

The Effect of Diglossia on Arabic Language Teaching and Learning in Higher Education in Yemen

Dr. Mohammed Hasan Ahmed AL Fattah

Assistant professor, Department of English,

College of Education, University of Amran, Yemen

Abstract

The present study sought to contribute to the small number of studies on Arabic instruction. It is an attempt to investigate the effects of diglossia on Arabic language teaching and learning in higher education situations in Yemen. It attempts to find out to what extent the use of vernacular by Arabic instructors affects teaching and learning Arabic in higher education classrooms. It presents an in- depth introduction to diglossia as applies in Arabic. Moving from theory to practice, this study addresses the practical implications of diglossia by investigating the reasons behind the use of slang dialect by university teachers in the classrooms while teaching standard Arabic especially the spoken form of language during the teaching process in the university. The overall goal of the study is to use the data provided by students and instructors help improve Arabic curriculum and teaching methods in higher education classrooms. The researcher provides a brief literature review that analyses the approaches of instruction in higher education in Yemen and some Arab countries and teachers' viewpoints regarding approaches to the instruction of Arabic diglossia as a theme in relation to Arabic. The data are studied and analysed from the sociolinguistic point of view. It is a sociolinguistic study of diglossia communication. It is based on the analysis of the elicited responses of 71 Yemeni university students and 26 university instructors in the departments of Arabic, in three public universities. The data are collected by two sets written questionnaires. The data are processed and analysed by the use of SPSS statistical program and the results of the questionnaires items were interpreted accordingly. The prime findings of the study reveal that both teachers and students show positive attitude towards MSA but students show more positive attitude towards using MSA than teachers. Unlike students, teachers show positive attitude towards vernacular Arabic. The teachers also advocate the notion of mixing vernacular Arabic and MSA in classroom interaction.

Abstract

1 1

Keywords: effect, diglossia, Modern Standard Arabic, vernacular, high variety, low variety

Introduction

"Diglossia was first put forward as specifically the linguistic situation in the Arab – speaking world by the French linguist and Arabist William Marçais in 1930" (ALQenaie, 2011). The term diglossia (lit two tongues) itself, however, was first coined and used by the Greek scholar Jean Psychari in his 1888 publication "My Journey" (Athens: S,K. Vlastos) to describe the complicated linguistic situation in Greece. So, the term "diglossia" is a Greek origin which composed of di (two) + glossia (language). A phenomenon in which distinct formal and informal varieties of a language are used in a given society. The variety used depends on social context (e, g, using one variety at home and another for more formal purposes). Diglossia is also found in the Arab world as well as some other languages. It is a wide term which is one of the important object concerned by the linguists. It exists in most of the countries all over the world. This term was first coined by Ferguson (1959) to denote the use of "two or more varieties of the same language by some speakers under different conditions" (Munika, 2003)

"The language varieties referred to in this definition are the standard language, also described as "high variety or 'H' and regional dialects, called "low varieties" or 'L' "Munika, 2003: 163). Ferguson went on to elaborate that "one of the most important features of diglossia is the specialization of function for 'H' and 'L' and that the importance of using the right variety in the right situation can hardly be overestimated. Fishman (1967) juxtaposed bilingualism with diglossia in the context of speech communities. Specifically, he referred to bilingualism as "essentially a characterization of individual linguistic behaviour" and to diglossia as a characterization of linguistic organization at socio- cultural level.

Some linguists think that the growing of awareness among some Arab specialists that the low levels of educational achievements and high illiteracy rates in most Arab countries are directly related to the complexities of the standard Arabic language used in formal schooling and in non-formal education. These

complexities mostly related to the diglossic situations of the Arabic language and make reading in Arabic an overly arduous process – " there are serious negative educational and social consequences related to these reading difficulties. " (Maamouri, 1998: 6). This study tries to connect the socio-linguistic aspects of Arabic diglossia to the present circumstances of higher education in Yemen.

Arabic variationist sociolinguistics flourished after Ferguson's article about diglossia in 1959. In this article, he drew the distinction between the standard language and the different vernaculars of each Arab country. In subsequent years, Arab variationist sociolinguistic research tended to concentrate on relating variation in language use to demographic factors like education, age, gender, and more recently, on issues related to language and identity and ethnic and naturalistic manifestations (Bassiouney, 2009). He also stated:

the earliest definite textual evidence, we have for the existence of a distinct language identifiable, as Arabic is an inscription on tombstone found at Nemara in the Syrian desert. This has been dated to AD 328 – recent by standards of Semitic languages"

The 23 countries of which Arabic is an official language have been described as diglossic speech communities, i. e. communities in which two varieties of a single language exist side by side. The official is typically MSA, but there is usually at least one prestigious vernacular spoken in each country. In Yemen, for example, there are various vernacular spoken varieties of Yemeni Arabic like Sana'ani dialect, Tehami dialect, Taizi dialect, Adni dialect, Lahji dialect, and Hadhrami dialect. According to Ferguson (1959), diglossia is a different situation from one in which there are merely different dialects within a speech community. In diglossic communities, a highly valued H (High) variety is learned in schools and is not used for ordinary conversations. That is to say, no one speaks H variety natively. The L (low) variety is the one used in conversations.

It is important to note the limitation of formal Arabic in real life situations because it is inadequate for communication. Versteegh (2004: 95) wrote "The colloquial language as the language of family and home is associated with in-group, with intimacy and friendship, whereas the high variety is associated with

social distance and official relationship". The use of formal Arabic is a sign of respect, but also creating a distance between speakers.

The problem of dialect choice is one that is unique to Arabic, since it has no standard spoken dialect, as do other diglossic languages. In Yemeni universities, Arabic language teachers come from different regions with different spoken dialects such as Sana'ani dialect, Tehami dialect, Adni dialect, Lahji dialect, and Taizi dialect.

Even though the problem of Arabic diglossia seems to have attracted the attention of Western sociolinguists, many Arab linguists have given it attention in the last three decades. Maaamouri (1973), El- Hassan (1977) and Eljebali (1993) have given accounts of diglossia and the "diglossic continuum " in the Arabic speaking world. "Most descriptions show the existence of a typical "linguistic continuum" in most Arab countries based on a diglossic situation which includes , (a) classical Arabic, (b) several fusha, (c) several local varieties of dominant regional dialect " (Maamouri, 1998: 36). To this central Arabic diglossia core can be added a bilingual situation of varying intensity in which the whole Arabic continuum finds itself in a dynamic conflictual differentiation with a " foreign language" such as French, or English in some Arab countries.

" A frequent social and cultural practice which exists in the Arab region shows the existence of a normative linguistic filter which transposes all colloquial speech forms into equivalent forms in the formal standard. This filtered transposition of orality happens unconsciously whenever one is asked to write down any colloquial form. It shows that Arabs associate writing with higher level formality which is only supposed to be possible in fusha" (Maamouri, 1998: 38).

Researchers have shown that there seems to be a strong correlation between the consciousness of a low cultural level and expectation of a higher level for written language among illiterate adults when they want a literacy mediator to help them with the writing of their messages. However, we can observe that the oral intervention of colloquial situations for purposes of better communication and this can be called code – switching situation.

Arabic language teachers use code – switching from standard Arabic to colloquial variety and vice versa. Parkinson (1991) points out that even Arab scholars such as Najeeb Mahfouz have faults on their use of grammar and vocabulary. Faulting Arabic language teachers in another commonplace which expresses the unhappiness of the Arab public with the low performance of the Arabic language teachers and its negative effect on the learning of standard Arabic (SA) in schools. Taha Hussien (1954) well- known Egyptian writer, considers that teachers of Arabic don't know the language well enough to the extent that they can efficiently communicate the subject matter to their students.

Najeeb Mahfouz and others have used the colloquial in their novels to add realism and life to their stories. B. Khraif wrote a darling article on the "danger of fusha for the colloquial in which he expressed the lack of immediacy and pertinence characterizing formal language of literature.

The mix of Arabic language patterns in the classroom leads to serious pedagogical problems and even to feelings of linguistic insecurity in formal school communication among high numbers of young Arab learners. This lack of security comes from a general feeling of low understanding of standard Arabic (SA) and low identification with its norms. It also comes from the failure of the language of Arab education to provide a feeling of symbolic meaningfulness and relevance to the child's needs.

Therefore, it is likely expected that a clash seems to occur in Arab classrooms between two conflictual practices. On the one hand, teachers deliberately try to neglect and undermine the actual speech habits of the learners. On the other hand, the same teachers find themselves often obliged to use the colloquial to communicate with their learners for one reason or another. Teachers and learners seem to show a frequent performance for a significant use of colloquial in conventions and in outside of the classroom.

Many Arab intellectuals and educators have long realized the negative impact of diglossia on the educational achievement and literary acquisition of Arab students. Several of them called for the use of local vernacular as a medium of instruction in order to overcome the mismatch between the spoken and written languages

(Owens, (1996). Many others on the other hand, proposed strongly to continue using modern standard Arabic to defeat the difficulties and obstacles resulted from the colloquial varieties used as a medium of instruction in teaching Arabic language to Arabs or non-Arab learners.

Having briefly discussed the negative effect of the mismatch between the spoken and written varieties of Arabic on learning and students' academic achievement, it is important to go beyond this mismatch, and focus instead on the linguistic environment in which the Arab learner grows up. Such a perspective will allow us to see whether and to what extent this environment is conducive to learning Arabic.

Several studies that investigated the linguistic environment in which the average the Arab learner grows up have shown that the mismatch between local vernacular and literary Arabic is not necessarily the direct cause of poor academic performance, but is itself a symptom of a larger problem that should be addressed if the high rate of illiteracy in the Arab world is to be curbed . perhaps in addition to asking how the mismatch between local vernacular and literary Arabic is impeding the learning of Arabic, an equally important and related question is: how does the environment in which the learner grows up acquiring language affect his/her ability to comprehend and learn the language instruction such an environment can be characterized by the following aspects:

1. Lack of exposure to literary Arabic.
2. Literary Arabic is not the language of instruction for all school subjects.
3. The complexity of Standard Arabic.

