

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Date: June 2004

I, Grèce Chami-Sather,

hereby submit this work as part of the requirements for the degree of:

Doctor of Education

in:

Curriculum and Instruction

It is entitled:

Moral Thinking of American, American Residing in

Lebanon, Lebanese Bilingual and Lebanese Children

This work and its defense approved by:

Chair: Dr. Richard R. Kretschmer, Jr.

Dr. Gulbahar Beckett

Dr. Peg Elgas

Dr. Suzanne Soled

Moral Thinking of American, American Residing in Lebanon,
Lebanese Bilingual and Lebanese Children

A dissertation submitted to the
Division of the Graduate Studies and Research
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In the department of
Curriculum and Instruction Program, Division of Teacher Education
College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services
University of Cincinnati

By

Grèce Chami-Sather

Submitted to my doctoral program committee

Dr. Richard Kretschmer, Jr. (Chair)
Dr. Gulbahar Beckett
Dr. Peg Elgas
Dr. Suzanne Soled

June, 2004

Abstract

Morality, thought, and culture as represented through language have been the focus of research within the past decade. Little research has, however, been directed toward linguistic encoding of morality in children in general, and in children from Arabic communities in particular. What are not clear are the general effects of culture and language on issues of morality. The direction of this research has been to determine patterns of similarities and /or differences between cultures and within cultures. This study therefore attempts to address this question by examining children from two cultural heritages (Arabic and American) and using two different languages (English and Arabic). Specifically, this study compared the verbal behaviors of children from English speaking homes, to children from Arabic speaking homes, from Arabic speaking homes where English is a second language, and from English-speaking homes where the family is located in an Arabic country but maintain American cultural values, such as celebrating Halloween, etc., when dealing with issues of morality. This design allowed the research to examine and explore the potential effects of culture and of language.

The researcher taped individual children from each of these four conditions while they attempted to respond to open-ended questions relating to situations that involve issues of morality, to definitions of moral values and to a survey involving the ranking of the moral values. The same survey was given to parents for additional supportive data. Analysis of data consisted of a discourse analysis of the linguistic moves made by each child in each situation, to see whether there is a difference between these four groups of children. Analysis of data also included the survey feedback received from parents of the same children. Results first show that there are universalities among the two cultures

(American vs. Arabic) where children behaved similarly in their verbal production, showing competence, and respecting the protocol of expected verbal behavior throughout the sessions. In content, children across the groups also behaved similarly demonstrating appropriate levels of understanding of hypothetical situations and providing solutions. Second, it was clear that the exposure to a second language and culture affected the production of English speaking groups residing in Lebanon. This effect appeared more at the level of discourse than at the syntax level, and more in the content of the utterances. In some instances, English bilingual children's form was heavily influenced by their first language and culture and in others, the content came closer to the responses of the monolingual English speaking children. Ties between language and culture seem so immutable particularly when religious connotations were involved. Possible effects of schooling and peer relations seem to play a role in the children's rankings of moral values as noticeable differences were recorded between children and their parents. Implications of this study could benefit parents as well as teachers in understanding the moral, cultural and linguistic needs of their children as they relocate from culture to culture and become immersed in different worlds and languages.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the graduate study program for the gift of scholarship, and thank my committee: Dr. Kretschmer (chair) for all his patience, dedication and for teaching me the love of research as well as his guidance and time in teaching me the art of writing and editing; Dr. Beckett, for her creativity and challenges that taught me perseverance and strength in research; Dr. Elgas for her guidance, support, help, kindness and encouragement; Last but not least Dr. Soled for her time and effort in helping me understand research quantitatively as well as her creative approaches to teaching during the coursework. I am also grateful to Dr. Pan for his efforts in supervising the statistical analysis. Moreover, to all my participants, parents and children, in Lebanon and the USA, thank you for all your input and the valuable knowledge you bestowed upon me. This research would not have materialized without you.

Special thanks to the administration of the Education Department and crew: Pat, Elaine, Amuna, Carol, Stephanie and last but not least Beverly. You have turned this place into an extended home with your warmth and support. Thank you.

I particularly like to dedicate this study for my late mother whose funeral I missed because I had accepted this scholarship. Mom, you repeatedly taught me to finish what I had started. Thank you for your wisdom and love. Mom I love you and miss you tremendously.

I would like to sincerely thank my father whose example in perseverance has been extraordinary. Dad, I remember the early mornings while you studied for your law degree and I would crawl out of bed and come and sit near you. You would hand me a pen and

ask me to write, I was five then. To my brothers and sisters in law Claude and Christianne (Un bon massage ca ferait du bien, non?), Charles and Cecilia (keef?) and Ralph and Rima (made it guys!) and to my uncle Mounir and Susan for your great support and love. To all my family in “Joun”, Lebanon and in St. Catharines, Canada, I thank you for your prayers.

To all my colleagues and friends, Roberto, Grandfield, Sultana, Nithya, Marietta, Kelly, Latiera and Danielle in the Education department. Your assistance has been unforgettable. To all my colleagues and friends in the Romance Language department, Huda, Phyllis, Dr. Jones, Michelle, Kathy, Connie, Karine and Fanny whose support was invaluable and who believed in me getting to the finishing line. To my friends, in Holland, Leila, Janny en Gerrit (Eindelijk ben ik ook daar vrienden!) and to my piano teacher and friend (Sister Marlene I will get to Malta soon to see you. Twenty years and a stupid war have separated us: It sure has been a long time). To my friends Grace T. and Ann B. who called every week and argued with me about philosophical issues, and to my friend Marty who balanced my days with laughter and jokes, Thank you.

To my Taekwondo friends and bodies and particularly to Grand Master Sung Tae Kim and Chokyonim Mike, Thank you for your encouragement.

And last but not most, I would like to thank my husband Brent whose encouragement, support and love have been perpetual and consistent. I love you and thank you from the bottom of my heart. To my sons: Mark for all your encouragement and technical skills in helping me prepare my presentations and tables, and Eric for keeping me company during those long nights and early mornings (crawling under my chair, are you done yet Mom?).

And to my stepsons Richard and Philip who occasionally checked on me as well as competed with me. Thank you for your warmth. I love you very much.

Grece

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Literature Review.....	3
Language development.....	4
Language and culture.....	7
Language and thought.....	11
Language, culture and moral development.....	13
Research on morality.....	17
Research on language and morality in Lebanon...	25
Research Questions.....	29
Hypotheses.....	29
II. METHODOLOGY	
Participants.....	34
Children.....	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Parents.....	39
Recruitment Sights.....	40
Beirut summer camp.....	40
Joun.....	41
Northern Kentucky.....	42
Meeting Sights.....	43
School in Lebanon.....	43
Homes in Lebanon and the Unites States.....	43
Tools.....	44
Selection of ten values.....	44
Interviews.....	45
Definitions.....	46
Surveys.....	47
Data Analysis.....	48
III. RESULTS	
Qualitative Results.....	51
Questionnaire.....	51
Question #1: Hardwork and obedience.....	52
English.....	52
Form.....	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Content.....	56
Responsibilities: home vs. school.....	57
Social behavior.....	57
Arabic.....	58
Form.....	60
Content.....	63
Question #2: Obedience and respect.....	65
English.....	65
Form.....	66
Content.....	67
Arabic.....	68
Form.....	70
Content.....	71
Question #3: Respect.....	73
English.....	73
Form.....	74
Content.....	76
Arabic.....	77
Form.....	78
Content.....	79
Question #4: Honesty	80

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
English.....	80
Form.....	81
Content.....	83
Arabic.....	84
Form.....	85
Content.....	86
Question #5: Forgiveness and Justice.....	87
English.....	87
Form.....	89
Content.....	91
Arabic.....	92
Form.....	94
Content.....	95
Question #6: Sharing, Caring, Planning, Economy.....	95
English	95
Form.....	98
Content.....	99
Arabic.....	100
Form.....	101
Content.....	102
Definitions.....	103

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
English	104
Form.....	107
Content	109
Arabic.....	110
Form.....	112
Content.....	112
Hardwork : English and Arabic.....	113
Obedience: English and Arabic.....	114
Respect: English and Arabic.....	115
Honesty: English and Arabic.....	116
Justice: English and Arabic.....	116
Forgiveness: English and Arabic.....	117
Caring: English and Arabic.....	118
Sharing: English and Arabic.....	118
Planning: English and Arabic.....	119
Economy: English and Arabic.....	120
Quantitative Results.....	120
Parents.....	122
Children.....	127
Parents versus Children.....	134
IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION.....	137

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
First Question.....	137
English Monolingual Group.....	138
Conversational patterns.....	138
Form.....	139
Content.....	141
Arabic Monolingual Group.....	142
Conversational Patterns.....	142
Form.....	143
Content.....	145
American residing in Lebanon and Bilingual Groups.....	147
Conversational patterns.....	147
Form.....	149
Content.....	151
Second Question.....	153
Form.....	153
Content.....	154
Third Question.....	155
Fourth Question.....	156
Fifth Question.....	157
Discussion of Results.....	159
Limitations of the Study.....	163

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Implications.....	166
Suggestions for Future Research.....	167
REFERENCES.....	170
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 The Interview Questions used to Explore the Ten Moral Values.....	180
Appendix 2 A Copy of the Letters and the Forms Sent to the Parents in English.....	181
Appendix 3 A Copy of the Letters and Forms Sent to the Parents in Arabic	183

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Children by Age and Sex.....	38
2. Kruskal-Wallis Testing Among Groups of Parents.....	124
3. Results of Hypotheses for Groups of Parents.....	126
4. Kruskal-Wallis Testing Among Groups of Children (Bilingual responding in English).....	128
5. Kruskal-Wallis Testing Among Groups of Children (Bilingual responding in Arabic).....	130
6. Results of Hypotheses Among Groups of Children.....	133
7. Results of Hypotheses Between Groups of Children and their Parents.....	136

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Language is a unique human product that defines societies. It allows individuals to relate to each other to form a cohesive whole, which has and can be defined as the culture of a particular society. For many decades, language has been of considerable interest, as researchers have attempted to understand its role in shaping the thought processes or the culture of a society. Thought processes within a culture are generally guided by the cultural standards and systems of values that are pertinent to particular situations and thus dictate the verbal and nonverbal behavior of individuals in a society (Bakhtin, 1986; Thomson, 2000; Vygotsky, 1986). These cultural standards or systems of values can be defined as the moral values of that society, and they are used to guide the actions of individuals as they conduct their lives. It is the intention of this study to explore the relationship between the triad of language, culture, and moral reasoning.

Comparative studies across cultures of the relationship between language, culture, and moral reasoning have been scarce. More specifically, there is a great gap in research representing cultural groups that have not been a center of focus possibly due to transient as well as constant changing conditions socially, politically, as well as geographically. Such populations mainly reside in the regions of the Middle East. Also, the main body of research on moral thought has involved either youths or adults. Fewer studies have been conducted on younger children.

The purpose of this dissertation, therefore, is to compare both culture and language as they reflect and affect the linguistic behavior of children from different underrepresented cultural backgrounds as they engage in moral thinking situations.

Statement of the Problem

The relationship between culture and language continues to be the focus of debate. Although it is clear that language is a representation of the culture and its thought patterns, it is not clear whether language shapes culture or whether culture shapes language. Research has either supported or negated the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Whorf, 1956) that “our worlds are shaped by our words” and that language is at the origin of thinking (Thomson 2000, p. 82). One possible approach to investigating this relationship is to focus attention on groups of children who differ according to their cultural backgrounds and the languages they use. Since morality is an intricate part of cultural values, a study relating to this sensitive aspect of language use might be instructive as a way of determining the possible effects of culture and language. Such a study would need to focus on two aspects of behavior, namely, the language forms used as they engage in moral reasoning and the content contained in the productions made by the child.

With the rise of interest in multiculturalism, it is time to compare western to middle-eastern cultures, and those that have not been extensively researched particularly Arabic speaking cultures. In this study, we will compare Arabic speaking, and English speaking children in the genre of moral reasoning. We will use four groups of children. The first group consists of Arabic speaking children living in an Arabic culture

(Lebanon). The second group consists of children living in an Arabic culture (Lebanon), but who regularly speak either Arabic or English. The third group consists of English speaking children living in an Arabic culture (Lebanon). The fourth and final group consists of English speaking children living in an English culture (United States). In order to understand the role of language, there is a need to compare bilingual Lebanese to monolingual Lebanese and American children. In order to understand the role of culture, it is important to compare Lebanese children, irrespective of language, to American children irrespective of residence. Comparisons will be made on two tasks related to the genre of morality reasoning. First, the children will be asked to apply their moral standards to a set of social problems addressing ten moral values. Second, the children will be asked to rank these ten moral values and then to define them. This will provide two samples of verbal behavior that can then be used to study the potential effects of language and/or culture. In order to determine whether these values are shared with their parents, we will have the children and their parents rank order these ten values and make a comparison between these two groups. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the verbal responses derived by four different groups of children on issues of moral values. More specifically this research aims at analyzing the cultural and linguistic features of different groups involved in moral thinking processes.

Literature Review

This literature review will begin with a short overview on language development as a way of setting the stage. It will be followed by a discussion of the relationship between language and culture, the relationship between language and thought, and the

relationship between culture, language, and morality. This will be followed by a discussion of pertinent research on morality and moral development in children from English speaking societies. This section will be followed by pertinent research on this same topic in Arabic speaking societies with particular reference to Lebanon.

Language Development

Numerous research efforts have been conducted on the development of the linguistic capacity of children (Carroll, 1999; Cazden, 1972, 2001; Chomsky, 1957, 1968, 1980; Gleason, 2001; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Piaget, 1932, 1970, 1983; Shatz, 1991; Tappan, 1991a; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1984, 1991; Wertsch & Stone, 1985). Carroll (1999) suggests that the study of language involves three processes: the understanding of language, the production language and the acquisition of discourse (genres) or the cultural patterns associated with the language they are learning. From the moment of birth, the senses of the child are active and interactive as the child begins to internalize stimuli coming from the surrounding environment. The child begins comprehending sounds and relating utterances to events. The child then attempts to reproduce the verbal sounds previously heard. As the children engage in these two activities, they simultaneously begin to understand how this language matches the discourse or cultural patterns of the language to which they have been exposed. Differing theoretical stances have distinguished between the two key factors in the acquisition of this complex system, namely the factor of genetics/hereditary and the importance of social aspects to its development. In the following, focus will be directed towards some of these theoretical positions.

In order to understand language development, it is necessary to observe children longitudinally and in the act of communicating because research seeks to understand the gradual developing aspect of linguistic moves. Earlier researchers and leading scientists (Chomsky, 1968; Leontiev, 1981; Luria, 1976, 1978; Vygotsky, 1986) investigated language and thought in order to establish a straightforward relationship between these two aspects of performance. Vygotsky, a leading Russian scientist, claims that individuals are complex beings who develop in a social cultural context. Individuals interact with their environment in a dynamic process. Consequently, the child is looked upon as an apprentice who internalizes experiences once he/she is exposed to them by the society. Vygotsky further states that “the true direction of the development of thinking is not from the individual to the social but from the social to the individual” (p. 36). Focusing more specifically on the area of morality, research on parental language and influence on morality development in the child has also been abundant (Belsky, 1984; Blum, Williams, & Firman, 1995; Bradley, Ramey, Barnard, Gottfried, Siegal, & Johnson, 1989; Bruner, 1975; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967).

Bruner (1975) stresses that children begin using types of talk (genres) as they pay attention to verbal sounds and tones, and salient details during their socialization with their parents and caregivers. They learn by rehearsing. Gleason (2001) suggests that though research seeks to establish recurring patterns in the development of the language, variations nevertheless seem to take place as to the “time of the onset, “the rate” as well as the “style of the language used by the child” (p. 6). They actually use the talk while playing or while engaged in a task. Children display this type of monologue as they repeat sounds they had previously heard and intonations of caregivers and direct parental

influences. From “motherese” or baby talk to more mature form of language use, children at first pay attention to the adult talk provided in their direct environment. As the child interacts with the environment, particularly with the mother or the caregiver, moral behavior becomes a focal point in the upbringing. Acquisition of more general patterns of talk takes place prior to understanding the different functional components, such as syntax and semantics.

Gleason (2001) also suggests that the development of verbal competence is an interactive process. Children do not just observe and then directly produce the verbal behavior. They are actually working on such competence as they observe their environment. All this takes place through the mediation of social influences. Gleason argues that with age, the introduction of social and educational aspects in the child’s life begins to play a more important role in the moral development as well as the language development. Ochs and Schieffelin (1979) suggest that children “actually develop a sense of what is preferred and expected” (p. 258). In this process, the children use trial and error strategies in order to find the appropriate verbal action as well as the genre that is compatible with a particular situation. They exist in a society that exposes them to various experiences and provides them with the knowledge they need to be competent, through imitation and later on through understanding the context in which certain utterances are said.

From a linguistic utterance, to a thinking unit, language acquisition is a multilayered process that occurs at the same time as the child is growing within a society. Spolsky (1998) suggests that children acquire language and social skills simultaneously. While interacting with the family members children observe, act and learn according to

expectations. The process of language development and the acquisition of social skills are actually very active and interactive and are culturally determined.

Language and Culture

According to Tappan (1997), language is a means of self-expression and communication and varies from culture to culture. Thomson (2000) suggests that “the fact of the matter is that the real world is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group” (p. 79). If habits are ways of thinking (genres), then they should be reflected in the speech and the choice of words used by that society. Words and sentences then become the mirror of thought. In exploring the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, Thomson argues that “language may be shaped by the world but in turn it shapes the world” (p. 81). As children choose words within a certain context (genre), their first awareness is of the utterance itself as a mere repetition of what was previously heard from the surrounding environment. When children become more and more socially aware and move to a different developmental stage, their choice of words would depend on their understanding of the situations and on selecting words appropriate to meaning and context. Such words also affect their behavior. Words then dictate meaning, which in turn generates action.

According to Bakhtin (1986), genres are chosen according to the situations in which they occur. Following Bakhtin’s theory (1981), Wertsch, Hagstrom and Kikas (1995) suggest that language analysis should start with the utterance, which is the “real unit of speech communication” (p. 280). Scribner (1985), whose work is deeply grounded in Vygotsky’s and Bakhtin’s theories, also emphasizes the notion of “speech

genres” (p. 280). Genres are organized logical forms of utterances and are closely related to the situations or the settings in which the individual is actually participating. Thus as we look at context, we find that utterances are closely related to culture, and are closely determined by situational moral values that rule the circumstances.

Thomson (2000) further suggests that “the way in which people use their native tongue has a strong effect on their attitudes towards those situations” (p. 87). The choice of words and the type of utterances are determined by the context in which they are occurring. During this cognitive process, most research examines not only one utterance at a time but a cluster of utterances within a context. When clusters of words are used often by a society and consistently within specific situations, they form genres of speech. Genres occur within specific social contexts.

Hymes (1974) defines the term “genres” as those verbal structures with a beginning and an end holding in between a certain recurrent pattern consistent with situations in which the individual finds him/herself. As we move from theory to practice, we look at the longitudinal development of children’s language in context and the choice of genres in their speech, particularly in the context of moral reasoning. In viewing cross-cultural groups, Shatz (1991) suggests that language is the most powerful tool of parenting. She argues that parents use language in order to transmit to their children what is acceptable in society both with regard to acceptable behavior and to societal values. In one of her cross-cultural studies, she concludes that though German, American, British, Korean and Japanese mothers used different clusters of utterances or genres of words in their communication, the messages they were trying to transmit were not significantly different. Syntactically, German mothers used more modals than

American mothers did while engaging with their children. Comparing British and American mothers, more negative modals (e.g., must not, should not) were generally displayed by British than by American mothers. However, American mothers displayed more modals in intensity. Semantically, while American mothers displayed focus on intention and possibility, German mothers showed more necessity and obligation. Those messages were aimed at guiding children in establishing general acceptable behavior around playing with toys, and sharing as well as focusing on eating habits.

Though cultures display different emphases on various aspects of activities in a child's life, nevertheless they still share universal values and expectations. The form of language might differ though the expected behavioral outcome might remain the same. There are a number of "ubiquitous features" throughout the world's languages that demonstrate linguistic universals (Facone, Kearns, Kopp, & Watson, 2000). The genres of speech that parents used, though different from one group to the other, conveyed a similar expectation from their children. At first, sounds, intonations, segregated words directly related to actions are primarily exhibited. These sounds in turn are adopted by the listener, the child in this instance, and finally incorporated into his /her own speech.

Vygotsky (1962) suggests the term "inner speech" in his theory. Inner speech is at first monologous, when the child begins babbling and talking to herself. This type of speech is used to rehearse ideas and organize thought, including those related to issues of morality. Based on Vygotsky's teachings, Bruner (1975) explains that language and action at first are "fused together" and consequently produce inner talk (p. 30). This type of talk is exhibited primarily in the form of monologue, a solitary speech, used while the child is performing an action. Vygotsky unlike Piaget (1932) argues that inner speech

helps the child organize and classify thought at its theoretical stage. As soon as the action separates from talk, language becomes more complex. Vygotsky (1962) argues that language is a communicative tool that is adopted, rehearsed through monologues and finally becomes the repertoire that directs the child's actions and consequently the child's thinking.

In analyzing communication from an ethnographic perspective, Saville-Troike (2000) suggests that "Although there is some controversy regarding the extent to which language shapes and controls the thinking of its speakers or merely reflects their world view, there is little doubt that there is a correlation between at least the vocabulary of a language and the beliefs, values, and needs present in the culture of its native speakers" (p. 360). In the book *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*, Fishman (1996) ponders over the loss of languages in cultures. He claims that language is the culture, and that the relationship is "symbolic" between the two components. He says: "Take it (language) away from the culture, and you take away its greetings, its curses, its praises, its laws, its literature, its songs, its riddles, its proverbs, its cures, its wisdom, its prayers" (p. 1). Thus language and culture are strongly intertwined and single effects are still to be researched.

Although the extant research clearly makes a link between language and culture through the concept of genre, what is still unclear about this research is whether acquisition of language alone makes the culture available to the child. For instance, does learning English by Arabic-speaking children provide an access into the discourse genre of English? This is an important question for it can shape our understanding of educational programming for children. Is language teaching sufficient for complete

mastery of the full range of language genres in a particular language, or should language teaching be part of a more comprehensive acculturation program.

Language and Thought

The proposition that speech is a higher mental function remains a focus in current research. As cited in Tappan (1997, Vygotsky declares that “Speech is nonintellectual and thought is nonverbal...However, at some point the two paths meet and verbal thought emerges” (p. 83). In his book, *Language and Thought*, Vygotsky (1986) suggests that “complex thinking with all its peculiarities is the very foundation of linguistic development” (p. 130). Once an individual speech is directed towards others in society, social influences begin to interact with the growth of linguistic skills. This component will depend upon the maturity level of the child. He argues further that before acquiring the expressions of thought in language, children actually start understanding the general use of the social component of language. The development of morality is then intertwined with the development of the appropriate language that accompanies it. Reflection of parental as well as societal influences are displayed in the form of moral linguistic behavior and therefore in action. According to Ochs and Schieffelin (1979) the process of linguistic acquisition is so dynamic that children also produce utterances even if their parents do not use them. This is a proof that “children are taking an active role in constructing language that is most useful to their needs and appropriate to their social status” (p. 88). They also stress that by looking at language as a socialization process, it would “relate children’s use and understanding of grammatical forms to complex yet orderly and recurrent dispositions, preferences, beliefs, and bodies of

knowledge that organize how information is linguistically packaged and how speech acts are performed within and across socially recognized situations”(p. 74).

Vygotsky’s (1986) theory of historical activity created a background for understanding the development of thought and language. At first, he speculated that thought and speech developed on two different planes at two different paces. The one plane is the individual plane and the second is the collective one. While focusing on the individual, Vygotsky believed that the biological factors of development would help the child develop elementary psychological functions such as “memory, perception and practical intelligence” (p. 124). On the other hand, Wertsch (1984) suggests that the social and cultural processes would regulate the child’s acquisition of speech and other “higher psychological functions” (p. 124).

According to Bakhtin (1986), language is always looked upon in a context; otherwise utterances will have no "semantic fullness of value” (p. 74). A single utterance isolated from the context “has no capacity to determine directly the responsive position of the other speaker, that is, it cannot evoke a response” (p. 74). While trying to understand the particular situation, and in this setting the moral situation, individuals within a certain group “understand, and sense the speaker's speech plan or speech will, which determines the entire utterance, its length and boundaries. We imagine to ourselves what the speaker wishes to say. And we also use this speech plan, this speech will (as we understand it), to measure the finalization of the utterance” (p. 77). In expressing thought, language is restructured based on the situation and the contextual frame in which it occurs. However communication seeks consistencies for the thought to be understood. While interacting with their parents and other members of the society,

children exhibit a certain repeated pattern of verbal behavior through listening. Bakhtin argues that without this recurring pattern, communication would be impossible to understand. If individuals within a certain setting had to build up new patterns and utterances for every situation, speech communication would be almost impossible (p. 79). Thus the way societies and cultural groups communicate with each other take certain forms that are reappearing through generations that grow within those societies. It is thus assumed that every language exhibits its own history that is contextualized within its cultural settings. In the context of moral reasoning, children will thus exhibit verbal behavior previously practiced by their caregivers and consistent with the history of the culture in which they are brought up. The types of verbal and nonverbal moves thus need to be explored for further understanding of higher mental functioning.

If there is a strong relationship between language and thought as presupposed by the above research, then any study of language must occur within a certain genre or way of talking. Such a genre could be communications involving moral reasoning. However, the research on language and thought also stresses the importance of form and content. When examining the language of children as they use language in social interaction, you need to address the way the child packages the message and the information contained in the message.

Language, Culture and Moral Development

As we look at language as a reflection of morality in a social cultural context, we need to examine the choice of words and linguistic forms that are used by children in this

context. The choice of words is determined by the message and the context in which the text exists. Context is practically defined by Winegar and Valsiner (1992) as the:

weaving together of words.... It is also the part or parts of a written or spoken passage preceding or following a particular word or group of words and so intimately associated with them as to throw light upon their meaning. It is the interrelated conditions in which something exists or occurs. It is also coherence in discourse. (p. 2).

With the culture as a centerpiece, Tappan (1997) suggests that moral and linguistic development goes “hand in hand.” He states that while interpreting the verbal responses of individuals in a moral situation, we must attend to “shape, form, and character of the language and forms of discourse used” (Tappan, 1992, p. 94). Consequently language will vary.

Gleason (2001) states that “a distinct personal linguistic style is part of one’s special identity” (p. 9). Vygotsky (1986), while emphasizing the social element, stresses that thought in general, and moral thought in particular, is determined by the tool that is used as a means of expression as well as by the child’s existence in the society with all its influences. Since Vygotsky does not deny the genetics and the existence of the innate linguistic devices in human beings, he argues that regardless, “verbal thought is decided upon by a socio-cultural ingredient that does not exist in the pure form of language and thought. The child’s intellectual growth is contingent on his mastering the social means of thought, that is, language (p. 94).

Brown (2000) suggests that culture is an integral part of the interactions between language and thought. The role of culture is to bridge between language and thought.

In a cultural context, morality is defined by the society to which one belongs. Tappan (1992) defines the functioning morality as the “psychological process that an individual invokes in order to respond to and resolve a specific problem, conflict, or dilemma that requires a moral decision and a moral action” (p. 101). Tappan further stresses the importance of language in the context when a child faces a situation that requires decision making and the application of moral judgment, “he or she responds to and resolves it with the help of speech and language (i.e. by talking through the solution to him or herself) just as he or she responds to and resolves any other problem” (p. 101).

Moral behavior is justified, according to Tappan (1997), by the action or activity in which the individuals are involved. From those situations separate situational components are derived. Berko-Gleason, Ely, Perlmann and Narasimhan (1996) suggest that one of the objectives of language socialization aims at teaching children to abide by the laws and regulations of acceptable behavior. As the adult interacts with the child in the environment, he/she adjusts the level of communication to the level of the child. The child in turn adjusts the speed of instruction according to his/her level. Children begin acquiring the linguistic and the nonverbal behavior appropriate for the situations in which they are actually participating. On a daily basis, children interact and act following a set of values and moral criteria. However to understand actions is to understand how people think, feel and socialize. Scribner (1985) argues the fact that “human mental processes are best understood in terms of human action” (p. 288). In this research, words will represent actions in general and moral action in particular.

As we move into a contextualized setting for research, complex concepts in a particular culture are understood through social interactions as Vygotsky (1986) noted.

