1. Introduction. Fishman (1970) has observed that an applied sociolinguistics is in order whenever new language varieties must be developed or whenever language varieties, old or new, must be taught. This paper deals with the second of these issues, language teaching, and is further limited to the case of teaching second languages, in the present case Egyptian Arabic (the Arabic of Cairo) as a second language to native speakers of English, with some attention to the question of English as a second language for native speakers of Arabic. I will further limit myself to "second" rather than "foreign" language teaching. Since sociolinguistics describes the conventions, patterns and constraints which together comprise native speakers' knowledge of what constitutes appropriate speech behavior in the speech communities of which they are members, the relevance of sociolinguistic findings and comparisons is greatest when we consider learners who are presently situated in the target speech community who need to interact successfully with native speakers, and who must as a minimum understand the cultural values which underlie speech if they are to interpret what is said with any accuracy. In addition, most second language learners consciously aspire to some level of communicative competence in the target language (this may not be true in foreign language learning, where grammatical competence may be accepted by teacher and students alike as the primary or sole goal of the teaching/learning enterprise) and readily recognize the importance of knowing as much as possible about the rules for the appropriate conduct of speech in the new community (Wolfson and Judd 1983).

This paper has several themes. The first is that almost everything that sociolinguists can discover about the sociolinguistic patterning of Arabic will have some relevance for the teaching and learning of Arabic as a second language. Second is the principle, illustrated here by three examples of sociolinguistic patterning, that while rules for the appropriate conduct of speech vary considerably from one society to another, there is an underlying universality to sociolinguistic rules which makes them readily comprehensible and accessible to language learners, while cross-cultural variability contributes to learners' continued interest. Third, there is some evidence that sociolinguistic rules are difficult for learners to acquire on their own, suggesting that some sociolinguistic facts need to be taught if second language learners are to achieve the desired goal of communicative competence.
2. Variable rules in English and Arabic. In every speech community, socially significant attributes are linguistically marked, but such markers are usually not context independent, but rather probabilistic and variable. Examples abound, but Fisher (1958) offered a clear "typical" example in his classic study of the alternation of -ing and -in as the present progressive suffix in the speech of a group of children in New England. Fisher found several social parameters that played a part in the selection of the variant used: sex (girls used the -ing variant more than boys), social class, personality (aggressive vs. cooperative), mood (tense vs. relaxed), formality of the situation, and topic of conversation. Fisher also found that certain "formal" verb stems appeared to require the formal suffix (e.g., correcting, interesting), while informal verb stems usually occurred with the informal -in suffix (e.g., punchin, chewin).

Variation such as that discussed by Fisher for New England English is interesting to language learners and easily comprehended by them, because the social factors involved - sex, social class, formality, etc. - are common factors in sociolinguistic variation everywhere. What varies is the particular mix of sociological features which counts in a particular speech community and the linguistic features which correlate with those sociological facts.

The study of such variation in urban varieties of English, beginning with Labov's landmark New York study of English (Labov 1966), has led to the model of the variable rule community, in which the speech community is seen as a group of speakers who share a set of norms rather than a set of behaviors. In the prototypical Labovian speech community, higher social class groups approximate more closely to the norms of the standard language in their use of linguistic variables, and within social class groups women are more sensitive than men to the prestige of the standard norm. Style shifting is seen as the result of interaction of "attention to speech" and the power of the prestige norms (Labov 1972).

The case of Arabic fits somewhat uncomfortably into the Labovian paradigm, and investigation of the sociolinguistics of Arabic is likely to further the development of "post-Labovian sociolinguistics" (Romaine 1982) in several ways. It is clear, for example, that socioeconomic class is not the only important social variable in Arabic speech communities (level of education, religiosity, and the urban: rural distinction may be as important), while it is not clear that we can really define a single set of norms which unites all the inhabitants of even a city such as Cairo. Different variables may have different social functions as group differentiators and markers of social identities, and there may be different patterns of prestige at different levels of the community. Perhaps the most basic difficulty in applying the variable rule model to Arabic, however, stems from the relationship between a speech community
in which speakers vary rather narrowly between standard and nonstandard variants within what is clearly one linguistic system (the typical urban North American case) on the one hand, and diglossic situations on the other hand, in which the ends of the diglossic continuum are so different linguistically that one hesitates to posit underlying forms in common. Nevertheless, linguists and language teachers alike must recognize that the way in which native speakers of Arabic usually speak is in fact neither "pure" colloquial nor "pure" classical Arabic, but a variety which fluctuates between the two poles (Badawi 1973). To the degree that this fluctuation is not an essentially haphazard kind of discrete alternation but a structured continuum of rule-bound behavior, the variable rule is a useful formal mechanism for representing that fluctuation.

