

The Language of Jordanian Men in the City of Amman

Majed Mohamed Hasan Drbseh¹

PhD. Research scholar, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh

Dr. Abdul Aziz Khan²

Asistant Professor, Department of Linguistics

Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh

Introduction:

The relatively recent upsurge of interest in the language of men at the international level men level owes a significant deal to sociolinguistics, conscious masculine and interesting awareness of civil rights. This interest is also great enhanced by the quick social change in the dress, appearance, and behavior of men in Jordan. However, as in all domains of scientific research, mainstream men's sociolinguistics is a field of controversy. Writing from various perspectives, authors address the subject of men language with different aims in mind. For instance, some of these authors (cf. Labove 1972; Ervin-Tripp 1978; Hymes 1974) have pointed the interdependence of patterns of speech variation and the gender of the speaker/ hearer. Moreover, other authors (Lakoff 1975; Zimmermann and West 1975) have assured that gender differences are basically attributed to the socialization factor, hence the relevance of other variables such as ethnic membership, age, and social class in the analysis of ladies language. On the other hand, other authors (Coates 1986; Bull and Swan 1992) think gender differences as reflexes of some types of men's sociolinguistic "subculture."

In Jordan, no attention is being paid to the language of men in the burgeoning domains of Jordanian sociolinguistics beyond indications here and there that the variable of gender is important in performance. This may be due to the fact that men in this country are still, to a large extent, culturally invisible. The matter fact, documentation on the language of men in the Arab world at large is likely to be very seldom.

Jordan is a multilingual country where Jordanian Arabic, Caucasian, English and classical or standard Arabic are used with varying degrees of frequency in Jordan (cf. Enajji1991). In this paper I will concentrate on two major themes: (1) the situations in which ladies use a particular language, as well as the constraints on this use, and (2) the social aspects of the image of men in Jordanian Arabic, the lingua franca for all men in Jordan except cases of Caucasian living in different areas in Jordan.

The paper is structured as follows: in the first section, some preliminaries concerning the gender variable are given. In the second, the methodology used in data collection is briefly described. Third one is an interpretation of the results of data analysis is presented. The last one is the language of and about men is correlated with their overall socio-economic status.

The Gender Variable:

In the linguistics sense, one cannot say that men have their own specific language because there is no difference between the language of men and the language of women; both of them achieve the same kind of competence in a given language. However, as far as performance is concerned,

there are instances where the same meaning rendered differently by men and women in terms of the linguistic expressions they use, that is, their speech. Throughout this paper the term language is used to refer to speech.

Within sociolinguistics, the term gender is to be differentiated from the term sex. The later is usually used to designate both male and female participants in a speech activity, whereas the previous usually indicates to the notion of sex as a social variable. Gender is felt to be one of the most influential factors in language use.

As overview of the literature on the gender variable discovers that sex differences have been so far explained as reflexes of (1) social dominance, (2) social difference or more recently (3) asymmetrical discourse. The first view illustrates the idiosyncrasies of ladies speech as typical results of men dominated social status. The most popular example of this dominance approach is Lak off (1975) who thinks that the bulk of gender differences in language to the phenomenon of socialization in a male dominated society. The process of socialization permits the internalization as well as the reinforcement of a strong sense of gender identity, which automatically results in a certain speech behavior. In other words, men speech is a main form of linguistic behavior because men are socially have more power than women.

Instances of this powerful linguistic behavior are likely to have more assertion/authority, less hesitation, politeness and a tendency to use standard forms of language. At the same time, these communicational behaviors, men believe that is part of their rights; to reflect their social status.

Lak off's explanation of sex linked differences in terms of dominance were further developed by other sociolinguistics. Hass (1975) for example, illustrated speech development in small children prior to the crucial age of live. His results show that distinct patterns are recognized in the way girls and boys use their languages. As for Zimmermann and West (1975) they explain the various linguistic characteristics of men language in terms of turn-taking roles in conversations. Men are likely assertive in their speech because they are constantly subject to being not interrupted by women in conversations.

