

using solidarity features at the radio of Adrar

Pr. bachir bouhanaia



Abstract

This paper reports the results of a field research within the

paradigms of Communication Accommodation Theory and Speech Accommodation Theory in an Arabic diglossic situation. Its main context is the local Adrar radio broadcast system. The data are elicited from various programs and newscasts. The study considers the use of contracted conjunctions by radio animators and newsreaders to either converge or diverge from their respective audiences. The results show that the agriculture program directed to low level and less-educated listeners is the one that uses the contracted conjunctions the most. As for the newsreaders, the female participant has a significant tendency towards contracting the conjunction; whereas, her male counterpart does not converge towards the audience but sticks to the standard linguistic norms of radio broadcast, i.e.: Modern Standard Arabic

Introduction

The use of contracted conjunctions reflects the radio animators' capacity to address different types of audiences due to personal willingness or to show no compliance with

the formal style of the programme. The newscasters consciously control the linguistic features; yet, they are not allowed to contract any linguistic items, since the latter are prescribed stylistic devices of Arabic radio broadcasts. At the theoretical level, contraction of language variables signifies using economy features (Preston 2001) to adapt, accommodate and converge towards the audience. Original Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) forms are equivalent to divergence from the audience particularly in programmes directed to low level uneducated people. On the other hand, stylistic variation mirrors the speaker's closeness/distance with the addressees, and shows how audience members are perceived and evaluated by the interlocutors/addressors.

This study puts into verification style shifts as addressee- or topic-influenced features of language use in a diglossic¹ situation, and tries to account for the personal factors that inhibit or hinder stylistic variation. The ultimate aim is to verify the results of former studies in both diglossic and non-diglossic speech communities, since the significance of style shifts varies from one speech community to another (Rickford, 2001)

The present research asks three important questions, which are:

1. Is speakers' stylistic variation due to topic?
2. Is speakers' stylistic variation due to personal (identity, motives) factors?
3. Is speakers' stylistic variation due to audience type?

¹ According to C.A. Ferguson (1959) a diglossic situation is characterized by the existence of two genetically related language varieties used by the same speech community. The superimposed variety is referred as High, or (H), while the informal one is called Low or (L). For Ferguson, (H) is appropriate for formal situations; whereas, (L) is strictly used in all informal contexts such as the home, street, market, etc.



To test the hypotheses of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) and Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT), the syntactic conjunctions {wa-; ma9a; 9ala} constitute its main linguistic items.

1. Concepts and Theory

Convergence is: "...a strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other's communicative behaviours in terms of a wide range pausal phenomena and utterance length, phonological variants, smiling, gaze, and so on..." (Giles et al., 1991:7). Divergence, however, occurs: "...when speakers want to distance themselves from their interlocutors" (Kerswill 1994; Gordon 2000). Both convergence and divergence underlie stylistic variation, linguistic accommodation, style shifts, and ways of speaking.

Style-shifting through convergence and divergence achieves personal as well as social goals on the part of the speakers. Among these are the instrumental, the relational, and the identity goals (Clark and Delia 1976 and 1979:200)¹. The instrumental object aims at creating a desired response on the part of the interlocutors and addressees. The relational end creates relationships between speech event participants. The final one, i.e. identity goal, means the building of a self-reflected image both on the part of the addressee and the addressor. It is a means of presentation of the self, to which

¹ -Clark, R.A, and J. G. Delia. 1979. *Topoi* and Rhetorical Competence. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65:187-206. They define these concepts as follows:

" (1) overtly *instrumental* [or *task*] objectives, in which a response is required from one's listener(s) related to a specific obstacle or problem defining the task of the communicative situation, (2) *interpersonal* [or *relational*] objectives, involving the establishment or maintenance of a relationship with the other(s), and (3) *identity* [or *self-presentational*] objectives, in which there is management of the communicative situation to the end of presenting a desired self image for the speaker and creating or maintaining a particular sense of self for the other(s).



Nikolas Coupland (2001:202) refers to as the “*relational self*”.

Accommodation to audience and/or to referee (Bell, 1992 and 2001) is an important sociolinguistic fact. In the first case, the communicators do not have a direct access to the audience’s feedback unless they are involved in a programme where call-in participants are involved in the debate. Because the radio animators have to address different types of audiences, their linguistic behaviour is limited by the required style and formality of the situation. They are also restricted by ‘discoursal conventions’ (Fairclough, 1989:19), i.e. the linguistic as well as social roles they are assumed to command and perform.

