Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Linguistics
ISSN 1948-5425
2019, Vol. 11, No. 5

Linguistic Nuances of Arabic Spoken in the North of Jordan, Irbid Region

Mamoun Issa Falah BANI AMER

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Technology Sydney

Sydney, Australia

Received: August 27, 2019 Accepted: September 19, 2019 Published: October 10, 2019

doi:10.5296/ijl.v11i5.15345 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v11i5.15345

Abstract

All major languages in the world have minor, categorical counterparts known as dialects. Although there exists one standardized version of the language, the dialects share features with that language that are common and some which are distinctly different. This paper talks about the linguistic dynamic extant amongst the population in the North Jordanian city of Irbid. Through a phonological, morpho-syntactic analysis of their speech in contrast with the so called standardized Jordanian, This paper attempts to discover certain feature distinctions in the North Jordanian speech and more specifically in the Arabic Spoken in Irbid region.

Keywords: Jordanian Arabic, Irbid Arabic, Fallahi, Al – Fusha, Standardized Arabic, Arabic phonology, Morpho-syntax, Sonority sequencing principle

1. Introduction

Arabic is a Semitic language, originally spoken by the nomads of Arabia. Owing to the Islamic expansion that took place in the 7th century, the language too expanded, incorporating various elements from the nearby countries through language contact, sociocultural influence and immigration. The classical Arabic has elaborate inflectional and derivational systems, however, Arab speakers do not make much distinction between the early Islamic Arabic and modern Arabic (Versteegh 2014). The variety is most commonly known as 'Al-Arabiyya Al-Fusha', and will hereafter be referred to as Al-Fusha. At the end of the 7th century, the Islamic population migrated and thus the language spread to places in Northern Africa like Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine, collectively termed as the Levant. There the languages settled, and gradually over the period of centuries through contact with the natives settled in the region as well as the neighbouring nations, it evolved incorporating distinctive features in terms of phonology, morphology and syntax. Through a gamut of socio-cultural factors, the specific features of the language currently stand portraying an array of differences and

nuances that are specific to the dialectal versions and some even challenge the existing predominant norms and regulations of linguistic rules

While in Jordan, the language came in contact with that of the native Jordanians, forming a pidgin which later morphed into a creole with certain identifiable similarities with Al-Fusha. Currently, Jordanian Arabic incorporates many regional varieties like the urban Madani, The rural Fallahi and the Bedouin Badawi (Zuraiq and Zhang 2006). While in Irbid Township, Madani is the most commonly used language, Fallahi finds extensive use in the rural context in the Irbid villages. A big part of places like Ajloun and Jerash also fall under this categorization.

The objective of this paper is to provide an analytical understanding of the Fallahi variety which would also be termed as Irbid Arabic in some parts of the paper. From phonological,morpho-syntactic and sociolinguistic aspects, elaboration of the differences and specific characteristics of the Fallahi variety in contrast with the Al-Fusha and more specifically, the Madani variety has been attempted.

In order to reach the objectives of the paper, three main studies have been considered, analyzed critically and referred to for instances that signify the various features that help in answering a certain set of questions. Apart from them, many other studies have also been extensively considered in order to gain a thorough understanding of specific features. The studies considered are –

1. "The Syntax-prosody Interface of Jordanian Arabic (Irbid Dialect)" - Abedalaziz Jaradat (2018)
2. "Foreign Words in Jordanian Arabic among Jordanians Living in Irbid City: The Impact of Foreign Languages on Jordanian Arabic" – Ibrahim Abushihab (2016)
3. "An experimental Sociolinguistic study of Language Variation in Jordanian Arabic" - Mohammed Nahar Al-Ali and Heba Isam Mahmoud Arafa (2010)

Other notable studies-

4. "Rural and urban dialects in contact in Jordan: the case of [tʃ] de-affrication in the rural dialect of Irbid suburbs" - Sharif Alrabab'ah (2018)
5. Assessing Al-Koura Rural Dialect Archaic Vocabulary Among the Young Generation - Amer Radwan Humeidat (2018)
6. The linguistic status of the modern Jordanian dialects – Ahmad Khalaf Sakarna (2005)

The questions that this paper attempts to answer are

A. What are some of the specific characteristics of Irbid Arabic that stand out when we compare this variety to the standardized Arabic, in terms of specific phonological nuances?
B. Are there certain socio-cultural factors that inadvertently determine the choice in the use of certain phonological principles? If yes what are they and how do they materialize?

