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Introduction
Giles has proposed Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT) to account for language usage between individuals (see e.g. Giles et al., 1977). That theory is concerned with determining what motivates an individual to de-accentuate ethnolinguistic characteristics and converge toward the dominant culture, or to accentuate his/her ethnolinguistic characteristics and diverge from the dominant patterns. Giles and other social psychologists have found that while regional dialects (or accents) connote integrity and a variety of socially attractive attributes, standard accents connote high socio-economic status and intellectual competence. They theorise that speakers will converge toward the dominant accent to the degree that they desire social approval from members of the dominant culture. While SAT primarily is concerned with accommodation of individual speakers, Giles and Johnson (1987) theorise that group patterns can be understood using elaborations of this theory. They do so partly by introducing the concept of group vitality. Giles believes that the degree of accommodation which takes place depends on group vitality.

Group vitality helps determine a sense of group identity. In Giles et al. (1977) three situational and structural factors were defined as influencing group vitality: ‘demography’, ‘institutional support’ and ‘social status’. It is understood in the model that convergent acts result from a speaker’s interest in acquiring the rewards which accrue to those similar to each other. The model also distinguishes between subjective and objective group vitality. This is necessary because the immigrant group may not perceive their status or institutional support as do other members of the society. In fact, recent articles (such as Johnson et al., 1983) suggest that the extent to which the group identifies with its own speech and other habits is more dependent on subjective group vitality than on objective criteria for the evaluation of vitality. When an immigrant group settles in a new country, its members often gradually assimilate to, or integrate with, the host culture. As part of this process, the immigrant group’s linguistic system converges with the local system. Bloomfield (1933) already characterised the situation as dependent on the relative size of the groups, the territorial relations, the degree of isolation of the immigrant group, and the cultural and linguistic attitudes of both groups. In addition, the linguistic and other social dissimilarities between the immigrant and host culture and the degree of plurality already present in the host culture both influence the rapidity with which the immigrant speech is assimilated, as will the immigrant group’s sense of identity. These parameters can all be subsumed under the factors of Giles et al.

Boyd (1987) proposes that three further contextual influences be considered separately: the historical, geographic and attitudinal factors. Historically, the social and linguistic situation of the immigrant group in their home culture is potentially relevant; this is certainly
true in the present study. Boyd felt that the distance between the home and new country is an important geographic factor. However, it seems that physical distance between the countries may perhaps be less critical than ability to return to the 'home' country. The geographic isolation or integration of settlement in the host country, and the self sufficiency of the immigrants in their new culture, can be subsumed under the demographic rubric above. The in- and out-group attitudes, toward the immigrant group, toward the immigrants' home community, etc., are clearly relevant. Boyd (1987) concludes that 'clearly it would be impossible to evaluate the chances for minority language survival based on such a long and complex list of social factors.' However, given that all of the factors are relevant, a brief clarification of the status of these factors in the present corpus is in order.

The study of language maintenance and erosion has traditionally been approached from sociological, socio-psychological, and linguistic perspectives. Most studies in this domain have been limited to analysis of language attitudes and self-report questionnaires, or speech produced under fairly artificial interactional circumstances. Very few larger scale studies of actual linguistic use have used the Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT) perspective. (See however, Coupland, 1984, 1985; Hindle, 1980.) None of these linguistic studies has attempted to integrate the perspective of Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory (ELIT) into their analysis. The present study, and Prince (1987, present volume) are then pioneering efforts in the attempt to determine how SAT and ELIT can characterise the actual speech production of subordinate group members. Given that an adequate theory will only be possible when data have been gathered from a 'diversity of multiethic settings' (Giles and Johnson, 1987, p. 93), hopefully these results will convince others to analyse their own data within the theoretical context provided by SAT and ELIT. This paper attempts to integrate linguistic findings with relevant social-psychological findings, to examine the process of integration of a specific immigrant linguistic system with its host. As such, it also examines the link between Speech Accommodation Theory and the Group Vitality model.

This paper delineates the sociological and demographic factors which create group vitality as defined by Giles et al. (1977); relevant sociolinguistic variables are introduced and results of two types of sociolinguistic analysis are presented. It presents data from a situation in which an immigrant group's vitality has changed radically between the 1950's and the present; it appears that the improved vitality is correlated with the linguistic choices made by group members. First, evidence is presented from interviews with two immigrant groups with similar 'home' cultures, but different settlement patterns. Data from these Labov-style interviews shows that greater contact with the host community leads to greater convergence toward the host's dialect. Subsequently, evidence is presented from radio and TV broadcasts which appears to show the degree to which improved in-group vitality has curtailed convergence to the dominant norm.

The social context for group vitality among Israeli immigrants from Arabic-speaking countries

The present study was conducted in Israel, where a change in an immigrant group's vitality, brought about by changes in social status, demography and institutional support, are correlated with changes in the phonetic realisations of specific sociolinguistic variables of the Hebrew dialect spoken by Arabic-speaking immigrants to the country. After 1948, most Arabic-speaking Jews were forced to leave their native countries in North Africa and the Middle East. While conditions in each 'home' society were different (Weingrod, 1985),
the underlying sociocultural similarities among these groups premitted both popular and professional publications to consider them a single subculture in Israeli society, and to refer to the groups as ‘edot ha-mizraḥ’ (Eastern Congregations) or as ‘Mizraḥi’ (Eastern) (Krausz, 1986; Weingrod, 1979, 1985; Herzog, 1984). The present paper will use the latter designation.

For the purposes of this analysis, ‘language shift’ will refer to acceptance of the dominant dialect of Hebrew, referred to as the koine (Blanc, 1968)—henceforth KI. Importantly, ‘language maintenance’ will refer to maintenance of certain phonetic characteristics of the Hebrew dialect spoken by the immigrants, rather than to maintenance of their native Arabic dialect, or other native language (Berber, Spanish, etc.). The linguistic data cannot be evaluated, without first sketching evidence which bears on the theoretical model.

