Language Maintenance in the Arabic–Speaking Community in Manchester, Britain: A Sociolinguistic Investigation

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Humanities

2011

Mohamed F A Othman

School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures

Table of Contents

(Word count 89.823)

Abstract

The present study examines Arabic language maintenance within two generations in the Arabic-speaking immigrant community in Manchester. Data was collected through participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and focus group discussions to investigate a number of issues: firstly, to ascertain whether the participants form a speech community, despite originating from different Arab countries and speaking dialects of Arabic specific to their country of origin. Secondly, the study also investigated language choice patterns in interaction within first and second generations, language ability in both generations, and attitudes towards Arabic language and bilingualism. In addition, the language policy of Manchester's Public Services and its influence on the maintenance of minority languages such as Arabic was also examined. The study attempted to provide a contemporary evaluation of language maintenance in an immigrant context. This is done through investigating the role of globalization and the supraterritorial activities associated with it in maintaining minority languages in diaspora (e.g. advances in communication technology, world transportation, etc.), and the roles of the multiple dialects and diglossia characterizing the Arabic language in Arabic maintenance.

The results show that Arabs from the different Arab countries in this study form an integrated speech community. They fulfil a number of criteria proposed by the different definitions of a speech community; e.g. communication amongst the members of the community, using a common language in communication, shared rules for language use, existence of linguistic differences between members of the community and those outside it, sharing of one formal variety, etc. The language choice patterns indicate that Arabic is functional in the participant families, and that parents actively seek to socialize their children in maintaining a demarcation in function between Arabic and English, whereby Arabic is used for intra-group interaction, and English for inter-group interaction. The results show that children have ability in Arabic and can use the language in real life situations for various communicative tasks. The participants also have positive attitudes towards their bilingualism and the maintenance of Arabic. As far as Manchester's Public Service language policy is concerned, there are provisions for Arabic and other minority languages in the services provided by Manchester City Council and related agencies, such as NHS, Courts, and Police, etc. Globalization, and the supraterritorial activities associated with it, have a positive influence on immigrant language maintenance in diaspora. The characteristic diglossia and multiple dialects of Arabic language are not an obstacle for its maintenance in Manchester. These results indicate ethnic language maintenance across the first and second generations of Manchester's Arabic-speaking community examined in this study.

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Mohamed Fathi 2011

Copyright Statement

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, my dearest wife, my children, and to my sisters.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep respect and gratitude to my supervisor Professor Yaron Matras for his guidance and support throughout this work.

I also would like to show my deep appreciation and thanks for Dr. Erik Schleef for his help.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to the University of Manchester for funding my PhD.

I would like to extend a heartfelt thanks to all the members, past and present, of the SLLC at the University of Manchester.

Transliteration System

Consonants

Arabic letter	Transliteration symbol	Arabic letter	Transliteration symbol
ء	’/ ʔ	ط	ṭ
ب	b	ظ	ẓ
ت	t	ع	‘/ ʕ
ث	ṯ	غ	ḡ
ج	j[1]	ف	f
ح	ḥ	ق	q
خ	ḵ	ك	k
د	d	ل	l
ذ	ḏ	م	m
ر	r	ن	n
ز	z	ه	H

[1] In Egyptian Arabic this sound will be represented by ‘g’.

س	s	و	W
ش	š	ي	Y
ص	ṣ		
ض	ḍ		

Vowels

Short vowels	Long vowels	Diphthongs
َ : a	ا : ā	َي : ay
ِ : i	ي: ī	َو : aw
ُ : u	و: ū	

The transliteration system outlined above, and used throughout this study, is the same system that is used in Hans Wehr's *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, 4th edition (1994). This system is also used in other studies on Arabic Linguistics; e.g. Brustad (2000).

Transcription Key

(n)	pause; *n* refers to the length of the pause in seconds
(.)	short pause less than a second
speech	transcribed speech using the transliteration system above
'*speech*'	translation of speech
[.....]	missing word, phrase or sentence
[-----]	missing turn

1 Language Maintenance (LM) in Urban Communities

1.1 Introduction

Manchester is an urban center that is characterized by a huge cultural and linguistic diversity. According to the Education Development Officer of the Central East District in INATSS (International New arrivals, Travellers and Supplementary Schools), there are approximately 160 languages spoken in Manchester schools. This reflects the large number of ethnolinguistic minorities who speak languages other than English in the city. The Arabic-speaking community is one of these minorities. There is a large community of Arabs in Manchester. This can be seen, for instance, in the services provided in Arabic by Manchester City Council. As will be illustrated in chapter 3, due to the big number of Arabs, the council, and other government agencies working alongside, provide different services in Arabic, including leaflets, documents, interpreters, translators, linkworkers, etc. The large numbers of Arabs in Manchester can also be seen through the existence of many Arabic schools in the city. According to the International New arrivals, Travellers and Supplementary Schools department there are five Arabic schools that are registered with the council; there are also many other Arabic schools that are not registered (cf. Chapter 3).

The present study attempts to assess Arabic maintenance/shift in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester; hence, it helps to fill a gap in the literature with regard to the study of Arabic in the European diaspora, which, according to Boumans and Ruiter (2002: 269), "has only just begun." Also, as Boumans and Ruiter (2002) indicate, most studies on Arabic-speaking diasporic communities focus on communities from a single country of origin; e.g. Moroccans in the Netherlands. Unlike these studies, the present study focuses on the Manchester Arabic-speaking community in general, that comprises Arabs from different Arab countries (e.g. Libya, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Algeria, etc.) speaking various dialects of Arabic corresponding to their countries of origin (cf. Chapter 4). The study will investigate Arabic maintenance in this community in two generations: the parent generation (i.e. the first generation who immigrated from the homeland as adults) and the child generation (i.e. the second generation who were born in Manchester or came to it at a younger age) (cf. Chapter 2 Methodology). To achieve that goal, data will be collected through participant observation, interviews and focus group discussions to gain insights into the language behavior of the two generations in the participant families. That is, the participants' language choice patterns in the different domains of language use (e.g. home, mosque, friendship, work, etc.), language abilities in Arabic and English, and language attitudes will be explored.

In addition to these community-internal determinants of language maintenance/shift, the study will also look at the language policy of Manchester to see to what extent the local circumstances are supportive to the maintenance of Arabic (the aims and research questions of the study will be illustrated in more detail in section 1.6).

In the present study, there were no particular assumptions set with regard to Arabic language maintenance; however, I was aware of the trend in the literature that language shift in immigrant communities starts with the second generation and is complete by the third generation, although of course there is also variation in this regard (cf. section 1.3.2 for a discussion of the three-generation shift pattern). With regard to the general stance towards the maintenance of Arabic, I, as a linguist, believe that it is important to maintain the different minority languages in Manchester and the unique language/cultural diversity that characterizes the city, and that there should be government effort to achieve that purpose. This position is occasionally articulated in the present study, particularly in the investigation of the language policy in Manchester. In this investigation I suggest, for example, that there should be an explicit language policy in Manchester City Council and other government agencies that guarantees that minorities can learn and preserve their languages (cf. Chapter 3).

The study is structured as follows: this current chapter (Chapter 1) talks about minority language maintenance/shift in urban communities. The language behavior of immigrant communities is explored and the three-generation shift pattern is discussed. A brief summary of previous research on Arabic maintenance in diaspora, as well as on immigrant languages in general in different contexts around the world, e.g. the UK, Australia, etc., is presented. The chapter also discusses some theoretical models that have been proposed by researchers as explanatory frameworks for language maintenance/shift. The last section of the chapter discusses the aims and significance of the study. It also provides introductory sections on the two gaps that the study will fill, explaining: first, the sociolinguistic situation of the Arabic language that is characterized by multiple dialects and diglossia, and in what way this may influence Arabic maintenance; second, the concept of globalization and the different supraterritorial activities associated with it (e.g. supraterritorial communication, transportation, markets, etc.), and how they can help immigrants maintain their native language. The methodology is discussed in chapter 2. There are two types of data in the present study: family data and Manchester's language policy data. The criteria for selecting the sample were explained and a family description table was provided. Methods of collecting the data; i.e. participant observation, interviews and focus group discussions, were thoroughly discussed in this chapter. However, when there was a need in some chapters to illustrate in more detail the methodology of collecting and assessing data,

this was presented in the relevant chapter. The chapter concludes with an illustration of ethical considerations related to the present study. In chapter 3, Manchester's language policy is investigated to see whether it is supportive to ethnic language maintenance. There are different provisions and services in Arabic and other community languages provided by Manchester City Council and agencies working alongside; e.g. NHS, Courts and Police, etc. This indirectly supports language maintenance; e.g. it gives the language status. However, the actual effort for maintaining Arabic is community internal. Chapter 4 shows that Arabs in the present study form a speech community despite originating from different Arab countries and speaking dialects of Arabic specific to their country of origin. It discusses the mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects and pan-dialect communication in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester.

In chapter 5, the participants' language choice patterns are explored and categorized using a continuum: consistently Arabic, mostly Arabic, mostly English and consistently English. The findings indicate that Arabic and English are used by both generations to varying degrees depending on different factors; e.g. domain, addressee, generation, etc. The multiple Arabic dialects were found to have no influence in language choice. Globalization, through advances in communication technology and transportation means, helps provide a function for Arabic, especially in the homeland. In chapter 6, speakers' actual abilities to use Arabic/English for natural purposes in realistic interaction situations are investigated. The focus is on children's ability in Arabic and parents' ability in English. Parents have varying degrees of English language ability. Children have ability in Arabic (spoken and written) and receptive competence in other dialects of Arabic than theirs, which shows that the existence of diglossia and multiple dialects does not have an influence on their language ability. Children's ability in Arabic is attributed to a number of factors; e.g. attending Arabic schools, speaking Arabic at home, watching Arabic satellite channels and visiting the homeland (which are facilitated by advances in communication technology and transportation), etc.

The participants' attitudes towards bilingualism and Arabic maintenance are examined in chapter 7. Both generations have positive attitudes towards Arabic and English, and within Arabic towards their own dialect, other dialects and MSA. Thus, the existence of diglossia and multiple dialects does influence language attitudes. For the participants, maintaining Arabic is crucial since Arabic is a symbol of identity and the language of the Quran. They also need Arabic for intra-group communication whether in Manchester or the homeland. As for English, it is the language of inter-group interaction; e.g. at work, education, etc. The participants have also positive attitudes towards maintaining their ethnic identity due to globalization and the different supraterritorial activities linked to it which facilitates contact with the homeland. In

chapter 8, a general conclusion of the principal findings of the present study is presented. I also provide a contemporary evaluation of language maintenance in an immigrant context. Then, the limitations of the study are discussed.

As mentioned above, the present study is concerned with Arabic as a minority language. In the next section (1.2), I will start with a discussion of the types of ethnolinguistic minorities and the common characteristics they share. Then, in section 1.3, the discussion will focus on non-indigenous/immigrant minorities as this is the case in the present study.

1.2 Types of ethnolinguistic minorities and the common characteristics they share

There are two types of ethnolinguistic minorities: indigenous minorities and non-indigenous or immigrant minorities. Both indigenous and non-indigenous minorities share some common characteristics. Discussing the European situation, Nelde (1992: 133-34), for example, provides a host of similarities between indigenous and non-indigenous minorities. Although Nelde is discussing the European situation, the similarities he provides hold valid, and can be generalized, to other ethnic minorities in different places in the world. One of the similarities he provides is that in Europe both types of minorities are stigmatized and the term 'minority' is often used in a discriminatory manner for both groups (1992: 133). This holds true for other minorities in other places. Moreover, the term minority is imprecise as it does not express the actual size relationship. For instance, as Nelde indicates, the so-called 'Flemish minority' (the Dutch-speaking inhabitants of Belgium) is in reality the majority; also, in cities like Stockholm, Brussels, and Berlin there are school classes in which Finnish, Arabic or Turkish minorities are in the majority (1992: 133). According to Paulston (1998), as well, the term 'minorities' is incorrect since it implies quantitative differences only, whereas the most significant distinction is that of a 'super/sub-ordinate' status relationship (Paulston 1998: 1, discussing Giordan 1992; Paulston 1994; Vilfan 1993). Thus, it is more appropriate to speak about privileged or dominant and non-privileged or non-dominant ethnic groups (Paulston 1998: 1, discussing Vilfan 1993: 6). Also, both indigenous and non-indigenous minorities use their native language as a 'group language' to differentiate them from the host community or from their surroundings. The social use of the mother tongue is restricted in both cases to the family domains and sometimes it extends to the semipublic domains (e.g. clubs, bars and restaurants), and rarely to the public domains (Nelde 1992). Moreover, for both groups the mother tongue lacks prestige, a fact which promotes assimilation and rejection of the native

language (Nelde 1992: 133-34 & Mckinnie and Priestly 2004: 24). For both groups, as well, new arguments in support of bilingualism and multilingualism seem to be applied only to the minorities, not to the majority. In other words, it is the minorities who have to learn the majority's language, not the other way around.

The present study is mainly concerned with non-indigenous minorities as this is the case in the Arabic-speaking immigrant community in Manchester, Britain. In the next section, I will explore the culture and language behaviors of such minorities.

1.3 Culture and language behaviors of non-indigenous/ immigrant minorities

1.3.1 Isolation, assimilation, or acculturation and integration

The phenomenon of non-indigenous minorities who leave their countries of origin and immigrate to other countries due to social, political, or economic reasons is as old as mankind. Due to the relative ease of travel across great distances and borders, the number of migrants has increased worldwide to the extent that in some countries (e.g. the Comoro Island) there are more immigrants than indigenous inhabitants; consequently, more non-indigenous than indigenous language communities (Nelde 1992: 139).

This large-scale migration results in increased language contacts in the multilingual world we are living in, bringing about cultural and language conflict. Such conflict is often inevitable since the immigrant groups often differ from the host inhabitants in culture and language. Thus, the issues of isolation, assimilation, and integration of these immigrants, which has been dealt with in much of the linguistic literature of the past few years, arises and comes to the surface (Nelde 1992: 141). Niznik (2003: 357-59) states that in theory, the newcomer immigrants, as regards their cultural and linguistic absorption, choose between three processes: isolation, assimilation, and acculturation.

Isolation refers to a state of immigrants' maximum disconnection from the host community and the establishment of their own infrastructure. Isolation as such suggests mother tongue maintenance; according to Winter (1993: 311), minority languages that are used in conditions of isolation, whether physical or cultural, will be preserved. Assimilation refers to the almost entire desertion and rejection of one's native language and culture of origin. As such, it involves the immigrants behaving "diglossically in the Fergusonian sense, i.e., their native language becomes the low variety and the host language the high variety, so that the influence of the host language on the migrant

language is greater than the reverse" (Nelde 1992: 143). The process of acculturation refers to the idea of being 'in between'; that is, to simultaneously selectively accept some of the elements of the host culture and preserve the culture of origin so that the two cultures are viewed as in complementary distribution to each other. Hence, the confrontation of the value systems of the two cultures does not lead to such a negative conflict, which results in the host culture engulfing the native culture, but rather to integration on the road to biculturalism. In the area of language, acculturation leads to bilingualism, and in most cases, to a bilingual speech community where the mother tongue is assigned to the intra-group spheres such as home and family; the host language to the wider, public, inter-group ones; e.g. work, government institutions, etc.

It is quite rare, however, according to Nelde (2000: 442), to find a state of symmetrical, equal-status bilingualism, which offers migrants the possibility of integration without assimilation. In Europe, for instance, migrant children are rarely, if ever, given the advantage of 'natural bilingualism' (i.e. ethnic language as school language) since school-language policy is generally not concerned with foreign languages other than English and other European languages. Thus, migrant children are exposed in school to 'artificial bilingualism' (i.e. children must learn, in addition to their mother tongue, both the host language and a prestigious foreign language such as English) (Nelde 1992: 134). In the UK, as well, the educational language policy emphasizes English as the language of instruction in schools, and there is much more concern with teaching modern foreign languages in schools than with teaching community languages (cf. Chapter 3). The old American notion describing America as a 'melting pot' for immigrants is another example which reflects an asymmetrical, non-equal-status bilingual context that forces immigrants towards assimilation rather than integration. For example, Fishman (1989: 404) states that the assimilationist legacy characterizing the American immigrant context has resulted in language shift among many immigrant and indigenous communities. As recurrently indicated in the literature, shift to the dominant language among immigrant minorities is usually complete within three generations, as illustrated below.

1.3.2 The three-generation language shift pattern

Many scholars indicate that language shift among immigrant groups is typically complete within a time span of three generations; e.g. Fishman (1966, 1972), Veltman (1983), Paulston (1986), Stoessel (2002: 94), and others. Gogonas (2007: 16) summarizes this three-generation language shift pattern as follows: the immigrant/first generation tries to learn the host community's language but speaks the native language

in intra-group settings, e.g. at home; the second generation may speak the native language at home but shifts to the dominant language at school and in the workplace; by the third generation, the dominant language becomes the home language, and effective knowledge of the mother tongue disappears. However, not all immigrant communities fit within these generalizations; there is variation among ethnic groups whereby the native language may be maintained for three generations or more. For example, in the German language enclaves that have been in Australia since the mid-nineteenth century, language was maintained for three or even five generations; interaction with older people, who were competent speakers of German, played a significant role in language maintenance for at least a generation (Clyne 2003: 28-29). Also, the oldest Serbo-Croatian-speaking community in southeastern Louisiana, USA, have maintained their language for seven generations (Conklin and Lourie 1983: 203, discussing Ward 1976). Garcia (1997), as well, indicates that while the traditional third generation shift pattern is obvious in the case of Hungarians and Italians in New York, other groups, e.g. Latino, Chinese and Asian Indian New Yorkers, maintain their native language for a longer period spanning the second and third generation. This variation among immigrant groups is also highlighted by Fishman (1985) in his typology of resolutions to interactions between two separate monolingual ethnolinguistic collectivities over three generations, although Fishman, as well, sees that the three-generation shift pattern is the most common. According to Fishman (1985: 57-69), this interaction may result in the intrusive or immigrant language being lost over three generations (and this is the typical pattern for most immigrant communities as he states); however, it may also result in the immigrant language being maintained along with the host language, usually in diglossic relationship whereby each one has its specific functions and domains.

In the present study, there is no third generation due to the recent date of immigration of the first generation (cf. Methodology chapter, section 2.1.1); thus, Arabic language maintenance will be explored in the first and second generations to see whether the language is transmitted to the second generation. For example, as mentioned above, the three-generation shift pattern indicates that the second generation may speak the native language at home but shifts to the dominant language outside it. Hence, as will be illustrated in section 1.5.1.1, the study will look into the second generation's language choice patterns in the different domains of language use. This will help gain insights into which language they use at home, with friends, at school, etc., and whether there is shift to English in the second generation. Also, their Arabic language ability will be investigated since language ability affects to a large extent language use. Thus, while the study does not relate to the three-generation shift

model as a whole, it pertains to those aspects of the model related to the behavior of the second generation. Also, tentative insights regarding language maintenance in the third generation will be obtained through the second generation's attitudes towards Arabic maintenance and their reports about their anticipated language use with their future children; however, no definite conclusions can be made since it is not known for sure whether these attitudes will be turned into reality in the future (cf. Chapter 7). As Pavlenko (2007: 176-77) indicates, interview data cannot be treated as 'truth' or 'reality itself'; "speakers use linguistic and narrative resources to present themselves as particular kinds of individuals" (cf. section 2.1.2.2.1).

In the next section, I will begin with a brief overview of previous research carried out on minority language maintenance/shift in different immigrant contexts, before moving on to discuss studies that deal with Arabic-specific contexts. After that, I will try to identify factors proposed by the different scholars as influencing language maintenance or shift in immigrant contexts.

1.4 Research on minority language maintenance/shift

As mentioned above, bilingualism and multilingualism result from language contact. They might be established or stable; i.e. patterns of bilingualism or multilingualism are of long standing, hence, we have a case of language maintenance. They may, however, be intermediary or transitional; i.e. they are a stage towards monolingualism in the host language, thus, we have a case of language shift (Thomason 2001: 4). The issue of minority language maintenance/shift has been discussed in a number of studies. These studies handled both indigenous and non-indigenous minority language maintenance/shift. Some studies have been concerned with indigenous minority language maintenance/shift in contact contexts where two or more languages have existed for a long time; however, one is replacing, or significantly influencing, the other (e.g. Dorian 1977, 1981, 1999, and Dorian (ed.) 1989; Gal 1979; Bergsland 1992; Hovdhaugen 1992; and others). On the other hand, non-indigenous minority language maintenance/shift in immigrant situations has been the focus of attention for other studies, as illustrated below.

1.4.1 Research on non-indigenous/immigrant minority language maintenance/shift

Much research has been done on immigrant language maintenance/shift in different immigrant contexts worldwide[2]. For example, the immigrant context in the United States has been studied by a number of researchers; e.g. García (1997), Sridhar (1997), Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971), Pearson and McGee (1993), Luo and Wiseman (2000), etc. Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971), for instance, investigated language choice in the Puerto Rican community in New York. The results suggested that the amount of Spanish and English claimed for conversation differs according to the domain of interaction. That is, Spanish was claimed to be most used in the domain of family, followed by friendship and religion. The least likely domains for Spanish were education and employment. The reverse is true for English.

Australia is another place characterized by sociolinguistic diversity. Recent immigrant languages in Australia have been investigated in a number of studies (e.g. Clyne 1976, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1991, 2003 and others; Clyne and Kipp 1999, 2006; Papadametre and Routoulas 2001; Smolicz 1981; Smolicz and Secombe 1985; etc.). Clyne (2003), for example, investigated minority languages maintenance/shift in Australia based on the rate of the community language use in the home domain as reflected by the language question in the 1996 census. The study found that there are different rates of ethnolinguistic variation in patterns of immigrant languages maintenance/shift among the different immigrant minorities. The highest shift in all the immigrant groups in Australia was attested among the Dutch, compared to groups such as those from China, Greece and Hong Kong.

In the UK context studies on immigrant language maintenance do exist, such as Wei (1994), Moffatt (1990), Raschka, Wei and Lee (2002), Rasinger (2010), but these are less prevalent than elsewhere. Wei (1994), for example, investigated the sociolinguistic situation in the Chinese community in Tyneside, Newcastle across three generations. The findings on the participants' language choice and ability indicated that there is intergenerational language shift from Chinese monolingualism to English-dominant bilingualism within the span of three generations, and that this shift is closely related to a shift from strong ethnic-oriented social networks to predominantly non-Chinese, peer group networks across generations. Rasinger (2010) investigated linguistic usage patterns in various domains and perceptions of ethnolinguistic vitality

[2] In this section, a number of such studies will be explored; in later chapters more studies conducted in different immigrant contexts around the world will be investigated and compared to the present study.

among Eastern European migrants in East Anglia. The results indicated that the native language is generally the preferred language in the home domain (i.e. in interaction with partners and children), although English is also used to some extent in communication between partners; in all other domains outside the family domain, e.g. workplace, friends, acquaintances, etc., there is a preference for the use of English. That is, language choice is domain-specific. Language use was also found to be influenced by the participants' subjective perceptions of ethnolinguistic vitality. The findings indicate a relatively low subjective ethnolinguistic vitality, with the participants evaluating both the importance of their native language and their ethnolinguistic group as significantly lower than that of English. This leads to a stronger desire to speak English compared to L1. Rasinger sees that the extent to which English is used by the participants, even in the home domain, along with the relatively long-term settlement plans in the UK that the respondents have, may indicate an initial sign of slow language shift towards English in the long run.

1.4.2 Studies on Arabic language maintenance

A number of studies have been conducted on Arabic language maintenance in the diaspora; e.g. Sawaie (1992), Dweik (1992), Daher (1992), Tribalat (1995), El Aissati (1996), Mehlem (1998), Clyne and Kipp (1999), Broeder and Extra (1999), Boumans and Ruiter 2002, Rouchdy (2002), etc. For example, Clyne and Kipp (1999: 137-216) investigated Arabic maintenance in the Arabic-speaking community in Melbourne. The results show that one of the main factors for the maintenance of Arabic among Arab Australians, notably Muslims, is related to their religious affiliation, due to the fact that the Quran and classical Arabic are crucial to Muslims. Thus, even in international families, with Muslim Arab fathers and non-Muslim, non-Arab mothers, children and mothers learnt to speak Arabic (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 141, discussing Penny and Khoo 1996). The incentives for Arabic maintenance among Muslim Arabs in Australia include access to the Quran, and visits to homeland and interaction with family members (Clyne and Kipp 1999). Dweik (1992) investigated language maintenance and shift in the Lebanese community in Buffalo. He found that the first generation had positive attitudes towards Arabic and used it at home and for intra-group communication; hence they maintained Arabic. The second and third generations did not use Arabic in their homes and communities and had negative attitudes towards it; thus, they shifted to English. Sawaie (1992) studied language loyalty and language shift among Arab immigrants in the United States. His findings indicated that early Arab immigrants in America (from 1882-1930) emphasized their loyalty to Arabic as evident

in their writings in the periodicals. This was not the case, however, with the second generation who had no interest in Arabic as a means of communication and who underwent increasing pressure to assimilate; hence, the maintenance of Arabic declined with it. Daher (1992) investigated language maintenance in the Lebanese community in Cleveland. The findings indicated a full shift at the production level in the second generation and at the comprehension level in the third generation (1992: 29). According to Daher, the speedy shift to English in the community is related for the most part to disloyalty to Arabic. As he states, Lebanese in Cleveland are not concerned with Arabic maintenance; they do not exert any effort to preserve the language, they do not have Arabic schools, and they do not use Arabic with their children at home for fear that it may influence children's acquisition of English which they consider more prestigious and practical (Daher 1992: 27).

As shown in the studies outlined so far, there are different determinants of language maintenance/shift in immigrant situations; e.g. language use, proficiency, attitudes, loyalty, etc. In the present study, I take a comprehensive approach to the investigation of Arabic language maintenance in Manchester by exploring all such determinants. Also, in addition to investigating the communicative and symbolic functions of Arabic, I will look at the local circumstances under which Arabs in the present study maintain their language; i.e. the language policy in Manchester and whether it is supportive of community language maintenance.

In the next section, I will look at the factors identified in the above studies and more factors that have been proposed by different scholars as influencing language maintenance/shift.

1.5 The theoretical framework of the present study

In order to provide a framework in which the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester can be described and the findings can be analyzed, I will discuss some theoretical models of language maintenance and shift that have been proposed by a number of researchers as illustrative and sometimes predictive frameworks for language maintenance/shift; e.g. Fishman (1964, 1965, 1966), Smolicz (1981), Winter (1993), Kloss (1966), Fishman (1991), etc. Instead of discussing the models individually, I will discuss the factors they identify as promoting language maintenance/shift, as relevant to the present study; e.g. the communicative function of the language, the symbolic function of it, the institutional resources for it, etc. Then, I will provide a summary of generalizations obtained from all the models.

1.5.1 Factors of language maintenance/shift

1.5.1.1 Language use/choice: communicative function of language

One of the important factors for immigrant language maintenance is related to its use as a medium of communication by speakers. Fishman (1966: 426) indicates that the relative frequency of language use in a contact situation gives an indication as to whether there is maintenance or shift. However, this use varies from what he refers to as one 'domain' to another, as discussed below:

Fishman's (1964, 1965 & 1966) domains of language use

The concept of domains refers to contextualized spheres of communication; e.g. work, friendship, home, religion, education, etc. These domains of language behavior represent the location of language maintenance/shift (Fishman 1966: 428). They are informative about language choice, and consequently language maintenance/shift, in bilingual and multilingual situations. They indicate that language choice is not only an individual language behavior, but also is related to the socio-cultural norms of the community. That is, "language choices, cumulated over many individuals and many choice instances, become transformed into the processes of language maintenance and language shift" (Fishman 1966: 429).

According to Fishman (1964 & 1966), specific domains may be more resistive of language shift than others are. The family domain, for example, militates against language shift more than the education or occupation domains do. Thus, the degree to which every domain contributes to language maintenance/shift is varied and relative. Moreover, sometimes even within the one domain, there exist individual differences with regard to each individual's contribution to language maintenance; for instance, the mother within the family domain may contribute more to language maintenance than, say, the father. In fact, the use of the native language at home, especially by the mother, is often cited in the literature as an important factor in maintaining the minority language since the intergenerational transmission of the mother tongue depends upon such use (Fishman 1966 & 1991: 162). Describing the role of the mother in the intergenerational transmission of Basque, for example, Fishman (1991: 162) states that it is a far more influential role than that of the father. Jongenburger and Aarssen (2001: 299), as well, state that the native language use is most often sustained longest in communication with the mother; thus, the mother often serves as the 'gate keeper' of native language use. It should be noted, however, that the role of the mother in

language maintenance cannot be taken for granted since this certainly depends on the entire family and social network structure more generally.

One of the most important determinants for the survival of minority languages in a contact context is related to the degree to which speakers are able to maintain a demarcation in function between their ethnic language and the dominant group's language, whereby each language is used in different domains from the other. Paulston (1998: 6), for instance, demonstrates that there are three major reasons accounting for the non-occurrence of shift in some contact situations; one of them is maintaining "a diglossic-like situation where the two languages exist in functional distribution where each language has its specified purpose and domain." This compartmentalization reinforces language maintenance since it promotes a state of stable diglossia (Fishman 1985). Also, according to Fishman (1991), the crucial problem for intergenerational mother tongue continuity is this regulating of the extent to which one language is reserved for outside relations and the other for inside relations (1991: 356). There might exist some sort of language overlap within the one domain, but this must be kept to a minimum to maintain the state of stable diglossia in a contact situation.

Thus, in the present study, the two generations' language choice in the different domains of language use; e.g. home, friendship, work, mosque, etc., will be investigated in order to gain insights into whether Arabic is still functional and whether there is compartmentalization in function between the native language and the host language; i.e. Arabic is used for intra-group interaction, and English for inter-group interaction (cf. Chapter 5). This communicative function of a language is important for its maintenance according to Clyne (1991). Haugen, as well, states that language will be maintained if it functions as a means of communication with people who we wish to speak with (1980: 114). Moreover, in order to investigate further the functionality of Arabic, the participants' ability to use the language for natural purposes in realistic interaction situations will be explored (cf. Chapter 6). Language ability is one of the factors that determine to a large extent bilinguals' language use (Wei 1994; Spolsky 1988). Also, according to Fishman (1966), language ability is necessarily of concern to language maintenance and shift since it is one of the indicators of whether preservation or change is operative.

It is not only the communicative value that is important for language maintenance; the emblematic value of the language is also important, as will be shown below.

1.5.1.2 Symbolic function of language

Winter (1993), in his model of major conditions favoring or disfavoring the survival of minority languages[3], emphasizes the importance of motivation for the process of language maintenance. This motivation arises not only from the communicative need for the language, but also from symbolic need for it; e.g. as a symbol of identity, group membership, etc. This emblematic function of language is of great importance since cultural differences between communities do not automatically lead to the division of 'we-group' and 'they-group', as Boneva (1998) indicates; rather, "the symbolic use by a group of any aspect of culture [especially language] in order to differentiate psychologically from others and maintain internal cohesion is decisive in ethnicity persistence" (Boneva 1998: 80). The symbolic function of language is also referred to by other scholars. For example, Conklin and Lourie (1993), in their investigation of factors supporting immigrant language maintenance/shift in the USA, refer to the importance of the emotional attachment to the ethnic language as a defining feature of ethnicity in its maintenance. Smolicz (1981), as well, concerned with community language maintenance/shift in Australia, has developed his model of 'cultural core values'. The model suggests that every group has a host of cultural values that are essential to its survival and continuation, and that form a kind of prerequisite for group membership: according to Smolicz and Secombe (1985: 11), such values "are regarded as forming the most fundamental components or heartland of a group's culture, and act as identifying values which are symbolic of the group and its membership." Moreover, these core values are most obviously discerned when the group is in danger and needs to protect its culture against outside pressures as can be seen in the responses of ethnic minorities in countries where the majority is bent on a policy of cultural assimilation; e.g. in Australia and the United States (Smolicz and Secombe 1985: 11).

Language is a more fundamental core value to some cultures and ethnic groups than to others. According to Smolicz (1983), language is a core value for Poles and Greeks; hence, they are more likely to maintain their native language in the immigrant context. The Dutch, conversely, lose their language quickly in a similar context since language is not vital for the survival of their ethnicity. It should be noted here as well that within an ethnic group, language may also have greater or lesser core value for some individuals. Also, to some groups, values other than language are considered to be more crucial. Italian and Irish communities, for instance, regard family cohesion and Roman Catholicism respectively as their core values according to Smolicz. Nevertheless,

[3] The model is based on his own experiences with a number of small languages in different parts of the world, especially the Low German speech community in which he was born.

there appears to be intergenerational and even intra-group variation as regards core values within the larger ethnolinguistic group (Clyne 1991: 91-102).

Language is usually most effective as a core value when it is combined with other core values; e.g. religion, and when such core values require using the language for specific purposes[4]. For example, Arabic has "respective claims to authenticity as the language of the Qur'an" (Clyne 2003: 65). It is also the language of prayer and worship; thus, Muslim Arab bilinguals cannot pray in a language other than Arabic. This is of great importance for its maintenance. According to Clyne and Kipp (1999: 137-216), for instance, one of the most important factors for the maintenance of Arabic among Muslim Arabs in Australia is the fact that the Quran and classical Arabic are essential to them. The notion of "religious classicals" (Fishman 1985, and 1991: 360) is also of relevance here; i.e. languages that have long been maintained on an intergenerational basis because of their links with divine revelation.

To sum up, the above discussion shows the importance of the emblematic function of a language in its maintenance. Thus, in the present study, in addition to investigating the communicative value of Arabic, as explained in the previous section, its symbolic value will be examined, as well. That is, the participants' attitudes towards Arabic, and also whether these attitudes are turned into real practices to maintain the language will be investigated. This is in line with Smolicz and Secombe's (1985: 13) view that attitudes do not necessarily correspond to reality; hence, it is important to know whether the cultural aspects evaluated as 'core' are really used within ethnic groups or have been reduced to "ideational, symbolic level only, with positive attitudes which are hardly ever activated in practice, as in the case of Gaelic for the great majority of Irish people."

1.5.1.3 Language policy of the host community: attitudes of the majority towards the minority group and language

Kloss (1966: 206-212), based on the German-English contact situation in the American immigrant context, suggests a model identifying factors that are clear-cut in promoting language maintenance and factors that are ambivalent; i.e. they can lead to either language maintenance or language shift. One of the ambivalent factors he identifies is related to the influence of the language policy of the host community; i.e. with regard to suppression of ethnic languages or permissive attitudes. According to Kloss, favorable attitudes can encourage pluralism or gradual integration into the host

[4] This connection between language and religion is also emphasized by Conklin and Lourie (1983) as one of the factors that promote language maintenance.

community which may eventually lead to language shift. Likewise, oppression of community language and culture may lead to either assimilation or more will and more efforts to maintain both (Kloss 1966: 211-12). In fact, suppression does not necessarily lead to absorption; Fishman (1985: 59), for instance, states that other practices, not necessarily ones overtly created by law, have influences with regard to language maintenance and language shift[5]. Winter (1993), as well, maintains that if it is the choice of speakers whether to use a particular language, then it is less likely than commonly believed that suppression of a language will succeed against the will of the speakers. Arabs in Manchester in the present study do not suffer from societal suppression or any kind of suppressive policies; rather, they suffer from the negative portrayal of them in the media, which stereotypes Arabs as dangerous, terrorist Muslims. Although this may force them to assimilate to hide their dissimilarity to the dominant group, it might also urge them to maintain their culture and language in their attempt to present the right picture of Arabs as they believe it to be.

The importance of the language policy of the host community in minority language maintenance is also emphasized by Fishman's (1991) model of 'reversing language shift', which is concerned with intergenerational mother-tongue discontinuity and how it can be arrested and reversed. In this model, Fishman provides a 'Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale' (Fishman 1991: 87) which consists of eight stages, each of which is a step towards reversing language shift. Stage one, in which language maintenance is "on the strong side" as Fishman states (1991: 401), emphasizes the importance of providing government activities in the minority language for language maintenance. In the present study, government service provisions in Arabic and other community languages offered by Manchester City Council and agencies working alongside council services, such as NHS, Courts and Police, will be investigated to gain insights into the language policy in Manchester and the extent to which such a policy is supportive for the maintenance of community languages in the city. As will be illustrated in chapter 3, although English is the official language in which government activities in Manchester are carried out, there are some services that are provided in Arabic and other community languages. For example, public notices in Arabic are issued on education, health, safety, legal questions and rights, etc. In addition, Arabic translators,

[5] Fishman states that even in the absence of explicit laws supporting the indigenous/host language, the establishment of the indigenous language can be attained via making rewards of all types; e.g. material, professional, governmental and educational rewards, to the immigrants, contingent on interactions with indigenous inhabitants and in the indigenous language. This host-language-encouraging rewarding system, in the absence of strong and compartmentalized reward traditions to the contrary, eventually leads to 'intergroup social dependency', which negatively influence ethnic language maintenance (Fishman 1985: 61-62).

interpreters, linkworkers, etc. can be provided in different locations: in police stations, courts, hospitals, etc. (cf. Chapter 3).

1.5.1.4 Ethnic language institutions

One of the factors Conklin and Lourie (1983: 204) provide as promoting language preservation is the spread of community language institutions; e.g. ethnic schools, clubs, media, press, etc. The importance of the existence of such institutions for language maintenance has been highlighted by other scholars as well. Fishman (1991) emphasizes the value of ethnic language mass media in language maintenance. Fishman means here presenting ethnic and regional media in the community language as in the case of Basque (1991: 174). In the present study, the availability of Arabic media and whether they have influence on language maintenance will be investigated. Although there is no Arabic TV or newspaper in the city, this can be offset by the fact that Arabic satellite channels are now extensively accessible everywhere due to the current advances in communication technology. Also, Arabic newspapers, whether issued in the homeland or in the UK, are available in shops in Manchester and on the internet.

The importance of community language institutions has been also emphasized by Fishman's (1985: 158-166) model which suggests a number of criteria to predict the survival rates of non-English languages in the USA. One of the criteria of survival that he provides is the existence of institutional resources; e.g. schools, local religious units, etc. Fishman indicates that institutionally strong community languages; i.e. those languages with many institutional resources, appear to have a relatively good chance with regard to the potential of their survival rates[6]. Fishman (1991), as well, emphasizes the impact of ethnic institutions, particularly ethnic supplementary schools that are controlled by the minority group and that do not need to comply with the host group's standards and criteria concerning obligatory education. Fishman refers to the role of these schools in literacy in the native language which he stresses as important in reversing language shift (1991: 95-98). Kloss (1966), as well, refers to the importance of schools; one of the factors he identifies as clear-cut in promoting language maintenance is membership of a denomination with parochial schools.

As will be illustrated in chapter 3, Arabs in Manchester have their ethnic schools that are run and controlled by them and that have freedom over their administration, methods, curricula, etc. Also, the mosque as well as Arabic schools can be considered as

[6] Of course, the survival also depends on other important factors like the number of speakers. As Fishman indicates, some languages which are institutionally active may rank low with regard to their survival just because their users are few (1985: 162).

equivalent to the parochial schools that Kloss (1966) refers to. The mosque can be regarded as a school where Arab adults and children spend hours praying, listening to religious teachings, learning the Quran and socializing; all these events are done in Arabic. Moreover, in all Arabic schools, Arabic language is a mandatory subject for all students. In addition, textbooks of the different modules are in Arabic, Arabic is the medium of instruction, and students must sit the exams in Arabic[7]. This is crucial regarding the school's contribution to language maintenance for a number of reasons: first, it provides "a real and significant function for the community language in the life of the student by using it as the means to a demonstrable end, thus enhancing its value" (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 50, discussing Kipp 1981). Second, it creates an environment in which the community language is the only language used or at least required to be used; this is enhanced by the fact that the language used by teachers and in administration is Arabic, which gives more authority to it. Eventually, the mother tongue is highlighted as a medium of learning and communication in the domain of education just as English, though of course in different types of education. However, it should be noted that such schools cannot guarantee language maintenance; they enhance it as long as it is already occurring in the home and community. That is, schools cannot make any significant independent contribution to language maintenance. According to Fishman (1985: 371), "in the case of school, it is the home-and-community that provides, preserves and directs its language maintenance contributions; i.e. the flow of language maintenance influence is much greater from the home-and-community into the school than, vice versa."

1.5.1.5 Numerical strength

The size of the immigrant group is one of the factors identified by scholars as important for ethnic language maintenance. Kloss (1966), for example, indicates that the numerical strength of the immigrant community enhances language maintenance in that large groups can have influence in state or local affairs and can afford more maintenance efforts such as constructing numerous educational and social institutions (Kloss 1966: 210). Fishman (1985: 158) presents the number of users of an immigrant language as one of the important criteria for its survival. As he states, immigrant languages with the largest numbers of users have the best chance of surviving; he also indicates that these numbers should be adjusted for the average age of the current users so that the younger counts for more than the older. This adjustment is significant

[7] Also, some of the Arabic schools can be regarded as religious schools since they teach only the Quran and Arabic language.

since the survival rates of some languages are higher than others due to the relatively older or younger nature of their users (Fishman 1985: 162). Moreover, Fishman (1991) refers to the intergenerationally, demographically concentrated family-neighborhood-community sphere, as an important step in reversing language shift. Fishman considers this as "a sound basis for long run intergenerational transmission" (1991: 161). The existence of concentrations of immigrant language speakers is also highlighted by Conklin and Lourie (1983: 204) as one of the demographic factors that enhance language maintenance. However, according to Clyne (2003) there is no necessarily complete concomitance between high concentrations and the rate of language maintenance/shift in the contemporary urban situation in Melbourne. As he states, while Macedonians have both the highest concentration and the lowest language shift, Maltese speakers, who have the second highest concentration, have witnessed a relatively high language shift (2003: 39).

To sum up, numerical strength as a factor that influences language maintenance is of relevance to the present study. There is a large number of Arabs in Manchester, which facilitates having ethnic language institutions; e.g. Arabic supplementary schools. This helps language maintenance, as mentioned above (cf. section 1.5.1.4). Also, as will be illustrated in chapter 3, local authorities in Manchester provide services in Arabic, which is largely due to the numerical strength of Arabs in the city. The large number of Arabs in Manchester also provides more opportunities and a large social context for the use of Arabic. This gives the language a communicative function, which enhances its maintenance (cf. section 1.5.1.1).

1.5.1.6 Distance from the host community

The cultural, linguistic, racial, religious, etc. distances from the host group are referred to by a number of researchers as factors that influence immigrant language maintenance or shift. Kloss (1966) indicates that the linguistic and cultural distance from the host community enhances language maintenance in that knowledge of such distance strengthens group consciousness among the members of the immigrant group, which urges them to exert more efforts to maintain their ethnic language, as less effort is made to acquire the host language and culture. On the other hand, such distance can render maintaining identity difficult, especially among younger generations; hence, it may militate against language maintenance (Kloss 1966: 211). The linguistic and cultural distance from the host group can help language maintenance in that, as Brown (2008: 2) states, the introduction of lexical and syntactic changes from a dominant language into a native language takes place more often in such cases in which two

languages have a common lineage than when two languages spring from different language families. This is because similarities between two languages can easily disguise fine lexical and grammatical changes. These changes present a threat to the continued existence of the native language (Brown 2008: 12). Also, the linguistic distance impedes the process of learning reading and writing in the host language, hence, helps maintain literacy in the community language; such literacy is important for language maintenance (Fishman 1991). As for the cultural distance, it draws a demarcation line between the two cultures which helps the immigrant to keep a relative distance from the host community.

The religious and racial distances from the mainstream are referred to by Fishman (1985) as factors that are helpful in the survival of non-English languages in the USA. Also, According to Paulston (1998: 6), one of the major factors for the non-occurrence of shift in a contact situation, is the "self-imposed boundary maintenance (Barth 1969), always for reasons other than language, most frequently religion, like the orthodox Jewish Hassidim."

In the case of the Arabic-speaking community under investigation, it is culturally, racially, religiously and linguistically distant from the host community. This may be suggestive of language maintenance; e.g. it helps the demarcation between the host and immigrant groups, strengthens group consciousness, etc., as above-mentioned. However, this distance may also make preserving identity difficult as Kloss (1966) indicates above, which is not in favor of language maintenance. In the present study, the maintenance of ethnic identity among the participants and whether this influences Arabic preservation, especially with regard to attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance will be investigated (cf. Chapter 7).

1.5.1.7 Level of education, occupation, and length of stay in the host country

One of the factors identified by Kloss (1966) as influencing language maintenance and shift is related to the educational level of the immigrants. As Kloss states, a lower educational level may lead to a tendency to stay aloof from the host culture and to perpetuate customs that maintain the values and traditions of the homeland, which can help maintenance. This is because it usually does not make for occupational mobility and urbanization. A lower educational level may also, however, prevent many activities that might enhance the native language; for example, it is difficult for immigrants with low educational level to establish ethnic educational institutions of sufficient quantity and quality to protect their native language against the

overwhelming influence of the host language (Kloss 1966: 210). On the other hand, a higher level of education may increase the possibility of contact with the host community and bring the immigrants closer to its culture, which may suggest language shift. That is, it makes for occupational mobility, fast urbanization and a keenness to interact with the host community and to take part in its social and political affairs. A higher level of education, however, facilitates many cultural activities; e.g. ethnic press, schools, etc., and promotes a higher culture around the ethnic language, which helps language maintenance (Kloss 1966: 210).

The length of residence in the host country is also identified by researchers like Conklin and Lourie (1983) as a factor that can influence language maintenance and shift; it can be a language maintenance factor if it is low and vice versa. Also, Urzúa and Gómez's (2008), in their study on Spanish maintenance among Puerto Ricans in Southbridge, New England, indicate that the longer the stay in the host community is, the less importance is placed on mother-tongue preservation. The occupation of the immigrants can also affect language maintenance. Skilled and professional immigrants can organize language maintenance efforts more efficiently than non-skilled or labor immigrants (Lewellen 2002; Conklin and Lourie 1983).

The above-mentioned factors of education, occupation and length of stay in the host community are of relevance to the present study. The participants have different lengths of stay in Manchester; e.g. five years, twelve years, twenty years, etc.; different educational levels that range between PhD, Master, university degree, under-university degree, etc.; and different occupations that range from white-collar to blue-collar; e.g. a university lecturer, a medical doctor, an accountant, a mechanic, a driver, etc (cf. Methodology chapter). This may/may not have influence on Arabic language maintenance; e.g. on language choice, attitudes, etc., as will be investigated in the relevant chapters.

To sum up, the above sections discussed various models of language maintenance/shift proposed by a number of researchers; e.g. Fishman (1964, 1965, 1966), Smolicz (1981), Winter (1993), Kloss (1966), etc. The discussion focused on the factors identified by the models as promoting language preservation or change, as relevant to the present study. In order to reach a better understanding of the process of language maintenance/shift, it is important to consider various factors as they apply to the case under investigation; i.e. the factors have to be considered in complementary distribution to one another. For example, if a group is linguistically and culturally distant from the host community; is numerically strong; uses the native language in intra-group domains, e.g. the home, friendship, etc.; considers their native language as core value;

and has institutional resources for language maintenance, then the group is most likely to maintain the mother tongue in immigrant situations.

A summary of generalizations regarding language maintenance drawn from the above models and factors can be given, as shown below.

1.5.1.8 Generalizations drawn from the models

Different generalizations can be highlighted. For example, the functionality of the community language is highly important in its maintenance since it creates a need for the language and thus helps its intergenerational transmission. The function of a language can be represented on a continuum: on the one end, there exists the communicative function of the language; on the other, we have the emblematic function of the language. In order for a minority language to be maintained, it must be used as a medium of communication in intra-group interactions, especially at home, and fulfill the communicative needs of its speakers in such settings; this is the most important function of any language. This can be achieved through maintaining a compartmentalized use of the ethnic and host languages; the former for intra-group communication, the latter for inter-group communication. The emblematic function is also important for minority language maintenance; that is, that the language is regarded as a means to flag emotions; e.g. as a symbol of identity and group membership.

The existence of community language institutions; e.g. ethnic schools, media, clubs, etc. can help secure functionality for the community language[8]. For example, ethnic schools that use the ethnic language as the medium of instruction[9], besides their being the primary and most important means for learning and maintaining community language literacy, create a somewhat formal attachment to the native language among the minority group, especially the younger generation since they realize they must use it in the formal domain of education to some extent like the host language is used in the mainstream schools which they attend. Hence, it provides children with an additional reason for why they have to maintain their mother tongue; e.g. the ethnic language is highlighted as important in order to get a certificate. The use of the community language in ethnic educational institutions provides a communicative function for the ethnic language since it is used as a means of interaction within the educational

[8] This existence depends to a large extent on factors such as the numerical strength of immigrants, their level of education, etc.

[9] Of course, not all ethnic schools use the community language as a means of instruction; some use the majority language as a language of instruction.

institutions. Ethnic media, clubs and gatherings as well help create a communicative function to the ethnic language.

Moreover, the functionality of the minority language, hence the likeliness of its maintenance and intergenerational transmission, increases when the language is tied to religion. That is, when the practice of a given religion has to be done in the community language, this creates a protected domain where the community language must be used, and thus, guarantees a function for it. In addition, having such a religious function will provide an important motive for transmitting the language intergenerationally, which is essential for its continuity and maintenance. Hence, there will be more effort both at home by the parents and in the wider ethnic community to pass the language on to future generations due to its religious function.

Another generalization that can be drawn from the models is that the difference or distance from the host community is to some extent helpful for minority language maintenance. Such a difference can be cultural, linguistic, religious, racial, etc. In other words, when the culture; i.e. the habits, the traditions, etc., of the immigrant is different from that of the host community, this helps draw a virtual demarcation line between the two groups. The linguistic difference from the host group, as well, helps sustain such demarcation line since it makes it clear for the immigrant that his mother tongue is not valid for inter-group interaction; it is valid only for intra-group interaction, thus, he/she becomes aware that he/she is different from the host group. The linguistic difference may also delay the immigrant's learning of the host language since it may be difficult for an immigrant to learn a language that is different from his/her native language. Religious distance as well helps maintain such a cultural boundary between the minority group and the dominant group; the teachings of some religions, e.g. Islam, require their followers not to adopt some of the customs, traditions and lifestyle of, for instance, western host communities. This demarcation is important for minority language maintenance since, for instance, it influences the pattern of social networks of the individuals of the ethnic community. That is, the individuals in the community, if such demarcation exists, will tend to have more social networks; e.g. friends, from the ethnic community than from the host community. Hence, there will be more need and more opportunities to practice and to develop competence in the native language, which is important for its maintenance.

The language policy of the host country influences minority language maintenance. If the host country supports linguistic and cultural diversity, it will be easier for minorities to maintain their ethnic language and culture than if the reverse holds true. Such support can take many forms; e.g. the availability of materials and interpreters in the community language in the different government institutions such as

police stations, hospitals, etc. It can also take the form of teaching the community language at mainstream schools. Moreover, it can be in the form of helping minorities to have their ethnic schools, media, etc. However, a supportive language policy can help community language maintenance only when there is a motivation and an exerted effort among the ethnic community to maintain their native language. That is, supportive language policies can not alone be a guarantee for minority language maintenance.

Finally, language maintenance is a multidimensional process attained only through the combined efforts of all sections of the ethnic community: the family, the neighborhood and the wider ethnic community; each contributes to language maintenance from a specific angle and to a different degree. For example, ethnic schools contribute more to literacy maintenance, whereas the home and ethnic community contribute more to spoken language maintenance.

In the next section, the aims of the study will be revisited in more detail, in the light of the factors of language maintenance/shift given above, explaining the research questions and the gaps that the study fills.

1.6 Aim and significance of the study

The present study pursues two goals: (1) to assess Arabic maintenance/shift in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester, Britain, as an urban diasporic community, and the determinants of this maintenance/shift; (2) to address various gaps in the literature for which the language situation in Manchester offers an ideal research site. The first goal will be investigated in terms of a number of aspects: the participants' language choice, language ability, language attitudes, and Manchester's language policy. The participants' language choice patterns will be explored in order to gain insights into whether Arabic is still functional and whether there is compartmentalization in function between the native language and the host language; i.e. Arabic is used for intra-group interaction, and English for inter-group interaction. As mentioned above, this compartmentalization is important for community language maintenance and is crucial for the intergenerational continuity of the mother tongue (cf. section 1.5.1.1). Thus, language choice for the two generations under investigation will be examined in the different domains of language use: home, friendship, work, mosque, etc. Moreover, language ability is another indicator of maintenance/shift, and language use depends to a great extent on it (cf. section 1.5.1.1). Thus, the participants' ability to use Arabic for natural purposes in realistic interaction situations will be investigated.

Another aspect of importance to the study of language maintenance which will be examined is the speakers' attitudes towards the native language (cf. section 1.5.1.2).

For example, Luo and Wiseman (2000) conceptualize ethnic language preservation in both behavioral and attitudinal dimensions: the former refers to the rate of language use as well as language proficiency; the latter refers to attitudes towards native language maintenance. In the present study, the participants' attitudes towards the different varieties of Arabic and how such attitudes influence language maintenance will be investigated.

Fishman (1985) points out that one of the social conditions that promotes immigrant language shift is the prohibition that these languages may encounter concerning their use in public and official functions or alternatively, the requirement that the host language be so used. Thus, as explained in section 1.5.1.3, the language policy of the host country is important to the investigation of community language maintenance. In the present study, Manchester's language policy will be explored to gain insights into the extent to which such policy supports minority language maintenance. The investigation will explore provisions in Arabic and other community languages in Manchester City Council's different departments (e.g. Linkworkers, M-Four Translation, etc.) and other agencies working alongside (e.g. NHS, Courts, Police), mainstream education, supplementary schools, etc.

The significance of the present study stems, first of all, from its being the first such study that investigates Arabic Language maintenance in Manchester and the UK. The study as a whole is also a step towards filling the gap in the literature regarding the study of Arabic maintenance in the context of migration to urban centers around the world, especially Europe (cf. section 1.1). Moreover, although the models of language maintenance/shift are important in the description of minority language maintenance, as aforementioned, less or almost no due attention has been given to two issues that are highly important to understand community language maintenance in diaspora. These are, first, the role of contemporary large-scale globalization which characterizes present-day social relations and life (and what accompanied it from advances in communication technology and means of transportation, global markets, change in motivation for immigration, etc.) in immigrant Language Maintenance. The second issue is the roles of both the multiple dialects and diglossia characterizing some languages; e.g. Arabic, in minority language maintenance in immigrant contact situations. These two issues are introduced below:

1.6.1 The role of multiple dialects and diglossia

1.6.1.1 What are multiple dialects, and what is diglossia? the sociolinguistic situation in the Arab world

The Arabic language is characterized by the existence of multiple dialects and diglossia. That is, in the Arab world there are multiple spoken dialects of Arabic corresponding to the different Arab countries; e.g. Egyptian Arabic, Syrian Arabic, Lebanese Arabic, etc[10]. There are lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic differences between these regional dialects. For example, the dialects may sometimes differ in the vocabulary used to refer to a specific thing. The word used for 'now', for instance, in Libyan Arabic is *tawwa*, while in Egyptian Arabic it is *dil-waʔt*; in Saudi Arabic it is *daḥīn*. The dialects may differ as well at the level of phonology. The voiceless uvular stop /q/ can be traced as an old Arabic phoneme which has developed into different phonemes in a number of dialects. For example, in Saudi, Libyan and most dialects it has become a voiced velar stop /g/ as in words like *gām* 'he stood', while in some Syrian and Egyptian dialects it has become /ʔ/ as in *ʔām*. There is also variation at the level of morphology. Negation in some dialects is formed by placing both pre- and post-verbal negation particles; i.e. *ma* (as a prefix) and *š* (as a suffix), while other dialects use only the prefixed particle. For instance, the negation of a verb like *rāḥ* 'he went' in Egyptian Arabic will be *ma-rāḥ-š*, whereas in Saudi Arabic it is *ma-rāḥ*. The dialects differ as well in conjugation paradigms and aspect formation. An example of the former is the difference in person inflection on the verb in the imperfect; e.g. *ʔaktib* 'I write' in Gulf Arabic and *niktib* 'I write' in Tunisian and Moroccan Arabic: in the Tunisian and Moroccan dialects the prefix *n* is used for the 1st singular while in Gulf Arabic *ʔ* is used. As for the variation in aspect formation, Egyptian Arabic, for instance, differentiates between subjunctive and indicative in the imperfect as in *ʿāyiz ʔaktib* 'I want to write' and *dil-waʔt baktib* 'now, I am writing' (i.e. the use of the prefix *ʔ* vs. *b*), while Iraqi Arabic does not make such distinction as in *ʔarīd ʔaktib* 'I want to write' and *hassa ʔaktib* 'now, I am writing'. There are also syntactic differences among the dialects. In Saudi, Syrian and most dialects interrogative particles usually come sentence initially as in *ʔīš tibbī* and *šū biddak* 'what do you want', whereas in Egyptian and Sudanese dialects these particles come sentence finally as in *ʿāyiz ʔīh* and *ʿāwiz šinu* (lit. you want what). Despite these differences, the dialects are generally mutually intelligible and speakers make use of their receptive competence in other dialects than

[10] Arabic dialects do not only correspond to countries but also to ethnic and social boundaries; e.g. religion, type of settlement (sedentary and bedouin), etc.

their own in pan-dialect communication, as will be illustrated in detail in chapter 4. Also, within the one country in the Arab world there are sub-dialects that vary from the north of the country to the south, from the west to the east, etc. For example, when Egyptian Arabic is mentioned, what is usually meant is Cairene Arabic; i.e. the Arabic spoken in the capital city. However, there are other sub-dialects in Egypt; e.g. Upper Egyptian Arabic, Alexandrian Arabic, etc. Egyptians are aware of such dialects through direct face-to-face contact and through the media. There are also lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic differences between these sub-dialects. For example the word used for 'grandfather' in Cairo is *giddū*, whereas in Upper Egypt it is *sīdī*. To take another example, the /g/ in Cairene and Alexandrian Arabic in words like *gīt* 'I came' corresponds to the /j/ in Upper Egyptian Arabic, and most of the regional dialects in the Arab world, as in *jīt*.

Moreover in every Arab country, besides these everyday vernacular varieties, there is a standard variety (Modern Standard Arabic), which is the same across the entire Arab world, as will be illustrated below. Again, there are phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical differences between this standard variety and the spoken dialects. For example, the interdental quality of the MSA sounds /ẓ/, /t̲/ and /d̲/ in words like *ẓāhir* 'obvious', *t̲ābit* 'still' and *d̲arra* 'atom' are lost in some dialects; e.g. Egyptian Arabic and Syrian Arabic as in *zāhir*, *sābit* and *zarra*. Also, unlike the dialects, MSA uses a case system. For example, MSA specifies the nominative, accusative, and genitive status of nominal forms using a system of suffixed case endings, which also reflect the definiteness of the form; e.g *kitāb-un* – a book (NOM), *ʔal-kitāb-u* – the book (NOM). In the dialects these suffixed case endings are not used. Additionally, MSA indicates verbal mood morphologically; e.g. suffixing /n/, which marks the 3rd person masculine plural indicative verb as in *yamšū-n* 'they walk', but which is omitted in the corresponding subjunctive and jussive forms as in *yamšū*; this morphological differentiation of mood is dispensed with in some dialects like the Egyptian and Syrian ones in which, for instance, *yamšū* is always used. Also, the sentence in MSA is mainly verb-initial (VSO) whereas in the dialects it is subject-initial (SVO). Both colloquial Arabic and standard Arabic are used in different situations from one another, as will be shown below. In sociolinguistics this phenomenon is referred to as 'diglossia'[11].

The term "diglossia" was first employed in sociolinguistics by Charles Ferguson (1959). Ferguson defines diglossia as follows:

[11] Other countries, as well, are characterized by the existence of two or more varieties of a language used by people. Examples of these countries include Greece, German-speaking Switzerland, and the island of Haiti.

> "Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a ... highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation" (Ferguson 1959: 336)[12].

Thus, in each Arab country there are generally two main types of Arabic. The first is the variety used at home and in informal situations in general with a little difference between educated and uneducated speakers. This variety is called ʔal-ʿāmmiyyah (colloquial Arabic). The other variety is called ʔal-fuṣḥā (standard Arabic)[13]. This standard variety is acquired through education. That is, Arabic speakers learn ʔal-fuṣḥā at school; hence, it is used as the medium of reading and writing with no variation across the Arab countries[14]. Thus, ʔal-fuṣḥā is associated with the educated people and specifically with formal situations[15]. For example, when a religious scholar gives a sermon at a mosque or on television, or when a politician speaks on television, they are expected to speak in ʔal-fuṣḥā, the standard Arabic. Also, as will be illustrated in chapter 4, standard Arabic is occasionally used in conversation in certain situations; e.g. expressing taboo and linguistic accommodation in pan-dialect interaction. In all these cases, however, this use is at the level of lexical items, phrases, etc., not at the level of an entire conversation conducted in standard Arabic (cf. sections 4.2.1.1.4 and 4.2.1.1.5). The average educated Arabs usually have receptive competence in standard Arabic, and as Altoma (1969: 3) states, they find it difficult to sustain a conversation in it only. However, they regard ʔal-fuṣḥā as the real language that should prevail in the

[12] Hence, according to Ferguson, two features characterize a diglossic situation: the first is the differentiation between the written and the oral modes; the second is a strict socio-functional complementarity of two separate sets of functions performed by two linguistically related codes.

[13] Ferguson calls ʔal-ʿāmmiyyah the 'low' variety, and ʔal-fuṣḥā (the superposed variety) the 'high' variety.

[14] In the Arab world, the vast majority of written materials (e.g. literature, newspapers, etc.) are in standard Arabic.

[15] Addressing the diglossia in the Arab world, Somech (1980) stated that "it has two language worlds: the elite, educated, and highly civilized world, which is expressed through literary Arabic, and the common daily and oral world, which is expressed through spoken Arabic" (Abu-Rabia 2000: 148, discussing Somech 1980).

society: "the colloquial lacks the prestige enjoyed by the [standard Arabic]" (Altoma 1969: 3). Official languages and standard varieties are often considered by political and popular discourse as fundamentally superior to unofficial languages and nonstandard varieties (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2001: 246, discussing Collins 1999). This prestigious view of standard Arabic is frequently heard among Arabic speakers. Ezzat (1974: 10), for example, indicates that it is actually desirable among educated Arabs to occasionally standardize style when speaking since they "believe that [standard] Arabic bears a higher cultural prestige than the local dialects." Abu Haidar states, "of course, like all Arabs, Iraqis hold Literary Arabic in great esteem" (2002: 295-96). Rouchdy (2002: 143), as well, refers to the view of standard Arabic as 'the ideal language', which exists among Arab Americans in her study. In the present study, as well, as will be illustrated in chapter 7, the participants regard standard Arabic as the real language and perceive it as in higher status than colloquial Arabic (cf. section 7.2).

Given the sociolinguistic situation of Arabic described above, it might be argued that the existence of multiple spoken dialects may be an obstacle for Arabic maintenance in diaspora since it may lead to such a situation in which an Arab immigrant, especially a child, finds him/herself confused regarding which dialect he/she must maintain and use in order to be able to communicate in intra-group situations, and which may result in the immigrant ceasing to use the language altogether and shift to the dominant language. Likewise, it might be argued that the existence of a variety for writing (MSA) and another one for speaking is an obstacle for Arabic maintenance in diaspora as it may be confusing for Arab children and may hinder them from learning MSA and Arabic literacy. In the present study, the roles of multiple dialects and diglossia and whether they influence the participants' Arabic language use, ability, attitudes, etc. will be investigated.

Having discussed the multiple Arabic dialects and diglossia and the possible influence they might have on Arabic maintenance, let us now turn to the discussion of globalization and its influence on immigrant language maintenance in diaspora.