One variable feature in Egyptian Arabic is the distribution of stop, sibilant and interdental fricative pronunciations of the Classical Arabic interdentals [θ], [ð] and [ItemImage] (Schmidt 1974, 1977). As the result of two diachronic sound changes, one changing the Classical interdentals to stops as soon as a distinctive Egyptian Arabic dialect was being formed and the other changing the interdentals to sibilants beginning some time after the fourteenth century (Birkeland 1952) and still productive, there are in contemporary Egyptian Arabic numerous lexical triplets with interdental fricative, sibilant and stop variants, e.g. [θa:liθ] ~ [sa:lis] ~ [ta:lit] third. Other lexical items - those that have not been in the colloquial vocabulary for a long time, including newly coined technical terminology and older words that are generally acquired by native speakers only through formal education, retaining their character as learned words - cannot now be colloquialized with stops, but any Arabic word with [θ], [ð] or [ItemImage] may be colloquialized by sibilant substitution, e.g., [mumaθiθil] ~ [mumassil] actor, but not *[mumattil]; [θawra]~ [sawra] revolution, but not *[tawra]. Synchronously, both linguists and native speakers tend to identify such variants with different linguistic systems (i.e., classical and colloquial) and to assign the alternations to code switching, code mixing or free variation. The important fact to note, however, is that such switching and mixing are orderly rather than random, and the variation is really not free. These alternations constitute a Labovian sociolinguistic variable, one correlated with facts of the social context.

The present writer investigated the stylistic use of interdental fricative, sibilant and stop pronunciations in lexical items with potential interdentals (the TH-variable) among 16 university students and 12 working class males in Cairo (Schmidt 1974). In each of four discriminable styles - relatively informal interview speech, formal interview style, reading passages and word lists - a distinctive distribution pattern appeared. Interdental fricatives accounted for slightly more than half of all realizations of the TH-variable when
reading from word lists, but in no other style. Sibilants predominated when reading from texts. Stops did not occur at all in the reading styles, but prevailed in the relatively casual parts of the interview. Stop and sibilant pronunciations were about equal in the more formal parts of the interviews.

The same general pattern held for the two informant groups (elite university vs. working class) with one major difference. While all of the university students produced at least some instances of interdental pronunciations, seven of the twelve working class informants produced no interdents at all, and the working class informants who did produce some instances of the classical interdents did so less than half as frequently as the mean for the university group. The Arabic TH-variable thus appears to be a highly developed sociolinguistic marker in Cairo, an indicator which co-varies along at least the two dimensions of style (attention to speech) and socioeconomic class (although level of attained education might define the groups more accurately). The variation is also Labovian in the sense that it operates for the most part below the level of conscious awareness. While there is general awareness that the interdental pronunciations are "correct" in terms of classical standard Arabic and native speakers are quick to label stop pronunciations as "colloquial," the status of the sibilant pronunciations is much less clear and individual members of the speech community are not aware of the ways in which they shift among variant pronunciations. Educated native speakers are typically skeptical when told that literate native speakers often substitute [s] for [θ] when reading Arabic, though in fact all educated speakers in this study did so.

One aspect of Cairo Arabic Th-variation in this study which did not fit the western sociolinguistic model was the absence of any apparent greater sensitivity on the part of women to the prestige of the classical/standard norm. The differences between the university men and women on the TH-variable were not significant. What was strikingly different was the behavior of the university men and women as a group as compared to the working class group (which, unfortunately, included only male subjects).