**Geographic and historical factors**

*Geography.* Given that the immigrant speakers under discussion come from different countries, where they lived under very different conditions, it is still possible to say that for the most part their original home was closer to Israel than the land of most other immigrants. On the other hand, in the Muslim countries they had not been permitted citizenship or the ownership of land, and in most cases they could not return to their country of origin. Thus, while a superficial interpretation would project that ‘Mizraḥi’ speakers would have less impetus to converge toward KI than (say) immigrants from the U.K. or the U.S., in actuality, they have a much stronger impetus to converge.

*Demographic background.* The first factor considered in Giles *et al.* (1977) is referred to as ‘demography’—that being the actual distribution of the immigrant population among other sub-communities in their new homeland. The influence of demographic plurality in the host culture (mentioned earlier) is also included under this rubric. The (relative) group size of the immigrant group, birth rate, marriage patterns, and the planned length of stay, also play important demographic roles (Boyd, 1987).

Immigration from North and Central Europe began during the Turkish or British mandate, while the ‘Mizraḥi’ immigration began in earnest after the establishment of the state of Israel, when immigrants were settled in like-membered groups. Some of the ‘Mizraḥi’ immigrants soon moved to urban centres, usually settling near friends or relatives from before immigration, and still retained the homogeneity of settlement patterns. By the mid-fifties, ‘Mizraḥi’ immigrants were to be found throughout the country, and the only settlement type which did not have strong ‘Mizraḥi’ representation was the kibbutz. The ‘Mizraḥi’ speakers were isolated from the host community, but were settled in a way which permitted a surprising degree of self sufficiency. In addition, while Northern European immigrants arrived with marketable industrial skills which permitted geographic and social mobility, ‘Mizraḥi’ immigrants remained longer in their original ethnic working class enclaves (Weingrod, 1979).

One demographic advantage gained by the ‘Mizraḥi’ immigrants was that the vast bulk of their settlement, combined with their preference for large families [as against the smaller families of the host culture] soon made them the single largest Jewish group in Israeli society, although many remained in the urban working class (Bernstein and Antonovsky, 1981; Smooha, 1987; Swirsky, 1981; Yishai, 1982).
Institutional support. This support, Giles et al.'s second factor, is provided by schools, the media, business or government services. Potentially there is a difference between separate (minority) institutional support and integration of the minority into the majority institutions. While these factors are clearly interdependent, Johnson et al. (1983) suggest that they are less so than is generally assumed. Gans (1979) and Weingrod (1985) point out that support for the immigrant religious and cultural institutions are relevant as well.

Initially, the 'Mizrahi' group had few institutional supports: the dominant culture requires literacy in the host language as well as other cultural talismans of the industrialised world. In addition, weak ties within the group inevitably permit stronger ties with other groups and where, as here, the out-group has the advantages [literacy, industrial-'literacy', social networks including 'gate-keepers' (Erickson and Shultz, 1981)] which the in-group needs, there are economic advantages to being forced to create outgroup ties.

'Mizrahi' immigrants arrived to find institutional positions filled completely by members of the koine speaking group, or by new immigrants who came from the same (non-'Mizrahi') networks (Shokeid, 1971; Shokeid and Deshen, 1974, 1982; Weingrod, 1966); the 'Mizrahi' immigrants, coming from the most disadvantaged groups in their original Jewish communities, had no secularly educated class of their own to act as mediators with the gate-keepers. However, both schooling and the army (where there is additional schooling) are obligatory for both sexes and presumably expedited the process of convergence toward the dominant culture. As the 'Mizrahi' immigrants became more demographically important, they acquired a power base in each form of institution.

Schools. Muslim and Christian Arabic-language schools are provided for the local Arabic speaking population. Separate nonreligious and religious Hebrew-language school systems are provided for the Jews. While initially the schools were dominated by the koine culture, in recent years 'Mizrahi' teachers and administrators have become predominant in many Jewish school districts.

Politics and government services. As already mentioned, initially, the 'Mizrahi' immigrants had fewer network ties with those in government service than European immigrants who entered around the same time. However, by 1971 they represented a majority of the Jewish electorate (Yishai, 1982). Their strong demographic position helped them enter not only the voting lists but the political cadres of the religious parties and right-wing nationalist parties (Cohen, 1983; Herzog, 1984; Shokeid and Deshen, 1982; Weingrod, 1985; Yishai, 1982, 1984). Both major parties have consistently raised the number of 'Mizrahi' representatives (MK's), while new 'Mizrahi' parties have entered the lists (Yishai, 1982). The political gains of the ethnic parties in recent elections is evidence of increased group vitality, and leads to greater group vitality by granting new political gate-keepers.

Media. Until recently, the radio and television media were government directed. While the official dialect required of broadcasters—which we will refer to as the 'Prescriptive Norm'—was the same in many respects as the 'Mizrahi' vernacular, the de facto broadcasting norm was the koine. One oft-cited proof of the 'Mizrahi' lack of influence on the media was the fact that until the 1980's, in a country with several popular music stations, the only forum for 'Mizrahi' style music was an obscure half-hour ethnomusicological program on the classical FM station and another on TV. Only within
the last few years have programs geared to the 'Mizrahi' market infiltrated the more 'popular' stations and 'Mizrahi' singers infiltrated the popularly defined 'Top Ten' programs, although their music has long outsold other music on the record-and-cassette stands in the markets. The consensus is that 60% of all music sales in Israel are 'Mizrahi'-style music, referred to locally as 'cassette music', because most of it is on pirated cassettes sold in the markets. In this paper we will follow Israeli usage, wherein 'pop' is a genre shared by the Israeli singers with their European and American rock counterparts, while 'cassette' genre has Greek, Turkish and Arabic roots. The cassette singers find their market in Arabic-speaking countries as well as in Israel.

**Social status background in the new country**

'Social status', also termed 'social structural factors' (Boyd, 1987), refers to both economic and political factors, such as the opportunities the members have for advancement in the new country and their ability to marshall political influence, the social classes represented in the group and the economic niche they occupy, as well as the actual power relations between the host and immigrant groups. It also includes the perceived status of the immigrants' native language—a factor which should perhaps be considered separately.