1.6.2 The role of Globalization

1.6.2.1 What is globalization?

The term globalization is an ambiguous one. Wiseman (1998: 1) describes it as "the most slippery ... buzzword of the late twentieth century." Thus, the definitions of globalization might be as legion as the number of experts on the topic (Lewellen 2002: 7). According to Scholte (2000: 41) "millions of lips have spoken the word globalization"; nonetheless a few have constantly utilized an explicit precise definition of

this term. Some define globalization as internationalization; another group as liberalization; yet, a third group as universalization; and still others as westernization, or more specifically Americanization. Scholte (2000: 46) defines globalization as "deterritorialization - or … the growth of 'supraterritorial' relations between people. In this usage, 'globalization' refers to a far-reaching change in the nature of social space. The proliferation and spread of supraterritorial - or … 'transworld' or 'transborder'-connections brings an end to what could be called 'territorialism', that is, a situation where social geography is entirely territorial. Although … territory still matters very much in our globalizing world, it no longer constitutes the whole of our geography."

Hence, one of the results of globalization is that even within the geographical boundaries of the homeland, people have access to and are challenged by other cultures and languages that are sometimes completely different from their own culture and language. Although this may have existed also in the past, it is more likely to have intensified in the current age of globalization due to the proliferation and spread of supraterritorial connections. For example, this occurs through foreign-language-school education, and electronic mass media such as radio and television that broadcast messages everywhere on earth in effectively no time. Moreover, certain movies (e.g. Hollywood movies that have acquired a global reach), music recordings, and certain printed materials like newspapers, magazines, novels, books, etc. are released simultaneously across the world. This may form a kind of challenge for countries to preserve their national language, identity and culture, yet in the case of immigrants, these features of globalization can help them to maintain their native language and culture through being in contact with the homeland by means of newspapers, books, music recordings, satellite media from the homeland, etc. Thus, generally, in the current age of globalization, migrants do not necessarily feel 'torn between two worlds' or have identity disorder, "but may develop bilingual and bicultural strategies to adapt to the new environment without denying or depreciating their culture of origin" (Roll 2003: 278, discussing Dittrich and Lentz 1994). In other words, globalization helps immigrants to maintain their ethnic language and identity in immigrant contexts. This is done through a number of aspects or transborder activities associated with globalization. These aspects are illustrated below.

1.6.2.1.1 Change in motives for immigration

According to Lewellen (2002: 125), in this contemporary age of globalization, migrations reveal different patterns from past migrations. For example, globalization has led to a much greater change in the motives for immigration. In Europe, for instance,

there have been the so-called 'guest workers' who were imported after the end of World War II to work in factories[16]. Currently, as Lewellen states, "with less need for what might be called railroad labor, the United States, Europe, Australia, and Japan have turned to encouraging elite migration, seeking highly educated people"; e.g. doctors, researchers, university teachers, executive managers, etc. (2002: 125). The motivation for such a type of immigration may not be solely economic, but also, intellectual; i.e. to benefit from the advances that the western world has achieved in the different fields of science. These highly educated immigrants have the intellectual capacity to provide and organize efforts to maintain the native language and identity; e.g. organizing ethnic schools which are run by members of the community. They may also see that they can maintain their ethnic language and identity even in diaspora, especially since contemporary large-scale globalization, and the increasing rates of migration that have accompanied it, have caused host countries to make legislations guaranteeing equality for all residents including immigrants, as is the case in the UK. In the present study, the motivation for immigration among the participant families and the attitudes towards the maintenance of Arabic language and identity will be investigated (cf. Chapter 7). Also, the Arabic supplementary schools that are prevalent in Manchester and their role in Arabic maintenance will be explored (cf. Chapters 3 and 6).

1.6.2.1.2 Supraterritorial communication

In earlier times, immigrant communities who managed to maintain their native culture and language in diaspora suffered from the territorial distance and borders which separated them from their national roots; thus in such communities the link with the motherland is often primarily in the imagination rather than in regular tangible communications (Scholte 2000: 171). Under these conditions, as Scholte indicates, the cultures of groups like Africans, African-Americans and Afro-Carribbeans significantly diverged during their separation from each other.

In contrast, the great advances in telecommunication technology associated with contemporary large-scale globalization have significantly enhanced the capacities of immigrants to sustain substantial contacts and deepen the ties both with each other worldwide and with the homeland. Thus, we have witnessed an abundance of social connections which are considerably separated from 'a territorial logic' of the kind where people normally have most of their interactions and affiliations with others who share

[16] Nowadays, the 'deterritorialization' of production, associated with globalization, has resulted in multinational corporations building factories for the different phases of production in different places of the world.

the same territorial space: for example, the same village, the same county, or the same continent (Scholte 2000: 47).

For example, as Scholte indicates, unlike in the past, it is now relatively easy for immigrants to write whatever they want in a fax, email, or a mobile-phone text message, and send it to their counterpart immigrants worldwide or their families and friends back home to read simultaneously. Moreover, telephone calls operate largely without regard of territorial space; immigrants can contact their families and friends in the home country at any time from anywhere for cheap and affordable costs by just dialing a telephone number[17]. Not only can immigrants speak to their friends and relatives in the homeland by phone, they can even see them while speaking; e.g. via the internet. Indeed, it is now easier for signs, text, images and sound to move instantaneously between people, irrespective of their territorial position or the territorial distances and borders that lie between them. In the present study, as will be illustrated in later chapters, this virtual environment of communication is important for the maintenance of Arabic language since it facilitates homeland-like communication situations without the need for physical proximity. Moreover, the existence of hundreds of Arabic satellite channels resulting from the contemporary advances in communication technology contributes significantly to the creation of this virtual environment of communication. Their being virtual makes them available for all Arab immigrants under investigation.

1.6.2.1.3 Supraterritorial transportation

Supraterritorial transportation, represented by the increased ease of travel to almost all parts of the world associated with globalization, is also helpful for immigrants in diaspora to maintain their native language and identity. The concept *ease of travel* refers here to the increase in the density or the number of flights, to the extent that an immigrant can book a flight ticket and travel anywhere in a few hours. In addition, this density is coupled with a concomitant reduction in airfares that has made flying relatively affordable (Scholte 2000). This helps immigrants maintain regular visits to their home countries, which is important for the maintenance of ethnic language, culture and identity. In the present study, in addition to the virtual communication with the homeland which is made possible by the advances in communication technology described above, the participants' maintain concrete interaction with the homeland

[17] Although immigrants in the past also wrote letters and spoke on the telephone, advances in communication technologies have resulted in a considerable increase in transborder communication between immigrants and their home countries, due to the relative ease, speed, affordability and quality of these modern means of communication.

through visits to their country of origin. Such visits are important for the functionality of Arabic, the ability in it and the attitudes towards its maintenance, as will be illustrated in later chapters.

1.6.2.1.4 Supraterritorial organizations

Another outcome of globalization is the spread of supraterritorial organizations that have given immigrants an institutional basis by bringing together immigrants with common ethnicity and national origin in the different parts of the world under a common organizational umbrella. For example, the 'World Union of Free Romanians' (which was established in 1984) has connected members in many countries (Scholte 2000: 171). Likewise, there are different Arab organizations in different parts of the world; e.g. America, Europe, etc. that aim to bring together Arab immigrants and organize their efforts to maintain links with each other and the Arab world. In the present study, the Arab organizations in Manchester will be explored to gain insights into their role in the maintenance of Arabic language and identity (cf. Chapter 7).

1.6.2.1.5 Supraterritorial/global markets

The global markets resulting from globalization have made it possible for immigrants in different immigrant contexts to sustain their national cuisine, music, dress, etc. more than in the past, by bringing 'home' goods within easy reach to expatriates worldwide through a coordinated transworld business strategy. In Manchester, for instance, as will be illustrated in chapter 7, Arab immigrants in this study have access to the different types of Arabic restaurants, food, dress, music, etc. All this is important in order to maintain the culture of origin *vis a vis* the overwhelming culture of the host community.

The above discussion shows that globalization and the different supraterritorial activities associated with it can play a role in immigrant language maintenance in diaspora. The present study will examine whether this applies to Arabic language in Manchester. That is, the study will investigate whether the advances in means of transportation (e.g. air travel) and communication technology (e.g. internet, telephone services, TV satellite channels, etc.), and the other aspects of globalization mentioned above, have influence on the participants' Arabic language use, ability, attitudes, etc. (cf. Chapters 5, 6, and 7).

To summarize, in section 1.6 I discussed the aims of the present study: first, to investigate the determinants of Arabic language maintenance in Manchester; i.e. whether Arabic is used in communication, whether the participants have ability in it,

their attitudes towards its maintenance, as well as the language policy of Manchester, the host community. The second aim is to address two gaps in the literature that have influence on immigrant language maintenance; i.e. the role of globalization, and the role of multiple dialects and diglossia on Arabic maintenance in Manchester. Based on the above-discussion, answers to the following questions are sought:

1. As the term 'speech community' entails communication among its members via a common language, yet the Arabs in the present study are from different Arab countries and speak various dialects, is there an Arabic-speaking community so that its language is maintained? Does this existence of multiple dialects influence Arabic maintenance in diaspora?
2. Does the existence of diglossia that characterizes the Arabic language influence Arabic maintenance in diaspora?
3. To what extent do the participants, especially the second generation, have ability in their ethnic language; i.e. Arabic?
4. What are the major patterns of language choice (Arabic vs. English) within the community?
5. What are the participants' attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance?
6. To what extent does the local authority in Manchester support the maintenance of Arabic and the other community languages? In other words, is there a minority-language policy in Manchester?
7. What is the role of globalization, characterizing contemporary social relations and contemporary life, in the maintenance of Arabic and other immigrant languages in diaspora?

Having discussed the theoretical framework, aims and research questions of the present study, in the next chapter I will discuss the methods of data collection. These include: participant observation, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions.

2 Methodology

Two types of data have been collected for the present study: family data, which is the core data (e.g. data on the participants' language choice, ability, attitudes, etc.); and data on Manchester's language policy (e.g. the provisions in community languages in Manchester City Council, courts, police, mainstream education, etc.). I will start with the family data in section 2.1, where I provide a description of the sample and the qualitative methods of data collection used in the present study. Then, in section 2.2, I will discuss the methods of collecting data on the language policy in Manchester. In the final section (2.3), the ethical considerations related to the study will be discussed.

2.1 Family data

2.1.1 The sample

The family sample consists of 17 families who are all of my direct acquaintances; some of them, I got to know during Arabic get-togethers and then we started to become friends and exchange family visits. Other families were my neighbours. Still others, I have known for three or four years and used to have strong relations with them since then. All families are Muslims, however, the sample, though does not contain non-Muslims, is characterized by heterogeneous features reflecting the diversity of the Arabic-speaking community; e.g. in terms of country of origin, occupation, education, length of stay in Britain, etc., as will be illustrated below. These variables play a role in immigrant language maintenance/shift as emphasized in the literature. Also, Muslims represent the largest section of the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester as emphasized by the participants and as is observable in streets, shops, Arabic get-togethers, Arabic schools, etc. Thus, we can draw generalizations, based on this sample, regarding Arabic language maintenance among Muslim Arabs living permanently in Manchester.

Four criteria were utilized in selecting the participants. First of all, they should have families (spouses and children who are at least three years old). Second, both parents had to be Arabs. Third, since Arabs in Manchester originate from a variety of countries, the participants had to be as much representative as possible of the diverse Arab countries. Fourth, they had to be living, or intending to live, in Manchester permanently; this means that student families who were temporarily living in the UK for studying were excluded. Moreover, the following characteristics were aimed for to give the sample breadth and make it more representative:

1. Families with different lengths of stay in Britain.
2. Families in which both of the parents were born and wholly or partially educated in the country of origin.
3. Families with children born and wholly or partially educated in the country of origin.
4. Families with children born and wholly educated in the UK.
5. Families where both, or one, of the parents were/was highly educated (university education or more).
6. Families where both, or one, of the parents were/was less educated (less than university education).
7. Families in which both, or one, of the parents had white-collar/prestigious jobs.
8. Families in which both, or one, of the parents had blue-collar/non-prestigious jobs.
9. Families with children at pre-school age.
10. Families with children at primary school.
11. Families with children at secondary school and after.
12. Families with children attending/not attending Arabic supplementary schools.

The goal of this heterogeneous sampling was to include participants who varied in their attitudes towards assimilation and their native language; hence "we could better understand the dynamics of ethnic language maintenance" (Luo and Wiseman 2000: 312-13). The description of the families is given in table 1 below.

Table 1 Families' description

Family No.	**Father's education[18] and occupation**	**Mother's education and occupation**	**Number and age of children[19]**		**Years in Manchester**	**Nationality**
			Daughters	**Sons**		
F1	MA from UK, Education Social worker	University degree, not working	2: 5/3 Y	2: 10/15 Y	12	Egypt

[18] As for fathers' and mothers' education, if the degree they have is from the UK, it will be highlighted. Otherwise, it should be understood that the degree is from the homeland.

[19] The number of daughters/sons will be mentioned first, then the age followed by the letter Y (Years old). Thus, in F1, for example, 2: 5/3 Y mean two daughters: one is 5 years old and the other is 3 years old.

F2	MA from UK, A teacher at an Islamic school	Secondary Stage Certificate, not working	3: 9/6/2 Y	2: 10/5 Y	8	Algeria
F3	BA, not working	Secondary Stage Certificate, not working	3: 15/6 Y, and <1[20]	1: 8 Y	6	Algeria
F4	PhD student in UK, various part-time jobs	BA student in UK, not working	----------	2: 3 Y, and <1	9	Palestine/ Jordan
F5	BA, an accountant	BA, not working	3: 14/12/5 Y	1: 4 Y	5	Egypt
F6	College degree, works in construction	BA, not working	----------	2: 3/2 Y	Father: 10, mother: 4	Jordan
F7	BA, taxi driver	BA, teacher at an Arabic school	2: 10/7 Y	-------	Father: 20, mother: 11	Iraq
F8	PhD from UK, medical doctor	BA, not working	3: 14/6 Y, and <1	2: 12/3 Y	14	Saudi Arabia
F9	PhD from UK, University lecturer	School teacher	2: 5/3 Y	-------	11	Libya
F10	MBCHB, Medical Doctor	Teaching certificate, not working	1: 27 Y	3: 28/25/ 18 Y	25	Libya

[20] <1 means a newly-born baby.

F11	College certificate, Barber	University degree, not working	1: 3 Y	-------	Father:9 Mother:4	Father: Algeria, Mother: Jordan
F12	PhD from UK, project consultant at University	PhD student in UK, not working	2: 6/1 Y	-------	8	Libya
F13	No qualifications, mechanic	College certificate, not working	2: 11/8 Y	1: 7 Y	Father:20 Mother: 13	Morocco
F14	BA in French language, interpreter	Secondary Stage Certificate, not working	2: 15/11 Y	1: 13 Y	9 [21]	Tunisia
F15	PhD from UK, head teacher of an Arabic school	University degree, not working	3: 32/ 29/22 Y	2: 28/19 Y	29	Libya
F 16	MSc., Engineer	Secondary Stage Certificate, not working	2: 16/15 Y	3: 13/9/3 Y	A year	Palestine
F17	BSc., admin.	BA, not working	1: 2 Y	1: 6 Y	4	Palest./Jordan

As shown in the table, there are two generations: the first/parent generation and the second/child generation. All the first generation immigrated from the homeland as adults whereas the second generation either were born and raised in Britain or immigrated to it at a younger age. The table also shows that children vary with regard to their ages, ranging from new-born to adult sons and daughters from long-established families, which meets the targeted characteristics of the participant families mentioned above, especially the inclusion of families with children at different levels of education.

[21] Before coming to Manchester, the family was living in Ireland, where children were born.

In the next section, I discuss the methods of data collection and the triangulation utilized in the present study.

2.1.2 Method: qualitative methods and triangulation

According to Silverman (2006: 34), researchers should choose their research methods based on what they are trying to find out. Also, Lanza points out that it is the research questions of a study that direct the choice of data collection procedures; i.e. the setting where data is collected, the time data collection takes, what sort of data is collected and how it is collected (Lanza 1997: 90). The research questions of the present study are concerned with such aspects of language maintenance as language choice, ability, attitudes, etc. Three techniques were utilized to collect the family data, achieving a triangulation[22]: participant observation, semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews, and focus group discussions. Thus, the present study is informed by "the qualitative research paradigm" (Remennick 2003: 436), drawing on and blending both the researcher's own reports on observation of the social world, and people's own interpretations of and reports on the sociolinguistic reality prevailing in their community (Denzin and Lincoln 2008: 29). As Silverman points out, qualitative methods might be favored if the researcher is concerned with exploring people's everyday behavior (2006: 34).

A qualitative analysis provides a more informative depiction of the nature of the interactions (Lanza 1997: 272). It focuses on "naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings, so that we have a strong handle of what real life is like" (Miles and Humberman 1994: 10). Hence, the phenomenon is investigated as embedded in its context so that the influence of the local context/setting is taken into account and the potential for understanding covert or underlying issues is strong (Miles and Humberman 1994: 10). This picture of the nature of interactions, mentioned above, transcends the individual participants to the larger ethnic community, offering insight into the community norms regarding language maintenance. One of the advantages of qualitative data is that they secure rich descriptions of the social world (Denzin and Lincoln 2008: 16, Miles and Humberman 1994: 10). For example, during participant observation, interviews and focus groups discussions, the participants gave a lot of data and revealed an insider's views regarding Arabic maintenance in other families outside the sample. This indirectly expands the size of the study's sample without necessarily including more families since it provides insights into language maintenance in the

[22] A triangulation was also utilized in collecting the data on Manchester's language policy, as will be illustrated later in section 2.2.

community as a whole, which makes it possible to generalize the study's findings to the community as whole.

Qualitative research of the kind conducted in the present study reveals the dynamic nature of language maintenance/shift. Language maintenance is not a matter of questions presented in a questionnaire to the participants: e.g. do you use Arabic or English in context X? Can you express yourself in Arabic? Etc. There is other important data that reveals itself through the interactive discussions between the researcher and the subjects and through the researcher's observation; for example, that speakers sometimes design their speech according to their interlocutor, as will be illustrated in chapter 5. Thus, one of the strengths of qualitative data analysis is that it enables the researcher to go further than snapshots of how many/what to why/how things occur (Miles and Humberman 1994: 10). Also, the analysis of qualitative data is a continuous enterprise, which is strength according to Miles and Humberman (1994: 12). For instance, as the example of audience-designed speech just mentioned above shows, qualitative data analysis allows for drawing conclusions (though not final) right from the beginning of data collection, which are verified later in the research (Miles and Humberman 1994: 11). Thus, data collection and analysis occur simultaneously, with each informing and focusing the other throughout the research process: "we begin our analyses early to help us focus further data collection. In turn, we use these focused data to refine our emerging analyses" (Charmaz 2008: 204).

According to Lanza (1997: 101), each methodology has inherent weaknesses. Despite the advantages of qualitative research explained above, in the general debate around qualitative research the issue of objectivity usually comes to the surface. There are personal subjectivities stemming from one's statuses, values, ideas, etc. (Ely et al. 1991: 221, discussing Peshkin 1988). Thus, since researchers in social science deal a lot with people's opinions and impressions, be them their own or those of others, they have to find a way to obtain affirmation of such impressions or subjective data, which can be achieved by having different verifications and assurances of their findings. Such a "process of gaining these assurances is called triangulation[23]" (Stake 2006: 33). The multiple sources of evidence achieved by utilizing a triangulation provide multiple measures of the variables under investigation, and helps increase the reliability of the study. As Yin (1994: 92) states, the principal benefit from triangulation is that the

[23] According to Miles and Huberman, (1994: 266), the term triangulation has been coined by Webb *et al.* (1965).

conclusions or findings are "likely to be much more convincing and accurate if ... based on several different sources of information" (in Grix 2004: 136-37)[24].

Denzin (1989b: 237-41) distinguishes different types of triangulation; e.g. by data (source, including persons, places, dates, etc.), by investigator, and by methodology (Flick 2002: 226-27). All three types were utilized in the present study. The family data was collected from various sources. That is, it was obtained from different members of the Arabic-speaking community and different families in different places, and within the families, from different participants; e.g. fathers, mothers and children. Thus, we have a two-generation source of data. A triangulation of investigators has been utilized as well in the form of using a research assistant to help carry out participant observation, as will be explained below in section 2.1.2.1. With respect to methodology, three techniques were utilized to collect the data as mentioned above: participant observation, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. Thus, a methodological triangulation was achieved by utilizing different methods of data collection within the qualitative research paradigm. These methods are discussed in detail below:

2.1.2.1 Participant observation

Of the three techniques I used in collecting the family data, participant observation of the families in the home setting and the community setting; e.g. during gatherings, meetings, religious celebrations, picnics, etc., was given priority and started in September 2008, about ten months before the interviews and the focus group, (and continued during and after the interviews)[25]. This means that none of the families was interviewed unless it had been participant-observed thoroughly in different settings; e.g. at the participants' homes, at my home, at parks, etc. The rationale behind this was to get the participants behaving naturally without biasing their behavior, and also to help me set the agenda for the semi-structured interviews and the focus group discussions.

Participant observation has been broadly accepted as a useful method of data collecting in sociolinguistic research (Wei 1994: 70). It was important for the present study for two reasons: first, it allows for an 'insider' view of the target community, especially when the community is unknown for the outsiders with regard to its norms

[24] According to Miles and Humberman (1994: 11), the "extensive efforts to replicate a finding in another data set" is also a verification strategy. Hence, another verification strategy used in the present study, besides triangulation, is the continuous comparison of the study's findings with those of other studies conducted by other researchers in other immigrant contexts, as we will see in the different chapters throughout the thesis.

[25] The participants' consent to take part in the present study and other ethical issues will be discussed later in section 2.3.

and values (Wei 1994: 72), which is the case with the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester. The 'insider' view was enhanced by the fact that the observer was a member of the community under investigation. The second reason is that the current study was aimed at exploring language maintenance; "participant observation allows the researcher to document and interpret social behaviours in naturally occurring contexts" (Wei 1994: 72).

The observation was done in an entirely natural atmosphere through exchanging family visits with the participant families. Hence, I was able to use my wife as a female research assistant to observe mothers in their interactions with children, since during most of these visits men were sitting in a separate room from the women's room[26]. The assistant also observed the other aspects that the observation focused on, of which examples are given below; e.g. language ability, social networks, etc. The gender of the fieldworker plays a vital factor in observational research (Silverman 2006: 84). That is, participants say different things to male and female researchers depending on whether the researcher is the same gender as the participant or a different one (Silverman 2006: 84, discussing Warren and Rasmussen 1977 and Warren 1988). Also, male or female researchers may sometimes gain/be denied access to participants or a community due to their gender. For example, male fieldworkers are sometimes excluded from making contact with female participants in certain situations (Silverman 2006: 84-85, discussing McKeganey and Bloor 1991). Thus, it was important to use a female research assistant in the present study to gain access to mothers. The use of assistants, after giving them appropriate training, is known in sociolinguistic research and has been used in a number of studies; e.g. Mills (2005), Al-Khatib (2001), and others. I trained my assistant as to what exactly to observe and how to do it before starting the family visits and carried out training sessions in which we participant-observed our close friends and their families. Also, before every visit we used to meet together to double-check she was fully aware of the points I wanted to observe. And immediately after every visit we used to meet once more to write down the observation notes we obtained.

In all the family visits, we either invited the participant family to our home or were invited by them to their home (sometimes over lunch or dinner). In addition, all families were met with in other places besides home; e.g. get-togethers at parks and mosques, trips, hospital during visits to the mothers on the occasion of giving birth, etc.

[26] In some contexts, it was possible for me to observe directly interaction between mothers and children; e.g. in get-togethers outside home, where women would sit in the same place as men and might sometimes exchange limited conversations. In addition, I got data on this aspect from the fathers and the children during the interviews and the informal casual conversations.

I also accompanied all the fathers in different settings; e.g. when attending mosque, bringing children form school, participating in Arabic get-togethers, such as playgroups, weekly religious meetings, celebrations, cafe meetings, etc.

According to Grix (2004: 130) and Silverman (2006), observations can be either structured focusing on specific concepts, classifications or categories in mind that are pre-prepared in advance before going into the field; unstructured waiting for classificatory systems, patterns or concepts to surface; or a combination of both beginning with loose categories which are adapted based on unstructured observation (Grix 2004: 130). The present study utilized a mixture of structured and unstructured observation. That is, I had in advance particular aspects in mind to document during observation, and concurrently was open to any new aspects that may appear while I was there in the observation scene. According to Silverman, this fulfils both the need to limit analysis through category formation and to permit some possibility of reinterpretation of the same data (2006: 93). Examples of the aspects which the observation focused on include: language choice in interactions between the different dyads in the family (father-mother, mother-father, father-children, children-father, mother-children, children-mother, and sibling-sibling); language choice in the media for the parents and children; the social networks of the parents and children and language choice in such networks; the ability to use Arabic and English in real life interaction; and frequency of contact with, and visits to, the homeland which sheds light on the role of globalization and the advances in communication technology and transportation associated with it in maintaining Arabic language in the Arabic-speaking diaspora of Manchester. Sometimes it was not possible, however, to observe directly some of the points mentioned above; e.g. the frequency of contact with, and visits to, the homeland. In such cases, both myself and my research assistant made use of informal casual questions for eliciting information regarding such points; i.e. a kind of "informal ethnographic interviews" (Wei 1994: 81). In such a technique, the observer would ask casual questions in the course of informal conversation with the participants to elicit the required information. However, the priority was always given to direct observation.

Since it was not possible to use a recorder during the observation as the participants would not allow anybody to record them with their families, and since the required data was not going to be used for any analysis of language structure (i.e. fine phonetic, morphological, etc. details), I have taken a language anthropological perspective in collecting the observation data. That is, writing down the observation notes and examples from the family visits was done in two ways, depending on the place of the meeting. In the meetings which took place in my home, I used to keep a paper and a pen in the kitchen before the family arrived so that when I wanted to write

down a note or a conversational example I could go and do it. Since my flat was very small, I could even listen to the conversations occurring in the lounge between the parents and their children or between children and my daughter or wife while I was in the kitchen. In the meetings which took place in the participants' homes, I used to keep a paper and a pen in my pocket and seize any opportunity I was left alone to write down notes and examples. In all cases, immediately after the meeting or the visit was over, I used to write down all the observation notes in details and assign them under pre-prepared headings or categories in order not to forget anything (for techniques of taking field notes, see Flick 2002: 168-69).

The observation has gone beyond the home domain to extend to the Arabic-speaking community as a whole to establish patterns of social language use. That is, I have observed language behavior in the community setting, such as the recreational contexts, get-togethers, demonstrations, etc. For example, there are weekly recreational get-togethers which can be called 'football playgroups'. There are about two or three playgroups of this kind[27], whose members are from the different Arab countries and come together every Saturday, Sunday and Tuesday for more than three hours to play football. I have been participating in these playgroups to observe language choice during playtime and how this indicates Arabic maintenance/shift. Participation in these playgroups fulfilled a number of purposes. First, it helped to know whether these playgroups are self-contained; i.e. whether membership is restricted for Arabs only, or other ethnic backgrounds, including British, are welcomed; hence, it gave an indicator of the degree of rootedness in the ethnic tradition. Second, these playgroups illustrated whether Arabic is the only language used in such an environment of spontaneous language use, namely the playground; and if there were instances of speaking English, whether it was solely due to an "external pressure" (Mackey 1968: 563-4) like the existence of a non-Arabic-speaker among them, or it was frequent and represented a habit. Thirdly, the playgroups helped gain insights into the mutual intelligibility of the various dialects of Arabic through observing Arabic speakers from the different Arab countries communicating with one another, each using his own dialect.

Religion is very important for the participant families and can be considered a vital 'core-value' for them, using Smolicz's (1981) terminology. This extends to the Arabic language as well which they consider a sacred language since the Quran was revealed to Prophet Muhammed in Arabic; hence, it must be maintained. Thus, one of the most important locations of observation is the mosque, especially during big

[27] I am talking here about the playgroups which I have been participating in regularly with some of the participants; of course there are many other playgroups in different places that I did not participate in.

gatherings and celebrations. These include, for example, the weekly Friday Congregational Prayer, the Iftar Time and the Qiyam Congregational Prayer during the month of Ramadan[28], Eid Al-Fitr Prayer and celebration[29], and Eid Al-Adha Prayer and celebration[30]. There are also the everyday five prayers which are held at mosque[31]. I have been participating in them and observing the language used for socializing before and after them.

As for children, I have been observing the children belonging to the participant families in the homes, get-togethers, etc., as illustrated above. I have also observed children belonging to families from outside of the sample in the Arabic school where I have been working. Besides my classes, I have attended classes of other teachers to see whether children used Arabic or English in the class setting: with their classmates and when communicating with their teachers. This has been informative with regard to their ability in spoken Arabic[32]. I have observed them also in the playground and break times to know their language choice during playing when they are away from the authority of their teachers and parents. Another important place for observation of children was the mosque. I have been teaching the Quran to children in one of the mosques every Sunday. Hence, I had the chance to observe the language used for interaction either amongst children or between them and their teachers. Also, these Quran classes focused on teaching children how to read the Quran and on improving accuracy with regard to the pronunciation of Arabic sounds, especially those sounds that are sometimes influenced by interference from English since they are not there in the English sound system; e.g. ḥ, ḵ, ḡ, etc. Thus, as a teacher in these classes, I used to observe and listen to children reading the Quran to improve the aforementioned aspects. Hence, I was in a position to evaluate children's competence in reading Quranic Arabic, and whether learning Quran positively influences children's ability in Arabic, especially with regard to Arabic phonology. The above-mentioned observation of

[28] The month of Ramadan is the ninth month of the Islamic Hijri Calendar; it is the sacred month during which Muslims fast everyday from Dawn time until Sunset, when they open their fasting (i.e. when they have Iftar, in Islamic terminology). Two hours later, after praying Isha Prayer, they start praying Qiyam Congregational Prayer which, though optional, a considerable number of Muslims are keen on doing it.

[29] This is the feast that Muslims celebrate at the end of the Month of Ramadan, the celebration starts with praying, and then people congratulate each other for the Eid and socialize.

[30] The feast that Muslims celebrate on the tenth day of the Month of Zu El-Hijja, the last month of the Islamic Hijri Calendar.

[31] There are five prayers in Islam which Muslims are supposed to do everyday. These payers are distributed throughout the day from Dawn time till night; every prayer takes about 5 to 10 minutes. It is highly recommended in Islam that these prayers are done at mosque.

[32] I have also interviewed their teachers, especially the teachers of Arabic, to gain insights into the children's command of the other language skills of Arabic, such as reading and writing.

children from outside of the participant families at the Arabic school and the mosque was also useful in exploring the roles of multiple dialects and diglossia, characterizing Arabic language, in the maintenance of Arabic in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester: whether they have a positive, a negative, or a neutral effect on Arabic maintenance. This is because in such settings children get into contact with Arabs speaking dialects of Arabic other than the dialect of their parents and also get into contact with Modern Standard Arabic (i.e. the written medium); hence, it becomes possible to comment on their ability to understand the different varieties of Arabic.

In summary, in this section I discussed the participant observation as a method of data collection in the present study. I explained why it was utilized, how it was conducted, and the different contexts in which it was carried out. In the next sections, I will discuss the other two methods; i.e. interviews (section 2.1.2.2) and focus groups (section 2.1.2.3).

2.1.2.2 Interviews

2.1.2.2.1 A note on interview data

One of the methods of data collection utilized in the present study is interviewing. According to Byrne (2004: 182), qualitative interviewing "is able to achieve a level of depth and complexity that is not available to other, particularly survey-based, approaches" (in Silverman 2006: 114). Ely (1991: 58), as well, argues that "interviews are at the heart of doing ethnography because they seek the words of the people we are studying … so that we can understand their situations with increasing clarity." However, a note is in order here regarding the reliability of interview data. In fact, not all social researchers agree that interviewing or asking people questions is a good way of finding things out. Hymes (1981: 84), for example, states that "Some social research seems incredibly to assume that what there is to find out can be found out by asking." Heller (2011), as well, indicates that interviews are "what a certain kind of person tells another certain kind of person, in certain ways, under certain conditions"; hence, interviews should be understood for what they are, and analysed accordingly (2011: 44). As Blommaert and Dong (2010: 42-43) indicate, materials and data obtained through interviews may be important, "but they are not more important than other kinds of materials [i.e. observational materials]." In the present study, although interviewing was utilized as one of the methods of data collection, I was aware of the argument that people's reports and narratives do not always correspond to reality (Pavlenko 2007: 169, discussing Tuominen 1998 & Vitanova 2004). According to Pavlenko (2007: 176-77), interview or narrative data cannot be treated as 'truth' or

'reality itself', and analysts should be "sensitive to the fact that speakers use linguistic and narrative resources to present themselves as particular kinds of individuals." Hence, rather than depending on narratives only, interview data should be triangulated with other methods of data collection; e.g. observation (Pavlenko 2007: 169). In the present study, different types of triangulations were utilized to gain assurances of the findings (cf. section 2.1.2 for detailed illustration). Thus, in line with Pavlenko's view above, when parents report, for instance, that they speak Arabic with their peer friends, such reports are corroborated by direct observation in different occasions, with different people and in different places. As Flick (2002: 134) indicates, observation "enables the researcher to find out how something factually works or occurs."

Although interview data do not necessarily represent facts, as mentioned above, they provide to some extent insights into the values and beliefs of the participants. Thus, when parents state, for example, that they speak Arabic with their friends or at home, such a statement, though is not necessarily a fact and needs corroboration, at least indicates that the community perceives the use of Arabic in high status. Another issue regarding interviews in the present study is that they helped obtain information regarding the points that were not sometimes possible to grasp during the observation; e.g. contact with relatives and friends in the homeland, visits to the homeland, etc. According to Merriam (1998: 72), "interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behaviour." Also, Byrne (2004: 182) suggests that "interviewing is particularly useful as a research method for accessing … things that cannot necessarily be observed" (in Silverman 2006: 114). Thus, different types of instruments or methodologies complement each other (Lasagabaster 2008: 74). In this latter case, corroboration of data was achieved by utilizing a triangulation of data source seeking to obtain the piece of data from different individuals; e.g. fathers, mothers, children, etc., and from the same participant in different occasions; e.g. formal interviewing and informal casual conversations. According to Yin (1994) using different sources of information increases the reliability of the findings.

2.1.2.2.2 Semi-structured interviews

As stated earlier, interviews in the participant families started after ten months of participant observation. Formal recorded interviews and informal interviews have been carried out with the fathers in all families and with the older children who are 18-years-old and above. The rest of children and the mothers have been interviewed informally through casual conversations. The interviews were administered in Arabic. The time of the recorded interviews ranged between thirty five and fifty minutes, and

they were carried out in different places: at my home, at the participants' homes, at mosque, etc.

The interviews were semi-structured; I chose the semi-structured interview technique since it "allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic" (Merriam 1998: 74). As Grix (2004: 127) states, it provides a certain level of flexibility and helps researchers pursue unanticipated lines of enquiry during the interview. Another point of noteworthiness concerning the interviews is that they were conducted by a member of the community under investigation (i.e. me). This, according to Bickerton (1971: 465), is an advantage since first of all it eliminates "the uncontrollable variable of speaker-reaction to a stranger"; second, "the awkwardness inseparable from the interview situations and any inhibiting influence from the recording apparatus itself are minimized by the presence of a known interviewer" (in Al-Khatib 2001: 156).

According to Merriam (1998: 75), asking good questions is the key to obtaining good data from interviewing. Several types of questions can be utilized to stimulate responses from participants. For example, Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, and Sabshin (1981) provide a list of four categories of questions (discussed in Merriam 1998: 76-78):

- Hypothetical questions; e.g. imagine your child did not join the Arabic school, what would he/she miss? Hypothetical questions trigger "respondents to speculate as to what something might be like or what someone might do in a particular situation" (Merriam 1998: 77).
- Devil's advocate questions; e.g. some people say that the Arabic dialects are not mutually intelligible, what would you say to them? Devil's advocate questions are useful when the interviewer wants to elicit the respondent's opinion and feelings about a controversial issue (Merriam 1998: 77).
- Ideal position questions; e.g. what do you think is the most important way to maintain Arabic in Manchester? Ideal position questions elicit the respondents' opinion and information (Merriam 1998: 78).
- Interpretive questions; this type of questions is particularly beneficial when the interviewee's answer to a given question is not clear, or at the end of a long discussion about a particular point, in order to offer a check on what the interviewer thinks he/she is understanding (Merriam 1998: 78). For example, after a discussion about the reciprocal comprehensibility of the Arabic dialects and whether they are used in cross-dialect interaction, an interpretive question is asked to get the core point; e.g. would you say that the Arabic dialects are

mutually intelligible and that when you communicate with Arabs from other countries than yours you use your own dialect?

Interview questions were normally followed by why/how questions to investigate in depth the respondent's point of view. The open-ended questions allow the interviewees to give their personal views on a particular topic without influence from the questions themselves (Dweik 1992: 111). Multiple questions and leading questions were avoided. Multiple questions include either one question which is in reality a double question or a chain of single questions which does not allow the participant to answer one by one. In both situations the participant is expected to ask for explanation or to provide an answer that covers just one part of the question, and that answer might be uninterpretable (Merriam 1998: 78). Leading questions are questions that reveal an assumption or a bias that the interviewer is making, which may not be held by the respondent. Such questions influence the participant to accept the viewpoint of interviewer (Merriam 1998: 78-79).

Two semi-structured sociolinguistic questionnaires containing guidelines of the points that I wanted to cover in the formal and informal interviews have been prepared: one for the parents' interviews and the other for the children's interviews[33]. They were to elicit, for example, the following (Sridhar 1997: 269, and others):

1. Demographic details: age, length of stay in the Manchester, educational qualifications of the parents, where they come from, etc.
2. Opportunities for use of the native language, especially at home, with friends and in Arabic gatherings (as stated by Detaramani and Lock (2003: 260), the extent to which the community language is used in the intra-group domains, such as the family and ethnic friends can give an indication of how likely it is to be transmitted to the subsequent generation).
3. Social networks: Indicators of rootedness in the ethnic tradition. Do the participants primarily interact with people from their ethnic community, with people from host community, or with contacts from both sides (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 304).
4. Language choice in the different domains of language use (Fishman 1965): home, work (for parents), school (for children), media, shopping, mosque, etc.: (e.g. do you use Arabic or English when you talk to your children, wife, etc.? Why? Do you use Arabic or English when you talk to your friends? Why?)
5. Parents' ability in English (spoken and written)

[33] The questionnaires used in the present study are presented in the appendices.

6. Attitudes towards Arabic and bilingualism, and the future of the ethnic language: (e.g. is maintaining Arabic important or not important? Why? Do you think being able to speak two languages is an advantage or a disadvantage? Why? Which language is more useful/beautiful for you? Why? Do you think Arabic will be maintained in the next generations? Why? Etc.)
7. Attitudes towards maintaining ethnic identity (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 190).
8. Attitudes towards whether Arabic is important to maintain ethnic identity (Clyne and Kipp 1999:191).
9. Parents' efforts towards Arabic maintenance: (e.g. what do you do to maintain Arabic? Do you send your children to Arabic schools, speak Arabic at home, make regular visits to the home country, watch Arabic media, etc.? Do children attend English schools?)
10. Children's future efforts to maintain Arabic among their prospective children.
11. The role of globalization in Arabic language maintenance: how the advances in communication technology, ease of transportation, global markets, etc. that are associated with globalization help Arabs in Manchester maintain their native language (e.g. do you visit the homeland or not? Why? Is travelling to the homeland easy and affordable now or not, compared to the past? How? Do you contact relatives and friends in the homeland? Why? Is it now easy and affordable to contact relatives and friends in the homeland or not? How? Etc.).
12. The roles of multiple dialects and diglossia in Arabic maintenance in Manchester: whether the existence of multiple dialects and diglossia has any effect (positive, negative or neutral) on Arabic maintenance in Manchester?
13. The mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects: whether Arabs understand other dialects of Arabic than their own or not (e.g. when you speak with your Arab friends and acquaintances, do you use Arabic or English? Does each one use his/her own dialect? Do you understand each other well? Can you understand the other dialects of Arabic? Etc.)
14. Children's command of Arabic: listening (understanding), speaking, reading and writing (Smolicz and Harris 1983: 138): (e.g. do you think children can: ask someone for his/her telephone number in Arabic? Tell a friend the plot of a movie he/she recently saw in Arabic? Discuss personal problems in Arabic? Read signs in streets/shops, a newspaper, a book, a story, etc.? Write a letter; fill in a form, etc.?)
15. Motivation for Arabic maintenance; whether participants consider Arabic as "a core-value" (Smolicz 1981) for them, whether they need it or see any value for it (i.e. communicative, religious), are emotionally attached to it and see it as

symbolic of ethnic identity: (e.g. is it important/not important for you that your children speak and preserve Arabic? Why? Is Arabic important for religion, with friends and relatives, etc.? Is Arabic important for membership in the Arabic-speaking community or not? Why?)

16. Parents' perception of support for Arabic:
    I. From the Arabic-speaking community: (e.g. are there enough Arabic schools? Do Arabs in Manchester support Arabic language maintenance? General height of the profile within the host community; that is, the visibility of the Arabic-speaking community through shop signs, restaurants, festivals, etc.)
    II. from outside the Arabic-speaking community: the perception of support or lack of support for a minority language like Arabic from the wider community could spring from the following areas:
        - Matters of public policy: (e.g. is Arabic taught in mainstream schools? Are interpreters available in hospitals, police station, etc? Are materials available in Arabic in public organization, etc.? Why do you think local authorities provide these services in Arabic? Etc.)
        - Personal experience; i.e. how the host community sees the immigrant community, this is reflected through the comments from others in the wider community (Clyne and Kipp 2006: 46): (e.g. do you hear negative comments on you as an Arab in the street? Do the British treat minorities as equal? Etc.).

2.1.2.3 Focus group discussion

The last technique I made use of is the 'focus group' discussions. This technique was employed by Clyne and Kipp (1999: 52-60) in their investigation of Arabic, Chinese and Spanish in Australia. In the present study, four focus group meetings were carried out, and all were held after I had finished the family interviews. They were held in different places: two at my home and two at mosque. The participants in the focus groups were members of the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester from outside of the sample families (see section 2.1.2.3.2 for a description of those participants); I had good relations with all of them since we used to meet in the different Arabic get-togethers. The number of participants in each group was two in addition to the researcher (i.e. myself). The time spent in each focus group ranged between sixty and eighty minutes. The focus group discussions were meant to obtain data regarding two aspects: Arabic maintenance and mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects:

2.1.2.3.1 Arabic maintenance

A focus group is "a discussion about a topic of particular interest … The participants in the group have some common characteristics that relate to the topic discussed in the group" (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 52, citing Greenbaum 1988: 10). In the case of the present study the topic of common interest is the use of the ethnic language; i.e. Arabic, and the interest in its maintenance and transmission intergenerationally. The philosophy behind the focus group methodology is that people usually feel more comfortable when they discuss topics as part of a group and the dynamics of group interaction will result in the participants' being more talkative. This yields more valuable information than could be obtained otherwise (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 52, discussing Greenbaum 1988: 18). Thus, besides the personal view obtained from the participant observation and the individual respondents' opinions gained from the interviews, the focus groups represented a group opinion that revealed the community thoughts regarding Arabic maintenance.

2.1.2.3.2 Mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects

There were two criteria for selecting the participants in the focus groups: first, as mentioned above, the number of participants in each group was decided to be two in addition to the researcher in order to facilitate the transcription and to be able to manage the discussion. Second, it was decided that the participants in each group be from different Arab countries in order to get conversational data that can be used to show that the Arabic dialects are mutually intelligible. Generally, the members of the focus group who were targeted for inclusion represented the following sections from the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester: Islamic religion, Arabic schools, and ordinary members of the Arabic community in Manchester who are concerned with Arabic maintenance. The participants in the first focus group were from Syria and Libya and were successively a PhD holder and an MSc. holder. In the second they were from Palestine and Libya and were a university lecturer and an Arabic-school head teacher. The third focus group consisted of an Egyptian librarian and a Jordanian factory worker. In the last focus group, I had a Saudi Engineer and an Algerian teacher.

Recorded conversational data for mutual intelligibility was obtained from other sources as well; e.g. Al-Bokhary Islamic Centre in Manchester, where I used to meet with Arabs from the different Arab countries and of different profiles (education, occupation, etc.) at least twice a week. For instance, different conversations were recorded during a gathering on the occasion of Eid Al-Adha, 2009.

The agenda of the Focus groups was as follows:

1. General introduction of the study.
2. Discussion of the importance of maintaining ethnic identity in the immigrant context.
3. Discussion of the importance of Arabic language in the maintenance of ethnic identity in the immigrant context.
4. Discussion of the ways in which Arabic can be maintained in Manchester, for example:
    I. Media (Arabic satellite channels)
    II. Ethnic schools
    III. Contact with/visits to country of origin (given the current advances in communication technology and world transportation)
    IV. Social networks
5. Discussion of the main difficulties in maintaining Arabic as community language in Manchester
6. Discussion of the conditions underlying the use of Arabic and the use of English by people from the Arabic-speaking community.
7. Discussion of how easy it is for children born in the UK to speak Arabic and to become literate in Arabic (taking into consideration the existence of multiple spoken dialects and diglossia).
8. Discussion of the mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects.
9. Discussion of the motivation of children born in the UK, or who have received much of their education in the UK, to learn the language of their parents.
10. Views on whether Arabic as a community language should be more widely learned by other British and about the mainstream school provision for Arabic.
11. Views on England's multicultural policies, and whether they have had any direct positive impact on the maintenance of Arabic.
12. Discussion of the role Arabic plays in the religious life of Muslim Arabs.
13. Reporting on findings obtained from the interviews with the participants; that is, to gain responses that could be useful in the interpretation of issues resulting from the findings.

In summary, section 2.1 explored the different methods used to collect the family data: participant observation, semi-structured interview and focus group discussions (the data obtained will be discussed later in the subsequent analysis chapters). The next section discusses the methods of collecting data on Manchester's language policy.

2.2 Manchester's language policy data[34]

In addition to the family data described above, data on Manchester's language policy was collected for the present study. Language policy data collection started in May 2009 and continued until October 2009. My plan was to cover it from three angles: the first is the policy makers, who take the decisions regarding providing services in minority languages. This was aimed at getting insights on how decisions regarding providing services in minority languages are taken and what criteria are employed. The second angle is the service provider; i.e. the different departments in Manchester City Council, the NHS, the Courts and Police, etc., in order to obtain data on the actual provisions. The third angle is the service user; that is minority-language speakers, as represented by the participant families. This was meant to gain information about how minorities perceive these provisions; e.g. whether they see them as sufficient or not. Thus, the source of data with regard to language policy in Manchester was Manchester City Council and related bodies such as NHS and Courts and Police, as well as the participant families. Such data was collected through interviews with different personnel representing different departments in the Council, solicitors, interpreters, etc., and through the internet; e.g. the websites of MCC, NHS, Courts and Police, etc. I also depended on my personal observation and the participants' reports during the interviews and focus groups on the provisions of Arabic and other minority languages in the services of MCC, NHS and Courts and Police. Thus, just as triangulations were utilized in collecting the family data, a triangulation was also used in collecting the data concerning Manchester's language policy.

Different semi-structured questionnaires have been prepared: one for the interview with the Chief Executive, the Leader or any of the Councilors in MCC in order to get information about how decisions regarding minority language provisions are taken; i.e. the Policy making as mentioned above. The other questionnaires were designed for the interviews in the different departments of Manchester City Council and other government agencies; i.e. the service provider. These include Linkworkers Service, M-Four Translation and Library Service departments to elicit, for example:

1. The status-quo of Arabic and other community languages in the services that the council provides (e.g. does the council provide publications in Arabic? does it offer advice, linkworker, interpreters, translators, telephone lines, help lines, etc. in Arabic? does it provide library services in Arabic: books, DVDs, CDs, etc.?);

[34] I am dealing here with the methods of collecting data on the language policy in Manchester. The policy itself and the data will be investigated in Chapter 3.

2. Why do they offer services in Arabic?
3. How do Arabs find out about such services? Etc.

There were also interviews in the International New Arrivals, Travellers and Supplementary Schools Team (Henceforth INATSS) which were aimed at eliciting information regarding the educational support they provide for new arrival children, and the teaching of community languages, particularly Arabic, in mainstream education and in the supplementary schools; e.g.:

1. Whether Arabic, or any community language, are taught in mainstream education.
2. Whether ethnic students can be entered for GCSEs and A Levels in their native languages.
3. How many Arabic schools are there in Manchester?
4. Are they supervised by MCC?
5. What kind of support do they receive from the Council?

The officials interviewed were selected and approached as follows: the starting point was to send an email to the Chief Executive and to the Leader of the Council. Then a meeting was arranged with the lead officer for community cohesion (as a representative of the Deputy Leader of the council who leads on community cohesion and social cohesion, and equal opportunities), and the manager of the M-Four Translation department. Upon interviewing these officials, they referred me to the different departments to carry out more interviews.

Interviews were carried out also in different mainstream schools and different Arabic supplementary schools to get a full picture about the status-quo of Arabic and community languages in the educational system in Manchester, and to check in reality the information I got during the interviews in INATSS. I visited a number of mainstream schools, which were suggested by INATSS, and carried out interviews with the head teachers. These Interviews were to elicit, for instance, whether schools offer Arabic as a subject, whether they offer modern foreign languages and community languages, whether such language learning is compulsory or optional, etc. I also visited a number of Arabic schools, which were suggested by the participant families, the teachers in the Arabic school where I used to work and INATSS. Interviews in the Arabic schools were carried out at three levels: the head teachers, the Arabic-language teachers, and the teachers of other subjects. The interviews with the head teachers were to elicit information regarding; e.g. whether the schools are registered in Manchester City Council, whether they are required to use specific curricula, whether they receive

subsidiaries, support, etc. from the Council, how many students are in the schools, etc. The interviews with the teachers of Arabic were aimed to know; e.g. what the Arabic language curriculum consists of, whether it is suitable for students, the level of students in Arabic, etc. Finally, the interview with the other teachers in the schools were meant to find out; e.g. whether they use Arabic or English in their teaching, whether children use Arabic or English when talking to their teachers, etc. These interviews were enhanced by participant observation in the Arabic school where I used to work as a teacher.

Having explained the methods employed to collect the family data and the Manchester's language policy data, a note is in order now regarding ethics.

2.3 Ethical considerations

Ethical issues resulting from the contact with the people under study play a part in all research (Flick 2002: 59). Grix indicates that social research in general intrudes to some extent in the lives of people, and qualitative research in particular often intrudes more (2004). As Stake points out, "Qualitative researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world." Hence, their manners must be good and their policy of ethics strict (1994: 244).

The present study involved collecting data by methods of observation, interviews and focus group discussions; such qualitative data collection techniques have their own ethical dilemmas (Merrian 1998: 214). Hence, a number of ethical points were carefully followed in this study. First of all, according to University of Manchester's policy on ethical issues and guidance on procedures for ethical practice in research, it was a must to obtain the participants' consent to participate in the study. Given my knowledge of the participants and upon the advice of community leaders, asking them to sign a consent form was not the appropriate way since it would intimidate them and make them uncomfortable. I also had concerns that it might affect my relations with them as a member of the community. The participants agreed to take part in the study with the belief that, in doing so, they are helping me, a member of their community, and are doing me a favor. This stance should be appreciated by the researcher in order to create what Creswell (2003: 65) refers to as reciprocal relationship between the researcher and the participants, based on mutual respect, appreciation and trust[35]. Hence, it was socially inappropriate and embarrassing to ask the participants to sign a form, something they do not feel comfortable doing, while they believe they are doing

[35] This reciprocal relationship was based as well on the mutual understanding of the nature of the research in terms of its aims, methods, etc., as will be illustrated below.

me a favor. This became even more compelling given that they were not paid for their participation; they would not have accepted payment since I am a member of their community. Thus, after consultation with my supervisor, it was decided that before I start observation, I would inform the participants in detail about the nature of the study and make sure that everyone fully agrees to participate, as shown below; then when I start the interviews, I get their consent orally recorded on tape (see appendix III for an example of the consent obtained from participants). This practice is in line with the School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures' guidelines which explicitly allow the practice of obtaining oral consent. Also, in general terms of ethics, the researcher's commitment to protecting the private sphere and value of the individuals under investigation is protected by a general code of honor that is applicable within the community of Arab migrants and which govern the personal friendship relationships between the researcher as a member of the community and the participants as members of the same community.

I was deliberately transparent and clear with the participants from the start and was keen that they be fully aware of the nature of the research; e.g. the institution in which it is conducted, its title, its aims, why it is done, etc. As Creswell (2003: 63) indicates, researchers should describe the purpose of the study to the participants; deception happens when the researcher has one purpose for a study in mind, but participants understand a different purpose. Thus, the participants were clearly informed that the study investigates Arabic maintenance in the Arabic-speaking community. I also discussed with them the different methods of data collection (participant observation, interviews and focus-group discussions), how they would be carried out, and what each method involved. For example, the participants were made fully aware that I would carry out interviews and collect observational notes, quotes and conversational examples regarding their and their children's language choice in different contexts (e.g. at home, at the mosque, with friends, etc.) as well as language proficiency and language attitudes. They were also told that this data would be collected during our family visits in my home and in their homes, our get-togethers outside homes, at mosque, etc. I also showed the participants examples of the collected data, quotes and conversations after the initial visits to make sure that they do not mind collecting such a kind of data. Having ensured this, I did not need to tell them before every visit that I would observe them, and I did not take notes in front of them. This was important in order not to bias their behavior during the visit; hence, I get reliable data. As I was not using any audio recording techniques, I was forced to record my observations at the earliest possible opportunity that I felt would not also interfere with the ongoing observation situation. If I had decided to make notes visibly in front of the

participants as soon as something happened that I wanted to record, this may have influenced their linguistic behavior and made them question what they had just said. In addition to the aforementioned information given to the participants, I made it clear for the respondents that the research is for a student project, data will be used for the purpose of this research only and will be used anonymously, names will be anonymised, the confidentiality of the information they provide would be safeguarded and data will be protected and will not be disclosed to a third party.

Participants were not shown notes for subsequent discussion; however, whenever there was a need to elaborate on any aspects that were not clear of the data collected through observation or interviews, I used to have informal conversations with the participants to further discuss these aspects. Also, in the focus group discussions, held with members of the Arabic-speaking community from outside of the participant families (cf. section 2.1.2.3), several aspects related to the maintenance of Arabic, revealed during interviews and observation in the participant families, were discussed. Since the members of the focus groups were not from the participant families, as just mentioned, the same procedures and information mentioned above regarding the nature, the aims, etc. of the study were also told to them to make sure they are aware of these aspects. They were additionally told that conversational quotes and examples from their speech during the focus group discussions will be used to investigate cross-dialect communication among Arabic speakers, and that pseudonyms, rather than their real names, will be used to protect their anonymity. However, I was deliberately careful not to imply to them to speak in any particular way. In one occasion, however, I was explicitly asked by one of the participants whether I want him to speak in his dialect. Hence, I had to give him an answer that does not influence his behavior, so I replied that he can speak in any way he likes.

As for the officials interviewed in the different departments of Manchester City Council; e.g. M-Four Translation, Library Service, Linkwork Service, INATSS, etc., they were told that the study explores Arabic maintenance among Arab immigrants in Manchester, and as part of this it investigates the language policy in Manchester to gain insights into whether such a policy is supportive to minority language maintenance. They were also told about the three angles that such investigation covers, as detailed in section 2.2[36]. In the Arabic schools, as well, in addition to informing the head teachers and teachers about the general purpose of the study, described earlier, I told them that I investigate the role of Arabic schools in Arabic maintenance among the child

[36] For information regarding how the officials interviewed were selected and approached, see section 2.2.

generation. I also obtained the consent of the Arabic school in which I used to work to observe children in school/playground setting.

To summarize the methodology, in this chapter I explained that there are two types of data collected for the present study: the family data and data on the language policy in Manchester. I discussed the methods of data collection; i.e. participant observation, interviews and focus group discussions, and the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research and the use of triangulations as a means to overcome the subjectivity that characterizes it. In the last section, the ethical considerations resulting from the study were explored.

In the next chapter, the language policy in Manchester will be discussed in order to gain insights into the local circumstances that may influence the maintenance of Arabic and other community languages in the city.

3 Minority Language Policy in Manchester

As explained in section 1.5.1.3, the language policy of the host country is important to the investigation of community language maintenance. Fishman (1985) points out that one of the social conditions that promotes immigrant language shift is the prohibition that these languages may encounter concerning their use in public and official functions or alternatively, the requirement that the host language be so used. Also, Fishman (1991: 401) emphasizes the importance of providing government activities in the minority language for language maintenance. This chapter investigates the provisions in Arabic and other minority languages offered by Manchester City Council (MCC) and agencies that work alongside Council services, such as the National Health Service Manchester Primary Care Trust (NHS PCT) and Courts and Police, and how this can be taken as indicative of the level of support provided by local authorities for community-language speakers in Manchester and the language policy in the city. Hence, we get an idea about the local circumstances in which minorities; e.g. Arabs maintain their native language. The data was gained from different sources: interviews with different personnel in MCC and other agencies, interviews with participant families, observation, the internet, emails, telephone conversations, etc. (cf. Chapter 2 Methodology, section 2.2). The chapter begins with a survey of the services in Arabic and other community languages provided in Manchester, followed by an analysis which seeks answers to the following questions: whether there is an explicit language policy in Manchester, how Manchester's language policy is formulated, whether there is a language hierarchy in the implementation of Manchester's language policy, and the educational language policy in Manchester. Investigating these questions will help answer the question of whether Manchester's language policy is supportive or not to the maintenance of Arabic and other minority languages. In the final section, a conclusion is provided.

3.1 Services in community languages in Manchester

3.1.1 Arabic Linkworker Service

MCC has what is called Manchester Advice whose primary job is to provide advice to people living in Manchester. Manchester Advice has different teams, and one of them is the 'Linkworkers' team that consist of bilingual employees employed for the purpose of providing advice for speakers of community languages; it is the 'First Tier' of advice for ethnic minorities within the council. The Linkworkers main offices are located in Cheetham Hill and Gorton South. Linkworkers service tries to cover all the primary

community languages in Manchester, such as the Asian languages, Arabic, etc. Speakers of community languages with no Linkworkers speaking them are dealt with in the Advice Centre at the Town Hall, where interpreters are provided for them.

There are two Arab Linkworkers for the Arabic-speaking community, a male and a female so that a client can ask for a male or female Linkworker, which usually occurs especially with Arab women. In an interview with the female Linkworker, she said that they provide advice in Arabic for Arabic speakers in general, not only for Arabs; for instance, they provide advice to those who speak Arabic from Eretria or anywhere. They provide different kinds of advice: Council housing, Council tax, social insurance, education, social services, health insurance, car insurance, private housing, bills, consumer rights, women's rights, racial discrimination, issues related to the Police, court, etc. The Linkworkers are available for consultation by appointments and sometimes on a drop-in basis. For example, the Arabic Linkworkers are available by appointment all days, but on a drop-in basis on Monday; they are available also on the phone everyday from 2pm to 4pm.

People know about the Linkworkers services through letters/leaflets that are sent to them from the council, which usually contains information about how to access the service of the Linkworkers. This information is translated in the different community languages including Arabic; e.g. 'to receive advice and information in Arabic or to get help from the council, please call the Linkworkers service on (the Arabic Linkworker's phone number).' Also, people in Manchester can get a book called 'A to Z: Guide to Council Services' which guide them to the Linkworkers and all other services provided by the council. In addition to the above-mentioned, government departments and public services have the phone numbers of the Linkworkers.

Linkworkers collect customers' feedback using a form that is handed out to customers whenever they finish a piece of work with them. This form is then sent to the service performance team who collate this information and advise the Linkworkers accordingly. The feedback is then taken into consideration during regular service planning meetings with the Linkworkers and it influences their plans. Moreover, as a service within the council, the Linkworkers inform the council about issues within their target communities and how these can best be addressed.

To recruit Arabic, or any other community language, Linkworkers, MCC advertise on its website and in the monthly 'Manchester Jobs Update' newsletter. The council advertises both full-time and part-time Linkworkers jobs. Then, candidates should pass an interview and an examination that tests their language proficiency in Arabic, or the relevant community language, and English as well as their degree of knowledge of the British laws. Candidates should also have experience in giving advice; e.g. from a

voluntary work or any other source. They also receive training before they start work, and then they receive training almost every month after appointment.

3.1.2 M-Four Translation

M-Four translation is a part of MCC. The main function of M-Four is providing translation and interpretation services in the different languages, including Arabic, to other agencies and departments; e.g. courts, NHS, solicitors, central government, etc. That is, it sells its services to such agencies which pay the fees to MCC. For example, if an Arab immigrant has a problem in a hospital, a court, housing department, etc., M-Four is contacted to get an interpreter; the request can be for a male or a female interpreter and M-Four provides him/her. M-Four also translates leaflets, booklets, flyers, etc. in the different languages, including Arabic, for MCC and other agencies and departments. Generally any document from the council can be translated in Arabic or any other language if requested. Hence, an Arab immigrant, for instance, can get information in Arabic concerning housing, health, education, etc. if he/she requests. M-Four deals also directly with minority language speakers. For example, if an immigrant wants to translate a personal document; e.g. a birth certificate, he/she comes directly to the M-Four department, pays the fees and gets the job done. M-four is responsible also for giving training to the free-lance translators who work with it upon request. It also gives training for MCC's staff to raise their awareness of the linguistic and cultural diversity that characterizes Manchester (interview with the M-Four manager); during this training MCC's staff get the necessary cultural and linguistic knowledge that enable them to do their job efficiently. As an example of this cultural knowledge that is given to those staff who deal with Arab and Muslim communities in general is: 'when entering a mosque, take your shoes off.'

According to its deputy manager, M-Four covers a broad range of known languages. The demand is the main criteria employed by M-four to decide which languages they provide services in. For example, in 1992, when M-four was founded, there was a need for 5 languages only (all of them were Asian languages), but circumstances changed and Somalis, Albanians, and Bosnians started to come to the UK; then in 2000 the Iraqis and Afghanis started to arrive as well. In addition, with the expansion of the EU, speakers from Western Europe started to move to the UK; e.g. Romania, Czech, Poland. Thus, M-four keeps adapting to newcomers. The demand determines, as well, the employment of full or part-time translators and interpreters. For example, M-Four has one Arabic full-time translator residing in office; besides there are more than 10 free-lance Arabic translators and interpreters (males and females) who

work upon request. There may be more than this in other languages such as Urdu or Somali due to their larger numbers. To be recruited as an interpreter/translator of Arabic or any other language, applicants must have a recognized certificate; e.g. the Diploma in Translation and Interpretation from the Institute of Linguistics, London (this degree has two levels, one for translation and another for interpretation; the interpretation level has different specializations: legal, medical, etc.). Applicants should also pass the linguistic exam (written and spoken) provided by M-Four. Then, the successful candidates get training in M-Four before they start work.

3.1.3 Library Service

There are 23 libraries in Manchester in addition to a Prison Library and a Mobile Library. The Library Services Department (or the Central Library) of MCC is responsible for all of them; it is the headquarters of all libraries. In an interview with the Access to Services Coordinator (ASC), she stated that the main aim of the libraries is to provide materials; e.g. books, audios, DVDs, and other resources to everyone in Manchester in his/her language, including minority language speakers since 'one of the main groups is people whose mother tongue is not English.'

