REFLECTION ON ANGLICISM: FROM JARGONIZING TO POPULARIZING SPEAKING IN RESHAPING THE LANGUAGE LANDSCAPE WITHIN THE ALGERIAN SOCIETY

Nadira Chahboub [1]   Ali Belaidi[2]
1Translation Institute- University of Algiers 2 (Algeria)
nadira.chahboub@univ-alger2.dz
2 Ecole Nationale Supérieure de Management (Algeria)
a.belaidi@ensmanagement.edu.dz

Abstract: Our paper suggests reflecting on the Anglicism process and its impact on educational standards. Despite the complexity of the Algerian linguistic landscape, political decisions have only added further complications, affecting everyday communication and reshaping social culture. Since the process was launched, many gaps and serious considerations have emerged. As a result, the linguistic landscape has changed since the operation was carried out. Regarding the methodological aspect, our paper is an exploratory and reflective study that employs comparative analysis of various language studies exploring the relationship between language, society, power, and knowledge. Additionally, it integrates interdisciplinary perspectives to communicate the political implications of Anglicism, tracing its impact from the University to society. Our article endeavors to evaluate this decision from multiple perspectives and anticipate how it may reshape society at various levels. It finally comes to the following conclusions: the Algerian linguistic landscape has drastically changed in Algerian society from the top to the bottom, and it is changing. The actual change will narrow the presence of the French language starting from everyday life to other contexts, but most importantly the professional sphere where the French language is more used. Our paper aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the common ground among the four languages used in Algeria. Additionally, it seeks to encourage researchers to conduct genuine scientific research on the integration of the English language, whether at the university level or within the educational system.

Keywords: Algerian speaking, anglicism; knowledge, political decision, power

---

[1] **Corresponding author :** Nadira Chahboub
[2] **ORCID ID** https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6641-1249

1. Introduction: The Language Structuring to Understand Algerian Society from the Bottom to the Top

Algeria is considered an Arabic country. Judged by its geographical inscription, North Africa, its Arabic language is more related to Islam as the main religion in this region. However, its past goes far beyond the Arabic conquests; it has actually a long and complicated history as a region (see Ibn Khaldoun). As a matter of fact, Algeria's History reveals the existence of many conquerors, and such a past had an impact on the cultural identities of this geographical area, and profoundly affected the society. Furthermore, it remained the object of conquering from other empires, in the recent past, which had been colonized by France, as the latest colonizer. However, its population spared no effort in the decolonization, which ended in the second half of the 20th century.

Indeed, as a decolonized country, Algeria is experiencing a deep discomfort with its cultural identities, and more precisely linguistic identity. From the historical sight, the Algerian society has the legitimacy to claim the appropriation of Arabic as an official and national language since 1962. Institutionally speaking, politics had claimed a singular national culture, although the plurality of the popular cultures. This adoption was responded to the Pan-Arab myths vehicle in this time of history (Dourari, 2007). In the same token, the discarding of Tamazight drowned the society in a deep and unsolved crisis till the language became constitutionally recognized as a second official and national language. But we are not at the end of the identity crisis (Chahboub & Belaidi, 2023).

Although the variety of its identities is closely related to the past, many contemporary conditions worsened the situation. As a result, the identity crisis and social discomfort could be noticed in the Algerian everyday life. Indeed, many aspects help us understand these crises, and we consider the linguistic aspect to be among the most important ones, which can give us clues to better understanding. Indeed, there are many valuable researches related to this topic giving us the hidden side of the identity crisis. However, we also believe that this field contains a heuristic value.

At first glance, we can identify many languages in everyday life. The most obvious are Arabic, Tamazight, and French. Although Tamazight speakers are considered a minority, ethnically speaking, the Algerian nation is united in its Amazighity (Dourari, 2003). This Amazighity has, on the other hand, divided others. Many historical reasons can be evoked (*see supra*), but we are more interested here in the contemporary issue of Algerian society related to its language/ languages.

Dourari (2007, 2003) and Taleb-Ibrahimi (2007, 1997) have stated the diversity of linguistic practice in Algerian society. Taleb-Ibrahimi (1997) has stressed the realities of *diglossia* in Algerian everyday life. This diversity is present with different degrees from one region to another and from the bottom to the top of the hierarchical society (Belaidi, 2020). By this token, the linguistic issue in Algerian society remains real, whether it was officially recognized or not. In this repertoire, although Arabic has been recognized as the official and national language since 1962, that was the language of administrative transactions, the French language, on the other hand, maintains the language of both economic and social practices (see Taleb-Ibrahimi, 1997).

More recently, the situation has changed since the recognition of Tamazight as the national language, then as an official language. Indeed, the constitution has added Tamazight as a second official and national language (Chahboub & Belaidi, 2023). Consequently, Algeria is officially a bilingual society, although it is in its earlier stages, especially when it is related to the Tamazight language, there are many to do to reach a real state of bilingualism.

Beyond this bilingual state, both languages maintain a conflictual relationship. Indeed, such a bilingualism acquisition has a long story of rejection of independence with the ban of the Tamazight language in public space: strong hate toward Amazigh people spread within big cities of Algeria. It becomes a 'rurally' branded, a shameful stain, and a source of embarrassment and discomfort. In contrast, Arabic spoken and written is assimilated to urbanity, civism, and religious orthodoxy (Belaidi, 2020).

At the intellectual level, the issue is located between Arabic intellects versus French intellects. Both groups are striving to appropriate Tamazight to endorse their group (Guerrid, 2007).