**Socioeconomic status.** The economic niche occupied by the immigrants was influenced by the background with which they arrived. Often the elite (the rabbis and other educators) retained their position within the community, while other members of the community earned their living in the larger Israeli community through trades. These speakers had no ideological commitment to farming and having been denied the right to own land in many of their native countries, they had no background in agriculture, and avoided settlement in agriculture, as much as possible. (However, see the work of Weingrod and Shokeid.) Their 'better educated' members had worked in skilled crafts which were not needed in the industrial society they had joined. Thus, initially, 'Mizrahi' dialect speakers' objective and subjective social status were both very low. Political and economic power was in the hands of the koine speakers.

**Linguistic 'status'.** Most cross-cultural work on language has emphasised ethnicity, but recent work takes socio-economic status into consideration as well (Bourdieu and Boltanski, 1975; Bourdieu, 1977, 1979; Thibault, 1983; Young et al., 1986). Steinberg found that 'most disadvantaged minorities have been willing to compromise their ethnicity for the sake of economic security, social acceptance and a sense of participating fully in society' (1981). On the other hand, we cannot forget that many sociolinguistic studies, beginning with Trudgill's (1972) discussion of overt and covert prestige, have shown that while a standard variety projects high socio-economic status, prestige is also connected with the more 'covert' models of social status. Herein, the ethnically or regionally marked variety projects positive social attributes which are not economically 'useful', such as group loyalty, cleverness, friendliness, warmth, physical and moral strength, a good sense of perspective and a sense of humour. Lack of these positive social attributes is often inferred from use of the prestige or prescriptive variety.

When the Arabic-speaking immigrants began to arrive in Israel, the local dialect of Hebrew was influenced by the Northern European languages which had arrived with earlier waves of immigration (Blanc, 1968). While there was a great deal of linguistic and social diversity, the local Hebrew 'koine' had a great deal of prestige, representing strength,
initiative, fair play and other positive social attributes, as well as high status and competence (Yoge, 1987). Speakers of the koine were members of the local industrialised culture, while the immigrant group came primarily from pre-industrialised strata of the Jewish communities from Muslim countries (e.g. Shokeid, 1971; Shokeid and Deshen, 1974; Weingrod, 1966). Thus, although the ‘host’ culture was both socially and linguistically quite diverse, the dissimilarity between the local Jewish culture and the immigrant culture was quite evident.

It is also relevant that the similarity between the immigrant group’s language and culture and the local Muslim community’s culture was even more salient. Although they spoke (usually an ethnic variety of) Arabic as a first or second language, their relationship with their original Arabic speaking ‘home’ culture was generally marred by the fact that they had been treated as second class citizens by the dominant Muslims. Consequently, it is often the case that these immigrants have a more conflictual relationship with the Israeli Muslim population than do Israeli Jews whose forebears came from Northern Europe (Margalit, 1988; Shokeid and Deshen, 1982; Smooha, 1987; Swirsky, 1981; Yishai, 1982, 1984). The immigrants arrived in a host country where language was clearly divided along religious lines, with Arabic spoken natively by the Muslim and native Christian communities, while the Hebrew koine was spoken by the Jewish community. For these immigrants, even more than for their coreligionists, Arabic had strong negative connotations, pushing them toward rapid adaption of the Hebrew language: speaking Arabic, or Arabic-accented Hebrew, was to identify with a pre-industrial, poor, Muslim reference group which had traditionally been their oppressors (Weingrod, 1966; Shokeid, 1971), while speaking the vernacular ‘koine’ identified one with an industrial society, and in addition connoted many positive social attributes.

**Linguistic background**

*Language academy.* Israel has a language academy which is taken seriously by the population. Not only does it make strong pronouncements, but it has radio slots to publicise them in prime time. While the radio slots are primarily used to publicise syntactic, lexical or morphological ‘rules’, all the broadcasters on the National government networks are officially required to know and use the prescriptive norm. In fact, however, Israeli Hebrew, like many languages with a language academy, has not one, but two ‘norms’: the vernacular norm, which we refer to here as the prestige norm or, following Blanc (1968), as the koine (K1) and the academy norm, discussed in such recent publications as Fellman (1974), Nahir (1983) and Rabin (1981), which we will refer to as the prescriptive norm (P1). The dialect spoken by the ‘Mizrahi’ group will be referred to as MI. Table 1 compares the Israeli two-norm system with some analogous systems where a similar pattern has emerged.4 In all three societies, the prescriptive dialect is much more similar to the non prestige dialect than to the prestige forms. In the present case, by converging from MI toward KI phonology,

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Academy/prescriptive</th>
<th>Prestige/koine</th>
<th>Nonprestige</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>Bokmål</td>
<td>Riksmål</td>
<td>Nynorsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Modern Standard Arabic</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Beduin/Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli Hebrew</td>
<td>'Safa tiknit' (PI)</td>
<td>Koine (K1)</td>
<td>'Mizrahi' (MI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
speakers not only are avoiding the MI ethnically marked form, but the academic prescriptive (PI) form as well. In the Arabic language situation, as speakers converge toward the more prestigious vernacular form, they not only avoid their own more ‘provincial’ form, but the so-called Modern Standard Arabic (or MSA) form as well.

The phonetic variables. Let us concentrate on the acknowledged differences between ‘Mizrahi’ and koine consonantal inventories which are used as stereotypic ‘markers’ (Labov, 1966). We find that the primary differences are in the realization of the sociolinguistic variables \((r), (h), \text{and } (\gamma)\)—which we will refer to here as \((\gamma)\). In Table 2, we find that in each case the ‘Mizrahi’ (or MI) form conforms to the prescriptive (or PI) form, rather than the koine (or KI) form.