A second example of variation which illustrates some of the complexities of the Cairo speech community is the distribution of uvular [q] and glottal ['] (the Arabic Q-variable), which in several ways rather neatly parallels the distribution of -ing/-in in English as described by Fisher (1958). The regular diachronic development of classical /q/ was from [q] to ['] in Cairo and Lower Egypt, resulting in a great many cognate pairs in the two codes ([gahwa]:[a:ha] coffee; [ga:l]:[a:l] to say), but it is somewhat over-simplified and misleading to speak of a simple synchronic contrast between [q] in classical/standard and ['] in Egyptian colloquial. In structured interviews, no speakers used ['] when reading from a text, but there was a residue of [q] even in the most casual parts of the interview, and a noticeable
inhibition of the glottal stop pronunciation when moving to more formal topics. The parallel with English -ing/in variation is rather striking: Fisher found that the choice of variants changed from an almost exclusive use of -ing in formal situations to a predominance but not exclusive use of -in in informal interviews. A second parallel between the English -ing/in alternation and the Cairo [q]:['] alternation is the relationship between this variable rule and specific lexical items. In addition to two lexical items which are never colloquialized with ['], [qur'ā:n] and [qa:hira], there are numerous others which usually appear with [q] in contexts normally construed as calling for colloquial, so that most Cairenes distinguish between such pairs as [qawī] strong and ['awi] very, [saqqaf] to educate and [sa''af] applaud even in informal speech.

In the case of the Arabic Q-variable there is differentiation by sex. In the study reported here, both the elite university males and the working class males used the standard uvular [q] more frequently than the university women did. In contrast to the western sociolinguistic hypothesis that women are more sensitive than men to the prestige of prescriptive forms, in this particular case Arab women seem to be deliberately choosing to downplay a particular standard phonological variant. Or, we might speculate, there is a competing non-classical prestige variety for Cairo with ['], which educated women recognize though educated men do not.

Royal [1985] has suggested an interesting resolution of this puzzle for Cairo Arabic. Royal concludes that the preference of women for ['] over [q], together with the tendency of Cairene women to palatalize [D] and [T] before high front vowels and the tendency of women to produce much weaker pharyngealized consonants are all part of a prestigious system for signalling social gender through a fronting and raising versus backing and lowering pronunciation convention, with fronted speech more typically associated with femininity and backed speech with masculinity. Royal's research dealt specifically with the variable of phonological pharyngealization (let us call this the Arabic Ph-variable), for which native speakers claim there to be masculine-feminine and class differences. Based on spectrographic analysis of second formant transitions in recordings of male and female speakers from two age groups in two Cairo neighborhoods (one a folk quarter in the older part of the city, the other a westernized affluent suburb), Royal found that males indeed produced markedly stronger pharyngealization than females in the affluent neighborhood. In the folk neighborhood, on the other hand, older subjects did not observe this sex distinction (pharyngealization by both men and women was heavier than in the affluent suburb group) but younger subjects were seen to be acquiring the distinction. In this case, what is especially interesting is that both upper class men and upper class women seem to be responding to a prestige norm which distinguishes between classes but which is not in the direction of classical
Arabic, since classical/standard Arabic requires strong differentiation between pharyngealized and nonpharyngealized consonants.

In sum, each of the three variable features we have considered for Cairo Arabic represents an interesting deviation from the pattern we would expect based on a variable rule model derived from North American sociolinguistic patterns. The typical North American case is for style shifting in the direction of a prestige (usually national) norm, with social stratification and greater sensitivity to the norm exhibited on the part of women. In the Arabic TH-variable, we see a pattern of style shifting towards the prescriptive, classical norm, with strong social stratification but without any apparent influence of speaker sex. The Arabic Q-variable, on the other hand, shows style shifting towards the classical norm by all informants, but with a countervailing tendency on the part of women to produce fewer classical variants than would be predicted on the basis of their socioeconomic and educational level alone. Finally, in the case of the Arabic PH-variable, we see social stratification and sexual differentiation both operating in favor of a less classical pronunciation that is now more prestigious in Cairene Arabic (at least for the westernized upper classes) than the classical norm of strong pharyngealization.

3. Personal address systems. As Philipsen and Huspek (1985) have pointed out, personal address is a sociolinguistic subject par excellence:

In every language and society, every time one person speaks to another, there is created a host of options centering around whether and how persons will be addressed, named and described. The choices speakers make in such situations, and their meaning to those who interpret them, are systematic, not random. Such systematicity in language behavior, whether of use or interpretation, is universal, although what elements comprise the personal address system and what rules govern its deployment, vary across contexts (p. 94).