What has been lacking to date are studies defining the relations between the different varieties. In the initial state of investigation one descriptive mechanism will be the establishment of tendential variational hierarchies. Parkinson's preliminary study (1994) illustrated the great differences between Arabic varieties in terms of the occurrence of short final vowels.

The present study discusses the basic linguistic problem in higher education classroom and the tools with which it can be tackled. It reviews briefly the diglossia literature and focuses on the linguistic situation in Yemen presenting ideas about future research prospects. It examines the effect of diglossia in higher education in Yemen. It discusses the obstacles posed by contemporary Arabic diglossia to Arabic language learning including the attitudes of teachers and learners. Some remedies are suggested. These include modification of the Arabic curricula in high institutions. It investigates how this diglossic environment affects students' academic attainment. It also reviews the relevant literature in the field of Arabic diglossia as far it takes to set the wider context and theoretical framework in which this study takes place. More focus is given to the context of studying Arabic in a native environment, since this study takes place in Yemen. The study hopes to provide first hand qualitative and descriptive data on experience of learning Arabic in a native environment in relation to the issue of diglossia.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

Diglossia is most likely a very widespread phenomenon in speech communities. Several countries and languages other than those in the Arabic world, which belong to this category are Greece, Switzerland, and Haiti (Fellman, 1973: 25; Ferguson, 1959: 326). Of these four, however, Arabic diglossia is as old as the language itself, and its classical language has remained relatively stable; the development of the other three diglossia situations is relatively more recent and fairly well known. The Arab situation is, also unique in that its diglossia split is linked with at least three other cleavages; geographical splittings, socio – economic splittings, and religious splittings. All of these cleavages have been mutually reinforcing since the beginnings of recorded time and cannot be easily separated from the history of this area of the world (Fellman, 1973: 25).

As mentioned earlier, the term "diglossia" was introduced for the first time in 1959 by Charles Ferguson, who modelled it on the French "diaglossic". Ferguson defined diaglossia as a "relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of language, there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety- the vehicle of a large and

respected body of written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation" (Ferguson, 1959: 340). The superposed variety is termed by Ferguson as the high (H) and the regional dialect as the low (L) variety.

Ferguson's diglossia model is valuable not only for its heuristic value in defining language varieties in terms of two idealized types, standard Arabic and dialect. It is also important for the fact that only with the integration of the two types within a single conceptual framework could be serious comparative work between the varieties begin. This took two directions. On the one hand purely structural studies were carried out defining similarities and differences between the two. On the other hand, a more fruitful line of research was opened up in the attempt to define the use of the two in contemporary Arabic society.

Ferguson distinguishes, however, between diglossic languages and languages that have standard and dialectal varieties of speech (Hashim, 2012). Ferguson (1959) claimed diglossic languages embody a higher register not regularly used "as a medium of ordering conversation, and any attempt to do so is felt to be...pedantic and artificial " (Ferguson, 1959: 35). Thus, in a diglossic language, the use of the more prestigious higher register is reserved for restricted contexts, in addition to the existence of separate speech registers. Ferguson also emphasized the role of a sizable body of literature and restricted literacy "to a small elite" in diglossic speech communities" (Ferguson, 1959: 36). He also pointed out that Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is a prestigious approach in term of instruction, but the reality is that it is not practical to use because MSA is not a living language.

Ferguson's original formulation of diglossia described not only an ideal dichotomy between linguistic varieties, but also an ideal socio-functional matrix into which these varieties are distributed. High varieties are used in formal situations, for writing, between strangers, for informal contexts, not used in writing, and conversation nor between friends (Owens, 2001).

Ferguson and others have re-examined the definition of diglossia to develop a more coloured picture of Arabic in use. Harry (1996) views Arabic as a continuum with classical Arabic or modern standard Arabic at one end and vernacular Arabic

at the other. Holes (2004) supports the opinion "the behaviour of most Arabic speakers, educated or not, is rather one constant style shifting along a cline at opposite ends of which are "pure" MSA and the "pure" regional dialect, more accurately conceived of as idealized constructs that real entities (Holes, 2004: 49). Bergman (2010) claims that the metaphor of continuum helps teachers and researchers conceptualize Arabic language use. " it also makes it clear that, to function effectively in Arabic –speaking societies, one must know both MSA and Arabic dialect" (Bergman,2010: 85).

Alan kaye (1972) approached the issue differently. He described Ferguson's definition of diglossia as impressionistic at best and viewed the diglossic situation of language like Arabic as flexible and changeable rather than stable as Ferguson originally stated. To Kaye, diglossia is not a stable situation because of the interaction between the varieties of languages. He understands the difference the varieties in terms of ill – defined vs. well defined. In the case of Arabic, interaction involves two systems because learned, spoken and used natively and, the second is modern standard Arabic, an ill – defined system because it is learned in school rather than natively. According to him, no ill – defined system is stable.

Stadlauer (2010) pointed out that language ideologies play an important role in Arabic diglossia. He has shown how language ideologies link language features to social processes in the Arabic diglossia and how research focuses on language ideologies could bridge linguistic and social theory.

"The diglossia situation is indeed problematic for linguistic community. It is considered to be a hindrance to educational and economic development, as national coherence" (Zughoul, 1980: 202). Sotiropoulos (1977: 7) states;

"..... If diglossia, objectively, is an ingenious device of necessity, nonetheless from the point of view of educational efficiency of telecommunications and mass media, diglossia is definitely a hindrance. In addition, in view of the fact that the function of the language is not strictly communicative, and the fact that language serves other emotional, cognitive, and the psychological needs, of the individual and society, the presence of diglossia in a speech community has limiting and even crippling effects on its expressive capacity".

Walters (1996) examined the diglossic situation as a case of language contact, leading to linguistic variation and language change. Diglossia, Walters (1996: 160) says, "has.... Never been lost, misplaced, or hidden" accentuating the contrast and prolonged contact between the standard and its different varieties that has characterized the Arabic language for centuries. He encourages the study of diglossia in 'Fergusonian' spirit, limiting it to cases characteristic of Arabic language, hence opposing Fishman's extension of the term. Walters refers to the linguistic situation in Tunisia and how diglossia has come to be a problem of some sort, particularly in the field of education. After its independence, Tunisia and Tunisian Arabic faced a threat of linguistic instability when the country has to choose the language to be used in all domains.

Rather than using Ferguson's term 'diglossia' Benjamin Harry prefers to describe Arabic's linguistic nature with El-Said Bedwi's 1973 description as "multiglossic language. Harry explains that multiglossia is a linguistic state in which different varieties of a language exist side by side in language community and are used under different circumstances with various functions. The varieties used in a multiglossic situation are placed in a continuum where speakers and writers constantly shift between different lects" (Harry, 1996: 69, cited in Hirsch, 2009: 5 – 6).

Because the debate over language policy in the Arab world, as in other parts of the world, is usually driven by political, economic and religious, but not necessarily by academic considerations, the call for the use of the local vernacular as the language of instruction has been met with strong resistance. Opponents of the vernacular argue that the vernacular is itself an outcome of illiteracy and doesn't have the expressive power (i. e. rich vocabulary) to be used as a vehicle of knowledge acquisition. They also argue, and justifiably so, that replacing literary Arabic with the vernacular would cut off future generations from vast body of works written in literary Arabic over the centuries (ALjundi, 1987). "In addition, the replacement of literary Arabic with the vernacular would undermine efforts to strengthen the utility of Arabic speaking countries" (Owens, 2001: 6).

In addition to the above argument, additional factors play an important role in preventing the use of vernacular Arabic. Negative attitudes towards the local vernacular make it difficult, and even impossible, to introduce it as a means of learning. It is also important to point out that despite the growing awareness among many educators, linguists, and language policy makers that the mismatch between local vernacular and the language of instruction, standard Arabic (SA), is to a large extent responsible for many difficulties in learning Arabic. Nowadays, the debate among policy makers and intellectuals is not whether to keep literary Arabic as a medium of instruction, but rather how to strengthen it, making it an effective tool of teaching and learning (Ayari, 1996).

Gumpers (1998) noted that diglossia exists not only in multilingual societies that have vernacular and classical varieties, but also in societies which employ separate dialect registers or functionally differentiated language varieties of whatever kind. He also investigated the social patterns that govern the use of one variety rather than the other.

Fishman (1972: 91-92) summarized his contribution to diglossia as having attempted "to tract the maintenance of diglossia as well as its distribution at the national and social level. "He also attempted to relate diglossia to psychologically pertinent considerations such as compound and coordinate bilingualism.

Though the problems of diglossia in speech communities are similar, the solutions are different in different communities. The Arabic situation is unique, this uniqueness deriving from the non – linguistic functions that Arabic serves. Arabic is of supreme importance as the religious language of the Muslims, who constitute about one fifth of human race.

Characteristics of Diglossia

Sociolinguists identified three characteristics of diglossic situation.

1, the circumstances under which each variety is used are clearly defined, so there is little mixing between the two.

2. the two varieties are clearly separate linguistically, so that at one time a speaker may be speaking either the H variety or the L variety, but never something half – way between the two.

3. everyone can speak the L variety, and will do so in informal situation, such as with friends and family members; but not everyone can use the H variety.

