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This research focused on individuals of Arab ancestry residing in the U.S. and examined various factors that might influence their cultural identity. The research examined the effects of religion, nationality, and gender on participants’ maintenance of Arab cultural identity, attitude toward the original and host cultures, in- and out-group socialization, and perceived discrimination. It also examined the effects of religion, nationality (Arab country of origin), gender, immigration generation, perceived discrimination, and sojourner status on acculturation mode. It also looked at the effect of religion and national origin on ethnogamy and self-identification. Finally, the research examined the relationship of self-identification, gender, in- and out-group socializing, and perceptions of the importance of events happening in Arab countries in the Middle East.

Using snowball sampling, I recruited 304 participants. Data were collected from participants living in 13 states with origins from 10 Arab countries. The participants were provided with self-administered questionnaires with closed-ended questions.

This study found that the participants’ Arab country of origin affected single participants’ ethnogamy; it also affected on in-group socializing and attitude toward the host culture. In addition, nationality and religion had
significant effects on participants’ attitude toward Arab country of origin and perceived discrimination by the host culture. Religion and American city of residence had an impact on self-identification. The results also showed that participants’ American city of residence had significant effects on self-identifications and the perceived importance of events happening in Arab countries in the Middle East. In addition, immigration generation and sojourner status affected acculturation modes. Gender did not have any significant effects.

The results of this study showed among other things that the major acculturation modes of Arab Americans in this sample were integration and assimilation and the majority of respondents selected the hyphenated identity Arab-American.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Cultural Identity

Research on cultural identity in the United States gained momentum in the past two decades (Collier, 1998; Gudykunst & Kim, 1997; Jackson, 1999). Cultural identity is not a static preexisting collective action of a social group; rather, it is a dynamic ongoing process undergoing constant reconstruction (Collier, 1998; Corcoran, 1993; Hall, 1990, 1997). Nevertheless, it is based on “common experiences in respect of a sense of continuity between generations” (Corcoran, 1993, p.10). Cultural identity foundations are collective memories of certain events that create shared historical moments and a sense of shared future or destiny (Corcoran, 1993). Regarding this point, Hall (1990, 1997) mentioned how “identity connotes identification” (1997, p. 47), and thus, it is always constructed through the difference where the ‘other’ plays an important role.

Hall (1990) argued that cultural identity is not fixed in the memory and thus it is not just about what we are, rather it is a matter of continuous interaction of history, culture, and power, and thus identity is about what we have become. Rather than viewing diaspora identity as a definition of immigrants in relation to their lost homeland, Hall (1990) viewed diaspora identities as “constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference” (p. 235). Moreover, Hall encouraged thinking about identities as uncompleted, as an ongoing process constructed from and within representations. Thus, Hall conceptualized cultural identity through two
frames, one is the frame of similarity and continuity and the other is that of difference from the “other.”

The process of creating cultural identity embraces all forms of communication from interpersonal interaction to mass communication (Corcoran, 1993); thus, media plays an important role in cultural and social constructions of identity and social memory. Moreover, media shapes interactions between groups as these interactions are governed by the constructed imaginary boundary that creates a binary system of difference, a system of “us” and “them.” Here, as McCall and Simmons (1978) put it, “we can be said to interact... with our images of them [members of other cultural groups]. We do not, after all, deal with them directly...but [we deal with them] as objects that we have clothed with identities and meanings” (p. 102).

Other factors that play a significant role in the formation of cultural identities are language and group consciousness (Hall, 1997), interactions with the in-group and out-group members (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and the dialectic structural-cultural forces (Drzewicka & Halualani, 2002). The dialectic structural-cultural forces are the relationship of the governmental and national power, policies, and tactics to the cultural practices of a group. Thus, cultural expressions become a mixture of discursive and interactional practices such as choosing cultural labels and symbols such as the music, food, dances, and celebrations (Jung & Lee, 2004).

For a long time scholars did not draw a clear distinction between studies of race, ethnicity, and culture. Most definitions of these terms overlap making
it hard to distinguish one from another (Jackson, 1999; Suleiman, 1999). Thus, many used the terms ethnicity, culture, and race interchangeably. However, Jackson (1999) made a distinction between ethnicity and race saying that race is a biological construct that has social meaning whereas ethnicity is socially-defined and culturally constructed. On the other hand, Jackson defined cultural identity as “a set of patterns, beliefs, behaviors, institutions, symbols and practices shared and perpetuated by a consolidated group of individuals connected by an ancestral heritage and a concomitant geographical reference location” (p. 33).

Scholars now agree that individual and group identities are not fixed, they are multiple, overlapping, constructed and performed historically and contextually where the in-group/out-group dialectic relationship plays a major role. For the purpose of this research, cultural identity is defined in the same manner Jackson (1999) defined it, as a sense of belonging to a cultural group with whom the individual shares a common ground and socially constructed inheritance of symbols, values, meanings, and beliefs that are in a continuous flux through interactions of humans. On the other hand, ethnic identity will refer to the national affiliation of individuals (e.g. Lebanese, Syrian, Palestinian, Iraqi etc). The following section presents an overview of the research on cultural identity of different groups in the United States.

Cultural Identity: A Mosaic of Research

The earliest research on cultural identity in the field of communication, in addition to other disciplines such as psychology and sociology, focused on
African Americans and little research was done on other cultural groups (Valdivia, 2004). As these other groups become more visible, attention was given to studying issues pertaining to their cultural identity, changing thus the binary system that studied cultural identity in the United States by looking only at Black and White (Valdivia, 2004). Research in this area, using the terms ethnic and racial interchangeably, widened and focused on three other minority groups in addition to African Americans. Namely, it focused on Latinos/Latinas, Native Americans, and Asian American diasporas. The following section introduces a snapshot of the research done on these minority groups in the United States. By the end of this section, I introduce Arab Americans as a minority group.

This section does not present a comprehensive literature review because that is not the focus of this dissertation; rather, it locates research on the cultural identity of Arab Americans within the frame of diaspora research in this country. Although I use instrumental labels, identification labels, to describe the different cultural groups, I do not intend to homogenize and stereotype these groups nor do I intend to erase or disregard the differences existing within each national background of the discussed cultural groups and the unique identities they have.

**African Americans and Cultural Identity Research**

The field of communication witnessed in the second half of the 20th century a wealth of research on issues relating to the cultural identity of African Americans, providing much insight and information about this minority
group (Eggerling-Boeck, 2002). Eggerling-Boeck (2002) points out that early research on Black identity started in sociology and focused on studying African American children’s racial preferences and self-identification (e.g. Clark & Clark 1939; Horowitz, 1939).

Among the scholars studying the cultural identity of African Americans in communication, Michael Hecht, Mary Jane Collier, and Sidney Ribeau have contributed much to the discipline as they have conducted and published empirical research (Jackson, 1999). In their books, Hecht, Collier, and Ribeau (1993), and later Hecht, Jackson, and Ribeau (2003) presented a comprehensive review and overview of the research addressing the African American identity. In addition, Jackson (1999) presented a comprehensive overview of research on racial, ethnic, and cultural identities in the fields of psychology, sociology, and communication as he presented the perceptions of European Americans and African Americans on the negotiation of cultural identity.

Researching on cultural identity of African Americans looked, in addition to many other aspects, at the relationship between social interactions and identity of African Americans as it was expressed by the choice of identity labels and linguistic choices, such as the use of the African American Vernacular English (AAVE), previously known as Ebonics and Black English (Hecht et al., 2003; Jackson, 1999; Valdivia, 2004). In addition, research looked at dyadic interactions (Hecht et al., 2003), racial group identification and interaction, and the effect of skin color or complexion on African American
identity (Valdivia, 2004). The existing research about African American cultural identity provided much insight and knowledge about this cultural group but researchers think that much more is needed (Hecht et al., 2003; Valdivia, 2004).

Native Americans and Cultural Identity Research

“The original Native people of North America” as Horse (2005, p. 61) refers to Native Americans, are among the different cultural groups that make up the American cultural mosaic. However, the Native American experience is inherently different from that of other cultural groups due to two main factors. First, they are the original people of the land that were forced into relocating to reservations. The second factor is the legal and political status they have under the U.S. Constitution regarding the treaties that are still in effect and the acknowledged tribal sovereignty of the different tribes referred to as Native Americans.

A review of published research on this group shows that although some research studied their acculturation mode (e.g. Choney, Berryhill-Paapke, & Robbins, 1995) the majority of research on Native Americans focused on health issues, identity development of children and adolescents, alcohol consumption, rhetoric, linguistics and school performance of Native American students (e.g. Dixon, 2003; Garrett, 2000; Lysne, & Levy, 1997; Nagel, 1995; Scholl, 2006; Stone, 2006). In addition, although many universities and academic institutions have departments of American Indian studies scholars assert the need for continued research taking the physiological influences of ethnic
nomenclature, that is the system of naming and assigning identity labels, and racial attitudes to study Native American identity (Horse, 2005).

*Asian Americans and Cultural Identity Research*

Asian Americans, a term coined by the historian and civil rights activist Yuji Ichioka in the late 1960s (Zhou & Lee, 2004), is used nowadays as a pan-ethnic label to refer to about 12 million first, second and beyond generation, foreign and U.S. born, citizens from different countries including China, Japan, Korea, Philippines, India, Vietnam, Cambodia, Pakistan, Laos, Thailand, Indonesia, and Bangladesh (Anderson & Lee, 2005; Zhou & Lee, 2004).

Research on this cultural group looked at different issues from the role Asian American workers played in forming a social terrain to the use of the American legal system to defend their civil rights (Anderson & Lee, 2005). Research in this area showed that people with this ancestry prefer to identify themselves by their ethnic labels (Zhou & Lee, 2004). Research on cultural identity of Asian Americans indicated that some of the factors affecting identity choices among their youth are gender, bilingualism, discrimination perceptions, immigration generation, and nationality (Jung & Lee, 2003; Zhou & Lee, 2004). Like scholars researching the cultural identity of other groups, scholars interested in the cultural identity of Asian Americans admit that, although this field is gaining momentum, more research is needed to tackle the challenges and changes that confront this cultural group’s identity in a global and transnational world (Zhou & Lee, 2004).
The Latino population is the largest cultural group, or so-called minority group, in the U.S. with a population that exceeds 40 million (Rinderle, 2005) of which the majority are of Mexican origin (Rinderle, 2005; Valdivia, 2004). People belonging to this cultural group could come from any country in Latin, or South America in addition to Mexico. The different identity labels that are used to describe this cultural group or sub-groups include: Mexican, Hispanic, Mexican American, Chicano/a, and Latino/a among others. These labels denote not only personal preferences but also social awareness and political stand (Rinderle, 2005; for an in-depth discussion of the use of each of these terms see Rinderle, 2005).

Due to the high visibility of this cultural group, research and academic institutions, in addition to governmental and marketing agencies, started giving more attention to studying Latina/os. Although the second half of the 1980s lacked material on Latino/ as (Valdivia, 2004), scholarship nowadays abounds with studies addressing different issues related to this group and its cultural identity. In addition, universities are active in recruiting Latina/o scholars at all levels to support their growing programs in Latina/o studies (Valdivia, 2004).

Communication, as a field of study, is giving more attention to this group and more is being published in the fields of acculturation, health and communication, identification and other related issues. Valdivia (2004) mentioned that the *Howard Journal of Communication* devoted an entire issue
in 1999 to Latina/os, health, and communication and that other journals such as *Communication Theory*, the *Journal of Communication*, and the *Communication Review* are publishing more U.S. Latino/a scholarship. In fact, the *Communication Review* dedicated an entire issue in 2004 (volume 7) for Latina/o communication and media studies. With the advancement and growth of Latino/a studies and scholarship, one can easily see how this fertile terrain will continue to grow and to address issues that in Valdivia’s (2004) words “beg for more work” (p. 110).

**Arab Americans**

In this research, the term Arab American is used in harmony with Suleiman’s (1999) definition to refer to all or any immigrants to the U.S. from any of the 22 Arabic speaking countries and their descendants. Arab Americans are one of the many cultural groups who immigrated and settled in the United States of America and became part of its mosaic of diversity. Although the number of Arab Americans in the United States is not known precisely, estimates range from 1,189,731 (U.S. Census Bureau Special Reports, 2005) to over 3 million (Haddad, 2004; Merskin, 2004) people who claim Arab ancestry. One source, Salaita (2005), even estimated the Arab American population in the United States to be about 5 million.

Arab Americans became a very visible group in the United States following the attacks of September 11, 2001 (Haddad, 2004; Howell & Shryock, 2003). Not only have they became more visible, but also they have became the object of perceived hatred and discrimination and the target of hate-crime (Fear
among Arabs and Muslims, 2005; Haddad, 2004; Howell & Shryock, 2003; Muneer, 2002; Shryock, 2002; Witteborn, 2004; Zogby, 2001). However, they also received support and friendship (Haddad, 2004; Howell & Shryock, 2003; Salaita, 2005).

Although Arab Americans have been living in this country since the second half of the 19th century (Hitti, 1923) and comprise a 100-year-old tile in its mosaic of cultural groups, various factors contributed to the fact that Arab Americans’ cultural identity, like all other diasporic groups, is still in a process of identity formation and reformation (Haddad, 2004). Among the many different factors affecting the formation and reformation of the cultural identity of the Arab American community are regulations and the foreign policy of the American government, the different political leanings in the United States along with those in the Arab countries, and the social interactions Arab Americans have within their communities and outside them (Haddad 2004; Salaita, 2005; Suleiman, 1999).

The erasure of a distinct identity of this group within the White dominance made Arab Americans invisible until the late 1960s. As the literature review of this dissertation shows, there is insufficient research on the cultural identity of Arab Americans who once again became very visible following the September 11 attacks on the United States. Thus, in order to draw a clearer picture of the mosaic of cultural groups in the United States we need to study the cultural identity of Arab Americans.
In the following chapter I introduce the historical background of Arab Americans. More specifically, I break down their immigration waves into this country and discuss some different factors that affected each immigration wave and the different stages of their struggle to gain recognition in the American mosaic of ethnic and cultural groups. Following that, in Chapter Three, I discuss the theoretical background guiding this study and present a comprehensive literature review to lay out the foundations for this research’s questions. In Chapter Four I introduce the methods. I outline the variables and their measurements, the data collection, sampling and participants. Then, in Chapter Five I discuss the results and conclude with Chapter Six where I discuss the significance of the research’s results in addition to the strengths, limitations, and implications for future research.
CHAPTER II. ARABS IN AMERICA: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

This chapter focuses on the history of Arab American in the United States. I believe that such a historical overview provides me with clues about factors that might influence identity. Arabs’ immigration to the United States can be divided into three waves. The first extended from the 1870s to World War I; the second was almost insignificant. It started in 1924 when the National Origin Act was put in effect and reduced the quota of immigrants from the Middle East to 100 persons per year. The third wave started post World War II and extends to the present. Each of the major two waves had its own particularities and significance for the Arab American experience in the United States.

The Early Immigration

Most of the early Arab immigration that started in the 1870s came from the Arabic speaking region of what was then known as the Syrian Ottoman region (Friedhelm, 1985; Haddad, 2004; Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985, 1994; Suleiman 1994, 1999; Younis 1995). At that time, the U.S. immigration and census books recorded all immigrants arriving from that region as immigrants from “Turkey in Asia” (Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985, 1994). Thus, at the early stage of immigration, records did not distinguish between the different ethnicities of the immigrants coming from the Ottoman Empire and other areas around the Mediterranean, consequently, Greeks, Arabs, and Armenians were all combined into one category (Suleiman, 1999). It was not until 1899 that immigration officials recognized the Arabic-speaking immigrants as “Syrians.”
This identification referred to all of those who immigrated from Mount Lebanon and later from other Arab countries such as Palestine and Syria.

However, this identification was not a nationalistic one, because at that time an independent Syrian political sovereignty did not exist, rather it was viewed as a cultural identity that identified those Arabic speaking individuals coming from that region (Naff, 1985, 1994). Nevertheless, some scholars stress that such identification was accurate because it distinguished these individuals from other Arabs, Turks, and Assyrians (Hitti, 1923).

Although scholars agree that most of the early immigrants were Christians, there is no consensus among scholars regarding the reasons behind the migration of these “early birds.” Naff (1985) asserted that the real reasons behind the first wave of immigration were neither religious persecution nor a poor economic situation in Mount Lebanon but rather a search for adventure and quick economic gain. On the other hand, Hitti (1923), Suleiman (1994, 1999), and Younis (1995) identified a combination of economic, political, and religious reasons for the migration. Hitti (1923), who highlighted the political and religious reasons over the economic, said, “The fact that most of the Syrian immigrants are Christians, whereas in Syria most Syrians are Muhammadan, seems to indicate that the religious situation has been a factor in their emigration” (p.52).

Yet, researchers agree that the first wave of immigrants came to this country without the idea of making it their permanent home; their aim was to work for two or three years, collect some wealth and then to return to their
country of origin where they would share their newly acquired wealth with their families and gain some prestige (Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985; 1994; Suleiman 1994, 1999).

Thus, the early immigrants were mainly men who were joined later by their spouses. However, the immigration by the end of the 19th century became a family movement (Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985, 1994). The early immigrants who returned to their countries of origin idealized social, political, and economic life in the United States and thus, unintentionally promoted immigration to the States (Hitti, 1923). Those who did not return, did the same thing by means of writing letters of praise and sending money to their families in the old country. Other factors that stimulated and facilitated immigration were tourists, steamship agents, and missionaries (Hitti, 1923).