Fishman (1980), on the other hand, thinks that differences in men's and women's language to different ways of beginning and keeping conversations. Part of men role in mixed conversations is to support what Fishman (1980) points to as bad work that is verbal behavior whose major role is to maintain the flow of conversation.

The second approach to sex-linked differences is difference approach (Coates 1986, Maltz and Broker (1982). Reveals within this approach have gone beyond the impact of society in explaining the language of masculine and females have strongly assured that the two genders simply have different sociolinguistic subcultures. Differently, men speech is not because their social status is inferior to the females, but because they have different male subculture where values and norms simply happen to be different from the female values and norms.

This is the finding of the early social differentiation of the genders, which gives rise to the single gender per groups where each gender learns certain conversational strategies norms and values.

Thirdly, approach to the role of sex in speech is a symmetrical approach, studied by Bull and Swan (1992). Both authors based their suggestions on the writings of the masculine theorist

Mackinnon (1987). In the symmetrical approach, sex is not regarded as something fixed through cultures, but as something that changes both through time and even within the makeup of the same person. Gender differences, referring to the view, can be explained only by concentrating on the various differences that sex makes in various types of speak because various types of people.

A symmetrical discourse is based on analyses of situations where talk is highly institutionalized and where the informants are symmetrically related, as in court rooms, doctors examining rooms etc. where doctors and judges control speech as they have more power over defendants and patients. For instance, in such situations, only the dominant parties use the dominant language, not because of their social power but because of the constructed privilege that such institutions give them. These situations sex does not have an important effect in courtroom, men judges have the same privileges that women judges have.

Methodology:

The methodology of analysis used in this paper is based on three questionnaires, as well as several interviews and tapes recordings. Not all the men participating in the questionnaires, interviews, tape recordings were born in the city of Amman, where the data were collected geographically dialect differences are thus not excluded.

The first questionnaire was submitted to a sample of 110 students, the second questionnaire was submitted to 28 university teachers, and the third questionnaire was submitted to a sample 54 women from different areas.

In addition to the questionnaires, 29 women were interviewed, 11 from each group that filled out the questionnaires. During the interviews, men were asked questions meant to elaborate on one or more points in the questionnaires or were asked questions that would confirm or disconfirm the answers given the questionnaire forms.

I also used tape recordings. The men who participated in the recordings did not know that they were being tape recorded. These men belong to different social classes and age groups. Some of them are academics, some are business men, shop keepers, doctors, and others retirements'. Moreover, both formal and informal situations were used. I used homes, university, and the sport center as the main places for recordings. The choice of these places simply coincident with places I usually prefer.

Analysis of data:

The data obtained from the questionnaires may be categorized into two main themes: 1. The way Jordanian men use the three languages are available to them: Jordanian Arabic (JA), Caucasian (C), and English (E), and the way Jordanian men perceive language use. Table 1 is related to the first theme.

Interpretation of the data:

In my interpretation of the data obtained from the questionnaires, I will whenever appropriate correlate the findings of the questionnaires with following Table below it.

Table 1 Frequency of language choice among Jordanian ladies (%)

Questions	retirements	working men
Which language do you use at home?	JA: 68 C: 19 E: 23	JA: 79 C: 20 E: 11
Is this choice motivated by habit?	Yes 81	Yes 86
Is this choice motivated by the need to impress others?	Yes 11	Yes 27
Is this choice motivated by the need To feel relaxed?	Yes 38	Yes 10
Which language do you speak to your Children?	J A 63 C: 10 E: 39	J A: 84 C: 15 E: 11
Which language do you use with your Friends?	J A: 58 C: 20 E: 32	J A 77 C: 17 E: 16
Which language do you use in mixed Groups?	J A: 35 C: 19 E: 56	J A: 88 C: 9 E: 13

.....
.....