" Diglossia has been described by Ferguson as being very stable. "Diglossia typically persists at least several centuries, and evidence in some cases seems to show that it can last well over a thousand years,(cited in Hudson, 2002: 2)

Ferguson (1959: 32) stated "The most important feature of diglossia is the establishment of rigid and complementary sets of exclusive function where (H) occurs only in situation where it is not appropriate for (L) to occur. cited in Hauser, 2008: 25). He identifies nine features of diglossia, all of which have been expanded upon, refined, and significantly contributed to by sociolinguists greatly concerned with bilingual societies. These features are:

1. Function: the specification of function for H and L is one of the most important features of diglossia. Only H is appropriate in one set of situations, while only L is appropriate in another, with only slight overlapping of the two sets.
2. Prestige. H is regarded superior to L by all speakers in a diglossia situation. They usually believe that H is more beautiful, more logical, and more capable of expressing important thoughts than L . in some cases, the superiority of H is related to religion especially in Arabic.
3. Literary heritage. There is always a sizable body of written literature in H which is highly esteemed by the speech community. In Arabic, where the body of literature represents a long span, contemporary writers and readers regard and appreciate the use of archaic words, phrases, or constructions of legitimate, even though the average educated reader will not understand such usage without research as his part,
4. Acquisition. L is invariably learned by children from their parents and from other children. H, however, is learned chiefly through formal education. This naturally

implies that the grammatical structure of L is learned intuitively, while that of H is learned in terms of rules and norms to be imitated.

5. Standardization. In Arabic speech community, there is no standard L because there is no single most important centre of communication. Thus, only regional standards exist in various areas.
6. Stability. Diglossia is not an unstable language situation, but can be persist well over a thousand of years. When communicative tension arises in a diglossia situation, they.... "... May be resolved by the relatively uncodified, unstable, intermediate forms of language.
7. Grammar. The grammatical structures of H and L always display extensive differences. H typically has grammatical categories lacking in L and has an inflectional system of nouns and verbs which is far less or non-existent in L. classical Arabic, for example, has a three cases in the noun, while the colloquial dialects has none.
8. Lexicon. A very great part of vocabulary of H and L is shared, with, naturally, varied forms and different uses and meanings of these forms in each language. It is quite expected, though, that technical terms and learned expressions in the H lexicon would have no regular L equivalents; and that popular expressions and the names of domestic or localized objects in the L varieties would have no regular H equivalents.
9. Phonology. H and L phonologies are moderately different in Arabic. Although their relationships in other diglossia situations cannot be easily generalized.

Many sociolinguists discussed the characteristics of Arabic diglossia. Palmer (2008: 93) wrote "The prestige of the Arabic language may be characterized as the two fold manifestation of nationalism and religion. As the nationalism, the very existence of a higher register like MSA often stirs pan-Arabic nationalistic feelings in the Arab world. Sulimam (2003: 43) described the "praise of a group's language (as) a well- known phenomenon" in nationalistic discourse. Any attempt to remove significance from MSA and place emphasis on a spoken variety may be seen as a

threat to supporters of such discourse. Zughoul (1980), citing a panel discussion about diglossia in Arabic, wrote that all the panel members rejected the use of spoken Arabic as a national language because it would widen "the gap between (spoken variety of Arabic) and (MSA),,, (and lead) to the unintelligibility of the Qura'an.

Problems of Diglossia

One of the major problems in understanding Ferguson's notion of diglossia, as Britto (1986) points out, is his unclear use of the term ' variety '. in fact, Ferguson admits that the terms ' language ', ' dialect', and ' variety' are used here without precise definition.. and occur sufficiently in accordance with established usage to be unambiguous for the present purpose". This vagueness has led to misinterpretations of the concept of diglossia (Rabie, 1991), thus extending its application to those situations of different languages rather than reserving the term exclusively to speech situations akin to Arabic, so, what situations exactly does the concept diglossia refer to? When proposing the term Ferguson attempted to extent it as to cover both the structural relationships and the functional distribution of the norms in speech community (ALQenaie, 2011: 15-16). Commenting on the exact functions and features of diglossia, the precise nature of the term as Ferguson originally described and indeed, Hudson (1984) calls for the delimiting of the definition of the term to speech situations that correspond exactly to the Arabic, and not to regard situations of different registers and codes, or different languages within the same society as cases of diglossia.

" The diglossic nature of Arabic presents students and teachers with additional complexities that influence classroom instruction " (Hirsch, 2009: 8).

Arab students are scrupulously required to avoid use of dialect in schools and are taught to systematize spoken "Ammia" whenever possible in order to maintain their national or religious identity. These problems of identity crisis, identity conflicts and ideological games have served to weaken the language and have created many misconceptions and difficulties for the average Arab learners (Maxos, 2002).

Arabic Diglossia

Arabic is one of the world languages characterized by the phenomenon of diglossia. The term diglossia as pointed out earlier was introduced by Charles Ferguson in a landmark study and defined as a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of language, there is a very divergent, highly codified or regional superposed variety – the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature either of an earlier period or in another speech community – that is learned largely by means of formal education and used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of community for ordinary conversation.

It is sufficient note that Arabic is often considered a "diglossic" language, denoting the existence of a higher and lower registers used in semi- exclusive context. (Ferguson, 1959). The higher register is sometimes referred to as fusha, classical Arabic, standard Arabic, or Modern Standard Arabic. This study adopts the term Standard Arabic (SA) to represent a version of Arabic related to the language found in the Holy Qura'an and used in formal context and writing. The lower register is referred to simply as colloquial Arabic or vernacular Arabic.

In Arabic, the written language is the high, "prestigious" variety while the spoken regional vernaculars constitute the low variety. The written variety, referred to as Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), is the formal literary Arabic. It is shared by all Arab communities and used in education, administration, literature, journalism and so forth. Regional vernaculars form the informal colloquial Arabic. They are used in everyday informal translations. Differences between them are widely exhibited in syntax, morphology, phonetics, and semantics.

Observation of the spoken language quickly revealed that in practice native speakers of Arabic who had access to both standard language and the dialect in any given stretch of speech rarely used purely one or the other variant" (Owens, 2001).

It is important to note here that standard Arabic and the colloquial varieties structurally opposed to each other, in terms of actual competence they are not of

equal status. Whereas the dialect is a native variety of Arabic and hence, by definition perfectly learned by all Arabs, the standard language is a variety learned as " second language in non-Arab world, (Tarrier, (1991).

The linguistic situations in the Arab world in general and in Yemen in particular are strongly characterized by diglossia which refers to the existence of two forms of language: the formal (standard) and the vernacular. The differences between the two forms have both undermined the appeal of Arabic as one of the most important languages used in teaching instructions among different levels of learning and teaching and weakened the effectiveness of teaching and learning process. Teachers, on the other hand, should deal with the questions: which Arabic variety should be used in the classrooms? Which variety is more effective in the classroom teaching? Why do the majority of teachers use the vernacular language in the classrooms?

According to Farghaly (2005), Arabic exhibits a true diglossia situation where at least three varieties of the same language are used within a speech community , and in circumscribed situations. Classical Arabic is the language of religion and is used by Arabic speakers in their daily prayers while Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) a more recent variety of classical Arabic, is used by educated people in more formal settings such as the media, classroom, and business. With family, friends, and in the community, people speak their own regional dialect which varies considerably from region to region. These three varieties are available to every Arab on a daily basis. For example, on any given day an Arabic speaker will use classical Arabic while reciting his daily prayers; MSA when listening to or reading the news, and his particular dialect at home with family or friends (Farghaly, 2009).

In Arabic, the low variety or dialect is acquired by children at home and without explicit rules of grammar and is assumed to be acquired "naturally". The high variety, classical Arabic and MSA are learned at school in the same way any other foreign language would be acquired. In each diglossic situation the high variety has a strong tradition of grammar as is the case with classical Arabic. There are grammar texts, dictionaries, and works on style and pronunciation. There is an

accepted and established norms for grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation which has minimal variation. In contrast, the same body of standards does not exist for the low variety and as a result there is a considerable variation in grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. For example, classical Arabic has three cases marked by case endings whereas the dialects have none. Further the word order differs as well in that classical Arabic and MSA have mostly VSO (verb – subject – object) word order while most Arabic dialects are SVO. There are differences in the wh- construct as well with MSA fronting it and in Egyptian Arabic it is not fronted. And in general, the low variety has simpler grammatical structure than MSA and less complex morphological structure.

Diglossia in the Arab world can be compared with that of Western Europe in the Middle ages, where Latin was the literary language but people spoke their local vernacular. Strictly speaking, though, Modern standard Arabic (MSA) is still living and evolving language in ways that the Latin of Middle Ages was not. Many people in the Arab world today know and use Modern Standard Arabic, due in part to a greater literary rate than that of the Middle Ages, the spread of mass media, and the prevalence of Islam and education in Quranic studies. Additionally, people continue to write fiction, poetry, magazine articles, political polemics and scholarly dissertations in Modern Standard Arabic.

The diglossic situation in the Arab countries is going to differ from country to country in terms of the relative linguistic distance which exists between fusha and the linguistic features of the specific Arabic dialect with which it is in contact. This situation is also dynamic and changing because of the dynamic nature of the dialects themselves. It is changing at two levels: first, at the level of any given Arabic colloquial, and secondly, at the level of the whole range of Arabic dialects. The fusha and the sum of all the colloquials in use in the Arab world represent the 'Arabic continuum' known under the ambiguous term commonly referred to as 'The Arabic language' (Maamouri, 1998). It is important to note that the colloquial varieties of Arabic differ more and more significantly from each other the farther away one goes from one's place of origin (Palmer,(2007).

Statement of the Problem

One of the most serious problems Arab students learning Arabic in the official classrooms face is the use of diaglossic languages of their teachers. Many Arabic language teachers use vernacular languages. Others use a mixture of modern standard Arabic and the colloquial Arabic. This entails that students will have to learn double sets of vocabulary items, as well as a whole set of skills involved in selection of the appropriate variety for a given context.

The existence of different varieties pertains to the fact that the Arabic language teachers often tend to mix elements from high variety (H) and low (L) in a highly variable way. This poses the additional problems of how to teach the students to produce this mixing of utterances.