In fact, his belief was that moral and linguistic development is shaped by the particular social, cultural and historical context in which it occurs. Following Vygotsky's lead, Tappan (1997) projects historical theory into the moral development of children. He argues that "moral development and language development go hand in hand" (p. 17). Bakhtin (1981) along with Vygotsky suggest that human "psyche" begins within the boundaries of societal connections. Behaviors of different types are first practiced with the others in the direct surrounding and then internalized into one's self to be adopted as one's own self: what Wertsch and Stone (1985) call the "psyche".

Scribner (1985) analyzes the "psyche" through the lens of historical theory. She suggests that Vygotsky's theory is viewed based on two fundamental assumptions: (1) as history changes, social activities also change; therefore human nature is also changing. The "psyche" or the "human mental life" according to Wertsch and Stone (1985) is also altering, and (2) History does not change; it actually develops in a certain direction. (p. 122). One example would be the prehistoric tools that preceded the modern machines, and the numbers that preceded the Algebraic concepts. The concept of change is thus characterized by an active incremental directional development rather than by an irrelevant changing process. Thus cultures would be affected by the different histories shared by particular groups. In this, we move towards the process of higher mental functioning within a culture, the focus of this study. Following Vygotsky's theory, Wertsch (1984) defines "history" as this perpetual process that moves forward. It is dynamic and involves "a stream of development" (p. 139). As thought is defined by context, and in this case the cultural context, focusing on moral development seeks to understand the way societies influence children's moral values and decision-making.

Thus, if we wish to study the potential interaction between language and culture, the genre of moral reasoning could be used. The question then becomes whether knowledge of a language can influence language performance on moral reasoning tasks, as in English use by Arabic children. Or, whether with exposure to multiple cultural settings, as in the case of English-speaking children in an Arabic environment, that first language use can be influenced by this secondary cultural environment. Again, this will shed light on our understanding of the relative influence of language per se and cultural considerations as well.

Research on Morality

Kohlberg (1964, 1971, 1993) studied moral development in children ages 10, 13 and 16 from middle and lower socioeconomic backgrounds. He provided students with a moral dilemma, and then classified utterances into categories and stages. Thus, he focused on the genres of morality reasoning. Kohlberg maintained that proceeding from one stage to another is neither the product of maturation (Piaget) nor is it a result of socialization (Vygotsky). He emphasized that the development of stages of morality results from thought processes about problematic situations and dwelling upon the fundamentals of acceptable or not acceptable behaviors in society. Though he denies socialization as an effective component, he maintains that talking about moral issues and role taking as well as social experiences promote development and that they do so by stimulating higher mental functions.

Kohlberg (1964) also concluded that children, at approximately the age of 10 and 11 tend to judge moral situations differently than older children do. In fact, older

children's moral thinking undergoes shifts as their awareness and experience increase in the social world. Following Kohlberg's logic, Crain (1985) suggests that younger children, in particular, base their moral judgments more on consequences, whereas older children base their judgments on intentions. Piaget (1932) writes:

When, for example, the young child hears about one boy who broke 15 cups trying to help his mother and another boy who broke only one cup trying to steal cookies, the young child thinks that the first boy did worse. The child primarily considers the amount of damage--the consequences--whereas the older child is more likely to judge wrongness in terms of the motives underlying the act. (p. 137).

Kohlberg formulated his theory of moral development into different levels and stages. Children go through five stages of moral development weaving from the self to the society as their awareness of social conformity increases. By the age of eleven, children's moral decisions are affected by two influential moral codes: obedience and punishment (Kohlberg, 1964). They understand the rules to follow and acknowledge that obedience ensues. However, they can also support the logic that "It's against the law," or "It's bad to steal because you'll get punished".

Another prominent figure in the research on morality, Rest (1979, 1985, 1986) attempted to define the aspects that trigger the moral behavior of older populations: youth as well as adults. In the attempt to find the components that create one's moral behavior, Rest based his research on Kohlberg's (1964, 1971, 1993) theory of stages of development. Rest (1979) consequently designed the Defining Issues Test (DIT) a tool that is quite popular in the business world. In this test, Rest tried to understand not only

the moral decisions that individuals based their daily behavior upon but also the reason behind their decision-making. Rest states that “not only do people differ in the course of action they prefer, but they differ in the basic categories and frameworks used to perceive and interpret the problem, in the transformations they make of bits of information into something of meaning and significance” (p. 84). With “basic frameworks” we look at different cultures and different ways of perceiving, thinking and expressing thoughts through genres and linguistic utterances.

According to Wells (1986) parents, while interacting with their children, choose words and utterances that best fit the situation. These utterances are employed towards communicating a certain message or reaching a certain objective in a moral situation. Tappan (1991a) suggests that when individuals “make moral choices and decisions in their lives, they represent those decisions and endow them with meaning” (p. 8). As we focus on the verbal expression of morality, Tappan (1991b, 1997) states that young children of different cultures display some kind of moral sensibility by the age of two. Interactions between children and their parents are the foundations for language development in the children. In the intent to follow the parental steps, children’s thinking, believing and acting become a reflective mirror image of parental behavior. With the gradual development of verbal competence comes the development of the thinking processes. The choice of words to best fit a situation would require a certain system or tool that brings forth the accompanying thoughts.

Cole (1974) suggests that “any attempt to understand the relation between culture and thinking must consider the question of language at an early stage” (p. 39). Language competence is thus transmitted through words that have been chosen in a certain situation

while engaging with another individual. As a reflection of thought, engaging in verbal utterances with others in the society draws attention to the societal influences that govern the behavior; that is, the moral societal values. One of those facets is the moral plane along which people base their behavior in real life situations.

The Whorfian hypothesis (according to Carroll, 1999) states that “there is no natural way to carve up reality; different languages do it in quite different ways” (p. 366). As the cultural world is shaped by its own words, those words or utterances carry two distinct characteristics: the first is that language determines “cognitive processes” and the second is that “the thought processes eventually vary from language to language” (p. 369).

While discussing culture, moral thought and language, Carroll (1999) points out two salient factors about the Whorfian hypothesis. One is that we need to compare languages that have similarities as well as differences. The second is that while comparing different languages, we need to look at actions that involve a habitual mode of thought. In Vygotsky’s theory of “history”, as Scribner (1985) analyses it, the process involving verbal behavior is dynamic and we need to look at “rudimentary forms of behavior “to explain higher mental functions” (p. 135). These are “everyday cultural forms of behavior...and they are significant...for revealing in pure form the defining properties of all higher systems of behavior” (p. 135). Following such theory, interacting in one society is thus characterized by the judgment, morality and value applications contextually embedded in the culture.

Tappan (1992) attempted to study the decision making process of youth in the United States. In one of his case studies, a 15-year-old girl, while indulging in a moral

decision-making situation, reported three different voices that aided her in decision-making, namely, the voice of the “I”, the voice of the “they” and the voice of her mother seemingly an influential figure in her life (p. 95). The “I” was the representation of her own person in relation to the other with whom she had to make a decision. The “they” could have come from the social learning and influences and other societal voices of moral values and honesty she had previously heard. Finally the participant brings forth the mother’s voice teaching her children concepts of right and wrong and social values. Tappan further emphasizes that one must pay detailed attention to the utterances in order to understand the moral functioning in a social cultural context. The importance of language in understanding morality is very crucial. He states that “attending to the shape, form and character of the language and forms of discourse used therein yields a much more interesting and useful picture of the dynamics and vicissitudes of human moral development ...” (p. 94). However, very few have paid attention to the narrative aspect of moral behavior (Day, 1991; Tappan, 1989, 1990; Tappan & Brown, 1989).

Moral thought and language remains an intriguing dynamic centerpiece of research awaiting more developmental research for further insight. While action also is an important representative of thought, Wertsch (1991) suggests that as soon as the child is aware of the social context, the following characteristics are evident: (1) “a child’s speech is as important as the role of action in attaining a goal.” and (2) “the more complex the action demanded by the situation, and the less direct its solution, the greater the importance played by speech in the operation as a whole” (p. 25-26). Turning to more complex actions such as moral behavior, actions in turn are embedded in a specific culture, a contextual whole that creates meaning and produces verbal behavior.

Connor and Day (1991) conducted longitudinal studies with adults and analyzed the narratives reporting moral actions involving the informants. Those studies demonstrated that those who could verbalize their stories seemed to understand the moral values expected from them. There was also evidence of existing voices. Day (1991) states “moral stories are a function of the audience to which they are told just like moral actions are a function of the audience to which they are played” (p. 27). These stories portray not only the child’s thinking but also the influence of others in his/her moral decision-making. The voices belong to the individuals, who are closest to the narrator, especially those in his/her social surroundings. In one of Day’s case studies, a young executive was asked to recount a situation at work where moral decisions needed to be made. The young executive talked about the voice that was most influential in his decision making process: his deceased grandfather’s voice in supporting values such as honesty, respect and care.

In another case study (Day, 1991), a young four-year-old, playing at a daycare, tried to protect a younger child who was in danger. He ran after him while the latter was trying to catch a ball crossing the street without watching for cars. The boy reported voices, one of which was his mother’s. She had always told him to help others when in need and to care for others. He also reported his grandmother’s voice that supported his mother’s view. Finally he reported the voice of his hero: the Hulk. This last figure could have been a TV character or a fictional figure in the child’s life. The Hulk’s voice was the voice of his hero. This figure portrayed heroism, power and justice. In the decision making process, the informants reporting voices played an important role in

guiding the moral thinking of the children. In general, there were values depicting right and wrong, fairness and justice as well as care.

When looking at morality, one must look at Piaget's (1932, 1970) and Kohlberg's (1964, 1971, 1993) research since it is the only body of research that dealt explicitly with morality and its development in children. In designing this study, we looked at the system of values and expectations of the American society across a certain timeline as exhibited in these studies. Kohlberg focused his research on the concepts of "right" and "wrong". In studying adults and school youth, he formulated the stages of moral development. One of his colleagues Gilligan (1982) drew attention to a fundamental flaw in this research, namely the exclusion of female informants. Gilligan's research (1982, 1990; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Gilligan, Brown & Rogers 1990; Gilligan, Ward & Taylor, 1988; Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987) on the feminist perspective of morality articulated the concepts of "care" and "love" as well as "justice". These values appeared to be the major steering values in cases of girls' moral decisions. Gilligan concludes that in her research, females exhibited more messages of equality, reciprocity and fairness.

In analyzing this body of research, and looking at it from a Vygotskian/Bakhtinian perspective, Tappan (1992) suggests that gender issues are important factors playing a major role in the moral behavior of boys and girls. He suggests that "what girls internalize during late childhood and early adolescence is a culturally and historically specific ideology about acceptable norms of feminine behavior [composed of language and forms of discourse framed primarily in the 'social language' of care]..." (p. 113).

As we consider different gender actions, we seem more inclined in research to look for differences even when similarities present themselves. While comparing

different cultures, Bersoff and Miller (1992) attempted to understand the interpersonal responsibilities to which members of different societies adhere. Of a sample of 120 Americans and East Indians, the researchers concluded that while Indians based their judgment on the interpersonal relationship between individuals of their own society, the Americans based their decisions on a sense of justice. In other words, if judgment was to be conducted on one member of the society it would depend upon who is being judged rather than carrying forth a just and fair decision. In a later series of studies, Bersoff and his colleagues (Bersoff, 1993; Bersoff & Miller, 1992, 1994a,b; Bersoff, Miller & Harwood, 1990) again concluded that Indians based their judgment on interpersonal relationships while the American participants seemed to emphasize freedom of choice and individualism. However, there were universal values exhibited when participants indulged in social obligations such as respect and obedience. The findings seem to emphasize that culture does play an important role in defining one's values and moral judgment regardless of the existing universals. In conclusion, moral decisions in the United States seem to center mainly on **justice, fairness, care, freedom, respect and obedience**, as well as concepts that are based on issues of **right and wrong**.

From this research, it is clear that one way of examining moral reasoning in children is to have them talk about situations that involve moral issues. The research on English speakers indicates that there are ten key values that highlight English culture. They are: hardwork, obedience, respect, honesty, forgiveness, sharing, caring, justice, planning, and economy (Dunn 1987; Gilligan, 1982, 1990). It seems reasonable then that if we want to explore the relationship between language, culture, and morality, we need to engage children in discussions about morality. This can be done in one of two

ways: a) discussing situations that involve moral issues in a manner similar to Kohlberg (1964, 1971, 1993) and b) asking children to define these ten values. It is also important to see how these values match those of their primary environment, so it is important to compare children's responses with parental responses.

Research on Language and Morality in Lebanon

The very few studies on morality in Arabic culture include a series of studies carried out by Davis and Davis (1989). In Morocco, they conducted studies on populations 11-21 years of age, or children in the stage of formal thought, as defined by Piaget. The research aimed at understanding attitudes and morality values of youth while engaged in problem solving situations. They posed the same question as did Kohlberg (1964), in what is known as the "Heinz" dilemma. In this situation a wife was dying of a disease and the only medicine to save her life was controlled by a druggist who demanded more money for it than the husband could ever have. Issues of **right and wrong, of honesty and obedience to laws, of caring and fairness** were all apparent in the justifications given by the youth. Fernea (1991) also conducted several studies, to explore language and cultural universals in Islamic children's behavior. He observed that in the parenting practices of Islam, it is believed that "the child is born without *agl*, or reason" (p. 6). It is therefore the job of the parents to infuse values and reason to aid the child in becoming a functioning adult in the society where obedience, discipline and politeness as well as conformity to norms are a duty. Loyalty to the family and service to the community as well as obedience are the expectations and norms of such societies.

Such values are then reflected in the language of nations sharing the same cultural and religious background.

Prothro and Diab (1974) researched the family patterns and values in a changing social context in the Middle East. They argued that societies in the Middle East held strong family ties. Their moral values reflected issues directly related to family support and honor. Culturally, such societies are highly patriarchal and the man is considered as the head of the family who is in charge of making decisions for the other members of the family. Their studies also seemed to imply that women were equally important, albeit less obviously.

To understand the morality, we need to peek into the history of that region. With the end of the Second World War, the colonialism of the French and the British left a great impact on the societal values and thoughts in Lebanon. People were affected by the way they dressed, the way they talked, the way they thought and the way they raised their children. Children were sent to schools established by Christian missionaries: French, British and American. In fact, Prothro and Diab (1974) claim that with the colonialism of the French and the British in that region of the world, “their cultural influence was nevertheless considerable... in a number of ways” (p. 208). The western life style was slowly being incorporated into the Lebanese daily life style.

With industrialization so minimal, and urbanization “compatible with the traditional family ways,” the reason for societal change pointed toward the direction of western and foreign presence in Lebanon (p. 209). New political ideas as well as new trends of thought infiltrated the customs of the conservative families in Lebanon, however more so in the cities than in the villages and remote mountainous areas.

Changes of family structure in the way of “greater freedom and equality for women and for youth can be expected to continue in the near future throughout the Arab East”

(p. 210).

However, a certain fundamental cultural atmosphere prevailed in the society. Williams (1968) having lived six months in an agricultural farming society at the borders of Lebanon and Syria interviewed people and youth about their personal ambitions and their expectations. Certain universalities that dominate this culture were apparent. These were fatalism and a great faith in God’s will. Williams stated that “Of the past, they say *el kabl ma bihimna*, [the past does not concern us] and the future is *min Allah* [from God]. And the present is largely in God’s hands as well and out of their control” (p. 118). Families were tightly knit and honor, obedience and respect were expectations parents had of their children. With modernization, however, one would expect certain principles to bend and alter however such closely connected concepts although the Lebanese society still seemed to resist the changing times.

During the last twenty years of civil war in Lebanon, educational research on values and morals as well as other areas of education was not available. Social and political changes as well as the inflation of the cost of living and the devaluation of the monetary system caused the anticipated annihilation of the large middle class in Lebanon. However, with the coming of the new era, and with attention being turned towards the Middle East, it is of great importance to design educational research in an attempt to research issues related to a number of problems especially the relation of morality and culture if any.

Based on this research, it is clear that the moral values of Islamic cultures may be quite different from those of English-speaking cultures although the recent influence of Western concepts of morality cannot be discounted. If there are differences, we would anticipate then that language use in moral reasoning tasks would reflect these differences. This is an important question with regard to two populations of children. First, do Arabic children learning English, use English reflective of Arabic or English cultural values or perhaps some combination of both. Second, do English speaking children living in an Arabic environment, use English reflective of Arabic or English cultural values, or some combination of both?

This literature review addressed developmental, social and cultural issues that were explored from a socio-cultural theoretical framework (Vygotsky, 1962, 1986). As we seek to understand the nature of language, according to Patton (2002), we need to capture individual responses, and be detailed about the nature of context in each case and to provide in depth descriptions of both the responses and the context. To achieve this intent, a qualitative approach would be most suitable (Patton 2002; Denzin & Lincoln 1998). Patton (2002) has also suggested that a quantitative approach would be appropriate for the purpose of generalizations from particular cases to wider populations. Thus this research will aim first at answering research questions that examine and probe each individual case using a qualitative approach as well as test specific hypotheses between groups using appropriate quantitative approaches.

Research Questions

The present study will focus on the effect of language and culture on moral responses of different groups of children. As we seek to understand the role of culture and language, the specific questions guiding this research are the following:

- 1) What are the linguistic moves of children from different groups while expressing their moral values in different situations?
- 2) What are the similarities and differences in languages between the groups (if any) while they are defining these values?
- 3) What are the similarities and differences if any in the rankings of values among these groups of children?
- 4) What are the similarities and differences in the rankings of values if any among the parents in these different groups?
- 5) What are the similarities and differences in the rankings of values if any between the parents and their children in each group?

Hypotheses

As we seek to understand the roles of culture and language, the following null hypotheses will be tested to examine the effects if any on moral responses of children and their parents. Since bilingual parents responded only in English the following specific hypotheses were tested for differences, if any, among the four groups of parents:

- H_01 : There will be no significant differences between the mean ranks of the four independent groups of parents.

- H*₀₂: There will be no significant differences in the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and Lebanese bilingual groups.
- H*₀₃: There will be no significant differences between the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and the American /Lebanese.
- H*₀₄: There will be no significant differences between the monolingual and the American groups.
- H*₀₅: There will be no significant differences between the bilingual Lebanese and the American groups.
- H*₀₆: There will be no significant differences between the bilingual Lebanese bilingual and the American /Lebanese groups.
- H*₀₇: There will be no significant differences between the American/Lebanese and the American groups.

As for the groups of children, the following hypotheses were tested as the bilingual Lebanese group responded in both languages:

- H*₀₁: There will be no significant differences between the four independent groups of children.
- H*₀₂: There will be no significant differences in the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and Lebanese bilingual group speaking English.
- H*₀₃: There will be no significant differences in the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and the bilingual group speaking Arabic.
- H*₀₄: There will be no significant differences between the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and the American /Lebanese.

*H*₀5: There will be no significant differences between the monolingual and the American groups.

*H*₀6: There will be no significant differences between the bilingual speaking Arabic and the American groups.

*H*₀7: There will be no significant differences between the bilingual speaking English and the American groups

*H*₀8: There will be no significant differences between the bilingual speaking Arabic and the American /Lebanese groups.

*H*₀9: There will no significant differences between the bilingual speaking English and the American/Lebanese groups.

*H*₀10: There will be no significant differences between the American/Lebanese and the American groups.

*H*₀11: There will be no significant differences between the Lebanese bilingual in Arabic and in English.

Finally, and in order to find the relation between the rankings of parents and their children a third set of hypotheses was tested. The specific hypotheses were the following:

*H*₀ 1: There are no significant differences between the rankings of Lebanese monolingual parents and their children.

*H*₀2: There are no significant differences between the rankings of Bilingual Lebanese parents responding in English and their children responding in English.

H_03 : There are no significant differences between the rankings of American /Lebanese parents and their children.

H_04 : There are no significant differences between the rankings of American parents and their children.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted based on a socio-cultural theoretical framework consistent with certain ontological and epistemological approaches. As suggested by Johnson (1992), “Ontology deals with philosophical issues about the nature of reality”(p. 31). In this research, the philosophical stance follows a constructivist approach. On the other hand, epistemology sets the foundation for the type of inquiry that one might select. With such a framework, I have chosen the subjective approach as “it is not possible to separate the inquirer from the object of inquiry and nor should such a separation be a goal” (p.32). According to Guba and Lincoln (1990), “the goal of inquiry is to arrive at an informed and sophisticated construction on which there is consensus among competent people...such a construction is always open to change and to reconstruction”(p.31).

Patton (2002) suggests that “qualitative case studies offer a method for capturing and reporting individualized outcomes” (p.158). He also adds that such an approach would permit the researcher to understand the world from the participant’s point of view rather than from the standardized view of a specific research design. Lancy (2001) claims that qualitative research paradigms are an excellent fit for studies that involve intricate and complex issues not generally known nor extensively researched. In this research as we looked at language and linguistic products for the representation of data, it is imperative that we pay attention to details in specific and context in general. Patton (2002) suggests that the importance of capturing moments and contexts entails the use of

qualitative methods such as questionnaires and definitions in order to collect verbal productions of different groups of children involved in the study. However, as we deal with underrepresented groups and with issues of moral and cultural complexity, capturing the maximum number of responses and ensuring consistency would require that quantitative methods be used such as surveys for the purpose of group feedback. Thus the use of quantitative collection of data as an additional component would frame the methodology of this research as a mixed methodology approach.

In fact, few studies have been conducted on moral development in a cross-cultural setting. This research aimed at comparing the verbal responses of four different groups of children ages 7-11 engaged in moral thinking situations. The children first responded to questions that revolved around moral issues, and then they defined certain values and finally rated those values on a scale from 1-10. The study also attempted to compare the ratings of the parents of participating children, on the same values. This was performed through surveys that were sent to the parents where the parents rated the same values on a scale from 1-10. The data consisted of videotapes and audiotapes of children while engaged in the interviews with the researcher as well as the survey ratings. The tapes were then transcribed and qualitatively analyzed. Finally the surveys collected from parents as well as from children were quantitatively analyzed.

Participants

As the focus of this study narrowed down and the targeted population became more defined, the use of purposeful sampling was appropriate. Patton (2002) supported

by Denzin and Lincoln (1998) states that “such sampling selects information-rich cases strategically and purposefully” which was the case in this research. (p. 243)

Children

The four groups of students selected for this study were of American and Lebanese nationalities as well as a mix of both. The place of residency, the language spoken, the parents' nationality and particularly the mothers and the socioeconomic level were the independent variables chosen for sampling purposes.

The following are the reasons this criteria was selected: 1) The place of residence would determine the general culture as well as the language spoken, 2) The spoken languages Arabic, English or both would determine the choice of words and the processes of thought, and 3) The parents' nationality is a variable that would determine the children's nationality and thus the cultural identity. However the mother's nationality was the most crucial variable to the study, as we believed that the mother in the household usually determines the culture in which children are living and thriving. We anticipated that the American mothers for example in Lebanon would celebrate events such as Halloween, Thanksgiving and similar occasions regardless of any religious or other social factors interfering with their lives. Finally, the socioeconomic background will determine the homogeneity of morality among the different groups as we believe that extreme cases if represented in the study will affect the outcome or the ranking of the values.

The children ranged between 7 and 11 years old. This is called the middle childhood where formation of identity is in the process of being solidified. This stage of

a child's life is characterized by the transition of the child from a dependent being into one with an independent character. In Piaget's terms (1932), the age range 7-11 is the period during which children begin to acquire a great deal of information about the world and are ready to move away from the self and into the awareness of others in society. During that period of time, the child is capable of learning a tremendous amount of facts and is in the process of bridging between childhood and adolescence. This is the time when children are able to conceive the abstract and formulate ideas.

There were four groups. The first group (G1) was a monolingual Lebanese group residing in Lebanon. The second group (G2) was the bilingual Lebanese who spoke both English and Arabic fluently. They too resided in Lebanon. The third group (G3) was of American mother and Lebanese father who were fluent in English but seemed also adequate in Arabic however, they preferred speaking English. They resided in Lebanon. The fourth group (G4) consisted of English-speaking children residing in the States.

The researcher interviewed all groups. It is expected that the results from this study will generate information that will help us understand the potential variations among cultural groups as they approach daily situations involving moral issues familiar to all groups and common to most cultures.

The first group (G1) consisted of ten children. (See table 1 for a distribution of the ages and sexes of the children). Six of the ten children were recruited from the researcher's neighborhoods and through family acquaintances. Three were from East Beirut, two from West Beirut and one from her village in South East Lebanon. The other four children were part of a summer camp based in an American sponsored school in Lebanon. The camp was located in West Beirut but attracted children from different

suburbs of Beirut. The researcher knew this site from her previous teaching experience in Lebanon and had kept an ongoing relationship during her absence from the country. All participants went to private schools and though they were exposed to French, they were only fluent in Arabic. Though French was another language taught at school, the children reported that they were not nearly as fluent in that language as they were in Arabic. With these children, the researcher used Arabic during the study.

The second group (G2) also included ten children. Eight of these children were recruited from the same summer camp as the first group. The other two were recruited from the researcher's village "Joun" in South East Lebanon. These participants were fluent in both languages (Arabic and English) and sometimes exposed at school to a third language (French). From the information gathered by the camp leader, the children came from different suburbs of East and West Beirut.

For the third group (G3), the number of children was supposed to be ten. . For recruitment purposes, the researcher contacted the American consulate in order to reach female American citizens living in Lebanon. To avoid outright rejection with the first contact, the researcher exchanged a few electronic communications with the consulate and sent a brief study proposal for the clarification of purpose.

Table 1

Children by Age and Sex

Note. G1-Monoligual Lebanese, G2-Bilingual Lebanese, G3-American/Lebanese, G4-American.

Age	7-yrs-old		8-yrs-old		9-yrs-old		10-yrs-old		11-yrs-old		Mean Age
Sex	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	
G1	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	8.7
G2	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	2	1	9.4
G3	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	8.6
G4	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	3	9.7

A week later, an American mother (Mrs. A.) who was working at the consulate emailed the researcher. Mrs. A. offered assistance and helped the researcher get in touch with the families in the area. The researcher then made the appointments. Many who were contacted were leaving abroad for the summer. The researcher then planned dates to meet with the children whose parents agreed to participate. This resulted in a total sample of four children.

The fourth group (G4), ten in all, was recruited from the researcher's neighborhood in Northern Kentucky, in the United States. These children were recruited from families befriended with the researcher. The researcher paid individual visits to the neighbors and explained the study and got the permission for children to participate. These children also go to the same school as the researcher's children.

Parents

Parents of the four groups of children responded only to surveys (see Appendices 2 and 3) that required them to rate ten values on a scale from one to ten. Parents whose children were in the summer camp were contacted through the camp leader. Those participants received the survey at home and responded to it through the school mail. As for the other groups, the researcher individually contacted the parents from her acquainted neighborhoods both in the United States and in Lebanon. Parents of monolingual Lebanese responded to the survey in Arabic while the rest of the parents from the other groups responded to the survey in English. The researcher personally collected the surveys from the above-mentioned groups.

Recruitment Sights

Beirut summer camp

The researcher contacted a summer camp sponsored by an American affiliated school in Beirut. She then sent the proposal to the school asking for permission to conduct the study. The school is located in a coastal suburb of Beirut, the capital city of Lebanon. After few phone calls to Lebanon, the permission was granted. The researcher then sent samples of greeting letters, permission slips and proposals addressed to parents and children in order to prepare the field for research once the camp had started. As soon as the researcher arrived to Lebanon on the 3rd of July, she contacted the school and meetings were setup to prepare packages to send to parents. The camp leader, a young energetic and extremely helpful person, recruited the participants once the camp enrollment was completed. Based on the criteria of age, gender, nationality of the parents and language spoken, the leader was able to divide the children into one of two groups: the monolingual and the bilingual. The samples were chosen and the researcher sent a package to each potential participant of those samples. The package included a letter of introduction, an explanation of the study and a letter of permission to be signed and a survey for parents to fill out. A return envelope was also included for parents to send all the necessary documents once they were ready. From the original sample of twenty-one children, only nineteen returned the packages. Four parents declined permission for their children to participate, and 16 agreed to be part of the study: 6 were monolingual Arabic speakers and 10 were bilingual.

“Joun”

This tiny village is situated at 300 meters above sea level and has a population of 10,000 inhabitants. The population consists of different religions and this village has one of the oldest monasteries in that part of the country. Affiliated to the monastery are two private schools: one administered by nuns and the other by priests. Both belong to the convent of “St. Sauveur” that was built early in the 19th century. The researcher spent a great part of her summers as a child in that village. The last time she had been there was at the brink of the civil war, when “Joun” was a hideout and a shelter from the bombs and the shellings in the cities. The researcher had not been back for about twenty years because all the original inhabitants of that village, Christians and Muslims were then evacuated and their homes were occupied and then torn apart. In 1994, the situation regained some normalcy.