C. Are there instances in Irbid Arabic that stand out in terms of features provided due to language contact? If yes, what are the instances?

This paper is divided into three major categories exploring the phonological aspect of the language, the sociolinguistic aspect of the language and the morpho-syntactic aspect of the language. These aspects are correlated with one another in the sense that all of these aspects eventually talk about Irbid Arabic as a variety of Standardized Arabic or Al-Fusha, and how they differ on certain specific key factors pertaining to the phonology, morpho-syntax and sociolinguistic parameters of the standard language in contrast with the dialect.

2. Discussion

2.1 Phonological Features in Irbid Arabic

Irbid Arabic has been noted to express instances where certain phonological features of the dialect stand out as significantly different from Al-Fusha in terms of maintaining relation with the phonological rules and regulations generally accepted for standardized languages. While some rules are broken, some are kept intact while the standardized language breaks them.

2.2 Characteristic Differences

Concerning Jordanian Arabic, the three aforementioned varieties namely Madani, Fallahi and Badawi are the ones that most inhabitants learn and use on a daily context. The three varieties pertain to the Urban, Rural and Bedouin languages respectively (Sakarna 2005). Officially, the language that children learn is Al-Fusha. This is also used for governance, news and entertainment media. Fallahi as a dialect differs from Al-fusha on various grounds. The most notable ones are discussed as follows –

One of the components that make Fallahi different from Al-Fusha is the syllable structure of the language (Broselow 2017). In Fallahi, the complex onsets exist while in Al-Fush they are omitted. Even in case of complex codas, it is only possible in the Fallahi variety and not in Al-Fusha, since in the former, it maintains the Sonority Sequencing Principle (Tamimi & Shboul 2013). Morpho-syntactic markers like case markers in Al-Fusha are subjected either to paradigm leveling or dropping. The genitive and accusative masculine plural case '*-i:n'* in Al-Fusha for example, is converted to the nominative case in Fallahi. An important hypothesis that can be derived here is that most varieties of Jordanian Arabic are influenced strongly by the neighbouring languages and not descended directly from Al-Fusha (Vesteegh 1984).

Another important feature of Fallahi that distinguishes it from Madani is the recurrence of discontinuous negation marker (Lafkioui 2013). An example is given as follows –

"He did not say that"

Fallahi- ma : ga : l - iʃ

Madani- ma : ga : l

Pharyngealization, or the articulation of vowel or consonants in the form of a glottal constriction, is another feature that distinguishes Fallahi from Madani, as exemplified below (Alwabari 2013).

"He said"

Madani – g a : l

Fallahi - g ʕ a : ʕ l ʕ

The presence of Alveo-palatal affricate in the place of standard K, is another distinguishing feature of Fallahi (Sabir & Alsaeed 2014). For example *k* - [tʃ] - *ammal* (Finish).

Besides, in Madani, /g/ is pronounced in the form of a glottal stop but not in Fallahi (Al-Ani 2014). There are numerous word level, phrasal and structural nuances that are not present in other dialects of Jordanian Arabic.

Language contact affects Fallahi Arabic to a certain extent (Rouchdy 2013). Rural women for example, tend to code mix Fallahi with Madani in their dialect, using glottal stops and avoiding the alveo-palatal variant of k and instead revealing a strong tendency towards using the marked variant [tʃ], an allophone of /k/ (Alrabab'ah 2018). The growth of Syrian refugees in the north of Jordan has also influenced the mixing of Syrian words in the Fallahi dialect.

2.3 Vowels and Consonants

Jaradat (2018) has highlighted the consonants and vowels of Fallahi spoken in Irbid in the consecutive tables as illustrated below –

Table 1. Consonants

	Plosive		**Nasal**	**Tap**	**Fricative**				**Affricate**	**Approximant**	**Lateral**
Labial		b	m		f						w
Interdental					θ		ð	ðˤ			
(Post)alveol ar	t	tˤ d	n	ɾ	s	sˤ	ʃ	z	dʒ		l
Palatal										j	
Velar	k	g									
Uvular					x		ɣ				
Pharyngeal					ħ		ʕ				
Glottal		ʔ					h				

(Jaradat 2018)

Table 2. Vowels

Front		Central			Back	
	Short	**Long**	**Short**	**Long**	**Short**	**Long**
High	i	i:			u	u:
Mid		e:				o:
Low			a	a:		

(Jaradat 2018)

The Tables validate the previous assertion of the presence of Velar /g/ in Fallahi along with the alveo-palatal variant /tʃ/ instead of k.