Most of the early Arab immigrants engaged in peddling; many congregated in major metropolitan areas such as New York, Boston, Detroit, Washington, Cleveland, and Chicago. However, these immigrants made it to every state in the union and almost every town of 5000 people or more (Hitti, 1923). As their families joined them, those immigrants settled down and became shop owners. Their shops became family businesses where men, women, and even children after returning from school would work (Banks, 2003; Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985, 1994). However, during and after World War I as the Latin American import trade diverted from Europe to the United States, some Arab Americans engaged in the export business and only a few were workers in industry and/or farmers (Hitti, 1923).
As communities grew and more people immigrated into the ‘new country’
different churches and social groups were organized reflecting the religious
diversity and even city or village of origin of the immigrants. At the beginning of
the 20th century, some Arabic immigrant literature was produced and
circulated among Arab Americans. In 1923, Hitti documented four daily
newspapers, two periodicals and two monthly magazines in addition to the only
religious Arabic magazine at that time, *Al-Asr Al-Dhahabi*, now *Awake*. Naff
(1985) mentioned that from 1896 to 1910 at least 21 Arabic printed
newspapers and magazines circulated among the ‘illiterate majority’ of the
Syrian Arab immigrants.

As these early immigrants recognized that America had become their
permanent home, they were on their way to assimilating into the mainstream
American culture. However, the dream of returning to their ‘*blad*’ (country)
remained alive with them. About 7% of the Arab community (referred to as
Syrian at that time) served in the American army during World War I. In some
areas 100% of the Syrian youth who were eligible for service volunteered for
service even before draft laws were issued (Hitti, 1923). Economically, those
early immigrants were doing very well. Indicating their economic prosperity,
Hitti, (1923) wrote “Correspondence with boards of charity and departments of
public welfare in the spring of 1920 failed to reveal any dependent Syrians” (p.
76).

The first wave of immigration originated from the Ottoman Empire. Thus,
some information about the political, social, and economic situations in the
Ottoman Empire helps to explain the identity of this wave of immigrants. The Ottomans used to appoint a “mutasarrif” governor, to take care of the administrative responsibilities. By the second half of the 19th century, European interest was growing in that area and different western European countries offered alliances and protection for the different religious sects in it.

The three dominant religions of that area were Christianity, Islam, and Druze. Most of the early immigrants though, were Christians with a few Muslims and Druzes (Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985, 1994; Suleiman 1994, 1999). However, the religious scene was not one of unity even among those who gathered under the same religious umbrella. Followers of each religion were divided into different sects with the exception of Druze.

Arabic language united the region and was the tongue of all its occupants. As for the economic structure, it was mainly based on agriculture and the silk trade with very minor and primitive industries.

Thus, it would be understandable that the identity of the first wave of immigrants had much to do with the family, religion, and city or village from where they had immigrated (Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985). However, all early immigrants, despite their diverse backgrounds, acknowledged their common Arabic roots; they referred to themselves by the cultural rather than political or national term, ‘awlad Arab’ meaning ‘sons of Arabs.’ Nevertheless, before 1920, those early immigrants preferred to distinguish themselves as Syrians rather than Arabs (Hitti, 1923; Naff, 1985, 1994; Suleiman 1994, 1999). At that time, the United States’ influence in that Syrian Ottoman province was almost
nonexistent in both the political and economic arenas except for the few missionaries who started some schools and churches (Naff, 1985).

During that period, most of the Arab immigrants’ encounters in the United States were positive. However, a few incidents proved to be the seeds of what these immigrants were going to face in the future. In 1905, Hitti (1923) reported exaggerated newspaper stories regarding riots in “Manhattan colony” which resulted in one murder and a few cases of stabbing. However, Hitti (1923) stated that both the New York Herald and The New York Times reported the incident as national notoriety for Syrians. This exaggerated reporting was an early negative portrayal of this group, a portrayal that was going to intensify in negativity in years to come.

During this period as well, the “whiteness” of these immigrants was challenged and they had to prove their “White” identity. In 1909, the United States District Court in St. Louis and later the Southern District Court of New York refused to naturalize Arabs because they were classified under the category of aliens other than white; however, these decisions were challenged at the Circuit Court of Appeals and the latter reversed the decisions of the lower courts (Hitti, 1923). Similarly, in 1914, a South Carolina District Court refused to grant citizenship to a “Syrian of Asiatic birth” on the ground that he did not belong to the White race. The counterargument was that Arabs belong to the Semitic race and thus they are of a pure White race (Naff, 1985; Saliba, 1999). However, this identification was not designed to raise the consciousness
of “Arabness” as much as a strategic move toward gaining access to the privilege of the White classification in the U.S.

Another recorded incident that equated Arab Americans with the prejudice and racism against African Americans and other minority groups during that period took place in 1920. Then, an official running for a position in Birmingham, Alabama circulated a printed campaign bill that mentioned the disqualification of African Americans, “Negro” as the bill said, and included the following message, “The Greek, and Syrian should also be disqualified [from voting]. I DON’T WANT THEIR VOTE. If I can’t be elected by the white men, I don’t want the office” (Hitti, 1923, p. 89).

As the above-mentioned incidents show, although Arab Americans by the 1920s had almost assimilated, they were not totally accepted in the “melting pot” culture of the United States of that time. Their racial identity was questioned affecting the construction of their cultural identity.

Between the Two World Wars

Not many scholars consider the period between 1924 and the Second World War to be a significant immigration period for Arab Americans. Thus, some of them talk about two immigration periods, the early one and the one post World War II (e.g. Friedhelm, 1986; Naff, 1985; Suleiman 1994, 1999). From 1924 to World War II, the immigration quota act limited the number of Arab immigrants permitted to enter the United States. Nevertheless, immigration continued as families, mainly women and children continued to join their family members in this country (Naff, 1985).
While Arabic speaking immigrants were reuniting with their families in their “new country,” political changes were taking place in the old one, changes that affected the Arabic speaking diaspora in the United States. Following World War I, the Ottoman rule over the Arabic speaking region in the Middle East ceased, and the League of Nations divided the previous Ottoman Syrian province between the two world powers at that time, France and Britain, giving them mandatory power over the region. As a result, the mostly Christian Mount Lebanon was enlarged geographically to include what later became Lebanon. With this enlargement and incorporation of other villages and cities outside the former Mount Lebanon, this newly French governed region became a reflection of the religious constituents of the area including Christians, Muslims, and Druze. In 1926, the French government proclaimed Lebanon a republic with a French created constitution that France altered and suspended any time it desired until the independence of Lebanon in 1946. The political situation during that period created some tension in the region and intensified the religious divisions in it. The creation of two separate republics, first the Lebanese and later the Syrian, caused ethnic or national feelings to surface. This affected the Arabic speaking diaspora in the United States (Suleiman, 1999).

This development in the previous Ottoman Syrian province had its impact on the immigrants as some of them started to encourage distinction from the bulk Syrian to more representative term such as Lebanese or even Syrian Lebanese. Names of some social clubs changed. However, that
nationalistic movement didn’t have great success (Suleiman, 1999). During the same period, Arabic language usage declined among the assimilating migrants and some of their media started to publish in English (Naff, 1985; Suleiman, 1999). In addition, a group of literary elite writers formed the infamous “arrbitah al qalamiaha,” literally meaning the union of pen-men including the famous Gibran Khalil Gibran, Michael Naimy, Nasseb Arida, Rasheed Ayaoub, and Ameen Rihani among many others (Younis, 1995). At that period as well, a major concern of Arab American immigrants was the role their women played in the new country and the kind of work appropriate for them (Suleiman, 1999).

Arab Americans’ racial identity was challenged again when, in 1942, a Yemeni Arab was declined citizenship in Michigan on the basis that Arabs are not White. However, the decision was later reversed in favor of the Yemeni immigrant (Naff, 1985; Saliba, 1999; Suleiman, 1999).

During the period, between the two World Wars, Arabs in America “functioned as a collective of communities whose bonds of solidarity beyond the family were mainly related to sect or country affiliation” (Suleiman, 1999, p 7). In addition, striving to remove their differences from the mainstream, Arab immigrants at that time almost lost their common language; with the exception of music and food, they became as Suleiman (1999) puts it, “an indistinguishable group from the host society” (p. 9).

However, as World War II ended, changes in the “old countries” were shaping ideology of a new wave of immigration that was going to leave its
impact on the “indistinguishable group” of Arabs who made America their home.

The Third Immigration Wave: The Shift

The post World War II wave of Arab immigrants was different from the previous waves. The difference was not only in the geographical origins of the Arab immigrants but also in their religious affiliation. The previous immigrants were predominantly Christians from the Levant, whereas immigrants during this third wave were more religiously diverse and came from various Arab countries including North Africa (Suleiman, 1999). The new arrivals came at a time when the Arab countries started gaining, or at least fighting for, their independence from the colonial powers as the western ideas and ideology of democracy and equality made its way into these countries. Thus, not only were the post World War II immigrants more educated but also they were more politicized and fascinated by democratic opportunities. As a result, they came to the U.S. determined to participate in its political and public life (Seikaly, 1999; Suleiman, 1999).

Another critical development to the Arab world and Arabs in the U.S. during that period was the establishment of the nation of Israel in 1948 in Palestine and the resulting expulsion of many Palestinians from that region. This resulted in the allocation of Palestinians to different Arab countries, including but not limited to Lebanon, Syria, Algeria, Tunis, and Libya. It also resulted in the later migration of many Palestinians to the United States, bringing the total number of Palestinians in the U.S. to an estimated 12.5% of
its total Arab population in 1980 (Seikaly, 1999). The Palestinian issue, or cause as it later came to be known, was going to become an integral concern in the ideological and identity questions of Arabs and Arab Americans.

During that period, western and American media started portraying the Arab world in a negative way (Ayish, 1994, cited in Hamada, 2001). Nevertheless, it was not until after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war that the Arab American community became visible in the United States (Abraham, 1994; Banks, 2003; Friedhelm, 1986; Hooglund, 1987, Salaita, 2005; Seikaly, 1999; Shain 1996; Suleiman, 1994, 1999).

The 1967 war revived a nationalistic and ethnic identity among the Arab descendants and the newly immigrated Arabs in the United States. Suleiman (1999) asserted that the “older and newer Arab-American communities ...were dismayed and extremely disappointed to see how greatly one-sided and pro-Israeli the American communication media were in reporting on the Middle East” (p.10). As a result, Suleiman added, “members of the third generation of the early Arab immigrants had started to awaken to their own identity and to see that identity as Arab, not ‘Syrian’ ” (p.10).

To fight the perceived bias in American media and lobby for awareness and support of more balanced American policies in the Middle East, some Arab American organizations were born. The first of those was the Association of Arab-American University Graduates (AAUG) (Seikaly, 1999; Suleiman, 1994, 1999). The incidents in the following years and the intensifying stereotyping and negative views about Arabs exposed that this group of immigrants was far
from being fully accepted into the American mainstream as it had once thought it was.

In 1972, the tragic massacre of Israeli Olympic athletes by a Palestinian commandos group accomplished nothing other than fueling the already intensifying stereotyped image of Arabs, as the media in the U.S. “played up the Arabs’ supposed sadism” (Kayal & Kayal, 1975. p. 216). The following years witnessed more developments on the political scene in the Middle East front. Among other events were the 1973 Arab Israeli war and the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon, killing hundreds of Lebanese and leading to the Sabra and Shatila massacres in which thousands of civilian Palestinians were killed. During that period, for Arab Americans in the United States, the ‘Palestinian cause’ provided a unifying terrain for the differently oriented Arab Americans as did the other events that took place in the Middle East (Shain, 1996). On the other hand, although the U.S. imported only 2% of its oil from Arab sources, the American media blamed the U.S. 1973 energy crisis on the Arab Oil embargo (Terry, 1975).

In the late 1970s the Abscam scandal represented what could be called an institutionalized harm to the image of Arabs (Abourezk, 1989). Accordingly, it can be said that the image of Arabs shifted in the last three decades of the 20th Century from idiot oil gurus obsessed with wealth, harems and sex to dictators, criminals and terrorists obsessed with killing and committing offensive acts against the west and humanity (Shaheen, 2001; 2004).
While all this was taking place, the U.S. witnessed the birth of many Arab American organizations that wanted to defend and advance Arab American interests and causes within the United States. In addition to the Arab Republican and Arab Democratic clubs, the established organizations included The National Association of Arab Americans (NAAA), founded in 1972; the American-Arab Anti Discrimination Committee (ADC), founded in 1980; the Arab American Institute Foundation (AAIF), founded in 1985; and the Arab American Political Action Committee (AAPAC) founded in 1998. Other service oriented organizations were the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS) established in 1970 and the Arab American and Chaldean Council (AACC) founded in 1979, in addition to many other organizations that are functioning nationwide.

However, the Arab activism in the United States did not alter the continued stereotyping, prejudice, and even hostility and violence at times (Abraham, 1994). Although some Arab Americans were elected to office such as James Abourezk, Mary Rose Oakar (currently the ADC president), and Nick Rahall II who made it to the U.S. congress, not forgetting the well known consumer advocate Ralph Nader, Arab American activists always faced difficulties and opposition because of their ethnic background (Suleiman, 1999). Ralph Nader, to provide only one example, was called “dirty Arab” by a Nixon cabinet officer.

In spite of these few examples, Arab Americans have been denied full participation in public life. Some forms of such denial, especially in the 1980s,
took the form of returning donations made by citizens of Arab descent by those running for offices (Abraham, 1994, p.196) and some candidates refusing to accept Arab American participants in their campaigns (Abraham, 1994), in addition to aggressive and negative propaganda (Suleiman, 1994). All of these factors influenced the ongoing process of identity formation of Arab Americans in the United States. Furthermore, the next section focuses on how this group of immigrants faired in the 1990s to the present.

Arab Americans Today

In 1999, Suleiman asserted that Arab Americans in the U.S. are doing well on the economic, professional, and educational level. He pointed out, however, that too many of them have to hide or de-emphasize their origin because of racism, asserting that their full integration and assimilation will not be achieved until Arab Americans can stop “struggling to be accepted in the American society” (p.16).

Arab Americans today are, as they were in 1923, present in all 50 states. Haddad, (2004) reported that two-thirds of the Arab Americans are living in 10 states and over a third of those are living either in California, New York, or Michigan and about 50% of the population lives in 20 large metropolitan areas. It is also believed that approximately 75% of the Arab Americans are Christians. The remaining 25% are Muslims (Sunni and Shiite), Druze, and a small Jewish minority (Haddad, 2004).

The diversity of the Arab American population today is reflected not only in this population’s different religious affiliations, but also in its different
national backgrounds with all that national backgrounds mean in the realm of various racial, tribal, and sectarian affiliations. On the linguistic level, although “fusha” that is Modern Standard Arabic, unites the Arabic speaking people, the different regional dialects of colloquial Arabic are mainly used in daily communication and add to the diversity within this group. However, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 75% of Arabs in the United States either spoke only English at their homes or spoke English very well (U.S. Census Bureau Special Reports, 2005). The Census Bureau (2005) reported that the four largest Arab groups are of the following ancestries: Lebanese (29%), Egyptian (14.5%), Syrian (8.9%) and Palestinian (4.2%).

In addition, the Census Bureau (2005) reported that the majority of the Arab population is male (57%). It reported that the proportion of the Arab population with a high school diploma or bachelor’s degree was higher than the national average. The same was true regarding the median income of Arab men, women, and families.

In addition to the Lebanese, Syrian, Egyptian, and Palestinian ancestry, the heterogeneous composition of Arab Americans today includes people who came from Jordan, Iraq, Morocco, Yemen, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Kuwait, Libya, United Arab Emirates, Oman, Qatar, and Bahrain. It also includes some who reported Berber, Kurdish, Bedouin, and Alhuceman background in the 2000 Census.
CHAPTER III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, LITERATURE REVIEW, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this chapter, I start with the theoretical background guiding this research. Then, I present a comprehensive literature review dealing with Arab Americans and the different factors affecting their cultural identity. Finally, I conclude the chapter with my research questions.

Theoretical Background

The theoretical framework of this research is based on two theories. The first is Berry’s acculturation model (Berry 1980, 2003) and the second theory that this research will benefit from is Tajfel and Turner’s Social Identity Theory (SIT) (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Berry’s acculturation model is applicable to both individuals and groups (Hayani, 1999). This model is based on the attitudes of an individual or a minority group toward the value of maintaining its cultural identity and characteristics and toward the value of maintaining relationships with the dominant group or host culture. The four outcomes that Berry (1980, 2003) suggested are isolation, assimilation, integration and marginalization. If the attitude toward maintaining cultural identity and characteristics is positive and the attitude toward the host culture is negative, the outcome is isolation or separation. In this case, the individual or group will maintain its ethic identity and cultural traditions without participating in those of the host culture. However, if the case was the opposite, where the person or group considers acceptance of the host culture positively and views maintaining his/her/its
cultural identity negatively, then assimilation occurs. In this case, the group would sacrifice its own cultural heritage on behalf of adopting that of the majority culture.

The other two possible outcomes of this model are marginalization, which happens when attitudes to both, own and host cultures are negative. On the other hand, integration occurs when attitudes toward both cultures are positive. This means maintaining cultural identity and practices and as well as adapting to the host culture. Table 1 presents a summary of the possible results based on the attitudes toward the two cultures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude toward maintaining own cultural identity</th>
<th>Attitude toward host culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative Marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that even though the acculturation model creates dichotomies, it is possible to describe the acculturation mode of an individual or group on a continuum (Hayani, 1999). It is possible as well for individuals and groups to implement different acculturation forms in different contexts as a strategy of cultural negotiation.