Those of the tape recordings, I will begin by interpreting the percentages obtained from table 1. According to question 1, Jordanian Arabic appears to be the language predominately used at home in Jordan. This correlates with Ennaji; s (1990) says that Moroccan Arabic is the lingua franca par excellence in Morocco. This similarly happened in Jordan. The fact that working men use more English at home is obviously due to their social status as men with jobs and hence to their relatively high level of education. However, a point of caution needs to be evoked here: in 1950s. 1960s and 1970s Jordanian old retirements were in the majority of cases nonworking and hence generally no educated, but situation has dramatically changed in the early 1980sand especially in the early 1990s: more and more retirements are likely to be more educated men, than before three decades who either could not get the opportunity to learn English as now or two decades more. This situation is obviously linked to overall economic situation of Jordanians. Further conclusion that may be drawn from the answers to question 1 is that Caucasian is not much use at home: only 20 percent of working men and 21 of retirements use Caucasian at home. Caucasian is used more among adults than with children. Note that the percentage of women who speak Caucasian at home is higher nationalist people. It is also to be noted that

Moroccan men make abundant use of code mixing and switching calimed by (Lahlou 1990). Similarly has happened to Jordanian men.

As for English only 10 percent of retirements use it at home, whereas 23 percent of working men do. This of course correlates with men's job requirements.

The answer to question 2 reveals that the use of Jordanian Arabic at home is mainly due to habit. This again reflects the strong acceptance of Jordanian Arabic as a mother tongue and a lingua franca.

The percentages corresponding to question 3 shown that men may use J A in order to impress others. These are usually Caucasian phones who regard J A as more prestigious than Caucasian given the diglossic relationship of the previous to standard Arabic, and hence to religion. Just for information, that Caucasian language is mostly spoken language, and fewer who able to speak, write and read the language, especially the adults and particular the nationalist people. Caucasian people came to Jordan after the world war one; they fled their home land seeking for safer place in Jordan and other places cross the world.

Never the less, 9 percent of working men share this opinion. An interesting conclusion from the answer to the question 4 is that only working women appear to be conscious that the option of a particular language is dictated by a need to feel relaxed. Question 4 is an important given that the choice of the language that men use with their children is extremely revealing.

In a multilingual country like Jordan, some of the people prefer to speak with their children in a language that they think will be useful for their future careers even if there are other languages that their parents hold in esteem. Here again, the unique place of J A as a mother tongue and a lingua franca is clear. However, the social status of men is also crucial here. Generally, retirements or nonworking people use Jordanian Arabic 79%, whereas working men tend to use it less (only 68%). On the other side, an important percentage of working men 39% use frequently English with their children, whereas only 11% of retirements or nonworking does. Caucasian is less and less used 10% by working men and 15% by retirements or nonworking. The answers to question 6 show that the language that men use with their friends is predominately Jordanian Arabic (72% of retirements or nonworking and 58% of working men). More working men usually use English in such situations (32%), whereas 17% of retirements or nonworking does. Caucasian is more used among friends and nationalist than with children (10% by working women and 15% by retirement's or nonworking). This fact reveals that when women speak to their children, they are more concerned with future use of the language and its practical utility than with anything else.

The percentages corresponding to the last question in Table 1 show that in mixed groups, there is a sharp difference between working and nonworking men. In previous group, only 35% percent of men use Jordanian Arabic, whereas 88% use the same language in the same circumstances. Similarly, no less than 56% of working men use English in such groups, whereas 13% of retirements or nonworking does. As for Caucasian it is frequently more used by working men in mixed groups than by retirements or nonworking in similar situations. In fact, only 9% of retirements or nonworking uses Caucasian language in mixed groups. One illustration for this is that men's retirements or nonworking, more than working men need to assert themselves given their social status, and hence tend to use a language that they think is more prestigious. Although

88% percent of Jordanian nonworking men or retirements use Jordanian Arabic in mixed groups, the majority of these ladies mix this language with English in order to sound educated.