In the second case, i.e.: accommodation to referee, both presenters and guests converge to or diverge from each other for several reasons (social status, personal genre, agreement/disagreement, and so on). According to Thakerar et al. (1982), there are two ways to accommodate: through subjective or through objective accommodation. This means that the speakers accommodate at will and monitor their language in accordance with their will.¹

The linguistic strategies of the speakers vary according to personal (age, sex, level of education) and non-personal (setting, topic, formality-informality of situation) factors. Their language strategy shifts in between formality and informality (careful vs. casual style in the Labovian (1966) division of styles of speech) to reach the largest number of listeners.

¹ Myers-Scotton (1985) calls this process “perceptual divergence” as it is controlled by the speakers. For Giles et al. (1991:10), this sociolinguistic phenomenon is termed “dis-accommodation”.



The radio presenters' conscious or unconscious style shifts are directly influenced by the audience. Bell (1991) refers to these switchings as either "*audience solidarity*" or as "*status solidarity*" oriented sociolinguistic phenomena. The animators and newsreaders diversify their style to show or build an identity, a social status, or a social class membership.

Labov (2001) makes a parallel between social stratification and stylistic variation; he labels them "Social/Stylistic Symmetry". He also classifies the speakers' awareness of a linguistic variable and the degree of its social stratification under the heading "The Sociolinguistic Interface"¹.

Face-to-face interaction, on the other side, makes the situation continuously changing. At any moment, speakers become hearers, and hearers become speakers. They adjust their speech according to whether they converge towards or diverge from co-participants. As a feed-back, they show agreement/disagreement through the maintenance of local or national standard norms of speech.

Starting from the theoretical background that stylistic variation underlies sociolinguistic change in progress (Labov 1966), we apply both speech (SAT) and communication accommodation theories (CAT) to an Arabic diglossic setting, i.e. Adrar Radio. The objective is to see whether the findings of Bell (1984, 1991a, 1991b, 1992, and 2001), Al-Khatib (1995 and 2001), Giles and Coupland (1991), Finegan and Biber (1994 and 2001), and Preston (2001) are verified in such a speech community.

¹ Labov (2001:86) says that it is "... the degrees of social awareness of a linguistic variable by members of the community, which in turn is based on the level of abstractness in the structures involved"



2. Accommodation Theories

Bell's (1991)¹ and Al-Khatib's (2001) studies constitute the hypothetical starting points of this research. To confirm or infirm their respective results, three male presenters of special radio programmes (dealing with agriculture, religion, or medicine) are recorded and analyzed. To test the validity of CAT concerning accommodation of newscasters to audience, three news bulletins presented by both a male and a female newscaster are also taped.

The communicators' accommodation to the audience is either "*responsive*" or "*initiative*" (Bell 1984, 1992, and 1986). Responsive and initiative accommodations form a continuum rather than a dichotomy. The former adaptation is the speakers' use of stylistic speech forms produced by the hearers or interlocutors. It may be negatively or positively evaluated by the audience. The latter accommodation, in contrast, may be apparent in the presenter's use of an informal style within a formal context to set a relationship with the audience and its expectations (cf. Pennebaker et al. 2003; Giles et al. 1987; Thakerar et al. 1982)². This accommodation is positively estimated by the

¹ Bell (1991a) summarizes the phenomenon in the following words: "We find that mass communication research and SAT both suggest independently that the twin factors of audience stereotyping and professional self-monitoring operate significantly in molding the language of mass communication" (page73).

² Pennebaker, J.W., M.R.Mehl, and K.G.Niederhoffer (2003) say: "...consequently, phrases, sentences, or entire texts must be considered within the context of the goals of the speaker and the relationship between the speaker and the audience." (p.549)

-Giles, H., A.Mulac, J.J.Bradac, and P.Johnson.1987. Speech accommodation theory: The first decade and beyond. In M.L.McLaughlin (ed.), *Communication Yearbook* 10:13-48. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

On page 21, they write: "It could be argued that not only do speakers converge to where they believe others to be, but in some (as yet unspecified) conditions to where they believe others *expect them* to be linguistically." (Original italics, in Bell 1991:98)

-Thakerar, J.N., H.Giles, and J.Cheshire.1982. op.cit.

