One of the Questionnaire

Part One of the Questionnaire addresses general background information about the respondents. In terms of age, 57.1% of respondents are between 18-25, 37.1% are 26-30, and 5.7% are above 30, with none under 18. Regarding gender, 42.9% are male and 57.1% are female. Concerning birthplaces, 51.6% are from Tlemcen, 31.5% from Maghnia, and smaller percentages from Setif, Sebdou, Tizi Ouzou, Bechar, and Sebra. As for residency, 65.8% reside in Tlemcen, 25.7% in Maghnia, and the remaining in Remchi, Sebra, and Nedrouma.

2.9.1.2 Part Two of the Questionnaire

This part reports on the data of the current study, which investigates the language attitudes towards the two neighbouring dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia. To answer the research questions, data obtained from the questionnaire were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). One-way “Analysis of variance” (ANOVA) tests were conducted to investigate whether there are differences in attitudes towards the dialect of Tlemcen and the dialect of Maghnia. Two additional ANOVA examinations were carried out on the dataset after dividing it by the raters' gender to determine if there are variations in ratings between males and females. The questionnaire verbal responses were converted into numerical data. In order to do this, numerical scores were assigned to each choice on the Likert scale used: (5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Not sure, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree.)

Q1: Attitudes towards Tlemcen and Maghnia dialects

Question one investigates raters' attitude towards two dialects of Arabic in Algeria; Tlemcen and Maghnia in terms of six personal traits (intelligence, kindness, deception, religiousness, ambition, and a good work partnership) and five choices (strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, strongly disagree). This question investigates the possibility of

differences in terms of attitudes towards the speakers of Tlemcen dialect, and the speakers of Maghnia dialect. In order to answer this question, the (SPSS) was used to calculate the mean and the standard deviation of the raters' answers for each trait and for the two speaking groups separately.

Dialect \ Traits	Intelligent	Kind	Deceptive	Religious	Ambitious	Work
Tlemcen Mean	3.4286	3.4638	2.9143	2.8286	3.6286	3.3286
Std. Deviation	.73369	.71906	.77540	.56806	.78337	.71670
Maghnia Mean	3.2571	3.4857	2.7429	2.8429	2.8714	3.2857
Std. Deviation	.77433	.63114	.69545	.47045	1.00609	.78284

Table 2.5 Descriptive Statistics for the different attitudes towards speakers of Tlemcen and Maghnia

Table 2.5 above shows reactions of the participants towards Tlemcenian and Maghniawi speakers for the six traits. As can be seen, the means for Tlemcen speakers come first, followed by Maghnia speakers as far as intelligence, deception, ambition, and favourability to work with, are concerned. However, when it comes to religiousness and kindness, the means for both dialects' speakers are nearly identical.

Intelligent: The ANOVA results showed a significant effect of the speakers' dialect on the listeners' attitudes towards intelligence across the two groups. The mean score for Tlemcen dialect (M = 3.42; SD = 0.733) was significantly different than Maghnia dialect (M = 3.25; SD = 0.774).

Kindness: A difference was barely noticed across the two dialects based on the ANOVA test results. Yet, Maghnia comes first with (M = 3.48; SD = 0.631), then Tlemcen with (M = 3.42; SD = 0.719).

Deception: The ANOVA results revealed a notable distinction between the groups in terms of the deception trait, with the means for Tlemcen speakers coming first (M = 2.91; SD = 0.775), followed by Maghnia speakers (M = 2.74; SD = 0.695).

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

Religiousness: Not much of a difference was noticed concerning religiousness for both dialects' speakers. Tlemcen (M = 2.82; SD = 0.568), and Maghnia (M = 2.84; SD = 0.47).

Ambition: The ANOVA results showed a remarkable effect of the speakers' dialects on the listeners' attitudes concerning ambition, with a huge difference between the two means for the two dialects. Tlemcen comes first with (M = 3.62; SD = 0.783), then comes Maghnia with (M = 2.84; SD = 1.006).