Since 1994, some of the families have come back and have regained possession of their homes with the help of governmental aid. The researcher since then has reconnected with old acquaintances. She has tried to revisit the village since 1997 when her family regained their home and rebuilt it. In the summer of 2003, two weeks prior to the start of the study, she took trips to the village, walked around and revisited places she had been around during her childhood. As some children were playing around in the streets, the researcher came forward and introduced herself, asking to see the mother(s).

“Joun” is a small village where the social circle is tightly knit and everyone seems to know everyone else. Thus, the contacted parents seemed to know the researcher’s uncle who is an influential figure in the village. Mr. C. has been promoting educational activities and peaceful interactions among the citizens of this village. The researcher’s

late grandfather used to be the village doctor and was known for his good deeds and generous character. The researcher introduced herself and the study to four families in that village and they agreed to participate. Thus, the researcher arranged meeting times with the children and their parents.

“Northern Kentucky”

This city hosts a population of 300,000 inhabitants. There are around 15,000 residents in the chosen neighborhood. Those are middle class citizens holding different types of jobs and sending their children to private Catholic schools. Many of these inhabitants seemed to have grown up in this area and known each other rather well. When the researcher moved to this neighborhood, five years ago, she established a good connection with her neighbors. The researcher’s children as well as the children in this neighborhood went to the same school. For a period of time, the researcher car-pooled with the neighbors taking children to school and back. The researcher and her family always participated in activities within the neighborhood. Thus, contact with families was relatively easy. First with a phone call, the researcher explained the research, and as parents agreed to participate, appointments were made based upon the availability of children. The children were then invited to the researcher’s home along with the parents if parental presence was needed. From this neighborhood, only nine families were recruited. To complete the ten participants from this group, one family was recruited from the Taekwondo training hall where the researcher and her children practiced Martial Arts. This last recruited family also lived in Northern Kentucky and the child participating in the study went to a private school similar to the rest of the participants.

This contact was also familiar to the researcher since both families had been practicing in that location for over a year prior to the beginning of the study. After setting up an appointment, the researcher interviewed the participant in the Master's house, which was annexed to the training hall.

Meeting Sights

School in Lebanon

Groups recruited from Lebanon required the researcher to move around in different parts of the city and its suburbs. With the temperatures soaring to 100 °F and high humidity, being in the open air was a very unpleasant and a physically demanding experience. Children recruited from the summer camp were interviewed at the school. The researcher had to seek those children in different spots in a widely spread out campus. The school covered six buildings scattered along the coast of Beirut. Ten of these children were interviewed in the teachers' lounge. This locality was comfortable with air conditioning and good lighting. There were glass walls all around allowing a visual access to the outside playground. The seating was also comfortable with lounge chairs and tables. Four of the children were interviewed in the shade of a tree, seated at a table outside and close by their activity centers at the school camp.

Homes in Lebanon and the United States

Children who were recruited from the researcher's neighborhoods both in Lebanon and in the United States were invited over to the researcher's home. However,

for those recruited in “Joun”, children were interviewed at their home. For the children recruited by the American consulate, the researcher had to go to their homes as people welcomed the idea of staying in the cool with the children. This was favored over going out during the day in the heat and exposing the children to heat and sunstrokes. The researcher traveled East and North in Lebanon to reach the participants. However, all sessions seemed similar and participants were comfortable in meeting with the researcher. In all settings, the researcher situated the camera so that the children’s verbal and nonverbal moves could be videotaped. The tape recorder was also setup at all sessions. It is also good to know that as a measure of reciprocating hospitality, the researcher brought in sweets, doughnuts and Baklava as a sign of hospitality and gratitude to the participating families.

Tools

Selection of Ten Values

To produce verbal responses, ten values were used in this study. Since the participants included boys and girls, and for the sake of total inclusion and unbiased results, this research included values that were previously identified by Gilligan (1982) as gender related behavioral characteristics. Thus there were values such as **caring, sharing, forgiveness and justice**. There were also values that involved the interaction of the children with their parents and issues that addressed the child’s awareness of the adults in their direct environment: **obedience, honesty, and respect**. Based on Rest’s (1979) Defining Issues Test (DIT) of moral judgment, there were economic values that seemed to be part of the daily lives in the decision making process of societies nowadays.

Those are: **hardwork, economy and planning**. These last values brought awareness of the child to one's own purpose of seeking excellence and living a better life, thus benefiting oneself.

Interviews

All sessions were audiotaped and videotaped. All sessions began with the questions asking children to solve problems using certain moral values. There were six questions in total in the interview (see Appendix 1). The questions except for question 2 were mainly open-ended questions. Once the child provided an answer, then the researcher would ask questions that probed these answers in order to gain an understanding of the moral bases upon which the answer was made. All questions probed into the daily behavior of children based on their moral upbringing. The first question probed into the child's daily chores. These were tasks that parents requested regularly and on a daily basis. With this question, the researcher was aiming at observing children's responses to the concept of "Hardwork". The second question looked into the concept of obedience. First, the researcher asked the close-ended question: "Do you always do what your parents ask of you to do?" In a pilot study conducted by the researcher, she found that children responded almost always affirmatively. However, if the question was immediately followed by the simple question: "All the time?" children seemed to contradict themselves and had more to add. The same technique was thus used in this study. The third question aimed at the concept of obedience. The researcher in this case used a voice to imitate a command accompanied by some nonverbal behavior (e.g. a facial frown). Questions 3, 4, and 5

aimed at the concepts of respect, honesty and forgiveness. The last question was presented in a problem format. This question had five sections. It engaged the participants addressed the values such as sharing, caring, justice, planning, and economy.

The researcher followed the same sequence at all times. The language used however was different depending on the different groups. The researcher also provided the English speakers with the English version and for the Arabic speakers with an Arabic translation. Colloquial Arabic was used to interview the monolingual children, as it is the naturally spoken form of the language in Lebanon. For the bilingual children, five of the children were interviewed in Arabic first and then in English and the other five were interviewed in English and then in Arabic.

Definitions

Once the interview was completed, the researcher asked the children to verbally define the following terms: obedience, hardwork, respect, honesty, forgiveness, sharing, caring, justice, planning and economy. Again, their responses were again audiotaped and videotaped. In the case where a child produced a short utterance or comment, the researcher chose to probe further in the same direction. For example the researcher asked: "What is justice?" The child answered: "Justice is to be just". The researcher would probe further: "Just like...(or) such as?" in order to enhance the child's responses. In the case where the child could not go further, the researcher moved on to the next question. There were two cases where children requested to know the meaning of certain concepts they did not know. Their responses were: "You tell me?" In these

instances, the researcher explained the concepts that children did not understand before preceding on with the task. In all other cases, the sessions were similar.

Surveys

This part of the data was collected in two sets. The first set of surveys was collected from the children. The researcher displayed ten note cards on a table in a random manner. The researcher labeled each note card with one value in large print. She then requested that the children displayed them in a sequential order from the most important to the least important. Only in one instance, a child requested that he displayed them in the opposite order. The child said: “I like to do it that way”, and that too was acceptable.

The second set of surveys was collected from the parents of the children who participated in the study. The surveys were sent home to the parents and parents had to respond in classifying the ten values on a scale from one to ten, using each number once. The surveys were sent in classical Arabic to the monolingual Lebanese and in English to the bilingual Lebanese as well as to the American families living in Lebanon and the families in the United States (See Appendices 2 and 3). Parents were asked to use scores from one to ten only once: i.e. different ratings for different values. This process was used because three parents, at the start of the study, responded using the value 10 for all items, which rendered the scoring meaningless. The researcher provided return envelopes for parents to send their responses back to school. Parents only contributed to the research through these surveys. There were no other communications with the parents.

All sessions were carried out in the same sequence across all groups of children. The researcher first administered the questions concerning morality. She then gave the children the terms to define. Finally the researcher requested that children ranked the ten values.

Data Analysis

All audio and videotaped recordings were transcribed using microethnographic procedures, as recommended by Ochs and Schieffelin (1979). Transcripts were recorded using pseudo-names for all participants. Data were transcribed twice: the first time as the researcher watched for verbal moves and the second, for nonverbal behavior. Verbal and nonverbal segments were all transcribed within context.

For the purpose of understanding the verbal and nonverbal moves, discourse analyses according to Chafe (1977) and Kretschmer (2002) were used in order to find relevant categories in form as well as in the content of the utterances. The focus was on the verbal and nonverbal contributions made by the children. Based on Kretschmer's method, analysis of utterances started at the sentence level, then at the phrase level and finally at the word level. His analysis system focuses first on the content of the sentence and then on the way the content is packaged using syntactic forms. Based on Chafe's (1977) approach, analysis looked at three major components: 1) the way the children organized their speech around the content, 2) the way utterances are packaged, and 3) the choice of syntax. Thus, using these two approaches which attempt to identify patterns of use, analysis for each item will focus on the content produced by the child and the

forms used to package this content into linguistically as well as functionally acceptable sentences.

The monolingual English and the monolingual Arabic groups were analyzed to establish the two end points with regard to form and content. The American Residing in Lebanon group was of interest to determine the effects of culture on performance. Since they were residing in Lebanon, it was of interest to determine whether Arabic values infiltrated their English based responses, either with regard to the forms of English used to encode their sentences or with regard to the content contained within their utterances. The Bilingual Lebanese group is of interest to see the effects of language and culture on performance. The question becomes whether this group's performance in English is similar to or different from the American monolingual group. This group being also fluent in Arabic, simultaneously, it is of interest to determine whether their performance in Arabic, was similar to or different from the Arabic monolingual group.

Qualitative analysis attempted to answer the research questions related to the ten moral values, in order, to determine the effect of culture and/or language if any on the choice of moral linguistic productions of the children across the different groups. Analytical scanning of the linguistic behavior of the children yielded categories related to first syntax and then the semantic composition (content) of the verbal moves made by the children. In some cases, especially with the Arabic speaking children, non-verbal moves became important since they seemed to supplement the verbal productions made by these children. This type of analysis was used for both conversational conditions, the problems involving moral decisions and the definition of moral values.

Quantitative analysis attempted to answer the hypotheses related to culture and language. Children's and parents' rankings were further quantitatively analyzed. Rankings yielded nonparametric testing. The Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric analysis for K independent samples was applied between the four groups of parents and children separately at first. The bilingual Lebanese group responded in Arabic at first and then in English. The American/Lebanese group though comprising of only four participants was also considered because as the sample size was small to begin with, the difference was not large enough to affect the outcome of the analysis. Moreover, the inclusion of this group would only promote knowledge and increase further information about the hypotheses that were quantitatively tested. Further analyses of differences between groups were carried out using the T-testing in order to determine the location of the significant differences among parents, among children and between parents and their children.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of language and culture on the moral responses of four groups of children: a) a monolingual group of Arabic children from Lebanon, b) a bilingual group of Arabic children from Lebanon, c) a group of English-speaking children living in Lebanon, and d) a group of monolingual children from the United States. This chapter will present the results of the study, focusing first on a qualitative analysis of the children's responses to a set of problem solving questions relating to ten values. This will be followed by a discussion of the responses of the children's attempt to define the ten moral values which acted as the focus of this study. This will be followed by a presentation of a comparison of a set of ratings made by the children and their parents using non-parametric statistical procedures.

Qualitative Results

In this section of the results, we will present the data on each problem-solving task. For each task, we will present representative examples of the responses made by the four groups of children. Then, a discussion of two aspects of the data will be presented, namely, the linguistic forms used to encode the information and the actual content of the responses themselves. The first section will deal with the responses in English, while the second deals with the responses in Arabic. This will allow us to look at both form and content and the potential effect each has on the performance of each of

these tasks as well as identify any similarities or differences between their expression in English and Arabic.

Question #1: Hardwork and Obedience

English

Responses to this question yielded information about the participants' understanding of responsibility for and chores requested by their parents. The question posed was: What do Mummy and Daddy ask of you to do? On a daily basis?

Representative samples of responses are presented below:

Group 1

The American Group

1. “ **They ask me to clean up my room and** brush my teeth without being asked and stuff like that...**and** keep my stuff cleaned up throughout the whole house **and** not letting all my toys and stuff lying around the house and stuff. Be nice to the people I **guess I mean like**....just be. (Hands under the table and head straight looking at researcher)
2. “**Do my chores and** treat everyone the way they wanna be treated...”
3. “Chores. **We will also have to make our beds and** wash dishes **and** every now and then we have to clean the house and stuff”.
4. To like ...**not a lot of things**...remove trash in my room.
5. **Clean my room ...uhm**...feed the dog...(arms crossed in front of her)...**They’ll let me go out and** play sometimes when there is nothing else to do...sometimes help clean the basement with my mother and my sister... and at school they ask me to do my work.

Group 2

The American Residing in Lebanon Group

1. **Mommy asks me how is school and** I would say fine and my dad asks me to do my homework... To read Arabic and English... They tell me to do things sometimes. They say: don’t get into fights **with anybody**.... behave...stuff like that.... (Hands under the table and sitting back straight, looking directly at the researcher)
2. If I make a mess in my room, I clean it up...I can’t eat eggs everyday. **You have to behave and then at 5:30** you can go to Megan’s (a friend) house.
3. Behave, talk nicely...not to annoy them ...not to get on their nerves.
4. **Sometimes they ask me to go do my homework**...**sometimes** when they ask me to help if the water is not filled, they ask me to go and fill the water and put the caps on all the bottles.

*Group 3**The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in English)*

1. **Mostly they ask me to study**.... Play with my baby brother... To not hit my baby brother... Ya... clean my room.
2. To be real good at school to not go with someone I don't know...to clean my room or to be nice to my sisters and brothers.
3. **They ask me not to fight with my brother and sister and** take care of them.
4. When I go to home, then my mom said that: go and wear your pajamas...wash your hands and **make your homework**.
5. **Read some stories** ...review something... what I studied in school...I am not supposed to hit my brother because I am not supposed to and respect him. That's all.
6. Do my homework after school and clean my room.

Children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. The different cultural groups including the Bilingual Lebanese children, were quite comfortable in their use of English. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of English in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either by words such as **mostly** or by the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Children seemed to listen carefully and answered relevantly within the context. The nonverbal behavior of children in this group included maintaining appropriate eye gaze with the researcher, hands folded or tucked under the table, and a seated in an upright posture.

All responses matched the question presented. The most prevalent form used by the children was the use of compound utterances, where **and**, **and then**, or an implied **and** were used. Examples are: group 1, #2 “do my chores and ...”, “and clean the house

and stuff”, group 2, #4, “ Sometimes they ask me to go do my homework” (the and is implied), and group 3 # 1, “Mostly they ask me to study ” (the and is implied). In all cases, this form was used to allow the child to extend his or her thoughts either to clarify or elaborate on the first statement made or to extend his thoughts to include other responsibilities or chores. This use of **and** and **and then** has been identified by Bloom, Hood, and Lightbown (1975) and deVilliers and deVilliers (1985) in the language of young English-speaking children.

In addition to the use of the conjunction **and** and **and then**, the children also listed their responsibilities or chores as a series of imperatives, or they presented short narratives where the responsibilities or chores were presented in a quasi-story-format. In the latter case, utterances detailing responsibilities or chores were formatted in either direct or indirect speech, usually quoting some adult figure.

In certain instances, the linguistic behavior of the American children and the American children residing in Lebanon showed more commonalities with one another than with the linguistic behavior of the Bilingual Lebanese children. While explaining chores and daily tasks, the American and the American residing in Lebanon children’s utterances seemed more complex than the more direct statements of the Bilingual Lebanese children. In order to amplify the meaning of their productions, the English-speaking children’s utterances often included prepositional phrases and relative clauses used to describe and/or clarify the conditions under which some actions were to occur. In utterance 1, in group 1, this child used the prepositional phrases “without being asked” and “throughout the house”. In utterance 3, in group 1, the prepositional phrase “every now and then” is used, while in utterance 5, group 1, the prepositional phrase “with my

mother and sister” is used. In utterance 2, group 2, the child uses the prepositional phrase “at 5:30”, and in utterance 4, group 2, the child uses the prepositional phrase “on all the bottles”. Such use of prepositional phrases by the Bilingual Lebanese children was rare if not non-existent. Clearly, the English-speaking children seemed adept at using prepositional phrases as a way of adding new information to the sentence or clarifying information already presented.

In addition to using prepositional phrases, the English speaking children also used relative clauses again as a way to clarify information provided in the sentence. For instance, in utterance 2 group 1, the child generated the following sentence: “... treat everyone the way they wanna be treated”. The use of the relative clause “... they wanna be treated” clarified the notion of “way”. This type of construction appeared with a high degree of frequency with the English-speaking children, but with much less frequency with the Bilingual Lebanese children. Again, these groups of children added syntactic complexity to their utterances, a factor that was absent in the Bilingual Lebanese children’s efforts.

All three groups of children used the present tense in the verbs indicating a factual timeless habitual action that could have occurred in the past, is occurring now, and will occur in the future. Use of this form signals the strength of the statement. (Kretschmer, 2003). The use of the present tense would also predict that the children would act in a similar fashion in future situations when exposed to similar conditions.

Content

Children recounted events of their lives in a seemingly logical and timely sequence. These events were based on the children's previous, but recent ongoing experiences. A review of the productions of all three groups of children seemed to demonstrate an awareness of parental input. Some children listed responsibilities and chores as a set of imperatives, almost as if they were productions made by another individual, probably an adult figure. In addition, many children in all three groups incorporated parental voices through the use of direct or indirect quotes. For instance, in utterance 1, group 1, the child generated "They ask me to clean up my room....". In utterance 4, group 2, the child states "Sometimes they ask me to go do my homework..." and in utterance 1, group 3, the child states "Mostly they ask me to study....". Direct and indirect speech use in efforts seem to signify that children had a strong understanding of verbal input and productions heard from the parents or other adults that have now become incorporated in their own moral voice.

As previously stated, children organized their discourse based on previous experiences in similar situations. Participants referred to duties at home and duties in school. Children used the first person as well as the second person. These verbal responses portrayed both the children's voices as well as the parents' voices. In examining the children's responses, two general categories of chores and responsibilities were identified: responsibilities at home versus school and appropriate social behaviors.

Responsibilities: home versus school duties

More similarities were observed in the American as well as the American residing in Lebanon participants than with the Bilingual Lebanese groups. The English-speaking children almost unanimously indicated chores at home. For instance, in utterance 1, group 1 and in utterance 2, group 2, each child emphasized cleaning up his or her room. While the English-speaking children emphasized duties at home and chores, the Bilingual Lebanese group emphasized responsibilities related to educational concerns. For instance, in utterance 1 and 4 in group 3, both of these children emphasized the importance of doing well in school and completing their homework. It should be noted, however, that these interviews completed with the Bilingual Lebanese children tended to be completed on the school grounds, while the interviews with the two English-speaking children tended to be done in the home. The presence of the place of the interview could have differentially affected the content of their responses.

Social behavior

Emphasis on social behavior was verbally expressed in all the groups; however, such emphasis tended to be more detailed in the Bilingual Lebanese children, than in the two English-speaking groups. Contrast utterance 3, group 2 with utterance 5, group 3. In the first utterance, this English speaking child merely states the behaviors which are to be followed, while in the second utterance, this Bilingual, Lebanese child indicated what he was supposed to do (I am not supposed to hit my brother) and provided an elaboration on this with the reason for this behavior (I am not supposed to and respect him.). It is obvious that the behaviors quoted seem to parallel adult comments made to the child.

Echoes of “the golden rule” were obvious such as in group 1, utterance 2, “Treat others like they want to be treated”. In this utterance we can suppose that this child must have probably heard this sentence at home or at school, which led him to reproduce such an utterance. In addition, some children expressed parental exigency for socially acceptable behavior such as in utterance 3, group 5 “to behave”, and “with people to be...” encouraging similar types of social behavior. These parental exigencies are probably related to comments made by the parents (adults) to the children, which were then internalized by them as a code of morality that guided their behaviors with others.

Arabic

Representative samples of responses to this question in Arabic now follow. For each group, the Arabic equivalent is presented at the bottom of each entry. It is preceded by an English equivalent to this Arabic production.

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in Arabic translated to English)

1. **To clean my room...study...** Do not play too much play station...
ان نطف اوضتي ادرس ما لعب كتير بلاي ستاشين .playstation
2. **They ask me to clean my room and do this and that...like this...and we should not speak neither to strangers nor to someone we do not know and such and stay with those we know.**
بيطلبوني انو صب اضتي واعمل هيك او ما اعمل هيك...وهيك...انو ما نحكي غريب مع حدا او حدا ما منعرفه...وهيك ونضلنا مع اللي نعرفهم...
3. **Wash my hands. I do not have any work at home**
غسل ايدي و انا ما عندي فرض بعد للبيت .
4. **Play a bit, have dinner and watch TV.**
اي وش بعل يوش يش عتاب احضرت.ف T.V .
5. **Sleep early and do my homework...play with my brother...Shower...Do my homework at the right time ...for example be good and not bother people**
نام بكير واعمل درسي اللعب مع خي اتحمم اعمل درسي بالوقت اللازم ومتلا كون منيحة وما ضايق غيري

6. Study and clean my room.

ادرس ونظف اوضتي.

Group 5

The Lebanese Monolingual Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. **That I have my lunch then I go down and do my homework and then** I can play the **computer**. I don't help at home

انو اكل وبعدان بنزل بدرس وبعمل فرضي وبعدين بلعب computer كمبيوتر. انا ما بشتغل بالبيت.

2. To study only.

انو ادرس بس

3. **Arrange my stuff and** always have my room organized...and with people **for us to be good** and to receive them in a good way... At school, that I should stay always attentive to what the teacher is saying and that the things that I do not understand, I ask the teacher. Most importantly that I pay attention in class.

رتب اغراضي واوضتي دايم مرتبة...ومع الناس انو نكون مناح ونستقبلهم بطريقة منيحة... بالمدرسة انو دايم كون نتبهة للي بتقوله المعلمة . اذا في شي ما بفهمه انه اسال المعلمة . اهم شي انه انتبه في الصف.

4. To study first thing after I had had lunch and **very very well** so I can pass my tests and they leave me for three or four hours continuously. When I finish all, I recite my lessons to them and then when I go to school I do well in my exams.

ادرس اول شي من بعد ما اتغذى وكثير كثير منيح حتى انجح بامتحاناتي وبخلوني شي ثلاث او اربع ساعات ورا بعض. وبس خلص كل شي ببسمعولي دروسي وبعدان بروح على المدرسة وبعمل كثير منيح بفحوصاتي.

5. **Every day they ask me that to eat and** finish my homework. I do not have to do anything but sometimes Mom needs someone to help her and I help her.

كل يوم بيطلبو مني انه اكل وخلص درسي . ما علي انه اعمل شي بس امرار الاما بدها حدا يساعدها وانا يساعدها .

6. **I wash my hands and** change my clothes and study.

بغسل ايدي وبغير تيابي وبدرس .

Children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency.

Not surprisingly, both groups of Arabic speaking children were quite comfortable in their use of Arabic. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of Arabic in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either utterances such as “they ask of me”, “that”, or just an action verb indicating the start of a verbal sentence in Arabic. In Arabic there are two forms of sentences: verbal starting with a verb, and nominal where a

noun and its modifier (possibly a prepositional phrase or an adjective) stand for a full sentence. Another indicator of conversational use of Arabic was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Utterances in Arabic were similar in both groups. Like the efforts generated by the English-speaking children, sentences produced by the Arabic speakers consisted mostly of compound sentences. This form allowed the child to extend his or her thoughts either to clarify or elaborate on the first statement made or to extend his thoughts to include other responsibilities or chores. This was very similar to the use of English by the English-speaking children. In addition to the use of the conjunction “and”, and “and then”, the children also listed their responsibilities or chores as a series of action verbs stated in an indirect way: “that I eat, and I do my home work”, “that I wash my hands and that I study”; or they presented short narratives where the responsibilities or chores were presented in a quasi-story-format. In the latter case, utterances listed a series of activities that needed to be completed (see utterance 3, group 5; utterance 4, group 5). This type of production was more common among the monolingual Arabic children than the Bilingual Lebanese children speaking in English. This may be a function of their background, with the monolingual Arabic children coming from more traditional, rural settings, and the Bilingual Lebanese-English coming from more Westernized, urban settings. When utterances were presented in a quasi-story-format, statements made by adults were presented, formatted in indirect speech (see

utterance 2, group 4). In some cases, the advice from adults is stated but not attributed to an adult figure, yet the utterances clearly show influences from previous statements made by adults in their environment. A prime example of this is utterance 3, group 5. Even though the productions by this child do not involve direct or indirect speech acts, the statements made are clearly reflective of statements previously heard by the child. For instance, a statement like: “At school, I should stay always attentive to what the teacher is saying ...” clearly seems reflective of previous statements made by the parent or teacher, such as “Pay attention to what the teacher says”. As in English, these utterances clearly show how these children have internalized external models of morality as guides to their own behavior.

The discourse rules of colloquial Arabic demand that the indirect speech (in the form of statements) be used rather than the direct speech (in the form of imperatives), which is a significant difference with English where speakers can direct listeners attention by making direct demands on them. Arabic speakers seem to influence their listeners by making statements that need to be followed rather than providing direct commands to their listeners. In addition, however, an interesting difference between Arabic and English was the overuse of the present tense by the Arabic speakers especially when listing a series of actions verbs. Although the English speaking children used imperative forms, the Arabic speakers seem to achieve the same effect by using present tense as part of their indirect speech efforts. Sometimes children referred to themselves in the first person singular, and other times in the plural. The subject was mentioned alternating between the “I” and the “we/us” as in utterance 2, group 4 and in utterance 3, group 5. This is direct contrast to the English-speaking children, who consistently

used the “I” form. When using the “I” form, the children always narrated some daily situations that they had personally encountered. When using the “we” form, there were echoes of “preaching” in that these utterances appeared to be addressed to an audience rather than statements made about their own behavior. For instance utterance 2, group 4, the statement “... we should not speak neither to strangers nor to someone we do not know ...” has the feeling that it is a statement that is for public rather than private consumption. In utterance 3, group 5, the same holds true for the statement “... and with people for us to be good and to receive them in a good way ...”. In this case, the audience was the researcher herself or perhaps an unknown other.

When comparing the productions of the Bilingual Lebanese children both in English and in Arabic, it appears that their productions in Arabic were more complete and detailed than their productions in English. Their Arabic productions were quite similar to those of the monolingual Arabic children, whereas their English productions tended to be less elaborated with a general absence of prepositional phrases and relative clauses. Like the monolingual Arabic children, there was a general use of indirect efforts by using statements rather than imperatives and the use of the present tense within these indirect efforts.

Hand gestures as well as head and facial grimaces were part of the nonverbal component of some of these children’s utterances. In utterance 2, group 4, the child used distinctive hand movements when demonstrating “this” and “that”; this child used the left hand to mark “this” and the right hand to mark “that”, as if to show a difference between these two concepts. In this instance, the gestures were half circular hand movements indicating a shift in the decision. In utterance 3 group 5, the participant gazed at the

researcher and outside the window displaying a pensive and stern mood. In addition, negative statements were accompanied by a horizontal headshake and sometimes by frowns. This is in contrast with the English-speaking children where the verbal component itself carried the content of the message. For instance, in utterance 1, group 1, this English-speaking child had his hands under the table and looked directly at the examiner when generating his effort. Interestingly, the Bilingual Lebanese children tended to use gestures both hand and facial more when generating Arabic rather than English productions

Content

Like the English productions, the content of the Arabic productions focused on both responsibilities both within the home and in the school and appropriate social behaviors. For instance, in utterance 1, group 4, the child lists his responsibilities at home, while in utterance 3, group 3, the child indicates his behaviors in school. Scattered throughout the productions of the Arabic children, were statements about codes of social behavior, such as “... we should not speak neither to strangers nor to someone we do not know ...” (see utterance 2, group 4), “... for example, be good and not bother people.” (see utterance 5, group 4), and “... and with people for us to be good and to receive them in a good way ...” (see utterance 3, group 5). However, the strongest message sent was a focus on the academic performance and the behavior of children in school. As the representative samples presented in groups 4 and 5 demonstrate, almost every utterance focused on the school and homework that parents demanded of their children. Interestingly, this again was very similar to the verbal responses of the

Bilingual Lebanese children in their English productions. Given the similarity of responses in English and in Arabic, it could be argued that it was not the setting of the interviews (as we argued previously), but the importance of school-related behavior in Arabic culture that influenced the content of these utterances.