Another informing theoretical background for this study is SIT. This theory consists of three parts: social categorization, social comparison and
social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This theory stresses the importance of considering threats to group identity when examining attitudes and behaviors. Thus, this theory warns of the impact of perceived discrimination of the majority group in the host culture against a minority or ethnic group on the latter’s cultural adaptation (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002). As SIT suggests, the more an ethnic minority group perceives negative out-group attitudes, the stronger the in-group identification will be. Based on SIT’s suggestion, and because the social position minority or ethnic groups acquire in the host culture is not simply dependent on their own choices but also on the perceived openness of the host society (Berry & Sam, 1996; Gordon, 1964), it is important to question the extent of perceived discrimination against Arab Americans because this might affect their acculturation modes.

Some of the communicative behavioral patterns of acculturation and maintenance of a group’s cultural identity include attitudes and acts in matters of language, marriage, friendship relationships, participation in cultural organizations, in addition to consumption of ethnic food and cultural media such as music and movies (Hayani, 1999). This theoretical framework may seem simple. However, it is comprehensive and provides me with an entry point into my research field.

Literature Review

Since the second half of the past century, scholars have given more attention to studying Arab Americans. Literature about Arab Americans focused on their stereotyped image in the western media, the Palestinian Israeli
conflict, and on Arab Americans’ history and identity. In addition, a few studies published after the September 11 attacks on the United States focused on the effect of these attacks on Arab Americans.

*The Stereotyped Image*

Much of the research about Arab Americans examined the stereotyped image of Arabs in the American and Western media. Shaheen (1983) presented how the American media’s ugly and negative stereotypes of Arabs accompany a child from his early years to graduating from college. Through “editorial cartons, television shows, comic strips, comic books, college and school textbooks, novels, magazines, newspapers and in novelty merchandise” (p. 328) Arabs were dehumanized and presented as the “bad guys.”

Focusing on this stereotyped image of Arabs in American media, Suleiman (1988) addressed different aspects of this stereotyping and presented a longitudinal study of American press coverage of the 1956, 1967, and 1973 Arab Israeli conflicts and showed how the negatively stereotyped Arab was used as a weapon in the American media in favor of Israel. Other scholars studied how news articles portrayed Arabs. Zaharana (1995) examined the portrayal of the Palestinians in the *Time* newsmagazine from 1948 to 1993, an image that went through total transformation from invisibility to high visibility after the signing of the Israeli-PLO Accord in 1993. Hashem (1995) did a content analysis of news articles published in *Newsweek* and *Time* magazines between January 1990 and December 1993. Hashem’s analysis showed that most of the time Arabs were portrayed as lacking democracy, unity, and
modernity in addition to having a heritage of defeat and fundamentalism. However, he found some coverage to reflect certain realities and fewer stereotypes when portraying Arabs.

In addition, Mousa, (2000) recapitulated a few studies that dealt with the Arab image in the West and outlined a “spill over” of the stereotyped image of Arabs and Muslims from the pre-1948 European press to the American press and media. This negative image became so imprinted in the media’s mind, Kamalipour (2000) mentioned the speed with which American authorities and media accused Arabs and Middle Easterners for attacks against American targets. For example, he mentioned the accusation of Arabs in the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, the crash of a TWA Boeing 747 in 1996, and the 1996 bombing at the Olympic Games in Atlanta. Arabs had no connection to any of these events, but the media never bothered to report the lack of connection or tried to undo the harm they had already done to the image of Arabs in the American citizens’ minds.

Adding to this topic of research, Wilkins (1995) did a qualitative and quantitative analysis of photographs published in the *New York Times* between July 1991 and June 1993. The author concluded that the images of Middle Eastern women during the period under study, constructed these women as passive, distant and impersonal.

In addition to studying Arabs' images in news articles and press coverage, scholars studied this stereotyped image in editorial cartoons and comic strips. Lendenman (1983) presented how the political cartoons in *The

Similarly, Artz and Pollock (1995) did a rhetorical analysis of editorial cartoons published in the *Chicago Sun-Times, the New York Times, Newsweek, the Chicago Tribune, and the Los Angeles Times* during the last five months of 1990. Artz and Pollock stated that the media successfully employed culturally accepted anti-Arab images to promote the American offensive in the first Persian Gulf War.

On the same topic, Stockton (1994) studied Arab images presented in hundreds of cartoons from editorial pages and comic strips. All the cartoons Stockton studied presented a dehumanizing image of Arabs. Before introducing a sample of such cartoons and the different ways in which western media and writers participated in creating this false image of Arabs, Stockton drew on the similar traits of archetype stereotyping that was previously employed to create a false image of African American, Jews, and Japanese. Furthermore, he discussed how these images were used to justify maltreatment of these groups;
he also mentioned that the negative image of Arabs in the U.S. intensified after the Arab Israeli war in 1967.

The image of Arabs in American entertainment media such as radio, television, and movies was also studied. Nasir (1979) studied the portrayal of Arabs in American movies in the first half of the 20th Century. In her study of movie titles exhibited in the U.S. between 1894 and 1960, Nasir found that an Arab male’s most frequent occupation, as portrayed in the sample she studied, was a criminal. Terry (1983) addressed how contemporary American fiction presented Arabs and the Muslims as “backward, greedy, lustful, evil, or inhumane” (p.316). Terry added that this group makes “convenient scapegoats in almost all contemporary fiction that deals with Middle East themes” (p. 316).

Jack Shahin is probably the most well known scholar addressing Arabs stereotyped image in entertainment industry and movies. In his book, *The TV Arabs*, Shaheen (1984) summarized his findings after examining about 300 programs and documentary episodes aired during the 1975-1976 and 1983-1984 TV seasons. From cartoons such as *Woody Woodpecker*, *Bugs Bunny* and other comedy shows such as *Laurel and Hardy*, *Mork and Mindy*, and *Happy Days*, to detective and police programs, Shaheen found the image of TV Arabs to be that of “baddies, billionaires, bombers, and belly dancers” (p.4). He stated that all the different shows and episodes he examined perpetuated “four basic myths about Arabs: they are all fabulously wealthy; they are barbaric and uncultured; they are sex maniacs with a penchant for white slavery; they revel in acts of terrorism” (p.4).
Shaheen (2001) reported his study of more than 900 Hollywood movies released between 1896 and 2001. In *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*, Shaheen exposed how the entertainment industry manufactured a prejudiced image of Arabs, condensing more than 250 million persons spread across 22 countries into a few dehumanizing portrayals. Out of the 900 films Shaheen analyzed, only 63 did not present Arabs with a negative stereotyped image.

In harmony with Shahin, Kamalipour (2000) mentioned the negative portrayal of Arabs in radio, television, and movies. Additionally, he named 50 movies that were released between 1974 and 1998 that always showed Arabs or Arabic speaking individuals committing attacks against Americans. Quoting from Semati, Kamalipour (1997) said that it is mistakenly belief that, “terrorism is essentially a Middle East problem, and most victims of terrorism are American” (Kamalipour, 2000, p. 67).

The stereotyped image of Arabs in scholarly work and academic textbooks were also studied by researchers. Said (1975) in *Orientalism and the October war: The shattered myths*, presented, in a critical approach, the myths about Arabs in the discourse of Orientalism. He showed how this discourse has always compressed, reduced, and stereotyped the image of Arabs. In addition, Said showed how the institutions sustained Orientalism by presenting myths as facts protected by a so-called “scientific” analysis. Ayish (1994) conducted a comprehensive content analysis of published relevant scholarly works from 1954 to 1994. Ayish concluded that all the published and unpublished
academic works agree that western media portrayed the Arab world in a negative way (Ayish, 1994, cited in Hamada, 2001). Al-Qazzaz (1975) also presented how social science textbooks, whether in the elementary, junior high, or high school, contributed to, carried on, repeated, and perpetuated negative stereotyped images and myths of Arabs. Additionally, Al-Qazzaz (1983) presented an update to his 1975 analysis of how social science textbooks negatively stereotyped Arabs.

Parallel to and in harmony with the images perpetuated in academic schoolbooks is that presented in the Protestant Sunday school textbooks Abu-Laban (1975) studied. The books she analyzed were “creating, as an educational by-product, black sheep [Arabs] in the family of God.” In these books, “Arabs are the most excluded of the deity’s descendants” (p. 166).

This negative image was presented even in games. Shahin (1983) mentioned one example of a teens’ game called “Oil Sheik” in which, like in Monopoly players attempt to acquire real estate but unlike Monopoly the money involves billions of dollars and the players are encouraged to gain control over the oil producing nations. Moreover, the game instructs the players to create a more “life like” game by wrapping pillowcases around their heads or if the player is ugly to cover his/her head with the pillowcase. Among the other dehumanizing features of this game, Shahin quoted from one of the game cards’ instructions that said, “impress Arabs with your patriotism by dating a camel” (p.330).
Suleiman (1994) also presented the results of a survey of high school teachers of World history in California, Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, New York, and Pennsylvania. The author’s survey indicated the teachers’ ignorance about and prejudice against Arabs and Muslims.

In 2000, another set of scholarly works addressed American students’ perceptions of Arabs. Kamalipour (2000) described American high school students’ perceptions of Arabs and the Middle East and concluded that these perceptions were “overwhelmingly negative” (Kamalipour, 2000, p. 58).

Stockton (1994) recognized that the inferiority of the “other” the stereotyped image presents, not only promotes the superiority of the stereotyper and his/her group, but also provides immunity for transgressing against the stereotyped group. In addition, he said that such stereotyping can justify key policy decision taken by the political power in addition to justifying injustices committed by individuals or nations against the stereotyped “other.”

In addition, Suleiman (1999) addressed the impact of the negative stereotyping of Arabs on Arab Americans, asserting that the Arab American community “has suffered and continues to suffer in many ways” (p. 1) as the negative stereotyped image of Arabs was internalized in the mind of America.

SIT suggests that otherness and in-group/out-group relationships in addition to the perceived discrimination a minority group may feel would affect the acculturation modes of the minority group into the host culture (Berry & Sam, 1996). Thus, the stereotyped image of Arabs in the United States raises the need for questioning the perceptions of those belonging to this minority
The Arab Israeli Conflict and the Palestinian Issue

The Arab Israeli conflict provided a fertile field for research. Many researchers were interested in the U.S. media coverage of the wars that erupted between Israel and different Arab Nations at different times.

Terry (1975) conducted a content analysis of three U.S and two European newspapers before, during, and after the 1973 Israeli Arab war. Among her findings, Terry noted that there was a slight increase in neutral coverage of the war in comparison to that of 1967, however, the “editorial coverage of the war and its aftermath tended to favor the Israeli position” (p. 8) but “there were some pro-Arab editorials” (p. 8). In addition, one of her notable findings was the tripling of the number of editorials on oil following the war and the oil embargo.

In harmony with Terry’s note regarding the slight increase in neutral coverage, Suleiman (1975) compared media reports about the Middle East in the 1973 war to those of 1967 and concluded that there was a shift toward a more neutral reporting in 1973. However, he mentioned that criticizing Israel remained a taboo and that “the media themselves ...have been a principal agent for propagating myths about the Middle East” (p. 37). Similarly, McClauere (1975) talked about a slight shift towards an American awakening regarding Arabs and their images. Touching on the Arab-Israeli conflict, the oil issue, and the U.S. economic situation in 1974, he asserted the need of the
American people to better understand the nature of the Arab Israeli conflict, and he stated his belief that the “American awakening” is a reality despite the “misrepresentations [of Arabs], particularly, within the news media” (p. 239).

Along the same line, Samo (1975) presented a case study of the coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict by the Kalb brothers. He exposed the reporters’ pro-Israeli and anti-Arab bias. Similarly, Farsoun, Farsoun, and Jay (1975) conducted a content analysis of the publications of “self-defined leftist” (p. 54) organizations in the U.S. and concluded that these organizations view the conflict in the Middle East as an outcome of the imperialist penetration to the area and Zionism as a product of capitalism and imperialism.

In 1983, McDavid published a study about the American press coverage of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and stated that it did not accurately show the Israeli aggression. McDavid saw the images the U.S. press presented of the Israelis as humanitarians while covering up the Palestinian and Lebanese civilian casualties. He contrasted that with the Canadian and French media coverage. They offered more realistic pictures of the invasion and Israeli practices against civilians that showed “obvious similarities to Nazi treatment of Jews” (p. 305).

Additionally, Shain (1996) echoed what others said regarding the invisibility of Arab Americans before the 1967 Arab Israeli war, which provided an ideological core and a national political agenda for Arab Americans. Moreover, the author asserts that the Palestinian cause provided a unifying terrain for the differently oriented Arab Americans and so did the other events
that took place in the Middle East such as the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982. However, Shain considered that the Palestinian Israeli agreements of the 1990s in addition to other political events that took place within the Arab countries or between Israel and some Arab countries have pulled the common rug from under these differently oriented groups and created a new challenge for Arab Americans in redefining their identity and agenda. Finally, Banks (2003) mentioned how the political events that took place by the end of the Twentieth Century in the Middle East and the years of unjust American foreign policy toward Arab countries have led to a rising activism by Arab Americans and to more expressions of pride in their cultural heritage.

As this volume of literature suggests, the Arab Israeli conflict which started in 1948 with what became known as the Palestinian Cause, provided a terrain to unite Arabs on one cause and to revive the national identity of Arab Americans (Friedhelm, 1985; Naff, 1985; Shain, 1996; Suleiman, 1975). Now, the many changes that took place in this regard, such as the establishment of a Palestinian authority in Israel and the calls for the establishment of two states on that land, make questioning the extent to which Arab Americans are still concerned about this, and other issues in Middle Eastern Arab countries, an important aspect for this research.

Historical Overview and Cultural Identity

The historical perspective and cultural identity of Arab Americans were interwoven topics for researchers. As early as 1923, about 50 years after the first documented Arab immigrant came to the United States, Hitti (1923)
provided an estimated number of Syrian immigrants and their offspring to be about 200,000, most of whom were Christians. Although those immigrants were concentrated in certain states more than others, they found their way to almost all of the 50 states of the Union. Hitti also provided a historical overview of the social, economic, and geographical characteristics of Syria and Syrians, as Arab Americans were referred to at that time. He stated that individuals are more inclined toward “local mind” than “social one” and lean toward a patriotism that takes the form of love for family, sect, and geography of homeland. He also talked about leadership, education, culture, religion, and language. Then, he addressed the background and causes of the early Syrian immigration to the United States, which, as Hitti reasoned, seem to be a mixture of economic, political, and social factors.

As for their organizations, the author noted that Syrians were almost absent from the political scene, except for one attempt of a Syrian who ran for a senatorial position as a Republican in New York but was defeated. However, the author brings out the ignorance of the American public about this group of immigrants and the public’s undue bigotry toward them. He asserted, “even at present [in 1923] the colossal ignorance and prejudice, on the part of some, is amazing and constitutes the chief obstacle in the way of better understanding” (p. 89).

Regarding assimilation, Hitti said, “far from being a melting pot, assimilation is ...more of a weaving process-weaving according to the old and slow hand-loom system by which each contributes his share toward the
production of the final fabric” (p. 99). However, Hitti mentioned that American mainstream, refusing to accept the contributions of the ‘Syrian’ into this weaving process, was not ready to accept their assimilation disregarding the services these immigrants provided to the country and public especially during the years of World War I when about 7% of the Syrian community served in the U.S. army. Hitti also focused on the religious status of the immigrant community saying that the majority of the immigrants were Christians, who just as the Muslims and Druze among them, retained their faith.

Elkholy (1966) researched, in 1959, the Muslim communities in Toledo, Ohio and Detroit, Michigan. Although Elkholy’s focus was on Arab American Muslims, his participants included Muslims from non-Arab countries such as India and Pakistan among others. His research was published in 1966. However, he said that his publication in 1966 was still up to date because of his continued contact with leaders in these communities. The author focused his research on whether Islam was hindering the assimilation of Muslim Arab immigrants into the host culture where the dominant religion is different from that of his participants’ religion. Elkholy found that although both the Toledo and Detroit communities shared the same characteristics regarding their origin of immigration and time spent in the host culture, the Toledo community showed more assimilation and was more religious as well.

Elkholy (1966) said that the main factor influencing the assimilation of his participants was their occupation more than anything else. He also mentioned that the third generation Muslims in Toledo were more religious
than those of Detroit who were more nationalistic. The author also recognized that, unlike the Detroit community he studied which was an enclave to some extent, the Toledo community had more social and economic interaction with people who did not belong to the same community or religious background.

Among the trends that Elkholy considered as trends of Americanization, was the role of women in the family; the roles women played were not only equal to those of men, but sometimes dominated the family. Moreover, women took a greater role in helping their husbands in the family’s business ventures. However, Elkholy’s remark about the role of women was not necessarily an indication of Americanization. Within the families in the areas where these immigrants came from, it was customary for women to take charge of the family matters when the husband was away from home, and it was, and still is, customary for them to play a role in economic and public life.

Naff’s (1985) book became a landmark in the history of Arab Americans in their new American home. In it, through a collection of different primary sources, she traced back the history and early experiences of the pioneer Arab immigrants, particularly from the Levant, or what she calls greater Syria. Naff presented an historical overview of the Arabs’ immigration to the U.S., which started in the 19th century.

Naff mentioned that the early immigrants came with the idea to better their economic status and return within two or three years to their country with wealth and prestige, whereas the later immigrants came with the idea of making America their home without cutting off their cultural roots. Settling in
and starting a business was a landmark in the assimilation of these immigrants into the American new home. To further their progress, many started seeking American citizenship and many times, they had to fight for it. Naff mentioned how between 1909 and 1920 many Arabs were refused citizenship because they were classified as “yellow” race. Such discrimination forced those immigrants to prove their “Whiteness” to become eligible for naturalization.