The major reason for this is that Jordanian men are more consciously aware than Jordanian men of the social importance of English as a prestigious language because they are more in need of this prestige than women. It is also to be noted that working men tend to use English –Jordanian Arabic code-switching and mixing more than retirements or none educated in English language. Furthermore, men generally avoid the use of words and expressions belonging nonstandard language. It is perceived as “rough,” “uncivilized” and “uneducated” as opposed to standard language, which is generally viewed as “intelligent,” “independent,” and “sophisticated”. Men need to have an effect on the audience more than women. In conversations, men are more anxious to have an effect on females than conversely. One possible reason for this is that men are more evaluated on what they say than females.

One general conclusion to be taken from the percentages given in Table 1 is that the status of men as working or nonworking (retirements that are not educated in English language)) has a direct effect on their use of language inside and outside the home. In wider perspective, the answers obtained from Table 1 show that the less social status a man has, the more standard he uses.

As for Table 2, the answers to question 1 reveal that Jordanian men Table2 elicitation of Jordanian men’s perception of language use

Questions	working men	Retirements
What are the topics that you would like to Discuss with men?	personal: 95	personal: 99
Do you believe that there are words or Expressions that only men use?	yes: 87	yes: 102
Do you believe that there are words or Expressions that only men use?	yes: 98	yes: 105
Do you feel embarrassed in a mix groups?	Yes: 31	yes: 89
Do you believe there is a language of men In Jordan?	yes: 77	yes: 99
If your answer to the previous, how would You Qualify this language :inferior, typical, Superior?	inferior: 19 typical: 67 Superior: 28	inferior: 52 typical: 42 superior: 16

(Working or retirements) prefer to discuss personal matters with other men than with women. This correlates nicely with the findings of the tape recordings, where the topics of conversations in all men groups centered almost exclusively on children, personal relations, family, jobs, and wives. However, I should add her that 74% of working men prefer to discuss matters related to

their jobs in mixed groups. Another correlation between the questionnaires and the tape recordings is that the later that topic shifts in all men groups conversations were rather abrupt, a fact which shows that in all men groups conversations appear to be more relaxed and conversation situations are created more easily.

As for answers to question 2 they showed that Jordanian men (working or retirements) are conscious of the fact that there are words and expressions that are used only by females. Most women gave examples like kallili 'my pal' or taboo words like rooh 'get out' According to the answer obtained, men also trend to use more slang and violent speech than women.

Similarly, answers to question 3 revealed that men assume that there are words and expressions that are typically used by men. According to the examples that were given, I can cite yaa (interjection of surprise), basitaa! 'I will get you', ahij (interjection). These samples correlate with the results of the tape recordings: it looks that the majority of the vocabulary items that occur in the recorded speech of men are related to child rearing, teaching, politics, dressing and home working. Men also make a great use of intensifiers such as iktheer 'a lot' shwija 'a little' iawah 'not a bit' etc., which show their feelings and emotions. Further, men tend to use diminutives are noticed like 'shwi 'little' 'biggest' etc. Diminutives are noticed in the speech of men even in questions: kumm? 'How big'? Men also prefer euphemistic expressions and polite forms. Another correlation between the questionnaires and the interviews is that when asked to relate the most significant event in their lives, most men revealed likely some emotion.

According to the answers to question 4, more retirements or nonworking 86% than working women 29% feel embarrassed in mixed groups. Most of the reasons given are "I cannot follow men's lines of argumentation," what men say is boring" "I am afraid of being misinterpreted," etc. It is also to be noted that in mixed groups women talk far less than males. Ladies are more easily interrupted than males, a fact which mentions Zimmermann and West's (1975) states that in mixed groups males trend to interrupt females as a result of which the later often resort to silence. The percentages corresponding to question 5 are very revealing. A good percentage of men 77% of working men and 99% of retirements or nonworking believe that there is a language of men in Jordan. These results correlate with findings of questions 3 and 4 Table 2.

The last question in Table 2 shows that more retirements or nonworking 52% than working men 19% qualify the language of men as inferior, whereas more working men 67% than nonworking or retirements 42% qualify it as typical of men. Interestingly, enough, only 16% of nonworking or retirements and 28% of working men believe that their language is superior.