The Library Services Department has a Community Access Team that consists of a number of coordinators; e.g. the Asian Community Coordinator, the Vietnamese Coordinator, the Chinese Community Coordinator, etc. The coordinators ensure that there are materials in the relevant community language that each one is responsible for. Community languages that are not assigned a coordinator are the responsibility of the Access to Services Coordinator. For example, there is no coordinator specifically for the Arabic-speaking community; hence, the provisions of Arabic materials are dealt with by the ASC who currently depends on one of the Central Library's staff for the job. This staff member works in the Central Library as a cataloguer for Arabic, Farsi and Urdu. She is originally from Kashmir, but she speaks and reads Arabic and Farsi and has many friends from these communities. When there is a need to buy books in Arabic, she brings her friends in to help choose the books, usually from a pre-prepared list. Upon receiving an invitation from her, I participated along with other Arabs in the process of choosing Arabic books in October 2009. The participants went through a list of book titles from Al Saqi Bookshop and decided what should be bought, taking into consideration to have materials that interest women, men, a religious person, a non-religious person, etc.; and also to have materials from the different Arab countries.

The main community language resources in all libraries are books, but there are also DVDs and Audios. There are Arabic books, for instance, on history, poetry,

literature, religion, etc. According to ASC, they have a decent amount of Arabic materials, but she thinks they are not enough since the Arab people who live in Manchester tend to be well-educated and literate, so there is a big demand for Arabic materials. They try to have a range of all philosophies from the various Arab countries. All these books are in Standard Arabic since it is rare to find books written in colloquial Arabic. There are also bilingual books where one page is in English and the opposite page is in Arabic; and Arabic-English stories for children. There are also CDs of world music, including Arabic music, in the different libraries, but not as much as books.

The Library Service Department attempts to provide books and materials that are appropriate for the community where the given library is based. Generally, the main collections for Arabic language are in the libraries in Chorlton, Crumpsall, Fallowfield, Central library (Language and Literature Library), Longsight and Withington. In addition, Arabic materials and materials in all the smaller languages, like Farsi, are moved around in the different libraries almost every six months to get the most use so that Arabs who live in Longsight, for instance, will see different books every six months.

MCC provides an annual budget for community languages materials. The Urdu and Chinese get the largest budget since their communities are very large. There is an annual budget of £1000 to spend on updating the Arabic materials, a similar amount for materials in Farsi, and smaller amounts for other smaller languages. Thus, the provisions of community language materials depend on the size of the given community and on the demand. For example, in 2009 the ASC has noticed that Arabic is more popular than Farsi so she took some money from Farsi and put it into Arabic.

The Community Services Team organises 'outreach' activities to publicise the library services among the local communities, including the Arabic-speaking community, in order to recruit new customers. Hence, they bring in community groups and show them the books and the IT service, and that they can read, watch and listen to materials in their mother tongue in the libraries. They also go to different places where there are refugees or new-arrivals; e.g. English classes, children centres' events, etc. and bring books in their ethnic languages and tell them that it is free. The ASC said: "we do our best to promote our services among minorities." Also, there exists often 'Dual Language Story Times' in the libraries, depending on who is there; e.g. Arabic and English, Turkish and English, etc. The Librarians know the families and they will ask a parent to read the story in Arabic and the librarian reads it in English. This is to give children a positive view of the different languages. There are also poetry readings and reading groups. In 2008 an Algerian poet and a Kurdish poet visited and read poetry in Arabic, Kurdish, and English. So they try to have cultural events from the different communities in Manchester.

3.1.4 Education

Provisions and services in Arabic and other minority languages in the field of education will be explored in the International New Arrivals, Travellers, and Supplementary Schools Team, mainstream schools, supplementary schools and the national community language initiatives in Manchester.

3.1.4.1 International New Arrivals, Travellers, and Supplementary Schools Team (INATSS)

INATSS was established in 2008 as part of a new structure at MCC after the former Diversity and Inclusion Team was disbanded. This team was designed to provide educational language support services for new arrival children in Manchester, to assess their language support requirements for successful inclusion into mainstream education, to oversee and promote additional non-mainstream educational provision such as Supplementary Schools, and to provide support for children with special educational needs.

The core team providing this service consists of five Education Development Officers responsible for six different districts of the city, in addition to a team of eight full-time Language Assistants who speak Arabic, Farsi, French, Somali and Urdu. These Language Assistants are recruited through the local authority (MCC), in consultation with the Educational Development Team. The Traded Services unit at MCC provide additional language support staff for INATSS that cover for those languages not spoken by its full-time language assistants.

The service provided by INATSS is aimed at providing support for children who speak a foreign language as their primary language, such as children from refugee families, families seeking asylum in the UK, etc. They focus on the attainment and attendance of a child in the classroom, and providing English language acquisition support to speed up his/her integration into the education system. This is done either through bilingual support in the classroom if suitable staff can be provided, or by providing more generic English acquisition support for a school if it is required.

Families are usually directed to the Educational Development services through the school or family support services of the council, such as Social Services. Following this, INATSS support begins with an interview with the child's parents and the school, where their preferred language for support is decided, and additional family support is given to increase their awareness of the support which is available to them from various agencies, including how to obtain relevant forms and leaflets. As English is the main language of education in the UK, the INATSS team concentrates on preventing a child's

lack of proficiency in English language becoming a barrier, but the INATSS also aims to actively promote bilingualism for the child wherever possible.

With this initial consultation completed, the child is then supported through an induction period either on a one-to-one basis or in small groups if there are other children with the same language needs. During this period, Language Assistants work closely with teachers and classroom assistants to ensure that the child is able to follow and understand subjects, and to participate as far as possible. Often lesson plans will be discussed with the Language Assistants prior to the class, to allow familiarisation with the subject being taught and enable the Language Assistants to prepare any key areas or highlight potential difficulties. As the child progresses both in language acquisition and school integration, this intensive support is usually phased out when the school decides it is no longer needed and replaced with more generic support, although the child is entitled by law to intensive support throughout their education if necessary. Home-School liaison is also carried out by the Language Assistants to discuss homework and attendance requirements with the family, alongside any messages that need to be relayed to the family on more practical matters such as lunch money, uniforms, or school forms which need to be completed.

3.1.4.2 Mainstream schools

Manchester mainstream schools have a considerable number of non-English students who speak a large number of languages other than English. According to the Education Development Officer of the Central East District in INATSS, there are approximately 160 languages spoken in Manchester schools. In some schools the number of these non-English students exceeds the number of English students, as emphasized by the head teachers. For example, in an interview with the Head Teacher of Webster Primary School, he stated that only 7% of the school's students (aged 5 and more) are White British, and the rest are from other ethnicities including Somalis, Arabs, Pakistanis, etc.

Exam Boards, such as AQA (Assessment and Qualifications Alliance) and Edexcel, provide a wide range of examinations in both GCSEs and A-Levels which cover many community languages (Arabic, Urdu, Punjabi, etc.) and modern foreign languages (French, Spanish, German, etc.). For children aged 7-11 (Key Stage 2) and 11-14 (Key Stage 3), the National Curriculum stipulates that tuition in modern foreign languages is compulsory.

Community language speakers can similarly be entered for GCSE or A-Level courses and examinations in their languages, but this is dependent on whether the teaching staff at the school can provide tuition in such languages. Within the

Manchester area Arabic is offered in GCSE and A-Level in a number of schools, as will be illustrated below. It is also often common for Urdu to be offered as an option for community language speakers, but given the vast linguistic diversity present at some Manchester schools, it would prove impractical and costly to provide optional language tuition in all languages. If a school can offer a community language as an option to its pupils then the school is responsible for all costs associated with sitting an exam in the language, but if the language is studied at a supplementary school then the child's parents are responsible for the subsequent costs of examination[37].

Whilst this is an accurate description of community language provision in most mainstream schools, more specialist schools have been encouraged in recent years to provide a greater choice of languages for pupils. One such secondary school is Levenshulme High School (a Specialist Language College), which offers its pupils an extended range of languages, including Arabic that can be studied towards achieving a qualification, although this remains an optional choice as the school follows the same National Curriculum guidelines as other mainstream schools. The choice of languages available is once again dependent on staff resources at the school, and also on the demand for courses based on pupil numbers. In an interview with the Arabic-language teacher in the school, she said that Arabic is taught as part of the curriculum for the school's students, and that students can sit for GCSE and A-Levels exams in Arabic in the school. Arabic is also offered as an option for community-language speakers in other mainstream schools, such as Manchester Academy. It is also offered in GCSE and A-Level in Islamic schools, such as Manchester Islamic High School for Girls and KD Grammar School for Boys[38].

3.1.4.3 Supplementary schools

The term 'supplementary school' refers to a network of non-mainstream educational and cultural support centres operating outside of normal school hours. According to INATSS, within the remit of MCC there are currently over 100 supplementary schools, of which 99 are registered with the council but which may not all be necessarily active. The council monitors and carries out regular visits to 65 of these schools, representing around 8000 pupils under the supervision of some 500

[37] Supplementary schools within the City of Manchester provide GCSE and A-Levels in certain languages such as Arabic and Chinese and are registered Examination Centres through Edexcel.

[38] These schools follow the National Curriculum in addition to Islamic studies, Quran and Arabic language.

volunteer staff, and amongst these there are 5 council-registered Arabic schools that provide Arabic language support as follows[39].

- 2 Libyan schools (one in Cheetham Hill, and one in Crumpsall)
- Saudi school (in Chorlton)
- Al-Manar school (in Burnage)
- Al-Hijra school (in Whalley Range)

Both of the Libyan schools teach the Libyan curricula taught in schools in Libya, but one of them is sponsored by the Libyan government and is open for students for free; the other is private and requires fees. The Saudi School teaches the Saudi curricula and is sponsored by the Saudi government, but requires fees from students. Al-Hijra School, Al-Manar school, and Al-Nour School teach curricula from the Arab world; e.g. Jordan. These schools teach also GCSE and A-Level in Arabic. In all schools, students are Arabs from the different Arab countries; however, there exists sometimes non-Arab students who are Muslim and want to learn Arabic. Teachers are employed from the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester.

INATSS works closely with the supplementary schools but, as emphasized by head teachers, it has no legal control over their services, and schools are not legally required to register with the council. However, schools may apply for maintenance grants of £300-600 per annum from the council providing that they fulfil certain criteria (Criminal Records Bureau-checked staff, Health & Safety requirements, regular monitoring to assess child safety), and this helps to maintain basic standards at participating schools. Additionally the council encourages supplementary schools to seek additional funding or to register as a charity, which requires similar standards to be in place before funds are granted.

The quality assurance of supplementary schools is carried out through monitoring, which can be divided into three general levels. These are as follows:

- Drop-in, informal checks to ensure basic Health & Safety, child safety standards are met.
- Semi-formal monitoring aimed at producing a public report, with the expectation that this report is shared with parents.
- Formal visit modelled on OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills) criteria. This is a longer, more rigorous visit which focuses on teaching and learning provision (inc. curriculum development), management, standards, and finances. Schools which successfully pass these visits are then awarded a Manchester Quality Standard award.

[39] There are other Arabic schools that are not registered with the council; e.g. Al-Nour School.

Five schools, amongst them the al-Manar Arabic School, have been awarded the Manchester Quality Standard to date, which officially recognizes their status as leading supplementary schools, and ensures that they have met the standards for which they are tested.

MCC has also helped to develop the Manchester Supplementary Schools Network, an umbrella body that all supplementary schools are encouraged to join. Membership of this body provides supplementary schools with a collective voice, and allows the wider group to have direct access to the council and its policy makers. As members of this body, any funding received is shared equally between the schools as well. In addition, the council also provides training for supplementary school staff in the following areas to promote higher standards at the schools.

- Classroom management[40]
- Teaching & learning
- Developing the curriculum
- Developing Mother Tongue languages
- Behaviour management
- Specific educational needs awareness
- Organisational and financial management issues

The interaction between supplementary schools and mainstream schools has been somewhat limited, and there remain some barriers between the two systems. It is difficult to bring the two systems together due to the differences in operating hours, although around 12 primary and secondary schools do host supplementary schools now. Usually this takes place as 'passive' hosting; where premises are let to the supplementary school under the authority of the host school governors, but it does establish a link between the two systems and brings a certain amount of shared responsibility for both parties.

3.1.4.4 National community language initiatives in Manchester

Outside London, Manchester is one of the largest centres for various community language initiatives. Perhaps the largest of these is the north-west regional centre for the *Routes Into Languages* programme, a national project aimed at promoting the teaching and learning of foreign and community languages in mainstream and supplementary schools[41]. This programme incorporates five universities from the Greater Manchester and North-West areas (Manchester Metropolitan University,

[40] As a staff member of one of the Arabic schools, I was frequently sent requests by my school to attend these training sessions.

[41] The 'Routes into Languages' website can be found at the following address http://www.routesintolanguages.ac.uk/northwest, accessed 28th July 2009.

University of Manchester, University of Salford, University of Bolton and University of Central Lancashire), and offers formal accreditation opportunities and recognition for language teachers such as those working in supplementary schools. Alongside this, children are also encouraged to learn community languages at Further and Higher Education institutions, both from bilingual and monolingual communities.

A part of the *Routes Into Languages* programme is the COLT project (Community of Lesser Taught Languages) which is based in Manchester Metropolitan University. The project is concerned with raising the profile of community languages with school pupils in the North West. The languages they work with are Arabic, Urdu, Chinese and Italian, all widely spoken in the relevant communities in Manchester but hardly ever touched on in schools (interview with manager). They are concerned with bringing pupils into University (the project is made up of a consortium of five universities as mentioned above) and giving them tasters in the languages and teaching them a little bit about the accompanying culture. For example, in 2009 Arab students who were studying Arabic at GCSE level were invited to Manchester Metropolitan University to participate in an Arab-film watching, followed by a discussion. One of the participant families received the invitation from the Arabic school where their daughter was studying.

According to the Manager of COLT, they have had quite a lot of success and found pupils would be interested in taking up community languages if they were offered. They are interested also in bringing on board speakers of these languages who are prominent in the community to show to the students examples of prosperous local people who speak community languages, hence prove to them that by learning a language their career prospects in the future are much better.

3.1.5 The National Health Service Manchester Primary Care Trust (NHS PCT)

Arabic and other community language speakers can receive assistance for medical care in their native language through interpreters (males and females) who are provided free of charge in hospitals and health centres. Services of those interpreters are obtained through different bodies, such as MCC's M-Four Translation Department, free-lance interpreters, etc. In some hospitals, e.g. the Central Manchester University Hospitals, there is a translation and interpretation department (also called linkworkers department) which provides interpreters for the hospitals. The process goes as follows: the patient notifies the relevant department in the hospital that he/she needs an interpreter, and then the department contacts the linkworkers department which provides the interpreter. If there is no linkworker for a given language, an interpreter is

obtained for it from the bodies mentioned above. Moreover, a lot of the publications in hospitals and health centres in Manchester contain a question translated in different community languages including Arabic, which asks whether a patient has difficulty speaking or understanding English. Under this question a telephone number is provided so that a patient can call to receive help in his/her native language. This was confirmed in interviews in different hospitals and health centres, with interpreters and also with the participants. In some cases, there exists in a health centre, for instance, a staff member who can speak the language; in that case the patient is referred to him/her. In fact, it is not an exception that hospitals and health centres in Manchester have bilingual staff members who speak community languages; e.g. the health centre in my area of residence has three Arab doctors, besides others who speak other community languages.

3.1.6 The Court System and Police Services

Articles 5 & 6 of the *European Convention on Human Rights* (ECHR) stipulate that anyone arrested or charged "shall be informed promptly, *in a language which he understands*, of the reasons for his arrest and of any charge against him"[42]. In addition to this, they also have the right to "*have the free assistance of an interpreter* if he cannot understand or speak the language used in the court." These rights apply to both the police and court services, and in order to provide such support, both legal services can draw upon the services of suitably qualified interpreters from a list of recommended registers, such as the *National Register of Public Service Interpreters* (NRPSI). Interpreters drawn from these registers have the necessary pre-requisites and experience to carry out this work, in addition to their language skills. If suitable interpreters cannot be recruited from such sources then alternative sources may be used, subject to the discretion of the courts or police. These include known local interpreters who have carried out such duties in the past, staff at university language departments, their own staff who speak the required language, and companies who provide video or audio interpreting services. Unless a private case is being brought before the courts, any public action by either the police or the courts must provide interpreting services free of charge to the defendant or arrested individual. Further detailed information on this is provided in by the *National Agreement on Arrangements for the use of Interpreters, Translators and Language Service Professionals in*

[42]The European Convention on Human Rights can be accessed at the following address http://www.hri.org/docs/ECHR50.html, accessed 06/11/2009.

Investigations and Proceedings within the Criminal Justice System, a document which is freely available to download from the *Her Majesty's Court Service* (HMCS) website[43].

Interpreting services for the Police are also provided by M-Four Translations and Language Line, a national telephone interpreting service. Access to this service can be obtained either through the Language Line itself or on request at local police stations[44]. Further information in various community languages can also be accessed from the Home Office website, in particular the 'Notice of Rights and Entitlements' document[45]. This document explains a person's rights whilst they are in police detention, and is available as both a text and audio version for Arabic and forty-two other community languages.

To sum up, we have seen above that MCC and agencies working alongside, such as the NHS and the Court and Police, provide different services and provisions in Arabic and other community languages in Manchester; e.g. linkworkers, interpreters, translators, library services, etc. In the next section, an analysis of these findings will be presented to investigate to what extent these services can be taken as indicative of the level of support provided by local authorities for community-language speakers in Manchester and the language policy in the city.

3.2 Analysis

The discussion below handles the following points: the three-angle data on language policy (i.e. the policy maker, service provider and service user), whether there is an explicit language policy in Manchester, how Manchester's language policy is formulated, the language hierarchy in MCC and agencies working alongside, and the educational language policy in Manchester.

3.2.1 Three-angle data on language policy

As mentioned in the Methodology chapter (section 2.2 Manchester's language policy data), my plan was to cover Manchester's minority-language policy data from three angles: the first one is the policy maker; i.e. who takes the decisions regarding providing services in minority languages. This was aimed at getting insights on how decisions regarding providing services in minority languages are taken and what criteria

[43]This document can be accessed at the following address http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk/infoabout/interpreters/index.htm, accessed 16th July 2009.
[44]The Language Line website can be accessed at the following address http://www.languageline.co.uk/, accessed 16th July 2009.
[45]This document can be accessed at the following address http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/police/815449/notice-of-rights/, accessed 16th July 2009.

are employed. The second angle is the service provider; i.e. the different departments in MCC, the NHS, the Courts and Police, etc., in order to obtain data on the actual provisions. The third angle is the service user, that is, minority-language speakers, as represented by the participants. This was meant to gain information about how minorities see these provisions, e.g. whether they see them as sufficient or not, how they perceive the purpose behind them, etc.

Obtaining information regarding the precise formulation of policy to cover the first angle was not readily available and difficult to access. In fact, it took several attempts before I could meet with any of the personnel involved in policy making; i.e. the lead officer for community cohesion (as a representative of the Deputy Leader of the council who leads on community cohesion and social cohesion, and equal opportunities), and the manager of the M-Four Translation department. In other words, I tried hard to contact different personnel, e.g. a number of councilors, but received no information and sometimes no reply to my emails, letters, or telephone calls. One of the councilors, I went to meet twice. The first time, I explained what I wanted but she could not give immediate answers, so I left her the questions I needed answers for and she promised to come back to me soon with answers, which never happened. Then, I went to her office once more after I failed to contact her many times by phone or email, and she apologized and again promised to help, which once more never happened. I also tried to contact the Chief Executive and the Leader of the council and after many referrals to different personnel, an appointment was arranged with the lead officer for community cohesion and the manager of M-Four Translation department. This encountered difficulty, I assume, reveals a gap between community-language service providers such as MCC and other government agencies on the one hand, and academic institutions such as universities on the other hand. It also illustrates the hurdles a researcher needs to overcome in urban fieldwork.

Moreover, concerning the second angle, it was not easy as well to get information from the council and government bodies like hospitals, for example. The problem encountered was that employees are inclined to refer enquiries to colleagues whom they assume are capable of dealing with the matter, but who may not in reality be capable of doing so. Sometimes, I was required to get permission first from the head authority before I could carry out an interview. This happened, for instance, when data was required regarding the interpretation and translation service in hospitals: in one occasion I was asked to get permission from NHS. Other times there was even suspicion in some departments that I might write bad things about them while they were doing a good job as they believed. This happened, for example, when I wanted to make an interview with one of the Linkworkers in Manchester Advice Department; they believe

that they are doing something extra-ordinary and do not want to lose their reputation. This in turn indicates that there is a mistaken view in such departments with regard to the role of academic research; i.e. it is just all about revealing the negatives and neglecting the positives.

3.2.2 Is there an explicit language policy in Manchester?

Based on the data given above, Manchester's language policy is characterized by a number of features. First of all, there is awareness in MCC and other government agencies working in Manchester of the linguistic diversity of Manchester and there are serious attempts to meet such diversity in their services. In this regard, training is given to the different departments within MCC to raise the linguistic and cultural awareness of its employees. This is important since the "lack of linguistic [and cultural] awareness" in service providers' staff is one of the reasons for the problems that minority-language speakers have in accessing services (Pugh and Williams 2006: 1227).

However, as emphasized by the participant families and by the different personnel in the different departments of MCC, services in Arabic and other community languages are not provided due to a desire to maintain minority languages, but rather to maintain equal opportunities among the residents of Manchester. As part of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000: section 2), local councils are legally required to provide equal access to their services[46]. Although there is no direct reference to language provision in this act, the advice of bodies such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission (including the former Commission for Racial Equality) indicates that failure to provide access to local authority services in languages other than English would deny access to those services for certain users[47]. Therefore to comply with the legal requirements set out in the Act, language provision is indirectly implied, and local authorities must provide their services in all required languages[48]. Thus, the motive for minority language provisions is the legal requirement that all inhabitants of Manchester have the right to access services in their native language. Another motive is the desire

[46] The Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000) can be found at the following address http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/ukpga_20000034_en_1#pb1-l1g2, accessed 20th October, 2009.

[47] The advisory document published by the Equality and Human Rights Commission can be found at http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/PSD/3_the_duty_to_promote_race_equality.pdf p.54, accessed 20th October, 2009.

[48] This finding corresponds to what Pugh and Williams (2006: 1236) found in their study on language policy and provision in social service organizations in England and Wales. The study "found that while most organizations had general equal opportunity policies, many lacked specific policies on language."

to avoid any misunderstanding that may result due to language barrier, especially in such areas as hospitals, courts and police.[49]

Thus, there is no explicitly-mentioned language policy regarding minorities; rather, there is an implied policy. In other words, there are guidelines from the central government which emphasize the principle of equal opportunities; then the implementation of such guidelines requires provision of services in community languages. Hence, it can be said that MCC's language policy is a by-product of the council's policy of equality. The difficulty referred to above which was encountered in obtaining data on language policy in Manchester is, I believe, attributable to the implied nature of such a policy. That is, since there is no direct reference to service provision in minority languages in the equality policy, and it is simply implied, there is sometimes a blurred vision in MCC with regard to 'who is responsible for what'. For example, on several occasions when different personnel were made aware of the content of this study, their initial reaction upon hearing the phrase 'community languages' was to refer the matter to M-Four Translation Department. There exists in the council such a belief that it is only M-Four Translation which is responsible for minority languages in Manchester and that any queries whatsoever in this regard should be forwarded to it.

Moreover, although the implied nature of the policy may not be currently affecting the level of provisions in minority languages in Manchester, it may on the long run affect that level which may increase or decrease according to the different explanations by the different departments of the principle of equal opportunities. Therefore, rather than implied policies, there must be "clear and explicit minority language policies" (Pugh and Williams 2006: 1240) which, first, state explicitly that there must be certain level of provision of services in minority languages. Pugh and Williams consider this explicit policy one of four requirements for the development of effective services to minorities (2006: 1240-1241). Although provision of services in community languages is referred to in the advisory document by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, this is not legally binding since the document is just a guide, not statuary. Second, such an explicit language policy must guarantee that ethnic minorities can maintain their native language. Hulsen, De Bot and Weltens (2002: 29), commenting on the situation in New Zealand, consider the lack of an explicit language policy "that ensures that non-English-speaking minority groups can learn or maintain their native language" a passive attitude from the government towards migrant groups

[49] The Arab participants in this study hold the same view; i.e. the provisions in community languages in Manchester have nothing to do with maintaining multilingualism. They are mainly aimed at guaranteeing equality and avoiding any problems that may stem from the language barrier.

and languages. Although Arab and other ethnic minorities in Manchester can learn their native language, this is largely confined to ethnic supplementary schools and is very limited in mainstream schools.

The existence of a language policy in Manchester, though implied, is important for the maintenance of Arabic and the other minority languages since the lack of it altogether represents a kind of "an anti-minority-languages policy, because it delegitimises such languages by studiously ignoring them and, thereby, not allowing them to be placed on the agenda of supportable general values" (Fishman 2001: 454). In Manchester there are provisions and services in Arabic and other community languages available for minorities in MCC and other government agencies. This, I believe, is supportive for minority language maintenance in that it lessens the pressure on minority-language speakers to learn English as they can handle their dealings in the council in their native language. This helps them maintain their native language.

Providing services in community languages also gives such languages a kind of prestige and status. For example, stage one in Fishman's (1991) model of reversing language shift emphasizes the importance that some government activities be offered in the community language since it reflects a degree of "power-sharing" (Fishman 1991: 401). In Manchester, Arabs and other minority-language speakers can access public services in their native language since there exists what Ager called, commenting on Britain's official policy towards linguistic minorities, a "practical acceptance of the need to use some languages in order to communicate with minorities" (1996: 53). This means that government institutions can be sometimes a "domain" (Fishman 1964; 1965 & 1966) where Arabic and other community languages may be used, especially for new immigrants who may be monolingual in their native language. This reflects favorable attitudes and institutional support from the government for community languages as well as enhances the status of these languages, which are both important for their ethnolinguistic vitality. According to the theoretical model developed by Giles and Johnson (1987), there are three major groups of factors that influence the ethnolinguistic vitality of immigrant language groups[50]; two of these are the institutional support provided by the host country and the status factors, such as the use of community languages in public domains (Hatoss and Sheely 2009: 129, discussing Giles and Johnson 1987)[51]. The rate of ethnic language maintenance increases with high ethnolinguistic vitality of the ethnic group, and vice versa (Giles *et al*. 1977: 308).

[50] Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977: 308-318), as well, consider these three groups of factors as determiners of the ethnolinguistic vitality of a minority group.
[51] The third one is the demographic characteristics of the immigrant group.

Having investigated the implied nature of the language policy in Manchester, the question now is how such a policy is formulated.

3.2.3 How is Manchester's language policy formulated?

Manchester's language policy has two parts that work simultaneously: one is concerned with providing services in community languages in order to help minorities manage their life until they acquire English; i.e. a multilingual "policy of tolerance during the transition to English stage" (Garcia 1997: 42). This is evident, for instance, in the inclusion of new arrival students in mainstream schools, where they receive support in their native language as well as English until they develop English proficiency so that they can participate successfully in all-English instruction and language ceases to become an obstacle in the face of educational attainment. It is also clearly emphasized by the manager of M-Four Translation Department, who stated in an interview that 'M-Four only provide their services to minority language speakers who do not speak English' and that they provide services until, for example, the speaker in need of interpretation has achieved an adequate level of spoken English. The other part of Manchester's language policy is concerned with helping the integration of minorities through encouraging them to learn English. This is clear in the council's provisions of free ESOL courses (interview with the Deputy Leader's representative). Such courses, according to the Deputy Leader's representative, are aimed at helping minorities learn English in order to be able to manage their daily life on their own without depending on others for interpretation, and integrate in the society since their inability in English prevents them from such integration; e.g. socializing with their English-speaking neighbours, having English-speaking friends, etc. It may be argued that the two parts of policy may contradict each other; i.e. providing services in minority languages may hinder the integration of minorities who might see no need to learn English since they can carry out their dealings in public service organizations in their native language. However, according to the Deputy Leader's representative, the council and other government bodies affiliated with it do/can not adopt this view for the simple reason that providing services in community languages is important to maintain the principle of the legal right of all to have equal access to services.

MCC's policy towards minorities is not rigid. This is evident in its different services; e.g. Library Service, Linkworkers Service, etc. Given the fluid numbers of minority-language speakers in Manchester, and the fact that events outside the region might result in an influx of speakers requiring different languages, MCC tries to remain alert to the changing language dynamics within the city. In light of this, they do not rely

on rigid policies to operate, but prefer to remain adaptable to changing circumstances. For example, during the war in Bosnia, there was an increased need for Albanian due to the increased influx of immigrants from that region; this is not the case now. The flexibility that characterizes Manchester's language policy is an advantage since a strict, rigid approach might prove to hinder council services, and subsequently a more responsive approach is needed. That is, such a flexible language policy, by allowing for continuous adaptation of the policy in response to changing circumstances, is necessary to avoid the waste of resources and effort. A flexible language policy is also important since it provides policy makers with the opportunity to be a step ahead in anticipation of any change in the demography of minority-language speakers in the city. For example, during the war on Iraq, the council predicted an influx of speakers from Iraq and adapted its resources to meet the increasing need for services in Arabic (interview in M-Four Translation department).

One of the consequences of the constantly changing demographic make-up of Manchester is that it is extremely difficult to keep firm statistics regarding the numbers of minority-language speakers across the city (interview with the Deputy Leader's representative). The non-existence of accurate data about the numbers of community-language speakers may lead to waste of resources and effort since it may result in providing services in the wrong place. According to Pugh and Williams' (2006: 1240) second requirement for developing effective services for minorities, there must be "accurate and comprehensive information on minority language use in local areas." Reliance on national censuses in this regard might be misleading given that the census is carried out every ten years while the number of minority-language speakers, as well as their places of concentration in the city, are constantly fluctuating. This is besides the other technical issues related to the nature of the questions incorporated in censuses which render census data less accurate with regard to pinpointing the number of minority-language speakers (Edwards 2001: 257)[52]. To overcome this problem, MCC keeps indirect statistics drawn from the number of speakers requesting services from providers such as M-Four, Linkworkers, etc. in each ward, but these figures are for council use only and are not available to the public.

The language policy of MCC is informed through a number of different bodies that provide council services. Service providers such as M-Four, INATSS, Linkworkers, Library Department, etc. provide core language and support services for the council,

[52] The censuses categories for ethnicity; e.g. White, Black Caribbean, Black African, Indian, etc. are inaccurate indicators of the diversity of the UK population and in the absence of specific questions on language, "it is not possible to extrapolate from census data the number or size of different language communities" (Edwards 2001: 241).

and in return they also provide feedback and inform the Executive regarding the effectiveness of services and how these might be improved. Input into this process is also provided by Policy and Performance officers who assess the quality of council services and report back to the Executive. Based on the information gathered from these service providers, the Executive then decides on the appropriate language provisions that the council has to provide, and as such 'decides' language policy. This process of feedback operates in the different departments within MCC, as stressed in the interviews, with the ultimate goal of improving the services provided. For instance, M-Four Translation Department gathers feedback from both its 'customers' and 'clients'; that is, the social services which request assistance from M-Four, and the end-users who benefit from the services respectively. Through this chain, feedback reaches M-Four, and then along with the other Officers who inform MCC, this feedback helps to formulate both the services which M-Four needs to operate successfully, and also inform the Executive as to the appropriate action needed regarding language policy and resources. In addition to this, M-Four has also trained around two hundred community-language speakers to become interpreters acting on their behalf, and these community figures provide a valuable link between the M-Four and the community, and eventually the council itself. The presence of community feedback which subsequently informs council via consultation with its service providers, suggests that council services aim to connect with community needs as far as possible. With the existence of such feedback, the circle of community-language provision (i.e. Policy maker, service provider and service user) is complete. Such a circle works both directions; i.e. from policy maker through service provider reaching service user, and vice versa suggesting a kind of bottom-up language planning which is really important for effective provision of services. Indeed, without the effective user involvement, it is likely that service providers "are misdirecting resources and excluding some minority language community members from accessing or using services" (Pugh and Williams, 2006: 1236).

3.2.4 Language hierarchy in the implementation of Manchester's language policy

There is a language hierarchy in MCC and other government agencies working alongside. Such a hierarchy has three levels and influences Arabic and other community language provisions in Manchester. At the first level, English is on the top of the hierarchy of all languages. This is evident, for example, in mainstream education in which English is the only language of instruction. As Blackledge and Creese state, it is clear that "the multilingualism of the population of the United Kingdom was not

reflected in 'mainstream' educational policy, with its emphasis on English at the expense of teaching minority languages" (2010: 3). Such a hierarchy is obvious as well in MCC's website[53]. The website is overwhelmingly in English and there is a shortage of information available in non-English scripts. While this may be interpreted as a matter of convenience and practicality, it may also reflect an active policy to promote English amongst these communities in areas such as the website, whilst retaining bilingual support in the provision of documents.

At the second level of the hierarchy, modern foreign languages are given precedence over community languages. This, however, is restricted to mainstream education which is mainly controlled by the central government; in all other services priority is given to the community languages that are really spoken in Manchester (I will return to this point in detail in section 3.2.5 below).

At the third level of the hierarchy, some community languages are given priority over others. Community languages are not treated on an equal footing with regard to services and provisions in them. That is, while all community-language speakers can get services in their native language, the level of services provided is heavily bound by the numerical strength of every minority group. By the level of services I mean whether a minority-language speaker can get instant services in his/her community language at any time without prior arrangements from the service provider, or he/she has to wait for such arrangement to be made (e.g. arranging for an interpreter, a translated document, a library book, etc. in his/her native language, to be made available for him/her, which may take some time). In this regard, it is only the languages that have a considerable number of speakers; e.g. Urdu, Somali, Arabic, etc., whose speakers receive constant provisions and immediate services in them at any time[54]. This, however, does not deny the effort exerted by the council and other agencies working alongside to provide services in the different community languages in Manchester.

All the participants in this study see that the services MCC provides in Arabic are sufficient and meet their community's needs. They usually referred to their relatives or acquaintances in Manchester who depend on such service provision in Arabic. For example, one of the participants said that although he does not use such service as he speaks English well, he knows people who depend on it; e.g. three of his Arab acquaintances, who newly arrived in Manchester, rely on this provision of services in Arabic as they speak very little English. Another participant indicated how such Arabic

[53] The website can be found at the following address http://www.manchester.gov.uk/, accessed 4th Oct. 2010.

[54] Thus, future demographic changes that may occur due to the constantly increasing number of immigrants in Manchester may result in alternation in the level of services provided in the different community languages.

provisions in the council are very useful for an old refugee couple she knows, who are Arabic monolinguals. She said that without these provisions they can not manage. One of the participants as well referred to a relative who fully depends on these provisions; she said this relative is sick and every time she goes to hospital or the GP, they assign an interpreter for her. Moreover, some participants referred to the educational assistance in Arabic that new-arrival Arab children, who do not speak English, receive in classroom in mainstream schools, which is useful for newcomer immigrant families who have children. In fact, all the participants have a similar view with regard to service provision in Arabic; i.e. that the council is doing a good job in providing services in Arabic and the different community languages in Manchester although this is not an easy task given the large number of community-language speakers in the city. This view may also be due to any of the following reasons: first, all participants are bilingual, sometimes even before they came to Manchester; thus, they can manage their dealings in MCC or government agencies in English. The reason may also be attributable to the numerical strength of Arabs in Manchester. That is, as mentioned above, the main criterion for determining the level of community-language provisions in MCC and other government agencies is the existence of a considerable number of speakers of the given language. Since Arabs form a considerable number, they have a good level of provisions in their languages, compared with other smaller community languages in Manchester. The third reason may be that the participants, especially those of them who lived in other European countries before they came to Manchester, always hold a comparison between Manchester and the European cities where they lived before, and the comparison is always in favor of Manchester.

3.2.5 Educational language policy in Manchester

As mentioned above (in section 3.2.4), the national curriculum, with its emphasis on English as the only language of instruction, gives precedence to English over all other languages. This resembles the educational policy in Canada where despite the government encouragement for heritage language maintenance efforts (e.g. ethnic language classes), all public education is in English and French, the official languages (Slavik 2001: 148). Thus, the mainstream educational policy in the UK and Manchester encourages immigrants to learn English and minorities are deprived access to mainstream education in their native language. Moreover, as Blackledge and Pavlenko state, minorities "are required to either learn English or accept that they will not gain access to information about their children's schooling (Blackledge)" (2001: 248). This is because "English is the only language of currency in the school setting (Blackledge)"

(Blackledge and Pavlenko 2001: 247). Minorities may, however, be partially responsible for such a situation according to Bourdieu's (1977, 1991) model of the symbolic value of one language or language variety above others. As Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001: 246-47) state, the model "rests on his [Bourdieu] notion that a symbolically dominated group is complicit in the misrecognition *(meconnaisance)*, or valorization, of that language or variety. The official language or standard variety becomes the language of hegemonic institutions because the dominant and the subordinated group misrecognize it as a superior language." Minorities may want their children to go to normal mainstream schools, where the education is in English, since they want them to acquire the superior language, English, in order to have better jobs in the future. Thus, they may not ask for formal government education in their ethnic language and may even reject it, and make up for this by having ethnic schools.

The National Curriculum stipulates also that tuition in modern foreign languages is compulsory for Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3. On the other hand, although Arabic and other community-language speakers can similarly be entered for GCSE or A-Level courses and examinations in their languages, this is dependent on whether the teaching staff at the school can provide tuition in such languages at the school, and also on the demand for courses based on pupil numbers. Thus, it is clear that the educational system gives priority to modern foreign languages over community languages despite the fact that some community languages are more widely spoken in Manchester than any of the modern foreign languages[55]. This is "a significant statement of status" (Lamb 2001: 5) which may reveal an implicit language hierarchy whereby languages that are spoken by less powerful members of the society; i.e. ethnic immigrant groups, are often "undervalued or overlooked" (Edwards 2001: 254). In this respect, the National Curriculum, I believe, is still influenced by the 1989 Order (SI 1989) which "suggested a hierarchy of languages" (Ager 1996: 97) since it gave priority for European languages over other languages. Such a situation needs to be changed through a revised educational policy that promotes the teaching of both community languages and modern foreign languages (Lamb 2001: 11).

The National Curriculum is still influenced, as well, by the Swann Report of 1985 which proposes that if a language is really the mother tongue of a group and is used for intra-group interaction, such as parent/child communication, "it will survive and flourish regardless of the provisions made for it ... within mainstream schools"; therefore, "mainstream schools should not seek to assume the role of community providers for

[55] Thus, while the number of speakers is a key criterion for providing services in community languages in MCC and other government organizations as above mentioned, it ceases to be so when it comes to language teaching in mainstream education.

maintaining ethnic minority community languages" (Ager 1996: 92, citing Swann 1985: 408, 771). Thus, as emphasized in the interview with INATSS, the teaching of Arabic and other community languages has been relegated to supplementary schools since it would prove impractical and costly to provide optional language tuition in all languages given the vast linguistic diversity present at some Manchester schools. Blackledge and Creese (2010: 48) "view complementary schooling as a response to a historically monolingual ideology, which ignores the complexity of multilingual England." Also, Wei (2006: 78) argues that supplementary schools in the UK were set up since the mainstream educational system failed to satisfy the needs of ethnic minority children (in Blackledge and Creese 2010: 48). Perhaps that is why supplementary schools are not controlled by MCC; have freedom over their curricula, teaching, management etc.; and receive support from MCC, though limited especially when it comes to finances. Thus, the ethnic schools are important since they help to some extent maintain the principle of equality and the right of minorities to receive education in their native language. They also provide culture education, which strengthens ethnic and cultural identity among children.

Supplementary schools are also highly important for minority language maintenance, especially with regard to literacy, as emphasized by scholars; e.g. Kloss 1966, Conklin and Lourie 1983, Fishman 1985, Fishman 1991, etc. (cf. section 1.5.1.4). For example, Fishman (1991: 95-98) emphasizes in stage five of his model of reversing language shift the importance of ethnic language literacy in home, community and supplementary schools in reversing language shift. In other words, literacy through institutions that are controlled by the minority group and that do not need to comply with the host group's standards concerning compulsory education. Arabs in Manchester, for instance, have their ethnic schools that are run and controlled by them and have freedom over their administration, curricula, methods, etc. In these schools Arabic language is taught as a subject, textbooks of the different modules are in Arabic, Arabic is used as the language of instruction and students must sit the exams in Arabic. This contributes significantly to Arabic language maintenance since it provides as actual and important function for the ethnic language in the lives of the students by using it as the means to a demonstrable end, which strengthens its value (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 50, discussing Kipp 1981); and highlights the native language as a means of learning and communication in the domain of education just like the host language, although of course in different kinds of education.

The real function for the native language, referred to above, is even more enhanced when the language is taught in mainstream schools. Such a teaching also enhances the status of community languages, which is usually low; hence, leads to a

fear that children might not want to preserve these languages (Lamb 2001: 6). This means that teaching community languages in supplementary schools should be in complementary distribution with their teaching in mainstream schools, and that the argument of the Swann Report that minority languages are the responsibility of ethnic groups (Edwards 2001: 252) is invalid. According to Nelde, "language planning depends overwhelmingly on the educational system whose impact may be stronger than the impact of the legalization of multilingual and multicultural prerequisites" (2000: 443). Although the teaching of Arabic and other community languages in mainstream schools is not done on an equal footing with modern foreign languages, such a teaching serves, at least partially, the purposes of providing a function for the community language in the life of students and enhancing its status. In order for such a teaching to fully fulfil these purposes, it must be done equally to modern foreign languages; i.e. students must be given the right to choose to learn a community language just like they have the right to choose to learn a foreign language.

Churchill (1986: 51-60) provides a classification of educational language polices in the OECD (the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries[56]. The model locates the OECD countries at different points on an ascending ranking of six stages based on their different responses to recognizing minorities' language problems and their actions in devising educational practices and policies to meet those problems:

> *Stage 1*: considers minority groups as having 'learning deficit' in L2 (the majority language) (Churchill 1986: 53). The 'typical policy responses' is to provide supplementary teaching in L2, with a rapid transition expected to instruction in L2 (p. 54).
>
> *Stage 2*: considers a minority group's deficit as being also related to family status (p.54). The policy response is to provide teaching programs similar to Stage 1, with additional special measures to aid the adjustment of minority people to the majority society; e.g. interpreting services in government institutions, counselling, youth programs, programs to facilitate job training and placement of minorities' members on the labor market, etc.
>
> *Stage 3*: considers a minority group's deficit as linked to the affective consequences resulting from the cultural differences between the minority group's culture and the majority culture; i.e. the failure of the majority society, particularly its educational system, to accept and view positively the minority's culture (p. 57). Additional policy responses include providing 'multicultural'

[56] These countries include, for instance, Australia, Belgium, Canada, UK, USA, and others (Churchill 1986: 31).

teaching programs for all students, raising teachers' awareness of cultural diversity and revising textbooks to eliminate ethnic and racial stereotyping (p.55).

Stage 4: assumes that the 'premature' loss of L1 inhibits learning of L2 and that this occurs for cognitive and affective reasons. An additional policy response is to provide support for L1 by studying it as a subject, and sometimes also as a medium of instruction (p.55).

Stage 5: assumes that L1 is threatened with vanishing if not supported. The policy response is the use of the minority language as a medium of instruction, usually in the early years of school (p.55).

Stage 6: considers the majority and the minority languages as having equal rights in society, with special support for the minority language to ensure broad social use (p.56). Policy responses comprise granting a minority language the status of an official language, separate educational institutions for language groups, and support measures for a minority language beyond the educational system (p.56).

Corson places Britain at stage 1 with regard to its treatment of new settler ethnic language speakers and at stage 3 in terms of the attitudes towards multiculturalism that curriculum experts advocate[57] (1990: 146-147). Manchester's language policy with regard to minorities can be located at various points of Churchill's stages[58]. For example, stage 5 in Churchill's categorization (p. 55) indicates that a minority language is used as a medium of instruction in mainstream education. Although this is not the case in Manchester, this can be compensated to some extent by the presence of ethnic supplementary schools; e.g. Arabic schools where the minority language is used in instruction. Manchester can thus be assigned somewhat to stage 5. Accordingly, the language outlook; i.e. the expected relationship between the minority language and the majority language, refers to L1 maintenance as an intra-group language, but in inter-group situations; e.g. work, trade, etc., minority uses L2 (Churchill 1986: 55). This is of significance for L1 maintenance since it maintains a compartmentalized use of the native language and the host language which assigns both languages different functions (Fishman 1985 & 1991: 356; and Paulson 1998: 6). Thus, the minority languages, as Churchill indicates, are expected to be preserved for use primarily in the home and ethnic social activities (1986: 58).

[57] The inclusion strategies of new arrival students in mainstream schools in Manchester, I see corresponds to stage 1 through providing supplementary teaching in L2; i.e. English, with a rapid transition expected to use of it (see Churchill 1986: 54).
[58] Donakey (2007: 54) has the same view.

Manchester can be also partially placed on stage 6 through the presence of such ethnic supplementary schools which represent independent educational institutions controlled and run by the relevant minority group (Churchill 1986: 56). However, Manchester does not meet the other criteria of Stage 6; e.g. minority language given the status of an official language, which needs top-down measures taken at national level. The teaching of Arabic and other community languages as a subject in mainstream schools, though limited as mentioned above, locates Manchester at Churchill's stage 4 since such a teaching represents support presented for the ethnic language by studying it as a subject (Churchill 1986: 55). The bulk of community language provisions in Manchester (i.e. interpretation, translation, linkworkers, etc.) places Manchester at stage 2 through providing special procedures to help adjustment of minorities to the majority society.

Manchester's language policy can as well be assessed against the document of Language Vitality and Endangerment by the UNESCO Ad Hoc Experts Group on endangered languages (2003). This document identifies nine factors for characterizing a language's vitality and overall sociolinguistic situation. The seventh factor (Government and Institutional Language Policies, including Official Status and Use) assesses official support for dominant and non-dominant languages which is ranked according to a scale of six grades (equal support, differentiated support, passive assimilation, active assimilation, forced assimilation, and prohibition). Manchester's language policy can partially be assigned to Grade 4 (passive assimilation). Although it does not fulfil the criterion in Grade 4 that non-dominant languages are explicitly protected by the government, the government encourages minorities to speak and sustain their native language, most often in intra-group settings such as home, rather than in inter-group ones like mainstream education (p. 13) where they are supposed to use the dominant language. This is evident, for instance, in MCC's encouragement for the existence of Arabic and other ethnic supplementary schools, and in mainstream schools' encouragement for parents to use their native language with their children at home, as confirmed during the interviews at schools. But, Manchester goes even a step beyond this through provision of services in minority languages; nonetheless, it does not reach grade 6 where all languages are protected via law, and the government supports the preservation of all languages through explicit policies (p. 13). The use of English as the sole language of instruction in mainstream education corresponds to grade 3 (active assimilation): the government encourages language shift among minority language groups by presenting education for them in the dominant language only (p. 13).

3.3 Conclusion

The language provisions offered by MCC indicate that the council attempts to respond to the needs of the numerous ethnic communities which fall under its remit. In this regard different services are provided in minority languages, though to varying degrees, depending on the number of speakers of each individual community language, as explained in section 3.2.4. Since there are a large number of Arabs in Manchester, different services are provided in Arabic; e.g. interpreters, translators, linkworkers, library services, etc. While this does not have a direct influence on Arabic maintenance, it can be said to indirectly help to some extent language maintenance in certain aspects. As explained above in section 3.2.2, it gives the language a kind of prestige and status. This affects positively speakers' attitudes towards it, which is important for its maintenance (cf. section 7.4.2 for the importance of positive attitudes for Arabic maintenance). Also, providing government services in Arabic creates more opportunities and more domains, besides the intra-group domains, in which Arabic can be used (cf. section 3.2.2). This helps somewhat in giving the language a function, which is important for its preservation (cf. section 1.5.1.8). In fact, the Arabic provisions illustrated above indicate that the domain 'communication with local services' can to a large extent be served by Arabic rather than English, as a result of Council policy. This is also important for new immigrants who may be monolingual in Arabic, hence cannot manage their dealings in government institutions in English. Thus, government support for Arabic maintenance is confined to the above-mentioned indirect support, alongside its encouragement for supplementary schools, which takes place in the form of monitoring for quality assurance and staff training, and is non-financial. However, the main effort for Arabic language maintenance is community-internal. For example, the teaching of Arabic is mainly done in the Arabic schools; in mainstream schools, Arabic is only offered as an optional choice for older students; i.e. in GCSE and A-level, and this is dependent on staff resources and on the demand based on students' numbers (cf. sections 3.1.4.2 and 3.1.4.3)[59].

To summarize, it can be said that MCC, and other government agencies working alongside it, are aware of the linguistic diversity that characterizes Manchester and attempt to meet it in their services; however, they are less concerned with maintaining such diversity. That is, service provision in Arabic and other community languages is not meant to maintain these languages, it instead aims to maintain equal access to service

[59] The community effort is not only led by institutions, but also by individuals; e.g. using Arabic with children at home, having Arabic satellite channels, etc., as will be illustrated in detail in later chapters on language choice, ability and attitudes.

for the residents of Manchester. Rather than this indirect language policy that is a legal requirement of the equal opportunity policy, there must be an explicit language policy which states clearly that there must be a certain level of provisions in community languages and which ensures that ethnic minorities can learn and maintain their native language. This, in addition to the council's attempts to promote the learning of English (e.g. through free ESOL courses), can help achieve the successful adjustment of minorities in both their acquisition of the host language, and maintenance of their own language, the two factors given by Hatoss and Sheely (2009: 127-28) in their study on language maintenance among Sudanese refugees in Australia.

Having investigated Manchester's language policy and the local circumstances in which Arabs and other minorities maintain their native languages, it is necessary to examine the community-internal circumstances or determinants of Arabic language maintenance; i.e. language use, language ability and language attitudes. However, before I embark on this investigation, I will investigate in the next chapter whether Arabs in Manchester form a speech community.

4 Do Arabs Form a Speech Community in Manchester?

4.1 Introduction

As mentioned in section 1.1, studies on Arabic maintenance in immigrant contexts usually focus on groups from a single country of origin; e.g. Lebanese in Cleveland (Daher 1992), Moroccans in Netherlands (El Aissati 1996; Mehlem 1998), Algerians in France (Tribalat 1995), etc. In Manchester, speakers' communication in Arabic is not limited to or oriented primarily towards fellow expatriates from the same country. It is not the case that Egyptians, for example, communicate with Egyptians, Libyans with Libyans, Syrians with Syrians, etc. Rather, Arabs in Manchester come from different countries and are in daily face-to-face contact with one another. Thus, the study argues for the existence of a more general Arabic-speaking community, and investigates Arabic language maintenance within it. This position of a more general community might be questioned; for example, the fact referred to above that most studies focus on Arabic-speaking diasporic communities from a single country of origin implies a sort of argument against this assumption[60]. In this chapter, I will conclude that Arabic speakers in this study form a speech community since they fulfil a number of criteria. These criteria have been proposed by the different definitions of a speech community; e.g. communication among the members of the community, using a common language in interaction, shared rules for using the language, existence of linguistic differences between members of the community and those outside it, sharing of one formal variety, etc. All these criteria will be investigated throughout this chapter.

The data was collected from participant observation and interviews. Conversational data was primarily obtained from four recorded focus group discussions that comprised participants from different Arab countries. Recorded conversational data was also obtained from Arabic gatherings in Al-Bokhary Islamic Centre in Manchester (cf. Methodology chapter: section 2.1.2.3).

The chapter is organized as follows: section 4.2 starts with exploring the various definitions of a speech community (4.2.1). Then, the discussion moves to show how Arabic speakers communicate using a common language, and how this contributes to their being a speech community. Hence, the mutual intelligibility of the Arabic dialects and the factors that enhance it are investigated (4.2.1.1); the speakers' shared standard formal medium is also explored (4.2.1.2). In the final section (4.2.2), a conclusion explaining the significance of the participants' being a speech community for Arabic maintenance is provided.

[60] This position has also been questioned in one of my PhD panel meetings.

4.2 Is there an Arabic-speaking community in Manchester?

To answer this question, let us first explore the various definitions that provide different criteria to judge the existence or non-existence of a speech community, and investigate whether such criteria apply to Arabs in Manchester.

4.2.1 What is a speech community?

The term 'speech community' is widely used by sociolinguists to refer to a community based on language. Many definitions have been proposed for speech community (Hudson 1980: 24-30). For example, there are these definitions which include such criteria as shared language use (Lyons 1970), frequency of interaction by a group of people (Bloomfield 1933 & Gumperz 1962), and shared attitudes and values regarding language forms and use (Labov 1972). Hockett (1958: 8) defines a speech community as follows: "each language defines a speech community: the whole set of people who communicate with each other, either directly or indirectly, via the common language."

Hockett's definition emphasizes two elements characterizing a speech community: a common language and communication. Based on long-term participant observation, Arabs in the present study communicate face-to-face on a daily basis. This communication is done using a common language; i.e. Arabic. That is, although in cross-dialect interactions each one uses his/her own dialect, this does not cause any failure in communication, as will be shown in the examples below[61]. This corresponds to S'hiri's (2002: 172) finding that it is untrue that "Arabs converse in Fuṣḥa [Modern Standard Arabic] when they meet", which confirms one of Abu Melhim's (1991, 1992) major findings that "contrary to the widespread belief or wish that when Arabs meet, they communicate by using Fuṣḥa, the fact is that they generally either stick to their own varieties or code switch as they judge necessary or suitable" (discussed in S'hiri 2002: 165). This is because the various dialects of Arabic are so closely related that they are mutually intelligible. Ennaji (1999: 385), for example, divides dialectical Arabic into regions; e.g. Egyptian, Syrian, Sudanese, Moroccan, etc., and states that "these regional dialects are intelligible to speakers of other dialects." Thomas states that while there are differences between the various Arabic dialects, "all of these dialects are generally mutually intelligible" (2000, paragraph 7, line 1). In addition, S'hiri states that despite differences, "the wider held belief, however, remains that all Arabs speak the

[61] There could exist some kind of accommodation; however, it does not contradict the fact that they speak in their own dialects (this point will be discussed in detail later in 4.2.1.1.5 Accommodation).

same language with slight variation" (2002: 152). There are, of course, other linguists; e.g. Mitchell (1962: 10) who sees that the Arabic dialects are widely divergent that they are mutually unintelligible, and that Arabic speakers from the different countries use written Arabic as a means of communication in pan-dialect situations. However, as will be illustrated below, this view is not true.

The mutual comprehensibility among the dialects was emphasized also by the different participants in the present study in the interviews, focus groups and casual conversations during the participant observation:

- 'In fact, I do not see big differences between the dialects.'
- 'The dialects are close to each other.'
- 'They are all branches of one language.'

The participants emphasized, as well, that they use their dialect in cross-dialect communication. The mutual intelligibility of the Arabic dialects was also observed by the researcher on a daily basis in Manchester through interaction with Arabs from the different countries, and casually in supermarkets, coffee shops, restaurants, streets and other public places, when being in an earshot of groups of Arabs speaking together. One such example occurred during a visit with a group of Arabs to the house of an Algerian to congratulate him for his performing Hajj[62]. The group consisted of two Tunisians, an Algerian, a Syrian, two Libyans, three Egyptians, two Palestinians, and two Saudis; hence, most of the Arabic dialects were represented. The group spent about two hours speaking about different topics, including the journey to Hajj, the Arab world, life in Manchester, children, etc. The conversation was very natural and everyone spoke in his own dialect without this causing any difficulty in understanding. The choice of dialects in pan-dialect communication is a significant piece of evidence for the mutual comprehensibility of them. If the dialects had not been mutually intelligible, speakers would have used their shared standard variety of Arabic (i.e. MSA)[63], or even another language (e.g. English) as a lingua franca in cross-dialect interactions. It is even socially

[62] Hajj is the Islamic Arabic word used for pilgrimage. It is conducted every year during the final mother of the Islamic Calendar. Muslims should go to Mecca, the Holy City, in Saudi Arabia to perform it. The Hajj procedures take about 4 days, but pilgrims usually stay a bit longer visiting different holy places, such as the Holy Mosque, prophet Muhammed's Mosque, etc. Upon pilgrims' return, friends and relatives go to congratulate them for performing Hajj.

[63] As will be illustrated later in this chapter, although MSA is sometimes used in linguistic accommodation in pan-dialect communication, this is typically done at the level of vocabulary items, phrases or sentences, not at the level of an entire conversation conducted in MSA (see also section 4.2.1.1.5 Accommodation).

inappropriate for the first generation Arabs to use English with Arab friends and contacts, as will be illustrated in chapter 5 (Language Choice).

The question now is what accounts for the mutual intelligibility of the Arabic dialects. This will be investigated in the next section (4.2.1.1). Then, in section 4.2.1.2, the shared written medium that Arabic speakers have will be discussed.

4.2.1.1 Factors for mutual intelligibility among spoken Arabic dialects

According to Gooskens (2007: 446), there are three main factors determining the intelligibility of a closely related language: the listener's attitude towards the language, the listener's contact with the language, and the linguistic distance to the listener's language. Gooskens used these factors to investigate the intelligibility of related 'languages' in her study (i.e. Norwegian, Danish and Swedish). In the present study, the factors will be utilized to examine the intelligibility of the Arabic 'dialects' which, though not languages but dialects related to one language, there are linguistic differences among them, as explained in section 1.6.1. In addition to Gooskens' factors, I will investigate in detail another two important factors for mutual intelligibility: the shared communicative competence among Arabic speakers and the linguistic accommodation they employ in conversation to overcome any dialect barrier.

4.2.1.1.1 Listener's attitudes towards the language

Ribbert and Thije (2007: 76), in their investigation of receptive multilingualism in Dutch and German, refer to the importance of the general attitude of the speakers of one language towards the speakers of the other language, and how this influences the speakers' choice to make use of their receptive multilingualism as a mode of interaction with each other, to use a lingua franca, or to use one of the interlocutors' mother tongue. Arabs in the present study, as illustrated in chapter 7, have a positive attitude towards the various dialects of Arabic, which stems from their need for receptive knowledge of the various dialects to communicate with other Arabs, and their view that Arabic, regardless of the various dialects, is one language which is symbolic of identity and is a prerequisite for group ascription (cf. section 7.2 Attitudes towards Arabic and English).

4.2.1.1.2 Listener's contact with the language

As for this second factor, Arabs in the present study are in daily contact with the various dialects of Arabic through their direct, face-to-face communication in their get-togethers. They use their dialects in pan-dialect interaction as the examples below

show. The contact with the various dialects is also maintained indirectly through watching Arabic satellite channels which are broadcasted in the various dialects (cf. Chapter 5). Both types of contact give speakers receptive competence in the various dialects, which is enough for mutual intelligibility and successful communication according to Romaine (1994) and Saville-Troilke (1989) (as we will see later in this chapter). Gooskens (2007: 462), as well, states that sometimes bilingualism plays a role in mutual intelligibility. For example, the Frisian speakers in her study can use their knowledge of both Dutch and Frisian to understand Afrikaans, which might explain why they have better test results for Afrikaans than could be predicted from both the phonetic and the lexical distances. That is, they perform well although there are large phonetic distances between Afrikaans and Frisian (Gooskens 2007: 456) and Frisians are faced with a large number of non-cognates when hearing Afrikaans (Gooskens 2007: 460-61). As for the Arabic dialects, speakers of a given dialect sometimes make use of their receptive knowledge of another dialect to understand a third one in pan-dialect communication. For example, an Egyptian speaker can make use of his knowledge that *sabbāṭ* means 'slipper' in Syrian Arabic to understand that word when used by a Lebanese, for instance.

According to Gooskens (2007: 462-63), these two non-linguistic factors mentioned above; i.e. attitude and contact, are important predictors of intelligibility, in addition to linguistic distance, in real-life settings[64].

4.2.1.1.3 Linguistic distance to the listener's language

As mentioned in section 1.6.1.1, there are linguistic differences between the Arabic dialects. However, the dialects are mutually intelligible; one of the important factors for this intelligibility is that there are great linguistic similarities among them. Ezzat, for example, shows through an analysis of the phonology, grammar (syntax and morphology) and lexis of various dialects of Arabic that there are shared linguistic features among the Arabic dialects that guarantee their reciprocal intelligibility (1974: 51). He even criticizes those non-Arab linguists who yield to "the fallacy" that Arabic dialects are widely divergent and that there is no reciprocal intelligibility among them (Ezzat 1974: 7).

Gooskens (2007) investigated the linguistic distances among the languages under investigation in her study based on the lexical distances and the phonetic distances. S'hiri (2002), in her investigation of Tunisian-Arabic speakers' linguistic

[64] For the role of non-linguistic factors in intelligibility, see also Bø (1978), Börestam (1987), Maurud (1976), and Delsing & Lundin Åkesson (2005) (Gooskens 2007: 445-446).

accommodation to Middle-Eastern Arabs (e.g. Egyptians, Syrians, etc.), repeatedly refers to the point that her participants' accommodation at the morphological, phonological, etc. levels to Middle-Eastern Arabs is not triggered by their desire to be better understood. This is because accommodation at such levels mostly does not contribute to the clarity of the message, which means that differences at such levels do not hinder mutual understanding in cross-dialect communication. In the present study, based on the recorded data obtained from the focus groups and the Arabic get-togethers, and on daily observation, the phonological, morphological and syntactic differences among the dialects of Arabic do not seem to hinder mutual intelligibility among them. For example, the Libyan pronunciation /g/ in words like *gāl* 'he said' corresponds to the Syrian pronunciation /ʔ/ as in *ʔāl*. The differences in these sounds do not cause difficulty in reciprocal understanding among speakers of both dialects (cf. section 4.2.1.1.3.2 for more discussion). Likewise, as the examples below show, it did not happen during the focus groups discussions, interviews or participant observation that a speaker was not understood and asked to explain what he said because, for instance, he used a different plural form or a different sentence structure from those used in the dialect of his addressees (cf. section 4.2.1.1.3.3). On the other hand, a speaker might be interrupted and asked for clarification of meaning if he uses a lexical item that is not used in the dialects of his addressees. Thus, I will focus below on the lexis and how speakers overcome lexical differences and understand each other. Also, as Ezzat (1974: 44) states, "lexis is the domain in which divergencies among the colloquials are most observable. Still, there are striking similarities which help towards intelligibility." After discussing the lexical distances among the dialects, I will briefly discuss the phonological, syntactic and morphological distances to show that they do not hinder intelligibility among the dialects.

4.2.1.1.3.1 Lexical distance among the dialects

Gooskens measured the lexical distances between the languages in her study based on the percentage of "non-cognates"; i.e. historically non-related words, which the subjects heard in the test (2007: 457). This is because non-cognates are supposed to be incomprehensible to listeners with no previous familiarity with the test language; hence a great percentage of these words will obstruct understanding (Gooskens 2007: 457). As for the Arabic dialects, one of the most supporting factors that enhances their mutual intelligibility is that there are large lexical similarities among them. As the examples below illustrate, a great extent of the vocabulary items are used to give the same meaning in the various dialects. In the daily contact with Arabs in Manchester,

communication is normally sustained for long stretches of talk without any of the participants using a word that is not used in the others' dialects. This is the case also in the focus groups discussions and the interviews which were conducted with Arabs from the different countries.

Even when a speaker uses a word or an idiom that is not used in the dialect of his interlocutor, which is normal given that even within the same country people sometimes use words and idioms that are not known or at least not used by others in other places, the meaning could be understood from the context or by providing illustration on the part of the speaker. However, this is the exception not the norm. That is, it does not occur to such an extent that it hinders communication and that the speech situation looks as if occurring between speakers of different languages. Consider, for example, the following conversation between a Libyan and an Egyptian in which communication flows spontaneously despite each speaker's use of lexical items that are not normally used in his interlocutor's dialect. The conversation was video-recorded during a social gathering in Al-Bokhary Islamic Centre in Manchester on the occasion of Eid Al-Adha, 2009. Participants in this conversation, along with the two speakers in example 2 below, came early before the gathering and were waiting for other friends to join them. They were sitting in the small room of the centre in which religious lessons are given and social gatherings are held.