Concerning the concepts of subjective an objective accommodation of Thakerar et al., Giles, Coupland and Coupland write: "The objective dimension refers to speakers' shifts in speech *independently measured* as moving toward (convergence) or away from (divergence) others, whereas the subjective dimension refers to speakers' *beliefs* regarding whether they are converging or diverging..." (1991:14)



listeners. Initiative of a speaker constitutes response to the hearers; response of speakers is inevitably an initiative with regard to the audience's expectations, a process called "referee design" (Bell, 1991)

There are cases where radio presenters cast a "solidarity-" or "status-" oriented (in Brown and Gilman's 1972 [1960] terms)¹ accommodative behaviour. When solidarity-oriented accommodation takes place, the speaker makes use of some 'stigmatized' linguistic forms such as local dialectal terms and expressions. When status-oriented accommodation prevails, the speaker sticks to and does not deviate from the norms; he/she does not 'background' his/her personal social status to converge towards the audience. This last phenomenon is labelled as "*Speaker Design model*" (Bell, 1984), which looks at stylistic variation as part of the speaker's identity building process.

Topics constitute important independent non-personal variables in the course of accommodation. Topical variation encompasses various sociolinguistic factors. Among these is the speaker's linguistic identification with a particular group.

Variation in terms of styles of speech occurs when speakers adjust their speech to that of a distinct group to which they identify themselves as members. Al-Khatib clarifies this point in the following terms: "...speakers engage in stylistic variation not because they are affected by the use of a particular topic (though they are usually) but because they

¹ Brown, R., and A. Gilman (1972[1960]:257) define the 'power semantic' as follows: "One person may be said to have power over another in the degree that he is able to control the behavior of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior. The power semantic is similarly nonreciprocal; the superior says *T* and receives *V*." (p.255) Concerning the 'solidarity semantic', they define it as: "...a distinction...which is sometimes called the *T* of intimacy and the *V* of formality. We name this second dimension *solidarity*..."



identify themselves as speakers belonging to or addressing a particular group of addressees." (2001: 407).

Styles, then, reflect the speaker's manner to usewords rather than the content of these words. The discrepancy between linguistic style and linguistic content constitute the basis for most studies on stylistic variation. This research draws upon the findings and hypotheses of those studies.

3. Methodology

The present research analyzes various radio programmes, and takes into consideration such independent variables as topic, audience, and addressee. The programmes are:

-Program1: *Medical Guidance* (hitherto *MG*). The presenter is a male. His program lasts for nearly half an hour. Three segments are recorded at three different dates, and the duration of the recordings is 29.12 minutes.

-Program2: *Agriculture Guidance* (*AG*). The presenter is a male Agriculture Engineer, and the duration of his program is less than quarter of an hour. Three sequences of the program are taped; the overall recordedmaterial is about 21.13 mns.

-Program3: *Religious Guidance* (*RG*). The program is presented by an Imam from 11.00 to 11.30 am on a daily basis. It deals with religious matters. Three parts of this program are registered. The recordedmaterial is about 21.13 mns.

-Program3: *Religious Guidance* (*RG*). The program is presented by an Imam from 11.00 to 11.30 am on a daily basis. It deals with religious matters. Three parts of this program are registered. The recorded sequences amount to 20.39 mns



Programs 4a & 4b: *Local News Journal*. The journal is broadcasted on Friday, only. It reports the events that take place in the Wilaya (province) of Adrar for the whole week. The newscaster is male (MN) or female (FN). For both newscasters, two instances of two programs are recorded. The second recording consists of the same news bulletin delivered at different moments of the same day. All the taped sequences represent 14.27 mns.

The total sum of recordings is 01.29 hour.

The results give valuable information about style shifts in relation to gender of speaker (Trudgill, 2000:79-80)¹. They also allow grasping any stylistic variation due in part or in whole to personal factors. Alternatively, the newscasters' non-use of varying linguistic forms addressed to different audiences proves that their behaviour is status-oriented rather than audience-oriented. We classify the styles of each programme as follows:

Table n°1: Characteristics of the radio programmes, according to topics, animators, and styles of speech.

programmes	Topics	Animator	Style
P1	MG	Doctor	Less/semi-formal
P2	AG	Engineer	Less/semi-formal
P3	RG	Imam	Formal

¹ Trudgill, P.2000. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to language and Society*, 4th edition. Penguin Books. For Trudgill: "Gender differentiation in language, then, arises because...language, as a social phenomenon, is closely related to social attitudes. Men and women are socially different in that society lays down different social roles for them and expects different behaviour patterns from them. Language simply reflects this social fact. If the social roles of men and women change, moreover, as they seem to be doing currently in many societies, then it is likely that gender differences in language will change or diminish also..." (Pp.79-80)



P4a	News	Male newscaster	Formal
P4b	News	Female newscaster	Formal

4. *Contracted conjunctions*

To test the hypotheses of CAT and SAT, a few linguistic variables are considered. These are the syntactic conjunctions (wa-; ma9a; 9ala). The programmes subdivide into two categories. The first consists of the three special radio programmes: MG, AG and RG. The second category is composed of the four news bulletins delivered by both the male and the female newscasters.