Good work partner: There was a significant effect of the speakers' dialects on the listeners' attitudes for the two groups. According to the ANOVA results Tlemcen comes first with (M = 3.32; SD = 0.716), followed by Maghnia with (M = 3.28; SD = 0.782).

Q2: Do males and females rate differently:

The point of this inquiry is to explore how male and female participants assess the speakers of the two dialects based on the mentioned personal characteristics. Essentially, it aims to determine if there is a noteworthy impact of the listeners' gender on the way they evaluate the speakers of the two dialects. To ascertain this, two one-way ANOVA tests were conducted separately for the male and female participants to examine if gender, as a variable, influences the participants' ratings on the speakers of different dialects:

Dialects / Traits	Intelligent	Kind	Deceptive	Religious	Ambitious	Work
Female Mean (on Tlemcen)	3.53333	3.5000	3.0000	2.8000	3.7667	3.4000
Std. Deviation	.77608	.62972	.70711	.55086	.72793	.72397
Female Mean (on Maghnia)	3.3000	3.0667	2.7667	3.0000	3.0000	3.0000
Std. Deviation	.70221	.73968	.56832	.37139	.98261	.70221

Table 2.6 Descriptive Statistics for the female raters

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

Table 2.6 above shows the one-way ANOVA for the female raters. As one can notice, there is a significant effect of the speakers' dialect on the female raters with all the six traits. The dialect of the speaker is a matter of concern for women in the Algerian context, as it appears.

Dialects / Traits	Intelligent	Kind	Deceptive	Religious	Ambitious	Work
Male (Tlemcen) Mean	3.2000	3.4333	2.7667	2.86067	4.0333	3.2667
Std. Deviation	.61026	.72703	.89763	.67612	.80872	.79492
Male (on Maghnia) Mean	3.4667	3.3667	2.7333	2.8000	2.5333	3.2333
Std. Deviation	.77608	.61495	.86834	.40684	.89955	.85836

Table 2.7 Descriptive Statistics for the male raters

Table 2.7 above shows the results of the one-way ANOVA for male raters. No significant effect due to the speakers' dialects was observed as far as deception, religiousness, and favourability for work are concerned. However, a significant effect is to be found with intelligence, kindness, and ambition.

2.9.1.3 Part Three of the Questionnaire

Q1: Do you feel a stronger connection with your own dialect speakers, or with others?

Choices	Number	Percentage
Speakers of my own dialect.	21	58.3%
Speakers of other dialects.	4	11.1%
With both.	7	19.4%
None of the above.	4	11.1%

Table 2.8 Distribution of participants' connection based on dialects

With a number of 21 participants (58.3%), the vast majority of the raters feel stronger connection with the speakers of their own dialect. Four participants feel the connection

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

with speakers of other dialects, four others chose to be neutral, while seven participants feel the connection with speakers of any dialect.

Q2: Between the two dialects of Tlemcen and Maghnia, do you perceive one of them as more prestigious than the other?

Choices	Number	Percentage
Yes, Tlemcen dialect.	17	47.2%
Yes, Maghnia dialect.	4	11.1%
None.	15	41.7%

Table 2.9 Participants' choice of a Prestigious dialect

The majority of the participants chose either Tlemcen dialect as more prestigious than Maghnia dialect, while the other majority didn't see any of the two dialect as more prestigious than the other. Only four participants chose Maghnia dialect as the more prestigious one.

Q3: Is there any specific words you like in Tlemcen speech? If yes mention them.

Choices	Number	Liked words	Translation
Yes.	20 (58.8%)	/ʔawʔaw/ /ntina/ /Wasem/	Peanuts You What
No.	14 (41.2%)	/ʔalek/ /jhob/ /Kirik /	To say Want How are you

Table 2.10 Word Preferences in Tlemcen Dialect

Q4: Is there any specific words you hate in Tlemcen speech? If yes mention them.