Verbal responses of children included indirect quotations and/or requests from parents about daily chores. There were no direct quotations and direct speech was nonexistent. According to Kretschmer (2002), in English, direct speech is used to convey that the words being produced are not his/hers but are attributable to a third person (p.126-127). This is not the case in Arabic. Quoting parental request directly was not apparent in any production by an Arabic speaker. Instead, the children used indirect speech acts like “They ask me that ...” or by statements that sounded like rules internalized by child like “... with people for us that we are good and that to receive them in a good way”. No matter the form used, the messages conveyed by these children seemed to reveal that these children have internalized their parents’ values have actually become into their own mental mapping.

In utterance 3, group 5, the double use of one word “very very good” is an interesting behavior. Its use seemed to indicate a need to reinforce the strength of the message being communicated by the child. In fact, this utterance seemed to relate to the verbal unit preceding it, that is, “to study”. A circular head motion and wide-open eyes with raised eyebrows, accompanied the use of the double of very.

Although the verbal behavior in Arabic was similar between the two groups, both groups of children, especially the Bilingual group, at times resorted to expressions in English in order to further their expressions in Arabic. In utterances 1 and 4, group 3,

the words **play station** and **TV** were uttered in English. In utterance 1, group 5, the word **computer** was uttered in English too. The use of English was required as there were no Arabic equivalent for these English-based words. It is also important to note that colloquial Arabic/Lebanese has adopted foreign words throughout the last century.

Question #2: Obedience and Respect

English

Responses to this question yielded information about the participants' understanding of obedience, or the ability to follow parental orders and/or requests. The question posed was: Do you do what they ask of you? All the time?

Representative samples of responses are presented below:

Group 1

The American Group

1. Not always... sometimes **when** I think that something they are asking me is not good I won't do it but if also it is something I really don't want to do it then I won't do it...but if is something good then Ya I will do it...
2. **Unless it is** something very very hard (laugh) Then... I tell them I don't know how to do it but I'll try...
3. I don't want to ...but I do...
4. **Sometimes. When it's important** and I know it's important, I'll follow the rules but **sometimes when it is kind of OK** and you don't have to, that then I don't do it.
5. Not really...maybe **when it is** something like I don't know...

Group 2

The American Residing in Lebanon Group

1. Yes...well not always...**sometimes...sometimes when** I am mad I don't do it...**sometimes when** I'm sad, I don't do it. **Sometimes when** I just don't want to, I don't do it.
2. **Sometimes I don't** ...I go watch a little TV ...when my mom is in the shower and then when she goes I sneak into the living room and go watch TV. I watch a little TV on cartoon network like one show and then ...then I go to clean my room up and then I go back and watch TV again.
3. **Sometimes...**
4. **Sometimes...when I'm lazy or angry** and don't feel like it...
5. **Sometimes...sometimes when I don't**, I tell my sister to go and do it ..

*Group 3**The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in English)*

1. Yes. **always**...only **sometimes I forget** things.
2. Sometimes **when I'm tired** she tells me: OK I don't need your help because the one who's working at my house can help her right now
3. **When I'm really mad** of someone and I don't want to do what he or she asks of me to do.
4. Ja...**No just once I didn't**...It's usually on Saturday and Sunday cause these are my free days **and I don't like to do anything**...just do what I want to do.
5. **Sometimes** I say no ...like I have a doll and I like it so much and my Mom wants to throw it and I say no.

As was true with the previous question, these children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. The different cultural groups including the Bilingual Lebanese children were quite comfortable in their use of English. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of English in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either words such as **mostly** or by the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of a utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Close examination of the utterances revealed similarities in form across the three groups of children. Children seemed to listen carefully and answered relevantly within the context. The nonverbal behavior of children in this group included maintaining appropriate eye gaze with the researcher, hands folded or tucked under the table, and a seated in an upright posture.

Children revealed responses using the adverbs (sometimes) or subordinate clauses (when) of time to detail the conditions under which they were obedient. When

subordinate clauses of time were used, the children opted for deletion of old information for the production of only new information. For instance, in utterance 3, group 3, the child states the new information “when I’m really mad ...”, omitting the old information “I am disobedient ...”. This type of utterance has been identified as an appropriate form in English, in both the conversations of English-speaking adults (Tannen, 1989) and in English-speaking children (McTear & Conti-Ramsden, 1992). Because the subordinate conjunction “when” marked the condition under which a behavior occurred, it was used interchangeably with “if” and “unless”, subordinate conjunctions of condition (see utterance 1, group 1 and utterance 2, group 1). This occurred most frequently among the American group than with the other two groups who preferred to use when or the adverb sometimes.

One very interesting utterance was the double use of the same word by participant 2, in the American group. Such a verbal behavior seems to emphasize the utterance and in this particular utterance “very very” modifies “it” being the parents’ request of the child to perform a chore or a duty. As with the previous question, all three groups of children used the present tense in the verbs indicating a factual timeless habitual action that could have occurred in the past, is occurring now, and will occur in the future. The use of the present tense would predict that the children would act in a similar fashion in future situations when exposed to similar conditions.

Content

A review of the content of the responses generated by these three groups of children seemed to imply an understanding of parental demands. Their responses clearly

showed that they understood what parents demanded and what it meant to be disobedient. However, in the utterances of the American group, children seemed to contest parental expectations in that they debated importance or reasonableness of those requests. For instance, in utterances 2 and 4, group 1, children were trying to reason through and even analyze their parents' requests. In utterance 2, the child seemed to find some of the requests hard to follow, while simultaneously acknowledging the importance to follow these requests. In utterance 4 Group 1, the child recognizes the importance of following rules, but provides a proviso that sometimes you don't have to follow the rules when it is "kind of okay".

On the other hand, both the Bilingual Lebanese and American residing in Lebanon children seemed to blame themselves for their behavior. This self-blaming behavior clearly shows that they have accepted parental standards and do not question them as some of the American children do. Examples of this self-blaming behavior are found in utterance 4, group 2, (when I'm lazy or angry) and utterance 3, group 3 (when I'm really mad of someone...). In these cases, the children showed guilt by pointing at themselves for not being able to carry out their parental demand.

Arabic

Representative samples of responses to this question in Arabic now follow. For each group, the Arabic equivalent is presented at the bottom of each entry. It is preceded by an English equivalent to this Arabic production:

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. **Only when** they want me to go to bed and I want to stay up too much. Or they tell me that I go and that I have a shower and I don't feel like it.

بس لمل بدن اياتي روح عالفرشة وانا بدني اسهر كثير . اوبيقولولي اه روح اخذ شاور وانا ما الي خلق.

2. All the time

كل الوقت .

3. Always... but few times No...But **mostly** I say Yes.

دايما ... الاوقات لا ...بس اكثر شي بقول اي .

4. No...because I do not like the thing that they are telling me...what? I have to keep putting stuff away and not play ...*That is not fair* (was actually said in English).

لا , لانه ما بحب هالشي اللي بيولولي اياه ...شو نه بدني ضلني عم صب وما لعب كل يوم *That is not fair*...

5. Yes, **but sometimes** I do not like that they tell me to throw something away and I don't want to because I want that thing.

اي اوقات ما بيعجني اللي بيقولولي اياه وشي انو بدني ايه وبيقولولي انه كبه وانا ما بدني .

Group 5

The Lebanese Monolingual Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. Ja...all the time...because **they are** my parents and I want to listen to them.

اي...دايما لانو هني اهلي وانا بدني اسمع كلمتهن...

2. Depends. If they ask me something I can do then I do it. If not then I don't.

حسب .ذا بيطلبو مني شي بقدر اعملو بعملو .واذا لا , ما بعملو .

3. It depends...if they ask of me to go to the store and get something and I don't feel like **it, I won't.**

حسب اذا طلبو مني انو انزل عل المحل وما الي خلق ما بنزل

4. I always do.

دايما بعمله .

5. Sometimes, I **don't feel like doing it**, but still I can't but do it. Because I don't know, I feel like I did something wrong. I feel bad. That first, these are your parents, and it is a shame that to say "yalla" that I don't feel like doing it...after all that your parents have done for you, you say finally... like that...It is not nice!!!

اي .امرار ما يكون عندي اخلاق اعملها بس ما بقدر الا ما اعملها . انو ما بعرف بحس كاتي عملت شي غلط . ما بحب ابدًا بتضايق . انو اول شي اهلو وعيب انو هيدا يعمل الواحد يلا انو ما الي خلق وبعدين انو كل شي بيعملو له اهله الواحد بالآخر بقلهم هيك . ما حلو .

Children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency.

In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of Arabic in a conversational

setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or

utterances. Those indicators included either utterances such as "sometimes", "No" or

just an action verb indicating the start of a verbal sentence in Arabic. Another indicator

was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Similarities prevailed in the children's responses in both groups. Unlike the English speakers, these Arabic speakers usually did not use temporal adverbs or subordinate conjunctions of time as a way of expanding on their efforts. Instead, the Arabic speakers would make a single statement such as "all the time" (utterance 1, group 5), "no" (utterance 4, group 4), and "sometimes" (utterance 5, group 5) as to whether they were obedient or not, and then provide some justification for their answer. In English, the child merely stated the justification by marking it with the temporal adverb or the subordinate conjunction. The only children who tended to follow this format were some Bilingual Lebanese children (see utterance 1, group 4).

In both sets of Arabic speakers' productions, there are the bold face utterances which are elongated syllables. These seemed to emphasize the importance of the concept being presented. For instance, in utterance 1, group 4, the syllables "only when" were stretched out by the speaker, while in utterance 3, group 5, the syllables "like it, I won't" was stretched out. Such elongated syllables did not appear with any frequency in the English productions, even with the Bilingual Lebanese children. With stressed syllables, some children used nonverbal gestures, stretching their necks forward and raising their eyebrows. For instance, in utterance 4, group 4, the child actually moved his head from side to side and waved his arms in a question mark fashion with an outward circular motion. As was true with previous efforts, an interesting difference

between Arabic and English was the overuse of the present tense with a series of action verbs possibly to make up for lack of imperative use common in English.

Content

Like the American children, children in both groups, but particularly with the Arabic monolingual speaking children, seemed to build up stories to either support or refute a certain moral concept. In some instances, children answered only affirmatively indicating their wish to obey their parents at all times. There were more honest emotions and feelings expressing desires and wishes. Obedience seemed to be an unquestionable must. This is clearly spelled out by utterance 4, group 5, where the child says "... these are your parents and it is shame that to say "yalla" ... "after all that your parents have done for you ..." and by utterance 1, group 1, where the child says: "... because they are my parents and I want to listen to them". However, there were instances where the child disputed or debated the legitimacy of the rule. In utterance 1, group 4, the child says "... or they tell me to go and have a shower and I don't feel like it"; in utterance 2, group 5, the child says "if they ask me something that I can do then I do it. If not then I don't"; in utterance 3, the child says "... if they ask of me to go to the store and get something and I don't feel like it, I won't." In all of these cases, clearly the children are putting conditions, or debating the reasonableness of the requests made by the parent.

Utterance 4, group 4 is interesting because this Bilingual Lebanese child states his exception to the rule, not in Arabic, but in English with "That is not fair". This child seemed quite upset about the "unfairness" of parental judgment standards. His narrative was uttered as if he were addressing himself rather than talking directly to the researcher.

It is also important to understand that the child did not expect any answers, but seemed to think out loud and monologue verbally. Echoes of justice and fairness as well as freedom to think seem to be issues in these self-explorations.

In some cases, children exhibited the self-blaming behavior demonstrated by the English productions of the American children residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese children as in utterance 5, group 5 (... I feel like I did something wrong, I feel bad). However, this self-blaming behavior was less apparent than in the two English-speaking samples described above. The child uttering the above statement of blame became more and more emotional as she continued with her answer. She actually showed some anger as she contemplated disobedience as well as not listening to the adults' advice. The last part of the first sentence, "still I can't but do it", sounded very powerful as the little girl emphasized her words in Arabic, especially the utterance "but". Her eyebrows moved up and down and then shook her head as if in dismay. While continuing with the narrative, she described the need of having to abide by her parents' commands. While relating this, she exhibited nonverbal signs of anger with a frown on her forehead and her lips in a pouting position to convey her disagreement even contemplating such a thought. Nonverbal gestures were also very dominant among the Arabic participants as they seemed to accompany the meaning and enhance the effect that the words had on the children themselves.

*Question #3: Respect**English*

Responses to this question yielded information about the participants' understanding of the emotional responses of parents toward their child's behavior, especially when the parents exhibited anger toward the child's behavior. This relates to the notion of respect in that how should the child react to parental emotions, that is, how respectful should they be. The question posed was: "When they say: Do that and do it now! why is that?" It should be noted that the children responded differently, with some taking it rather seriously and others with a smile and denying that their parents really ever got angry with them. Representative samples of responses are presented below:

*Group 1**The American Group*

1. Uh... **When... When** I'm mean to my sister andAt School ? Yeah , when I'm doing something they don't want me to do, or I don't listen to them.
2. **When** they ask of me over and over again to do something and I don't do it.
3. I guess **when** I argue about it...and I don't want to do it or something...because ...I don't know
4. 'cause like you might say: oh I don't want to do that or something...
5. You're pretty mad at me for doing something I did not do it right....Not following directions the first time they were given...not following them...Then they'lluhm....send me to my room, say I am grounded if it is really bad and sometimes they will correct me and tell me what I did wrong.

*Group 2**The American Residing in Lebanon Group*

1. Because ..uhm.... **Sometimes if they lost something or something broke and or somebody wrote on the wall...**
2. **Sometimes when** I say no.... they force me to do it but (innu) without hitting...but not in a bad way...maybe they yell...but not in a bad way.
3. **If** I don't do it **then** they yell and if I do it then they say thank you.
4. I cry.... Then I stop and clean up the room and go tell my mom can I come out of my room and she says go back and the second time, I ask her can I get out but then my mom says No ! I need you to think about it ...go back".

5. They are getting angry **because** they want you to do something and you're going to be lazy and not doing it...

Group 3

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in English)

1. Not about me...about my brother...and sometimes she's angry about me **because** she thinks I'm hitting my brother. She thinks... but she doesn't say anything.
2. **Because** that's when I don't do what they ask of me and I do something real wrong.
3. They are mad of me...**because** they are ...because we did something wrong and they are really mad about this and they are ...fight.
4. Like normal, like parents get angry...like they tell me make my homework early like six or seven o'clock at night and not later.
5. Maybe they are starting to get angry **when** they ask me to do something the first time and I don't do it **then** they ask me again.

Children once more seemed to abide by the conventions of the spoken English. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either utterances providing new information such as “maybe”, “because” or just a subject-verb utterance introducing a new argument. Another indicator was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Children seemed to listen carefully and answered relevantly within the context. The nonverbal behavior of children in this group included maintaining appropriate eye gaze with the researcher, hands folded or tucked under the table, and a seated in an upright posture.

There was a frequent use of the adverb “when”. This utterance seemed to be favored by the American group. In turn, the Bilingual Lebanese favored the utterance “because” as a subordinating conjunction. The choice of conjunctions seemed to differentiate one

genre from the other. The American group residing in Lebanon tended to vacillate between these two forms. “When” seemed to indicate temporal conditions, that is, when they are disciplined, while “because” seemed to emphasize cause-and-effect conditions, that is, why the parent disciplines them.

In all three groups, some of the children provided short narratives that answered the question. For instance in utterance 5, group 1 (from the American group), the child provided a narrative about when he was disobedient and the parent became angry, and the outcome of this event. Similar narratives were generated in utterance 4, group 2 (from the Americans Residing in Lebanon group) and utterance 4, group 3 (from the Bilingual Lebanese group). In group 2, utterance 4 (from the American residing in Lebanon group), there were nonverbal moves such as the increase in the tone of voice indicating dissent or disagreement and frowns accompanied the statement when imitating the parent’s command, used to emphasize the point of the narrative. This is of significance given the usual lack of nonverbal moves when the children were generating English. Such nonverbal moves were more common with Arabic productions rather than with English productions.

The Bilingual Lebanese and the American Residing in Lebanon had the tendency to repeat the main clause while the American group seemed to delete the old information beginning with the subordinate clause in a manner similar to that found under the section entitled Obedience. As was previously stated, the omission of old information when generating “when” clauses is a common practice with English adult and child speakers (McTear & Conti-Ramsden, 1992; Tannen, 1989).

Even though children are narrating events which would have belonged to the past, they still used the present tense with considerable frequency and high intensity which again emphasize that, in these children's thinking, the past, present and future seem to converge together in their use of the present tense.

Content

Common categories were observed among the three groups. First, almost all of the children interpreted this question not how they should react when the parents become angry, but rather how the parents reacted to them when they became angry or disobeyed them. In every instance, they talk about how parents discipline them. First, the reasons for disciplining often involved issues around sibling rivalry that seemed to aggravate parents and cause punishment. Examples of this appear in utterance 1, group 1, utterance 1, group 3, and utterance 3, group 3. A second reason for disciplining is not respecting the belongings of others, either by breaking something or stealing something. An example of this appears in utterance 1, group 2. A third reason for disciplining is not doing homework or chores at home. Examples of this appeared in utterance 5, group 2 and utterance 4, group 3. A last category for disciplining was because the parents needed to repeat their demands several times. Examples of this occurred in utterance 1, group 1, utterance 2, group 1, and utterance 5, group 3. In all cases children seemed to understand the cause and effect relationship that existed between their parent's reactions to their disobedience. Not once did there appear to be any questioning of the parents' right to discipline the child and that the parents' reaction was unreasonable. This was even

true when the child indicated that he was being disciplined because “they did not want me to do that or something”.

Arabic

Representative samples of responses to this question in Arabic now follow. For each group, the Arabic equivalent is presented at the bottom of each entry. It is proceeded by an English equivalent to this Arabic production:

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese Group in Arabic translated into English)

1. They get upset with my brother and my sister **because** they keep saying this is for me and she says this is for me.

لا يبزعلو من خي واختي لانو بيضلوا يقولو هيدا الي هيدا الي وهي بتقل هيدا لالي

2. When they say (please) do this and I don't do it and they come and say: well, we are saying please and you are not listening to us (the utterance please is said in English)

وقت اللي بيقولولي بليز اعمل هالشغلة انا مش عم بعملها وييجو يقولو لي ولو نحن عم نقول بليز ونت مش عم تسمع

3. It would be that they want me to do something I need to do and I am not doing it and it is necessary that I do it.

بكيون بدهم اياتي اعمل شي لازم اعمله وما عم بعمله وضروري اعمله.

4. As usual, they get upset when I and my brother fight and I do not sleep early.

مثل العادي يبزعلو لما كون عم بتخانق انا وخي ومش عم نم بكير

5. They yell but not much if they want me to do something and I say later and then I run do it immediately.

بيعطو بس مش كثير اذا بدهم اياتي اعمل شي وبقلهم بعدين ودغري بروح بعملها

Group 5

The Lebanese Monolingual Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. Not from me ...they are usually upset and tired of all day working and business. But I usually do what they ask of me.

مش مني...مش ضروري بكونو هني منرفزين من شغلهم كل النهار وتعبانين

2. Never, she does not get angry with me and I don't like to upset her.

ابد ما بتزعل مني وما بحب زعلها

3. When my Mom gets upset with me, I kiss her on her cheek and she forgives me.

وقت اما بتزعل مني بوسها على خدها وهي بتسامحني

4. They get upset with me when I am not well behaved and I don't respect them.

يبزعلو مني لما ما بكون مهذبة وما عم احترمهم

5. It could be because I gave them a hard time in my studies, or I broke something, and when that happens, I hate it and I don't like it at all and I get upset myself. Then they tell me to stay in my room and they don't yell nor do they hit me and after fifteen minutes they tell me to go out of my room.

بكون عملت شي غلط متلا كسرت شي او بالدرس عذبت شوي الماما بتزعل لانو بدھا اياتي كون شاطرة وادرس منيح بالمدرسةولما بتزعل ماما وبتعصب انا ما بحب بزعل كثير... انا كثير بزعل ...

As was true of previous questions, children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of Arabic in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either utterances including an action verb indicating the start of a verbal sentence in Arabic, or a noun and a prepositional phrase indicating a nominal sentence. Another indicator was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

These children's utterances were complex as well as syntactically similar across the Arabic-speaking groups. Unlike the English utterances, these utterances were always complete sentences. In these sentences they tended to vacillate between using "when" as a temporal marker (see utterance 2, group 4; utterance 4, group 4; utterance 3, group 5; utterance 3, group 5) and "because", "if", or "as usual" as cause-and-effect markers (see utterance 1, group 4; utterance 4, group 4, utterance 5, group 4). As was true of the English-speaking children, some of these children presented short narratives (see utterance 4, group 5). In this utterance, the child provided a scenario in which he provides the reason he was disobedient, what happened, and how it was resolved. This

narrative was quite similar in tone and construction as those produced in English with the intense use of the present tense.

Content

One of the most striking points about the productions by the Lebanese monolingual children is the fact that four of the ten children indicated that the parents did not become angry with them. This was usually because they recognized the need to be solicitous of them because of their respect for their parents and see no need to cause them “trouble”. This is in sharp contrast to the other groups, including the Lebanese Bilingual children when conversing in both English and Arabic.

When children did acknowledge that they caused parents to become angry, children seemed to fully understand the consequences of their actions. They also seemed not to contest the punishment administered by the parents nor did they resist their decision. Instead, children often expressed how upset they were because of their parents’ anger and they expressed some remorse as well as feelings of guilt when causing parental anxiety such as in utterance 5, group 5. Generally, children understood their parents’ intent and were able to give a wide variety of examples of not so acceptable behavior, which would have triggered their parents’ anger. Some of those behaviors included the fact that parents had to repeat several times children’s chores, children behaving in a socially unacceptable way, fighting among siblings, the lack of respect for property such as breaking something valuable, and finally failing to focus on studies. All of these reasons were repeated in the English-speaking children’s utterances, except for the latter, namely, focusing on studies. This repeats the value Arabic families have

on the need to do well in school, a value seen as characteristic of responses to other questions.

Question #4: Honesty

English

Responses to this question yielded information about the participants' understanding of honesty. The question posed was: When do they get angry with you? What do they tell you to do? In responding to this question, children tended to discuss the consequences of their actions and how fair (honest) these consequences were.

Representative samples of responses are presented below:

Group 1

The American Group

1. **Sometimes when** I forget to call when I am over at a friend's house or something and they'll know I am and sometimes I come home at the wrong time and I get, I guess... **grounded** from Nintendo for like a day or so.
2. No TV, no computers and no playing outside.
3. **Depends on what's happening**...if I did something really bad like egg somebody's house or something...they probably **ground** me for a month. Or if I hit my sister then they probably ask me to go to my room or **be grounded**.
4. To do what they told me the first time to do. Then they'lluhm.... send me to my room, **say I am grounded** if it is really bad and sometimes they will correct me and tell me what I did wrong.
5. I probably **get grounded** or something...

Group 2

The American Residing in Lebanon Group

1. A little sometimes and they tell me to go to my room.
2. Sometimes when I say no.... they force me to do it but (innu) without hitting...but not in a bad way...maybe **they yell**...but not in a bad way.
3. They, **they yell** at me...just that...If I don't do it then they yell and if I do it then they say thank you.
4. **They yell** and they send me to my room and then they say: Jay, come down now here and then I do.

Group 3

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in English)

1. They will take away my computer and I would go to my room.
2. They ask me to go to my room and do my work.
3. They don't punish me and they talk to me.
4. They're actually...they tell me like they're going to take the play station... no more TV for one week...go to your room...*(using the hand showing a cutting motion hitting perpendicularly against the other hand)* and I don't know...cause I get so scared...I think that they might do it
5. Like normal...like parents get angry...like they tell me make my homework early like six or seven o'clock at night and not later... (eye gaze away from the researcher)

As was true with previous questions, these children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of English in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either utterances such as "they don't", "like", "sometimes" as a way of introducing new information to guide the listener to that part of her conceptual field that addresses this question. Another indicator was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Children seemed to listen carefully and answered relevantly within the context. The nonverbal behavior of children in the American as well as the American residing in Lebanon groups included maintaining appropriate eye gaze with the researcher, hands folded or tucked under the table, and a seated in an upright posture.

In examining these responses, the differences between the groups were quite striking, especially in light of the responses to previous sentences. In explaining consequences, the American group used complex utterances that extensively explained usually what behavior caused the consequence and what the consequence was. For instance, in

utterance 1 group 1, this child indicated the reason for the consequence, namely, coming home at the wrong time, and what the consequence was, namely, grounded from Nintendo. Interestingly, some children provided multiple scenarios such as utterance 3, group 1, where the child provided one scenario of acting bad at a friend's house and then provided a second one hitting his sister, which resulted in different consequences. All of these productions were quite dense with many connected thoughts usually signaled by subordinate conjunctions such as when (temporal relationships) and if (cause-and-effect relationships).

In contrast, the Bilingual Lebanese and American residing in Lebanon groups used short utterances and/or shorter narratives. Sentences were simply packaged in direct statements. One complete sentence seemed to represent a single complete thought as in utterance 2, group 2, and utterance 3, group 3. In the American group, children were able to use single utterances to explain a general concept such as "grounded" in utterances 1, 3, 4 and 5, group 1, while the Lebanese and American Lebanese groups used narratives, or a string of sentences to express emotions or facts. While the American group used shorter utterances contracting concepts into one or two utterance sentences, the Lebanese tended to explain in greater detail.

The nonverbal behavior, while minimal in the American and American residing in Lebanon groups, was more observed in the Lebanese group. Facial grimaces, hand gestures and eye gazes towards and away from the researcher seemed to reinforce the message to which these actions were attached. In one instance, the child's hand gesture in utterance 4 group 3 implied the severity of that action. In utterance 5 of the same

group, the eye gaze away from the researcher seemed to indicate the end of the exchange (as in utterance 5, group 3).

Once again we see the mixture of the two languages in the utterances of the American residing in Lebanon such as in utterance 2, group 2, where the child utters the Arabic word “innu” meaning “that is” as he tries to justify his parents’ actions and protect their reputation. He actually tries to mix the utterances in order to soften the action of the parents.

Content

In all cases, children revealed strong and robust messages expressing their understanding and acceptance of the parental actions. They also expressed a strong understanding of what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior and what are the levels of tolerance of their parents. Losing privileges, deprivation of rights to social activities, and confinement seem to be the ways parents dealt with their children’s disobedience. Children overall were very specific in supplying examples from their daily lives as in group 1 utterances 3 and 4, group 2 utterance 2, and group 3 utterance 4. However, only in the American group, did children express the behaviors that would cause the degrees of severity. As mentioned previously, the best example of this is utterance 3, group 1. In this example, the degree of punishment depended upon the type of the unacceptable behavior performed. In examining the responses of the American children, the categories causing punishment were: respecting others’ properties, getting along with siblings, and following orders promptly. With the other two groups, participants confined themselves to simply talking about the consequence, with little attention to the

reasons for them. It is probably this reason why the productions of the American children tended to be longer, and more intense since they were attempting to accomplish two tasks, not one.

In detailing the punishments, all three groups identified similar types of punishment. The most commonly identified strategies were confining children to their bedrooms, depriving them from social activities, or taking away privileges such as computer or video games.

Arabic

Representative samples of responses to this question in Arabic now follow. For each group, the Arabic equivalent is presented at the bottom of each entry. It is proceeded by an English equivalent to this Arabic production:

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. Maybe I get punished or something like that and I am forbidden to play with the computer games.

بممكن اتقاصص او شي هبك ويمكن ممنوع اللعب الكمبيوتر **computer**

2. They stop talking to me and they are upset with me.

بيطلو يحكو معي انو بيز علو مني .

3. They get upset with me and they say that they will not do what I asked of them and that what is to be done is for my own benefit, but no punishment.

انو بيز علو مني ما حنعمل يللي بدك ايانا نعمله وهيدا الشي منشانك مش منشانا .

4. They take me to my bedroom and they take away my TV and I'm stuck (smacking his hands against each other) and they take away my playstation.

بيفوتوني على اوضتي وبياخدوا مني التيفي TV وعلقت . وبياخدو البلاي ستايشن **playstation** .

5. They tell me what I did wrong and they ask me to do my homework early and go to bed early.

بيولو لي شو عملت غلط بيطلبو مني انو اعمل درسي بكير وروح عالفرشة بكير .

Group 5

The Lebanese Monolingual Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. No...I just kiss my mom .

لا...بس بيبوس ماما ...

2. Not from me...they would be frustrated with their work or just tired...

مش مني ...هني بيكونو منرفزين من الشغل او تعبانين ...

3. It would be because I am not listening to what they are asking me to do and I am not being polite. I make them angry.

بكون ما عم اسمع الكلمة وما عم اتهدب معهم . عم اعصبهم .

4. She does not get angry...I do everything she tells me.

ما بتزعل مني ...بعمل كل شي بتقول للي .