(1)

Egyptian: ba'at-tilī rsāla **dilwaʔt**.
'You have sent me a message now.'

Libyan: **nibbī** nzūrūkum il-yūm iḥnā wil-'āʔila.
'We and the family want to visit you today.'

Egyptian: mafiš mašākil (.) Mistannīyinkum.
'No problem. We are waiting for you.'

Libyan: mitʔakkad ʔaḵī, mafiš **bās**?
'Are you sure, brother, there is no problem?'

Egyptian: ḵāliṣ.
'At all'

Libyan: **bāhī**.
'Ok'

In this example, communication was not hindered by the Egyptian speaker's use of *dilwaʔt* which means 'now' in Egyptian Arabic, and for which Libyans use *tawwa*. Likewise, interaction was not hampered by the Libyan speaker's use of *nibbī*, *bās* or *bāhī*, which respectively mean in Libyan Arabic 'we want', 'difficulty' and 'OK', and which are not

used in Egyptian Arabic. The meaning was easily guessed from the context. The above example and the subsequent ones below may also refer to an occurrence of some kind of lexical accommodation in speakers' repertoires in the Manchester Arabic-speaking community compared with the homeland varieties. That is, due to the daily face-to-face contact with speakers of the various dialects, which is not available for many of their counterparts in the home country, Arabs in the Manchester speech community have a more varied linguistic repertoire; i.e. one that contains elements from the various dialects, which helps them understand each other in pan-dialect interaction. Consider also the following conversation, which was recorded in the same session of example 1 above, between an Iraqi and a Jordanian who were talking about a third person. Notice how the Jordanian speaker could easily guess from the context that *dazzītlū* in Iraqi Arabic means *ba'aṯṯlū* 'sent':

(2)

Iraqi: **dazzītlū** email?
'did you send him an email?'

Jordanian: lā **ba'aṯṯlū** rsāla.
'no, I sent him a text message.'

Iraqi: wkīfa ḥwālū?
'and how is he?'

Jordanian: ʔal-ḥamdu lillāh.
'fine.'

In the following example, from one of the tape-recorded focus group discussions[65], the Libyan interlocutor was not asked to explain the meaning of the word *yišbaḥ* 'see' as his addressees, a Syrian and an Egyptian (the researcher), were able to guess its meaning from the context although it is not used in the Syrian dialect or the Egyptian dialect. However, he was asked to explain the meaning of the word *bakkūš*, which was not easy to guess. In this extract, participants were discussing the importance of visiting the homeland for Arabic maintenance among children:

(3)

Libyan: ḥatta hiyya iz-ziyāra biṣifa 'āmma lil-balad il-ʔum biyilga ʔabnāʔ 'ammah wʔabnāʔ ḵāltah (2) hadūl nās yiḥibbūh wiyḥinnū 'alīh ʔakṯar mil-lī **yišbaḥ** fīhum fiš-šāri' ihnī. ʔanā ʔa'raf wāḥid **bakkūš** (.) ma-yitkallamš bil-'arabī ʔabadan.

[65] As explained in the Methodology chapter, in every focus group there were two participants in addition to the researcher (cf. section 2.1.2.3.2).

'generally, when the child visits the homeland, he finds his cousins, who love him and treat him more kindly than the people he sees in the street here. I know someone who speaks no Arabic at all.'

R (interrupting): **bakkūš ya'nī ʔīh ?**

'what is the meaning of bakkosh?'

Libyan: ya'nī yitkallam bil-linglīzī faqaṭ. rāḥ lilībyā ga'ad šahrīn ḥaḍar il-monāsabāt (.) tilgīh taʔahhal taʔhīl mā šāʔ ʔallāh lisānah inṭalag.

'it means he speaks English only. He went to Libya for two months, so he became fluent in Arabic.'

Syrian: mā šāʔ ʔallāh.

'this is what Allah wanted.'

Although the example shows that it is the Egyptian speaker who asked for the meaning of *bakkūš*, however, the Syrian participant gave a sign that showed that he as well wanted to ask about the meaning. That is, he nodded his head to signal that he agreed with the question. We notice also in this example that the Libyan speaker explained the meaning of *bakkūš* in advance in Libyan Arabic immediately after it *ma-yitkallamš bil-'arabī* 'he speaks no Arabic', since he thought that the addressees might not understand. When he was asked to explain the meaning again he did it in a mixture of Egyptian Arabic and MSA *ya'nī yitkallam bil-linglīzī faqaṭ* 'it means he speaks English only', to make sure that the addresses understand this time. That is, he used /g/ instead of /j/ in *bil-linglīzī* 'in English' as in Egyptian Arabic, and *faqaṭ* 'only' from MSA instead of *bass*. Since the Egyptian speaker is the one who asked about the meaning, he used Egyptian Arabic; then, when he realized that the Syrian speaker wanted to understand as well by giving the gesture mentioned above, he accommodated to him using MSA.

Consider also example 4, from another focus group, in which a Palestinian was telling a story to the researcher (R) and a Libyan. He was saying that there is no preaching for Christianity in Gaza in Palestine, and when one of the European priests wanted to preach in Gaza, he went to a village there and lived with them for a year:

(4)

Palestinian: wba'd sana ʔāl **lil-ḵūrī** taba'ū illi-kbīr ʔinnū ʔanā (2) ʔidirt ya'nī ʔinnī ʔanaṣṣar majmū'a.

'and after a year he said to his senior priest I could convert a group to Christianity.'

R: **ʔil-ḵūrī lli huwwa l-ʔassīs?**

'the khory is the priest?'

Palestinian: ʔil-qissīs li-kbīr, ʔā.

'the senior priest, yes.'

In this example, the addressee could guess the meaning of *ḵūrī* 'priest' from the context, but since he was not sure whether he guessed it right or not, he asked for an explanation. In the following conversation as well, from the same recorded session given above in examples 1 and 2 from Al-Bokhary Islamic Centre, an Egyptian speaker asked for the meaning of *dišdāša*, 'a kind of Arabic clothing for men', when he heard it from an Iraqi speaker who gave him the equivalent in MSA *jilbāb*:

(5)

Iraqi: ʔištarīt **dišdāša** jdīda.
'I have bought a new dishdasha.'

Egyptian: **dišdāša ya'nī ʔī ?**
'what is the meaning of dishdasha?'

Iraqi: **jilbāb** ya'nī.
'it means jilbab.'

Egyptian: ʔā, galabiyya (2) ʔištaritha bkām ?
'O' yes, galabiyyah. How much did you buy it?'

Notice how the Egyptian speaker confirmed that he understood the meaning by giving the Egyptian equivalent *galabiyya* and then continued speaking in the Egyptian dialect and asked *ʔištaritha bkām?*. He wanted to flag that the conversation can be resumed again in the dialects; i.e. that non-intelligibility is the exception, and once it is overcome by using MSA, they can return back to the dialects. It is a circle that started with colloquial Arabic (Iraqi dialect), followed by MSA to illustrate meaning, and back again to colloquial Arabic (Egyptian dialect).

Sometimes, as mentioned in example 3, the speaker himself explains the meaning of a word or an expression in advance without a request from his addressee when he thinks that it might hinder the addressee's understanding. Consider the following example from a focus group discussion in which a Libyan was talking about a family in which children are very competent in Arabic since their father takes them to mosque to learn Quran.

(6)

Libyan: ʔanī šufit 'āʔila (.) li-ṣġār fīhā yitkallamu injlīzī biṭalāqa, wil-bū wil-ʔum injlīziyyathum ḍa'īfa jiddan (.) ya'nī nās **ikbār ḵityārīn**, wma'a hāḏa yitkallamu 'arabī kwayyis, ma-ni'rafš kīf. Bas laʔann il-ʔab miḥāfiẓ ʔinnū yirfa'hum li-drūs il-Qurʔān.

'I have seen a family in which children speak English fluently, and the parents' English is very weak; they are old people. However, children speak Arabic well, I do not know how. This is because the father takes them to Quran lessons.'

Syrian (agreeing): yāk̲idhum li-drūs il-Qurʔān.

'Takes them to the Quran lessons.'

In this example, the Libyan speaker used two successive synonyms *ikbār* and *k̲ityārīn* for 'old' to explain that the parents in this family were old people. He thought that his addressees, a Syrian and an Egyptian (the researcher), might have difficulty understanding one of the synonyms. Therefore, he used the two synonyms to make sure that his addresses understand what he meant, and indeed *k̲ityārīn* is used in the Syrian dialect, and *ikbār* is used in Egyptian Arabic with slight variation in pronunciation *kubār*. Consider also the following example from a focus group in which participants were discussing whether Arabs in Manchester consider Arabic as important or not. The Saudi participant said that there are differences between generations and the Algerian participant agreed with him saying:

(7)

Algerian: ʔanā ʔaẓun hunā il-jīl iṯ-ṯānī kamā qāl ʔak̲ūnā ʔabā Farīd[66] yuḥāwil ʔan yuḥāfiẓ ʿala il-luğa il-ʿarabiyya (.) lākin kamā qāl ʔannahum mitʿarraḍīn ʿindamā yamšūn lil-madrasa al-ʔinglīziyya fayadrusūn bil-luğa al-ʔinglīziyya. maṯalan ʔanā ʔawlādī **ḥāṭṭuhum** (.) **wāḍiʿhum** fī madrasa ʔislāmiyya [.....[67]] lākin il-luğa mumārasa [.....] ʔiḏā lam yastaṭiʿ il-ʔinsān ʔan yatakallam bil-luğa fahuwa ğīr musayṭir ʿalayhā, waʔanā maʿa ʔak̲ ʔabā Farīd ʔinn maʿa il-waqt (.) tastaṭīʿ ʔan tataqahqar il-luğa yaʿnī .

'I think that the second generation, as our brother Abu Farid said, are trying to maintain Arabic, but as he said, they study in English in the English schools. For example, I registered my children in an Islamic school ….. but language is practice …… and if a person does not speak in it, it is not under control. And I agree with brother Aba Farid that with the passage of time, the language can deteriorate.'

[66] To protect the anonymity of participants, pseudonyms were used in conversational examples in the present study.

[67] A dotted line like this means that there is a missing word, phrase or sentence that I did not write either because I could not get it due to a recording problem or because it is irrelevant to the point being discussed.

Like in the previous example, in this example, the Algerian participant used two successive synonyms; i.e. *ḥāṭṭuhum* and *wāḍiʿhum* 'I put them', to explain that his children are registered in an Islamic school. He used *ḥāṭṭuhum* first since it is the one used in Algerian Arabic. Then, when he thought that his addressees, a Saudi and an Egyptian, might not be able to understand it, he used the other synonym *wāḍiʿhum* which is from MSA to make sure that they understand. He did not know that, as in Algerian Arabic, in Egyptian Arabic and Saudi Arabic the first synonym is used, but is pronounced as *ḥāṭiṭhum*.

At the lexical level, the mutual intelligibility among the Arabic dialects stems from, and is enhanced by, a number of factors. First, in many cases the lexical item that is used to refer to a specific thing or to give a specific meaning in one dialect is also used in the different dialects with a close meaning, which facilitates guessing the meaning from the context. For example, in a conversation after prayer at mosque, an Algerian was telling his Egyptian addressees that he got a new baby. He said *zād ʿindī wild il-yūm* 'I got a baby today'. He used the word *zād* to mean 'got'. This word means 'increased' in Egyptian Arabic. Although it was the first time for the Egyptian addressees to hear this word used in this sense, they could guess the meaning from the context because the word is used in Egyptian Arabic with a similar meaning to mean 'increased in number'. Moreover, Libyans use the word *yirfa'* to mean 'to take somebody to a place'. This word is used in other dialects like the Egyptian and Syrian dialects to mean 'to lift'. Thus, in example 6 above, the Libyan participant used *yirfa'* to mean 'take somebody to', and the addressees, a Syrian and an Egyptian could understand the meaning. The example is reproduced below as 8:

(8)

Libyan: ʔanī šufit ʿāʔila (.) li-ṣ̄ār fīhā yitkallamu injlīzī biṭalāqa, wil-bū wil-ʔum injlīziyyathum ḍaʿīfa jiddan (.) yaʿnī nās ikbār ḵityārīn, wmaʿa hāḏa yitkallamu ʿarabī kwayyis, ma-niʿrafš kīf. Bas laʔann il-ʔab miḥāfiẓ ʔinnū **yirfaʿhum** li-drūs il-Qurʔān.

'I have seen a family in which children speak English fluently, and the parents' English is very weak; they are old people. However, children speak Arabic well, I do not know how. This is because the father takes them to Quran lessons.'

Syrian (agreeing): **yāḵidhum** li-drūs il-Qurʔān.

'Takes them to the Quran lessons.'

Notice how the Syrian participant responded by saying *yāḵidhum li-drūs il-Qurʔān*. He used *yāḵidhum*, the equivalent of *yirfaʿhum* in Syrian Arabic; this shows that he could

understand the meaning of *yirfa'hum* from the context. Consider also the following exchange from conversation 4, reproduced below in example 9:

(9)

Palestinian: wba'd sana ʔāl lil- ḵūrī **taba'ū** illi-kbīr ʔinnū ʔanā (.) ʔidirt ya'nī ʔinnī ʔanaṣṣar majmū'a.
'and after a year he said to his senior priest I could convert a group to Christianity.'

R: ʔil-ḵūrī lli huwwa l-ʔassīs?
'the khory is the priest?'

In this example, the addressees, a Libyan and an Egyptian, could understand the meaning of *taba'ū*, which means 'his' in Palestinian Arabic, without asking the interlocutor although in Egyptian Arabic and Libyan Arabic a different word is used: *bitā'ū* and *mtā'ū* respectively. However, since *taba'* is sometimes used in Egyptian and Libyan Arabic to mean 'belong to', it was easy to understand it. Moreover, in the Saudi dialect, a different word is used for 'his'; i.e. *ḥaggū*. Consider the following conversation between the researcher, a Saudi and an Algerian during one of the focus group discussions (I will give in (10) the first two turns between the researcher and the Saudi participant; the Algerian participant's turn is given in example 7 above):

(10)

R: hal il-'arab il-moqīmīn hinā biyi'tibrū il-luġa il-'arabiyya šīʔ muhim [.....]?
'do Arabs living here consider Arabic an important thing?'

Saudi: wallāhi hiyya 'ala ḥasab il-ʔajyāl (.) ʔil-jīl il-qadīm hiyya il-luġa il-ʔum hiyya il-luġa il-'arabiyya wabittālī ʔaqwiyā fil-luġa il-'arabiyya. Lākin il-ʔajyāl ʔabnāʔahum (.) biḥukm it-ta'līm wal-madāris il-linjlīziyya badat tiḍ'af il-luġa il-'arabiyya 'indahum laʔannū maṣdar it-ta'līm **ḥaggahum** ʔil-ʔinglīzī [.....] waʔin kānū lā yazālū yiḥāfẓūn lākin ma'a il-ʔajyāl hayanḵafiḍ mustawāhā.
'It depends on the generation. For the older generation, Arabic is the mother tongue, so they are competent in it. But the child generation, their Arabic started to be weak because the language of their education is English, although they still maintain Arabic.'

In this example, the plural *ḥaggahum* was used since the Saudi speaker was referring to a group. Although the equivalent of *ḥag* in Egyptian Arabic and Algerian Arabic is *bitā'* and *tā'* respectively, *ḥag* is used in Egyptian Arabic and Algerian Arabic, with slight variation in pronunciation, to mean 'belong to', so it was easy for the addressees (an Algerian and an Egyptian) to understand it from the context. Hence, communication was

not hindered which is evident from the Algerian speaker's building upon and agreeing with the Saudi speaker's opinion, as shown in his turn in example 7 above.

Another factor that enhances mutual intelligibility among the dialects at the lexical level is that a vocabulary item may have different synonyms in Modern Standard Arabic, and every dialect uses one of the synonyms; thus, it becomes easy to understand the meaning even when the interlocutor uses a different synonym from the one used in the addressee's dialect. For instance, a 'house' has different synonyms in MSA: *manzil*, *dār*, *bayt*. The three synonyms are used in the various dialects as observed during interactions with Arabs in Manchester; likewise, the synonyms for yesterday: *ʔams*, *ʔal-bāriḥa*, *ʿašiyya*; for shop: *ḥānūt*, *dukkān*, *maḥall*; for butcher: *jazzār*, *laḥḥām*, *qaṣṣāb*; for friend: *ṣadīq*, *ṣāḥib*, *rafīq*; etc. For example, during a social gathering with a group of Arabs in Al-Bokhary Islamic Centre, following a weekly religious lesson, a discussion started about an Islamic tradition called *ʿaqīqa* which refers to the act of slaughtering a lamb or a cow when a person gets a new baby, and inviting friends, relatives, and the poor to eat. The discussion centered on the conditions for having this event right according to the Islamic teachings. One of these conditions is that the butcher should not be given any part of the lamb as a fee for slaughtering it. Consider the following extract from this recorded conversation in which 'butcher' was referred to by the Iraqi and Egyptian speakers using the three synonyms given above without this causing any failure in communication:

(11)

Iraqi speaker 1: mā yinṭūn šay **lil-jazzār** ʔaw **il-laḥḥām**.
'They do not give anything to the butcher.'

Iraqi speaker 2: yāḵdūnhā, ʔabū Sallām.
'They take it, Abu Sallam'

Iraqi speaker 1: huwwa hāṯi il-muškila.
'that is the problem.'

Egyptian speaker 1: ʔ**il-gazzār** yaḵudha winta tiddīlū taman (.) yibʔa kida ḵalāṣ.
'if the butcher takes it and you give him a fee, it is ok.

Egyptian speaker 2: mumkin yaḵudha wmā yuzkur wimayitkallimš wmayʔulš
'he may take it and does not mention and does not say.'

Iraqi speaker 2: ʔabū Sallām, kān hāḏa **il-gaṣṣāb** illi jārnā (.) zamān waṣṣītā ʿala ʿaqīqa [……] Wīn il-liḥbayšāt, il-miʿlāg, il-galb, il-kilwa, [……] Wsawwīt wiyyāh muškla.

'Abu Sallam, once I asked the butcher next to us for aqeeqa (lamb) ….. where are the inside stuff of the lamb: the heart, the kidney, the liver, ….. and I made a trouble with him.'

The verb 'want', as well, has different synonyms in Modern Standard Arabic: *yurīd*, *yabḡī*, *ya'ūz*, *yawadd*. These synonyms are used in the various dialects, but might differ in pronunciation from MSA. Consider the following example from a focus group in which *yabḡī*, *ya'ūz* and *yawadd* are used by the Libyan speaker, the Egyptian speaker (R), and the Syrian speaker as *tibbāhā* and *tibbī*, *'āwiz* and *'āwzīn*, and *biddū* respectively without causing a failure in communication. Before the discussion started, it was explained to the participants that the researcher is the only person who would listen to and use the data in the discussion; then participants talked about the researcher's flat and his desire to move out:

(12)

R: aʔnā bass ʔillī hayisma'hā whaktib il-muḥtawa bta'hā bil-'arabī.

'only me will listen to it, and I will transcribe its content into Arabic.'

Libyan: bil-'arabī ?

'in Arabic?'

R: bil-'arabī, ʔā.

'yes, in Arabic.'

Libyan: ḵawwaftinā. 'ammāl nigrā fil-grāmar winrājiʿ. Wibil-lahja **tibbāhā** […..] ya'nī bil-lībī **tibbāhā** […..]?

'you scared us. I kept studying and reviewing grammar. And you want it in colloquial Arabic ….. I mean you want it in Libyan Arabic …..?'

R: […..] Kul waḥid yitkallim bil-lahga illī ti'gibū.

'….. everyone speaks in the dialect he likes[68].'

Libyan: fī lahja taw ʔānī maṯalan nitlāgā ma'a (.) ʔaḵ mil-maḡrib ʔinta matifhamhāš […..] Wilammā nitkallim ma'āh miš zayy manitkallim ma'āk inta, niḥāwil ingarrib il-lahja.

'there is a dialect that you cannot understand, like the dialect I speak with a person from Morocco. When I speak with him is not like when I speak with you. I try to make my dialect understandable to you.'

Syrian (joking): ʔinta ʔūl iš-šī illī mā yifhamū.

'say what he cannot understand.'

[68] I was deliberately keen not to imply to participants to speak in any particular way. In this occasion, however, I was explicitly asked by the participant whether I want him to speak in his dialect. Hence, I had to give him an answer that does not influence his behavior, so I replied that he can speak in any way he likes.

R (laughing): ʔaywa ʿašān maʿrafš aktibū.

'yes, so I cannot write it.'

Libyan (joking): **tibbī** tifham inta wallā mā **tibbī**?

'do you want to understand or not?'

R: lā **ʿāwiz** afham [.....] šuftū iš-šaʔʔa fHorniman House?

'no. I want to understand ..... You see the flat in Horniman House?'

Syrian: yā sīdī ʔallā yyassir.

'may Allah makes things easy.'

Libyan: rabbī karīm. In šāʔ Allāh niḥaṣṣilūlak k̲īr minhā.

'Allah is generous. God willing, we will find a better one for you.'

R: rabbinā ysahhil.

'may Allah makes things easy.'

Libyan: ḍīg hiyya ktīr walla.

'it is so narrow.'

Syrian: ʔultillū taʿālā ʿindī ʿašaʔʔitī. Bas ʔanā baštʔʔak̲k̲ir laʔaṭlāʿ.

'I asked him to take my flat, but I will move out late.'

Libyan: ʔamtā btiṭlaʿ inta?

'when are you moving out?'

Syrian: fī July.

'in July.'

Libyan: lā, māzāl.

'no, it is late.'

Syrian: huwwa **biddū** yiṭlaʿ badrī (.) **biddū** yiṭlaʿ fi September.

'he wants to move out early in September.'

R: ʔā ʔanā **ʿāwiz** aṭlaʿ fi September [.....]

'yes, I want to move out in September .....'

Libyan: wallahi nḥāwil. ʔānī ʿindī šigga lākin biʿīda ʿalīk [.....]

'we will try to find one for you. I have a flat but it is far away ....'

R: lā iḥnā bnīgī **ʿāwzīn** nuʿud fil-kulliyya. law niʔdar, niskun fig-gamʿa.

'no, when we come we want to live at the faculty. If we can, we will live at university.'

Moreover, the existence of sub-dialects within the one country in the Arab world (cf. section 1.6.1.1) sometimes facilitates mutual intelligibility among the Arabic dialects. For example, Cairene Arabic speakers in Egypt sometimes make use of their knowledge of the other sub-dialects of Egyptian Arabic; e.g. Upper Egyptian Arabic, Alexandrian

Arabic, etc., to understand the dialects spoken by Arabs in other countries. Consider, for example, the following conversation, from the same session of example 11 above from Al-Bokhary Centre, between an Iraqi and two Egyptians about a mutual friend. The Iraqi speaker was saying that this friend does not have male children, although people call him *Abu Aḥmad* 'Father of Ahmad'. He used the word *ḵaṭiyya* which indicates 'regret and sympathy' that this friend does not have a male child. Although this word is not used in Cairene Arabic in this sense, the addressees could understand it because it is used in the same sense in some areas in Egypt. The conversation is given below:

(13)

Egyptian 1: ʔizzayy abū Aḥmad.
'how is Abu Ahmad?'

Iraqi: walla zīn.
'good'

Egyptian 2: ʔiḥnā binnādīlū abū Aḥmad, bass illi anā 'rafū (2) inn abū Aḥmad 'andū banāt bass.
'we call him Abu Ahmad, but what I know is that he has girls only.'

Iraqi: ʔī huwwa **ḵaṭiyya** mā 'indū awlād, lākin fil-'irāq (.) nigullū abū Aḥmad.
'yes, he (O' dear) does not have male children, but in Iraq we call him Abu Ahmad.'

Egyptian 2: wi **ḵaṭiyya lī** bass? ʔinta za'lān 'alī kida lī? Kul illi ygībū rabbinā kwayyis.
'why 'khatiyya'? Why do you feel sad about him like this? All what Allah gives is good.'

All the above examples show that there are great lexical similarities among the dialects. They show also that there are lexical differences among them. However, these differences do not seem to hinder intelligibility, and we have seen through examples that speakers can overcome them by guessing from the context, asking for the meaning, etc. These great lexical similarities among the dialects may be an important part of the explanation for the fact that when Arabs from the different countries in this study come into contact each one uses his own dialect of Arabic. This corresponds to Gooskens' (2007: 464) finding that semicommunication between speakers of the three West Germanic languages Dutch, Frisian and Afrikaans (i.e. communication in their own languages without a lingua franca or without one speaker using the language of the

other (p. 445)[69]), is not widely used compared with that between speakers of the three Scandinavian languages Norwegian, Danish and Swedish because there are larger lexical distances between the former group than the latter one, despite the fact that the phonetic distances are not larger than in the Scandinavian area.

Having investigated the lexical distance among the dialects, I will briefly explore below the phonological, syntactic and morphological distances.

4.2.1.1.3.2 Phonological distance among the dialects

As mentioned above, the phonological, morphological and syntactic differences among the dialects do not cause difficulty in understanding. For example, it did not happen in the examples above or during the focus group discussions, interviews or casual conversations with Arabs in Manchester that a speaker was not understood or asked for explaining the meaning of what he said because he pronounced a lexical item in a different way from the way it is pronounced in the dialects of his addressees; or because he used a different plural form or a different sentence structure from those used in the dialect of his addressees. For instance, lexical items may vary in pronunciation from one dialect to another; however, this does not seem to hinder mutual intelligibility. Take, for instance, these extracts from example 12 above, which are given below in example 14:

(14)

Libyan: [.....] ʻammāl **nigrā** fil-grāmar winrājiʻ. Wibil-lahja tibbāhā [.....] yaʻnī bil-lībī tibbāhā [.....]?

ʻ..... I kept studying and reviewing grammar. And you want it in colloquial Arabic…. I mean you want it in Libyan Arabic ….?ʼ

R: [.....] Kul waḥid yitkallim bil-lahga illī tiʻgibū.

ʻ.... everyone speaks in the dialect he likes.ʼ

Libyan: [----------]

Syrian (joking): ʔinta **ʔūl** iš-šī illī mā yifhamū.

ʻsay what he cannot understand.ʼ

R (laughing): [----------]

Libyan (joking): [----------]

[69] Haugen (1966) and Gooskens (2007) use the term ʻsemicommunicationʼ to refer to ʻreceptive competenceʼ. Ribbert and Thije (2007) employ the term ʻreceptive multilingualismʼ. Also, according to Gooskens (2007: 445), Braunmüller & Zeevaert (2001) employ the same term, ʻreceptive multilingualismʼ.

[70] An irregular dashed-line like this means that there is a missing turn here that I did not write since it is irrelevant to the point being discussed.

R: lā ʻāwiz afham [.....] šuftū **iš-ša**ʔʔ**a** fHorniman House?

ʻno. I want to understand ..... You see the flat in Horniman House?ʼ

Syrian: [----------]

Libyan: [----------]

R: [----------]

Libyan: **ḍīg** hiyya ktīr walla.

ʻit is so narrow.ʼ

Syrian: ʔ**ultillū** taʻālā ʻindī **ʻaša**ʔʔ**itī**. Bas ʔanā baštʔʔakkir laʔaṭlāʻ.

ʻI asked him to take my flat, but I will move out late.ʼ

Libyan: [----------]

Syrian: [----------]

Libyan: [----------]

Syrian: [----------]

R: ʔā ʔanā ʻāwiz aṭlaʻ fi September [.....]

ʻyes, I want to move out in September ……ʼ

Libyan: [.....] ʔānī ʻindī **šigga** lākin biʻīda ʻalīk [……]

ʻ..... I have a flat but it is far away ….ʼ

R: lā iḥnā bnīgī ʻāwzīn **nuʻud** fil-kulliyya. law **niʔdar**, niskun fig-gamʻa.

ʻno, when we come we want to live at the faculty. If we can, we will live at university.ʼ

In this example, the Libyan speaker's pronunciation /g/ in words like *nigrā* ʻwe read', *ḍīg* ʻnarrow', and *šigga* ʻflat' does not hinder his Syrian and Egyptian addressees to understand him although in their dialects /ʔ/ is used instead of the /g/ as obvious in words like *ʔūl* ʻsay' and *ʔultillū* ʻI said to him', *iš-šaʔʔa* ʻthe flat', *ʻašaʔʔitī* ʻto my flat', and *niʔdar* ʻwe can'. Even the deletion of the /ʔ/ in the Egyptian speaker's *nuʻud* ʻwe stay' did not hinder the others' understanding. Likewise, notice the Libyan speaker's pronunciation /j/ as in *winrājiʻ* ʻand we review' and *lahja* ʻdialect', which corresponds to the Egyptian speaker's pronunciation /g/ as in *lahga* ʻdialect' and *tiʻgibū* ʻhe likes it'. Communication was not hampered by such differences.

Thus, the phonological differences do not seem to cause difficulty in communication. They are not that big so that they hinder pan-dialect mutual comprehensibility. It is easy for a hearer to understand that *ʔult*, *gult* and *qult* are the same word and refer to the same meaning 'I said', that *lahga* and *lahja* refer to 'dialect', and that the use of the alveolar nasal /n/ in the first syllable of the Iraqi Aarbic *yinṭūn* 'they give' in example 11 above does not make it a different word from the Egyptian

Arabic *yiʿṭū* (in which the voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/ is used instead[71]). Even children can understand this (cf. Chapter 6 Language Ability). The difference between these pairs of corresponding words involves only the insertion/deletion of a sound or the substitution of one sound by another, depending on the dialect. This, according to Gooskens (2007), is a sign indicating that the phonological distance between the dialects is not large, which increases the mutual intelligibility among them.

Moreover, the point referred to above that the existence of sub-dialects within the one country in the Arab world sometimes help intelligibility, can be of importance here as well. I will take the Egyptian dialect as an example. One of the features that distinguish Cairene Arabic from many of the dialects spoken in the rest of the Arab world is the use of the voiced velar stop /g/ instead of the voiced alveolar fricative /j/, and of the glottal stop /ʔ/ instead of /g/. However, Cairenes and other Egyptians are aware of these sounds since they are pronounced as /j/ and /g/ in Upper Egypt; hence, it becomes not difficult at all to understand words containing these sounds when interacting with Arabs from the different countries, as in the examples given above. To take another example, the equivalent of the English words 'big', 'tall', 'came out', 'descended', and 'knew' in a number of dialects are *Kabīr*, *ṭawīl*, *ṭalaʿ*, *nazal*, *ʿaraf*. In Cairene Arabic the short vowel /a/ is changed to the short vowel /i/ when pronouncing these words, so they are pronounced as *kibīr*, *ṭiwīl*, *ṭiliʿ*, *nizil*, *ʿirif*. However, Cairene-Arabic speakers are aware of the different realizations of these words since they are pronounced with the /a/ in some parts of Egypt; i.e. the first two are pronounced as *Kabīr*, *ṭawīl* in Upper Egypt and the other three as *ṭalaʿ*, *nazal*, *ʿaraf* in Alexandria. Hence, their understanding is not hindered by such differences and they can get the meaning easily although replacing the short vowel /i/ by the short vowel /a/ or vice versa sometimes result in different words. This is of course facilitated by the fact that the consonants are the same in the different realizations, and there is this opinion which sees that "consonants are more important for decoding cognates [hence, for mutual intelligibility] than vowels" (Gooskens 2007: 464).

4.2.1.1.3.3 Syntactic and morphological distance among the dialects

Like the phonological differences, the syntactic and morphological differences between the dialects do not seem to hinder pan-dialect communication. For example, 'what is your name' in Egyptian Arabic is *ʔism-ak ʔī* (name-your.2MS what), while in Iraqi Arabic it is *š ism-ak* (what name-your.2MS). The differences in the place of the

[71] The retaining of the final alveolar nasal /n/ in the Iraqi Aarbic *yinṭūn* and the deletion of it in the Egyptian Arabic *yiʿṭū* will be discussed in the next section about the morphological differences between the dialects.

question word 'what' *ʔī* and *š* does not cause difficulty in understanding. Moreover, the 3rd person masculine plural indicative verb ending is dispensed with in some dialects and retained in others without a problem in understanding. Consider the verbs *yinṭūn* 'they give' and *yāḵdūnhā* 'they take it' in example 11, which is reproduced below in example 15. Notice how the 3rd person masculine plural indicative verb ending *n* is retained in Iraqi speaker 1's and Iraqi speaker 2's pronunciation of the verbs *yinṭūn* and *yāḵdūnhā* respectively and how it does not hinder the understanding of the Egyptian speakers in whose dialect it is omitted (in the Egyptian dialect these verbs are pronounced as *yiʿṭū* and *yaḵdūhā*):

(15)

Iraqi speaker 1: mā **yinṭūn** šay lil-jazzār ʔaw il-laḥḥām.
'they do not give anything to the butcher'

Iraqi speaker 2: **yāḵdūnhā**, ʔabū Sallām.
'they take it, Abu Sallam'

Iraqi speaker 1: huwwa hāṯi il-muškila.
'that is the problem.'

Egyptian speaker 1: ʔil-gazzār yaḵudha winta tiddīlū taman (.) yibʔa kida ḵalāṣ.
'if the butcher takes it and you give him a fee, it is ok.

Egyptian speaker 2: mumkin yaḵudha wmā yuzkur wimayitkallimš wmayʔulš
'he may take it and does not mention and does not say.'

We see here that the Egyptian speakers used the equivalent of *yinṭūn* and *yāḵdūnhā* in Egyptian Arabic; i.e. *yaḵudha* and *tiddīlū* (both in 3rd person masculine singular). This shows they did not face difficulty in understanding. Consider also example 16 from a focus group in which the Libyan speaker uses a plural form *sanawāt* 'years'. In the Egyptian dialect and the Syrian dialect *sinīn* is used. In this example, speakers were talking about Libyan students who come to the UK and after they finish their PhD they stay and do not return to Libya. The Egyptian participant (R) and the Syrian participant were saying that Libyans are not required by their government to return, but the Libyan participant had a different view:

(16)

Libyan: fīl-ʿagd illī btiktibū, wāḥda min il-ḥājāt ʔinnak lāzim tirjaʿ.
'in the contract you write one of the things is that you should return.'

Syrian: lāzim tirjaʿ?
'you should return?'

Libyan: wilāzim itgarrī (.) ḵamas **sanawāt**. baʿdahā (.) tuʿtabar fī ḥillin min ʔamrik.
'and you should teach for 5 years and after that you are free to go.

R: fimaṣr nafs ik-kalām.
'the same in Egypt.'
Syrian: na'am, na'am.
'yes, yes.'

Based on all the above, it can be said that Gooskens' linguistic-distance factor does not seem to cause a hindrance for mutual intelligibility among the Arabic dialects. The other two factors of Gooskens; i.e. the listener's attitudes towards the language and the listener's contact with the language also help the mutual intelligibility among Arabic dialects, as explained above. Factors of shared communicative competence and accommodation, and how they help mutual intelligibility among the dialects, will now be discussed.

4.2.1.1.4 Shared communicative competence

The mutual intelligibility among the Arabic dialects investigated stems not only from the above mentioned factors, but also from the common knowledge that speakers share of the norms underlying the socially appropriate use of the language. In other words, in order for any group to communicate successfully there should be a shared communicative competence. According to Romaine (1994: 24), communicative competence involves knowing not only the language code, but also the rule for using it in socially suitable situations. The communicative competence "deals with the social and cultural knowledge speakers are presumed to have to enable them to use and interpret linguistic forms" (Saville-Troike 1989: 21).

Arabs from the different countries in the present study have a broad range of the shared knowledge, about the norms underlying the appropriate use of Arabic language in different social circumstances, that Saville-Troike (1989: 21) states as important in order for speakers to communicate appropriately: "knowledge and expectation of who may or may not speak in certain settings, when to speak and when to remain silent, whom one may speak to, and how one may talk to persons of different statues and roles, what appropriate non-verbal behaviors are in various contexts, what the routines for turn-taking are in conversation, how to ask for and give information, how to request, how to offer or decline assistance or cooperation, how to give commands, how to enforce discipline." For instance, when children address adult Arabs they should use titles, such as *'ammū* 'uncle', *ḵāla* 'aunt', etc. whether the adult addressee is their real uncle/aunt, a parent's friend or even someone they do not know. Consider the following example in which the researcher was talking to a 10-year old Iraqi girl during a family visit:

(17)

R: ʔintī ʿandik kām sana?

'How old are you?'

Girl: ʿašra yā **ʿammū**.

'Ten, my uncle.'

In this example, the girl is addressing her interlocutor using *ʿammū* 'uncle' since he is her father's friend and she knows that it is socially inappropriate to address adult Arabs by their names. This applies also to the following conversation with a 5-year old Egyptian girl during a family visit. When the researcher's daughter (henceforth Jana) opened the flat's door, the girl came to report this:

(18)

Girl: **ʿammū**, jana fataḥit il-bāb.

'Uncle, Jana opened the door.

R: ṭayyib, ʔūlilhā tiʔfilū.

'Ok, tell her to close it'

Girl (went and came back): muš raḍya yā **ʿammū**.

'She refused, uncle.'

When adults address each other, they tend to use *ʔabū* 'father of' plus the name of a son or a daughter, with a preference for sons. Consider, for example, these extracts from conversation 11, which are provided below in example 19, in which Iraqi speaker 2 addresses Iraqi speaker 1 using ʔabū plus Iraqi speaker 1 son's name:

(19)

Iraqi speaker 1: mā yintūn šay lil-jazzār ʔaw il-laḥḥām.

'they do not give anything to the butcher'

Iraqi speaker 2: yāḵdūnhā, ʔ**abū Sallām**.

'they take it, Abu Sallam'

Iraqi speaker 1: [----------]

Egyptian speaker 1: [----------]

Egyptian speaker 2: [----------]

Iraqi speaker 2: ʔ**abū Sallām**, kān hāḏa il-gaṣṣāb illi jārnā (.) zamān waṣṣītā ʿala ʿaqīqa [……] Wīn il-liḥbayšāt, il-miʿlāg, il-galb, il-kilwa, [……] Wsawwīt wiyyāh muškla.

'Abu Sallam, once I asked the butcher next to us for aqeeqa (lamb) ….. where are the inside stuff of the lamb: the heart, the kidney, the liver, ….. and I made a trouble with him.'

In fact, although I have known Iraqi speaker 2 for a long time and we meet every week in social gatherings, I do not know his first name until now since he is always addressed with *ʔabū* plus his son's name. Consider also the beginning of example 7, given in 20 below, in which the Algerian participant, in response to one of the researcher's questions, refers to a Saudi participant's view using *ʔabū* plus the Saudi participant son's name:

(20)

Algerian: ʔanā ʔaẓun hunā il-jīl iṯ-ṯānī kamā qāl ʔaḵūnā **ʔabā Farīd**[72] yuḥāwil ʔan yuḥāfiẓ ʿala il-luğa il-ʿarabiyya [……]

'I think that the second generation, as our brother Abu Farid said, are trying to maintain Arabic …..'

Another social norm in conversation that Arabs in this study share is that the older has the right to speak first before the younger and when the older speaks the younger should not interrupt him/her. The parents even try to teach their children these social norms of conversation. For instance, during a visit to a family the father was telling a story about an incident and the son interrupted him trying to tell parts of the story. Then the father got angry and told the son strictly to stop interrupting him since this is inappropriate. Moreover, there are other signs that Arabs in the present study have shared extra-linguistic or non-verbal knowledge about their language. For example, they have the same rules of politeness: the same norms for evaluating what is regarded as a taboo, a compliment, an insult, etc. For example, it is not regarded as a compliment that a man says to an Arab woman from the participant families that she is beautiful; this is socially inappropriate for Arabs in the present study and for many others as well.

One of the signs of the shared communicative competence among Arabs in this study is that they sometimes have MSA and colloquial Arabic in functionally complementary distribution. For example, they tend to use MSA rather than colloquial Arabic when talking about taboos; notably those that are sex-related. Thus, as seen during participant observation, they would rather refer to sexual organs, sexual intercourse, etc., by the MSA equivalent rather than the colloquial equivalent. Likewise, they sometimes tend to use MSA when in formal settings, given the diglossic nature of Arabic (in all these cases, however, this use is at the level of lexical items, phrases or sentences, not at the level of a whole conversation conducted in standard Arabic, as the examples below demonstrate). This, as well, shows that they have shared rules for

[72] *ʔabā* is another version of *ʔabū*, with a different case ending which occurs when the noun is in the accusative.

speaking and shared knowledge of the socially appropriate use of language in different social circumstances. For instance, sometimes during the focus groups and interviews, the participants tried to use MSA and frequently switched between MSA and colloquial Arabic. The participants are triggered to use MSA by the formality of the situation associated with using a recorder and deliberately sitting together for discussing a specific topic[73]. However, as conversation proceeds, they start to talk in their dialects. In one of the focus groups, for example, participants spent some time before the discussion started speaking about different things. They spoke entirely in their dialects. But when the discussion began, the Syrian participant frequently switched to MSA until he was told to feel free to speak in his dialect. The beginning of the conversation which was in colloquial Arabic is given in example 12 above. I will give in 21 below part of this example (in which the participants were talking about the researcher's flat and the desire to move out), and the part that followed in which the Syrian speaker was trying to speak in MSA as the conversation turned to the formal discussion of the topic of the focus group; i.e. Arabic maintenance in Manchester:

(21)

Syrian: huwwa biddū yiṭla‘ badrī (.) Biddū yiṭla‘ fi September.
'he wants to move out early in September.'

R: ʔā ʔanā ‘āwiz aṭla‘ fi September [……]
'yes, I want to move out in September ……'

Libyan: wallahi nḥāwil. ʔānī ‘indī šigga lākin bi‘īda ‘alīk [……]
'we will try to find one for you. I have a flat but it is far away ….'

R: lā iḥnā bnīgī ‘āwzīn nu‘ud fil-kulliyya. law niʔdar, niskun fig-gam‘a.
'no, when we come we want to live at the faculty. If we can, we will live at university.'

Libyan: [----------]

R: [……] ṭayyib [……] ʔil-ḥifāz ‘ala il-luġa il-‘arabiyya muhim wallā miš muhim (3) ʔī wighit nazarkū?
'……. ok, ….. is maintaining Arabic language important or not important. What is your opinion?'

Syrian: ḍarūrī il-wāḥid **yuḥāfiẓ** ‘ala il-luġa il-‘arabiyya. ʔil-ʔawlād wil-ʔusra **‘indamā yaḏhabūn** liziyārat il-ʔahl fī (.) fil-waṭan il-ʔumm yaḥtājūn **nataḥaddaṯ** ma‘ahum bil-luġa il-‘arabiyya. Waʔiḏā qarrarū fī yūm min al-ʔayyām il-

[73] There are, of course, other possible triggers for using MSA in conversation than merely the formality of the situation or expressing taboo; e.g. accommodation, which will be discussed in detail below when we talk about the directions that accommodation take: either towards Modern Standard Arabic or towards the dialect of the addressee.

ʿawda ʔilā (.) lisūryā maṯ̲alan, **yaḥtājūn** il-luġa il-ʿarabiyya waʔillā **sayuʔaṯ̲ṯ̲ir ḏ̲ālik** ʿala taḥṣīlhum id-dirāsy.

'It is necessary that we maintain Arabic since when the family goes back to the homeland to visit the relatives, we speak to them in Arabic. Also if we decide to return to Syria for good, children will need Arabic in school.'

The last turn of the Syrian speaker contains many instances of MSA. Notice, for instance, the pronunciation of the interdental sounds /ẓ/, /ṯ̲/ and /ḏ̲/in *yuḥāfiẓ*, *nataḥaddaṯ̲*, *sayuʔaṯ̲ṯ̲ir*, *yaḏ̲habūn*, and *ḏ̲ālik* respectively. In Syrian Arabic the interdental quality of these sounds are normally lost. Notice also the use of the 3rd person masculine plural indicative verb ending in *yaḏ̲habūn* and *yaḥtājūn*. In Syrian Arabic, these verbs are pronounced without the final *n*. The word choice as well is from MSA; e.g. *ʿindamā*, *yaḏ̲habūn*, *nataḥaddaṯ̲*, and *ḏ̲ālik*. In Syrian Arabic *lammā*, *yirūḥū*, *niḥkī*, and *hādā* respectively are used. The speaker is triggered to use MSA not by his desire to accommodate, since he speaks Syrian Arabic which is well-known to his addressees due to widespread popularity of Syrian media and soap operas among Arabs; that is, he does not need to accommodate. Also, in the casual conversation before the start of the discussion, he was speaking in Syrian Arabic and the other participants understood him well. The trigger for using MSA is rather the formality of the situation which was highlighted by the interviewer's use of the MSA phrase *wiġhit nazarkū* to ask the participants about their 'point of view' regarding the importance of Arabic maintenance.

Consider also the following example from another focus group, in which an Egyptian participant is responding to the researcher's question whether maintaining Arabic is important:

(22)

Egyptian: ʔā ṭabʿan. il-waḥid biyisʿā ʔinnū yʿallim in-nās it-tanyīn il-luġa il-ʿarabiyya (.) **famina l-ʔawlā** ʔinn huwwa yaʿnī **yabda**ʔ binafsū (.) fayaʿnī da **ḥatman** lazman ʔinn il-ʔawlād **yastaṭīʿūn ʔan yataḥaddaṯ̲ū l-uġa l-ʿarabiyya, waʔin lam yakun qirāʔatan fakitābatan**.

'yes, of course. We try to teach Arabic to others, so we should start with ourselves. It is necessary that children can speak Arabic, and if they cannot read, they should learn how to write it.'

In this example, the Egyptian participant switches every now and then to MSA (as highlighted in bold). For instance, he retained the interdental quality of /ṯ̲/ in *yataḥaddaṯ̲ū*, which is normally lost in Egyptian Arabic. In addition, he maintained the

short vowels /a/ and /i/ in the pronunciation of *famina l-ʔawlā* and *yabdaʔ*. In Egyptian Arabic, *famina l-ʔawlā* is pronounced as *famn l-ʔawla*; that is, the short vowel /i/ before the /n/ and the short vowel /a/ after it in *famina* are lost, and the long vowel /ā/ in *l-ʔawlā* is replaced by a short vowel /a/. Also, the short vowel /a/ before the /b/ in the Standard Arabic *yabdaʔ* is changed to /i/ in the Egyptian version *yibdaʔ*. Notice, as well, the use of the MSA Structure in *yastaṭīʿūn ʔan yataḥaddaṯū l-luġa l-ʿarabiyya, waʔin lam yakun qirāʔatan fakitābatan*: the use of *yastaṭīʿūn*, *yataḥaddaṯū*, and *waʔin lam yakun* as opposed to the Egyptian Arabic equivalent *yiʔdarū*, *yitkallimū*, and *win makanš*; the retaining of the final *n* to mark the 3rd person masculine plural indicative verb form *yastaṭīʿūn* and the deletion of it in the verb *yataḥaddaṯū* to mark its 3rd person masculine plural subjunctive verb form as it is used after *ʔan*; the use of the short vowel /u/ in *yakun* instead of the long vowel /ū/ to mark the 3rd person singular masculine jussive form of the verb as the verb is used after *lam* 'not'; and the use of 'tanwīn' in *qirāʔat-an* and *fakitābat-an* (i.e. suffixing the case ending *an* to these nouns since they are in the accusative case), which is a feature of MSA not colloquial Arabic[74]. In Egyptian Arabic these words are pronounced without tanwīn as *qirāʔa* and *fakitāba*. This Egyptian speaker kept switching to MSA throughout the discussion; e.g. he used *ʔaṣ-ṣabāḥ*, *lā taʿūd*, *ʔal-masāʔ* which mean respectively 'the morning', 'do not return', and 'the evening'. In Egyptian Arabic *ʔiṣ-ṣubḥ*, *matirgaʿš*, and *bil-līl* are used respectively. It cannot be said here that he is accommodating to make himself better understood since one of his addressees is an Egyptian and the other one, although not Egyptian, frequently used Egyptian Arabic throughout the discussion, as will be illustrated in example 24 below. That is, there is no need for accommodation as both addressees understand Egyptian Arabic. Hence, the plausible trigger for using MSA is the formality of the situation.

The importance of the above-mentioned shared rules of speaking and interpretation of speech performance is emphasized in a number of definitions of a speech community. For example, Hymes (1972: 54) defines a speech community as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech." Moreover, Romaine (1994: 22) defines a speech community as "a group of people who do not necessarily share the same language, but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language. The boundaries between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic." For her, 'receptive competence' (Romaine 1994: 23) is enough for a

[74] In a few cases 'tanwīn' is used in colloquial Arabic; e.g. *ṭabʿan* 'of course', *šukr-an* 'thanks', etc.

speech community membership since it guarantees successful communication. Saville-Troike (1989: 23), as well, holds the same view:

> "Only shared receptive competence is necessary for successful communication. Knowledge of rules for appropriate communicative behavior entails understanding a wide range of language forms, for instance, but not necessarily the ability to produce them. Members of the same community may understand varieties of a language which differ according to the social class, region, sex, age, and occupation of the speaker, but only a few talented mimics will be able to speak them all. In multilingual speech communities, members often share receptive competence in more than one language but vary greatly in relative ability to speak one or the other."

Thus, the least that can be said regarding Arabs in the present study is that they have 'receptive competence' in the various dialects of Arabic, as evident in the examples above, which is enough according to Romaine (1994) and Saville-Troike (1989; 2003) to make of them a speech community.

4.2.1.1.5 Accommodation

It may be argued that the Arabic dialects are mutually intelligible, and that when Arabs from different countries converse each one speaks in his/her own dialect; however, he/she does not speak exactly in the same way he/she does when speaking to his/her family at home or to people from his/her own country. Of course, there exists some kind of accommodation or adjustment in pan-dialect interaction among Arabs in this study, which conforms to what Ezzat (1974: 11) states in his study on the mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects. However, this does not discredit the position that the dialects of Arabic are mutually intelligible since even speakers of the same language/dialect within the same country tend to accommodate to each other in conversation either to make themselves better understood as, for instance, when a word, an idiom, etc. is used in a region or in a social class, age, etc. and not in the others within the same country; or to create intimacy with their interlocutors by reducing dissimilarities between them. According to the Accommodation Theory, the emphasis with regard to accommodation in interaction situations is sometimes on increasing intelligibility, whereas in other times it can be on causing the speaker to be perceived more favorably (Giles and Powesland: 1997: 234). As S'hiri (2002: 149) and Giles and Coupland (1991: 60) indicate, accommodation in conversation is an activity

that all people experience regardless of the languages or varieties they speak. One of the well-known examples illustrating this phenomenon, according to S'hiri, is code-switching to another language or variety.

What I mean here is that it is normal for people to accommodate and that accommodation does not contradict mutual intelligibility of the Arabic dialects as long as they are used as the medium of communication in pan-dialect interaction. Moreover, accommodation does not usually occur in such a way that the speaker stops using his dialect altogether in conversation and converts fully to his interlocutor's dialect or to MSA (these are the main two ways of accommodation as will be illustrated below). It is not even an easy task for an Arab from a given country to sustain a whole conversation in the dialect of another country or in MSA since Arabs normally have receptive, not productive, competence in the various dialects and MSA[75]. Accommodation normally occurs when necessary as Abu Melhim (1991, 1992) indicate (discussed in S'hiri 2002: 165). Thus, the hearer can still tell that his/her interlocutor is, say, Algerian, from the way he/she speaks[76]; and as long as the hearer can tell that, the dialect the interlocutor uses is Algerian Arabic and not anything else regardless of whether the speaker accommodates or not.

Moreover, the degree of accommodation among the Arabic dialects is not symmetrical since the intelligibility among them is asymmetrical as well. For example, the Egyptian dialect is widely intelligible to most Arabs due to the overwhelming dominance of Egyptian TV, cinema and Media in the Arab world (Versteegh 1993: 70, and S'hiri 2002: 153)[77]. Hence, as Abu Haidar (2002: 293-294) in her study among Iraqis in London states, Iraqis accommodate to Egyptian and Levantine Arabic more than the other way around. That is, Iraqis engage asymmetrically in this linguistic behavior; i.e. accommodation. As seen in some of the examples above, Egyptians do not accommodate as much as speakers of other dialects; e.g. Algerians, do in cross-dialect communication. Generally, the more you go towards the west of the Arab world (towards Morocco) the more the need for accommodation increases (Ennaji 1999). For example, in her investigation of Tunisian-Arabic speakers' linguistic accommodation to

[75] Accommodation usually occurs at the level of using vocabulary items, phrases or sentences from MSA or from the dialect of the interlocutor, not at the level of an entire conversation.
[76] I.e. from the lexical, phonological, syntactic and morphological differences that distinguish the hearer's dialect from Algerian Arabic. So, I do not mean here differences in accent; rather, I mean the dialect differences.
[77] Now, due to the existence of hundreds of Arabic satellite channels which resulted from the great advances in communication technology associated with globalization, other dialects of Arabic, e.g. the Syrian, the Lebanese, the Kuwaiti dialects, etc. started to be widely understood. S'hiri (2002: 153), for instance, sees that Levantine Arabic is now widely understood, though to a lesser extent than Egyptian Arabic, due to the spread of satellite channels.

middle-eastern Arabs[78], S'hiri (2002: 165) found that it is Tunisians who accommodate to Middle Eastern Arabs, and not the other way around.

Another important finding in S'hiri's (2002: 165) study is that the Tunisian participants accommodated in a variety of ways to their Mashreqi/Middle-Eastern Arab interlocutors; i.e. by including Sharqi Arabic (i.e. the dialect of their interlocutors), MSA, and English elements in their speech. This corresponds to Abu-Melhim's (1991, 1992) finding that diglossic, multiglossic and bilingual code switching plays a significant role in linguistic accommodation among Arabic speakers.

In the present study, accommodation takes two main directions: towards MSA and towards the dialect of the addressee. As for the former, it was mentioned earlier that sometimes during the focus groups and interviews, the participants switched between colloquials and MSA and I discussed some possible triggers for using MSA in conversation; e.g. the formality of situation and expressing taboos. However, I have not talked yet about a very important trigger for this using of MSA; i.e. accommodation in conversation to increase comprehensibility. Consider, for instance, example 5 above. As aforementioned, the Egyptian speaker asked for the meaning of *dišdāša*, 'a kind of Arabic clothing for men', when he heard it from the Iraqi speaker. Then, the Iraqi speaker gave him the equivalent in MSA *jilbāb* to explain it. Also, in one of the focus groups, the Algerian participant accommodated to his Egyptian and Saudi addressees in MSA to make himself better understood. Consider example 23[79]. The Algerian participant's speech contains many instances of MSA as highlighted in bold, but when the discussion was interrupted by an outsider, since it was being conducted at a mosque, he switched to colloquial Arabic which is evident in his use of *ydīr* 'run/do' and *tā'ū* 'his'.

(23)

Abd Aziz: **min ḵlāl il-'uṭla** (.) **yuḥāwil ʔannahu yu'arriḍ** lil-luġa ʔal-maḥalliyya wahāḏā **sawfa yusā'iduh** 'ala il-iḥifāẓ 'alayhā. **waʔayḍan** ʔaẓun ʔinn il-walad ʔiḏā kān **yastaṭī'** yitamakkan

[78] The term Middle Eastern Arabs refers to Arabs from the east of the Arab world (starting from Egypt) as opposed to those from the west (starting from Libya); i.e. "Maghrebis" or Westerners. Tunisians use the word 'Sharqis' or 'Mashreqis' to refer to Middle Eastern Arabs (S'hiri 2002: 154).

[79] His accommodation in MSA is evident also in example number (7) above from the same focus group. Consider, for instance, his use of *kamā* 'as', *ʔabā* 'Father of', *yuḥāwil ʔan* 'he tries to', *ʔannahum* 'they', *yamšūn* 'they go', *fayadrusūn* 'they study', *wāḍi'hum* 'I put them', *lam yastaṭi'* 'he cannot', *ʔan yatakallam* 'to speak', *tastaṭī' ʔan* 'it can', *tataqahqar* 'it deteriorates'.

min il-luğa il-ʿarabiyya fayibdaʔ **yistaʿmilhā** fid-daʿwa (.) yaʿnī il-ḵiṭāba **wil-kalām** maʿa **il-ʔaṣdiqāʔ** ibtāʿū. **ṯumma yastaṭīʿ** huwa ʔiḏā tamakkan min il-luğa il-ʔinglīziyya yimšī lil-kutub il-ʿarabiyya wyaʔḵuḏ wayutarjim (.) whāḏihi tuʿtabar quwwa.

'through vacation, he tries to be exposed to the local language and this will help him maintain it. Also, I think that if the boy is able to be competent in Arabic, he can use it in giving religious speeches and talking to his friends. Then, if he is able to be competent in English, he can go to the Arabic books and translate from them, which is considered a strength.'

Outsider: salāmu ʿalīkum, jalsa ḵāṣa hāẓi ?

'hello, is it a private talk?'

Abd Aziz: yaʿnī huwwa ḵūnā **ydīr** fid-dukturā **tāʿū**.

'our brother is doing his PhD.'

Notice the MSA uses in the first turn as in *min ḵlāl* 'through', *il-ʿuṭla* 'the vacation', *yuḥāwil ʔannahu* 'he tries to', *yuʿarriḍ* 'expose', *sawfa* 'will', *yusāʿiduh* 'it helps him', *waʔayḍan* 'and also', *yastaṭīʿ* 'he can', *yistaʿmilhā* 'he uses it', *il-kalām* 'and speaking', *ʔaṣdiqāʔ* 'the friends', and *ṯumma* 'then'. In Algerian Arabic these are not used; instead, Algerians use, for example, *fī* 'through', *il-kunǰī* 'the vacation', *yisiyyī baš* 'he tries to', *yʿāwnu* 'it helps him', *ṯānītak* 'and also', *yiqdar/yigdar* 'he can', *wil-hadra* 'and speaking', *liṣḥāb* 'the friends', *imbaʿd* 'then'. Also, there are words from Algerian Arabic, but they were pronounced in MSA; e.g. *ʔaẓun* 'I think', *yaʔḵuḏ* 'he takes', *huwa* 'he' and *hāḏihi* 'this (feminine)'. In Algerian Arabic, these words are pronounced as *ʔinẓun*, *yāḵuḏ*, *huwwa*, and *hāḏī*. The trigger for using MSA here is an attempt to accommodate to the addressees given that the speaker is Algerian and his interlocutors are Egyptian and Saudi. That is, as mentioned above, accommodation is asymmetrical since the intelligibility among the dialects is asymmetrical. Thus, this Algerian participant is triggered to use MSA to make himself as much understood as possible so that his contribution to the discussion is clear[80]. His switching to colloquial Arabic when replying the outsider, as evident in his use of *ydīr* 'do' and *tāʿū* 'his', can be because his keenness to be understood by the outsider is less than his keenness to be understood by the participants in the discussion. That is, the outsider was not addressing him; hence, if the outsider cannot understand him, he (the outsider) can be answered by the other participants. On the other hand, in the discussion, the participants are addressing him;

[80] This is facilitated by his competence in MSA due to his work as a teacher of Arabic.

therefore, he tends to use MSA since he feels he must be as much intelligible as he can. This gains credit by the fact that he made much use of MSA throughout the discussion, as opposed to his interlocutors who were mainly speaking in their own dialects.

Accommodation is sometimes also directed towards the dialect of the addressee. This usually occurs when the dialect of the addressee is a widely known one; e.g. the Egyptian dialect. Consider, for instance, example 6 above from a focus group in which the Libyan speaker rather than using the commonly-used word for 'old people' in Libyan Arabic; i.e. *šībān*, accommodated to his Syrian and Egyptian addressees by giving two synonyms for the word: *ikbār* from Egyptian Arabic and *ḵityārīn* from Syrian Arabic. Also, in another focus group, a Jordanian participant spoke mostly in Egyptian Arabic to his Egyptian addressees to the extent that one can only tell that he is not Egyptian through his few uses of words or sounds from his original dialect; e.g. using /j/ instead of /g/ in few words. Consider, for instance, example 24 from this focus group discussion:

(24)

R: ʔil-ḥifāz ʿala il-luġa il-ʿarabiyya muhim wallā miš muhim?
'is maintaining Arabic important or not important?'

Jordanian: ṭabʿan muhim **giddan**.
'of course, it is very important.'

R: lī?
'why?'

Jordanian: ʿašān il-wāḥad yiwarris ʔawlādū il-ʿādāt wit-taqālīd **bitaʿtū**.
'to pass our habits and traditions to our children.'

R: ʿallī ṣūtak.
'speak up.'

Jordanian: ʿašān *il-wāḥad* yiwarris ʔawlādū wʔaṭfālū ʔaw **il-ʔagyāl** illī **gayya** (.) il-luġa il-ʿarabiyya il-ʔumm. Hiyya luġat **il-ganna** ṭabʿan, wiʿašān yifahhim ʔaṭfālū barḍu ḥaḍaritnā il-ʿamīqa **giddan** illī ṭabʿan (.) **ʔaṣlahā** il-luġa il- ʿarabiyya.
'to pass Arabic to our children or the next generations. Arabic is of course the language of the Paradise, and also to make our children understand our deep civilization whose origins are Arabic language.'

R: Wasīm, ʿandak ḥāga?
'do you have anything to add, Wasim?'

Egyptian: ʔā ṭabʿan [……] ḥatman lazman ʔinn il-ʔawlād yastaṭʿūn ʔan yataḥaddaṯū l-luġa l- ʿarabiyya [……]

'Yes, of course …… It is necessary that children can speak Arabic ……'

In this example, the Jordanian speaker used the Egyptian /g/ sound instead of the Jordanian /j/ sound in *giddan* 'very', *il-ʔagyāl* 'the generations', *gayya* 'next', and *il-ganna* 'the paradise'. Also, although *ʔaṣlahā* 'its origin' is used in both dialects, he pronounced it as it is pronounced in Egyptian Arabic; i.e. placing the stress on the second syllable *la*. In Jordanian Arabic the stress is on the first syllable *ʔaṣ*. He used also the Egyptian lexical item *bita'tū* 'his'; in Jordanian Arabic *taba'ū* is used. The only sign that shows that this speaker is not Egyptian is his use of the short vowel /a/ instead of /i/ in *il-wāḥad* 'the individual'. In Egyptian Arabic *il-wāḥid* is used. Even this is not clear evidence since *il-wāḥad* is used in some parts of Egypt. The Jordanian speaker's use of Egyptian Arabic can be interpreted as an attempt to make himself better understood by his addressees since he might have thought that his own dialect might not serve this purpose effectively. There might be other explanations as well, as will be explained below; e.g. he might be triggered by his desire to reduce dissimilarities with his addressees or by the numerical strength of the Egyptian participants who were the majority in the discussion.

In other words, accommodation is not always aimed only at increasing comprehensibility; it seems that other incentives are also in operation. For instance, according to the accommodation theory, sometimes the purpose of accommodation is also an attempt on the part of the speaker to be perceived more favorably by the addressee by reducing dissimilarities between them. This function of accommodation is normally attested when the accommodation is directed towards the dialect of the addressee, as can apply to example 24 above. Also, as observed in the daily contact with Arabs in Manchester, it is not uncommon that an interlocutor uses a word or an expression from the dialect of his/her addressee to be perceived favorably, especially of course from the widely known dialects. In many cases, Arabs use Egyptian expressions when talking to the researcher; e.g. *ʔinta 'āmil ʔī baʔa* 'how are you?'; *yā bāša* which is a title used by Egyptians when addressing each other; etc. Using such Egyptian Arabic expressions adds nothing to the comprehensibility of the speaker; it is intended to create intimacy rather than to enhance intelligibility.

