

Original Research Article

LANGUAGE CHOICE AND NATIONAL IDENTITY AMONG YOUNG MALAY STUDENTS IN A UNIVERSITY DOMAIN

Abstract

This study examined the relationships between national identity and language choices of Malaysian multilingual youths in the university domain of language use. One hundred Malay undergraduate students were selected as participants of the study. The participant aged between 17 to 25 years old. A questionnaire comprising three sections was used to gather information about participants' demographic profiles, their language choices, and the concepts of their national identity. To investigate their language use and the relationships between variables, SPSS software was used. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the participants' profiles, as well as participants' used languages in the family domain of language use. A correlation coefficient analysis was used to examine the relationships between variables. The study found that national language is dominantly used in their daily activities. Also, the national identity was found to influence the language choices of Malays.

Keywords

Language choice, National identity, Malay language, University domain

Introduction

Language is not simply an assortment of words, but an entity that connects an individual to his state or nation. The sense of belonging to one state or nation requires the presence of symbols of various kinds through which people can be identified with. These can be flags, songs, nation's history, and on top of these is a common language (Grzywacz, 2013). A shared common national language that consolidates and cohere its users into one community is considered as a significant liaison. In fact, using a common language throughout the territory unites its inhabitants (Simpson 2007). The common sense of a nation is formed based on a shared language as an important factor that links a group of people to their nationality. As a result, people usually make an intimate symbolic linkage between their language and their nationality. Therefore, language provides a tool of communication through which the users melts into a national mass (Simpson, 2007). In other words, language is defined as an identity and unity for those people who use it as a communicative tool. Judt and Lacorne (2004) state that language is an important factor that assists individuals to express their memberships inside their nation. Further, the issue of language choice, especially in multilingual countries, is attributed to an individual's identity (Granhemat & Abdullah, 2017) who has tendencies towards using a particular language in a particular communicative event, rather than the social situation (Rahman et al., 2008).

To trace back this relationship between language choice and national identity, we need to go back to the eighteenth century. Gottfried Herder was the first one who postulated the indispensable relationship between national identity and language. So long as the word nation is linked to one language, different nations express different importance toward their own language (Pavlenko, 2002). Thereof, some consider language amongst the most important factors that tie up all those people who use it, while the common denominators in other nations can be their

ethnicity or religion (Pavlenko, 2002). According to Baker (2003), language is considered as an avatar of identity. Further, language has a significant role in forming national identity, especially in the colonized multilingual countries where English is used as a formal language. In such cases, national identity usually plays a key role in language choice with aboriginal people as it is considered as an allegiance to their nation. The formal use of the English language poses some challenges for those people and they are forced to forgo their national language and use English instead. Therefore, the relationship between language and national identity has observed a surge of interest by several scholars. The extent to which people choose their language depending on their feeling towards their national identity entices several scholars in different communicative events.

However, little is known about the relationship between national identity and language choice in different domains especially in the Malay society (Granhenat, & Abdullah 2017). Indeed, the inclination to national identity existed when student's language conflicts by local, national, and international literacy issues (Maganda, 2016). This conflict usually occurs in a university domain within an international community and it is known as national and international language tension. From a historical perspective, the meaning of language is different from one nation to another. For instance, the Georgian language played the role of the foundation in the modern Georgian nation, whilst in the pre-modern time, culture and ethnic ties played this role (Amirejibi-Mullen and Rusudan, 2011). Furthermore, the orientation to different ethnic identities that existed in a multilingual society can be considered as a conflict to a single national identity (Warikoo, 2005). However, several studies (Granhemat 2017; Burhanudeen 2006; Rahman et al., 2008) have been conducted to investigate this relationship between language and national identity in Malaysia. In addition, Granhemat (2017), who investigated this

relation in a family domain, concluded that in multilingual Malaysian society, more research is needed to understand how the Malay national identity is correlated with the choice of languages used in different domains.