Standard Arabic has been neglected in the Arab world, and nearly all teachers, in schools, institutes, and universities don't use standard Arabic. Most of the instructors use slang diglossia instead. The matter of neglecting standard Arabic which is the language of the Holy Qur'an is considered a big linguistic problem. This neglect seems to be socially and religiously dangerous matter for the culture of the Arab world because standard Arabic forms an important part of the culture of the Arab world. The present study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent the teachers of Arabic use standard Arabic during their teaching?
2. To what extent the teachers of Arabic use vernacular Arabic during their teaching?
3. Does the use of vernacular Arabic influence the learners' linguistic performance?
4. Why do the teachers of Arabic use vernacular Arabic during their teaching?

Objectives of the Study

This study is being undertaken to explore the extent to which standard Arabic and vernacular Arabic can be used in higher education classrooms, and investigate the impact of the diglossic situation on learning Arabic as an L1.

It presents data collected from undergraduate students who study Arabic in the colleges of education and colleges of languages in three public universities in Yemen. The data also collected from teachers who have experience in teaching Arabic courses to those students. It aims at:

1. Identifying to what extent Arabic language instructors use standard Arabic in higher education classrooms.
2. Identifying the reasons behind using vernacular Arabic in the classrooms by Arabic language instructors during their teaching university students.
3. Investigating the influence of the use of diglossia on Arabic language teaching and learning in higher education classrooms .
4. Investigating the influence of the use of vernacular Arabic on the learners' linguistic performance.

The present study will try to grasp the notion of diglossia in Arabic, with an attempt to establish a solid ground for further research into the area.

Importance of the Study

University teachers must be aware of the importance of standard Arabic, and be able of addressing their learners learning accurately using standard Arabic. Understanding both the situational and linguistic context by the university teachers will help them to activate the appropriate interaction of their learners and this makes them familiar with standard Arabic in its spoken form.

By doing so, students will have practical knowledge on how to incorporate the concept of standard Arabic and produce accurate spoken standard Arabic.

It is also important to point out that diglossia is a wide term which is one of the important objectives concerned by the linguists. It exists in most of the countries all over the world. It is used to answer the possible needs of the society and the needs of the speakers of the exact language. There are many factors that lead to use diglossia in communication between the members of any society which is

related to the situation of the speaker and to which he speaks to. This means you need not a variety of language to all people without taking care of the factors that are existed around you to be understood by anyone whom you speak to. Diglossia is a wide term which is used within the same language according to the needs, the environment, and the factors around you during communication, but sometimes it has some extension to be within multilingual community by using the language as high variety and another as low variety.

Rationale of the study

The rationale for this study is based upon the need to understand why Arabic language teachers use vernacular Arabic in the higher education classrooms? To what extent they use standard Arabic during teaching Arabic and addressing their learners inside the classrooms. Qualitative data was elicited in the questionnaire.

Sadly (2006) pointed out that the field of Arabic language teaching and learning was still deficient of trained professionals. Ryding (2006) also wrote that there are few people that could be considered professionals of Arabic language teaching.

Scope and Limitation

Diglossia is not the only concept distinctive of Arabic sociolinguistics. At this juncture, however, one may register a certain disappointment in the failure of Arabic sociolinguistics to adequately define further positions on a prospective typological scale. Admittedly, one reason for this is the fact that Arabic covers sociolinguistic landscapes whose only coherency at times appears to be almost accidental fact that the language used in each part happens to be Arabic.

This research will limit its scope to the experiences of higher education learners and teachers in Yemen. Setting its context, this research will study a group of learners of Arabic in a native environment in an attempt to providing rich empirical data to investigate the effect of diglossia on learning Arabic in higher education situation.

Methodology

This study presents the results of a recent questionnaire designed by the researcher which consisted of two quantitative closed – ended questionnaires. Two surveys from three public universities, Sana'a university, Amran university, and AL-Baydha'a university, the first from students learning Arabic in these three universities and a similar survey to teachers of Arabic teaching in the departments of Arabic in various colleges, provide the data for this study. It should be noted that this research is exploratory in nature using only the statistical procedures. It should be considered a pilot for further statistical analysis.

The particular set of data used in this research from the respondents was gathered between March and June 2014. The data used in this research represent responses on the two surveys that pertained in some manner to the issue of learning Arabic. The surveys gathered detailed bio- information from each of the respondents. The actual items in the survey, however, were multiple likert options. The likert scale was a four point rubric with a range of possible responses from "always, sometimes to rarely and never". The respondents were asked to tick or highlight the numeral that corresponded with their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. A four point scale was chosen to disallow the respondents from indicating neutral responses.

Subjects: the participants are 71 Yemeni university students including males and females learning standard Arabic in the departments of Arabic, college of education and college of languages, University of Amran, college of education, Arhab, college of education, Sana'a, University of Sana'a, college of education Rada'a and college of education AL- Bayda'a, University of AL – Bayda'a, Yemen and 26 University teachers including males and females, teaching several courses such as grammar, literature, morphology, stylistics and linguistics in the aforesaid Universities. Due to the small sample size this study should be considered a stepping stone to future research on a large scale.

Instrument

The data of this study was collected through a controlled elicitation method based on a closed questionnaire. This type of questionnaire enables the researcher to reach large numbers of respondents and statically control for variables and analyse the data accordingly. The questionnaire consists of two parts: the first part

composed of 50 items given to the students; and the second part composed of 63 items given to the teachers. For each item, the subjects were asked to select the appropriate item. The questionnaire was administered in the academic year 2013 – 2014.

Nature of the study

The data collected through this study was analysed to inform the researchers, Arabic program coordinators and designers, and teachers of Arabic at higher education level about the effectiveness of using standard Arabic on the proficiency of the learners of Arabic. Objectives were designed to gather data related to the following research questions:

1. What is the effect of diglossia on the quality of learning in higher education in Yemen?
2. Why do many higher education instructors use vernacular Arabic?

These questions become more valid while teaching Arabic in a native environment where it is apparent not only the two varieties exist but also many intermediate forms of the language in between the two. Would that demotivate the learners at all ? (ALMamari, 2011).

The questionnaires data were collected through close – ended questions asked to undergraduate students in the departments of Arabic in six colleges of three public universities. Other questionnaires data were collected through close- ended questions of actual teachers of Arabic in these three universities.

Review of the Related Literature

The present study attempts to look at the issue of diglossia from different angles. First, a review of the relevant literature will provide a better understanding and definition of the phenomenon from a socio linguistic point of view. A brief introduction to this field will suffice to situate the academic position of this study since it emerged from the practical experience of the researcher as a teacher in the field. A brief discussion is then given to the pedagogical implications of diglossia

in the field of language teaching. The literature review ends with a look at the experience of learners and teachers of Arabic with diglossia.

This study examines the effect of the use of diglossia in higher education situations and the Arabic teaching strategies. As revealed in this study, research has emphasized the learners and instructors opinions. Ultimately, there is a lack of research on the effects of using diglossia in Arabic teaching situations in Yemen.

In the present study, the researcher provides a general overview of an important macro context of this study, which is the Arab world. He discusses diglossia in general and diglossia in light of Arabic in particular.

Charles Ferguson is the first linguist who started using "diglossia". He argued that diglossic speech communities have a "High" variety that is very prestigious and a "Low" variety with no official status; they are in complementary distribution with each other. For instance, the "High" variety might be used for literary discourse while the "Low" variety is used for ordinary conversation.

His original definition of diglossia was that the two varieties are in diglossic relationship with each other and are closely related) Hashim, 2012). Therefore, diglossia is not bilingualism. In his defining examples, he points out that the "High" variety is always an acquired form, and that some educated native speakers might even deny that they use the "Low" variety. An important component of diglossia is that the speakers have the personal perception that the "High" variety is the "real" language and the "Low" variety is in "incorrect usage". In Arabic, people talk about the "High" variety as being "pure", Arabic and the dialects as being corrupt forms.

Research on Arabic Language Instruction

Little research has been done to discuss the current state of Arabic instruction in higher education. Perhaps the lack of research is due to the reality that Arabic..as-a world – language is only now emerging at the high school – level.

Hashim (2012) conducted a study to investigate the impact of diglossia in teaching and learning the Arabic course in Sana'a secondary schools, Yemen. The

study revealed that there is a clear neglect of MSA use in the teaching of the Arabic course lessons in Sana'a secondary schools. In spite of their appreciation of MSA, both students and teachers occasionally have recourse to the dialects in classroom interaction for different reasons. The teachers maintain that they sometimes use the dialect to students' lesson assimilation, whereas the students report that they understand better when receiving lessons in MSA but they cannot communicate in this variety.

ALQenaie (2011) examined diglossic switching in Kuwaiti Arabic along four main dialectal phonological varieties. The occurrences of each of the four phonological varieties are correlated with four sociolinguistic variables (age, gender, religious affiliation, and area origin) and six recording groups (social gathering group observation, semi – structured interviews, political show, Kuwaiti National assembly, and xutba 'religious sermon') to which the respondents belong. A distribution and frequency analysis shows that there is a tight dependent relation between the production of the dialectal features and sociological/ recording groups. Further, a correlation and multivariate analysis shows that only 'age' correlates significantly (negatively, with 3 out of 4 of the dialectal markers. It is established that the speech situation in Kuwait is a multiglossic one, where seven overlapping levels exist in a functionally distributed sociolinguistic relationship.

Eva Hashim (2011) conducted a study to investigate the impact of diglossia on Arabic language instruction in higher education in the United States. The study revealed that both students and instructors think Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) should continue to hold prominent place in Arabic curriculum.

Allosh (2002) favours teaching Arabic language through Standard Arabic (SA), the common denominator among all educated Arabs. The problem with this instructional approach to Arabic is that it offers the students little opportunity for typical everyday oral interaction.

Gass (2006: 32) wrote " Many would point out that SLA is quite skewed in the direction of a languages, but not Arabic. Arabic is not one of them, but the acquisition of Arabic is a field awaiting exploration". Such exploration will add to the capacity and utility of Arabic language study.

