

Assessing Al-Koura Rural Dialect Archaic Vocabulary Among the Young Generation

Amer Radwan Humeidat

The University of Jordan, Jordan

E-mail: humeidatamer@yahoo.com

Received: August 1, 2018	Accepted: August 13, 2018	Published: August 31, 2018
doi:10.5296/ijl.v10i4.13457	URL: https://doi.org/10.529	96/ijl.v10i4.13457

Abstract

The present study deals with the phenomenon of lexical loss in Al-Koura Rural Dialect in Irbid Governorate, in the northern part of Jordan. Some pre-cultural words suffer from loss and disappearance, and hence, become obsolete. The study aims at identifying the pre-cultural words that are undergoing lexical loss. The study also investigates the diffusion of pre-cultural words among the young generation speakers. The study also examines the linguistic and extra linguistic factors such as solidarity marker, level of education on certain pre-cultural words among the young generation. The present study involved two central methods necessary to achieve the purposes of the study. The first method was to make interview recordings with old group members to collect pre-cultural words through addressing general questions. The questions covered a variety of topics such as food, clothes, glasses and weather. The second method was to compile a questionnaire with the pre-cultural words to be distributed among the young speakers. The questionnaire contained 222 pre-cultural words which refer to several spheres and contexts of life in the society at the previous era. The questionnaire was distributed to 400 young participants. The study group included school and college male and female students. The study group also included other employees from different governmental sectors in Al-Koura District. The findings showed that 168 words were not much familiar to the young speakers. The findings also revealed that the pre-cultural words were sort of familiar to the male young speakers rather than the female young speakers. The lower the age, the less familiar s/he with the traditional pre-cultural words. The educated young speakers who have a lower or medium education level obtain little knowledge of pre-cultural words. The solidarity among the young speakers appeared to be higher than that of the old people.

Keywords: Language loss, Dialect loss, Lexical loss and attrition.



1. Introduction

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is administratively partitioned into 12 governorates. Each governorate is subdivided into a number of districts which in turn combine a number of villages or towns. Irbid governorate embraces nine districts, each of which is consisted of a number of villages. The nine districts are: The Capital District (Al-Qasabeh), Al-Aghwar Al-Shamaliyyeh, Al-Koura, Al-Mazar Al-Shamali, Al-Ramtha, Bani Obaid, Bani-Kinanah, Taybeh and Wasatiyyeh. The current study explores Al-Koura District, which is located in the north western parts of Irbid governorate. Al-Koura District (henceforth, KD) is about 25 kilometers to the west of the Capital District (Al-Qasabeh). It has an area of 210 square kilometers and comprises 22 villages with its administrative center in <u>Der Abi Saeed</u>. It enjoys a high population density. According to the Jordan national census of 2017, it has a population of 170340. The young population who live in KD are 55181, whose age range between 18 to 35 years old. Besides, the youngest population are 75257, whose age below 18. It also hosts a great number of workers and labors from different countries. It is situated on a fertile and productive plain with a range of mountains. It is one of the most attractive areas of Jordan, that is characterized by its fertile soil and abundant springs.

"Arabic is the official language across the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan" (Welchman, 1988:868). Jordanian Arabic has a variety of dialects, including urban, rural and Bedouin dialects (Rosenhouse, 2016). "These forms of Arabic are mutually understandable, that is, each form is comprehensible to its instantaneous neighbors" (Suleiman, 1985:6). A dialect is generally considered as a technical term for a variety of language that is socially lower than the appropriate form of the language (McArthur and McArthur, 2005). Al-Koura Rural Dialect (henceforth, KRD) is a vernacular variety of Jordanian Arabic that is distinguished from other varieties by a set lexical features. KRD is a variety that reflects a historical contact between the people who reside in the villages across the district. KRD is used in Irbid, particularly, in the northwestern part of Irbid, Jordan. This variety is associated with and uniformly spoken by the villagers in KD. However, the dialect varies from one area to another and from one social class to another, it changes from one age to another (Finegan, 2014). Apparently, the vocabulary items and other aspects of the variety which are involved in the speech community are distinguished from other varieties with respect to particular words and expressions which are used as symbolic markers of one specific variety rather than another.

At any rate, Al-Koura community has recently experienced considerable social, economic, cultural, and technological changes as well as a movement towards modernization. This dramatically affects the pre-cultural and inherited vocabulary in the dialect which may, in turn, lead to some linguistic change across the region. That is because, on the one hand, "lexical use varies and changes within communities across space and time, and this feature can be ascribed to the linguistic change" (Millar, et al., 2014:2). On the other hand, the words are used as a marker of cultures and hence a cultural index of the cultural world of society (Newman, et al., 2012). In this regard, the lexicon of a dialect is inclined to be contiguous to the nature and the geographical diffusion of a culture (Carver, 1987). As a matter of fact, there has been suggested crucial evidence of the process of first language loss (or a part of it)



observed in the speech of native speakers who have never resided in a different environment (Sebina, 2014).

Therefore, KRD traditional pre-cultural vocabulary items which refer to the early objects, follow and belong to the customs and behaviors may have experienced a kind of attrition across the region over time, and they have turned to be out-dated and lost among the successive generations. This change may have resulted from the fact that lexical loss unavoidably requires words for objects that are no longer culturally appropriate or convenient (Craig, 1998). Taking into account, the traditional words that have had a lesser geographical distribution and have stopped referring to steady formal contexts and regular situations appear to be more susceptible to loss and disappearance. Further, there is a general inclination towards substituting inferior dialectal elements of a moderately limited scale with principal dialectal elements that have a wider diffusion.

1.1 The Theoretical Framework

The present study examines the attritional process that affects traditional pre-cultural words and terms which are principally associated with general spheres of the social life in the society at the previous era. This is based on the first language and the first environment which results in the loss of a portion of the rural dialect in KD. A process that occurs across successive generations. The theoretical framework of the current study is primarily based on which language is lost (L1 or L2) and in what environment (first or second) that is made by de Bot and Weltens, 1985 but ascribed to Van Els, 1986. This will be made through establishing strong relationships between the linguistic change and sociolinguistic factors such as age, gender, level of education, etc. Lexical loss may be initiated by young speakers or may be internalized within the language system.

1.2 The Statement of the Problem of the Study

The present study is concerned with KRD words that have begun to suffer from the processes of deterioration and obsolescence. There is crucial evidence that the pure speech of a dialect is hurriedly evaporating in the countryside due to modern facilities of intercommunication. It also explores the ensuing compensation for the loss of natural lexicon by utilizing other alternative words which are great fit to different situations and contexts. The study also focuses mainly on the role of some significant factors responsible for such a phenomenon. This is intended to examine how far lexical change within the dialect has progressed over time and to provide a thorough analysis and clarification of this idealized picture.

1.3 The Objectives of the Study

The study aims to answer three main research questions addressed and posed thoroughly:1-What are the words that are undergoing lexical attrition in KRD? 2-What is the level of familiarity with KRD old-fashioned terms among the young generation? 3-What is the effect of solidarity, level of education, gender and age on certain old and out-dated terms among the young generations?



2. Literature Review

Language loss is a blanket term that covers attrition, incomplete acquisition, language death and even language change (Schmid et al., 2004). In addition, language attrition has most often been considered a subdivision of language contact, language change and language death rather than as a subject of language acquisition and bilingualism (Schmid and Köpke, 2013). Language loss can be the consecutive situation of loneliness from human contact (Major, 2001). Language loss is a broad term pertaining to the processes involved in a reduction and decline of linguistic skills, which refers to the intergenerational process and this kind of loss is not caused by a brain damage such as aphasia and dementia. Suffice it to say that it refers only to the healthy individuals who suffer from attritional process (Extra and Verhoeven, 1999). This is an intergenerational course of action, where the first generation fails to or poorly transmit the entire knowledge system of the language or portions of that knowledge system to the successors.