Through the analyses, changes in scores and numbers of occurrences according to duration of speech, to intra-personal factors as style or genre, and to inter-personal sociolinguistic features as prestige and social status are highlighted. Concerning prestige, we compare the style used by the speaker to converge or diverge from the audience and addressees. The comparison is, hence, both on the horizontal (or stylistic) level and the vertical (or prestige) level (cf. Preston, 2001:289).

a) Special programmes

The examination of the results shows that:

1. The Agriculture engineer has the highest use of contracted conjunctions. His score is 72.03%. This number confirms that the topic of agriculture and the nature of the audience, the *fellahs*, encourage the use of economy “*quick and easy*” (Preston, 2001) features. The engineer’s linguistic behaviour may be termed “over-accommodation”. Over-accommodation ‘happens when older people are addressed



in a simplified vocabulary with a high-pitched tone of voice and slow speech" (Brown and Draper, 2003:11; see also Bilous and Krauss 1988)¹.

2. The doctor is the second speaker to use contracted items, i.e.:48.01%. MG, then, is a topic developed in a mixed formal-less formal style, since it addresses a large public which may not be highly educated. The targeted audience, in this case, influences the style of speech.
3. The Imam has an insignificant use of reduced items ($p=02.43\%$). He maintains formality through elaborate linguistic forms, such as formal MSA expressions, and does not make use of economy features. His style is formal.
4. At the level of style, one may say that both AG and MG are developed in a less formal style as compared to RG.

b) The Newscasters

both male and female newscasters data are analysed according to the number and percentages of contracted /non-contracted conjunctions used in each programme. It is worth pointing out that both programmes are the same news bulletin delivered on the same day at different moments. The topics are also the same.

We obtain the following results:

1. The first remark is that both newscasters have a reduced percentage of economy features, i.e. 01.71% of contracted conjunctions throughout all the sessions. However, the

¹ Brown, A, and P .Draper. 2003. Accommodative speech and terms of endearment: elements of a language mode often experienced by older adults. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 41(1):15-21, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

On page 16, they add the following definition of 'over-accommodation': "Within speech accommodation theory, the term over-accommodation refers to a particular pattern of speech modification that sometimes characterizes speech addressed to older people".

-Bilous, F.R, and R.M.Krauss. 1988. Dominance and accommodation in the conversation behaviours of same- and mixed-gender dyads. *Language and Communication* 8:183-94.



female broadcaster does not completely respect the formality of the style, and uses some contracted items during the second session (n=12.5%). At the reverse of her male counterpart, and although she reads the same news bulletin, she does not restrict herself to the use of standard forms.

2. The female newscaster contracts the coordinating conjunction {wa-} three times as {w-} and as {♦★}. Although this number is not significant, it instances the idea that women have a characteristic “feminine” (Ritchie Key 1975:34) usage of language, and have sex-preferential tendencies (Trudgill 2000:185)¹.

3. Although the female newscaster’s numbers and percentages of contracted items are not noteworthy, they show that there is a difference of conformity to the prescribed formal style on her part.

4. The male broadcaster respects the style of the news bulletins; whereas the female newsreader does not comply with it.

5. Economy vs. Elaborated linguistic features

Preston (1991 and 2001) and Finegan and Biber (1994 and 1996) concur that economy features such as contracted items are more probable in oral presentations, i.e. for spoken texts (Fairclough, 1989:24). They also characterise the use of low informal styles. female newscasters data are analysed

¹ Ritchie Key, M. 1975. *Male/ Female Language, with a comprehensive bibliography*. The Scarecrow Press Inc., Metuchen: New Jersey, USA.

37. Trudgill, P. 2000, op.cit.

Concerning sex-preferential tendencies, Trudgill clarifies the point and says: “The examples of sex-specific *distinct* male and female varieties came from technologically non-advanced food-gathering or nomadic communities where sex roles were much more clearly delineated. It is therefore possible that the larger and more inflexible the difference between the social roles of men and women in a particular community, the larger and more rigid the linguistic differences tend to be?” (p.185) (original italics)



according to the number and percentages of contracted /non-contracted conjunctions used in each programme. It is worth pointing out that both programmes are the same news bulletin delivered on the same day at different moments. The topics are also the same.