Data Analysis

Table (1). Students' responses (Psychological factors)

1	I like learning standard Arabic.	3.7	93%
2	I prefer standard Arabic to receive lectures from my teacher.	3.6	91%
3	I feel it great useful when the teacher uses standard Arabic	3.6	90%
4	I feel proud when I speak standard Arabic.	3.4	85%
5	I feel self-confident when I speak standard Arabic	3.3	82%
6	I prefer to listen to programs produced in standard Arabic.	3.2	81%
7	I think standard Arabic is not used because the teachers don't realize its value and its status.	3.1	79%
8	Teachers encourage me read useful books in standard Arabic.	3.0	76%
9	The teachers don't use standard Arabic because they have weak intentness, and they are not aware of the social reality.	2.8	70%
10	I am criticized when I address my classmates and friends by standard Arabic.	2.7	68%
11	Teachers encourage me to make argumentation and discussion by standard Arabic.	2.6	66%
12	I find so difficult when I speak standard Arabic.	2.6	64%
13	I receive respect from the society when I speak by standard Arabic.	2.5	61%
14	My family encourages me to speak by standard Arabic.	2.4	61%
15	The department motivates its students to speak by standard Arabic.	2.3	58%
16	I avoid using standard Arabic fearing from my classmates' irony.	2.3	57%
17	I feel embarrassed when I address my younger brothers by standard Arabic.	2.3	56%
18	The society supports using standard Arabic.	2.2	56%
19	I feel proud when I speak vernacular Arabic.	2.2	55%
20	The deanship encourages the students of the department to use standard Arabic for addressing.	2.2	55%
21	I feel embarrassed and confused when I speak standard Arabic.	2.2	54%
22	I prefer to receive lectures in vernacular Arabic because it is easier.	2.0	51%
23	The use of Standard Arabic makes me feel I am stranger.	1.9	48%

The data analysis for this study was consisted with the analysis procedures used in this type of research. The data was then organized into major themes that arose from the coding. The two major categories of data were analysed. After grouping the data, the researcher uncovered the participants' views on the use of diglossia and discovered which experiences helped achieved competence.

The analysis will first look briefly at the results yielded from the survey. This will serve to paint the larger picture of the study community in relation to the topic. Then the analysis focuses on major themes related to the issue of Arabic diglossia that have been identified by the literature reviewed.

The researcher presented data (2014) from the department of Arabic students and teachers questionnaires that addressed a myriad of issues concerning the teaching and learning of Arabic language. The data showed that the majority of students want to use standard variety of Arabic and many of their teachers encourage the practice. This data is designed by the researcher to elicit feedback exclusively from students who studied Arabic for at least three years. The results do, however, present patterns and trends in language perception and usage are worthy of note. The quantitative items on the questionnaire were

arranged into several categories. These items may be categorized as follows:

1. The psychological factors: students survey includes 14 items, and the teachers survey includes 6 items.
2. The educational factors: the students survey includes 18 items, and the teachers survey includes 24 items.
3. The social factors: students survey includes 14 items, and teachers survey includes 9 items.
4. Curriculum and syllabus: the components, evaluation, weaknesses and strengths of the curriculum are related to teachers, so the teachers survey includes 23 items.

The results reveal that students show positive attitudes towards Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) . Table (1) shows that they always (80.1%) like learning MSA.

They always feel proud when they speak MSA (59.2%). They also feel self-confident when using MSA . Table (1) shows the different average of their feeling self – confident when speaking MSA (always 54.9%, sometimes 28.2%, rarely 9.9%). On the other hand, students have a strong desire to receive lectures in MSA. Table (1) shows the different rates of students' desire to receive lectures in MSA. 74.6% of them always prefer MSA, 19.7% of them sometimes prefer MSA to receive lectures. They show this positive attitude because they always (43.7%) (sometimes 28.2%) receive encouragement from their teachers to use MSA in their argumentations and discussions (item 14). They show this positive attitude although they receive no encouragement from their families, deanships, departments or even their societies (items 17 to 21). On contrary, their responses to item 23 were distributed between positive and negative attitudes towards vernacular Arabic. 45.1% of them never prefer to receive lectures in vernacular Arabic and (36,2%) of students prefer vernacular Arabic to receive lectures.

On the other hand, avoiding MSA by students appeared in rates: never 31%, rarely 22.5%, sometimes 33,8% and always 12.7%. Avoidance of MSA is perhaps related to the difficulty students face when they speak. This difficulty appeared obviously in their responses to item 6 in the rates: never 15,5%, rarely 14.1%, sometimes 46.5% and always 18.3%. In term of reasons, student recourse their not using of MSA to fearing from making mistakes during classroom interaction and fearing from their classmates' irony (item 9).

It is worth mentioning here that(76.7%) of students find it great useful when teachers use MSA in classroom interaction. But they attribute the rare use of MSA by the teachers to the teachers' not- realization of the value and status of MSA. 50.7% of students think that teachers don't use MSA frequently in classroom interaction because they have weak intentness, and they are not aware of their social reality (items 11 and 12).

(2). Table (2) Students' responses (educational factors).

24	The teacher makes modal reading using standard Arabic.	3.2	80%
25	I understand the lecture well when the teacher uses standard Arabic while teaching.	3.2	80%
26	The teacher encourages me to read useful books.	3.1	76%
27	The teacher corrects my mistakes during reading.	3.0	76%
28	I practice reading books other than the university ones.	2.9	73%
29	The difficulty in learning standard Arabic results from the mehod.	2.9	73%
30	Using standard and vernacular Arabic helps to understand the lectures better.	2.9	71%
31	I use standard Arabic when I ask my teacher or have a dialogue with him.	2.8	70%
32	Teachers use standard Arabic while presenting the lectures.	2.7	68%
33	Receiving lectures in vernacular impedes understanding the lesson.	2.7	68%
34	Teachers don't clarify the importance of standard Arabic for their students,	2.7	68%
35	I use vernacular when I address my teacher because I am not proficient in standard Arabic.	2.7	67%
36	The teacher gives me enough chance to read reading lessons.	2.7	67%
37	I avoid using standard Arabic while dialogue because of its difficulty.	2.5	64%
38	I face difficulty in learning standard Arabic lessons.	2.4	61%
39	The difficulty in learning standard Arabic results from the syllabus.	2.4	60%
40	When the teacher uses standard Arabic students don't interact during lecture.	2.3	58%

Table (2) uncovers that students don't use MSA when addressing their teachers because they are not proficient in standard Arabic. It shows the different degrees of vernacular Arabic use by students when addressing their teachers. 14.1% of them never use vernacular Arabic, 23.9% of them rarely use vernacular Arabic, 35.2% of them sometimes use vernacular Arabic, and 25.4% of them always use it when addressing their teachers (item 24).

On the other hand, students support the idea of mixing MSA and vernacular Arabic in classroom interaction. The rates of their responses to this item are as follows: never 8.5%, rarely 18.3%, sometimes 40.8% and always 29.6% (item 25). However, it is important to point out that students understand their lectures more better when their teachers use MSA. 60.6% of them always understand the lectures well when the teachers use MSA in classroom interaction and 14.1% of them sometimes understand the lectures well when the teachers use MSA (item 26). Furthermore, they think that the use of vernacular Arabic in classroom interaction hinders assimilating the lectures. The degrees of average of their responses to item 27 are: never 16.9%, rarely 22.5%, sometimes 28.2% and always 31%.

Regarding the use of MSA by teachers, the degrees of average of students' responses are as follows: 12.7% of them think that teachers never use MSA, 16.9% of them think that teachers rarely use MSA, 45.1% of them think that teachers sometimes use MSA and 22.5% of them think that teachers always use MSA in classroom interaction (item 28). On the other hand, students themselves use MSA when addressing their teachers or having a dialogue with them. Table (2) illustrates the different degrees of average of students' responses regarding the use of MSA during classroom interaction. 12.7% of students never use MSA, 14.1% of them rarely use MSA, 47.9% of them sometimes use MSA and 23.9% of them always use MSA (item 29). Students point out that they don't use MSA frequently when addressing their teachers because their teachers themselves don't clarify the importance of standard Arabic (item 30). They also don't use MSA outside the university in their daily life communication (item 31). Consequently, students face many difficulties in learning MSA lessons. They also avoid using MSA because of its difficulty. Table (2) illustrates the degrees of average of students' responses regarding the difficulty they face when learning MSA (item 32). 12.7% of students never have difficulty when learning MSA, 33.8% of them rarely face difficulty when learning MSA, 33.8% of them sometimes face difficulty and 18.3% of them always face difficulty when learning MSA. Students also complain that the teachers' methods of teaching cause some difficulties for them (item 39). Moreover, they attribute the difficulty they face when learning MSA to the syllabus itself (item 38). As illustrated in table (2), 31% of students think that their difficulty sometimes results from the syllabus and 18.3% of them think that the

difficulty always results from the syllabus. The difficulty they face when learning MSA may lead to the lack of interaction between the teachers and students during lectures because they feel bored when the teacher uses MSA in classroom interaction (items 40 and 41).

Table (3) students' responses (social factors)

41	I consider the use of standard Arabic religious and national assignment.	3.5	88%
42	I read the holly Qura'an too much and this makes me proficient in standard Arabic.	3.5	88%
43	The use of standard Arabic helps for comprehension because students use different varieties.	3.5	88%
44	My use of standard Arabic males my distinctive student for my teachers.	3.5	86%
45	The college and the university are responsible for using standard Arabic.	3.4	85%
46	The staff teachers of the department address each other by standard Arabic and encourage the students to use it.	2.6	64%
47	I speak by standard Arabic outside the university and while studying other subjects.	2.4	60%
48	The use of standard Arabic by the teacher progressively makes the students feel bored.	2.3	58%
49	The use of standard Arabic by the teacher progressively makes people describe him as arrogant.	2.3	57%
50	My family uses standard Arabic when they address each other.	1.8	45%

Table (3) shows that there are also some social factors cause the rare use of MSA by students in classroom interaction and outside the university. 57.7% of students' family never use MSA and 11.3% of students' family rarely use MSA. 88.1% of students think that the college and the university don't take their responsibility to encourage students and teachers use MSA (item 47). The teachers also don't address each other in MSA, and they don't encourage their students to use it (item 46).

