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Abstract
The formation of the Hasawi first-person possessive adjective (FPPA) is seen by most people as a distinctive or marked feature for Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). This study aimed at investigating the morphological and phonological features of that adjective, and finding the extent to which it is related to MSA. To do this, the researcher conducted two surveys and audio recorded a pre-designed word list that covered all possible sequences. The findings show that there are some underlying rules for the formation of the Hasawi FPPA, and that it is deep-rooted in Standard Arabic.
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INTRODUCTION

Hasawi Dialect (hereinafter HD) is one of the of Saudi dialects that has a distinctive and influential character in the dialects of the Gulf region. This dialect has been discussed locally at the syntactic level and the lexical level. The researcher decided to investigate only part of HD: the first-person possessive adjective. Previous work related to Hasawi was too general, and the dialect was dealt with as a core or source of other Gulf countries dialects, including countries such as Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Qatar, and United Arab Emirates. In these countries HD is still spoken by some minorities, a fact that justifies the attribution of Gulf Arabic 'Khaliji' to the dialect under investigation (Qafisheh, 1977). Besides, due to the immigration of some Najdi and Southern families, as mentioned by Nyrop (2008), in addition to the media, this dialect started to emerge with the Najdi and Southern dialects contributing to the emergence of a new blend called Modern Hasawi. Some would consider that a threat to the old HD. In addition to that, the researcher believes that HD is, for some folks, a source of humor due to the abnormal lengthening, shortening, conversion and elision of some sounds. Bassigney (2010) attributed the attachment of humor to this dialect is the fact that it is difficult to understand. Here, the researcher saw that research is needed to contribute to the field with a discussion of the HD, accompanied by a phonological analysis of the composition of the first-person possessive pronoun (hereinafter FPPA), in several structures, including the singular and plural, masculine, feminine, animate and inanimate, and then compare it to the modern standard Arabic (MSA) as well as to English.
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Significance and aims of the study

The study aimed at utilizing the structure of the Hasawi FPPA to uncover the unseen phonological rules behind the morphological formation of this adjective, how they are described phonologically and to show what type of phonological processes take place when producing this adjective. The study should contribute to the interpretation of some characteristics of the HD using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), employing the description method of English phonological processes. The results of this study should illuminate the underlying principles of HD FPPA.

Questions and Hypothesis of the study

The study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the morphological and phonological rules behind the formation of Hasawi possessive adjective?
2. How does HD differ from MSA?
3. To what extent do the Hasawi and non-Hasawi people know use and know about this type of FPPA?

The research hypothesizes that:

1. There are some morphological and phonological rules that guide the formation of Hasawi possessive adjective.
2. The HD differs from the MSA in some ways.
3. Hasawis use this type of possessive much in their daily life.
4. Non-Hasawi people know much about this type of possessive.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The roots of HD go back to the family of Central Semitic. It is the Arabic dialect spoken in the eastern part of Saudi Arabia, namely in Al-Ahsa region. This dialect, which branches into other sub-dialects, is dominant in the eastern area despite the presence of some other local dialects in the same region spoken by different tribes. Some of the main features of this dialect are the lengthening of short words and shortening of other words (Aljumah, 2008). HD is spoken by an estimate of 200,000 speakers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Ethnologue, 2009).

In the Holy Quran, this use of possessive is found in some cases. One is found in verse 20 (Sura: Al-Haqah): “Indeed, I was certain that I would be meeting my account.” The second one is in verse 25 and 26: (Al-Haqah): “But as for he who is given his record in his left hand, he will say, Oh, I wish I had not been given my record … And had not known what is my account.” These words include FPPAs that are constructed the same way as HD; My account (Hisabiyah) and My record (Kitabiyah). In the same Sura, verse 28: My wealth has not availed me and 29: Gone from me is my authority include cases where the possessive adjective is formed in the same way as HD. The possessive adjective “my” in My wealth (Maliyah) and “my” in My authority (Sultaniyah) are other instances of the presence of this sequence on the Holy Quran. Although these are found in the Holy Quran, many Arabic Hasawi speakers may not know this fact, let alone other Arabic speakers from
other different regions. Some would even render this formation of possession as funny or strange.

