

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

LEBANESE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF WHO
THEY ARE:

A STUDY ABOUT IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE CHOICE

by

DENISE ELIAS ATALLAH

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Master of Arts

to the Department of English

of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

at the American University of Beirut

Beirut, Lebanon

December 2018

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

LEBANESE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF
WHO THEY ARE:
A STUDY ABOUT IDENTITY AND LANGAUGE
CHOICE

by
DENISE ELIAS ATALLAH

Approved by:

Lina Choueiri, Professor
English Department



Advisor

Arthur Michael Vermy, Assistant Professor
English Department



Member of Committee

Rula Diab, Professor
English Department



Member of Committee

Date of thesis/dissertation defense: 12/17/2018

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

THESIS, DISSERTATION, PROJECT RELEASE FORM

Student Name: Atallah Denise Elias
Last First Middle

Master's Thesis Master's Project Doctoral Dissertation

I authorize the American University of Beirut to: (a) reproduce hard or electronic copies of my thesis, dissertation, or project; (b) include such copies in the archives and digital repositories of the University; and (c) make freely available such copies to third parties for research or educational purposes.

I authorize the American University of Beirut, to: (a) reproduce hard or electronic copies of it; (b) include such copies in the archives and digital repositories of the University; and (c) make freely available such copies to third parties for research or educational purposes after : **One --- year from the date of submission of my thesis, dissertation, or project.**
Two --- years from the date of submission of my thesis, dissertation, or project.
Three ---- years from the date of submission of my thesis, dissertation, or project.


Signature

February 6th, 2019
Date

This form is signed when submitting the thesis, dissertation, or project to the University Libraries

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Lina Choueiri, whose understanding, patience, invaluable comments, and guidance added considerably to my graduate experience. I have learned so much about research in the process of writing this MA thesis, and I owe it all to you. Thank you so much for all the time and effort you put into helping me reach this point.

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Prof. Rula Diab and Prof. Arthur Michael Vermy, for the assistance they provided at all levels of the research project.

I would also like to thank my family for the support they provided through my entire life and in particular, I must acknowledge my husband, Tony, without whose love, encouragement and assistance, I would not have finished this thesis.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Denise Elias Atallah for Master of Arts

Major: English Language

Title: Lebanese University Students' Perception of Who They Are: A Study about Identity and Language Choice

This study uses a three-part survey (quantitative data) to explore the language choices made by the Lebanese educated youth in 33 different contexts of daily communication, educational and personal activities as well as their perceptions concerning the importance of different aspects of identity: personal, relational, social, and national.

The language choices made by the participants are a little different from what the previous literature suggests. Most participants speak Lebanese Arabic (LA) for daily communication and interaction showing that on a social level, the Lebanese prefer to use their mother tongue. In the educational context, the Lebanese prefer the language used by the institution they go to. And for personal activities, a combination of LA and French or English is used by the participants.

As for the different aspects of identity that were examined, personal identity was viewed as the most important by the majority of the participants, and national identity was perceived as the least important by most participants.

The present study establishes a relationship between identity as seen by the young Lebanese and the language choices they make by observing that LA is used exclusively only in social contexts, and is used along with French or English in personal contexts (the most important aspect of the Lebanese's identity), and is not used at all in educational, academic contexts.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
A. Introduction	3
B. Language Situation in Lebanon	3
C. Language Choice in Different Studies	6
D. Identity and Aspects of Identity	15
1. The Concept of Identity	15
2. Aspects of Identity	17
E. Relevant Studies about Language and Identity	20
F. Language and Identity	23
III. METHODOLOGY	27
A. Research Questions	29
B. Participants	30
C. Instrument	32
D. Data Collection	34
IV. FINDINGS	39
A. Instrument	40
B. Results	41
1. Demographic Distribution of Sample	41
2. Language Choice	46
a. Daily Communication and Interaction	46
b. Educational Activities	54
c. Personal Activities	61
d. Language Choice and Gender	70
e. Language Choice and Religion	70
3. Aspects of Identity	77

a. Aspects of Identity and Religion	86
C. Summary of Findings	87
1. Language Choice	88
2. Aspects of Identity	89
V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	91
A. Demographic Distribution	91
B. Language Choice	93
1. Language Choice and Religion	95
C. Aspects of Identity	96
1. Aspects of Identity and Religion	98
D. Language Choice and Identity	98
E. Summary of Discussion	100
VI. CONCLUSION	101
A. Summary of Findings	101
B. Limitations	102
C. Recommendations	102
Appendix	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE (English)	105
B. QUESTIONNAIRE (French)	109
C. QUESTIONNAIRE (Arabic)	113
D. CONSENT FORM (English)	117
E. CONSENT FORM (French)	119
F. CONSENT FORM (Arabic)	121
G. LANGUAGE CHOICE AND GENDER	123

H. ASPECTS OF IDENTITY AND GENDER	128
I. EMAIL SCRIPT	130
REFERENCES	131

TABLES

Table		Page
1	Distribution of Courses in the Visited Faculties at the Lebanese University ...	33
2	Number of questionnaires included in the study	34
3	Distribution by Gender and Religion.....	43
4	Languages Spoken by Participants.....	44
5	Native Language of Participants by University.....	45
6	Second Language of Participants by University.....	45
7	Third Language of Participants by University.....	46
8	Lebanese Arabic in Daily Communication by University.....	48
9	Standard Arabic or a Combination of SA with Another Language in Daily Communication by University.....	49
10	French in Daily Communication by University.....	50
11	English in Daily Communication by University.....	51
12	Combination of two Languages in Daily Communication by University.....	52
13	Combination of Three Languages (LA, FR, and EN) in Daily Communication by University.....	53
14	Lebanese Arabic in Educational Activities by University.....	55
15	Standard Arabic or a Combination of SA with Another Language in Educational Activities by University.....	56
16	French in Educational Activities by University.....	57
17	English in Educational Activities by University.....	58
18	Combination of Two Languages in Educational Activities by University...	59
19	Combination of Three Languages in Educational Activities by University.....	60
20	Lebanese Arabic in Personal Activities by University.....	62
21	Standard Arabic or a Combination of SA with Another Language in Personal Activities by University.....	63
22	French in Personal Activities by University.....	64
23	English in Personal Activities by University.....	65

24	Combination of Two Languages in Personal Activities by University.....	66
25	Combination of Three Languages in Personal Activities by University.....	68
26	Native Language (NL) and Religion.....	69
27	Second Language (SL) and Religion.....	70
28	Third Language (TL) and Religion.....	71
29	Chi Square Tests for Daily Communication and Religion.....	72
30	Chi Square Tests for Educational Activities and Religion.....	73
31	Chi Square Tests for Personal Activities and Religion.....	74
32	Importance of Personal Identity to All Participants.....	76
33	Importance of Social Identity to All Participants.....	77
34	Importance of Relational Identity to All Participants.....	77
35	Importance of National Identity to All Participants.....	78
36	Composite Scores of Aspects of Identity.....	79
37	Composite Scores for Personal Identity by University.....	80
38	Composite Scores for Social Identity by University.....	81
39	Composite Scores for Relational Identity by University.....	81
40	Composite Scores for National Identity by University.....	82
41	Composite Scores for All Aspects at Three Universities.....	82
42	Multivariate Tests for the Different Aspects of Identity and Religion.....	84
43	Multivariate Tests for Aspects of Identity and Religion by University.....	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Arabic is the official language in Lebanon. Most educated Lebanese people speak at least one language other than Arabic _ French or English _ and many speak three languages: Arabic, French and English. This is due to the rich historical background that Lebanon has: the French Mandate and Catholic missionaries promoted French; the Evangelical missionaries promoted English; Arabic was no longer the language used for education; it was replaced by either French or English and more recently by both in some schools. (See Chapter Two)

Foreign languages are perceived by the Lebanese as signs of education, sophistication, and distinction. Someone who speaks French or English is usually more educated than someone who can only speak Arabic.

Language use, choice, and perceptions of language vitality and importance are interesting topics in Lebanon because the Lebanese context offers a variety of languages for the educated Lebanese to choose from in the different situations they encounter in their daily lives. The educated Lebanese make use of the availability of different languages to choose from and often use two or three languages at the same time to make certain statements about themselves. Language is a powerful tool and the choices one makes are statements of who one is _ self-identity.

The concept of identity has shifted greatly _ over the last couple of decades _ from being defined as something that is constructed and that lasts a lifetime, unaltered, to being defined as something that is reconstructed, redefined, and revised to make different statements depending

on the context. The Lebanese identity is a great example of a dynamic identity that cannot be clearly defined. There have been many attempts (See Chapter Two) to define the Lebanese identity, but reaching a definition of identity that applies to all Lebanese people is out of question because of the many factors _ history, religion, etc. _ that affect identity and because of the many aspects that are involved in forming an identity _ personal, social, relational, national _, not to mention that each aspect alone is also constantly changing and being reinvented and reconstructed.

This study explores both these complex and interesting concepts as perceived by the Lebanese: language choice and different aspects of identity. More specifically, the present study explores the language choices Lebanese university students report they would make in different contexts and whether language choice is affected by gender and religion. Then, this study investigates the participants' perception of how important each aspect of identity is, and whether their perceptions concerning the different identity aspects are affected by gender and religion. Finally, the study will examine whether a relationship exists between language choice and specific aspects of identity.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

The following literature review consists of five parts. First, the language situation in Lebanon will be discussed. Second, it provides a discussion of studies that have dealt with language choice and use as well as attitudes towards the different languages in Lebanon. This part also reports on the significance of factors such as gender and religion in relation to language choice or use. Third, the concept of identity is introduced, and then the different facets of identity are identified and defined. The fourth part provides an overview of studies that investigate the concepts of aspects of identity and language choice and the factors that might influence them, specifically gender and religion. The fifth and last part discusses the relation between language choice and identity.

B. Language Situation in Lebanon

Three major languages share the Lebanese scene: Arabic, French and English. Other languages that are used in Lebanon are Armenian and Kurdish, but they are mostly used among the Armenians (4%) and Kurds (1%) living in Lebanon who represent but a small proportion of the Lebanese population (Esseili, 2017). These languages will not be discussed in the present study.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Arabic was the main language used in society and education. With the coming of both the Catholic and the Protestant missionaries that built schools and universities, bilingual schools education started, and French and English were

introduced and shared the education field with Arabic consequently, spreading the English and French cultures (Shaaban and Ghaith, 2002, Diab, 2009, Esseili, 2017). French catholic schools were established “in areas with greater concentrations of Maronites, and Anglican schools were founded in Druze dominated areas. The missionary educational enterprise at the time assigned Arabic a literary function in education while foreign languages were assigned a scientific and modernizing function” (Esseili, 2017).

Before the French mandate, French was taught only in private and religious schools, but with the mandate, it became an obligatory subject in public schools as well. Arabic was limited to history, geography, ethics, civic education, social sciences, law and literature, and French was used for all other subjects. After the independence, Arabic became the only official language, but the French language and culture remained part of the Lebanese identity of the Christian elites. In the early 20th century, the Christian elite wanted Lebanon to be a bridge that connects the East to the West, and this is best done by maintaining a dual identity through French / Arabic bilingualism while Muslims embraced Arabic and an Arab identity instead. At the same time, Christians value Arabic and the cultural identity that is associated with it as much as Muslims do. (Esseili, 2017)

This situation escalated to what was perceived by Muslims as social inequality, compelling the government to make English an official alternative to French in the bilingual system of schooling. 72% of Francophones in Lebanon were still Christians, but 61.5% of them perceived English as more useful than French. Nonetheless, they still considered French to be a valuable additive language and as such were not ready to give up on it. Studies done at the beginning of the millennium showed that French was losing ground to English which is viewed as more useful _ than both Arabic and French _ in terms of science, technology and business

(Shaaban and Ghaith, 2003), that English was perceived as more useful than French on an international level (Esseili, 2017), and that university students perceived English to be easier to learn than Arabic or French (Diab, 2006).

The number of students enrolled in public schools has decreased from 37% students in 1999-2000 to 30.7% in 2017-2018 whereas the number of students enrolled in private schools has increased from 63% in 1999-2000 to 69.3% in 2017-2018 (Esseili, 2011, Ministry of Education Report, 2018). The number of public schools has decreased from 49.4% to 43.5% between 1999-2000 and 2017-2018. That of private schools, on the other hand, has increased from 50.6% in 1999-2000 to 56.5% in 2017-2018. Of the total number of schools (2885) in 2017-2018, 46.5% use French as the main medium of instruction, 30.8% use English, and 22.7% use both French and English _ in the sense that they start teaching both languages as early as kindergarten although the main language of instruction i.e. that used to teach other subjects such as math and sciences is usually either French or English _ compared to 1999-2000 when 62.49% used French, 19.68% used English, and 17.83% used both French and English. This last observation shows the regression French has witnessed compared to English.

Joseph (2004) examines the Lebanese language and identity patterns. He argues that despite the fact that English is highly regarded by the Lebanese and the fact that English-Arabic-French trilingualism is advocated in recent Lebanese educational policies, Arabic-French bilingualism is still a prominent identity marker for many Lebanese in particular Christian Lebanese who are likely to have different perceptions of their national and linguistic identity than their Muslim counterparts.

C. Language choice in different studies

The following section discusses studies about language choice, namely two studies by Shaaban and Ghaith (2002 and 2003), a study by Diab (2009), and two studies by Esseili (2011 and 2017). These studies deal with language choice and with attitudes towards the different languages used in certain contexts. These studies also examine the effect some factors may have on language choice and use.

Shaaban and Ghaith (2002) investigates the perceptions of 176 students at the American University of Beirut (AUB) concerning the vitality of Arabic, French and English in reference to the situations these languages are used in, in various social, educational and business domains, and in the domains of culture. The study also examines the factors of gender, religion, first foreign language, and income in relation to the perception of overall vitality of Arabic, French and English. The instrument used was a questionnaire made up of three parts. The first part elicited demographic information _ mainly gender, religious sect, language knowledge, and family income bracket. The second part _ a modified subjective ethnolinguistic vitality questionnaire _ elicited the perceptions of the students of the vitality of Arabic, French and English. The third part _ a sociolinguistic survey elicited data on language use.

The study shows that French is losing ground to English in most educational and scientific domains. English was perceived, by most participants, as the most vital language for use in science and technology, university education, secondary education, vocational education, medicine, and business. Arabic was perceived as the most vital language for national identity, religious activities, personal identity, self-expression, entertainment, elementary education, talking about daily events, discussing daily concerns, talking to family, conversing at parties and with peers at school, discussing literature, and talking for fun. French had but a minor role to

play when compared to Arabic and English in Lebanon according to the participants in that study. These findings could have been affected by the fact that the data were collected at an English medium university, where the students' favorable view towards English is reflected by their choice of an English medium university.

Gender and first foreign language didn't turn out to be factors that affect the perception of the ethnolinguistic vitality of Arabic, French or English. Religion and income, however, proved to be factors that influence the participants' perception of the vitality of the three languages. More specifically, Christians perceived Arabic and French to be more vital than did their Muslim counterparts, and the high-income participants perceived English and French as more vital than did the low-income participants.

Another study carried out by Shaaban and Ghaith in 2003 had as a purpose to investigate the linguistic attitudes of 176 AUB students and to examine whether these attitudes are affected by gender, religion or first foreign language. The instrument this study used was a 31-item questionnaire that consisted of two parts: one part eliciting demographic information and one part investigating the linguistic attitudes of the students. The latter part consisted of seven variables. These were the attitudes towards: utility of the first foreign language (FL) compared to Arabic, FL as a status marker, foreign language media, English versus French language media, use of English/French in certain public domains, language in education and society, and the utility of English versus that of French. The results concerning the attitudes of the students can be summarized as follows. Lebanese students in this study showed a positive attitude towards English as the language of the future and as the language that would help them land better jobs and enjoy better opportunities. Furthermore, every language was assigned a role to play according to the participants in this study: Arabic was viewed as the language of daily

communication and interaction, French as the language of education and culture and English as the language of science, trade and technology. As for the three factors that were studied in relation to the attitudes, gender proved insignificant in determining the attitudes of the participants; religion and first foreign language however proved to be determining factors in linguistic attitudes. Muslim students had a more positive attitude towards the utility of Arabic whereas Christian students viewed the role of the FL in social life more favorably than Muslim students.

One main limitation of both of Shaaban and Ghaith's studies (2002 and 2003) is the fact that the sample was made up of AUB students only. Including participants from French medium universities and Arabic medium universities could have provided different results since, as Shaaban and Ghaith indicate in their study, even the students who speak French as a first FL at AUB think very highly of the English language; otherwise, they would have gotten enrolled in a French medium university. Another limitation is that in both studies, no distinction between Standard Arabic and Lebanese Arabic was made. So when asked about the vitality or utility of Arabic, the participants could have been referring to either SA or LA.

There are more limitations to the study Shaaban and Ghaith conducted in 2003: the favorable attitude towards English may well be the result of the choice of a sample that has already expressed a positive attitude towards English simply by choosing AUB. Another limitation is the instrument that was used. As Shaaban and Ghaith mention, the small number of items for each variable resulted in small values of the alpha internal coefficients. Therefore, more items must be included for each variable to ensure higher alpha values.

Diab (2009) conducted a study that had three main purposes: (1) to investigate Lebanese university students' perceptions of ethnic, national, and linguistic identity _ the participants had

to define “Arab” identity and “Lebanese” identity, they had to discuss whether they believe the Lebanese are Arabs, and they had to state which languages they thought are essential to know in Lebanon _, (2) to explore their preferences for First Foreign Language (FFL) choice and choice for medium of instruction at school, and (3) to examine whether gender, religion, and/or FFL are factors that affect either the participants’ perception of national, ethnic, or linguistic identity or FFL choice and choice of medium of instruction.

The participants for her study were 86 Lebanese American University students from different disciplines, aged between 18 and 28. 45% were males and 55% were females; 65% were Muslims and 35% were Christians. They all speak Arabic as a native language, 63% went to English medium schools and 37% went to French medium schools.

Two instruments were used in the study: a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part elicited background information about the participants and the second part explored the participants’ perceptions of ethnic, national, and linguistic identity as well as their preferences for FFL choice and learning in Lebanon. Chi Square tests and cross tabulations were used to test the relationship between the three factors _ gender, religion, and FFL _ and the perceptions of identity and the preferences for FFL. 24 students volunteered to participate in the semi-structured interviews, which lasted between 25 minutes and 1 hour and ten minutes. 10 were males, 14 were females; 10 were Christian, 14 were Muslim; and 15 spoke English as a FFL and 9 spoke French. Students were told they could reply in either Arabic or English. They used Arabic mostly but at times switched codes (either English or French). As for the analysis, concepts and categories were identified in the data; the data were coded and labeled, and dominant themes emerged.

The study's results were as follows. Most participants defined "Lebanese" as someone who has a Lebanese passport, anyone who is born in Lebanon, someone who has Lebanese parents, or someone who has Lebanese ancestors. Most participants (60%) defined "Arab" as anybody who speaks Arabic as a Native language (NL). 75% said that the Lebanese are Arabs because they speak Arabic as a NL, because Lebanon is located in the Middle East, or because there's a shared history and culture with Arab countries. 25% said the Lebanese are not Arabs, but rather Phoenicians. The only factor that was shown to affect ethnic identity was religion.

The study found that English is viewed by most participants as an essential language to know because it is the international language in today's world, rather than for reasons of belonging to either the American or British cultures. Another important finding is that students who went to French medium schools still feel a strong sense of affiliation to both the French language and culture implying that French is still viewed as a marker of identity for many. FFL of participants proved to be a factor that affects students' preferences for choice of FFL: participants whose first FL is English would like their children to learn English first while only 50% of those whose first FL is French want their kids to learn French and 38% want their kids to learn English.

Just like Shaaban and Ghaith, Diab mentions one main limitation of her study: the participants were all LAU students, and she suggests that further studies be conducted taking into consideration students from other social and economical backgrounds _ private vs. public universities _ and students with different language preferences _ French medium universities vs. English medium universities _ which is exactly what the current study is doing.