We obtain the following results:

1. The first remark is that both newscasters have a reduced percentage of economy features, i.e. 01.71% of contracted conjunctions throughout all the sessions. However, the female broadcaster does not completely respect the formality of the style, and uses some contracted items during the second session (n=12.5%). At the reverse of her male counterpart, and although she reads the same news bulletin, she does not restrict herself to the use of standard forms.
2. The female newscaster contracts the coordinating conjunction {wa-} three times as {w-} and as {♦★}. Although this number is not significant, it instances the idea that women have a characteristic “feminine” (Ritchie Key 1975:34) usage of language, and have sex-preferential tendencies (Trudgill 2000:185)¹.
3. Although the female newscaster’s numbers and percentages of contracted items are not noteworthy, they show that there is a difference of conformity to the prescribed formal style on her part.

¹ Ritchie Key, M. 1975. *Male/ Female Language, with a comprehensive bibliography*. The Scarecrow Press Inc., Metuchen: New Jersey, USA.

37. Trudgill, P. 2000, op.cit.

Concerning sex-preferential tendencies, Trudgill clarifies the point and says: “The examples of sex-specific *distinct* male and female varieties came from technologically non-advanced food-gathering or nomadic communities where sex roles were much more clearly delineated. It is therefore possible that the larger and more inflexible the difference between the social roles of men and women in a particular community, the larger and more rigid the linguistic differences tend to be?” (p.185) (original italics)



4. The male broadcaster respects the style of the news bulletins; whereas the female newsreader does not comply with it.

5. Economy vs. Elaborated linguistic features

Preston (1991 and 2001) and Finegan and Biber (1994 and 1996) concur that economy features such as contracted items are more probable in oral presentations, i.e. for spoken texts (Fairclough, 1989:24). They also characterise the use of low informal styles. female newscasters data are analysed according to the number and percentages of contracted /non-contracted conjunctions used in each programme. It is worth pointing out that both programmes are the same news bulletin delivered on the same day at different moments.

The topics are also the same.

We obtain the following results:

1. The first remark is that both newscasters have a reduced percentage of economy features, i.e. 01.71% of contracted conjunctions throughout all the sessions. However, the female broadcaster does not completely respect the formality of the style, and uses some contracted items during the second session (n=12.5%). At the reverse of her male counterpart, and although she reads the same news bulletin, she does not restrict herself to the use of standard forms.

2. The female newscaster contracts the coordinating conjunction {wa-} three times as {w-} and as {♦★}. Although this number is not significant, it instances the idea that women have a characteristic “feminine” (Ritchie Key



1975:34) usage of language, and have sex-preferential tendencies (Trudgill 2000:185)¹.

3. Although the female newscaster's numbers and percentages of contracted items are not noteworthy, they show that there is a difference of conformity to the prescribed formal style on her part.

4. The male broadcaster respects the style of the news bulletins; whereas the female newsreader does not comply with it.

5. Economy vs. Elaborated linguistic features

Preston (1991 and 2001) and Finegan and Biber (1994 and 1996) concur that economy features such as contracted items are more probable in oral presentations, i.e. for spoken texts (Fairclough, 1989:24). They also characterise the use of low informal styles. Elaborated linguistic features are characteristic of written material and are attributes of high formal styles of speech.

Preston's (2001) contention is that there are two "specific communicative mandates"; the first is "*be quick and easy*", which leads to economy of speech. The second is "*be clear*", which leads to elaboration of language style (Preston, 2001:280-281). However, Lesley Milroy (2001:277)² sees that these mandates are problematic as

¹ Ritchie Key, M. 1975. *Male/ Female Language, with a comprehensive bibliography*. The Scarecrow Press Inc., Metuchen: New Jersey, USA.

37. Trudgill, P. 2000. op.cit.

Concerning sex-preferential tendencies, Trudgill clarifies the point and says: "The examples of sex-specific *distinct* male and female varieties came from technologically non-advanced food-gathering or nomadic communities where sex roles were much more clearly delineated. It is therefore possible that the larger and more inflexible the difference between the social roles of men and women in a particular community, the larger and more rigid the linguistic differences tend to be?" (p.185) (original italics)

² Milroy, L.2001. Conversation, spoken language, and social identity. In Penelope Eckert and John R.Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP.



they are in conflict with the necessity to communicate efficiently. For her, economy features are not ad hoc informal spoken language features, and elaborate ones are not always characteristic of formal speech. She gives examples of high-prestige dialects which are more economical than the low-prestige dialects.

In the following lines, we compare the results obtained from two different sets of radio programs. The first set consists of an oral material. The presenters develop topics rather than 'read' texts. The second set is composed mainly of written texts read by the newscasters and the Imam.

The religious radio program (RG), which is among the first series along agricultural (AG) and medical guidance (MG), consists of two types of presentations. In the oral part, the Imam answers questions sent to him by the listeners. In the written/read part, the Imam delivers sermons, discusses particular topics, and reads already prepared texts. The oral part is considered in the first set, while the written part is the core of the second.