On the contrary, the genuine loss of central linguistic characteristics as an attritional process is not restricted to languages. It is also present with dialects (Millar et al., 2014). Dialect loss or semi-loss occurs in the environment of the first language monolingual situations. This form of attritional process generally refers to the loss of a traditional and locally entrenched variety in order to create one either from outside the community or from a specific group within the equivalent community (Britain, 2002b). Further, a dialect may evaporate as a whole, or it can vanish by its divisions in the course of a constant process of lexical loss which occurs whenever significant modifications influencing one linguistic group rapidly change the living conditions of its individuals, and this indeed intimidates the diffusion of words and their meanings (Filipović and Pütz, 2016). The degeneration of dialect involves the erosion of linguistic resources and the gradual deterioration of important regionalized stereotypical features which are most likely to result in decline in variation between varieties of the same language, in combination with the fact that alternatives will be replaced by impressive forms spread over extensive areas.

Definitely, the loss of original and genuine terms in a dialect is specified and assigned to lexical attrition (Beal, 2006). A substantial number of scholars have agreed that the attrition process will have an effect on all facets of the language system in various ways and on many different levels. The most susceptible language areas in loss are the lexicon. Lexical knowledge appears to be more vulnerable to loss than any other linguistic perspectives. This is reasonable because vocabulary is formed of individual units rather than a sequence of rules. Nation (1990) makes clear that speaker's familiarity with words requires both receptive and productive knowledge. Briefly, receptive knowledge can be viewed as the ability to recognize and understand a word when it is spoken or written while productive knowledge can also be regarded as the ability to create a word when one writes or speaks. Therefore, it can be assumed that the words are recognized receptively first and after purposeful and incidental learning seem to be accessible to productive use (Zhou, 2010).

First and foremost, lexical attrition manifests itself in the first stages of the language loss, and this can be traced through determination of absent or modified elements in the oral discourse.



This implies that when a term undergoes the process of loss, the speakers of that dialect avoid using it, and it is not passed on or transmitted to the next generation. Conversely, when speakers stop using some traditionally entrenched pre-cultural dialect forms, they have to substitute them with the latest patterns as they lose their impact on the inhabitants and culture. On the one hand, disuse generates a ferocious sphere of attrition particularly when the objects and things for which the words referred to become obsolete on account of their deep relations to the conventional customs no longer practiced. On the other hand, the effect of the existence of two languages or varieties which live side by side has either excluded a portion of one specific language or variety or filled in the huge linguistic gaps the language or variety begins to show signs of.

Lexical loss happens when the inhabitants of a particular region adopt and take on words and terms from a new neighboring culture which matches and conforms with their social class and prestige. Besides, the members of the community, particularly the younger people always attempt to discard some of the locally embedded pre-cultural words and this can be ascribed to the change in the self-esteem of the speech community (Saeidfar and Tohidian, 2012). A clear manifestation of lexical attrition can be justified as that dialect vocabulary in a regular and constant flux and acclimatizes to times and society (Beal, 2012). Consequently, the lower prestigious pre-cultural words and terms have become less effective and eroded over time. On the contrary, new critical words will acclimatize to new life styles, adapt to external contact, and become accustomed to modernity (Filipović and Pütz, 2016). This indicates that lexical attrition of embedded regional vocabulary in the dialect is, to a greater extent, the outcome of modern acculturation or dialect fading.

Likewise, the decline in the frequency of pre-cultural words use among the young speakers of the community and the decline in the range of social areas of life allow traditional words to be affected by loss. Instead, loss is a result of innovation of new words in the community. The vanished words would end up replaced by new innovative words to keep up with the fashion in the speech for reasons of prestige, and that is most likely to help spread the new words to other members of the speech community. Introducing new words engenders a competition between different words that reach a point of non-use and consecutive abandonment. Consequently, the introduction of new words will trigger substitution. So when it is the time to explain the archaic words within the local rural dialect, what concerns most is the status of the words in terms of their sociolinguistic aspects.

However, the degree of language system deterioration depends on the number of words being disused in everyday life and the number of speakers who disuse the words and this is likely to provide empirical and decisive evidence of that phenomenon. This implies that the knowledge system may become aggravated and very hard to be accessed because of irregular input and frequent disuse of the first or primary language. As a result, the traditional words run away and contract as they slowly fall into abandonment among successive generations. The traditional words have become less common words and are most likely to be bound to be lost, like unique speech styles or register variants. In that behalf, the traditional dialectal words are being lost among the young generations, since there is a strong propensity for



localized dialect terms to evaporate in favor of more prestigious, extensive, and nationally distinguished vocabulary items.

The amount of literature on traditional words loss is rather scarce. One attempt at providing an explanation and analysis of the lexical loss of a dialect can be found in Deli, et al.'s (2014) study, Saeidfar and Tohidian's (2012) study, Britain's (2009) study and Simmelbauer's (2000) study. Deli, et al.'s (2014) study was conducted to examine the familiarity level of Sarawak Malay Dialect (SMD) words in the speakers of younger generations. This study includes 50 SMD words consisting of a combination of popular and seemingly archaic dialect vocabulary. The tool that is used in this study is a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire which is given out to 37 participants who are native of SMD speakers and their ages range between 13 to 26 years old. The overall findings show that approximately 50 percent of the words were not acknowledged and were weird to most of the speakers.

Saeidfar and Tohidian study's (2012) examined the impact of social class and age on attrition of some outdated words and expressions of Isfahani dialect. A questionnaire was given out to 120 male/female residents from three social groups each including 40 upper-social class; 40 middle-social class and 40 low-social class with ages range of 25 to 26. The questionnaire includes 20 old words and expressions of Iran dialect. Each participant was required to mention the meaning in front of the words, they are familiar with. The results indicate that the lower the age, the less knowledge about the meaning of words. Besides, the lower the social class, the more knowledge about the meaning of the words.

Britain's (2009) survey was conducted by the Norwich-based *Easter Daily Press* 1991. A questionnaire compiled of a collection of local dialect words was dispensed across the region to adults and children, who were asked whether they were familiar and aware of the words proposed in the questionnaire. Britain stated that " those participants who were over 60 years old recognized over three quarters of the words, and those participants who were under 18 less than one word in five". Furthermore, Britain delineated that "words which were confined to Norfolk and Suffolk were less than half as likely to be recognized by adults and fourteen times less likely by the under 18-years-olds as those found beyond East Anglia".

Simmelbauer's (2000) conducted a study of lexical usage in Northumberland to determine the level of the traditional dialect lexis that had undergone lexical attrition. A questionnaire was designed to elicit 101 concepts. Interviews were conducted with subjects of both genders. The findings revealed that several words were known by few or no subjects, and the knowledge of others deviate according to the age or gender or location of the informants. The findings also provided evidence that many words have been eroded, while some of the traditional terms are confined to the elderly people. Simmelbauer asserted that female and male participants recognized the same number of the dialect words, and they tended to be very familiar with them.

3. Methods and Procedures

The present study involves two central methods of data collection. These methods are structured interviews recording with the old group members (control group) and a



questionnaire among the young group members (study group) to determine the level of current knowledge and familiarity with the historical lexical items. Therefore, the first step was to elicit the data (pre-cultural words) from old peoples' responses while they were making replies to the researcher's questions. These words are very unknown and unfamiliar to the researcher. The researcher prepared 82 questions in the native language. These questions covered a variety of topics. The second step was to compile a questionnaire to be distributed into the young participants. The questionnaire consists of 222 pre-cultural words. The pre-cultural words were selected on the basis of the researcher's unfamiliarity with and ignorance of. The control group of the study consisted of 20 old participants; and their ages ranged between 55-85 years old. Therefore, the average age is 65. The study group consisted of 400 school, college male and female students and other employees from different sectors across the region. This group's age range between 18-35 years old. It should be noted that all the involved participants of the study permanently reside in Al-Koura District.

The instrument of the current study is a 3-point Likert scale questionnaire rating for familiarity (Familiar, Uncertain, Unfamiliar). The familiarity rating technique is considered to be significant because it informs the researcher how frequent dialect speakers read, hear or use words and how well they recognize the meaning of certain dialect items. The questionnaire is used to elicit both qualitative and quantitative data. The questionnaire is based on a corpus of elicited interviews responses. The data being investigated is gleaned from those structured interviews. There were two sections included in the questionnaire. The first section of the questionnaire contained social questions about the participants' gender, age, level of education, participants' occupation, communal and social activities such as helping poor people and neighbors. The second section of the questionnaire consisted of a selection of pre-cultural words and terms that participants were required to fill in with a mark to show their knowledge of and familiarity with. The participants were also required to provide any other supplementary words that give the same meaning and refer to the same context to the marked words.