Another study conducted in the Lebanese context is that by Fatima Esseili (2011). The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of the spread of English on languages, national

identity and the official language policy in Lebanon. More specifically, her study had six main purposes: to describe the language situation _ to examine the conflict between Lebanese Arabic (LA) and Standard Arabic (SA) on the one hand, and SA and French and English on the other _, to explore the participants' ideas about languages, to see what preferences the participants have about Second Language (SL), to explore the reasons behind using foreign languages in daily communication, to investigate the domains of language use, and to point out the challenges facing foreign language education.

Esseili discusses the difference between Standard Arabic and Lebanese Arabic, a difference created by the opposing views the Lebanese have about their origins _ whether Arab or Phoenician _ and the differences in the desire to belong to either the Arab world or the more sophisticated West (Suleiman, 2003; Diab, 2009). Those who feel they are Arabs and identify with the surrounding Arab world have higher esteem for SA whereas those who insist they are Phoenicians and identify more with Western values consider LA to be their native language rather than SA (Suleiman, 2003).

To triangulate the study, Esseili used mixed methods: field notes and in person observations supplemented with online observations, a questionnaire, and interviews.

The questionnaire consisted of four different parts. The first part elicited background information. The second part dealt with the participants' perceptions concerning Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Lebanese Arabic (LA). The third part dealt with the participants' perceptions toward and the function of the languages used in Lebanon (MSA, LA, French and English). The final part of the questionnaire investigated some of the reasons behind code switching, a common phenomenon among Lebanese speakers.

The participants weren't exclusively students, unlike participants in earlier research dealing with issues of language choice. The questionnaire was distributed, using Facebook, to 401 students, unemployed individuals and employees from different professions aging between 18 and 75. The participants were to complete the questionnaire in the language of their choice. The sample used for analysis though was 276, 38% of which were males and 62% were females. The average age of the participants was 28 years.

The second method used by Esseili was semi-structured interviews which were conducted after the participants had completed the questionnaire. The interviews were used to "compensate for what the surveys could not obtain" and to gather in-depth information from teachers who use English as a medium of instruction. A total of 16 teachers and 35 participants _ not teachers but students or employees _ were interviewed.

One of the major findings of the study is that foreign languages have spread in Lebanon in different venues such as street signs, ads, directions, shops, menus, restaurant names, etc. and English seems to be taking over French even when it comes to government-related issues which used to be in French. Other major findings concerning language use and choice include (1) religion wasn't found to be a predicting factor for language choice, which is contrary to what earlier studies had reported, (2) the participants were equally interested in learning French and English; however, English was ranked as the most important language to learn by most participants. English was also the most preferred language to use in digital settings; French was the least preferred. (3) 92% said that Lebanese Arabic is Lebanon's mother tongue. (4) To communicate with close family members and friends, most participants preferred to use Lebanese Arabic. At work a combination of Lebanese Arabic, English and French is usually used. (5) For different situations _ such as talking about religion and Internet topics, telling

jokes, greeting, insulting, flirting, etc. _ the choices differed: some chose Lebanese Arabic, others English; very few chose French. (6) Finally, participants reported that Standard Arabic is the preferred language to use in three cases: talking about poetry and literature, reading newspapers, and reading books.

Some of the limitations Esseili discusses are using Facebook and the questionnaire. The first limitation was using Facebook, which although was great for a speedy data collection still had a few disadvantages: not enough Christian representation _ since Esseili herself is a Muslim and therefore a big number of her Facebook contacts and their contacts are Muslim _, no economic background diversity _ usually people befriend people from more or less the same socio economic background _, no language options available on Facebook _ usually people on Facebook prefer English since this social network was created in English _, and the use of the Internet and Facebook which leaves out many people _ there are only 1 million Lebanese Internet users and there's no telling how many have a Facebook account.

In discussing the link between religion and language choice and preference in the Lebanese context, Joseph (2004) mentions that during the Ottoman period, Arabic-French bilingualism became an important identity marker for certain (not all) Christian sects, notably the Maronites. Anyone who knew French was an educated Christian, and more specifically a Maronite or Roman Catholic. Someone who knew English was likely to be an educated Muslim or Orthodox Christian. Arabic, on the other hand, is the mother-tongue of nearly the whole native-born Lebanese population.

Shaaban and Ghaith (2002 & 2003), Suleiman (2003), Joseph (2004), and Diab (2009), among others, all found religion to be a factor that affects language choice and preference while

Esseili (2011) found that religion did not play an important role in determining the participants' language choices.

Describing the language situation and exploring the domains of language use are an integral part of the purpose of the current study.

The part of the questionnaire used by Esseili examining the language choices made by the Lebanese will be used in the present study since it provides a comprehensive list of situations a person may encounter and it provides the participants with four options of languages to choose from: SA, LA, French and English. This is important in the present study because one of its main aims is to provide an update on the language situation in Lebanon, and taking the SA / LA distinction into consideration helps the researcher explore the importance of SA in the daily life of the Lebanese. Although Esseili's population and purpose for examining language choice in Lebanon are very different from those of the present study, the part concerning language choice will be the same for the previously mentioned reasons.

Gender is a factor that will be studied, since, as Suleiman points out, females and males make different language choices simply because they are males and females. Therefore, gender is a factor that potentially affects language choice and as such, will be examined.

The discrepancy in the results concerning the effect religion has on language choice and use makes it interesting to examine whether religion is a determining factor for language choice in today's Lebanon.

D. Identity and Aspects of Identity

1. The Concept of Identity

Over the years, many studies have been conducted dealing with the concept of identity and the aspects of identity: social, personal, relational, and national identity. The following section provides an overview of these concepts as seen by many researchers.

The concept of identity has changed greatly from being a unidimensional concept into becoming a dynamic, multidimensional, context-dependent one. Identity was understood to go through phases of development in which an individual progresses in a linear manner until he/she “achieves” an identity (Jones, 2009). Another more recent model suggests that identity is a dynamic process of “constant becoming” _ as Wenger (1998) calls it _ closely linked to various socially constructed subject positions (Jones, 2009).

When research on identity was first conducted _ by first generation sociolinguists _, identity was viewed as a concept with easily defined social categories such as age, gender, socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, etc. A person belonged to one social group. Traditionally, identity was viewed in terms of belonging to one particular group, and what it meant for someone to belong to that group (Duff, 2002). In later research, and as a result of the development of sociocultural theory, researchers started to look at identity from a different perspective. Studies were conducted analyzing the manifestation of identity in discourse. And so the concept of identity came to be understood as shifting, as having multiplicity. Recent research deals with identity as a dynamic, multilayered, socially constructed process. A person belongs to many groups at one particular time and across a lifetime. One person can have multiple identities and choose to activate one _ or more _ of them at a particular time, in a specific context.

Not only does an individual perform different aspects of his / her personal identity in a given context, but he / she is also part of many communities _ such as family, the workplace, a friendship group, etc. _ at a particular time in their lives and across their lifespan (Eckert and Mc Connell-Ginet, 1995), which allows one to speak of “identities” _ what Joseph (2004) refers to as ‘multiplicity’ _ rather than one clearly defined “identity”.

Along the same lines, Jones (2009) states that identity is a social construct, and that one’s sense of self is derived from the many social identities one has. She cites Merchant et al. (2006) who think that two categories of identity exist: “anchored” identities which are profoundly influenced by a long history of socio cultural practice such as gender or religion, and “transient” identities, those which are more easily made, re-made, and un-made. For Parkinson and Crouch (2011), identity is (1) socially constructed, (2) something we do, not something we are, (3) something we rebuild every time we think or speak, (4) different according to the situation, and (5) negotiated with others, in the sense that it is not enough to assign a certain identity for ourselves; others need to accept this identity. Others also assign certain identities to us which we either embrace or resist. Lee, Wong & Azizah (2010) also assign an important role to “others” in the development of identity which they see as an unconscious, ongoing, dynamic, and evolving process. They say that identity is developed as a result of the interactions with others, the relationships with the outside world, and how one views himself / herself based on these interactions and relationships.

Studying identity construction or investigating how people negotiate their identities in different contexts is beyond the scope of the current study which aims at reporting on the perceptions of Lebanese students regarding different aspects of identity, which necessitates a discussion of the concept of identity.

Many aspects of identity _ namely personal identity, relational identity, social identity and national identity _ have been examined in different studies. The following section defines and explains each one of these facets / layers of identity and clarifies how they relate to one another.

2. Aspects of Identity

Personal identity, or what Joseph (2004) calls individual identity, sometimes referred to as self-identity, is a part that is unique to every individual. Individual identity is partly formed by ranking oneself in comparison to other individuals with the same group; it is 'constructed' based on the consciousness of other selves in comparison with the self. In this sense, individual identity is socially constructed (Joseph, 2004). Aspects of personal identity are professional status, nationality, ethnicity, gender or social class. Personal identity is the sum of the traits, values, private beliefs, and abilities that are unique to every individual (Cheek, Smith, and Tropp, 2002).

Every person has a 'multiplicity' of identities since first, everyone has various roles with respect to others _ one's identity shifts according to the context one is in _ and second, there are many versions of every person depending on the way people perceive his/her 'self'. This inclusion of the other in the self is relational identity. Relational identity reflects how we see ourselves in the context of our intimate relationships. It is pride in and validation from intimate others (Cheek, Smith, and Tropp, 2002).

As discussed above, earlier research on identity suggested that one belonged to one social group. However, later research shows that an individual can assume different social roles and therefore belong to several social groups at any given time or across his/her lifetime. Identity is socially constructed and individuals have multiple identities rather than one identity (Parkinson

and Crouch, 2011). Some of these social roles are continuous _ they expand over a lifetime such as mother, daughter, etc. _, and some are temporary _ they expand over a particular period of time such as student, employee, etc. The combination of the groups one chooses to belong to form his/her social identity. A main concept in social identity is salience. Having a salient identity is knowing which identity to activate based on the situation (Lengner, Hennigs, & Wiedmann, 2013). Joseph (2004) also discusses social identity, referring to it as group identity: each group one belongs to constitutes group identity, the group could be a nation or a town, a religion or sect, a school or club, a company or profession, or social class, to name a few.

Social identity is how an individual defines himself/herself, and how others define him/her (Velasquez, 2010). Individuals recognize that they are members of different groups, and it is this knowledge of themselves as members of groups that constitutes their social identity. These individuals seek to achieve a positive identity by comparing their group to other out groups. Language in this case plays a major role by either privileging certain groups _ if it is viewed as a language that conveys prestige or sophistication _ or by weakening other groups' view of themselves. This comparison results in what Giles and Johnson call "social competition", and social competition occurs when members of a certain group identify strongly with their social group _ whose members consider language as an important symbol of their identity. Although each individual is a member of many social groups, which are all part of his / her social identity, they are not all of the same importance in a specific context. It is only when the groups' linguistic characteristics are significant that one uses in-group speech markers. (Giles and Johnson, 1987)

Suleiman (2003) describes national identity as having a multi-dimensional nature making it difficult to account for its meaning. Both Suleiman (2004) and Joseph (2004) speak of a

national identity in the context of Lebanon. Joseph maintains that religion is one of the factors that define national identity for the Lebanese.

In an attempt to define the Lebanese national identity, Esseili (2011) argues that there are similarities such as traditions, common cuisine, national holidays, customs and language that constitute a “general” Lebanese national identity. However, defining the Lebanese national identity becomes very hard when the religious, social, political, etc. differences come into play because, as she says, the double nature that the country has: Arab and western, the Arab-Phoenician dichotomy, the existence of many religious and ethnic groups, and the use of many languages.

Lebanon has been described as suffering from “split personality” as a result of the complex linguistic situation (Sayigh, 1965); and inflicted with “schizophrenia” as a result of the double nature that the country has: Arab and western natures (Gordon, 1985). It has also been described as having an “identity crisis” (Kraidy, 1998) as a result of Arab-Phoenician dichotomy and the existence of many ethnic groups. (Esseili, 2011, p.60)

The factors that define Lebanese national identity, as viewed by Suleiman (2003) and Joseph (2004) are religion, history or as Fernandez (2009) calls it in the case of Lebanon, “the myth of common ancestry”, culture, and a common homeland.

Religion (as discussed in the literature review) is another important factor that will be studied since, as many researchers _ Shaaban and Ghaith, 2002; Suleiman, 2003; Joseph, 2004; Diab, 2009 _ have indicated, it is a major element of the Lebanese identity. Therefore, religion is a factor worth investigating.

The present study aims at exploring the perceptions of a particular age group, that between 18 and 25 years, on the importance of the four different identity aspects discussed in the literature review: personal, relational, social, and national identity.

E. Relevant Studies about Language and Identity

Razmjoo (2010) conducted a study in the Iranian context examining the impact the different aspects of identity have on Iranian learners' English language achievements. He also investigated whether a relationship exists between gender, educational level, and age and the different aspects of identity and language achievement. In order to do that, two different instruments were used: a questionnaire to identify different aspects of identity and a language achievement test to measure the achievement levels of the participants.

The questionnaire was distributed to 1700 language learners, but only 180 were completed since the rest of the participants didn't feel comfortable sharing information about their beliefs, attitudes and ideas.

The questionnaire was adopted from the fourth version of Cheek, Smith and Tropp's (2002) scale. Some items were deleted, some were added, and some were reworded. To enhance the validity of the Persian version of the questionnaire, it was translated back by two experts who confirmed that the original concepts were unchanged. To further ensure the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher ran a factor analysis of questionnaire items and the results indicated that "personal, relational, social and collective aspects of identity constitute four relatively distinct categories of identity attributes with adequate psychometric characteristics" (Razmjoo, 2010, p.109). As for the reliability of the questionnaire, Jowkar and Latifian (2006) ran the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of reliability and the indices were .63 for personal identity and .67

for social identity and .55 for ethnic/national identity. The researcher also calculated the reliability index for all five variables _ the indices were .55 for personal identity, .69 for social identity, .69 for ethnic/national identity, and .79 for relational identity _ and for all the items of the questionnaire _ the reliability index was .88. Therefore each factor alone and the combination of all the factors have acceptable reliability indices. (Razmjoo, 2010, p. 109)

The questionnaire that was used is relevant to the purposes of the present study, and therefore, a part of it will be used as part of the instrument for this study. The different aspects identified in the Iranian study are personal, social, collective _ or ethnic/national _ and relational. The four aspects will be thoroughly examined.

The data was analyzed using a combination of descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. The results of the study showed that none of the aspects of identity is a predicting variable for language achievement in the Iranian context. The only demographic variable that was found to affect two aspects of identity _ namely personal and relational _ was gender.

Another study conducted in the Lebanese context is that by Fatima Esseili (2011). The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of the spread of English on languages, national identity and the official language policy in Lebanon.

Esseili used mixed methods: field notes and in person observations supplemented with online observations, a questionnaire, and interviews.

The questionnaire consisted of four different parts. The first part elicited background information. The second part dealt with the participants' perceptions concerning Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Lebanese Arabic (LA). The third part dealt with the participants' perceptions toward and the function of the languages used in Lebanon (MSA, LA, French and

English). The final part of the questionnaire investigated some of the reasons behind code switching, a common phenomenon among Lebanese speakers.

The part of the questionnaire used by Esseili examining the language choices made by the Lebanese will be used in the present study. Although Esseili's population and purpose for examining language choice in Lebanon are very different from those of the present study, the part concerning language choice will be the same.

The participants weren't exclusively students, unlike participants in earlier research dealing with issues of language choice. The questionnaire was distributed, using Facebook, to 401 students, unemployed individuals and employees from different professions aging between 18 and 75. The participants were to complete the questionnaire in the language of their choice. The sample used for analysis though was 276, 38% of which were males and 62% were females. The average age of the participants was 28 years.

The third method used by Esseili was semi structured interviews which were conducted after the participants had completed the questionnaire. The interviews were used to "compensate for what the surveys could not obtain" and to gather in-depth information from teachers who use English as a medium of instruction. A total of 16 teachers and 35 regular participants were interviewed.

One of the major findings of the study is that foreign languages have spread in Lebanon in different venues such as street signs, ads, directions, shops, menus, restaurant names, etc. and English seems to be taking over French even when it comes to government-related issues which used to be in French _ the government used to circulate information using the French language. Other major findings concerning language use and choice include (1) religion wasn't found to be a predicting factor for language choice, which is contrary to what earlier studies had reported, (2)

the participants were equally interested in learning French and English; however, English was ranked as the most important language to learn by most participants. English was also the most preferred language to use in digital settings; French was the least preferred. (3) 92% said that Lebanese Arabic is Lebanon's mother tongue. (4) To communicate with close family members and friends, most participants preferred to use Lebanese Arabic. At work a combination of Lebanese Arabic, English and French is usually used. (5) For different situations _ such as talking about religion and internet topics, telling jokes, greeting, insulting, flirting, etc. _ the choices differed: some chose Lebanese Arabic, others English; very few chose French. (6) Finally, participants reported that Standard Arabic is the preferred language to use in three cases: talking about poetry and literature, reading newspapers, and reading books.

F. Language and Identity

There exists a relationship between language and identity, as explained in several studies. The following section will review some of these studies and will establish a relationship between the two concepts of language and identity.

Joseph (2006) explains that the language speakers choose to use, as well as having a productive function of giving people a sense of belonging to certain communities, also has a function of defining an "us" in opposition to a "them".

Language is a defining factor of the Lebanese national identity. Many consider the Lebanese Arabs because they speak Arabic. National belonging to many is determined by the language one speaks. Suleiman (2003) talks about the nature of the interaction between language and national identity and says that it is not always clear. He states that, based on "almost" universal agreement, language is a primary, if not the primary, ingredient that defines the Arab

nation. Al-Husri, the greatest ideologue of Arab nationalism according to Suleiman, was determined that language constituted, with history, the back bone of Arab national identity. For him, being an Arab came to be more or less synonymous with being an Arabic speaker. However, when one speaks of Arabic, it is not clear whether Standard Arabic or the colloquial variety of Arabic is in question. For some, such as Kamal Yusuf al-Hajj in Lebanon, Arabic in its standard form is one of the four ingredients _ along with political geography, political economy and history _ which mold the Lebanese national identity. For others, Arabic serves as a part of Lebanese national identity only in its colloquial form. The present study will include this distinction when investigating language choice, and will provide insight into whether Lebanese university students associate national identity with either Standard Arabic or Lebanese Arabic.

Suleiman (2004) views language as a form of cultural practice that links the members of a speech community to each other at a particular time and also links them to their history, to their past in which their cultural practices and ideological concerns are rooted. He thinks of language as an emblem of identity. He gives an example that stresses this function of language by telling a story about speaking Arabic with Israeli soldiers in Occupied Palestine and refusing to speak Hebrew or even English because, as he explains, speaking Arabic bonded him internally with other Palestinians, and externally vis-à-vis an occupying other. In such a situation of language contact, language choice helps the speaker achieve specific objectives.

Language is directly related to identity (Bailey, 2002; Jones, 2009; Velasquez, 2010). Linguistic forms and varieties are used in particular contexts for particular ends in highlighting certain aspects of an individual's identities (Bailey, 2002). Language is an important socio cultural factor that helps people establish and maintain social and even national identities (Jones, 2009). Jones (2009) mentions that to make sense of their experiences, people use language. The

continuous interaction between language and social contexts gives people the opportunity to understand their experiences in the world. Therefore, in the case of bilinguals, this suggests one of two things: either someone who speaks two languages experiences the world in two different ways, or a “bicultural identity” is created. Exploring the relationship between bilingualism and identity is at the core of this study, and it is important to note that bilingualism and identity are closely linked.

Individuals get to know life through the experiences they have, and language gives names to the items that constitute their experiences. Therefore, language allows people to form a “conception of self rather than simply *being*” themselves (Joseph, 2004, p. 11). In this sense, individual identity is linguistically constructed.