Table (4). Teachers' responses (psychological factors).

Sn	Item	Mean	Percent
1	I feel proud when I speak standard Arabic.	3.77	94%
2	I support learning standard Arabic.	3.77	94%
3	I feel proud when I speak vernacular Arabic.	3.73	93%
4	I like speaking in standard Arabic.	3.65	91%
5	I encourage learners for dialogue and argumentation in standard Arabic.	3.58	90%
6	I encourage my family member on addressing in standard Arabic.	2.81	70%
7	I feel affected when I speak standard Arabic.	2.58	65%
8	I prefer not to use standard Arabic too much because it is not relevant to the daily life at present.	2.46	62%
9	The chairman of department urges me to teach in standard Arabic.	2.42	61%
10	students don't interact When using standard Arabic.	2.38	60%
11	The society encourages to use standard Arabic.	1.88	47%
12	The deanship urges me to teach in standard Arabic.	1.81	45%

Table (4) reveals that teachers also show positive attitude towards MSA but not as positive as students. 65.4% of teachers always like to speak MSA. 34.6% of them sometimes like speaking MSA. However, the results show that students show more positive attitude towards speaking MSA than teachers (students 80% in comparison to teachers 65.4%). On the other hand, teachers feel more proud when speaking MSA than students. They show more frequency (88.5%) in comparison to students (59.2%).

Unlike students, teachers also show positive attitude towards vernacular Arabic. 73.1% of teachers feel proud when they speak vernacular Arabic in comparison to students who show high average in comparison to students. 54.9% of students feel self - confident when they speak MSA whereas 42.3% of teachers sometimes feel affected when they speak MSA. In spite of the teachers' negative feeling towards MSA, 88.5% of them support learning MSA. 65.4 of them also encourage their

students to use MSA in dialogues and argumentations. Table (4) also shows that 38.5% of teachers think that students don't interact when using MSA by the teachers in classroom interaction. Another reason for rare use of MSA by teachers is due to its irrelevant to the daily life. The teachers' responses to item 1o are: never 30%, rarely 11.5%, sometimes 38.5% and always 19.2%.

It is also important mentioning here that the deanship of the college and the departments of Arabic don't urge their teachers and students to use MSA. It is also noticed that neither teachers nor students receive any encouragement from the family and the society as illustrated in tables 3 and 4.

As regards mixing vernacular and modern standard Arabic (MSA) helps in assimilation during teaching sessions, the results reveal a contradiction between teachers and students, and the students' responses seem to be more frequent than teachers'. The degree of average of students' responses regarding mixing of MSA and vernacular Arabic are rarely 18.3%, sometimes 40,9% and always 29.6% whereas the teachers' degree of average are rarely 34.6%, sometimes 26.9% and always 15.4%.

Therefore, the use of vernacular Arabic, from the teachers' point of view, negatively affects the students' linguistic attainment. On contrary, they advocate the notion of mixing vernacular and MSA as a means of getting students comprehend much better since 88.8% of them mentioned that this mixture helps in lessons assimilation as illustrated in table (4). 53.8% of teachers are with the opinion that the use of vernacular Arabic contributes in maximizing the learners' deficiency (item 18).

The degree of average of MSA use by teachers when addressing their chairmen and deanship appeared in rates rarely 11.5%, sometimes 53.8% and always 23.1%. Teachers attribute their avoidance of MSA during classroom interaction to their fearing from making oral mistakes (item 24).

Table (5) teachers' responses (educational domains)

Sn	Item	Mean	Percent
13	I examine the learners composition and amend their linguistics mistakes.	3.73	93%
14	I amend the learner oral mistakes during his reading.	3.65	91%
15	I concentrate on the learner's spellings and grammatical mistakes when I follow writing composition,	3.54	89%
16	I concentrate on improving the learners' correct oral communication skills.	3.35	84%
17	I use different styles to improve the learners linguistics performance.	3.31	83%
18	I give the learner sufficient chance to develop correct reading skills	3.23	81%
19	The society Diglossia supports using standard Arabic. The use of vernacular contributes to increase the learners weaknesses during teaching,	3.04	76%
20	I show my interest in oral tests periodically to evaluate the learners' linguistics performance.....	3	75%
21	I recognize the learners' interest and their different hopes.	2.85	71%
22	I avoid criticizing the learner when listening to his oral mistakes during the classroom participation.	2.54	64%
23	I use audio and visual aids which help to improve the learners linguistics skills.	2.5	63%
24	Mixing between vernacular and standard Arabic helps in learners' comprehending.	2.31	58%
25	Using standard Arabic in 50% and vernacular in the same percentage contributes to facilitate the learning process well.	2.27	57%
26	Using vernacular Arabic helps on comprehending during teaching Arabic	2.23	56%
27	When using standard Arabic in presenting the lecture in notice the learners' carelessness.	2.08	52%
28	I avoid using standard Arabic during presenting the lecture fearing from making oral mistakes	2	50%
29	I find it difficult to use standard Arabic during presenting the lecture	2	50%
30	I avoid standard Arabic during presenting the lecture because I feel affected.	1.69	42%
31	The use of standard Arabic impedes the lecture and results not to achieve the desired objectives.	1.65	41%
32	Standard Arabic is considered a valid means for only writing process.	1.62	41%

Teachers avoid using MSA during classroom interaction fearing from making oral mistakes. The degree of average are illustrated in table (5) . However, 69.2% of teachers attribute their avoidance of using MSA to the students' carelessness when

the teachers use MSA. 50% of them avoid using MSA because they find it difficult to use MSA (item 26).

Table (6) shows that teachers sometimes (53.8%) use MSA when addressing their colleagues, chairmen and deanship. Only 23.1% of them always use MSA. 30.8% of them never use MSA outside the college whereas 11.57% of them always use MSA outside the college. Although teachers receive respect from their society, they don't use MSA outside the college. They neglect using MSA frequently because they don't receive training courses and workshops about the importance of standard Arabic and how to use MSA during their normal communication.

Table (6). Teachers' responses (social factors).

Sn	Item	Mean	Percent
33	I use standard Arabic while addressing my colleagues or chairman or deanship.	2.88	72%
34	I receive respect from the society when I speak by standard Arabic.	2.88	72%
35	I speak standard Arabic outside the college.	2.38	60%

Table (7). Teachers' responses (qualifying factors).

Sn	Item	Mean	Percent
36	The training courses contribute to increasing the proficiency professionally and scientifically.	3	75%
37	I participate actively in the training courses activities. .	2.73	68%
38	I work to execute what is benefited from these training courses.	2.62	66%
39	The topics of the training courses answer the teacher' training needs.	2.38	60%
40	A qualified team of academicians and experts manage the training courses.	2.31	58%
41	I receive sufficient qualitative training courses.	1.88	47%

In terms of reasons of using vernacular Arabic in classroom interaction, the findings unveiled that the teachers have recourse to the lack of training courses and workshops. Table (7) reveals that 38.5% of teachers never receive training courses (item 36) and 42.3% of them rarely receive training courses and the topics of these training courses don't answer the teachers' needs.

Table (8). Teachers' responses (curriculum and syllabus).

Sn	Item	Mean	Percent
53	Arabic curricula concentrate on improving the learner' written and oral skills.	4.6	115%
50	The topics of Arabic concentrate on linguistic knowledge.	3.35	84%
43	Theoretical data is more dominating than improving the linguistic skills.	3.31	83%
61	Arabic syllabuses need reevaluation to answer the learners' needs in developing the communicativeskills.	3.27	82%
62	The public teaching atmosphere doesn't help to develop oral skills to use standard Arabic.	3.23	81%
49	The topics of Arabic provide the learner with scientific knowledge not oral linguistic skills.	3.19	80%
44	Syntax lectures concentrate on what the learner needs to improve his proficiency in comprehending sentences and their generating.	3.15	79%
48	The content of Arabic curriculum consolidates the learner's ability to use the language functionally.	3.08	77%
59	The syntax lectures contribute to improving the learners' ability of writing and speaking.	3.08	77%
47	The content of Arabic curriculum is poor to many values which confirm the importance and the status of standard Arabic.	2.96	74%
56	Arabic syllabuses abide by gradualism in presenting topics.	2.96	74%
60	The syntax lectures provide sufficient chances to practice its applications.	2.96	74%
42	Arabic curricula concentrate on the science of the language not the language itself.	2.92	73%
45	Arabic curricula are characterized with including many terms which the learners don't understand.	2.81	70%
55	Arabic syllabuses suit the learners' mental and linguistic level quantitatively and qualitatively.	2.73	68%
57	Arabic syllabuses contribute to constructing learners able to write in correct Arabic and understand it.	2.73	68%
51	The duration of lectures suits the learners practice to apply the syntactic rules.	2.65	66%
52	I face syntactic mistakes in the content of the syllabus.	2.62	66%
58	Arabic syllabuses contribute to developing learners creative skills.	2.58	65%
54	The curriculum of Arabic is connected with the learner's reality and his practical life and his needs and	2.54	64%

requirements of his era.