4. Data Analysis

The data was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative analysis was to find the occurrences of archaic words. Qualitative analysis answered the research questions regarding the level of familiarity of KRD old-fashioned terms among the young generation in addition to the effect of solidarity, level of education, gender and age on certain old/outdated terms among the young generations.

5. Results and Discussion

In this section, the researcher presented the results of the study. The traditional and pre-cultural words included in the present study were classified into several spheres. The general spheres of life which contained the relevant words were classified as follows and the number of the words included in each sphere was marked as well: Food related words (13), Clothes related words (25), Glasses related words (2), Shoes related words (6), Housing internal-objects (52), Housing external-objects (27), Marriage related words (3), Names of Groups of people (3), Peoples' adjectives and professions related words (15), Animal related



adjectives and objects (11), Women's' hairstyle related words (2), Coins related words (3), Weight units (4), Weather related words (10), Land related words (5), General social verbs (26), General traditional words (15). The overall total of the words is 222 traditional words.

This section aimed at identifying the traditional and pre-cultural words that have experienced lexical attrition in KRD. It was used a specific equation to identify the phenomenon of lexical attrition in KRD. The equation was based on three main scales. Each scale was given a number in sequence. The dialectal words were highly attrited when they recorded the mean score between 2.35 and 3. Whereas, the words that recorded the mean score between 1.68 and 2.34 were recognized as moderately abandoned. Otherwise, the words were considered to be familiar to the young speakers. All words included in the following table indicated that all words were highly unfamiliar to the young speakers. The table 1 presented an example of word of each sphere of life and the level of attrition.

N	Word	Mean	Standard deviation	Percentage	Level of attrition
1	al∫æmænZor	2.72	0.56	90.6%	High
2	γazijat	2.77	0.47	92.3%	High
3	\$ winat	2.51	0.81	83.6%	High
4	Tæksijeh	2.79	0.47	92.9%	High
5	mestæhed	2.84	0.36	94.6%	High
6	ĥabon	2.80	0.44	93.3%	High
7	Alfid	2.73	0.56	90.9%	High
8	Surbeh	2.77	0.47	92.3%	High
9	țare∫	2.84	0.36	94.6%	High
10	kokæh	2.81	0.44	93.6%	High
11	quðleh	2.54	0.72	84.6%	High
12	qærṭæh	2.68	0.57	89.3%	High
13	ŞaŞ	2.65	0.58	88.3%	High
14	∫ælhæbon	2.73	0.49	90.9%	High
15	Şfir	2.77	0.47	92.3%	High
16	jexrez	2.84	0.36	94.6%	High
17	xænas	2.83	0.36	94.3%	High

Table 1. Means, standard deviation and percentage of the words.

It can be concluded that (168) traditional words registered the mean score between (2.35) and (3). These words achieved the percentage (0.76%). This indicated that the relevant words were highly unfamiliar among the young speakers in KRD and dialectal words have become obsolete. These traditional words were not recognized or were not regular among most of the young speakers. The local dialect, thereby, is experiencing a kind of attrition because of dialects contact and some sociolinguistic factors.

The current study attempted to group participants on the basis of social factors such as education, gender and age. Then it looked at examining how certain traditional words were



recognized by each specific group. The analysis presented in table 2 showed that there are significant differences at $p \le 0.05$ between males and females. This indicated that the participants' use of the out-dated words varied. The females yielded a higher mean score (2.7045), whereas the males yielded a lower mean score (2.5944). This means that the male participants frequently recognize the archaic words more than the female participants. That is because they have a considerable contact with old people, meet with new people and move from one place to another.

Ν	Sphere	V	Par	М	S	T-T	Sig
1	Food associated words	Μ	220	1.9342	.32339	4.00	*0.00
		F	180	2.0878	.41101	4.08	*0.00
2	Clothes associated words	М	220	2.0213	.26911	2.25	*0.02
		F	180	2.0873	.30809	2.25	*0.02
3	Glasses associated words	Μ	220	2.4250	.63659	1.75	*0.04
		F	180	2.5477	.74082	1.75	.0.04
4	Shoes associated words	Μ	220	2.5130	.36245	2.65	*0.00
		F	180	2.6091	.35865	2.03	10.00
5	Housing internal-objects	Μ	220	2.2296	.32133	3.06	*0.00
		F	180	2.3408	.39101	5.00	.0.00
6	Housing external-objects	Μ	220	2.4473	.32879	3.76	*0.00
		F	180	2.6032	.46936	5.70	10.00
7	Marriage associated words	Μ	220	2.2667	.44033	0.67	*0.03
		F	180	2.2955	.40235	0.07	0.05
8	Names of Groups of people	Μ	220	2.3537	.44539	0.25	*0.01
		F	180	2.3652	.47030	0.23	0.01
9	Peoples' adjectives associated words	Μ	220	2.4930	.34504	1.96	*0.04
		F	180	2.5703	.44168	1.90	0.0-
10	Animal associated adjectives and objects	Μ	220	2.3523	.40368	2.85	*0.00
		F	180	2.4761	.45514	2.85	
11	Women's' hairstyle associated words	Μ	220	2.4500	.49811	1.27	*0.02
		F	180	2.5273	.68320	1.27	10.02
12	Coins associated words	Μ	220	2.5463	.50415	2.35	*0.03
		F	180	2.5712	.56239	2.33	0.05
13	Weight Units	Μ	220	2.3819	.40284	6.35	*0.00
		F	180	2.7398	.66140	0.55	0.00
14	Weather associated words	Μ	220	2.4544	.33072	3.28	*0.00
		F	180	2.5686	.35913	5.20	0.00
15	Land associated words	Μ	220	2.6689	.39994	2.64	*0.01
		F	180	2.7364	.41174	2.04	0.01
16	General social verbs	М	220	2.5004	.34201	2.81	*0.00
		F	180	2.6114	.42852	2.01	0.00
17	General traditional words	М	220	2.5204	.39098	2.49	*0.00
		F	180	2.6427	.55573	2.47	*0.00
	Overall	М	220	2.5944	.33698	2.62	*0.00
		F	180	2.7045	.47329	2.02	0.00

Table 2. The mean, standard deviation and T-test by the gender variable

The analysis also showed that there are apparent differences based on the participants' age. The results showed that the participants whose age ranged between 32 and 35 yielded the highest score (2.71). The participants whose age ranged between 18-23 registered the mean score (2.66). The participants whose age ranged between 23-28 yielded the mean score (2.65),



while the participants whose age ranged between 28-32 registered the least mean score (2.64). Therefore, the overall mean score was (2.65).

ANOVA was run to find any statistically significant differences among the participants responses in accordance with the age variable. The analysis showed that there are significant differences across the traditional words of social life spheres. The results also showed that there are statistically significant differences at P< 0.05 level in accordance with the age variable among the young speakers. This implies that the age variable plays a vital role on the familiarity with and knowledge of the out-dated words. This is based on the F value that registered the score (0.352). The significant difference is (*0.011) level. The following table 23 shows the results of ANOVA analysis.