Diphthongs in Fallahi are also found to be absent. Therefore a word like ‘saif’ in Al-Fusha is changed to sound like *s e: f* in Irbid Arabic (Jaradat 2018).

2.4 Syllabic Structure in Irbid Arabic

A feature of Irbid Arabic or more specifically Fallahi is the presence of complex onsets when they are followed by long vowels (Altakhaineh 2016).

Sba: ħa (CCV: CV) - Swimming

Wla: d (CCV: C) – Children

This also shows that Fallahi tends to maintain the Sonority Sequence Principle, which says that the nucleus of a syllable structure, the vowel, forms the peak of the syllable sonority and is preceded as well as succeeded by a cluster of consonants with the coda gradually decreasing the sonority (Clements 1990). This exists in direct contrast with the Modern Standard Arabic which possesses structures that violate Sonority Sequence Principle (Selkirk 1984).

3. Stress in Irbid Arabic

Stress assignment in Arabic dialects vary in terms of syllable weight and relative position according to other syllables (Saeigh-Haddad & Hekin-Roitfarb 2014). The way the stress structure materialises in Fallahi is depicted as follows

Final superheavy syllable is stressed

Taħ. ˈsiin (developing)

If final syllable is not superheavy, then the stress falls on the heavy penultimate

is. ˈtaf. Sar (ask about)

For a light penultimante, the antepenultimate receives the stress

ˈiʃ. ta. ra (he bought)

Morphological structure of Fallahi affects assignment of stress (Al-Ani 2014). In the word 'Maktabeh' (Library), the stress falls on the antepenultimate because of the absence of a superheavy ultimate syllable. However on affixation of – hum, the stress shifts to the heavy penultimate.

ˈmak. ta. be-[h] → mak. ta. ˈbe-[t] - hum

Zuraiq (2005) has also found that Irbid Arabic tends to lengthen the stressed syllables in contrast with the Al-Fusha counterpart.

4. Sociolinguistic Impact on Phonological Variables of Irbid Arabic

Around 88 km to the north of Amman, lies the Governorate of Irbid. With Al-Fusha being considered the official urban dialect, the localized dialects are often considered inferior, as happens with most cases of language standardization (Zuraiq and Zhang 2006). This motivates the local speakers to adopt more of the urban dialects it the cost of their own (Abd-el-Jawad 1986).

This section of the paper considers the phonological variables /θ/, /dʒ/ and /ð/ since they are the most subject to change when the local speakers are considered.

4.1 Phonological Variables Influenced by Sociolinguistic Factors

The following three phonological variables are considered because of the significance they portray in term of social variation.

1. /θ/, the voiceless inter-dental fricative has two other discrete variants, voiceless dental stop [t], and voiceless alveolar fricative [s]. In Irbid Arabic, these three represent a separate phoneme each. These three variants differ in a number of ways while occurring in different conditions. As shown in the following examples, they differ in terms of various minimal pairs (Al-Ali & Arafa 2010)

e.g.1.	/θa:mIr/	[θa:mIr]	"Thamir"
	/sa:mIr/	[sa:mIr]	"Samir"
	/ta:mIr/	[ta:mIr]	"Tamir"
e.g.2.	/θara/	**[**θara**]**	"soil"
	/sara/	[sara]	"He left early"
	/tara/	[tara]	"She can see"

These three variants, [T], [t], and [s] can be allophonic variants of the same phoneme /T/. For example

/θala:T/ [θala:T] "three"

/θala:T/ [tala:t] "three"

/θala:T/ [sala:s] "three"

The local speech variety of Irbid associates the interdental fricative [T] with itself. The [t] and [s] however, represent the standardized and prestigious Urban Speech.

2. /dʒ/, the voiced post-alveolar affricate has two types: voiced post-alveolar affricate [dʒ], and voiced alveolar fricative [Z]. It must be noted that [dʒ] is associated more with Irbid Arabic whereas [Z] is associated with the Urban Speech.