Moreover, everyday speaking can be practiced, consciously and unconsciously associated with more than two languages. Such diglossia varies from one region to another and from social class to another. Consequently, the recognition of Thamazight, accompanied by the graphical issue, has led a number of scholars to propose different options: between Arabic, Latin, and Thifinagh graphics (Chahboub & Belaidi, 2023, Roberts, 2014). We believe that the government is the most qualified to decide the choice related to the calligraphy of Tamazight. Meanwhile, other organizations, especially the associative groupings, while depending on their activities, can work with the graphic that fits their needs regarding their region (see Robert, 2014).

Presently, the linguistic situation remains the same. Furthermore, to the Internet and social media, English, as an international language, seems to occupy more and more space in different levels of society. With the new generation, the English language is becoming more present. Randomly, some popularized English words are used in everyday life. Moreover, the use of the English language is becoming more prevalent in boastful contexts.

In the intellectual sphere, however, Algerian scholars are conscious that scientific productions are more valuable and recognizable in English than other languages. On the other hand, French seems to occupy less and less space; with the new generations of students and professors too, the trend leans more toward English. In higher education, particularly within English departments, numerous recent studies have focused on enhancing the learning-teaching process by shifting from a teacher-centered approach to a learner-centered one. The introduction of innovative technological tools in English language teaching and learning, for instance, aims to foster a supportive learning environment and encourage reflective practice (Benmouhoub & Maouche, 2018). Additionally, the implementation of picture-based activities has been utilized to enhance students' communicative competence (Othmene & Bouyakoube, 2018), among other effective approaches, methods, and strategies. Nonetheless, further research is needed to explore how English can be introduced in various science departments that have traditionally relied on the French language for instruction. This will also necessitate a focus on training for educators.

Recently, the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research has engaged in a serious process to move into English. Algerian University launches an Anglicism process. Although there is always, somehow and somewhere, a skepticism toward this decision, all Universities and departments are compelled to take part in this process. Many departments are already working with English. More recently, all the universities have conducted English placement tests for their professors, professor assistants, and lecturers.

Such a move will reshape not only the intellectual level in the short term but will have a serious impact in the long term on society. The addition of the English language to the other existing languages is increasing the dynamic of Algerian society. Such dynamic does not display clearly, and catching the rhythm of such a dynamic invites us to look deeply at the

way how the structure is moving. Language is the most revealing means to understand the dynamic of society. On the other hand, tackling the Algerian issues at the linguistic level is a real challenge; the new realities of the world impel Algerian society to go with them. By the same token, the official introduction of the English language in the Algerian university, endorsed by the institutions, is reshaping, positively or negatively, slowly the language landscape of Algerian society from the top to the bottom: our concern here is related to the whole process.

How we could tackle the logic of language in Algerian speaking, with two official and national languages and the process of Anglicism of the university? And what is the relation between knowledge and power regarding the languages in Algerian society? And what will be the impact of the bilingualism and the Anglicism of the Algerian speaking?

Our main aim in this paper is to display the complexity of the languages in Algerian society, and how Anglicism will affect the landscape of Algerian society. However, before we display the effect, at reflective level, we prefer to give an overview about language, and how it shapes the culture and logic in society in different social categories. Furthermore, language can reveal more than that, it reveals the history and present and the future of society. The following sections tackle all these issues. Then we move to the process of Anglicism, not as a new process but rather as a continuity of the linguistic issues in Algerian society.

In relation to our methodology, it is important to emphasize the exploratory and reflective nature of our contribution. This exercise is crucial for uncovering various concepts that may arise and for suggesting new avenues for investigation. These concepts will guide us in pursuing research with targeted methodologies and techniques. Additionally, we recognize that the process of conceptualization serves as a cornerstone for developing a theoretical understanding of the phenomenon. Therefore, we will provide justification for any methods or techniques adopted in future research on this topic.

2. Language as a Framework to Analyze a Society

The significance of language cannot be overstated - this is true both as an independent topic of study, as noted by (Crystal, 1987), and in the context of philosophical discussions within the social sciences, as observed by (Rorty, 1967). Despite this, it is surprising that language is often overlooked by many social scientists. Critical approaches to analyzing social issues have frequently involved the reconsideration of fundamental linguistic categories, as demonstrated by the works of notable scholars including Chomsky, Foucault, Baudrillard, Derrida, and others. Ritzer & Ryan (2011), assert that:

> The study of language is a window to all of the social sciences […] from Cartesian [philosophical] "subject-centered reason" and rational action, to Fichtean "communicative social action" and symbolic interaction […]. Modernist, structuralist epistemologies stressing the Cartesian subject-object dichotomy had been confronted by postmodernist, poststructuralist epistemologies, which stress the "habitus" and the "life world." (p. 347).

According to Ritzer and Ryan (2011), exploring the anthropological and sociological dimensions of language, involves the development of artificial languages that feature simplified grammar. The interplay between language and social structures is a fascinating area of study for social scientists, as they uncover intricate patterns that arise from human language use. Ethnolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, and sociolinguistics are all subfields that delve into these complex relationships.

Linguistics delves into the fascinating realm of pragmatics, which explores the nuances of contextual background features. This field shares a connection with sociological ethnomethodology, as both seek to understand how people "accomplish talk." Being aware of sociocultural context and social psychological situations can help us distinguish between angry and joking behavior, for instance.

Sociologists have delved into the concept of "symbolic interaction," deriving insights from G.H. Mead's observation that for interaction to occur, individuals must share "significant symbols." These symbols hold practical implications that all participants involved can comprehend clearly (Ritzer & Ryan, 2011, p. 347).