5. They get angry with me and ask me to stay in my room. They do not yell and they do not hit me but ..they don't get very angry, and after fifteen minutes they ask me to come out of my room.

بعصبو .وبيقولو لي خليك باوضتك . وما بيعيطو وما بيضروني . ما بيعصو كثير وبعد ربع ساعة بيقولولي اضهر من الاوضة.

As was true of previous questions, children seemed able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of Arabic in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included words such as “not really”, “they” or changes in the tone of voice, that is, a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Again there were similar categories between the two groups. Simple sentences and simple statements seemed to express single thoughts. There were more compound sentences connected by the conjunction “and”, and less complex utterances. These productions are quite similar to the English productions by the American Residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese Group. Unlike the American and American Residing in Lebanon groups in English, nonverbal gestures were very common. Head gestures such as inclination of the head, vertical head shakes to indicate the negative and one straight head down to signify the end of the utterance occurred with a high degree of

frequency. Hand moves were evident in this section as well; these gestures seemed to reinforce some decisive act being presented in the utterance as in utterance 4, group 4. In that particular utterance, the child smacked his hands noisily one against the other and catching one hand in the other showed a sign of “getting stuck”. As he did this, his voice was becoming louder and huskier. Such actions clearly demonstrated that he was getting more emotionally involved in what he was saying, that is, he was truly concerned about the effects of punishment on his life.

Content

In most cases, these children revealed strong and robust messages expressing their understanding and acceptance of the parental actions. These Arabic speaking children reported that parents used some strategies to punish their children that were identified by the English speaking groups. Strategies such as confining children to their bedrooms or depriving them from social activities were commonly identified. Another type of punishment was to take away privileges such as the computer games or video games. Unlike the English-speaking children, these Arabic speakers indicated a practice confined to their group. Deprivation of social contact with the parents seemed to be a practice employed by Arabic speaking parents. An example of this appeared in utterance 2, group 4. In this example, the child explicitly states that “They stop talking to me and they are upset with me”, clearly where the child is deprived from any type of social interaction with their parents.

Discrepancies were observed between the groups where some of Lebanese monolingual children seemed to deny that their parents got angry with them, such as in

utterances 1, 2, 4, group 5. This is consistent with their productions in the above section entitled “Honesty”. While the Bilingual Lebanese group revealed as well as explained their punishments, the Lebanese monolingual group seemed a bit more reserved and confined their utterances to simple statements. In one instance, utterance 3, group 5, the child’s reply did not address punishments, but provided a reason why parents got angry, rather than stating what punishments were doled out by the parents. . It was almost as if this group of children did not want to fully discuss whether parents did or did not punish them. It was almost as if they were trying to protect the “reputation” of the parents.

Question #5: Forgiveness and Justice

English

Responses to this question yielded information about the participants’ understanding of forgiveness. The question posed was: When do you think people fight? Over what? From the responses of the children we will derive the level of tolerance to others and to their actions, hence we will look at forgiveness and permissiveness. In this section we will consider the concept of forgiveness as a solution of conflict where one individual offends another individual. When people fight, they are able to forgive only certain acts or verbal behavior confronting them as part of the fight or disagreement. Part of this forgiveness involves issues of justice, that is, whether it is moral to forgive someone when the actions produced by that individual exceed the boundaries of unjust acts. Representative samples of responses are presented below:

Group 1

The American Group

1. Maybe because they are jealous of each other or they want a better toy or something...Like I was playing with that first... and they want to play cards first but they did not ask the other person first... (hands under the table and eyes in the center)
2. Ya... That happens a lot with (a friend's name) at school... because she usually fights over the stupidest little thing... one time I had a Halloween party and I did not invite her and she was not very nice and I was **like I don't care**. (*hands holding on to the edge of the chair*)
3. Like if they want to see their kids play soccer and there's another one at the same time... they might fight over who's goin to go which... or might fight over who gets tugged by someone or whatever... and all that other kina stuff that need arguin'... Sometimes my friends fight over who's goin to go first in Kickball **or something** like that. Sometimes a kid trips over another kid and they blame it on that other person, and then tell the teacher and get him in trouble **or whatever**...
4. I don't know... maybe they don't believe in what other people do...
5. People get angry because they don't get their way... when two countries fight or something, they fight for freedom.

Group 2

The American Residing in Lebanon Group

1. Because they are mean and they are cruel... they fight sometimes here... every time I go with a girl and then I tell her to wait for me and I go back and I come back and she is with another girl. (*hand swaying and pointing to self*)
2. Fighting and killing over just silly **consequ**... I mean **reasons** (*frowns and head a bit tilted sideways*)... like taking one country or moving the piece of land or trying to take over the whole world like Adolph Hitler. Someone is doing something wrong that is supposed to be stopped.. or someone wants to take something.
3. Because uhm... sometimes if they lost something or something broke and.. or someone wrote on the wall... I sometimes watch it in TV and it makes me sad. (*eyes growing bigger and head is moving in a small circular way*).
4. Because they're no rules and laws and they break the rules... because other people are doin stuff that they don't want others to do ... because people think differently than others... sometimes they think war helps to get back stuff but it really hurts a lot of people that have nothing to do with it. (*Looking sideways and shifting eyes away from the center and back*)

Group 3

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in English)

1. They had stolen somebody's country and they want it back... I feel mad and sometimes maybe someone stole something. (*frowns and voice changes*)
2. Because... because when one of them wants to do one thing and they really want to do it and they want to make it up together and they go to some place and they will fight ... (*Arms moving different directions such as left and right*) Like the husband wants to go in one place (*points in one direction*) and the wife in another place but they do not agree on one place. So they keep fighting and fighting (*voice rises and facial grimaces*). Finally...

3. Because they are ...Because we did something wrong and they are really mad about this and they are ...fight. (points to oneself and shakes head vertically)
4. I don't know really...like in .. like they have in Iraq...there they are fighting I don't know they wanted to get guns...(scratches head and bites nails).
5. Maybe because they are mad or maybe because they took something from each other and they're hitting each other and like this. (Right hand swaying back and forth).

Form

As was true with previous questions, these children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of English in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either utterances such as “because” “maybe”. Another indicator was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

When answering this question, the children's utterances became lengthier and more complex. This was due to the fact that, unlike some of the previous questions, this question consistently generated narratives rather than one or two sentences. Unlike previous questions, all three groups of children displayed nonverbal behaviors that reinforced the messages being communicated. However, in the Bilingual Lebanese group, these nonverbal behaviors became more explicit, paralleling the nonverbal behaviors reported earlier that accompanied the Arabic productions described in previous sections. For instance, in utterance 2, group 3, the child moved his arms moving in different directions while raising his voice. This is very similar to previously reported efforts by Arabic speaking children.

The participants seemed to abide by the conventions of narratives by providing an anchored statement that clearly signaled to the listener the reason for fighting. For

instance in utterance 1, group 1, this child states jealousy as a reason; in utterance 1, group 2, the reason stated is “they are mean and they are cruel”; in utterance 5, group 3, the reason stated is “because they are mad”. These reasons were often marked by adverbs such as “maybe” and “like” or by the subordinate conjunction “because”. Children were very creative in providing hypothetical situations at home, at school and in different social occasions that could account for the reasons given. These hypothetical situations were often attributed to “they”, or an unknown group of people who could have generated these behaviors. In some cases, specific individuals were labeled like friends, but rarely did the explanation involve themselves. Such behavior is not unexpected given the nature of the question which suggests that the children engage in a hypothetical rather than real-life explanation.

As previously stated, the children would start with a general statement and then would go into detailed descriptions of events that explained these general statements. Interestingly, there are two instances of when “I don’t know” appears, namely, utterance 4, group 1 and utterance 4, group 3. In both instances, this utterance was followed by pauses or use of place holder utterances, such as “really” and “like in”. This use of “I don’t know” seemed to give the speakers a chance to regain their thoughts and regenerate ideas, while not losing their turn to the other communication partner. Such instances of holding one’s place while seeking time to formulate ideas has been reported in adult speakers by Tannen (1989) and in middle school speakers by Kretschmer (in preparation).

In this task, there appears for the first time, a reformulation effort on behalf of the child. In utterance 2, group 2, the child used the word “consequence” but he

immediately realized that it was the wrong choice and replaced it by the word “reasons”. According to Carroll (2004) and Tannen (1989), such reformulation problems are common when English speakers are involved in generating utterances that are either new to them or are conceptually more complex than more mundane topics. It could be argued that this task, unlike others previously reported, may be a more cognitively demanding task.

Again the use of the present tense dominates the utterances even though the children’s utterances moved into narratives. The use of the present seems to break the barrier of time and promotes such utterances as true across a wide behavioral continuum. In this, the conceptual field is the moral behavior and the consequence upon breaking the rules.

Content

As would be expected given the nature of the question, conflict was the central theme of these children’s efforts. Interestingly, the American group focused their notions of conflict to daily activities such as wanting to play cards or with another toy, being invited into Halloween parties, playing soccer, with one exception. In utterance 5, group 1, this child expanded the topic away from more mundane issues to one involving fighting between two countries, or a more political example. Like the American group, the American residing Lebanon group too tended to emphasize more mundane issues, except for utterance 3, group 2. In this case, the child makes reference to “Adolf Hitler” and one country taking over another country, another instance of a politically motivated example. The same trend was apparent with the Bilingual Lebanese group, except that

there were two political references (see utterance 1 and 4, group 3). In these examples, one child makes reference to stealing one's country, while the second makes direct reference to the war in Iraq.

With regard to the mundane situations, conflicts seemed to center around the following issues: a) fairness (utterance 1, group 1), b) equal access to events (utterance 2, group 1), c) following the social and/or game rules (utterance 2, group 1), d) violations of social rules (utterance 1 and 4, group 2; utterance 5, group 3).

Within the Bilingual Lebanese group, there was one utterance that requires special attention, namely, utterance 2, group 3. Most of the mundane conflicts cited by these three groups tended to involve either children or hypothetical individuals. In this example, the combatants are the child's parents. Although the example is framed in a hypothetical way, the behaviors detailed ring true, that is, actual occurrences that the child has witnessed at home. Interestingly, of all the utterances, this is the one that is accompanied the most by nonverbal behaviors such as arm movements accompanied by changes in intonational patterns.

Arabic

Representative samples of responses to this question in Arabic now follow. For each group, the Arabic equivalent is presented at the bottom of each entry. It is preceded by an English equivalent to this Arabic production:

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese (in Arabic translated into English)

1. Someone stole something from somebody else **because** they can't stand each other and they argue with each other.

حد سرق غرض لتني كرمال ما بيطيؤوا بعض وكرمال انو شارعو بعض .

2. I only know about my mother and father. When my Mom...every Sunday we go to Saida, to my mom's parents and my mom keeps saying "come on, hurry up". When my dad is ready and he goes down and waits in the car he starts yelling: "you said come on finish up and you are still not ready".

انا بعرف عن امي وببي . لما ماما عم بتقول ..كل احد نحنا منروح على صيدا. عند اهل امي وامي بضلها عم بتقول بسرعة . لما بي بخلص وبنزل ينظر بلسيارة ببليش عم بعيط . اتي عم تقولي لنا انو يللا خلصو وانت بعد ما خلصت.

3. **Because** that we did something to them that is not good and they do not like the thing we did to them. They should all respect each other. At the end nothing is going to happen... That the war will not do anything... They fight because they did not agree and maybe this country did something to them and they did not do anything. I get scared for the people who get hurt and because we get hurt.

كرمال انو عملنا لهم شي مش منيح وهن ما حبوا طريقة الشي اللي عملنا لهم اياه . لازم كلهم يحترموا بعض . وما حيصير شي بلاخر... انو ما رح تعمل شي الحرب... بيتخانقو لانو ما بيكونو كتير متفقين وبكون هالبلد عاملهم شي وهن مش بيكونو عاملين له شي . انا بخاف كرال العام الي صر لهم ي او كرمال ان صر لنا شي .

Group 5

The Lebanese Monolingual Group (in Arabic translated into English)

1. They fight **because** they may have broken something or they are, I don't know... at home someone is playing and the other wants it too... Sometimes in the street people yell but I don't know why. At school, I fight with my friend many times (*shakes her head and lifts her chin up slightly*). **Because** for example, we would be three together (*showing three fingers*) and I am talking to one and we think the other is following us, but instead she goes to a third person and starts gossiping about us. (*points at herself*) Instead she should come and talk to me (*points to herself again*)... and so she comes and says sorry. In a year's time we fight about five times and sometimes she shows off (*rolls her eyes and looks away*).

بيخانقو... بيكونو بسبب بيكونو كسرو شي او بكونو ما بعرف... بالبيت حدا عم يلعب والتاني بيصير بدو اياه... امرار بالطريق بيعيطو لسبب انا ما بعرف . بالمدرسة بتخانق مع رفيقتي عدة مرات . لانو متلا منكون تلاتة وبكون عم احكي مع واحدة هي ونفكر انو هي لاحقتنا بس ما بتكونو بتروح عند واحدة تانية وبتصير تحكي علينا. وتقول انو لي مش تغلني احكي معا بلاخر بتصير تقول لي **sorry** . بالسنة بتخانق 5 مرات وكان هي بتشوف حالها علينا .

2. That they do not do like they want to... they laugh at each other. (*looks down in discontent or disagreement*)

انو بيعملو متلا ما بدهم بيضحكو على بعض .

3. People get upset with each other because there is something we call "you're out". And it is not a very nice expression. (*frowns and moves her head sideways*)
الناس بيز علو من بعض لانو في كلمة اسمها سنغوفة . ومنها حلوة .

4. People make fun of each other and such... (*eyes down in discontent*)

النس عم تضحك على بعضها وهيك

As was true of previous questions, children were able to express their

ideas with ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of Arabic in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either nouns as the beginning of nominal sentences mainly to anchor the subject argument or by the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of a utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

The utterances in Arabic varied from short narratives to just a simple statement involving compound sentences which recounted events and lived experiences. Participants seemed to abide by the conventions of the spoken Arabic where nominal sentences began with a noun or a subject and the verbal sentences started with the verb proceeded by “that” as in group 5 utterance 2.

With the root system in Arabic, the first letter of the verb and the last two letters indicate who the subject is. Past and present tenses were used to express events in their logical temporal sequence. This is the one time that these Arabic children truly began using the past tense to retell stories. Unlike English, one cannot use the present tense to tell a story. The past belongs to the past events that began in the past and ended in the past. The simple present and the continuous present are expressed in one form in Arabic and in those cases the habitual present seems to be prevalent such as in utterance 2, group 4. Thus it seems like children would use the past to retell stories that had truly occurred in their life rather than hypothetical situations with no time limits. This comes in support of the argument we offered regarding the use of the present tense in the previous question.

Content

Children seemed to draw from their experiences at home, at school and their direct social circle including relatives, friends and peers. They also seemed skilled in discussing general matters and showed the ability to generalize from a single situation to a general case, as in utterance 3, group 4. Some situations were hypothetical and others real. Surprisingly enough, there was hardly any mention of war in either of those groups except for one example utterance 3, group 4. While some children referenced the closest experience as being at home as in utterance 2, group 4, others described situations from social interactions at school (utterance 1 group 5). Issues included tolerance as in utterance 1, group 4, fairness and justice as in utterance 3, group 4, and understanding as in utterance 2, group 4 and utterances 1 and 3, group 5. Respect of others seemed of importance as it was mentioned several times in group 5, namely, utterances 2 and 4. As is true of many of the productions in Arabic, many of these utterances were punctuated with nonverbal gestures and intonational patterns (see utterances 2 and 3, group 4). Nonverbal gestures such as raised eyebrows, eyes gazing down, headshakes and eyes rolling seemed to be part of their efforts as they generated these utterances. Surprisingly there was no mention of the war except in group 4, utterance 3 where the child finds such an action totally absurd and unnecessary as no one benefits “ that the war will not do anything”.

*Question #6: Sharing, Caring, Planning, Economy**English*

Responses to this question yielded information about the participants' understanding of sharing, caring, planning and economy. Since the questions posed for

these three areas were closely related, it was decided to discuss them in tandem rather than separating them into separate sections. The questions posed were: a) If you had a million dollars, would you like to share it with? b) your brother/sister if he/she had none (sharing), c) with a friend if he/she had none (caring) and d) how much would give him/her (planning, economy). Representative samples of responses are presented below:

Group 1

The American group

1. Pretty fancy...probably mom and dad..because they said if we ever won something then the first thing they would do is buy me a horse and then maybe they would buy me a really really nice horse /and also because my mom loves to travel. Maybe with a friend if I had a lot of money.
2. Six zeros...definitely...my family, my aunt, my grandma..I'd give Master Kim some for the new do Jang... to my brother but he is still young.../ I'd put some on the side for school and I go buy some stuff of course...My Mom wants new stuff of course and I want her to have her car because then I get to ride in it. Her favorite car is a van or a punch buggie....I would keep some for if something happened, if the money got caught in something then I would have some on the side. To a friend only if he really needs it.
3. I'll give some of it to charities like the charity down the street like the UMW or something, like those down the road. Give some stuff to them to the swim club I go to. I'd give some to my parents and buy some stuff that is really expensive. My brothers I'd give some ..like five hundred dollars each...Ja...keep some in my college fund so in the long run I could keep it if I need it and when I go to college .. I will also buy a car and a pool and stuff like that..with a friend, as much as he needed.
4. Buy a lot of stuff...dirt bikes and bunny rabbits...and soon as I'm done with that I will give the rest to my Mom and Dad... to my brother or sister? Maybe...because he already has 300 dollars..I'd give them each 100 dollars. To a friend I would give him ten dollars.

Group 2

The American Residing in Lebanon group

1. What I would do?... would improve this hotel....me and my father and would like to ... I would like to see the same thing as in America...I will help that happen... to a friend? Yes...innu if it was a case of emergency not just if he needed to buy something that is not important. If he is going to buy something and he is not going to pay me back...well I don't mean pay me back..but innu if he does not need it, maybe if he's buying a toy...No..I would not give him unless if it was important...if it was very important. Yes, if he really needed them. Maybe I would spend...I doubt it. Yes a little...maybe to improve this town. You see that building over there, it is not finished and there are a lot of buildings like that in Lebanon and they are not finished... You see? They should be taller and a lot of them are not finished and the outside is done but the inside is not done.

2. I would buy stuff and a house and a car and toys...To the poor .Ja...To my sisters...Ja...200 hundred dollars each.. with a friend? I don't know. I leave some...so if I grow up and I don't have any more so I keep it....
3. I would save it till I grow up ...sometimes. Maybe use some... when school comes I buy my books and some of things I need. With a friend, maybe ...Ja. One thousand or two thousands. I would spend, I don't know: maybe ten or fifteen.
4. My friends, my parents and my family. A thousand each to my family and 500 to my friends...the rest in the bank..

Group 3

The Bilingual Lebanese in English

1. With my **family ...poor people...** With a friend, I would give one thousand each. I would buy what I need...and what I want.
2. My **family and poor people and the orphanage.** If my friend had more money then I would give my family...I would give him 300 dollars. If nobody needs the money then I would use half and put the rest in the bank account...People save money because they want to save time.
3. The **poor** people... I would share some with **my brother and sister** and some with my mom and dad and then to the poor people. With a friend I will give him three hundred dollars. Maybe I would give my family and that would be all that I have ..then I will give it to him. By buying clothes and some shopping, perfume, watch, and diskman, radio.
4. With my friends, with the **orphanage**, with **my family**, and with everybody. Don't know how many zeros. I would divide the money in equal groups equally, and give them equally to all...and I would give them the same amount of money and take the same. I would give the best friends I have ever had , the best best friends who helped me when I broke my foot, with the car. My mom was driving and the wheel came on my foot and I was getting out of the car...even my best friends were really helping me so I could walk and get a drink . Ja, I would like to give them some presents...
5. With **my family** if I had a lot, but if I had a little then I would share it with my Mother and father but not with my brother and sister because they loose their money all the time. Not all the time sometime. My brother two times and my sister once... Ja...I share with a friend but it's **better to share it with my family** because family is more important than my friends.

As was true with previous questions, these children were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of English in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either the introduction of new information or the repetition of old information. Another

indicator was the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of an utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

As children responded, there were phrasal utterances with deletion of old information. Children would start their utterances with new information then would weave back and forth to try and justify their decisions. Children were using complex as well as compound sentences to express their thoughts and ideas. Short sentences evidenced clarity of thought and knowledge. The start of utterances would be responses to the questions beginning with short utterances, followed by children slipping into the narrative to justify their decisions. One example is group 1, utterances 1 and 2. The same behavior was observed in the American Residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese groups.

Children seemed comfortable in choosing utterances compatible with their complete thoughts. There were short pauses between utterances at times as children pondered over their thoughts. There was a dominant use of the modal “would” in all the groups. In such a hypothetical situation, the choice of “would” alternated with the modal “will”. Both utterances seemed to indicate a willingness to share, to be equal and just in sharing as well as fair among all. Unlike the other children, American children used contractions such as “I’d” instead of “I would” as in group 1, utterances 1, and 2. Its equivalent as a full utterance was presented in group 2 for example in utterance 1 and group 3 overall. The use of equal shares was also common as in group 3, utterance 4; group 2, utterance 4; and group 1, utterance 3 such as “500 dollars for each”.

Once again the use of an Arabic utterance appears in one child's English narrative (see utterance 1 group 2). The same utterance had been encountered before by the same child and the meaning of the utterance "innu" or "that is" was an attempt on his behalf to repeat what he had said before and elaborate on it; thus enhancing the utterance by reinforcing it with another language.

The use of the same utterance twice was again noted, a feature that also appeared earlier in a similar context with the word "very". The use of "best best" seems to amplify the modified word "friend".

Content

Awareness of children to the needs of their surrounding environment seemed quite elaborate. The common ground among the groups was the acknowledgement of the concept that one needed to share their good fortune. Recipients of this sharing were members of the direct family, friends and, finally, the poor and needy of the community. However, in the American responses, there is evidence that children had been exposed to adult conversation about their educational and economic future: a concept familiar to children in the United States but not in evidence with the Arabic speakers. One such example is "funds for college" as appears in utterances 2 and 3, group 1. This term is commonly used by American parents when discussing the educational future of their children, but such terms are not present, or even relevant to Arabic-speaking parents living in Lebanon even when their children are bilingual.

In a hypothetical situation it was clear that children wanted to share with their families, brothers and sisters and particularly they mentioned the "poor", "charities", and

clubs. Sharing was indicated by the fact that the participants wanted to divide their money equally among their brothers and sisters. Children exhibited a feeling of “fairness” while partitioning their funds. However, the words used or genres varied between the groups. For example while the American would mention “charities” and “church” and “organizations” as in group 1, utterances 2 and 3, the American Residing in Lebanon as well as the Bilingual Lebanese children mentioned the “poor” and the “orphanage” and the “needy countries”.

A very important difference is in the use of the direct environment to further their utterances. In utterance 1, group 2, the child pointed at some buildings as he produced this verbal production. By pointing at the object in this scene, the speaker was asking the listener to pay attention to this non-verbal cue. Thus, the speaker resorted to a visual aid in order to justify his point of view. With such a hypothetical question, this child seemed to have a hard time trying to accept his present and the feeling that one might encounter when things are not going as fast as they should be.

Arabic

The following are examples of the Arabic speaking groups translated into English:

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese (in Arabic translated into English)

1. with my family and friends..if my friend doesn't have money I will give them each 600 dollars and to my brother it not necessary that I give him anything. My brother has 530 dollars and his birthday just passed and he received 300 more, which makes it 830 dollars but those who need I give them like the poor...the rest when I need it I will use it.
- 2.It is too much money...I would share it with people. I would give my maternal cousins and grandma and the countries that need it. I would give a friend too and the rest I would keep in the bank for when I grow up.
3. I would give my parents 200,000 and myself 200,000 and the rest I would spend.
4. I would buy stuff for me and my brother and sister and I would not give out any money

I would keep it in the bank.

Group 5

The Monolingual Lebanese (translated into English)

1. I dream of having a villa, with a swimming pool in it and toys that I love. But sometimes I see a poor beggar in the street and I say “*haram*”(pity)(*rolls her eyes in disagreement*) and I should give him money and act like I should defend him **and I should give him work**... and that I should make a store to give them food and drink and stuff... **With a friend, I would give her, but I first would give my brothers and sisters** and the rest I keep in the bank, maybe I get my own children and I leave them money.
2. I would distribute money to the poor and the needy and bring them presents and help my parents pay my tuition and give to my brother and sisters. I would give to a friend without asking why. Then I would keep the rest, but I would spend 500 on myself first.
3. My grandmother, my parents and brothers and sisters and those who are in need of something I would help them. **For a friend, I would give as much as he wants, but I have to be careful if he asks for a big amount. He might be lying about it**, so I would give him a small amount and **then I would help him find work**.
4. First I would buy everything I want and then I would divide equally among my brothers and my sisters. **For a friend I would give if he needs it badly and if he does not have any money**. I would buy clothes and toys and not leave anything in the bank.

Children seemed as enthusiastic at the end of the session as at the beginning. They were able to express their ideas and feelings with great ease and fluency. In all cases, children seemed to abide by the conventions of Arabic in a conversational setting. There were indicators marking the beginning as well as the end of sentences or utterances. Those indicators included either nouns to indicate the start of a nominal sentence or a verb to indicate the beginning of a verbal sentence, or by the tone of voice: a diminishing sound marking the end of a utterance and a rising tone marking the beginning of an utterance.

Form

Children’s expressions were lengthy and precise. Participants resorted to simple statements followed by short narratives that seemed to express their thought process

rather than the end result. One example is in group 5, utterance 3. The feeling was that the participant was thinking out loud to reach a justification for his decision. The use of the word “equal” was also present in the utterances of the children in Arabic. One example was in group 5, utterance 4 and another example was in group 4, utterance 1. In the last example the child did not use the word “equal” but suggested to give an equal amount of money to his siblings. The use of the future tense and the present were both recorded.

The Arabic use of the equivalent of “should” was contrasted with the use of “would” in the English group. The modal “should” occurred with a high degree of frequency in the Arabic efforts. The use of the modal “should” seemed to carry with it a sense of obligation which often triggered expressions of guilt, sometimes quite intense. This is in contrast with the English use of the modal “would” which seemed to carry more of a sense of a freedom of choice. In other words, the use of the modal “would” seemed to imply that the action might or might not take place as no obligation is attached to it. Thus, expressions of guilt were less prevalent and when they did occur they were less intense.

Content

It seemed as if the children knew exactly how they should divide the money. In many cases, there was a fair share for everyone of the family. In the case of the Lebanese and the Lebanese American, family members came first before anybody else. The extended family seemed to play a major role in some children’s lives. Grandmothers, aunts, cousins were mentioned in the stories children told. Friends were

brought into the discussion; however, participants seemed reluctant to lend a friend some money. They were more cautious in giving friends money than with family members. Judgments as to the use or non-use of the money seemed logical. In utterance 3, group 5, the speaker suggested other ways of helping a friend earn money: by helping him find a job. Conditions were specific as to giving money to friends generally more so than for the family. Children were aware of spending as well as keeping money though the plans were not as precise as those of the English speaking groups. Children in general had a sense of the importance of money in their lives. Planning was demonstrated through their division of the monies. "Keeping money in the bank" seemed to be a general practice for saving and for controlling expenditures.

Definitions

Children seemed to respond to the best of their knowledge to each term given by the researcher. Research has suggested that adults tend to define words using two primary forms: the Aristotelian format or a format that uses a nominal complement marker. According to Walker (2003), an Aristotelian definition consists of the term being defined, the superordinate that is followed by the copula plus a subordinate or relative clause that explains the initial term. As an example, let us look at the following definition: A spoon is a tool for eating. "A tool" is the superordinate term, and "for eating" is the critical information or the copula that explains the term "spoon". In other instances, Luria (1976) states that speakers can also cast their utterances using the nominal complement marker. In this case, a spoon would be defined as "something like a rod with a round ending that you can eat with". The utterance "something like"

categorizes this utterance as nominal complement marker. We will now present a discussion of the definitions of the English groups and then those by the Arabic groups. In each group, efforts of three participants were chosen as representative examples of the entire group.

English

Group 1

The American group

Participant #1

Hardwork: what you need to do and you work hard for it.

Obedience: means obey your parents ...Ja...do what they tell you to do..

Respect : God's house, church, do not rip off a page in the books...don't do anything like that...don't play with anything you're not supposed to do

Honesty: telling the truf..truth

Forgiveness: if someone hurts you, you forgive them. You say do you forgive me and I say I forgive you or whatever. They say can you forgive me and you say yes.