Scholars’ outlooks on the relationship between language and identity, in a bilingual setting, are divided into those who think that language has nothing to do with identity, in the sense that the speaker of a second language does not necessarily have to identify with the cultural background of the language he / she is speaking, and those who think that language is a marker of identity.

In a study conducted at a South African university exploring the relationship between language use and cultural identity, the participants were “aware of the instrumental value of proficiency in English in education” and viewed the growing power of English as a threat to their culture (Parkinson and Crouch, 2011, p. 86). In another study, students who had good mastery of English were experiencing “stigmatization as inauthentic Africans who spoke too much English” (Mc Kinney’s, 2007).

Asmah Haji Omar (1998) investigated the relationship between linguistic identity, an individual's ethnic heritage, and the place of linguistic identity in the individual as a member of a group. It was found that an individual's linguistic identity changes with the environment and situations of language use and with the individual's development. Lee Su Kim (2001; 2003; 2005; 2006) found that resentment of English was prevalent among Malay participants who perceived the use of English as an attempt to show off and as a betrayal of the Malay cultural identity while the non-Malay participants reported that they were viewed as being "too Westernized" because they only spoke English and weren't fluent in Mandarin.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The present study has four main aims to accomplish. First, this study aims at investigating the language choices that Lebanese university students report making in different contexts. Second, the study explores whether gender and religion are factors that are linked to language choice. Third, it aims at exploring which aspect of identity is considered by the Lebanese university students as the most important. Fourth, the study investigates whether gender and religion are factors that affect how the participants perceive the various aspects of identity. Last, the present study attempts to find whether there exists a relationship between language choice and the most important aspect of identity, which, if affirmed, will be investigated and defined.

This chapter starts by discussing the rationale of the present study and its purpose. Then, the research questions are introduced. And the last section of this chapter discusses the study design: the participants, the instrument, the data collection method, and the data analysis.

The studies conducted aiming to provide a representation of the languages used by Lebanese students _ reviewed in the previous chapter _ collected their data at English medium private universities and approached students that had already expressed favoritism for English by having chosen to get enrolled in an English medium institution. Moreover, the distinction between Standard Arabic (SA) and Lebanese Arabic (LA) was not made except in Esseili's (2011) study. The current study deals with these limitations first by providing data from both private and public institutions and from institutions that use French, English and Arabic as media

of instruction. The distinction between SA and LA is provided as part of the language options for the language choice part.

The present study addresses the issue of language choice based on the context. Many studies have been conducted investigating this issue, some of which are Ghaleb and Joseph (2000) and Esseili (2011). Most of the studies addressing this issue explore whether Lebanese speakers choose to speak Arabic, French, or English in any given situation. This study makes a further distinction within Arabic: Lebanese Arabic and Standard Arabic, a distinction also used in Esseili's work (2011) in the context of language choice in Lebanon. Therefore, the participants in this study have to specify whether by Arabic they mean Standard Arabic or the Lebanese colloquial variety of Arabic. Apart from that, this study also aims at providing an update on the distribution of languages depending on the situation.

Another important issue that is explored in this study is that of the aspect of identity (personal, relational, social or ethnic/national) which is viewed by the Lebanese youth as the most important aspect in determining their identity. The study will try to determine whether one aspect of identity is more likely to dominate others, and therefore form the basis for defining identity in Lebanon for future studies.

Regarding the second part _ the part about identity _, many studies have investigated the concept of national identity and the factors that form the Lebanese national identity (Joseph, 2004; Suleiman, 2003). Most studies conducted in the field of language and identity try to define identity and the various aspects that form an identity or in some cases, such as that of Lebanon, the different layers of one dynamic identity. Other studies investigate whether identity and language are correlated. However, no studies have tried to establish a relationship between language choice and specific aspects/layers of identity _ namely personal, social, relational and

national _ in Lebanon. Many studies deal with the different layers that form identity, but no study has tried to see whether one of these layers/aspects might dominate others in certain groups. In Lebanon this would help examine whether the future Lebanese generation has a stronger sense of social affiliation, national affiliation, or simply a personal sense of identity unique to each one. This study would provide a better understanding of the different Lebanese groups as having either individualistic or collectivistic tendencies, as belonging to their religious group, to their community, or to their country as a whole.

Then the relationship between language choice and the aspect of identity, if any, will be established and defined through the analysis of the data. Moreover, the relationship between language choice and the different aspects of identity and two essential factors in defining the identity of the Lebanese youth _ gender and religion _ will be explored.

A. Research Questions

The research questions investigated in the present study are the following:

1. What are the language choices made by the Lebanese educated youth in different situations?
2. Is there any significant difference between male and female young Lebanese regarding language choice?
3. Is there any significant difference between the different Lebanese religious groups regarding language choice?
4. Which aspect of identity is considered to be more important by the Lebanese youth?
5. Is there any significant difference between male and female young Lebanese regarding aspects of identity?

6. Is there any significant difference between the different Lebanese religious groups regarding language choice and aspects or categories of identity?
7. Is there any relationship between Lebanese youth's language choice and certain aspects of identity? If so, what aspect of identity (personal, relational, social or ethnic) is predicted through language choice?

B. Participants

The sample of the present study is 302 Lebanese university students between the ages of 18 and 25. Most university students in Lebanon belong to the 18 to 25 age group. Moreover, the chosen age group is part of the new generation and as such can tell us something about whether there has recently been a change in language choice habits in the given contexts.

In spring 2014, the researcher went to three different universities in Lebanon: two private universities, one in which the primary medium of instruction is English _ The American University of Beirut _, and one in which the primary medium of instruction is French _ Université Saint Joseph _, and one public university in which the primary medium of instruction is Arabic _ the Lebanese University, in specific the Faculties of Law, History and Arabic Literature. These faculties were chosen because they are some of the few faculties in which most courses are given in Arabic. A student of Law at the Lebanese University for example has to take a total of 44 courses in order to graduate, 36 of which are in Arabic and only 8 of which are either in French or in English _ mostly language courses _, depending on whether the student speaks French or English as a second language. It is almost the same number of courses for both Faculties of History and Literature. Table 1 shows the division of courses in these faculties.

Faculty	Law	Literature	History
Number of courses in Arabic	36	32	32
Number of courses in French or English	8	2	2

Table 1: Distribution of Courses in the Visited Faculties at the Lebanese University

The students that go to AUB, the students that go to USJ, and the students that go to the Lebanese University speak either French or English as a SL. AUB and USJ students usually come from families that have higher social statuses than the families of LU students since tuition fees at private universities in Lebanon are much higher than those at the Lebanese University. These universities were chosen to allow the researcher to collect data from students coming from different social, economic, and educational backgrounds in Lebanon.

The Iranian study carried out by Razmjoo (2010) included 180 participants, and the Lebanese study conducted by Fatima Esseili (2011) included 276 participants. Most sociolinguistic studies use around 100-150 questionnaires. However, since the present study compares between three universities, the researcher set out to collect a total of 360 questionnaires, some of which were disregarded based on two exclusion criteria: incompleteness and age (outside the set range).

120 questionnaires were distributed at each university. Table 2 shows how many questionnaires were collected, how many were disregarded based on either incompleteness or age, and how many were included in the study. 104 questionnaires were filled at USJ but 6 had to be disregarded, leaving 98 questionnaires to be included in the study. 110 questionnaires were

filled at the Lebanese University, 9 of which were not considered, leaving 101 questionnaires to be included. 107 were collected from AUB, 4 of which were incomplete, leaving 103 questionnaires to be included in the study. Thus, the researcher was left with a total of 302 questionnaires that fit the inclusion criteria.

University	Collected	Incomplete	Outside Age Range	Included in Study
USJ	104	4	2	98
LU	110	5	4	101
AUB	107	4	0	103
Total	321	13	6	302

Table 2: Number of questionnaires included in the study

C. Instrument

A questionnaire was used as the instrument for this study. Since this study aims at reporting on the choices made by students, it is a good idea to use an instrument that allows a big number of people to participate, thus yielding more representative quantitative data and results, as opposed to qualitative data where the researcher will have to limit him / herself to a few cases to keep from ending up with overwhelming data. Moreover, a questionnaire was chosen as the instrument of this study for the following reasons: low cost, efficiency, the ability to provide a “fair amount of basic information needed to describe the social scene”, and ability to help the researcher understand the relationship between different variables. (Esseili, 2011, p.70)

This study also examines the participants’ perception regarding which aspect of identity is more important, but it doesn’t investigate the construction and negotiation of identity/identities

which would have necessitated the use of a qualitative method. Therefore, given the purposes and scope of the present study, a questionnaire is the most appropriate instrument.

The present study employs a questionnaire made up of three parts as the data collection instrument. The first part of the questionnaire explores the demographic distribution of the chosen sample. The second part investigates the linguistic choices made by these participants. And the third part explores the importance of the different aspects of identity as viewed by the Lebanese participants.

The first part, the demographic information, will include the following factors, which are all important to understand the demographic distribution of the participants: religion, gender, age, native, second and third language.

The second part of the questionnaire is adopted from Fatima Esseili's PhD dissertation (2011). It investigates the language choices made by the educated Lebanese youth when speaking to different people and those made in different situations. What makes this part of the questionnaire different from all the studies conducted on the topic of language choice and use in Lebanon is the fact that the languages under investigation here are French, English and two different varieties of Arabic: Lebanese Arabic and Standard Arabic _ a distinction mentioned in Esseili's work in the context of language choice in Lebanon.

The third part is adopted from a study about language and identity in the Iranian context by Razmjoo (2010). This part explores the different aspects of identity and the importance of each to the different participants. The first 14 items deal with how important personal identity is to the participants. Items 15 through 22 investigate the importance of social identity. Items 23 through 26 explore the importance of relational identity, and the last 5 items explore the

importance of ethnic/national identity. A Likert scale was used. The participants had to answer on a Likert scale from 1 to 5, 1 being “extremely important”, 2 being “important”, 3 being “neutral”, 4 being “not so important” and 5 being “not important at all”.

The questionnaire contained a total of 71 items. The time needed to complete the questionnaire is estimated at 5-7 minutes.

Prior to conducting the study, and in order to verify that the estimated time is accurate and that all the items in the questionnaire are clear to the participants, a pilot study was conducted. The sample for the pilot study was 25 participants. The questionnaires collected for the pilot study were discarded and were not used as part of the 302 questionnaires that constituted the data for the study.

D. Data Collection

The researcher made two visits to each of three universities in Lebanon namely AUB, USJ and the Faculty of Law, Faculty of History and the Faculty of Arabic Literature at the Lebanese University in 2014.

Because the present study was conducted under IRB supervision, the researcher first obtained AUB’s approval to conduct part of the study off campus. Then, the approval of USJ and the Lebanese University to collect data on their campuses were sought out.

The researcher contacted instructors from the three universities. The instructors were chosen randomly from a list provided by the administration at each university. The researcher sent instructors an email (See Appendix I) and asked for their permission to visit their classes and to inform their students about the project: 6 instructors were contacted at AUB (they all

allowed the researcher to visit their classes), 10 at the Lebanese University (they all allowed the researcher to visit their classes), and 12 instructors were contacted at USJ (9 allowed the researcher to visit their classes). Then the researcher left the questionnaires with the students who filled them out. The researcher left a drop box where students can place the questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed in the morning and the drop box was collected from the classrooms in the late afternoon. The same procedure was followed in all three universities.

The questionnaire was given to AUB students in English (see Appendix A) since the primary language of instruction at AUB is English, to USJ students in French (see Appendix B) since the primary language of instruction there is French, and to Lebanese University students in Arabic (see Appendix C) since the primary language of instruction at the visited faculties is Arabic. The reason why the questionnaire was given in three languages was to ensure that all the participants at a specific university can answer it: AUB students definitely know English, USJ students definitely know French and Lebanese University students in the visited faculties definitely know Arabic. Forcing this choice on them however might represent a limitation for this study.

One hundred and twenty questionnaires were distributed at each university to make a total of 360 questionnaires overall. However, only 302 fit the inclusion criteria, so the sample size for this study is 302.

The data were entered to SPSS. Each part of the questionnaire was analyzed alone in order to draw conclusions regarding each research question alone. Then the relationships between the different parts were discussed.

The first part of the questionnaire helps the researcher divide the participants into different groups based on their religion, gender, and the native, second and third language they speak. The second part of the questionnaire provides an answer to the first three research questions _ language choice in different contexts, gender and language choice, and religion and language choice. The third part of the questionnaire provides an answer to the fourth fifth and sixth research questions _ importance of the four aspects of identity as perceived by the participants, gender and aspects of identity, and religion and aspects of identity. Relating and comparing the results of both the second and third part of the questionnaire provides an understanding of whether a relationship between language choice and aspects of identity exists.

The different categories (nominal variables) are the following: gender (male or female), religion (Maronite, Orthodox, Catholic, Druze, Sunni, Shiite, Protestant, or other), language choice (Standard Arabic, Lebanese Arabic, French, or English) and aspect of identity (social identity, personal identity, relational identity, or national identity).

Gender and religion are both independent variables. Language choice and aspect of identity are both dependent variables. This study provides quantitative data to establish some sort of relationship between the following variables: gender and language choice, religion and language choice, gender and personal identity, religion and personal identity, gender and social identity, religion and social identity, gender and relational identity, religion and relational identity, gender and national identity and religion and national identity. For each of the fore mentioned variables, there was a set of two hypotheses to be tested (the null hypothesis H0 and the alternative hypothesis H1).

First, the participants were subdivided by gender and religion, based on the first part of the questionnaire.

Second, the native (NL), second (SL), and third (TL) languages spoken were presented for all participants and then the distribution of the NL, SL, and TL by university was presented. Then the results regarding the language choices made by participants in each of the three categories of contexts _ daily communication and interaction, performing educational activities, and performing personal activities _ were shown, followed by a similar analysis of the different categories of contexts for the participants of each university.

In order to test the relationship between gender and language choice and religion and language choice, contingency tables were drawn and Chi square tests were computed using SPSS. Chi square tests can only be computed using actual numbers, not means or frequencies, so the actual numbers obtained by the questionnaires were used in this part of the data analysis process.

Concerning the third part of the questionnaire, tables show how important each aspect of identity is, separately. Every group of Lickert items represents one construct. Therefore, each construct will be discussed alone. The first 14 items, dealing with personal identity, were presented in a table showing the raw numbers, the means, standard deviations, standard scores (z scores) and composite scores. The second 8 questions, dealing with social identity, were presented in a different set of tables; the 4 questions dealing with relational identity were presented in a third set of tables, and the last 5 questions dealing with national identity were presented in a fourth set of tables.

In order to record the responses of the participants, first the scale was coded as follows: 1 represents “not important at all”, 2 represents “not so important”, 3 represents “neutral”, 4 represents “important”, and 5 represents “extremely important”. Then, means, standard

deviations, z scores and composite scores were calculated in order to draw conclusions concerning each construct, separately.

Composite scores are preferable from a statistical standpoint because they tend to provide a more reliable and valid measure of our construct. Composites are more reliable and valid because they combine information from multiple smaller, repeated measures of the construct. Without standardized scores, it is difficult to make comparisons. Standard scores allow us to make comparisons of raw scores that come from very different sources. (Stevens, 2016)

To examine whether a relationship exists between gender and the four aspects of identity and between religion and the four aspects of identity, a Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted.

Once the relationships _ or lack of _between the different variables were established, through the comparison of the obtained results indicating the different language choices made by the Lebanese youth and the aspect of identity considered as the most important, Kendall's tau b was computed in order to see how strong the relationship, if any, was.

The results and tables are shown in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In order (1) to examine the language choices made by Lebanese university students, (2) to investigate whether language choice is affected by gender and/or religion, (3) to explore the views of Lebanese university students on the importance of the different aspects of identity _ personal, social, relational, and national _ , and (4) to examine whether gender and/or religion affect the level of importance with which the different aspects of identity are perceived, a questionnaire was distributed at AUB, USJ, and LU. 103 questionnaires from AUB, 98 from USJ, and 101 from LU are included in this study. The responses were entered to SPSS, and the results are discussed in this chapter.

This chapter consists of eight different parts. The first part discusses the pilot study. The second part provides information about the demographic distribution of the sample first in terms of gender and religion, and then in terms of native, second, and third languages spoken by all participants, and compares between the participants' native, second, and third languages for each of the three universities that were visited for data collection. The third part discusses language choice. The different contexts given in the questionnaire are divided into three categories: daily communication and interaction, educational activities, and personal activities. In this part, language choice is discussed by category across the three universities. The fourth part reports on the Chi Square test results in order to show whether a relationship exists between the different categories of contexts and gender. The fifth part deals with the categories of contexts and religion by way of looking at Chi Square tests. The sixth part reports on how important the aspects of identity in question are viewed by all the participants in this study and compares

between the answers given in each university. The seventh and eighth parts report on the results of the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) in order to explore the relationship between the aspects of identity and gender _ seventh part _, and the relationship between the aspects of identity and religion _ the eighth part.

A. Instrument

A pilot study was conducted involving 25 participants whose age range, gender and religious distribution reflected that targeted in the study. The time estimated for completing the questionnaire was proven to be accurate _ 5 to 7 minutes. The items on the questionnaire were all clear.

In addition to checking for clarity, the pilot was used to provide reliability statistics concerning the constructs in the third part of the questionnaire: aspects of identity. Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each construct, and the results came in as follows.

The personal identity subscale consisted of 14 items ($\alpha = .817$). The social identity subscale consisted of 8 items ($\alpha = .76$). The relational identity subscale consisted of 4 items ($\alpha = .704$). The national identity subscale consisted of 5 items ($\alpha = .849$). The Cronbach's Alpha values presented in this paragraph indicate that all the items do in fact measure the intended underlying constructs.

B. Results

1. Demographic Distribution of Sample

As indicated in the methodology chapter, the researcher collected a total of 360 questionnaires. Some questionnaires were disregarded because they were incomplete or the age was outside the set range. 120 questionnaires were distributed at each university _ AUB, USJ and the Lebanese University (LU). 103 questionnaires at AUB, 98 questionnaires at USJ, and 101 questionnaires at LU fit the inclusion criteria. Thus, the researcher was left with a total of 302 questionnaires.

The demographic distribution of the sample based on gender and religious sect is shown in Table 3.

		Sex				Total	Percentage %
		Male	Percentage	Female	Percentage		
Religion	Sunni	18	5.9	29	9.6	47	15.5
	Shiite	24	7.9	44	14.7	68	22.5
	Druze	2	0.7	6	2	8	2.6
	Maronite	28	9.3	51	16.9	79	26.2
	Catholic	5	1.7	18	5.9	23	7.6
	Orthodox	17	5.6	17	5.6	34	11.3
	Protestant	0	0	2	0.7	2	0.7
	None	5	1.7	1	0.3	6	2
	Other	2	0.7	4	1.3	6	2
	No Answer	11	3.6	18	5.9	29	9.6
Total		112	37.1	190	62.9	302	100

Table 3: Distribution by Gender and Religion

112 males took part in the present study (37.1%) and 190 females (62.9%). Concerning religion, 123 of the participants identify themselves as Muslims (40.7 %), 138 identify themselves as Christians (45.7 %), and 41 participants identify themselves as neither (13.6%).

The first part of the questionnaire also elicited information about the native, second and third languages spoken by the participants. Table 4 provides information concerning the languages spoken by the participants.

	Arabic	%	French	%	English	%	Other	%	Total
NL	270	89.4	18	6	13	4.3	1	0.3	302
SL	24	8	187	61.9	86	28.5	5	1.6	302
TL	8	2.6	54	17.9	198	65.6	42	13.9	302

Table 4: Languages Spoken by Participants

The majority of the participants (89.4%) speak Arabic as a native language (NL). It is expected since all the participants are Lebanese that the majority speak Arabic as their native language. As for the second language (SL) spoken by the participants, most participants (61.9%) speak French and 28.5% speak English as a second language. Most participants (65.6%) speak English and 17.9% speak French as a third language (TL).