Sometimes, accommodation is triggered by the numerical strength of the speakers of a given dialect in a given setting. For example, in a weekly Arabic get-together which was usually dominated by Iraqis, it was observed that even Egyptians attending these meetings sometimes attempt to accommodate to Iraqis, as in example 11 above about *'aqīqa*, which is reproduced below in 25:

(25)

Iraqi speaker 1: mā yintūn šay lil-jazzār ʔaw il-laḥḥām.
'they do not give anything to the butcher'
Iraqi speaker 2: [----------]
Iraqi speaker 1: [----------]
Egyptian speaker 1: [----------]
Egyptian speaker 2: mumkin yaḵudha **wmā yuzkur** wimayitkallimš wmayʔulš
'he may take it and does not mention and does not say.'

Notice how Egyptian speaker 2 used *wmā yuzkur* 'and does not mention'. He used the negation form (*mā*+verb), as in Iraqi Arabic, and dispensed with the negation suffix *š* that is used in Egyptian Arabic. Even the choice of *yuzkur* itself is not Egyptian Arabic; in Egyptian Arabic *yitkallim* or *yiʔūl* is normally used. Thus, this structure in Egyptian Arabic would be *wimayitkallimš* or *wmayʔulš*, both of which the speaker gave after accommodating using *wmā yuzkur*. The trigger for accommodation here is not to increase comprehensibility since the Egyptian dialect is widely understood by Arabs. Besides, if the speaker had used only Egyptian Arabic equivalent *wmayʔulš* that he gave after *wmā yuzkur*, he would have been understood as well since *yiʔūl* is used also in Iraqi Arabic with slight variation as *yigūl*. Accommodation is rather triggered by the numerical strength of the Iraqis attending this gathering, who were the overwhelming majority. It might also be triggered by the Egyptian speaker's desire to be perceived more favorably by the Iraqi addressees, as mentioned above.

Besides the preceding incentives for accommodation, S'hiri (2002: 169) provides showing off as a possible trigger for accommodation in her study. According to her, "what is being shown off is the versatility of the accommodator's linguistic repertoire … There is therefore a hidden kind of prestige in converging linguistically with others." In the present study, as a number of participants emphasized, accommodation is sometimes a means of showing off. This is especially the case when it is directed towards MSA or English, which is always confined to occasional lexical insertions and idiomatic expressions since it is socially inappropriate among Arabs to speak with each other in English (cf. Language Choice chapter) and, on the other hand, MSA is not the vernacular used for daily communication among Arabs. One possible explanation for this is that in the Arab world, as S'hiri (2002: 169) states, the capability to speak MSA and foreign languages; notably English, is appreciated and is taken to signal learning and culture although neither of them are used in daily communication. In the following turn in example 26, taken from conversation 16 above, the Libyan participant is explaining that Libyan post-graduate students in the UK must teach for 5 years in Libyan

universities after getting their degree; then they are free of any governmental commitment:

(26)

Libyan: wilāzim itgarrī (.) k̲amas sanawāt. ba'dahā (.) tu'tabar **fī ḥillin min ʔamrik**.

'and you should teach for 5 years and after that you are (free to go).

The Libyan speaker's use of the sentence *fī ḥillin min ʔamrik* 'you are free', which is in MSA, adds nothing to the clarity of the message. One of the plausible explanations for using it in this example is that he just wanted to show off his knowledge of MSA. The same trigger applies to the following situation in which an Egyptian speaker during a gathering in Al-Bokhary Centre was talking about how he went secretly to Egypt on vacation and returned without telling anybody:

(27)

Egyptian: ruḥt maṣr ʔa'at šahr wirgi't bdūn mā ʔūl liḥad, **wakāna Allāhu bis-sirri 'alīm**

'I went to Egypt, spent a month, and returned without telling anybody, and Allah knows the secret.'

The speaker's use of the Standard Arabic idiomatic expression *wakāna Allāhu bis-sirri 'alīm* 'and Allah knows the secret' does not contribute to the clarity of the message; he just wanted to show that he knows Standard Arabic although he was uneducated. Thus, he used this expression which has a sophisticated style; i.e. the topicalization of 'secret'. As a normal declarative sentence, it would be structured as *wakāna Allāhu 'alīmun bis-sirri*. Also, he pronounced the sentence with the short vowels; /a/ on the last letter of *kāna*, /u/ on the last letter of *Allāhu*, and /i/ on the last letter of *bis-sirri*. This is normally dispensed with in Egyptian and most colloquial dialects of Arabic.

The choice of MSA or the dialect of the addressee in accommodation depends on a variety of factors. One of these factors is practicality, which might apply to example 23 of the Algerian speaker. That is, since his interlocutors speak two dialects, Saudi and Egyptian, it might be difficult to accommodate in two varieties at once. Hence, the practical choice is MSA. Another decisive factor is the speaker's productive competence in the colloquial dialects and MSA. For example, the Algerian speaker in example 23 has a good extent of productive competence in MSA due to his work as an Arabic teacher to non-natives; hence, he preferred to accommodate in MSA. On the other hand, the Jordanian speaker in example 24 has competence in the Egyptian dialect; hence, he mainly spoke it throughout the discussion. Sometimes also it is the purpose of accommodation that determines the direction that accommodation takes. For

example, if the purpose of accommodation is to reduce dissimilarities and be perceived more favorably, accommodation is normally directed towards the dialect of the addressee. If the purpose of accommodation is showing off, for instance, MSA is most likely to be used rather than the dialect of the addressee, as aforementioned.

So far, we have been discussing the mutual intelligibility of the various spoken dialects of Arabic; i.e. *oral communication*, and that this is part of the evidence that Arabs form a speech community since it means that they share a common language. In this respect, it has been indicated that there are various factors for such intelligibility; e.g. contact with the dialects, linguistic similarities amongst them, accommodation, etc. Let us now turn to the *written communication* since "the verbal code may be transmitted on oral, written, or manual (signed) channels" (Saville-Troike 1989: 23). In this regard, Arabic speakers share one written medium, as will be discussed in the next section.

4.2.1.2 Shared standard written medium

As mentioned in section 1.6.1.1, despite the various spoken dialects, there is one medium of reading and writing; i.e. MSA. It is the medium that children learn in the Arabic schools in Manchester without any differences among schools, be it a Saudi, a Libyan, etc. school. Also, if anyone listens to the news on any Arabic satellite channel (like Al-Jazeera, Al-Arabiya, etc., which have news-readers from the different Arab countries), he/she can hardly tell the nationality of the news-reader since the news is read in MSA.

Although MSA is not a vernacular of daily interaction unlike the dialects, as illustrated above Arabs in the present study sometimes use MSA in linguistic accommodation to overcome dialect barriers in pan-dialect communication (cf. 4.2.1.1.5). They also share the conversational strategy of using MSA in functionally complementary distribution with the dialects (e.g. to talk about taboos, in formal situations, etc.). This indicates a shared communicative competence, which contributes, as mentioned above, to the participants' being a speech community (cf. section 4.2.1.1.4 Shared communicative competence). Also, Arabs in this study share a prestigious view of MSA and consider it as important as the dialects, if not more important, given its connection with the Quran and Islam. This is evident in their attitudes towards MSA and their wish that all Arabs speak MSA not the dialects as repeatedly mentioned in the interviews and casual conversations (cf. Chapter 7). This prestigious view can be another plausible trigger, besides the aforementioned ones, that explains why Arabs in the present study occasionally try to standardize their language

as is obvious in the above examples of switching between colloquial Arabic and MSA (cf. section 1.6.1.1). Moreover, besides the need for MSA among Arabs as the reading and writing medium, there is a need for receptive understanding in it, especially in such formal registers as education, news, religious speeches, etc.

Another important point regarding MSA is that, as Rouchdy (2002: 143-44) states, it acts as a unifying force among Arabs whether in the homeland or in diaspora. Rouchdy sees that standard Arabic generates a sense of ethnic identity among Arab Americans who come from different countries (2002: 143). In this regard, she cites Romaine's (1982: 24) reference to the sociolinguistic variation in speech communities: "individuals [in a community as a whole] may share the same *Sprachbund* without necessarily sharing the same *Sprechbund*" (in Rouchdy 2002: 143). According to Rouchdy, Arab Americans do not share the same *Sprechbund* since they came from different countries[81]. However, standard Arabic is the *Sprachbund* that functions as a symbol that distinguishes Arabs as being different from others, the non-Arabs, and creates a feeling of "us versus them" (2002: 143-44). This applies to Arabs in this study, who consider Arabic language in general including both MSA and the dialects as a symbol of identity that differentiates them from the surrounding groups (cf. Chapter 7, for more discussion on attitudes towards MSA). All this indicates that the shared written medium (MSA) that the participants have also contributes to their being a speech community.

So far there exists one written medium, coupled with mutually intelligible spoken dialects, and all are related to one language; i.e. Arabic. It should be noted here as well that multilingualism in itself does not contradict the existence of a speech community according to some definitions; e.g. Gumperz (1962): "We will define [linguistic community] as a social group which may be either monolingual or multilingual, held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and sets off from the surrounding areas by weaknesses in the lines of communication" (cited in Hudson 1980: 25). Thus, the emphasis here is on communication rather than on shared language.

Even if we suppose, for the sake of argument, that the various dialects correspond to various speech communities, this may be the case in the Arab world, not among Arabs living in diaspora. Living in diaspora makes Arabs from the different Arab countries come closer to each other and consider themselves as one community speaking one language due to the mutual intelligibility among their dialects and the

[81] Arabic speakers can be said to share the same *Sprechbund* in the sense that although they speak various dialects specific to their countries of origin, these dialects are mutually intelligible and speakers can actually understand each other speaking their own varieties, as explained in the examples above.

shared written medium (MSA) they have in common. Such a feeling can make of them a speech community. According to Hudson (1980: 25-26), there is a kind of definition of speech community; e.g. Halliday (1972), that "puts emphasis on the speech community as a group of people who *feel* themselves to be a community in some sense, rather than a group which only the linguist and outsider could know about."

Moreover, the existence of linguistic differences between Arabs in this study and the other surrounding groups including the dominant one contributes significantly to the position that they form a speech community. That is, they speak, read and write a totally different language from the surrounding groups including English, and there is this kind of definition of a speech community that requires the existence of 'some specifically linguistic differences' between the members of the community and those outside it (Hudson 1980: 25). For example, Gumperz (1968: 114) defines a speech community as "any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language use."

Thus, based on all the above-mentioned, we can define a speech community in diaspora as: a group of people who communicate with each other through mutually intelligible language/varieties of a language, and who feel themselves to be a single community that is different from the surrounding ones. This is the case with regard to Arabs in the present study.

In summary, we have seen in this chapter that Arabic speakers in the present study form a speech community although they originate from different countries and speak various dialects of Arabic. They fulfill a number of criteria proposed by the different definitions of speech community. For example, they communicate with each other and this communication is done through a common language; i.e. Arabic. In this regard, it has been explained that the spoken Arabic dialects are mutually intelligible; Arabic speakers also share one standard formal medium. The question now is what importance this existence of a speech community has for Arabic maintenance in Manchester.

4.2.2 Significance of the existence of a speech community for Arabic maintenance

The existence of a speech community with mutually intelligible spoken dialects and one written medium creates a motivation for Arabic maintenance in the community, unifies the efforts exerted by the members of the community who are from different countries to maintain Arabic, and makes the means for that maintenance available and

valid for all the members, regardless of the nationality or the dialect. That is, the members of the community become concerned with Arabic maintenance in a general sense, not with the maintenance of the relevant dialect to each one; e.g. the Egyptian, Libyan, Saudi etc. dialects. That is why there are Libyan students, for instance, studying in a Saudi school, and Saudi students studying in a Libyan school, and so on. The same applies to teachers in such schools. Likewise, one finds an Egyptian family visiting an Algerian one and a Saudi family visiting a Syrian one; and a Tunisian family watching a Syrian channel and an Egyptian family watching a Saudi channel, etc. That is why also some Arabs; e.g. those who cannot travel to their homeland due to political reasons, go to different Arab countries on vacations in an attempt from the parents to expose their children to an Arabic-only-speaking environment. All such things help Arabic maintenance among children and are facilitated only by the existence of a speech community and what it entails from a common language used for communication among its members. Thus, an immigrant Arab does not have to send his children to a school belonging to people from his own home country, to visit the homeland only, to watch channels or to make friends with families speaking his own dialect only. Any Arabic school, Arabic channel, Arab country, and Arab family can do the job of helping maintain Arabic, regardless of the nationality or the dialect. The mutual intelligibility of the spoken dialects and the one written medium that characterize the Arabic-speaking community in the present study are important for Arabic maintenance in that they help neutralize any negative effect that multiple dialects and diglossia might have on the maintenance of Arabic (cf. sections 5.4.5 and 6.6).

Having established that Arabs in this study form a speech community, in the next chapter, I will investigate the participants' language choice patterns.

5 Language Choice

5.1 Introduction

According to Lanza (1997: 198), language choice is a key concept in the sociolinguistic approach to language. In this regard, Fasold (1984: 180) states that sociolinguistics, as a field of research, exists since there are choices in language use. In this chapter, I will explore language choice in interaction and the media in sections 5.2 and 5.3 respectively; then, an analysis of these findings will be presented in 5.4. Finally, a conclusion on the findings is given in 5.5. The data is drawn from long-term participant observation in a range of situational contexts, face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions.

In much of the sociolinguistic investigations of language choice Fishman's concept of 'domains of language use' has been extensively used (Wei 1994: 9); e.g. Fishman, Cooper and Ma 1971; Fishman 1965, 1972; Greenfield 1972; Pearson and McGee 1993; Othman 2006; and others. In the present study, as well, the domains are used as parameters of language choice, but they are integrated under larger categories that describe language choice according to the degree of consistency[82]. I used this approach since, as will be seen below, language choices are not always uniform in the one domain whether between generations (i.e. the parent generation and the child generation); or within the one generation, particularly the child generation. That is, sometimes, only Arabic is used, other times only English is used, still in other settings both languages are used with one being used more than the other. Hence, language choice in interaction is described under the following categories that represent a continuum: 'consistently Arabic, mostly Arabic, mostly English, and consistently English (equal use of both languages was not attested)[83]'; and subdivided under these categories are the settings or domains in which such patterns are attested, as summarized in table 2 below. Also, this approach flags consistency as key to understand language maintenance just as the domains are. That is, using Arabic in the home domain, for instance, is important, but it is important also to know the degree of consistency of such use; i.e. whether it is the only language used, or is used along with English and in the latter case whether it is used more than English or less than it. This

[82] This approach was used by other researchers, as well; e.g. Dweik's (1992) study on the Lebanese community in Buffalo; Mills' (2005) study of language choice (Spanish and English) in the Hispanic community in Arizona; etc.

[83] 'Consistently Arabic' means always or constantly; i.e. no English is used except for few daily used expressions, e.g. daily ticket, council, town hall, etc. 'Mostly Arabic' indicates that both languages may be used, but Arabic dominates. The same applies to the other two categories but with regard to English: 'Mostly English' and 'Consistently English'.

gives an insight as to whether Arabic will be maintained, by providing a clear picture of how consistently it is used by the different individuals. As Hatoss and Sheely (2009: 135) state, not measuring the rate of language use is one of the limitations of the survey method in measuring language use in their study, since due to the absence of such measuring, it is not clear which language is most used. The categories help, as well, indicate the dynamic nature of language choice and that speakers continuously design their speech according to their audience (Bell 1984). For example, as will be shown below, children use Arabic consistently when they interact with peers who do not speak English, and English consistently when interacting with peers who speak English.

5.2 Language choice patterns in interaction

The findings on language choice in interaction indicate that Arabic and English are generally used by both generations with varying degrees, as detailed below. I will first give, in table 2, a summary of language choice patterns and the settings in which each one obtains, organized according to the categories mentioned above; i.e. according to the degree of consistency. For example, 'Consistently Arabic' is attested in parents' interactions with each other, with children, etc. as detailed in the table, and so on for the other categories in the table. Then, a detailed discussion of every category and its settings will follow, in which examples and conversations obtained from the families during participant observation will be provided.

Table 2

Language choice pattern	**Setting in which it is attested**
Consistently Arabic	- Parents' interactions with each other - Parents interaction with children - Children interaction with parents - Children interaction with 1st generation Arabs - Children interaction with Arabic-speaking peers who do not speak English - Parents' interactions with their Arab friends, relatives and contacts in Manchester, homeland, and the Arab world

Mostly Arabic	- Children-siblings interactions in 5 out of 11 families who have Arabic-English-speaking children - three children in three of the families, when interacting with their Arabic-English speaking friends
Mostly English	- Children-siblings interactions in 6 out of the 11 families who have Arabic-English-speaking children
Consistently English	- Parents' interactions with non-Arabs at work, mosque, neighbourhood, etc. and with Arabs in the presence of non-Arabs - Most children, in the families who have Arabic-English-speaking children, when interacting with their Arabic-English-speaking friends

5.2.1 Consistently Arabic[84]

5.2.1.1 Parents' interactions with each other

In all the families, the language used between parents is always Arabic in all cases whether the father or the mother is the one who initiates the conversation. Some of the participants even referred to Arabic as 'the official language' of home. For example, during a visit to a mother in hospital who has recently given birth, my wife sat with the mother in her room, and I went out with the father to have tea in the hospital's cafe. The husband telephoned his wife to ask if she needed anything. The conversation was all in Arabic and his wife was speaking to him in Arabic as well. Moreover, in another family, the husband wanted to give myself and my family a ride home after one of the visits, so he asked his wife for her car:

(1)

Husband: ʔanā ḥarūḥ ʔawaṣṣalhum.

'I will give them a ride.'

Wife: ḥatitʔakk̲ar?

'*Will you be late*?'

Husband: mumkin ʔāk̲ud 'arabītik?

'*Can I take your car*?'

[84] Henceforth, by Arabic I mean the relevant dialect of the speaker, unless I specify.

Wife: lī?

'*Why*?'

Husband: laʔan 'arabītī fīhā ḥāgāt kitīr.

'*Since my car is full of things*.'

Wife: ṭayyib ḵudhā.

'*Ok, take it*.'

Husband: ṭayyib iddīn il-muftāḥ.

'*Ok, give me the key*.'

5.2.1.2 Parents' interactions with their children

When parents talk to their children, they always use Arabic. This is the norm in all families. This conforms to what El Aissati (1996: 47) and Mehlem (1998: 86, 94) state: in the Netherland and Germany (and possibly other European countries), Arabic is still the language of interaction between Moroccan Arab immigrants and their children. By contrast, according to Tribalat (1995: 47), in France most of the first-generation Algerian and Moroccan Arab immigrants report communicating with their children in French, either exclusively or in addition to Arabic (discussed in Boumans and Ruiter 2002: 271). In one of the visits to a family, the father was telling a story and his son was continuously interrupting the father trying to tell parts of the story. Then the father got angry and told the son in Arabic to stop interrupting him since this is inconvenient. The same father in another situation was collecting his other son from the Arabic school. In the way home, he was speaking to his child in Arabic: he asked his son to shake hands with me, introduced me to him, then started to ask him about how the day was, about his friends, and about what he studied at school. Moreover, in another family, the father spoke to his son (3 years old) in Arabic all the time: when talking seriously, when giving instructions, and when playing with him. For example, he asked his son in Arabic whether he wanted some perfume, to give the perfume to him (the father) and then to go out of the room and close the door. This was confirmed in another meeting with this family during a visit to my home. When they entered the father said to his son:

(2)

Father: sallim 'alā 'ammū, gullū kīf ḥālak, šū ʔaḵbārak.

'*Shake hands with your uncle, say how are you to him.*'

In another situation when the child was embarrassed, the father said to him:

(3)

Father: ʔinta ḵajlān? rūḥ ʿind māmā.

'Are you embarrassed? Go to your mom.'

The mother also speaks to her son in Arabic. For example, when the son started to fight with my daughter over one of his toys during one of the visits to them, she said to him:

(4)

Mother: ʔitrik il-luʿba hādi. ḵid luʿba ṯānya.

'Let this toy, take another one.'

5.2.1.3 Children's interactions with their parents

Children also talk to their parents in Arabic. During one of the visits to a family the phone rang and the daughter (9 years old) asked her mother in Arabic to allow her to answer the phone. The mother refused and asked her daughter in Arabic to see the dialling number, and the daughter told her the number in Arabic as well. In another family, the father and his daughter were doing shopping and the girl reminded her father to buy sugar:

(5)

Daughter: lā tinsā, ʔimmī bidhā sukkar

'*Do not forget, my mother wants sugar*.'

Father: ʔālatlik ʔay nūʿ?

'*Did she tell you which kind*?'

Daughter: hiyyā ʔālat ʔay nūʿ.

'*She said any kind.*'

Father: wīn makān issukkar?

'*Where is the place of the sugar*?'

Daughter: hūn fūʔ irraf.

'*Here, on the shelf*.'

Another girl in a different family was telling her mother about what her sister did:

(6)

Daughter: māmā, ʔiḵtī talʿab bil-ḥūta l-mayta.

'*Mom, my sister is playing with the dead fish*.'

Mother: gūlīlhā māmā tawwa twarrīk.

'*Tell her your mother will punish you*.'

Daughter: bāhī

'*Ok*.'

Consider also the following conversation between an 18-year-old boy and his father:

(7)

Son: Binimšū lis-sūg ʔanā wi-bin ʿammī.
'I am going to the market with my cousin.'

Father: bāhī.
'OK.'

Son: ma-bnitʔakk̲irūš.
'We will not be late.'

Father: maʿāk iflūs?
'Do you have money?'

Son: maʿāy.
'I have.'

In a different family, a 3-year-old son called his father many times and asked him to open the door for him, he asked his father also to give him chocolate and biscuits. Moreover, during one of the meetings with another family in a park, the father and his son had this conversation in which the son wanted to get off his bike because he was tired and the father refused:

(8)

Son: ʔanā tiʿibit.
'I got tired.'

Father: Lā ḥabībī. Lāzim tāk̲id il-bisklīt lid-dār.
'No, my love. You have to take the bicycle home.'

Son: rāḥ anzil wa trikhā.
'I will get off and leave it.'

Father: law tarikithā bakibbahā fiš-šāriʿ.
'If you leave it, I will throw it in the street.'

Son: (crying) wīn māmā?
'Where is my mom?'

Father: lā tibkī. k̲allīk zalami.
'Do not cry, be a man.'

Consider also the following exchanges, in which Arabic is always used as well between the mother and her child in the same family:

(9)

Mother: ta'āl k̲id tiffāḥ.

'Come and take an apple.'

Son: ʔarkab bisklīt.

'I want to ride the bicycle'.

The son also wanted ice cream while we were in the park:

(10)

Son: biddī ʔayis ikrīm.

'I want ice cream.'

Mother: rāḥ injīb mid-dikkān.

'We will buy from the shop.'

Parents use a number of discourse strategies with their children to urge them to speak in Arabic and avoid mixing the two languages:

5.2.1.3.1 Parents' discourse strategies with their children

Lanza (1997: 262-72) provides a continuum of five parental discourse strategies: Minimal Grasp Strategy (Ochs 1988), Expressed Guess Strategy (Ochs 1988), Adult Repetition, Move On Strategy and Code-Switching) that are ranked according to the degree to which they contribute to the parents' negotiation for a monolingual or a bilingual context with their children. They are also ranked according to the extent to which they force the child to stick to the use of one language in interaction or the extent to which they open up the chance for using both languages. Thus, at the monolingual end of the continuum, the parents give a minimal grasp of the child's mixing of languages in communication. This highlights their monolingual role; hence, the child is more compelled to use one language. At the bilingual end, the child's language mixing triggers the parents' use of the other language. This generates bilingual discourse; hence, opens the opportunity for the child to use both languages (Lanza 1997: 268). Thus, the discourse strategies can "be seen as *contextualization cues* (Gumperz 1977, 1982a) ... [that] serve to signal a frame for the ongoing interaction as an essentially monolingual or bilingual one" (Lanza 1997: 268).

In the present study the norm which was observed in all families is that children consistently use Arabic with their parents, as shown in the examples above. Children's language mixing in interactions with parents was observed in only a limited number of situations, which are given in the examples below, and was observed to occur under certain conditions, particularly when children have been in recent contact with English

before the situation, as will be illustrated. The mixing also occurs in a very limited way by using just a word or a sentence, and when children remember that they are speaking with their parent or when the parent reminds children to speak Arabic, they start to speak Arabic for the rest of the conversation. In this regard the parents actively seek a monolingual context with their children. This is based on what I observed through the examples below and what the parents and their children said. In fact, there is no way to know whether the parents are consistent in their negotiation of a monolingual context when not observed or interviewed. In the present study, the Minimal Grasp Strategy and Expressed Guess Strategy (Ochs 1984, 1987, 1988), which are both types of requests for clarification made by adults, were observed as will be shown below. Ochs's descriptive labels indicate a difference in the extent to which the child is forced to reformulate his or her utterance (Lanza 1997: 262). However, the linguistic forms used for requests for clarification have "their effect on the development of children's linguistic and communicative competence, in that they force children to monitor their language both for the forms they use and the ways in which they use these forms" (Lanza 1997: 262, citing McTear 1985: 169). Parents may pretend they do not understand (Minimal Grasp Strategy) by using, for instance, 'I don't understand', 'Say that again', or Wh-interrogatives; hence, rely mainly on the child to reformulate the repairable utterance (Lanza 1997: 263)[85]. Consider the following example:

(11)

Father:	ʔīš biti‘mil?
	'What are you doing?'
Son (in English):	Reading.
Father (in a high rise intonation):	**ʔīš? mā fhimt**.
	'What? I did not understand.'
Son: (smiling and using Arabic):	ʔaqraʔ.
	'I am reading.'
Father:	ʔuk̲tak rāḥit?
	'*Did your sister leave?*
Son:	lā, bitil‘ab ma‘a ṣāḥbithā taḥt.
	'*No, she is playing downstairs with her friend*.'
Father:	līš?

[85] Saunders (1982b) and Taeschner (1983) used this strategy of feigning a lack of understanding with their own bilingual children when their children spoke in the other language. Taeschner (1983) claims this 'educational strategy', as she calls it, is the best for maintaining bilingualism.

	ʻ*Why?*ʼ
Son:	ʔultilhā tilʿab hinā lākin hiyya rāḥit maʿa ṣāḥbithā.
	ʻ*I told her to play here, but she went with her friend*.'
Father:	ṭayyib.
	ʻ*Ok.*'

This example occurred at mosque. The context in which it took place is as follows: the child was sitting with his friend speaking in English. Then the father interrupted their conversation and asked his child about what he was doing. Since the child has been just speaking in English with his friend, he continued using English with his father. When the father reminded him to speak Arabic using the minimal grasp strategy which functioned in the negotiation of a monolingual context, the son repeated the same content of his utterance but switched languages[86]. Then, he continued speaking Arabic for the rest of the conversation. This shows that the child's language mixing with his father occurred under influence from contact with English prior to the interaction with the father and was not a habit. Of noteworthiness here is that the child was not observed mixing languages for the whole three hours we spent at mosque. Also, during the meetings with this child's family in my home, in their home, in get-togethers, etc., he was observed to use Arabic all the time with his parents.

Sometimes it is the parent who tries the reformulation of the repairable utterance through using the expressed Guess Strategy, which is a yes-no question (Lanza 1997: 263), as in the following example:

(12)

Mother (in Arabic):	ʔintā ʻāwiz trūḥ maṣr ʻašān tišūf mīn?
	'You want to go to Egypt to see who?'
Child (in English):	grandpa.
Mother (in Arabic):	**giddak?**
	'Your grandpa?'
Child (in Arabic):	ʔaywa giddī.
	'Yes, my grandpa.'
Mother:	wiʻāwiz tišūf mīn kamān?
	'And who else do you want to see?'
Child:	ʻāwiz ʔašūf ḵaltu wʻammitu ʻašān hummā waḥašūnī ʔawī.

[86] The father's use of a high rise intonation pattern functioned as "negative sanctioning" (Lanza 1997: 263).

'I want to see my aunts because I miss them a lot.'

In this example, the father and mother were collecting their son from school. Then, the mother started talking to the boy about a visit which they will go on to the homeland. When the boy used English in response to her question, the mother reformulated and questioned his utterance using Arabic, as indicated in bold. Then, the child repeated the same content of his utterance but switched languages. The context of the conversation; i.e. in the way home immediately after school, indicates that the child's use of English was a result of using it all day in the school, especially that he was playing with his classmates when the parents collected him. When the mother reformulated the child's utterance in Arabic, she highlighted that this is a context for Arabic use; hence the child started to speak Arabic for the rest of the conversation. In fact, this is the only instance in which this child was observed to mix languages with his parents during this meeting with the family. Also, in the different meetings with this family, the child was observed to use Arabic consistently with his parents.

The Minimal Grasp strategy and Expressed Guess Strategy are significant in negotiating a monolingual context as Lanza (1997) indicates. That is, in these requests for clarification "in the terminology of conversation analysis, the question/answer pair form an adjacency pair (Schegloff and Sacks 1973), a sequentially constrained pair of turns at talk" (Lanza 1997: 265). When the first part of the pair occurs, this creates a slot for the occurrence of the second pair-part; a non-occurrence of the second pair-part is taken as a 'violation/absence' (Lanza 1997: 265). The evidence for this kind of constraint is that once a non-occurrence happens, the first pair-part is reiterated (Lanza 1997: 265, discussing Schegloff 1972). Thus, the Requests for Clarification call for a response by the child, which helps negotiating a monolingual context[87].

Döpke (1992a: 67), as well, provides a continuum of what she calls the six insisting strategies used by the parents in her study. The strategies are arranged according to their "increasing constraint on the ongoing conversation as well as on the child's linguistic ability in German" (Döpke 1992a: 67). The last two on the continuum are highlighted by Döpke as high-constraint strategies. These are the 'display of non-understanding' and the 'request for translation', with the pressure from the former being surpassed by the latter which Döpke describes as "the most explicit of all insisting strategies" (Döpke 1992a: 68). The 'display of non-understanding' corresponds to the

[87] Children from an early age understand that there is a conversational requirement whereby they should provide a reply to a question (Lanza 1997: 265, discussing Shatz and McCloskey 1984).

Minimal Grasp Strategy which was discussed above. The request for translation is used in the following conversation between a father and his 10-year-old daughter during a visit to my home:

(13)

Father: gūlī lʿammū mīn il-midarrisa il-lī biddarrisik fil-madrasa il-ʿarabiyya?
'Tell your uncle who is the teacher who teaches you in the Arabic School?'

Daughter: ḵāla ʔinās.
'aunt Inas.'

Father: min wīn hiyya?
'Where is she from?'

Daughter: min maṣir.
'From Egypt'

Father: taʿālī māmā. ʔugʿudī wiyyānā.
'Come and sit with us.'

Daughter: *(in English)*: *No. I will sit with my mom.*

Father: **ʔitkallamī ʿarabī yā bintī.**
'Speak Arabic, my daughter.'

Daughter: (in Arabic): zīn, barūḥ ʿand māmā.
'Ok, I will go to my mom.'

in this example, the girl was speaking with her father in Arabic, her use of English in response to the father's request occurred since at this instance she was busy reading a text message which she received from her classmate. So, when the father asked her to sit with us, she used English, the language she was reading in at this moment. Then, when the father asked her to speak Arabic, she repeated the content of her utterance again, but this time in Arabic. Also, like in the above examples, the girl in this example was observed to use Arabic consistently with her parents whether during the context of this meeting or in the other meetings with this family.

Another strategy can also be added to the list of strategies discussed above. I will call it the 'no-reply strategy'. That is, the parent may even not reply if children talk to him/her in English. The 'no-reply strategy' can be considered, using Döpke's terminology, a 'high constraint strategy' since it exerts pressure on the child to speak the other language. Through this strategy the parent negotiates a monolingual context with the child, and conveys to the child a 'meta-communicative message' (Bateson

1972, cited in Lanza 1997: 255); i.e. this is a context in which to speak Arabic only. Thus, the parent signals the inappropriateness of English in such contexts of parent-children interactions. Consider, for instance, the following example that illustrates the no-reply strategy. The son was speaking with his non-Arab neighbour in front of the house, and then the father called him:

(14)

Father:	Sāmī, gūl lummak tisawwī akil. '*Sami, ask your mother to make food*.'
Son (in English):	Why?
Father (looking at him with no reply):	no speech
Son:	zīn, zīn. līš? '*Ok, ok. Why*?'
Father:	ʔiwa kida, bil-ʿarabī. '*Yes, like this, in Arabic*.'
Son:	ṭayyib gullī līš tibbī ʔummī tsawwī akil. rāḥ yitʿaššūn maʿnā? '*Ok, tell me why you want my mother to make food. Are they (he means the researcher and his family) going to have dinner with us*?'
Father:	ʔiwa. '*Yes*.'

Like the children in the above examples, this child as well was observed to speak Arabic consistently with his parents. In this particular situation, as obvious from the context of the conversation, he has been in close contact with English prior to the situation (i.e. speaking with his neighbour), which triggered his use of English at the beginning. Once the father highlighted the context as one where Arabic is to be used, this temporary trigger disappeared and the child returned back to the norm he is used to in his interaction with parents; i.e. the use of Arabic.

5.2.1.4 Children's interactions with first generation Arabs

Children speak Arabic when talking to first generation Arabs (e.g. their parents' friends, neighbours, etc.), especially if the first generation speak to them in Arabic. This was observed during the Quran classes that I held every Sunday at mosque, and in the Arabic school where I taught. This was confirmed also by one of the respondents who

taught in an Arabic school and who also held Quran classes in one of the mosques. Moreover, in a weekly playgroup in which a group of Arabs used to gather every Saturday to play football, one of the participants brought his son. The son was speaking in Arabic all the time with his father's friends. In a different occasion, one of the Egyptian students in Manchester invited myself and two of the participants to his house for dinner. The two participants brought their two sons (both 10 years old) with them. The children were speaking with us in Arabic; then after dinner, they went to the lounge to play together. They were interacting with each other in English; however, when I joined them they started to use Arabic for the whole hour I spent playing with them. Moreover, during a visit of a family to my home, I started talking to children in Arabic, and they responded in Arabic as well. Then, whenever they wanted to talk to me they used Arabic even if it was they who initiated the conversation. The following conversation is between myself (R) and the 5-year old girl in this family. She was asking where my daughter (Jana) is to play with her:

(15)

Girl: Jana fīn ʿalašān ʔalʿab maʿāhā?
'Where is Jana to play with her?'

R: Jana guwwa fil-ʔūḍa.
'Jana is in the room.'

Girl: haruḥlahā.
'I will go to her.'

Consider also this conversation with a daughter in another family:

(16)

R: bitrūḥī madrasa ʿarabiyya walla inglīzīyya?
'Do you go to an Arabic or an English school?'

Daughter: barūḥ madrasa ʿarabiyya wi-ŋjlīzīyya.
'I go to an Arabic and an English School.'

R: mīn ʔaṣḥābik?
'Who are your friends?'

Daughter: Wafāʔ fil- madrasa l-ʿarabiyya wi Amy fil-linjlīzīyya.
'Wafaa in the Arabic School and Amy in the English school.'

5.2.1.5 Children's interactions with Arabic-speaking peers who do not speak English

When children interact with their Arabic-speaking peers who do not speak English, Arabic is used. In one of the families, the father's and the mother's sisters live in France; they contact them via the internet. Children as well talk with their cousins on the internet using Arabic since, as the parents said, they do not speak French and their cousins do not speak English; thus, the common language is Arabic. This was also observed when their cousin was visiting them in Manchester. In another family, children said that they chat with their cousins in the homeland on the internet using Arabic since their cousins do not speak English. Moreover, in all the family visits, I went with my wife and my 3-year-old daughter (Jana). It was observed that when children realized that Jana did not speak English, they started to use Arabic with her. For example, during a family visit to my home, this conversation occurred between their daughter and Jana. The daughter in this family started the conversation in English by asking Jana, 'how are you? Do you go to school?' Then when she realized that Jana could not understand, she started to talk in Arabic:

(17)

Girl: ʔint ismik īh?

'What is your name?'

Jana: ʔanā ʔismī Jana.

'My name is Jana.'

Girl: wi bābā ʔismū īh?

'And what is your father's name?'

Jana: ʔismū Maḥammad ... ʔanā ʿandī ʿarūsa bitaʿtī.

'His name is Mohamed ... I have a doll.'

Girl: wa-nā kamān ʿandī ʿarūsa fil-bīt, tīgī nilʿab bil-ʿarūsa btaʿtik?

'Me too, I have a doll at home, what about playing with your doll?'

Jana: haʔūl limāmā ʔawwil.

'I will tell my mom first.'

In a different family, too, the two daughters were speaking in English with Jana at the beginning, but when they realized that she did not speak English, they converted to Arabic, and they even sometimes tried to use Egyptian Arabic although they were not Egyptian. For example, when she was playing with Jana, the 10-year-old girl used Egyptian Arabic (E. A.) when asking Jana about her two dolls:

(18)

Girl (speaking in E.A.):	dī ʔismahā Fayrūz, ṭayyib dī ismahā īh?
	'This is called Fayrooz, what about this one?'
Jana (throwing it on the floor):	dī ismahā Hanā.
	'This is called Hana.'
Girl:	ʔinkasarit? rāḥ niḏhab bīhā lid-duktūr.
	'Was it broken? We will take it to the doctor.'

In another situation Jana was crying wanting juice and the girl was trying to calm her down by offering, in a mixture of Egyptian Arabic and Iraqi Arabic, to give Jana her juice:

(19)

Girl: ḵudī dā, lammā yiḵlaṣ ta'ālī ḵudī marra ṯānya.

'Take this and when it is finished, come and take once more.'

5.2.1.6 Parents' interactions with their Arab friends, relatives and contacts in Manchester, homeland, and the Arab world

In all the families, parents have only Arab friends from the different Arab countries, living in Manchester[88]. Some parents still have friends in the homeland and the Arab world as well. Parents have also relatives in the homeland, and some have relatives living in other countries in the Arab world. The language parents use with all such contacts is always Arabic, whether in face-to-face communication as with relatives, friends, neighbours and other Arab contacts in Manchester, e.g. a plumber, a mechanic, assistants in shops, etc.; or in indirect communication with relatives and friends in the homeland via the telephone, the internet, etc. This was observed during the family visits and in the other sites of observation, such as mosques, playgroups, get-togethers, etc. For example, during one of the family visits, the father received five phone calls from his Arab friends in Manchester. In other families, as well, the father received phone calls from, and made phone calls with, Arab friends in the Arab world; e.g. in Syria and Saudi Arabia. The language used during these phone calls was entirely Arabic.

[88] Parents do not have non-Arab friends; they may have non-Arab colleagues at work, for example, but they do not have close relations with them outside work.

5.2.2 Mostly Arabic

5.2.2.1 Children-siblings interactions in 5 out of 11 families who have Arabic-English-speaking children

I explore in this section children who use 'mostly Arabic', which means that they use English also. Hence, what will be investigated here is language choice in children-sibling interactions in families who have Arabic-English-speaking children; i.e. those who have the ability to use Arabic or English. This is because children who are not proficient in English have no alternative other than using Arabic. Thus, 6 families will be excluded here: in 3 of them there is no children sibling interaction since 2 families have a child and a newly born baby and the third family have only one child. In the other 3 families, although there is children-sibling interaction, in 1 family children have no ability in English as they have not gone to school yet. In the other 2, children have low ability in English since they have not been for long in English schools. Hence, in the 3 families, children interact with each other in Arabic.

Excluding these 6 families, there are 11 families who have Arabic-English-speaking children and where there is children-sibling interaction. Although English dominates in 6 families (out of the 11 families) in children-siblings interactions (cf. 5.2.3.1), in 5 families children interact with each other in Arabic more than English. For example, during a visit to one of these families, children (a 10-year-old son and a 5-year-old daughter) were talking mostly in Arabic when they were playing with their cat. Then when they started to fight because one of them wanted to take the cat, Arabic was also used during their fight in which they were very angry. After that when their father talked to them to stop this, each one started to argue with the father in Arabic that the other one was the guilty. Moreover, during a visit to a different family, the older son (12 years old) was playing with his baby sister talking to her in Arabic. He was also talking to his younger brother (3 years old) in Arabic most of the time.

5.2.2.2 Three children in three of the families, when interacting with their Arabic-English-speaking friends

Most children who are competent in English use it with their peer friends (cf. 5.2.4.2). Some children, however, speak Arabic with their friends although they are very competent in English. For example, during casual conversations with 3 children (a 14-year old girl, a 15-year old girl, and a 19-year old boy) in 3 different families, they reported that they speak mostly in Arabic with their Arab friends. The 14-year-old girl said that when she was young, she used to speak English with her Arab friends. But

now, she speaks Arabic more than English with them. However, when there are non-Arabs, they speak in English. The 15-year old girl said that it is a shame to be an Arab and not speak Arabic, which also reflects a positive stance towards Arabic (cf. Chapter 7, section 7.2 for an illustration of attitudes towards Arabic). Although these are self-reports which have their possible limitations; e.g. that they might not correspond to real language behavior, this was triangulated with direct observation of those children interacting with their friends in different occasions; e.g. during birthday celebration, at mosque and other Arabic gatherings. Such reports were also elicited from those children in different occasions and from the parents as well, which enhances them to some extent through achieving what Denzin (1989b) refers to as a triangulation of data source (cf. section 2.1.2 for an illustration of triangulations utilized in the present study).

5.2.3 Mostly English

5.2.3.1 Children-siblings interactions in 6 out of the 11 families who have Arabic-English-speaking children[89]

In children-siblings interactions in 6 families, Arabic and English are used but English is used more. Thus, the number of families where children use English more than Arabic with their siblings is slightly more than the number of families where children use Arabic more than English; i.e. the 5 families in 5.2.2.1 (the motivations for children's use of Arabic and English will be discussed below in the analysis section). It should be noted here that since the focus of the study was on investigating the use and maintenance of Arabic, no conversational examples on the participants' use of English were collected, and code-switching was not investigated; such investigation also requires recorded conversational data, which was not possible to obtain in the present study, as explained in the Methodology chapter. However, code-switching is of concern to the study of language maintenance and shift (Fishman 1966: 426), and in the present study the mixing of Arabic and English was observed in children-sibling interaction; in children-peers interaction outside the family, English is used consistently by most children, as illustrated in section 5.2.4.2 below. Nonetheless, due to lack of conversational data and systematic observation on code-switching, I cannot further comment on this issue.

[89] The 6 families that were excluded in section 5.2.2.1 above will be excluded here as well.

5.2.4 Consistently English

5.2.4.1 Parents' interactions with non-Arabs at work, mosque, neighbourhood, etc.; and with Arabs in the presence of non-Arabs

Parents, especially fathers, have contacts with non-Arabs with whom they use English in such domains as Mosque, neighbourhood, workplace, and shopping. With Arabs in these domains, however, Arabic is consistently used as illustrated above, especially at neighbourhood and mosque[90]. At mosque also Arabic only is used in prayers, and sometimes along with English in religious speeches; e.g. the Friday Speech. In both cases, Standard Arabic is the used variety. Parents use English also with Arabs when they are in the presence of non Arabs. There are social "pressures" (Mackey 1968: 563-4) that influence parents towards the use of English rather than Arabic in such situations; that is, it is socially inappropriate to use a language that is not understood by some of the participants in conversation.

5.2.4.2 The majority of Arabic-English-speaking children[91] when interacting with their Arabic-English-speaking friends

Children who do not speak English or have low ability in it communicate with their friends in Arabic. On the other hand, children who are competent in English (except for the 3 children in the 3 families mentioned in 5.2.2.2) use English with their Arab friends whether at the Arabic schools, the English school, or in their get-togethers. Children acquire and use Arabic at home, but gradually become English dominant, particularly however, with peers. This corresponds partially to Garcia's (2003) finding in the Hispanic immigrant community in Los Angeles, California: the children of the first generation acquire Spanish at home, and then most of them gradually become English dominant. In one of the families, for example, a 10-year-old son reported that he has Arab friends from school, but he uses English when speaking with them although they speak Arabic well. In another family, the 8-year-old son explained that he has two Arab friends at the English school, and that he speaks with them in English. Children's interaction in English with their peer friends was also observed in the Sunday teaching class which I gave to Arab children at mosque and in the Arabic school where I taught. This was confirmed as well by one of the participants who taught Quran at another

[90] More than five parents have Arab contacts at work as well. For example, in one of the families, the father who works in construction has Arab colleagues at work and uses Arabic with them and English with non-Arabs.

[91] These are the children in 12 families: the 11 families mentioned in section 5.2.2.1 in addition to a family, which have a child who is competent in English, but was excluded since there is no children-sibling interaction.

mosque to children and who also taught at an Arabic school. Sometimes, as an 18-year-old boy reported, children use Arabic at the English school when they do not want non-Arab classmates to understand what they are saying; i.e. as a secret language.

To sum up, the findings on language choice in interaction indicate that Arabic is used consistently in parent-parent interactions, parents-children interactions, children's interaction with first generation Arabs and with Arabic-monolingual peers, and parents' interactions with their Arab friends and contacts. Both Arabic and English are used in a number of settings: Arabic is used more than English in children-sibling interactions in 5 out of 11 families with Arabic-English speaking children, and in 3 children's interaction with their Arabic-English bilingual peer friends. English is used more than Arabic in children-sibling interactions in 6 out of the 11 families. Consistent use of English is attested in parents' interactions with non-Arabs at work, mosque, etc. and with Arabs in the presence of non-Arabs, and in most children's interactions with their Arabic-English bilingual friends.

In the next section, the participants' language choice in the media will be investigated.

5.3 Language choice in the media

All the families, except for one, have both Arabic and English satellite channels[92]. Thus, both Arabic and English media are watched. In section 5.3.1, the first generation's language choice in the media will be discussed; the second generation's choice is presented in 5.3.2.

5.3.1 Parent generation

Parents in all families always watch Arabic channels for entertainment and news. Some of them sometimes watch also English channels for news to know about UK internal affairs. The entertainment materials; e.g. talk shows, TV drama series and movies, etc. are usually in the various dialects of Arabic while the news is always in MSA. The materials they watch sometimes form a topic of discussion with their friends in their get-togethers. For example, there is an Arabic gathering twice a week in which I always participated with some of the participants. During such meetings, participants spoke about different issues, and would often talk about a talk show or a movie that they watched. In one of the meetings, a participant talked about a TV program

[92] This family has Arabic channels only. Also one of the families does not have TV; however, they watch the Arabic channels on the internet.

broadcasted on an Arabic channel (Al-Sharja TV), and almost all the attendees engaged in the conversation.

Parents, especially fathers, read Arabic and English newspapers. They read the Arabic newspapers in hard copy and online. For example, during one of the visits to a family, the father switched on the computer revealing many Arabic newspapers' websites on the desktop. He said that he always reads Arabic newspapers on the internet. Another father reported that there is a shop in Manchester selling Arabic newspapers that are issued in London, and that he usually buys them. As was observed, there are several shops that sell Arabic newspapers in Manchester.

5.3.2 Child generation

Children in 2 families watch Arabic channels only. In the rest of the families children watch both Arabic and English channels. In one of the families, for instance, the son (8 years old) reported that he watches cartoons with his younger sister (6 years old) on 'Al-Jazeera Lil-atfal' (Al-Jazeera for Kids), 'MBC3' and 'Bara'em' (Toddlers), all Arabic channels. He also mentioned the names of some of the Arabic cartoons and programs he watches. Moreover, in many of the family visits, when entering the family's house, children were found watching Arabic cartoons. One of the families have a DVD recorder at home; so they record Arabic cartoons and programs from the Arabic channels for their daughter and run them for her in the time that suits them everyday. Even in the one family that do not have a TV, children watch Arabic channels on the internet. For example, the 10-year-old son reported that he watched Arabic cartoons and programs online, e.g. Al- Majd Lil-atfal (Al- Majd for Kids). He also had videos in Arabic. This applies also to his siblings.

The materials children watch are in both MSA and colloquial Arabic. They watch cartoons in MSA on those Arabic channels that broadcast only in MSA, such as Al-Jazeera Lil-atfal, Bara'em, Al-Majd Lil-atfal, and also on other Arabic channels that broadcast cartoons in MSA and Colloquial Arabic. They watch cartoons in various dialects of Arabic on the different satellite channels; e.g. the Egyptian, Syrian, etc. channels.

Children watch also English materials. One of the fathers said that children watch English cartoons in the afternoon and Arabic cartoons in the evening. But the parents keep watching English cartoons to a minimum as much as they can since they always have concerns that children may learn things from English cartoons that contradict the Arabic habits and traditions and Islam. This fear reached such an extent

in one of the families that the parents disconnected the English channels in order not to leave any chance that their children may watch them.

In some of the families, children watch Arabic TV drama series and movies with their parents. Some children watch them because their parents ask them to do so. However, other children watch these series and movies because they like watching them. For example, in one of the families, their daughter (14 years old) said that she likes watching Arabic movies and TV drama very much. In another family, the eldest daughter (15 years old) said that she likes them as well. She even talked about one of the TV series that she was watching with her parents at that time.

As for reading, children who learnt reading, read in English more than in Arabic because there are few shops that sell Arabic reading materials. Reading in Arabic is confined to materials from the Arabic schools or materials that the parents bring from the homeland. However, in one family, their 19-year-old son reads Arabic materials; e.g. news, on the internet. Reading materials in Arabic are available only in MSA.

In summary, we have discussed above the participants' language choice in interaction and the media respectively. The findings indicate that Arabic and English are used in interaction with different degrees of consistency; e.g. consistently Arabic, mostly Arabic, mostly English, and consistently English, and we have seen the different settings in which each category obtains (cf. section 5.2). As for language choice in the media, parents always watch Arabic channels for entertainment and news; some of them sometimes also watch English channels for news. Children watch both Arabic and English media. The materials the participants watch on Arabic TV are in colloquial and standard Arabic (cf. section 5.3). In the next section, an analysis of these findings is presented.

5.4 Analysis

The analysis below handles the following points: both generations' motivations for language choice, influence of domain of language use, addressee, generation, education, etc. on language choice, the functional compartmentalization between Arabic and English and the role of parents' discourse strategies as a means to maintain such demarcation among children, whether the existence of multiple Arabic dialects and diglossia influences Arabic language use, and the role of advances in communication technology and transportation means in providing a function for Arabic in the homeland.

5.4.1 Motivations for using Arabic and English in interaction

5.4.1.1 Parents/first generation's motivations

Parents are motivated to use English when they are in inter-group contexts. Also, in "complex sociolinguistic contexts where multiple participants from various ethnic and linguistic background [are] present" (Hatoss and Sheely 2009: 135), the host group's language is used (cf. 5.2.4.1). On the other hand, parents use Arabic in home interaction, whether with each other or with children; the motivation for this is twofold. First, parents are keen on using their native language at home in order to pass it on to their children. This is what all parents emphasized during casual conversations with them in the family visits and during the interviews. They consistently try to urge the children to use and acquire Arabic by making it clear for them that at home Arabic is the only language which has to be used. Here are some of the parents' comments in this regard:

- 'they speak enough English at the English school, they should speak enough Arabic as well and this can be done at home only.'
- 'we do not fear our children may not acquire English, our fear is that they may not acquire Arabic. That is why we use Arabic at home.'
- 'they will learn English sooner or later as long as they go to an English school. Therefore, we should pay more attention to Arabic.'
- 'English is completely forbidden at home.'
- 'the language of home is Arabic since we want them to maintain the Arabic identity.'
- 'that is our language. I want my children to acquire it.'

The second trigger is that all the parents (like all the first generation) are born in their homeland and came to Manchester as adults. Therefore, they are more competent and fluent in Arabic than in English; hence, feel more comfortable and more confident speaking in Arabic than English. According Luo and Wiseman (2000: 309), "foreign-born [homeland-born] immigrants often find their ethnic language easier to use and more expressive of their feelings." Also, Lutz's (2006: 1423) study on Spanish maintenance among Latino Youth in America states that languages other than English are much more likely to be used in families with homeland-born parents.

The parents' better ability in Arabic than English accounts also for their use of Arabic with Arab friends and contacts. However, this can also be attributed to the parents' positive attitudes towards their native language. All the parents spoke about how they loved Arabic, and they even considered it more beautiful than English (cf.

Chapter 7 Language Attitudes). Hence, although they can speak English, they seize any opportunity to use Arabic, and the best chance to use it is in intra-group communication with friends and contacts whether in Manchester or the homeland. Since the parents and their friends have the same desire, it becomes socially inappropriate to speak in English when in the company of Arab friends; i.e. the unmarked choice in such setting is always Arabic.

5.4.1.2 Children's motivations

Children's motivations to use Arabic are varied. For example, they consistently use Arabic with parents due to the parents' persistent insistence that children speak Arabic at home. Thus, they are motivated by their desire to please the parents and abide with their orders. In this regard, it should be highlighted that the Arab families in this study, and many others in Manchester, are a mirror image of their traditional counterparts in the Arab world. In such families parents' control over their children is considerably strict, children are firmly required to obey and respect their parents, they depend on their parents financially until they finish education, do not leave house to live independently until they get married, and there is an emotional bond among family members, etc.

The desire to please parents and the proficiency in Arabic can account for children's interaction in Arabic more than English with siblings in the 5 families in 5.2.2.1. However, children in the 6 families in 5.2.3.1 use English more with siblings although they are competent in Arabic and their parents have the same strategy of using Arabic at home. Hence, the children's own desire to speak Arabic, their native language, can also be taken as a motivation. This motivation applies also to the 3 children in 5.2.2.2 who use Arabic more than English with their Arab peer friends. As stated by a 15-year-old girl: 'I like to speak Arabic; it is a shame to be an Arab and not speak Arabic.' Fulfilling this desire is facilitated by those children's competence in Arabic (children's ability in Arabic will be discussed in chapter 6).

Lack of English proficiency sometimes provides a reason for children's speaking Arabic; precisely with non-English speaking peers (5.2.1.5). Children search for a lingua franca, which is Arabic in this case, to keep the wheel of conversation going on and avoid a communication breakdown. Less ability in English compared with Arabic may also be responsible for children's use of Arabic with the first generation Arabs in general (5.2.1.4). Older Arabs always use Arabic in intra-group communication, whether with adults or children, since they are more competent in Arabic than English. Thus, children may get the feeling that they will not be able to communicate with the first generation

unless they use Arabic with them. They even sometimes do this as a sign of respect as some of them reported since it is impolite to speak to adult Arabs in English. Children may also associate Arabic use with older Arabs since children are required to use Arabic with their parents. That is, they extend the use of Arabic from the parents to first generation Arabs in general; e.g. parents' friends, teachers in the Arabic schools, etc. In the latter case, besides the above motivations, it is also the regulations in the Arabic schools which require that Arabic is the language to be used, especially that teachers always order children to speak in Arabic with them; hence, children try to abide with the orders and regulations.

The motivation for children interaction in English with their Arab peer friends and siblings is that this is a school-like situation. Children spend most of their day at the English school interacting with their peers in English only, be they Arab or British. Hence, they cannot avoid using English when they find themselves with peers; i.e. they associate being with peers with the use of English, whether those peers are their siblings (cf. 5.2.3.1) or friends from outside of the family (section 5.2.4.2). Moreover, in such interactions they are usually not directly observed by parents, unlike when they interact with parents, so they are less likely to be criticized by their parents. In their interactions with siblings children use both Arabic and English with precedence for English in most families (cf. 5.2.3.1) since these interactions occur mostly at home, a domain where Arabic is supposed to be the only language used according to their parents. On the other hand, in their interactions with peer friends outside home they fully import the school language (i.e. English) to be utilized since they are usually totally away from their parents' authority. This is of course facilitated by children's high competence in English, the language they use at school; hence, they find it easy and feel comfortable using English.

5.4.2 Influence of domain, addressee and generation on language choice

It is clear from the above that, as Fishman (1964, 1965 & 1966) states, there is a relationship between language choice on the one hand and the domain of interaction and the type of addressees/participants within the domain on the other hand (cf. Chapter 1, section 1.5.1.1). The setting and the type of addressee and participants within the setting are the main triggers for both generations' choice of Arabic or English (such a choice is facilitated as well by language competence; see section 6.5.2.4 for the relationship between language choice and language ability). For instance, being in the home domain triggers the use of Arabic as the language of interaction. Also, within the

home domain children form a very important trigger for parents' use of Arabic whether in parents' interactions with each other or with the children themselves; and parents in turn form a very important trigger for children's use of Arabic, specifically when interacting with the parents. When children interact with one another, however, English is also used and may even be used more than Arabic in some families. Boumans and Ruiter (2002: 269) discuss the status of Moroccan Arabic in the current European situation and remark that in the second generation, the language of the host country tends to replace Arabic as a means of communication with siblings and friends. Also, Broeder and Extra (1999) in their investigation of language choice patterns among second generation Moroccans in the province of Northern Brabant, Netherlands, found that choosing the mother tongue as the medium of interaction is only done in a dominant manner with the parents (discussed in Boumans and Ruiter 2002: 269-70). Thus, role-relation (e.g. parent-child, child-child, etc.) plays a role in language choice. According to Fishman (1965: 95), in some groups particular language behaviors are required or at least expected of particular individuals with each other; hence, their language behavior is not merely a matter of individual preference, but also a matter of role relations that are related to the socio-cultural norms of the community. Language choice patterns in the present study are related to the socio-cultural norms of the Arabic community, not only to individual preferences. This is important for language maintenance since "language choices, cumulated over many individuals and many choice instances [i.e. the society as a whole, not single individuals and choices], become transformed into the processes of language maintenance and language shift" (Fishman 1966: 429).

Generally, then, we can say that the home domain with most of its components and members is a trigger for using Arabic. This indicates that Arabic is functional, which is important for its maintenance. The importance of the home domain for ethnic language preservation is highlighted by different scholars. For example, Mills (2005: 122), in her study on Spanish use at home among Hispanics in Arizona, demonstrates that once such use is eroded, "there is little hope for continued use of Spanish by individuals and, certainly, across generations." Brown (2008: 1), in his investigation of intergenerational Belarusian utilization and maintenance in Belarus, refers to the home domain as "the last bastion in terms of language maintenance." Moreover, according to Fishman (1964, 1966), the importance of the different domains in maintaining the minority language is relative (cf. section 1.5.1.1). Certain domains seem to be more resistive of language shift than others are; for example, the family domain resists language shift more than, say, the occupation domain does.

The relationship between domain/addressee and language choice, referred to above, exists in other domains as well. For example, being with ethnic friends (the friendship domain) and ethnic contacts (e.g. at the domains of mosque, neighbourhood, shopping, etc.) represents a primary motive for the parents and the first generation in general to use Arabic. However, the existence of non-Arabs in such settings triggers the first generation to use English. In the second generation, the peer group setting in general is a trigger for using English. This includes Arab peers' settings; however, the existence of non-English speaking peers in such settings triggers children to use Arabic. This means that speakers design their speech according to their audience (Bell 1984), which corresponds to Wei's (1994: 93) finding in the Chinese community of Tyneside, Newcastle: they speak both Chinese and English with those who themselves use both languages and they use only Chinese with those who themselves are Chinese monolinguals.

Both generations are different in that the first generation's language choice patterns are uniform, with almost no variation whether in intra-group or inter-group interactions. On the other hand, there is variation in the language choice patterns of the second generation in intra-group interactions, specifically with peers. This refers to an influence of generation on language choice, which is most evident in the domain of friendship and in interactions with peers and siblings. In other words, while parents use Arabic consistently with their Arab peer friends, children's language choice patterns are generally: consistently English with peer friends (cf. 5.2.4.2), mostly English with siblings in 6 families out of 11 (cf. 5.2.3.1), mostly Arabic with siblings in 5 families out of 11 (cf. 5.2.2.1). As mentioned above, the use of English in children-children interaction is a result of the increased input with English through expanded contact with a greater number of speakers due to entering English school, for instance[93]. According to Lanza (1997: 322), the increased amount of input with the language results in an increased amount of output as well. The more children progress in the English educational system, the more they become proficient in English and their language choices tend to be English dominant in their interactions with their peers since as Wei (1994: 104) states, bilingual's language use depends to a big degree upon his/her language ability (cf. Chapter 6 Language Ability, section 6.5.2.4, for more on the relationship between language choice and language ability). Children in the 11 families mentioned above go to English schools. In fact, in the present study, children in the majority of families attend English schools; only 3 families out of 17 have solely children who are under schools age. Thus, children in these 3 families have no ability in English

[93] The notion of input will be further elaborated upon below in section 5.4.4.1.

and interact in Arabic only with peers and/or siblings. Also, children in 2 families out of 17 have limited ability in English since they have not been for long in the English school; consequently they interact with siblings and peer friends in Arabic only. Hence, there might be a relationship between children's language choice with peers and attending English schools or ability in English. A similar finding is reported in Lutz's (2006: 1423) study on Spanish maintenance among Latino Youth in America: the majority of youth acquire the native language first at home; however, once they enter and proceed in school they shift to a greater use of English. In the present study, however, this shift is primarily with peers. In the same vein, Urzúa and Gómez (2008: 456) in their study on Spanish maintenance among Puerto Ricans in Southbridge, Massachusetts, state that regardless of their being born in the host or home country, and regardless of using L1 at home, when children enter school, they are forced to shift to English due to using English as the medium of instruction and communication with peers[94]. The inter-generational differences in language choice patterns, described above, were found also in Kuo's (1974a) study of Mandarin-speaking families in the US Midwest: whereas the parents speak mainly Mandarin at home, half of the children use English all or most of the time when speaking to their siblings and other Chinese children (Luo and Wiseman 2000: 309). However, unlike in the present study, in Kuo's study, children respond in English when addressed in Mandarin by their parents.

5.4.3 Influence of education, occupation and length of stay in Britain on language choice

As illustrated in the Methodology chapter (in the families' description table), the parents in this study vary with regard to their period of stay in Britain, occupation and education. However, as the language choice patterns discussed above (in section 5.2) indicate, all parents maintain demarcation in function between Arabic and English in the various domains of language use whereby English is used for inter-group communication; e.g. workplace, and Arabic for intra-group communication; e.g. ethnic friends and family. Thus, the variation in the parents' level of education, occupation, or length of stay in an English-dominant environment does not seem to have any influence

[94] The effect of school on language choice has been emphasized by other scholars. For example, Porcel's (2006) study among Miami Cubans found that the majority of the second generation Cuban immigrants are English dominant bilinguals, in contrast to a minority in the first generation, and that school plays a crucial role in this regard (Lasagabaster 2008: 70). Moreover, Raschka, Wei and Lee (2002: 10), in their study on the Chinese community in Tyneside, state that as children begin school, they use the dominant language as the principal language of interaction outside the home domain.

on such functional language demarcation that they all sustain. This is a positive indicator for Arabic maintenance since it reveals the important value that they associate with their language. In Urzúa and Gómez's (2008: 457) study on Spanish maintenance among Puerto Ricans in Southbridge, New England, they found that the longer the period spent on the mainland was, the more English was being used at home. Moreover, according to Kloss (1966), high and low educational levels are ambivalent factors that can promote either language maintenance or shift (cf. section 1.5.1.7). In the present study the parents maintain a clear separation between the two languages regardless of such variables, which is an important step towards language maintenance, as will be explained below.

5.4.4 Compartmentalized use of Arabic and English

Wei's (1994) study on the Chinese community in Tyneside, Newcastle reveals that there is no clear demarcation in function between English and Chinese. Both languages are predominantly used in family and intra-group interactions: within the child generation (between children and their siblings, and children and peers); between parent generation and child generation (parents and their children, and parents and other children); and sometimes even within the parent generation, however, with lower rates for English (between spouses at home or between parents and their peers). Thus, the host language creeps into the normal domains of the native language. In the Arabic-speaking community, as just mentioned above, parents maintain a clear compartmentalization in function between the native language and the host language (the former for intra-group functions and the latter for inter-group ones). Children maintain this functional demarcation in their interactions with parents, first generation Arabs, and Arabic-speaking peers who do not speak English. According to the Personal Benefit Model (Karan 2000: 68), "individuals, consciously or subconsciously, make decisions to use certain languages in certain situations" and "these individual decisions are motivated by what people consider to be their personal good" (in Hatoss and Sheely 2009: 129). Thus, the primary motivation behind language choice according to Karan is to get personal benefit. In the case of Arabs in the present study, the personal benefit is maintaining social contact with their own ethnic community on the one hand and managing their life in the wider English community on the other hand. These individual decisions, being accumulatively adopted by the individual members of the community, are turned into collective decisions or a social norm for the whole community. The compartmentalization is important for language maintenance as recurrently mentioned

in the literature (cf. section 1.5.1.1) since it helps sustain a function for the minority language *vis a vis* the dominant language.