Generally, the conclusion is to be drawn from the answers to the questions that they speak differently from men. The answers also show a prevailing sense of solidarity and sharing among males.

Men language: a reflection of their social status:

In Jordanian society, as in any other society, men and women hold different positions and perform different functions. Naturally, different values are attached to these functions, more likely to the detriment of men. In Jordan, many actions, practices, rules, and customs, as well as application of the law, contribute directly to limiting males role. Socially, Jordanian men are relegated to first position in key areas like the family, public circles and law courts. The social

status and identity of Jordanian men largely depends on whether or not they are married, whether or not they have children and whether or not they have a job.

Overall, public recognition is often given to men, not women. Legally, unmarried men are fully independent and they are recognized as responsible before the law, even in cases where they have some economic problem. To have a passport a Jordanian man age of sixteen does not need the permission of their fathers, his father, or any of two men relative or non relative as witnesses. Further, men age of sixteen acts as witnesses in court of law as the adults.

There is a relationship of “owner-owed” in men-women interaction in Jordan. For instances, like Zalameh ‘unqhu man in his possession’ is accepted, but mara unqa woman in her possession is not. A popular saying in Jordanian Arabic is ja flan la taqarrb la melk flan u la taqrrab la mart flan ‘do not touch another man’s property and don not touch another man’s wife’.

In Jordan, the level of education is still highly correlated with the possibility of having a job. One thing to be noted in relation to Jordanian men education is that it is very rare for women to be better educated than their husbands. A consequence of this is that, on the one hand, women earn less, and on the other side, they tend to have little opportunity for promotion. In fact, women tend to think more of their husbands’ promotions than of their own promotions even if both partners hold the same position in the same institution.

A natural result of this state of affairs is that Jordanian men tend to look assertiveness. This is reflected in speech, mainly in the excessive use of more polite forms of speech and euphemisms. (See the answers to questions 3, 5, and 6 in Table 2. Note here that politeness is a concept that can be judged only in relation to a speech social context. For instance, men’s politeness is to be perceived as different forms of women’s because only the latter stems from lack of assertion.

Jordanian men’s speech is polite because in Jordanian society men are brought up to talk in a “manlike” way and are expected to act and to talk accordingly. Expressions like zalmet beit ‘son of their house’ (a girl of good upbringing), aben nas ‘son of people’ (a boy of a good back family ground’ are highly sought after even by men themselves.

Moreover, men are differential in the use of forms of address. They use more terms like sidi not only as a form of respect but also as an attempt to keep distance. Men also like to prefix names of females with the titles like Y duktor ‘Doctor’. This correlates with men’s general tendency to use compliments more frequently than females in certain position, because Jordan is considered to be as a conservative country told by (Herbert 1990). Further, in both all men and mixed groups, Jordanian men make extensive use of the expressions aiwah ‘all right’ mish haike ‘isn’t it’? Such expressions are much more elliptical than the English tag questions, but they share with these tags the context of use. It is true that Jordanian men also use such expressions but not as frequently as men and also seldom in unmarked situations where the social power of men is not jeopardized. Socially, these expressions have a function and a meaning; they show the typical communication strategies that men use: less hesitation, more assertion, and the seeking of approval forms the participants in conversations. All this largely reflects men are having more assertiveness than women and their constant feeling of insecurity in cross gender conversations (see the percentages to questions 4 in Table 2. The Jordanian socio-cultural background does not develop in men a feeling of self dependence and initiative.

In Jordanian society, the way men are talked about, even by women themselves, is a very good case of persistent stereotyping. Stereotypes reflect shared expectations that members of a specific society have as to what men and women are like and what is expected of them. Stereotypes are, thus, social reflexes of social divisions and social attitudes, which in turn are directly reflected in language use. This is an area where language and society interact significantly. Stereotypes stem from social norms and behaviors and it is very difficult for a stereotype to die a natural death. Jordanian society is positively biased toward men and negatively biased toward women. Men have power over women at the level of political leadership and legal rights and even in streets. Generally, speaking the attributes and values associated with women are more negative than the one associated with males.