Table 3. The results of ANOVA analysis

N	Sphere	Source	Sum	Df	Mean	F	Sig
1	Food associated words	В		3	.023	.165	*0.016
		W	55.407	396	.140		
		Total	55.476	399			
2	Clothes associated words	В	.384	3	.128	1.541	*0.042
		W	32.897	396	.083		
		Total	33.281	399			
3	Glasses associated words	В	.492	3	.164	.345	*0.039
		W	187.986	396	.475		
		Total	188.478	399			
4	Shoes associated words	В	.734	3	.245	1.864	*0.041
		W	51.977	396	.131		
		Total	52.711	399			
5	Housing internal-objects	В	.204	3	.068	.528	*0.010
		W	51.000	396	.129		
		Total	51.204	399			
6	Housing external-objects	В	.110	3	.037	.223	*0.009
		W	65.403	396	.165		
		Total	65.514	399			
7	Marriage associated words	В	.621	3	.207	1.157	*0.004
		W		396	.179		
		Total	71.522	399			
8	Names of Groups of people	В	2.382	3	.794	3.898	*0.000
		W	80.667	396	.204		
		Total	83.049	399			
9	Peoples' adjectives associated words	В	.131	3	.044	.282	*0.006
		W	61.453	396	.155		
		Total	61.585	399			
10	Animal associated adjectives and objects	В		3	.049	.263	*0.013
		W	74.138	396	.187		
		Total	74.286	399			
11	Women's' hairstyle associated words	В		3	.582	1.685	*0.029
		W	136.732	396	.345		
		Total	138.477	399			
12	Coins associated words	В		3	.261	.925	*0.025
		W		396	.282		
		Total	112.338	399			



13	Weight units	В	.114	3	.038	.119	*0.030
		W	126.406	396	.319		
		Total	126.519	399			
14	Weather associated words	В	.030	3	.010	.083	*0.019
		W	48.301	396	.122		
		Total	48.331	399			
15	Land associated words	В	.122	3	.041	.244	*0.014
		W	65.704	396	.166		
		Total	65.826	399			
16	General social verbs	В	.120	3	.040	.266	*0.023
		W	59.584	396	.150		
		Total	59.704	399			
17	General traditional words	В	.358	3	.119	.525	*0.033
		W	89.884	396	.227		
		Total	90.241	399			
		В	.176	3	.059	.352	*0.011
		W	65.990	396	.167		
	Overall	Total	66.166	399			

Scheffe test showed that there are significant differences between the four main categories of the age variable in favor of the category (18-23) and (23-28). This makes the traditional words highly unfamiliar within the two previous specific categories. This is to ascertain that only two categories were highly affected by the attritional process, meaning that the age variable played a significant role in attriting and abandoning the traditional words among the young speakers. In other words, it can be suggested that the lower the age, the less knowledge of the traditional words. However, they might recognize the words, but they did not know their meanings. This is ascribed to the slight frequency of use among the two specific categories. It might be attributed to the little contact with old people. The following table 4 presented the results of Scheffe analysis.

Ν	Sphere	Age	Mean	18-23	23-28	28-32	32-36
1	Food associated words	18-23	2.0266	-	0.039*	0.935	0.256
		23-28	2.0141		-	0.040*	0.476
		28-32	1.9981			-	0.245
		32-36	2.0410				-
2	Clothes associated words	18-23	2.0758	-	0.021*	0.125	0.256
		23-28	2.0753		-	0.012*	0.578
		28-32	1.9976			-	0.962
		32-36	2.0578				-
3	Glasses associated words	18-23	2.5000	-	0.014*	0.874	0.145
		23-28	2.5250		-	0.012*	0.658
		28-32	2.4268			-	0.258
		32-36	2.5000				-
4	Shoes associated words	18-23	2.6122	-	0.027*	0.500	0.269
		23-28	2.5597		-	0.013*	0.478
		28-32	2.5346			-	0.562
		32-36	2.4815				-
5	Housing internal-objects	18-23	2.3189	-	0.024*	0.274	0.256
		23-28	2.2712		-	0.010*	0.546

Table 4. The results of Scheffe test analysis



		28-32	2.2699			-	0.314
		32-36	2.2855				-
6	Housing external-objects	18-23	2.5306	-	0.000*	0.846	0.145
		23-28	2.5204		-	0.011*	0.963
		28-32	2.5316			-	0.753
		32-36	2.5778				-
7	Marriage associated words	18-23	2.3312	-	0.001*	0.257	0.978
		23-28	2.2528		-	0.010*	0.756
		28-32	2.2642			-	0.124
		32-36	2.2296				-
8	Names of Groups of	18-23	2.3333	-	0.000*	0.258	0.589
	people	23-28	2.4528		-	0.019*	0.476
		28-32	2.2439			-	0.245
		32-36	2.4148				-
9	Peoples' adjectives and	18-23	2.5399	-	0.024*	0.355	0.256
	professions associated	23-28	2.5361		-	0.031*	0.365
	words	28-32	2.5065			-	0.986
		32-36	2.5719				-
10	Animal associated	18-23	2.4156	-	0.004*	0.355	0.145
	adjectives and objects	23-28	2.4104		-	0.003*	0.600
		28-32	2.4146			-	0.362
		32-36	2.4741				-
11	Women's' hairstyle	18-23	2.4673	-	0.006*	0.985	0.830
	associated words	23-28	2.4667		-	*0.001	0.478
		28-32	2.4756			-	0.782
		32-36	2.6778				-
12	Coins associated words	18-23	2.5338	-	0.021*	0.520	0.256
		23-28	2.5500		-	0.012*	0.578
		28-32	2.5569			-	0.962
		32-36	2.6815				-
13	Weight Units	18-23	2.5654	-	0.014*	0.586	0.756
		23-28	2.5813		-	0.012*	0.159
		28-32	2.5762			-	0.358
		32-36	2.6222				-
14	Weather associated words	18-23	2.5242	-	0.020*	0.457	0.256
		23-28	2.5133		-	0.047*	0.759
		28-32	2.5037			-	0.961
1.7		32-36	2.5289		0.001.0	0.045	-
15	Land associated words	18-23	2.7111	-	0.021*	0.365	0.568
		23-28	2.7250		-	0.041*	0.415
		28-32	2.6805			-	0.962
10	Company 1 as a 's 1 as -1	32-36	2.6844		0.000*	0.259	-
16	General social verbs	18-23	2.5769	-	0.000*	0.258	0.330
		23-28	2.5574		-	0.017*	0.222
		28-32	2.5314			-	0.562
17	Conorol traditional	32-36	2.5744		0.020*	0500	-
17	General traditional words	18-23	2.5730	-	0.039*	0.568	0.853
		23-28	2.5794		-	0.040*	0.147
		28-32	2.5813			-	0.235
		32-36	2.6711		0.020*	0.025	-
		18-23	2.6642	-	0.039*	0.935	0.256
		23-28	2.6543		-	0.040*	0.476
		28-32	2.6406			-	0.245
	l	32-36	2.7122				-



Overall			

The analysis showed that there are clear differences between the four major categories of the level of education variable according to the mean scores. Respectively, the postgraduate participants registered the highest mean score (2.67). The secondary school participants registered the mean score (2.66). The diplomat participants yielded the mean score (2.65), whereas bachelor participants yielded the least mean score (2.63). Therefore, the overall participants registered the mean score (2.65).

ANOVA was applied to find any statistically significant differences among the participants based on the variable of the level of education. The analysis showed that there are significant differences between the categories of participants. The results showed that the significant differences are at P< 0.05 level. This is based on the F value that registered the score (0.112). The significant difference is at (*0.005) level. The table 5 presented the results of ANOVA analysis.

Table 5. The results of ANOVA analysis

Ν	Sphere	Source of contrast	Sum	Df	Mean	F	Sig
1	Food associated words	Between groups	.106	3	.035	.254	*0.036
		Within groups	55.370	396	.140		
		Total	55.476	399			
2	Clothes associated words	Between	.481	3	.160	1.934	*0.022
		groups					
		Within groups	32.800	396	.083		
		Total	33.281	399			
3	Glasses associated words	Between	2.016	3	.672	1.427	*0.031
		groups					
		Within groups	186.462	396	.471		
		Total	188.478	399			
4	Shoes associated words	Between	.742	3	.247	1.884	*0.041
		groups					
		Within groups	51.969	396	.131		
		Total	52.711	399			
5	Housing internal-objects	Between	.092	3	.031	.237	*0.020
		groups					
		Within groups	51.112	396	.129		
		Total	51.204	399			
6	Housing external-objects	Between	.033	3	.011	.066	*0.029
		groups					
		Within groups	65.481	396	.165		
		Total	65.514	399			
7	Marriage associated words	Between	.751	3	.250	1.401	*0.014
		groups					
		Within groups	70.771	396	.179		
		Total	71.522	399			
8	Names of Groups of people	Between	1.624	3	.541	2.632	*0.010
		groups					
		Within groups	81.425	396	.206		
		Total	83.049	399			
9	Peoples' adjectives and	Between	.080	3	.027	.171	*0.016



	professions associated words	groups					
		Within groups	61.505	396	.155		
		Total	61.585	399			
10	Animal associated adjectives	Between	.049	3	.016	.087	*0.019
	and objects	groups					
		Within groups	74.237	396	.187		
		Total	74.286	399			
11	Women's' hairstyle	Between	.305	3	.102	.292	*0.029
	associated words	groups					
		Within groups	138.172	396	.349		
		Total	138.478	399			
12	Coins associated words	Between	.115	3	.038	.136	*0.035
		groups					
		Within groups	112.222	396	.283		
		Total	112.338	399			
13	Weight units	Between	.341	3	.114	.357	*0.010
		groups					
		Within groups	126.178	396	.319		
		Total	126.519	399			
14	Weather associated words	Between	.107	3	.036	.294	*0.011
		groups					
		Within groups	48.224	396	.122		
		Total	48.331	399			
15	Land associated words	Between	.159	3	.053	.321	*0.034
		groups					
		Within groups	65.666	396	.166		
		Total	65.826	399			
16	General social verbs	Between	.124	3	.041	.275	*0.021
		groups					
		Within groups	59.580	396	.150		
		Total	59.704	399			
17	General traditional words	Between	.039	3	.013	.058	*0.043
		groups				1	
		Within groups	90.202	396	.228	1	
		Total	90.241	399			
		Between	.056	3	.019	.112	*0.005
		groups				1	
		Within groups	66.109	396	.167	1	
		Total	66.166	399			
	Overall						