5.4.4.1 Discourse strategies as a means to maintain demarcation between Arabic and English

As the parents emphasized and as was observed through the examples in section 5.2.1.3.1, the parents actively try to model a monolingual context for their children in family interactions and even impose language demarcation through using discourse strategies that negotiate a monolingual context, which significantly enhances language maintenance[95]. According to Döpke (1992a: 55), the child's family, especially his/her parents, play an influential role in the acquisition of the minority language. The firm demarcation of the two languages allows the child to process both languages separately, which is believed to be a prerequisite for the acquisition of two independent language systems. In this regard a number of points should be highlighted concerning the strategies used by parents with their children; such strategies which are highly important for minority-language maintenance according to Döpke (1992a), Saunders (1982b), Taechner (1983) and Lanza (1997). First, these strategies are 'high constraint strategies'; e.g. Minimal Grasp, Expressed Guess, Request for Translation, etc. (cf. section 5.2.1.3.1). This helps children develop an active command and use of Arabic which is important for Arabic maintenance. That is, the 'high constraint strategies' require a response, a content response, on the part of the child more than other strategies; e.g. Repetition Strategy (in which the parent just repeats the semantic content of the child's utterance, in a non-question form, using the other language). Hence, they help the child to develop an active competence rather than a passive/receptive competence of the minority language. According to Döpke's (1992a) study, only the children who were met with the so-called 'high constraint strategies' acquired an active command of German, the minority language, and actively used it, since only these strategies require a content response on the part of the children; hence, compel them to apply actively their knowledge of German (Döpke 1992a: 55). In the same vein, Döpke (1992a: 56), cites Saunders (1982b: 140) who states, "it is (...) the father's impression that (...) if he had continued to speak German to Frank and Thomas but had not persisted in eliciting German responses from them, they would have become receiving bilinguals only, with their knowledge of German confined to comprehension and their ability to speak the language limited."

[95] As mentioned in section 5.2.1.3.1, this finding is based on the participants' reports and on what I have observed; there is no way to know whether parents consistently use these discourse strategies when they are not observed.

Moreover, the strategies used by parents are those which negotiate a monolingual context. On the other hand, the strategies which open the opportunity for using both languages; e.g. Move On Strategy and Code-Switching Strategy[96], were not attested. In other words, as the examples in 5.2.1.3.1 indicate, the parents do not simply carry on the dialogue, showing understanding of the child's use of the other language. Rather, they attempt to make the child stick to the native language; for example, they pretend they do not understand and ask for clarification (Minimal Grasp and Expressed Guess Strategies), they do not respond (No-reply Strategy), or they ask for using the native language (Request for Translation Strategy) (for detailed discussion of these strategies see section 5.2.1.3.1 above). The parents' negotiation for a monolingual context with their children through the use of such discourse strategies helps the language socialization of their children, especially when it starts from childhood[97]. According to Lanza (1997: 252), the concept of language socialization was implied in Goodz's (1989) study which looked into the relationship between parental language use and child language mixing in French-English bilingual families in Montreal. The concept means that "parents provide input, metalinguistic input, to their children as to what is appropriate language use" (Lanza 1997: 252). Thus, the linguistic input the parents provide to children in the present study (i.e. their negotiation for a monolingual context with children through using discourse strategies) is more likely to socialize children in monolingualism in family interactions, which has implications for Arabic maintenance. As Lanza states (1997: 317), a greater amount of language preservation may be expected when the minority language-speaking parents utilize discourse strategies which negotiate more of a monolingual context. According to Boumans and Ruiter (2002: 271), a limited amount of input in the minority language made by parents "can be expected to reduce the pace of language acquisition, and even lead to incomplete acquisition, that is, language loss from one generation to the other."

According to Döpke (1992a: 55), the importance of 'consistency' in the parents' language choice has been emphasized by many scholars; e.g. Ronjat 1913, Leopold 1949, McLaughlin 1978, Clyne 1982, Saunders 1982b, Kielhöfer and Jonekeit 1983, and Taeschner 1983. Thus, children's socialization into language compartmentalization or language mixing does not depend solely on the input they receive from parents, but

[96] In the Move On Strategy, the parent just continues the conversation and responds in his/her native language to the child's use of the non-native language. In the Code-Switching Strategy, the parent code-switches in response to his/her child's code-switching.

[97] This negotiation reveals the dynamic, interactive nature of context and language choice as opposed to the static view of context revealed above through indicating language choice as a function of addressee. The dynamic notion of context has been proposed by a number of scholars; e.g. Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz (1978: 12), Goodwin and Duranti (1992: 6 & 31), Duranti (1992), Gumperz (1982a & 1992), and Auer and Di Luzio (1992) (Lanza 1997: 254).

also on the extent to which this input as well as the parents' response to mixing become consistent and accumulated[98]. That is, if the parent usually responds with negative sanctioning to his/her child's mixing, negotiates a monolingual context and does not mix languages with the child, the child is socialized into language demarcation, and vice versa (Lanza 1997: 269). In this regard, as aforementioned, the parents keenly negotiate a monolingual context in interaction with their children. This parents' consistent interactional style influences the child's perception with regard to the appropriateness of mixing (Lanza 1997: 270). Given the plurifunctionality of the linguistic forms used in some discourse strategies; e.g. requests for clarification[99], it is the parents' consistency of interactional style that helps the child interpret the metalinguistic message the parent tries to convey by using the discourse strategies exactly as the parent wants. For instance, if the parent consistently maintains clear separation between the languages in interactions with the child, the child will interpret the 'what' repair cue in the Minimal Grasp Strategy, for instance, as a signal made by the parent since the he/she (the child) has made a mistake (i.e. mixing languages), and not as a request for repetition which will be the case if the parent normally negotiates a bilingual context with the child, mixes languages and accepts mixing (Lanza 1997: 270).

Lanza sees that the strategies that the parents employ to negotiate a monolingual context in discourse with their children are most important for minority-language maintenance in the early years (in which the parents are the main/sole interlocutors the child has) in that they contribute to establishing bilingualism. This is true of her study where the kind of family bilingualism investigated is that in which one parent is a minority-language speaker while the other is a majority-language speaker. In the family bilingualism in the present study, however, both parents are minority-language speakers, which means that children are most likely to be monolingual in the minority language in these early years before school; consequently, there is likely no need to use the strategies in pre-school age. The strategies are most important in establishing and maintaining bilingualism when the input with the majority language increases through augmented contact with a greater number of speakers; e.g. when children start to go to school. Here, I agree with Lanza that other factors as well

[98] According to Cook-Gumperz (1986b: 54), "children's language socialization occurs as part of the continuing history of conversational exchanges that make up daily life" (in Lanza 1997: 269).

[99] Lanza (1997: 262) notes that the linguistic forms that initiate requests for clarification are plurifunctional. For example, according to Corsaro (1977), in addition to their function of requesting clarification, they have their functions as a turn-filler, a means of signaling surprise at a preceding utterance, etc. Also, Langford (1981) noted that such requests as *Pardon? and What?* were often seen by children in his study as an occasion to check for some source of trouble.

enhance language preservation; e.g. the increased contact with speakers of the minority language and going on visits to the homeland (Lanza 1997: 317).

Fishman (1966 & 1991: 162), Jongenburger and Aarssen (2001: 299), and others emphasize the role of the mother as a custodian of the native language (cf. section 1.5.1.1). Also, according to Luo and Wiseman's (2000: 320) study on ethnic language maintenance among Chinese immigrant children in the US, the mothers' role in shaping the language behavior of children; i.e. language use, proficiency, etc., is more important than that of the fathers, which might be related to the different roles that mothers and fathers play. That is, whereas the traditional role of the father is that of a remote and strict, the customary role of the mother is that of the emotionally committed caretaker (Luo and Wiseman 2000: 320, discussing Shon and Ja 1982: 212). On the other hand, Lanza (1997: 250-51), commenting on Döpke (1986 & 1992a) and Russell (1987), states that "if the father is the input for the minority language, and he is a traditional father [i.e. being more involved in play than in child care as in Russell's study], there is a greater chance of success for language maintenance." This is because play lends itself to more child-centred speech or mode of interaction which, according to Döpke, the more the minority language parent utilizes in interaction with the child, the more the child is likely to acquire and speak the minority language. Although this view is concerned with discourse structures of parents following the one person, one language strategy in international families[100], it has, along with Fishman's and Jongenburger and Aarssen's views, implications for Arabic maintenance in the present study since both parents in all the families are minority-language speakers (i.e. Arabs). Hence, it can be hypothesized that the parental discourse strategies have a stronger impact in the present study in terms of socializing children into monolingualism in family interactions since they are used by both parents. Of noteworthiness here is that the use of the strategies by the father in particular is highly important in the case of the Arab families in this study since in these families the father is the main authority at home, unlike the situation in western communities[101]. This authority extends to some extent to the language behavior to be followed by children at home. Hence, when the father uses discourse strategies, he highlights the inappropriateness of mixing and the necessity of monolingualism in family interactions, which consequently becomes the norm for children at home. The influence of Arab fathers on Arabic maintenance has been referred to as well by Penny and Khoo's (1996) finding that in international families in

[100] Where one parent is a minority-language speaker and the other is a majority-language speaker; e.g. in Döpke's studies of bilingual German-English families in Australia.

[101] This corresponds to Ahdab-Yehia's (1980: 147) finding, in her study in the Detroit Maronite Arabic community, that for the majority of the respondents (72%) fathers or husbands are "the figure of authority" at home.

Australia with Muslim Arab fathers and non-Muslim, non-Arab mothers, the children and the mothers had learnt to speak Arabic well (discussed in Clyne and Kipp 1999: 141).

5.4.5 Does the existence of multiple dialects of Arabic influence Arabic language use?

The existence of multiple dialects does not influence the communicative function of Arabic and its use in interaction in intra-group situations where speakers of the different dialects exist. The patterns of language choice indicate that parents always use Arabic in pan-dialect interactions; e.g. with Arab friends and contacts from the different countries (cf. section 5.2.1.6). In all the patterns where Arabic is mentioned to be used, what is meant by Arabic is the relevant dialect to every individual participant. Thus, when first generation speakers use Arabic for interactions with ethnic friends and contacts, the implication is that each speaker is using his/her own dialect for this purpose[102] since all the participants have contacts and friends from the different Arab countries. The same applies to the child generation, especially in their interactions with the first generation; e.g. their parents' friends, and in interaction with their peer children who do not speak English. In the last case, it has been shown through examples in section 5.2.1.5 that occasionally some children attempt to make some use of the dialect of the child who does not speak English. Also, as illustrated in section 5.3, the participants watch Arabic satellite channels in the different dialects.

All of this demonstrates that, as explained in chapter 4, the spoken Arabic dialects investigated in this study are mutually intelligible and that the existence of multiple dialects, as the study's sample indicates, does not prevent the existence of an Arabic-speaking community whose members are able to communicate successfully, with each using his/her own dialect (cf. Chapter 4, for detailed illustration). Thus, it becomes obvious to an Arab immigrant that he/she does not need to speak all dialects in order to be able to communicate with other Arabs. What are needed are two things: the immigrant speaking his/her own dialect, and a receptive knowledge of the other dialects. Concerning the first, since all Arabic dialects are spoken varieties, they are acquired at home, given the importance of home domain in L1 maintenance (Fishman 1964; 1966). Thus, it is the responsibility of the family to speak their relevant dialect Arabic at home in order to transmit it to children. As illustrated above, in the participant families, Arabic (the relevant dialect to each family) is the language of communication

[102] As illustrated in chapter 4, there might be sometimes a sort of accommodation; e.g. when the speaker uses an expression or a word that is not used in the dialect of his addressee (see section 4.2.1.1.5 for detailed illustration).

between the parents and children at home (see also chapter 6, for a discussion of children's spoken language ability).

In terms of the second; i.e. the receptive knowledge of the other dialects, it can be acquired naturally without great effort or prior instructions due to the similarities that exist between the various dialects (cf. Chapter 4); and in the community through direct, face-to-face contact with Arabs from the different countries or indirect contact through the Arabic-speaking media. For example, the first generation are accustomed to being in contact with the various dialects even before immigration, either directly through face to face communication with other Arabs who work and live in their homeland; e.g. Iraqis, Libyans, etc.; or indirectly through TV and media. Hence, they already have such receptive knowledge. As for the second generation, who have been born in the UK, they also acquire such receptive knowledge through contact with Arabs in Manchester or through watching Arabic media. For example, during the participant observation and during daily contact within the Arabic-speaking community, it was observed that Arab children interact with Arabs, especially adults speaking other dialects than theirs, without failure in communication (see section 6.4.1).

Thus, as far as Arabic use is concerned, the multiple Arabic dialects do not play any negative role in Arabic maintenance. Rather, they seem to play a positive role, especially in the child generation. That is, the existence of various mutually intelligible dialects in close proximity during daily face-to-face interaction, the prevalent sense among Arabs in this study that they all speak Arabic regardless of the various dialects (as will be illustrated in chapter 7), their existence as a speech community, and their being in diaspora where everybody seeks out common things that will tie him/her with people of his/her own ethnolinguistic group, all gives acceptance to, and develops tolerance towards, the various linguistic structures used in the various dialects. This lessens the restrictions on the use of language (spoken language; i.e. the dialects) with regard to correctness of grammar, vocabulary, etc., especially in children's speech. That is, a child may use a lexical item or a structure from a dialect other than his/hers, which sometimes occurs in the participant families as reported by parents, without being criticized by parents as being incorrect. Moreover, Arabs usually have receptive competence only in the various dialects and cannot evaluate whether a speaker of another dialect speaks it well or not. All this encourages children to speak and functionalize the language, which is important for the maintenance of it (cf. section 1.5.1.8), since children do not fear to be measured in, or criticized at, their proficiency level in spoken Arabic; i.e. their dialect. It is such criticism that led children in some minority-language communities to decide to stop using their language. For example, according to Thomason (2001: 53), it is said that in two minority languages in the

United States: Chinook in the Pacific Northwest and Swedish in areas of the northern Midwest populated by Swedish immigrants, "the elders in the community laughed at the children for making mistakes in the community's ethnic-heritage language; unwilling to undergo continual teasing, the children simply switched completely and permanently to English."

Having discussed the communicative function of Arabic for the participants within their ethnic community in Manchester, I will discuss below this function in the homeland. In this regard, globalization and the supraterritorial activities linked to it play an important role.

5.4.6 The role of globalization, and the associated supraterritorial activities[103], in providing a function for Arabic in the homeland

The functionality of Arabic exceeds the intra-group settings in Manchester to the homeland. The advances in communication technology and transportation means that accompanied the contemporary large-scale globalization led to "deterritorialization –or … the growth of supraterritorial relations between people" (Scholte 2000: 46). This proliferation and spread of 'transborder' connections influence the immigrants' social network structure and make it possible for immigrants to sustain regular, close and concrete interactions with the country of origin, which is important for language maintenance, especially among children. For example, the current advances in communication technology made it easy and affordable for the participant families to maintain regular contact with their relatives and friends in the homeland and in other countries through the telephone, internet, etc. By contrast, in the past, as emphasized by the participants, the primary means of contacting the homeland was letters and then the telephone which was very expensive. Thus, at that time contact with the homeland was limited due to financial, and sometimes technical, reasons. The advances in world transportation made it possible and affordable for Arabs in the present study to regularly visit the homeland or/and be visited by relatives from the homeland. All the participant families visit their country of origin at least once a year; some families even visit the homeland twice a year. In fact, social networks in the homeland (e.g. relatives, friends, contacts, etc.) may be more important for Arabic maintenance among Arab children in this study than social networks in Manchester. That is, in the present study, the data on language choice indicate that one of the domains in which Arabic is used

[103] For a discussion of globalization and the different supraterritorial activities associated with it, see section 1.6.2.

consistently is the parents' interaction with their Arab friends in Manchester. By contrast, children's interaction with their Arab friends in Manchester is a domain in which English is used consistently. Thus, while the participants' social networks in Manchester, particularly friends, influence the parents to use Arabic, they influence the children to use English, which is not in favor of Arabic maintenance. On the other hand, the parents' and children's social networks in the homeland influence both of them towards the use and maintenance of Arabic since they need it when visiting or contacting the homeland.

5.5 Conclusion

The language choice patterns reveal some facts that are highly significant for Arabic maintenance in Manchester: first, the functionality of Arabic in daily interactions in the participant families. In this respect, parents maintain clear separation in function between the two languages whereby Arabic is reserved for family and intra-group communication, and English for the inter-group one. This protects traditional domains of native language use; e.g. home. Children, as well, maintain demarcation between Arabic and English in interactions with parents, first generation Arabs, and Arabic monolingual peers. They also use Arabic along with English in interactions with siblings. Thus, Arabic has a role in the lives of the first and second generations, which is suggestive of language maintenance. As Haugen emphasizes, the communicative function of language is the main factor for language maintenance (1980: 114). Of noteworthiness here is that the existence of multiple Arabic dialects does not influence the use of Arabic in pan-dialect situations (cf. 5.4.5). Also, Globalization, through the associated advances in communication technology and transportation means, helps provide a function for Arabic in the homeland (cf. 5.4.6). The existence of Arabic speakers in domains where English usually dominates, e.g. shops, hospitals, etc., also creates more opportunities and more domains to use the language in so that an Arab living in Manchester can manage his/her life communicating mostly in Arabic. This is facilitated by the availability of Arabic provisions in the local government institutions (cf. Chapter 3).

Despite the functionality of Arabic explained above, the differences in the motivations of both generations to use Arabic in their interactions may raise some concerns about the future of Arabic in the third generation when the second generation get married and have children. For children, most of the motivations are external stemming from their pragmatic need to be able to communicate, to please their parents, to abide with regulations, etc. On the other hand, the parents' motivations to use Arabic are mostly internal stemming from their own internal desire to feel the homeland, to

maintain their native language, etc. For example, the second generation's choice of Arabic is sometimes triggered by the first generation's better ability in Arabic than English. When this second generation have children and become parents, such ability trigger will no longer exist; hence, they may interact with their prospective children in English[104]. Thus, unless the second generation have the motivation, like the first generation, to maintain their native language, there might be less chance of Arabic maintenance in the third generation, and Arabic language may follow the typical three generation language shift pattern (cf. section 1.3.2 for a discussion of this pattern).

Having explored the participants' language choice patterns, it is necessary to examine their language abilities, as shown below.

[104] Boumans and Ruiter (2002: 270) give a similar view in their study which discusses the status of Moroccan Arabic in the current European situation.

6 Language Ability

6.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter, language choice patterns for the first and second generations were investigated. To explore further Arabic language maintenance/shift, I will investigate in this chapter the two generations' abilities to use Arabic and/or English. First, I provide an introduction in this section (6.1) in which I explain which aspects of ability will be investigated, followed by an illustration of methods of data collection (section 6.2). Parent's and children's language abilities are discussed in sections 6.3 and 6.4 respectively. Then, an analysis of such findings is given in section 6.5. Finally, a conclusion is provided in section 6.6.

In investigating language ability I am not concerned with testing such aspects as accuracy, grammar, rules of sentence formation, lexical items, complexity of speakers' linguistic structures, etc. The terms proficiency, competence, and ability will be used interchangeably to refer to "the actual knowledge a speaker has of a language which is made use of in a variety of situations" (Wald 1981: 2, cited in Wei 1994: 105). Thus, I have examined whether speakers can use Arabic and/or English to perform a range of practical, communicative tasks. The rationale behind adopting this approach is that a speaker may have knowledge of many aspects of the language (e.g. grammar, lexical items, etc), but is unable to use this knowledge in real interaction. This real ability to use the language for natural purposes in realistic interaction situations is, in my opinion, the most important criterion for evaluating language maintenance/shift in immigrant contexts. Wei (1994) employed the same method to investigate language ability in the Chinese community in Tyneside, Newcastle. Dweik (2000: 189) as well in his study among Chechens in Jordan utilized the same method for testing proficiency.

The ability to use the language in social interaction "is usually acquired through socialization, and cannot properly be assessed out of context" (Wei 1994: 105). Hence, the participants' language ability was examined during the participant observation and interviews through investigating their general competence (e.g. whether they can speak Arabic/English, Understand Arabic/English, etc.) and situation-specific competence (e.g. whether they can converse about topic X in Arabic/English, etc.). This latter type produces more precise evaluations (McKinnie and Priestly 2004: 31). I also made use of Wei's (1994: 106) five conditions according to which he assessed the speaker's spoken and written language ability in Chinese and English. These five conditions are as follows:

Spoken language (for both host and ethnic language):

1- Can understand routine greetings, simple statements and questions (e.g. statements and questions about health, weather, prices of goods in shops, etc.).
2- Can make simple statements and answer simple questions.
3- Can partake in casual conversation.
4- Can understand radio and TV programs, films, etc.
5- Can communicate efficiently and with general ease in a range of social contexts.

Written language (for both host and ethnic language):

1- Can read simple signs and notices; e.g. in shops and streets.
2- Can write own name and a few simple words.
3- Can fill in simple forms and write informal letters.
4- Can read newspapers, books, magazines, and formal business documents.
5- Can efficiently perform a range of tasks which entail the use of written language

As Wei states, conditions 1 and 2 (for both spoken and written languages) are indicators for a 'basic' ability to use and understand the language. Not fulfilling these conditions refers to a 'zero' ability to use the language. Condition 3 indicates that the speaker has 'average' language ability. Conditions 4 and 5 are respectively indicators for 'above average' and 'near native' ability.

In the existing literature on language maintenance and shift in linguistic minority communities, the focus has been on investigating bilinguals' ability to use the spoken language more than on their ability to use the written language (Wei 1994: 107). In the present study, I will investigate ability in Arabic and English in the different language skills: speaking and understanding, and reading and writing. Examining ability in the different skills in the two languages is important. For example, Wei (1994: 107) states: "Bilinguals, especially young bilinguals, can very often speak two languages with similar degree of fluency while being literate in only one - usually the language they learn in school." Thus, in addition to assessing bilinguals' spoken language ability, their literacy ability has to be examined as well (Wei 1994: 107, discussing the Linguistic Minorities Project 1985, and Williams & Snipper 1990).

I will pay more attention to the parents' ability in English, and the children's ability in Arabic. The logic behind this is that parents are undoubtedly natively proficient in Arabic since they all came to Britain as adults; hence, there is no need to focus on their competence in Arabic. Concerning children, as was observed during the participant

observation, they are competent in English due to attending English schools (cf. Analysis section in this chapter: section 6.5.3 on factors for children's ability in English). This was emphasized as well by the parents in the interviews and casual conversations. Even the children who have not gone to the English school yet or those who have been in it for a short period are most likely to become proficient in English as they advance in the English educational system. This is what I observed and what the parents emphasized based on the experience with the older children in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester.

6.2 Methods of collecting the data

McKinnie and Priestly (2004: 26-29) give a typology of methods for assessing linguistic competence of bilinguals (e.g. observation, self-assessment, evaluation in the field by peers, etc.)[105]. Also, according to Fishman, to assess competencies "there is usually no practical alternative to either collecting self-report data about them …, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, to letting trustworthy and informed observers report their impressions as well and as uniformly as they can" (1991: 49). In the present study, participant observation and parents' and children's reports were utilized to gain insights into language ability. My choice of methodology was based on the following reasoning: First, as Fishman (1991: 49) states, competence can be inferred from "observed listening-to-[Arabic/English] behavior; e.g., observed laughing or smiling at the right time when in earshot of [Arabic/English] humor, observed correct following of oral or written instructions conveyed in [Arabic/English], etc". Competence can also be inferred at the level of production from observed use of Arabic/English in the different everyday situations. This can be achieved by trained observers who have been in "protracted face-to-face interaction" with the population under investigation (Fishman 1991: 49). Given the fact that I am a member of the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester, I have been able to observe such things in the natural environment of the home during the family visits, in the wider Arabic-speaking community during get-togethers at mosque, Parks, the Arabic schools, etc.

Second, since parents are in direct contact with their children they are "in the best position to provide as accurate data as possible" (Villa and Villa 2005: 169) concerning their children's language ability, especially in Arabic. Thus, I also depended on the parents' evaluation of their children's language ability, especially with regard to colloquial Arabic given the existence of various Arabic dialects. This 'Reported

[105] McKinnie and Priestly's typology is based to a large extent, as they mention, on Blair (1990: 67-106), with additions culled from the literature and their own experience.

Proficiency Evaluation' (Radloff 1991: 127-53) has been elicited from the parents during the semi-structured interviews through pre-prepared questions and during the participant observation through informal casual questions. Third, 'self-assessment' (McKinnie and Priestly 2004) provides significant insights into language competence. For example, Hatoss and Sheely (2009) utilized it in their investigation of language skills of the Sudanese-Australian refugee-background youth. Also, Fishman and Cooper (1971: 138) found that self-assessment for proficiency in Spanish was significantly related to the total Spanish repertoire. Moreover, Lemmon and Goggin (1989) found that self-ratings effectively reflect language abilities (in McKinnie and Priestly 2004: 28). Hence, self-assessments were taken into consideration and elicited during the interviews and the participant observation. Given the potential limitations of self-assessments; e.g. that they might be biased or might not reflect adequately real language ability, they were combined with other assessment methods, especially direct observation. Such triangulation increases the accuracy of the data collected (cf. Methodology chapter for more on the triangulations used in this study).

Concerning children's command of Modern Standard Arabic, it was assessed at the level of literacy ability in it since MSA is primarily the written medium for Arabic-speakers, as well as at the level of the receptive understanding in it which Arabic speakers normally need in such formal registers as the Arabic education, religious speech, and the news (and also MSA children materials broadcasted on Arabic TV). In this regard, attending an Arabic school and the child's academic level at the school were good indicators of their command of Standard Arabic (besides my personal observation during the family visits, at mosque, etc., parents' reports on their children's proficiency, and children's self-assessments). This is because in all the Arabic schools the different modules are in MSA, and students must sit the exams in MSA. Moreover, there is an Arabic-language module in all schools, and even in some schools Arabic language and Quran are the main modules taught.

6.3 Parent/first generation's language ability

The first generation led most of their lives and received most or all of their education in the homeland. Hence, all of them are more proficient in Arabic (spoken and written) than English. The first generation have ability in spoken English (which they use in interactions with non-Arabs at work, mosque, etc.) and written English. However, there are individual differences in this regard, which are attributable to a number of factors, as will be explained later in the analysis, section 6.5.1 (the tables below show parents' ability in English). The assessments of parents' ability in spoken and written

English are based on participant observation in different social contexts in which Wei's conditions, given above, were employed. Utilizing Wei's (1994: 106) conditions, the majority of fathers (14 out of 17) were observed to have 'near native' ability in spoken English (i.e. fulfilling condition 5: can communicate efficiently and with general ease in a range of social contexts), 2 fathers have 'above average' ability (i.e. fulfilling condition 4: can understand radio and TV programs), and 1 father has 'average' ability (i.e. fulfilling condition 3: can partake in casual conversation). As for mothers, the majority of them (15 out of 17) have 'average' ability in spoken English, and 2 of them have 'above average' ability. The important point to highlight here with regard to parents' ability in spoken English is that all parents have the ability to communicate using English. Concerning written English, it was observed that 12 fathers have 'near native' ability (i.e. fulfilling condition 5: can efficiently fulfil a range of tasks which require the use of written language), and 5 fathers have 'average' ability (i.e. fulfilling condition 3: can fill in simple forms and write informal letters). With regard to mothers, 15 of them have 'average' ability in written English, and 2 have 'near native' ability.

Table 3 parents' ability in spoken English

Level	**Fathers**	**Mothers**
Average	1	15
Above average	2	2
Near native	14	-
Total No.	17	17

Table 4 parents' ability in written English

Level	**Fathers**	**Mothers**
Average	5	15
Near native	12	2
Total No.	17	17

6.4 Child/second generation's language ability

6.4.1 Speaking and understanding

In all the families, children speak and understand their respective dialect of Arabic well. They can sustain a conversation in it; this is evident in their conversations with their parents and the first generation Arabs (cf. Chapter 5 Language Choice). They can, for instance, understand commands, give and follow instructions, give directions, invite people to their house, ask questions, and tell the story of an event. Generally, children can communicate efficiently in their dialect of Arabic in different social contexts. Consider, for example, this conversation between a mother and her 7-year-old daughter during a visit to my home:

Mother:	ʔišrabī il-ʿaṣīr.
	'Drink the juice.'
Daughter:	mū ʿaṭšāna.
	'I am not thirsty.'
Mother:	rūḥī lʿabī maʿa Jana.
	'Go and play with Jana.'
Daughter:	ṭayyib, kam ʿumrahā?
	'OK, how old is she?'

During one of the visits to another Family, their 10-year-old son told the story of someone found killed near their home. He told the whole story in Arabic: how the gang chased the killed person, how he went upstairs in one of the buildings then came down, how they killed him with a knife, how the police came and what they did, etc. The same boy in another situation at mosque talked about a competition in the Arabic school which he attended three days a week (besides the English mainstream school). The competition was on memorizing a Surah (a chapter) from the Quran. He explained how the competition went, which parts of the Quran he recited, the number of children participants and from which level, and how he did in the competition. He explained all this in Arabic. Moreover, during a visit to a different family, the father and the eldest daughter (15 years old) engaged in a debate about her friends, which was conducted all in Arabic; she even used some sophisticated Arabic words in this debate; e.g. *ʿurūbtī* 'my Arabnesss', *hawītī* 'my identity', etc.

Children understand Modern Standard Arabic when they listen to religious speeches, when they watch materials in it on the Arabic TV, etc. (I discuss here only the receptive competence in MSA, and as aforementioned, the criterion of assessment is

whether children can understand MSA in such contexts that normally require this receptive competence (cf. section 6.2 above). Thus, Wei's conditions for spoken language ability were not utilized here since these conditions are for everyday spoken language, which is not the case with regard to MSA[106]). For example, older children can to a great extent understand the news in MSA on channels such as Al-Jazeera, Al-Arabiyya, etc. They understand as well religious speeches given in MSA; e.g. the Friday Speech and the speeches on the Arabic TV. Children can also understand cartoons in MSA broadcasted on Arabic channels such as 'Al-Jazeera for Kids', 'Al-Majd for Kids', etc. The parents said that children sometimes need help from them when they do not understand the meaning of a word or an expression. In one of the visits to a family, the children were watching a cartoon in MSA; they were very attracted to it which indicates that they understood and were not only watching the pictures since they were old: a 12 year old son and a 6 year old daughter. They also explained what the cartoon was about. In another family, children (13 years and 9 years), after attending the Friday Congregational Prayer at mosque, were engaged in a debate about different aspects of the Friday Speech which was given (in MSA) prior the prayer. In a different family, their 18-year-old son was observed watching a documentary in MSA on Al-Jazeera Documentary channel about 1991 Gulf War. Also, in all the families, parents are keen that their children learn and memorize parts of the Quran. Some of the families depend on the Arabic schools to that end. Other families send their children to mosque to learn it. Still others teach their children the Quran themselves at home. In two of the families, the fathers and children (two boys and a girl) used to meet twice a week to read and memorize the Quran. Children recite the Quran very well according to the rules of reciting. In these two families parents exert a lot of effort to teach children reciting the Quran. As will be illustrated below, learning the Quran enhances to some extent certain aspects of competence in Arabic (cf. section 6.5.2.3).

Children understand other dialects of Arabic than theirs when, for instance, they watch Arabic channels or when they talk to Arabs from the different Arab countries. They might be even more competent in the dialects than their peers in the homeland since they are in daily face-to-face interaction with these dialects, unlike their peers in the Arab world. This receptive competence guarantees successful communication (Romaine 1994: 23) in pan-dialect interaction. For example, this is a conversation between myself (R) and a 3-year-old boy during a visit to a Jordanian family. The boy was very sleepy and wanted to go to bed:

Boy: rāḥ nām.

[106] I will return to Modern Standard Arabic below when I discuss children's literacy abilities.

'I will sleep.'

R: lī?

'Why?'

Boy: ʔanā ta'bān.

'I am tired.'

Boy: ʔi'ṭīnī baskūt.

'Give me a biscuit.'

R: ʔinta miš ʔult hatnām?

'Didn't you say you would sleep?'

Boy: bakulhā wa-nā nāyim.

'I will eat it while sleeping.'

R: ṭayyib ṣaḥṣaḥ wa-nād dīk waḥda.

'OK, wake up and I will give you one.'

Boy: lā ʔanā bnām.

'No, I will sleep.'

In this example, the child did not face any problem in understanding such Egyptian Arabic constructions that are not used in the Jordanian dialect; e.g. the negation particle *miš*, or the expression used for 'wake up' *ṣaḥṣaḥ*. This applies also to the constructions that are pronounced differently in both dialects; e.g. the pronunciation of *ʔult* and *lī* which respectively are pronounced as *gulit* and *līš* in Jordanian Arabic. Moreover, during a mobile phone call with an Iraqi participant, his 10-year-old daughter wanted to talk to my daughter (Jana), so he asked me to put the phone on the loudspeaker for Jana. This is the conversation between the two girls. Notice that the Iraqi girl sometimes even tried to speak in Egyptian Arabic:

Girl: kīfik yā Jana? ʔintī gamīla.

'*How are you, Jana? You are beautiful*.'

Jana: ʔizzayyik?

'How are you?'

Girl: ʔintī izzayyik?

'You, how are you?'

Jana: hatīgī 'andinā?

'*Will you visit us*?'

Girl: ṭab'an.

'*Of course*.'

Jana: hastannākī.

'*I will wait for you*.'

Girl: in šā ʔallāh.

'*God willing*.'

Consider also this conversation between myself and a 12-year-old son during a visit to a Saudi family; the boy was watching an Arabic show on an Arabic channel for children:

R: qanāt ʔī dī ?

'*What is this channel?*'

Son: qanāt Barā'im.

'*Toddlers' channel.*'

R: dī gdīda?

'*Is it new?*'

Son: ʔī, jdīda.

'*Yes, new.*'

R: bitšūf fīhā ʔī?

'*What do you watch on it?*'

Son: biti'riḍ kartūn.

'*It shows* cartoon.'

R: ʔik-kartūn illī bti'riḍū biykūn bil-fuṣḥā walla bil 'āmmiyya?

'*The cartoon it shows is in standard or colloquial Arabic?*'

Son: bil-fuṣḥā.

'*In standard Arabic.*'

In this example, communication ran smoothly despite the differences between the Egyptian and Saudi dialects. For instance, 'what' and 'this' are pronounced in Egyptian Arabic as *ʔī* and *dī*, whereas in Saudi Arabic they are pronounced as *ʔīš* and *hāḏī*. Likewise, the child could easily understand the Egyptian realization of the sound /j/ in Saudi Arabic, which is /g/, as in the word *gdīda* 'new.'

To sum up, children can speak and understand their relevant dialect of Arabic well. They also have receptive ability in MSA and in other Arabic dialects than theirs. There are, however, differences amongst children due to the differences in their age, for example. Older children who are, for instance, 15 or 16 years old are more competent in the language in terms of aspects such as choice of lexical items, complexity of linguistic structure, etc. than the younger ones; e.g. those who are 4 or 5 years old. This is because older children have more years of exposure to the language

in the home, the community, etc. due to their age. However, generally, all children have the ability to use the language for natural purposes in realistic interaction situations, which is the criterion employed to assess ability in this study, as illustrated above.

6.4.2 Reading and writing

Children in 3 families are under school age. The rest of the families (14 families) have children who go to school; all of them (39 children) go to Arabic schools besides the English schools. These Arabic schools teach the curricula taught in the Arab countries; e.g. the Saudi school teaches the entire Saudi curricula, the Libyan Schools teach the entire Libyan curricula, etc. Other schools teach only Arabic language and Islamic religion. In all these schools text books are in MSA and children must sit the exams in MSA. Thus, children can normally read and write in MSA. Besides, the parents confirmed that their children could read and write and that they learnt this in the Arabic schools. Utilizing Wei's (1994: 106) conditions, children's ability to read and write Arabic were observed to range between 'basic', which applies to children in their early years in the Arabic school (i.e. fulfil conditions 1 and 2: can read simple signs and notices, and can write own name and simple words); 'average' (i.e. fulfil condition 3: can fill in simple forms and write informal letters); and 'above average' (i.e. fulfil condition 4: can read newspapers, books, magazines, etc.) (the table below shows children's ability in written Arabic). The latter two ability levels, 'average' and 'above average', apply to older children who are in higher levels in the Arabic schools. However, the differences in children's ability in reading and writing are not only due to age or years of attending Arabic schools in Manchester. There are 3 children in 3 families who have 'near native' ability in reading and writing, as shown in table 5, although they are younger (two are 15 years old and the third is 12 years old) than some of the children who have 'above average' ability. One of those children, his parents have sent him to the homeland to complete his primary education. The other 2 children arrived in Manchester after they have received part of their primary education in the homeland.

The important point with regard to children's ability in written Arabic is that children have a certain level of ability in it, which they mainly learn in the Arabic schools in Manchester. This ability was observed during fieldwork on different occasions. In one of the families, the father used to take his 10-year-old son to mosque every weekend to revise with him the Arabic lessons that the child learnt in the Arabic school. During one of these sessions, the father first dictated the son a text in Arabic to train him on writing. The son wrote most of it correctly without making mistakes. Then he asked the son to read a text from one of the books he was studying at the Arabic school and the

child did very well. At this point I interrupted the child and asked him to explain what he understood from what he read, and he did explain it well. In another family, their son was saying that there were many Arabic channels that he used to watch online; so I asked him to write down the names of these channels and how to access them online. He started to write the steps of how to access them; then he wrote the names of each channel and when he came to the name of one of them which was difficult to write; i.e. 'Al Jazeera for Kids, his younger sister (9 years old) challenged him that he could not write it and offered to write it for him, however, he could write it.

Table 5 Children's ability in written Arabic based on observation

Basic	Average	Above average	Near native	Total No.
13	7	16	3	39

Although children in the 14 families can speak and understand their respective dialects of Arabic, and can read, write and understand MSA, they are more competent in speaking than in reading and writing. They speak Arabic more than they read or write it, and the spoken language is more important for them than the written language since they need the spoken language in daily communication. Moreover, like their peers in the Arab world, they learn to speak (at home) long before they learn to read and write (which occurs systematically in the Arabic schools). This affects their relative ability in such skills. Only the 3 children, referred to above, who received part of their education in the homeland can be excluded from this; those children's ability in reading and writing is close to their spoken Arabic ability.

We have explored above the first and second generation's language abilities. The focus in the first generation has been on English language ability whereas in the second it has been on Arabic language ability. In the next section, these findings will be analyzed. First, the variance in parents' ability in English will be discussed to understand the reasons behind it. Then, the factors for children's ability in Arabic and English respectively will be explained.

6.5 Analysis

6.5.1 Variance in parents' ability in English

There are differences among parents in their ability in spoken and written English that are attributable to a number of factors. For example, as shown in section 6.3, there are gender differences; i.e. the fathers are usually more proficient in English

than the mothers. While the vast majority of fathers have work, the vast majority of mothers do not (cf. Methodology chapter). Even those mothers who work (2 mothers) are teachers at Arabic schools; hence, all their colleagues are Arabs. This means that mothers have almost no chance for intensive interacting in and practising of English, apart from the limited chances they get, for instance, during shopping, at mosque, etc. Thus, these differences between fathers and mothers can be also related to occupation/non-occupation differences or differences in the degree of interaction within the host community and in the host language. For example, one of fathers does not work and his ability in spoken English is less than that of other fathers although he has been in Manchester for 6 years; likewise, 2 of the mothers are students (one is a PhD candidate and the other is an undergraduate student) and their spoken English ability is higher than the that of the other mothers since they have more chances for practising English.

While having an occupation or not affects the degree of parents' ability in spoken English, the type of occupation does not seem to play a role in this regard. The fathers work in a variety of jobs ranging from white-collar jobs; e.g. doctors, university teachers, accountants, etc. to blue-collar ones; e.g. construction, taxi driving, etc. (cf. Methodology chapter). Nonetheless, they are competent in speaking English regardless of the kind of job each one has. The type of occupation affects, however, the parents' ability in written English. For example, the fathers who work in jobs that require high command of written English, e.g. a doctor, a university lecturer, etc., are more competent in written English than the fathers who work as a barber, a mechanic, etc. Fathers with blue-collar jobs form 4 out of 5 fathers whose written English ability is 'average', as opposed to the rest of fathers (12 fathers) who have 'near native' ability. However, the degree of ability in English literacy is influenced by other factors, such as the level of parents' education, whether parents have received some education in Britain, and the level of English learning they achieved in their homeland before immigration[107]. For instance, the 12 fathers with 'near native' ability in written English, besides having jobs that require high command of written English, all have university degrees, some of them received part of their education in the UK (as is the case with those with post-graduate degrees), and others received their higher education in the homeland in English[108].

According to Kloss (1966), a lower educational level may lead to isolation from the host culture, which helps maintenance. On the other hand, a higher level of

[107] In most of the Arab countries, English is taught as a school subject throughout education until university.
[108] Also, some parents have taken English courses after arriving in Britain.

education increases the possibility of contact with the host community and brings the immigrants closer to its culture, thus, it may suggest language shift (see also Conklin and Lourie 1983). While education and occupation affect positively parents' ability in English and enhance it, these variables, and the increased English competence resulting from them, do not seem to influence parents' ability in Arabic (spoken and written). Parents are as competent in Arabic as their peers in the homeland; they are generally more competent in Arabic than in English. It is the parents' ability in Arabic that seems to affect their English ability. That is, since parents were born and lived most of their life in the homeland, they are natively proficient in Arabic and feel more comfortable using it; hence, they use it more than English, which is not in favor of their proficiency in English. Wei (1994) found that speakers who are proficient in Chinese have moderate or low ability in English while those with limited command of Chinese have a better command of English (1994: 110).

6.5.2 Factors for children's ability in Arabic

6.5.2.1 Formal learning of Arabic in Arabic schools or/and homeland

A number of explanations can be provided for children's competence in Arabic (spoken and written). For instance, attending Arabic schools is the main factor for ability in Arabic literacy. The second generation acquires spoken Arabic at home and literacy in Arabic at the Arabic schools. Thus, children in 14 families out of 17 can read and write in Arabic since they go to Arabic schools (the children in the remaining 3 families are under-school-age). In this regard, parents and children emphasized that if the children had not attended Arabic schools, they would not have been able to learn Arabic literacy. This was stressed as well by the teachers and head teachers in the Arabic schools. Also, some parents had tried hard to teach their children literacy at home before they sent them to Arabic schools, but never succeeded or achieved a very limited success compared with that achieved when children joined Arabic schools. The Arabic schools are also important for spoken Arabic competence since "the formal learning of Standard Arabic might revive the student's ethnic identity and spiritual motivation, which could lead to a retrieval of the spoken language" (Rouchdy 2002: 145). All this highlights the role of ethnic schools in immigrant language proficiency and maintenance (cf. Chapter 3). For example, Lutz (2006: 1427), in her study among Latino youth in America, found that those who go to Cuban private bilingual schools are much more likely to speak Spanish than their peers who attend mainstream schools.

Receiving part of the primary education in the homeland is another factor that positively influences children's ability in Arabic, especially literacy. Although children in

14 families can speak their respective dialects of Arabic, and can read and write in MSA, they are more competent in speaking than in reading and writing. Excluded from this are 3 children in 3 families whose Arabic literacy ability is close to their spoken one. Parents and children said that the reason for this is that these 3 children have received part of their primary education in the homeland. Teachers in the Arabic schools as well hold this view regarding receiving part of education in the homeland. For instance, one of the Arabic teachers referred to a piece of written composition by a girl who received education in her homeland until year 6. The teacher was impressed by the high quality of the girl's style and choice of words. Luo and Wiseman (2000: 318) found that Chinese immigrant children who immigrated to the US after the age of 5 are more fluent in Chinese than those who were born in the US or immigrated at/before the age of 5[109]. In the present study, 2 of the 3 children referred to above arrived in Manchester when they were 9 years old which explains why their spoken Arabic ability is close to their literacy one, unlike the majority of children. However, of noteworthiness here is that the majority of children were born in Manchester or came to it before the age of 5; yet, have competence in Arabic (spoken and written). All those children attend Arabic schools, as mentioned above. There are also other reasons for children's ability in Arabic; these are given below.

6.5.2.2 Current advances in communication technology and transportation means

As mentioned in chapter 5 (section 5.4.6), the current advances in communication technology and transportation means, associated with globalization, made it relatively easy and affordable for the participant families to maintain regular contact with, and visits to, their relatives and friends in the homeland. Since their relatives cannot speak English, children have to speak Arabic with them all the time, even with their peers. Hence, unlike in Manchester where Arabic and English are used in daily interaction, children, when visiting the homeland, get the chance to practise Arabic as the only language of daily communication. This increases their competence in Arabic. In fact, there is a sort of consensus among the participants in the interviews and focus groups that maintaining regular visits to the homeland is highly important for children to maintain Arabic. Also, Arabs from outside the participant sample frequently talked about children who became competent in Arabic after visiting the homeland. This corresponds to Lanza's (1997: 250) finding, in her study on Norwegian-American families in Norway,

[109] Luo and Wiseman (2000: 318) chose the age of 5 as a cut-off age "because this is the typical age that children enter formal education and by this age important grammatical and linguistic features are embedded in children's cognitive framework (Menyuk 1972)."

that children's going on visits to the USA provided them with a greater amount of input in English, which in turn had an effect on their English output. Moreover, in his study on Basque-Americans in the USA, Lasagabaster (2008: 86) found that visits to the Basque Country has the main "effect on the actual efforts made to speak Basque, that is to say, on language competence." These visits also help children acquire the norms of their ethnic culture through living for extended periods in an environment where no other culture prevails, and maintain an emotional link with the home country by having friends there and socializing with their relatives. All this enhances the maintenance of Arabic language, culture and identity.

The worldwide availability of Arabic satellite channels is another factor for children's competence in Arabic. According to Carreira (2002: 41), "the [ethnic] media provides a formal model of language that may well help to improve levels of competence in the community." It also helps create discourse in the community, which is important for competence as well. Carreira (2002: 45) sees that Spanish-language television provides U.S. Hispanics with varied linguistic input. For example, while soap operas offer them exposure to the different dialects of Spanish, news programs expose them to the formal registers of the language. In the present study, as illustrated in chapter 5, parents and children watch materials in their own dialect and in the various dialects of Arabic on the Arabic satellite channels. This enhances competence in their own dialect, and the receptive competence in the various dialects of Arabic (which is supported also by their being in daily face-to-face interaction with speakers of such dialects) (cf. section 4.2.1.1.2). In one of the focus groups, for instance, a Libyan participant referred to a famous Syrian TV drama series which was currently broadcasted. He said that it raised a lot of discussion among Arabs in Manchester. He was at his friend's house and found a number of Arabs from different counties talking about it and gathering to watch it. He said also that the Syrian dialect used in the drama influenced some of the Libyan youth he knew. For example, he heard Libyans saying *yā lla*, an expression that Syrians use before entering a place where there are women to draw their attention that there is a man coming in, instead of coughing loudly and saying *ʔiḥim*, the way which Libyans normally use to that end.

Moreover, children watch materials in MSA on such channels, which introduces them to the formal register of Arabic and helps them learn it when they start going to the Arabic school. According to Abu-Rabia's (2000: 155) finding, early exposure of preschool children to literary Arabic in diglossic situations enhances their reading abilities and their reading comprehension abilities of literary Arabic later on in the early stages of elementary school. Also, Iraqi (1990) found that such exposure enhances children's listening comprehension and oral language abilities (discussed in Abu-Rabia

2000: 155)[110]. Thus, by watching materials in MSA, children in the present study learn a lot of Standard Arabic structures, formulas, expressions, etc., that might not be used in the individual dialects. Even if they are used in the dialects, children learn to say/pronounce them as they are said in Standard Arabic; e.g. with short vowels, case endings, etc., not as they are said in the dialects which might be different from Standard Arabic. Thus, these materials give children a taster of MSA before they join Arabic schools to learn it. As one of the fathers said, his son frequently uses structures and expressions from Standard Arabic which he gets from watching materials in standard Arabic on the Arabic channels; e.g. *ḥasanun* 'well', *šukran jazīlan* 'thank you very much', *ʔayna qalamī*? 'where is my pen?', *haḏihi wardatun jamīlah* 'this is a beautiful flower', *hayyā binā* 'let's go', etc. Thus globalization, through Arabic satellite channels, reinforces the spread of MSA among Arabs, a spread which is also supported by being in diaspora, to the extent that some of the participants perceive that the circumstances in which MSA can become the spoken variety are more in Manchester than in the Arab world (cf. Chapter 7, section 7.2 attitudes towards Arabic and English). Arabic satellite channels also help children to keep in touch with the Arabic culture and lifestyle through maintaining virtual contact with the traditions, culture, language, etc. of the homeland while they are away from it. Clyne and Kipp (1999: 184), commenting on the role of watching television in the community language on language maintenance, indicate that this watching exposes children to both the language and it cultural context. This may play a significant role in the children's acculturation (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 187). Fishman, as well, in his model of Reversing Language Shift (1991), refers in stage two to the importance of the availability of mass media in the community language in language maintenance (cf. Chapter 1, section 1.5.1.4).

6.5.2.3 Quran learning

Fishman (1985, and 1991: 360) refers to the so-called 'religious classicals'; i.e. languages that have long been maintained on an intergenerational basis because of their links with divine revelation. One of the examples he gives for religious classicals is Quranic Arabic. Quranic Arabic is important for Arabic maintenance. Although it is not a spoken variety, parents' keenness that their children learn the Quran is important for children's acquiring and increasing ability in Arabic. The parents and children hold this view; this was emphasized also in all focus groups. For example, during one of the focus

[110] These findings "accord with Ayari's (1996) suggestion that the difference between spoken Arabic and literary Arabic is a diglossic relationship that can be mediated by exposing these students to literary Arabic ... at early ages", which will enhance their reading ability (Abu-Rabia 2000:155).

groups, a participant said that he believes for sure that by learning the Quran children can learn Arabic. However, this view cannot be taken for granted since many non-Arabic speaking Muslims learn to recite the Quran; this does not indicate anything about their ability in Arabic. Thus, learning the Quran by itself cannot be a means to learn Arabic and does not guarantee proficiency in Arabic. It can be said to enhance certain aspects of competence, specifically at the level of phonology; however, the overall competence in the language is acquired through interaction and socialization in the home and the ethnic community, attending Arabic schools, etc. That is, learning the Quran helps children acquire and master the sound system of Arabic, especially the sounds that are not there in the English sound system; e.g. ḥ, ḵ, ḡ, etc. For example, some of the children who attended my Quran teaching classes were unable to pronounce some of these sounds correctly at the beginning due to interference from English, but after a while they could master them. Thus, Quran learning helps to a certain extent counterbalance such interference. Also, learning the Quran, like watching TV materials in Standard Arabic, gives children a taster of MSA, given the similarities between Quranic Arabic and MSA. Moreover, as will be illustrated in the language attitudes chapter (section 7.4.1), the Quran is a key factor for the positive attitudes towards Arabic. Such attitudes are important for competence in Arabic (Standard and colloquial).

6.5.2.4 Parents/family

The most important contributor for children's ability in spoken Arabic is the family/home. This corresponds to Lutz's (2006: 1423) finding among Latino Youth in America that it is likely that oral proficiency in Spanish for most children is gained at home. Lutz (2006: 1424) found that "parents' language skills in English ... play an important role in predicting their children's Spanish-speaking proficiency": the less the parents' proficiency in English is, the more the children's proficiency in Spanish is. In the present study, the parents' ability in Arabic, which is better than that in English, affects their children's ability in Arabic. It prompts children to use Arabic with parents at home (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.4.1.2), which is important for acquiring and enhancing Arabic proficiency.

Parents' birthplace also has a strong effect on ethnic language speaking ability. According to Lutz (2006: 1424), there are important differences in Spanish language proficiency between children of US-born parents and children of foreign-born parents (e.g. homeland-born parents): the former is less likely to have high levels of Spanish-speaking proficiency compared to the latter. This may be because homes with homeland-born parents are much more likely to be locations where languages other

than English are spoken (Lutz 2006: 1423). Thus, as Lutz states, "parents' nativity is more important than the child's in predicting high levels of Spanish-speaking proficiency ... children who speak Spanish well do so because they live in an environment in which their foreign-born parents use Spanish with them" (2006: 1427)[111]. In the present study, both parents in all families are born in the homeland; i.e. foreign-born.

The most important family-related factor for children's ability in spoken Arabic is, however, the parents' persistent insistence that Arabic is used at home; hence, children gain competence in it. All parents emphasized this view that without the insistence on using Arabic at home, children will not acquire it (see section 5.4.1.1 for some of the parents' comments). In this regard, as was observed, Arabic is used consistently in interaction between parents and between parents and children, as illustrated in chapter 5. Parents are motivated to use Arabic at home, whether with each other or with children, by their desire to pass it on to their children (cf. section 5.4.1.1). Parents are the main source of extensive daily input in the native language for children. Thus, although the vast majority of children were born and raised in the immigrant context and go to English schools where they spend most of their day speaking English, they speak Arabic well (cf. section 6.4.1). Raschka, Wei and Lee (2002: 19), in their study on the Chinese community in Tyneside, found that: children whose parents consistently and exclusively used Chinese as the language of interaction will generally have good levels of Chinese ability whereas children whose parents used both Chinese and English interchangeably on the whole had a much lower level of Chinese proficiency. Of noteworthiness in the present study is the parents' use of discourse strategies which negotiate a monolingual context in interaction with their children, and that these strategies are mostly 'high constraint strategies'. The 'high constraint strategies' require a content response on the part of the child. Hence, they help the child to develop an active competence rather than a passive/receptive competence of the minority language (cf. Chapter 5: section 5.2.1.3.1, and section 5.4.4.1).

Moreover, the parents' persistence that Arabic is used at home and their use of discourse strategies that negotiate a monolingual context with children can be considered, using Brown's (2008: 2) terminology, as 'protective measures' that guard the use of Arabic in the immigrant context. When such measures deteriorate, "a native language often becomes vulnerable to lexical and syntactic changes from a dominant language" (Brown 2008: 2); this is not in favor of ethnic language proficiency and maintenance. These changes present a threat to the continued existence of the native language (Brown 2008: 12). Also, Brown sees that the introduction of changes from a

[111] Stevens (1985) has similar results concerning the influence of parents' nativity on children's language (Lutz 2006: 1427).

dominant language into a native language takes place more often in such cases in which two languages have a common lineage than when two languages spring from different language families. This is because similarities between two languages can easily disguise fine lexical and grammatical changes (2008: 2). Unlike Belarusian and Russian in Brown's study, Arabic and English derive from different language families, which helps to some extent prevent the introduction of changes from English, the dominant language, into Arabic, the native language.

Based on the above-mentioned, practising the language is a key factor in gaining ability in it. For instance, in his study on Moroccan Arabic in the Netherlands, El Aissati (1996) found that the second generation's proficiency in Moroccan Arabic correlated with the age of immigration to the Netherlands and the reported amount of Arabic use in daily communication (discussed in Boumans and Ruiter 2002: 274). However, the relationship between language proficiency and language use is a dialectic one (Wei 1994). It cannot be determined for certain which one leads to the other; i.e. whether children use Arabic since they are competent in it or they are competent in Arabic since they use it. This applies also to English. In other words, although all children are competent in Arabic, the great majority of them use English consistently in interaction with their peer friends (cf. Chapter 5 Language Choice, section 5.2.4 Consistently English), and most of them interact with their siblings in English more than in Arabic (cf. section 5.2.3 Mostly English). Moreover, although most children are also competent in English, all of them use Arabic consistently in interactions with parents (cf. section 5.2.1 Consistently Arabic), and some of them use it more than English in interaction with siblings at home (cf. section 5.2.2 Mostly Arabic). Therefore, it can be said that competence in any of the two languages is not the sole reason for choosing one language or the other in interaction. Language choice is the result of the interplay of a number of interrelated factors, such as language proficiency, language socialization, the domain of language use, the participants, etc (also cf. Chapter 5, section 5.4).

The reciprocal influence between language proficiency and language use is also evident in the first generation. As mentioned above, the fathers have more opportunities to practise English than the mothers since most fathers work while most mothers do not work. Hence, the fathers are more competent in English than the mothers. Also, in the first generation, since the parents are more competent in Arabic than English, they use Arabic in all of their interactions, apart from inter-group interactions. This latter pattern corresponds to Wei's (1994: 114) finding concerning the relationship between language choice and language ability in the Chinese community in Tyneside: speakers with high Chinese language ability use Chinese only or Chinese-dominant language choice patterns, both with family members and with non-family

members. However, the second part of the correlation in Wei's finding; i.e. that speakers with higher English ability use the English-dominant language choice patterns, corresponds only to the child generation's interactions with peers. In their interactions with the first generation, Arabic is used (cf. Chapter 5). It should be noted here that Wei sees that language ability does not provide a comprehensive explanation of language choice. However, he believes that it determines to a great extent bilinguals' language use (Wei 1994: 104).

So far we have investigated the possible reasons for children's ability in Arabic; e.g. Arabic schools, receiving education in the homeland, visits to, and contact with, the homeland, Arabic satellite channels, Quran learning, and the parents' use of Arabic with children, which all, combined together, enhance children's ability in the native language. The question now is what accounts for children's ability in English; this will be discussed below.

6.5.3 Factors for children's ability in English

Attending English school is the key factor in children's ability in English; as explained in chapter 5, it influences children's language choice towards English (cf. section 5.4.2). Children acquire spoken English and literacy in English at the English schools. Thus, children in 3 families out of 17 have no ability in English since they have not gone to an English school yet, whereas the majority of children have ability in Arabic and English since they go to an English school. The parents and children emphasized that if the children had not attended English schools, they would not have been proficient in English. Acquiring a language is bound by receiving input in it. That is why children acquire Arabic, not English, at home; since they receive input in Arabic not English. Receiving input in English does not happen in a systematic way so that children can acquire English unless children go to English schools. In his study on Basque-Americans in the USA, Lasagabaster (2008: 87) refers to the importance of English schools in proficiency at English: the participants in his study emphasized their desire not to look different from classmates at school due to language. This makes them keen on learning and speaking English; that is why the overwhelming majority of them are very competent in English (spoken and written) which they consider their 'natural' language, compared with the relatively low percentage of them who can speak Basque, French and Spanish.

Attending English school may also influence ability in Arabic. Children acquire Arabic at home before they acquire English. Thus, in the prior-English-school stage, children are almost Arabic-monolinguals. Those Arabic monolinguals start to turn into

Arabic-English bilinguals in the English-school stage. With the passage of time, this might affect their Arabic ability, especially with regard to literacy, since they read and write in English more than they do in Arabic as they attend English schools much more than they attend Arabic schools which they go to outside of school hours. Thus, it can be said that ability in English sometimes affects negatively ability in Arabic, specifically literacy, in the child generation. This view was emphasized also in the interviews and focus groups.

6.6 Conclusion

The findings above indicate that as far as Arabic language ability is concerned, there is Arabic maintenance in both the first and second generations. The generation difference that exists with regard to ability in Arabic is mainly due to the fact that the first generation was born, educated and raised in the homeland. Hence, they are more competent in Arabic than the second generation who was born, educated and raised in the host country. This does not mean, however, that the second generation is not competent in Arabic; as illustrated above, although there are differences in spoken language competence among children relative to their age, e.g. with regard to such aspects as choice of lexical items, complexity of linguistic structures, etc., all children have the ability to use the language for natural purposes in realistic interaction situations (cf. section 6.4.1). Likewise, although there are differences in written language competence among children due to, for example, differences in years of attending Arabic school, age, receiving education in the homeland, etc., all children have a certain level of ability in reading and writing which they learn in the Arabic schools in Manchester (cf. section 6.4.2). This ability in Arabic that both generations have suggests Arabic maintenance. That is, having competence in Arabic encourages children to use the language since they do not struggle with it. As mentioned above, proficiency is one of the factors that determine language choice. Such a use guarantees a function for the language, which is a prerequisite for its survival and intergenerational transmission (cf. section 1.5.1.8). Of most importance in this regard is that children's ability in English does not influence their use of Arabic with parents at home. Likewise, parents' ability in English does not affect their use of Arabic with children and the demarcation they maintain between the two languages. However, as mentioned in chapter 5 (section 5.5), children's proficiency in English may affect their anticipated use of Arabic with their prospective children (i.e. the third generation) in the future when they themselves get married since both of them will be very competent in English. If this occurs, it will have negative consequences on Arabic maintenance.

The findings that children have receptive competence in other dialects of Arabic than theirs, as well as ability in written Arabic (MSA) indicate that as far as Arabic language ability is concerned, the multiple dialects and diglossia, characterizing Arabic language, do not seem to be an obstacle for language maintenance. With regard to the multiple dialects, as mentioned in chapter 5 (section 5.4.5), speakers need only receptive competence in them in order to communicate in intra-group situations. This competence is obtained naturally in the community through being into daily face-to-face interaction with speakers of the various dialects; as explained in Chapter 4, Arabs in the present study form a speech community, which entails communication among its members. The receptive competence in the dialects is also obtained through watching Arabic satellite channels which broadcast in the various dialects (cf. section 6.5.2.2). In fact, the Arabic satellite channels show how globalization, through advances in communication technology associated with it, has a positive role in language ability. Such a role is also evident through the advances in transportation means; they facilitate regular visits to the homeland which, as aforementioned in section 6.5.2.2, help children's competence in the native language.

As for diglossia, in the entire Arab world MSA is mainly a reading and writing medium which is learnt at school (cf. section 1.6.1.1), and, unlike colloquial Arabic, it is not used as a vernacular (as shown in sections 4.2.1.1.4 and 4.2.1.1.5, MSA sometimes appears in conversation, but this is confined to certain situations, and occurs at the level of words or phrases not complete conversations). Thus, Arabic speakers may be able to read, write and understand MSA, but find it difficult to sustain a conversation in it. Hence, this is the most that should be expected from Arab immigrant children. They do not need to speak MSA. What they need, concerning MSA, are two things: first, to learn literacy in it, which they normally learn in the Arabic schools in Manchester (cf. 6.5.2.1) just as their peers in the Arab world learn it at schools. In this regard, as explained in chapter 4, the fact that Arabs in the present study form a speech community with one shared written medium; i.e. MSA, facilitates learning the standard written variety since an Arab family in Manchester can send their children to any Arabic school regardless of the nationality of its sponsors or whether it teaches a Saudi, a Libyan, etc. curriculum (cf. section 4.2.2).

The second thing that children need concerning MSA is to have receptive knowledge in it just like that needed in dialects of Arabic other than their own, perhaps even less so since MSA is not a vernacular and is not needed on a daily basis as is the case with colloquial Arabic. Children need to have receptive competence in MSA mainly in three major registers: education, the news and religious speeches, all of which are formal (cf. section 6.4.1). This receptive knowledge in MSA is acquired in the Arabic

schools, through Arabic-speaking satellite media that broadcast in MSA, and through the religious speeches that are given in MSA at mosques. All these facilities in which MSA is used would not have existed if there had not been an Arabic-speaking community that shares one standard formal medium; hence, it can be said that such an existence of a speech community helps overcome the negative role of diglossia on Arabic maintenance in Manchester.

Having examined the communicative function of Arabic and the participants' language abilities, in the next chapter I will look at the symbolic function of the language, as illustrated below.