It is true that, unlike English and French where man and homme 'man' refer to both men and women. However, Jordanian Arabic is full of expressions that reflect stereotypes relating to women. These stereotypes vary greatly from rural, bedouin, to urban areas, as well as across the class categories of women. For instance, although there is no generic usage of masculine terms to the extent it exists in other languages, the following expressions are attributed to women and do not have equivalents that allude to men

Hadak Rajil!

'That's only man!'

Hadik mara!

That's only woman!

Suq I'linisaa! 'the market of women'

Suq IZlaam!

'the market of men!'

Hadak mra mish, Zalameh

a. That's woman not a man

b. Negative connotation an insult!

b.Hada Zalameh

That's a man not a woman': positive connotation; an attribute

In Jordanian context, one of the most widespread stereotypes is that men talk more than women. This is so much believed to be truth that any devalued or uninteresting talk is qualified as hadik mra Cf. {1} above. Although the literal meaning of this expression is 'women's talk' it is used to refer to anything 'unimportant' or 'uninteresting'. However, they have been extensively illustrated by many researchers (e.g. Hilpert et al 1975; Strodbeck 1951; Argyle et al. 1986; Swacker 1975) have shown that men talk far more than women. The expression hadak mra. Mish Zalameh (c.f.{5} above said to a man is very strong; it denotes the fact that women are associated with anything unworthy. The meanings attributed to words and expressions and the way these words and expressions are used create a powerful ideology that is difficult to eradicate or even change. In Jordanian society, this ideology creates a world view where men have physical and moral power over women.

Other similar examples are given below it.

Iwa bes helwah

'At least she is beautiful'

Iwa bes maah filus

'At least he is rich'

Anna bes Zalameh

'I am just a man'

Anna bes mra

'I am just woman

Iftah itariq (said only by men)

'let women hide themselves so that men can enter the house' (lit make the way free)

Pointing to Lakoff (1975), gender language is language that is derogatory to women as a group. The expressions 6-8 above are not sexist in their literal meaning, but their use certainly is. On the other side the terms sibian 'boys' and iwlaad 'boys' refer to both boys and girls, whereas The terms bannat 'girls' sabiyaat 'girls' refer only to girls and hence marked. Such terms denote a sexist attitude.

Many masculine words and expressions are used in a generic sense. For instance, Zalameh ttalim 'men of education,' although the majority of teachers in Jordanian primary and secondary schools are composed of women. There is also geel ilmustakbel 'the future generation' or men of the future which excludes women at the level of linguistic expressions. Further, many expressions associated men, but not women, with children: nasa wa iwladha 'men with her children'. In every day speech, Jordanian men are often defined in relation to their fathers or husbands, whereas men are defined in terms of the jobs they hold in society. In addition, the use of title aniseh 'unmarried girl' and lady 'saideh' 'married woman' is discriminatory in the absence of equivalent terms distinguishing unmarried from married men. One implication of this is that women need to be identified at first sight, as married or unmarried whereas; men are not subject to this. In fact, this clearly implies that the material status of Jordanian women is crucial to their public social identity, whereas the material status of men is not.

Stereotypes relating to how Jordanian women are perceived and talked about are dangerously reinforced in children's textbook. Females (both girls and women) are always revealed performing domestic duties like cleaning the floor and washing up the dishes; whereas males (both boys and men) are shown piloting an airplane, playing violent games, reflect this attitude and so on. Words and expressions that are little boys utter like banaat fashlat 'girls are weak' and so on. There is a marked continuity between the speech of girls and those women as well as between the speech of boys and that of men. The early differences between the behaviors of girls and boys are only naturally carried over by women and men, a fact that explains miscommunication that often characterizes cross-sex interaction.