Table 2. Triglossic realizations of \((r), (h)\) and \((\gamma)\). Note that the ethnically marked, nonprestige form (MI) conforms to the prescriptive norm (PI), not the prestigious koine form (KI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>((r))</th>
<th>((h))</th>
<th>((\gamma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(\gamma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(\times)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(\gamma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((r)\). A quote from a speech pathology text book from the mid-sixties helps to convey the prescriptive attitude connected with choice of \((r)\) realization.

It would seem reasonable for the immigrant from Europe to adopt the correct pronunciation of specific Semitic sounds from the resident Oriental ‘Mizrahi’ Jews. Instead, the reverse occurred. The teacher, representative of a modernizing intelligentsia, was looked upon by his pupil as an authority in every respect, including, of course, pronunciation. Consequently, it was the faulty European Hebrew pronunciation which was taken over, step by step, by the Oriental Jews. We must correct the ugly uvular \([r]\) with its harmful vocal consequences not only among the Occidental, but also among the Oriental Jews, with whom it has become fashionable (Gumperz and Tell-Bauberger, 1966, p. 513).

Thus, although prescriptivists may use various epithets for the KI \([R]\) pronunciation, it appears that by 1966—15 years after the bulk of the immigration from Arab countries—the immigrants had adopted the koine \([R]\), in spite of the academy proclamations. While the speech pathologists’ characterisation of \([R]\) as ‘fashionable’ among MI speakers is not a quantitative formulation, it is a roughly accurate description of \((r)\) usage in the mid to late sixties.

\((h, \gamma)\). A more recent quote gives the prescriptivist position on use of pharyngeal \([h, \gamma]\).

In Hebrew, correct gutteral pronunciation, which expresses its kinship to Arabic, has long been considered a lower-class rather than an upper-class characteristic—despite the Broadcasting Authority’s instructions to be as throaty as possible at the microphone. (In a Jerusalem Post article on a production of ‘My Fair Lady’, where a leading ‘Mizrahi’ pop singer plays the role of Eliza Doolittle. Pomerantz, 1986).

Thus, it seems that in 1986, despite general awareness of the prescriptive norm, use of pharyngeal realisations for \((h, \gamma)\) carried unfavourable connotations.

In theory, the academy and nationalised broadcasting systems provide an impressive linguistic support, which should also provide an ‘institutional support’ for the ‘Mizrahi’ immigrants. In fact, however, just as in the Arabic and Norwegian language situations
discussed above, the socioeconomic power of the prestige norm is stronger than the prescriptive power of the academy norm (Yaeger-Dror, 1986, to appear); to the great chagrin of the Academicians, radio and TV announcers do not consistently conform to the prescriptive norm. The degree of conformity to PI in the media will be discussed in greater detail below.

It is clear that within Israeli society the MI form is dispreferred, while the KI form is prestigious. In a study by Davis (1983, 1984) to be discussed in greater detail below, after the interviewer has requested the word-lists, and discussed speech attitudes with the interviewees, their linguistic insecurity actually prompts them to use less of the PI/MI forms in the ‘post-interview’ talk than they had used in their interview style.

Ethnolinguistic identity theory in action

Inevitably, between the late 1940’s or early 1950’s when they arrived, and the 1980’s, the ‘Mizrahi’ community expanded demographically, raised their socio-economic status and acquired access to the institutional support systems. If the data follow Giles’ and others’ prediction, initially the ‘Mizrahi’ speakers would have had little ‘group vitality’ and would have converged radically toward the koine. Subsequently, when their sense of group vitality strengthened, they would diverge from this linguistic reference group to focus on their own group identity. To verify this, we will now present a detailed analysis of (r), (h) and (γ) usage by ‘Mizrahi’ group members.

Previous linguistic studies of MI

Two researchers have conducted systematic studies of Hebrew language use by MI speakers: both studies used Labov-style interviews (Labov, 1966), interviewed speakers from similar ‘home’ society backgrounds and were carried out in the late seventies. However, while one set of interviews was carried out in an isolated rural area, the other set was carried out in a less isolated area. Bentolila (1983) looked at MI usage among speakers from a small ‘moshav’ community, settled primarily by immigrants from the same small town in Morocco. Speakers in Bentolila’s study are all quite religious and are members of multiplex social networks (Milroy, 1980), living in an isolated community where they rarely interact with outsiders before they enter the army at 18. In contrast, Davis’ (1983, 1984) speakers (who we will refer to broadly as ‘town’) come from towns where a large—but not overwhelming—percentage of the population is ‘Mizrahi’, and MI speakers do interact with people from other backgrounds every day.

The more traditional SAT framework is concerned with individual accommodation between the interviewees and the interviewers. In this case, the town speakers were interviewed by two interviewers, one of whom had a foreign accent (Davis, personal communication), while the rural speakers were interviewed by a teacher from the local elementary school, who formed a part of their social network, and was known to be from ‘Mizrahi’ background. Thus, at least theoretically, the rural speakers may have a greater tendency to use the MI form with the interviewer.

One can project from Giles et al. (1987) and Thakerar et al. (1982), that ‘group accommodation’ could take place: individuals who have more extensive contacts with speakers of other groups will thus be more likely to adapt their pronunciation to the KI norm. If that is the case, then—even though both groups of speakers come from the same type of family and religious background (Davis, personal communication)—the more
isolated speakers in Bentolila's corpus will show a greater tendency to use the MI form than the speakers in Davis' corpus, who have much more opportunity to meet and socially interact with members of the KI speaking community before adolescence, if only at school and in the work place. We also project that the older speakers, who are out of the work force will show least convergence toward the KI norm. While there is no official status for such claims in the SAT literature, we will see that the projections are borne out by the data.

