Original Research Article

A Comparative Study of Language Profiles Across Two Multilingual Jordanian Communities

Ibrahim Rawshdeh[1*]

[1]University of Pannonia, Veszprem, Hungary Veszprem, jozsef Attila u. 34/2, 8200

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Rawshdeh
University of Pannonia, Veszprem, Hungary Veszprem, jozsef Attila u. 34/2, 8200

Abstract: Many researchers underscore the need to study bilinguals and multilinguals by unleashing different methods to fathom full range of its trajectories and complexities including their personal beliefs, policies, practices, values, norms, realities and expectations (García & Lin 2017). This study examines the multilanguage proficiency, practices, and attitudes among Bilingual Jordanians (N=22) predominantly residing in Jordan and trilingual Jordanians (N=26) living in Hungary. The participants answered to an online composite questionnaire that included a subjective overall language proficiency questionnaire, self-assessed language skills (Can-Do questionnaire), a Language Use and a language attitude Questionnaire. Results using the Spss software indicated that overall self-assessed proficiencies in each language positively correlated with the 4 language skills of that language for both participant groups. However, no statistically P significant differences in the scores of overall proficiencies between the two groups were found for Arabic (L1) and English (L2). Moreover, Language use and attitudes patterns revealed that Jordanian trilinguals exhibited greater linguistic flexibility and a more diverse multilanguage use compared to bilinguals, and they showcased a more positive outlook on multilingualism.

Keywords: Language Use, Attitudes, Proficiency, Bilinguals, Trilinguals, Jordan.

1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of multilingualism has become a prominent aspect of contemporary society. The growth of multilingualism is linked to social, linguistic, and cultural shifts brought about by globalization, social and geographic mobility, changes in the political and economic spheres, and technological advancements. Although multilingualism has existed throughout human history, Aronin and Jessner (2015) argue it is the uniquely phenomenon of the modern era. This phenomenon is not merely the addition of languages to the individual and society, Aronin and singleton (2012) argue that multilingualism encompasses language education, Language ideologies and policies across all domains, as well as community and individual language use patterns.

Nowadays, the term "multilingualism" refers to a variety of social, institutional, and individual usage patterns as well as group and individual competency and circumstances in which people interact and use many languages. According to Franceschini (2009) the examination of multilingual phenomena considers the utilization of multiple languages, encompassing regional languages, minority languages, languages spoken during migration, and dialects, to differing extents of competence among people and communities. Thus, the term "multilingualism" is becoming more and more common, referring to societies, countries, and individuals that use many languages to varied degrees in daily life and a range of contexts. Therefore, those that are multilingual possess two or three languages in their repertoires.

The complex interplay between bilingualism and multilingualism has become a subject of heightened scholarly attention, prompting discussions on language counting practices, distinct terminologies, and the psychological and social motivations behind the use of multiple languages. This study looks into the nuances of multilingualism, examining the multilingual profiles among bilingual Jordanians in Jordan and trilingual Jordanians in Hungary. By exploring language

proficiency, use, and attitudes, this research contributes to the growing corpus of knowledge on the relationship between language use and identity construction in multilingual settings.

Research Questions:
1. How does overall self-assessed language proficiency correlate with specific language abilities (speaking, understanding, and reading & writing) in those particular languages for bilingual and trilingual individuals?
2. Are the overall proficiencies in Arabic and English significantly different among bilinguals and trilinguals?
3. How do bilingual and trilingual individuals differ in their use of multiple languages across various social contexts and specific purposes?
4. How do the attitudes of Jordanian bilinguals living in Jordan differ from those of multilingual Jordanians living in Hungary towards bilingualism and trilingualism, and what factors contribute to these differences?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Romaine (2013) points out that to the majority of the world's population, Bilingualism and Multilingualism are commonplace necessities of everyday life. Sociolinguists use the two terms interchangeably as they believe that the term "Multilingualism" exceeds being a normal phenomenon, but rather an essential aspect of people's lives. For instance, Romaine (1995:384) contends that both terms refer to the usage of two or more languages in a community. Trilingualism and bilingualism are two examples of concepts that Weber and Horner (2012) combine into one notion of "multilingualism," rather than making a distinction between them.

Multilingualism is seen as a result of the fundamental human ability to converse in multiple languages; however, some scholars have suggested that speakers themselves construct multilingualism. Cruz-Ferreira (2010) asserts that "multilingualism" is more about individuals than languages. An individual who is bilingual or multilingual may select one language code over another for a variety of reasons. These reasons could be based on simplicity, self-image, or group identity, among other factors. For instance, the person may decide to always speak in a more formal manner to convey that they are well-educated, or they may choose to speak informally to demonstrate their strong sense of community with other members of society, presuming that informality is the norm (saidat, 2010).

Additionally, Pavlenko (2006) highlights the idea that traditionally, bilingualism and multilingualism are considered as synonymous concepts. For this reason, she adopts the term "bilingualism" to investigate the elements of both bilingualism and multilingualism, focusing solely on the number of languages used by the speaker. Following that logic, using two languages to achieve social aims is the phenomena known as bilingualism, while multilingualism is when people use more than two languages to fulfill their social demands (Altarriba & Heredia, 2008).