Choices	Number	Hated words	Translation
Yes.	19 (54.3%)	/Kirik/	How are you?
		/ʔasem/	What?
		/ʔotlek/	Told you
		/fajen/	Where?
No.	16 (45.7%)	/ʔawʔaw/	Peanuts
		/ntina/	You
		/derweʔ/	Now
		/jih/	Yes

Table 2.11 Distribution of Disliked Words in Tlemcen Dialect

Q5: Is there any specific words you hate in Maghnia speech? If yes mention them.

Choices	Number	Hated words	Translation
Yes.	14 (40%)	/Wayeʃ/	Men
No.	21 (60%)		

Table 2.12 Distribution of Disliked Words in Maghnia Dialect

Q6: Is there any specific words you like in Maghnia speech? If yes mention them.

Choices	Number	liked words	Translation
Yes.	4 (11.4%)	/fouqa ʃ/	When?
		/safatli/	Send me
No.	31 (88.6%)	/mrigla/	Okay
		/wafa/	What?

Table 2.13 Word Preferences in Maghnia Dialect

2.9.2 Analysis of the Interviews

The interview used for this study included 4 open-ended questions for the purpose of collecting qualitative data to support the employed questionnaire. It must be noted that the chosen interviewees were not originated from Tlemcen neither from Maghnia in order to avoid bias.

2.9.2.1 Part One of the Interview: First Impressions

Q1: What were your first impressions when you interacted with speakers of both dialects (Tlemcen/Maghnia)?

F1, F2, F3 showed positive attitudes towards females speaking Tlemcen dialect, F2 stated that: “they sound cute and feminine”. Yet, they showed negative attitudes towards males speaking Tlemcen dialect perceiving them as feminine unlike males speaking Maghnia dialect who were perceived as more masculine and manly receiving positive attitudes despite the fact that they were linked with the extensive use of insult words.

M1, M2, M3 didn't exhibit significant reactions towards the speakers of the two dialects, however they also mentioned that they disliked men who speak with the [?] sound which belongs to the Tlemcen dialect.

Q2: Did you adapt with speakers of both dialects (Tlemcen/Maghnia)?

Females agreed that they couldn't adapt easily with Tlemcenian speakers. F3 said that: “it may seem normal to others, but for me their accent made me feel less than them, that's why I couldn't adapt with them”. On the other hand, they stated that they adapted easily with Maghnawi speakers.

Males agreed that they adapted easily with speakers of both dialects.

2.9.2.2 Part Two of the Interview: Personal Preferences

Q1: Do you see that one of the two dialects (Tlemcen/Maghnia) is prestigious than the other? If yes, which one? And why?

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

M1 and M2 stated that they don't consider any of the two dialects as prestigious. While M3 and all the female participants stated that they consider the dialect of Tlemcen as more prestigious because of the mixing between Arabic and French.

Q2: Which dialect of the two (Tlemcen/Maghnia) do you prefer? And why?

Females were quite precise with their preferences. As far as male speakers are concerned, female participants preferred the dialect of Maghnia because they viewed it as masculine like it was previously mentioned. On the other hand, as far as female speakers are concerned, they preferred the dialect of Tlemcen because they viewed them as feminine.

Male participant on the other hand, didn't show any specific preference towards any of the two dialects, except for M2 who said that he liked women who speak with the [?] sound.

2.10 Interpretation and Discussion of the Results

The main objective of this research is to examine the different language attitudes towards Tlemcen dialect compared to attitudes towards Maghnia dialect. For the sake of collecting reliable data, the matched-guise technique of the indirect approach was adopted to investigate language attitudes. A total of 35 respondents completed the online questionnaire where they were asked to rate the speakers of the two dialects on a Likert scale based on six traits: intelligence, kindness, deception, religiousness, ambition, and favourability to work with. The four recordings were in fact only two speakers who presented themselves as different guises. Also, additional interviews were conducted in order to support the questionnaire and gather qualitative data as well. The interviews were conducted with six interviewees (3 males and 3 females) who were not originated from Tlemcen neither from Maghnia.

2.10.1 Interpretation of the Questionnaire

The researcher used the SPSS in order to analyse the data collected from the questionnaire, providing descriptive statistics to generate results concerned with the attitude question of the study and also to explore whether the gender of the raters have an impact on this investigation of language attitudes.