Ervin-Tripp (1971) has provided an elegant formal analysis of an American address system, in the form of a computer flow chart with a series of binary selectors for setting and addressee identity. For Western American English, the major output choices are: Title + Last Name (Dr. Jones), Mr./Mrs./Miss + Last Name (Mrs. Roberts), Kin Title + First Name (Uncle George), First Name (Bill), and Ø or no-naming, which is the choice whenever an addressee's name is not known, or when a speaker is unsure of what address form is appropriate. The binary selectors which determine which address form is appropriate include: whether the addressee is an adult or a child, since children are nearly invariably first-named by adults; whether speaker and hearer are co-present in a status marked setting, e.g., a courtroom, which
requires that personal ties be masked; whether the addressee is a relative, and if so whether older or younger generation, since Uncle George is appropriate while Nephew Billy is not; whether or not the addressee is a friend or colleague and, if a colleague, of higher rank; whether the addressee has given dispensation to the speaker to use a less status marked address form (please call me George); whether or not the addressee has by virtue of office some special claim to a specific title (Mr. President), etc. While American culture is generally viewed as very informal and while native speakers consider the system to be straightforward, there are additional complications. Whenever full titles cannot be realized, as when the last name is not known, some titles can be abbreviated (e.g., Dr. without a last name in the case of an M.D. but not a Ph.D.), but most cannot (Excuse me, Mr. is not a possible abbreviation for Excuse me, Mr. Smith if one cannot remember the gentleman's name). There are no widely agreed upon norms for how to address in-laws, and conflicts between personal preferences in such cases frequently force a resort to no-naming.

There is also a complicated system of address forms used in Egyptian Arabic. Not surprisingly, choices of address forms are based on familiar social categories: sex, age, age relative to the speaker, setting, etc. But there are differences as well, some of which derive from different social determinations of common selectors. For example, at the American University in Cairo, large meetings of the entire faculty are status marked situations for American and Egyptian colleagues alike, i.e., more formal address forms will be used, but departmental meetings are so marked only for some Egyptian professors and virtually no American professors. The selector "friend or colleague" may also be defined differently. Ervin-Tripp observes that for an American assistant professor to call a new colleague of the same age and rank by Professor + Last Name would be considered very strange on the U.S. West Coast, but not so in Egypt. There are many differences between the American and Egyptian systems in the area of kinship terms, both in the forms used and in the persons to whom they may be applied. One is the interesting use in Arabic of what Ayoub (1964) has called "bi-polar" kin terms, ego addressing alter with the term which in its literal sense would be appropriate for alter addressing ego. A father may call his son father and be called father in return. As Ayoub points out, this phenomenon of the senior borrowing from the kinship vocabulary of the junior occurs in a special social context, when the senior wishes the junior to do something, but chooses a conciliatory request form rather than an abrupt command. American English and Egyptian Arabic also differ in the ways in which kinship terms can be extended to non-kin in solidary fashion. [‘abla] elder sister is used by students to address any female teacher. While such extensions happen sometimes in American English, so that many children address close family friends who are not in fact related as Aunt X or Uncle Y, in Egypt one may use a kin term appropriate in age and generation to address strangers. If I hail a cab in
Cairo, I shout [ya: taks] but once I am in the cab, if I light a cigarette and offer one to the driver (it would be rude not to) I often address him as [ya: 'ax] brother, if he is approximately my age, or [ya: 9ammil] uncle if he is, say, 15 years my senior.

In terms of output categories, there are major differences between the American English and Egyptian Arabic systems. In the simplest terms, Arabic has many more options to choose among. When the addressee's name is known, the problem of address is not automatically solved. A student whose name appears on a class list as Mohamed Moustafa Abdel Hamid may be Mr. Abdel Hamid in English, but Mr. Mohamed in Arabic, or perhaps Mr. Moustafa, since very common first names such as Mohamed, Ahmed, Ibrahim are often dropped in favor of second names. This never happens with women's names, but with married women there are additional complications. Women in Egypt do not change their legal names when they marry, nor do they use their husbands' names in professional situations, but upper class women may use their husband's first or last names socially. So a woman whose official name is Omneya Fayek Kassabgy may be Mrs. Kassabgy (Title + LN) or Omneya (FN) in English, but in Arabic she might be Omneya (FN) or Karima (an unofficial additional personal name known only to close friends and family). At the school where she teaches she would be Miss Omneya (Title + FN) or simply Miss or ['ablal; to professional colleagues, she would probably be Madame Omneya (Title + FN); and socially she might be addressed as Madame Gazala (Title + husband's LN) or Madame Wisam (Title + husband's FN) or Madame Doctor Wisam (Title + husband's title + husband's FN). For a woman lower on the social scale, the more common address terms would be [sitt] + FN or husband's FN, or ['um] + FN of eldest son or, if she has no sons, eldest daughter. Still lower in the social structure, mostly with recent immigrants from the countryside, one finds conscious avoidance of any personal address forms for women; one can hear a husband address his wife as [ya: gama:9a], literally group.