Scheffe test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the four major categories of the level of education variable in favor of the secondary school and diploma categories. The descriptive analysis showed that the low or medium level of education has a great negative impact on the pre-cultural words prevalence and knowledge of among the participants who belong to the secondary school and diploma categories. The secondary school category yielded the mean score (2.66). The diploma category registered the mean score (2.65).

This is to determine that the merely two categories were typically affected by the attritional process. This means that the attrition process started at an early period of adolescence. It can be suggested that the lower and the medium level of education, the less knowledge of the archaic words. This also might be ascribed to the partial linguistic knowledge or partial



linguistic experience, whereas a high level of education allows understandable knowledge of language (Bhat, 2017). Moreover, the participants might have a slight exposure to the traditional words. This might also refer to the variety used at the school and college which help to substitute the archaic words with new ones. The following table 6 presented the comparisons between the categories within the level of education.

Image: secondary School 2.0212 - 0.025* 0.258 0.655 Diploma 2.0164 - 0.030* 0.121 2 Clothes associated words Secondary School 2.067 - 0.032* 0.521 3 Clothes associated words Secondary School 2.067 - 0.033* 0.454 0.452 3 Glasses associated words Secondary School 2.5500 - 0.007* 0.576 0.489 4 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.5500 - 0.009* 0.540 4 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.5500 - 0.009* 0.540 4 Bachelor 2.3875 - 0.258 - 0.009* 0.480 5 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.6222 0.002* 0.500 0.879 6 Housing internal-objects Secondary School 2.3114 - 0.035* 0.689 5 Housing external-objects	Ν	Sphere	Level of education	Mean	Sch	D	В	PG
Image: biologic		k				0.025*	0.258	
I Food associated words Bachelor 2.0032 . . 0.521 Postgraduate 2.0038 . . 0.033* 0.545 0.152 2 Clothes associated words Diploma 2.0738 . 0.003* 0.489 3 Glasses associated words Diploma 2.0738 . 0.007* 0.576 0.485 3 Glasses associated words Diploma 2.5500 . 0.007* 0.576 0.485 3 Glasses associated words Diploma 2.5427 . 0.009* 0.540 4 Shoes associated words Diploma 2.5698 . 0.009* 0.448 5 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.514 . 0.005* 0.659 6 Housing internal-objects Secondary School 2.3114 . 0.005* 0.658 6 Housing external-objects Bachelor 2.2904 . . 0.535 7 Marriage associated		— • • • •		2.0164		-		
Postgraduate 2.0608 2 Secondary School 2.0577 - 0.033* 0.545 0.152 3 Diploma 2.0107 - - 0.003* 0.489 3 Bachelor 2.0107 - - 0.009* 0.540 3 Glasses associated words Secondary School 2.5500 - 0.009* 0.540 4 Secondary School 2.5427 - 0.009* 0.540 6 Diploma 2.5427 - 0.009* 0.540 8 Ostordary School 2.6484 - - 0.258 9 Postgraduate 2.4841 - 0.009* 0.448 1010ma 2.5598 - 0.009* 0.448 10210ma 2.5498 - 0.009* 0.648 10210ma 2.2714 - 0.008* 0.658 10210ma 2.2904 - 0.151 10310ma	1	Food associated words						
2 Secondary School 2.0657 - 0.033* 0.545 0.152 3 Diploma 2.0173 - 0.003* 0.489 3 Glasses associated words Secondary School 2.5500 - 0.007* 0.576 0.485 4 Shoes associated words Bachelor 2.3875 - 0.009* 0.540 4 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.5427 - 0.009* 0.440 5 Postgraduate 2.4884 - - - 0.528 6 Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 6 Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 6 Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 6 Diploma 2.574 0.002* 0.500 0.837 7 Housing internal-objects Bachelor 2.2046 - 0.151 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.5144<								-
2 Clothes associated words Diploma 2.0738 - 0.003* 0.489 3 Bachelor 2.0107 - - 0.962 7 Glasses associated words Secondary School 2.550 - 0.007* 0.576 0.485 4 Shoes associated words Bachelor 2.3875 - 0.009* 0.540 6 Postgraduate 2.4884 - - 0.258 7 Shoes associated words Bachelor 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 8 Bachelor 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 9 Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 9 Bachelor 2.390 - 0.005* 0.689 9 Housing internal-objects Secondary School 2.3114 - 0.005* 0.689 10 Diploma 2.5244 - - 0.035* 0.645 10 Diploma 2.5495 -			Č Č		-	0.033*	0.545	0.152
2 Clothes associated words Bachelor 2.0107 Image: Clothes associated words 3 Bachelor 2.0107 Image: Clothes associated words - 0.007* 0.576 0.485 3 Glasses associated words Diploma 2.5427 Image: Clothes associated words - 0.258 4 Postgraduate 2.4884 Image: Clothes associated words - 0.258 4 Shoes associated words Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.500 6 Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 Image: Clothes associated words - 0.0576 0.689 5 Postgraduate 2.4961 Image: Clothes associated words - 0.0576 0.689 6 Housing internal-objects Postgraduate 2.2904 Image: Clothes associated words - 0.000* 0.589 0.468 6 Housing external-objects Secondary School 2.514 - 0.000* 0.223 6 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>Diploma</td> <td>2.0738</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>0.003*</td> <td>0.489</td>			Diploma	2.0738		-	0.003*	0.489
Image: state in the ima	2	Clothes associated words					-	
3 Secondary School 2.500 - 0.007* 0.576 0.485 3 Glasses associated words Diploma 2.3875 - 0.009* 0.540 4 Bachelor 2.3875 - 0.238 - 0.238 4 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.6222 - 0.000* 0.485 5 Shoes associated words Diploma 2.5306 - 0.009* 0.448 6 Postgraduate 2.4961 - 0.155 - 0.005* 0.658 6 Housing internal-objects Secondary School 2.3114 - 0.000* 0.589 0.668 0 iploma 2.2725 - 0.000* 0.589 0.668 0 iploma 2.2740 - 0.003* 0.223 6 Housing external-objects Bachelor 2.5244 - 0.003* 0.223 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.3222 - 0.001* <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Postgraduate</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td></t<>			Postgraduate					-
3 Glasses associated words Diploma 2.5427 . 0.009* 0.540 Bachelor 2.3875 . . 0.258 Postgraduate 2.4884 . . 0.009* 0.540 Postgraduate 2.4884 . . 0.028 0.500 0.879 4 Shoes associated words Diploma 2.5698 . 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 . . 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 . . 0.005* 0.658 Postgraduate 2.4961 5 Housing internal-objects Bachelor 2.2904 6 Diploma 2.5274 . 0.003* 0.628 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.324 . 0.003* 0.524 6 Diploma 2.3256 . </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>Č Č</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>0.007*</td> <td>0.576</td> <td>0.485</td>			Č Č		-	0.007*	0.576	0.485
Bachelor 2.38/5 - - 0.258 Postgraduate 2.4884 - - 0.002* 0.500 0.879 A Shoes associated words Diploma 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 - 0.005* 0.558 Postgraduate 2.4961 - 0.005* 0.658 Bachelor 2.2725 - 0.005* 0.669 Bachelor 2.2904 - 0.005* 0.669 Bachelor 2.2940 - 0.005* 0.649 Postgraduate 2.5414 - 0.003* 0.223 Bachelor 2.5244 - 0.001* 0.658 0.554 Postgraduate 2.490 - 0.254 - 0.254	2					-	0.009*	
Postgraduate2.4884IIII4Shoes associated wordsSecondary School2.6222-0.002*0.5000.8793Bachelor2.5306I-0.15500.15500.1554Postgraduate2.4961II-0.15500.6895Postgraduate2.4961II-0.005*0.6896Bachelor2.2904II0.007*0.6090.4887Postgraduate2.2840II-0.003*0.2238Postgraduate2.5414I0.000*0.5890.4689Postgraduate2.5414I0.000*0.5890.46810Postgraduate2.5414I0.000*0.5890.4689Postgraduate2.5414I0.000*0.5890.46810Postgraduate2.5455IIII9Marriage associated wordsSecondary School2.322I0.001*0.5580.5699Postgraduate2.1860IIIIIII9Peoples' adjectives associated wordsSecondary School2.3389I0.011*0.5550.88510Postgraduate2.4419IIIIIIIII9Peoples' adjectives associated wordsSecondary School2.3356I<	3	Glasses associated words	Bachelor	2.3875			-	0.258
4 Shoes associated words Secondary School 2.622 - 0.002* 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 - 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 - 0.005* 0.658 5 Postgraduate 2.4961 - 0.005* 0.689 6 Diploma 2.2725 - 0.005* 0.689 7 Postgraduate 2.2840 - - 0.151 9 Postgraduate 2.5244 - 0.003* 0.223 9 Postgraduate 2.5495 - 0.001* 0.555 9 Narriage associated words Bachelor 2.3056 - 0.025* 10 Postgraduate 2.4802 - 0.005* 0.569 9 Postgraduate 2.1860 - 0.255* 0.855 9 Postgraduate 2.4302 - 0.005* 0.569<			Postgraduate					-
4 Bachelor 2.5698 - 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 - 0.009* 0.448 Bachelor 2.5306 - 0.155 Postgraduate 2.4961 - - Secondary School 2.3114 - 0.006* 0.658 Bachelor 2.2904 - 0.007* 0.669 Bachelor 2.2904 - 0.008* 0.689 Bachelor 2.2904 - 0.008* 0.689 Bachelor 2.5274 - 0.003* 0.234 Postgraduate 2.5495 - 0.001* 0.658 0.954 Bachelor 2.3056 - 0.224* 0.254 0.254 Bachelor 2.3056 - 0.005* 0.569					-	0.002*	0.500	0.879