The author asserted that many Arab immigrants settled and established themselves in their new country, and yet they continued to have nostalgia for their old one and never gave up their cultural heritage, which they passed to the second generation that, although they may have lost some of the language, retained cultural habits and values. Naff said that settling in the “new world” has altered some of the native habits of the Syrian-Arab American immigrants; factors that affected this alteration process were the “family’s economic status, the number of Syrians in its community, and the strength of its attachment to the cultural heritage” (p. 280). Although families, as Naff said, remained the cornerstone for this group of immigrants, the conservatism of these families was altered and the traditional patriarchal extended family notion disintegrated and gave way to a similar notion but within a smaller unit.

In addition, Naff (1985) addressed the major role that women played by stepping forward and taking the lead in meeting the societal needs and in preserving cultural identities by establishing social clubs and organizing activities to support financing the religious meeting places. However, the writer
claimed that the Americanized children of these immigrants although held to the cultural moral values of their ancestors had a cultural void, which they “filled from the well of American myth and history” (p. 292). Conversely, the author says that World War II and the Great Depression had its impact on the assimilation of this minority group and concluded “If political and economic events had not reactivated Arab immigration and an interest in Arab culture, Syrian-Americans might have assimilated themselves out of existence” (p. 330).

Friedhelm (1985) also addressed the history of the Arab immigrants to the United States, which he traced back to the 1880s. He pointed out that the social and religious organizations in addition to the ethnic press have played a major role in their social integration in the host country.

Almost two decades after Elkholy’s (1966) research, Haddad and Lummis (1987) researched five Islamic centers in the United States. Four of these mosques had Arab American Muslim majority and were founded by the 1930s. In studying Toledo, Ohio, Dearborn, Michigan, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Quincy Massachusetts, and Rochester, New York, Haddad and Lummis reported a transformation in the traditional roles of Imams (the Muslim religious leader or clergy) from that of a leader in prayer to that of a minister who provides counseling, tutoring in the faith, and represents the community to the general public.

In addition, their study reported different attitudes and degrees of strictness in adhering to traditional Muslim beliefs. These attitudes varied from one mosque to another and so did the acceptance of the liberty of dress and
grooming of women attending religious prayers at these mosques. This study revealed the major role women in the Dearborn area played in establishing mosques as places for worship and for community social activities. Haddad and Lummis’s study was conducted in what they considered liberal and moderate Muslim communities because they could not have access to the conservative sites. In addition to interviews, they collected a total of 338 surveys in three of the five sites. They concluded that there is at least a nucleus of an American Islam which, although it adheres to the fundamentals of Islamic beliefs, allows individuals to decide what it means to be a Muslim and American. However, the researchers pointed out that the data they collected indicated “some Muslims are feeling at home and welcome assimilation into American life, while others are genuinely concerned that it [assimilation] will jeopardize the maintenance of Islamic values” (p. 171).

Naff (1994) asserted that it was not until after World War II that Arab Americans began to develop an Arab identity to counter the ignorance about the history of Arabs. Suleiman (1994) asserted that being sick of “the outsiders” image, Arab Americans started to assimilate more into the American way of life during and after World War I when they started joining the army and fighting on behalf of the United States. In addition, following the war and realizing that America was their permanent home, those immigrants started to develop an Arab-American community; they started to be more united and less factionalized. In addition, they started to engage in campaigns to better inform the American citizens and others about their Arab heritage.
According to Suleiman (1994), after World War II, the Arab American communities nearly assimilated fully and almost lost their Arab identity but this identity loss was reversed because of the Palestinian cause and the post World War II Arab immigration wave of highly educated and politicized individuals and professionals. Those immigrants were looking for a better life for themselves and for their home countries as well; thus, they started working in the political arena in their newfound home. In addition to this, the identity awakening of the third generation of the early Arab immigrants and the 1967 Arab Israeli war, all, Suleiman asserted, contributed to the emergence of an Arab identity rather than just a national one and led to the formation of some Arab American activist organization.

Suleiman (1994) surveyed 394 politically active Arab Americans. The author collected data about issues of ethnicity, American party orientations, and political activism. The major finding of this survey was that Arab Americans, young and old, were showing more commitment toward their Arab-American community.

Haddad (1994) sketched the religious composition and affiliation of the Arab American immigrants. She did not ignore the role of the 1967 war in reawakening the Arab identity among the various religious groups and gaining more power over the national identity (e.g. Lebanese, Syrian, Palestinian...). In addition, Haddad provided a view of the different religious sects making up the Arab American community: Christians, Muslims, and Druze. Then, she examined the history of establishing their roots in the United States. She also
focused on Islam in the US and the different nature it is taking as Arab American Muslims are assimilating and integrating into the American society. However, Haddad acknowledged that, “the Arab American community is changing and will continue to change “in constituency and in its forms of self-identification in the years to come” (p. 84). In addition, she pointed out that the new immigrants with their ideologies and commitments in addition to the U.S. tolerance or intolerance of the aspirations of this community will have a great impact on how this identity will be shaped.

Shain (1996) presented his opinion about the challenges facing different Arab American groups in the United States. He focused on the rhetoric and actions of some Arab American leftist activists in the United States as well as on that of some Islamic groups. He echoed what others said regarding the invisibility of Arab Americans before the 1967 Arab Israeli war, which provided an ideological core and a national political agenda for Arab Americans. Shain categorized Arab Americans into two groups, the isolationists and the integrationists. The isolationists tend to resist what he calls a “powerful assimilation vision found in America” (p. 22), whereas the integrationists resist total assimilation into the dominant White culture of the U.S. and call for cultural and political recognition; they identify themselves as Americans and supporters of American values and of a vision of pluralist democracy. The author concluded that a determining factor of how Arab Americans will face these diasporic challenges will depend on the different political events within the U.S. and in the countries of origin.
Among scholars who focused on issues pertaining to Arab American identity is Seikaly (1999). Using interviews in the Detroit area, he focused on themes that relate to Palestinian community identity. The author found that, on the social dimension, the attachment to cultural ethnicity is a “defining feature of the Palestinian group” (p. 30). On the political dimension, the Palestinian community is divided between those who feel desperation and no hope based on the history they have had with the political promises and the Palestinian Cause, and others who try through their life to create bridges that connect them to the past. Whatever the case is, Seikaly stated that the Palestinians’ community identity is in crises due the political events and conditions in the Middle East.

Similarly, Ajrouch (1999) used Muslim-Arab focus groups from the Dearborn area over a period exceeding a year during which she focused on the participants’ perceptions of the meaning of being Arab or American and which identity the participants took for themselves. In her findings, Ajrouch states that religion, Islam in this case, played a major role in the formation of the Arab identity. In addition, she said that although “there is no blatant assertion that ethnicity tends to be a gendered process among Arab Americans” (p. 138) gender still plays a major role in the degree of assimilation to the dominant culture where women bear the weight of maintaining the Arab identity of the family and community.

Additionally, Joseph (1999) argued that the representations of the “non-free” hyphenated Arab (Arab-) through a variety of popular and scholarly
discourse served as basis for creating the designation of difference of the Arab-from the American. Joseph argued that the conflation of all Arabs as one set and the conflation of those representations with the hyphenated Arab in America served to erase the difference between Arabs themselves in order to create a difference “between the free, white, male American citizen and this constructed Arab” (p. 260). The author added that the tool for creating this difference was through the representations of the religious, political, and social orders in the Arab, Middle Eastern, and Islamic world.

Joseph (1999) argued that discrimination and hate against Arabs in the U.S. during and after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war created the need for organized hyphenated Arab politicized organizations to defend them. However, the author feared that the representations of this non-free hyphenated Arab through the media, so called scholarship, and political discourse, in contrast with the “free American” have created what might be the emerging “other” after the collapse of the hated communist “other.”

Caniker (1999) summarized the social and economic conditions of the Arab community in southeast Chicago. That community was facing significant discrimination and stereotyping. Caniker mentioned that because of the economic changes the city witnessed, there was deterioration in the safety net within the Arab community in that area. The author found that part of the problems facing the Arab community in southeast Chicago were due to the interweave of political, economic and social factors including stereotyping and discrimination against this community.
After the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States, a few studies were published addressing Arab American’s life and experiences following the attacks. In October 2001, Zogby presented the results of a poll of Arab Americans conducted between October 8 and 10, 2001. The poll commissioned by the Arab American Institute Foundation (AAIF) had a margin of error of ±4.5% and showed that 60% of the 508 surveyed were worried about the “long-term effects of discrimination” (p.2) against them because of the September 11 attacks. In addition, it showed that only 20% of those surveyed said that they had personally experienced discrimination because of their Arab American background, but 45% said that they personally knew someone who suffered discrimination since the attacks because of his/her Arab American cultural background. However, almost half of the young Arab Americans reported that they had experienced discrimination since September 11.

The poll’s result also showed that 69% believe that profiling of Arab Americans had increased since the attacks; however, 54% of those polled although they disagreed with politicized profiling, reported that they think it is justified. Finally, the poll’s result indicated that 84% of those polled said that their ethnic background is important in defining their identity and 88% were proud of their ethnic heritage and 83% considered securing the rights of the Palestinians personally important to them.

In May 2002, Zogby International conducted a second poll for the AAIF. Seventy-five percent of those surveyed were born in the United States; this poll (Arab American Institute, 2002) yielded similar findings to that of 2001 and
had a margin of error of ± 4.5%. However, the results of this 2002 poll indicated an increase of 10% in those reporting personal experience of discrimination because of their ethnic background after September 11 (30% compared to 20% in the 2001 poll). On the other hand, the percentage of those surveyed who said that they personally knew someone who suffered discrimination since the attacks because of his/her Arab American ethnic background was 45% in the 2001 survey and 40% in May 2002.

In addition, this survey results showed that perceived discrimination toward Arab American students decreased at schools to 21% from a reported 49% in 2001. However, perceived discrimination remained the same among neighbors and friends (25%).

The percentage of those surveyed who believe that profiling of Arab Americans had increased since the attacks increased by 9% in the 2002 poll from the 69% reported in 2001. In addition, the poll’s results indicate that 59% of Arab Americans surveyed reported that their public display of their heritage was not affected by the consequences of September 11, 70% of those who reported an effect were 18-24 years old and 79% of students reported an effect on their public display of their ethnicity.

The percentage of those surveyed who said that their ethnic pride has not changed after the September 11 attacks remained 73%, 15% reported an increased pride and 8% reported less pride in their ethnic background. However, the percentage of those surveyed who are proud of their ethnic heritage was almost 90% in both 2001 and 2002. In addition, 73% reported
having strong emotional ties with their family’s countries of origin (42% reported very strong ties and 31% reported somewhat strong emotional ties).

The poll also asked the feelings of reassurance Arab Americans had toward the Bush administration’s conduct toward Arab Americans. The 2002 results showed a decline of 36% in those who said they feel reassured in 2002 compared to 2001. The percentage fell from 90% in 2001 to 54% in 2002.

Muneer (2002) addressed the change within the American citizenship display of African Americans and Latinos/as as those belonging to these ethnic groups felt the need to express their Americanism by approving the profiling and sharing in the hate violence. Quoting from an article published in the *New York Times* in September 23, 2001, Muneer said that African Americans and Latinos/as Americans have given in to racial profiling after having been its victims for years.

Muneer (2002) also mentioned how the discrimination, attacks, and hate-crimes forced Arab Americans, Muslims, and South Asian communities to accommodate and strategically adapt to embrace their American identity by displaying and waving flags in order to prove their belonging. He also said that the post September attacks against Arab American and South Asian communities created an awareness among individuals belonging to these groups that they can not debase race by way of class belonging because they all came to realize that no matter what class they belonged to, they were still not White.
Like Muneer, Shryock (2002) noted how the attacks forced Detroit’s Arab Americans to exaggerate their American identity. Shryock (2002) said that this was a strategy to avoid the consequences of not belonging. Howell and Shryock (2003) concluded that what once was believed to be true about Arabs of metropolitan Detroit entering the cultural mainstream is “likely to be dismissed today as wishful thinking” adding “the image of Arab Detroit changed within hours of the 9/11 attacks. As evidence, they pointed out that Dearborn, due to its high Arab concentration, was the first U.S. city to have its own office of Homeland Security and that the number of FBI staff in Detroit’s office doubled during 2002. They also asserted that “the mass mediated structures of public opinion…have performed well as a conduit for anti-Arab” (p. 451) sentiments. Again, this change in the attitudes toward and fears from Arab Americans would raise many questions about its effect on their cultural identity formation or expression. Realizing this, Banks (2003) mentioned how the political events that took place by the end of the Twentieth Century in the Middle East and the years of unjust American foreign policy toward Arab countries have led to a rising activism by Arab Americans and to more expressions of pride in their cultural heritage.

In addition, Saskia Witteborn (2004) examined the effect of 9/11 on the “communal identity enactment of 5 Arab women” (p. 83). Witteborn was lucky to have conducted part of her research before the attacks and thus was able follow up after the attacks with the same participants, five Arab women, and find a change in labels they used to express their identity after the attacks.
In her research, Witteborn found that national identity (such as Egyptian, Lebanese, or Palestinian) was emphasized after 9/11 as a means to raise the public awareness of the diversity within the Arab world and to counteract ascribed monoethnic identities (Witteborn, 2004). However, the participants less frequently used the identity labels “Arab” and “Arab American” after 9/11. In addition, she found that her participants’ usage of the label “Arab” after 9/11 was extended to meanings of “social relationships within a community organization” (p. 94). She found that instead of using the label “Arab American” more often after the attacks, her participants did not use this “panethnic” identity.

Haddad (2004), asserted that “Tempered by prevalent hatred and ‘othering’ many are re-identifying themselves as Arab-American or Muslim – American” (p. 51). Haddad said that there are many questions that Arab immigrants in the United States need to answer regarding what identity they want, an American identity or a hyphenated one, and what impact their religious affiliation plays in forming this identity. Finally, Salaita (2005) emphasized how notions of patriotism after the September 11 attacks have distorted the life of American and Arab American citizens. In addition, Salaita highlighted the intricate interaction between Americans of Arab ancestry and other ethnic groups and the role xenophobia, racism, and stereotyping plays in this regard. Salatia argued that rather than altering American attitudes toward Arab Americans, the September 11 attacks reinforced the positive and negative pre-existing attitudes. The attacks offered racists with a rhetorical justification
for their attitudes and offered multiculturalists a rationale to fight exclusionary ideals and promote inclusionary ones.

As this literature review reveals, many studies presented empirical evidence documenting the stereotyped image of Arabs in the U.S. media. However, the assumptions made in the available published works about the acculturation of Arab Americans were either based on studying the Muslim communities, many times including non-Arab Muslims (e.g. Ajrouch, 1999; Elkholy, 1966; Haddad & Lummis, 1987; Haddad, 2004) or were based on adopting the four types of Berry’s (1980) model of acculturation without supporting research (e.g. Haddad, 2004; Shain, 1996; Suleiman, 1994, 1999).

Scholars agree that the cultural identity of Arab Americans is in a process of construction and reconstruction; this is in harmony with what scholarly work of cultural identity suggests. Thus, my study questions what type or types of acculturation the Arab American community is showing in 2006. It also attempts to answer Haddad’s question (2004) about what identity Arab Americans want, an American identity or a hyphenated one. In addition, this research asks what impact their religious affiliation play in forming this identity.

Due to the complexity and multiplicity of identities, it would be presumptuous to claim that one research project can capture all of the different features and complexities of identity. Thus, this research attempts to unveil some aspects of Arab American’s self-perceptions of their cultural identity under the umbrella questions: who do Arab Americans say they are
today? What issues are of concern to them? What role do ethnicity, religion, gender, and immigrants’ generation play in their acculturation modes?

Research Questions

The Effects of Religion, Nationality, and Gender

The literature review suggests differences in cultural identity’s importance to Arabs immigrating in different immigration waves. It showed that the first wave, which was mainly Christians, almost fully assimilated into the host culture. Not until the immigration wave after 1967 did Arab cultural and ethnic identities come to the forefront. Thus, it is important to examine the effects of the religious affiliation of participants. The same is true regarding ethnicity. The first wave of Arab immigrants were not only Christians but also came mainly from Lebanon and Syria; however, the later wave came from other Arab countries. Thus, I will also look at the effects of nationality. In addition, the literature review revealed the role woman played in preserving cultural identity of Arab immigrants. Thus, looking whether differences in attitude toward the original and host cultures and maintenance of cultural identity exist between the males and females is not only justified but seems necessary. Thus, I consider the effect of gender.

I have chosen ethnogamy as one of the dependent variables because the choice of a marriage mate is one of the measures of cultural perseverance (Gordon, 1986; Hayani, 1999). Furthermore, as the literature review showed, people choice of identification is key in presenting their identity, thus this was another dependent variable. Berry’s acculturation model is based on attitude
toward maintaining one’s cultural identity and one’s attitude toward the host culture, thus I included these two dependent variables. I also used these two variables to determine participants’ acculturation mode. As SIT suggested and as the literature review showed, socializing habits with people who belong to one’s cultural group or those of the host culture play a crucial role in identification and in acculturation. Therefore, I included in-/out-group socializing as other dependent variables. Similarly, SIT suggests that the degree to which a group perceives discrimination affects their integration into the host culture, and the literature review showed how much stereotyping Arab Americans suffered; thus, the variable perceived discrimination is included.

For Research Question 1, I will examine the effects of religion, nationality and gender on ethnogamy, self-identification, maintenance of cultural identity, attitude toward the original and host cultures, in-group/out-group socialization, and perceived discrimination. My research questions are:

RQ1: How do religion, nationality and gender affect:

(a) ethnogamy or choice of marriage mate,

(b) self-identification,

(c) maintenance of Arab cultural identity,

(d) in- and out-group socializing,

(e) attitude toward Arab cultural background,

(f) attitude toward the host American culture,

(g) perceived discrimination against Arabs by host country,
(h) acculturation mode (i.e., isolation, integration, assimilation, marginalization).