In this regard, Allah emphasized that in the Holy Quran saying “it was sent in in clear Arabic tongue” (Holy Quran, S.26 V195). Most Arabs at the time were known to speak highly standard Arabic that was impeccable and almost faultless as it appears in their poetry, prose and eloquent speeches. In addition, SA was spoken by the people surrounding the Arabian Peninsula almost in the same way, as proved by some Arabic language scholars who excelled in the field of Arabic syntax (Wikipedia). In our case, this form of possessive in HD, which was uncommon, could have copied such use in the Holy Quran. The question is if that fact were made known to the people in the Arabian Peninsula, would that suffice to make the dialect worthier of consideration.

General Possessive Formation in Some Languages.

Expressing possession differs among languages. In Arabic, for instance, possessive adjectives are attached to the end of the word as a suffix, which is described in Arabic as a personal pronoun that changes depending on the possessor, whether first person, second person, or third person, singular or plural, masculine or feminine. Hence the sequences qalam ī (my pen), qalamuna (our pens), baituha (her house), etc. In English, possessive adjectives are single words that precede the noun, and not attached to it so that you can find my car, your book, their house, etc. In French, possessive adjectives are a little more complicated. For example, the possessive adjective for the first person singular changes depending on the noun it modifies. If the noun is singular and masculine, the pronoun is mon as in mon stylo (my pen). If it is plural and masculine, the pronoun is mes as in mes stylos (my pens). It also changes because of gender, too. If the noun is singular and feminine, the pronoun is ma as in ma sœur (my sister). In other words, the possessive adjective must match the word it modifies. It is noticed that the pronoun mes is used with singular feminine and with plural masculine, too. Similarly, in Spanish, the possessive adjective changes according to the noun whether singular or plural as in mi bolígrafo (my pen) and mis plumas (my pens). However, it does not change according to gender as in mi padre (my father) and mi madre (my mother). In Chinese, singularity and plurality are indicated by the possessive adjective itself, not the word. An FPPA would look something like this 我的 (my) 钢笔 (pen), transliterated into Wǒ de gāngbǐ. The plural would look something like this 我的笔 (my pens), transliterated into Wǒ de bǐ, with what might seem a suffix (gāng) added to the word pen.

First-Person Possessive Adjective (FPPA)

In Arabic, Standard and Modern Standard, possessives are constructed by adding a pronoun to the word as a suffix, which differs depending on the intended meaning or who is meant by the possession. For example, kitabī (my book), kitabuk (your book), kitabuh (his book), kitabuha (her book), kitabūna (our book), kitabuhum (their book), etc. In Arabic, the possessive is a suffix added to the noun while in English it is a single word that precedes the noun. The possession we are concerned about here is the first person singular, a suffix -ī in Arabic and a single entity my in English. This single entity is described as a possessive adjective in English which, as is the case with all possessive
adjectives, is located directly before the noun. In both languages, the first person singular possessive does not change if the noun is singular or plural, masculine or feminine, animate or inanimate. In other words, and as opposed to French, the possessive adjective does not have to match the word it modifies. An English speaker can say *my* pen, *my* pens, *my* mother, *my* father, *my* dog, and *my* house.

In Arabic, a speaker can say the same words *qalamَي* (my pen), *aqlamiََََََََ* (my pens), *ummiََََََََ* (my mother), *abbiiََََََََََ* (my father), *qalbiَََََََ* (my heart), and *baitَََََََ* (my house). These possessives may change in some other languages depending on the nouns being in possession whether plural, singular, feminine masculine, etc. The Arabic structure of the first person singular possessive may seem to be consistent in all regions where Arabic is spoken as a first language. However, as will be seen in the discussion below, there can be some differences in some Arabic dialects. The focus in this study will be on HD, which shows a distinct way for possessives, which will be explored in detail as will be shown from the analysis of the data collected from Hasawi people who were born and bred in Al-Ahsa region.

**Phonological-Morphological- Analysis**

Basically, phonological and morphological analysis needs some rigorousness, meticulousness and accuracy in transcription, managing data, analysis and description. Such analysis requires a combination of certain analytical skills, techniques and reasoning needed for problem solving. It needs collectedness, patience and staying on good terms with the people being consulted and interviewed. An important aid in morphological and phonological analysis is the paradigm. Marlett (2001) believes that for a phonological analysis, it is helpful to use a paradigm which involves columns and rows of lexical material, where the common elements, such as a stem or a suffix, are shown.