4 Bachelor 2.5306 - 0.155 Postgraduate 2.4961 - 0.356 0.658 5 Bachelor 2.3114 - 0.036* 0.356 0.658 5 Bachelor 2.2904 - 0.005* 0.689 6 Postgraduate 2.2904 - 0.003* 0.253 6 Postgraduate 2.2904 - 0.003* 0.233 6 Postgraduate 2.2904 - 0.003* 0.233 6 Postgraduate 2.5414 - 0.003* 0.233 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.5244 - 0.003* 0.253 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.3222 - 0.001* 0.658 0.954 7 Marriage associated words Bachelor 2.3222 - 0.001* 0.55 0.855 8 Names of Groups of people Secondary School 2.383 - 0.	4	Shoes associated words		2.5698		-	0.009*	0.448
Postgraduate 2.4961 Image: Constant of the secondary second	4						-	
5 Secondary School 2.3114 - 0.036* 0.356 0.658 5 Diploma 2.2725 - 0.005* 0.689 6 Bachelor 2.2904 - - 0.151 Postgraduate 2.2840 - - 0.005* 0.689 6 Housing external-objects Secondary School 2.5414 - 0.003* 0.223 7 Marriage associated words Bachelor 2.5274 - 0.003* 0.233 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.3222 - 0.001* 0.658 0.954 7 Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.3226 - 0.025* 0.450 8 Names of Groups of people Secondary School 2.3389 - 0.011* 0.555 0.885 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.346 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secon			Postgraduate					-
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Secondary School		-	0.036*	0.356	0.658
5 Housing internal-objects Bachelor 2.2904 Image: mail objects Image: mail objects Bachelor 2.2904 Image: mail objects Image: mail	~	TT 1 1 1 1						
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	5	Housing internal-objects		2.2904			-	0.151
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Postgraduate	2.2840				-
6Housing external-objectsBachelor2.52440.354Postgraduate2.54957Marriage associated wordsSecondary School2.32220.001*0.6580.954Diploma2.25360.025*0.4500.5690.450Bachelor2.30560.025*0.450Postgraduate2.18600.2548Names of Groups of peopleSecondary School2.33890.011*0.5550.885Diploma2.43020.005*0.5690.9549Peoples' adjectives associated wordsDiploma2.43020.2459Peoples' adjectives associated wordsSecondary School2.54560.002*0.24510Peoples' adjectives associated wordsSecondary School2.55611Animal associated adjectives and objectiSecondary School2.43330.007*0.10211Momen's' hairstyle associated wordsSecondary School2.43330.013*0.5110.14811Women's' hairstyle associated wordsSecondary School2.43330.013*0.5110.14811Women's' hairstyle associated wordsDiploma2.47440.002*0.30112Secondary				2.5414	-	0.000*	0.589	0.468
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	~	TT · · · · · · · ·	Diploma	2.5274		-	0.003*	0.223
Marriage associated words Secondary School 2.3222 - 0.001* 0.658 0.954 7 Marriage associated words Diploma 2.2536 - 0.025* 0.450 8 Bachelor 2.3056 - 0.025* 0.450 8 Names of Groups of people Secondary School 2.3389 - 0.011* 0.555 0.885 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.4302 - 0.005* 0.569 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.5456 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.5456 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 10 Animal associated adjectives and objects Bachelor 2.5156 - 0.007* 0.420 10 Animal associated adjectives and objects Secondary School 2.438 - 0.007* 0.420 10 Postgraduate 2.4090 - 0.362	6	Housing external-objects	Bachelor	2.5244			-	0.354
Marriage associated wordsSecondary School2.3222-0.001*0.6580.954Diploma2.2536-0.025*0.450Bachelor2.3056-0.025*0.450Postgraduate2.1860-0.254Postgraduate2.1860-0.001*0.5558Names of Groups of peopleSecondary School2.3389-0.011*0.5550.885Diploma2.4302-0.005*0.5690.5690.569Bachelor2.2833-0.012*0.245-0.2459Peoples' adjectives associated wordsSecondary School2.5456-0.024*0.1240.2569Peoples' adjectives associated wordsDiploma2.5379-0.031*0.36510Postgraduate2.5566-0.020*0.8750.42010Animal associated adjectives and objectsSecondary School2.4326-0.007*0.10210Animal associated adjectives and objectsBachelor2.4300-0.362-0.36211Women's' hairstyle associated wordsSecondary School2.4333-0.013*0.5110.14811Women's' hairstyle associated wordsDiploma2.4744-0.027*0.30013Bachelor2.4917-0.027*0.30114Diploma2.4744-0.027*0.301			Postgraduate	2.5495				-
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				2.3222	-	0.001*	0.658	0.954
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	7		Diploma	2.2536		-	0.025*	0.450
8 Secondary School 2.3389 - 0.011* 0.555 0.885 9 Diploma 2.4302 - 0.005* 0.569 9 Bachelor 2.2833 - - 0.245 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.5456 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 10 Diploma 2.5379 - 0.031* 0.365 11 Postgraduate 2.5156 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 11 Momen's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4326 - 0.007* 0.420 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4383 - 0.017* 0.362 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4833 - 0.013* 0.511 0.148 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Diploma 2.4744 - 0.027* 0.300	/	Marriage associated words	Bachelor	2.3056			-	0.254
$ \frac{8}{10} \\ \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 &$			Postgraduate	2.1860				-
8 Names of Groups of people Bachelor 2.2833 - 0.245 9 Postgraduate 2.4419 - 0.245 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.5456 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Diploma 2.5379 - 0.031* 0.365 10 Postgraduate 2.5156 - 0.020* 0.875 0.420 10 Animal associated adjectives and objects Secondary School 2.4138 - 0.007* 0.102 10 Animal associated adjectives and objects Bachelor 2.4326 - 0.007* 0.102 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4333 - 0.013* 0.511 0.148 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Diploma 2.4744 - 0.027* 0.300 11 Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.221			Secondary School	2.3389	-	0.011*	0.555	0.885
Bachelor 2.2833 C C 0.245 Postgraduate 2.4419 - - - Peoples' adjectives associated words Secondary School 2.5456 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 Peoples' adjectives associated words Diploma 2.5379 - 0.031* 0.365 Bachelor 2.5156 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 Postgraduate 2.5566 - 0.031* 0.365 Postgraduate 2.5566 - 0.020* 0.875 0.420 Postgraduate 2.4326 - 0.007* 0.420 Diploma 2.4138 - 0.007* 0.420 Bachelor 2.4090 - - 0.362 Postgraduate 2.4360 - 0.013* 0.511 Postgraduate 2.4360 - 0.027* 0.300 Postgraduate 2.4744 - 0.027* 0.300 Polploma 2.4917 - 0.221 </td <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>Diploma</td> <td>2.4302</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>0.005*</td> <td>0.569</td>	0		Diploma	2.4302		-	0.005*	0.569
9 Secondary School 2.5456 - 0.024* 0.124 0.256 9 Peoples' adjectives associated words Diploma 2.5379 - 0.031* 0.365 Bachelor 2.5156 - 0.020* - 0.986 Postgraduate 2.5566 - 0.020* 0.875 0.420 10 Animal associated adjectives and objects Secondary School 2.4138 - 0.007* 0.102 Bachelor 2.4138 - 0.007* 0.102 Bachelor 2.4090 - 0.007* 0.102 Bachelor 2.4360 - 0.013* 0.511 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4833 - 0.013* 0.511 11 Women's 'hairstyle associated words Diploma 2.4744 - 0.027* 0.300	8	Names of Groups of people	Bachelor	2.2833			-	0.245
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Postgraduate	2.4419				-
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Secondary School	2.5456	-	0.024*	0.124	0.256
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	0	Deeples' adjustives associated words				-	0.031*	0.365
Postgraduate2.5566Image: Constraint of the symbolImage: Constraint of the symbol <td>9</td> <td>reopies adjectives associated words</td> <td></td> <td>2.5156</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>0.986</td>	9	reopies adjectives associated words		2.5156			-	0.986
Diploma 2.4138 - 0.007* 0.102 Bachelor 2.4090 - 0.362 Postgraduate 2.4360 - 0.362 Postgraduate 2.4360 - 0.013* 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4744 - 0.027* Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.221								-
Image: Diplomation of the image: Diplomation of			Secondary School	2.4326	-	0.020*	0.875	0.420
Bachelor 2.4090 - 0.362 Postgraduate 2.4360 - - 0.362 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Secondary School 2.4833 - 0.013* 0.511 0.148 Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.027* 0.300	10	Animal appropriated adjusting and all in the	Diploma	2.4138		-	0.007*	0.102
Secondary School 2.4833 - 0.013* 0.511 0.148 11 Women's' hairstyle associated words Diploma 2.4744 - 0.027* 0.300 Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.221	10	Ammai associated adjectives and objects	Bachelor	2.4090			-	0.362
Diploma 2.4744 - 0.027* 0.300 Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.221			Postgraduate	2.4360				-
Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.221			Secondary School	2.4833	-	0.013*	0.511	0.148
Bachelor 2.4917 - 0.221	11	Women's' heirstyle associated words	Diploma	2.4744		-	0.027*	0.300
Postgraduate 2.5698 -	11	women's nanstyle associated words	Bachelor	2.4917			-	0.221
			Postgraduate	2.5698				-