As a result, this study aimed to examine the relationships between the language choice of the Malay youth and their feelings towards their national identity. Attention was focused on the impact of national identity on language since language is considered as a nexus through which its users melt into a national mass. Hence, national identity was considered as independent variables and language choice as dependent variables to find the most used languages and the extent to which it is affected by the sense of national identity of the students in the university domain. Hence, the research questions for the current study are:

- 1) What is the dominant language used by the young Malay students in the university domain?
- 2) What is the relationship between the dominant languages used by the young Malay students and their national identity in the university domain?

Literature Review

Identity-related factors are deemed amongst the most significant factors of social life. Recently several studies have investigated the relationship between these factors and the choice of language (Byram, 2006; Granhemat & Abdullah, 2017; Pavlenko, 2002; Rovira, 2008). National identity is considered as an important factor that affects language choice in the field of sociolinguistics, especially in multilingual countries (Granhenat & Abdullah, 2017). Hence, several studies reported a controversial result as different people accord different importance to language in relating to their national identity (Pavlinko, 2002). Furthermore, different studies

have investigated different domains to assess the relationship between language choice and national identity like in the family domain and suggested that this relationship needs to be investigated in different domains (Granhemat & Abdullah, 2017). Further, students' inclination towards their own nationality affects their language choice, especially when their language conflicted between local, national, and international literacy issues (Maganda, 2016) as they live within an international community.

The trend of research on language practice among Malay has focused on linguistic choice in different communicative events. To trace down this trend we can find that Abdullah (1979) was the first one who examined language choice among Malaysians in different domains to find the relationship between language and identity. Later in 1987 Meedin investigated the same issue by focusing on Malays who were living out of Malaysia. In addition, Maya Khelmani David (2008) investigated this relationship among Malaysian in general. While Rahman et. al (2008) investigated language choice among Malaysians in the family domain. Briefly, all of them found that national identity is an effective factor when two or more languages can be used in different communicative events.

Given the fact that language is seen as an important requisite for national identity, different communities express different importance towards their own language. For instance, Eight-in-ten or more British, Hungarians, and Germans believe that speaking their national language is an important indicator of their nationality. In contrast, Canadian and Italian are the least likely to link language and national identity. This relationship holds an important meaning especially in multilingual countries where English is imposed as a formal language beside the national one like in Malaysia.

Due to these inconsistent perceptions towards both language and national identity, inconsistent literature can be seen clearly in reviewing the related past studies. Firstly, Omar (1998) investigated whether there is a correlation between the use of language with an individual's national identity among Malaysian in general or not. The findings showed that language choice in the individual is not inborn and not fixed, but changes with the individual's development, environment, and situations of language use. Omar (1998) concluded that language choice is no longer important to be considered as a marker of national identity for Malaysians. Instead, they use other markers such as shared values and socio personality traits, food, clothing, and religious and cultural celebrations can be considered as important markers for national identity. In another study, Patrick (2008) conducted comparative research between Arctic communities and among Southern urban Inuit in Ottawa. Patrick focused particularly on language, and national identity in light of local, national, and global processes that help shape conceptions of Indigeneity and Inuitness. Patrick contended that the mutual relation between both language and the sense of belonging for the country makes this feeling towards the country an important indicator for language choice.

In contrast, McCarty et al. (2006), who investigated the same issue among Navaho, implied that a fundamental link is perceived between Navaho language and Navaho identity. They concluded language is an essential indicator of belonging to this nation. Hence, to be a Navajo you should speak Navajo. In addition, McCarty stated that language helps to preserve their own identity. In another study, Denton (2014), in a comparative study, investigated the use of language among Nuyoricans and Caribbeans, as a multilingual people, and its relation to their own national identity. Denote affirmed that using Spanish is stigmatized among Nuyoricans. In

the same study, Denton also investigated the use of English among Caribbean inhabitants and he concluded that using English is a betrayal of Hispanic heritage and identity in Puerto Rico.

Williams (2009) investigated the importance of national identity and its direct effect on language in the coastal town of Caernarfon. Williams (2009) concluded that attitudes towards national identity and the role of the language are equivocal. On the contrary, Searle (2010), who investigated the link between land and language, found that there was a strong link between language and people's senses of nationalism. Searle concluded that the ability to speak the aboriginal language is equated with the ability to be a part of this society and the sense of belonging to this land.