The comparison between the two sets shows that, if there is a difference between the two modes of presentation, it will be at the level of elaborated or economy linguistic features due either to "attention paid to speech" (Labov, 1966 and 1972) or to "regional" (Finegan and Biber, 1994)¹ variation, or to "speaking" vs. "reading aloud" activities, which are

She sees that "the ease mandate is problematic for other reasons; there is a traditional assumption that the principle of least effort is constantly at odds with the need to communicate efficiently, and this has sometimes been said rather vaguely to account for linguistic change" (p. 277)

¹ Finegan, E., and D. Biber (2001) define the word "register" as follows: "...we use the term "register" to represent language varieties characteristic of particular situations of use... Register includes not only the spoken varieties relating to "formality" and often designated as "styles" but other spoken and written situational varieties as well." (page 239)



differently valued in Arabic diglossic settings (Walters, 1994).

In other words, the number of contracted/ non-contracted items used in the two sets of programs illustrates the idea that “economy” is favoured by oral “be quick and easy” topics, whereas “elaborated” linguistic features are most favoured by written “be clear” material such as news bulletins. If we find reverse results, these will verify L.Milroy’s arguments that high-prestige, or formal standard dialects use economy features and that there is a difference between interactive and *monologic* or written discourse.

The overall results for the oral material are:

Table n° 1: Overall results of oral contracted/non-contracted items

Mode/programs		Contracted		Non-contracted	
		N°	%	N°	%
Oral	AG	237	72.03	92	27.96
	MG	133	48.01	144	51.98
	RG	10	3.49	276	95.50
	Total	380	42.60	512	57.39

When the topic is presented orally, the number and percentage of contracted items is significant (n=380 or 42.60%). However, the difference of percentage between the contracted and non-contracted items is not too important (n=132 or 14.79%). The results of the written materials are as follows:



Table n° 2: Overall results of written/read contracted/non-contracted items

Mode/programs		Contracted		Non-contracted	
		N°	%	N°	%
Written	WD1	00	00	124	100
	MN	00	00	138	100
	FN	03	1.71	172	98.28
Total		03	0.68	434	99.31

The results clearly show that when the material is written, the number of contracted items is insignificant (n=03 or 0.68%). The number of non-contracted or elaborated items has a high occurrence with such a mode of presentation. If we compare between the two sets and modes, i.e. oral and written, we come to the following conclusions:

1. The highest number of contracted items is obtained during oral radio programmes.
2. The written material does not allow speakers to use contracted or economy items as it is a marker of formality and standard norms.
3. During the oral presentations, the presenters do not stick to the formal style; rather, they shift towards a less formal style through the use of an important number of contracted items.
4. The results obtained from both sets confirm the hypothesis that the oral material favours economy features, whereas, the written one prefers elaborated linguistic features:



These findings verify Finegan and Biber's (1994 and 1996) assumptions that: "...elaborate linguistic structures belong to literate situations of use; economical ones to oral ones" (Preston, 2001:282). They also confirm that, although the radio presenters are not in a face-to-face interaction with the audience, they may be influenced by the "imagined hearers" (Preston, 2001:283). According to Allan Bell (1984 and 1992)¹, this sociolinguistic situation, corresponds to the concept of "referee design", which is descriptive of an invisible audience, or overhearers, or the referee to whom the speaker accommodates. These external sociolinguistic factors encourage style shifts, and lead the speaker to pay "attention to his speech" (Labov, 1972).

5.1 Economy Features: Status or Audience Oriented

A closer look at the numbers and percentages of contracted items, or economy features shows divergent processes of accommodation due mainly to "audience status" or to "audience solidarity" (Bell, 1991b). "Audience status" refers to the fact that the radio presenters or communicators accommodate their speech to the listeners through the use of a high percentage of non-contracted features.

"Audience solidarity" is the process whereby communicators respect local norms of verbal communication while delivering their speech. They resort to the use of certain linguistic forms such as reduced or shortened vowels, deleted or contracted consonants. They

¹ Allan Bell (1984) defines referees as "third persons not physically present at an interaction but possessing such salience for the speaker that they influence language choice even in their absence." (p. 328).



set a solidarity mandate with the audience, or show “...no less than a celebration of in-group solidarity” (Coupland, 1985:158).