3. /ð/, the voiced interdental fricative has three discrete voiced types: the voiced interdental fricative [ð], the voiced dental stop [d], and the voiced alveolar fricative [z]. These three types are used as allophones of the same phoneme /ð/ in different settings because of social variations in the dialect. [ð] is associated with Irbid Arabic, while the other two allophones represent the urban speech. Let us look at the following example:

/ðahaba/ [ðahaba] "he went"

[zahaba] "he went"

[dahaba] "he went"

However, the differences between [ð], [d] and [z] in Standard Arabic is phonemic in nature as they assume the role of contrastive features in a number of minimal pairs (Yasin & Owens 1987). The following examples show what happens in this scenario:

e.g.1 /ðala/ [ðal: 1a] "he disgraced himself"

/zala/ [za: la] "he made a mistake"

/dala/ [dal: a] "he guided someone"

e.g.2 /ðaka/ [ðak: a] "he made a 'religious' sacrifice"

/zaka/ [zak: a] "he paid alms"

/daka/ [dak: a] "he pounded"

4.2 Role of Gender in Choice of Phonological Variant

Al-Ali and Arafa (2010), in their experiment has found several instances that show the role of gender in the choice of phonological variants. These will be discussed in this section here.

The results of their experiment showed that each of the phonological variables /θ/, /dʒ/ and /ð/ has multiple iterations. The interdental /θ/ has a standard and a local variant [θ], and two non-local variants [τ] and [s] (Al-Ali & Arafa 2010). The other interdental /ð/ has four types: the standard local variant [ð], and the other non-local types - [d] [z], and [t]. Similarly, the affricate /dZ/ has 4 types: the standard local [dʒ], and the non-locals - [ʒ], [tʃ] and [ʃ]. Males and females differ in terms of choice and duration of the phonological variants of /θ/, /dʒ/ and /ð/.

Regarding /θ/, the results as documented by Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) revealed that "the [θ] variant, which is considered the standard and the local variant, was used in 75% of the total number of occurences of the /θ/ variable, while the other three, which are perceived as

non-local urban variants and identified with prestige, were employed in 25% of /θ/ occurrences" (P.234). However, speakers vary in their choice of these non-local urban varieties. Males use them less frequently than females. It has also been reported that 79% of women change the interdental /θ/ to the non-local stop [t] or sibilant [s] while speaking. This suggests that non-local variants in Irbid Arabic is more preferred by the females. This adoption of non-local type is suggested to result in a language change phonologically. Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) also report that "the tendency to replace [ð] with the non-local variants [d], [z] or [t] in forty-three percent of /ð/ occurrences is more frequent among the female subjects. This tendency reflects a drift, which is more frequent (70%) in females' pronunciation, towards the non-local urban variants. In contrast, males tend to use the standard local interdental variant [ð] more often" (P.235).

Concerning the voiced affricate /dʒ/, the following four types were identified: the standard local [dʒ] variant and the non-local [ʒ], [tʃ] and [ʃ]. However, Al-Wer (1991) found that only the former two types - [dʒ] and [ʒ] are more prevalent in the female speech in Irbid. Even though the [tʃ] and [ʃ] have not yet been established in Irbid Arabic, Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) state that "the use of these variants in the near future may be more frequent in people's speech, especially in words ending with /dʒ/" (P.235). Their results also exemplify the following - [tʃ] is used in 25% of the cases with the word "/taadʒ/ (crown)" but not found in /dʒazar/ (carrots). Notably, all occurrences of [tʃ] was seen to appear in male speech, while [ʃ] occurred predominantly in female speech. This indicates that [tʃ] associated closely with males, whereas [ʃ], more with females. The [ʒ] forms the larger amount of female speech, while [dʒ] is used predominantly by males. Al-Wer (1991) connects [dʒ] to toughness and [ʒ] to softness as no other visible social stigma is found to be attached with the use of one type over the other. The use of non-local stop and sibilant types thus tend to be associated with being soft and feminine. They symbolize prestigious urban social life style, whereas the local types are more connected to the conceptions regarding being tough and masculine. Thus, out of a desire to associate themselves with a particular lifestyle, women tend to incorporate more non-local types in their speech while men retain the use of local types. Abdel Jawad (1986) points out that men use the standard variants more often than women, while women use the socially prestigious forms more often. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2015) have provided similar thoughts in this regard. Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) further expand upon this by stating that "the tendency of males to use more stigmatized variants in their speech than females may be seen in terms of the symbolic value of such variants in defining oneself as either masculine or feminine" (P.235).

As far as the durations of frication accompanying the [θ], [ð], [ʒ] and [dʒ] types are considered, the examination of acoustic data in the experiments conducted by Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) indicated that females produce shorter duration of [θ] and [ð] than males. Their Assumption states that "lengthening the fricative, probably, makes frication noise more obvious. This may also be an attempt by males to demonstrate virility. Unlike males, females tend to shorten frication duration in order to produce less noisy and noticeable fricative, a feature regarded as suiting female softness" (P.236).