Since both sets of interviews were conducted in the late seventies using the techniques pioneered by Labov (1966), there should be no difference of change in real time between them. Only data taken from these comparable interviews are included in Table 3. The only noncomparable factor is the interviewer effect, mentioned earlier. Table 3 shows that our expectations are fulfilled for (r), (h) and (γ) usage. In fact, while (r) is almost entirely realised as [R] for the town speakers, it is still consistently [r] for the men and boys, and primarily [r] for the women and girls from the rural community. Not surprisingly, the rural women appear much more sensitive to the KI norm than the men. This is consistent with the known tendency for women to converge to the overt prestige norm, while the men are more likely to favour a covert norm. For (h) and (γ) the picture is somewhat more complex: there is a clear change in apparent time for the 'moshav' older and adult speakers and between the adult and child town speakers. Rural adults (who have the most contact with KI speakers) are more like their town counterparts than the rural children are, since, as already mentioned, the 'moshav' children do not have much contact with KI speakers and therefore need not converge toward the KI norm. Consequently, the rural children not only use a greater percentage of the MI variant in Interview Style than their town counterparts, but they use more of the MI variant than do their parents.

Table 3. Percent of MI realization of variables, relative to the age group of the interviewee. Data adapted from Bentolila (1983) and Davis (1983, 1984). Number of speakers per group in parentheses. The Davis studies have two child populations: those who speak Arabic at home (identified in the table as Child') and those who do not. Relative numbers for men and women are listed separately (M/F) in Bentolila's data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult (16)</td>
<td>Child' (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(γ)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the expanded interpretation of the SAT model, we projected that the 'moshav' speakers, with their multiplex networks and few outside contacts, would show consistently greater retention of the MI variables, especially the children and old folks, who rarely leave the 'moshav'. On the other hand, we would expect that Davis' two groups of children, having basically the same amount of contact with the host community, would speak quite similarly. Note how well the data fit the Speech Accommodation Model: in almost every case 'moshav' speakers are more conservative than the town speakers from the same age group. In fact, the 'moshav' children not only retain more MI realizations than the town children, but they also are more conservative than their parents. In contrast, although one group of town children use [r, h] and [γ] when speaking Arabic at home, the difference between the two groups of children in the Davis study is negligible. The two studies show
that those speakers who come into most contact with outsiders (the adult population and Davis' children) have the greatest need to converge to the KI forms prevalent in the society, while speakers with less need to interact with outsiders (notably Bentolila's children and old speakers) are less likely to converge toward the KI patterns, despite the fact that KI speech dominates the radio and TV, including the children's programming.

**Audience design as a form of speech accommodation**

In fact, it is of interest to discover to what degree the media conform to the PI or MI norms, and how such conformity is viewed by the public. Before doing so, it seems advisable to introduce an added dimension to the SAT framework of our study. Bell (1984, 1985) points out that analysis of mass media data demonstrates accommodation on the part of the broadcasters to the expected audience of their speech. This convergence toward a given norm is understood to be stylistic. Bell (1984) showed that in New Zealand, the more 'popular' the radio station, the more its reporters converged toward the local dialect. Given that some of the same reporters work for more than one network, it was clear that they were converging toward the audience which they expected for that station. Bell (1985) found a similar pattern in the written reports of different newspapers; he found that the more 'popular' press in England uses a more 'telegraphic', American, style than *The Times*.

A similar pattern of style shifting can be found in an analysis of speech on different Israeli stations. The more 'careful' the overall speech style of a radio or TV program, the greater the style should conform to the PI required by the Academy. Officially, no broadcasters can be hired who are incapable of conforming to the PI style. However, while conformity to this style is perfunctory at best, as Bell found, the more 'popular' the station, the weaker the conformity to the prestige norm.\(^9\)

**Language usage by news broadcasters**

The different radio stations are clearly directed at different audiences. (See Note \(^9\).) The bulk of the programming cannot be compared. To ensure comparability, this analysis will take into consideration only news broadcasts on different stations. All radio stations monitored are national government stations, which theoretically must use the PI (\(r, h, y\)) categorically; the data will demonstrate that they do not. The FM station (apparently) is assumed to be most concerned with 'proper', prescriptive, speech, while stations with increasingly popular programming—Station A, Station B and 'Gale Tsahal', the Army Station—reveal decreasing concern with Academy pronouncements. This study will present data for the three sociolinguistic variables under analysis.

*Pharyngeals.* Use of the pharyngeal (\(h\)) or (\(y\)) forms in news broadcasts is so sporadic as to be unworthy of analysis.

*Apical (\(r\)).* On the other hand, Fig. 1 provides a benchmark for apical (\(r\)) usage converging toward a prescriptive norm as the intended audience becomes more prescriptive; these results are surprisingly similar to Bell's results for determiners. Data for Fig. 1 were collected in 1983–1985.

Comparison of the news styles shows a difference in spontaneity among the styles as well as a difference in the audience design. The more carefully articulated the broadcasting speech style, the greater the percentage of [\(r\)]. Carefully articulated news, whether targeted for new immigrants or for the deaf, most consistently maintains the PI [\(r\)] form. Note that
[r] is no easier to hear or understand than [R], but that convergence toward [r] is a sociosymbolic acceptance of the prescriptive norm in the slowest and most carefully articulated newscasts. We assume, then, that the higher percentage of (r) in these slowly articulated broadcasts reflects a change in register rather than audience design. On the other hand, the difference between the regular media news as broadcast on TV, the FM classical music station, Station A, Station B, or the Army Station is clearly a difference traceable to audience design.

The changing de facto norms for news broadcasts
A thorough analysis of group vitality would take into consideration political patterns with the 'Mizrahi' representation becoming much more prominent in the late seventies (Herzog, 1984; Margalit, 1988; Yishai, 1984), along with consideration of symbolic ethnicity (Gans, 1979), with ethnic festivities becoming more important in the late seventies and 'Mizrahi' songstyles and singers being integrated into the KI rock establishment in the early eighties (Weingrod, 1979). Spot analysis of news broadcasts from the sixties and seventies reveals little or no [r], while the analysis here shows more. Our contention is that even this new lip service (if you will) to the PI (r) form in news broadcasting follows the curve of MI group vitality. Certainly the same trend toward increased use of [r] can be found in the analysis of pop songs which follows.