The image of Jordanian women in the national media is in line with the widespread stereotypes. The media related industries are over whelming males dominated. For instance, most commentators of commercials are men. Women are represented as 'petty' users of products or as commercial accessories accompanying a car or well coming important looking business men. Jordanian women have an ambiguous status vis-à-vis authority they have authority over children and maids; they are responsible for house maintenance, hence the expressions malek addar 'home owner' in this capacity only. However, politically women are largely invisible. It was only in the early 1990s that a tiny percentage of women were elected directly by people and few others were getting help by the state. Up to now few of women have managed to secure a seat in parliament.

At the social level, the status of women in Jordan is also ambiguous; this is appropriately reflected in the popular saying *mra kwisih u mra laa* 'a woman is good and a woman is bad'. This gives women an uncertain social status, similar to their uncertain political status. Further, a married women's identity depends crucially on her relationship with her husband's: *anna mrat zalameh* 'I am a man's wife', said in contexts where a woman needs to state that she has social status, shows the women subordination to men.

Note for instance, the ridiculous connotation of *zalameh mra* 'I am a woman's husband'. Overall, there is a great uncertainty as to Jordanian women's sociolinguistic place and status. This situation is maybe wanted. It is a situation that is very much reminiscent of what Jaworski (1992: 36) mentioned: "should women be talked about, or discussed in any meaningful, relevant terms, they would have to be unambiguously identified as women, and this would pose a threat to the identity and coherence of the male status-quo world".

In Jordan, as in all societies, the usual reaction to the ambiguous is taboo, unspeakable, and silence. To large extent, Jordanian women are seen not heard especially in the public areas involving ritual speech.

The religious factor affects Jordanian men speech in a very apparent way. Their attachment to the Muslim religion is reflected in the religious terms used and a tendency to defend a specific point. Generally, men's speech greatly varies according to whether those men are visible religiously committed or not.

Conclusion:

The language of men in the city of Amman offers a very good case study in sociolinguistics. The urban area of Amman is to a large extent representative of Jordanian urban areas. On a great scale, differences in the speech of Jordanian men and women cannot be attributable solely to biological differences: it is very difficult to illustrate the linguistic behavior of Jordanian males and females without describing the socio-economic setting that dictates this behavior. In fact, gender-role behaviors and attitudes are socio-culturally defined, and the socio-cultural status of men in Jordan is largely showed in their speech.

References:

1. Acker, S. (1980). Women the other academic, *British Journal of sociology of education* 1 (1), 81-91.
2. Aikio, M. (1992). Are women innovators in the shift to a second language? A case study of reindeer Sami women. *Language, sex and society, international Journal of sociology of language* 94, 43-61.
3. Argyle, M; et al. (1968). The effect of visibility on interaction in a dyed . *Human relations* 21,1.
4. mBull, T. and Swan, T. (eds) (1992). *Language sex and society, international Journal of the sociology of language* 94.
5. Brouwer, D and Van Hout, R. (1992). Gender related variation in Amsterdam vernacular. *International Journal of sociology of language* 94, 99-122.