Peirce (1923) proposes to shift to a generalized approach that is sometimes called semiotic. Peirce's semiotic approach suggests that reality is represented by an interpretative community using signs. Language facilitates communication between humans and animals, with continuity between animal and human communication. This applies to fields like anthropological linguistics, ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics.

In human languages, signs play a crucial role, but none may be more crucial than "symbols" like words and phrases. A collection of these symbols, possibly accompanied by iconic or indexical signs, can form a "text." While any recorded symbolic communication is a type of text, we typically associate language with written language and its formal foundation, known as *la langue* according to De Saussure.

Structuralists have put forward arguments about how language and communicative symbols relate to each other in a general sense. They have proposed the idea of a "deep semantic structure" that exists in all human languages' underlying grammar, reflecting a narrated universe (Ritzer & Ryan, 2011, p. 348).

According to De Saussure, there is a fundamental difference between the structural form of language (langue) and the spoken word (parole). This distinction is synchronic and pertains to the actual utterance produced by a person who is socialized into a relatively fixed language system during their lifetime. Saussure's ontological assumptions regarding the arbitrariness of the signifier have been a topic of debate, with Walter Benjamin among those who have opposed them.

Similarly, Chomsky (1957) draws a parallel to Saussure's perspective by distinguishing between "competence" and "performance." One can accurately utilize a language's grammar without possessing any comprehension of linguistics as a whole, or even the utilization of linguistic principles specific to that language.

In the following section, we display the most important sight related to language understanding.

2.1 Reason and Language

The correlation between our habitual thoughts and behaviors with language lies in the fact that the structure of our spoken language greatly influences how we perceive and interact with the world around us. In order to fully comprehend how language shapes our behaviors and experiences of reality, we must juxtapose it with the language we use in our everyday lives (Engelke, 2017, p. 249). Language shapes our perception of abstract concepts like time, space, justice, and love. We use gestures and body language to make these ideas tangible. The way we categorize space also influences our perception of our surroundings (Engelke, 2017, pp. 251-252).

Another aspect of the language interest, as we mentioned above, thought and reality have to do with questions of meaning and comprehension. It is not so easy to distinguish what we call 'nature' from what we call 'culture'. Engelke (2017) sees that "values played a functional role in the maintenance of a culture"(p. 109).

According to Fanon's (1967) analysis, individuals living under colonization and struggling with feelings of inferiority due to the loss of their native culture are forced to confront the language and cultural norms of the colonizing nation. By adopting the standards of the mother country, the colonized can elevate their status and shed their uncivilized identity. This process involves rejecting their own cultural heritage, effectively becoming "whiter" by shedding their "blackness" and ties to the jungle.

Related to Tamazight, also called Berberian language, the Greeks and Romans used them to distinguish themselves from other people. Engelke (2017) states:

> 'Barbarian' was a derogatory term used to describe the language of other peoples as kind of 'babble' – not only unintelligible, but undeveloped. 'Savage' derives from the Latin *sylva*, or wood; people, in other words, who lived more like animals (pp. 67-68).

These three key concepts heavily influenced the social evolutionary approach during its early stages. While a biologist's taxonomic classification system would include kingdom, phylum, and class, an anthropologist's focus was on distinguishing between the savage, barbaric, and civilized at a more general level.

2.2. Understanding the Language as Social Construction of Everyday Life Reality

In the context of how we perceive reality, language is commonly regarded as a system of signs that holds the utmost importance in human society. Its roots can be traced back to the innate ability of humans to express themselves vocally. This ability allows us to detach from our current subjective state and engage in verbal communication. The use of language is crucial in maintaining the shared objective understanding of everyday life. It is through this shared language that we interact with others and comprehend the reality of face-to-face situation (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, pp. 51-52).

In this token, Berger & Luckmann (1966, p. 52) argue that "the face-to-face situation possesses an inherent quality of reciprocity that distinguishes it from any other sign system. The ongoing production of vocal signs in conversation can be sensitively synchronized with the ongoing subjective intentions of the conversants". This means that language has its roots in everyday life and is primarily used to describe the reality we experience in our conscious state. Reality is dominated by the pragmatic motive, governed by practicality, and is casually shared with others.

Moreover, Language can transcend everyday reality and span multiple spheres of meaning. Any theme that extends beyond the bounds of reality can be deemed a symbol, and the method of achieving such transcendence through language is known as symbolic language. At the level of symbolism, linguistic communication achieves the greatest possible separation from the present moment of daily life, enabling language to ascend to realms that are not only beyond our everyday experience, but beyond our very perception (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 55).

The two researchers consider that language creates symbols, which become a tangible part of our daily lives. Symbolization is crucial to our shared understanding of reality and shapes our perception of the world. Given that our daily lives are primarily driven by the practical need to know how to accomplish tasks, pragmatic competence in performing routine

activities takes center stage. As a result, this knowledge holds a prominent position in the social stock of knowledge, as it is invaluable in navigating our daily lives.

In our day-to-day existence, our focus is largely on the practicalities of accomplishing tasks. Consequently, having the ability to competently perform routine activities becomes of utmost importance. Such knowledge is highly valued in society, as it plays a crucial role in helping us navigate our daily lives. Berger & Luckmann (1966) argue that:

> The validity of my knowledge of everyday life is taken for granted by myself and by others until further notice, that is, until a problem arises cannot be solved in terms of it. […] My knowledge of everyday life is structured in terms of relevance. Some of these are determined by immediate pragmatic interests of mine, others by our general situation in society (Ibid., pp. 58-59).