Justice: hmmm... I don't quite really know yet...but in court there's a judge, he asks questions and the person who thinks they saw what happened and there is a place beside him and they tell who they saw that they knew...and if it...they go to court and stand on the other side and if they are guilty they go to jail.

Sharing: like share what we were talking about the money with your brother or whatever, and give it

Caring: to help someone and uh it's to sort like respect care for someone, our parents have to care for kids.

Planning : it means to do something later and it's what your going do with whatever...it's also like if you have to do it you sort of plan it.

Economy : I don't know...

Participant #2

Hardwork: working hard for something you want I guess...

Obedience: like doing something when we are asked to.

Respect: like if you borrow something that's theirs you don't like totally trash it.

Honesty: telling the truth

Forgiveness: uhm...uhm...(looks away)...(frowns)

Justice: I don't know the meaning of that word

Caring: being like concerned about other people

Sharing: like if you have something you like share it with your people.

Planning: making like a schedule for things you want to do

Economy: something they talk about on the news a lot. I think it has something to do with money but a lot of things have stuff to do with money.

Participant #3

Hardwork : give in your best effort in everything

Obedience : probably ...just to do what they tell you to do.

Respect : **to be kind to someone,, and auh....and**

Honesty : Uh... you always tell the truth

Forgiveness : if he just .. if they try to apologize and you say apology accepted

Justice : **....makes me think of war...uh...**

Caring: to be thoughtful about someone and thought and helpful

Sharing : sharing means to give someone ..uh...let someone borrow something

Economy : uhm...like the way money is handled

Planning : planning means to prepare for an event coming up

Group 2

The American Residing in Lebanon group

Participant #1

Hardwork: working hard for something... I learned that in **tarbiat** (the Arabic word for Civic Education) it's like working hard for something to get...working hard for your life...

Obedience: To obey....someone...to obey someone...

Respect: respect someone...like respect your father ...respect your mother....respect anyone.

Honesty: being honest with someone...If you kept a secret from someone, **ya'nni** (Arabic place holder) if you broke something that is his that he really loves and he tries to find who did it and you don't know and you tell him it wasn't me, then that would not be honest...but telling him it was you would be honest

Forgiveness: If someone broke something that's yours, and he told you and he honestly tells you he did it, you forgive him...**innu** (utterance in Arabic meaning that is) he tells you.

Justice : is the right thing, the law **innu** (Arabic utterance for That is :which is a place holder)

Caring: Taking care and feeling for others.

Sharing: giving and receiving... I think it is helping ... no ... to give someone something

Planning: preparing something ahead of time

Economy: being a bit selfish ...actually I have no more ideas....

Participant #2

Hardwork: means I am doing hardwork

Obedience : listen tolike the teacher and do something

Respect: respect your elders...stop fighting..

Honesty: I know what it means but I forgot.

Forgiveness : it means like that if they did something really bad and they wanted and then the police wanted to put them in jail and the lady or the man would feel sorry and they would forgive them.

Justice: uhm...(looks down)

Sharing: Like I share with you a toy. Like one day means I have it and one day you have it.

Caring: I care about you...like I don't care and I care...I don't know how

Planning: like if somebody is in a gang and then we make a trap so we make a plan that could catch him.

Economy: uhm..don't know

Participant #3

Hardwork : you have to do hardwork by cleaning and if you're twelve you have to cook

Obedience : listen

Respect : Don't do bad things...always say yes sir and yes mam...you do what your mom says and you listen to what they say and you make your bed and when they tell you to do something , you don't wait ,you have to do it right away.

Honesty : You're honest with somebody.. I mean I'm not going to lie to you and I am gonna get you your two dollars back for example.

Forgiveness: If somebody fights and the other person is crying, then I forgive the other person

Justice: I don't know...

Sharing : if I had a...if I had a hotdog and there's only one and somebody else wants the hotdog , and there wasn't enough , I would look at it and I would cut it like that in half and take two breads and put one on each one. That' s sharing (she uses her hands to explain the action)

Caring : Caring? I care about my friends and they always don't want me to be with them..so I care about my friends even when they tell me to go or I don't want you then I go to my other friends but I still care about them.

Planning : like I'm gonna plan on doing something like plant a tree..

Economy : I don't know...

Group 3

The Bilingual Lebanese Group (in English)

Participant #1 (10) G

Hardwork : Hardwork at my school and my job...

Obedience: To say yes to my mother

Respect: I have to respect my mother and father, my teacher...

Honesty: Truth

Forgiveness: I have to forgive someone who did a fault and he walked up to me and he tells the truth and he is sorry...

Justice: When a guy made a fault just to go to the court and tell the mister to tell the guy to give the money or something like that.

Sharing: I have to share the money or the pens...

Caring: Take care of someone and take care of my work or my job

Planning: I have to plan to go out shopping to...

Economy: I don't know (*shakes her head*)

Participant#2

Hardwork : means you have to work hard.

Obedience: if she tells me go and fix the room, I go and fix the room

Respect: respect with my mother if she tells to do this then I make it... like obey

Honesty : is you don't lie and if your mother tells you the truth , if you hit your brother and she says did you hit him? Or your sister? Then you have to tell that's right

Forgiveness: if I'm in a birthday and there are four birthdays and I can tell them I cannot go

Justice : is we make everything just and

Caring: I care about my brother and if my brother hit my sister I care about her.

Sharing: I share with my brotherI give him something if I have a toy with me I let him play with it

Planning : you make a plan , like a trip with my cousins, like this.

Economy : don't know..what's economy?(researcher explains)

Participant #3

Hardwork : It's when someone is working very very hard and they take risks to go through. When they go to caves and they live outdoor.

Obedience: When you obey a command, like when your parents tell you to do this, you don't say I don't want to do it, you quickly do it...like in the army if your commander asks you to do *it then you do it. (points with the finger to the side)*

Respect: When you respect others the way how they look and how tall they are...you don't if they're black or white...you don't call them white or black...you don't call them hey you black I don't want to play with you anymore...

Honesty: When you say the truth and you don't lie and you be (*one head shake*) honest

Forgiveness : if someone breaks something ...it's wrong... like break your TV or a vase then he knows that he tries to make it up and then he tries to do it better.

Justice: Don't know...(opens the arms as if in a semi circular motion)

Sharing: you can do it with anything. You can share your happiness your sadness or you toys and money. You're sharing everything you can with that person

Caring : when you care for a family or friend you do something for them like your Mom tells you go do that for me and you go do it

Planning: you want to do something and before you do it , you have to plan what you are going to do. Like when you travel you don't just go anywhere you plan if you are going here or there. First to that place then to this place then to the other.

Economy: don't know...(shrugs the shoulders)

Form

Children's responses demonstrated their knowledge as well as their capacity to chose genres that were compatible with the concepts. Children seemed to apply the conventions of defining words in English using either the format of Aristotelian definitions or the nominal complement where they cast their utterances using sentences

and limiting their verbal input to format definitional forms. As a result there were minimal narratives and those were particularly short demonstrating examples of hypothetical situations that would support their explication of terms. This was not surprising as the concepts involved in this study were abstract which required certain metalinguistic as well as metacognitive skills quite similar to an adult mental mapping.

The verbal behavior of the children in the three groups was comparable and quite similar. Simple utterances including simple as well as compound sentences were recorded. Children alternated between the use of infinitive phrases, gerund phrases and action verbs. Gerunds and gerund phrases included utterances such as “telling the truth”, “saying what is right”. In these utterances, children drew upon situations from their daily life. Sometimes they would use opposites such as in participant 2, group 3, on caring. Imperatives were also significantly used showing the necessity of the action to justify the concept in question in that particular situation. The use of direct complement of the verb was highly recorded such as in participant 1, group 1, on obedience “obey your parents...do what they tell you to do”.

Some other times they would use very short narratives. These utterances would start with an infinitive verb, which in Aristotelian terms, is considered as the superordinate, followed by a complement (definitional criteria). Children chose to repeat the concept using the derivative verb (such as respect: to respect), which seemed to anchor the concept. Then they would complete their definition with a short example. Such examples are: in group 1, participant 3, on respect, on sharing; group 2, participant 1 on obedience. Nominal complement markers (Walker, 2003) included utterances such

as in participant 2, group 1, on hardwork and economy; participant 1, group 2, on honesty.

In some cases the children used “you” with the verb rather than the infinitive form with “to”. The “you” was observed particularly in the American group. The other two groups seemed to use the pronoun “I” as a predominant pronoun utterance. Both “I” and “you” seemed to imply a virtual person or an actor as if to replace the “one” impersonal pronoun in the English grammar. This feature seemed to strengthen the argument sending a stronger message and a more robust feeling to their verbal responses. Nonverbal behavior seemed minimal as the utterances were shorter except for group 3, participant 3 who seemed to use nonverbal gestures more so than others. However, there were some facial gestures and small circular head movements that sometimes accompanied some utterances in the Bilingual Lebanese group.

Content

Children brought forth a wealth of information as they defined these terms. Defining terms though seemed to prompt the children to giving examples that seemed more real than hypothetical. They were simple and straightforward. It also seemed that the more embedded the concept was in their moral life, the shorter the sentences were and the simpler the utterances. It also seemed that the more practiced a certain concept was, the shorter the response and the shorter the response time.

In all groups, the use of “you” versus the “I” seemed to send a stronger message and a more robust signal that children thought was very important to share. In the “I” sentences, the child recounted a situation that he ordinarily faces. In the “you” sentence,

there was a general feeling about how the others should be acting rather than making a personal statement. Moreover the use of the present tense seemed to indicate a habitual action practiced in the past, the present and expected in the future.

Arabic

Group 4

The Bilingual Lebanese(in Arabic translated into English)

Participant #1

Hardwork: we have to work hard and study well ...we also have to work hard.

Obedience: we obey our father and the older people. That is whatever they ask of us we do.

Respect: If my mom told me to do something I just do it and I respect her.

Honesty: we tell the truth

Forgiveness: means trust (**this word was said in English**)

Justice: in the court...

Caring: we care about someone very much and not lose stuff and such...

Sharing: like sharing money and at school stuff.

Planning: that we plan to travel and

Economy: be economical or keeping some money.

Participant#2

Hardwork: one works hard to bring money to his parents.

Obedience: When mom and Dad ask you to do something and you do it without getting on their nerves.

Respect: when one goes to visit and eats with the mouth open wide ...one must respect the other. You don't say : "oh you do not have any toys to play with?" . You must not hurt his feelings.

Honesty: when he does something wrong and his mom and dad come and ask him :who broke it? He tells the truth (*arms moving sideways*)

Forgiveness: if he steals something he tries to do "good" to the person he stole from and gives him his money back.

Justice: When someone by law gets what he deserves.(**this utterance was in English**)

Caring: When we pay attention to someone who is sick and in the hospital if he is very weak.

Sharing: if you have something nice and your friend would like to borrow it or see it ,you give it to him and you don't say :no , you can't touch it or see it.

Planning: when one travels alone and he does not know the country (**this word was said in English**), he takes a map (**this word was said in English**),and he looks at places. He takes a piece of paper and a pencil and he writes : I today want to do this first then second then third.(*moves his hand as if he is writing*).

Economy : this... you're saving for another day (this utterance was said in English).
It means don't spend all your money except when you need it.

Participant #3

Hardwork: like working in the classroom

Obedience: If they say something I listen to it.

Respect: to respect others and family

Honesty: if someone promises to take you to the movies and they don't then they are not honest.

Forgiveness: if someone does something wrong, you forgive him.

Justice : if someone steals something from people and they talk about him

Sharing: you let others play with your toys.

Caring: that he cares about his friends and others

Planning: if you have a project and you don't know what to do, you plan for it.

Economy : like money in the bank

Group 5

The Lebanese monolingual (in Arabic translated into English)

Participant #1

Hardwork: means to do what one must all do.

Obedience: to respect the parents and not to ask them to get something they cannot afford.

Respect: to respect one's parents and friends and not to cause trouble among each other... laws.

Honesty: to be honest and tell everything.

Forgiveness: we go back to the way we were, because I did not mean it.

Justice: everything one deserves. They go to court and people get their fair share.

Sharing: to share equally in everything for each a part of toys or food.

Caring: to care for one's stuff and preserve them. To care about people too.

Planning: don't know...

Economy: to collect..not to spend

Participant #2

Hardwork: one must study to succeed.

Obedience: That he listens to the words and not say I don't want to do it.

Respect: that he respects the other... if someone is older one respects him.

Honesty: not to lie. If someone attacks someone else, one must confess that he did it.

Forgiveness: That they forgive...they are upset if someone does something he should not do and he does not understand it and he is doing wrong.

Justice: man must be honest with others and not lie to others.

Sharing: not everything that he takes to oneself.

Caring: one must focus on one's work and not to get distracted. If someone is sick one must care for him.

Planning: plan something that you work on.

Economy: don't know

Participant #3

Hardwork: to work on our behavior with others, to be successful with others and be good to them and share with them my new toys.

Obedience: we respect others and not to make them accountable.

Respect: respect each other, and others, be polite not make fun of them.

Honesty: to be honest Justice: to share with others...must give the money back.

Forgiveness: not to fight but on the contrary to forgive and to love: one must say I forgive you.

Sharing: That people share everything they have

Caring: we care about the poor and the needy and my brothers and the needy people.

Planning: how mom plans.. you take this and you take that.

Economy: not to spend all my money.

Form

Utterances took a different genre in this section. The temporal use of “when” is quite predominant in Arabic usually confused with “if” as a conditional statement.

Children followed the conventions of definitions in Arabic. The utterances were shorter and more direct. There were complete sentences with action transitive verbs indicating the need for an actor or agent and a direct object. The utterances including verbs were stated in the present tense. Sentences again seemed simpler and abiding by the conventions of definitions in the language. Some infinitives were negative as well “not to spend all my money” or “not to fight with others” as in group 5, participant #2, on sharing and honesty. Participant #3 chose to use “if” and “like” to present situations that would need more attention to details.

Content

In this group, children exhibited some type of preaching behavior. The verbal behavior of children both of Arabic speaking and the Bilingual Lebanese was very similar and organization of content showed similarities as well. Infinitives and “have to”

sentences were predominant in this group and bilingual children responded similarly in English and in Arabic. There were imperative form sentences “respect others” and infinitive form sentences that seemed to relay imperative requests “to share ...must give money”. Children’s verbal responses alternated between their own experiences and often-heard messages. The start of the topic was marked either by an infinitive, a negative infinitive or an imperative. However these options seemed accessible and used by all groups similarly. The particular use of the subject “we” was again of interest to this study as children in the Arabic speaking group exhibited more of this pattern seemingly to convey a preaching message. Participant 1 used “we” as a subject for all the necessary actions. This genre lends itself to a feeling that such moral values have become embedded in the participant’s life and that he/she is ready to apply them in the greater social circle. Consequently, the child is not only following a command but also preaching it.

The following section will summarize each concept across the groups to compare the definitional responses of the children.

Hardwork: English and Arabic

Among the English speaking groups this concept was looked upon as work that required effort. The American group generalized their statement to include a description of the term without any specific situations, while the American residing in Lebanon were more specific in identifying situations such as in participant 3, group 2, “cleaning and cooking when you are twelve”. Unlike the English speakers, the Bilingual Lebanese children mentioned the work that one needs to do “at school”. This behavior was

consistent with the Bilingual Lebanese who defined hardwork as study or work in the classroom. The Lebanese monolingual applied the term to academic school performance, good behavior, and bringing money in return for hardwork. The content of those definitions seems to support the utterances transcribed from the children's responses on the questionnaire (question 1). The importance of "school" reinforces the argument we previously made about the importance of "academia and homework" to the Arabic speakers.

Obedience: English and Arabic

The American groups seemed to express this value through a series of actions: "obey", "do", and "just do", "listen" and "respect". Similar to the other English speaking groups, the participants emphasized the action of listening to parents and to other individuals identified as "they", probably to all of the adults close to the child. The Bilingual Lebanese group when speaking in English behaved similarly to the two American groups emphasizing the action of "saying yes" (see participant 1, group 3), and the action of following orders as in "if she tells me to go and fix my room, I go and and fix...." (participant 2, group 3). One particularly interesting utterance was in the Bilingual Lebanese group and uttered by participant 2 where the child refers to obeying orders from a commander as an authority figure in the army, possible influence of ongoing events in the Middle East. When speaking in Arabic, both groups equated obedience to listening to the "mother and father". Some Arabic speaking children went on a tangent describing obedience as modesty and humility. Participants 1 and 3 in group 5 identified obedience as controlling oneself in the face of demands made by the

parents that go beyond their capabilities while simultaneously not holding the adults accountable for their actions. These data seem consistent with the findings of question 2 in the above section as the children aimed at all times to obey their parents and by so doing to respect them.

Respect: English and Arabic

While the American group emphasized respect (superordinate) as connected with objects and places (as the complement of the action), as in participant 2, group 1, and participant 1, group 1, the other two English speaking groups defined this concept in terms of people as recipients of the actions. In fact, the American group residing in Lebanon talked about “Respect your elders”, “your parents”, “the older people”, and “do what you are told to do”, while in the Bilingual Lebanese group, “respect your mother” and “ people...the way they look”. The Bilingual Lebanese group in Arabic mentioned the respect of friends, of people, of manners at the table, while in the monolingual, the respect of others and politeness were the top of the list. Respect and obedience in all groups seemed to complement each other. These results support the findings from question 3 presented previously. It was universally observed that all children carried out their parents’ demands and respected them as it is shown in their plan of actions. They also understood the consequence of their behavior by accepting the punishment attached to it and equalizing action to its equivalent reaction. This argument seems consistent with the findings in the questionnaire as children expressed their thoughts.

Honesty: English and Arabic

The American monolingual group uniformly defined the term as “telling the truth”. The American Residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese definitions in English were very similar in that they not only emphasized the truth but also reinforced the absence of “lies”. The Arabic speaking groups defined honesty using hypothetical situations and seemed to focus on this concept in terms of an absence of lies or not keeping a promise. In the case of the child who spoke about “promise”, it seemed that the child was drawing his information from a direct experience (see participant 2, group 4). Children were honest in revealing their feelings and no further content difference was recorded between the groups which is consistent with the findings of question 4 in the above section.

Justice: English and Arabic

This concept was connected to the courts, to the outcomes of war and to the law in the American groups, while it was connected only to the concept of law in the American group Residing in Lebanon. However a general observation was that children seemed to want to express what this concept was but it was too complex to be put in words. One child admitted that “ it makes me think of ...war” (see participant 3, group 1). In group 2, “law” and “the right thing” were equivalents used to define this concept. If the Bilingual Lebanese group made a specific definition of this concept when conversing in English, they tended to refer to the court; however, the majority of the subjects chose to provide no definition. Children in the Arabic group produced more expressions and definitions though in different genres. The concept was elaborated as

children expanded their utterances using hypothetical examples and equivalence such as: “gets what he deserves” (see participant 2, group 4; participant 1, group 5) or in the word “the court” (participants 1 in groups 4 and group 5). One child mentioned honesty as an equivalent term to justice. The utterance “what he deserves” was spoken in English probably from a possibly previously heard statement elsewhere in his life. The concept of justice as argued before seemed to be stated in a more robust way by the children in the Lebanese groups. The definitions uttered in this section seem to support the findings of the previous section where children responded to question 5 in the questionnaire. In those responses, individuals outlined reasons for fights and disagreements and what the outcomes of these disagreements might be, responses which are consistent with notions of justice and the possible outcomes of instances of rectifying injustice.

Forgiveness: English and Arabic

The American children seemed to understand apology as a two-way interaction; a negative action followed by a verbal apology. Children, in the American groups as well as in the Arabic speaking groups, told short imaginary narratives to explain such a concept. Some Arabic utterances were mixed with the English again as placeholders, a characteristic seemingly typical of group 2 (see participant 1, group 2). It was clear that in all examples children understood that forgiveness would only occur if the assailant would admit feelings of regret that the offended would accept. Only then can forgiveness take place. However, such an intriguing concept was quite complex to be equated with only one verbal equivalent. It was quite similar that children needed that the offended say “I forgive you” or an equivalent utterance such as “I did not mean it” so

this process can go through (see participant 3, group 5; participant 1, group 5; participant 1, group 1; participant 3, group 2). These findings seem to complement the utterances that children produced during question 5 in the questionnaire. In that section children seemed to understand the reason behind people fighting and in the Arabic groups' children demonstrated their discontent and discomfort not only verbally but through nonverbal means as well.

Caring: English and Arabic

Caring and thoughtfulness and being aware of the needs of others were all definitions that children in all groups produced. Examples and narratives were given as to caring about other people's feelings, personal belongings, work, and individuals such as people, friends and family. These utterances seem to support the utterances shown in the questionnaire section (question 6). Categories chosen in concordance with the concept of caring seem to match the categories offered as an answer to the question posed by the researcher. Children talked about caring for sick people, caring about things, about others and particularly parents and family members. One particularly interesting utterance was provided by participant 1, group 1 who looked at that concept from the point of view of parents. They are the ones caring for their kids.

Sharing: English and Arabic

The English speaking groups produced similar ideas. Children wanted to share money, objects (stuff) and belongings as well as toys. An interesting utterance was made by participant 3, group 2, where the child wanted to share a hotdog and went to the

extent of using nonverbal gestures to help the listener visualize the situation. Participant 3, group3, gave a very emotional and abstract definition, namely, “share your happiness, your sadness” then added “toys and money”. The Arabic speaking group produced similar responses. However the word “equally” as in participant 1, group 5 seems to support a previous feature dominant in the questionnaire, question 6 where the monolingual and the Bilingual Lebanese groups frequently produced the words “equal” frequently giving the impression that children focused on fairness towards particular members of their direct environment.

Planning: English and Arabic

The English and Arabic groups produced similar concepts including scheduling, preparation for an upcoming event and traveling. Some children offered a hypothetical situation with a short narrative and others explained within one sentence what they needed to do in order to give this planning a concrete format. There was one interesting utterance where this concept carried negative connotations (see participant 2, group 2), where the child wanted to “trap someone”. Participant 2, group 4 produced a very detailed utterance where the child described step by step what needed to be done in order to have a successful trip. These data support the findings in the previous section (question 6) where children demonstrated the capacity to plan their expenditures by dividing their monies into different parts and spending according to a certain detailed plan.

Economy: English and Arabic

Some children across the groups did not know the meaning of this term and others seemed to guess that it was “the way money is handled”(see participant 3, group 1), or “something they talk a lot about on the news”(see participant 2, group 1). One interesting utterance was given by participant 1, group 2, namely, “being selfish”. The Bilingual Lebanese group seemed not to produce any utterances in English but produced utterances in Arabic explaining that economy was “be economical and keeping some money” (see participant 1, group 5) and “not to spend” (see participant 3, group 5). The fact that some children did not know the meaning or could not express it was consistent with their behavior during the questionnaire. It may be that because the children did not really understand this concept, they either abstained from answering or produced very minimal responses.

Quantitative Results

The purpose of this section is to examine the similarities and differences among the four groups of children and the four groups of parents. Furthermore, this section will answer hypotheses comparing the groups of parents to their children on the surveys. The different samples of population were selected based on their nationality, age, languages spoken, and place of residence. Thus these selective factors became the independent variables. The dependent variables were the rankings of ten moral values.

Primarily the survey required ratings from participants based on a Likert-type rating scale from 1-10, with one being the least favorable and ten the most favorable. However, at the start of the study, the first three parents rated all values equally giving all

values a maximum score. With such feedback, the only procedure that would have rendered this survey informative would have required that the research design be changed from ratings to rankings. By requesting that the parents and the children use each score only once, more variations and meaningful outcome was insured.

The rankings on the surveys of the ten values given to children and parents yielded the use of nonparametric testing using $\alpha = .10$ as a level of significance. This level of significance would allow a greater critical region or a more liberal region. The justification for using such α is that the researcher designed this study from an unbiased stance based on null hypotheses. Thus by attaining a conclusion that there is less than 10% probability that any difference (if any) is due to chance, we are allowing a greater probability that differences are the result of independent variables. We, therefore, expand the limits of the treatment area allowing further discussion and elaboration of the findings and giving more power in rejecting false null hypotheses.

To analyze rankings and to avoid a Type II error (where the researcher fails to reject a null hypothesis that is actually false), a Kruskal-Wallis test for nonparametric measures of three or more independent samples was used to test for any significant differences among 1) the groups of parents and 2) the groups of children. For the groups of children, the test was conducted twice: once with the Bilingual Lebanese group speaking English and another time with the same group speaking Arabic.

For the purpose of examining the statistical variations between and among the groups of participants, non-parametric computations were carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) to test the specific hypotheses related to the study. This section will explain the results

of hypotheses tested 1) between the groups of parents, 2) between the groups of children, and 3) between the children and their parents.

Parents

Since the Bilingual Lebanese parents only responded in English, the following null hypotheses were specifically tested. The basic aim of these hypotheses was to analyze and look for significant differences in rankings of moral values, if any, among the four different groups. The purpose of testing the first hypothesis was to determine the effect of culture on the ranking of different moral values. The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted and the following are the results:

H_01 : There are no significant differences between the four independent groups of parents.

The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded results that supported significant differences between the groups regarding the moral value “caring”. (See Table 2 for results). In order to find which of the four groups were specifically different, a series of Mann-Whitney tests between two independent samples was carried out among all four groups. The alpha comparable level was a two-tailed $\alpha = .10$ as provided by Gravetter and Walnau (2000, p. 702). The use of a two-tailed testing was justified by the fact that the sample size was too small compared to the magnitude of the dependent variables.

H_02 : There are no significant differences in the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and Bilingual Lebanese groups.

Computations revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups, and thus failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H_03 : There are no significant differences between the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and the American Residing in Lebanon.

The Mann-Whitney test revealed no significant differences between the rankings of the Lebanese group and the American Residing in Lebanon and we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H_04 : There are no significant differences between the Lebanese monolingual and the American groups.

The Mann-Whitney test revealed significant differences between the groups on the value of “caring” with $U = 20.5, p < .10$, “hardwork” $U = 27.000, p < .10$, and “justice” with $U = 24.500, p < .10$. All other information supported the null hypothesis and no further significant differences were observed.

Table 2

Kruskal-Wallis Testing Among Groups of Parents

<i>Monolingual/Bilingual/ American Residing in Lebanon/American</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>n</i>	χ^2	<i>p < .10</i>
Honesty	3	34	1.032	<i>n.s.</i>
Obedience	3	34	.504	<i>n.s.</i>
Caring	3	34	7.107	< .10
Sharing	3	34	2.899	<i>n.s.</i>
Economy	3	34	4.436	<i>n.s.</i>
Hardwork	3	34	4.926	<i>n.s.</i>
Respect	3	34	2.167	<i>n.s.</i>
Planning	3	34	3.986	<i>n.s.</i>
Justice	3	34	4.527	<i>n.s.</i>
Forgiveness	3	34	2.442	<i>n.s.</i>

H_05 : There are no significant differences between the Bilingual Lebanese and the American groups.

There was not enough evidence to support the findings that there were any significant differences between the groups and thus we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H_06 : There are no significant differences between the Bilingual Lebanese and the American Residing in Lebanon groups responding in English.

Results indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups.

H_07 : There are no significant difference between the American Residing in Lebanon and the American groups.

There were no significant differences between the groups and we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Thus the only significant difference was between the Lebanese monolingual and the American groups on three moral values, while there were no apparent differences between any of the other groups. (See Table 3 for results).

Table 3

Results of Hypotheses for Groups of Parents

<i>Between Groups</i>	<i>p</i> < .10
<hr/>	
<i>H</i> ₀ 2: Monolingual vs. Bilingual	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H</i> ₀ 3: Monolingual vs. American Residing in Lebanon	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H</i> ₀ 4: Monolingual vs. American	< .10 on <i>Hardwork, Caring, Justice</i>
<i>H</i> ₀ 5: Bilingual vs. American Residing in Lebanon	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H</i> ₀ 6: Bilingual vs. American	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H</i> ₀ 7: American Residing in Lebanon vs. American	<i>n.s.</i>

Children

The same procedure applied to parents was applied to this group of analysis. The following specific hypotheses were tested. To analyze the differences between the groups and minimize Type II error, a Kruskal-Wallis test was primarily applied to test for significance among K independent samples. This test is an alternative to the single-factor, independent measures analysis of variance. Again the SPSS program was used for analysis. The first part of the first hypothesis was tested with the Bilingual Lebanese group in English. The second part of the hypothesis was tested with the Bilingual Lebanese Group speaking Arabic. The following are the results of the specific hypotheses:

H_01a : There is no tendency for the ranks in any treatment to be systematically higher or lower than the ranks in any other treatment conditions. There are no differences between the groups.