Accordingly, we could conclude that language functions as a significant factor for individuals' identity (Hafriza, 2006). This can be seen clearly especially, where one language is more important than others in a specific domain like English which is used formally in a university domain (Granhemat, 2017). Accordingly, it is clear that there is a lack of understanding of the relationship between national identity and language choice in different contexts. Therefore, this study sought to find whether language is correlated with national identity in the university domain among Malay students or not.

Methodology

This section states the research design along with the samples included and the implemented instrument. In addition, it provides detailed information about data collection and data analysis.

Research design

This study was implemented to investigate national identity as a significant factor that determines the choice of language in the multilingual Malay society. As a result, the study adopted a non-experimental correlational coefficient research design. This study aimed to investigate the existence and the strength of this relationship between national identity and language as an important indicator in determining the issue of language choice among Malay students in the university domain. Moreover, a questionnaire of three parts was utilized to collect information about students' demographic profiles, their language choices in the university domain, and their national identity.

Samples

The participants for the current study were 100 undergraduate students from University Putra Malaysia. The Survey method involved random sampling inside the targeted population. As a result, the participants were selected randomly from the faculty of science, the faculty of modern language and communication, and the faculty of engineering. In addition, most of the participants (72%) were female and their ages ranged between 18 to 22 with a mean of 22.5. In this age, it is believed that they can discern their daily linguistics experience and comprehend identity-related questions. See table 1 for more information.

Table1: Respondents profile

Age	18-20	34%
	21-23	60%

	23-25	6%
Faculty	Modern language	18%
	Science	45%
	Engineering	37%
Gender	Female	76.3%
	Male	33.7%

Instrument

To collect the data, a questionnaire was used as the only instrument in this study. The questionnaire was adapted from Granhenat (2014) to examine the issue of language choice and its relationship with their national identity among Malay in the university domain. This questionnaire consisted of three parts.

The first part collected biographical information. The second part posed 10 communicative events in the university domain. In this part, the participants were asked to choose the language they usually use in these events. This part was adapted from Granhenat (2014), who investigated the issue of language choice in the family domain, to be used in the university domain. The respondents were instructed to answer the second according to the

employed five-Likert scale. This scale ranged from a minimum score of 1 (Very frequently) to 5 (Never).

Finally, the third part, the National Identity Measure (NIM), was adopted from Granhenat (2017) to investigate the importance of national identity for youth students. The respondents were instructed to answer this part according to the employed five-Likert scale. This scale ranged from a minimum score of 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

Data collection procedures

First of all, the data was collected within two weeks. The questionnaire was sent via WhatsApp to the targeted participants. All the information regarding the identity of the researcher as a student in University Putra Malaysia and the reason for data collection were stated clearly in the online questionnaire. No name or any identity information was requested except their ethnic background. The reason was stated clearly that this study was implemented to understand the issue of language choice among Malay students. Thus, we ensured that the participants understood the procedure for answering the questionnaire. Moreover, they were also informed that the data was used for academic purposes rather than being a personal initiative.

Data analysis procedures

The study adopted a quantitative approach to analyze the data. The data was uploaded to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Two statistical tests were run to address the two research questions.

To answer the first research questions, to determine the language used between Malay undergraduate students in the university domain, a descriptive analysis was used. This was

achieved by calculating the mean scores of the agreement level from the students on the responses among the chosen language in different communicative situations inside the university. The mean scores of the responses for each item ranged from 1- 5. According to Hanson, et al (2005) The mean scores of agreements range from 1.00 to 2.33 are considered as low, mean scores from 2.34 to 3.67 are considered as moderate, and mean scores range from 3.68 to 5.00 are considered high.