Nevertheless, female speech demonstrated longer frication duration in [ʒ] of the [dʒ] type. Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) state "one rationalization is that women reduce the salience of the dental stop by prolonging the frication part of the affricate, thereby the segment produced resembles the non-local prestigious [ʒ] variant rather than the local [dʒ]" (P.236).

4.3 Role of Educational Setting in Justifying the Speech Variation

This section is also built upon the findings by Al-Ali and Arafa (2010) as they attempt to narrow down upon the factors that affect the choice of the aforementioned phonological variants and whether or not there exists any correlation between various other implicit socio-cultural factors in making that decision.

In order to explain the role played by education, the data was from high school and university students. While the former group is used to a more homogenous setting that includes children from the same colony or locality and linguistic background, the latter group involves students who have been in contact with other students from outside countries. This would also include students from adjoining nations and other countries of North Africa and the Middle East, bringing a dynamic variety of similar languages with them (Suleiman 2013). Thus the latter forms a more heterogeneous group that would indicate clear instances of effects of language contact like borrowing and integration of loanwords, code mixing and code switching, use of other variants of language in order to signify upper social hierarchy and many more. In the experiment, clear differences were observed in the use of the local types [ð], [dʒ], and [θ] and the corresponding non-local types among high school and university students. The findings indicate that university students use the non-local types in higher frequency than high school students. On the contrary, high school students use the local types [ð], [dʒ], and [θ] more, the frequency being 63%, 67%, and 52%, respectively (Al-Ali and Arafa 2010). Drawing reference from the previous section, the female students tend to retain the use of local types more than the male students. This also means that linguistic behaviour of university students are highly influenced by the university setting and exposure to new settings would lead the students to opt for the other type in order to keep correlation with the required social norms (Abushihab 2015). Level of education too plays a significant role in retention or loss of lexicon especially when languages are in contact (Humeidat 2018). With an increase in the nature and number of contact with people from outside communities, people tend to shift from their regular use of linguistic norms and incorporate themselves into a newly adapted structure in accordance with the requirement of the social dynamic (Milroy & Llamas 2013).

The results along with the explanations given conclude that the use of local, colloquial types and structures of a particular phonological variant is inversely correlated with the amount and nature of contact with individuals and groups from foreign nations. Nonetheless, this type of a linguistic shift is not abrupt in nature, instead an effect of building up of multiple factors that has been acted upon only when certain specific social norms require the individual to do so. According to Eckert (2003) "While adolescence patterns of variation begin to fall into the kinds of global patterns found in the adult population, I would argue that this does not signal a sudden awareness of the social functions of variation, but the adaptation of an already robust sociolinguistic competence to a new set of social meanings" (P.8). Therefore, even

though high school students are aware of the social connotations attached with specific variants and types, their use of localized types only refer to their instinct of fitting in with the community that they are exposed to for the major part of the time. In this case their favouritism towards the localized types is their way of adapting to the community that they live in. Same can be said for the university students, who, because of the nature of their social dynamic, tend to use the non-localized types more frequently in their speech in order to accommodate themselves with the kind of social community that they live in and interact with on a daily basis, creating a particular set of diglossics (Al-Sobh, Abu-Melhim & Bani-Hani 2015). Non localized types usually carry connotations of prestige and a higher social status. That is something which would be more relevant to a university student but less to a high school student. The latter might even be ostracized for their use of so called 'sophisticated' speech in a school setting where most people resort to using the localized types.

5. The Morpho-syntactic Features in Irbid Arabic – Borrowing From Neighbouring and Globally Predominant Languages

Crystal (1992) defines lexical borrowing as "a term used in comparative and historical linguistics to refer to linguistic form being taken over by one language or dialect from another; such borrowings are usually known as loanwords" (P.41). Language contact and cultural osmosis results in the borrowing of certain foreign words from the languages of the countries that are influencing the contact as well as languages that are globally dominant like English (Zibin 2019). Hashemi et al (2014) says "Borrowing words is a common and unavoidable phenomenon that is closely related with relation of different linguistic communities" (P.225). Standard and classical Arabic being rich in their vocabulary, Arab grammarians restrict from importing words and phrases into the lexicon (Ennaji 2013). Instead in order to Arabize certain words and to find alternatives for the words without Arabic equivalent, Arabic institutions were established.

According to Abushihab (2016), most words that are borrowed have gender and number as inflections and are subjected to Jordanian Arabic grammatical system. Irbid Arabic has two plural types: sound plurals and broken plurals (Ben-Meir 2015). Sound plurals are formed by adding inflectional suffix /- uun/ or /- aat/ to the nouns. The glottal stop (-ʔ) in final position is mostly replaced by /w/.