In the case of address forms used to strangers whose name is not known, the range of output forms is also far greater in Egyptian Arabic than in American English. While Americans have only limited options such as Sir, and Ma'am, restricted in use (so that no-naming is generally preferred), the system of titles which may be used alone in Arabic is extremely rich. Without any attempt to be exhaustive, here are listed some forms heard during a single 20 minute metro ride, arranged roughly from most formal to least formal, although in fact several dimensions of choice are involved. The speaker is a ticket taker, and the frame is [taza:kir ya: ___] tickets, ___ , which does not permit no-naming.

taza:kir ya: afandim term of great respect, to a well dressed man or (more common) woman
| taza:kir ya: be:h | highly respectful, to a man who appears to have high status |
| taza:kir ya: usta:z | literally *professor*; respectful but not as deferential as the above forms |
| taza:kir ya: siyadtak ya: HaDritak | roughly *sir* or *ma'am* [siyadtik], [HaDritik]. Sex of speaker is important: women say [HaDritak] more often than men and almost never use [siyadtak] or [be:h] |
| taza:kir ya: Hagg(a) | literally *one who has made the pilgrimage*. Respectful religious term of address to older but not high status person. Not used to a friend or acquaintance unless it is known that addressee has in fact made the pilgrimage |
| taza:kir ya: sayyid ya: sitt ya: 'a:nisa | Mr., Mrs., Miss; generally to an equal, though note that servants usually address the woman of the house as [sitt]; [sayyid] used most often to a young man |
| taza:kir ya: misyu ya: mada:m ya: mazmaze:l | again, Mr., Mrs., Miss; to an equal or one perceived as higher in rank; polite. Social class of speaker determines whether these or forms closer to French will be used |
| taza:kir ya: m9allim | literally *teacher*, but used by extension to a foreman, plant floor supervisor, pimp, hashish dealer, etc. When addressing a stranger the form is most often used with rough types |
| taza:kir ya: 9ari:s | literally *bridgegroom*; jocular, to a young boy |
| taza:kir ya: 9amm ya: 9amm išše:x | literally *uncle on father's side*, *wise uncle*. Respectful term to an elderly lower class passenger |
taza:kir ya: ba:ša

pasha; while under the system of Turkish titles in Egypt, the pasha outranked the bey, the term [be:h] remains an address form of respect, while [ba:ša] is used only sarcastically. Can be used with children, friends, equals and subordinates, but an addressee who perceives himself as higher in status would take offense.

taza:kir ya: afandi

also sarcastic (cf. [afandim] above, a respectful term)

taza:kir ya: kapten

captain, can be used to a young man who looks like an army private

taza:kir ya: usTa

to anyone who appears to be a skilled or unskilled worker

taza:kir ya: rayyis

boss, usual term of address to waiters

taza:kir ya: 'ibni ya: binti

my boy, son, my girl; friendly

taza:kir ya: walad ya: bint

boy, girl; unfriendly and threatening, often followed by an order to leave the train or move to a second class car.

4. Discourse sequencing rules. The sociolinguistic patterning of language is of course not limited to phonological and lexical variation, but extends to the organization of discourse in speech events such as lectures, discussions, sermons, interviews, meetings, transactional events such as ordering a meal in a restaurant, casual conversations and the like, all of which have rules for proper beginnings, middles and ends. Violations of such rules by native speakers are noticed and commented upon by other native speakers, and since these rules vary so much from culture to culture, violations and misperceptions on the part of non-native speakers who operate under different cultural assumptions and attitudes are likely to result in severe crosscultural misunderstandings.