The participants who reported speaking French as a second language speak English as a third language. However, the number of the participants who speak English as a third language is higher than that of participants who speak French as a second language. The reason behind this

difference is that of the 18 participants who reported speaking French as a native language, 12 speak Arabic as a second language and English as a third language.

The following tables show the breakdown of languages in each university. Table 5 reports on the native language of the participants, table 6 on their second language, and table 7 on their third language.

University	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Arabic	83	80.6	88	89.8	99	98.0
French	8	7.8	9	9.2	1	1.0
English	11	10.7	1	1.0	1	1.0
Other	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	103	100.0	98	100.0	101	100.0

Table 5: Native Language of Participants by University

At AUB, where the language of instruction is English, 83 (80.6%) speak Arabic as a native language. At USJ, where the language of instruction is French, 88 (89.8%) speak Arabic as a native language. At the Lebanese University (LU), in specific the faculties of Arabic Literature, History, and Law, where the language of instruction is Arabic, 99 (98%) of the participants reported having Arabic as a native language.

Since the participants in this study are Lebanese, it is expected that a significant majority of participants speak Arabic as a native language.

University	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Arabic	16	15.5	7	7.1	1	1.0
French	25	24.3	82	83.7	80	79.2
English	59	57.3	8	8.2	19	18.8
Other	3	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
FR & EN	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0
No SL	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	103	100.0	98	100.0	101	100.0

Table 6: Second Language of Participants by University

As for the second language spoken by AUB participants, 59 (57.3%) speak English as a second language and 25 (24.3%) speak French. It is expected that more AUB students speak English rather than French as a second language. However, a good number of AUB students (almost 25%) speak French as a second language.

82 (83.7%) participants from USJ reported speaking French as a second language and only 8 (8.2%) reported speaking English. This reflects the fact that most USJ students went to French medium schools, which is expected since the language of instruction at USJ is French.

As for the second language spoken by the participants from LU, 80 (79.2%) speak French and 19 (18.8%) speak English which shows that LU students mostly come from French medium schools.

University	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Arabic	4	3.9	3	3.1	1	1.0
French	35	34.0	6	6.1	13	12.9
English	33	32.0	87	88.8	78	77.2
Other	3	2.9	1	1.0	2	2.0
No TL	28	27.2	1	1.0	7	6.9
Total	103	100.0	98	100.0	101	100.0

Table 7: Third Language of Participants by University

35 (34%) AUB participants speak French as a third language, 33 (32%) speak English, and 28 (27.2%) do not speak a third language. The number of participants that speak English (33) as a third language is superior to that of participants who speak French (25) as a second language. This is justified by the fact that of the 33 participants, 8 participants speak French as a native language, Arabic as a second and English as a third language.

As for the third language spoken by USJ participants, 87 (88.8%) speak English as a third language. This shows that students who go to French medium schools usually speak three languages _ there was only one participant that does not speak a third language.

Of the 101 participants from LU, 78 (77.2%) speak English and 13 (12.9%) speak French as a third language. Since most LU students come from French medium schools, it is expected that a high percentage of them speak three languages, just like USJ students.

2. Language Choice

The second part of the questionnaire explores the different language choices that the Lebanese university students in this study reported they would make in the different situations given in the questionnaire. The different situations are divided into 3 categories (See Methodology): daily communication and interaction, performing educational activities, and performing personal activities. The following parts discuss language choice in the different contexts, then in relation to gender, then religion.

a. Daily Communication and Interaction

The following tables show the language choices that the participants reported they would make in the first category of contexts given in the questionnaire: daily communication and interaction.

Table 8 shows how many participants would use Lebanese Arabic when communicating with the people in their lives.

Daily Communication	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mother	76	73.8	78	79.6	93	92.1
Father	85	82.5	87	88.8	97	96.0
Siblings	51	49.5	69	70.4	85	84.2
Grandfather	95	92.2	91	92.9	98	97.0
Grandmother	89	86.4	91	92.9	100	99.0
Friends	34	33	40	40.8	74	73.3
Partner/husband/boyfriend	38	36.9	48	49.0	76	75.2
Boss	32	31.1	37	37.8	76	75.2
Waiter	69	67	78	79.6	84	83.2
Doctor	53	51.5	45	45.9	76	75.2
Maid	35	34	43	43.9	58	57.4
Coworkers	49	47.6	47	48.0	75	74.3

Table 8: Lebanese Arabic in Daily Communication by University

Lebanese Arabic (LA) is used by the majority LU participants in daily communication and interaction _ between 84 and 99% when speaking to family members, and between 73 and 83% when talking to friends, partners, bosses, waiters, doctors, and coworkers. The lowest percentage for speaking LA for daily communication was in the case of maids _ 57.4%.

LA is also used by the majority of AUB and USJ participants when communicating with their mothers _ 73.8 and 79.6% respectively _, fathers _ 82.5 and 88.8% respectively _, grandmothers _ 86.4 and 92.9% respectively, grandfathers _ 92.2 and 92.9% respectively _, and waiters _ 67 and 79.6% respectively _, but LA is used to a lesser extent by these participants when communicating with siblings _ 49.5% for AUB students and 70.4% for USJ students _ ,

friends _ 33 and 40.5% respectively _, partners _ 36.9 and 49% respectively _, bosses _ 31.1 and 37.8% respectively, doctors _ 51.5 and 45.9% respectively, maids _ 34 and 43.9% respectively _, and coworkers _ 47.6 and 48% respectively.

Table 9 shows how many participants would use Standard Arabic or a combination of Standard Arabic with another language when communicating and interacting with people on a daily basis.

Daily Communication	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mother	0	0	0	0	0	0
Father	0	0	0	0	0	0
Siblings	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandfather	0	0	1	1.0	0	0
Grandmother	0	0	0	0	0	0
Friends	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partner/husband/boyfriend	0	0	1	1.0	1	1.0
Boss	4	3.9	1	1.0	3	3.0
Waiter	2	1.9	1	1.0	1	1.0
Doctor	2	1.9	0	0	0	0
Maid	2	1.9	0	0	2	2.0
Coworkers	1	1	0	0	2	2.0

Table 9: Standard Arabic or a Combination of SA with Another Language in Daily Communication by University

A negligible number of people use Standard Arabic (SA) in daily communication and interaction as the participants from all three universities have reported. The highest percentage is reported when speaking to one's boss: 3.9% of AUB participants, 1% for USJ participants, and 3% of LU participants.

Table 10 shows how many participants would use French when interacting with the people in their lives.

Daily Communication	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mother	4	3.9	9	9.2	2	2.0
Father	3	2.9	8	8.2	0	0
Siblings	8	7.8	13	13.3	1	1.0
Grandfather	2	1.9	2	2.0	1	1.0
Grandmother	4	3.9	4	4.1	0	0
Friends	9	8.7	13	13.3	2	2.0
Partner/husband/boyfriend	10	9.7	10	10.2	0	0
Boss	1	1	36	36.7	3	3.0
Waiter	0	0	1	1.0	1	1.0
Doctor	4	3.9	24	24.5	5	5.0
Maid	2	1.9	12	12.2	1	1.0
Coworkers	1	1	19	19.4	2	2.0

Table 10: French in Daily Communication by University

The highest percentages for using French for daily communication are reported by USJ participants; the lowest are reported by LU participants.

13.3% of USJ participants reported they would use French to communicate with their siblings, 13.3% with their friends, 10.2% with their partners, 36.7% with their bosses, 24.5% with their doctors, 12.2% with maids, 19.4% with coworkers. As for AUB participants, the percentage of those who would use French in daily communication is low. The highest percentages reported for using French by AUB participants are 8.7% when talking to friends and 9.7% when communicating with partners. LU participants reported mostly not using French in daily communication.

Table 11 shows how many participants would use English to speak to people daily.

Daily Communication	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mother	7	6.8	0	0	2	2.0
Father	5	4.9	0	0	1	1.0
Siblings	22	21.4	2	2.0	3	3.0
Grandfather	3	2.9	2	2.0	1	1.0
Grandmother	5	4.9	2	2.0	1	1.0
Friends	22	21.4	3	3.1	4	4.0
Partner/husband/boyfriend	20	19.4	2	2.0	4	4.0
Boss	49	47.6	4	4.1	4	4.0
Waiter	16	15.5	4	4.1	6	5.9
Doctor	21	20.4	3	3.1	5	5.0
Maid	39	37.9	30	30.6	26	25.7
Coworkers	26	25.2	1	1.0	2	2.0

Table 11: English in Daily Communication by University

The participants from AUB reported they would use English more than those from USJ and LU in daily communication and interaction. English plays a relatively important role compared to French in daily communication for AUB students, but not for USJ or LU students.

21.4% of AUB participants would use English to communicate with their siblings, 21.4% with friends, 19.4% with their partners, 47.6% with their bosses, 15.5% with waiters, 20.4% with their doctors, 37.9% with maids, 25.2% with coworkers. On the other hand, very few of USJ and LU participants reported using English in daily communication except when speaking to maids _ 30.6% of USJ participants and 25.7% of LU participants use English with maids.

Table 12 shows how many participants would use a combination of two languages _ LA and FR, LA and EN, or FR and EN _ when communicating with the people in their lives.

Daily Communication	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mother	16	15.5	11	11.2	4	4.0
Father	10	9.7	3	3.0	3	3.0
Siblings	22	21.4	11	11.2	7	6.9
Grandfather	3	2.9	2	2.0	1	1.0
Grandmother	5	4.9	1	1.0	0	0
Friends	31	30.1	25	25.5	5	5.0
Partner/husband/boyfriend	30	29.1	30	30.5	5	5.0
Boss	16	15.6	16	16.3	8	7.9
Waiter	15	14.6	14	14.3	6	5.9
Doctor	22	21.4	23	23.5	12	11.9
Maid	24	23.3	12	12.3	12	11.9
Coworkers	22	21.4	21	21.4	9	8.9

Table 12: Combination of two Languages in Daily Communication by University

The use of two languages simultaneously in daily communication is reportedly more common among students of AUB and USJ than among LU students. Code switching is more likely to take place in universities where the medium of instruction is either French or English rather than Arabic.

AUB and USJ participants reported using a combination of two languages in most daily communication contexts _ percentages range between 14.6 and 30.1% for AUB participants and between 11.2 and 30.5% for USJ participants _ except for three contexts: when talking to grandfathers, grandmothers and fathers _ 2.9 to 9.7% for AUB participants and 1 to 3% for USJ participants.

Table 13 shows how many participants would use Lebanese Arabic, French and English when communicating with the people in their lives.

Daily Communication	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mother	0	0	0	0	0	0
Father	0	0	0	0	0	0
Siblings	0	0	2	2.0	5	5.0
Grandfather	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandmother	0	0	0	0	0	0
Friends	7	6.8	17	17.3	16	15.8
Partner/husband/boyfriend	5	4.9	7	7.1	15	14.9
Boss	1	1	3	3.1	7	6.9
Waiter	1	1	0	0	3	3.0
Doctor	1	1	3	3.1	3	3.0
Maid	1	1	1	1.0	2	2.0
Coworkers	4	3.9	10	10.2	9	8.9

Table 13: Combination of Three Languages (LA, FR, and EN) in Daily Communication by University

Code switching using three languages is only used in three cases by all participants: when communicating with friends, partners, and coworkers. Higher percentages for using three languages simultaneously were reported by USJ and LU participants _ 17.3% of USJ participants and 15.8% of LU participants would use three languages to communicate with their friends, 7.1% of USJ participants and 14.9% of LU participants would use three languages to interact

with partners, and 10.2% of USJ participants and 8.9% of LU participants reported they would use three languages to speak to coworkers _ rather than AUB students _ 6.8, 4.9 and 3.9% of AUB participants would use three languages to interact with friends, partners, and coworkers respectively.

In daily communication and interaction, LA is the language used by the highest percentage of the participants in all three universities. SA is not used for daily communication by the participants irrespective of the university they go to. French is most widely used by USJ participants, not used at all by LU participants, and only used in low percentages in interacting with friends and partners by AUB participants. English is most widely used by AUB participants in all contexts of daily communication. A combination of two languages is used in all cases of daily interaction contexts by AUB and USJ participants, but not by LU participants. A combination of three languages is used in only three contexts _ friends, partners, and coworkers _ by participants from all three universities.

b. Educational Activities

The second category of situations is performing educational activities, which includes speaking to teachers, discussing literature, discussing scientific topics, reading newspapers, reading books, writing emails, reading academic articles and books, and reading for pleasure.

Table 14 shows how many participants reported they would use Lebanese Arabic when performing educational activities at AUB, USJ, and LU.

Educational Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	9	8.7	5	5.1	23	22.8
Literature	21	20.4	21	21.4	22	21.8
Scientific	8	7.8	9	9.2	13	12.9
Newspaper	15	14.6	19	19.4	19	18.8
Books	3	2.9	5	5.1	6	5.9
Emails	2	1.9	4	4.1	23	22.8
Academic	3	2.9	4	4.1	13	12.9
Pleasure	8	7.8	13	13.3	25	24.8

Table 14: Lebanese Arabic in Educational Activities by University

To perform educational activities, LA is most used by LU participants in all contexts except for reading books. AUB and USJ participants use LA in only two cases: to discuss literature _ 20.4% of AUB participants and 21.4% of USJ participants _ and to read newspapers _ 14.6% of AUB participants and 19.4% of USJ participants.

Table 15 shows how many participants reported they would use Standard Arabic or a combination of Standard Arabic with another language when performing educational activities.

Educational Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	7	6.8	7	7.1	36	35.8
Literature	16	15.5	13	13.3	73	72.3
Scientific	6	5.8	1	1.0	15	14.9
Newspaper	26	25.2	16	16.3	71	70.3
Books	15	15.6	13	13.3	71	70.3
Emails	2	1.9	2	2.0	22	21.8
Academic	9	8.7	5	5.1	57	56.4
Pleasure	17	16.5	12	12.2	54	53.5

Table 15: Standard Arabic or a Combination of SA with Another Language in Educational Activities by University

It is mostly LU participants that would use SA in educational contexts. 35.8% of LU participants would communicate with their teachers using SA, 72.3% would use SA to discuss literature, 14.9% would use SA to discuss scientific topics, 70.3% would read the newspaper in SA, 70.3% would use SA to read books, 21.8% would send emails in SA, 56.4% would read academic articles in SA, and 53.5% would use SA to read for pleasure.

Some AUB and USJ participants would use SA in some cases: to discuss literature _ 13.3% of USJ participants and 15.5% of AUB participants _, to read the newspaper _ 25.2% of AUB participants and 16.3% of USJ participants _, to read books _ 15.6% of AUB participants and 13.3% of USJ participants _ and to read for pleasure _ 16.5% of AUB participants and 12.2% of USJ participants.

Table 16 shows how many participants reported they would use French when performing educational activities.

Educational Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	0	0	65	66.3	19	18.8
Literature	16	15.5	48	49.0	4	4.0
Scientific	6	5.8	59	60.2	38	37.6
Newspaper	7	6.8	33	33.7	4	4.0
Books	9	8.7	40	40.8	4	4.0
Emails	1	1.0	27	27.6	7	6.9
Academic	2	1.9	53	54.1	9	8.9
Pleasure	8	7.8	37	37.8	3	3.0

Table 16: French in Educational Activities by University

It is mostly USJ participants who would use French in performing educational activities. 66.3% of USJ participants would use French to communicate with teachers, 49% would use French to discuss literature, 60.2% would use French to discuss scientific topics, 33.7% would use French to read the newspaper, 40.8% would use French to read books, 27.6% would send emails in French, 54.1% would use French to read academic articles, and 37.8% would use French to read for pleasure.

AUB and LU participants would rarely use French in educational contexts. 15.5% of AUB participants reported they would use French in only one of the contexts which is to discuss

literature. 18.8% of LU participants reported they would use French to communicate with teachers and 37.6% reported they would use French to discuss scientific topics.

Table 17 shows how many participants reported they would use English when performing educational activities.

Educational Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	67	65.0	1	1.0	6	5.9
Literature	37	35.9	4	4.1	1	1.0
Scientific	65	63.1	8	8.2	15	14.9
Newspaper	41	39.8	9	9.2	1	1.0
Books	56	54.4	13	13.3	8	7.9
Emails	92	89.3	29	29.6	23	22.8
Academic	75	72.8	11	11.2	8	7.9
Pleasure	56	54.4	16	16.3	6	5.9

Table 17: English in Educational Activities by University

Mostly, English is used by AUB students in educational contexts: 65% of AUB participants reported they would use English to speak to teachers, 35.9% would use English to discuss literature, 63.1% would use English to discuss scientific topics, 39.8% would use English to read the newspaper, 54.4% read books in English, 89.3% send emails in English, 72.8% use English to read academic articles, and 54.4% read in English for pleasure.

It is also used by USJ participants and LU participants but to a lesser extent. 13.3% of USJ participants read books in English, 29.6% send emails in English, 11.2% discuss academic topics in English, and 16.3% read in English for pleasure. 14.9% of LU participants use English to discuss scientific topics and 22.8% send emails in English.

Table 18 shows how many participants would use a combination of two languages _ LA and FR, LA and EN, or FR and EN _ when performing educational activities.

Educational Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	17	16.5	17	17.3	10	9.9
Literature	13	12.6	12	12.2	0	0
Scientific	18	17.5	19	19.4	14	13.9
Newspaper	14	13.6	18	18.4	4	4.0
Books	20	19.5	24	24.5	7	6.9
Emails	5	4.8	31	31.6	17	16.9
Academic	14	13.6	24	24.5	10	9.9
Pleasure	14	13.6	17	17.3	10	9.9

Table 18: Combination of Two Languages in Educational Activities by University

The use of two languages in educational contexts is found in all three universities but the frequency of occurrence in the three universities is low. The highest percentages for the use of two languages in educational contexts are: 19.5% of AUB participants read books in two different languages, 31.6% of USJ participants and 16.9% of LU participants send emails using two languages.

Table 19 shows how many participants would use Lebanese Arabic, French and English when performing educational activities.

Educational Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	3	2.9	3	3.1	7	6.9
Literature	0	0	0	0	1	1.0
Scientific	0	0	2	2.0	6	5.9
Newspaper	0	0	3	3.1	2	2.0
Books	0	0	3	3.1	5	5.0
Emails	1	1.0	5	5.1	9	8.9
Academic	0	0	1	1.0	4	4.0
Pleasure	0	0	3	3.1	3	3.0

Table 19: Combination of Three Languages in Educational Activities by University

AUB participants don't use a combination of LA, French, and English when performing educational activities. Very few USJ participants reported they would use a combination of LA, French, and English in educational contexts. A low percentage of LU participants _ 6.9% to communicate with teachers and 8.9% to write emails _ reported they would use a combination of LA, French and English to perform educational activities.

LA is used by LU participants to perform educational activities, and LA is only used in two cases for AUB and USJ participants: to discuss literature and to read newspapers. SA plays an important role in performing educational activities as it is used by LU participants in all contexts and by AUB and USJ participants in 50% of the contexts: to discuss literature, to read

newspapers, to read books, and to read for pleasure. French is predominantly used by USJ participants to perform educational activities. English is predominantly used by AUB participants. It is also used by USJ participants in 50% of the given contexts: to read books, to send emails, to read academic articles, and to read for pleasure. A combination of two languages and a combination of three languages isn't used much by the participants in this study. Code switching is more commonly used for the purpose of daily communication and interaction than it is for educational activities.

c. Personal Activities

The third category of contexts is performing personal activities, which includes discussing religion, discussing intimate topics, telling jokes, insulting someone, greeting people, asking someone out, expressing anger, ordering food, completing job applications, sending personal emails, discussing taboo subjects, chatting, and texting.

Table 20 shows how many participants reported they would use Lebanese Arabic when performing personal activities.