2.3. The Nature of Language as a Nature of Society

According to Foucault, language is a significant means of conveying similarities and patterns on a global scale. As such, it deserves to be studied in the same way as society is, with its own unique elements, laws of affinity, and convenience. The importance of language cannot be solely derived from its meaning, which is the primary focus of grammarians. Language occupies a middle ground between the visible forms of nature and the concealed convenience of esoteric discourse. It is a fragmented nature, divided against itself and deprived of its original transparency due to admixture. Yet, it is also a secret that carries within itself, close to the surface, a decipherable sign of what it is trying to say. At the same time, it contains a buried revelation that is gradually being illuminated with greater clarity (Foucault, 1994, pp. 35-36).

Foucault (1994) asserts that all language has value only as a discourse. He states that:

> The art of language was a way of 'making a sign' – of simultaneously signifying something and arranging signs around that thing; an art of naming, therefore, and then, by means of reduplication both demonstrative and decorative, of capturing that name, of enclosing and concealing it, of designating it in turn by other names (p. 43).

In the realm of history, it is important to recognize that some historical facts may be presented by non-specialists, leading to potential misrepresentations or distortions that serve specific interests. This reality is particularly relevant today, as the public depends on a variety of sources for information and knowledge. As a result, historians, tasked with accurately documenting events, face a considerable challenge in navigating the overwhelming amount of easily accessible information disseminated through mass media. This reliance on such platforms for information jeopardizes the integrity of the historical record for peoples and nations, ultimately impacting the audience's comprehension of truth and accurate historical narratives (Rais Ali & Medjahed, 2024).

2.4. The Being of Language as a Social Being

Historically, and according to Foucault, we are more constrained by representation. However, Nowadays, we are more concerned by the meanings even though we can easily find the representation as a way of orientation and understanding the world. The language was never to be anything more than a particular case of representation or signification. The profound kinship of language with the world was thus dissolved.

2.5. The Representative or Signifying Function of Language and Speaking

Limiting one's view of language to its classical status narrows our understanding of society. However, it is more interesting to look at the real function of language in our everyday life. The signifying function of language resides in speaking. The speaking unveils the untold truth of the local history, but we also demand the process of unveiling because the truth must be transmitted secretly undetectable.

Whether one analyzes literature based on its intended message, conveyed ideas, promises made, or commitments made, or examines the methods by which these messages are conveyed (using linguistic or psychoanalytic paradigms), is of little consequence. Such modes of analysis are rooted in a classical understanding of language, where signification was reflected in the form of representation, signifying elements, and signified content, making it appropriate to analyze literature accordingly. However, literature illuminates language in its true form and essence.

To properly investigate the Arabic language's archaeology, one must consider its sources and epistemology. In the context of Algerian history, shifting from one language to another has resulted in numerous distortions and shifts in meaning. Rather than conveying a specific meaning, these shifts often produced mere representations. Additionally, this approach ignored the content, making it simple to manipulate elements to suit one's needs.

3. Speaking: When the Society Speaks to Us

To truly comprehend representation, one must consider its strict definition. As a means of conveying thought, language serves as a representation. These representations do not originate from the external world but rather exist within their own space. This internal network allows for meaning to arise. Language is situated within the void created by representation. It has no other place or significance outside of this context. Therefore, language is utilized within representation and in its duplication, which serves to hollow it out (Foucault, 1994[1966], pp. 78-79).

The opposition between content and form is a fundamental necessity that gradually emerges and finally assumes importance. It is impossible to construct a science or a philosophy with the received vocabulary. A general denunciation confuses what is distinct in representation with the abstract one and separates what should remain united. There is a need to build up a vocabulary of perfect analytic language. Criticism judges and profanes language by speaking of it in terms of representations and truth (Ibid., p. 80).

In certain cultures, such as Algerian culture, the use of secondary languages can be met with criticism or commentary, as there exists a strong connection between language and representation. However, in Western societies, this connection is often broken or transcended through the use of socialized language. In this token, Foucault (Ibid.) reports that: *"The meaning of words does not pertain, in any case, to anything but each individual's representation and even though be accepted by everyone who has no other existence than in the thought of individuals taken separately"*(p. 82). Thus, the complexity of language and thought presents a challenge when it comes to representation. While language is a powerful tool for communication, it is unable to capture the entirety of thought in an instant. Rather, language must arrange the various components of thought piece by piece in a linear order, which can limit the expression and conveyance of complex ideas.

3.1. The Logic and Social Culture through the Language

Although we may acknowledge that "thought" is in some sense a linguistic expression of an individual's thinking, it still requires a comprehensive social theory of the mind to understand the true nature of the relationship between a thinker and their social environment. Only through a process of careful and deliberate construction can we develop a dynamic and clear understanding of this complex interplay (Horowitz, 1974, p. 426).

Drawing from Mead's (1934) theory on the social self and the concept of the generalized other, we can demonstrate how societal processes shape one's reflective thinking. The generalized other is the internalized audience that one interacts with, made up of a focused and abstracted organization of attitudes held by those involved in the social context of behavior and experience. The structure and substance of chosen social experiences that are later filtered and selected become the generalized other that one engages with, ultimately shaping their social boundaries and constraints.

Conversation and thought are interdependent. The interaction between speaker and listener shapes our ideas and beliefs, becoming part of our mental structure and shaping our intellectual habits. Recognizing this dynamic exchange can help us better understand our own mentality. Our thoughts and beliefs are shaped by the people we associate ourselves with. So, it's important to be aware of our attitudes and their impact on us.