Interviewing people and recording their speech for analysis is a form of sociolinguistic inquiry which entails fieldwork, interviews and documentation. Moreover, there is a need for describing the geography and spatial distribution of speakers, whether they live in small towns, villages, or remote areas. And in terms of the language investigated, there is a need for classification of the language (phyllum, group, subgroup, etc.) in addition to determining the typological features (sound inventories, tone, noun classes) and the salient pragmatic features known as the socio-cultural norms related to speech habits (Van der Veen, 2010).

The author emphasizes having clear objectives and sound representations, knowing exactly what needs to be achieved, and what theoretical assumptions the researcher has about language and its phonology. The author also sets three major objectives that a research on phonology would have: First, studying the speech sounds and the sound structure or patterns of the language under investigation; second making generalizations about the sounds functions and the distribution of this language; and third, making generalizations by uncovering the underlying principles about the sound patterns that occur in the speakers’ productions.
The questions of variation, markedness and unmarkedness are also among the issues that need to be considered when investigating a language in terms of its phonological and morphological structures. Moravcsik and Wirth (1986) referred to markedness and unmarkedness as the "relationship between the degree of our familiarity with things and the number of distinctions we can perceive among them". In other words, markedness refers to the state of standing out as uncommon or different in comparison to more common or regular forms. Unmarked forms are the forms that are more dominant and are accepted by default. Linguistically speaking, markedness involves the characterization of a "normal" linguistic unit against one or more of its possible "irregular" forms.

Frequency-based phonology is an approach to phonology proposed by Bybee (2003). This approach takes much effort, more elaborate corpora accompanied by extended observation. This frequency-based study must be supported by meaningful statistics, showing which sounds are frequent or less frequent. Bybee talked about the two ways for describing frequency: token frequency, as the occurrence of a unit in running text, and type frequency, as the dictionary frequency of a pattern.

Another important aspect of a phonological analysis is the speaker's metalinguistic awareness of the speaker, whose intuition can sometimes provide beneficial information for the analysis of some features. Hodson and Edwards (1997) and Koda (2007) suggest some linguistic activities such as rhyme games and other language games such as syllable inversion within words which may be explored in order to test a speaker's metalinguistic awareness within a given speech community.

The author emphasizes the use of narrow transcription, but at the same time warns against relying on words in isolation since single words may behave differently when used in context. In other words, single words can, in most cases, pronounced differently if used in connected speech, be it vowel shortening, elision or assimilation. For example, the word red is pronounced/red/ if in isolation, while the /d/ sound is assimilated with /b/ sound in the sequence red bull [rebəl]. In a similar way, the word can is pronounced /kæn/ if in isolation, while it is pronounced [kəm] in I can play the piano. Here, the vowel is reduced to a schwa /ə/ and the /n/ is assimilated regressively with sound /p/ taking the same place of articulation.

**Stress movement and Vowel Change**

Change in word length could result in a change in stress and change in vowels. Kreidler (1987) mention different types of stress differentiation: "contrastive stress, the comparative weight of initial and final syllables, lexical loss, new derivations, rhythmic leveling, and the attitudinal factor of "prestige"" (p. 100). The author also mentioned that a change in syllable might result in a change in stress, and an excellent example of this is the words moral /ˈmɔrəl/ and morality /məˈrælɪti/, where the stress moves to the second syllable.
METHOD

To answer the questions of the study and find the phonological and morphological rules behind the formation of HD FPPA and illustrate the differences between this dialect and the MSA, the researcher designed a reading card for possessive adjectives which included FPPA only. This card had eight columns with words that were classified into eight categories: animate feminine singular, animate masculine singular, inanimate feminine singular, inanimate masculine singular, animate feminine plural, animate masculine plural, inanimate feminine plural, and inanimate masculine plural. This card was given to a selected sample of people who had been born and bred in the Al-Ahsa region, where HD exists. They were asked to read the words (or sequences) in a natural way as they would always do when they talked to the people within the Hasawi community. Their readings of the words were recorded and analyzed by the researcher to find out how this possessive adjective is formed and pronounced in an attempt to find a logical interpretation to the formation of these sequences and elicit any differences between that dialect and MSA in terms of the FPPA structure.