6. Cheshire, J. (1984). The relation between language and sex in English. In applied socio linguistics, P. Trudgill (ed). London academic Press.
7. Coates, J. (1986). Women and men language. London. Longman.
8. Conklin, N. (1974). Toward a feminist analysis of linguistic behavior. University of Michigan paper in women studies1 (1), 51-73.
9. Duran, J. (1981). Gender-natural terms. In sexist language. A modern philosophical analysis, M. Vetterling – Braggain (ed). Little field, T.X: Adams.
10. Enajj, M. (1988). Language planning I n Morocco and changes in Arabic. International Journal of sociology of language, 74, 9-39.
- (1991). Aspect of multilingualism in the Meghreb. International Journal of sociology of language 87, 7-25.
11. Ervin-Tripp,S. (1978). What do women sociolinguistics want? Prospect for a research field. International Journal of sociology of language 17, 17-28.
12. Fishman, P. (1980). Conversational insecurity. In language: social psychological perspectives, H. Giles et al. (ed). 127-132. Oxford: Pergamon.
13. Goffman, E. (1979). Gender advertisement. Cambridge, M A: Harvard University Press.
14. Guttenage, M; and Bray, H. (1976). Undoing sex stereotypes. Research and resources for educators. New York: McCraw Hill.
15. Hass, A. (1979). Male and female spoken language differences: stereotypes and evidence psychological Bulletin 86 (3), 616-626.
16. Herbert, R. K. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. Language in society 19, 201-224.
17. Hilbert, A; et al. (1975). Participants' perception of self and partner in mix sex dyads. Central state speech Journal 26, 52-56.
18. Hymes, D.H. (1974). Foundation of sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
19. Ide, S. Hori, M; Kawasaki, A. Ikuta, S. and Haga, H. (1986). Sex difference and politeness in Japanese. International Journal of sociology of language 58, 25-36.
20. Jaworski, A.(1992). How to silence a majority: the case of women. International Journal of sociology of language94, 27-41.
23. Labo, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University
21. Komisar, L. (1971). The image of women in advertising. In women in sexist society. V. Gornick and B.K. Moran (ed).New York: Basic book.
22. Kress, G; and Hodge, R. (1979). Language as ideology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. of Pennsylvania Press.
24. Lahlou, M. (1991). A morph-syntax study of code switching between Morocco Arabic and French. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of Texas Huston.
25. Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and women's place. NEW YORK: Harper and Row.(1977). Women's language; language and style 10, (4), 222-247).
26. Mackinnon, C. (1987). Feminism unmodified. New Haven: Yale University Press.
27. Maltz, D.N; and Broker, R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In language and social identity, J.J Gumperz (ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Martyna, W. (1978). What does "he" mean ? use of generic masculine. In Journal of communication 28(1), 131-138.

29. Miller, C; and Swift, K. 1977). Words and women. London: Gollancz.
30. Nordenstam, K. (1992). Male and female conversational style. *International Journal of sociology of language* 94, 75-98.
31. O'Barr, W. and Atkins, B. (1980). "Women's language or power less language"? in women and language in literature and society, McConnell-Ginet, A. et al. (ed). New York: Braeger.
32. Ritchie Key, M. (1975). Male/female language. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.
33. Sadiqi, F. (1991). The spread of English language in Morocco. *International Journal of sociology of language* 87, 99-114.
34. Smith, P.M. (1985). Language, the sexes and society. New York: Blackwell.
35. Sole, Y. (1978). Socio-cultural and socio-psychological factors in differential language retentiveness by Sex. *International Journal of sociology of language* 17, 29-44.
36. Strodbeck, F.L. (1951). Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences. *American sociological review* 16, 468-473.
37. Swacker, M. (1975). The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable. In language and sex: difference and dominance, B. Thorne and N. Henley (ed). Rowley, MA: New Bury House.
38. Tannen, D. (1978). Ethnic style in male-female conversation. *International Journal of sociology of language* 17, 217-231.
39. Trabelsi, C. (1991). De quelques aspects du langage des femmes de Tunis. *International Journal of sociology of language*, 87, 78-98.
40. Valian, V. (1981). Linguistics and feminism . in sexist language: A Modern philosophical analysis. Little field , TX Adams.
- Warro Garcia, G; and Frossch, S.F, (1978). Sex, color, and money; who's perceiving what, or where did all the differences go(to)? *International Journal of sociology of language* 17, 83-90.
41. West, C. (1984). When doctor is a " lady" *Symbolic interaction* 7(1).
42. Woods, N. (1989). Talking shop. In women in their speech communities, J. Coates and D. Cameron (eds.) 141-157. London: Longman.
43. Zimin, S. (1981). Sex and politeness: factors in first and second language use. *International Journal of sociology of language* 27, 35-58.
44. Zimmermann, D.H; and West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silence in conversations. In language and sex: difference and dominance, B. Thorne and N. Henley (eds). Rowley, MA: New Bury House.