 Table 6. The results of Scheffe test analysis



		1					
		Secondary School	2.5583	-	0.006*	0.239	0.458
12	Coins associated words	Diploma	2.5613		-	0.000*	0.354
12	Coms associated words	Bachelor	2.5444			-	0.269
		Postgraduate	2.6047				-
		Secondary School	2.5958	-	0.020*	0.895	0.357
13	Weight Light	Diploma	2.5919		-	0.030*	0.259
15	Weight Units	Bachelor	2.5354			-	0.258
		Postgraduate	2.6163				-
		Secondary School	2.5358	1	0.001*	0.245	0.123
14	Weather associated words	Diploma	2.5103		-	0.000*	0.601
14	weather associated words	Bachelor	2.4983			-	0.635
		Postgraduate	2.5372				-
		Secondary School	2.7233	-	0.004*	0.857	0.256
15	I and accession demonds	Diploma	2.7214		-	0.001*	0.453
15	Land associated words	Bachelor	2.6850			-	0.975
		Postgraduate	2.6744				-
		Secondary School	2.5856	-	0.003*	0.630	0.245
16	Concern to a sign work a	Diploma	2.5592		-	0.041*	0.547
16	General social verbs	Bachelor	2.5404			-	0.245
		Postgraduate	2.5590			0.000* - 0.895 0.030* - 0.245 0.000* - 0.857 0.001* - 0.630 0.041* - 0.639 0.017* - 0.699 0.017* - 0.365 0.040*	-
		Secondary School	2.5728	-	0.000*	0.699	0.111
17	General traditional words	Diploma	2.5920		-	0.017*	0.222
1/	General traditional words	Bachelor	2.5967			-	0.333
		Postgraduate	2.5922				-
		Secondary School	2.6625	-	0.001*	0.365	0.225
		Diploma	2.6578		-	0.040*	0.487
		Bachelor	2.6381			-	0.957
	Overall	Postgraduate	2.6733				-

"Solidarity refers to a kind of connection to other people, to other members of a group, large or small" (Laitinen, and Pessi, 2014:2). The researcher addressed questions to the participants so as to understand the social solidarity level among them and towards the old people. Solidarity is a blanket term that covers pro-social behaviors such as money-donating to vagabonds, donating money to charity organizations, helping your neighbors and voluntary community work (Koster and de Beer, 2017). The answers of the questions construed solidarity between the individuals and towards the old people. This seems more likely to develop empathy between the individuals. Solidarity can also be construed through disusing the associated words and this clearly interpret empathy among the young individuals. The relevant questions to the solidarity markers were suspiciously selected to spot any effect that might help identify evidence of lexical loss among the young speakers. The results showed that the positive responses of the participants whose age ranged in the two categories between (18-23) and (23-28) recorded the score 358, whereas the negative responses of the participants within the same categories recorded the score 425. The analysis also showed that the positive responses of the participants whose age ranged in the two categories between (28-32) and (32-35) recorded the score 182, whereas the negative responses of the participants within the same categories recorded the score 199. The final results showed that there are no solidarity markers of the young speakers towards the old speakers. However, there is a higher level of social solidarity among the young speakers.



5.1 Discussion

Lexical loss, on the one hand, takes place where the dialect itself may have equivalent forms to represent one thing or one specific context for which they may indeed compete to make one form survive and the other one disappears over time or the referents, on the other hand, to which the words refer become obsolete. There comes to a point that the disappearance of referents will result in a loss of local words over time. Besides, neologism plays a significant role in the process of lexical loss. The creation of new words generates a situation that requires a competition between words that come into disuse and other words that ultimately substitute them.

Respectively, the results also show that gender plays a critical role in abandoning the archaic words. The female speakers feel highly unfamiliar with such archaic words. Females are committed to select the urban words as a symbolic sign of asserting their identity. Females are expected to work outside the house, so they make close bonds outside cultural community.

Age variable seems to be most evident in lexical attrition. The results show that the traditional words loss occurs during a specific period of time. The traditional words declined within only two categories of age. The categories that the speakers' age ranged between 18-23, and speakers' age ranged between 23-28. Speakers choose the words which are more urban and get rid of rural words. This indicates that the more the younger speakers, the greater the abandonment and neglect of the traditional words from rural dialect.

The level of education plays, to some extent, a considerable role in lexical loss, but not a strong predictive factor among the young speakers. The level of education is considered an ambivalent factor. Attrition rate is lower among participants with a higher level of education. Differently, the attrition rate is higher among participants with a lower or medium level of education.