Abushihab (2016) provides the following examples in this regard.

/muʕalim/ - male teacher

muʕalimuun - male teachers

/mudarisa/ - female teacher

/mudarisaat/ - female teachers

/hasnaʔ/ - beautiful girl

/hasnawaat/ - beautiful girls

Broken plurals are formed through gemination that is insertion of a vowel or a semi- vowel or changing of vowel order (Neme & Laporte 2013). The following examples show how it is done (Abushihab 2016):

/tuħfa/ - a present

/tuħaf/ - presents

/kitab/ - a book

/kutub/ - books

Irbid Arabic also show two types of feminine gender. The first type inserts the feminine morphological marker '– t' (Abushihab 2016):

/muʕalim/ male teacher.

/muʕalimatun/ female teacher.

The other type is feminine as a personification of inanimate objects. By using /haðˁa/ for masculine and /haðˁihi/ for feminine, in this case, we can differentiate between the two (Abushihab 2016):

/haðˁa qamar/ - this is a moon (masculine)

/haðˁihi ʃams/ - this is a sun (feminine)

Moreover, the borrowed words in Irbid Arabic are also inflected by number in the same manner as exemplified below (Abushihab 2016):

/televizjon/ - television (English).

/televizjonaat/ - televisions (inflectional Arabic plural suffix / - aat/ added.)

/kundara/ - one shoe (Turkish)

/kanadir/ - a pair of shoes (Broken Plural).

/subermarket/ - supermarket (masculine) - /haðˁa subermarket/.

/kamira/ - camera (feminine) - /haðˁihi kamira/.

Irbid Arabic includes many words that are borrowed from foreign languages like English and Turkish. Abdul-Sahib (1986) remarks that Arab grammarians mostly stress on the process of Arabization. This process refers to the complete incorporation of foreign words and modifying them as seen fit to match the Arab dictionary.

Al-Saidat (2011) distinguishes between loanwords, borrowing and code- switching. In code-switching, the speakers alternate between two different languages while loanwords are foreign words integrated into a speaker's native language. Since most of the English and Arabic loanwords are inflected by gender and number, they are considered to be borrowed items in Irbid Arabic and not a part of code-switching.

Abushihab (2016) in his study has reportedly categorized the borrowed words in Irbid Arabic under a number of groups. The findings are shown in the following table

Table 3

Category	Example Word	Source Language
Political Term	/kungress/ congress	English
Consumer Terms	/bitza/ pizza	English
Technical Terms	/radjo/ radio	English
Houshold Terms	/dʒoket/ jacket	English
Recreational Terms	/mosiqa/ music	English
Educational (scientific) Terms	/bakalorjus/ bachelor	English
Religious and Social Terms	/pri:st/ priest	English
Miscellaneous	/efendi/ gentleman	Turkish

(Abushihab 2016)

These findings show a heavy influence of English and moderate influence of Turkish in redefining the lexicon of Irbid Arabic. The former can be explained as a result of contact with English as the most dominant language in the world, while the latter is explained by the geographical proximity. Most of these words are incorporated into the lexicon as an effect of Language contact and sociolinguistic variables affecting the use of a language. Abushihab (2016) has provided more instances where each of the specific categories has exemplified instances of borrowing into the Irbid Arabic lexicon, a few of which, specifically pertaining to more Turkish examples, are illustrated as follows

Table 4. Political and governance related terminology

Borrowed word	Word as per source	Source language
baʃa	baş (leader)	Turkish
zinzanah	zindan (prison cell)	Turkish
ʕaskeri	asker (soldier)	Turkish
Parlaman	parliament	English
ʔistratidʒija	strategy	English
brotokol	protocol	English
dictator	dictator	English

Table 5. Consumer related terminology

bojah	boya (paint)	Turkish
sadʒ	sa ç or sac (sheet iron for cooking)	Turkish
zandʒabil	zencefil (ginger)	Turkish
hamburger	hamburger	English
bitza	pizza	English
ʔisbirin	aspirin	English

Table 6. Technological terminology

soba	soba (stove)	Turkish
ʃader	çadır (tent)	Turkish
darabzin	tirabzan or trabzan (stair rail, banister)	Turkish
radjo	radio	English
sterjo	stereo	English
kombuter	computer	English