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

In his publication “Attitudes to Language”, Garrett (2010) pointed out to the intricate correlation between attitudes and behaviour, stating that “it is not always straightforward, linear or predictable even if language attitudes are common in our daily lives and impact the way we assess others based on their communication styles”. This can be confirmed in the current study, where the participants displayed favourable attitudes towards individuals who spoke the dialect of Maghnia. They viewed them as kinder, more religious, and less deceptive, yet this positive attitude did not result in a strong desirability to work with them. Conversely, participants showed favourability towards speakers from Tlemcen despite the fact that they perceived them as less kind and more deceptive.

Generally speaking, the analysis of the data collected indicates that the attitudes held by participants towards Tlemcen and Maghnia dialects were influenced by: the different personality traits of the speakers, the dialect spoken, and the gender of the listeners. Evaluators exhibited favourable attitudes towards the Tlemcen dialect in relation to traits associated with power, such as intelligence, ambition, and work partnership. Conversely, the Maghnia dialect elicits positive attitudes when it comes to traits associated with solidarity, such as kindness, deception, and religious beliefs. Additionally, the results reveals that the dialect spoken by the speakers holds significance for females, as evidenced by the findings. It is worth noting that the participants' responses regarding religiousness were largely neutral. Many individuals opted for the middle option on the Likert scale, steering clear of the extreme response categories.

2.10.1.1 Solidarity and Power

Ibrahim Eltouhamy (2015) states that: “**Various scholars, including Gardner and Lambert (1972) and Milroy (1980), have proposed a 2-axis model to represent power and solidarity, with numerous labels associated with these concepts.**” The raters perceived speakers of the Tlemcen dialect as notably more intelligent, more ambitious and likable for work partnership compared to speakers of the Maghnia dialect. However, they were also seen as less kind, and more deceptive than the Maghnia speakers. This indicates that the Tlemcen dialect and its speakers are associated with positive attitudes related to

power traits. Conversely, the Maghnia dialect speakers were considered to be more kind, religious, less deceptive, and significantly less ambitious than their counterparts from Tlemcen. In essence, speakers of the Maghnia dialect evoke positive attitudes in terms of solidarity traits.

2.10.1.2 Males and Females rate differently

The results indicate that the speakers' dialects did not have a significant effect on male raters' perceptions of deception, religiousness, and favourability to work with. However, when it comes to kindness, intelligence, and ambition there was some noteworthy judgments' differences. Generally, male participants displayed similar reactions towards both dialects in terms of deception, religiousness, and favourability to work with. They were also positive towards both dialects perceiving the speakers of Maghnia as more intelligent and the speakers of Tlemcen as more ambitious. Conversely, female raters exhibited significantly different responses to speakers' dialects across all traits. Their perceptions of the Tlemcen dialect were more positive than those of males in terms of intelligence, kindness, ambition, and willingness to collaborate with. Despite this, females still considered speakers of the Maghnia dialect to be less deceptive and more religious than speakers of the Tlemcen dialect. Therefore, the dialect spoken by individuals is evidently important for females in the Algerian setting.

2.10.1.3 Personal Preferences

Q1+Q2: Connection and Prestige

Concerning connection and feeling of belonging, most of the participants felt stronger connection with speakers of their own dialect showing favourability towards linguistic familiarity. Others felt connection with speakers of any dialect or language variety indicating that they may value connection beyond linguistic barricade. While the rest minorities chose to be neutral. On the other, concerning the question of prestige, nearly half of respondents chose the dialect of Tlemcen as more prestigious than Maghnia dialect. This may indicate the association of Tlemcen dialect with high social status and respect., while the other half didn't choose any of the two dialects as prestigious, they just may consider both dialects equal in terms of prestige, or don't take prestige into

consideration at all. The left minority with only 11.1 % considered Maghnia dialect more prestigious.