Only a brief example will be given here, dealing with the sequencing of openings to telephone conversations. This is of interest since Schegloff (1968) has provided an ethnomethodological analysis of some aspects of conversational openings which are apparently universal, while Godard (1977) has given an exam-
ple of crosscultural variation. Schegloff's analysis begins with two rules for American telephone conversations: (1) the answerer speaks first, and (2) the caller provides the first topic. A single deviant case leads Schegloff to provide a more abstract analysis, tied to the more general goal of accounting for coordinated entry into two-party conversations in general, in which the first utterance of the conversation is not the answerer's "hello" but the ring of the telephone, which Schegloff characterizes as the first part of a Summons-Answer sequence. The first part of this adjacency pair establishes the conditional relevance of the second part. Given the first element, the second is expected, so that if there is no answer the caller will infer that no one is home and if the answerer lifts the telephone receiver he speaks first. A further characteristic of the category Summons is that it is a summons for some reason, so the caller's right and obligation to raise the first substantive topic is established. Godard, on the other hand, has contrasted some aspects of the expected behavior of the caller and answerer at the beginning of telephone conversations at private residences in the United States and France. Among the differences which Godard notes are: in France, but not in the United States, the caller checks the number, and once assured that he has reached the right house will give his identity before he asks for his intended addressee; in the United States, but not in France, the caller often questions the answerer's identity (e.g., Is this Robert?) or may ask to speak to someone other than the answerer (e.g., Hello, may I speak to Jane, please?). Interpreting this behavior in terms of French norms, Godard found such behavior incredibly rude, since in France the caller must name himself, and, if acquainted, converse with the answerer before asking for anyone else. What seems normal to an American strikes a French speaker as a dehumanizing treatment of the answerer as no more than a mechanical extension of the telephone.

Telephone conversational openings in Cairo are different from those in France and in the United States. The following conversation, taken from a corpus of 215 telephone beginnings recorded in Egypt, is in many respects typical:

**Answerer:** alo:
**Caller:** alo:
**Answerer:** alo:
**Caller:** mi:n byitkallim?  
Who's speaking?
**Answerer:** 'inta mi:n?  
Who are you?
**Caller:** 'abul magd mawgu:d?  
Is Abu el-Magd there?
**Answerer:** 'ana 'abul magd.. mHammad?  
I'm Abu el-Magd. Mohammed?
**Caller:** 'aywa.. 'izayyak ya: be:h?  
Yes.. how are you, Bey?
Answerer: 'ilhamdulilah, wizayyak 'inta?
Caller: Fine, and you?
Answerer: 'ilhamdulilah
Caller: wallaha:hi ya: 'ax, 9ayz as'alak Ha:ga
Really, brother, I want to ask you something.

This call may strike some western readers as bizzare (simply because they are familiar with very different norms for conversational openings), but there is nothing unusual about such a call in Cairo. The first thing to be noticed is that at the beginning of the conversation there is a series of hello's with no self-identification by either speaker. In his second turn, the caller requests identification from the answerer, but this is refused by the answerer, who counters by demanding the identity of the caller. Instead of providing self-identification in the next turn, the caller instead guesses the identity of the answerer. This is confirmed by the answerer, who then attempts to guess the identity of the caller. After both guesses are confirmed, talk proceeds through a series of greetings and responses until finally, after twelve turns, the message is introduced, or at least the caller indicates that he does have a topic to introduce. A common reaction of foreigners living in Egypt is that there are no rules for telephone conversations at all in Cairo, but there are indeed rules, regularities of behavior and norms of interpretation, not only for the series of ritualized greetings at the end of the sample call presented here but also for the apparently disorderly initial exchanges.

The initial problem for entry into any conversation is availability for talk. Schegloff suggests that simply lifting the telephone receiver establishes presence, while the answerer's hello establishes availability. However, it seems for telephone conversations, as opposed to some other types of Summons-Answer sequences (e.g., face to face encounters) availability is not securely established and talk cannot proceed until identities are known. Different cultures provide different norms for establishing such identity. A German telephone answerer typically identifies himself automatically when answering, without knowing the identity of the caller. Most Americans do this only when answering a business telephone, seldom when answering a telephone in a private residence; and Egyptians apparently never provide such identification of self during the answerer's first turn.