The changing de facto norms for singing 'pop' music
The next section will compare use of (r) by various popular Israeli singers. While speech data generally must be extracted from archives, pop records, and tapes of songs can be found in most libraries; where possible, the more recent corpus of songs (gathered from radio and TV broadcasts between 1983 and 1987) has been supplemented by songs from the sixties and seventies by the same singers.

Trudgill (1983) has already made good use of data from pop singers, while Prince (1987, this volume) makes good use of data from a folk music genre. Trudgill (1983) documented a shift in the socio-phonological characteristics of songs sung by British pop singers. His study showed that the singers chose to use specific non-native phonetic variables in their singing style. Since, especially in the 1960's, a British stereotype of U.S. phonology was emulated, the singers were presumably not converging directly toward their British audience's dialect, but were presenting themselves to their audience as competent pop
singers—where presumed competence in this genre was apparently positively correlated with the emulated dialect’s singers. Similarly, although Israeli pop and folk style singers come from both KI and MI backgrounds, it appears that in the 1960’s both pop and ‘Israeli’ folk genres (as vs Yemenite or other MI folk genres) were dominated by a KI style, which included [R]. Just as Trudgill demonstrated that between the mid-sixties and the early eighties the dialect norm for ‘pop’ music in England has shifted from a hyperdialectal pseudo-U.S. phonology to a pseudo-Liverpool phonology, the norm for ‘pop’ or ‘folk’ singing in Hebrew has shifted from a KI [R]-ful model to a more MI [r]-ful model.\textsuperscript{10}

**Acquisition of the genre norm**

The 1987 Pestigal (‘Kids’) uses preteen and early-teen singers instead of professional singers; this allows us to see at/by what age children become aware of, and emulate, the newer ‘pop’ norm. In fact, all but the oldest group of singers on the program used categorical [R] in their songs. Presumably, only this oldest group (16–17 years old) was trained to use the [r], as are the army’s professional singers (who are 18–21).

**Army singing groups.** Use of (r) can be traced through comparing individual singers, or by comparing groups. Israel’s army is divided into five sections which are entertained by local artists. Consequently, each section has its own song group made up of recruits to that division. Many of the most popular singers today, MI and KI alike, started their careers in the Nahal Group, which was formerly regarded as the best and most popular. By comparing army group songs, we found that [R] was the norm in the sixties, but was replaced in the seventies by [r].

**Folk singers.** Similarly, the ‘folk’ singers and groups popular in the 1960’s were recorded with categorical [R], but by the 1970’s were generally recorded with [r]. Just as the comparison of news broadcasts showed more [r] in the 1970’s and 1980’s, so does the comparison of pop-folk, and army-group-pop songs.

**Popular song programs.** Songs from the TV ‘Top 20’ [‘Lahit Barosh’], henceforth LB, and from the yearly finals for the pan Europe ‘Eurovision’ Song Contest [‘Kedem Eirovision’]; henceforth KE, also show that expectations evolved slowly toward the [r] norm—comparison of (r) use on these programs can be found on Table 4.

**Table 4a. (r) usage. Number of songs in the given genre in the given year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Army pop</th>
<th>KI folk</th>
<th>Kids' pestigal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[R]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4b. (r) usage. Number of songs which made it to the LB (‘Top 20’, TV program), KE (Televised ‘Eurovision Finals’). All singers pooled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[R]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} Just as the comparison of news broadcasts showed more [r] in the 1970’s and 1980’s, so does the comparison of pop-folk, and army-group-pop songs.
Table 4 (a and b) presents the use of \( r \) for Army group songs, for popular ‘folk’ groups, and for specific popular music programs, regardless of the singers’ backgrounds. It is apparent from Table 4 that although in 1966 [R] was predominant, by 1974 even the majority of KI popular music singers have come to expect that popular singing style genre ‘should’ use the \( r \). Since neither [b] nor [g] occurs at all in this style of singing, it appears that introduction of [r] is the token prescriptivism, which was introduced earlier in a song genre, and may now be in the process of integration into the news broadcast genre. (It is probably not coincidental that while only a small minority of MI news broadcasters have been hired, at least one half of the ‘pop’ singers come from MI backgrounds.)

**Audience design: pop songs sung to adults and children**

While Table 4 demonstrates that expectations for popular song genre changed in the 1970’s, audience design also plays some part in the decision of singers. It is possible to directly compare the LB and KE programs, sung live before an adult audience, with the yearly Winter Songfest for children, or ‘Pestigal’ (henceforth ‘Kids’) televised before a live, preteen audience. This comparison shows that even in 1985, [R] usage actually predominates before a live audience of children (with many of the same songs and singers).

Table 5 compares three singers from the ‘Pestigal’ with each other and with themselves singing to an adult audience. In two of the three cases, more [R] occurs when children provide the main audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singer program</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>YB</th>
<th>MB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB21</td>
<td>100(33)</td>
<td>100(46)</td>
<td>100(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids’</td>
<td>100(30)</td>
<td>65(40)</td>
<td>88(27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of individual song and interview styles**

As mentioned above, although the ‘Mizrahi’ immigrants arrived in the early 1950’s, their musical style was not permitted on the airwaves until the early 1980’s. Consequently, data pertaining to the use of Hebrew by ‘Mizrahi’ singers should be relevant to our study. In this section we will compare KI ‘pop’ singers of European ancestry, with several ‘pop’ singers of ‘Mizrahi’ background, who began their music career at different points along the continuum from 1955-1985. All ‘pop’ songs were analysed from the live KE and LB broadcasts.

**KI singers’ \( r \) use.** Of 12 very popular non-‘Mizrahi’ singers or groups, two sing with categorical-[R], eight sing with near categorical [r], as did the two army singing groups monitored. All 12 (or in the case of groups, their representative singer) use categorical [R] in interview style with pop program moderators. These figures can supply a baseline for comparison with the MI singers whose data follow.