*The Effect of Immigration Generation on Acculturation Mode*

Second and subsequent generations of immigrants show different acculturation patterns from the first generation (Gordon, 1986; Hayani, 1999). Thus, a second research question is:

RQ 2: What is the relationship between immigration generation and acculturation mode?

*Acculturation Mode and Perceived Discrimination*

SIT suggests that the more an ethnic minority group perceives negative out-group attitudes, the stronger the in-group identification will be. In other words, the social position minority or ethnic groups acquire in the host culture is not simply dependent on their own choices but also on the perceived openness of the host society (Berry & Sam, 1996; Gordon, 1964).

A research question here is:

RQ 3: Does perceived discrimination influence participants’ acculturation modes?

*The Influence of Gender and Others’ Cultural Background on Identification in Context*

Witteborn (2004) found that Arab American women strategically used different cultural or ethnic identifying labels in different contexts after September 11, 2001. This research asks whether the participants use different identifying labels in different contexts based on the cultural background of
those with whom they are socializing. In addition, because Witteborn only studied females, this research asks about men as well.

RQ 4: Does the gender of the participants and the cultural background of those they are interacting with affect their use of different identifying labels?

The Influence of Sojourner Status on Acculturation Mode

As the literature review showed, Arab Americans who came with the view to spend a few years during which they accumulated some wealth and then return to their country were less concerned about their role within the host culture than those who realized that they were here to stay or those who came with that view in mind. Thus, this research questions the relationship between sojourner status and acculturation mode.

RQ 5: Do respondents who plan to move back to their country of origin show different acculturation modes than those who do not?

The Relationship Between Self-Identification and Assessments of the Importance of Issues in the Middle East

Scholars asserted the role of the Palestinian issues in the formation of Arab-American identity (e.g. Shain, 1996; Suleiman, 1994, 1999) but they questioned its importance after 1996. Thus, this research asks:

RQ 6: Is there a relationship between self-identification of Arab Americans and their perception of the importance of events happening in the Arab countries in the Middle East?

Finally, because earlier research showed an effect of U.S. city of residence on acculturation I first assessed whether city significantly affected
any of the independent variables. That allowed me to know whether I needed to control for the city variable when I ran the analyses to answer my research questions.
CHAPTER IV. METHODS

In this chapter, I present the methods I used in this research. I specifically present the sampling design, participants, data collection, research sites, in addition to the variables and their measurements.

Sampling Design

I used snowball sampling. In snowball sampling, “members of the target population...are asked to provide names and addresses of other members of the target population, who are then contacted and asked to name others” (Singleton & Straits, 2005, p 138). This sampling design depends on some sort of referral, where the participants contacted at the beginning of the data gathering process identify other members of the target population who might be willing to participate in the study.

I chose this design because of the concern my participants might have thinking that my study is some kind of undercover scheme from a certain government agency or group and thus either refuse to participate or participate giving false information that they assume will keep them out of trouble. My concern stemmed from three specific reasons. The first reason is the stories circulating within the Arab-American communities about FBI and other governmental security agencies visiting and questioning them. The second reason is the current secret surveillance issues. The third reason was the announcement of U.S. Attorney General Alberto Gonzalez on February 21, 2006 that three Arab Toledo-area men have been indicted for suspected terrorist activities.
Participants

A total of 304 individual (159 females, 143 males, and one gender unknown) participated in this study. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 84. The majority of participants were married \( (n = 171) \) with 102 single respondents. The remaining participants \( (n = 31) \) reported that they were either engaged, widowed, or divorced.

One hundred and sixty-nine (56\%) of the respondents reported a Christian religious affiliation, 125 (41\%) reported a Muslim religious affiliation, and 10 (3\%) respondents reported other religious affiliations such as Druz, agnostics, or Atheists.

The majority of the participants \( (n = 190, 63\%) \) reported being born outside the United States and 37\% reported being born in the United States. The majority of respondents reported that they have American citizenship \( (n = 245 \text{ participants, } 81\%) \), 18\% \( (n = 54) \) reported carrying a green card, and the remaining respondents reported other status without specifying it. Hatab (2007) reported that more than 80\% of Arab Americans have citizenship. So the large proportion of citizens in my sample is not unusual. The participants lived in 13 states with the highest rate of participation from Ohio \( (n = 117, 39\%) \), Michigan \( (n = 78, 26\%) \) and Pennsylvania \( (n = 66, 22\%) \). As for the respondents’ or their Arab ancestors’ Arab countries of origin, the majority reporting their Arab origin were from Lebanon \( (n = 132, 46\%) \), Syria \( (n = 77, 27\%) \), or Palestine \( (n = 34, 12\%) \). Twenty-one participants did not specify their own or their ancestors’ Arab country of origin. It is worth mentioning that the
distribution of nationalities in this study’s sample corresponded with the
distribution of Arab groups reported by the U.S. Census Bureau (2005) except
for the Egyptians. For the breakdown of the participants’ Arab country of
origin, see Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arab Country of origin</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>% of U.S. Arab population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The reported percentage in this table represents the calculated percentage of the
reported Arab country of origin and not of the total number of participant. The percentage
of U.S. Arab population represents the percentage of individuals with these national
ancestries as reported in the Census Bureau Special Reports (2005).

Lebanese, Syrians and Palestinians have similar cultural traits. Not only
do they come from the same geographical area but also they all speak what is
known as the Levantine dialect of colloquial Arabic although dialectal
differences exist among them. Lebanon has almost equal numbers of
Christians and Muslims with a Druz minority whereas Islam is the religion of the majority in both Syria and Palestine.

Data Collection

To collect the data for my study, I used self-administered written surveys (Appendices A and B). The survey consisted of 50 closed and open-ended questions. Data collection started as soon as I obtained approval from BGSU’s Human Subjects Review Board and the Human Resources Office at the University of Toledo. Data collection started on May 7th and concluded the last week of September 2006. Of the 450 distributed questionnaires, 310 were returned out of which 304 were used. Six questionnaires were not used because they were returned unanswered or with only a few questions answered. An Arabic version of the questionnaire (Appendix B) was created for the use of participants who were not proficient in reading English or preferred to answer the survey in Arabic. Participants were given the choice between a questionnaire in English or in Arabic when they were initially contacted. Out of the 304 completed questionnaires, 14 were completed in Arabic.

Research Sites

I chose three different locations as my entry gates. The first was Toledo, Ohio where about 15,000 Arab Americans (Semaan, 2001) live. I recruited 83 participant from Toledo. The second with a similar number of Arab residents was Allentown, Pennsylvania (Semaan, 2001). I recruited 53 participants from Allentown. The third major site was Dearborn, Michigan where there is a highly populated Arab community; according to the 2000 U.S. Census figures, there
are 96,625 people of Arab ancestry living in metropolitan Detroit. I recruited 48 participants from Dearborn.

The three sites increased the heterogeneity of the population of Arab Americans in my sample, and thus increased the representation of the population’s different ethnic and religious affiliations. However, because I used snowball sample, I was able to recruit participants from other states. These states included Arizona (n = 10, 3%), California (n = 3, 1%), Florida (n = 3, 1%), Illinois (n = 10, 3%), New York (n = 4, 1%), New Mexico (n = 3, 1%), and Texas (n = 3, 1%). Less than 1% of the total participants came from Iowa, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

Variables and Their Measurement

Independent Variables

Religion. Participants were asked to report their religious affiliation. The available choices for this question were: Christian, Muslim, Druze, Agnostic, Atheist, and other.

Nationality. Participants were asked to specify the nation from which they or their Arab ancestors immigrated.

Gender. Participants were asked to choose one of the two options male or female.

Immigration generation. To identify whether a participant belongs to a first generation of immigrants or second and subsequent generations of immigrants, participants were asked to indicate whether they were born in or outside the United States. Those born inside the United States are considered
to be second or beyond generation and those born outside the United States are considered to be first generation immigrants.

Sojourner status. Sojourner status refers to whether participants plan to stay in the host culture or return permanently to their country of origin. The questionnaire identified immigrants who plan to move back to their country by asking on a five-point scale anchored by 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely) the likelihood of respondents permanently returning to their country of origin within the next five years. This question was reverse coded. Another question asked on a five-point scale anchored by 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely) the likelihood of respondents permanently considering the U.S. to be their home within the next five years. An index was created by averaging the scores for the two questions (Cronbach’s alpha = .68, $M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.06$).

Dependent Variables

Ethnogamy. Ethnogamy refers to the marriage habits of the participants. The degree to which there is intergroup marriage is one of the measures of ethnic salience and persistence (Gordon, 1986; Hayani, 1999). For this dependent variable the questionnaire asked nine questions. Three questions asked the respondents to report on five-point scales about the extent to which they would encourage or discourage their best friend to marry someone of his/her own (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. Another three questions asked them about the extent to which they would encourage or discourage their best friend from marrying someone of a different (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. These six items were the same for all participants. The additional
three questions differed for married and unmarried respondents. Married participants were asked three yes/no questions concerning whether their spouse had the same (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. The answers were given values of 1 and 2 and were averaged with the other six questions to create an index for ethnogamy (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.69, $M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.2$). Scores could range from one to four with a higher score reflecting greater ethnogamy.

Respondents who were unmarried were also asked additional three questions. They were asked to report on five-point scales the extent to which they were likely to marry someone of the same (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. These items were averaged with the other six questions described above as a measure of ethnogamy for those who were unmarried (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.74, $M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.66$). Scores could range from 1 to 5 with higher scores reflecting greater ethnogamy. Separate regressions were run for married and unmarried respondents.

*Self-identification.* Self-identification plays an important role in studies of cultural identity. Studies such as that of Hayani (1999), Jackson (1999), Jung and Lee (2002), and the U.S. Census (2000) provided their participants with different cultural or ethnic labels from which the participants chose the one they perceive to reflect their identity best. Thus, for this dependent variable the questionnaire asked each participant to describe how he/she is most likely to describe him/herself and provided six options. The options were: Arab, American, ethnic (e.g. Lebanese, Jordanian), Arab American, ethnic-American
(e.g. Lebanese-American, Jordanian-American), and the final option was open to the participant to specify. Seventy-six participants identified by the label Arab, 15 participant identified by the label American, 61 participants identified by the ethnic label, 127 identified by the label Arab American, 21 participant identified by the ethnic-American label and only 4 participants identified by the label Other.

*Maintenance of Arab cultural identity.* As pointed out previously, to test communicative behavioral patterns of acculturation and maintenance of a group’s cultural identity, researchers can look at attitudes and acts in matters of language, marriage, friendship relationships, participation in cultural organizations, in addition to their consumption of ethnic food and cultural media such as music and movies (Hayani, 1999). To measure cultural maintenance, this research questionnaire used nine items. The questions asked respondents to describe their Arabic speaking and reading proficiency, their frequency of watching Arabic satellite T.V channels and reading Arabic newspapers, magazines, and WebPages; and their frequency of seeking information and current news about their or their Arab ancestors’ country of origin. Respondents were also asked how often they listen to Arabic music at home and in their cars, how often they consume their ethnic food at home, and how much they agree that Arab Americans need to maintain their cultural identity. Similar questions were used by Hayani (1999) studying acculturation modes of Arabs in Canada and by Jung and Lee (2004) when studying the social construction of cultural identity of Korean American students.
Participants responded to each question on a five-point scale ranging from 1 to 5 with higher scores reflecting greater cultural maintenance. Responses to the nine questions were averaged to create an index (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82, \( M = 3.48, \ SD = 1.36 \)).

*In-group and out-group socializing.* SIT suggests that the more identification one has with his/her in-group the more his/her association would be with members of this group. In addition, Gordon (1986) showed that social interaction between members of an ethnic group and those in the host society is an indication of the degree of assimilation of the ethnic group. Thus, the questionnaire asked about the socializing habits of the participants in their free time.

The participants were asked to report on five-point scales from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very frequently): how often in their spare time they socialize with Arab friends not from their country of origin, friends from their country of origin, and friends who do not have an Arab origin and who are Caucasian White or friends who do not have an Arab origin and are not White. Hayani (1999) and Suleiman (1994) used similar questions in their previously mentioned studies. The two questions asking about friends from country of origin and those having Arab background were averaged to specify in-group (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.70, \( M = 3.62, \ SD = 1.11 \)). The other two questions about friends who do not have an Arab origin indicated the out-group socializing (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.79, \( M = 3.32, \ SD = 1.21 \)).
Attitudes toward Arab and American host cultures. As Berry (1980) suggested, the mode of acculturation of a certain group or individual is affected by the attitudes this group or individual have toward both the original and host cultures. Thus, the questionnaire used eight items, four for each culture, to measure the attitudes of the participants toward Arab and American cultures. On a five-point scale anchored by 1 (not at all proud) to 5 (very proud), the participants were asked to report how proud they are of their Arab culture and a similar question asked about pride in American culture. Another question asked about the emotional ties the participants had to their or their ancestors’ country of origin whereas a similar question asked about the emotional ties to the United States. Participants rated their emotional ties on five-point scales anchored by 1 (not at all) to 5 (very strong). The questionnaire included items about the participants’ perception of the importance of preserving cultural identity and the importance of adapting to the host American culture using a five-point scale anchored 1 (not at all) to 5 (very important). The other two questions asked about the importance of the learning and/or retaining Arabic language and learning and/or retaining English language using a similar five-point scale. These questions were adapted from similar questions used by Verkuyten and Thijs (2002) when studying cultural maintenance and adaptation between minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands. Elkholy (1966), Haddad (1994), Hayani (1999), Zogby (2001) and the Arab American Institute (2002) employed similar questions. Answers to the four questions for attitude toward each culture were averaged to create an index for
attitude toward Arab culture (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.68, \( M = 4.31, SD = 0.73 \)) and another index for attitude toward host culture (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.69, \( M = 3.87, SD = 0.77 \)).

**Perceived discrimination.** To describe the respondents’ perceived openness of the host culture and their experience of discrimination, the questionnaire used three questions. One question asked how welcoming the American mainstream is to Arab Americans. Responses were reported on a five-point scale anchored by 1 (not welcoming at all) to 5 (very welcoming). This item was reverse coded. Another question asked about the frequency with which the participant had personally experienced discrimination within the past year. Answers were reported on a five-point scale anchored by 1 (not at all) to 5 (very frequently). The third question asked the participants to report how many people with their cultural background they personally know that have experienced discrimination in the past year because of their cultural background. Answers were reported on a five-point scale anchored by 1 (not at all) to 5 (almost all). Responses to the three questions were averaged, after reverse coding the question how welcoming the American mainstream is to Arab Americans to create an index for perceived discrimination (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.66, \( M = 2.49, SD = 0.99 \)).

**Acculturation modes.** As mentioned, Berry’s acculturation model is based on the attitudes of individuals or a minority group toward the value of maintaining their cultural identity and characteristics and their attitude
toward the host culture. The four outcomes that Berry (1980) suggested are isolation, assimilation, integration and marginalization.

To describe the acculturation modes of the participants in my sample, I used the responses of the participants to the variables of maintenance of cultural identity and attitude toward the host culture. After calculating the means of the items measuring each variable, scores below the mean on both variables were considered to be showing negative attitudes toward maintaining their cultural identity and toward with the host culture and thus were fit into the marginalization category. Scores above the mean on both showed integration. On the other hand, score above the mean on maintaining Arab cultural identity and below the mean on attitude toward the host culture were fit into isolation. Finally, scores below the mean on maintaining Arab cultural identity and above the mean on attitude toward the host culture were fit into assimilation.

*Importance of issues in the Middle East.* To measure the importance of events in the Middle East to the participants, the questionnaire asked three questions relating to Palestine, Iraq, and Lebanon/Syria. Questions here used a five-point scale ranging from not important at all to very important. Responses to the three questions were averaged (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.87, $M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.78$).
CHAPTER V. RESULTS

In this chapter I present the results of the statistical analysis I ran to answer the research questions. I first report preliminary analyses for the differences among cities and then present the primary results. For ease of presentation, these are organized by the type of analysis.

Preliminary Analyses

In earlier research on the acculturation mode of Muslim Arab Americans, (although the study included some non Arab Muslims), Elkholy (1966) found that Muslim Arab Americans in both the Toledo and Detroit communities shared the same characteristics regarding their origin of immigration and time spent in the host culture, but those in the Toledo community showed more assimilation and were more religious as well. In addition, Haddad and Lummis (1987) reported different attitudes and differences in attitudes toward traditional Muslim beliefs among their participants based on their U.S. city of residence. This finding prompted me to analyze the differences between the research sites, combining all those who reported residence different from my three entry sites in a category other, to check if the cities of residence had an effect on my other independent variables. The results showed that there was a relationship between city of residence and religion ($X^2(3, N = 294) = 79.28, p < .0001$) and between city and the gender of participants ($X^2(3, N = 298) = 17.92, p = .0005$) in addition to a relationship of city with Arab country of origin ($X^2(9, N = 304) = 69.66, p < .0001$). Because of these significant relationships, I controlled for the
city variable when I ran subsequent analyses but reported its effect on the dependent variables only when it was significant.

Regression Analyses

For Research Question 1a, c, d, e, f, g and 6, I ran stepwise regression where I entered city as a control variable on the first step and entered the other independent variables on the second step. The participants (n = 10) who reported religious affiliations other than Christian or Muslim were eliminated from the analyses. The small number (n = 41) who reported a nationality other than Lebanese, Palestinian, or Syrian, were combined into an Other category. For all of these research questions except for RQ6, the independent variables included religion (Christian or Muslim), nationality (Lebanese, Palestinian, Syrian, or Other) and/or gender (male, female).