When an answerer does not self-identify, the usual case, an American caller typically attempts to confirm the identity of the person he intended to reach and apparently has (Is this George?) or, if he has been able to make the identification by voice, will proceed to greetings (Hi, George, this is Bill), while an Egyptian caller in the same situation is likely to respond hello to the answerer's hello (one third of the conversations in my sample have hello as the caller's first utterance). This strikes most
Americans as over-insistent, since although it is possible to find examples of repeated hello's in American telephone conversations these are usually in cases of an exceptionally poor connection or on those occasions when an answerer picks up the telephone and does not immediately say anything, in which case the caller's hello is analyzed by Schegloff as a repetition of the summons. The clearest indication that the Egyptian rules are different is the fact that Egyptian informants report that they do not view such repeated hello's as over-insistent, and are not offended by them.

What Americans find most offensive about Egyptian telephone calls, however, is the caller's second turn in the sample call, his [mi:n byitkallim?], the demand to know the identity of the answerer when voice identification has not succeeded. American callers do sometimes request the identity of answerers, of course. Schegloff points out that when a caller formulates a location by relation to some person, such as X's home or X's office, if the voice of the answerer is not recognizable as that of X, then the result may be a request for identification. Something like that seems to operate in the Egyptian speech community also, and may be related to an expectation that a high percentage of telephone calls will result in wrong numbers. The resulting rule is slightly different for the two speech communities: in the United States a caller requests identification only if there is evidence that the party reached is not the party intended; in Cairo, one requests identification unless there is positive evidence that the party reached is the one wanted. Note, however, that the Egyptian answerer does not satisfy the caller's demand for identification, and here the rules for the two cultures coincide. In the United States, a called person responds to a demand for identification without discomfort or anger only if he recognizes that he is a person who would not normally be expected to be in that place. Most (but not all) Egyptians similarly report that they find such demands offensive. More importantly, in none of the calls recorded did Egyptians answer such demands.

Egyptian and American telephone conversational beginnings are alike, then, in several respects. They all have the same categories of sequenced interaction: summons, answer, greeting, introduction of message. They are alike in the fact that an answer may self-identify, but usually does not, and in the availability of identification by voice quality. But there is an equally strong difference in the fact that there is a strong reluctance on the part of both callers and answerers in Egypt to give any self-identification before ascertaining the identity of the other, the reasons for which must be sought in the general culture. Repeated hello's are an attempt to ascertain identities through voice. If this is unsuccessful, Egyptian callers demand identification from the answerer far more frequently than do American callers, although this does not result in called persons giving up their rights to prior self-identification by callers.
5. Implications for second language learning and teaching.

The sociolinguistic patterns discussed here—variable rules in English and Arabic, personal address forms and discourse sequencing rules—have been chosen from a very broad range of possible sociolinguistic topics primarily because there are some data available on which to base a comparative sociolinguistics, but also because in each case there is some connection to problems of second language learning and teaching.

In the case of variable sociostylistic rules of phonology, there is some evidence (Schmidt 1977) that these may transfer to the target language, so that the persistent pronunciation problems of Egyptian Arabic speakers in mastering the English interdental fricatives may be attributed to the fact that in Egyptian Arabic the alternation between interdentals and sibilants is sociolinguistically determined, while in English these sounds are assigned to separate phonemes which are not in sociolinguistic variation. A pedagogical implication is that a rather common device used by teachers of English in the Arab world, stressing the identity of English [θ] and [d] with Arabic orthographic حـ and حـ, seems misguided, for although there are minimal pairs showing that Arabic [θ, d] and [s, z] are phonemically contrastive in careful speech, the fact remains that any printed حـ may be read aloud as [s] without occasioning much notice. Identification of English [θ] with Arabic حـ is therefore precisely what must be avoided.