Solidarity is an important social variable used in sociolinguistics. Solidarity is an honorable sense of belonging together (Doreian and Fararo, 2012). A sense of solidarity permits the speakers to maintain the local dialect (Wardhaugh and Janet, 2015). The results indicate that the traditionally archaic words are less likely to be used with greater occurrences by a quite number of young speakers especially the participants of the two certain categories whose age ranges between (18-23) and (28-28). This means that the young participants do not attempt to build a strong communal solidarity and do not attempt to maintain their heritage words and culture. The use of archaic words seem to be a marker of group solidarity towards the old speakers.

The disuse of the traditional words in specific contexts increases solidarity towards the young generations of speakers. The essential purpose of the abandonment of traditional words is related to the sense of solidarity among and towards the young speakers.



6. Conclusion

The archaic words are commonly regarded to be the least satisfying and pleasant components of the colloquial local dialect. The archaic words have been considered to be primitive on account of their low beauty rating particularly in the eyes of young female and male speakers who shift to the urban counterparts owing to their high prestige rating with respect to the effeminateness and the masculinity. The archaic words have been associated with only the older and uneducated rural speakers. The archaic words have generally been used by the older, uneducated rural women, and, to a lesser extent, old men.

It can be concluded that the phenomenon of attritional process that appears to be most likely at the heart of lexical change among the young speakers of the community, and this is the result of the agricultural occupations, animal husbandry and social traditions that have become fundamentally moribund. More specifically, the words and terms related to agriculture, local environment and cultural traditions and norms have been perceived as fossilized words. It can also be concluded that the rural dialect is more jeopardized than the urban dialect due to the influence of levelling and convergence processes.

The old speakers use the heritage dialect in its full lexical aspect, the middle young speakers are rather acquainted with the same rural dialect but employ mostly the governing dialect with its component, and the youngest speakers are less familiar with the heritage dialect and probably recognize and identify few words. The youngest speakers of the district are not used to emphasizing their rigid social ties with their district and differentiate themselves from the old speakers. The youngest speakers assimilate the radically social, economic and political changes over time, and proceed in conformity with these changes in favor of feeling much development in several sectors such as health, agriculture, trade and education which help to identify evidence of improving the standards of living.

6.1 Recommendations

The researcher suggests, firstly, that young and adult speakers should be well-acquainted with the archaic words and ambiguous terms in Al-Koura Rural Dialect. This will eventually allow for a better and more natural comprehension of the out-dated and old-fashioned words. In effect, these obsolescent words and terms should be inherited and acquired from successive generations and they should also be passed on from one generation to another to preserve our culture and its annexes from obliteration.

Furthermore, it is recommended to allow the young speakers to show solidarity markers with their old group members to establish breeding grounds of interests and benefits to the entire society. On the other side, it is also recommended to support and contain the younger generations' interests and desires in combination with the latest developments; changes and new technologies so as to preserve the heritage of the local inhabitants and genuine cultural values in favor of society prosperity and progress.

Finally, it is also recommended that social cohesion and unity among the local members of the community should be strengthened to avoid any danger that might affect the local dialect,



social behaviors, culture and the identity of its carries; that can only be achieved through reconstructing the culture thoroughly.

References

Beal, J. C. (2006). Language and Region. Routledge.

Beal, J. C. (2012). Urban North-Eastern English. Edinburgh University Press.

Bhat, M. A. (2017). The Changing Language Roles and Linguistic Identities of the Kashmiri Speech Community. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Britain, D. J. (2002b). Phoenix from the ashes? The death, contact and birth of dialects in England. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics*, *41*, 42-73.

Britain, D. J. (2009). One foot in the grave? Dialect death, dialect contact, and dialect birth in England. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (196-19), 121-155.

Carver, C. M. (1987). *American regional dialects: A word geography*. University of Michigan Press.

Craig, C. G. (1998). Language Contact and Language Degeneration (257-271). Florian Coulmas (Ed.). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

De Bot, K., & Weltens. B. (1985). *Taalverlies: Beschrijven versus verklaren. Handelingen van bet adztendertigste Nederlandse Elologencongres*. APA-Holland Universiteitspers, Amsterdam, 51, 61.

Deli, R. M., Mustafa, R., & Sarbini-Zin, M. (2014). Word Familiarity in Sarawak Malay Dialect: Assessing Vocabulary of the Young. *International Journal of the Malay world and civilization. Iman*, 2(1), 45-51.

Doreian, P., & Fararo, T. J. (Eds.). (2012). *The problem of solidarity: Theories and models*. Routledge.

Extra, G., & Verhoeven, L. (1999). Immigrant minority groups and immigrant minority languages in Europe. *Bilingualism and migration*, 3-28.

Filipović, L., & Pütz, M. (Eds.). (2016). Endangered Languages and Languages in Danger: Issues of documentation, policy, and language rights (Vol. 42). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Finegan, E. (2014). Language: Its structure and use. Cengage Learning.

Isurin, L. (2000). Deserted island or a child's first language forgetting. Bilingualism: *Language and Cognition*, *3*(2), 151-166.

Kohnert, K. J., Bates, E., & Hernandez, A. E. (1999). Balancing Bilinguals Lexical-Semantic Production and Cognitive Processing in Children Learning Spanish and English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 42*(6), 1400-1413.



Köpke, B. (2002). Activation Thresholds and Non-Pathological First Language Attrition. Advances in the Neurolinguistics of Bilingualism. Essays in Honor of Michel Paradis. F. Fabbro. Udine, Forum: 119-142.

Koster, F., & de Beer, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Ethnic Diversity and Solidarity: A Study of Their Complex Relationship*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Laitinen, A., & Pessi, A. B. (2014). Solidarity: Theory and Practice. An Introduction. In Laitinen, A., & Pessi, A. B., (ed), *Solidarity: Theory and Practice*. Lanham: Lexington Books.1-29.

Major, R. C. (2001). Foreign accent: The ontogeny and phylogeny of second language phonology. Routledge.

McArthur, T. B., & McArthur, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Concise Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Millar, R. M., Barras, W., & Bonnici, L. M. (2014). *Lexical variation and attrition in the Scottish fishing communities*. Edinburgh University Press.

Nation, I.S.P. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House. New Standard Dictionary of the English Language. (1937). New York: Funk and Wagnall

Newman, S. M., Larkin, E., Friedlander, D., & Goff, R. (2012). *Intergenerational Relationships: Conversations on Practice and Research Across Cultures*. Routledge.

Olshtain, E., & Barzilay, M. (1991). Lexical retrieval difficulties in adult language attrition (139-150). In Seliger, H.W., & Vago, R.M. (Eds.), *First Language Attrition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenhouse, J. (2016). Arabic as an under-documented language: Distinctions between neighboring Arabic dialects. *In Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics 171ASA*, 26(1), 060009. ASA.

Saeidfar, A., & Tohidian, I. (2012). *Attrition of Isfahani dialect: social class and age effects*. (7324-7327. Elixir International Journal. (Vol 44).

Schmid, M. S., & Köpke, B. (Eds). (2013). *First language attrition*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Schmid, M. S. Köpke, B., Keijzer, M and Weilemar, L. (Eds.). (2004). *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues (Vol. 28)*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Sebina, B. (2014). First language attrition in the native environment. *Language studies working paper*. University of Reading. (Vol 6). 53-60.

Simmelbauer, A. (2000). *The dialect of Northumberland: a lexical investigation (Vol. 275)*. Universitätsverlag C. Winter.



Suleiman, S. M. (1985). Jordanian Arabic between diglossia and bilingualism: Linguistic analysis. John Benjamins Publishing.

Van Els, T. (1986). An overview of European research on language attrition. In B. Weltens, K. de Bot and T. van Els (Eds.), *Language Attrition in Progress* (pp.3-18). Dordrecht: Foris.

Wardhaugh, R., & Janet M. F. (2015). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (7th ed). Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell.

Welchman, L. (1988). The development of Islamic family law in the legal system of Jordan. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 868-886.

Zhou, S. (2010). Comparing receptive and productive academic vocabulary knowledge of Chinese EFL learners. *Asian Social Science*, 6(10), 14.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)