In the case of Adrar radio presenters, we find two tendencies. First, contracted {wa-} is a linguistic form which encourages audience solidarity. Second, the less contracted {9ala-, ma9a-} are audience status oriented. We summarise this idea as follows:

<i>Conjunctio ns.</i>	<i>Audience status</i>	<i>Audience solidarity</i>
wa-	-	+
ma9a-	+	-
9ala-	+	-

The overall analysis of the radio sessions for the three programs yields the following results:

- {wa-} Audience Solidarity Factor

The coordinator {wa-}, reduced to {w-} and {w★-} in fluent speech, is the most significantly contracted item ($p=47.49\%$). During the Agriculture program (AG) {wa-} scores a consistently higher percentage of contractions ($p=66.11\%$). In the MG series, {wa-} receives 28.88 % of reductions. The religious program (RG) has the least number and percentage of contracted coordinator ($p=5\%$).

The results make it obvious that the coordinating conjunction {wa-} has the highest number of contractions during the three programs and the nine sessions. It is followed by the conjunction {9ala} which scores 16.09%.



We can conclude that the agriculture programme allows the speakers to use more audience solidarity forms than is the case for the two other radio series.

Topics such as agriculture problems, harvesting the crop, and using the manure with fresh grains compel the speaker to use a “quick and easy” style of speech. It means use of economy features to deliver more information in less time, and also to show a clear will for solidarity with the audience (or in-group membership solidarity in N. Coupland’s (1985) terms).

- AG, Audience Solidarity Program

The number of contracted items in AG leads to one deduction: AG is an audience solidarity radio program. The percentages of reduced linguistic forms are over 50% for each item.

The speaker, who is an agriculture engineer, makes use of economy features to say a lot in a short span of time ($t=21.13$ minutes). He also uses economy features to be understood by a large number of listeners who are not or less educated. From another angle, his topic does not necessitate a formal style of language. This accounts for his high score of economy features along the three sessions of the radio programme ($p=65.17\%$).

- Audience Status factors

There is a crossover point between the three programs; it is that of the conjunction {ma9a}. For AG, it is 100% reduced, whereas there is 0% of reduction in the other two radio programs. This intersect illustrates the idea that ‘audience status’ factors are characteristic of each program. They



depend on the nature of the topic, the speaker's status and the audience addressed.

-MG and RG, Audience Status Programs

The results of both MG and RG show that these programmes are more status than solidarity oriented. For MG, the conjunctions seem to be insignificantly contracted to meet the audience's need in matter of communication. In RG, the Imam seldom contracts the linguistic items, for example {wa-} = 5%. On the reverse, he makes use of most conjunctions in their CA/MSA original forms.

Conclusion

This research shows that in a formal diglossic situation such as a radio, newsreaders and radio animators use contracted conjunctions. They do so to converge towards their audience members which may be literate/illiterate or educated/uneducated. However, not all radio animators converge towards their audiences. To account for this sociolinguistic phenomenon, the literature on communication proposes 'economy' and 'elaborated' (Preston 2001) linguistic features. That is, the speakers use fewer words to say a lot in a short span of time. They also make use of "be quick and easy mandates" (Finegan and Biber 1994 and 2001) to send information and be well received by the listeners.

From another angle, convergence/divergence processes are clear illustrations of the speakers' stylistic variations mainly to set a close or a distant relationship with the audience members. They are either "audience status" or "audience solidarity" (Bell, 1991) oriented radio programmes. The



findings of this research are that the coordinating conjunction {wa-} is a marker of solidarity with the audience and is a highly contracted item. AG, which deals with agriculture, is the most important ‘audience solidarity’ program. It uses “be quick and easy” mandates as it is directed to an uneducated or a less-educated category of people, the fellahs.

References

- Abd-el-Jawad, H, 1981, *Lexical and Phonological variation in Spoken Arabic in Amman*, PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Abd-el-Jawad, H, 1987, “Cross-Dialectal Variation in Arabic: Competing Prestigious forms”, *Language in Society* 10: 359-367.
- Al-Khatib, M.A, 1995, “The impact of interlocutor sex on linguistic accommodation: A case study of Jordan radio phone-in program”, *Multilingua* 14 (2):133-150.
- Al-Khatib, M.A, 1988, *Sociolinguistic change in an expanding urban context: A case study of Irbid city, Jordan*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Durham.
- Al-Khatib, M.A, 2001, “Audience design revisited in a diglossic speech community: A case study of three different TV programs addressed to three different audiences”, *Multilingua* 20(4):393-414.
- Bell, A. 1984, “Language style as audience design”, *Language in Society* 13: 145-294.
- Bell, A.1986, “Responding to your audience: Taking the initiative”, Paper presented to the *Minnesota Conference on linguistic Accommodation and Style-shifting*, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Bell, A.1991a, *The language of the News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bell, A.1991b, “Audience accommodation in the mass media”, in Howard Giles, Justine & Nikolas Coupland (eds.) *Context of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: CUP and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de L'Homme: Paris, pp: 69-102.
- Bell, A.1992, “Hit and miss/ Referee design in the dialects of New Zealand television advertisements”, *Language and Communication* 12 (3/4):327-340.
- Bell, A. 2001, “Back in style: reworking audience design”, in Penelope Eckert and John R.Rickford (eds.) *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Bilous, F.R, and R.M. Krauss, 1988, “Dominance and accommodation in the conversation behaviours of same- and mixed-gender dyads”, *Language and Communication* 8:183-94.
- Brown, A., and P .Draper, 2003, “Accommodative speech and terms of endearment: elements of a language mode often experienced by older adults”, *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 41(1):15-21, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