Research Question 1a: Predicting Ethnogamy

Research Question 1a asked how religion, nationality, and gender affect ethnogamy. I measured the dependent variable ethnogamy with nine items. Three questions asked the respondents to report on five-point scales about the extent to which they would encourage or discourage their best friend to marry someone of his/her own (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. Another three questions asked them about the extent to which they would encourage or discourage their best friend from marrying someone of a different (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. These six items were the same for all participants. The additional three questions differed for married and unmarried respondents. Married participants were asked three yes/no questions
concerning whether their spouse had the same (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. The answers were given values of 1 and 2 and were averaged with the other six questions to create an index for ethnogamy (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.69). Scores could range from one to four with a higher score reflecting greater ethnogamy.

Respondents who were unmarried were also asked additional three questions. They were asked to report on five-point scales the extent to which they were likely to marry someone of the same (a) religion, (b) culture, and/or (c) nationality. These items were averaged with the other six questions described above as a measure of ethnogamy for those who were unmarried (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.74). Scores could range from 1 to 5 with higher scores reflecting greater ethnogamy. Separate regressions were run for married and unmarried respondents.

For married participants, the regression model did not show significant differences among participants on any independent variable. As for unmarried respondents, the regression model showed significance on Arab country of origin, $F(3, 133) = 6.66, p < .0001, R^2 = .06$. Unmarried Syrians ($M = 4.1, SD = .66$) were significantly more ethnogamous than unmarried Lebanese ($M = 3.4, SD = .69, B = -.49, t(85) = -4.45, p < .0001$).

Research Questions 1c: Predicting Maintenance of Arab Cultural Identity

Research Questions 1c asked how religion, nationality and gender affect maintenance of Arab cultural identity. Nine items were used to assess maintenance of Arab cultural identity. The items asked respondents to
describe: (1) their Arabic speaking proficiency (2) their Arabic reading proficiency, (3) their frequency of watching Arabic satellite T.V. channels, (4) their frequency of reading Arabic newspapers, magazines, and web pages, (5) their frequency of seeking information and current news about their or their Arab ancestors’ country of origin, (6) how often they listen to Arabic music at home, (7) how often they listen to Arabic music in their cars, (8) how often they consume their ethnic food at home, and (9) how much they agree that Arab Americans need to maintain their cultural identity. Participants responded to each question on a five-point scale ranging from 1 to 5. Higher scores on each item reflected greater maintenance of Arab cultural identity. Responses to the nine questions were averaged (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82). I found no significant effects for any of the independent variables on maintenance of Arab cultural identity.

Research Questions 1d: Predicting In- and Out-group Socializing

Research Question 1d focused on how religion, nationality, and gender affect in- and out-group socializing. Four questions were used, two to assess in-group socializing and two to assess out-group socializing. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 to 5 how often they socialize with: (1) Arab friends not from their or from their ancestors’ Arab country of origin, (2) Arab friends from their or from their ancestors’ Arab country of origin, (3) friends who do not have Arab origin and who are not Caucasian White, and (4) friends who do not have Arab origin and who are Caucasian White. Responses to the first two were averaged to create an index for in-group socializing (Cronbach’s
alpha = 0.7). The final two questions asking about friends who do not have Arab background were averaged to create an index for out-group socializing (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.79).

I ran two stepwise regressions, one for in-group socializing and another for out-group socializing. Although in-group socializing was relatively frequent ($M = 3.62, SD = 1.1$), the regression model showed significant difference among countries, $F(3, 303) = 4.19, p = .006, R^2 = .04$. Syrians ($M = 3.95, SD = .85$) were more likely to socialize with in-group associates than Lebanese ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.25; B = -.17, t(205) = -102, p = .003$). However, participants did not show any significant difference in in-group socializing based on religion or gender.

As for the out-group socializing, neither religion nor nationality nor gender had a significant effect. Participants reported relatively frequent out-group socializing as well ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.21$).

To compare in-group and out-group socializing, I ran two sample t-tests on each level for city, nationality (country of origin), and gender. The results showed that on average, those originally from Syria reported significantly more in-group socializing ($M = 3.95, SD = .9$) than out-group socializing ($M = 3.17, SD = 1.14, t(76) = 4.6, p = < .0001$). None of the other t-tests were significant.

**Research Question 1e: Predicting Attitude Toward Arab Cultural Background**

Research Question 1e asked how religion, nationality and gender affect the participants’ attitude toward Arab cultural background. Four questions were used to measure participants’ attitudes toward Arab cultural background.
Two questions asked: (1) how proud participants were of their Arab cultural background and (2) how participants describe their emotional ties to their or their ancestors’ Arab country of origin. A third question asked participants to describe their agreement with the statement: Arab Americans need to maintain their own cultural identity. The final question asked how important the Arabic language was to the participants. All questions had answer options from 1 to 5 with larger numbers reflecting more favorable attitudes. The answers to the four questions were averaged to create an index for attitude toward Arab cultural background (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.68).

The regression model showed significance on religion and nationality ($F(7, 293) = 4.04, p = .0003, R^2 = .09$) but not on gender. Participants’ attitudes toward their Arab cultural background were relatively favorable ($M = 4.31, SD = .73$), but Muslims ($M = 4.54, SD = .61$) had more favorable attitude toward their Arab cultural background than Christians ($M = 4.27, SD = .6; B = -.27, t(291) = -2.68, p = .008$) and Syrians ($M = 4.6; SD = .5$) had more favorable attitudes than those grouped in the Other category ($M = 4.18; SD = .8, B = -.39, t(116) = -2.98, p = 0.02$).

**Research Question 1f: Predicting Attitude Toward the American Host Culture**

Research Question 1f asked if religion, nationality and gender affect attitude toward the host American culture. Four questions were used to measure the attitudes of the participants toward the host culture. Two questions asked: (1) how proud the participants were of their American identity and (2) how they describe their emotional ties to the United States. The third
question asked the participant to describe their agreement with the statement:
(3) Arab Americans should adapt to the American culture as is. The fourth
question asked how important the English language was to the participant. All
questions had answer options from 1 to 5 with higher scores reflecting more
favorable attitudes. The answers to the four questions were averaged to create
an index for attitude toward the host culture (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.69).

The stepwise regression results indicated significant differences in the
independent variable nationality, $F(3, 301) = 3.25, p = .02, R^2 = .03$. Although
the average attitude toward the host American culture was favorable ($M = 3.86,
SD = .77$), Syrian participants had significantly more positive attitudes ($M =
4.04, SD = .7$) toward the host culture than Palestinians ($M = 3.55, SD = .6, B =
-.25, t(109) = 1.71, p = .01$). However, no significant differences were detected
in any of the other independent variables.

To compare attitude toward Arab culture and attitude toward the host
American culture I ran two sample t tests. The results showed that on average,
Christians and Muslims had more favorable attitudes toward Arab cultural
background ($M = 4.09, SD = .8$ and $M = 4.34, SD = .6$ respectively) than toward
the American host culture ($M = 3.84, SD = .68, t(168) = -3.35, p = < .03$ and $M =
3.63, SD = .88, t(124) = -6.83, p < .0001$ respectively).

**Research Question 1g: Predicting Perceived Discrimination**

Question 1g asked how religion, nationality and gender affect perceived
discrimination against Arabs by the host country. I used three questions to
assess perceived discrimination. One question asked how welcoming the
American mainstream is to Arab Americans from 1 (not welcoming at all) to 5 (very welcoming). This question was reverse scored. Another question asked about the frequency with which the participant has personally experienced discrimination within the past year from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very frequently). The third question asked the participants how many people with their cultural background that they personally know that have experienced discrimination in the past year because of their cultural background from 1 (not at all) to 5 (almost all). Responses to the three questions were averaged creating an index for perceived discrimination (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.66).

Both, religion and nationality had a significant effect on perceived discrimination, $F(4, 289) = 10.01, p < .0001, R^2 = .01$. Although respondents did not perceive extensive discrimination ($M = 2.5, SD = .99$), Muslim participants ($M = 2.78, SD = .9$) were significantly more likely than Christians ($M = 2.31, SD = .98, B = -.04, t (287) = -3.84, p = .0001$) to perceive discrimination against them by the host culture. As for countries, significant difference in perceived discrimination was found between Palestinians and Syrians where Palestinians ($M = 2.87, SD = .77$) were more likely than Syrians ($M = 2.29, SD = 1.0, B = -.08, t (109) = -0.52, p = .03$) to perceive discrimination against Arabs by the host culture.

**Research Question 6: The Relationship Between the Assessment of Current Events and Self-identification**

Finally, Research Question 6 asked about the relationship between Arab Americans’ self-identification and the importance to them of events happening
in the Arab countries in the Middle East. For self-identification, respondents were asked how they were most likely to describe themselves. They were provided with six choices: (a) Arab, (b) American, (c) ethnic (e.g. Lebanese, Egyptian, Yemeni), (d) Arab-American, (c) Ethnic-American, or (f) Other. Respondents who selected the Other category of self-identification were dropped from the analysis because of the small number (n = 4). I asked the participants three questions concerning the importance to them of the events in Palestine, Iraq, and Lebanon/Syria. They responded on five-point scales ranging from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important). Responses to the three questions were averaged (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.87).

The regression results showed that Arab Americans who resided in different differed significantly in their perceptions of the importance of events in the Middle East. The events happening in the Arab countries in the Middle East were significantly more important to those living in Dearborn (M = 4.05, SD = 1.05) than to those residing in Toledo (M = 3.46, SD = 1.3, B = .03, t (129) = .16, p = .02) or in cities combined in the category Other (M = 3.43, SD = 1.3, B = .6, t (162) = 3.73, p = .001).

The regression also indicated that the importance of issues in the Middle East varied among Arab Americans’ who identified themselves differently F(4, 295) = 6.08, p < .0001, R² = 0.13. Events happening in the Arab countries in the Middle East were significantly more important for participants identifying as Arabs (M = 4.34, SD = 1.02) than those identifying as Americans (M = 2.94, SD = 1.5, B = -.72, t (89) = -1.85, p = .0003) or those identifying with their
ethnic background ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.2$, $B = -.06$, $t (135) = -.23$, $p = .002$). In addition, events happening in the Arab countries in the Middle East were perceived as significantly more important for participants identifying as Arab-Americans ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.21$) than those identifying as Americans ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.5$, $B = -.72$, $t (140) = .94$, $p = .01$).

Non-Parametric Analyses

Research Question 1b: Predicting Self-identification

Research Question 1b asked how religion and nationality affect self-identification. For religion, respondents were classified as Christian or Muslim. Those who reported other religious affiliations ($n = 10$) were dropped from the analysis. Those who reported any nationality other than Lebanese, Palestinian, or Syrian were combined with those who did not report a nationality into an Other category ($n = 63$). For nationality, participants were classified as Lebanese, Palestinian, Syrian, or Others. For self-identification respondents were asked how they were most likely to describe themselves. They were provided with six choices: (a) Arab, (b) American, (c) Ethnic background (e.g. Lebanese, Egyptian, Yemeni), (d) Arab-American, (e) Ethnic-American, or (f) Other. Respondents who selected the Other category of self-identification were dropped from the analysis because of the small number ($n = 4$).

I also was concerned about the effect of city on self-identification. Participants who reported residence in a city other than Allentown, Dearborn, or Toledo were combined into an Other category ($n = 63$). Because entering city as another variable would create low counts in many cells for a multinomial
logit model, I couldn’t use it as a control variable. Instead I used multiple chi-
squares to answer Research Question 1b.

The chi-square showed significant difference in self-identification among
participants residing in different cities ($X^2(12, N = 300) = 22.07, p = .03$).
Participants from all four locations were least likely to identify themselves as
Americans or Ethnic Americans and identified themselves most frequently with
the labels Arab or Arab American. Participants residing in Toledo were more
likely than residents from Allentown or Dearborn to identify themselves by
ethnicity rather than as Arabs. Table 3 shows the self-identification by city.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Choice of Identification by U.S. City of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square showed a relationship between religion and self-
identification ($X^2(4, N = 290) = 10.21, p < .04$). The label Arab-American was
selected the most by both Christian and Muslim participants, although more
Muslims than Christians selected this label. The label American was selected
the least frequently by both Christian and Muslims, although Muslims were less likely to select this label than Christians. Table 4 shows the identification by religion.

Table 4

**Participants’ Choice of Identification by Religious Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Arab American</th>
<th>Ethnic American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>21.03</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>57.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>36.53</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muslim</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>42.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>50.41</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for how nationality and gender affect identification, the chi-square showed no significant differences in self-identification among participants reporting different national background ($\chi^2(12, N = 290) = 11.33, p = .5$) or gender ($\chi^2(5, N = 302) = 13.28, p = .23$).

*Research Questions 1h, 2, 3 and 5: Predicting Acculturation Mode*

Several research questions focused on potential determinants of acculturation mode. RQ1h examined the effects on acculturation mode of religion, nationality, and gender, RQ2 explored effect of the immigration generation. RQ3 asked about the effect of perceived discrimination by the host culture, and RQ5 examined the effect of respondents’ sojourner status, or their plans to move back to their or their ancestors’ Arab country.

For these questions, participants were assigned to one of the four categories of the acculturation model (i.e., integration, assimilation, isolation,
and marginalization) based on their attitudes toward Arab culture and their attitude toward the host culture. Table 5 shows the overall acculturation modes of the participants. Due to the small number \(n = 6\) of participants showing marginalization, this category was dropped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Marginalization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>61.18</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 6 shows the participants’ three acculturation modes based on city. As the table shows, the majority of the participants from each city showed an acculturation mode of integration. At the same time, the acculturation mode of isolation occurred least frequently in Toledo, Allentown and the cities combined in the category other. Participants residing in Toledo and in the cities combined in the category Other showed assimilation more than those in Dearborn and Allentown. In Dearborn both isolation and assimilation were equally unlikely acculturation modes.
Table 6

Acculturation Mode by U.S. City of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.89</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.42</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To answer the research questions, I used a multicategory logit because the dependent variable acculturation mode is categorical and has more than two outcomes. I kept the continuous variables (i.e., perceived discrimination, sojourner status) as such because the multicategory logit accepts both categorical and continuous variables. The analysis showed no significant differences in acculturation modes based on the participants’ religious affiliation $X^2(2, N = 288) = 5.48, p = .06$, nationality $X^2(6, N = 298) = 7.43, p = .28$, gender, or perceived discrimination $X^2(2, N = 294) = 4.47, p = .11$.

However, immigration generation was significantly associated with participants’ acculturation modes $X^2(2, N = 296) = 35.47, p < .0001$ and so was sojourner status $X^2(2, N = 304) = 28.87, p < .0001$ (See Table 7).
Table 7

*Maximum Likelihood Analysis of Variance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td><em>p = 0.06</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration generation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.47</td>
<td><em>p &lt; .0001</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td><em>p = 0.11</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td><em>p &lt; .0001</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td><em>p = 0.28</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable city was not added to this multicategory logit because of the low counts it would create in each category. However, when I replaced the category perceived discrimination with city and reran the test, the results did not change and city was not significant.

As for how immigration generation affected the acculturation mode, the multicategory logit showed that when compared to those born outside the United States, participants who were born in the U.S. were less likely to have an acculturation mode of integration (-0.96) or isolation (-0.65) than an acculturation mode of assimilation, controlling for sojourner status (See Table 8).

As for sojourner status, keeping the immigration generation fixed, comparing integration to assimilation \(2 \times -0.7148 = -1.4296\) \(e^{-1.4296} = 0.24\), for each unit increase in sojourner status, move back to country of origin or stay in the United States, the odds of integration over assimilation is multiplied by .24. Comparing isolation to assimilation, \(2 \times -1.5957 = -3.1914\) \(e^{-3.1914} = 0.04\), keeping the immigration generation fixed, for each unit increase in sojourner status, move back to country of origin or stay in the United States, the odds of isolation over assimilation is multiplied by .04. Furthermore, comparing
integration to isolation, keeping the immigration generation fixed, for each unit increase in sojourner status the odds of isolation over integration is multiplied by 5.82.

To split the sojourner status into two discrete groups, I used mean split. I assigned participants whose score on sojourner status was below three (on a scale from 1 to 5) to group “move back” and those whose score was above three to group “stay.” Those whose score on sojourner status was three (n = 44), were excluded from both groups. Participants who reported that they most likely will move back to their country of origin were a small number (n = 37), nevertheless, they showed mainly an acculturation mode of integration or isolation whereas those who reported that they most likely to make the U.S. their permanent home not only were the majority (n = 223) but also were more likely to integrate or assimilate rather than show an acculturation mode of isolation. See table 9 for the break down of acculturation mode by sojourner status.

| Table 8 |
| Results of Multinomial Logistic Regression of Acculturation Mode by Sojourner Status and Immigration Generation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration generation</td>
<td>-0.96*** (.15)</td>
<td>-0.65*** (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner status</td>
<td>-0.71*** (.20)</td>
<td>-1.60*** (.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.80*** (.91)</td>
<td>5.03*** (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N = 304

Notes: Reference category for the equation is ACCULT_MODE of Assimilation
ACCULT_MODE of Marginalization was dropped due to low counts
Standard errors are in parentheses
*p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001
Table 9

Acculturation Mode by Sojourner Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay (U.S. Permanent home)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>85.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.52</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move Back</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.15</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4: Self-identification When Interacting With Arabs or Non-Arabs Descent

Research Question 4 asked if the gender of the participant affects their use of different identifying labels based on the cultural background of those they are socializing with. The questionnaire asked the respondents how they are most likely to identify themselves when they are with people of Arab descent but not from their or their ancestor’s Arab country of origin. Participants were provided with six choices: (a) Arab, (b) American, (c) ethnic (e.g. Lebanese, Egyptian, Yemeni), (d) Arab-American, (c) Ethnic-American, or (f) Other. A similar question asked how the participants are most likely to identify themselves when they are with people of non Arab descent. They were provided with the same identification labels as choices. As before, those who selected other were dropped from the analyses.