In addition to words in isolation, the researcher did, in fact, listen to the same words in context to see if that would have any phonological or morphological changes. So, he designed another card with the same words used in everyday natural speech to find out how connected speech might impact the formation and pronunciation of the first-person singular possessive adjective.

To justify any exceptions to the rule the researcher might come up with, the researcher designed two short questionnaires to address and justify those exceptions in which different ways were used to express possessiveness. There were two questionnaires, one designed to be answered by a sample of people who were born and lived in Al-Ahsa and one for another sample of people who were not from Al-Ahsa at all.

The researcher also attempted to find out the sound patterns that emerged from producing these possessives and, if possible, make a generalization about that dialect by exposing the underlying principles about those patterns in the Hasawi speaker’s productions. Any interactions between the phonemes caused by the addition of possessive suffix in Arabic will be discussed by the researcher. These could relate to assimilation, elision or any other phonological processes.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The following is an analysis of the possessive adjective in isolation and in context, in addition to peoples’ attitudes and opinions of these sequences.

Analysis of words in Isolation

The table below is similar to the reading card given to the participants, but this one has the English meanings and a transliteration of the participants’ pronunciation as was pronounced in the recording. The researcher, as mentioned earlier, decided to do a phonological and morphological analysis of the recording to uncover the underlying principles behind the structure of these sequences.
Regarding the structure of the new word sequences, the formation of FPPA, as is seen clearly from the table above, is done by substituting the Hasawi suffix “yah” for the MSA suffix “i” in most of the eight cases mentioned earlier. For instance, the first-person possessive adjective for the word ammah (aunt) is formed by adding the suffix i in MSA ammati, while this suffix is substituted by yah in the HD, producing the sequence ammutyah. Another example is plural word al’a:bi (toys) is formed by adding the suffix i in MSA al’a:bi:ti, while this suffix, too, is substituted by yah in the HD, producing the sequence al’a:byah. With a few exceptions, there appears to be total consistency in the formation of HD FPPA regardless of the words being singular, plural, animate or inanimate. All sequences for this type of possessive are formed by adding the suffix yah. However, there are a few phonological processes involved which will be discussed later in this study.

### Analysis of words in context

The table below is different from the one above in that the reading card given to the participants included the FPPA in sentences. Here it has the English meanings and a transliteration of the participants’ pronunciation as was pronounced in the recording. The researcher, as mentioned in the methodology, included this to find any possible changes in the formation of such possessive and explain the phonological and morphological principles underlying the structure of these sequences.
Table 2. Words in Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>First Person Possessive Adjective in context</th>
<th>Inanimate Feminine Singular (object)</th>
<th>Inanimate Masculine Singular (object)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(object)</td>
<td>I visited my sister on Thursday</td>
<td>I washed my car</td>
<td>I cleaned my house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aana zert $i$.khit.yah yomelkames</td>
<td>aana gassalt* sayarut.yah</td>
<td>aana naddaft $bait.yah$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subject complement)</td>
<td>This is my sister</td>
<td>This is my car</td>
<td>This is my house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hathì* $i$.khit.yah</td>
<td>Hathì* sayarut.yah</td>
<td>Hathà** $bait.yah$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In Arabic, the demonstrative pronoun “Hathì” is used for feminine; ** hatha for masculine.

As is seen clearly from the table above, the structure of the word sequences in connected speech shows that the formation of FPPA is done in the same way. The Hasawi suffix “yah” takes the place of the MSA suffix “i” in most cases with no impact of being used in connected speech. For instance, the FPPA for the word okht (sister) is formed by adding the suffix i in MSA okhti, while this suffix is substituted by yah in HD, producing the sequence $i$.khit.yah in the sentence aana zert $i$.khit.yah yomelkames (I visited my sister on Thursday). The word $i$.khit.yah is an object of the verb visited. Another example exists for the same word as a subject complement. The sentence Hathì $i$.khit.yah (This is my sister), the word sequence ikhityah remains the same. With only a few phonological variations and exceptions, the same can be said as regards the consistency that exists in the formation of the HD FPPA regardless of the words being in isolation or in connected speech, being singular, plural, animate or inanimate. Any sequence for FPPA is formed by adding the suffix yah. However, these few phonological variations and exceptions will be discussed later in this study.