To answer the second research question, to determine the relationship between national identity and language choice, a correlation coefficient analysis was employed. Correlation coefficient analysis was used to find the strength of the relation between the two variables. The strength of this relation was determined by calculating the value of (r). According to Lee Rodgers & Nicewander (1988), this value ranges from -1.0 to 1.0. Further, -1.0 shows a perfect negative correlation, a correlation of 1.0 shows a high positive correlation. Finally, a correlation of 0.0 shows no relationship between the two variables.

Results and Discussion

The goal of this study was to investigate the dominant language in daily communication among Malay students in the university domain. In addition, it aimed to investigate the relationship between the sense of nationalism and their language choices in the university domain. However, in less than one week we received a total of 100 responses from the targeted population. Thus, the data was analyzed quantitatively and presented in two parts as it is shown below.

Language Used in University Domain

The participants' language choices were examined by presenting 10 social events. In each social event, the participants were asked to indicate their choice(s) of language(s) for the two languages (Malay and English) according to the five-point Likert scale (Very frequently =5 to Never =1).

As a multilingual country, the Malay students have two language choices with a combination of both. Accordingly, 3 choices of language were identified and codified as follows: 1=Malay, 2 =English, and 3 =mixed use of Malay and English.

Moreover, according to the five-point Likert scale employed, each participant could achieve a score ranging from a minimum of 10 to a maximum of 50 with a median score of 25 for each language. The median of a scale can be deemed as a cut-off point for categorizing data, the mean score of 25 was selected as a cut-off point to decide each participant's most used language(s) in each social event.

In addition, Table 2 shows the comparative scale that was used to determine the dominant language in the university domain. Accordingly, if the ranking of any score from the participants for the 3 codes (Malay, English, and English - Malay) was equivalent to the cut-off mark or greater than the median, the code was assumed to be the language(s) most used or the language(s) of the individual participant's preference in the corresponding social event in the language university domain.

Table2: Languages in the University Domain of Language Use

Participant's Choice of language(s)	Scale
--	--------------

1=Malay	IF score of Malay= 25 or> 25 and score of English<30, the choice of language was considered Malay.
2=English	IF score of English= 25 or> 25 and score of Malay<30, the choice of language was considered English.
3= Mixed-use of Malay and English languages.	IF score of Malay= 25 or> 25 and score of English= 25 or> 25, The choice of languages was considered a mixed-use of the Malay and English.

*25= Median of participants' language choice

Accordingly, Table 3 shows that the three languages were used by the participants. Moreover, the Malay students used more of the Malay language (45.5%) than the English language(33.7%). Moreover, according to the data, the Malay language scored the highest mean (= 3.2). Moreover, the first code (the Malay language) got the highest loading item and scored 90 (in a range of 18-90) in the third situation in the questionnaire. Furthermore, the second code (the English language) got the highest loading factor and scored 85 in the 12th item. Finally, the participants used a mix of English and Malay (20.9%) as well. The third code (English and Malay) got the highest loading factor and scored 70 in the first situation of the questionnaire.

Table 3. Participants' Most Used Languages in the university domain

Languages	Responses	Pct.	Pct. of Cases
Malay	473	45.5%	454.8%
English	350	33.7%	336.5%
Mixed use	217	20.9%	208.7%
Total	1040	100.0%	1000.0%

Accordingly, the most used language was the Malay language (45.5%), the English also was used (33.7%), but less than the national language. In addition, the result showed that some students chose both languages.

However, even though English is the official language in the university domain, the result showed that Malay students, in the university domain, frequently use their own national language more than the official English language. Therefore, this result is compatible with several scholars (Granhemat, 2017; Mei et al. 2015; Ying 2015) who found that the national language is the

dominant language and it is used more than the formal second language among the aboriginal people in different communicative events.