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there were some significant differences among the groups regarding the value of “justice” with $\chi^2 = 12.777 (2, n = 34), p < .10$. As Table 4 shows, results revealed significant differences between the groups, with the Bilingual Lebanese group responding in English and we reject this null hypothesis. We conclude that at least one of the mean rankings is different.

Table 4

Kruskal-Wallis testing Among Groups of Children (Bilingual responding in English)

Monolingual/Bilingual/ American Residing in Lebanon/American	<i>df</i>	<i>n</i>	χ^2	<i>p</i> < .10
Honesty	3	34	1.309	<i>n.s.</i>
Obedience	3	34	3.576	<i>n.s.</i>
Caring	3	34	1.734	<i>n.s.</i>
Sharing	3	34	3.966	<i>n.s.</i>
Economy	3	34	1.025	<i>n.s.</i>
Hardwork	3	34	.777	<i>n.s.</i>
Respect	3	34	2.722	<i>n.s.</i>
Planning	3	34	1.162	<i>n.s.</i>
Forgiveness	3	34	.907	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>Justice</i>	3	34	12.777	< .10

H_01b : There is no tendency for the ranks in any treatment to be systematically higher or lower than the ranks in any other treatment condition.

The same null hypothesis was tested with the Bilingual Lebanese group responding in Arabic and again as Table 5 reveals, there were significant differences with the value of “justice”, and $\chi^2 = 10.168$ (2, $n = 34$), $p < .10$.

To locate where the significant differences existed and to identify between group differences, a series of Mann-Whitney tests was further conducted to search for the specific differences. One series of tests was conducted with the Bilingual Lebanese group responding in English and another series was conducted with the Bilingual Lebanese group responding in Arabic.

Table 5

Kruskal-Wallis Testing Among Groups of Children (Bilingual responding in Arabic)

<i>Monolingual/Bilingual/ American Residing in Lebanon/American</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>n</i>	χ^2	<i>p < .10</i>
Honesty	3	34	3.603	n.s.
Obedience	3	34	1.420	n.s.
Caring	3	34	1.361	n.s.
Sharing	3	34	4.764	n.s.
Economy	3	34	.672	n.s.
Hardwork	3	34	1.335	n.s.
Respect	3	34	3.384	n.s.
Planning	3	34	2.089	n.s.
Forgiveness	3	34	.546	n.s.
Justice	3	34	10.168	< .10

Thus the specific hypotheses were tested:

H_02 : There are no significant differences in the rankings of the Lebanese monolingual and Bilingual Lebanese group speaking English.

Results indicated that there were significant differences regarding the value of “justice” with $U = 23.500, p < .10$.

H_03 : There are no significant differences in the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and the Bilingual Lebanese group speaking Arabic.

Results showed no significant differences between the two groups and we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H_04 : There are no significant differences between the ratings of the Lebanese monolingual and the American Residing in Lebanon.

Results indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups and we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H_05 : There are no significant differences between the monolingual and the American groups.

Results indicated that there were significant differences regarding the value of “justice” with $U = 20.000, p < .10$.

H_06 : There are no significant differences in the mean rank between the Bilingual Lebanese Group speaking Arabic and the American groups.

Results showed that there were significant differences on the value of “honesty” with $U = 22.000, p < .10$, and we thus reject the null hypothesis.

H_07 : There are no significant differences between the Bilingual Lebanese Group speaking English and the American groups.

There were no significant differences and we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H_08 : There are no significant differences between the Bilingual Lebanese Group speaking Arabic and the American Residing in Lebanon groups.

Results showed significant differences between the two groups regarding the value of “justice”, with $U = 4.000$, $p < .10$.

H_09 : There are no significant differences between the Bilingual Lebanese Group speaking English and the American/Lebanese groups.

Results indicated that there were significant differences between the two groups on the value of “justice”, with $U = 5.50$, $p < .10$.

H_010 : There are no significant differences between the American Residing in Lebanon and the American groups.

Results showed significant differences between the two groups only regarding the value of “justice”, with $U = 3.000$, $p < .10$. All other values showed no significant differences.

As a summary, the concept of “justice” seems to be the focus of differences between the groups in general. (See Table 6 for results).

Table 6

Results of Hypotheses Among Groups of Children

<i>Between Groups</i>	<i>p < .10</i>
<i>H₀2: Monolingual vs. Bilingual in English</i>	<i>< .10 on Justice</i>
<i>H₀3: Monolingual vs. Bilingual in Arabic</i>	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H₀4: Monolingual vs. American Residing in Lebanon</i>	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H₀5 : Monolingual vs. American</i>	<i>< .10 on Justice</i>
<i>H₀6 : Bilingual in Arabic vs. American</i>	<i><.10 on Honesty.</i>
<i>H₀7 : American Residing in Lebanon vs. American</i>	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H₀8 : Bilingual in Arabic vs. American –Lebanese</i>	<i>< .10 on Justice</i>
<i>H₀9 : Bilingual in English vs. American Residing in Lebanon</i>	<i>< .10 on Justice</i>
<i>H₀10 : American Residing in Lebanon vs. American</i>	<i>< .10 on Justice</i>

Parents vs. Children

The last set of hypotheses required the use of the Mann-Whitney independent samples procedure. These hypotheses were aimed at researching the differences, if any, between the parents' decision and the children's in ranking the moral values. The following are the results:

H_01 : There are no significant differences between the rankings of Lebanese monolingual parents and their children.

The analysis revealed some significant differences between the two groups and we conclude that we reject the null hypothesis. The values that showed differences are: "hardwork" with $U = 27, p < .10$ and "planning" with $U = 26.5, p < .10$.

H_02 : There are no significant differences between the rankings of Bilingual Lebanese parents responding in English and their children responding in English.

Results revealed that there is a difference between the two groups on the values of "caring" $U = 25, p < .10$, "economy" $U = 26, p < .10$, "justice" $U = 25, p < .10$, and "forgiveness" $U = 26, p < .10$.

H_03 : There are no significant differences between the rankings of American Residing in Lebanon parents and their children.

Results showed no significant differences between the different groups.

H_04 : There are no significant differences between the rankings of American parents and their children.

There were some significant differences on the value of “honesty” with $U = 25.5$, $p < .10$.

In summary, the differences observed were between the groups of Lebanese monolingual parents and their children, Bilingual Lebanese parents and their children and American parents and their children. The only exception to this difference was between the American Residing in Lebanon parents and their children where we seemed to fail in rejecting the null hypothesis. This could be attributed to the small number of participants in this group where $n = 4$. (See Table 7 for results).

Table 7

Results of Hypotheses Between Groups of Children and their Parents

<i>Between Groups</i>	<i>p < .10</i>
<i>H₀1: Monolingual</i>	<i>< .10 on Hardwork, Planning</i>
<i>H₀2: Bilingual in English</i>	<i>< .10 on Caring, Economy, Justice, Forgiveness</i>
<i>H₀3: American Residing in Lebanon</i>	<i>n.s.</i>
<i>H₀4: American</i>	<i>< .10 on Honesty</i>

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The present research has attempted to answer the questions related to the variations of linguistic behavior of children across several cultural groups in two countries. In this section, we will attempt to summarize and discuss the results relative to the three questions posed by this study. First, we will describe the linguistic behaviors of monolingual English and Arabic speakers, concentrating on the form of these behaviors and their content. Second, we will describe the behavior of the two key groups, English speaking children residing in Lebanon and the bilingual Lebanese children. We will compare them to the monolingual groups in order to determine how they differ from and are similar to these two groups of speakers. Third, we will describe the behaviors of these four groups on their definition of the ten values used in this study. Again, we will make comparisons between the two key groups – English speaking children residing in Lebanon and the bilingual Lebanese groups. Third, we will then discuss the similarities and differences among and between the parents and children as they rated the ten values used in this study. Fourth, we will discuss the implications of these results to both practice and future research.

First Question

The first question to be addressed is: What are the linguistic moves of children from different groups while expressing their moral values in different situations? In order to address this question, we will first present the results on the form and content of the utterances produced by the monolingual American and Lebanese groups followed by

the American group residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese groups. For this purpose we will discuss simultaneously the similarities as well as the differences in form and in content.

English Monolingual Group

Conversational Patterns

My general feeling during the process of presenting the first set of questions was such that children across the groups approached the sessions with an open mind and considerable verbal freedom to express themselves. They seemed at ease and showed verbal competence appropriate for their age. Children actually had a sense of what was expected in such situations and chose utterances compatible with the context. While formulating verbal responses to problematic situations, children seemed familiar with the conventions of the dialogue in English. They were respectful of the amount of time required while formulating the length of their utterances, and wait-time seemed to be respectively consistent. Wait-time (Barnhart, 1982; Sather & Kretschmer, In press; Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. 1981; Williams 1981) is the time between the last utterance of one speaker and the first utterance of the next one. Children waited for the researcher to complete her utterances before they began theirs, and responded in appropriate genres and with appropriate utterances to fulfill the purpose of the questions being asked. There were markers indicating the beginning and end of each speech segment. For example they used an increasing tone to indicate the beginning of a sentence, and a slightly decreasing tone to indicate the ending of the sentence.

Most of the **nonverbal** behaviors of the American children consisted of folding their hands in front of them, looking straight ahead at the researcher, and making single

vertical headshake to mark a positive answer or a single horizontal headshake to mark a negative answer. For most children, this type of behavior seemed to last to the end of this session. Children did not seem to use any other physical or motor behavior while speaking.

Form

Children were well socialized in the practice of discussions and in giving full answers to questions. The nature of the task affected the types of forms used by these children. Some questions encouraged the use of short narratives that posed personal experiences from their lives or hypothetical situations as ways of responding to the question. Other questions resulted in the child providing a single response with some justification, resulting in more abbreviated productions.

The narratives generated by these children involved the use of connectors such as **and** and **and then**, as ways of extending the reporting of the behaviors produced by the child as part of this response. With Question 5: Forgiveness and Justice and Question 6: Sharing, Caring, Planning, Economy, the narratives were clearly anchored to the precipitating event that required forgiveness or instances of injustice or that required acts of sharing and/or caring. In addition, the children used many elaborative terms such as prepositional phrases as a way of detailing specifics related to these actions. In addition, there was a remarkable use of the **present tense** in English accompanied by the pronouns “I/they” and “you”. These pronouns were recorded with high frequency and children used them to include the voices of different people using their own words. Use of these forms allowed the child to incorporate statements probably made by adults living in their

world as a way of justifying their answers to the questions. Use of these personal pronouns was also related to the tendency of these children to use real life situations. Use of “you” allowed the students to indicate a general rule. In addition, the use of present tense allowed the student to indicate that the response was applicable now and in the future.

Abbreviated productions usually consisted of a) imperatives that addressed the question, and b) deletion of old information or the use of a place holder coupled with a conditional clause usually marked by **if**, **when** or **because** that provides a justification or reason for an implied agreement or disagreement with the concept being posed. Examples of the latter would be “sometimes when I think that something they are asking me is not good I won’t do it...” (an example of a place holder) or “To do what they told me the first time to do” (an example of omission of old information). Which connector was used depended upon the nature of the task. For instance, **if** and **when** were used in responses to Question 1: Obedience and Respect, while **because** was more common to Question 3: Respect. These abbreviated productions could be a single utterance usually a chore that needed to be completed as a way of responding to the sentence or a series of productions connected by **and** and **and then**.

The use of contractions indicative of a certain level of comfort in the language was observed in the utterances of this group of children. In addition, there was one interesting feature of the utterances, namely, the repetition of the same word usually to signal an increase the intensity of the utterance (very very).

Content

Throughout the entire session, children used personal, mundane events as ways of responding to the question. For instance, when mentioning duties and chores, the children indicated the importance of doing their work at home, helping their parents, keeping the house clean, removing trash, sorting out the basement, and tidying up their bedrooms. They seemed to be aware that children were expected to follow certain rules of social conduct. For instance, children were to behave at all times, watch their manners, be friendly, not fight with siblings, and respect elders and belongings. They seemed to be aware of the need for constraints from parents and the fact that they often violated these constraints, which necessitated the imposition of disciplinary action. Most of these actions were seen as appropriate or necessary, although there were indications that sometimes they were arbitrary and sometimes conditions allowed for their violation. In some cases, there was a recognition that rules are relative and contextually bound, that is, they apply in some situations and not in others. This was indicated by the use of the adverb **sometimes**. They also recognized the conditions and actions required to demonstrate a sense of sharing and caring toward others. Most of the sharing was directed at family members with an occasional reference to outside members such as “the poor”. Finally, when talking about future plans and goals, they indicated actions that clearly were American in origin; for instance, putting monies away for College is a future goal in the American context, but not necessarily in the Lebanese context. The most interesting response was to Question 5: Forgiveness and Justice, where all of the examples provided related to personal problems encountered in the child’s life and seemed to involve more “mundane” events. This is in sharp contrast

with the responses of the Monolingual Arabic speakers who talked not only about real life experiences, but also made references to the warfare in the region, especially Iraq.

One additional factor revolves around the use of the modal **would**. When framing issues related to tasks that needed to be completed, the children would use this modal as a way of indicating intended action.

When children told stories, there was no emotional accompaniment to their verbal utterances, either through intonation or other non-verbal actions. The use of visual movements was not present in the speech of these participants. The children hardly moved their arms from under the table or moved from their stationary position. Children did not volunteer their specific feelings about what they were saying but tended to only generate details of actions and their consequences. In detailing these actions and consequences, there were indications of self-blame especially when responding to issues of punishment and respect. The children saw the behaviors as their problems. In other words, they saw themselves not meeting parental expectations. Because of this, parents were then well within in their rights to exercise disciplinary actions. However, there were indications among these children that some rules seemed somewhat arbitrary and unfair, and that the punishment resulting in their application was also seen as unfair.

Arabic Monolingual Group

Conversational Patterns

The monolingual Arabic-speaking children behaved similarly to the monolingual American group. Children approached the sessions with an open mind and the verbal

freedom to express themselves. They were at ease and showed verbal competence appropriate for their age. Children actually had a sense of what was expected in such situations and chose utterances compatible with the tasks at hand. They seemed at ease in discussing these matters with the examiner. As in the American group, children seemed familiar with the conventions of the dialogue in Arabic. Wait-time, which is the time between the last utterance of one speaker and the first utterance of the next one, was observed in these children. Children waited for the researcher to complete her utterances before they began theirs before responding in appropriate genres and with appropriate utterances to fulfill adequately the purpose of the questions being asked. There were markers indicating the beginning and end of a speech segment. For example they used an increasing tone to indicate the beginning of a sentence, and a slightly decreasing tone to indicate the ending of the sentence.

Unlike the American group, the Lebanese children exhibited many nonverbal behaviors, consisting of facial grimaces, hand gestures, and headshakes, to accompany their verbal productions. These behaviors seemed to last throughout the session. These behaviors were consistent across Arabic speaking children with variations in intensity. In some instances, the nonverbal behavior was so extreme that in one make-believe situation the emotions were so intense, so that the movements generated by the child took over the whole effort.

Form

Children were well socialized in the practice of discussions and giving full answers to questions. As with the American group, the nature of the task seemed to

affect the responses of the children. Some questions prompted the use of narratives while others seemed to prompt the use of less abbreviated responses. However, it should be noted that the Arabic monolingual group tended to use narrative explanations more than the English monolingual group.

When generating narrative structures, these children, like in the English group, exhibited with a noticeable frequency the utterances **and** and **and then**. There was a remarkable use of the present tense in Arabic just as there was in the English speaking group, which signaled that events occurring now had applicability to future events. Unlike the English speakers, these utterances were accompanied by inclusive pronouns such as “we” along with the individual forms of “I” and “they”. Use of these pronouns allowed the children portrayed voices of different people, while simultaneously allowing them to make general statements that transcended specific events. Unlike the English speaking group, imperatives were absent and only statements were recorded. Instead, they made indirect statements which were interpreted as actions that needed to be completed. In making the translations of Arabic into English, the researcher framed the English translations as imperatives, but in actuality, they were actually statements in the original Arabic. In the productions of the monolingual Arabic children, there were subordinate clauses and the children seemed to understand this subordination. However, unlike English utterances, the use of “when” was replaced by the use of “because” in connecting logical sequences. Thus, Arabic speakers seemed to stress cause and effect relationships rather than conditional ones. Unlike the English speaking group, there were no sentence fillers such as **sometimes** as the Arabic language does not permit such a verbal behavior. In addition, the Arabic speaking children tended not to begin sentences

with new information, choosing to introduce the old information as a statement and then adding new information onto the sentence. This is unlike the English monolingual children who would either use sentence fillers, or omit the information by presenting the new information immediately. Contractions again do not exist in the Arabic language and thus nonexistent in the behavior of the children in this group. A particular behavior that was present in this group was the feature of linguistic intrusion where individuals in one language, namely Arabic used the utterances of another language, English, to represent lexical items that do not exist within the native language (TV, play station, computer).

Content

When generating these productions, these Arabic speaking children offered utterances indicative of time and context. As context was socio-culturally situated there were instances of answers reflective of cultural settings particular to one society but not necessarily another such as English. When mentioning duties and chores, the children indicated the importance of doing their homework related to school. Chores at home, helping parents tidying up their bedrooms seemed not to occupy too much of the child's utterances, and came last on their list of parental requests. This was unlike the American group who emphasized the importance of house chores. As with the American group, there was mention of social acceptable behaviors. Children were to behave at all times, watch their manners, be friendly, not fight with siblings, and respect elders and belongings. One extra request was for children to be hospitable and to receive people in a kind and friendly manner. Unlike the American group, the Arabic speaking children

used the utterance “sometimes” to substitute a whole sentence or a whole concept. This utterance was a lonely utterance and children did not offer details about particular situations. When American children used sometimes, they always provided the reasons surrounding its use.

An important difference between American and Arabic children was the role of the parents in their lives. American children acknowledged that parents sometimes became angry with them because they did not follow the rules. In contrast, there were Arabic children who seemed to suggest that there was no conflict, either because the parents did not become angry or because they did not violate any of the rules of the home. In some cases, when such conflict was acknowledged, the repair strategies were very direct such as kissing the mother or doing everything to avoid making the parents upset with them.

Unlike the American group, the children wanted to share the money with their families first and then with the “poor”, “orphanage” or the “poor countries”. In discussing sharing, these children mentioned the importance of sharing with the family first unconditionally, while they put conditions on friends borrowing money. Placing conditions on sharing with friends was not evident in American children. The response to Question 5: Forgiveness and Justice was interesting as these students often imported situations not related to their immediate situation, such as war in the Middle East. Their sense of injustice transcended beyond just family or personal issues, as in the American children, to injustice on a more regional or global basis.

Unlike the American children, Arabic speaking children tended to frame many of these statements using the modal “should” rather than “would”. Unlike American

children, they see actions as having to be completed, almost with an obligation, where American children, see these actions as needing to be completed, more by choice than by social obligation. This is an interesting difference between these two groups of children.

When these children told stories, they exhibited many emotionally heightened nonverbal actions to supplement their verbal utterances. Unlike the American group, children volunteered emotional expressions particularly when it was related to concepts such as disobedience and disrespect. These speakers would punctuate their efforts with facial expressions and hand movements. While there were indications of self-blame in the American group, children in the Lebanese group seemed to either deny disobedience or deny the punishment. However, there were some indications of their attempts to contest parental request, but these efforts were not significant given their infrequency.

American Residing in Lebanon and Bilingual Lebanese Groups

Conversational Patterns

As with the two monolingual groups, both of these groups of children exhibited a level of comfort and ease to perform the tasks being asked of them. Children were eager to solve the problems and reach answers to the questions. When direct information was not accessible to them, they were able to provide hypothetical situations as answers to the problems presented. Their responses were also adequate and compatible with the situations. Children actually had a sense of what was expected in such situations and chose utterances compatible with the context. Like the other two groups, each of these groups of children seemed at ease in discussing matters, exhibiting social skills as well as

language adequacy. While examining verbal responses, both groups of children seemed familiar with the conventions of the dialogue in English and as would be expected, the Bilingual Lebanese children were familiar with the conventions of Arabic as well. They were respectful of time while choosing the length of their utterances, and employed wait-time in a manner consistent with each language. All children waited for the researcher to complete her utterances before they began theirs, and responded in a manner that adequately fulfilled the purpose of each question asked. Finally, there were markers indicating the beginning and end of a speech segment. For example they used an increasing tone to indicate the beginning of a sentence, and a slightly decreasing tone to indicate the ending of the sentence.

The accompanying nonverbal behavior exhibited by the American children residing in Lebanon most frequently resembled the behavior of the American monolingual group. However, in one instance a participant used hand gestures indicating the action of cutting and with a headshake indicated an emotional response to watching people fighting. In contrast, the Bilingual group behaved in similar ways to the monolingual Lebanese, both in English and in Arabic. There were hand gestures, head movements, facial grimaces and changing tones of voice as well as headshakes to mark negative or positive answers. In addition, Bilingual Lebanese children moved their arms and hands and pointed to reinforce the point they were trying to make. This type of behavior was present throughout the interview and across most of the utterances of the children in this group.

Form

Children were well socialized in the practice of discussion and in giving full and appropriate answers to questions. As was true of the monolingual students, the task requirements influenced the generation of specific linguistic forms. Some tasks resulted for both groups in narratives. Narrative use occurred when the children were providing either memories of previously lived experiences or the formulation of hypothetical situations compatible as a way of answering these questions. As noted before, such narrative forms were more common among Arabic than among English monolingual children. The verbal behavior of both groups tended to resemble the Arabic monolingual group in that both groups tended to generate narrative structures rather than single utterances that included a justification.

The general use of “**and**” and “**and then**” was consistently used by both groups of children and such behavior is consistent with both groups of monolingual speakers. There was a remarkable use of the present tense similar to all the two monolingual groups. This was, however, predominate use of “**I**” and “**you**” in the American Residing in Lebanon Group, a form consistent with the American monolingual group. On the other hand, the bilingual group seemed to use “I” and “we”, both in English and Arabic, more frequently. Such pronoun use was consistently used by the Arabic monolingual group. Imperative use is of interest as well. While the Bilingual children exhibited more statement like sentences in both English and Arabic, the American residing in Lebanon Group exhibited more imperatives. Children in both groups were aware of the use of subordination. English monolinguals tended to use more conditional relationships, while Arabic monolinguals tended to use the causal form “**because**” more

often. The use of because was the subordinate conjunction of choice in the speech of both the American residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese Groups. While deletion of old information occurred in the utterances of the American monolingual group, these two groups, the Bilingual Lebanese and the American Residing in Lebanon groups, had the tendency to repeat the main clause like the Arabic monolingual group. As children warmed up to the situation, there were sentence fillers and the use of words that marked certain pauses in the language such as “I don’t know”, forms found in the American monolingual group. These utterances were present in the behavior of the American Lebanese but not in the Bilingual Lebanese group. Contractions, a form found in English monolingual children, appeared in the utterances of the American Residing in Lebanon but not in the Bilingual Lebanese Group, even when they were speaking in English. An interesting feature of both these groups was the appearance of English fragments in the Arabic utterances of one participant from the Bilingual Lebanese group, and the appearance of Arabic in the English utterances of one participant from the American residing in Lebanon group. As the children were explaining concepts within their productions, they suddenly switched from Arabic into English, usually to reinforce the point they were making. For instance, one child was explaining a concept of parental injustice and got so carried away that he stated in English “... and that’s not fair.” This feature is known as code switching where the individual switches from one language to the other to support a certain statement or to complement it.

Content

In the case of narratives, children offered utterances indicative of time and context. As context was socio-culturally situated, there were instances of cultural settings particular to one society but not the other. When mentioning duties and chores, the children in both groups indicated the importance of doing homework that seemed to occupy first place in parental requests. This obligation was solely articulated by the Arabic monolingual group. This behavior was more apparent in the Bilingual Lebanese group than the American Residing in Lebanon group, but there were individuals in both groups who expressed this obligation.

Both groups mentioned social acceptable behavior. Children were to behave at all times, watch their manners, be friendly, and not fight with siblings, and respect elders and belongings. These tasks were common to all groups. There were indications of cultural specific utterances. One such utterance was “help my mom to put the caps on the bottles of water” uttered by a Bilingual Lebanese child. This is a task related to the postwar era in Lebanon where people have to fetch their own water, ration it and bottle it themselves.

When children from both groups told stories, there was a great deal of emotional accompaniment to their verbal utterances, a characteristic more common of Arabic monolingual children. At times, there were indications of self-blame, similar to the American group, while responding to punishment and respect from both groups of children. However these expressions were not as intense as those found in the English monolingual children. In addition, children from both groups showed indications of debating the legitimacy of parental requests and questioning their reasonable, a behavior

seen more commonly among English monolingual children than among Arabic monolingual children.

Children in both of these groups, like the American group, demonstrated their understanding of the correlation between a particular action and its consequence. They clearly expressed the reasons behind their parents' discontent. The concept of punishment was closely related to the behaviors children presented. Some of these behaviors were: sibling rivalry, repetitive parental requests, disrespect, not adhering to the rules of safety. Children offered stories to explain particular situations and seemed to understand which punishment was connected to which type of action. Children reported types of punishment ranging from withdrawal of certain privileges, certain social interactions as well as confinement to their bedrooms. This too was similar to the punishment that American monolingual children provided. Unlike the Arabic monolingual children, children from these two groups did not indicate that parents were not unhappy with them, nor did they present solutions that easily resolved conflicts between child and parents, such as kissing the parent or making every attempt to avoid conflict.

The responses to Question 5: Forgiveness and Justice are of particular interest. Both groups provided examples drawn from mundane situations related to school and family life, but both groups also provided examples that go beyond these mundane areas marking references to "war" and international situations and/or personalities. For instance, one American Residing in Lebanon child made a reference to Adolph Hitler, while one Bilingual Lebanese child referred to the situation in Iraq.

While the use of the modal “**would**” was predominant in the utterances of the American monolingual children, the children in these two groups tended to use the modal “should”, a form more common of the Arabic monolingual group. The modal “should” indicated a need and a necessity to carry out actions in a dutiful sense. Though children displayed their understanding of the concepts of sharing, caring, planning and economy, the context was less defined than in the American group. While American children talked about “funds” and organized charities, these two groups talked about poor countries and poor people in a manner consistent with the Arabic monolinguals. In answering the last question, children from these two groups, like the Lebanese monolingual group, mentioned the importance of sharing with the family unconditionally while they seemed to present conditions when friends borrowed money.

Second Question

The second question guiding this research was: What are the similarities and differences in languages between the groups (if any) while they are defining these values? As in the previous section, we will also consider the form of the definitions and their content to identify consistent patterns within these productions.

Form

Analysis of such utterances revealed common features across the groups, both in English and in Arabic. The use of Aristotelian definitions and of nominal complement markers was recorded. According to Walker (2003), this type of verbal behavior is a signal of higher meta-linguistic capacities and is usually learned through school. In all

the groups, such skills were observed. Children in both languages similarly respected the conventions of such verbal utterances limiting their production to simple, compound or in some instances complex sentences. The use of the pronouns “I” and “you” were also observed in English, while the Arabic speaking groups opted for “one”, “man”, “people” as the actors or agents of the actions in their utterances. Again the subordinate conjunction “when” as a conditional marker was consistently used by the English speaking groups (English monolinguals, Americans Residing in Lebanon), while the Arabic speakers (Arabic monolinguals, Bilingual Lebanese) consistently chose “if” as the conditional marker.

Content

All across the groups, children exhibited information rich utterances. Their cognitive production seemed comparable and only when values became very abstract (economy, planning) did the children chose not to produce any explanations. Except for honesty and justice where certain cultural instances surfaced, all other verbal productions were very similar. If there were differences, they tended to revolve around specific references to the children’s own unique lives.

While commonalities seemed to prevail, some differences were observed in the following areas. While hardwork meant chores to English monolingual speakers, it involved school to the groups residing in Lebanon. While obedience was defined as listening to parents by the English speakers, in some Lebanese residing groups, it was also connected to issues of self-control, not just listening to the parents. Some of the children also made reference to social conflicts such as war. This is possibly due to the

post war era that is now dominating in Lebanon, and the exposure of children to the war in Iraq. While American respected things and people, this value was only confined to people in the other three groups.

Honesty was agreed upon as telling the truth; however, additional conditions were produced by the Lebanese groups, that is, the need to keep a promise and the need to tell no lies. Justice was conceptualized by the English speaking children as relating to court matters and/or doing the right thing, while the Lebanese groups sent stronger messages that entailed messages such as “gets what he deserves”. In forgiveness, children across the groups agreed that only if the offender were to ask for forgiveness and apologize, would forgiveness be only granted. Caring and sharing also produced similar utterances where children agreed to place their family members first and provide for needy people second. The last two values (planning, economy) produced few if any responses due to their abstractness. When the children did make an attempt to define these words irrespective of the language used, they tried to connect them to familiar situations from their daily lives.