Morphological Analysis

A morphological analysis does not appear to be too hard to do on words in the table above. It is evident that almost all the words end with the suffix yah added to the root, being the entity possessed. The word sister, which is animate, feminine singular becomes my sister in HD Arabic by adding a suffix to the root word okhti (sister), and the product is $i$.khit.yah. The word house becomes my house also by adding the suffix yah to the word bait (house), producing $bait.yah$. This applies to all eight cases in the columns mentioned earlier. Anyone reading the table above would be able to apply the rule to new words not mentioned in the table, which implies that there is some logic behind such formation. However, there are a few cases where the suffix is not added to the root and the speakers preferred, for some reason, to keep the MSA suffix i as in the words jaddati (my grandmothers) and eyali (my children), while at the same time, as stated by the participants they would use both interchangeably in some cases.

Moreover, the addition of the suffix yah appears to be the same in words in isolation and in connected speech. The question of exceptions and variations, as emphasized before, does not influence the generality of the rule across the dialect in terms of first-person possessive adjective. Interviews and discussions with some of the participants verify this claim, explain and clarify why these exceptions exit and what they might signify.
Phonological Analysis (In isolation – In connected speech)

The section above discussed the formation of FPPA in terms of their morphological features. Here we need a phonological analysis that accounts for all the changes that take place in the pronunciation of the FPPA sequences.

*Phonemic change.*

It is noticed that replacing the FPPA MSA suffix \(i\) by the Hasawi suffix \(yah\) causes some changes in some of the phonemes in the words it is added to. Starting with a singular noun, the MSA word \(okhti\) (my sister - pronounced /ˈʊxti/) where the /x/ sound is a velar fricative. In HD it becomes /ɪ.ˈxɪt.jəh/. Another example is the word \(khalati\) (my aunt - pronounced /ˈxaləti/) becomes /xəˈlʌt.jəh/. In the first example, we notice that three changes: the vowel /ʊ/ changes into /ɪ/ at the beginning of the word, there is a vowel insertion /ɪ/ between the two consonants /x/ and /t/ that seems to reduce consonant cluster, and finally the suffix /i/ becomes /jəh/. It is worth mentioning here that Arabic does not allow consonant clusters (Archibald, 2003; Boudlal, 2001; Gafos, 2003; Haddad, 2005; McCarthy, 2005). The word \(qalami\) (pronounced /ˈqələmi/) becomes /qəˈləmjəh/. In the second example, there are also few changes. The schwa in /ˈxaləti/ become /ʌ/ in HD and so does the schwa in the word /ˈqələmi/. This can apparently be attributed the stress that moved to the second syllable in HD. From another aspect, some changes are manifest in the formation of FPPA with plural words. The word \(akhawati\) (pronounced /ˌɑxɑˈwati/) becomes /xɑˈwat.jəh/). In the HD, the first sound /ɑ/ is omitted, and the suffix \(jah\) is added to form the HD FPPA. As is clear from the examples above, in HD, stress tends to remain in the same place in plural words and shift in singular words.

*Stress movement*

Stress seems to play a role in the formation of the HD FPPA. Stress movement makes some changes to the vowels within the word sequence. If we look at these pairs of words, we can see clearly stress movement and the changes that take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Stress movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Meaning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My aunt (mother’s sister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My aunt (father’s sister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My toys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ʔ is a pharyngeal fricative.*

Even though there are some exceptions, two general rules can be formulated as such:

1. When the Hasawi suffix \(yah\) is added to a singular noun, the Standard Arabic suffix \(i\) is omitted, and the stress moves to the second syllable.
2- When the Hasawi suffix $yah$ is added to a plural noun, the Standard Arabic suffix $i$ is omitted, but the stress remains on the second syllable.

**Hasawis’ Attitudes**

The researcher conducted a survey using some Hasawi words from the tables 1 and 2 above in an attempt to find out to what extent Hasawi people use and look at their HD. They gave somewhat diverse responses which, however, provided some significant, noteworthy details.

**Table 4. Using HD with family and Friends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words from HD</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>many</th>
<th>not many</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/xaˈlət.jəh/</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʔamˈmat.jəh</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/xaˈwɔː.ljəh/</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ˈɑːnə.zərt</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xaˈwɔː.ljəh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the number of participants who use the HD FPPA with their families and Hasawi friends is much lower than the number who never use it.