Two multinomial analysis tests were run. When interacting with people of Arab descent but not from the participants’ or participants’ ancestors Arab country of origin, the results showed significance for cities \(X^2(4, N = 298) = \)
24.14, \( p = .02 \) but not for gender. For the breakdown of identification labels by cities, see Table 10.

Participants from Allentown and Dearborn more frequently identified themselves with the labels Arab and Arab American whereas those from Toledo and Other identified by the labels Ethnic most often and Arab or Ethnic American next most frequently. The label American was least used by participants from all cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Participants’ Identification Labels When Interacting with People of Arab Descent by Cities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Percent Row Pct</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Arab American</th>
<th>Ethnic American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>39.76</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar pattern of results was found when the participants were interacting with people of non Arab backgrounds; gender did not affect the choice of identification labels but cities did, \( X^2(12, N = 297) = 24.58, p = .01 \). For the breakdown of identification labels by cities, see Table 11.

Participants from all cities, except for those from Toledo, identified themselves the most frequently by using the label Arab American; those from
Dearborn used this label more than any other participants. The second most chosen label by participants in all cities, except for Toledo was Arab. Very few participants from any of the locations were likely to identify themselves as Americans. Participants from Toledo were about equally likely to use the Ethnic American, Arab American, or Ethnic labels.

Table 11

Participants’ Identification Labels When Interacting with People of Non-Arab Descent by Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Arab American</th>
<th>Ethnic American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>39.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION

This study was designed as a first step in exploring the cultural identity of Arab Americans in the 21st Century. Much of the previous research dealing with Arab Americans confused them with people from other Middle Eastern or Islamic countries (e.g., Ajrouch, 1999; Elkholy, 1966; Haddad, 2004; Haddad & Lummis, 1987). Emphasis was placed on exploring how this minority group identifies itself and how it maintains, locates, and recreates its cultural identity in the midst of a country where multiple cultural groups coexist and interact. So, this research not only dealt exclusively with Arab Americans but also responded to the calls for research on how this cultural group views itself and how it is reconstructing its identity (e.g., Haddad 2004).

In this chapter I summarize the research findings and discuss them in the context of previous research findings. Then I discuss the implication of the results for the theories that guided it. I also examine research on Arab Americans in the context of research on other ethnic groups. Finally, I discuss the strengths and limitations of the current research as well as the possibilities and need of future research relating to cultural identity of Arab Americans.

Determinants of Cultural Identity

Research on cultural identity suggests that many factors play an important role in the process of its formation and reformation. Among these factors are those of religion, family, socialization, immigration generation, sojourner status, education and ethnicity (Hayani, 1999). Other issues or elements that influence cultural identity are ethnic and cultural labels, cultural
change, and sensibility toward one’s cultural background (Horse, 2005). In this section, I introduce the findings about determinants of cultural identity studied in this research, namely nationality, religion, gender, immigration generation, sojourner status, perceived discrimination, and city of residence.

**Nationality**

In the questionnaire for this research, I used the term ethnic to refer to the original Arab nationality of the participants or their ancestors. Nationality was the independent variable that affected most dependent variables in this research, although its effects were small. The third wave Arab American immigrants were educated and came with elevated nationalistic emotions which were revived following the Arab-Israeli war in 1967 (Sueliman, 1999) and, as this research showed, nationality remains an important factor in creating the Arab American diasporic identity for these research participants.

Syrian participants were the national group that consistently differed from some other Arab national groups. Unmarried Syrians were more ethnogamous than unmarried Lebanese. Syrians were the only ones doing significantly more in-group than out-group socializing. Syrians had significantly more positive attitudes toward their Arab cultural background than participants grouped in the category Other. Syrians had more positive attitudes toward the host culture than Palestinians and Syrians were also less likely than Palestinians to perceive discrimination by the host culture. In the past century, Arabs identity consciousness resulted not only from the degree of education and rising decolonization movements in the Arab countries but also
from the perceptions of unjust American stand toward Arabs. For the past few years, American politics were unfriendly, even hostile some might argue, toward Syria and thus the more in-group than out-group socializing and highest positive attitude toward Arab culture among participants of Syrian origins could be a result of the perceptions of biased American politics against Syria although the same participants showed a positive attitude to the American host culture and low perceptions of discrimination. As for the significantly higher perception of discrimination and less favorable attitudes toward America by participants with Palestinian background, it is most likely due to the same reasons discussed earlier regarding the American political stand toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

This positive relationship between Arab Americans and their original homeland does not necessarily affect their ties with their new homeland in a negative way as the positive attitude of the participants toward American culture shows. In fact, by having their ties strong with both homes, they have the ability to act as representatives of each culture and nation to the other and thus create unique connections that bridge the two cultures and promote more effective intercultural communication and understanding.

Nationality did not have any significant effect on the dependent variables of ethnogamy of married participants, self-identifications, out-group socializing, maintenance of Arab cultural identity, or acculturation modes of the participants.
Religion

Religion was a second independent variable with significant results in this research, although it too had small effects. Religion is very important to the majority of Arabs (Nydel, 2006). For the participants of this research, religion had an impact on self-identification, attitude toward Arab culture, and perceived discrimination. Muslims were less likely to identify by the label American and more likely to identify as Arab American than Christians. Muslim participants had significantly more favorable attitudes toward Arab culture than Christian participants and they also perceived more discrimination than Christian participants.

Religion though, did not have a significant effect on the dependent variables of ethnogamy, maintenance of Arab cultural identity, in- or out-group socializing, attitude toward American host culture, or on participants’ acculturation modes.

The results showed that religion is not affecting or hindering Arab Americans from developing a unique Arab American identity tailored from an interweave of Arab and American values and lifestyles. This is what Haddad and Lummis (1987) pointed out when they indicated that some Muslims are welcoming assimilation into American life, and what Elkholy (1966) mentioned about the religious community in Toledo. He observed that, although Toledo residents were religious, they had more social and economic interaction with people who did not have the same ethnic or religious background.
Gender

Gender did not have any significant effects on any of the dependent variables of this study. It did not affect ethnogamy, self-identification, maintenance of Arab cultural identity, socializing habits, attitudes toward Arab and American culture, or perceived discrimination. The result of this research did not indicate any significant differences in the acculturation modes of Arab Americans based on gender. This finding challenges Ajrouch’s (1999) claim that gender still plays a major role in the degree of assimilation of Arab Americans into the dominant culture. However, the absence of gender effect in this study could be a result of changing times where men and women are enjoying similar liberties or even from the perception that they share such similar freedoms in a country where gender equity is valued. However, this area needs to be explored in future research.

Immigration Generation and Sojourner Status

The other two determinants of cultural identity of Arab Americans in this research were immigration generation and sojourner status. These two variables also had small effects. Those who were born in the host culture were more likely to show an acculturation mode of assimilation than integration or isolation. This is a predictable finding as we expect that second generation immigrants would assimilate more easily than first generation immigrants. However, immigration generation interacted with sojourner status in affecting acculturation modes. As for sojourner status, the results indicated that the majority (n = 24, 65%) of the small number of participants (n = 37) who
indicated their desire to move back to their country of origin showed an acculturation mode of integration. As for those who indicated that they planned to make the U.S. their permanent home their acculturation modes were mainly those of integration and assimilation.

Perceived Discrimination

Regarding perceived discrimination, 19% of the respondents reported perceived discrimination higher than the mean. This percentage is comparatively low and similar to the 20% reported by Zogby (2001) and less than the 30% reported in Zogby (2002). In addition 23% reported that they personally knew someone who suffered discrimination in the past year due to their cultural background. This figure was 45% in Zogby’s report in 2002. However, percentages from my sample cannot be taken as accurate estimates of the population parameters because my sample was not random.

City of Residence

The city of residence affected the identification labels used by participants on three levels. The first is the label they are most likely to use in general and the other two are the labels selected when interacting with other Arabs versus non-Arabs. Residents of Dearborn and Allentown were more likely to identify themselves as Arab or Arab American than those in Toledo or cities combined in category Other. The participants seemed to strategically choose the label by which they identify. For residents from Dearborn and Allentown, more reported using the identification label Arab when interacting with people from their own or another Arab country whereas more of them used the label
Arab-American when interacting with those who do not have Arab cultural background. These results suggest the fluid identity those residing in Dearborn and Allentown are willing to take so that they may adapt to the environment they are in.

**Self-Identification**

The results of this study showed that participants most frequently selected the hyphenated identity of Arab American (See Table 4), but they vary their choice of labels to manage their own acculturation; thus, tailoring their choices to their own needs and aspirations. So, respondents may change their identification depending on the ethnicity of the persons with whom they are interacting.

Unlike Witteborn’s (2004) study where her participants less frequently used the identity labels Arab and Arab American after 9/11, participants in this study were used these two labels more frequently than any other identifying label. However, it should be noted that Witteborn had only five female participants who strategically, as she asserted, were using their identity labels as a response to the events of September 11 and to show the diversity within the Arab culture.

Another finding of this study was the significant but small relationship between importance of events happening in the some Arab countries in the Middle East, namely in Palestine, Iraq, Lebanon and Syria, and the participants’ choice of identification labels. This is in harmony with what Banks (2003) stated about the relationship between the political events that
took place by the end of the Twentieth Century in the Middle East, the years of unjust American foreign policy toward Arab countries and the rising activism by Arab Americans which lead, as Bank asserted, to more expressions of pride in their cultural heritage.

These results echo what authors such as Friedhelm, (1985), Naff (1985), Shain (1996), and Suleiman (1994) said regarding the relationship between the events happening in the Arab countries and the identity of Arab Americans. This is also in harmony with Naff's assertion that many Arab immigrants settled and established themselves in America and yet, they continued to have nostalgia for their old one and never gave up their cultural heritage, which they passed to other generations.

If self-identifying as American is perceived as a strategy for exaggerating American identity, then this study did not reveal any exaggeration in expressing an American identity; respondents were least likely to identify themselves with the American label. This lack of exaggerating American identity with self-identifying labels is worth noticing because it contrasts with Muneer’s (2002) and Shryock’s (2002) assertions that Arab Americans exaggerated their American identity following the attacks in September 11, 2001 by waving flags and displaying them in front of their homes, stores and on their cars and even skin. However, many factors could explain the difference in these findings. One explanation could be the participants’ feel less need to assert their American identity now than they did immediately following the tragic attacks in 2001. Another explanation could be because no one can
identify the participants in this research they felt safe to express what they really feel rather than feeling the need to exaggerate their American identity in order to avoid the backlash of being a visible other. Another explanation could be that Arab Americans were not exaggerating their American identity after September 11 but rather they were simply showing their patriotic and nationalistic emotions as their fellow Americans did in response to the attack on their country.

Theoretical Implications

The purpose of this study was not to test the theoretical framework guiding it; however, it has implications for both Berry's acculturation model and Tajfel and Turner's Situated Identity Theory. First, I discuss the implication of the findings for Berry's theory of acculturation and then for SIT.

The findings of the study support Berry's (1980, 2003) bidirectional model of acculturation's suggestion that an individual or group can have strong feelings toward two cultures. Participants in this study showed strong positive attitudes toward both Arab cultural background ($M = 4.31$, $SD = .73$) and toward the host culture ($M = 3.87$, $SD = .78$).

Berry's (1980, 2003) acculturation model suggested that individuals can strategically make different acculturation choices in situations. Participants in this research had different identification choices where they could strategically choose when to belong to which group (example of group identification choices were Arab, Arab American, Ethnic, or Ethnic-American). This finding is in harmony with Berry's (1980, 2003) acculturation model that allows individuals
to tailor their acculturation modes based on circumstances and preferences and thus allows for different forms and ways of acculturation.

Berry's model identified four acculturation modes into which individuals can be classified based on their attitude toward maintenance of their original culture and attitude toward the host culture. In this study, I measured attitude toward host culture and attitude toward maintenance of original culture as continuous variables and then used this information to classify participants into one of the four acculturation modes. Reducing interval level variables to categorical variables reduces the number and power of statistical analyses available. So, using the interval measures rather than the categorical variables might make more sense in future research.

The findings of this research were sometimes inconsistent with SIT and other times it was not supportive to what the theory suggests. The findings were inconsistent with SIT’s suggestion that the more an ethnic minority group perceives negative out-group attitudes or discrimination, the stronger the in-group identification will be (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In other words, as SIT suggests, the greater the perceived discrimination felt by individuals, whether this perceived discrimination is felt to be directed toward the individuals themselves or their cultural group, the more likely they are to socialize and identify with their heritage group. Although Palestinian participants were more likely than Syrian participants to perceive discrimination by the host culture, Syrian’s were the only national group that reported socializing significantly more with in-group associates than out-group ones. There was no significantly
greater likelihood of in-group than out-group socializing by Palestinian informants.

If, as SIT suggested, more perceived discrimination means more in-group identification, we would have expected to see Palestinian participants identifying more than other participants by certain labels whether ethnic or cultural. However, this was not what the results indicated; the results of this study did not show any relationship between nationality and identification labels chosen by the participants.

This research also did not support what SIT suggested regarding a relationship between perceived discrimination and acculturation or adaptation to the new culture (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002). In fact, perceived discrimination of the participants did not have any significant effect on their acculturation modes. This could be due to the relatively low level of perceived discrimination the participants showed ($M = 2.5, SD = 1$).

However, the finding that Muslim participants perceived more discrimination than Christian participants ($M = 2.78, SD = .9, M = 2.31, SD = .98$ respectively) is in harmony with what SIT suggested. Muslims in this context, are out-group members, in a Christian majority population.

These results suggest the need to revise and extend SIT to account for the complex relationships between perceived discrimination, adaptation to the new culture, and the different affiliations or identities individuals have. Individuals and groups may perceive discrimination by the host culture and yet strategically adapt and acculturate to it for different reasons. In addition,
although the attitude my participants showed toward the host culture was a positive one, this positive attitude was not reflected in the choice of identification label American but rather by the label Arab-American.

The Study of Arab Americans in the Context of Research on Other Cultural/Ethnic/Minority Groups

The purpose of this study was not to compare Arab Americans with other cultural groups; however, it would be beneficial to touch on some common and different variables that affect the continued construction of cultural identity among these groups. Arab Americans share the struggles other minority groups living in the United States faced in the continuous process of structuring their cultural identity. Yet, Arab Americans have as well their unique experiences and struggles. Unlike African Americans, Latino/as, and Native Americans, Arab Americans are not legally recognized as a minority group. This makes them part of the White mainstream and thus deprives them of certain privileges that are extended to those recognized as minority groups. This entails the absence of purposeful official effort to integrate this group of people to be represented whether in political, economic, or even educational levels.

Latino/a choice of name labels carry connotations of social class, political awareness, linguistic implications, and even educational levels (Rinderle, 2005). However, the labels usually used by and about Arab Americans do not carry such connotations, or at least, so far, no one claimed that the different labels used to describe Arab Americans, whether by Arab Americans themselves or by others, have any such implications. And unlike
Latino/as, African Americans, and Native Americans who witnessed different changes in identity labels used to refer to them, Arab American was a stable label used in the past 50 years to refer to this cultural group. However, this label, as the other labels used to refer to other groups, was used in a broad and oversimplified way that resulted in erasing the differences among those belonging to the same cultural group.

Some other differences between Arab Americans and Latino/as is the diverse religious background that Arab Americans have and thus the role religion plays is different when compared with Latino/as who mainly are of the same or more similar religious affiliation as the dominant culture. However, similarities also exist. Demographic variables such as country of origin and place of residence in the U.S. have an impact on the cultural identity of African Americans (Eggerling-Boeck, 2002) and on that of Arab Americans. Similarly, religion plays a significant role in the identity of Native Americans, and it does in the construction of cultural identity of Arab Americans.

Finally, research on the cultural identity of Arab Americans is in its infancy and can benefit from the wealth of research about the other cultural groups in the United States.

Strengths and Limitations

Like all research projects, this study has its strengths and limitations. First, this study expanded upon past research that looked at the cultural identity of Arab Americans; however, unlike past studies that included other
Muslims or Middle Easterners who were not Arabs, this study exclusively included Arab Americans with origins from different Arab countries.

Another strength of this study was the length to which steps were taken to provide integrity with data collection process. Social desirability effects were not as likely to occur because the surveys were self administered and completed anonymously, the identities of the participants were protected by not asking any questions that would identify any particular participant.

In addition, this study expanded on some qualitative research, such as that of Witteborn (2004) and included participants of both genders. Furthermore, it was first to focus on the cultural identity of Arab Americans and to statistically study the acculturation modes of Arab Americans by investigating the participants’ views and responses rather than classifying them into Berry’s acculturation mode without any supporting data.

This study also had some weakness and limitations. In addition to the inherent limitations with self administered surveys, such as not allowing for in-depth follow up questions and the influence the length of the questionnaire and the clarity of questions can leave on participants, I believe that I could have better worded some questions. For example, the questions asking about marriage mates could have included a separate question to ask those who were widowed or divorced about their choice of marriage mate if they were to remarry.

Additionally, this research’s results are limited on generalization to the population of Arab Americans. This limitation is due to the data collection
method: snowball sampling. It was beyond my resources to obtain a sampling frame of all Arab Americans from which to draw a random sample. Another limitation of this study was the small effects that were found for the independent variables examined in this research. Finally, if I had had a bigger sample, I could have studied research questions within nationalities. For example, I could have assessed whether perceptions of discrimination were related to acculturation mode or in-group and out-group socializing within each national group.