Q3+Q4: Liked/Disliked Words in Tlemcen Dialect

Majority of the participants had specific words they like or dislike in the dialect of Tlemcen. However, what is worth noting from the collected data, is the significant similarity of answers for the two opposite questions, in other words, while some participants liked specific words in the dialect, others actually disliked the exact same words: Kirik/, /ʔotlek/, /ʔawʔaw/. This suggest the diversity of attitudes that people can show towards the same dialect.

Q5+Q6: Liked/Disliked Words in Maghnia Dialect

Unlike the previous responses concerning Tlemcen dialect, most of the participants remained neutral towards the dialect of Maghnia. Only few indicated that they have specific words they like in the dialect. What is worth noting is that the word /Wayeʃ/ was specifically mentioned by a considerable portion of the respondent as the word they dislike in this dialect.

2.10.2 Interpretation of the Interview

This study conducted interviews with participants to gather qualitative data that would complement the data collected from a questionnaire. The participants, who were not from Tlemcen or Maghnia, were chosen to avoid bias. The interviews contained four open-ended questions and were divided into two parts: first impressions and personal preferences.

2.10.2.1 Part One: First Impression

Concerning the first question that dealt with the interviewees first impressions on both dialects' speakers, females in general had showed positive attitudes towards female speakers from Tlemcen, and perceived female Tlemcen speakers as "cute and feminine" (as stated by F2). Conversely they showed negative attitudes towards male speakers from Tlemcen perceiving them as feminine, and positive attitudes towards speaking the Maghnia dialect, who were seen as more masculine despite their use of insult words. Male interviewees on the other hand didn't show any overt attitudes towards both

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

dialects, yet they disliked men using the [ʔ] sound characteristic of the Tlemcen dialect. The second question dealt with the adaptation of the interviewees with speakers of both dialects. The female participants stated that they had some difficulty to adapt with speakers from Tlemcen, F3 mentioned feeling inferior because of the accent, however they found it much easier to adapt with speakers from Maghnia. Male participants stated that they easily adapted to speakers of both dialects.

2.10.2.2 Part Two: Personal Preferences

The first question for this part of the interview was about the Perception of Prestige between Tlemcen and Maghnia Dialects. M1 and M2 did not consider either dialect to be prestigious, while M3 and all female participants viewed the Tlemcen dialect as more prestigious due to its mix of the French language with Arabic. The second question was about the participants' Dialect Preferences. Female Participants preferred the Maghnia dialect for male speakers, finding it more masculine, and favoured the Tlemcen dialect for female speakers, considering it more feminine. Male participants on the other hand Showed no specific preference for either dialect. M2 expressed a liking for women who speak with the [ʔ] sound of the Tlemcen dialect.

The interviews reveal distinct gender-based perceptions and preferences regarding the Tlemcen and Maghnia dialects. Female participants had clear preferences and attitudes influenced by perceptions of femininity and masculinity linked to each dialect. Male participants were generally less opinionated but noted specific dislikes and preferences related to certain phonetic features. These insights highlight the social nuances and gender dynamics in dialect perception and preference.

2.10.3 Discussion of the Results and Conclusion

This chapter has been devoted to deal with the research methodology, introducing the research instruments used in order to collect data, the participants in this research study, as well as the results interpretation and discussion. This research demonstrates that attitudes towards Tlemcen and Maghnia dialects are influenced by: the different personality traits of the speakers, the dialect spoken, and the gender of the listeners.

The results showed that Tlemcen speakers were seen as less kind, more deceptive, more intelligent, more ambitious and likable for work partnership compared to speakers

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

of Maghnia who were seen as be more kind, religious, less deceptive, and significantly less ambitious, however when it comes to favourability to work partnership, participants chose the speakers of Tlemcen dialect. This can be translated into the following: Tlemcen dialect is associated with power traits, while Maghnia dialect is associated with solidarity traits.