Personal Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion	55	53.4	66	67.3	59	58.4
Intimate Topics	33	32.0	42	42.9	64	63.4
Tell Jokes	62	60.2	77	78.6	85	84.2
Insult Someone	63	61.2	69	70.4	77	76.2
Greet	40	38.8	24	24.5	34	33.7
Ask a (wo)man out	42	40.8	35	35.7	73	72.3
Express Anger	61	59.2	63	64.3	90	89.1
Order Food	46	44.7	62	63.3	60	59.4
Job Application	2	1.9	9	9.2	14	13.9
Personal Email	4	3.9	8	8.2	32	31.7
Taboo Subjects	33	32.0	41	41.8	63	62.4
Chat	32	31.1	27	27.6	80	79.2
Text Messages	18	17.5	23	23.5	28	27.7

Table 20: Lebanese Arabic in Personal Activities by University

Most participants in all three universities use LA to perform personal activities except for completing job applications and writing personal emails for AUB and USJ participants.

Percentages of participants who use LA to perform personal activities range between 17.5 and 61.2% for AUB participants, between 23.5 and 78.6% for USJ participants, and between 27.7 and 89.1% for LU participants.

Table 21 shows how many participants reported they would use Standard Arabic or a combination of Standard Arabic with another language when performing personal activities.

Personal Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion	16	15.5	12	12.2	38	37.6
Intimate Topics	3	2.9	1	1.0	9	8.9
Tell Jokes	1	1.0	2	2.0	6	5.9
Insult Someone	3	2.9	1	1.0	6	5.9
Greet	7	6.8	2	2.0	20	19.8
Ask a (wo)man out	2	1.9	2	2.0	2	2.0
Express Anger	3	2.9	1	1.0	1	1.0
Order Food	2	1.9	0	0	1	1.0
Job Application	3	2.9	6	6.1	41	40.6
Personal Email	3	2.9	5	5.1	18	17.8
Taboo Subjects	0	0	0	0	19	18.8
Chat	2	1.9	2	2.0	3	3.0
Text Messages	3	2.9	2	2.0	33	32.7

Table 21: Standard Arabic or a Combination of SA with Another Language in Personal Activities by University

SA is used by AUB and USJ participants mostly in the case of discussing religion _ 15.5% of AUB participants and 12.2% of USJ participants _ but not to perform other personal activities. However, SA plays a more significant role for LU participants who would use it in performing certain personal activities such as discussing religion (37.6%), greeting (19.8%), completing job applications (40.6%), writing personal emails (17.8%), discussing taboo subjects (18.8%), and writing text messages (32.7%).

Table 22 shows how many participants reported they would use French when performing personal activities.

Personal Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion	4	3.9	9	9.2	0	0
Intimate Topics	6	5.3	23	23.5	5	5.0
Tell Jokes	2	1.9	6	6.1	2	2.0
Insult Someone	2	1.9	9	9.2	1	1.0
Greet	5	4.9	33	33.7	9	8.9
Ask a (wo)man out	5	4.9	31	31.6	2	2.0
Express Anger	2	1.9	8	8.2	0	0
Order Food	0	0	5	5.1	2	2.0
Job Application	1	1.0	38	38.8	10	9.9
Personal Email	2	1.9	24	24.5	9	8.9
Taboo Subjects	4	3.9	23	23.5	1	1.0
Chat	5	4.9	15	15.3	1	1.0
Text Messages	5	4.9	16	16.3	3	3.0

Table 22: French in Personal Activities by University

French is mostly used by USJ participants to perform personal activities. 9.2% of USJ participants would use French to discuss religion, 23.5% to discuss intimate topics, 33.7% to greet someone, 31.6% to ask someone out, 38.8% to complete job applications, 24.5% to write

personal emails, 23.5% to discuss taboo subjects, 15.3% to chat, and 16.3% to write text messages.

French doesn't play a key role in performing personal activities for AUB and LU participants.

Table 23 shows how many participants reported they would use English when performing personal activities.

Personal Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion	15	14.6	2	2.0	1	1.0
Intimate Topics	40	38.8	12	12.2	7	6.9
Tell Jokes	14	13.6	2	2.0	2	2.0
Insult Someone	13	12.6	8	8.2	9	8.9
Greet	20	19.4	5	5.1	11	10.9
Ask a (wo)man out	34	33.0	7	7.1	11	10.9
Express Anger	19	18.4	4	4.1	1	1.0
Order Food	28	27.2	7	7.1	12	11.9
Job Application	89	86.4	20	20.4	22	21.8
Personal Email	90	87.4	25	25.5	19	18.8
Taboo Subjects	42	40.8	6	6.1	3	3.0
Chat	25	24.3	13	13.3	3	3.0
Text Messages	34	33.0	13	13.3	11	10.9

Table 23: English in Personal Activities by University

English is mostly used by AUB participants to perform personal activities. 14.6% of AUB participants reported they would use English to discuss religion, 38.8% to discuss intimate topics, 13.6% to tell jokes, 12.6% to insult someone, 19.4% to greet someone, 33% to ask someone out, 18.4% to express anger, 27.2% to order food, 86.4% to complete a job application, 87.4% to write personal emails, 40.8% to discuss taboo subjects, 24.3% to chat, and 33% to write text messages.

English is also used by USJ and LU participants but to a much lesser extent. The use of English by participants from USJ and LU is most common in two cases: to complete job applications and to send personal emails.

Table 24 shows how many participants would use a combination of two languages when performing personal activities.

Personal Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion	12	11.7	9	9.2	1	1.0
Intimate Topics	19	18.4	17	17.4	8	7.9
Tell Jokes	21	20.4	11	11.2	2	2.0
Insult Someone	19	18.4	8	8.2	5	5.0
Greet	27	26.2	22	22.4	11	10.9
Ask a (wo)man out	19	18.4	19	19.4	7	6.9
Express Anger	17	16.5	21	21.4	8	7.9
Order Food	26	25.2	21	21.4	17	16.8
Job Application	8	7.8	20	20.4	14	13.9
Personal Email	4	3.9	31	31.6	13	12.9
Taboo Subjects	21	20.4	23	23.5	11	10.9
Chat	33	32.0	27	27.6	7	6.9
Text Messages	35	34.0	29	29.6	15	14.9

Table 24: Combination of Two Languages in Personal Activities by University

The use of two languages simultaneously is more common at AUB and USJ than at LU. 20.4% of AUB participants would use a combination of two languages to tell jokes. 26.2% of AUB participants and 22.4% of USJ participants would use a combination of two languages to greet someone. 25.2% of AUB participants and 21.4% of USJ participants would use a combination of two languages to order food at a restaurant. To discuss taboo subjects, 20.4% of AUB participants and 23.5% of USJ participants would use a combination of two languages. 32% of AUB participants and 27.6% of USJ participants would use a combination of two

languages to chat. 34% of AUB participants and 29.6% of USJ participants would use a combination of two languages to write text messages. USJ participants use a combination of two languages in the following cases as well: to express anger (21.4%), to complete job applications (20.4%), and to write personal emails (31.6%).

Table 25 shows how many participants would use Lebanese Arabic, French and English when performing personal activities.

Personal Activities	AUB		USJ		LU	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion	1	1.0	0	0	2	2.0
Intimate Topics	2	1.9	3	3.1	8	7.9
Tell Jokes	3	2.9	0	0	4	4.0
Insult Someone	3	2.9	3	3.1	3	3.0
Greet	4	3.9	12	12.2	16	15.8
Ask a (wo)man out	1	1.0	4	4.1	6	5.9
Express Anger	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
Order Food	1	1.0	3	3.1	9	8.9
Job Application	0	0	5	5.1	0	0
Personal Email	0	0	5	5.1	10	9.9
Taboo Subjects	3	2.9	5	5.1	4	4.0
Chat	6	5.8	14	14.3	7	6.9
Text Messages	8	7.8	15	15.3	11	10.9

Table 25: Combination of Three Languages in Personal Activities by University

A combination of LA, French and English is rarely used in personal activities among the three universities; it is used to greet people _ 3.9% of AUB participants, 12.2% of USJ participants, and 15.8% of LU participants _, chat _ 5.8% of AUB participants, 14.3% of USJ participants, and 6.9% of LU participants _, and send text messages _ 7.8% of AUB participants, 15.3% of USJ participants, and 10.9% of LU participants. Code switching between three languages is more common at USJ and LU than at AUB.

To perform personal activities, LA is the language that is most widely used by participants from all three universities. SA is used only to discuss religion by AUB and USJ participants, but is more used by LU participants in performing personal activities. French plays a negligible role in completing personal activities for AUB and LU participants and is only used in this category by USJ participants. English is predominantly used by AUB participants, and used by USJ and LU participants in only two contexts. When it comes to speaking two languages, LU participants code switch rarely while AUB and USJ participants code switch more often. The use of three languages is more common at USJ and LU than at AUB, but it isn't prevalent overall.

In the present study, the language choices the participants reported they would make are as follows: LA is the most predominantly used language in daily communication and interaction and in performing personal activities, but it is not used to perform educational activities. In contrast, SA is used to perform some educational activities, but it is not used with personal activities or daily communication. French is used in all three categories _ daily communication, educational activities, and personal activities _ but only by USJ participants i.e. at the university where the medium of instruction is French. Similarly, English is most widespread among AUB participants _ at the university where the medium of instruction is English _ for all three

categories of contexts. English is also used by USJ participants to perform educational activities. Code switching between two languages is not common at LU where the language of instruction is Arabic. However, it is a phenomenon that is widespread at AUB and USJ but only for daily communication and to perform personal activities, not for educational purposes. Code switching between three languages rarely used overall.

d. Language Choice and Gender

Based on the results of the cross tabulations between the language choices the participants would make in different contexts and gender, gender was not found to be a factor that affects the language choices made by the participants in the present study in daily communication or to perform personal activities. Gender plays a small role in performing educational activities. Males and females make different language choices in 50% of the educational contexts (See Appendix G for tables showing cross tabulations between language choices and gender).

e. Language Choice and Religion

The following section starts by presenting the native, second, and third languages that the participants speak in relation to religion. Then, the results of the cross tabulations between the language choices the participants would make in different contexts and religion are presented.

Table 26 shows the native language spoken by the participants in relation to religion.

		NL				Total
		Arabic	French	English	Other	
Religion	Sunni	43	3	1	0	47
	Shiite	63	3	2	0	68
	Druze	8	0	0	0	8
	Maronite	72	4	3	0	79
	Catholic	20	1	2	0	23
	Orthodox	29	3	2	0	34
	Protestant	0	1	1	0	2
	None	3	0	2	1	6
	Other	6	0	0	0	6
	No Answer	26	3	0	0	29
Total	270	18	13	1	302	

Table 26: Native Language (NL) and Religion

The native language of 90% of the participants is Arabic, irrespective of religion. Since the study's sample consists of only Lebanese students, it is expected that a significantly high percentage of them speak Arabic as a native language.

Table 27 shows the second language spoken by the participants in relation to religion.

		SL					Total	
		Arabic	French	English	Other	French & English		No Second Language
Religion	Sunni	3	23	21	0	0	0	47
	Shiite	4	34	30	0	0	0	68
	Druze	0	4	4	0	0	0	8
	Maronite	6	64	9	0	0	0	79
	Catholic	1	19	3	0	0	0	23
	Orthodox	5	23	5	1	0	0	34
	Protestant	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
	None	2	1	2	1	0	0	6
	Other	0	4	1	1	0	0	6
	No Answer	2	15	10	0	1	1	29
Total		24	187	86	3	1	1	302

Table 27: Second Language (SL) and Religion

The majority of the Christian participants speak French as a second language, which is along the same lines with the existing literature. However, when it comes to Muslim participants, they are almost equally divided between those who speak French as a SL and those who speak English as a SL, which contradicts what the existing literature suggests.

Table 28 shows the third language spoken by the participants in relation to religion.

	TL					Total
	Arabic	French	English	Other	No Third Language	
Religion Sunni	1	9	24	1	12	47
Shiite	1	18	34	3	12	68
Druze	0	4	4	0	0	8
Maronite	1	9	67	0	2	79
Catholic	2	2	18	0	1	23
Orthodox	0	5	27	0	2	34
Protestant	1	1	0	0	0	2
None	1	1	2	1	1	6
Other	0	0	5	1	0	6
No Answer	1	5	17	0	6	29
Total	8	54	198	6	36	302

Table 28: Third Language (TL) and Religion

Most Christian participants speak English as a TL, and half of the Muslim participants _ those who reported speaking French as a SL _ speak English as a TL.

Chi Square tests of independence were performed to examine the relation between the language participants would use in daily communication and religion. The results are shown in Table 29.

Daily Communication	Df	X2	P	N
Mother	45	73.881	.004	302
Father	45	101.030	.000	302
Siblings	63	84.706	.035	302
Grandfather	45	133.163	.000	302
Grandmother	36	112.387	.000	302
Friends	54	105.194	.000	302
Partner	72	104.376	.008	302
Boss	72	103.379	.009	302
Waiter	54	92.323	.001	302
Doctor	54	85.611	.004	302
Maid	72	123.509	.000	302
Coworkers	81	79.268	.534	302

Table 29: Chi Square Tests for Daily Communication and Religion

The relation between the language participants would speak with their mother, father, siblings, grandmother, grandfather, friends, partner, boss, waiter, doctor, and maid and religion was significant. The language the participants choose in daily communication is affected by religion in all contexts except for when talking with coworkers. This means that the Christian participants in the present study and the Muslim participants make dissimilar language choices in daily communication and interaction.

Chi Square tests of independence were performed to examine the relation between the language participants would use in performing educational activities and religion. The results are shown in Table 30.

Educational Activities	Df	X2	P	N
Speaking to Teachers	117	124.424	.302	302
Discussing Literature	126	143.413	.137	302
Discussing Scientific Topics	117	130.601	.184	302
Reading Newspapers	117	148.513	.026	302
Reading Books	117	113.081	.585	302
Writing Emails	108	157.521	.001	302
Reading Academic Articles	99	115.498	.123	302
Reading for Pleasure	126	138.780	.206	302

Table 30: Chi Square Tests for Educational Activities and Religion

The relation between the language participants would use to read newspapers and to write emails and religion was significant. The language the participants choose to use when reading newspapers and to write emails is affected by the religion of the participant. This means that the Christian and the Muslim participants in the present study make different language choices only when sending emails and when reading the newspaper, but make similar language choices to perform the other educational activities.

For the third category _ performing personal activities _ of contexts given in the questionnaire, Chi Square tests of independence were performed to examine the relation between the language participants would use to perform personal activities and religion. The results are shown in Table 31.

Personal Activities	Df	X2	P	N
To discuss religion	90	172.906	.000	302
To discuss intimate topics	108	131.739	.060	302
To tell jokes	81	134.000	.000	302
To insult someone	81	96.914	.110	302
To greet someone	108	147.436	.007	302
To ask a (wo)man out	72	88.894	.086	302
To express anger	72	83.350	.170	302
To order food	63	60.779	.556	302
To complete a job application	117	150.965	.019	302
To write personal emails	117	99.199	.882	302
To discuss taboo subjects	81	103.258	.048	302
To chat	90	80.275	.759	302
To write text messages	117	130.783	.181	302

Table 31: Chi Square Tests for Personal Activities and Religion

The relation between the language participants would speak to discuss religion, to tell jokes, to greet someone, to complete job applications, and to discuss taboo subjects and religion was significant. This means that Christians and Muslims make different language choices to discuss religion, to tell jokes, to greet someone, to complete job applications, and to discuss taboo subjects, but make similar language choices in the remaining 8 contexts of performing personal activities.

Religion plays a significant role in the language choices the participants in this study make in daily communication and interaction and in some contexts of performing personal

activities, but religion doesn't play a role in the languages the participants choose to use in educational contexts.

3. Aspects of Identity

The third part of the questionnaire investigates the importance of the specific aspects of identity as perceived by Lebanese university students. The students at three different universities _ AUB, USJ, and LU _ were asked to rate the importance _ as they perceived it _ of 31 items relating to identity on a scale from 1 to 5. A different number of items (reliability tests were conducted, as mentioned earlier in this chapter) represented each of four aspects of identity: personal, social, relational and national. The students' answers were entered to SPSS and means and standard deviations were calculated. Then, to provide more reliable measures of the underlying constructs (the four aspects), composite scores were computed with unit-weighted z scores. As discussed in the methodology chapter, composite scores offer a more comprehensive score for each construct since they combine information from multiple smaller, repeated measures of the construct, and standard scores (z scores) are used since they allow researchers to draw comparisons between raw scores that come from diverse sources. The composite scores are then compared to help clarify the difference in the way the four aspects of identity involved are viewed by the participants. This comparison is done on two levels: the composite score of each aspect for the whole sample is presented first, and the composite scores of the various aspects for the participants from each university are compared.

The personal identity construct included 14 items of which the means, standard deviations and z scores were calculated. Table 32 shows the results.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z score
Possessions	302	4.25	.901	0.13
Values	302	4.65	.788	0.66
PersGoals	302	4.59	.763	0.60
Appearance	302	3.87	.916	0.28
MyReligion	302	3.93	1.256	-0.16
Emotions	302	4.21	.984	0.08
Thoughts	302	4.42	.846	0.34
MySex	302	3.73	1.218	-0.33
BeingUnique	302	3.80	1.123	-0.29
SelfKnowledge	302	4.25	.890	0.14
SelfEvaluation	302	4.26	.906	0.14
Occupation	302	4.36	.846	0.27
Dialect	302	3.66	1.112	-0.42
SexualOrientation	302	3.87	1.076	-0.24
Composite Score				1.2

Table 32: Importance of Personal Identity to All Participants

Personal identity is an aspect considered by many participants as important as Table 32 shows. The mean of means for personal identity is 4.13. The composite score for personal identity is 1.2. The means for the items forming the personal identity construct are mostly high, which suggests that most participants view personal identity as important. However, the standard deviation values are also high especially for religion, sex, uniqueness, dialect, and sexual orientation. This suggests that the answers given by the participants were not uniform.

Eight items made up the social identity construct. The means, standard deviations, and z scores for each item are presented in Table 33.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z score
Popularity	302	3.56	1.045	-0.12
PeopleReaction	302	3.72	1.065	0.04
Reputation	302	3.60	1.231	0.07
Residence	302	3.80	1.141	0.11
Gestures	302	3.85	1.009	0.17
Attractiveness	302	3.67	1.017	-0.01
SocialBehavior	302	4.00	.951	0.34
SocialClass	302	3.24	1.205	-0.37
Composite Score				0.23

Table 33: Importance of Social Identity to All Participants

The mean of means for social identity is 3.68. The composite score for social identity is 0.23. The means for the social identity items are relatively high (answers range between 1 and 5, so an average greater than 3 is significant) suggesting that most participants view social identity as important. However, the standard deviation values are very high, suggesting that the answers of the participants varied greatly from the means.

The relational identity construct was made up of four items. The means, standard deviation, and z scores for each item are shown in Table 34.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z score
CloseRelationships	302	4.34	.922	0.22
CloseExperiences	302	4.07	1.017	-0.07
CloseBonds	302	4.01	.995	0.13
Connectedness	302	4.13	.992	-0.01
Composite Score				0.27

Table 34: Importance of Relational Identity to All Participants

The mean of means for relational identity is 4.14. The composite score for relational identity is 0.27. Although the means for the items representing relational identity are very high _ all above 4 _ suggesting that participants view relational identity as very important, the standard deviation values are also high suggesting that all participants didn't necessarily view relational identity as very important. However, even with the high values of standard deviation, we can still conclude that most participants viewed relational identity as important rather than very important.

Five items formed the national identity construct. The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 35.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z score
Generation	302	3.67	1.145	0.13
Race	302	3.12	1.264	-0.32
MyAge	302	3.34	1.172	-0.15
Belonging	302	3.67	1.134	0.13
Pride	302	3.81	1.281	0.23
Composite Score				0.02

Table 35: Importance of National Identity to All Participants

The last aspect under investigation is national identity. National identity has a mean of means of 3.52. The composite score for national identity is 0.02. The means for the items representing this construct are not as high as those of other constructs, but the standard deviation values are higher. This means that participants' answers varied greatly, and that the answers were not all close to the mean.