Implications for Future Research

This study outlined some facets of the cultural identity of Arab-Americans and provided insight on some of the ways in which this cultural group maintains its culture. Participants in this research selected a hyphenated identity, where their Arab cultural background and their American identity create a fusion of distinct particularities that might become the nucleus for bridging a widening gap between Arabs, Muslims, and the United States. Thus, this identity might, in the long run, help in facilitating intercultural communication between Arabs and Americans.

In harmony with the results of Zogby’s (2001, 2002) polls, the participants in this study are proud of their Arab heritage and are at the same time integrating into the American main stream as they are showing positive attitudes toward the American host culture.

Furthermore, although this study answered many questions relating to the cultural identity of Arab Americans, the results raised many questions that
will guide future research. Such questions include those that ask why nationality is a factor in the cultural identity of Arab Americans and why differences were clear between individuals from different Arab countries. Additional investigation should check whether differences exist among individuals belonging to the same religious or national group and what it means to Arab Americans to be Arab, American, and Arab-American. Further questions relate to how the current ongoing events in Iraq, Palestine, and Lebanon, where sectarian divisions seem on the rise, are going to affect the cultural identity of Arab Americans. And what differences exist within the same subgroups of participants. Additionally, other theories than those used in this study can be used to provide the theoretical framework for future research.

In conclusion, this research showed that Arab Americans are here to stay. Although they are preserving their cultural identity, they are also integrating into the host culture. An additional area of research would be to study the ways this cultural group is integrating into the host culture and examining the different features of this integration. Additionally, groups continue to create and recreate their identities. This research was a first step in unveiling some aspects of Arab American’s self-perceptions of their cultural identity. Future academic research will need to investigate other aspects of the cultural identity of this group in addition to studying the reconstruction of this identity over time using similar and other methodologies such as longitudinal studies, in-depth interviews and triangulation.
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APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle or check ( √ ) the answer that best represent your answer

Please note that the term ethnic background is used to refer to the country from where you/your ancestors originally originated, while cultural background is used to refer individuals from any of the Arab countries.

1. You are you most likely to describe yourself by the label:
   a. Arab       b. American       c. Ethnic background (e.g. Lebanese, Egyptian,..)
   d. Arab American      e. Ethnic –American (e.g. Jordanian-American; Palestinian-American )
   f. Other specify:

2. How often do you perceive the need to refer to yourself using a different label than the one you used in question 1?
   (never) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)
   Why & When:

3. How would you describe your Arabic speaking proficiency?
   (not proficient at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very proficient)

4. How would you describe your English speaking proficiency?
   (not proficient at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very proficient)

5. How would you describe your Arabic reading proficiency?
   (not proficient at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very proficient)

6. How would you describe your English reading proficiency?
   (not proficient at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very proficient)

7. How often do you read Arabic newspapers, magazines, WebPages…?
   (never) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)

8. How often do you watch Arabic satellite T.V channels?
   (never) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)

9. How often do you seek information and current news about your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin?
   (never) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)

10. The main way you are informed of news about your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin is:
    (please rank based on importance of source to you. Example: if TV is the main source, then put next to it 1 if radio comes directly after put next to it 2 )
    _____ TV        _____ Internet        _____ Radio        _____ Personal contacts
    _____ Newspapers and Magazines        _____ Other specify:
    If married please answer question all parts of 11 then go to question 13. If not married, please go to question 12 and answer all its parts.

11. If married is your husband/wife:
    a. Of your religious background     Yes No
    b. Of your cultural background     Yes No
    c. From your country of origin     Yes No

12. If you marry, how likely is it you will marry:
    A. Someone of your cultural background (very unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (most likely)
    B. Someone of your religious background (very unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (most likely)
    C. Someone from your country of origin (very unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (most likely)
13. How often do you listen to Arabic music at home?
   (not frequent at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)

14. How often do you listen to Arabic music in your car? (if you don’t have a car, in the family car)
   (never) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)

15. Would you encourage or discourage your best friend from marrying:
   A. Someone of her/his cultural background  (strongly discourage) 1 2 3 4 5 (strongly encourage)
   B. Someone of her/his religious background (strongly discourage) 1 2 3 4 5 (strongly encourage)
   C. Someone from her/his country of origin (strongly discourage) 1 2 3 4 5 (strongly encourage)

16. How proud are you of your Arab cultural background?
   (not proud at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (extremely proud)

17. How often do you consume your ethnic food at home?
   (never) 1 2 3 4 5 (very frequently)

18. How would you describe your emotional ties to your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin?
   (very weak) 1 2 3 4 5 (very strong)

19. How proud are you of your American identity?
   (not proud at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (extremely proud)

20. How would you describe your emotional ties to the United States?
   (very weak) 1 2 3 4 5 (very strong)

21. How important to you is the Palestinian-Israeli problem?
   (not important at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very important)

22. How important to you are the problems in Iraq?
   (not important at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very important)

23. How important to you are the events on the Lebanese/Syrian arena?
   (not important at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very important)

24. Arab Americans need to maintain their own cultural identity as much as possible.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 (strongly agree)

25. Arab Americans should adapt to American culture as it is.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 (strongly agree)

26. How important to you is Arabic language?
   (not important at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very important)

27. How important to you is English language?
   (not important at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very important)

28. How welcoming of Arabs do you perceive the American mainstream to be?
   (not welcoming at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very welcoming)

29. Do you think in the next 5 years you will go back to permanently live in your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin?
   (very unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (very likely)

30. Do you think in the next 5 years you will go back to visit your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin?
   (very unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (very likely)

31. How important do you think retaining Arabic language should be to those of Arab descent?
   (not important at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very important)
32. When you are with Arab people not from your or your ancestors’ Arab country, how are you most likely to refer to yourself?
   a. Arab  
   b. American  
   c. Ethnic background (e.g. Palestinian, Kuwaiti…)  
   d. Arab American  
   e. Ethnic –American (e.g. Lebanese-American; Syrian -American…)  
   f. Other, specify:  
   Why:  
33. When you are with people of non-Arab origin, how most likely to refer to yourself as?
   a. Arab  
   b. American  
   c. Ethnic background (e.g. Palestinian, Kuwaiti…)  
   d. Arab American  
   e. Ethnic –American (e.g. Iraqi-American; Egyptian-American…)  
   f. Other, specify:  
   Why:  
34. How often, in your spare time, do you socialize with: (please answer the four parts of the question)
   A. Arab friends not from your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin?  
      (not at all)  1       2       3       4       5  (very frequently)  
   B. Friends from your or your ancestors’ Arab country of origin?  
      (not at all)  1       2       3       4       5  (very frequently)  
   C. Friends who do not have an Arab origin & who are not Caucasian White  
      (not at all)  1       2       3       4       5  (very frequently)  
   D. Friends who do not have an Arab origin & who are Caucasian White  
      (not at all)  1       2       3       4       5  (very frequently)  
35. How likely are you to make the U.S. your permanent home?  
   (very unlikely)  1     2      3     4      5  (very likely)  
36. In the past year, have you personally experienced discrimination you perceived to be because of your Arab cultural background?  
   (never)  1      2      3     4      5  (very frequently)  
37. In the past year how many people with your cultural background you personally know have experienced discrimination because of their Arab cultural background?  
   (none)  1      2    3   4   5  (almost all)  
38. How often do you participate in activities of: (please answer all parts of the question)
   A. Arab ethnic or cultural organization (e.g. Jordanian cultural club)  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   B. American cultural organization  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   C. Arab American political group  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   D. American political group  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   E. Christian religious organization  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   F. Muslim religious organization  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   G. Druze religious organization  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
   H. Other religious organization  
      (never)  1      2   3   4   5  (very often)  
39. Would you encourage or discourage your best friend from marrying:
   A. Someone not of her/his cultural background  
      (strongly discourage)  1      2   3   4   5  (strongly encourage)  
   B. Someone not of her/his religious background  
      (strongly discourage)  1      2   3   4   5  (strongly encourage)  
   C. Someone not from her/his country of origin  
      (strongly discourage)  1      2   3   4   5  (strongly encourage)  
40. What is the primary language you use at home with your family?  
   a. English  
   b. Arabic  
   c. Arabic and English  
   d. Other, specify:  
   Biographical Data  
41. GENDER :  
   Male  
   Female  
42. MARITAL STATUS:  
   Married  
   Single  
   Engaged  
   Widowed  
   Divorced  
   Separated
43. U.S. CITIZENSHIP STATUS:  
   Citizen  Permanent Resident  
   Other, please specify visa type:

44. PLACE OF BIRTH:  
   United States  Outside the United States

45. AGE:  Please specify:

46. EDUCATION: Highest degree attained or working toward  
   Elementary (Grades 1-5)  Intermediate (Grades 6-9)  Secondary (Grades 10-12)  
   College  Graduate  Other specify:

47. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION:  
   Christian  Muslim  Druze  
   Agnostic  Atheist  Other, Specify:

48. If you are working full time, your average annual salary is:  
   less than 27,000  between 27,000 and 37,100  more than 37,100

49. Please specify the country from where you or your Arab ancestors originally immigrated:


THANK YOU GRACIOUSLY FOR YOUR TIME.  
PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE ADMINISTRATOR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1- أي تعبر عن التعبير التالي تفضل استخدامه لتشير إلى نفسك؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>برلماني (أحد البلدين) تشير إلى الرمز المعرفي لدى البلدان الفردية، مثل: (أبيا) فيما الرمز 5 يشير إلى الرمز المذكور بين البلدين.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(في أي حالات كبيرة) إذا القيمة بينهما تشير إلى الدراجات بين الرمادين.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تشعر بجاجتك إلى استخدام تعبير آخر غير التعبير الذي اختبرته في السؤال الأول؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(أبيا، ولا مرة) (في أي حالات كبيرة)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>كيف تصف طلاقك بينك وبين العربية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>كيف تصف طلاقك بينك وبين الإنجليزية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>كيف تصف طلاقك بينك وبين الإنجليزية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تقرأ وصوف ومجامع باللغة العربية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا القراءة أبدا) (أقرأها مرارًا) (أقرأها مرارًا مرتين)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تبحث عن معلومات وأخبار حالية عن بلدك أو بلد أسلافك العربي؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا أبحث أبدا) (أبحث عنها مرارًا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>10- الوسيلة الرئيسية التي تعرف من خلالها عن أخبار من بلدك أو بلد أسلافك العربي هي في الدرجات onSubmit رقم بلد على ترتيب أهمية الوسيلة الإعلامية لديك. مثل: إذا كان التلفزيون هو الأهم لدي ضع قربه رقم 1؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11- إن رقيق أو رفيفة دوامة:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>نمولاً من خلفيتك الدينية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>نمولاً من خلفيتك العربية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>نمولاً من بلدك أو بلد أسلافك العربي؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رقم</td>
<td>السؤال</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>إذا تزوجت، ما هي إمكانية أن يكون رفيق أو رفقة زوجتك؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تستمع إلى الموسيقى العربية في المنزل؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تستمع أبداً) 1  لا تستمع إليها مرات عديدة 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تستمع إلى الموسيقى العربية في سيارتك (إذا لم تكن تملك سيارة في سيارة العائلة)؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تستمع أبداً) 1  لا تستمع إليها مرات عديدة 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>هل تشجع أفضل صديق أو صديقة لديك بالخروج من شخص؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تشجع أبداً) 1  لا تشجع أبداً 4  لا تشجع أبداً 4  لا تشجع أبداً 4  لا تشجع أبداً 4  لا تشجع أبداً 4  لا تشجع أبداً 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تتخلو في المنزل؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تتخلو أبداً) 1  لا تتخلو أبداً 2  لا تتخلو أبداً 3  لا تتخلو أبداً 4  لا تتخلو أبداً 5  لا تتخلو أبداً 5  لا تتخلو أبداً 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>كيف تصف ارتباطك العاطفي بلديك أو بلد أسلافك العربي؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تشعر بالمشاعر) 1  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 2  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 3  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 4  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تأكل طعاماً عربياً في المنزل؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تأكل أبداً) 1  لا تأكل أبداً 2  لا تأكل أبداً 3  لا تأكل أبداً 4  لا تأكل أبداً 5  لا تأكل أبداً 5  لا تأكل أبداً 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>كيف تصف ارتباطك العاطفي بالولايات المتحدة الأمريكية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تشعر بالمشاعر) 1  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 2  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 3  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 4  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>إلى أي حد هى مهمة لك القضية الفلسطينية الإسرائيلية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تشعر بالمشاعر) 1  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 2  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 3  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 4  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>إلى أي حد هى مهمة لك المشاكل في العراق؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تشعر بالمشاعر) 1  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 2  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 3  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 4  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>إلى أي حد هى مهمة لك الأحداث على الساحتين اللبنانية والسورية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تشعر بالمشاعر) 1  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 2  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 3  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 4  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5  لا تشعر بالمشاعر 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>إلى أي حد هى مهمة لك الأحداث على هويتهم العربية على قدر الإمكان؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(لا تؤيد أبداً) 1  لا تؤيد أبداً 2  لا تؤيد أبداً 3  لا تؤيد أبداً 4  لا تؤيد أبداً 5  لا تؤيد أبداً 5  لا تؤيد أبداً 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رقم</td>
<td>السؤال</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>إلى أي حد توافق على الجملة التالية: يجب على العرب الأميركيين أن يتبنوا طريقة العيش الأميركية كما هي؟ (أوافق جدا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>إلى أي حد هي مهمة للك اللغة العربية؟ (غير مهمة جدا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>إلى أي حد هي مهمة للك اللغة الإنجليزية؟ (غير مهمة جدا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تجد أن غالبية المجتمع الأميركي مرحب بالعرب؟ (غير مرحب جدا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>هل تعتقد أن في السنوات الخمس المقبلة ستعود إلى بلدك أو بلد أسلافك العربي لعيش فيه؟ (من غير المرجح)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>هل تعتقد أن في السنوات الخمس المقبلة ستقوم زيارة بلدك أو بلد أسلافك العربي؟ (من غير المرجح)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>إلى أي حد تعتقد أن المحافظة على اللغة العربية يجب أن يكون مهمًا للعرب الأميركيين؟ (لم تكن هناك)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>عندما تكون مع أشخاص من أصل عربي ولكن ليسوا من بلدك أو بلد أسلافك العربي، أي تعبرية من التعابير التالية تفضل استخدامه لتشير إلى نفسك؟ (أ- عربي، ب- أميركي، ج- نسبتي للبلد الذي أنت منه (مثال: فلسطيني، كويتي..) ح- البلد الذي أنت منه وأميركي، د- عربى أميركي)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>عندما تكون مع أشخاص ليسوا من أصل عربي، أي تعبرية من التعابير التالية تفضل استخدامه لتشير إلى نفسك؟ (أ- عربي، ب- أميركي، ج- نسبتي للبلد الذي أنت منه (مثال: فلسطيني، كويتي..) ح- البلد الذي أنت منه وأميركي، د- عربى أميركي)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>في أوقات فراغك، إلى أي حد تعاطى (الرجاء الإجابة عن الأجزاء الأربعة للسؤال)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>هل تعتقد أن ستجلل الولايات المتحدة البلد الذي تعيش فيه دائمًا؟ (من غير المرجح)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>هل اختبرت شخصيًا خلال السنة الماضية تمرًا عنصريًا شعرت أنه بسبب أصلك العربي؟ (لم اختبر ذلك مطلقًا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>هل اختبرت أشخاص تعرفهم من خليفة عربية خلال السنة الماضية تمرًا عنصريًا شعرت أنه بسبب أصلهم العربي؟ (لا أحد)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. إلى أي حد تشارك في نشاطات: (الرجاء الإجابة عن كل إجابة عن كل إجابة)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(لا أشارك أبدا)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>(أشارك مرات عديدة)</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- مؤسسات ثقافية عربية
- مؤسسات ثقافية أمريكية
- تجمعات سياسية عربية/أمريكية
- تجمعات سياسية أمريكية
- هيئة دينية مسلمة
- هيئة دينية سماوية
- هيئة دينية أخرى

39. هل تشتنتج أو لا تشتنتج أفضل صديق أو صديقة لديك بالتزوج من شخص

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(لا أشجع كثيرا)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(أشجع كثيرا)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ليس من خلفية عربية? (لا أشجع أبدا) | 1
- ليس من خلفية أو خلفيتها الدينية? (لا أشجع أبدا) | 1
- ليس من بلد/ها أو بلد أسلافه/ها العربي (لا أشجع أبدا) | 1

40. ما هي اللغة الرئيسية التي تستخدمها في المنزل؟

- الإنجليزية
- العربية
- الإنجليزية والعربية

41. المعلومات الأخرى

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الجنس</th>
<th>أذكر أنثى</th>
<th>أذكر أنثى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

42. الوضع العائلي

- متزوجة/مطلق/أرملة
- مطلقة/منفصلة
- مطلق/منفصلة

43. الجنسية الأمريكية:

- حامل للجنسية الأمريكية
- غير حامل/كل

44. مكان الولادة

- الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية
- خارج الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

45. العمر من فضلك حدد:

46. المستوى التعليمي, أعلاه شهادة حصلت عليها أو أنت مسجل خليلاً للحصول عليها

- ابتدائية
- ثانوية
- جامعية
- دراسات عليا

47. الدين

- مسيحي
- مسلم
- موحد
- لا أدين

48. إذا كنت تتعامل بدوام كامل، ما هو معدل راتبك السنوي?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>أكثر من 37100</th>
<th>37100 و 37000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

49. من فضلك حدد البلد العربي الذي تحددت أنت أو أسلافك منه

50. مكان السكن الحالي

| المدينة | |