7 Language Attitudes

7.1 Introduction

Luo and Wiseman (2000) indicate that native language maintenance has two dimensions: a behavioral dimension (i.e. the rate of language use and language ability), and an attitudinal dimension (speakers' attitudes towards native language maintenance). In the previous chapters, the behavioral dimensions of Arabic language maintenance were discussed. In this chapter, I will investigate the attitudinal dimension. First, I describe in this introductory section the importance of attitudes in language maintenance as highlighted in the literature, and explain how the data has been collected. After that, I discuss in sections 7.2 and 7.3 respectively the participants' attitudes towards Arabic and English, and their perception of support for their native language from the host and ethnic communities. Then, an analysis of findings will be presented in 7.4, followed by a conclusion in 7.5.

As Urzúa and Gómez (2008: 451) state, the importance of individual and social attitudes in language maintenance has generally been emphasized; e.g. Mejias *et al.* 2002 and Suarez 2002. Generally, language shift tends to proceed if attitudes to the native language maintenance are negative. For example, Dweik (2000: 193) found that among the factors responsible for the survival of the Chechen language among Chechens of Jordan was the positive attitudes of the Chechens towards their language. Holmes *et al.* (1993) investigated the language situation among three ethnic minorities in New Zealand, and among the factors she identifies as responsible for language maintenance is the positive attitudes towards the ethnic language (in Dweik 2000: 186). Also, Conklin and Lourie (1983) refer to the importance of the emotional attachment to the community language in its maintenance. It is important that people value their language, yearn for it, and even weep for it since such attitudes represent a first step towards its maintenance (Fishman 2001b: 223): "Like all aspects of culture, a language is still bound in the bond of the living as long as the living feel a bond to it, in terms of affection, responsibility and motivation" (Fishman 2001b: 223). The positive attitudes towards the heritage language, along with the need for it, are significant sources of motivation for using and maintaining the language. As Winter (1994) demonstrates, to retain a language, the motivation for using it among its speakers must be strengthened. The attitudes are also important for immigrants who try to learn their ethnic language as a second/foreign language, according to Kenny (1992: 121) in his study titled, *Arab-Americans Learning Arabic: Motivation and Attitudes*. Kenny refers also to Gardner's (1985) emphasis on the importance of parents' attitudes to the student's target

language for the performance in class. For example, in the case of Arab students in America who study Arabic as a Foreign Language, their performance in classroom could be influenced by the parents' positive attitudes towards Arabic as a native language and their encouragement for children to learn and use it at home, as opposed to showing fears about children's learning the language of the 'old country' (Kenny 1992: 120-21).

According to Fishman, attitudes can be assessed by collecting self-report data about them or through observation (1991: 49). The attitudinal data in the present study were obtained through the responses of the thirty four parents and twenty five children to questions in the interviews and the informal conversations during the participant observation, and through the focus group discussions. Exemplars of these questions include: which language is more beautiful? Which language is more useful in different social contexts (e.g. at work, at home, with friends, etc.)? Which language do you prefer in different contexts (education, at home, etc.)? Is it important for you to speak English? Is it important for you to speak Arabic? Is it important for you to maintain Arabic? Do you fear losing it? Is maintaining Arabic important/not important to maintain the Arabic identity? Is Arabic important for membership in the Arabic-speaking community; i.e. is it a must to speak Arabic in order that you are considered an Arab? Does this apply to any dialect; i.e. do you consider a person speaking any dialect of Arabic as an Arab? Do you consider yourself as Arab, British, or both? Do you have a British citizenship? Etc. All these questions were followed by 'why' questions to investigate in depth the motivations behind language attitudes. Moreover, the open-ended questions used allow the participants to give their personal views on the topic of discussion without influence from the questions themselves (Dweik 1992: 111). This framework for collecting data is fashioned after a number of scholars who investigated language attitudes in different contexts; e.g. Dweik (1992), Dweik (2000), King (2000), Al-Khatib (2001), Urzúa and Gómez (2008), Hatoss and Sheely (2009), and others. Nevertheless, the questionnaires used by those scholars were adapted in a way so as to best serve the purpose of the present study with this particular community under investigation. Also, more questions were used in the present study. Of noteworthiness, as well, is that a lot of attitudinal data was obtained from the participants without asking any questions during the participant observation, through their extended talks and their deeds. According to Fishman, attitudes can be inferred "from things occasionally said and done", by trained observers who have been in prolonged face-to-face interaction with the community under investigation (1991: 49).

In order to assess attitudes, the participants' answers were transcribed. Then, I compared how each participant answered every question, counted the frequency of similar replies and recurring themes, looked into the relations of answers of one

question to another and the reasons every participant gave for his answer. This was aimed at categorizing the participants' attitudes towards Arabic and English; e.g. into positive, negative, neutral. Of noteworthiness here is that there was a very high degree of conformity in the participants' answers, which yielded one category only: positive attitudes to both languages. For example, in response to the question of 'which language is more beautiful?' the answer was always Arabic; to the questions 'is it important to speak English?' and 'is it important to speak Arabic?' the answer was always yes; to the question 'which language is more useful in different social contexts?' the answer was Arabic at home, and English at work/education; and so on. It was important to consider the relations between answers to reach an accurate description of attitudes. For example, the participants' answer that Arabic is more beautiful than English, does not necessarily imply negative attitudes towards English, which was confirmed by their answers to other questions; e.g. that it is important for them to speak English. The interpretation of all answers and the relations between them showed positive attitudes to both languages, and a total lack of unfavorable attitudes as indicated below.

7.2 Attitudes towards Arabic and English

The data indicate that parents have a positive attitude towards bilingualism. They consider it as an asset, which is evident in their different comments:

- It is an advantage; it is an exercise for the brain;
- It provides more work opportunities;
- We live in Britain, so we should mingle with the community;
- It helps know more cultures and mingle with people;
- Here (in Britain) it is a necessity.

Children too see speaking two languages as an advantage since it helps learn more cultures, and sometimes helps also in job seeking. For example, one of the children reported about his sister who applied for a job in a law company and they wanted a person who speaks Arabic and English.

The parents' and children's positive attitudes towards English stem from their need for it in inter-group settings, especially at work, English school and university. The parents' positive attitudes towards English can also be explained as having to do with the general attitudes towards learning foreign languages, notably English, in the Arab world. That is, such attitudes were acquired in the homeland before their immigration since in the Arab world the capability of speaking foreign languages is valued and is

taken as a sign of learning and culture (S'hiri 2002: 169). The positive attitudes towards English among the child generation can be explained in terms of Lasagabaster's (2008: 87) notion of 'keeping to the norm'; i.e. the immigrant children's desire not to look different from classmates at school due to language. This "makes them embrace English wholeheartedly, which would explain why their attitudes are so positive."

Concerning Arabic, both generations have positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance, whether colloquial or standard. The positive attitudes towards colloquial Arabic stem from the need for it in intra-group communication. Even children are aware of this need and some of them said that they even fear losing it since if this occurs, they will not be able to communicate with their parents, relatives and Arabs. Related to this is the feeling prevalent among a number of parents and children that they might not live in Britain forever, and that they might choose or be forced to return home in the future, so they must maintain Arabic.

The participants have positive attitudes not only towards their own dialect, but also towards the other dialects. These attitudes stem from the participants' view that Arabic, regardless of the various dialects, is one language which is symbolic of identity. Thus, Arabic is used in get-togethers not only because the Arabic dialects are mutually intelligible, but also as a signal of identity. The positive attitudes towards the dialects spring also from the participants' need for at least a receptive knowledge of the various dialects in order to be able to communicate and participate in the Arabic-speaking community. This need is especially enhanced by their being in diaspora where the Arabic-speaking community consists of Arabs from different Arab countries. Living in diaspora creates more tolerance among Arabs in this study towards the various dialects which is motivated by their search for a common ground with other Arabs to have a sense of unity and maintain their native language. Thus, they consider any dialect of Arabic as Arabic; hence, qualifying for group membership. Hence, as many of them said, they do not mind that their children speak and maintain any dialect of Arabic, and not necessarily the dialect of their country of origin, as long as it is a dialect of Arabic. Children, also, see Arabic as important to maintain the Arabic identity. For them, as well, to be Arab you must speak a dialect of Arabic[112]. It seems that low proficiency in Arabic is a source of shame or at least embarrassment among the second generation. One of them even criticized Arabs in the Arab world who want their children to speak English at the expense of Arabic. With regard to identity, it should be indicated that the first generation consider themselves as Arabs in the first place and British in the second without this affecting their Arabic identity or Arabic maintenance. They get the British

[112] As Fishman (1991: 360) states, ethnocultural mother tongues "are definitely 'inside'-related and, indeed, they are requirements for ethnocultural membership."

citizenship to facilitate their life in the UK and also because it gives them better treatment abroad. Children also see themselves as Arabs in the first place and British in the second; one of them even talked about having a global identity. However, they believe that this does not affect their Arabic language and identity. This view of children of themselves as Arabs and British may be a result of influence from the parents. According to Van Dan Berg (1988: 254), "ethnolinguistic identities are created through interactions with the parents and other family members in the homes and neighborhoods" (cited in Luo and Wiseman 2000: 308).

Both generations have also positive attitudes towards Modern Standard Arabic. They view that it is important for education. Besides its importance in the Arabic schools, children can also study MSA as a module in the English mainstream education; e.g. in GCSE and A-Level. Hence, as highlighted in the focus groups and interviews, children and parents find it an easy way of getting high marks in one of the modules without exerting much effort as Arabic is already spoken at home and children study in Arabic in the Arabic schools. Also highlighted in the focus groups was the economic value of Arabic in Manchester. A participant who teaches MSA to non-native speakers said, 'now Arabic is important in the field of work'. Indeed, there are many places in Manchester where Arabic is taught to non-natives who want to work in the Arab world or want to learn Arabic because they are Muslims. Also, like the spoken dialects, the participants consider MSA as a symbol of identity. It unifies them and helps sometimes overcome the differences that exist between the dialects. This corresponds to Rouchdy's (2002: 143-44) view (in her article entitled *Language Conflict and Identity: Arabic in the American Diaspora*) that standard Arabic represents an expression of identity and a unifying force among Arabs whether in the homeland or in diaspora.

Although the participants have positive attitudes towards both MSA and the colloquial dialects, as illustrated above, they perceive MSA as in a higher status than the colloquial dialects. The view, frequently heard in the Arab world, that MSA is the real language and that it should be the spoken language for all Arabs (cf. section 1.6.1 the role of multiple dialects and diglossia) is popular among the first generation Arabs in this study, which matches Rouchdy's (2002: 143) finding of the notion of the ideal language (i.e. standard Arabic) that exists among Arab Americans. Here are some of the participants' comments:

- 'In my opinion, we should speak standard Arabic rather than colloquial Arabic.'
- 'I wish all Arabs speak standard Arabic instead of the dialects.'
- 'The origin of all dialects is standard Arabic, so we should return to using the origin.'

- 'I always like to listen to standard Arabic. It is the language that we all should speak.'

Some parents even perceive that the circumstances in which MSA can become the spoken variety may be more in Manchester than in the Arab world. That is, in the Arab world, it would be regarded as odd to make any use of MSA in the street; perhaps even by those who advocate that standard Arabic replaces colloquial dialects in daily communication. By contrast, in Manchester MSA is not regarded as odd when occasionally incorporated in conversation in certain situations; e.g. in linguistic accommodation in cross-dialect interaction[113] (this typically occurs, as mentioned in chapter 4, at the level of vocabulary items, phrases or sentences, not at the level of an entire conversation conducted in MSA). Thus, by accommodating in MSA, it may gradually become the medium of interaction, at least in cross-dialect communication.

One last point concerning attitudes towards Arabic is related to what Walbridge (1992: 192) states that it is well-known that Arabs perceive their language as superior to other languages in Richness and beauty. This makes Arabic language an important symbol for Arabs (Walbridge 1992: 192, discussing Fishman 1973). In the present study, the view is popular among the parents that Arabic is more beautiful than English. Children also, though many of them prefer English as a language of instruction in education, have the same view; some of them do not know why, they just feel it like this, as they said. This opinion might have been passed to the participants through the Arabic media as it is frequently heard in it. More importantly, however, is that such a view has also to do with the centrality of Arabic to Islamic religion (the connection between Arabic language and Islam will be further discussed in the analysis below). Many of the parents and children gave this reason when asked why they thought Arabic was more beautiful than English: they said literally, 'it is the language of the Quran.' It was also claimed in one of the focus groups that Arabic speakers can master any language since Arabic is rich in sounds.

7.3 Perception of support for Arabic from the ethnic community and the host community

The question arising now is how Arabs in the present study perceive the support for their community and native language both from the Arabic-speaking community

[113] As mentioned in chapter 4, unlike in most of the Arab countries, in Manchester the Arabic dialects are in daily contact, which sometimes necessitates some sort of accommodation in pan-dialect communication when speakers face a dialect barrier. This accommodation is either towards one of the interlocutors' dialects or towards MSA (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.2.1.1.5 Accommodation).

itself and from the host community. That is, do they think there is such support or not? Getting an answer to this question is important since their perception of the existence or non-existence of such support influences their attitudes towards, and efforts to, maintain Arabic as a native language. If they believe that there is a sort of support for their ethnic community and language internally (from the Arabic-speaking community) and externally (from the host community) this enhances their positive attitudes towards the maintenance of Arabic and motivates them to exert effort to maintain it.

As for the support from the Arabic-speaking community, the majority of participants think that Arabs support the maintenance of Arabic. They talked about how they and their Arab acquaintances are keen that their children speak and maintain Arabic, and the effort exerted to that end (e.g. speaking Arabic a home, visiting homeland regularly, having Arabic satellite channels at home, sending children to Arabic schools, etc.). They also talked about the wide spread of Arabic schools which are an important resource of Arabic maintenance. Another source of support for the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester, as perceived by the participants, is related to its profile within the host community. That is, the community is visible in Manchester, especially in these areas where Arabs are concentrated, through the shop signs that are written in Arabic, Arabic restaurants, Arabic signs in supermarkets, Arabic and Islamic attire visible on the streets, etc. García reports a similar situation in New York City where languages other than English have always been used by private businesses in order to sell more to the different ethnic communities in the city (1997: 42).

With regard to the support from the host community, as illustrated in chapter 3, the local government in Manchester provides services in Arabic language; e.g. interpreters, linkworkers, leaflets, etc. While Arabs in the present study see this as a sort of support for their community, they believe it is not motivated by a governmental desire to maintain Arabic. It is only meant to maintain equal opportunities and facilitate the provision of services. However, the participants see that these provisions are important since they give a kind of prestige to Arabic and enhance the positive attitudes towards Arabic language, especially among children (cf. section 3.2.2). These provisions are also important for new immigrants whose English is sometimes poor. Also, such provisions and support make Arabs have a positive view towards the local government and the host community. The participants think that Manchester is the most suitable place for Arabs in Britain and even in Europe given the fact that it is a multilingual, multicultural city, and given the support that immigrants receive and the freedom they have compared to other European countries. For example, many of the participants who lived in other European countries; e.g. France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain etc. before Manchester, always held comparisons between Manchester and the European cities in

which they lived before, in terms of the support for minorities, and the result is always in favor of Manchester.

We have seen above that the participants have positive attitudes towards English and Arabic, and with regard to the latter, they have positive attitudes not only towards their relevant dialect, but also towards the other dialects of Arabic as well as MSA. They also see that there is support for Arabic maintenance from the Arabic-speaking community and indirect support for the language from the host community. The question now is how to explain the participants' language attitudes; this will be investigated in the analysis section below. Also, the importance of such attitudes for Arabic maintenance will be explained in this section.

7.4 Analysis

7.4.1 How can we explain the participants' language attitudes?

A number of factors can be provided to explain language attitudes in the present study:

7.4.1.1 Fitting in the norm and being in diaspora

Hatoss and Sheely (2009: 141), in their study among Sudanese youth in Australia, found that they generally have a positive stance towards preserving their native language and culture, and simultaneously they are stimulated to learn the dominant language; i.e. English, and fit into the host community. In the present study, the findings demonstrate that the participants do not see any contradiction between having positive attitudes towards both Arabic and English. That is why they consider bilingualism as an asset that should be encouraged. This indicates the participants' desire to fit in the host community while preserving their ethnic language and identity. In this regard, there is no difference between the two generations. Lasagabaster (2008: 78), in his study on the Basque diaspora in the US, demonstrated that there is a high percentage of positive attitudes towards Basque and English. He also found that there are no unfavorable attitudes to both languages; this is of noteworthiness, as he states, since such a state may not be found in other language contact contexts (Lasagabaster 2008: 78, discussing Lasagabaster & Huguet 2007). In the present study, there is a total lack of unfavorable attitudes towards Arabic or English. Also, all the participants demonstrated positive attitudes towards both languages.

The participants' positive attitudes towards all the languages and dialects in their repertoire (i.e. English and Arabic, and within Arabic towards the Arabic dialects in

contact in Manchester) can be explained as having to do with their being in diaspora. Lasagabaster (2008: 84), for example, suggests that there may be "some connection between being a member of diaspora and a speaker of a minority language ([e.g.] Basque or Welsh), and positive attitudes towards the different languages in contact." He concluded that while there are no unfavorable attitudes towards Basque among Basque Americans (Lasagabaster 2008), there is a small percentage of unfavorable attitudes towards it in the homeland (Lasagabaster & Huguet 2007). The same phenomenon, as he states, was observed also by Johnson (2005) who investigated the Welsh diaspora in the Argentinean province of Chubut. The members have positive attitudes towards all their languages; i.e. Welsh, English and Spanish. Of particular noteworthiness concerning Arabic in the present study is that Arabs in Manchester form a speech community whose members communicate through mutually intelligible dialects (cf. Chapter 4), which may as well explain the participants' positive attitudes towards the dialects; i.e. they need the dialects for daily communication within the community, as illustrated in chapter 4.

7.4.1.2 Religious function of Arabic

The religious function of Arabic represents an important motive for the positive attitudes towards it among Arabs in the present study, which corresponds to Rouchdy's (2002: 142) finding among Arab Americans. Due to its connection to the Quran, Classical Arabic has a status of sanctity stemming from the sacredness of Islam (Antoun 1989: 103). As Walbridge (1992: 191) states, "Arabic is the language of Islam, and it is generally agreed that in order to appreciate the beauty of the Koran one must read it in Arabic." Moreover, obligatory prayers, *ṣalā*t, must be done in Arabic. Given the similarity between MSA and Quranic/Classical Arabic, the Arab layman has the belief that MSA is the language of the Quran, which is one of the factors for the positive attitudes towards MSA. This status of MSA and Classical Arabic gives the corresponding colloquial varieties "a special status and authenticity" (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 329-330). Kenny (1992: 133) states that one of the most popular reasons for studying Arabic among Arab Americans was to be able to read the Koran. All this emphasizes the significance of Islam for Arabic maintenance in the present study. A different situation can be found with regard to Christianity in Dweik's finding among Lebanese Christians in Buffalo: in this community "Arabic was abandoned because it had no religious ... value to these Lebanese. The Bible was neither originally written nor recited in Arabic" (1992: 117). Dweik (1980), as well, has demonstrated that Muslim Yemenites in Lackawanna (near Buffalo) have preserved Arabic more effectively than Christian Lebanese in the same community.

Nonetheless, it should be noted that this discrepancy between Christian and Muslim immigrant groups with regard to language maintenance does not always hold true (Sawaie 1992: 88).

Due to its connection to Islam, Arabic whether spoken or standard has also a high status among non-Arab Muslims in Manchester, which gives it a prestige among Muslim Arabs, as in the case of the families in this study. In this regard, different stories were given by the participants about situations in which they were in contact with non-Arab Muslims and how the latter expressed their admiration of Arabic even though they did not speak it. The parents said that this gives credit and value to Arabic among children and shows them that speaking Arabic is not stigmatized; rather, it is something that they should be proud of. This leads to positive attitudes towards Arabic, which is important for its preservation. Lasagabaster (2008: 79) states that the social value attributed to a language is more significant than the number of its speakers. He found that the Basque Americans from the Spanish-Basque Country are more favorable to Basque than to Spanish. Although Spanish plays an important role in the American society, it is true as well that despite the large numbers of the speakers of Spanish in the south-west, the Spanish spoken in this region is often stigmatised (Lasagabaster 2008: 79). On the contrary, the Basque Americans from the French Basque Country are more favorable towards French than Basque. In fact, stigmatization and marginalization may lead immigrants to reject their heritage language and culture. However, the reverse trend may also hold true; i.e. the immigrants adhere too powerfully to their values and traditions and have extreme faithfulness to their ethnic culture (Hatoss and Sheely 2009: 127, discussing Colic-Peisker and Tilbury 2003). Daher (1992: 26) demonstrates that the covert and overt bias of ordinary Western citizens and the constant attacks on Arabs and their culture in the Western media can persuade Arabs living in the West of their inferiority to the extent of denying their Arabic identity and language. In the present study, it seems that the negative portrayal and stigmatization of Arabs in the Western media, as the participants reported, enhances the participants' positive attitudes towards the Arabic language and identity and makes them cling more tightly to their culture. Here are some of their comments:

- 'The media in this country stereotypes Arabs as terrorist Muslims; however, this makes us adhere more strongly to our culture, language and religion.'
- 'We, Arabs, are shown on TV as dangerous fundamentalists, but we know who we really are and that this is nonsense, and we try to convey this to the people.'
- 'Regretfully, they portray us as violent people who oppress women and force them to wear the head scarf, which is completely wrong.'

- 'There are of course differences between our culture and the British culture, but the media shows these differences in an unfair, biased and ignorant way. This makes us feel sad, but at the same time motivates us more to protect our identity, habits and traditions.'
- 'It is a shame that the media here shows the Arab world as only a source of petrol, and does not show the British people our great civilization and culture.'

7.4.1.3 Level of acculturation and communicative need

The positive attitudes towards Arabic can also be explained in terms of the participants' 'level of acculturation' (i.e. the self-perception of belonging more to either the ethnic culture or the host culture (Mills 2005)[114]) and 'communicative need' (Mills 2005):

7.4.1.3.1 Level of acculturation

The participants see themselves as belonging more to the Arabic culture than the host culture; i.e. the level of acculturation approaches the Arabic extreme. Here are some of their comments:

- 'I am an Arab in the first place, and a British in the second place.'
- 'I belong to both of the Arabic and English cultures, but more to the Arabic culture.'
- 'We never forget our Arabic identity. Although we here, as immigrants, have also the identity of the host country, but we consider ourselves as more Arabs than British.'
- 'I have lived in the Uk for a long time and have acquired to some extent the British culture, but still the Arabic identity, culture, habits and traditions are more influential in my life.'

Thus, the participants are loyal to their ethnic identity; and consequently to their ethnic language which is an important component of ethnic identity. This connection between ethnic language and ethnic identity is recurrently referred to by scholars. For example, Ward & Hewstone (1985: 286) state that an ethnic language is "a necessary attribute for membership in an ethnic group" (in Luo and Wiseman 2000: 308). The connection can be best illustrated by Daher's statement about Arabs in the West, who under conditions of stigmatization from the media and the host community, may deny their identity as Arabs; thus, "They often disown their language because they are searching

[114] Acculturation is sometimes referred to as assimilation (Mills 2005: 112).

for a new identity" (1992: 26). Also, Rouchdy (2002) refers to the importance of ethnic pride and identity, as opposed to assimilation, since they lead to pride in the ethnic language. One aspect that shows that the participants in the present study still identify as Arabs is their use of Arabic names. According to Al-Khatib's finding among the Armenians of Jordan, the giving and using of Armenian proper names indicates that the members of the community still identify as Armenians (2001: 174).

With regard to the participants' loyalty to their ethnic identity, globalization plays an important role, as illustrated below:

7.4.1.3.1.1 The role of globalization in the attitudes towards ethnic identity

Globalization influences immigrants' perception of, and attitudes towards, their ethnic identity. This is done through a number of aspects associated with it. For example, globalization has led, as Lewellen (2002: 125) states, to a much greater change in the motives for immigration than earlier times. Lewellen was particularly referring to the encouragement that countries, such as the United States, Australia, European countries, etc. provide to elite migration, as opposed to railroad labor or guest workers migration of the past, seeking highly educated people; e.g. doctors, researchers, university teachers, executive managers, etc. The motivation for such a type of immigration may not be solely economic, but also, intellectual; i.e. to benefit from the advances that the western world has achieved in the different fields of science. In the present study, for example, eleven out of seventeen fathers reported that they left the homeland originally for the purpose of study; either to get undergraduate or postgraduate degrees. Then, after they finished their study, they started to work and decided not to return to the homeland[115]. These highly educated Arab immigrants have the intellectual capacity to provide and organize efforts to maintain the native language and identity (for example, as explained in chapter 3, there are many Arabic supplementary schools in Manchester which are organized and run by members of the Arabic-speaking community). They also believe, as emphasized in the interviews and casual conversations, that neither they nor their children need to assimilate. That is to say that they can maintain their ethnic language and identity even in diaspora, especially since contemporary large-scale globalization, and the increasing rates of

[115] There are also other Arab immigrants in Manchester whose motivation for immigration is related to the political conditions within their homeland; e.g. war as in the case of Iraq, or oppression as in the case of Libya. Moreover, the deterritorialization of workplace that resulted from the deterritorialization of organizations in the form of multinational corporations may also form a viable reason for a number of Arab immigrants in Manchester. For instance, one of the researcher's acquaintances in Manchester was working in a company in his homeland; then he moved to Scotland to work in branch of the same company, and now he moved once more to work in another branch in Manchester.

migration that have accompanied it, have caused host countries (as is the case in the UK) to make legislations guaranteeing equality for all residents including immigrants and prohibiting discrimination based on language, race, religion, ethnicity, etc[116]. This leads to some extent to affirmation of ethnic identity and rejection of assimilation among the participants.

Also, the supraterritorial communication, transportation, organizations, etc., associated with globalization (cf. section 1.6.2), influence the way immigrants think about the relationship between their ethnic identity and territorial geography. In other words, the space-time compression associated with globalization makes them believe that preserving the ethnic identity and language is not necessarily solely attainable by being within the boundaries of the homeland. According to Mlinar, globalization has radically altered experiences of proximity and social connectedness, shaking "traditional territorial identities based on contiguity … and clearly (physically and socially) identifiable borders" (1992: 1). That is, ethnic identity can be 'deterritorialized'. Such 'deterritorialization' makes immigrants believe that they can maintain their ethnic language and identity wherever they are; thus, as the participants in the present study emphasized, they can maintain their Arabic identity anywhere, even in diaspora. In this respect, as explained above, the participants still consider themselves as Arabs, although they are away from the homeland, and at the same time they do not disengage themselves from the new identity of the host country. This conforms to the notion that recent anthropological inquiry emphasizes; i.e. that all identities may be negotiable in particular contexts (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2001: 251). That is, "in contexts where many individuals are no longer monocultural monolinguals, but belong to a number of different, often newly created, groups, this flexible view allows us to investigate various identities as linked to particular contexts and practices, rather than to predetermined overarching categories" (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2001: 251). There exists among the participants in the present study somewhat of a diasporic identity due to the ability to sustain personal, cultural, and economic connections with the homeland over long distances. Since language is an inherent aspect of ethnic identity, as explained above, it can be maintained in diaspora as well.

All these aspects of globalization help to some extent ease the potential negative consequences of what Scholte (2000: 180) refers to as the "increased hybridization at the level of individuals" that characterizes many immigrants, and which may affect immigrants' ability to maintain their ethnic identity and language. According to Scholte, a multidimensional or hybrid identity may take different forms. In the case of

[116] This is evident, for example, in the services provided by the local authorities in Manchester for Arabs and other minorities in the city, as explained in chapter 3.

immigrants, for instance, it may take the form of persons with two or more nationalities. The hybrid individuals can highlight several strong aspects of their identity, which can lead, for instance, to conflict and competition between national loyalties (Scholte 2000: 180). If this happens, the immigrants' sense of self can become ambiguous and unsettling due to holding several national identities at once: the nationality of their state and that of their country of origin (Scholte 2000: 226). This may result in the immigrants feeling torn and lost; hence, they may sacrifice one identity for the sake of the other in order to overcome such struggle and conflict. Given the hegemony and dominance of the host community, the sacrificed identity, and consequently the sacrificed language, may well be the ethnic ones.

However, the increased capability of maintaining both identities among the participants in the present study, referred to above, which is largely made possible by globalization and its accompanying supraterritorial activities that characterize contemporary social relations, helps them to some extent overcome such a state. According to Scholte, for instance, immigrants in earlier times "were frequently torn between their original and adopted territorial homelands well before air travel and telephone calls allowed migrants to 'stay' in their place of birth from a distance" (2000: 180). Such a state is attained as well through the other supraterritorial activities associated with globalization. For example, global media such as Arabic satellite channels keep Arab immigrants in the present study in touch with their ethnic language and culture from distance (cf. Chapter 6). Global markets have made it possible for immigrants to sustain their national cuisine, music, dress, etc. by bringing 'home' goods within easy reach to them in the different immigrant contexts. The participants in the present study, for instance, have access to the different types of Arabic restaurants, food, dress, music, etc. All this is important in order to maintain their native culture *vis a vis* the overwhelming culture of the host community. Also, supraterritorial organizations have brought together immigrants with common ethnicity in the different parts of the world. For example, there are different Arab organizations in different parts of the world; e.g. America, Europe, etc. that aim to bring together Arab immigrants and organize their efforts to maintain links with each other and the Arab world. One of these organizations is the European Council for Ifta'a. Although this is mainly an Islamic organization, it helps Arabs in diaspora to maintain their Islamic and Arabic identities. For the participants in this study, both identities are very related and inseparable: being an Arab is important for practicing Islam since he/she will be able to read, understand and appreciate the beauty of the Quran without translation; i.e. in the original language in which it was revealed. Also, being a Muslim is connected to Arabness since the prophet of Islam himself was an Arab, and the Quran was revealed in the Arabian

Peninsula. In Manchester as well there are such Arabic organizations that are based in large mosques like the Arabic Mosque in Didsbury, south Manchester. There is also the Arabic Islamic Center in Whalley Range. Such establishments have contacts with their counterparts in the Arab world and maintain links with them. For instance, intellectuals and scholars are invited to give speeches in Manchester. Other bodies also exist that are not related to mosques; e.g. the Libyan society (Al-Nady Al-Barouny), the Palestinian forum, the Syrian society, etc. All these bodies organize Arabic events and celebrations, and are open for all Arabs regardless of nationality.

7.4.1.3.2 Communicative need

In addition to the level of acculturation, discussed above, Mills (2005) also indicates that the communicative need for the native language is also important in its maintenance. In the present study, the participants reported that they need Arabic for their daily communication at home, ethnic community, and the homeland. Such a need contributes significantly to the positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance. Sawaie (1992) states that the loss of interest in Arabic as a functional tool for communication is one of the factors for the relinquishment of loyalty to Arabic among Arab immigrants in America in his study. Rouchdy (2002) also refers to the importance of the existence of communicative need for the language. The communicative need for Arabic in the homeland that the participants perceive exists and is supported by the fact that it is relatively easy and affordable for them to maintain regular contact with, and visits to, the homeland, due to globalization and the advances in communication technology and transportation means that have accompanied (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.4.6).

The communicative need for Arabic in intra-group situations in Manchester is enhanced by the large numbers of Arabic speakers in the city. Also, the current political conflict in the Arab world has resulted in more immigrants in Manchester, especially from such countries as Iraq, Palestine and Libya. All this created a social context in which Arabic is used. This context is strengthened, as well, by the existence of many Arab students in the city. In other words, globalization has resulted in an increased number of students studying abroad. This applies in particular to an increasing number of Arab students who choose Britain for study, especially after the attacks of September 11th in the US which resulted in large numbers of Arab students preferring not to go to the US to study given the tight measures adopted against them. Thus, the substitute was to go to the UK, Australia, New Zealand, etc. In the present study, the participant families have contacts with Arab students studying in Manchester. For example, a Saudi

participant said that he exchanges family visits and participates in regular get-togethers with the Saudi students in Manchester. He said that there are about 200 Saudi students in the city. Another family from Egypt has friends among the many Egyptian students in Manchester. One of the Algerian families has friends from the Egyptian and Syrian students. The increased number of Arab students in Manchester is important for Arabic maintenance since it increases the number of fluent speakers of Arabic; hence, it creates a larger social context in which Arabic can be used. As Holmes (1992: 67) states, the existence of people with whom one can regularly use a language is essential in order to maintain it (in Al-Khatib 2001:165). This is particularly important since those students usually come with their children, who are also competent or even monolingual speakers in Arabic, which creates a social context for Arab immigrant children where they can communicate in Arabic. As illustrated in chapter 5, one of the contexts in which Arabic is used consistently is children's interactions with their Arab friends who do not speak English. The influence of the constantly increasing numbers of Arab students in Manchester on Arabic maintenance can be said to parallel to some extent the influence of the constant Spanish migrations on Spanish maintenance in the USA, which is considered by many scholars as the most important factor for Spanish language maintenance in America (Villa and Villa 2005: 169; McCullough and Jenkins 2005: 106).

Mills (2005: 121) found that with each subsequent generation the perception of acculturation is more towards the host culture[117] (i.e. in her study, the American culture) than the ethnic culture (i.e. the Hispanic one), and there is a reduced perception of communicative need for the native language (i.e. Spanish). In the present study, the first and second generations reported that they consider themselves as belonging more to the Arabic culture than English culture, which shows that acculturation is more Arabic than British regardless of generation. Also, both generations' emphasis on their need for Arabic in daily communication indicates that the participants' perception of the communicative need for Arabic is not influenced by generation. Urzúa and Gómez (2008: 458), in their study among Puerto Ricans in New England, report a positive correlation between age and attitudes towards Spanish language maintenance, whereby older Puerto Ricans place more importance on ethnic language preservation. In the present study, both the first and the second generations have positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance, which suggests no relationship between generation and attitudes towards Arabic maintenance. There is also no relationship between generation and positive attitudes towards English.

[117] The study investigated language maintenance and shift in the small northern Arizona Hispanic community of Flagstaff.

Luo and Wiseman (2000: 322) found that Chinese immigrant children who were born in the US or immigrated at a very young age (at/before the age of 5) tend to be less positive towards Chinese language maintenance than those who immigrated after the age of 5; the latter group value Chinese as their ethnic language more. In the present study, the majority of children were born in Manchester or came to it before the age of 5, yet have positive attitudes towards Arabic. Thus, the age of arrival in the UK/the birth place does not seem to influence children's attitudes towards Arabic.

Within the first generation, attitudes towards Arabic are not affected by length of stay in Britain. By contrast, Urzúa and Gómez (2008: 457) found that the longer the period spent in the USA is, the less importance is placed on Spanish maintenance. In the present study, as illustrated in the Methodology chapter, the parents have different lengths of stay in Manchester; e.g. five years, twelve years, twenty years, etc.; however, they all have positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance. Also, the level of education or occupation does not appear to influence attitudes towards Arabic. The parents have different education levels that range between PhD, Master, university degree, under-university degree, etc. However, they are all favorable towards Arabic, which corresponds to Lasagabaster's (2008: 79) finding that the educational background of the Basque Americans has no influence on their attitudes towards Basque. Likewise, the parents have different occupations that range from white-collar to blue-collar; e.g. a university lecturer, a medical doctor, an accountant, a mechanic, a driver, etc. All this is important for Arabic maintenance since it reveals that such attitudes are not individual; rather they are collective or group attitudes representing the Arabic-speaking community as a whole regardless of its individual members' level of education, type of occupation or length of stay in the host community. These group attitudes show how important Arabic is for Arabs in the present study, and form a momentum that leads to practical efforts for maintaining Arabic.

To sum up, the above discussion shows that there are several factors for the positive attitudes towards Arabic and English in the present study; e.g. fitting in the host community, being in diaspora, the communicative need, the level of acculturation, the religious function with regard to Arabic, etc. In the next section, I will discuss the importance of these positive attitudes for Arabic maintenance and their influence on language choice and language ability.

7.4.2 Importance of attitudes for Arabic maintenance in the present study

Attitudes are very important for Arabic maintenance in the present study. First of all, they influence greatly language choice. As seen in chapter 5, parents use Arabic consistently at home and with their friends. One of the motivations behind this is that they have positive attitudes towards Arabic and see it as a symbol of identity. It is also these positive attitudes that make the parents speak Arabic to their children and insist that Arabic is used at home since they want to transmit the language to their children. Urzúa and Gómez's (2008: 457) found a relationship between positive attitudes towards language maintenance and language used at home: the more importance was placed on Spanish maintenance, the less English was used at home. Of high importance in the present study is that the parents' positive attitudes towards English did not influence their language choice patterns and the demarcation they try to maintain between Arabic and English.

Also, Luo and Wiseman's (2000: 317) study among Chinese immigrants in the US, reports a significant relationship between parents' attitudes towards the ethnic language and children's use of it. In the present study, the parents have positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance. Thus, the parents' positive attitudes towards Arabic may be said to influence positively children's use of the ethnic language, which may provide an important explanation for children's use of Arabic at home, especially with their parents. In the present study, as well, children's positive attitudes towards Arabic can be said to be stemming from and influenced by the parents' attitudes towards it. The parents repeatedly referred to this connection through anecdotes about Arab families in Manchester. For example, one of the parents talked about his friends who are very positive about Arabic and its maintenance and as a result their children, too, have positive attitudes towards Arabic and consider it very important for them. Another parent said he had two Arab colleagues at work. He said their children have positive stance towards Arabic and are keen on going to Arabic schools; this is because their parents are very keen on the language and actively instill in their children that Arabic is important. One of the parents as well compared her family to a neighbouring Indian family. She said her children have positive attitudes towards Arabic since they as parents are interested in their language and culture, whereas her Indian neighbour's children are not interested in their native language since their parents are not interested either. Luo and Wiseman (2000: 320), commenting on Kuo's (1974b) argument that parents' attitudes to Chinese and/or English influence the bilingual socialization of Chinese immigrant children in America, state that: immigrant parents

instill in their children, when they are very young, attitudes towards their native language and culture, then the children continue to cling to this emblematic bond.

Another aspect that shows the importance of attitudes in Arabic maintenance is related to their influence on language ability. The findings indicate that parents and children harbour a favorable attitudinal stance towards both MSA and colloquial Arabic, which may positively influence the children's ability in them. With regard to MSA, these positive attitudes represent the most important motivation for the parents' keenness that children attend Arabic schools to learn MSA and literacy. It might be understandable that parents are keen that children learn spoken Arabic since they need it for communication in their daily life, and also when they contact or go on visits to relatives in the homeland. On the other hand, MSA is not used as a vernacular by Arabic speakers[118]; it is the written and formal medium which is used in certain registers; e.g. religion, news, and Arabic school education. This means that children do not need it as much as they need colloquial Arabic.

Also, as mentioned above, the positive attitudes towards spoken/colloquial Arabic positively affect using and speaking it. Such use helps competence in it (cf. Chapter 6 Language Ability, section 6.5.2.4), especially that the parents have positive attitudes towards the various dialects which makes them tolerate their children's use of structures, vocabulary items, etc., from other dialects than theirs. This encourages children to speak Arabic; that is, if the parents criticize children as not speaking correctly (i.e. their dialect), the children might cease to speak Arabic altogether (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.4.5). In addition, the participants' positive attitudes towards the various dialects enhance the receptive competence in, and the mutual intelligibility among, the dialects. According to Gooskens (2007: 446), one of the factors that help the intelligibility of a closely related language is the listener's attitude towards the language (cf. Chapter 4).

The importance of attitudes in Arabic maintenance is also emphasized by Dweik (1992) in his study on the Lebanese community in Buffalo. Unlike the positive attitudes towards Arabic in both of the parent and child generations in the present study, in Dweik's study early Lebanese immigrants (in the period between 1900 and 1940) had very positive attitudinal stance towards Arabic; hence promoted using the language in almost every domain (1992: 105). The second and third generations (the period between 1940 and 1970), however, held strong and positive attitudes to English and

[118] As mentioned earlier in this chapter, MSA is occasionally used in certain communicative contexts; e.g. linguistic accommodation in pan-dialect communication, and this is typically done at the level of vocabulary items, phrases or sentences, not at the level of an entire conversation conducted in MSA (see also chapter 4, section 4.2.1.1.5 Accommodation).

negative attitude towards Arabic. To them, English was more beautiful and useful than Arabic (Dweik 1992: 116). Also, unlike the second generation in the present study who see low ability in Arabic as a source of shame or embarrassment, the second and third generation in Dweik's study showed no negative sentiment towards Arabs in the USA who could no longer speak Arabic (Dweik 1992: 116). Such attitudes were regarded by Dweik as one of two main factors of language maintenance among the first generation, and language shift among the second and third generations. Similarly, in Sawaie's (1992) study, although the pioneer Arab immigrants in America (from 1882-1930) emphasized their loyalty to Arabic as evident in their writings in the periodicals, this was not the case with the second generation; hence, the knowledge of Arabic began to weaken with it. As Hitti (1924: 100-101) describes the situation: "The old generation of Syrians still hold Arabic in almost sacred regard. They throng to hear a speaker in this rich and musical mother tongue. The reverse is true of the native-born generation" (cited in Sawaie 1992: 85).

Daher (1992) as well suggests that disloyalty to Arabic may be the most important factor responsible for the speedy shift to English in the Lebanese community in Cleveland who witnessed a total shift at the level of production in the second generation and at the level of comprehension in the third generation (1992: 29). As he states, Lebanese in Cleveland do not feel sad for the loss of Arabic, are not interested in its maintenance, do not exert any effort to preserve it, do not have schools where children can learn it, and they even do not want their children to speak and acquire it for fear that it might interfere with acquiring English which they consider as more practical and more prestigious (Daher 1992: 27).

The importance of attitudes is emphasized also in Rouchdy's (2002) study among Arab-Americans in Detroit. Arabs in the present study can be compared in terms of their attitudes towards Arabic language and heritage to the second group of Arab Americans in Rouchy's study; i.e. those who immigrated after the mid 1960s. Like Arabs in the present study, this group considered Arabic as their mother tongue, and had positive attitudes and were inclined towards their ethnic language and heritage. All this favored Arabic maintenance. Unlike this group, the first group of Arab Americans in Rouchy's study (those who immigrated after World War II) was confronted with the anti-ethnic sentiment and the stress for conformity and assimilation prevalent at that time; Arabic was a language that if Arabs used outside the home they would not make friends and would be isolated from the wider American society which would never consider them as 'good patriots' (Rouchdy 2002: 142, discussing Orfalea 1988: 107). This 'feeling of paranoia' reflects Arab Americans' attitudes towards Arabic at that time. Thus, this group attempted to disengage themselves from their ethnic heritage and language to

the extent that some went so far as to anglicize their Arabic names to avoid bias and discrimination at work or when applying for a job. Arabs in the present study, by contrast, due to the British legislations prohibiting discrimination based on language, race, religion, ethnicity, etc. can use Arabic inside and outside the home, do not fear discrimination at work due to their being Arabs, and have pride in their ethnic language. Also, they still maintain their Arabic names and give their newly-born children Arabic names. This is contrary as well to Ahdab-Yehia's (1980: 145) finding, in her study in the Detroit Maronite community, that Arabic surnames are infrequent since the members of the community have always favored American surnames; hence they changed their Arabic ones. As Dressler (1988: 188) states, "an early sign of language decay is the cessation of giving and using proper names in the recessive language, particularly in oral in-group interactions" (cited in Al-Khatib 2001:165).

7.5 Conclusion

The findings indicate that the participants' have positive attitudes towards their native language. In this regard, they have positive attitudes not only towards their relevant dialect, but also towards the other dialects of Arabic as well as MSA. This indicates that the existence of multiple dialects and diglossia does not influence attitudes to Arabic. The participants' attitudes towards Arabic show that they consider Arabic as 'a core value' (Smolicz 1981) that is crucial to the survival and continuation of the Arabic-speaking community, and a prerequisite for group membership. This is important for language maintenance. Also, Arabic as a core value for them is combined with another important core value; i.e. religion. According to Smolicz, language is usually most effective as a core value when it is combined with other core values, and when such core values necessitate the use of the language for specific purposes (cf. section 1.5.1.2). Also, Conklin and Lourie (1983) refer to the significance that religious ceremonies require command of the community language. This is the case with regard to Arabic language and Islamic religion.

Thus, as far as language attitudes are concerned, it can be concluded that there exist favorable conditions for the maintenance of Arabic. Of particular noteworthiness here is that the positive attitudes towards Arabic stem from both its affective and instrumental value for the participants. That is, the participants reported that they consider Arabic as more beautiful than English, symbolic of identity, etc. (i.e. affective value). They also reported that they need it for intra-group communication (i.e. instrumental value). Moreover, the participants' positive attitudes towards Arabic are accompanied by real efforts and practices to maintain it. That is, attitudes do not

necessarily correspond to real language behavior[119]. It is also possible that the expression of positive attitudes may sometimes be a means to disguise the decline in language use and the lack of effort for language maintenance (Fishman 1964). Hence, it is important to know whether positive attitudes are turned into actions or not (cf. section 1.5.1.2). In the present study, besides the positive attitudes towards Arabic, parents exert effort to maintain it. For example, they use Arabic at home with their children and insist that children speak Arabic, and as illustrated in chapter 5, they use different discourse strategies to achieve that. Thus, parents try to maintain a demarcation between Arabic and English. Parents are also keen to have Arabic satellite channels at home, visit the homeland, etc. to help children acquire and maintain Arabic. Not only are parents concerned with the maintenance of the spoken language, they are also concerned with maintaining the written medium. Hence, they send children to Arabic schools to learn literacy in Arabic, to mosque to learn the Quran, etc. (cf. Chapter 6). Thus, in the case of Arabs in the present study, the positive attitudes towards Arabic are activated into practice.

As aforementioned, children have positive attitudes towards Arabic regardless of whether they were born in the host country or the homeland. This may tell us to some extent about the future of Arabic maintenance in the third generation. In other words, children have positive attitudes towards Arabic although the majority of them were born in Britain, and this might be a result of influence from the parents' attitudes. This means that the third generation will likely experience similar positive attitudes towards Arabic as those experienced by the second generation with their parents (first generation). Hence, the third generation may have favorable attitudes towards Arabic since, as explained above, parents' attitudes towards the ethnic language influence children's language socialization. This is important for Arabic maintenance in the third generation. Also, when the second generation have positive attitudes, they will likely try to maintain Arabic among their own children in the future (third generation). The positive attitude is the first step towards the maintenance of an immigrant language. Without positive attitudes, the practical effort to maintain the language is not likely to start (Fishman 2001b: 223).

Another important portent that may tell us about the future of Arabic maintenance in the third generation can be obtained from the child generation's self-

[119] This is the situation in the case of Irish and Welsh, for example; i.e. Irish and Welsh parents have positive attitudes towards the languages and want their children to maintain them, but they do not use them with their children (King 2000: 167, discussing Baker 1992, Benton 1986, Paulston 1994: 86, and Lyon & Elis 1991).

reports about their anticipated language use with their own future children[120]. Children in the present study emphasized in the interviews and casual conversations that they would speak Arabic to their prospective children and send them to Arabic schools in order to maintain Arabic. They reported also a preference to marry an Arab; one of them said that some of his friends have non-Arab mothers and their Arabic is not good, so the mother is important for Arabic maintenance since she is always with children. Such self-reports about language use with prospective children may give a picture about language maintenance in the third generation; however, no definite predictions can be made since it cannot be determined whether such positive attitudes and commitment to Arabic maintenance in the second generation will be converted into real practices in the future or not. In this regard, the fact that the second generation speaks Arabic well (cf. chapter 6) may possibly help them fulfil their wishful thinking and commitment to speak and maintain Arabic among their future children. However, as explained in chapter 5, the child generation, unlike their parents, are very competent in English, which might affect their language choice with their prospective children who will also be competent speakers of English. Thus, both may use English rather than Arabic in their interaction at home. Of noteworthiness here, on the other hand, is that the children's desire to speak Arabic with their prospective children is accompanied by concerns about Arabic maintenance and fear to lose Arabic, which can be taken as a positive sign of language maintenance in the future according to Brown (2008: 13). However, the maintenance of the native language is also conditional that practical efforts are made to promote the intergenerational transmission of the ethnic language (Brown 2008: 10).

In the previous chapters, we investigated different aspects related to Arabic language maintenance in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester, including language choice, language ability, language attitudes, and Manchester's language policy. In the final chapter below a conclusion of the findings is provided.

[120] Self-reports about language use with children in the hypothetical were utilized by Brown (2008) in his study on Belarusian language maintenance; such data is an accepted research method for the study of language preservation/shift (Brown 2008: 5, discussing De Vries 1992).

8 Conclusion

In this concluding chapter, I present first a general concluding statement about the principal findings of the present study. Then, I provide a contemporary evaluation of language maintenance in an immigrant community. In the last section, I discuss the limitations of the study

8.1 General conclusion for the findings of the present study

The study looked into Arabic maintenance in the Arabic-speaking community under investigation. Language maintenance here does not mean such a complete maintenance in which the native language is maintained in the immigrant context exactly as in the homeland. According to Sridhar (1997), such complete maintenance does not exist. Rather, language maintenance in the present study is investigated through a number of perspectives; e.g. whether the language is still functional in daily use vis-à-vis English, whether there is compartmentalization in function between the native language and the host language, whether the participants have ability in the ethnic language so that they can functionalize it in realistic interaction, whether they have positive attitudes towards the native language and its maintenance and exert effort to that end, whether the language is transmitted intergenerationally, and whether the language policy in Manchester is supportive of language maintenance. The study also investigated two important issues that have not received their due in the literature on immigrant language maintenance: firstly, how contemporary globalization which characterizes present-day social relations and life can help immigrant minorities, such as the one in this study, maintain their ethnic language; secondly, the influence that the multiple dialects and diglossia may have on Arabic maintenance in an immigrant context. Thus, the study helps fill a gap in the literature regarding these issues.

As indicated in chapter 5, language choice patterns indicate that there is a compartmentalization in function between Arabic and English. There are differences between the first generation and the second generation in this regard. That is, the first generation maintains a complete compartmentalization between the two languages whereby Arabic (the relevant dialect to each speaker) is used consistently in intra-group communication (e.g. with spouse, children, friends, etc.), and English in inter-group interaction (e.g. with non-Arabs at work, mosque, etc.). On the other hand, while children maintain this demarcation in their interactions with parents, first generation Arabs and non-English speaking peers, they use both languages with siblings (English more than Arabic with siblings in 6 families out of 11, and Arabic more than English with siblings in 5 families out of 11). They also use English consistently in interactions with

Arabic-English speaking peers. However, despite these generation differences, the language choice patterns indicate that Arabic is still functional in the participant families in daily interactions, which is important for its maintenance. In this regard, as illustrated in chapter 5, parents use different discourse strategies; e.g. non-response strategy, minimal-grasp strategy, etc., with their children to urge them to speak Arabic. Such strategies are particularly important since they help socialize children in monolingualism in family interaction, especially as the strategies that parents use are 'high constraint ones', which forces the child to respond.

This communicative function of Arabic is supported by the participants' ability in it. Children, for example, have ability in spoken and written Arabic, as illustrated in chapter 6, which is another sign of Arabic maintenance. Children can use their relevant dialect to perform a range of communicative tasks in real life situations. This is evident, for example, in their use of Arabic with parents and first generation Arabs. Concerning written Arabic, children learn literacy in MSA in the Arabic supplementary schools which they attend. In such schools, students have to sit the exams in MSA and use text books which are in MSA. Children's competence in Arabic encourages them to use the language in communication since they do not struggle with it. As explained in chapter 6, competence is one of the factors that determine language choice. Such use guarantees a function for the language, which is a prerequisite for its survival and intergenerational transmission. Of most importance in this regard is that children's ability in English does not influence their use of Arabic with parents at home. Likewise, although parents have ability in English, this does not affect their use of Arabic with children and the demarcation they maintain between the two languages.

Another indicator of Arabic maintenance in the present study is obtained from the participants' positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance in both generations. As illustrated in chapter 7, the participants have positive attitudes towards their own relevant dialect which they need for parent-children communication, children-parent interaction, interaction with relatives, etc. They also have positive attitudes towards other dialects of Arabic in which they need receptive competence to communicate with people speaking other dialects than theirs. The positive attitudes apply also to MSA, which the participants consider a unifying factor for them regardless of nationality. Such attitudes towards all forms of Arabic are also linked to the fundamental function of Arabic in the practice of Islam and understanding of the Quran. It is also related to the participants' view that Arabic, regardless of the various dialects, is one language which is symbolic of identity and group membership. Such positive attitudes towards Arabic are important for its maintenance since they influence language choice. As mentioned in chapter 5, one of the principal motivations for

parents' use of Arabic with children is related to their positive attitude towards their native language and their desire to transmit it to their children. The positive attitudes also influence language ability; e.g. they form one of the motivations for parents to send their children to Arabic schools to learn MSA. Of particular noteworthiness is that the positive attitudes towards Arabic stem from both its affective and instrumental value for the participants. They reported that they consider Arabic as more beautiful than English, symbolic of identity, etc. (i.e. affective value). They also reported that they need it for intra-group communication (i.e. instrumental value). Moreover, the participants' positive attitudes towards Arabic are accompanied by real efforts and practices to maintain it. For example, parents use Arabic at home with their children and insist that children speak Arabic, are keen to have Arabic satellite channels at home, go on visits to their homeland, etc. They also send children to Arabic schools to learn literacy in Arabic.

Another encouraging factor for the maintenance of Arabic is related to the language policy in Manchester. The British legislations that ban discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, language, etc. encourage Arabs in the present study to maintain their Arabic language and identity, along with the English ones, since they do not fear discrimination when, for instance, applying for a job or accessing government services. In this regard, it was illustrated in chapter 3 that local authorities provide different services in the different community languages in Manchester including Arabic. This is represented in the availability of Arabic interpreters, translators, linkworkers, documents, etc. in the different departments of MCC and agencies working alongside, such as NHS, Courts, Police, etc. Such provisions add an extra domain where Arabic can be functionalized and used in inter-group interactions. This also helps new immigrants who may not speak English to manage their life in their native language. It also gives the Arabic language a kind of prestige and status, especially among children, which is of benefit for its maintenance. The status of Arabic is enhanced as well by the fact that Arab students can have Arabic as a module in GCSE and A-Level. Local authority's support for minorities, including Arabs, is also represented to a certain extent in the limited encouragement they provide for minorities to establish their ethnic supplementary schools. For example, MCC provides some training for teachers working in supplementary schools, carries out inspection visits to schools to check such aspects as safety, and encourages mainstream English schools to host supplementary schools for fees. MCC also provides financial support, although very limited, for supplementary schools. While the investigation of Manchester's language policy that has been carried out within the present study examines the status quo of that policy and does not propose to offer an alternative to it, such investigation may help inspire some kind of

reconsideration of policies in support of community languages. For example, it might contribute to what Blackledge and Creese (2010: 74) refer to as policy and practice in the inclusion of supplementary schools in the wider educational agenda. Moreover, rather than an indirect policy which is implied from the national guidelines that stipulate the principle of equality, it was suggested in the present study that there should be an explicit minority language policy which states clearly that there must be a certain level of provisions in community languages and which ensures that ethnic minorities can learn and maintain their native language. The implied nature of the policy may in the long run affect the level of provisions in community languages, which may increase or decrease according to the different explanations by the different departments of the principle of equal opportunities.

In summary, it can be concluded that Arabic is still functional in both the first and second generations. There are, however, some concerns regarding this communicative function in the third generation. That is, as indicated in chapter 5, one of the motivations for the second generation's choice of Arabic is sometimes the parents' better ability in Arabic than English. When this second generation have children and become parents in the future, such ability trigger will likely no longer exist; hence, they may interact with their prospective children in English. Thus, unless the second generation have the motivation, like the first generation, to maintain their native language, there might be less chance of Arabic maintenance in the third generation, and use of the Arabic language may follow the typical 'three-generation language shift pattern' (cf. section 1.3.2). In this regard, there are tentative indications of Arabic maintenance in the third generation that are obtained from the second generation's positive attitudes towards Arabic, their fears to lose it, and their reports that they will maintain it among their prospective children in the future; i.e. they will use Arabic with them at home as their parents currently do, send them to Arabic schools, maintain contacts with and visits to the homeland, even marry an Arab, etc. However, these indications are cautious as it cannot be determined whether these wishful intentions will be turned into real practices in the future or not (cf. Chapter 7).

It can be concluded also that the efforts for maintaining Arabic are mainly community-internal, reflecting a kind of bottom-up maintenance effort led by both individuals and institutions without depending on the government to that end. The individually-led efforts are manifest in the parents' keenness that their children speak and maintain Arabic; hence, they speak Arabic to them, send them to Arabic schools, maintain regular contacts with and visits to the homeland, have Arabic satellite channels at home, etc. The institutionally-led efforts are particularly represented by the existence of many Arabic supplementary schools, and Quran sessions and Arabic lessons at

mosques. This bottom-up language maintenance effort is to some extent different from the situation in a country like Australia where, for instance, government and government-aided multilingual radio stations broadcast in many community languages and where far more community languages are taught in mainstream education besides supplementary schools (Clyne and Kipp 1999: 17-18). This may suggest a need for more and real mainstreaming of community language teaching in Manchester rather than the current relegating of this task to part-time ethnic community schools. Another conclusion in the present study is related to the motivations for Arabic maintenance. The most important motivations for Arabic maintenance in the present study are sustaining contact with the homeland, communicating within the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester, understanding the Quran and practicing Islam, maintaining the Arabic identity, and obtaining ethnic group membership.

8.2 Towards a contemporary evaluation of language maintenance in an immigrant community

The study provides a contemporary evaluation of language maintenance in an immigrant context, which has implications for immigrant language maintenance in diaspora in general. It may contribute to the general understanding of the positive role that globalization might play in helping immigrant language maintenance. That is, globalization, and what is associated with it from supraterritorial activities that characterize contemporary social life (cf. section 1.6.2), appears to be one of the factors that helps participants preserve Arabic. As explained in chapter 5, the advances in communication technologies and transportation means associated with globalization make it possible for the participants to maintain regular contact with and visits to the homeland. This is important for Arabic maintenance since it gives the language a communicative function in the homeland, in addition to its function in the immigrant context (cf. section 5.4.6). This communicative need for Arabic in the homeland represents an important motivation for the positive attitudes towards Arabic and its maintenance (cf. Chapter 7). Also, such visits to the country of origin enhance children's ability in spoken Arabic as they find themselves in a context in which Arabic is the only language used. They also help children acquire the native culture (cf. section 6.5.2.2). The acquisition of native language and culture is supported as well through watching Arabic satellite channels, which all participants have at their homes. Such channels enhance children's receptive competence in the other dialects of Arabic since they broadcast in various dialects. The channels help children develop receptive competence in MSA since some of these channels broadcast in MSA (cf. section 6.5.2.2). This role of

Arabic satellite channels as a helpful factor in Arabic maintenance in the present study indicates how the contemporary advances in communication technology associated with globalization have introduced global media as a potential, cheaper alternative to local ethnic media, which may be unaffordable for many immigrant communities to establish within the host country. The advances and other supraterritorial activities associated with globalization (e.g. supraterritorial organizations, media, markets, etc.) also led to 'deterritorialization' of ethnic identity, which makes the participants believe that they can maintain their ethnic identity wherever they are, even in diaspora where they are outside of the boundaries of the homeland (cf. section 7.4.1.3.1.1).

The study has implications, as well, for research on Arabic maintenance in diaspora around the world. Most studies on Arabic-speaking immigrant communities focus on communities from a single country of origin whereas the present study specifically argues for the existence of a more general Arabic-speaking community (cf. Chapter 4). This reflects more the real situation of Arabic speakers in Manchester, and most often in other immigrant contexts, who come from the different Arab countries and are in daily face-to-face interaction with each other. This view of the Arabic-speaking community as a varied, rather than a uniform, one should be taken in consideration in future research on Arabic in diaspora. In the present study, this heterogeneity provided the opportunity to investigate the roles of multiple dialects and diglossia on Arabic maintenance in diaspora, which fills a gap in the literature in this respect. In this regard, the findings indicate that multiple dialects and diglossia do not influence language maintenance; they do not affect the participants' use of Arabic, their ability in it or attitudes towards its maintenance (cf. sections 5.4.5, 6.6 and 7.2 respectively). In other words, the dialects are mutually intelligible; hence, a speaker needs only receptive competence in them for intra-group communication. This receptive competence is naturally acquired through direct face-to-face communication with Arabs speaking the various dialects within the community, and virtually through the Arabic satellite channels that broadcast in the various dialects. As for diglossia, MSA is the reading and writing medium for all Arabs, not a spoken variety. Hence, speakers need only to learn literacy in it and to have receptive competence in it in certain formal registers; e.g. religion, education etc. This is attained through Arabic schools, Arabic satellite channels, mosque, etc.

Also, as shown in chapter 4, the participants form a speech community with mutually intelligible spoken dialects and one written medium. This supports their effort to maintain Arabic in that it unifies the efforts exerted by the members of the community, who originate from different countries, to maintain Arabic, and makes the means for that maintenance available and valid for all the members regardless of the

nationality or the dialect. That is, the members of the community become concerned with Arabic maintenance in a general sense, not with the maintenance of the relevant dialect to each one. Thus, Arabs in the present study, in their attempt to maintain Arabic among their children, do not feel they have to send children to an Arabic school belonging to people from their own home country, to watch their country of origin's channels only or to make friends with families speaking their own dialect only. Any Arabic school, Arabic channel, Arab family can do the job of helping maintain Arabic, regardless of the nationality or the dialect. All these resources for Arabic maintenance are made available for all the participants in the present study by the fact that the participants form a speech community with mutually intelligible spoken dialects and one written medium. Thus, if children do not have ability in Arabic, do not use it, are not concerned about its maintenance, and language shift takes place, it will be most probably due to reasons other than the existence of multiple dialects and diglossia. As long as there is the motivation, will, and effort among Arabs to maintain Arabic, the multiple dialects and diglossia will not be an obstacle for language maintenance.

The study also has implications for research on minority language maintenance in general, especially the emphasis on such determinants of language maintenance as the functionality of the ethnic language, speaker ability in it, the positive attitudes towards its maintenance and the accompanied effort exerted to achieve that purpose. As such, it highlights the importance of utilizing a kind of a comprehensive approach in future research on language maintenance by exploring it from different perspectives in order to gain a full picture of the maintenance/shift of an immigrant language. For example, it is not enough to investigate attitudes only without studying aspects such as language use and language proficiency to see whether positive attitudes are turned into real practices and effort to maintain the native language. Likewise, focusing on the language behavior only; i.e. language use and proficiency, as most studies on immigrant language maintenance do, may also be not enough since it does not take into account the symbolic function of the ethnic language for its speakers.

8.3 Limitations of the study

One of the limitations of the present study is that there is no third generation given the relatively recent date of immigration of the first generation. Thus, no definite conclusions can be made regarding Arabic maintenance in the third generation so that we can confirm or contradict the trend in the literature that language shift is complete over three generations. As aforementioned, right now what we have regarding LM in the third generation is wishful thinking or commitments from the second generation; however, no conclusions can be made since it cannot be determined whether such

commitments will be converted into real practices in the future to maintain the language. Thus, it is suggested that future research on the Arabic speaking community consider three-generational families. Another limitation is that the study, as mentioned in chapter 5, did not investigate code-switching; the focus of the study was on investigating the maintenance of Arabic and also such an investigation requires obtaining recorded natural conversational data in the participant families, which was not possible to gain in the present study. However, it should be noted that code-switching is of concern to the study of language maintenance and shift in immigrant contexts, and should be taken into consideration in future research. Finally, it remains to say that while the conclusions drawn in this study cannot be generalized to all Arabs in Manchester, they can still be said to apply to a substantial section of the Arabic-speaking community that shares similar characteristics as the participants in the present study.