-Brown, R., and A. Gilman 1972 [1960], “The pronouns of Power and Solidarity”, in Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed.) *Language and Social Context*, Penguin, London, UK.

-Clark, R.A, and J. G. Delia, 1976, “The development of Functional Persuasive Skills in Childhood and early Adolescence”, *Child Development* 47(4):1008-1014.

-Clark, R.A, and J. G. Delia, 1979, “*Topoi* and Rhetorical Competence”, *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65:187-206.

-Coupland, N.1985, “Hark, hark, the lark”: Social Motivations for Phonological Style Shifting”, *Language and Communication* 5:153-71.

-Coupland, N. 2001, “Language, situation, and the relational self: theorizing dialect-style in sociolinguistics”, in Penelope Eckert and John. R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP.

-Fairclough, N.1989, *Language and Power*. Longman Group, UK.

-Finegan, E., and D. Biber, 1994, “Register and Social Dialect Variation: an Integrated Approach”, in Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan (eds.), *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, pp.315-47, Oxford: OUP.

-Finegan, E., and D. Biber, 1996, “Register and Social Dialect Variation: A Reconsideration”, *NSF “Workshop on Style”*, Stanford University.

-Finegan, E., and D. Biber, 2001, “Register variation and social dialect variation: the Register Axiom”, in Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP.

-Giles, H., A. Mulac, J.J. Bradac, and P. Johnson. 1987. Speech accommodation theory: The first decade and beyond. In M.L. McLaughlin (ed.), *Communication Yearbook* 10:13-48. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

-Giles, H. and N. Coupland, 1991, *Language, contexts and Consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

-Giles, H, J. Coupland, and N. Coupland (eds.), 1991, *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: CUP and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris.

-Gordon, M.J, 2000, “Phonological Correlates of Ethnic Identity: evidence of divergence?” *American Speech* 75(2): 115-136.

-Kerswill, P, 1994, “Dialects Converging: rural speech in Urban Norway”, *Oxford studies in language Contact*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

-Labov, W, 1966, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, Washington, D.C: Center for Applied Linguistics.

-Labov, W,1972, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

-Labov, W, 2001, “The anatomy of style shifting”, in Penelope Eckert and John R.Rickford (eds.) *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP, pp:85-108.

-Milroy, L, 2001, “Conversation, spoken language, and social identity”, in Penelope Eckert and John R.Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP, pp: 268-278.

-Pennebaker, J.W, MR. Mehl, and K.G. Niederhoffer, 2003. Psychological Aspects of Natural Language Use: Our Words, Our Selves. *Annual Revue of Psychology* 54:547-77.



-Preston, D.R, 1991, "Sorting out the Variables in Sociolinguistic Theory", *American Speech* 66:33-56.

-Preston, D.R, 2001, "Style and the psycholinguistics of sociolinguistics: the logical problem of language variation", in Penelope Eckert and John R.Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP.

-Rickford, J.R, 2001, "Style and stylizing from the perspective of an autonomous sociolinguistics", in Penelope Eckert and John R.Rickford (eds.) *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: CUP.

-Ritchie Key, M, 1975, *Male/ Female Language, with a comprehensive bibliography*. The Scarecrow Press Inc., Metuchen: New Jersey, USA.

-Thakerar, J.N., H.Giles, and J.Cheshire, 1982, "Psychological and linguistic parameters of speech accommodation theory", in Colin Fraser and Klaus R.Scherer (eds.), *Advances in the Social Psychology of Language*. Cambridge: CUP, pp.205-55.

-Trudgill, P, 2000, *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to language and Society*, 4th edition. Penguin Books.

-Walters, K, 1994, "Diglossia, Linguistic Variation, and Language Change in Arabic", in Mushira Eid (ed.) *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics VIII*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp: 157-197.