Notice, however, that transfer of a sociolinguistic variable in this case does not result in a sociolinguistic error in the sense of violating some English sociolinguistic norm. This is because the only type of TH-variation which has a sociolinguistic interpretation in English when produced by native speakers is the substitution with stops (e.g., dese and dose for these and those); sibilant pronunciations (zese and zose) are clearly foreign and native speakers tend to be very tolerant of such errors. Therefore, when looking for sociolinguistic variables which are likely to be relevant for Arabic as a second language, it would be best to concentrate initially on those which trigger strong reactions by native speakers and for which non-native speakers are expected to produce variants which carry normative interpretations within the speech community. The best candidate for such research is probably the voice quality of pharyngealization (or Royal's more general series of contrasts along the fronting/raising vs. backing/lowering dimension). This is a case in which native speakers attach strong judgments to the sociolinguistic variable: weak pharyngealization is considered polite and cultured, but upper class men who exhibit weak pharyngealization are criticized by working class men for speaking like girls; heavy pharyngealization is viewed as an aspect of "the original Arabic language" and associated with frankness, but women who pronounce pharyngealized consonants too strongly are perceived as unfeminine. This is also a case in which non-native speaker behavior may vary along the same dimension which triggers
such value judgments among native speakers. Kahn (1975) compared
the degree of pharyngealization in the speech of male and female
Arabic speakers and male and female American students trained by
a male native speaker instructor. The comparison revealed that
the difference between American males and females was less than
half the difference between the sexes for Arabs, and that the
overall formant values for Arab women were higher than for the
American women, i.e., the American women exhibited stronger
pharyngealization than the Arab women. Before concluding that it
is important for non-native learners of Arabic to be taught by
native speakers of the same sex, however, we need to know how
heavy pharyngealization in non-native Arabic is judged by native
speakers. A working hypothesis might be that there is a thresh-
hold level in phonology, below which non-native speakers are
simply labeled [+foreign] and above which they are vulnerable to
the same kinds of judgments which native speakers make of other
native speakers.

Some of the contrasts between the American English and Cairo
Arabic personal address systems clearly need to be taught to non-
native speakers. Leaving aside the more exotic aspects of these
address systems (as seen by outsiders), even the simple contrast
between Title + Last Name (the American pattern) and Title +
First Name (the basic Egyptian pattern) is poorly understood by
non-native speakers, and few Americans resident in Egypt have any
clear notion of how the Egyptian address system works. In some
cases, the misunderstandings are simply amusing, as when an Ame-
rican secretary in an Egyptian firm puzzled over why she was
listed in the company telephone book as Ms. + FN (an anomalous
form in both cultures) or when two librarians at the American
University in Cairo were slightly put out to find that one of
them was listed by FN and one by LN. On the grounds that most
Egyptian faculty members have studied or lived abroad and would
prefer the western pattern, a decision was made to list them all
by last name, while "staff" were listed according to the Egyptian
pattern. In a few cases, conflicts between address systems have
more serious consequences, and I know of one case in which an
American supervisor considered dismissing an American English
teacher because she did not have her students' respect. The only
evidence for that was the fact that the students addressed the
teacher as Miss Mary, which the American supervisor did not rec-
nounce as a respect pattern in spite of long residence in the
Arab world.

As evidenced by the telephone conversation example, it may
be the area of discourse in which the risk of severe crosscul-
tural misunderstandings most frequently arises and where second
language instruction should be most concerned. In addition,
there is some evidence that the sociolinguistic aspects of dis-
course are extremely difficult for non-native speakers to acquire
on their own (Scarcella 1979, 1983). The problem here for an
applied sociolinguistics for language teaching is where to begin
within an area of sociolinguistic patterning that has so many
aspects: openings and closings, turn-taking, semantic formulas
for speech acts such as praising, criticizing, apologizing,
verbal routines (see Gregory and Wehba, this volume), and so on.
The list of phenomena to be considered is a long one. For the
application of sociolinguistic findings to second language pedag-
ogy, the identification of sociolinguistic patterns in any of
these areas will be relevant. But for an applied sociolinguis-
tics which seeks to identify likely problem spots for second
language learners and research those areas, rather than simply
applying whatever is available (as I have done here), probably
the best approach is to begin with a framework which is broad
enough to encompass a range of linguistic phenomena. One such
framework which could guide research is the concept of polite-
ness, especially as developed by Brown and Levinson (1978) who
view politeness as a principle of face-to-face interaction related
to both concern for speakers' and addressees' good image
(face) and respect for the territorial claims of both, a univer-
sal framework within which there is great cultural variability.
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NOTE

1. Readers should be warned that the data on which this paper is based were gathered more than ten years ago and therefore may be dated in some instances. A preliminary conceptualization of the material here was presented at the Symposium on Sociolinguistics and Applied Anthropology, Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Amsterdam, 1975.