As mentioned in the introduction of this section (and in the methodology chapter), z scores and composite scores allow for a reliable comparison of the various aspects of identity as viewed by the participants in the present study. Table 36 shows the different means and composite scores for all aspects of identity.

Aspect of Identity	Personal	Social	Relational	National
Mean	4.13	3.68	4.14	3.52
Composite Score	1.2	0.23	0.27	0.02

Table 36: Composite Scores of Aspects of Identity

Personal identity has the highest composite score _ 1.2 _ followed by relational identity _ 0.27 _, then social identity _ 0.23 _, and finally national identity _ 0.02.

Personal identity is then viewed by the Lebanese university students that participated in the present study as the most important aspect. Second to personal identity in importance is relational identity. Third, comes in social identity which is close to relational identity in importance. The least importance was given to national identity by most participants.

In order to compare between the three universities, as was done with language choice, every aspect of identity will be examined in all three universities. The following section reports on the importance of the identity aspects separately as viewed by participants from AUB, USJ and LU.

Table 37 reports on the importance of personal identity as viewed by the different participants in this study.

University	AUB			USJ			LU		
	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score
Possessions	4.07	.952	-0.02	4.17	.920	0.13	4.51	.770	0.34
Values	4.58	.913	0.54	4.48	.911	0.47	4.88	.355	1.77
PersGoals	4.67	.772	0.75	4.38	.914	0.36	4.71	.516	0.89
Appearance	3.80	.844	-0.34	3.84	.927	-0.23	3.98	.980	-0.28
MyReligion	3.79	1.318	-0.23	3.69	1.342	-0.27	4.31	.997	0.06
Emotions	4.08	.977	-0.01	4.12	1.028	0.07	4.42	.919	0.18
Thoughts	4.42	.846	0.39	4.35	.909	0.33	4.49	.782	0.31
MySex	3.62	1.253	-0.38	3.73	1.189	-0.27	3.81	1.206	-0.36
BeingUnique	3.99	1.024	-0.10	3.85	1.087	-0.18	3.57	1.219	-0.56
SelfKnowledge	4.17	1.004	0.80	4.19	.795	0.18	4.38	.847	0.15
SelfEvaluation	4.27	1.050	0.17	4.16	.858	0.13	4.35	.780	0.13
Occupation	4.36	.948	0.28	4.24	.909	0.21	4.48	.642	0.36
Dialect	3.55	1.235	-0.44	3.68	1.001	-0.37	3.73	1.085	-0.48
SexualOrientation	3.94	1.092	-0.14	3.79	1.151	-0.23	3.88	.993	-0.37
Composite score			1.27			0.33			2.14

Table 37: Composite Scores for Personal Identity by University

The composite score for the personal identity construct for LU is 2.14, which is the highest among the three universities. That of AUB is 1.27, and that of USJ is 0.33. Thus, personal identity is more important to LU students than it is to AUB students. And it is more important to AUB students than it is to USJ students as the composite scores in Table 38 show.

Table 38 reports on the importance of social identity as perceived by the different participants in this study.

	AUB			USJ			LU		
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score
Popularity	3.37	1.102	-0.25	3.63	.988	-0.01	3.67	1.021	-0.08
PeopleReaction	3.60	.994	-0.05	3.65	1.132	0.01	3.90	1.063	0.14
Reputation	3.52	1.170	-0.11	3.53	1.105	-0.10	3.77	1.385	0.01
Residence	3.70	1.074	0.05	3.69	1.188	0.04	3.99	1.145	0.21
Gestures	3.96	.989	0.31	3.78	.979	0.14	3.83	1.059	0.08
Attractiveness	3.54	1.083	-0.1	3.60	.905	-0.04	3.86	1.040	0.11
SocialBehavior	4.06	1.046	0.39	3.94	.895	0.34	4.00	.906	0.28
SocialClass	3.45	1.186	-0.17	3.33	1.053	-0.29	2.95	1.314	-0.61
Composite Score			0.07			0.09			0.14

Table 38: Composite Scores for Social Identity by University

The highest composite score for the social identity construct is that of LU _ 0.14 _ compared to 0.09 for USJ and 0.07 for AUB. Hence, social identity is most important to LU students, and social identity is more important to USJ students than to AUB students.

Table 39 reports on the importance of relational identity as viewed by the different participants in this study.

	AUB			USJ			LU		
	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score
CloseRelationships	4.49	.979	0.22	4.24	.826	0.26	4.29	.942	0.2
CloseExperiences	4.23	1.040	0.04	3.92	1.109	-0.1	4.05	.876	-0.06
CloseBonds	4.20	1.042	-0.07	3.86	.942	-0.18	3.97	.974	-0.14
Connectedness	4.17	1.097	-0.09	4.09	.964	0.07	4.11	.904	0.01
Composite Score			0.1			0.05			0.01

Table 39: Composite Scores for Relational Identity by University

The composite scores for the relational identity construct are 0.1 for AUB, 0.05 for USJ and 0.01 for LU. So, relational identity is most important to AUB students and least important to LU students.

Table 40 reports on the importance of national identity as viewed by the different participants in this study.

	AUB			USJ			LU		
	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score	Mean	Std. Deviation	z score
Generation	3.64	1.170	0.24	3.53	1.142	0.07	3.81	1.120	0.06
Race	2.98	1.204	-0.31	3.18	1.287	-0.2	3.18	1.299	-0.43
MyAge	3.17	1.216	-0.15	3.34	1.130	-0.09	3.50	1.154	-0.2
Belonging	3.48	1.228	0.09	3.55	1.104	0.09	3.97	1.005	0.22
Pride	3.55	1.348	0.14	3.63	1.170	0.16	4.25	1.212	0.42
Composite Score			0.01			0.03			0.07

Table 40: Composite Scores for National Identity by University

The composite scores for the national identity construct are 0.07 for LU, 0.03 for USJ and 0.01 for AUB. These scores show that national identity is most important to LU students and least important to AUB students.

Table 41 shows the composite scores for each university so that a comparison can be drawn between the importance of each aspect of identity for each university.

University	AUB	USJ	LU
Personal Identity	1.27	0.33	2.14
Social Identity	0.07	0.09	0.14
Relational Identity	0.1	0.05	0.01
National Identity	0.01	0.03	0.07

Table 41: Composite Scores for All Aspects at Three Universities

For the participants from USJ, personal identity is the most important aspect; second comes social identity; third, relational identity and fourth national identity. For the participants from LU, personal identity comes in first, social identity second, national identity third and relational identity fourth. For the participants from AUB, personal identity comes in first, relational identity comes in second, social identity comes in third, and national identity comes in fourth. The personal identity construct is statistically the most highly regarded by participants from all three universities, but for the other three aspects of identity, their importance is statistically perceived differently depending on the university.

The next section explores the effect of gender on the perception of the importance of identity aspects.

Gender was not found to be a factor that affects the participants' perception of personal identity, relational identity, social identity, or national identity. (See Appendix H for MANOVA test values)

The following section examines whether religion affects how important identity aspects are perceived to be by the participants in this study as one group, and then as three groups: USJ participants, LU participants, and AUB participants.

a. Aspects of Identity and Religion

A Multiple analysis of Variance was run in order to examine whether how important a specific aspect of identity is viewed by the participants is affected by religion. The multivariate test values are shown in Table 42.

Identity Aspect	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.
Personal	.550	1.293	.017*
Social	.273	1.110	.249
Relational	.130	1.059	.376
National	.193	1.261	.117

Table 42: Multivariate Tests for the Different Aspects of Identity and Religion

Religion was shown to be a factor that affects the perception of how important personal identity is perceived, but that was not the case for the remaining three aspects: social, relational, and national.

A MANOVA was also run to examine the religion factor by university and to compare between them. The following section reports on those results.

AUB			USJ			LU		
Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.
1.709	1.322	.016*	1.466	1.218	.078	1.239	1.047	.362
.928	1.225	.109	.990	1.448	.016*	.589	.854	.783
.551	1.491	.039*	.519	1.528	.037*	.283	.819	.748
.518	1.079	.343	.421	.942	.575	.524	1.259	.140

Table 43: Multivariate Tests for Aspects of Identity and Religion by University

For USJ participants, religion affects the way they view social identity and relational identity, but not personal or national identity. For AUB participants, religion was found to be a factor that affects how important personal and relational identity are, but it wasn't found to be a factor affecting social and national identity. For LU participants, religion does not play a role in the perception of the importance of any of the aspects.

C. Summary of Findings

The distribution of the languages spoken by the participants is as follows. Most participants, being Lebanese, speak Arabic as a native language irrespective of gender or religion. Most Christian participants speak French as a second language whereas the Muslim participants were divided almost equally between those who speak French and those who speak English as a second language. However, when gender is taken into consideration, most females, both Christian and Muslim, speak French as a second language. So gender, but not religion, is a factor when it comes to second language spoken. Finally, most participants speak English as a third language.

1. Language Choice

The exploration of the language choices made by the participants in three different categories of contexts yielded the following results.

For daily communication and interaction, Lebanese Arabic is used by the majority LU participants. LA is also used by the majority of AUB and USJ participants when talking to their mothers, fathers, grandmothers, grandfathers, and waiters, but LA is used to a lesser extent by these participants when talking to siblings, friends, partners, bosses, doctors, maids, and coworkers. To perform educational activities, LA is mostly used by LU participants. AUB and USJ participants use LA only to discuss literature and to read newspapers. To perform personal activities, most participants in all three universities mostly use LA.

Standard Arabic is mostly not used by any of the participants for daily communication purposes. It is mostly LU participants that would use SA in educational contexts. To perform personal activities, SA is used by AUB and USJ participants only in the case of discussing religion. However, SA plays a more significant role for LU participants who would use it in performing certain personal activities such as discussing religion, greeting, completing job application, writing personal emails, discussing taboo subjects, and writing text messages.

USJ participants reported using French in daily communication, in performing educational activities, and in performing personal activities. French doesn't play a significant role in any of the categories for AUB and LU students.

English plays a significant role in daily communication for AUB students, but not for USJ or LU students. As for performing educational and personal activities, English is mostly used by AUB students; it is also used by USJ and LU students but to a lesser extent.

For daily communication and interaction and for performing personal activities, the use of two languages simultaneously is more common among students of AUB and USJ than among LU students. In educational contexts, the use of two languages is found in all three universities but it is rarely used.

The use of three languages simultaneously was not common for the participants in this study; it is mostly used by USJ and LU students only to greet people, chat, and send text messages.

Language choice was examined in relation to two factors: gender and religion. Gender was not found to be a factor that affects language choice for any of the categories although it plays a role in determining the language choice for some educational contexts like speaking to teachers, discussing scientific topics, reading newspapers and reading academic articles and books. Religion however was found to be a factor that affects language choice in daily communication and interaction, and in some contexts within the personal activities category _ to discuss religion, tell jokes, greet, complete job applications, and discuss taboo subjects_ but not in performing educational activities.

2. Aspects of Identity

The most important aspect of identity for all participants was personal identity, followed by relational identity, then social identity and finally national identity. When the results were broken down by university, the most important aspect remained the same, but the importance of the other aspects as viewed by the different students of the three universities differed. For AUB students, relational identity came second, social identity came third, and national identity came last. For USJ students, social identity came second, relational identity came third and national

identity came last. For LU students, social identity came second, national identity came third, and relational identity came last.

Gender and religion were also investigated in relation to the importance given to the various aspects of identity, and gender was not found to be a contributing factor to how important a certain aspect was viewed by the participants, whereas religion was found to be a contributing factor only in the case of personal identity. When broken down by university, the results differed: gender was found to be a factor that affects the perception of personal identity by USJ students, and religion was found to be a factor that affects the perception of social and relational identity by USJ students, and personal and relational identity by AUB students.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Educated people in Lebanon usually speak French, English, or both in addition to speaking Arabic, their native language. The present study examines the language choices made by Lebanese university students in three categories of contexts they may encounter daily: daily communication and interaction, educational activities, and personal activities. It also investigates whether gender and religion affect these language choices. The second concept examined in this study is that of identity _ four aspects of identity _ and whether gender and religion play a role in how important the participants perceive the aspects of identity to be.

A. Demographic Distribution

The first part of the questionnaire elicited information about the gender of the participants, the religious group they identify with, and the native, second and third language they speak. This section provides the analysis of the results obtained concerning the demographic distribution of the participants.

Concerning the gender distribution of the sample, female participants in the present study outnumber male participants. This difference might be a result of the fact that specific faculties were visited in both the Lebanese University and Université Saint Joseph, mostly faculties with focus on humanities and social sciences, majors in which more females than males are enrolled.

As for religion, both religions are almost equally represented in this study: 40.7% Muslims _ 15.6% Sunni, 22.5% Shiite and only 2.6% Druze _ and 45.7% Christians _ 26.1% Maronites, 7.6% Catholic, 11.3% Orthodox, and only 0.7% Protestant. These percentages don't

quite reflect the distribution of religious sects in Lebanon, but there is a representation of all religious sects and the distribution reflects some facts concerning the different sects: the Druze and Protestants are minorities, the Maronites outnumber the Catholics and Orthodox _ 36.2% Christians most of whom are Maronite Catholics (US Department of State, 2017) _, and the Sunni and Shiite are close to each other in number _ 28.7% Sunni and 28.4% Shiite (US Department of State, 2017).

The languages spoken by participants were mostly as expected: most people in Lebanon speak Arabic as a native language _ irrespective of gender or religious sect _ and either French or English as a second or third language.

Concerning the second and third language spoken by the participants, the results of the current study show that most Christians speak French as a second language and English as a third language, which is in line with what the previous literature suggests. However, the results of this study do not reflect the assumptions made for Muslims: that most Muslims speak English as a second language. Almost 50% of the Sunni participants and 50% of the Shiite participants speak French as a second language and English as a third language. Religion, as per this study, does not correlate with French as a second language.

It is worth noting that a relationship exists between the choice of second language and gender. 49.6% of the Muslim participants speak French as a second language. 48 (60.8%) out of the 79 female Muslim participants speak French as a second language. On the other hand, only 13 (29.5%) out of the 44 male Muslim participants speak French as a second language. It is then female Muslims mostly rather than males who speak French as a second language and English as a third.

For educated Lebanese university students between 18 and 25 years, it is more likely than not that they speak French as a second language. For females, the likelihood is even bigger. The Christian participants in this study speak French as a second language, but for the Muslim participants, there's a 50-50 chance they speak French as a second language.

It is interesting to note that only one participant at USJ does not speak a third language whereas at AUB, 27.2 % do not speak a third language. This reflects the fact that students who attend French medium institutions usually speak English as a third language, but students who attend English medium institutions do not necessarily speak French or any other third language. There are students who attended French medium schools at AUB (almost 25%) but there are no students who attended English medium schools at USJ.

B. Language Choice

The first research question is about the language choices Lebanese university students would make in different situations. The results were mostly as expected.

LA is the main language the Lebanese use to communicate in informal social settings and in their personal lives in general, but not for educational purposes. The Lebanese use their mother tongue, LA _ LA, as Esseili's (2011) study shows, is considered by 92% of the participants as the mother tongue of the Lebanese _ in performing daily and personal activities. This finding reflects the results attained by both Esseili (2011) and Shaaban and Ghaith (2003). The role of SA is almost negligent. SA is not used in daily communication or to perform personal activities and is only used to a minimal extent in a few educational contexts. SA doesn't play a role in the lives of the Lebanese, a finding that is in line with Esseili (2011). French only plays a role in French medium institutions where it is needed for educational purposes, but it is

also used in daily communication and personal activities. So French is used not only for instrumental purposes _ for practical, functional reasons _ but also for integrative _ positive attitude towards the target language group and the potential for integrating into that group _ purposes. This finding supports what Diab (2009) points out: those who speak French as a second language still feel a strong sense of affiliation to the French language and culture. English is used at AUB in almost all contexts and all categories. It is used for daily communication and interaction, for educational activities and for personal activities. So English is used by AUB participants for both instrumental and integrative purposes, which contradicts what Shaaban and Ghaith (2002) and Diab (2009) that suggested students thought of English as an important language to learn because it is today's international language, and because it is the most vital language to use in mostly educational contexts.

The use of two or more languages simultaneously is thought to be very common among Lebanese young people. The results of this study showed that code switching was not as common as one expects it to be, based on what the participants have reported. It was practiced by USJ and AUB participants _ so by a group that has a higher socioeconomic status since both AUB and USJ are private and expensive universities _ in both daily communication contexts and in performing personal activities. Code switching is not common in educational circles, where student use the language primarily adopted by the institution they go to, which makes sense since the students in USJ or AUB have chosen to get enrolled in institutions that use foreign languages. They signed up for an education in a language other than their own, and therefore use that language for any type of communication in educational contexts.

French and English are widespread mainly for educational purposes, not in society as the literature asserts/suggests. They are no longer viewed by the Lebanese as languages of “prestige” or “sophistication”, but rather as educational instruments that they are making use of.

To conclude, Lebanese Arabic is used in informal contexts, French and English are used in more formal, academic contexts: reading, technology, education, and scientific issues, and Standard Arabic is rarely used and only when reading books and academic documents. The two languages that are mostly used in speaking are Lebanese Arabic and English. Standard Arabic is not used in speaking; it is only used in reading. French is only used in specific academic contexts and is not used in social contexts anymore.

1. Language Choice and Religion

Thirty-three contexts were given in the questionnaire. The participants reported on which language they would use in each context. Chi Square tests were computed in order to examine whether religion affects the language choices Lebanese university students would make.

Religious sect turned out to be a factor that affects language choice when speaking to people: mother, father, siblings, grandfather, grandmother, friends, partners, bosses, waiters, doctors, and maids. However, when speaking to teachers and coworkers, religion does not influence the language choices participants would make.

Religious sect was also found to be a significant factor in choosing to speak a language over another in the following situations: talking about religion, telling jokes, greeting people, completing job applications, reading newspapers, writing emails, and discussing taboo subjects.

Christians and Muslims make different language choices. Religion is a factor that affects the language choices made by the participants in the present study. Christians and Muslims use

different languages to communicate with their friends and family members. In educational contexts, Christians and Muslims make the same language choices. However, when performing personal activities, they make similar choices in half of the cases and make dissimilar choices in the remaining cases. Therefore, religion plays an important role in language choice when it comes to daily interaction and to some extent when it comes to performing personal activities. It seems that religion affects the participants' perceptions concerning language use and utility. Shaaban and Ghaith (2002, 2003) found that linguistic attitudes and the view of ethnolinguistic vitality are affected by religion. Diab (2009) found that religion affects ethnic identity. Suleiman (2003) and Joseph (2004) also found religion to affect the Lebanese's language choices. The only study in which religion was not found to be a factor influencing language choices is that of Esseili (2011).

C. Aspects of Identity

Participants preferred personal identity to the other aspects of identity. Across the three universities, personal identity was viewed as the most important.

Earley and Gibson (1998) in discussing the difference between individualistic and collectivistic cultures state that in individualistic cultures, personal goals have primacy over the goals of specific groups, whereas in collectivistic cultures, goals and welfare of the extended group have primacy over those of the individual. Santos, Varnum and Grossmann (2017) argue that individualism promotes a view of the self as self-directed, autonomous, and separate from others and that individualistic cultures prioritize independence and uniqueness. Collectivism, on the other hand, fosters an interconnected view of the self that overlaps with close others, with individuals' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors embedded in social contexts. Collectivistic cultures emphasize family ties and fitting in (Santos, Varnum, and Grossmann, 2017).

The Lebanese culture has been considered as a collectivistic culture since it values family ties and group memberships. A study conducted in the context of Lebanon by Ayyash-Abdo (2001), examining 517 Lebanese university students, reports that 27.9% of the participants were individualists while 67.3% were collectivists.