Also, male raters showed similar and positive attitudes towards both dialects, however, female raters did not show similar attitudes towards the two dialects. In fact, females exhibited significantly different responses to speakers' dialects across all traits. Not only this, but data collected from the interviews also showed that unlike male interviewees, female ones showed positive attitudes towards female speakers from Tlemcen, perceiving them as "cute and feminine", while they had negative attitudes towards male speakers from Tlemcen, perceiving them as feminine. Female interviewees found it difficult to adapt to speakers from Tlemcen, feeling inferior because of the accent, but found it easier to adapt to speakers from Maghnia. Unlike males who easily adapted to speakers of both dialects. As evidenced by the findings, the dialect spoken by the speakers holds much significance for females.

The data collected reflects that more than half of the participants have a strong sense of connection with their own dialect community, highlighting the importance of linguistic identity in their social connections. In addition to this, for most of the participants, Tlemcen dialect was generally seen as more prestigious.

On this basis, the current study can come with the following conclusions concerning the research questions and hypotheses:

1_ Attitudes towards dialects are shaped by various factors, including the distinct personality traits of the speakers, the specific dialect being spoken, and the gender of the listeners. People in Algeria (in the department of Tlemcen) hold positive attitudes towards the dialect of Tlemcen as far as power traits are concerned, and positive attitudes towards the dialect of Maghnia as far as solidarity traits are concerned. Also, indeed Tlemcen dialect is seen as more prestigious than Maghnia dialect.

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

2_ Confirming the second research hypothesis, the results clearly demonstrate that individuals of different genders do evaluate and assess others based on their spoken dialects.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

General Conclusion

Language researchers have reached the agreement that making definitive conclusions regarding linguistic issues is unattainable due to the dynamic nature of language, which is continuously evolving. Nevertheless, some inferences can be drawn considering that the primary objective of this sociolinguistic study is to investigate what attitudes people in Algeria hold towards the dialect of Tlemcen in comparison to the dialect of Maghnia.

This research work consists of two chapters. The first chapter delves into the theoretical framework of the research, providing the fundamental concepts that underpin this study of language attitudes. It also provides some insights into the main methodological approaches to carry research studies in this field. As well as an overview on the intricate linguistic situation in Algeria moving on to Tlemcen and Maghnia. On the other hand, the second chapter is devoted for the practical part that contains the research methodology as well as the data analysis and discussion and interpretation of the results.

Furthermore, the primary findings derived from this investigation demonstrated that, attitudes towards the Tlemcen and Maghnia dialects are distinctly shaped by the perceived traits of the speakers. The Tlemcen dialect is generally associated with traits related to power, such as intelligence, ambition, and favourability for work partnerships. In contrast, when it comes to solidarity traits: kindness, religiousness, and less deception, Maghnia dialect received more positive attitudes. These perceptions underscore the different social values and stereotypes attached to each dialect.

Gender as well plays a crucial role in forming language attitudes. Female participants demonstrated a greater sensitivity to dialect distinctions across all traits compared to their male counterparts. This indicates that women in the Algerian context may be more attuned to linguistic nuances and their social implications.

The participants' responses to personal preference questions further highlight the deep-rooted connection between language and identity. The majority noted their strong feeling of connection towards those who speak the same dialect as them (speakers of

General Conclusion

their own dialect). This highlights the importance of language familiarity and cultural belonging. Furthermore, almost all of the respondents perceived Tlemcen dialect as the prestigious one, reflecting its higher social status within the community.

Participants held positive attitudes towards Maghnia dialect concerning solidarity traits, yet this did not translate into desirability to work with its speakers, illustrating the complex relationship between attitudes and behaviour. This complexity is further supported by Garrett's (2010) assertion that the relationship between attitudes and behaviour is not always straightforward.

Confirming the first hypothesis, people indeed tend to associate the dialect of Tlemcen with high status and prestige, while the dialect of Maghnia is seen as less prestigious. The second hypothesis is also confirmed, it is evident that individuals of different genders tend to evaluate and assess others based on their spoken language variation.