In this respect, Horowitz (1974) reports that "reasoning involves deliberate approval of one's reasoning. One operates logically (applies standardized critiques) upon propositions and arguments […] from constituted viewpoint that one approves or disapproves of given arguments as logical or illogical, valid or invalid" (p.427). This means that for an individual to be considered logical, it is essential that there exists a consensus among the members of their discourse universe regarding the soundness of a common concept of logical reasoning. In other words, a shared understanding of what constitutes good reasoning is a prerequisite for an individual to be regarded as logical. Horowitz argues that to be deemed logical, it is crucial for an individual to have a consensus with their discourse community on the validity of a commonly accepted concept of logical reasoning. Simply put, a mutual comprehension of what defines sound reasoning is necessary for one to be recognized as logical.

Mills suggests that our understanding of language and meaning should be viewed through the lens of social behavior. This involves considering the role of language in facilitating human behavior, as well as how reflection influences our use of language. Over time, scholars have shifted from a focus on grammar and language structure to exploring the social and behavioral contexts in which language is used. Through these different perspectives, we have come to understand that the meanings of words and symbols are shaped by the coordinated actions of society. Moreover, language and its meaning should be approached from a social behavior perspective, examining how language influences human behavior and how our reflections impact our use of language. Scholars now focus on exploring the social and behavioral contexts in which language is used, revealing that society's coordinated actions shape the meanings of words and symbols (Mills, 1939, p. 673).

Language is a means of social control. Symbols gain meaning from shared responses. Effective communication requires establishing common responses. Symbols shape social behavior and are crucial to human thought. Word meanings are created and maintained through interactions within communities. Thought involves manipulating these meanings. Symbols mediate the interplay between individuals and their social surroundings, shaping the mind. Language is a tool for social regulation through shared symbols. Effective communication requires a shared understanding of symbols, which shape social behavior and

cognition. Words' meanings evolve through communal interactions and are fundamental to thought. Symbols mediate the interaction between individuals and their social environment, shaping the mind (Horowitz, 1974, p. 426). In this token, Horowitz explains the relationship between our behavior and language as follows:

> By acquiring the categories of a language, we acquire the structured "ways" of a group, and along with the language, the value-implicates of those "ways." Our behavior and perception, our logic and thought, come within the control of a system of language. Along with language, we acquire a set of social norms and values. A vocabulary is not merely a string of words; immanent within it are societal textures– institutional and political coordinates (Ibid., p. 433).

In studying vocabularies, Mills has the ability to detect implicit evaluations and the underlying patterns that are considered social cues for behavior. The words we use to express ourselves are often influenced by the social norms around us. Although our thoughts are not necessarily shaped by language, they still rely on the tools of social action. The creation of meaning is a collective effort, and symbols are the key determinants in this process. While new meanings can be derived from these symbols, they must still be defined in terms of the established words and their meanings. This is important because the understanding and acceptance of these new meanings is dependent on this collective knowledge (Mills, 1939, p. 676).

The interpretation of a symbol varies depending on the culture or social group that is analyzing it. When translating from one language to another, a translator may feel that there is an unwritten and mysterious tradition guiding their interpretation. This tradition is not consistent, and reflects the societal norms that shape the behavior of the scholar translating the text, their personal experiences, and the intended audience of their work. These hidden factors that influence meaning are like logical interpreters, formed from the meaningful actions of these different groups.

When there is a disruption in social interactions, such as a conflict between classes, it can impact our communication and thinking. This can result in misinterpretations of symbols and an inability to effectively communicate with one another. Without shared understanding of the social context that gives meaning to symbols, different groups may respond to them in different ways, leading to a breakdown in genuine communication.

Mills (1939) believes that our social and philosophical terms can obscure important factors and serve a social purpose. These distinctions vary between cultural traditions. In Algerian thinking, these distinctions did not determine the subject matter. Some problems arise due to chance factors, like grammatical or social accidents.

Socially speaking, we categorize people based on their appearance as either old or young, often distinguishing between grey hair and hair without grey strands. However, it is important to note that there is a distinction between biological and chronological age. Chronological age refers to the number of years a person has been alive, while biological age refers to the state of a person's physical health and overall wellbeing. "The employment of one word for both chronological age and the honourable pattern of behavior toward old persons reflect the unquestioned appropriateness of the reverential conduct better than any separate terms could" (Horowitz, 1974, p. 426).

3.2. The Depiction of Institution

We provided coordinates for a sociological approach that considers the relationship between social behavior and cognition, language and cultural habits, and intellectual and cultural contexts. These contexts can be seen as factors that influence thinking, as social structures provide specific and limited materials for assimilation, or as thinkers align themselves with particular interests.

After conducting a thorough analysis, we have delved into the socio-psychological aspects of this issue and proposed two connective mechanisms as potential explanations. These formulations not only shed valuable insight, but also offer a framework for further research to reconstruct the intellectual patterns from a cultural perspective.

In the coming sections we present the issue of Arabization in the intellectual sphere, as a political decision, and how the French language has resisted such exclusion. Then we move to the introduction of the English language as a political decision and what kind of consequence we can anticipate.

4. The Arabization Policy of the Algerian University

Although the linguistic issue was present before the independence of Algeria, our concern is more stressed in the post-independence period. Hence, from 1962 to 1966, the University of Algiers remained French in its programs. Since then, the Algerian government has started thinking about reviewing the political, social, and cultural of the Algerian university. Thus, the university adopted the Algerianization of higher education and scientific research. Since then, the number of students is constantly increasing (Arouss, 2007).