46	Arabic credit hours are adequate and suitable..	2.46	62%
63	The department organizes communicative activities and cultural competitions that illustrate the learners' skills in using standard Arabic.	2.23	56%

The results also unveiled that the teachers have recourse to the curricula of Arabic. Table (8) reveals that 46.2% of teachers point out that the curricula of Arabic sometimes concentrate on theoretical topics related to the science of language and not the language itself. 86.5% of them point out that theoretical data in Arabic curricula is more dominating than improving the linguistic skills (item 43). 61.4% of teachers point out that Arabic curricula are characterized with including many terms which the students don't understand (item 45). The majority of teachers point out that the content of Arabic curricula is poor to many values which confirm the importance and the status of standard Arabic (item 47). 46.2% of teachers point out that the Arabic syllabuses rarely contribute to improving the students' creative skills. 7.7% of them point out that Arabic syllabuses never contribute to improving students' creative skills (item 58). The public teaching atmosphere doesn't help to develop the skills of using MSA (item 62). The department never (38.5%) organizes communicative activities and culture competitions that illustrate the students' skills of using standard Arabic (item 63).

To tackle these problems, the teachers are with the opinion that Arabic syllabuses need re- evaluation to answer the learners' needs in developing the communicative skills (item 61).

Discussion of the Results

The results reveal that both teachers and students show positive attitude towards MSA but students show more positive attitude towards using MSA than teachers. The students have a strong desire to receive lectures in MSA. 95.7% of them (including the different degrees of MSA use 'always', 'sometimes, and 'rarely') prefer MSA in classroom interaction because they understand better when the teacher uses MSA. In spite of their strong desire, 69% of students avoid using MSA due to its difficulty, fearing from making mistakes and fearing from their

classmates' irony. They also attribute their avoidance of using MSA to the teachers' not realizing the value and importance of MSA. In addition, the rare use of MSA is related to psychological, educational, and social factors. On contrary, 71.7% of them show negative attitude towards vernacular Arabic because they think that the use of vernacular Arabic hinders understanding lectures. The results also unveil that although the students' appreciation of MSA, they don't use it when addressing their teachers because they are not proficient in communication skills.

On the other hand, from the students' point of view the teachers don't use MSA because they have weak intentness, and they are not aware of their social reality. The teachers attribute their avoidance of using MSA to the students' carelessness when they use MSA in classroom interaction. 50% of them avoid using MSA because they find it difficult to use MSA Unlike students, teachers show more positive attitude towards vernacular Arabic. 73.1% of teachers feel proud when they speak vernacular Arabic in comparison to students who show high average in comparison to students. 82% of teachers always feel proud when they speak vernacular Arabic. 54.9% of students feel self - confident when they speak MSA whereas 42.3% of teachers sometimes feel affected when they speak MSA. The teachers also advocate the notion of mixing vernacular Arabic and MSA in classroom interaction. As regards mixing vernacular and modern standard Arabic (MSA) helps the students' assimilation during teaching sessions, the results reveal a contradiction between teachers and students, and the students' responses seem to be more frequent than teachers'. Therefore, the use of vernacular Arabic, from the teachers' point of view, negatively affects the students' linguistic attainment. In addition, the rare use of MSA causes many difficulties for the students in learning MSA lessons.

Conclusion

The analysis of the data presented the results of the data collected, interpretations of which represent the main findings of the study. These findings were closely scrutinized and analysed, and main conclusions were reached. It then provided us with statistical insight that enabled us to understand the phenomena.

This study focused on the status of diglossia in the Arab world and addressed the main problems behind the way it is treated. With Classical Arabic (CA) being equated with Qura'anic Arabic, hence, delimiting in usage to the recitation of the Qura'anic we are left with Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) at the top of the speech continuum. In each Arabic community there always exist two opposing poles, two varieties – The standard (High) and colloquial (Low) – which are in functional distribution. Each variety functions to serve a given level of speech. However, as the discussion continues, it shows that such a treatment does not reflect the notion of diglossia in a clear way. Therefore, rather than a strict dichotomy and a two – division of function, diglossia should be treated as a gradient of speech situations. Further, the study stresses the status of diglossia as a speech situation, where it should be distinguished from bilingualism. While the latter deals with different varieties of same language. As a result, the term code-switching for former. Also, distribution is drawn between standard and prestige language, and an overview of the literature illustrates there are situations where the term standard must be reserved for the H variety, while the prestige for L.

The effect of Diglossia

Difficulty in learning MSA often expected to occur to learners in such a situation. Ferguson expected that confusion may occur. He suggested that the confusion posed by trying to learn a diglossic language seems likely to learn two languages at once. This problem seems to be real in Arabic. The data show that there is such confusion faced by students.

The future of Arabic Diglossia

In the foreseeable future, diglossic situation in Yemen in particular and in the Arab region in general could continue to produce dramatically wider ranges of linguistic distance between the various Arabic colloquials and fusha. The fracturing of the internal structure and dynamics of the Arabic language continuum will have important consequences in the field of education. One of these consequences could be the numerous daily activities. However, modern fusha would still play an important role even though next generations of Arabs would

not be any more adopt at using it than their parents. The effect of this on the future of Arab education cannot be considered in optimistic terms.

The researcher claims that Arabic diglossia is a definite aggravating factors in the low results of the learners since this phenomenon affects all the classes of Arab societies without discrimination, only urgent and appropriate language planning decisions, better language instruction, more schooling, and whenever possible, the additional provision of improved socioeconomic conditions, could bring good and useful results.

Since the nature of educational reform and change is complex, lengthy and dynamic, rapid developments should not be expected soon on the Arab educational scene. "It may even take generations to achieve an Arab language policy and practice that would change the nature of Arabic instruction and turn it from a bar to an open door to learning and better living conditions in the whole Arab region" Maamouri, 1998: 69).

Solutions for Arabic Diglossia

Arabic researchers developers should be aware of the implications of Arabic diglossia for their applications since it is hard to build a system that can handle all of the varieties of Arabic simultaneously. Developers must be clear as to which variety of Arabic is appropriate for their specific applications. For example, an application for speech recognition of Arabic conversations will most probably need dialect resources while another for processing Arabic news broadcasts would require Modern Standard Arabic resources whether in the form of linguistic knowledge or in corpora for training purposes.

- 1, Students need to aware that the ability to use a more standard variety easily and competently in some situations is absolutely essential for their future.
- 2, Acceptance of the varieties, and encouragement for students to select the most appropriate variety for each situation is therefore the most moderate and practical approach. It is even possible for teachers to encourage students to be proud of their own indigenous variety of Arabic while simultaneously stressing that access to the

standard variety is vitally important for future success. And teachers can furthermore recognize that the ability to switch appropriately between H and L varieties of Arabic when required demonstrates sophisticated behaviour that shows a good understanding of the linguistic demands of the society we live in (Deterding, 1998). Teachers should encourage the use of standard Arabic in the classroom.

To continue suggesting solutions, Maxos (2002) proposes that understanding of Arabic is based on scientific analysis of the actual use of the language by the majority of people who speak it. Second, Arab countries need to promote secular and liberal attitudes that include an in-depth understanding of the culture, heritage and diversity of the Arab Islamic-Middle Eastern society. Third, there is a need for respect and tolerance of the national function of each type of language within the ethnic and cultural richness of the region. The result has to be reconciliation between spoken and written Arabic, which means reconciliation between the authority and the intellectual elites on one hand and the overwhelming majority of the Arab people on the other. It also means bridging the gap between past and present.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study presents some interesting findings regarding diglossia,, especially in connection to Arabic. There always remain opportunities for further research into the area, which always serves to develop our understanding of the diglossia. ALQenaie, 2011: 259) developed some suggestions:

1. Measuring attitudes of the speakers towards the dialect in particular and diglossia in general using different scales. This helps us understanding the nature of the switching between varieties involved in the speech continuum, and perhaps the motive behind it.
2. It might be interesting to add information about the socio-economic status of the residential areas.

3. There are many more interesting features of the dialect that could be studied to give a better understanding of its linguistics, which forms key differences between MSA and the dialects.
4. Future research can consider a wider and more balanced variety of respondents. My respondents were chosen from three universities to ensure validity and authenticity of any conclusions. But future research can organize for a better representation.
5. Arabic curricula need re-evaluation to develop the learners' creative skills and to answer the learners' needs in the near future.
6. Strategies of teaching methods of MSA need to be improved to cope with quick developments in all fields of knowledge.

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

It has been established that diglossia is the linguistic reality of Arabic by a speaking community of more than 300 million of speakers. As seen thus far, a lively scholarly debate at the intersection of sociolinguistics and language teaching pedagogy has enriched our understanding of this concept and linguistic phenomenon. However, discussion around this issue is not only linguistic but is political, social, religious and national as well, and could be changed sensitive especially in relation to the teaching of Arabic (ALBatal, 1992). It must be noted that spoken Arabic "is often stigmatized as a less prestigious variety of Arabic and less worthy of study even though it is the language of choice for day to day communication for native speakers" (Palmer, 2007: 111).

The diglossic nature of Arabic has tremendous pedagogical implications and poses serious challenges to both the teaching and learning of the language (ALBatal, 1992) which is indeed of direct relevance to this research. This diglossic reality poses three major problems in teaching and learning a language, according to Ferguson (1971), ALMamari, 2011) are:

1. Learning two languages in one: which is a common challenge in learning and teaching Arabic. There is more to be learned than one language. This is seen in the

experience of students who learn Modern Standard Arabic then get exposed to a dialect. "Although MSA and the dialects do show a considerable amount of overlapping and the students' knowledge of MSA will greatly facilitate the frustration and disappointment felt by the students once they face the realities of diglossic situation in the Arab world (ALBatal, 1992: 287).

2. Choice of dialect: according to Ferguson (1971, cited in ALBatal. (1992) this problem is unique to Arabic since it has no standard dialect as do other diglossic languages such as Haitian Creole and Greek if the choice is made to teach an Arabic dialect, which one is to be chosen and why?
3. Existence of intermediate form of language: in certain contexts, educated Arabic native speakers tend to mix elements from the High and Low varieties. The existence of intermediate levels of Arabic has been proposed as an alternative model to diglossia.