**MI singers’ \( r \) use.** Many of the most popular singers come from ‘Mizrahi’ background. In this section we will present data from singers who started the same way the other pop singers did—for the most part, in the army performing groups. The singers presented in Table 6 are divided roughly into age groups.
Table 6 presents some answers, and some questions. On the one hand, it is obvious that for all but the youngest speakers, the KI [R] is categorical in interview style, while the MI–PI form is preferred in song. Only the oldest singer and the youngest men use any of the KI form in song. YG sings ladino songs (with [r]) from his own background, but only recently began to use an apical [R] when singing ‘pop’ songs. He never sings ‘cassette’ style songs. When interviewed in Hebrew, or even when performing in a movie in Hebrew or English, he uses the KI [R] form categorically. Thus, YG is found to avoid the now acceptable [r] in nonethnic performance style, although his KI age mates have accepted it.13

The next age group of singers (those who began singing in the sixties) is more accommodative to the newer song-style norm. All four of the singers from this age group used [R] as members of the army Nahal group, but have used [r] categorically in singing since the 1974 (the first year for which we have data), as have the two KI singers from this age group. None of the singers in this age group uses pharyngeal [h] or [γ] in pop songs.

The younger singers present the most varied accommodative data. The women have converged to the KI pattern more consistently than the men. Only O H sings ‘cassette’ music as well as ‘pop’.14 The men all have been cassette singers—in Hebrew and Arabic—with a following in the Arab community as well. While two—BS and MM—have made the transition to pop music, two have not apparently attempted to do so.15

Comparison of ‘pop’ and ‘cassette’ song styles

Figure 2 shows the (r, h, γ) for all four of the youngest men, singing cassette songs, while Fig. 3 presents the (r, h, γ) from pop and cassette style of BS and HM. In each case, the cassette style is directed to the ‘Mizrahi’ market, while pop songs are for the general KI market. Audience design combines with the impression formation factor discussed earlier, allowing more of the marked form in the cassette style than in the pop singing style.16

As with the older group of singers, earlier in their career these singers accommodated much more radically toward the KI unmarked forms than they do today. Figure 4 shows the contrast between the 1973 pop style of BS and his singing styles today.

Thus, it appears that in the sixties singers converged towards the assumed attributes of their primary audience; as the vitality of the MI group rose, the attributes of that audience were changed symbolically by the convergence with the MI (r). Since MI speakers are the
Fig. 2. Percentage-\( r, h, \gamma \) in broadcast cassette songs with top singers from MI background, 1986.
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Fig. 3. Percentage-\( r, h, \gamma \) in broadcast songs with top 'pop' singers from MI background, 1985-1986: audience design of cassette vs pop styles.
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Fig. 4. Percentage-\( r, h, \gamma \) in songs broadcast by BS; 1973-1986.
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assumed audience for 'cassette' songs, singers converge much more radically for all three variables when singing 'cassette' style than when singing 'pop' style.

**The influence of ethnolinguistic vitality on speech accommodation**

SAT explores the underlying motivation and determinants of linguistic shifts. This paper presents evidence from one society in which, as one group's ethnic 'vitality' (as defined by Giles *et al.*, 1977) has risen, the entholinguistic presentation of self—as measured by sociolinguistic variables—has also been demonstrably strengthened.

While retaining a theoretical commitment to vitality as an important determinant of ethnolinguistic patterns, Giles and Johnson (1987) proposed an updated and additional set of propositions for projecting the underlying psychological motivations for relative degrees of language maintenance-change. Selecting from among this set of propositions, members of a subordinate ethnic group which

(a) identifies strongly with the ethnic group
(b) feels insecure relative to the dominant group
(c) identifies with few other non-ethnic social categories and
(d) perceives ingroup vitality as high

are more likely to maintain some form of ethnolinguistic identity, while those who

(a) identify weakly with the group
(b) feel no insecurity relative to other groups within the society
(c) identify with other, non-ethnic, social categories and
(d) perceive ingroup vitality as low

are candidates for 'ethnic suicide', or 'language death'.

Some of the proposals of ethnolinguistic identity theory (b, c and especially a and d) do not appear to be fully substantiated by the present corpus. Evidence from recent studies (Ayalon *et al.*, 1986; Sharot, 1985; Yogev, 1987) shows that while ethnic pride has been rising for MI group members, they still show greater pride in their Israeli group membership, which should militate towards preference for KI rather than MI speech patterns. An additional attitudinal factor pointed out earlier further militates in the direction of KI acceptance: \([r, h, \gamma]\) are all stereotypically 'markers' of Arabic accented speech. Margalit (1988), Smooha (1987), Swirsky (1981) and Yishai (1982, 1984) all find that the bulk of anti-Arab sentiment emanates from the MI community, which should, therefore, be more antagonistic to use of these variables than the KI speakers. Given that this is the case, despite any attitudinal ethnic vitality retained by the MI speakers, this vitality should be weakening and should be especially weak for linguistic variables.

MI group members identify less strongly with their own group today than they are likely to have done 30 years ago. They certainly feel less insecure relative to the other groups in Israeli society than they did upon their arrival (Shokeid, 1971; Shokeid and Deshen, 1974, 1982). Their immediate social networks include more outgroup members and they identify more strongly with supra-ethnic social categories, which unite them with the dominant society. Consequently, it seems that the demographic changes discussed earlier have been more important a factor in the improvement of MI ethnolinguistic vitality than the 'attitudinal' factors proposed in Giles and Johnson (1987).

Many other societies also have changed their ethnic group vitality in the twentieth century. It is already clear that 'language death' like that reported by Dorian (1982) and others, is an offshoot of reduced vitality. On the other hand, very little sociolinguistic data has been gathered from societies with rising group vitality. More extensive analysis of MI linguistic choices, and the choices of speakers in other cultures with rising ethnic group
vitality may help to tease out which aspects of ethnic vitality are most likely to lead to linguistic divergence from the dominant norm, like that discovered here. In fact, in different situations, the factor which has raised ethnolinguistic vitality may be quite different. In the present case, the most critical factor influencing vitality appears to be the increasing demographic strength of MI speakers relative to other Israeli Hebrew speaking groups. On the other hand, analyses of Quebec French speaking (QF) society show that ethnolinguistic vitality has been greatly strengthened since the 1960’s despite—and some studies maintain because of—the weakening demographic position of the Francophone population. Further in-depth study of both of these sociocultures should determine whether some common factor can be found to underlie these two apparently different scenarios.