The matter of language in relation to national identity was a significant concern for policymakers who recognized the importance of not exclusively promoting the French language. Activists advocating for nationalistic ideals were particularly persistent in their efforts to have the Arabic language recognized as a fundamental aspect of the national identity, and sought to promote its use in universities, particularly in the social sciences. Despite various challenges, policymakers remained steadfast in their commitment to promoting Arabic language education. In 1979, the official decision was made that human and social sciences must be taught in the Arabic language.

The process of Arabization ended in contradictory results and the loss of some knowledge with the abstention from using the French language to the use of Arabic. This failure is more related to the process being more political than objective and strategically done. The imposition of the Arabic language on complete generation had also accompanied the emergence of the Islamic movement.

Over time, a sense of belonging to a particular ideology became prevalent among different groups of people in Algeria. This eventually led to a division between those who spoke Arabic and those who spoke French. The division was not only linguistic, but it also extended to the intellectual sphere. This divide has continued to exist in Algerian society until today, shaping the way people interact with each other and influencing various aspects of their lives.

The most attractive criticism about the Arabization process is that the process was improvised and auto-excluded from international research activities. Some scholars have stated that the Arabization of social sciences reached an advanced level, but it did not attain satisfaction regarding the terminology and the whole conceptual construction. It is important to recall the emergency aspect of the policy and the confusion between the language as an expression of identification and the language as a means to learn and produce knowledge. As

a result, there was confusion between political, social, and scientific perspectives towards Arabic language and scientific languages, causing delays in research due to the Arabization process.

On the other hand, some disciplines have kept using the French language in their teaching, which can seem more controversial. Indeed, all technological branches have maintained the French language in their departments. There are many reasons for such skepticism about Arabic, but the most important ones are the market labor and all industries function in the French language. There is no room for the Arabic language (Guerrid, 2007). The departments are only responding to the demand of the labor market dealing totally in French.

In addition, it appears that Algerian universities are consistently replicating the French model by dividing researchers into groups. This has resulted in an individualistic approach to research activities, a lack of collaboration, and a dearth of independence in planning and programming in the scientific fields.

To summarize, the relationship between language issues and higher education and scientific research in social sciences became worse with the lack of translation. Such a lack has blocked scientific communication and the circulation of new scientific knowledge (Arouss, 2007).

Also, we can recall the Arabization process that was fulfilled by professors from the Middle East, especially in social and human sciences. Meanwhile, the technological field was mostly thought from Europe. However, the worsening state is that the government has appealed to the koranic students to teach Arabic or even to follow their university studies with any requirement just knowing Arabic. Such politics has degraded the level of social sciences (Guerrid, 2007).

At the same time, as mentioned above, this choice coincided with the Islamic movement and ended with the domination of universities by the Islamic-Arabic orientation (Guerrid, 2007, pp. 290-311).

5. The Constitutionalization of the Tamazight Language

Since 2016, the Tamazight language has become the official language of Algerian society. Since this year, Algeria has been officially a bilingual country. The recognition of Tamazight was accompanied by the graphical issue in which the Tamazight alphabet will be learned. Although the government has the complete power to decide on which alphabet to write Tamazight, it remains unclear. Officially, many institutions display their title in three languages: Arabic with its alphabet, and Tamazight with Tifinagh, French with the Latin alphabet. Implicitly, the Tifinagh writing is present. On the one hand, in most primary schools, Tamzight is taught in the Arabic alphabet. On the other hand, most researches at universities related to Tamazight are done in Latin (Chahboub & Belaidi, 2023).

The question of the graphic unveils the real issue in intellectual spheres related with Arabic speaker and French speaker intellectuals. Each of them tries to appropriate the Tamazight to reinforce their sphere. As we can imagine, this issue is more persistent at the University level. After the recognition, the Tamazight is no longer a social issue (see Chahboub & Belaidi, 2023).

6. Knowledge and Power in the Algerian University

According to Dourari (2003), to become modern, Algerian society needs to increase its rational capacities within teleological sight in different fields. Such aim is achieved as a try to assess the relation between knowledge and power; because the knowledge is consistent in 'intellection' of the being of thing and the phenomena as perceptions. A perceptive and orderly effort is necessary to establish the truth. It requires complex training to produce a thought determined by space, time, and object. This object is firstly from the nature order requiring the knowledge from nature sciences, as quantitative knowledge; and an object of cultural order relying on human and social sciences, it is qualitative knowledge. In both cases, the knowledge aims to develop paradigms.

The ability to turn ideas into action is what defines power. This ability is best observed in the practical execution of ideas over time. Effective implementation requires a strategic balance between saying and doing, each of which plays a crucial role in articulating truth. The resulting knowledge is woven into the fabric of society, reflecting the social norms and conventions that have been established through communicative and interactive processes. Ultimately, power is about mastering the know-how of managing these processes to achieve our goals.

Many studies have emphasized that politicians and scholars have distinct approaches. The two roles are separate and hierarchical. Scholars prioritize seeking the truth; while politicians may be swayed by scientific evidence but do not necessarily make it a priority in their actions. These are two different ways of expressing and accomplishing the same goal, as the pursuit of knowledge does not consider the circumstances of its reception or social acceptability. In contrast, politicians prioritize pragmatism, seeking the appropriate time and method to reveal the truth.

A power looks for the language, the tone, and the appropriate moment to tell the truth. Another power is more preoccupied with its survival, and conserving it will disguise the truth. However such orientation is justified depending on the nature of the problem (Dourari, 2007, p. 69).

6.1. Exocentric Problems

The exocentric problems are more related to the status of the institutions of knowledge: the norms that help to designate their leaders. This status and these norms are shaped by the political context, giving those in power the authority to determine the nature of knowledge within society (Dourari, 2003, pp. 70-73).