Bibliography

Abu Haidar, F. 2002. Arabic and English in conflict: Iraqis in the UK. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *Language Contact and Language Conflict in Arabic. Variations on a Sociolinguistic Theme*. Routledge Curzon. 286-96.

Abu Melhim, A. 1991. Code-switching and linguistic accommodation in Arabic. In: B. Comrie and M. Eid, eds. *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 231-50.

Abu Melhim, A. 1992. *Communication across Arabic Dialects: Code-Switching and Linguistic Accommodation in Informal Conversational Interactions*. Ph.D. dissertation. Texas A & M University, College Station.

Abu-Rabia, S. 2000. Effects of exposure to literary Arabic on reading comprehension in a diglossic situation. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 13: 147-157.

Ager, D. 1996. *Language Policy in Britain and France*. London: Cassell.

Agnihotri, R. 1979. *Process of Assimilation: a Sociolinguistic Study of Sikh Children in Leeds*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, England: York University.

Ahdab-Yehia, M. 1980. The Detroit Maronite community. In: B. Aswad, ed. *Arabic Speaking Communities in American Cities*. The Centre for Migration Studies of New York, Inc. 137-54.

Al-Khatib, M. 2001. Language shift among the Armenians of Jordan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 152: 153-77.

Altoma, S. 1969. *The Problem of Diglossia in Arabic: A Comparative Study of Classical and Iraqi Arabic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Antoun, R. 1989. *Muslim Preachers in the Modern World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Auer, P. and Di Luzio, A. 1992. *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ayari, S. 1996. Diglossia and illiteracy in the Arab world. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 9: 243-52.

Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Bateson, G. 1972. A Theory of play and fantasy. In: *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Bell, A. 1984 (1997). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 145-204.

Benton, R. 1986. Schools as agents for language revival in Ireland and New Zealand. In: B. Spolsky, ed. *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 33–76.

Bergsland, K. 1992. Language contacts between Southern Sami and Scandinavian. In: E. Jahr, ed. *Language Contact: Theoretical and Empirical Studies. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 60*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 5-16.

Bhatia, T. 1981. Trinidad Hindi: three generations of a transplanted variety. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 11(2): 135-150.

Bickerton, D. 1971. Inherent variability and variable rules. *Foundations of Language* 7: 1457-1492.

Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. 2010. *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*. Continuum.

Blackledge, A. and Pavlenko, A. 2001. Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 5 (3): 243-57.

Blair, F. 1990. *Survey on a Shoestring: A Manual for Small-Scale Language Surveys*. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Blommaert, J. and Dong, J. 2010. *Ethnographic Fieldwork. A Beginner's Guide.* Multilingual Matters.

Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Boneva, B. 1998. Ethnicity and the nation: the Bulgarian dilemma. In: C. Paulston and D. Peckham, eds. *Linguistic Minorities in Central and Eastern Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 80-97.

Boumans, L. and Ruiter, J. 2002. Moroccan Arabic in the European diaspora. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *Language Contact and Language Conflict in Arabic. Variations on a Sociolinguistic Theme*. Routledge Curzon. 259-85.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Braunmüller, K. & Zeevaert, L. 2001. *Semikommunikation, rezeptive Mehrsprachigkeit und verwandte phänomene. Eine bibliographische Bestandsaufnahme [Semicommunication, receptive multilingualism and related phenomena. A bibliographical overview].* Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit– Folge B, nr. 19. Universität Hamburg.

Broeder, P. and Extra, G. 1999. *Language, Ethnicity and Education: Case Studies of Immigrant Minority Groups and Immigrant Minority Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Brown, N. 2008. Language shift or maintenance? An examination of language usage across four generations as self-reported by university age students in Belarus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29 (1): 1-15.

Brustad, K. 2000. *The Syntax of Spoken Arabic: A Comparative Study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti Dialects.* Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Byrne, B. 2004. Qualitative interviewing. In: C. Seale, ed. *Researching Society and Culture*, 2nd edn. London: Sage. 179-92.

Bø, I. 1978. *Ungdom og naboland [Youth and Neighboring Countries]*. Stavanger: Rogalandsforskning (rapport 4).

Börestam, U. 1987. *Dansk-svensk språkgemenskap på undantag [Danish-Swedish Language Community as a Special Case]*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Carreira, M. 2002. The media, marketing and critical mass: portents of linguistic maintenance. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 21 (2): 37-54.

CIIL (Central Institute of Indian Languages) 1994. *Proceedings from the International Conference on the Maintenance of Indian Languages and Culture Abroad*. Unpublished MS.

Charmaz, K. 2008. Grounded theory in the 21st century. In: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. California: Sage. 203-41.

Churchill, S. 1986. *The Education of Linguistic and Cultural Minorities in OECD Countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Clyne, M. 1976 (reprinted with corrections 1983). *Australia Talks*. (=Pacific Linguistics, series D, No. 23) Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies.

Clyne, M. 1981. Second generation foreigner talk in Australia. In: M. Clyne, ed. *Foreigner talk*. The Hague: Mouton. 69-80.

Clyne, M. 1982 (2nd ed. 1985). *Multilingual Australia*. Melbourne: River Seine.

Clyne, M. 1985. *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages* (=Pacific Linguistics, series C, No. 92) Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies.

Clyne, M. 1991. *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. and Kipp, S. 1999. *Pluricentric Languages in an Immigrant Context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Clyne, M. and Kipp, S. 2006. *Tiles in a Multilingual Mosaic: Macedonian, Filipino and Somali in Melbourne.* Pacific Linguistics. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies.

Colic-Peisker, V. and Tilbury, F. 2003. 'Active' and 'passive' resettlement: the influence of support services and refugees' own resources on resettlement style. *International Migration* 41 (5): 61-91.

Collins, J. 1999. The Ebonics controversy in context: literacies, subjectivities and language ideologies in the United States. In J. Blommaert, ed. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 210– 234.

Conklin, N. and Lourie, M. 1983. *A Host of Tongues: Language Communities in the United States.* New York: Free Press.

Cook-Gumperz, J. 1986b. Caught in a web of words: some considerations on language socialization and language acquisition. In: J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro, and J. Streeck, eds. *Children's World and Children's Language*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Cook-Gumperz, J. and Gumperz, J. 1978. Context in children's speech. In: N. Waterson and C. Snow, eds. *The Development of Communication*. New York: John Wiley.

Corsaro, W. 1977. The clarification request as a feature of adult-interactive styles with young children. *Language in Society* 8: 315-36.

Corson, D. 1990. *Language Policy across the Curriculum*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Creswell, J. 2003. *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, London: Sage.

Daher, N. 1992. A Lebanese dialect in Cleveland: language attrition in progress. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *The Arabic Language in America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 25-35.

Delsing, L-O & Lundin Åkesson, K. 2005. *Håller språket ihop Norden? En forskningsrapport omungdomars förståelse av danska, svenska och norska [Does the Language Keep the Nordic Countries Together? A Research Report on How Well Young People Understand Danish, Swedish and Norwegian]*. Copenhagen: Nordiska ministerrådet.

Denzin, N. 1989b. *The Research Act* (3rd edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. 2008. Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. California: Sage. 1-44.

Detaramani, C. and Lock, G. 2003. Multilingualism in decline: language repertoire, use and shift in two Hong Kong Indian communities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24 (4): 249-73.

De Vries, J. 1992. Language maintenance and shift: problems of measurement. In: W. Fase, K. Jaspaert and S. Kroon, eds. *Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 211- 22.

Dittrich, E. and Lentz, A. 1994. 'Die Fabrikation von Ethnizitat' [The fabrication of ethnicity]. In: R. Kobler and T. Schiel, eds. *Nationalstaat und Ethnizitat* [Nation-State and Ethnicity] (Frankfurt/M: Verlag fur Interkulturelle Kommunikation). 23-43.

Donakey, A. 2007. *Language Planning and Policy in Manchester*. Unpublished MA dissertation, The University of Manchester.

Dorian, N. 1977. The problem of the semi-speaker in language death. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 12: 23-32.

Dorian, N. 1981. *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dorian, N. (ed.) 1989. *Investigating Obsolescence. Studies in Language Contraction and Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dorian, N. 1999. The study of obsolescence: stages, surprises, challenges. *Languages and Linguistics* 3: 99-122.

Dressler, W. 1988. Language death. In: F. Newmeyer, ed. *Language the Socio-cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A. 1992. Language in context and language as context: the Samoan respect vocabulary. In: A. Duranti and C. Goodwin, eds. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dweik, B. 1980. *A Sociolinguistic Study of Arabic Linguistic Variations*. Proceedings of the University-wide Conference on Communicative Behavior: Approaches and Research Center for Studies in Cultural Transmission. Buffalo: State University of New York.

Dweik, B. 1992. Lebanese Christians in Buffalo: language maintenance and language shift. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *The Arabic Language in America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 100-118.

Dweik, B. 2000. Linguistic and cultural maintenance among Chechens of Jordan. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 13(2): 184-195.

Döpke, S. 1986. Discourse structures in bilingual families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7: 493-507.

Döpke, S. 1992a. *One Parent One Language: An Interactional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Edwards, V. 2001. Community languages in the United Kingdom. In: G. Extra and D. Gorter, eds. *The Other Languages of Europe: Demographic, Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 243-260.

El Aissati, A. 1996. *Language Loss among Native Speakers of Moroccan Arabic in the Netherlands.* PhD Dissertation, University of Nijmegen. (Publ. As Studies in Multilingualism, Vol. 6. Tilburg University Press, 1997).

Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D., and Steinmetz, A. 1991. *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles*. London: The Falmer Press.

Ennaji, M. 1999. The Arab world (Maghreb and Near East). In: J. Fishman, ed. *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford University Press. 382-395.

Ezzat, A. 1974. *Intelligibility among Arabic Dialects*. Beirut: Bouheiry Brothers.

Fasold, R. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ferguson, C. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325-44.

Fishman, J. 1964 (1966). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. In: J. Fishman, V. Nahirny, J. Hofman and R. Hayden, eds. *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton. 424-58.

Fishman, J. 1965 (2000). Who speaks what language to whom and when? In: L. Wei, ed. *The Bilingualism Reader*. London: Routledge. 89-106.

Fishman, J. 1972. *Language in Sociocultural Change*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fishman, J. 1973. *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. 1985. *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity.* Berlin: Mouton.

Fishman, J. 1989. *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. 2001. *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. 2001b. If threatened languages can be saved, then can dead languages be revived? *Current Issues in Language Planning* 2: 222-30.

Fishman, J. and Cooper, R. 1971. The interrelationships and utility of alternative bilingualism measures. In: W. Whiteley, ed. *Language Use and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 126-42.

Fishman, J., Cooper, R. and Ma, R. 1971. Alternative measures of bilingualism. In: J. Fishman, R. Cooper and R. Ma, eds. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 483-512.

Flick, U. 2002. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Gal, S. 1979. *Language Shift. Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Gambhir, S. 1981. *The East Indian Speech Community in Guyana: A Sociolinguistic Study with Special Reference to Koine Formation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Garcia, M. 2003. Speaking Spanish in Los Angeles and San Antonio: who, when, where, why. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 22 (1): 1-21.

García, O. 1997. New York's multilingualism: world languages and their role in a U.S. city. In: O. García and J. Fishman, eds. *The Multilingual Apple. Languages in New York City*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 3-50.

Gardner, R. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second-Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivations*. Baltimore: E. Arnold.

Ghuman, P. 1994. *Coping with Two Cultures: British Asian and Indo-Canadian Adolescents.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. and Taylor, D. 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In: H. Giles, ed. *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press. 307-348.

Giles, H. and Coupland, N. 1991. *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Giles, H. and Johnson, P. 1987. Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68: 69-99.

Giles, H. and Powesland, P. 1997. Accommodation theory. In: N. Coupland & A. Jaworski, eds. *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook*. Houndmills, London: Macmillan. 232-239.

Giordan, H. 1992. *Les Minorités en Europe: Droits Linguistiques et Droits de l'Homme*. Paris: kime.

Gogonas, N. 2007. *Ethnolinguistic Vitality and Language Maintenance in Second-Generation Migrants: A Study of Albanian and Egyptian Pupils in Athens*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex.

Goodwin, C. and Duranti, A. 1992. Rethinking context: an introduction. In: A. Duranti and C. Goodwin, eds. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodz, N. 1989. Parental language mixing in bilingual families. *Enfant Mental Health Journal* 10 (1): 25-44.

Gooskens, C. 2007. The contribution of linguistic factors to the intelligibility of closely related languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28 (6): 445-467.

Greenbaum, T. 1988. *The Practical Handbook and Guide to Focus Group Research*. Massachusetts, Toronto: Lexington.

Greenfield, L. 1972. Situational measures of normative language views in relation to person, place and topic among Puerto Rican bilinguals. In: J. Fishman, ed. *Advances in the Sociology of Language* Vol. II. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Grix, J. 2004. *The Foundations of Research*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gumperz, J. 1962. Types of linguistic community. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4: 28-40.

Gumperz, J. 1968. The speech community. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. London: Macmillan. 381-6.

Gumperz, J. 1977. Sociocultual knowledge in conversational inference. In: M. Saville-Troike, ed. *Linguistics and Anthropology. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Gumperz, J. 1982a. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. 1992. Contextualiztion revisited. In: P. Auer and A. Di Luzio, eds. *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M. 1972. Sociological aspects of semantic change. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguists.* Bologna: il Mulino. 853-88.

Hatoss, A. and Sheely, T. 2009. Language maintenance and identity among Sudanese-Australian refugee-background youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30 (2): 127-144.

Haugen, E. 1966. Semicommunication: the language gap in Scandinavia. *Sociological Inquiry* 36: 280- 297.

Haugen, E. 1980. Language fragmentation in Scandinavia. In: E. Haugen- J.D. McClure-D. Thomason, eds. *Minority languages today*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 100-119.

Heller, M. 2011. *Paths to Post-Nationalism. A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hitti, P. 1924. *The Syrians in America*. New York: George H. Doran.

Hockett, C. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

Holmes, J. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Holmes, J., Roberts, M., Verivaki, M. and Áipolo, Á. 1993. Language maintenance and language shift in three New Zealand speech communities. *Applied Linguistics* 14 (1): 1-24.

Hovdhaugen, E. 1992. Language contact in the Pacific: Samoan influence on Tokelauan. In: E. Jahr, ed. *Language Contact: Theoretical and Empirical Studies. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 60*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 53-70.

Hudson, R. 1980 (2nd edition 1996, reprinted 2001). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hulsen, M., De Bot, K. and Weltens, B. 2002. "Between two worlds." Social networks, language shift, and language processing in three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153: 27-52.

Hymes, D. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 35-71.

Hymes, D. (ed.) 1981. *In vain I Tried to Tell You: Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Iraqi, J. 1990. *Reading to Arabic-Speaking Kindergarten Children Compared to Alternative Enrichment Activities as a Means of Improving Listening Comprehension and Language Skills*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Haifa.

Johnson, I. 2005. *How green is their valley? Subjective vitality of Welsh in the Chubut Valley and the Cordillera, Argentina*. Paper Presented at the Language and Global Communication Conference, Cardiff: Cardiff University, 7-9 July.

Jongenburger, W. and Aarssen, J. 2001. Linguistic and cultural exchange and appropriation: a survey study in a multi-ethnic neighbourhood in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22 (4): 293–308.

Karan, M. 2000. Motivations: language vitality assessments using the perceived benefit model of language shift. In: G. Kindell and M. Lewis, eds. *Assessing Ethnolinguistic Vitality: Theory and Practice, Selected Papers From the Third International Language Assessment Conference. Publications in Sociolinguistics*. Dallas, TX: SIL International. 65-77.

Kenny, D. 1992. Arab-Americans learning Arabic: motivations and attitudes. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *The Arabic Language in America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 119-61.

Kielhöfer, B. and Jonekeit, S. 1983. *Zweisprachige Kindererziehung*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg Verlag.

King, K. 2000. Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3 (3):167-84.

Kipp, S. 1981. *Reconstructing a Pattern of Language Use and Language Shift*. MA thesis, Monash University.

Kloss, H. 1966. German-American language maintenance efforts. In: J. Fishman, V. Nahirny, J. Hofman and R. Hayden, eds. *Language Loyalty in the United States.* The Hague: Mouton. 206-52.

Kuo, E. 1974a. Bilingual pattern of a Chinese immigrant group in the United States. *Anthropological Linguistics* 16: 128-40.

Kuo, E. 1974b. The family and bilingual socialization: a sociolinguistic study of a sample of Chinese children in the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 92: 181-91.

Labov, W. 1972. On the mechanism of linguistic change. In: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 512-38.

Lamb, T. 2001. Language policy in multilingual UK. *Language Learning Journal* 23: 4-12.

Langford, D. 1981. The clarification request sequence in conversation between mothers and their children. In: P. French and M. MacLure, eds. *Adult-Child Conversation*. London: Croom-Helm.

Lanza, E. 1997. *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lasagabaster, D. 2008. Basque diaspora in the USA and language maintenance. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29 (1): 66-90.

Lasagabaster, D. and Huguet, Á. 2007. *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts. Language Use and attitudes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lemmon, C. and Goggin, J. 1989. The measurement of bilingualism and its relationship to cognitive ability. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 10: 133-55.

Leopold, W. 1949. *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child*. Vols. 1-4. Evanson, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Lewellen, T. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21st Century*. Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

Linguistic Minorities Project, 1985. *The Other Languages of England*. London: Routledge.

Luo, S. and Wiseman, R. 2000. Ethnic language maintenance among Chinese immigrant children in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 24: 307-24.

Lutz, A. 2006. Spanish maintenance among English-speaking youth: the role of individual and social characteristics. *Social Factor* 84 (3): 1417-33.

Lyon, J. and Ellis, N. 1991. Parental attitudes towards the Welsh language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 12 (4): 239–251.

Lyons, J. 1970. *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mackey, W. 1968. The description of bilingualism. In: J. Fishman, ed. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. 554-84.

Martin, M. 1996. *Spanish Language Maintenance and Shift in Australia*. Doctoral dissertation, Australian National University.

Maurud, ø. 1976. *Nabospråksforståelse i Skandinavia: en undersøkelse om gjensidig forståelse av tale- og skriftspråk i Danmark, Norg og Sverige [Mutual Intelligibility of Neighboring Languages in Scandinavia. A Study of the Mutual Understanding of Written and Spoken Language in Denmark, Norway and Sweden]*. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet.

McCullough, R. and Jenkins, D. 2005. Out with old, in with the new? Recent trends in Spanish language use in Colorado. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1 & 2): 91-110.

McKeganey, N. and Bloor, M. 1991. Spotting the invisible man: the influence of male gender on fieldwork relations. *British Journal of Sociology* 42 (2): 195-210.

Mckinnie, M. and Priestly, T. 2004. Telling tales out of school: assessing linguistic competence in minority language fieldwork. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 25 (1): 24-40.

McLaughlin, B. 1978. *Second Language Acquisition in Childhood*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McTear, M. 1985. *Children's Conversation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Mehlem, U. 1998. *Zweisprachigkeit marokkanischer Kinder in Deutschland*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

Mejias, H., Anderson, P. and Carlson, R. 2002. Attitudes towards Spanish language maintenance or shift (LMLS) in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of South Texas. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 158: 121-40.

Menyuk, P. 1972. *The Development of Speech*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Merriam, S. 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mesthrie, R. 1992. *Language in Indenture: A Sociolinguistic History of Bhojpuri-Hindi in South Africa*. London, New York: Routledge.

Miles, M. and Huberman, A. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mills, S. 2005. Acculturation and communicative need in the process of language shift: the case of an Arizona community. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1 & 2): 111-25.

Mitchell, T. 1962. *Colloquial Arabic: The Living Language of Egypt*. London: The English Universities Press LTD.

Mlinar, Z. 1992. *Globalization and Territorial Identities*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Moag, R. 1978. Linguistic adaptations of the Fiji Indians. In: V. Mishra, ed. *Rama's Banishment: A Centenary Volume on the Fiji Indians*. Australia: Heinemann.

Moffatt, S. 1990. *Becoming Bilingual: A Sociolinguistic Study of the Communication of Young Mother-Tongue Panjabi-Speaking Children*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Mukherjee, A. 1980. *Language Maintenance and Language Shift among Panjabis and Bengalis in Delhi: A Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Delhi.

Nelde, P. 1992. Ethnolinguistic minorities within the European community: migrants as ethnolinguistic minorities. In: E. Jahr, ed. *Language Contact: Theoretical and Empirical Studies. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 60*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 131-148.

Nelde, P. 2000. Prerequisites for a new European language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21(5): 442-50.

Niznik, M. 2003. The Russian language as a base factor: the formation of the Russian community in Israel. In: R. Munz and R. Ohliger, eds. *Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective*. London: Frank Cass. 355-369.

Ochs, E. 1984. Clarification and culture. In: D. Schiffrin, ed. *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Ochs, E. 1987. Input: a socio-cultural perspective. In: M. Hickmann, ed. *Social and Functional Approaches to Language and Thought*. New York: Academic Press.

Ochs, E. 1988. *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Orfalea, G. 1988. *Before the Flames: A Quest for the History of Arab Americans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Othman, M. 2006. *Language Choice among Arabic-English Bilinguals in Manchester, Britain*. Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of Manchester.

Papadametre, L. and Routoulas, S. 2001. Social, political, educational, linguistic and cultural (dis-) incentives for languages education in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22: 134-51.

Paulston, C. 1986. Social factors in language maintenance and language shift. In: J. Fishman, A. Tabouret-Keller, M. Clyne, B. Krishnamurti, and M. Abdulaziz, eds. *The Fergusonian Impact. Festschrift in Honour of Charles A. Ferguson* (vol. 2). New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 493-511.

Paulston, C. 1994. *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Paulston, C. 1998. Linguistic minorities in Central and Eastern Europe: an introduction. In: C. Paulston and D. Peckham, eds. *Linguistic Minorities in Central and Eastern Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1-17.

Pavlenko, A. 2007. Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 28: 163-88.

Pearson, B. and McGee A. 1993. Language choice in Hispanic-background junior high school students in Miami: a 1988 update. In: A. Roca and J. Lipski, eds. *Spanish in the United States. Linguistic Contact and Diversity*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 91-101.

Penny, J. and Khoo, S. 1996. *Intermarriage: A Study of Migration and Integration.* Canberra: AGPS.

Peshkin, A. 1988. Virtuous subjectivity: in the participant observer's I's. In: D. Berg and K. Smith, eds. *The Self in Social Inquiry: Researching Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 267-81.

Porcel, J. 2006. The paradox of Spanish among Miami Cubans. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10: 93-110.

Pugh, R. and Williams, D. 2006. Language policy and provision in social service organizations. *British Journal of Social Work* 36: 1227-1244.

Radloff, C. 1991. *Sentence Repetition Testing for Studies of Community Bilingualism*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Rangila, R. 1986. *Maintenance of Panjabi Language in Delhi: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL).

Raschka, C., Wei, L. and Lee, S. 2002. Bilingual development and social networks of British-born Chinese children. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153: 9-25.

Rasinger, S. 2010. Ethnolinguistic vitality and language use amongst Eastern European migrants in East Anglia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31 (3): 287-300.

Remennick, L. 2003. From Russian to Hebrew via HebRush: intergenerational patterns of language use among former Soviet immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24 (5): 431-53.

Ribbert, A. and Thije, J. 2007. Receptive multilingualism in Dutch-German intercultural team cooperation. In: J. Thije and L. Zeevaert, eds. *Receptive Multilingualism*. John Benjamins. 73-102.

Roll, H. 2003. Young ethnic German immigrants from the former Soviet Union: German language proficiency and its impact on integration. In: R. Munz and R. Ohliger, eds. *Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective*. London: Frank Cass & Co Ltd. 272-88.

Romaine, S. 1982. *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities*. London: Edward and Arnold Ltd.

Romaine, S. 1994. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Ronjat, J. 1913. *Le Development du Langage Observé Chez un Enfant Bilingué*. Paris: Champion.

Rouchdy, A. 2002. Language conflict and identity: Arabic in the American diaspora. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *Language Contact and Language Conflict in Arabic. Variations on a Sociolinguistic Theme*. Routledge Curzon. 133-48.

Russell, G. 1987. Fatherhood in Australia. In: M. Lamb, ed. *The Father's Role: Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Satyanath, T. 1982. *Kannadigas in Delhi: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Delhi.

Saunders, G. 1982b. *Bilingual Children. Guidance for the Family*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Saville-Troike, M. 1989 (2nd Ed.). *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. Blackwell.

Saville-Troike, M. 2003 (3rd Ed.). *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. Blackwell.

Sawaie, M. 1992. Arabic in the melting pot: will it survive? In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *The Arabic Language in America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 83-99.

Schegloff, E.1972. Sequencing in conversational openings. In: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schegloff, E. and Sacks, H. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8: 289-327.

Scholte, J. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Macmillan Press LTD.

Shatz, M and McCloskey, L. 1984. Answering appropriately: a developmental perspective on conversational knowledge. In: S. Kuczaj, ed. *Discourse Development: Progress in Cognitive Development Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

S'hiri, S. 2002. Speak Arabic please!: Tunisian Arabic speakers' linguistic accommodation to Middle Easterners. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *Language Contact and Language Conflict in Arabic. Variations on a Sociolinguistic Theme.* Routledge Curzon. 149-174.

Shon, S. and Ja, D. 1982. Asian families. In: M. McGoldrick, J. Pearce and J. Giordano, eds. *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*. New York: The Guilford Press. 208-28.

SI. 1989. *The Education (National Curriculum) (Modern Foreign Languages) Order 1989*. Statutory Instrument 825. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Siegel, J. 1987. *Language Contact in a Plantation Environment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverman, D. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage.

Slavik, H. 2001. Language maintenance and language shift among Maltese migrants in Ontario and British Columbia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 152: 131-52.

Smolicz, J. 1981. Core values and ethnic identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4: 75-90.

Smolicz, J. and Harris, R. 1983. Ethnic languages and immigrant youth. In: M. Clyne, ed. Australia Talks: *Essays on the Sociology of Australian Immigrant and Aboriginal Languages*. (=Pacific Linguistics, series D, No. 23) Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies. 131-75.

Smolicz, J. and Secombe, M. 1985. Community languages, core values and cultural maintenance: the Australian experience with special reference to Greek, Latvian and Polish groups. In: M. Clyne, ed. *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages* (=Pacific Linguistics, series C, No. 92) Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies. 11-38.

Somech, S. 1980. *The Problem of Language in Modern Arabic Literature. Teaching Contemporary Arabic Series*. Tel Aviv: Ministry of Education and Culture, Curriculum Center, Tel Aviv University.

Spolsky, B. 1988. Bilingualism. In: F. Newmeyer, ed. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey Vol. IV Language: The Social-cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 100-18.

Sridhar, K. 1997. The languages of India in New York. In: O. García and J. Fishman, eds. *The Multilingual Apple. Languages in New York City*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 257-280.

Stake, R. 1994. Case studies. In: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Stake, R. 2006. *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. London: Guilford.

Stevens, G. 1985. Nativity, intermarriage, and mother-tongue shift. *American Sociological Review* 50: 74-83.

Stoessel, S. 2002. Investigating the role of social networks in language maintenance and shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153: 93-131.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R. and Sabshin, M. 1981. *Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.

Suarez, D. 2002. The paradox of linguistic hegemony and the maintenance of Spanish as a heritage language in the United States. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 23 (6): 512-530.

Swann, M. 1985. *Education for All. Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*. Chairman: Lord M. Swann. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (Cmnd9453).

Taeschner, T. 1983. *The Sun Is Feminine: A Study on Language Acquisition in Bilingual Children*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Thomas, G. 2000. The spoken Arabic dialect of the Maronites of Cyprus. *The Journal of Maronite Studies* 4 (1): paragraph 7, line 1. [Accessed 21 June 2010 - stable URL http://www.cypnet.co.uk/ncyprus/people/cypmaronites/dialect.html].

Thomason, S. 2001. *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tribalat, M. 1995. *Faire France. Une Enquête sur les Immigrés et Leurs Enfants*. Paris: La Découverte.

Tuominen, A. 1998. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140: 59-76.

UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (Brenzinger, M. *et al.*) 2003. *Language Vitality and Endangerment*. Paris: UNESCO. WWW available at http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf (Accessed 06/11/2009).

Urzúa, A. and Gómez, E. 2008. Home style Puerto Rican: a study of language maintenance and use in New England. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29 (6): 449-66.

Van Dan Berg, M. 1988. Long term accommodation of (ethno) linguistic groups towards a societal language norm. *Language and Communication* 8: 251-69.

Veltman, C. 1983. *Language Shift in the United States*. Berlin, New York, and Amsterdam: Mouton.

Versteegh, K. 1993. Levelling in the Sudan: from Arabic creole to Arabic dialect. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 99: 65-79.

Vilfan, S. 1993. *Ethnic Groups and Language Rights*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

Villa, D. and Villa, J. 2005. Language instrumentality in Southern New Mexico: implications for loss of Spanish in the Southwest. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1 & 2): 169-84.

Vitanova, G. 2004. Gender enactments in immigrants' discursive practices: Bringing Bakhtin to the dialogue. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 3 (4): 261-77.

Walbridge, L. 1992. Arabic in the Dearborn mosques. In: A. Rouchdy, ed. *The Arabic Language in America.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 184-204.

Wald, B. 1981. Topic and situation as factors in language performance. *NCPR Working Paper California*: National Centre for Bilingual Research.

Ward, C. 1976. The Serbian and Croatian communities in Milwaukee. *General Linguistics* 16: 151-65.

Ward, C. and Hewstone, M. 1985. Ethnicity, language and intergroup relations in Malaysia and Singapore: a social psychological analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6: 271-96.

Warren, A. 1988. *Gender Issues in Field Research*. New bury Park, CA: Sage.

Warren, A. and Rasmussen, P. 1977. Sex and gender in fieldwork research. *Urban Life* 6: 359-69.

Webb, E., Campbell, D., Schwartz, R. and Sechrest, L. 1965. *Unobtrusive Measures*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wehr, H. and Cowan, J. 1994. *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic.* New York: Ithaca.

Wei, L. 1994. *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wei, L. 2006. Complementary schools, past, present and future. *Language and Education* 20 (1): 76-83.

Williams, J. and Snipper, G. 1990. *Literacy and Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.

Winter, W. 1993. Some conditions for the survival of small languages. In: E. Jahr, ed. *Trends in linguistics. Studies and Monographs 72. Language Conflict and Language Planning*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 299-314.

Wiseman, J. 1998. *Global Nations? Australia and the Politics of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* London: Sage.

Online Resources

Equality and Human Rights Commission website: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com, accessed 20th October 2009.

Her Majesty's Courts Service website: http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk, accessed 16th July 2009.

Home Office Police website: http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk, accessed 16th July 2009.

Language Line website: http://www.languageline.co.uk/, accessed 16th July 2009.

Manchester City Council website: http://www.manchester.gov.uk/, accessed 4h Oct. 2010.

Office of Public Sector Information [Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000)] website: http://www.opsi.gov.uk, accessed 20th October 2009.

'Routes into Languages' website: http://www.routesintolanguages.ac.uk , accessed 28th July 2009.

The European Convention on Human Rights: http://www.hri.org/docs/ECHR50.html, accessed 6th November 2009.

Appendices

Appendix I. Family questionnaires

A note on the organization of questions:

I attempted to organize the questionnaires in such a way that each question/idea leads to the other in order to keep the interview going spontaneously as in casual conversations. This makes the respondents feel more at ease and minimize the formality of the interview situation, which results in more talking on the part of participants. Thus, as will be seen below, in some cases I did not maintain a rigid dichotomy between all sections and questions whereby each question is categorized under its relevant section/title. Rather, a more flexible approach was adopted and as such some questions that are relevant to particular sections were included under other ones. For example, under language choice in the Home/Family domain, questions 7, 8 and 9 about children's language choice in the Media domain were asked. This is because the preceding questions were talking about children's language choice. Thus, to maintain the flow of conversation, the questions moved to talking about children, which is evident also in the next groups of questions 12-14 (about children's language choice in the domains of Mosque, Ethnic School and Ethnic Community) and 15-23 (about children's language choice in the domain of Friendship). Similarly, questions 27-37 about the mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects were assigned to the section on Friendship domain since the preceding question was asking about the parents' language choice with Arab friends (who are from different countries). Likewise, questions 43-52 about the role of globalization (the role of advances in communication technology and transportation means) in language maintenance were categorized under the Friendship domain since the preceding question was about friends and contacts in the homeland and the Arab world. The same applies to the questions on the role of multiple dialects and diglossia in Arabic maintenance, which were included under the section on children's command of Arabic.

I. Parents' interviews:

1. Demographic details:

- Where do you come from? What about your wife?
- Do you have educational qualifications/work? What about your wife?
- Where were your children born? Their age?
- How long have you been in the UK?
- Why did you leave home country: work, education, etc.?
- Do you feel any change in your proficiency in Arabic language since you left the homeland? What about your wife and children? If yes, give examples? How does this make you feel?

2. Parents' motivation to maintain Arabic and their attitudes towards Bilingualism:

- Is maintaining Arabic important or not important? Why?
- is Arabic important/not important for your religion?
- is Arabic important/not important to make friends?
- is maintaining Arabic important/not important to maintain the Arabic identity?
- Is it important/not important for you that your children speak and maintain Arabic? Why?
- In order for your children to be Arabs, do they have to maintain and speak Arabic? In other words, is Arabic a prerequisite for the membership in the Arabic-speaking community or not? Why?
- Does this apply to any dialect; that is, do you consider any person speaking any dialect of Arabic as an Arab or not?
- If yes, do you agree that your children maintain and speak any dialect of Arabic, and not necessarily your own dialect?
- Do you think Arabic will be maintained in the next generations? Why?
- What do you do to maintain Arabic?
- What do you think is the most important way to maintain Arabic in Manchester?
- Do you think being able to speak two languages is an advantage or a disadvantage? Why?
- do you fear losing Arabic?
- Which language is more beautiful? Why?
- Which language is more useful for you? Why?

- Do you need Arabic or English for your daily communication? Where (home, work, neighbourhood, mosque, etc.)?
- Where did you learn English? Your wife?
- Did you take courses when you arrived in Manchester? What about your wife?
- Can you express yourself appropriately in English? Your wife? Children?
- Can you read and write in English? Your wife? Children?
- Which language do you feel easy and comfortable when talking in? What about your wife?

3. Use of Arabic and English in the different domains of language use: home, friendship, work, media, shopping and mosque:

(A) 'Home/Family' domain.

1- Do you use Arabic or English when you talk to your wife?
2- What about her: does she use Arabic or English when she talks to you?
3- Do you use Arabic or English when you talk to your children? What about them?
4- Does your wife speak to children in Arabic or English? What about them?
5- What do you do if children speak to you in English?
6- Do children talk to their siblings in Arabic or English?
7- Do they watch Arabic TV channels or English TV channels?
8- What do they watch (cartoon, movies, etc.)? In Standard/colloquial Arabic? Which dialects?
9- Do they read Arabic or English stories/books?
10- What language do they use when they are angry, embarrassed, discussing personal problems with you?
11- What language do they use when they write personal letters/diaries?
12- At the mosque and in the Arabic school, do children communicate with their teachers using Arabic or English? What about the teachers?
13- At the mosque and in the Arabic school, do children communicate with their friends using Arabic or English?
14- Within the wider ethnic community, do children use Arabic or English when communicating with older Arabs, e.g. parents' friends?
15- Does entering school affect children's social network?
16- Are their friends changed after entering school?
17- Do they have mainly Arab friends, English friends, or a variety from both sides?

18- Do children interact mainly with Arabs or British: in the neighborhood, school, and mosque? Why?
19- Which language they use with these contacts?
20- When sending text-messages to their Arab friends, do they use Arabic or English? Why?
21- Do children participate in Arabic get-togethers? How often?
22- Do they have Arab friends and contacts in the homeland or in the Arab World?
23- Which language they use with them?

(B) 'Friendship' domain.

24- Do you interact mainly with Arabs or British (your acquaintances):
    A- In the neighborhood: what nationalities? Do you exchange visits/chat? What about your wife? Your children?
    B- Mosque: do you chat? Wife? Children?
    C- Work: do you chat?
    D- Your friends? What nationalities? What about your wife?
25- Why do you have Arab friends?
26- When you speak with your Arab friends and acquaintances, do you use Arabic or English? What about your wife?
27- If Arabic, which dialect do you use: do you use your own dialect or the dialect of your interlocutor?
28- If his/her own dialect, do you speak in exactly the same way as you do at home or with someone from your own country or do you try to accommodate? Do the addressees understand you?
29- What about your Arab interlocutors: Does each one use his/her own dialect or try to use the others' dialects?
30- Do you understand the various dialects of Arabic? What about your wife?
31- What would you say to those who say that Arabs do not understand each other?
32- Does it happen or not that your Arabic interlocutors use words or idioms not used in your dialect? Give me an example?
33- What do you do in this case: how can you understand the meaning?
34- Do you try to infer the meaning from the context or just ask your interlocutor about the meaning?
35- How often is this possible to happen?

36- Does this hinder/not hinder a successful communication?

37- Do you happen, or not, that you sometimes try to use the dialect of your interlocutor? Why?

38- When you talk with an Arab friend in the presence of a non-Arab, do you use Arabic or English? What about your wife?

39- When sending text-messages to your Arab friends, do you use Arabic or English? Why? What about your wife?

40- Do you participate in Arabic get-togethers (meetings, celebrations, play groups, etc.)? How often? What about your wife and children?

41- In these gatherings, do you invite mixed groups of people or mostly Arabs?

42- Do you have friends and contacts in the homeland or in the Arab World? Your wife?

43- Do you contact, or not, your relatives and friends in your home country?

44- Is it now easy/affordable or not to contact them, compared with the past? How?

45- How do you contact them? Telephone, internet (chatting and e-mails), mobile-phone text messages, etc.? What about your wife and children?

46- How often do you contact them? What about your wife and children?

47- Why do you contact them?

48- When sending text-messages to relatives in homeland, do you use Arabic or English?

49- Do you visit your home country regularly, or not?

50- How often?

51- Do you take your children with you, or not?

52- Is travelling to your home country affordable and easy, or not, compared to the past? How?

53- Do you feel expectations from people in your social network (e.g. friends, parents and relatives, etc.) concerning the language you use? For instance, how would they react if you do not use Arabic with your children?

(C) 'Work' domain.

54- At workplace, which language do you use, Arabic or English?

55- Do you have Arab colleagues at work?

56- If you have an Arab colleague at workplace, when you meet him/her do you greet him/her in Arabic or English? What about him/her?

57- When you speak with an Arab colleague about work, do you speak Arabic or English? What about him/her?

(D) 'Media' domain:

58- Do you watch Arabic satellite channels or English channels?

59- For news, which one do you watch? How often? What about your wife and children?

60- For entertainment, which one do you watch? How often? What about your wife/children?

61- Do you watch, or not, Arabic TV drama, movies, videos, DVDs? How often? What about your wife/children?

62- Do these Arabic TV series and movies form a topic of conversation between you and your Arab friends, or not? Which language is used in such conversations? What about your wife/children?

63- Do you buy Arabic videos and DVDs? Where?

64- Do you buy Arabic stories/books for children? Where?

65- Do you read Arabic newspapers or English newspapers? Online or hard copy? What about your wife/children?

(E) 'Shopping' domain.

66- When shopping for food, do you use Arabic or English? What about your wife?

67- When shopping for clothes, do you use Arabic or English? What about your wife

68- Are there Arab shop assistants in supermarkets? Which language do you use with them?

69- When shopping for books, do you use Arabic or English? What about your wife?

70- Are there in Manchester shops selling Arabic clothes, food, books, newspapers, magazines, DVDs, CDs, videos, stories for children etc?

(F) 'Mosque' domain.

71- Do you go to mosque? How often?

72- Do you use Arabic or English there?

73- Is the Friday weekly speech given in Arabic or English?

(G) Other domains.

74- Do you go to an Arabic mechanic/plumber or an English mechanic/plumber? Which language you use with him?

75- To put up a satellite, do you go to an Arab or English technician? Which language you use with him?

4. Children's command of Arabic and English: understanding, speaking, reading and writing:

Do you think children can:

- Understand their colloquial dialect of Arabic? What about English?
- Speak their colloquial dialect of Arabic? What about English?
- Ask someone for his/her telephone number in Arabic?
- Tell a friend the plot of a movie he/she recently saw in Arabic?
- Discuss personal problems in Arabic?
- Give directions in Arabic over the phone about how to find his/her house?
- Describe in Arabic the appearance of a family member to someone?
- Understand other dialects of Arabic when they are engaged in a conversation with Arabs from the other Arab countries? Why?
- Understand other dialects of Arabic when they watch Arabic satellite channels?

    - ♦ Does the existence of various dialects help children learn and maintain Arabic, make it difficult for children (hinder children) to maintain Arabic, or is it of neutral influence? Why?

- Understand Standard Arabic?
- Understand Cartoons and movies in Standard Arabic? Do they watch cartoons and movies in Standard Arabic?
- Understand TV news in Standard Arabic? Do they watch news in Arabic?
- Read Standard Arabic: read signs in streets and shops, a newspaper, a book, a story, etc.?
- Write in Standard Arabic: write a letter, fill in a form, etc.?

    - ♦ Do you teach your children (do you intend to teach them) literacy in Arabic? How?
    - ♦ Does the difference between Standard Arabic and the various dialects of Arabic make it difficult for children (hinder children) to learn and maintain literacy in Arabic, or is it of neutral effect? Why?
    - ♦ Do/will you send them to Arabic schools? Why?

- Does entering English school affect their ability in Arabic? What about English? How?
- Does entering Arabic school influence their ability in Arabic? How?
- Suppose your child did not join the Arabic school, what would happen?

- Read the Quran?

  - Do/will you send them to mosque to learn Quran? Why?

5. Parents' perception of support for Arabic:

A) From the Arabic-speaking community: e.g. are there enough Arabic schools? Do Arabs in Manchester support Arabic language maintenance? General height of the profile within the host community: that is, to what extent is the Arabic speaking community visible in Manchester; e.g. are there shop signs in Arabic, Arabic signs in supermarkets, Arabic restaurants, supermarkets, etc.?

B) From outside the Arabic-speaking community: in the following areas:

1- Matters of public policy: e.g.
   - is Arabic taught in mainstream schools?
   - Are interpreters available in hospitals, police stations, etc.?
   - did you make use of interpreters in government institutions before?
   - Are materials in Arabic language available in Manchester City Council, public organization, etc.?
   - Do you think this is enough?
   - Why do you think they provide materials, interpreters, etc. in Arabic?

2- Personal experience: i.e. how does the host community see the Arabic immigrant community, as reflected through the comments from others in the wider community?
   - Do you hear negative comments on you as an Arab in the street?
   - Do the British treat minorities as equal?
   - Are they open to migrants?
   - Do they value different cultures and languages?

6. The role of globalization in Arabic maintenance in diaspora:

I) the positive effects:

1- Motivation for immigration *(see demographic details)*

2- Supraterritorial communications *(see friendship domain)*

3- Supraterritorial transportation *(see friendship domain)*

4- Supraterritorial markets *(see shopping domain)*

5- Supraterritorial organizations: Are you a member in any Arabic organization (e.g. club, society, etc.) in the UK or Manchester? Do you know about any Arabic organization in the UK or Manchester?

II) The negative effects

- Do you hold the British nationality? Why?
- Does this affect, or not, your Arabic identity? Do you find yourself, for instance, in conflict between the two nationalities? Why?
- Do you consider yourself an Arab, a British, or both?
- Does this influence Arabic maintenance?

7. The role of multiple dialects and diglossia *(see children's command of Arabic)*

8. Children's use of Arabic in the different domains, especially the home, as compared to their use of English: *(see home domain)*

II. Children's interviews

1) Demographic details:

- What is your name?
- How old are you?
- Where were you born?
- How old were you when you left the home country?
- Did you receive education in the homeland or the UK?

2) Social networks:

- Do you interact mainly with Arabs or British (your acquaintances):
    - In the neighborhood: what nationalities? Do you use Arabic or English with them? Why?
    - School: what nationalities? Do you use Arabic or English with them? Why?
    - Mosque: what nationalities? Do you use Arabic or English with them? Why?
- Do you have mainly Arab friends, English friends, or a variety from both sides? What nationalities? Why?
- Which language do you use with your Arab friends? Why?
- When sending text-messages to your Arab friends, do you use Arabic or English? Why?
- Are your friends changed after entering school?
- Do you participate in Arabic get-togethers? How often? Do you use Arabic or English?
- In these gatherings, do you invite mixed groups of people or mostly Arabs?
- Do you have Arab friends and relatives in the homeland or in the Arab World?
- Do you contact your relatives and friends in your home country?
- How do you contact them? Telephone, internet (chatting and e-mails), mobile-phone-text messages, etc.?
- How often do you contact them?
- Do you visit your home country regularly/any Arab country? How often?
- Do you feel expectations from people in your social network (e.g. friends, parents, older Arabs, relatives, etc.) concerning the language you use? For instance, how would they react if you do not use Arabic with them?

3) Children's command of Arabic: understanding, speaking, reading and writing:

- Do you understand your colloquial dialect of Arabic? What about English?
- Do you speak your colloquial dialect of Arabic? What about English?
- Can you ask someone for his/her telephone number?
- Can you tell a friend the plot of a movie he/she recently saw?
- Can you discuss personal problems?
- Can you give directions over the phone about how to find his/her house?
- Can you describe the appearance of a family member to someone?
- Do you understand other dialects of Arabic when you are engaged in a conversation with Arabs from the other Arab countries; e.g. your father's friends? Why?
- Do you watch Arabic cartoons, movies, etc.? In Standard or colloquial Arabic?
- Do you understand other dialects of Arabic when you watch cartoons, movies, etc. on Arabic satellite channels?
    - Does the existence of various dialects help you learn and maintain Arabic, make it difficult for you (hinder you) to maintain Arabic, or is it of neutral influence? Why?
- Do you understand Standard Arabic?
- Do you understand Cartoons and movies in Standard Arabic? Do you watch cartoons and movies in Standard Arabic?
- Do you understand TV news in Standard Arabic? Do you watch news in Arabic?
- Can you read Standard Arabic: read signs in streets and shops, a newspaper, a book, a story, etc.?
- Can you write in Standard Arabic: write a letter, fill in a form, etc.?
    - Did you learn literacy in Arabic? Where?
    - Does the difference between Standard Arabic and the various dialects of Arabic make it difficult for you (hinder you) to learn and maintain literacy in Arabic, or is it of neutral effect? Why?
    - Do you go to an Arabic school? Why?
    - Does entering English school affect your ability in Arabic? What about English? How?
    - Does entering Arabic school influence your ability in Arabic? How?
- Can you read the Quran?
    - Do you go to mosque to learn Quran? Why?

4) The role of Globalization:

I. The Positive effect:

- Supraterritorial communications *(see social networks)*
- Supraterritorial transportation *(see social networks)*

II. The negative effect: *(see children's motivation for Arabic maintenance and their attitudes towards bilingualism)*

5) The role of multiple dialects and diglossia *(see children's command of Arabic)*

6) Children's use of Arabic in the different domains, especially the home, as compared to their use of English:

- **Home:** do you talk to your father in Arabic or English? What about him?
- Which language do you prefer in such interactions? Why?
- Do you talk to your mother in Arabic or English? What about her?
- If you speak to parents in English, what do they do?
- Do they ask you to speak Arabic? Why?
- Do you talk to your brothers and sisters in Arabic or English? Why?
- When your Arab friends visit you do you talk in Arabic or English? Why?
- What language do you use when you are angry, or embarrassed?
- When you discuss personal problems with your parents, do you use Arabic or English?
- What language do you use when you write personal letters/diaries?
- Do you read Arabic or English stories? If Arabic, in Standard/colloquial Arabic?
- **Media:** Do you watch Arabic satellite channels or English channels?
- For news, which one do you watch? How often?
- For entertainment, which one do you watch? How often?
- Do you watch, or not, Arabic TV series, movies, videos, DVDs? How often?
- Do these Arabic TV series and movies form a topic of conversation between you and your Arab friends, or not? Which language is used in such conversations?
- Do you buy Arabic videos and DVDs? Where? What about English?
- Do you read Arabic newspapers or English newspapers?

- Are there shops that sell Arabic newspapers, books, magazines in Manchester?
- **At the mosque and the Arabic school**: do you communicate with your teachers using Arabic or English? What about the teachers? Why?
- At the mosque, the Arabic school and the English school do you communicate with your Arab classmates and friends using Arabic or English? Why?
- **With Arab friends**: do you use Arabic or English? Why? *(See social networks)*
- **Within the wider Arabic community:** do you use Arabic or English when communicating with older Arabs; e.g. your parents' friends? Why?

7) Children's motivation for Arabic maintenance and their attitudes towards bilingualism

- Is being able to speak two languages an advantage or a disadvantage'? Why?
- Which language is more beautiful? Why?
- Which language would you prefer to use for instruction at school? Why?
- Which language is more useful for you? Why?
- Is it important for you to speak English? Why?
- Is it important for you to speak Arabic? Why?
- Do you fear losing Arabic? Why?
- Do you need Arabic or English for your daily communication: home, school, neighborhood, mosque, friends, etc.)?
- Is Arabic important or unimportant to make friends?
- Is Arabic important or unimportant for your religion? And for education?
- Is maintaining your Arabic identity important or unimportant?
- Do you consider yourself as Arab, British or both (e.g. in terms of culture: language, celebrations, habits, traditions, food, etc.)?
- Is Arabic important or not important to maintain the Arabic identity? Why?

- Is it important for you that your children speak and maintain Arabic? Why?
- What will you do to make them maintain Arabic?
- Will you speak to them in Arabic or English? Why?
- Will you send them to Arabic schools to learn literacy?
- In order for you and your children to be Arabs, do you have to maintain and speak Arabic? In other words, is Arabic a prerequisite for the membership in the Arabic community?

- Does this apply to any dialect; that is, do you consider any dialect of Arabic as qualifying for group membership?
- If yes, do you agree that your children maintain and speak any dialect of Arabic, and not necessarily your own dialect?
- Do you think Arabic will be maintained in the next generation? Why?

III. Focus group agenda

1- Is maintaining Arabic language important or not? Why?
2- What role does Arabic play in the religious life of Muslim Arabs?
3- Does Arabic have any economic value for Arabs in Manchester?
4- Is Arabic considered a core value for Arabs in Manchester?
5- Do Arabs see Arabic language as prestigious or not?
6- How can we maintain Arabic among children in Manchester, for example:
    - Speaking Arabic at home
    - Learning Quran
    - Arabic media
    - Ethnic schools and mosque
    - Contact with/visits to country of origin
    - Social networks
    - Receiving education in homeland
7- Discussion of the main difficulties in maintaining Arabic as community language in Manchester:
    - Are there any problems influencing the maintenance of Arabic in Manchester?
    - Like what?
    - How can they be overcome?
8- Discussion of the role of multiple dialects and diglossia in Arabic maintenance: how easy it is for children born in the UK to speak Arabic and to become literate in Arabic (taking into consideration the existence of multiple spoken dialects and diglossia, and the differences between the script/writing systems of English and Arabic):
    - Does this existence of various dialects make it difficult for children to maintain Arabic? Why?
    - Do you think the various dialects of Arabic are mutually intelligible? Why?
    - Does the existence of various dialects hinder successful communication among Arabs in Manchester?
    - Is it easy for children born in the Manchester to learn reading and writing in Arabic? Why?
    - Does the existence of Standard Arabic besides various vernaculars make it difficult for children to learn literacy in Arabic?

- Does the difference in script between the two languages impede literacy in Arabic in the case of those children?
- What should patents do to help children learn literacy?

9- Discussion of the motivation of children born in the UK, or who have received much of their education in the UK, to learn the language of their parents:
   - Do children born in the UK have the motivation to learn Arabic, given the pressure of English? Why?
   - How can parents increase their children's motivation to learn Arabic?

10- Views on whether Arabic as a community language should be more widely learned by other British and about the mainstream school provision for Arabic:
   - Is Arabic taught in mainstream schools? Why?
   - Do you think Arabic should be more widely learnt by other British? Why?

11- Perception of support for Arabic:

   I- From the Arabic community: e.g. are there enough Arabic schools? Do Arabs in Manchester support Arabic maintenance? General height of the profile within the host community: that is, to what extent is the Arabic speaking community visible in Manchester; e.g. are there shop signs in Arabic, Arabic signs in supermarkets, Arabic restaurants, supermarkets, etc.?

   II- From outside the Arabic community: in the following areas:

   1- Matters of public policy; e.g. is Arabic taught in mainstream schools? Are interpreters available in hospitals, police station, etc.? Are materials in Arabic language available in public organization, etc.? Do you think this is enough? Why do you think they provide materials, interpreters, etc. in Arabic?

   2- Personal experience; i.e. how does the host community see the Arabic immigrant community, as reflected through the comments from others in the wider community?

12- Views on England's multicultural policies, and whether they have had any direct positive impact on the maintenance of Arabic:
   - Does the language policy in the UK encourage bi/multilingualism?
   - How does this affect the maintenance of Arabic?

13- Discussion of the conditions underlying the use of Arabic and the use of English by people from the Arabic-speaking community:
   - In which situations do people from the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester commonly use Arabic; and in which they commonly use English?

- What are the circumstances/pressures that influence Arabs in Manchester towards the use of Arabic or English in the different situations?

14- Discussion of Arabic as a symbol of identity and group membership:

- Do you consider Arabic as one language, given the existence of the various dialects? Why?
- Do you consider it a symbol of identity and a prerequisite for group ascription?
- Does this apply to any dialect; that is, do you consider any dialect of Arabic as qualifying for group membership?

15- Discussion of the role of globalization in Arabic maintenance:

- <u>The positive effects:</u>

Does globalization enhance Arab immigrants in Manchester to maintain their Arabic language and identity? How?

- Did it lead to a change in the motivation for immigration among Arabs (so that it becomes not only economic as it was in earlier times)? If yes, is such a change helpful for Arabic maintenance? How?
- Are the advances in communication technology associated with globalization helpful in maintaining Arabic language and identity among Arab immigrants in Manchester? How?
- What about Arabic satellite channels? Do they help maintain Arabic and overcome dialect differences?
- What about the ease of travel associated with globalization?
- What about the global markets?
- What about the Arabic organizations? Do you know about any Arabic organization in Manchester or the UK?

- <u>The negative effects:</u>

- Do you think holding two nationalities and the increased possibilities of maintaining both, thanks to globalization, threatens the Arabic identity in the immigrant context? Why?

16- Finally, do you think Arabic language will be maintained in the next generations in Manchester? Why?

Appendix II. Manchester's language policy questionnaires

I. Leader of Manchester City Council/Councilors:

- Who decides community language policy, and at what level within the Council are these decisions made?
- Is there a formal committee? Who sits on the committee? When do they meet?
- Are there any national guidelines which each council in the UK adheres to regarding community language policy?
- Who decides which materials (housing advice, benefits etc.) should be translated into community languages?
- Who decides which services should be provided, such as community libraries, linkworkers, 'INATSS', school services etc.?
- How are these decisions made, and what are the criteria?
- Do you receive feedback from the different departments within the Council concerning provisions in community languages? How do you, as policy makers, benefit from this?
- What budget is available for community language services, and how are these funds allocated?
- Why do you provide such services?
    - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
    - Or is it an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
    - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- As a councilor, you have a certain number of community language speakers in your ward. How do you assess their needs and aim to provide targeted services for them?
- How effective do you feel that community language services and policy are within your ward, and across central Manchester?
- Do you have official statistics on, for example, the number of Arabic speakers in Manchester and their distribution across the wards?

- What sociological data does the Council collect concerning them (age, origins, occupation, education, date of arrival, religion, diachronic history, reasons for coming to Manchester etc.)?
- How do you co-ordinate local services provided by the Council with national services, such as Police, NHS, Courts, etc.?

II. Linkworker Service:

- How many Arabs are there in Manchester?
- What is your role in MCC?
- Do you provide your services free of charge?
- Where do you provide your services: hospitals, courts, etc., or just in your office?
- Why do you provide such services?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
  - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do you cover all community languages in Manchester?
- What criteria are employed to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What do you do with uncovered community languages?
- What about Arabic?
- Do you have signs, leaflets, flyers, booklets, etc. in Arabic?
- How many Arabic linkworkers do you have?
- Do you have males and females?
- If an Arab immigrant asks for a female or male linkworker, do you provide her or him?
- How do you recruit Arab linkworkers?
- What qualifications should they have?
- Do they work full-time or part-time?
- Is it a permanent job?
- Do they receive good salaries?
- Who pays them?

- How can immigrants find about your services?
- Do immigrants have to take an appointment in advance?
- Which community-language speakers come to you more? Why?
- What about Arabs? Why?

III. M-Four:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Do you provide interpreting and translation only?
- Is it for free?
- Where do you provide your services: hospitals, courts, etc., or just in your office?
- Why do you provide such services?
    - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
    - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
    - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do you cover all community languages in Manchester?
- What criteria are employed to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What do you do with uncovered community languages?
- What about Arabic?
- Do you have signs, leaflets, flyers, booklets, etc. in Arabic?
- How many Arabic interpreters and translators do you have?
- Do you have males and females?
- If an Arab immigrant asks for a female or male interpreter, do you provide her or him?
- How do you recruit Arab interpreters?
- What qualifications should they have?
- Do they work full-time or part-time?
- Is it a permanent job?
- Do they receive good salaries?
- Who pays them?
- How can immigrants find about your services?

- Do immigrants have to take an appointment in advance?
- Which community-language-speakers come to you more? Why?
- What about Arabs? Why?

IV. INATSS:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Is what you provide just interpreting and translation or something else?
- Do you provide your services for children in schools only?
- Why do you provide such services?
    - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
    - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
    - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do you have language assistants for all community languages in Manchester?
- What criteria do you employ to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What do you do with community languages for which you do not have assistants?
- How many bilingual professionals/support workers do you have?
- How many Arabic-English bilingual professionals do you have?
- Do you have males and females?
- If an Arab immigrant asks for a female or male professional, do you provide her or him?
- How do you recruit those Arab bilingual professional?
- What qualifications should they have?
- Do they work full-time or part-time?
- Is it a permanent job?
- Do they receive good salaries?
- Who pays them?
- How can immigrants find you?
- Do they have to take an appointment in advance?
- Which community-language-speakers come to you more? Why?

- What about Arabs? Why?
- Can ethnic students be entered for 'GCSEs and A Levels' in their own native languages?
- Is entering GCSEs and A Levels in native languages popular among ethnic students?
- Among which ethnic background is it most popular?
- What about Arabs?
- Do schools offer those ethnic students teaching in community languages or they just give them the exams? What criteria are employed to decide?
- Who prepares exams?
- Are there any community languages that are taught in mainstream schools? Why?
- If yes, in what stages?
- Is it optional or compulsory for students to study community languages?
- What about modern foreign languages?
- What languages are taught?
- What about Arabic?
- Why these languages?
- Who chooses the languages to be taught in schools:
  - Is it the city council?
  - What criteria are employed for such choice?
- Why is community language teaching provided in schools?

V. Mainstream schools:

- How many students are there in your school?
- How many of them are British, Arab and other ethnic backgrounds?
- Do you have Arab teachers?
- Do you have ethnic teachers?
- Do you consider English as the language of school? Why?
- Are ethnic students allowed to speak their native languages at school?
- Does school attempt to promote bilingualism or only English among community-language speakers? Why?
- Do you have bilingual support workers?
- In what languages?
- Do you have one for Arab students?
- What is his/her role exactly? What kind of support does he/she provide?

- How do you recruit them? Who pays for them?
- Can ethnic students be entered for 'GCSEs and A Levels' in their own native languages?
- Is entering GCSEs and A Levels in native languages popular among ethnic students?
- Among which ethnic background is it most popular?
- What about Arabs?
- Do schools offer those ethnic students teaching in community languages or they just give them the exams? What criteria are employed to decide?
- Who prepares exams?
- Are there any community languages that are taught in mainstream schools? Why?
- If yes, in what stages?
- Is it optional or compulsory for students to study community languages?
- What about modern foreign languages?
- What languages are taught in your school?
- What about Arabic?
- Why these languages?
- Who chooses the languages to be taught in schools:
    - Is it the city council?
    - What criteria are employed for such choice?
- Why is community language teaching provided in schools?
    - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
    - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants?
    - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?

VI. Supplementary Education Department: (in INATSS)

- What is your role regarding supplementary schools?
- How many supplementary schools are there in Manchester?
- How many Arabic schools are there in Manchester?
- How many Arabs are there in Manchester?
- What is the benefit of ethnic schools?
- What is the council's policy in connection with these schools?
    - Are they authorized?

- Who authorizes them?
- Does the council inspect them?
- Does the council fund them?
- Does the council require these schools to teach specific curricula?

- Why do you support Ethnic schools?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and the right to receive education in the native language?
  - Do you think the support you provide is enough? Why?
- Are there English Islamic schools in Manchester?
- How many?
- Are they government schools?
- Do they teach Arabic as one of the subjects?
- Who designs the Arabic language curriculum?
- Are there Arab students in these schools?

VII. Arabic schools:

1) Head teachers:

- How many Arabic schools are there in Manchester?
- How many students are there in your school? What nationalities?
- How many Arabs are there in Manchester?
- Are Arabs in Manchester keen to send their children to Arabic schools?
- What is the benefit of such schools?
- Who funds your school?
- What is the council's policy in connection with Arabic schools?
  - Are they authorized?
  - Who authorizes them?
  - Does the council inspect them?
  - Does the council require these schools to teach specific curricula?
  - Does the council fund/support them?
- Do you think the support the council provides is enough/not enough? Why?

2) Teachers of Arabic:

- Are students motivated to learn Arabic? Why?
- Can they read and write in Arabic?
- Do they face any difficulties in learning Arabic literacy?
- Is the Arabic language curriculum suitable for students?
- Which language do you use in class for teaching?
- Which language students use in class with you/classmates?
- Do you think Arabic schools are important? Why?

3) Teachers of other subjects:

- Can students read and write in Arabic?
- Is it difficult/not difficult for children to receive education in Arabic? Why?
- Which language do you use in class for teaching?
- Which language students use in class with you/classmates?

VIII. Library Services Department/public libraries in Manchester:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Do you have materials in all community languages?
- Which community languages do you have most?
- Is borrowing allowed?
- Is it for free?
- What do you do with uncovered community languages?
- What criteria do you employ to decide which languages to provide services in?
- Do you have materials in Arabic?
- What types: books, stories, DVDs, Videos...etc.?
- How many?
- Are they new or old materials?
- Do you update such Arabic materials regularly?
- Who chooses the materials to be bought?
- What are the criteria?
- Who pays for the purchase?
- Do you have Arab librarians? How many?

- Why do you provide materials in community language?
    - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
    - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
    - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do minorities use these library services regularly?
- Which minority uses these services most?
- What about Arabs?
- Do you have signs, leaflets, flyers, booklets, etc. in Arabic?

Apendix 111 Example of consent obtained from participants

"This is a study conducted to get the degree of a PhD from the University of Manchester. The study investigates Arabic maintenance in the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester. As you already know, I have been collecting observational data and conversational examples on different aspects related to language maintenance; e.g. language proficiency, language attitudes and language choice, etc. in your family. This data have been collected during our family visits at my home and your home, our get-togethers outside of the homes, at mosque, in parks, etc. I also showed you examples of the observational and conversational data I collected and you agreed to participate in the study. I need also your consent that I use quotes and data from the interview I am carrying out today with you. As you have been fully informed before, the data obtained from the interviews and observation will be used for the purpose of this research only and will be used anonymously, names will be anonymised, the confidentiality of the information you provide will be safeguarded and data will be protected and will not be disclosed to a third party. Do you agree to participate?"