If, as it appears, there is more maintenance of MI variables today than there was in the 1960’s, we can infer that the motivation for such linguistic divergence from the KI norm is stronger than the combined force of the social need to converge toward members of the host culture, the need to adopt the overt prestige patterns, and the need to diverge from the pattern of the Arabic speaking group, which these speakers consider as their enemy. Giles et al. (1987) rightly question ‘what factors are implicated in the resolution of this conflict’. Only further analysis of different group patterns, and different individual patterns can answer this question.

All the evidence shows that while accommodation was necessary when the ‘Mizrahi’ ethnic group had low group vitality, as demographic group vitality has grown, convergence to the KI norm has decreased among ‘Mizrahi’ singers; in fact, accommodation toward the MI norm—at least for the (r) variable—has increased in the media. Comparing the evidence from the two earlier studies shows that in spite of this increase in group vitality, accommodation to the host culture is still a strong influence on speech in an interview style. The greater the amount of contact with the host culture, the greater the use of the unmarked KI forms.
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NOTES

1 Between 1971 and the present, ‘Mizrahi’ representation among governmental gate-keepers has increased fourfold, although complete parity with their demographic position has only been reached at the local governmental levels (Yishai, 1984).

2 In 1985 ‘Honey and goodtimes’ [‘Al hadvash veal hakefak’] was initiated as a daily Army musical request show and ‘The notes of the East’ [‘Mitsiile hamizruh’] was initiated the following year on Station B, as a weekly musical request show. In Israel, the primary Hebrew Language stations are government owned and can be loosely characterised by their programming: classical and educational (FM), light classical and ‘public affairs’ (Station A), ‘light’ pop (Station B) and heavier popular music (Army). In fact, the intended audience for ‘Gale Tsahol’, the Army Station, is army recruits (aged 17–22).

3 I am grateful for much documentary support for this position, found in Naor (1986).

The academy, or prescriptive, inventory is identical to the ‘Mizrahi’ speakers’, but to converge to the koine the ‘Mizrahi’/’M/ (glottal and pharyngeal, respectively) must be omitted, /h/ (pharyngeal voiceless fricative) merged with /x/ (velar voiceless fricative) and the [r] (which we use here for apical flap, trill or fricative) converged with the koine [R] (which we will use here for velar [non-native] or uvular [native] fricative or trill). A discussion of the development of KI can be found in Blanc (1968). While there is a great variety of /r/-types in use in Israeli society, the distinction between MI apical [r] and KI (or converged) velar or uvular [R] is sufficient for present purposes.

A ‘moshav’ is a rural semi-communal settlement; that is, generally land is owned individually, but decisions are made, and farming is done communally. Many ‘Mizrahi’ immigrants were settled in this type of community.

Actually, the MI interviewer himself was quite hypercorrective toward the KI norm. In spite of recent sociolinguistic claims (Douglas-Cowie, 1978; Rickford, 1986), the non-native interviewers’ speech in the Davis study may prompt less convergence toward the KI norm than does the hypercorrective interviewer’s speech in the Bentolila study. An analysis of this accommodation is beyond the bounds of the present study.

The new MI music programs provide an exception which will be dealt with in a subsequent study.

I am in total agreement with Nik Coupland, who says (personal communication) ‘The [impression formation explanation] do[es]n’t at all contradict the SAT explanation, but refine[s] its motivational functioning. . . . Song genres impose their own constraints on dialect. In fact, it is a particularly salient case of dialect and register . . . being inseparable concerns.’ While there is no space here to further explore these important aspects of the song genre as a carrier of dialect, these aspects should certainly not be forgotten.

Two [R]-ful groups—Machina and Solo Brosh—, eight [r]-ful singers—Shlomo Artsi, Hava Alberstein, Rami Kleinstein, Moti Giladi, Sarai Tsuriel, Arik Einstein, Sharon Lifshitz, Shuli Natan—and Lehakot Pikud Tsafon and Pikud Darom [two of the Army groups].

Interviews were videotaped from various ‘pop’ music programs: primarily ‘Lahit Barosh’, ‘Ad Pop’ and ‘Zehu Ze’. One male program moderator during these interviews used [r] consistently, but not categorically. The other male moderator, and both female moderators used nearly categorical [R]. The two ‘cassette singers’ were interviewed on the ‘Mitslile hamizraḥ’ program, by an interviewer with mixed [r, R].

A parallel case in U.S. ‘pop’ music is Harry Belafonte. He retained an ‘r-ful’ singing style long after other black (and many white) singers began to use an ‘r-less’ pop genre norm.

The press reports that OH had to take a tutor, to introduce the pharyngeals into the ‘Mizrahi’-style songs.

Here we see again the common tendency for women to converge to the overt prestige norm, while the men are more likely to favor a covert norm. What is unusual here is that this tendency has been strengthened among the men since the emergence of stronger group vitality in the ‘Mizrahi’ community.

Another factor which cannot be ignored is the hypercorrection which is quite evident for YG, HM and BS: while the KI singers have managed to adopt the new [r]-ful singing style consistently, these MI singers have not done so.

I am grateful to Davis for having supplied his estimate of the [r] percentages which could not be found in the articles cited.

A caricature of ‘cassette’ style.

The high incidence of [R]-ful songs is due to the large number of songs by one group which hit the yearly Top-20. In addition, an analysis of hypercorrection toward the KI [R] is in progress.

These singers are: Yoram Gaon; Avi Toledano, Yizhar Cohen, Yardena Arazi and Gali Atari, Boaz Sharabi and Ofra Haza; Haim Moshe and Rita; Moshe Giat and Nissim Garame.
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