An examination of the relationship between these two approaches within knowledge institutions highlights a negative global attitude toward knowledge. Using a Weberian perspective, an analysis of domination showcases the prevalence of administrative bureaucracy. This reality results in a sense of unease within institutional functioning, including the scientific community.

The value of knowledge cannot be determined solely by statutory measures. This is due to discordance in status consistency between the functions of universities and the external prestige of knowledge, which is further complicated by bureaucratic dominance and weak economic status. While universities play a consultative role, their power is limited to the viewpoint. This is a global reality for institutions of higher education (Dourari, 2003, pp.70-73). Additionally, as Roberts (2014, p. 302) points out, the primary issue facing Algerian institutions is the prevalence of informal practices over formal ones, which has seeped into university structures as well. This issue is rooted in the distribution of power and how universities navigate the field of science and knowledge.

However, when we examine the overall acceptance of the Arabization process as a legitimate political movement, it becomes evident that no Arab nation is currently creating knowledge in its native language. Decisions are not being guided by knowledge, given that all knowledge is being generated by Western societies using the English language.

It would be unwise to exclusively use Arabic or Tamazight at the Algerian University, as this would hinder the production of scientific knowledge. Utilizing English as a language of instruction and research would provide an advantage. Proficiency in English is a key factor in determining the level of success and influence of a civilization. Even the most efficient translations cannot match the pace of progress and innovation in Western knowledge production.

University operates under a predetermined process that values the power of knowledge. Unfortunately, the bureaucratic system in place does not adequately support professors in harnessing their expertise to benefit the institution's leadership. In essence, within the university's realm of knowledge, authority takes precedence over the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge. There are notable barriers to intercultural communication between Algerian university teachers and researchers and their international counterparts at various levels (Amara & Hanifi, 2025). Several key challenges have been identified, and initiatives have been undertaken to overcome these obstacles, fostering a deeper understanding within the global academic community.

6.2. The Endocentric Problems

The hierarchical power structure within Algerian universities is not conducive to the promotion of knowledge. Unfortunately, those occupying the authoritarian top positions often lack the necessary appreciation for the value of knowledge. Additionally, the epistemic subject is often marginalized in decisions that impact the institution. While this is not the only reason for the decline of knowledge within Algerian society, it is an important factor. To reverse this trend, the epistemic subject must work towards greater autonomy and become more aware of their role in the production of knowledge and society. It is vital to recognize that it is the professors who hold the reins of power within universities, and that Algerian universities are currently unable to generate new knowledge on their own. (Dourari, 2003, p. 75). In this context, Dourari says:

> Le bras de fer qui dure entre les universitaires (savoir = S : Is) et la tutelle (pouvoir = P : Ip) pose la question de reconnaissance mutuelle de deux acteurs/actants engagés dans des dimensions et sur des isotopies différentes. Les réactions gauches du pouvoir non seulement employé et employeur, mais, pis, contribuent à augmenter le capital de défiance sauf à dire que l'impasse est le but recherché activement et intelligemment (2003, p.75).

The administration of the institution must be managed by scientists who specialize in its main function (knowledge) and who are responsible for the realization of commands, infrastructures, recruitment, etc.

6.3. Political Power and Knowledge

Modern politics is scientificized with experts, specialists, and so on. The political decision is narrowed by the rationale allowing the politician to take over the scientific. The politician has to reintroduce the human ingredient and the axiological moment. The pragmatic model allows the readjustment and permanent reciprocity between the couple's decision/ scientific reason-technic. The political power formulates the problem and asks for the scientific to figure out the solutions (Dourari, 2003, p. 77).

Regarding the juxtaposition of linguistic politics and scientific decision-making, it is often observed that while the latter requires ample time, the former necessitates practicality. Such a scenario presents a dual paradigm, wherein power is typically driven by its self-interest, rather than a desire for knowledge. Concerning the relative decision to the linguistic politic of the State, when the scientific decision needs time, the political decision needs pragmatism. We are facing a double logic. Generally speaking, the power is not interested in the knowledge it does not claim only its aura. The politician suggests that society is not scientifically knowledgeable (Dourari, 2003, p. 79).

6.4. The Problem of Conventional Language between Power and Knowledge

Politics often leads to the use of conventional language, which can make it challenging for scholars to distance themselves from it. This creates a complex and indirect relationship between research methods and the political implications of the work. It's important to avoid analytical errors that arise from unquestioningly accepting the limitations of conventional thinking. This issue is particularly prevalent in social science, where research can quickly take sides and identify with one perspective (Becker, 2007, p. 223). In this vein, Becker states that:

> Most social scientists have been trained to distinguish between judgments about facts and what are called "value judgments," judgments about what's good and bad, and warned especially not to let their ideas about what is wrong influence their conclusion about exists (2007, p. 225).

Becker means that when we conform to the standard interpretations of the subjects we study it can have significant implications both in terms of technicalities and morals. By limiting our understanding to established definitions, we may miss out on uncovering new insights and perspectives. Additionally, accepting conventional definitions can have ethical implications, as it may contribute to the perpetuation of unjust norms and systems. Therefore, it is crucial to approach our studies with an open mind and a willingness to question established norms and definitions.

The crux of the matter is that the category of occurrences we aim to make broad statements about only share the ethical beliefs of influential individuals and factions in the community. Consequently, a scientist who employs a standard definition encounters enormous challenges in uncovering any universal insights regarding the topic under examination.