Third Question

The third question guiding this research was: What are the similarities and differences, if any, in the rankings of values among these groups of children?

To answer this question, we need to refer to the eleven hypotheses that we tested among the children using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney tests. The monolingual and the Lebanese bilingual showed no significant differences in ranking the values particularly when the language was in Arabic. However, when English was used, there

was a significant difference with the English monolingual ranking lower on the “justice” value than the Bilingual Lebanese children when they were using English. In Prothro’s studies (1961), while interviewing parents on the issues of child rearing practices in Lebanon as compared to the United States, Lebanese parents, unlike the American mothers, ranked justice as one of the main values they tried to instill in their child. This may be why Bilingual Lebanese children’s rankings in both languages – English and Arabic – were higher on this value, since they came from a Lebanese home irrespective of the language they were using.

Fourth Question

What are the similarities and differences in the rankings of values if any among the parents in these different groups?

To answer this question, we need to refer to the eleven hypotheses that we tested among the children using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney tests. The groups of parents seemed to rank the values in general in a similar fashion. The only significant differences were between the Arabic monolingual and the English monolingual groups. The other two groups, Americans Residing in Lebanon and the Bilingual Lebanese children, were not significantly different from each other or with either of the two monolingual groups. The two monolingual groups differed on the issues of caring, justice and hardwork with the Lebanese scoring higher on justice and lower on hardwork and caring. As in Prothro’s (1961) study, parents of American ranked values differently than the Lebanese. In the case of “justice”, parents of Lebanese ranked this value higher than American parents, providing support the findings of this study.

For hardwork and caring, the only significant differences that were detected existed between the parents of the Lebanese and American children, where both language and culture are different. With research being so minimal in the cultural groups involved in this present study, we tend to attribute such results to the fact that though very similar, different cultures still weigh values differently. Prothro (1961) argued that while parents of Lebanese children expected their children to do less around the house, American mothers seemed to emphasize those chores more than Lebanese parents. American mothers seemed to reinforce that “they expected the child by the age of five to exercise considerably more personal responsibility in this matter” (p. 101). This again seems to support our findings that Lebanese mothers did not insist on chores while American parents did.

As for caring, the issue seemed quite universal although quantitative analysis tended to find some significant differences. Children across the groups showed care for their family relations as well as friends. The fact that they wanted to share with them and give equally and unconditionally is proof that care is a universal value. American and Lebanese societies care for their elders, and for direct family relationships as well as the welfare of friends in need.

Fifth Question

What are the similarities and differences in the rankings of values if any between the parents and their children in each group?

To answer this question, we need to refer to the eleven hypotheses that we

tested among the children using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney tests. More significant differences were noticed between the different groups of parents and their children than between the children themselves and between the different groups of mothers. There were differences between the children and their parents within three groups: the English monolingual group, the Arabic monolingual group, and the Bilingual Lebanese group. In the monolingual group, parents and their children differed on the issues of hardwork (children ranking this lower) and planning (children ranking this higher). The bilingual differed on caring (children ranking this higher) economy (children ranking this higher), justice (children ranking this lower) and forgiveness (children ranking this higher). The American differed on honesty (children ranking this lower). The only group that did not have a difference was the American Residing in Lebanon group, but this may be a case of having too small of a sample to determine any potential differences.

The next logical question would then probe into the many differences noted between the children and their parents. In this instance, I would like to suggest that this may be due to schooling and to the potential influence of the peer group. It is possible that schooling especially for the Bilingual Lebanese group was an important influence. These children are in a school system that is operated within the American tradition. Interestingly, it was this group that had the most differences between parents and children. In addition, there is no argument that children, through their exposure to popular culture, often develop values that are at odds with their parents. It is possible that the values developed and favored by the peer culture to which these children were exposed might influence some of the results of this study. For instance, it is possible that

peers within an American context may not place as much value on honesty as their parents, and this difference might result in the difference seen statistically. Similar arguments could be made for many of the other differences found as well.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In Chapter 1, culture and language were identified as important constructs in understanding how children manage talking about moral reasoning. It was argued that language is the mirror through which cultural values are articulated. It was suggested that possession of particular language might predispose a speaker of that language toward the values represented by the culture that uses that language (Fishman, 1996; Saville-Troike, 2000; Thomson, 2000; Whorf, 1956). In constructing our study, we had four groups of children. Two, namely, the monolingual English and the monolingual Arabic were included in order to establish a base line against which to compare the other two groups. One group consisted of Americans residing in Lebanon. This group was included because it used English in a home where American values were paramount, but they were surrounded by a second language and culture, Arabic-Lebanese. If culture is a construct that is less dependent upon language, then we would expect to see intrusion of Arabic culture into the linguistic productions of these children. The second group consisted of Bilingual Lebanese children. This group has two languages: English and Arabic. Their mastery of English occurred within an English-speaking educational setting, while their mastery of Arabic occurred within their homes. If language is a mirror to culture, then we would expect that when these children used English they

should be similar to the monolingual English speakers, and their use of Arabic should mirror the monolingual Arabic speakers.

The results of this study clearly show that there was a difference between the monolingual speakers, American and Lebanese, both in form and in content. In looking at the Americans Residing in Lebanon group, it is clear that the forms that they used come closer to the monolingual English group. However, there were instances when even at the form level, there were more Arabic-like productions than English-like productions. For instance, this group tended to use narratives more often, a trend that seemed to be more characteristic of monolingual Arabic children than monolingual English ones. They also had more of a tendency to use **should** and to repeat old information, forms that again were more characteristic of Arabic speaking children than English speaking ones. In the area of content, there were more uses of events outside of their immediate environment, especially in the area of justice. This is more true of monolingual Arabic speaking children than monolingual English speaking children.

In looking at the Bilingual Lebanese children, it becomes clear that the forms used in English often paralleled those used in Arabic. For instance, when conversing in English, they used many of the same non-verbal actions used by monolingual Arabic children. In addition, when conversing in English, they also tended to use more narratives, more the I/we pronouns rather than the I/you form, more **because** construction than **when** constructions, fewer, if any, contractions, and finally, more instances of supplying old information rather than deleting it as did the monolingual English speakers. However, there were instances when some of these children would switch from Arabic into English to express ideas such as the instance of the child who in the heat of the

moment stated that the parental actions were unfair. This, of course, could be a function of the listener, that is, the child knew the researcher was fluent in both Arabic and English and felt that it was appropriate to make this switch. In any case, the fact still remains that this child did make the switch from Arabic into English. Finally, many English vocabulary words found their way into their Arabic productions, words that do not have any Arabic equivalent.

With regard to content, a slightly different picture emerges. Many of the Bilingual productions were similar to those of the Arabic monolingual children. But, there were many instances when their productions both in English and in Arabic paralleled the content of monolingual English speakers rather than monolingual Arabic speakers. For instance, the Bilingual Lebanese children were less likely to state that there were no problems with their parents. In addition, they were more likely to question the legitimacy of parental actions and they were more likely to make statements about self-blame, that is, the reason parents disciplined them is because they did not follow the rules laid down by the parents. These latter two qualities were more characteristic of monolingual English children than monolingual Arabic children.

These latter two characteristics are interesting in light of one of the statistical findings made in this study. In ranking moral values, it was the Bilingual Lebanese children who had the most discrepancies in their rankings with their parents. Although it was not possible to make direct comparisons between these values with the parents because of our failure to ask the parents to define these values, it is significant that this finding emerged. If there are differences, then it would not be particularly surprising to see this finding to emerge.

What does this seem to say about our initial argument about the relation between language and culture? An argument I would now bring forward is that we need to think of language and culture as potentially independent constructs. When children learn language, they are simultaneously acculturated into a set of cultural values, including moral ones (Tappan, 1991b, 1992; Vygotsky, 1962, 1978). It is for this reason that the ties between language and culture seem so immutable. However, the data from the other two groups of children in our study seem to provide some insight into this issue. When looking at the American Residing in Lebanon group, it is clear that even their linguistic productions in English are somewhat affected by their exposure to a second language and culture, namely, the Arabic language and culture. However, most of these effects appear more in the area of discourse than syntax, i.e., the excessive use of narratives in their explanations and the repetition of old information. In addition, the content of some of their productions parallel those of Arabic speaking children rather than English speaking children. When looking at the Bilingual Lebanese children, it is clear that their use of English linguistic forms is heavily influenced by their first language, Arabic. However, when looking at content, some of their responses come closer to monolingual English speaking children than Arabic speaking children. Also, a potential area of research is to look at children who speak one language and are then immersed into a culture that uses a different one, such as the American Residing in Lebanon group. By looking at these groups, it might be possible to further tease out the notion of language and culture. It is clear that this group of children was influenced by their exposure to Arabic culture. What is not clear is where this came from, since our information on these children is somewhat limited. Such information would be of

considerable use to parents and institutions that are faced with relocating families from one culture to another.

Limitations of the Study

As we look to possible areas of future research, we consider the gaps that could or should have been avoided as we conducted the study. In such qualitatively rich research, the presence of the researcher inevitably plays a role in the outcome of the verbal productions of children as well as the analyses of the productions. According to Patton (2002), “In thinking about the issue of closeness to the people and situations being studied, it is useful to remember that many major contributions to our understanding of the world have come from scientists’ personal experiences”(p.49). Rubin and Rubin (1995) argue that “ you have to accept that how you are seen by the person being interviewed will affect what is said”(p.39). Eliminating researchers’ bias could be one of the most challenging aspects during the process of research and particularly while interpreting data. In the case of this study, this researcher is herself Lebanese, and a person who comes from a bilingual tradition, in this case trilingual – Arabic, French, and English. It is possible that this set of factors may have biased the results, but she made every attempt to undermine this possibility by sharing her findings with others such as her major professor and other doctoral students to establish the legitimacy of her findings.

This study was predominately a qualitative study where every individual is unique and the responses are also unique thus potentially limiting the generalization of results to the whole Arabic speaking population. It would have been interesting to include

children from a variety of cultural backgrounds representing the entire Muslim community, especially in the Middle East. It is possible that different results would have occurred if children from Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, or even Egypt had been used in addition to those from Lebanon.

Although this sample of children included subjects from both sexes, it was not possible to separate responses from male and female children. This would have resulted in even smaller sample sizes making generalizations from the data even more difficult than already present. It would have been useful if the study had been able to obtain equal sizes of boys and girls in each sub-sample under study in order to determine the existence of similarities and differences between the two sexes.

As we consider the statistical analyses employed in this study, the sample size in particular in the group of American residing in Lebanon was not ideal. With so many items in each section, sample sizes should have been larger to insure more robust results. As we could only recruit the four children from the American residing in Lebanon, a possible search might have been more successful during winter time when people are less likely to travel and leave for vacation. Thus we could have recruited more children and insure more representations across the four groups.

Another limitation is the lack of sufficient data from the parents. Our only instrument was the survey administered in English only. Ideally, it would have been useful if we could have administrated it in Arabic too allowing direct and corresponding comparison between parents and their children. Also, it would have been ideal if we could have administered a similar set of moral reasoning questions to the parents as we did to the children. Such information would have provided us with some insights as to

the possible reasons for the differences in the ratings of the 10 moral values between parents and children. If this was not possible, then having the parents define, not only rate, moral values might have been instructive as to possible differences between parents and children.

One of the conditions that cannot be ruled out as a possible contamination of the results is the role of educational setting. It would have also been ideal to have recruited children from the same school setting, which might or might not have been possible given the diversity of the sample of children residing in Lebanon. Such controls would have limited possible effects due to educational input, to the individual differences, and/or to the differences between the ratings of parents and children. If it can be agreed that morality is closely bound to religious teaching, especially, in the Islamic world, it would have also been informative to probe into the civic education or (*tarbiat in Arabic*) that is taught in the schools. Is the information transmitted as part of this subject matter area compatible with the pre-existing religious beliefs? If not, again this could have been a possible cause in the types of responses generated by the children residing in Lebanon and the ratings between Arabic speaking parents and children.

Another limitation of this study is not being able to predict whether children in similar situations would actually carry out their verbal responses. In other words action and words are quite different from one another. To observe the application of such moral reasoning in real life situations mandate the use of natural and longitudinal observations. Natural observations of children in their day-to-day environments, while interacting with others would provide valuable insight into whether what the children verbalize in these interviews are reflected in real life. Without establishing the

relationship between talk and real actual actions, leaves many missing links from this study.

Implications

The implications of this study are that when doing research in language especially between language groups or within individuals learning multiple languages, it is important to separate the notion of language and culture. This would support the notion that educational programs for bilingual children, should focus not only on the linguistic forms of the language, but also on the cultural values of that language. Thus educational programs that stress enculturation simultaneous to language learning may be a more productive way of making children bilingual, than programs that focus on the language itself.

Parents and teachers responsible for the upbringing of the new generations need to acknowledge and realize the importance of cultural differences not only that there is a difference but also how the cultures are different and how they are reflected in the linguistic components of that culture. The complexity of the relationship between language and culture requires that teachers pay distinctive attention to the culture the children originally come from, namely the culture they share at home. With relocation and immigration processes, children encounter other cultures and languages that require both cognitive and linguistic effort. Thus teachers can become catalysts through which children can transfer easily between the cultures and languages of home and school.

Bridging between society and school, Tharp (1989a, 1989b) suggested the notion of cultural compatibility, which exists between “education and cultural patterns”.

Focusing on the cultural linguistic behavior in academic settings, linguistic moves, nonverbal clues, and using that kind of information to build qualitatively facilitating educational processes would provide a great paradigm shift in the management as well as the performance and academic achievement of students. In his studies, Barnhardt (1982) described the eagerness and volunteering answers behavior of the children that was misconstrued and considered as disruptive behavior in the classroom. This type of eagerness present in some cultural verbal and nonverbal behavior as this study also shows, can be an aiding device in the hands of teachers as they seek to promote learning in a classroom environment. With the age of ethnographic analysis of classroom settings, teachers are able to understand and transform differences in cultural discourse into curricula that would aid and scaffold students in an all inclusive learning centers and transform classrooms into settings of excellence and success.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study has demonstrated that children at the middle school level from different cultures can feely engage in verbal moral thinking. However, hypothetical situations as mediated action could be a factor in altering the decision making as well as the content and form of verbal production of children. Tappan (1991b) suggests that any type of mediation that promotes moral thinking has an effect on the decision itself. Dunn (1987) points out a crucial difference between the understanding exhibited by verbal behavior and the actual action in a particular situation. In separating action from words, Tappan (1991b) argues that mediated action is defined by the medium of

expression. Thus as we look at the action itself as the medium we encounter discrepancies between what is being said and what is being done. As we look towards parts of the world where minimal research has been conducted on moral activity, suggestions for future research would include the focus on verbal moral responses as well as the actual moral deeds themselves. For this purpose, repetitive observations of children's interactions with others in naturalistic situations would be necessary. This could take place in playgrounds at schools or in situations where moral decisions are involved. Another possibility is observing group interaction while discussing issues of morality and situations similar to our present study. In fact, with issues revolving around national security, safety, harmonious living and peaceful approaches, it is crucial to have studies that would enlighten us about the behavior of people in the areas less known in the world.

From a linguistic point of view, further research is encouraged as we try to understand the behavior of children in classrooms and their expressions of thoughts and feelings as they develop an understanding of linguistic forms. Teachers of English as a Second Language as well as immersion teachers seem eager to focus on particularities of the grammar. Moreover, as language portrays a deeper thinking process as demonstrated by our attention to the content of utterances produced by children, it is important that teachers understand "what is being said" at the early stages of language development to aid children in developing the "how to say it" part. In depth research of this issue would involve longitudinal studies over several years to determine the growth of utterances about morality. As part of this study, it would be important to look at the form and content of such productions, to see their evolution over time.

Morality deeply rooted in religion requires that researchers try to understand where both meet. The common grounds between religion and morality are particularly important in our understanding of morality development in the case of the Islamic religion which dominates the Middle East. In order to make these places a safe haven where true education is promoted and safe expression of mind is permitted, it is important that we understand both. This type of study with its sensitivity would require that the researcher interview parents as to the boundaries of religion and morality, that is, where they think religion ends and where morality begins. This could be done on a comparative basis, looking at the contrast between Christian, Jewish, and Islamic thought as well as the variety of Islamic sects such as Sunni, Shiite and Druze existing across the Arabic world. Such data would be useful to teachers in order to see how school instructions can be compatible with home or if this is not possible, provide an understanding of potential conflicts between home and school. In addition, as all religions meet in the classrooms, it is important to find the common grounds to pave the way for children and future generations to converge. This would promote harmonious relationships and a better understanding of conflict resolution or dilemmas as we provide generations with a common lens through which they could view their world.

References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barnhardt, C. (1982). Tuning-in: Athabaskan teachers and Athabaskan students. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural issues in Alaskan education. Vol. II*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Center for Cross-Cultural Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 814).
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parents: A process model. *Child Development*, 55, 83-96.
- Berko-Gleason, J., Ely R., Perlmann, Y. & Narasimhan, B. (1996). Patterns of prohibition in parent –child discourse. In D.I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis & J. Guo (Eds.), *In Social interaction, social context and language* (pp. 205-217). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bersoff, D. M. (1993). Culture, context and the development of moral accountability judgments. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 664-676.
- Bersoff, D.M. & Miller, J. (1992). Culture and moral judgment: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(4), 542-554.
- Bersoff, D.M. & Miller, J.G. (1994a). The cultural context of everyday family relationships. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.), *Morality in Everyday Life: A Developmental Perspective* (pp.259-283) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University

- Press.
- Bersoff, D.M. & Miller, J. (1994b). Cultural influence in moral status of reciprocity and the discounting of endogenous motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 592-602.
- Bersoff, D.M., Miller, J.G. & Harwood R. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and in the United States: Moral imperatives on personal decisions. *Journal of Personality & Social psychology*, 58, 33-47.
- Bloom, L., Lightbown, P., & Hood , L. (1975). Structure and variation in child language. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* , 160, (40, No. 2) .
- Blum, N. J., Williams, G. E., & Firman, C. (1995). Disciplining young children: the role of verbal instruction and reasoning. *Pediatrics*, 96, 336-341.
- Bradley, R., Ramey, C., Barnard, K., Gottfried, A., Siegal, L., & Johnson, D. (1989). Home environment and cognitive development in the first three years of life: a collaborative study involving six sites and three ethnic groups in North America. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 217-235.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Bruner, J.S. (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. *Journal of Child Language*, 2, 1-19.
- Carroll, D.W. (1999). *Psychology of language*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Carroll, D.W. (2004). *Psychology of language* (4th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thompson Learning.
- Cazden, C.B. (1972). *Child language and education*. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

- Cazden , C.B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning*.
Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chafe, W.L. (1977). The recall and verbalization of past experience. In R.W. Cole
(Ed.).*Current issues in linguistic theory*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University
Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. (1968). *Language and mind*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and representation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cole, M. (1974). *Culture and thought*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Connor, D., & Day, J. M. (1991). Compensation and exchange: Being moral in time.
Adult Development, 3, 160-179.
- Crain, W.C. (1985). *Theories of Development*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Davis, S.S., & Davis, D.A. (1989). *Adolescence in a Moroccan town: Making social
sense*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press
- Day, J.M. (1991). Narrative, psychology and moral education. *American Psychologist*,
46, 167-178.
- de Villiers, J.G., & de Villiers, P.A.(1985). The acquisition of English. In D. Slobin
(Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition: Vol. 1: The data* (pp. 27-
140). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1998). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*.
Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dunn, J. (1987). The beginnings of moral understanding: Development in the second
year. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The Emergence of morality in young*

- children* (pp.91-112). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Faccone C., Kearns R., Kopp A., & Watson E. (2000). The effects of language on thought. Project presented at a conference. Retrieved July 31, 2003, from <http://www.unc.edu/~jdumas/projects/languagethought.htm>
- Fernea, E. (1991). Muslim Middle East. In J.M. Hawes, & N.R. Hiner (Eds.), *Children in historical and comparative perspective: An international handbook and research guide* (pp. 447-490). New York: Greenwood.
- Fishman, J. (1996). What do you lose when you lose your language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages* (pp. 55-78). Center for Excellence in Education: Northern Arizona University.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Physiological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1990). Joining the resistance: psychology, politics, girls and women. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 29,501-536
- Gilligan, C. & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations: gender differences and similarities. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 34, 223-237.
- Gilligan, C. Brown, L.M & Rogers, A. (1990). Psyche embedded: a place for body relationships and culture in personality theory. In A. Rabin, R. Zucker, R. Emmens & S. Frank (Eds.), *Studying persons and lives* (pp.137-195). New York: Springer.
- Gilligan, C., Ward, J & Taylor, J. (1988). *Mapping the moral domain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. & Wiggins, G. (1987). The origins of morality in early childhood

- relationships. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 277-305). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gleason, J.B. (2001). *The development of language*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gravetter, F.J. & Wallnau, B. (2000). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1990). Can there be a human science? *Person Centered Review*, 5(2), 130-154.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R., (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hoffman, M.L., & Saltzstein, H.D. (1967). Parent discipline and the child's moral development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 45-57.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Johnson, D. (1992). *Approaches to Research in 2nd Language*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Kohlberg, L. (1964). Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M.L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman (Eds.). *Review of child development research Vol. I*, (pp. 381-413). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought: how to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In T. Mischel (Ed.). *Cognitive development and epistemology*(pp. 213-255). New York: Academic.
- Kohlberg, L. (1993). The child as a moral philosopher. In C. Sommers,& F. Sommers (Eds.). *Vice and virtue in everyday life* (pp. 557-582). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Kretschmer, R.R. (2002). *Manual on Grammatical Analysis*. Unpublished document, University of Cincinnati.
- Kretschmer, R.R. (In preparation). *The oral discourse patterns of middle school children*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Cincinnati.
- Lancy, D.F. (2001). *Studying children and schools: Qualitative research traditions*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Leontiev, A.N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In J.V. Wertsch, (Ed.), *The concept of activity in soviet psychology* (pp.37-71). White Plains, NY: Sharpe.
- Luria, A.R. (1976). *Cognitive development: its cultural and social foundations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Luria, A.R. (1978). The development of writing in the child. In M.Cole (Ed.), *The selected writings of A.R. Luria* (pp. 105-125). White Plains, NY: Sharpe.
- McTear, M. & Conti-Ramsden, G. (1992). *Pragmatic disability in children*. Chichester, UK: Ellis Horwood.
- Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D.H. (1975). *Statistical package for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). . New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1979). Transcript as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics*. (pp. 58-72). New York: Academic Press.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Structuralism*. New York: Basic Books

- Piaget, J. (1983). Dialogue III. Jean Piaget's views on the psychology of language and thought. In R. W. Rieber & G. Voyat (Eds.), *Dialogues on the psychology of language and thought: Conversations with Noam Chomsky, Charles Osgood Jean Piaget, Ulric Neisser, & Marcel Kinsbourne* (pp.107-120). New York: Plenum.
- Prothro, E.D. (1961). *Child rearing in the Lebanon*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Prothro, E.D. & Diab, L.N. (1974). *Changing family patterns in the Arab East*. American Beirut, Lebanon: University of Beirut/Heidelberg Press.
- Rest, J. (1979). *Development in Judging Moral Issues*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J.R. (1985). An interdisciplinary approach to moral education. In M.W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), *Moral education: Theory and application* (pp. 9-27). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rest, J. (1986). *Moral Development: Advances in research and theory*. New York: Praeger.
- Rubin, H.J. & Rubin I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2000). Ethnography of communication. In S. McKay & N.H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic and language teaching* (p351- 382). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sather, G. & Kretschmer, R.R. Jr. (In press). Lebanese/ Arabic and American Children's Discourse in Group Solving Situations. *Language and Education*.

- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.B.K. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Scribner, S. (1985). Vygotsky's uses of history. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 272-290). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press
- Shatz, M. (1991). Using cross-cultural research to inform us about the role of language development: Comparisons of Japanese, Korean, and English, and of German, American English, and British English. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Cultural approaches to parenting* (pp. 139-153). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tappan, M.B. (1989). Stories lived and stories told: the narrative structure of adolescent moral development. *Human Development*, 32, 300-315.
- Tappan, M.B. (1990). Hermeneutics and moral development: interpreting narrative representations of moral experience. *Developmental Review*, 10, 239-265.
- Tappan, M.B. (1991a). Narrative, authorship and the development of morality. In Tappan, M.B. & Packer, M.J. (Eds.), *Narrative and storytelling implications for understanding moral development*. (pp. 5-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tappan, M.B. (1991b). Narrative, language and moral experience. *Journal of Moral Education*, 20, 243-256.
- Tappan, M.B. (1992). Texts and contexts: Language, culture and the development of moral functioning. In L.T. Winegar, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Children's development*

- within social contexts: Metatheoretical, theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 93-117). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tappan, M.B. (1997). Language, culture and moral development: A Vygotskian perspective. *Developmental Review, 17*, 78-100.
- Tappan, M.B. & Brown, L.M. (1989). Stories told and narratives learned: toward a narrative approach to moral development and moral education. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*, 182-205
- Tharp, R. G. (1989a). Psychocultural variables and constants: Effects on teaching and learning in schools. *American Psychologist, 44*, 349-359.
- Tharp, R. G. (1989b). Culturally compatible education: A formula for designing effective classrooms. In Trueba, H. T., Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (Eds.). *What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts?* (pp. 51-66). New York: The Falmer Press.
- Thomson, D.S. (2000). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis: Worlds shaped by words. In McCurdey, D.W. & Spradley J. (Eds.), *Conformity and conflict: Readings in cultural anthropology* (pp. 79-91). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986) *Thought and language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Walker, S.J. (2003). Cognitive, linguistic and social aspects of adults' noun definitions. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 30*, 147-161.
- Wells, G. (1986). The language experience of five-year-old children at home and at

- school. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), *The social construction of literacy* (pp. 69-93). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1984). The zone of proximal development: some conceptual issues. In B. Rogoff, & J.V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the "Zone of Proximal Development": New directions for child development* (pp. 7-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991) *Voices of the mind: a sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. Hagstrom, F. & Kikas E. (1995). Voices of thinking and speaking. In L.M. Martin, K. Nelson, & E. Tobach. (Eds.) *Sociocultural psychology: Theory and practice of doing and knowing* (pp. 276-290). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. & Stone C.A. (1985) *Culture, communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought and reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Williams, J.R. (1968) *The youth of Haouch El Harimi: A Lebanese village*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, M. D. (1981). Observations in Pittsburgh ghetto schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 12, 211-220.
- Winegar, L.T. & Valsiner, J. (1992). A cultural historical context for social context. In L.T. Winegar & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Children's development within social context: Metatheory and theory* (pp. 1-14.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX 1

The Interview Questions used to Explore the Ten Moral Values

Interview

1. What do Mummy and Daddy ask of you to do?
On a daily basis? ((**Hardwork, Obedience**))

2. Do you do what they ask of you?
All the time? (**Obedience, Respect**)

3. When they say: do that! And do it now! (Change the tone of voice to a command)
Why is that? (**Respect**).

4. When do they get angry with you?
What do they tell you to do? (**Honesty**)

5. Why do you think people fight? (**Forgiveness**)
Over what? (**Justice**)

6. If you had a million dollars, would you like to share it with?
 - a. Your brother/sister if he/she had none? (**Sharing**)
 - b. with a friend if he (she) had none? (**Caring**)
 - c. How much would you give him (her)? How would you spend it?
(**Planning**)
 - e. Why? (**Economy**)

APPENDIX 2

A Copy of the Letters and the Forms Sent to the Parents in English

Survey in English

Dear Parents;

By completing this survey I indicate my consent for my responses to be used in this research project.

It is commonly believed that the most practiced values among nations are those mentioned below. Please observe that these values are not in any order.

1. Please rate these values according to their importance to you using a value from 1-10 (1 being the least important and 10 being the most important).
2. Please use each number only once by checking the right box.

Thank you for your cooperation

Grece Chami-Sather

APPENDIX 3

A Copy of the Letters and Forms Sent to the Parents in Arabic

Survey in Arabic

الى حضرة الاهالي الكرام

باجابتكم على ها الاستطلاع، تعبرون عن موافقتكم على استخدام اجابتكم فى هذه الدراسة

من المعروف أن القيم الممارسة على شكل واسع هي التالية

- الرجاء الملاحظة أن هذه القيم بدون أي ترتيب معين.
- الرجاء وضع علامة لكل من هذه القيم حسب أهميتها بالنسبة لكم من الرقم (1 إلى 10).
- الرجاء استعمال كل رقم مرة واحدة بوضعه في الخانة المناسبة.

شكراً لتعاونكم

غريس الشامي