Language and National Identity

Firstly, the participants answered the 18 items of the NIM according to the five-point Likert scale (5=strongly agree to 1=strongly disagree). Thus, their national identity ranged from a minimum score of 18 to a maximum of 90 (Mean = 44.88, SD = 2.48). In addition, item number 17 was the highest loading item and scored 90 (in a range of 18-90), while item number 18 was the lowest loading factor and scored 55. Then, the respondents' national identities were categorized as low, moderate, and high.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Respondents' national identity

NI	No	Percentage
Low	7	4
Moderate	12	6
High	81	90

Table 4 shows that most of the participants (90%) were identified with a high sense of nationalism. Accordingly, this study indicated that the sense of national identity among the younger generation in Malaysia was considerable. To some extent, this is compatible with Granhenat & Abdullah but in contrast to Mokhtar & Lokman's (2016) study that indicated that solidarity and integration in a multi-cultural society like Malaysia is still a question mark.

A correlation analysis (Using the Pearson correlation test) was conducted to determine the relationship between national identity as a dependent variable and language choice as an independent variable.

Table 5: The relationship between national identity and language choice.

Independent variable	Dependent variable	Correlation coefficient (r)	Sig (p)
National identities	Language choice	.0658	.050

The result in Table 5 shows that there is a significant positive correlation ($r = .0658$ and $Sig = .050$) between national identity, as an independent variable, and language choice, as a dependent variable. This positive relationship supports the suggested hypothesis by the literature that assumes the existence of the significant relationship between an individual's feelings towards his nationality and his language choice. As a result, this study may suggest that students

who have a sense of belonging to their national identity may use their national language frequently more than any other official language in their multilingual context.

However, the link between language choice and national identity can be explained by referring to Fishman (1972). Fishman considers language as the symbol of uniqueness and authentic nationalism. Further, he argues that our feeling toward our identity resides in our language. Therefore, linguistic differentiation is often used to highlight the separateness of people, whereas linguistic similitude is often used to highlight the unity of people. In addition, within the national domain, language is much more than a simple code for communication. The national language is a symbol infused with values and morals and people usually make an intimate symbolic linkage between their national language and national identity. Consequently, unlike a national anthem or a national flag, a national language produces and performs an important meaning towards our national identity. Further, the national language of the aboriginal people melts the whole citizens, who use this language, into a national mass (Vogl & Hüning, 2010). Based on the result, it can be said that language is deemed to express as well as to help in creating national communities (Mace, 1995).

Finally, It is not surprising to find that language plays an important role in unifying a nation together (Alexander, 1989). As a result, the current study is consistent with several scholars who investigated this relationship between language and identity. For example, Friedman (2006) stated that the feelings towards our nationality play a significant role in the process of language choice. In addition, Bilaniuk (2005) contended that, consciously or not, our feeling towards our nationality is a determinant factor in the process of language use and choice in daily communication. In contrast, despite this harmony between this result and the literature, this result is different from Peacock (2012). Peacock stated that our national identity is not the

only factor that affects our language, especially for youth. In addition, Peacock stated that our feeling towards our identity is changeable, not just from one person to another, but from time to time as well, as it is context-dependent. According to this unstable feeling, peacock gave less priority to the role of national identity in the process of language choice.

It is important to mention that the mix-use between the two aforesaid languages can be attributed to different variables besides the identity-related factors. Some variables like educational level, religion, and language proficiency may affect language choice also in a multilingual context like in Malaysia (Lefor and Ting, 2012).

It is noteworthy to mention that this study was conducted among Malays, hence it cannot be generalized among Malaysians. The Malaysian nationality is composed of two main nationalities, namely, Indian-Malay and Chinese-Malay, beside the Malay people. Hence, the current findings are bounded among Malay. Moreover, although our data offered meaningful results, we attest that one hundred students can be considered as a restriction to the current finding and may jeopardize generalizing the inference of our study.

Finally, despite the above-mentioned limitations, we suppose that this study has opened the door for more new and unprecedented issues that call the need for more studies to investigate the relationship between the notion of national identity and its crucial effect on the language of adolescence. The need for research that investigates identity is most powerful during this age when the ties to one's parents begin to weaken and s/he begins to ask the question, who am I in relation to everyone that surrounds me?

Conclusion

Our study endeavored to examine the extent to which national identity is widespread among the younger generations of the Malay youth students in a university domain. Even though English is considered the language of instruction formally in the university, we found that national language is dominantly used in their daily activities.