When we adopt existing language and perspectives in our studies, we inadvertently accept all the assumptions about morality that come with those words and ideas. However, if scholars use neutral language and constructs, they can engage in scientific discussions about any phenomenon without being influenced by preconceived notions of right and wrong.

7. Conclusion

In Algerian society, language serves as a crucial form of representation, whether it be Arabic, French, or English. As a result, social categorization can be easily discerned based on the daily language used by individuals. This gives rise to three distinct categories of speakers: those who speak Arabic, those who speak French, and a new category of English speakers that is emerging. Interestingly, this third category primarily comprises the younger generation who has largely neglected the French language. This trend is likely responsible for the decline in French speakers in Algeria.

To summarize, the Algerian linguistic landscape has drastically changed in Algerian society from the top to the bottom, and it is changing. The actual change will narrow the

presence of the French language starting from everyday life to other contexts, but most importantly the professional sphere where the French language is more used.

According to Dourari (2003, pp. 81-83), there is a need for the inversion of hierarchies and roles, which is both necessary and beneficial. The administrative structure should accompany the pedagogical and scientific aspects, serving as a logistic bridge between knowledge and power. It is crucial that knowledge holds a superior position within society and that the role and status of knowledge undergo a revaluation. To ensure that power is effectively wielded, there must be a focus on producing tangible results. The importance of technological knowledge is recognized by the political sphere. Those in power who are knowledgeable understand that organizing social knowledge is essential for modernity. Societies must produce and socialize knowledge to acquire the necessary skills to thrive in the modern world.

References

Amara, N., & Hanifi, A. (2025). Barriers to international communication among Algerian university teachers and researchers: A study of challenges in spoken and written English communication. *Educational and Didactic Research Review, 14*(1), 27–44.

Arouss, Z. (2008). At-taʻlīm al-ʻālī, al-masʼala alūġawiyya wa ḥālat al-ʻūlūm al-iğtimāʻiyya fī ad-dūali al-maġāribiyya: al-ğazāʼir ʼunmūdağan [Higher education, the question of language, and the state of social sciences in the Maghreb countries]. In N. Benghabrit-Remaoun & M. Haddab (Eds.), *Insaniyat, 12*(1), 109–121.

Becker, H. S. (2007). *Telling about society*. University of Chicago Press.

Belaidi, A. (2020). The linguistic landscape of Algerian society: From distinction to discrimination. *Language, Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 11–25.

Benghabrit-Remaoun, N., & Haddab, M. (2008). L'Algérie 50 ans après: État des savoirs en sciences sociales et humaines (1954–2004). *Insaniyat, 12*(1), 11–37.

Benmouhoub, L., & Maouche, S. (2018). Improving English language students' oral fluency through YouTube non-fiction videos. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 1*(1), 38–48.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Penguin.

Chahboub, N., & Belaidi, A. (2023). Tamazight: Officialisation et enjeu de la citoyennabilité linguistique en Algérie. *Aleph, 10*(3), 11–29.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. Mouton.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Dourari, A. (2003). *Les malaises de la société algérienne: Crise de langues et crise d'identité*. Casbah Editions.

Dourari, A. (2007). Politique linguistique en Algérie: Entre le monolinguisme d'État et le plurilinguisme de la société. *Politiques linguistiques en domaine francophone*, Vienne, octobre, 2011.

Engelke, M. (2017). *Think like an anthropologist*. Pelican Books.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. Grove Press.

Foucault, M. (1994). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences* (Original work published 1966). Vintage Books.

Guerrid, J. (2007). *L'exception algérienne: La modernisation à l'épreuve de la société*. Casbah Editions.

Horowitz, I. L. (Ed.). (1974). *Power, politics and people: The collected essays of C. Wright Mills*. Oxford University Press.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society: The definitive edition*. University of Chicago Press.

Mills, C. W. (1939). Language, logic and culture. *American Sociological Review, 4*(5), 670–680.

Othmene, M., & Bouyakoube, N. (2018). What works to prove students' communicative competence in Algerian universities? Using picture-based activities. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 1*(1), 140–154.

Peirce, C. S. (1923). *Chance, love and logic: Philosophical essays*. Harcourt Brace.

Rais, A., & Medjahed, Y. (2024). Media and history: Dialectical relationship between media and history, documenting the historical memory with new visions in the frame of the information society. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 7*(1), 126–142.

Richard, R. (1967). *The linguistic turn*. University of Chicago Press.

Ritzer, G., & Ryan, M. (2011). *The concise encyclopedia of sociology*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Roberts, H. (2014). *Algérie-Kabylie: Études et interventions*. Barzakh.

Taleb-Ibrahimi, K. (1997). *Les Algériens et leurs langues: Éléments pour une approche sociolinguistique de la société algérienne*. Éditions El Hikma.

Taleb-Ibrahimi, K. (2000). L'Algérie: Langues, cultures et identité. In H. Remaoun (Ed.), *L'Algérie: Histoire, société et culture* (pp. 61–72). Casbah Editions.

Web Sources:

Encyclopædia Britannica. (2023, August 17). *Ibn Khaldun*. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ibn-Khaldun

Saussure, F. de. (1997). *Cours de linguistique générale* (Édition critique). https://monoskop.org/images/f/f1/Saussure_Ferdinand_de_Cours_de_linguistique_generale_Edition_critique_1997.pdf (Accessed June 7, 2023)

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. (2023, April). *Conducting English placement tests for PhD students in preparation for foreseen English LEA*. https://www.mesrs.dz/index.php/en/2023/04/conducting-english-placement-tests-for-phd-students-in-preparation-for-forseen-english-lea (June 7, 2023)