Table 7. Household terminology

mobilja	mobilya (furniture made of wood)	Turkish
dʒazma	çizme (top boot)	Turkish
baltˁ o	palto (coat)	Turkish
oðˁ a	oda (room)	Turkish
bantˁ alon	pantaloon	English
balkon	balcony	English
robe	robe	English
glas	glass	English

Table 8. Recreational terminology

kamandʒa	kemen çe (violin)	Turkish
ʃatir	şatir (merry)	Turkish
alzahar	zar (die used games)	Turkish
ʔaflam	films	English
bjano	piano	English
ʔobera	opera	English

Table 9. Educational terminology

ʔibrindʒi	birinci (first, highest, priority)	Turkish
ʔabla	abla (a respectful address for a female teacher)	Turkish
tambal	tembel (lazy, indolent)	Turkish
bajolodʒi	biology	English
doktor	doctor	English

Table 10. Religious and social terminology

daʃir (negative sense)	dişarı (outside, out, exterior)	Turkish
boʃ	boş (empty)	Turkish
ʔidʒrabat	çorap (sock)	Turkish
brotastant	protestant	English
kaθolik	catholic	English
vatikan	vatican	English

Table 11. Miscellaneous terminology

basˁ mah	basma (finger print)	Turkish
kubri	köprü (bridge)	Turkish
jufarmal	frenlemek (to brake)	Turkish
bas	bus	English
ʔinʃ	inch	English
jarida	journal	English

6. Summary and Conclusion

In light of all information provided by numerous studies over time, a detailed analysis of a very specific topic has been made possible. This paper at the very outset put forth a set of questions and attempted to answer them. Summarizing this paper helps us realise whether or not those questions have been answered.

The phonological features of Irbid Arabic elaborates certain key features that differentiate the dialect from Al-Fusha or the standard Arabic. Those features are inclusive of Syllable structure, pharyngealization, specifications in terms of vowels and consonants and syllable stress.

In terms of certain phonological features and variations where the localized and non-localized variations are kept under scrutiny, the paper highlights the difference between three key features and elaborates two social factors, gender and education as independent variables that help determine the choice and duration of those features.

Finally, it exemplifies influence of language contact in the form of lexical borrowing and gives us instances of borrowing from both English and Turkish. The reason behind chosing the two languages are simple – while the former is a global linguistic giant, the latter is a direct geographical influencer.

In conclusion, the information provided in this paper are far from complete. There are numerous other cases studies and experiments that deal with a variety of other factors in the same category. Irbid Arabic as a dialect also has many other features that fall beyond the scope of this paper. For instance, acoustic modelling of specific speech patterns in contrast with those of standard dialects can open up new dimensions in the understanding of evolution of the dialect in particular and create a slot for a historical linguistic study as well. In general,

it is safe to assume that Irbid Arabic is just one aspect of understanding dialects of Arabic in Northern Jordan and many more wold open up with proper background reading, thorough examinations and field testing.

Acknowledgement

In preparation of my research, I had to take the help and guidance of some respected persons, who deserve my deepest gratitude. As the completion of this research gave me much pleasure, first of all, I would like to show my gratitude to my great brother Mr. Bany Amer, Ameen English Instructor, English Department, Al-Majmah University, KSA, for giving me a good guidelines for research throughout numerous consultations. I would also like to expand my gratitude to all those who have directly and indirectly guided me in writing this research.

In addition, a thank you to all Professors who have taught me at Applied Linguistics Program, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Australia, in particular Dr Jacquie Widin, who introduced me to the Methodology of work and made valuable comment suggestions on my paper which gave me an inspiration to improve the quality of this work.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents and all the members of my family, for their support during my staying in Australia. I would like also to mention my sweet daughter with much love who was born in Jordan on May 15th, 2018 as I was away during my study and I cannot wait to see her.

References

Abd-el-Jawad, H. R. (1986). The emergence of an urban dialect in the Jordanian urban centers. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 61*(1), 53-64.

Abushihab, I. (2015). Dialect and Cultural Contact, Shift and Maintenance among the Jordanians Living in Irbid City: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(4), 84-91.

Abushihab, I. (2016). Foreign words in Jordanian Arabic among Jordanians living in Irbid city: The impact of foreign languages on Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(2), 284-292.

Al Tamimi, Y. A., & Al Shboul, Y. (2013). Is the phonotactics of the Arabic complex coda sonority-based?. *Journal of King Saud University-Languages and Translation, 25*(1), 21-33.

Al-Ali, M. N., & Arafa, H. I. M. (2010). An experimental sociolinguistic study of language variation in Jordanian Arabic. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics, 3*, 220-243.