**Table 5. Using HD with non-Hasawi people**

| /aχˈwʌn.jəh/ | 8% | 10% | 5% | 8% | 70% |
|/xaˈlət.jəh/ | 5% | 10% | 8% | 10% | 68% |
|/qɑˈlʌm.yah/ | 5% | 13% | 8% | 10% | 65% |
| /seɪ.yəˈrʌt.yəh/ | 15% | 5% | 5% | 8% | 68% |
| Average     | 8% | 9% | 6% | 9% | 68% |

As for using this HD possessive adjective with non-Hasawi people, the results show that more than two thirds of the participants said they would not use it at all, and only around 23% said they would use such sequences with non-Hasawi people. This indicates that Hasawi people use the HD FPPA more with their families and Hasawi friends than with non-Hasawi people.
Non-Hasawis’ Attitudes

To find out to what extent the Saudi society know and look at the HD, the researcher conducted another survey using some Hasawi words from the tables 1 and 2 above. The responses were varied, but they gave some significant indications.

Table 6. Percentage of those who heard the word sequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>many</th>
<th>not many</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ak wan.jah/</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/xa lat.jah/</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/qa lam.yah/</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/'ana zert xa wa:l.jah/</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/'ana tqa'der mat sa xa wa:l.jah/</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table above shows that most of the participants are not familiar with the dialect or never heard about it. However, a smaller number gave positive responses, implying that the dialect is not too abnormal. This dichotomy will be explained later in this study.

Regarding the originality of the dialect, this part of the survey shows to what extent the participants believe that the Hasawi dialect has some roots in Standard Arabic. The table below shows that most of the participants are either skeptical about the originality of the sequences or even do not believe in its existence in Standard Arabic nor in the Holy Quran in the first place.

Table 7. Percentage of those who believe in its originality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>I do not Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Holy Quran</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The survey results and analysis of the recording helped answer the questions of the study which evolved around the morphological and phonological rules behind the formation of Hasawi possessive adjective, how HD differs from the MSA, and to what extent do Hasawi people use this type of word sequence. In answer to the first question, HD FPPA is formed by adding the suffix $j$ah to the of the word instead of the MSA suffix $i$. This happens in all cases in HD FPPA with very few exceptions where Hasawi people would accept both suffixes ($i$ and $j$ah). In other morphological and phonological terms, the addition of the suff $j$ah is the unmarked feature of HD, while the MSA $i$ is the marked, at least from the Hasawi point of view. This type of possessive is deep-rooted in Standard Arabic and is used a number of times in the Holy Quran, the Holy Book Arab and Muslim scholars regard as perfect in terms of language. The second part of the first question is dealt with phonology-wise. The formation of the HD FPPA sequence entails some elision and/or insertion of some phonemes from the root word. And also entails stress movement from
the first to the second syllable in singular nouns. With plural nouns, stress remains on the same syllable.

The second question addresses the extent to which Hasawi people use such sequence in their speech within the family and Hasawi friends on the one hand, and with non-Hasawi people on the other. The results show that they use it more with friends and family than with others. However, it was surprising 68% of the participants said they would not use HD FPPA with non-Hasawi people, but what was much more surprising was to find out that 58% would not use this sequence even with family and Hasawi friends even though they are Hasawi people living in A-Ahsa region. As a researcher, I would attribute that to (1) the immigration of tribes in the past (2) financial boom and associated job opportunities in the region (3) the media, which may as well have contributed to the emergence of the what is known as the Saudi Arabian Dialect. On the other hand, most of the Non-Hasawi participants confirmed they rarely or never heard about these sequences, and most of them did not know or suspected the originality of these sequences. Apparently, the two results make much sense and can support each other. As long as 68% of the Hasawi participants would not use the HD FPPA with non-Hasawi people, it is logical that 65% of the non-Hasawi participants rarely or never heard this type of possessive.

The first and second hypotheses have been verified since the study proved that the formation of the Hasawi first-person possessive adjective follows some morphological and phonological rules rules. Besides, it seems to have root in Standard Arabic, although not very common, and its formation differs from the typical way of forming first-person possessive adjective in Arabic. The third hypothesis has been rejected since the results show that most of the participants would not use HD FPPA, and only a small percentage confirmed they would use it in their daily life, whether with Hasawi or non-Hasawi people. The last hypothesis has been verified too since most of the non-Hasawi participants did not actually know much about the HD FPPA.
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