To conclude, this research shed light on the complex nature of language attitudes in Algeria and Tlemcen department in particular, showing how can societal norms, cultural values, language variations, and gender as well can all have a role in the process of shaping people's attitudes towards different language variations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albarracín, D., Sunderrajan, A., Lohmann, S., Chan, S., & Jiang, D. (n.d.). *The Psychology of Attitudes, Motivation, and Persuasion*. https://www.asc.upenn.edu/sites/default/files/202107/e3eff4_62c5bd039c4045dca9d2fc343dfb9403.pdf

Arabic Script IPA symbol Symbols used in IVAr. (n.d.). <https://reshare.ukdataservice.ac.uk/852878/15/transliteration.pdf>

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Multilingual Matters.

Belmihoub, kamal. (2018). *Language Attitudes in Algeria*. https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2116&context=bb_pubs

Boucekif, A. (2012). *The Effect of Trade Activities On Language Variation at The Algerian/Moroccan Border: Maghnia Speech Community*. [Magister, University of Tlemcen]. Dspace UABT. <file:///C:/Users/mcs/Downloads/bouchrif.pdf>

Dendane, Z. (2012). *Sociolinguistic Variation and Attitudes towards Language Behaviour*. LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Ellen Bouchard Ryan, & Giles, H. (1982). *Attitudes towards language variation: social and applied contexts*. E. Arnold.

Fishman, J. A. (2012). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge University Press.

Garrett, P., Coupland, N., & Williams, A. (2003). *Investigating language attitudes: Social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance*. University of Wales Press.

Grand Canyon University. (2023). *Qualitative vs. quantitative research: What's the difference?* GCU. <https://www.gcu.edu/blog/doctoral-journey/qualitative-vs-quantitative-research-whats-difference>

Guettaia, F. (2019). *A Dialectal Comparative Study of Two Algerian Neighbouring Speech Communities: Maghnia and Tlemcen*. [Master degree, University of Tlemcen]. Dspace UABT. <http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/bitstream/112/14724/1/guettaia-fatna.pdf>

Habash, N.Y. (2010). *Introduction to Arabic Natural Language Processing*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.

Kaid Slimane, H. (2017). *Lexical Variation and Dialect Shift: A Gender-related Issue in Tlemcen Speech Community*. [PHD, University of Tlemcen]. Dspace UABT. <http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/bitstream/112/9578/1/kaid-slimane-hynd.pdf>

Kircher, R., & Zipp, L. (2022). *Research Methods in Language Attitudes*. Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Linda Melander English, C-Essay, & Dalarna, H. (2003). *Language Attitudes Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Language*. <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:518098/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

Rabahi, H. (2016). Historical View of Maghnia Speech Community. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 06(02), 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2016.62011>

Ralph Fasold. (2001). *The sociolinguistics of Society* (I. Ben Saleh Ben Mhammed, Trans.). Al Malik Suoud University.

Reem Bassiouney, & Walters, K. (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Arabic and Identity*. Routledge.

Shuy, R. W., & Fasold, R. W. (1973). *Language Attitudes: current trends and prospects*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

APPENDICES

1_ Questionnaire in English:

Section One:

Age:

Gender:

Place of birth:

Place of residency:

Section Two:

Speaker number (...):

Strongly agree / agree / Neutral/ disagree/ Strongly disagree

- Intelligent / / / /

- kind / / / /

- deceptive / / / /

- Religious / / / /

- ambitious / / / /

- A good work colleague / / / /

Section Three:

1- You feel a stronger connection with speakers of:

1_ Speakers of my own dialect.

2_ Speakers of other dialects.

3_ With both.

4_ None of the above.

2- Do you think one of the two dialects (Tlemcen and Maghnia) is prestigious than the other?

1_ No

2_ Yes, the dialect of Tlemcen.

3_ Yes, the dialect of Maghnia.

3- Are there any certain words or sentences you like in the dialect of Tlemcen? If yes mention them.

4- Are there any certain words or sentences you hate in the dialect of Tlemcen? If yes mention them.

5- Are there any certain words or sentences you like in the dialect of Maghnia? If yes mention them.

6- Are there any certain words or sentences you hate in the dialect of Maghnia? If yes mention them.