As for the relationship between national language and national identity, the result supports the suggested hypothesis by the literature that assumes the existence of the significant relation between identity and language choice. Thus, our study offered clear evidence for the hypothesized relation between language and national identity among the youth in a multilingual context. Accordingly, students who have a sense of belonging to their national identity may use their national language more than any other language inside their multilingual context.

Finally, future work may investigate this issue among Malaysian citizens. This nationality includes Chinese-Malay and Indian-Malay, as their own ethnic languages can be considered as variables as well. Such a study can provide a holistic view of Malaysian society and may provide different results for the aforementioned variables. Furthermore, including more samples to this study may present more meaningful results to test this relationship in future studies.

References

Abdullah, N. A. (1979, April). Some observations on code-switching among Malay-English bilinguals. In *seameo 14th Regional Seminar: Singapore*.

Abdullah, N. A. (1979, April). Some observations on code-switching among Malay-English bilinguals. In *SEAMEO 14th Regional Seminar: Singapore*.

Alexander, N. (1989). *Language policy and national unity in South Africa/Azania*. Cape Town: Buchu Books.

Amirejibi-Mullen and Rusudan. (2012). *Language policy and national identity in Georgia* (Doctoral dissertation, Queen Mary, University of London).

Anna Grzywacz (2011). The Role of Language in Nation-Building Process. *Jurnal linguistik terapan*. <https://jlt-polinema.org/?p=284>

Baker, C. (2003). Language planning: A grounded approach. In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & L. Wei. (Eds.), *Bilingualism beyond basic principles*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (Eds.). (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.

Bilaniuk L (2005) *Contested Tongues: Language Politics and Cultural Correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Byram, M. (2006). Languages and identities. Retrieved July, 29, 2010.

Denton, R. A. (2014). *Hablo Español, You Know? Language and Identity in the Puerto Rican Diaspora*.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). The relationship between Micro-and Macro-Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When. In A.S. Dil (Ed.),

Friedman DA (2006) (Re)Imagining the Nation: Language socialization in Ukrainian classrooms. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

Granhemat, M., & Abdullah, A. N. (2017). Gender, ethnicity, ethnic identity, and language choices of Malaysian youths: The case of the family domain. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 26-36.

Grzywacz, A. 2013. The Role of Language in Nation-Building Process. Posted in Jurnal Linguistik Terapan on 11/06/13, retrieved on 30/08/17. <http://www.canyonresources.com.au/our-business/birsok-projects-cameroon/>

Hafriza Burhanudeen, (2006). Language and Social Behavior: Voices from the Malay world. kl: penerbit universiti kebangsaan Malaysia adalah anggota

Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L. P., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 52(2), 224.

Hongyuan Mei, Mohit Bansal, and Matthew R. Walter. 2015. What to talk about and how? selective generation using lstms with coarse-to-fine alignment. CoRR, abs/1509.00838

Judt, T., & Lacorne, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Language, nation and state: identity politics in a multilingual age*. Springer.

Lee Rodgers, J., & Nicewander, W. A. (1988). Thirteen ways to look at the correlation coefficient. *The American Statistician*, 42(1), 59-66.

Lefor, P. J., Benke, M., & Ting, E. (2003). Information technology and adult learners at Empire State College. *New Directions for Student Services*, (102).

Mace, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Literacy, language, and community publishing: essays in adult education*. Multilingual Matters.

Maganda, D. (2016). Conflicted Worlds of Multilingual Communities in Africa: Literacy Tangled in Words. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 12(1), 53-78.

Maya Khemlani David (2008). Language Choice of Urban Sino-Indians in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 3: 217-233

McCarty, T. L., Romero-Little, M. E., & Zepeda, O. (2006). Native American youth discourses on language shift and retention: Ideological cross-currents and their implications for language planning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(5), 659-677.

Meedin, H. (1987). Language choice among Malay-English bilinguals. (Unpublished Master Research Paper). Georgetown University, USA.

Mokhtar, M. A. M., & Lokman, A. M. (2016). Characteristics and Level of Nationalism Among Malaysian Youth. *Journal of Media and Information Warfare Vol*, 8, 156-193.