The fact that participants in the present study preferred personal identity over social, relational, and national identity signals that Lebanon might be moving from being a collectivistic culture to becoming an individualistic one. The Lebanese youth perceive their personal identity as the most important aspect of their identity. They care more about doing well for themselves than about helping their community to become better. They celebrate their individuality. This is a phenomenon that is becoming more and more common, as suggested by Santos, Varnum, and Grossmann (2017) who claim that individualism is on the rise, and that the increase in individualism is taking place on an international level, and is not restricted to developed countries.

Participants from USJ and LU prioritize social identity over relational identity. Social relationships occupy a very important part in the lives of the young Lebanese. However, for AUB participants, it was the opposite; they view relational identity as more important than social identity. Personal relationships, for AUB students play a more significant role in their lives than social relationships.

For USJ and AUB participants, national identity was viewed as the least important aspect. The personal lives and the personal and social relationships are regarded in a higher status than national belonging.

For LU participants, relational identity was viewed as the least important of all four aspects. They value their personal and social lives most. Less important than those is their sense of national belonging followed by personal relationships.

1. Aspects of Identity and Religion

Religion does play a big role in perceiving the aspects of identity. Personal identity is perceived differently by participants from different religious groups. When broken down by university, more statistically significant results appeared. This suggests that religion is not the only factor in play in this case. Maybe socioeconomic status contributes to these statistically significant results, because the relationship between aspects of identity and religion became more observable when the results were broken down by university. Social and relational identity are viewed differently by USJ participants from different religious groups. Personal and relational identity are viewed differently by AUB participants having dissimilar religious beliefs. However, for LU participants, the perception of how important the different identity aspects are was not affected by religion.

D. Language Choice and Identity

The fact that LA is more used than SA, and that the role of SA is negligent when compared to that of LA is an indication that the Lebanese educated youth identify more with being Lebanese than with being Arabs, that they have a “Lebanese national identity” rather than an “Arab national identity”, which contradicts the results in Diab (2009) suggesting that 75% Lebanese students think they are Arabs while only 25% think they are descended from Phoenician origins.

Maybe the use of French by USJ participants in almost all contexts is a means to make certain statements concerning their identity especially the personal, social, and relational aspects of identity rather than national identity. They may still be showing a sense of affiliation to the French language and culture which might still be viewed as part of the Lebanese identity for some (Diab, 2009).

Similar to French at USJ, English at AUB can be used as a way to define a personal, social and relational identity in line with the culture that AUB promotes. The use of English in almost all contexts could also be a result of the desire Lebanese students have to be successful in a world where English is the most widely spread language, where English is the language that will get them better jobs, promotions, and opportunities.

The observations concerning French and English in the present study explain why national identity was viewed as the least important by almost all USJ and AUB participants. The fact that USJ students use French to communicate with close people daily, to perform educational tasks, and to perform personal activities rather than using Arabic reflects their desire to belong to the Western, French culture rather than the surrounding Arab world. The same goes for AUB students who use English in all contexts of their life because it gives them a sense of belonging to the Western culture, or because of practicality (instrumental purposes). LU students use mostly Lebanese Arabic in daily communication and when performing personal activities and use a combination of Standard Arabic and Lebanese Arabic for educational purposes. LU students feel like they belong to the Lebanese culture represented by the university they go to. This might explain why national identity didn't rank last among the four aspects of identity for LU participants.

E. Summary of Discussion

Most participants in the present study speak LA for daily communication and interaction. However, for educational purposes and to perform personal activities, the participants from each university preferred the language that is adopted by the institution they go to _ USJ participants use French to complete educational activities, AUB participants use English, and LU participants use Arabic, both SA and LA. Code switching, which was thought to be used by the majority of the Lebanese to show educational level and sophistication, was not reportedly used very commonly among the educated sample in the current study. Gender does not affect the language choices made by the participants but religion does in most cases.

Of the four aspects of identity explored in the present study, personal identity was valued the most by all participants across the three universities showing that the Lebanese culture is being transformed from a collectivistic type of culture to a more individualistic one. National identity was valued the least for USJ and AUB participants possibly reflecting the desire of USJ and AUB participants to belong to the French and American cultures respectively.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The following chapter provides a summary of the main findings of the study. Second, it discusses the limitations of the study, and ends by providing recommendations for further studies.

A. Summary of Findings

Most participants in the current study speak Arabic as a native language, most females irrespective of religion speak French as a second language _ some males speak French and some speak English as a second language _, and most participants speak English as a third language.

Concerning the language choices made by participants in the different categories, LA is used by the majority of the participants for daily communication and interaction. For educational activities, LU participants use LA, USJ participants use French, and AUB participants use English. As for personal activities, it is mostly a combination of LA and French or English that is used by USJ and AUB participants, and LA that is used by LU participants.

Gender was not found to be a factor that affects language choice for the participants of the present study. However, religion turned out to be a factor that affects language choice in the cases of daily communication and interaction and personal activities, but not in educational contexts.

As for the last part of the study, the part investigating the importance of each aspect of identity as viewed by the participants, the most important aspect of identity was personal

identity, followed by relational identity, then social identity and finally national identity. When the results were broken down by university, the most important aspect remained the same, and the least important aspect also remained the same for USJ and AUB participants, but not for LU participants.

Gender was not found to be a contributing factor to how important a certain aspect was viewed by the participants, whereas religion was found to be a contributing factor only in the case of personal identity. When broken down by university, the results differed: gender was found to be a factor that affects the perception of personal identity by USJ students, and religion was found to be a factor that affects the perception of social and relational identity by USJ students, and personal and relational identity by AUB students.

B. Limitations

The current study used contexts for language choice that are representative of most situations, and provided four language options for the participants to choose from, while also taking into consideration the SA / LA distinction. Gender was not represented equally, but the sample reflects the reality of the gender distribution in Lebanon. Religion, on the other hand, was represented equally. One limitation of the present study might be the fact that only four of the many aspects of identity were considered. Gender identity, for example, was not addressed mainly because it is beyond the scope of this study.

C. Recommendations

Future studies could be conducted to explore the following questions:

1. What are the reasons that drive the Lebanese educated youth to make certain language choices?
2. What are the perceptions that the young educated Lebanese have towards SA and LA? And why has the use of SA become so reduced?
3. Why do the young educated Lebanese prefer some aspects of their identity over others?
4. What might be the reasons behind the Lebanese culture shift from collectivism to individualism?

Further studies should be carried out in the purpose of delving deeper into understanding the reasons behind the language choices made by the Lebanese youth rather than just reporting on them. The present study used quantitative data exclusively. However, using mixed methods could yield interesting results concerning the reasons behind the language choices made by the participants.

The use of quantitative data was appropriate given the purpose and the scope of the present study. However, to get a deeper understanding of why the Lebanese educated youth have formed these perceptions about identity and the different aspects of identity _ about why national identity is viewed as the least important and personal identity as the most important _ further inquiries have to be made using interviews or follow up surveys which include open-ended questions. The use of qualitative methods to complement the quantitative methods could provide data that would explain why the Lebanese are moving towards a more individualistic culture. Questions concerning the perceptions of LA vs SA could be asked to better understand why the role SA plays in the daily lives of the Lebanese is so minimal. Qualitative studies could offer

important insight into how the Lebanese educated youth define or understand each aspect of identity presented in this study, and the reasons behind them favoring one aspect over another.

The present study proved that one aspect of identity _ personal _ dominates the three others. This could be a stepping stone towards forming a clearer sense of what the Lebanese identity is or is becoming.

APPENDIX A QUESTIONNAIRE (English)

PART ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male Female
2. Age: _____
3. Religious Affiliation:
 - a. Sunni b. Shiite c. Druze d. Maronite e. Catholic f. Orthodox
 - g. Protestant h. None i. Other (specify) _____ j. I choose not to answer
4. What is your first/native language? Arabic French English Other: _____
5. What is your second language? Arabic French English Other: _____
6. What is your third language? Arabic French English Other: _____

PART TWO: LANGUAGE CHOICE

Directions: Choose the language that you prefer using in each of the following situations. You can choose two languages if that's the case.

SA: Standard Arabic LA: Lebanese Arabic FR: French EN: English

1. Which language(s) do you primarily use to communicate with the following?

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| a. Mother | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| b. Father | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| c. Siblings | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| d. Grandfather | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| e. Grandmother | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| f. Friends | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| g. Partner/husband/boyfriend | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| h. Teacher | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| i. My boss | SA | LA | FR | EN |
| j. Waiter | SA | LA | FR | EN |

k. Doctor SA LA FR EN

l. Maid SA LA FR EN

2. Which language(s) do you primarily prefer to use in dealing with the following situations

a. To talk about religion SA LA FR EN

b. To talk about intimate topics SA LA FR EN

c. To talk about poetry & literature SA LA FR EN

d. To talk about a scientific topic SA LA FR EN

e. To tell jokes SA LA FR EN

f. To insult someone SA LA FR EN

g. To greet someone SA LA FR EN

h. To hit on a (wo)man SA LA FR EN

i. To express anger SA LA FR EN

j. To order food in a restaurant SA LA FR EN

k. To complete a job application SA LA FR EN

l. To write a personal letter/e mail SA LA FR EN

m. To read newspaper SA LA FR EN

n. To read a book SA LA FR EN

o. To speak to my co-workers SA LA FR EN

p. To write emails SA LA FR EN

q. To read academic articles and books SA LA FR EN

r. To read for pleasure SA LA FR EN

s. To discuss "taboo" subjects SA LA FR EN

t. To chat SA LA FR EN

u. To write text messages SA LA FR EN

PART THREE: ASPECTS OF IDENTITY

Directions: For each of the following items, choose the number between 1 and 5 that best represents how important you consider the item to be in your life.

1. Extremely important, 2. Important, 3. Neutral, 4. Not so important, 5. Not important at all

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The things I own, my possessions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. My personal values and moral standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. My personal goals and hopes for the future | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. My physical appearance: my height, my weight, and the shape of my body | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. My religion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. My emotions and feelings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. My thoughts and ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. My sex, being male or female | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. My feeling of being a unique person, being distinct from others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. My self-knowledge, my ideas about what kind of person I really am | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. My personal self-evaluation, the private opinion I have of myself | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. My occupational choice and career plans | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. My language, such as my regional accent or dialect or a second language that I know | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. My sexual orientation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. My popularity with other people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. The ways in which other people react to what I say and do | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. My reputation, what others think of me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Places where I live or where I was raised | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. My gestures and mannerisms, the impression I make on others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. My attractiveness to other people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. My social behavior, such as the way I act when meeting people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. My social class, the economic group I belong to, whether lower, middle or upper class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. My relationships with the people I feel close to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. Sharing significant experiences with my close friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. Having close bonds with other people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. My feeling of connectedness with those I am close to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. Being a part of the many generations of my family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. My race or ethnic background | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. My age, belonging to my age group or being part of my generation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. My feeling of belonging to my community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. My feeling of pride in my country, being proud to be a citizen | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX B QUESTIONNAIRE (French)

PREMIERE PARTIE: INFORMATIONS DEMOGRAPHIQUES

1. Sexe: Male Femelle
2. Age: _____
3. Affiliation Religieuse:
 - a. Sunnite b. Chiite c. Druze d. Maronite e. Catholique f. Orthodoxe
 - g. Protestant h. Aucune i. Autre (specifier) _____ j. Je choisis de ne pas répondre
4. Quelle est votre première langue? Arabe Français Anglais Autre: _____
5. Quelle est votre deuxième langue? Arabe Français Anglais Autre: _____
6. Quelle est votre troisième langue? Arabe Français Anglais Autre: _____

DEUXIEME PARTIE: CHOIX DE LANGUE

Instructions: Choisissez la langue que vous préférez utiliser dans chacune des situations suivantes. Vous pouvez choisir deux langues si c'est le cas.

AS: Arabe Standard AL: Arabe Libanais FR: Français AN: Anglais

1. Quelle(s) langue(s) utilisez vous pour communiquer avec les suivants?

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| a. Mère | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| b. Père | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| c. Frères et soeurs | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| d. Grand père | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| e. Grand mère | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| f. Amis | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| g. Partenaire / mari / copain | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| h. Enseignant | AS | AL | FR | AN |
| i. Patron | AS | AL | FR | AN |

j. Serveur (au restaurant) AS AL FR AN

k. Docteur AS AL FR AN

l. Bonne AS AL FR AN

2. Quelle(s) langue(s) préférez vous utiliser dans les situations suivantes?

a. Pour discuter de religion AS AL FR AN

b. Pour discuter des sujets intimes AS AL FR AN

c. Pour discuter des poèmes et de la littérature AS AL FR AN

d. Pour discuter des sujets scientifiques AS AL FR AN

e. Pour raconter une blague AS AL FR AN

f. Pour insulter quelqu'un AS AL FR AN

g. Pour saluer quelqu'un AS AL FR AN

h. Pour impressionner un homme / une femme AS AL FR AN

i. Pour exprimer la colère AS AL FR AN

j. Pour commander à manger au restaurant AS AL FR AN

k. Pour remplir une demande d'emploi AS AL FR AN

l. Pour écrire une lettre / email personnel AS AL FR AN

m. Pour lire un journal AS AL FR AN

n. Pour lire un livre AS AL FR AN

o. Pour parler avec mes collègues AS AL FR AN

p. Pour écrire des emails AS AL FR AN

q. Pour lire des articles et livres académiques AS AL FR AN

r. Pour lire pour le plaisir AS AL FR AN

s. Pour discuter des sujets "taboos" AS AL FR AN

t. Pour chatter AS AL FR AN

u. Pour écrire des textos AS AL FR AN

TROISIEME PARTIE: ASPETS D'IDENTITE

Instructions: Pour chacun des points suivants, choisir le nombre entre 1 et 5 qui represente l'importance de ce point dans votre vie.

1. Extrêmement Important, 2. Important, 3. Neutre, 4. Pas Très Important, 5. Pas Important du Tout

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Les choses que je possède, mes possessions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Mes valeurs personnelles et mes bonnes mœurs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Mes objectifs et espoirs personnels pour le futur | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Mon apparence physique: ma taille, mon poids, et forme de mon corps | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Ma religion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Mes émotions et sentiments | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Ma pensée et mes idées | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Mon sex, être male ou femelle | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Mes sentiments d'être unique, d'être distingué(e) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Ma connaissance de soi, mes idées sur la sorte de personne que je suis | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Mon auto-evaluation personnelle, l'opinion privée que j'ai sur moi meme | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Mon choix de métier et plans de carrière | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Mon langage, par exemple l'accent regional ou le dialect ou une deuxième langue que je sais | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Mon orientation sexuelle | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Ma popularité avec les gens | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. La facon de laquelle les gens réagissent à ce que je dis et ce que je fais | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Ma réputation, ce que les autres pensent de moi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. La place où j'habite ou la place où j'étais élevé(e) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Mes gestes et maniérisme, l'impression que je fais sur les autres | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Mon attrait pour les autres | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. Mon comportement social, par exemple la façon de laquelle j'agis quand je rencontre quelqu'un | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Ma classe sociale, le groupe économique auquel j'appartiens, classe inférieure, moyenne ou supérieure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

23. Ma relation avec les gens auxquels je me sens proche	1	2	3	4	5
24. Partager des expériences importantes avec mes amis proches	1	2	3	4	5
25. Avoir des liens étroits avec les gens	1	2	3	4	5
26. Mon sentiment de connexion à ceux qui sont proches de moi	1	2	3	4	5
27. Appartenir aux plusieurs générations de ma famille	1	2	3	4	5
28. Ma race ou contexte ethnique	1	2	3	4	5
29. Mon âge, appartenance à ma génération	1	2	3	4	5
30. Mon sentiment d'appartenance à ma communauté	1	2	3	4	5
31. Mon sentiment de fierté pour mon pays, être fier d'être un citoyen	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

استطلاع رأي

الجزء الأول: معلومات ديموغرافية

	أنثى	ذكر	1. الجنس:
		_____	2. العمر:
كاثوليكي	ماروني	درزي	3. المذهب: سني
لا أريد الإجابة	غير ذلك (حدد)	لا انتماء مذهبي	أرثوذكسي بروتستانتني
غير ذلك: _____	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	4. ما هي لغتك الأم؟
غير ذلك: _____	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	5. ما هي لغتك الثانية؟
غير ذلك: _____	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	6. ما هي لغتك الثالثة؟

الجزء الثاني: اختيار اللغة

تعليمات: اختر اللغة التي تفضل استخدامها في كل من الحالات التالية.

	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
1. أي لغة تستعمل (ين) بالاعتماد على التواصل مع التاليين؟				
الأم	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الاب	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الأشقاء	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الجددة	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الجد	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الأصدقاء	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الشريك/الزوج/الحبيب	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الاستاذ	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
رب العمل	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
النادل	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى
الطبيب	الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى

الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	الخادمة
				2. أي لغة تفضل استعمالها في الحالات التالية؟
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتكلم عن الدين
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتكلم عن المواضيع الحميمة
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتكلم عن الشعر والأدب
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتكلم عن المواضيع العلمية
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لإلقاء الدعابات
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لإهانة أحد ما
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لإلقاء التحية
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتودد إلى رجل/امرأة
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتعبير عن الغضب
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لطلب الطعام في مطعم
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لتعبئة استمارة عمل
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لكتابة رسالة (الالكترونية) شخصية
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لقراءة الجريدة
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لقراءة كتاب
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للتكلم مع زملاء العمل
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لكتابة رسائل الكترونية
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لقراءة مقالات وكتب اكااديمية
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للقراءة للتسلية
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لمناقشة المواضيع المحرمة
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	للدردشة
الإنكليزية	الفرنسية	اللبنانية	الفصحى	لكتابة الرسائل النصية

الجزء الثالث: اوجه الهوية

تعليمات: لكل من المواضيع التالية اختر رقما ما بين 1 و5 بحسب اهمية هذا الموضوع في حياتك.

5	4	3	2	1	
5	4	3	2	1	1. مقتنياتي الشخصية
5	4	3	2	1	2. قيمي الشخصية ومعايري الأخلاقية
5	4	3	2	1	3. اهدافي الشخصية وتطلعاتي للمستقبل
5	4	3	2	1	4. مظهري الخارجي: طولي, وزني, وشكل جسمي
5	4	3	2	1	5. ديني
5	4	3	2	1	6. مشاعري وأحاسيسي
5	4	3	2	1	7. أفكاري
5	4	3	2	1	8. جنسي: كوني ذكر ام أنثى
5	4	3	2	1	9. شعوري بأني فريد, مختلف عن الآخرين
5	4	3	2	1	10. معرفتي بذاتي, أفكاري عن نوع الشخص الذي أنا عليه
5	4	3	2	1	11. تقييمي الذاتي, رأيي بنفسي
5	4	3	2	1	12. خيارى لمهنتي ومسيرتي المهنية
5	4	3	2	1	13. لهجتي أو لكنتي أو لغتي الثانية
5	4	3	2	1	14. ميولي الجنسية
5	4	3	2	1	15. شعبيتي بين الناس
5	4	3	2	1	16. الطريقة التي يتفاعل بها الناس مع ما أقول وما أفعل
5	4	3	2	1	17. سمعتي, كيف يراني الآخرون
5	4	3	2	1	18. المكان الذي أقيم فيه أو المكان الذي ترعرعت فيه
5	4	3	2	1	19. حركاتي, الإنطباع الذي اتركه عند الآخرين
5	4	3	2	1	20. جاذبيتي عند الآخرين
5	4	3	2	1	21. تصرفاتي الإجتماعية, مثل الطريقة التي اتصرف بها عندما اتعرف على أحد
5	4	3	2	1	22. طبقتي الإجتماعية, الطبقة الاقتصادية التي انتمي اليها, السفلى, الوسطى ام العليا
5	4	3	2	1	23. علاقتي بالناس المقربين الي
5	4	3	2	1	24. مشاركة تجاربي المميزة مع أصدقائي
3	2	1			25. وجود رابط قوي مع الآخرين
			5	4	
5	4	3	2	1	26. شعوري بالترابط بمن هم مقربين الي
5	4	3	2	1	27. انتمائي إلى مختلف اجيال عائلتي

5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1

28. عرقي أو خلفيتي الإثنية
29. عمري, انتمائي إلى جبلي
30. شعوري بالانتماء إلى جماعتي
31. فخري بوطني وفخري بكوني مواطن

APPENDIX D

Lebanese University Students' Perception of Who They Are: A Study about Identity and Language Choice

Principal Investigator: Professor Lina Choueiri

American University of Beirut

Consent Form

We are asking you to participate in a research study. Please read the information below and feel free to ask any questions that you may have.