As noted above, the field of teaching Arabic has benefited from the advances in language teaching such as moving away from traditional models of teaching toward more communicative techniques and from achievement testing toward proficiency rating. This challenged Arabic language educators to improve teaching Arabic as a medium of communication and functionality. Such a challenge brings the diglossic nature of Arabic to forefront, since Modern Standard Arabic is not used in daily communication, and using it as such does not replicate the reality of Arabic language speakers, while most of the spoken dialects of Arabic are not written.

Palmer (2008) criticizes the fact that field of Arabic language teaching and learning " seems to have frozen in Ferguson's idealized characterization of diglossia: the higher is emphasized – even though it is only part of the language – whereas the lower register is disrespected and ignored, even though it is widely used in many situations and circumstances" (Palmer, 2008: 93). However, Allosh, (1992) argues against promoting spoken dialects, especially against using the colloquial approach since the mission of most Arabic language programs is to achieve the level of educated speaker. In addition, knowledge of MSA opens

access to literature and language of the Arab past that is unavailable in the colloquial.

Thus, " these views and counter views will have an enormous impact on syllabus design, for they will determine whether an Arab syllabus should contain MSA only or MSA and colloquial variety integrated together, and if the later, at what level and in what order" (ALBatal, 1992: 287).

This study represents an original contribution to knowledge in a variety of ways. It contributes to the dialectological studies of Arabic. It provides us with an insight into the study of diglossia and its effect on language learning and teaching. It is anticipated that this research will benefit the Arabic teaching and learning community by offering ways to provide students and teachers with optimal modes of instruction and communication. Further, this study utilizes a huge corpus of data extracted from a large number of informants which was analysed. Main statistical analyses were performed. This approach proved to be useful in providing deep insights into the nature of linguistic variation.

References

ALBatal, M. (1992). Diglossia Proficiency. The Need for an Alternative Approach to Teaching. In Rouchdy, The Arabic Language in America (pp.284 – 304). Detroit: Wayne State University press.

ALjundi, A. (1987). AL – Lughat Alarabyia fi muwajahti Al- lughaat AL- ajnabiya. (The Arabic language facing foreign languages). Majma Allugha Alarabiya Alurduni2, 4-6.

ALMamari, H. (2011). Arabic Diglossia and Arabic as a foreign Language: The Perception of Students in World Learning Oman Centre. MA thesis submitted to the SIT Graduate Institute in Brattleboro, Vermont, U.S.A. (2011).

Allosh, M. M. (2002). " Ahlan Wa Sahlan" Functional Standard Arabic for beginners. In A Roucdy. The Arabic Language in America.

Allosh, M. M. (1992). Designing a proficiency oriented syllabus for Modern Standard Arabic as a foreign language. In A Roucody. *The Arabic Language in America* (pp. 251 – 283).

ALQenaie, Shamlan Dawood (2011). *Kuwaiti Arabic: A socio - phonological perspective*. Ph. D. thesis submitted to the university of Durham, U.S.A (2011).

Ayari, Salah (1996). Diglossia and Illiteracy in the Arab world. *Language, culture, curriculum* (1996) vol., 9, No. 3, pp, 243 – 253.

Bassiouney , R. (2009). *Arabic sociolinguistics*. United Kingdom; Edinburgh University Press.

Bergman,E.(2010). The most Things Change: A Learner's perspective in learning another Arabic dialect. *Journal of the less commonly language* ,vol. 9, (p. 85).

Deterding, D. (1998). Approaches to Diglossia in the classroom: The Middle way. *RECT*, 1998 (2)18-23.

Elgibali, Alaa(1993). Stability and language variation in Arabic: Caiene and Kuwaiti dialects. In *perspectives on Arabic linguistics*, Ed. Mushira Eid& Clive Holes, PP. 75 – 96. Amsterdam& Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

El –Hassan, S.A. (1977). Educated spoken Arabic in Egypt and the Levant: A critical review of diglossia and related concepts. *Arvivum linguisticism: A Review of comparative philosophy and General linguistics*, 8, PP. 112 – 132.

Fargaly, A. (2005). A case for inter grammar. In Eligible, A. Ed. *Investigating Arabic current parameters in Analysis and Learning*. Brill Boston.

Fargaly, A, and Sha'alan , K. (2009). Arabic Natural Language Processing. Challenges and solutions. *ACM trans. Asian lang. inform. Process*, 8, 4, (December, 2009).

Fakher, A. (1995). Arabic as a foreign language: Bringing Diglossia into the classroom: Bridging Theory and Practice (pp. 135 – 147). New York Garland.

Fellman, Jacj (1973). Sociolinguistics problems in the Middle Eastern Arab world: an overview. *Anthropological Linguistics* 15, (1). 24 – 32.

Farris, Amal (1975). Diglossia in Arab speech communities. The classical language compared with the Syrian vernacular. The National Institute of education, US (1975).

Ferguson, Charles (1959).

Diglossia. Word, 15,325-340.

Fishman, Joshua (1972). *The society of language*, Newburg House.

Gass , S. (2006). Models of second Language acquisition. In: M. Wahba, Z. A. Taha, & L. England (Eds.), *Handbook for Arabic Language teaching professionals*, (pp. 21- 23). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gumpers, John (1967). On the Ethnology of linguistic change in William Bright, ed. *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, 27 – 38.

Hary, B. (1996). "The importance of the language continuum in Arabic multi-glossia". In A. Elgibali (Eds.). *Understanding Arabic: Essays in contemporary Arabic Linguistics in Honour of El-said Badawi* (p.66-90). Cairo: The American University Press.

Hashim , Eva (2011). *The Impact of Diglossia on Arabic Language Instruction in Higher Education: Attitudes and Experiences of Students and Instructors in the US*. Ph. D. Dissertation, California State University, U.S (2011).

Hashim, Ibraim (2012). *The Impact of Diglossia in Teaching and Learning The Arabic Course to Sana'a Secondary schools, Yemen*. MA thesis submitted to the department of English, Algeria University, Algeria (2012).

Hauser, H. (2008). *Biliteracy and Skills Transfer: literacy skills transfer from Arabic to English focussing on lexical Access*. A thesis submitted to the university of North Dakota (2008).

Hirsch, B. J. (2009). *Integrating Dialects into the Modern Standard Arabic High school classroom*. M. A. thesis submitted to the faculty of Concordia, (2009).

Holes , C.D. (2004). Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties. Revised Edition. Georgetown Classics in Arabic Language and Linguistics Series. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Hudson, A. (2002). Outline of a theory of diglossia. International journal of society and language, 157 (2002).

Hudson, A. (1994). Diglossia as a special case of "Register varieties". In D. Bilbert & E. Finigan (Eds.) sociolinguistic perspectives on Register, Oxford: Oxford University press, pp. 294 – 314.

Husien, Taha (1957). ALugha alfusha wa talim ash – shabab. vol. 4, PP. 890 – 894, 911.

Ibrahim, Mohammed Hasan, (1993). Foreword. in Palmer, Edward L. 1993. Toward a literate world Westview press.

Kaye, Alan (2001). Diglossia: the state of art. International journal of society and languages, 152 (2001), pp. 117 – 129.

Maamouri, M. (1998). Arabic Diglossia and its Impact on the quality of Education in Arab Region . international Literacy Institute, University of Pennsylvania, USA. Human Development: Moving Forward workshop.

Maamouri, Mohammed (1973). The linguistic situation in independent Tunisia. " The American journal of Arabic studies. I, 50 – 65.

Maxos, Hussien (2002). Problems of spoken written –Arabic. Arabic for non-natives series: comparative studies 1995- 2002 Irames Group Damascus, Syria.

Munika, Chavez (2003). The Diglossic Foreign language classroom: Learners' views on L1 and L2 Functions. The University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Owens, Jonathan (2001). Arabic sociolinguistics. Koninklike Brill NV, Leiden, 2001.

Palmer, Jermy (2007). Arabic Diglossia: Teaching only the standard variety is Disservice to students. Arizona working papers in SLA & reading, 14, 111 – 122 (2007).

Palmer, Jermy (2008). Arabic Diglossia: students' perceptions of spoken Arabic After living in the Arabic speaking world. Arizona working papers in SLA & teaching, vol. 15; 81 – 95 (2008).

Parkinson, Delworth B. (1991). Searching for Modern fusha. Real – life formal Arabic, in ALarabiya, 24, 31 -64.

Parkinson, Delworth (1994). Speaking fusha in Cairo: The Role of the Ending vowels" in Suliman (ed.), PP. 179 – 212.

Ryding, K., C. (2006). Teaching Arabic in the United States. Kassim, M. Wahba, Zainab A. taha & Liz. England (Eds.). handbook for Arabic language teaching professionals)pp. 13 – 20). Mahwah. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sotiropoulos, Dimitri (1977). Diglossia and the National Language Question in Modern Greece, linguistics 197, 5-3).

Suliman, Y. (2003). The Arabic language and National Identity. Washington: Georgetown University press.

Stadlauer, S. (2010). Language Ideologies in the Arabic Diglossia of Egypt. Colorado Research in Linguistics. June, 2010. Vol.22, Boulder; University of Colorado (2010).

Vereteegh, K. (2004). The Arabic language. Edinburgh University press.

Wahba, K. (2006). Arabic Language Use and the Educational User. In K. Wahba, Z. Taha, & L. England Handbook for Arabic language Teaching Professionals (pp. 139 – 155). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Walters, K. (1996). " Diglossia linguistic variation and the change in Arabic". Perspectives on Arabic linguistics. Papers from the Eighth Annual symposium on Arabic linguistics. Current Issues in linguistic Theory, 8, 157 - 196. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Younis, M. (2006). Integrating the colloquial with fusha in the Arabic as a foreign language classroom. In K. Wahba, Z. Taha & L. England, Handbook for Arabic Language Teaching Professionals (pp. 157 – 166). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zughoul, Mohammed (1980). Diglossia in Arabic: Investigating Solutions. Anthropological linguistics, vol. 22. No. 5 (May, 1980) 201 - 17.