2_ Questionnaire in Arabic

استبيان

الجزء الأول:

السن:

الجنس:

مكان الازدياد:

مكان الإقامة:

الجزء الثاني:

المتحدث رقم (...):

اتفق / اتفق بشدة/ لا اعرف / اختلف / اختلف بشدة

ذكي/...../...../...../.....

طيب/...../...../...../.....

مخادع/...../...../...../.....

متدين/...../...../...../.....

طموح/...../...../...../.....

شريك عمل جيد...../...../...../...../.....

الجزء الثالث:

1_ هل تشعر بالانتماء تجاه:

أ_ متحدثي لهجتك.

ب_ متحدثي اللهجات الأخرى

ج_ تجاه كليهما

د_ لا شيء مما سبق

2_ هل تعتقد ان احدى اللهجتين (تلمسان او مغنية) هي أكثر شأنا (برستييج) أكثر من الأخرى؟

أ_ نعم، لهجة تلمسان.

ب_ نعم، لهجة مغنية.

د_ لا.

3_ هل هناك أي كلمات او عبارات تحبها في لهجة تلمسان؟

4_ هل هناك اي كلمات او عبارات تكرهها في لهجة تلمسان؟

5_ هل هناك اي كلمات او عبارات تحبها في لهجة مغنية؟

6_ هل هناك اي كلمات او عبارات تكرهها في لهجة مغنية؟

3_ Interview in English

Age:

Gender:

Section One: First Impressions

1_ What were your first impressions when you interacted with speakers of both dialects (Tlemcen/Maghnia)?

2_ Did you adapt with speakers of both dialects (Tlemcen/Maghnia)?

Section Two: Personal preferences

1_ Do you see that one of the two dialects (Tlemcen/Maghnia) is prestigious than the other? If yes, which one? And why?

2_ Which dialect of the two (Tlemcen/Maghnia) do you prefer? And why?

4_ Interview in Arabic

السن:

الجنس:

_ الجزء الأول: ردّات الفعل الأولية:

1_ كيف كانت ردة فعلك الأولى حين الاستماع لكلا اللهجتين (تلمسان ومغنية)؟

2_ هل استطعت التكيف مع متحدّثي كلا اللهجتين؟

_ الجزء الثاني: تفضيلات شخصية:

1_ هل تعتقد ان احدى اللهجتين هي أكثر شأنًا (برستيچ) من الأخرى؟

2_ هل تفضل إحدى اللهجتين على الأخرى؟ ولماذا؟

الملخص:

يهدف هذا البحث إلى تحليل المواقف اللغوية التي يحملها الجزائريون تجاه لهجات المجتمعات المجاورة في تلمسان ومغنية. الهدف هو استكشاف كيف يمكن أن يكون للاختلاف في الكلام تأثير كبير على تصورات الناس تجاه المتحدثين أنفسهم وسماتهم الشخصية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يسعى هذا البحث إلى التحقيق فيما إذا كان الذكور والإناث يقيمون أو يحكمون أو يتفاعلون بشكل مختلف مع المتحدثين بلهجات مختلفة.

Resume:

Le présent travail de recherche tente d'analyser les attitudes linguistiques des Algériens envers les dialectes des communautés de parole voisines de Tlemcen et de Maghnia. L'objectif est d'explorer comment la variation linguistique peut avoir un impact significatif sur les perceptions des gens envers les locuteurs eux-mêmes et leurs caractères. De plus, cette recherche vise à étudier si les hommes et les femmes évaluent, jugent ou réagissent différemment aux locuteurs de différents dialectes.

Abstract:

The current study endeavors to examine the language attitudes of Algerians towards the dialects spoken by neighboring communities in Tlemcen and Maghnia. The objective is to investigate the extent to which speech variation can influence individuals' perceptions of the speakers themselves and their personalities. Furthermore, this research seeks to explore potential differences in how males and females evaluate, assess, or respond to speakers of various dialects.

Key Words:

Attitudes _ language attitudes_ social stereotypes_ speech variation_ language_ dialect_ Tlemcen speech community_ Maghnia speech community.