A. Project Description

1. In this study, you will be asked to fill a questionnaire.
2. The estimated time to complete this study is approximately 5 to 8 minutes.
3. The research is being conducted with the goal of writing a Master's degree thesis.
4. Data and information from this research study will be shared only with my committee members at AUB.
5. This study aims at addressing the issue of language choice based on the context. Another important issue that will be explored in this study is that of the aspect of identity which is viewed by the Lebanese youth as the most important aspect in determining their identity.

B. Risks and Benefits

Your participation in this study does not involve any physical risk or emotional risk to you beyond the risks of daily life. You have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time for any reason.

There are no particular benefits to you personally from participating in the research study. Your participation may help us to better understand the way Lebanese, university students view their identity.

C. Confidentiality

Your name or other identifiers will not be attached to your answers so that your confidentiality can be maintained. Your privacy will be ensured in that all data resulting from this study will be analyzed, written, and published in aggregate form.

D. Contact Information

If you have questions, you are free to ask them now. If you have questions, concerns or complaints about the research later, you may contact the research team (Prof. Lina Choueiri) at lc01@aub.edu.lb. If you wish to contact someone independent of the research team for questions, concerns or complaints about the research, for questions about your rights as a participant, to obtain information or to offer input, you can contact the Institutional Review Board at irb@aub.edu.lb.

E. Subjects rights

Your participation is VOLUNTARY and refusal to participate does not involve any penalty. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty. You may skip any question on the surveys that you do not wish to answer.

Do you have any questions about the above information?

Do you voluntarily consent to take part in this study? **Yes** **No**

Location: _____
signature

Researcher's

Date: _____

Date: _____

Time: _____

Time: _____

APPENDIX E

Perception des Elèves d'Universités Libanaises de Leur Identité: Une Etude sur L'Identité et Le Choix de Langue

Investigatrice Principale: Prof. Lina Choueiri

American University of Beirut

Formulaire de Consentement

Vous êtes invités à participer à une étude. Prière de lire les informations suivantes et vous pouvez poser les questions qui vous viennent à l'esprit.

A. Description du Projet

1. Dans cette étude, vous aurez à compléter un questionnaire.
2. Le temp nécessaire à compléter ce questionnaire est estimé à 5 à 8 minutes.
3. La recherche est faite dans le but d'écrire une thèse de Master.
4. Les données et informations collectées durant cette étude seront présentées aux membres du comité de thèse.
5. Le but de cette étude est d'adresser le choix de langue basé sur le contexte et d'explorer l'aspect d'identité perçu par les jeunes Libanais comme le plus important en determinant leur identité.

B. Risques et Avantages

Votre participation à cette étude n'impliquera aucun risque physique ou émotionnel au-delà des risques journaliers. Vous avez le droit de retirer votre consentement et d'arrêter votre participation à un moment quelconque et pour une raison quelconque.

Vous ne bénéficiez pas personnellement d'avantages particuliers pour avoir participé à cette étude. Votre participation pourrait nous aider à mieux comprendre la façon dont les étudiants d'universités libanaises perçoivent leur identité.

C. Confidentialité

Votre nom et d'autres identificateurs ne seront pas attachés à vos réponses pour que la confidentialité soit maintenue. Votre identité restera secrète vu que cette étude sera analysée, rédigée et publiée en forme collective.

D. Informations de Contact

Si vous avez des questions, vous pouvez les poser maintenant. Si vous avez des questions ou des plaintes plus tard, vous pourrez contacter le groupe de recherche sur lc01@aub.edu.lb.

Si vous voulez contacter quelqu'un indépendant du groupe de recherche pour poser des questions ou des plaintes à propos de la recherche, pour poser des questions concernant vos droits comme participants, ou pour obtenir des informations, vous pouvez contacter le comité d'examen institutionnel sur irb@aub.edu.lb.

E. Droits des sujets

Votre participation est volontaire et le refus de participer n'entraînera pas une pénalité. Vous pouvez arrêter votre participation à un temps quelconque sans subir de pénalités. Vous pouvez laisser des questions non-répondues si vous ne desirez pas d'y répondre.

Avez-vous des questions sur les informations sus-mentionnées?

Consentez-vous volontairement de participer à cette étude? Oui Non

Place: _____

Signature du groupe de recherche

Date: _____

Date: _____

Temps: _____

Temps: _____

APPENDIX F

نظرة تلامذة جامعيين لبنانيين حول هويتهم: دراسة عن الهوية واختيار اللغة

المحقة الرئيسة: البروفسور لينا شويري

الجامعة الأميركية في بيروت

استمارة موافقة

إننا نطلب منك المشاركة في دراسة بحثية. نرجو منك قراءة المعلومات التالية وبإمكانك طرح أي سؤال قد يخطر لك.

أ- توصيف المشروع :

1. يتوجب عليك في هذه الدراسة ملء إستمارة.
2. الوقت المتوقع لإتمام هذه الإستمارة يقدر بحوالي ال 5 إلى 8 دقائق.
3. الهدف من إجراء هذا البحث هو كتابة رسالة لشهادة الماجستير.
4. سيتم مشاطرة معلومات وبيانات هذه الدراسة مع أعضاء هيئة الماجستير في الجامعة الأميركية في بيروت وحسب.
5. هدف هذه الدراسة هو التطرق إلى مسألة خيار اللغة بحسب السياق واكتشاف أي وجه من اوجه الهوية هو الأهم بنظر التلامذة اللبنانيين بتحديد هويتهم .

ب- المخاطر والفوائد

إن مشاركتك في هذا البحث لا تشمل أي مخاطر جسدية أو نفسية تتعدى المخاطر التي تواجه في الحياة اليومية. يحق لك سحب موافقتك أو وقف مشاركتك في أي وقت كان ولأي سبب كان. مشاركتك في هذا البحث ليس لها فوائد محددة لك شخصيا, إلا أنها قد تساعدنا على فهم كيف يرى التلامذة الجامعيين هويتهم بطريقة افضل.

ج- السرية

لا ترفق أجوبتك باسمك بهدف المحافظة على السرية. سيتم المحافظة على خصوصيتك عبر دراسة وتحليل وكتابة ونشر بيانات هذه الدراسة بشكل إجمالي.

د- معلومات الاتصال

إن كان لديك أي أسئلة, بإمكانك طرحها الآن. في حال خطرت لك أسئلة أخرى لاحقا أو شكوى عن هذا البحث, بإمكانك التواصل مع فريق البحث على البريد الإلكتروني خاصة البروفيسور لينا شويري lc01@aub.edu.lb

إن كنت ترغب في التواصل مع أحد من خارج فريق البحث لطرح أي أسئلة عن هذا البحث أو لتقديم شكوى، أو لطرح أسئلة عن حقوقك كمشارك، أو للحصول على معلومات، أو لإعطاء رأيك، يمكنك التواصل مع لجنة الأخلاقيات على البريد الإلكتروني irb@aub.edu.lb

– حقوق المشاركين

مشاركتك طوعية ورفضك المشاركة لا يستدعي أي جزاء. يحق لك أن توقف (ي) مشاركتك بأي وقت كان من دون تحمل أي جزاء. يحق لك ألا تجيب (ي) عن أي سؤال من الاستمارة إن كنت لا ترغب (ين) بذلك.

هل لديك أي أسئلة حول المعلومات أعلاه؟

هل توافق (ين) طوعاً على المشاركة في هذا الدراسة البحثية؟ نعم _____ لا _____

توقيع الباحث

المكان: _____

التاريخ: _____

التاريخ: _____

الوقت: _____

الوقت: _____

APPENDIX G

LANGUAGE CHOICE AND GENDER

The following tables present the breakdown of the sample by native language, second language, and third language spoken respectively and gender.

		NL				
		Arabic	French	English	Other	Total
Sex	Male	97	7	7	1	112
	Female	173	11	6	0	190
Total		270	18	13	1	302

Table 26: Native Language (NL) and Gender

A significant majority of both males and females speak Arabic as a native language. A few speak French or English as a native language.

		SL						Total
		Arabic	French	English	Other	French & English	No Second Language	
Sex	Male	10	55	45	2	0	0	112
	Female	14	132	41	1	1	1	190
Total		24	187	86	3	1	1	302

Table 27: Second Language (SL) and Gender

The majority of the male participants are divided almost equally between those who speak French and those who speak English as a SL. However, with females this is very different.

The majority of females speak French as a SL, and a much smaller number of female participants speak English as a SL. This shows that gender does play a role in the choice of second language.

		TL					Total
		Arabic	French	English	Other	No Third Language	
Sex	Male	5	29	58	4	16	112
	Female	3	25	140	2	20	190
Total		8	54	198	6	36	302

Table 28: Third Language (TL) and Gender

Half of the male participants speak English as a third language whereas almost two thirds of females speak English as a third language. This is due to the fact that most female participants speak French as a SL and English as a TL.

The following section reports on the cross tabulations between language choice and gender.

Chi Square tests of independence were performed to examine the relation between the language participants would use in daily communication _ the language they would speak with their mother, father, siblings, grandfather, grandmother, friends, partner, boss, waiter, doctor, and maid _ and gender. The results are shown in Table 29.

Daily Communication	Df	X2	P	N
Mother	5	4.906	.427	302
Father	5	2.422	.788	302
Siblings	7	10.430	.165	302
Grandfather	5	5.783	.328	302
Grandmother	4	10.110	.039	302
Friends	6	5.708	.457	302
Partner	8	11.487	.176	302
Boss	8	11.214	.190	302
Waiter	6	4.326	.633	302
Doctor	6	11.857	.065	302
Maid	8	5.441	.710	302
Coworkers	9	11.090	.270	302

Table 29: Chi Square Tests for Daily Communication and Gender

The relation between the language participants would use to speak with their mother, father, siblings, grandfather, friends, partner, boss, waiter, doctor, maid, and coworkers and gender was not significant. The language the participants choose to use in daily communication and interaction is not affected by the gender of the participants. Males and females make similar language choices in daily communication irrespective of gender.

The relation between the language participants would use to speak with their grandmother and gender was significant. $X^2(4, N=302)=10.110, p=.039$. The language the participants choose to speak with their grandmother is affected by the gender of the participant. Males and females make different language choices when talking to their grandmothers.

As for the second category _ performing educational activities _ of situations given in the questionnaire, Chi Square tests of independence were performed to examine the relation between the language participants would use in performing educational activities _ speaking to teachers, discussing literature, discussing scientific topics, reading newspapers, reading books, writing emails, reading academic articles, and reading for pleasure _ and gender. The results are shown in Table 30.

Educational Activities	Df	X2	P	N
Speaking to Teachers	13	31.348	.003	302
Discussing Literature	14	16.418	.289	302
Discussing Scientific Topics	13	30.301	.004	302
Reading Newspapers	13	23.381	.037	302
Reading Books	13	21.302	.067	302
Writing Emails	12	10.551	.568	302
Reading Academic Articles	11	23.759	.014	302
Reading for Pleasure	14	18.115	.202	302

Table 30: Chi Square Tests for Educational Activities and Gender

The relation between the language participants would use to speak to their teachers, to discuss scientific topics, to read newspapers, and to read academic articles and gender was significant. Male participants and female participants choose different languages to speak with their teachers, to discuss scientific topics, to read newspapers, and to read academic articles. However, for the other contexts of educational activities, male and female participants make similar language choices.

Chi Square tests of independence were performed to examine the relation between the language participants would use to perform personal activities _ to discuss religion, to discuss intimate topics, to tell jokes, to insult someone, to greet someone, to ask someone out, to express

anger, to order food, to complete a job application, to write personal emails, to discuss taboo subjects, to chat, and to write text messages _ and gender. The results are shown in Table 31.

Personal Activities	Df	X2	P	N
To discuss religion	10	13.259	.210	302
To discuss intimate topics	12	11.302	.503	302
To tell jokes	9	3.367	.948	302
To insult someone	9	6.887	.649	302
To greet someone	12	26.280	.010	302
To ask a (wo)man out	8	8.035	.430	302
To express anger	8	12.216	.142	302
To order food	7	.333	1.000	302
To complete a job application	13	10.879	.621	302
To write personal emails	13	7.748	.860	302
To discuss taboo subjects	9	9.139	.425	302
To chat	10	11.077	.352	302
To write text messages	13	18.995	.123	302

Table 31: Chi Square Tests for Personal Activities and Gender

The relation between the language participants would speak to greet someone and gender was significant. $X^2(12, N=302)=26.280, p=.010$. The language the participants choose to speak to greet someone is affected by the gender of the participant. The female participants in this study reported they would use languages to greet people different from those the male participants reported they would use. However, greeting people is the only context in which this difference was reported. The participants both males and females reported they would use the same languages to perform other personal activities.

APPENDIX H

ASPECTS OF IDENTITY AND GENDER

A Multiple analysis of Variance was run in order to examine whether gender affects how important a specific aspect of identity is viewed by the participants. Table 48 shows the multivariate test values.

Identity Aspect	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.
Personal	.061	1.255	.236
Social	.008	.267	.976
Relational	.018	1.261	.286
National	.010	.588	.709

Table 48: Multivariate Tests for the Different Aspects of Identity and Gender

The Pillai's Trace values for all four aspects _ .061 for personal identity, .008 for social identity, .018 for relational identity, and .010 for national identity _ showed that there is no significant relationship between gender and any of the aspects of identity in question.

Gender is not a factor that affects the participants' perception of personal identity, relational identity, social identity, or national identity.

Since, in this study, students from three different universities took part, a MANOVA was run by university to compare between all three universities in whether gender affects the degree of importance of the different identity aspects as viewed by the participants. The following

section discusses the effect gender has on determining the importance of certain aspects of identity at AUB, USJ and LU.

Table 49 shows the results for the multivariate tests for aspects of identity and gender by university.

Identity Aspect	AUB			USJ			LU		
	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.	Pillai's Trace	F	Sig.
Personal	.229	1.504	.132	.313	2.247	.014*	.187	1.198	.295
Social	.026	.257	.978	.179	2.037	.053	.133	1.516	.165
Relational	.069	1.511	.207	.061	1.280	2.85	.011	.229	.922
National	.036	.601	.699	.049	.801	.552	.064	1.116	.359

Table 49: Multivariate Tests for Aspects of Identity and Gender by University

The only significant value is that of the relationship between gender and personal identity at USJ. For USJ participants, gender only affects how personal identity is viewed but does not affect the way social, relational or national identity are viewed. For both AUB and LU students, gender does not affect the way they view any of the aspects. Therefore, gender plays but a minor role in the perception of how important a certain identity aspect is.

APPENDIX I

EMAIL SCRIPT

This is not an official AUB email message. It's only for research purposes.

Dear Instructor,

My name is Denise Atallah. I am a graduate student at AUB and I am conducting a study about language and identity for my thesis (I am attaching a copy of the proposal in case you wish to know more about the study). **The study is purely for research purposes.**

I am using quantitative data, and for data collection, I need to collect 360 questionnaires: 120 from AUB, 120 from USJ, and 120 from the Lebanese University.

All I need from you is to allow me to speak to your students at the end of your session and hand them out consent forms and questionnaires (attached with this email) to fill at home. Then, I will come back the following session and place a box where the students can drop the questionnaires and consent forms.

This process will not take any of the time dedicated for your sessions. And the questionnaire will take the students 5 to 7 minutes to complete.

To reply, to ask any questions, or share comments, you can contact the primary investigator, Prof. Lina Choueiri at lc01@aub.edu.lb or you can contact me on my email address deniseatallah@hotmail.com, or call me on 70-131654.

Thank you for taking the time to read this,

Best Regards,

Denise Atallah

References

- Haji Omar, A. (1998). Language planning and image building: The case of Malay in Malaysia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (130. 1) 49-65.
- Ayyash-Abdo, H. (2001). Individualism and collectivism: The case of Lebanon. *Social Behavior and Personality* (29. 5) 503-518.
- Bailey, B. (2002). Language, race, and negotiation of identity: A study of Dominican Americans.
- Cheek, J; Smith, S; Tropp, L. (2002). Relational identity orientation: A fourth scale for the AIQ. *Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting in Savannah, GA.*
- Diab, R. (2006). University students' beliefs about learning English and French in Lebanon. *System* (34) 80-96.
- Diab, R. (2009). Lebanese university students' perceptions of ethnic, national, and linguistic identity and their preferences for foreign language learning in Lebanon. *The Linguistics Journal. Special Edition* 101-120.
- Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics* (23. 3) 289-322.
- Earley, C; Gibson, C. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism-collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management* (24. 3) 265-304.

- Eckert, P; McGinet, S. (1995). The production of 'girl' in an educational setting. *Gender and Education* (7. 2) 143-156.
- Esseili, F. (2011). English in Lebanon: Implications for national identity and language policy. (Doctoral dissertation). Purdue University.
- Esseili, F. (2017). A sociolinguistic profile of English in Lebanon. *World Englishes* 684-704.
- Fernandez, A. M. (2009). National, linguistic, and religious identity of Lebanese Maronite Christians through their Arabic fictional texts during the period of the French Mandate in Lebanon (Doctoral dissertation). Georgetown University.
- Ghaleb, M., & Joseph, J. (2000). Factors affecting students' perceptions of the status and use of languages in Lebanon. In K. Shaaban (Ed.), *Language and education* (pp. 287-307). Beirut, Lebanon: Lebanese Association for Educational Sciences.
- Giles, H; Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (68) 69-99.
- Jones, S. (2009). Bilingual identities in two UK communities: A study of the languages and literacies of Welsh and British-Asian girls (Doctoral dissertation). Nottingham University.
- Joseph, J. (2004). *Language and Identity: National, ethnic, religious*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joseph, J. (2006). Linguistic identities, double-edged swords. *Language Problems and Language Planning* (30. 3) 261-267.
- Kim, L. (2003). Multiple identities in a multicultural world: A Malaysian perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* (2) 137-158.
- Kim, L; Lee, K; Wong, F; and Azizah, Y. (2010). The English language and its impact on identities of multilingual Malaysian undergraduates. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies* (10. 1) 87-101.

- Langner, S.; Hennigs, N.; Wiedmann, K. (2013). Social persuasion: Targeting social identities through influencers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* (30. 1) 31-49.
- Mc Kinney's. (2007). Language, identity and English education in South Africa. *English Academy Review, A Journal of English Studies* (24. 2) 1-5.
- Ministry of Education Report. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.crdp.org/stat-details?id=26000&la=ar>
- Parkinson, J; Crouch, A. (2011). Education, language, and identity amongst students at a South African University. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* (10. 2) 83-98.
- Razmjoo, S. A. (2010). Language and identity in the Iranian context: The impact of identity aspects on EFL learners' achievement. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* (2. 2) 100-121.
- Santos, H; Varnum, M; Grossmann, I. (2017). Global increases in individualism. *Psychological Science*.
- Shaaban, K; Ghaith, G. (2002). University students' perceptions of the ethnolinguistic vitality of Arabic, French and English in Lebanon. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* (6. 4) 557-574.
- Shaaban, K; Ghaith, G. (2003). Effect of religion, first foreign language, and gender on the perception of the utility of language. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* (2. 1) 53-77.
- Suleiman, Y. (2004). *A war of words: language and conflict in the Middle East*. Cambridge University Press.

Suleiman, Y. (2003). *The Arabic language and national identity*. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.

US Department of State. (2017). International religious freedom report for 2017. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

Velasquez, M. (2010). *Language and Identity: Bilingual Code-switching in Spanish-English Interviews* (Thesis). University of Toronto.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. London and Paris: Mouton.