Omar, A. H. (1998). Language planning and image building: the case of Malay in Malaysia. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 130(1), 49-66.

Patrick, D., & Tomiak, J. A. (2008). Language, culture and community among urban Inuit in Ottawa. *Études/Inuit/Studies*, 32(1), 55-72.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). Bilingualism and emotions. *Multilingua*, 21(1), 45-78.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). We have room for but one language here: Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingua*, 21(2-3), 163-196.

Peacock, E. A. (2012). National identity and language: Class differences among youth in western Ukraine. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 5(1), 59-73.

Rahman, A. R. M., Heng, C. S., & Abdullah, A. N. (2008). What Determines the Choice of Language with Friends and Neighbours? The Case of Malaysian University Undergraduates. *Language in India*, 8(10).

Rovira, L. C. (2008). The relationship between language and identity. The use of the home language as a human right of the immigrant. *REMHU-Revista Interdisciplinar da Mobilidade Humana*, 16(31), 63-81.

Simpson, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Language and national identity in Asia*. Oxford University Press.

Suleiman, M. (1993). A study of Arab students' motivation and attitudes for learning English as a foreign language. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Arizona State University.

Warikoo, N. (2005). Gender and ethnic identity among second-generation Indo-Caribbeans. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 28(5), 803-831.

Williams, E. (2009). Language attitudes and identity in a North Wales town: "something different about Caernarfon"? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2009(195), 63-91.

Appendix

First part: demographic information

Age

18-20 / 21-22 / 23-24

Faculty

FBMK (Faculty Of Modern Languages And Communication)

FASSA (faculty of science)

Engineering

Second part: data related to the choice of language

Part 1: National Identity Measure (NIM)

-
- 1 I am a worthy member of the nation I belong to. 1 2 3 4
 - 2 I feel I don't have much to offer to the nation I belong to. 1 2 3 4
 - 3 I am a cooperative participant in the nation I belong to. 1 2 3 4
 - 4 I often feel I'm a useless member of the nation I belong to. 1 2 3 4
 - 5 I often regret that I belong to this nation. 1 2 3 4
 - 6 I often feel that it is not worthwhile to be a member of the nation to which I belong to. 1 2 3 4
 - 7 I feel good about the nation I belong to. 1 2 3 4
 - 8 In general, others respect the nation that I am a member of. 1 2 3 4
 - 9 I feel that being a member of this nation is worthwhile. 1 2 3 4
 - 10 My nation has very little to do with how I feel about myself. 1 2 3 4
 - 11 The nation I belong to is an important reflection of who I am. 1 2 3 4
 - 12 The nation I belong to is important to my sense of the kind of person I am. 1 2 3 4
 - 13 In general, belonging to this nation is an important part of my selfimage. 1 2 3 4
 - 14 The nation I belong to is superior to other nations in many aspects. 1 2 3 4
 - 15 My nation is not as important as many other nations in the world. 1 2 3 4
-

-
- 16 The nation I belong to plays a more important international role than other nations. 1 2 3 4
- 17 In competition with others my nation comes off worse. 1 2 3 4
- 18 My nation has been successful in its international policy. 1 2 3 4
- 19 I admire important Malaysian people. 1 2 3 4
- 20 One of Malaysia's strengths is that it emphasizes events of national historical importance. 1 2 3 4 21
- Malaysia has a strong historical heritage. 1 2 3 4
-

Third part: National Identity Measurement (NIM)

Social events adapted from Granhenat & Abdullah (2017).



The Family Domain and its 12 Social Events

The domain of Language Use

Social Events: What language do you use?

University domain

1. Speak to your lecturer in the class
2. Speak to your lecturer alone
3. Express your happiness towards your friends
4. Express your anger towards your friends
5. Discuss a personnel matter with your friend
6. Watch movies/television shows
7. Speak to a Malay classmate
8. Speak to a Chinese classmate
9. Speak to an Indian classmate
10. Speak to your friends in the presence of students of a different race



UNM