Al-Ani, S. H. (2014). *Arabic Phonology: An Acoustical and Physiological Investigation* (Vol. 61). Walter de Gruyter.

Alrabab'ah, S. (2018). Rural and urban dialects in contact in Jordan: the case of [tʃ] de-affrication in the rural dialect of Irbid suburbs.

Al-Saidat, E. (2011). English Loanwords in Jordanian Arabic: Gender and Number Assignment. *Language Forum, 37*(1), 59-72.

Al-Sobh, M. A., Abu-Melhim, A. R. H., & Bani-Hani, N. A. (2015). Diglossia as a result of language variation in Arabic: Possible solutions in light of language planning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(2), 274-279.

Altakhaineh, A. R. M. S. (2016). *Compounding in Modern Standard Arabic*. Jordanian Arabic and English (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).

Alwabari, S. (2013). Non-native production of Arabic pharyngeal and pharyngealized consonants (Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University).

Al-Wer, E. (1991). Phonological variation in the speech of women from three urban areas in Jordan. *PhD dissertation.* UK: University of Essex.

Bani-Yasin, R., & Owens, J. (1987). The Phonology of a Northern Jordanian Arabic Dialect. *Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 137*(2), 297-331.

Ben-Meir, N. (2015). Patterns of the Urban Jordanian Arabic Broken Plural.

Broselow, E. (2017). Syllable structure in the dialects of Arabic. In *The Routledge Handbook of Arabic Linguistics* (pp. 32-47). Routledge.

Clements, G. N. (1990). The role of the sonority cycle in core syllabification. In J. Kingston, & M. E. Beckman (Eds.), *Papers in Laboratory Phonology I: Between the grammar and the physics of speech* (pp. 283-333). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1992). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Blackwel Publishers.

Eckert, P. (2003). *Linguistic Variation as a Social Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Ennaji, M. (2013). Language contact, Arabization policy and education in Morocco. In *Language contact and language conflict in Arabic* (pp. 88-106). Routledge.

Hashemi, E. S. *et al.*. (2014). Phonological Adaptation of Arabic Loan Words in Persian. *Consonants in International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 4*(6), 225-236.

Humeidat, A. R. (2018). Assessing Al-Koura Rural Dialect Archaic Vocabulary among the Young Generation.

Jaradat, A. (2018). The Syntax-Prosody Interface of Jordanian Arabic (Irbid Dialect). *Doctoral dissertation.* Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa.

Lafkioui, M. (2013). Reinventing negation patterns in Moroccan Arabic.

Milroy, L., & Llamas, C. (2013). Social networks. *The handbook of language variation and change*, pp. 407-427.

Neme, A. A., & Laporte, E. (2013). Pattern-and-root inflectional morphology: the Arabic broken plural. *Language Sciences, 40*, 221-250.

Rouchdy, A. (Ed.) (2013). *Language contact and language conflict in Arabic*. Routledge.

Sabir, I., & Alsaeed, N. (2014). A brief description of consonants in modern standard Arabic. *Linguistics and Literature Studies, 2*(7), 185-189.

Saiegh-Haddad, E., & Henkin-Roitfarb, R. (2014). The structure of Arabic language and orthography. In *Handbook of Arabic literacy* (pp. 3-28). Springer, Dordrecht.

Sakarna, A. K. (2005). The linguistic status of the modern Jordanian dialects. *Arabica, 52*(4), 522.

Selkirk, E. (1984). On the major class features and syllable theory. In Aronoff, & Oehrle (Eds.), *Language Sound Structure: Studies in Phonology* (pp. 107-136). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Suleiman, Y. (2013). *Language and society in the Middle East and North Africa*. Routledge.

Versteegh, K. (1984). *Pidginization and Creolization: The case of Arabic* (Vol. 33). John Benjamins Publishing.

Versteegh, K. (2014). *Arabic Language*. Edinburgh University Press.

Wolfram, W., & Schilling, N. (2015). *American English: Dialects and Variation* (Vol. 25). John Wiley & Sons.

Zibin, A. (2019). A Phonological Analysis of English Loanwords Inflected With Arabic Morphemes in Urban Jordanian Spoken Arabic. *SAGE Open, 9*(2).

Zuraiq, W. (2005). *The production of lexical stress by native speakers of Arabic and English and by Arab learners of English*. University of Kansas.

Zuraiq, W., & Zhang, J. (2006). Phonological Assimilation in Urban Jordanian Arabic.

Copyrights