Some researchers indicated that research in trilingualism is carried out in the theoretical vein of bilingualism and there are no real efforts to delimit trilingualism in its own right (Aronin, & Hufeisen, 2009). Although certain salient similar features could be noticed in both bilinguals and trilinguals, there are some distinct features that could be observed in trilingualism. Some bilinguals' practices could serve as a venue for exploring and understanding possible essential features of trilinguals' practices and competence. For example, Aronin, and Hufeisen (2009) indicated that multilingualism is complex in different respects and aspects. In a very important sense, the complexity of multilingualism is increasingly greater than that of bilingualism. While this evidence is not conclusive, the findings gleaned from different studies could convince us that in many different important ways an additional, third language acquisition is distinct from second language acquisition (Aronin, & Hufeisen, 2009).

The previous arguments lay the foundation for our research on language dynamics among bilingual Jordanians in Jordan and trilingual Jordanians in Hungary. The fuzzy boundaries that delineate being bilingual from tri or multilingual will be tested as to how different or similar are the multilingual use and attitudes of our two Jordanian groups who share first language and a similar background.

Our study profiles the two multilingual participant groups according to different language use practices and multilingualism attitudes. Similarly, Harris (2006) studied the self-representations language use patterns of 30 adolescents (aged 15) mainly from South Asia in West London, he distinguished three patterns: the use of a mixed language consisting of mainstream and minority languages when speaking with parents; the use of the mainstream language when speaking with siblings; and the use of the minority language when speaking with grandparents. Harris pointed out a relation between the participants gender and their language use, as was similarly reported by Li (1996) in the investigation of language practices of three Chinese generations living in Britain. A study by Fasya and Sari (2021) showed that language choice in a trilingual speech community in Indonesia was affected by the participants gender, age, and level of education.

In addition to interlocutors, Domain is seen as an essential determinant of language choice, Fishman (1991) identified major domains as family, friendship, religion, education, and employment. According to Parasher (1980),

although English predominates in some low domains, such friendship and neighborhood, as well as high domains *like* education, government, and employment, people in India still use their mother tongue and another language in the family domain. Similar findings were observed by Ningrat (2019) who reported that language practices of Tanjung Luar Community in Indonesia varied across formal and informal domains of language use.

One topic frequently discussed in sociolinguistics is the relation between language attitude and language choice in multilingual societies. Dweik and Qawar (2015) highlighted the significance of language attitude in determining language choice based on how the community labels and identifies the language. Furthermore, they claim that a language becomes enticing to speakers who are enthusiastic about it and prefer it in most encounters. On the other hand, if speakers hold negative sentiments regarding a language, they develop reluctance to using it.

A number of studies highlighted the role of language attitude as a language choice stimulator. Fitriati and wardani (2020) investigated the attitudes of English, colloquial Indonesian, and local languages of 100 multilingual university students. The results show a positive linkage between appreciative attitudes toward the languages and the dominance of their use in communication, colloquial Indonesian was the most dominant because they describe it as the national language and lingua Franca in Indonesia. Moreover, Taqavi and Rezaei (2019) interviewed 19 Azerbaijani bilinguals to determine their language choice and identity construction processes in family and friendship domains. They found that language attitudes and ideologies are the main reason for Azerbaijani bilinguals' language choice in family and friendship domains.

To sum up, Language use determinants in the multilingual context are traced back to a variety of factors, language choice of a speaker is dependent on participants, settings, and topics (Sumarsono, 2013, p. 199-200). Other scholars such as Meyer and apfelbaum (2010) proclaim that "cognitive, social, and historical aspects, such as participants' level of linguistic competence and degree of linguistic regulation, may play an important role in multilingual communication." All in all, Language dynamics in multilingual settings are shaped by a variety of abilities acquired through diverse linguistic repertoires, leading to nuanced language practices for specific purposes Lüdi (2007). Scholars argue that to comprehend the phenomenon that is "Multilingualism," it is crucial to delve into language practices, with language choice as a key factor. "Language choice is an important aspect to discuss in a study of multilingualism" (Romaine, 2006).

Following the First World War, the UK invaded Jordan along with several other Arab nations, incorporating Jordan into the British Empire. Arabic has been designated as the official language of the state of Jordan by its constitution ever since it gained independence from Britain in 1946. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan's Constitution (1952) further affirmed the nation's linguistic and cultural autonomy by declaring that Arabic is the only official language and that Islam is the official religion of Jordan. English in the Jordanian context has gained major significance since the emergence of the country. Realizing the importance of English as a gauge of progress and modernity and as a language for communication with the rest of the world. According to Harrison (1975) the Jordanian government supported the launch of the English-language and encouraged English language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. Alomoush (2015) placed the English language as Jordan's most widely spoken foreign language, particularly among educated elites and younger generations. Moreover, the improvement of English language competency has been a primary goal in Jordan's educational reform initiatives, as noted by Barnawi and Al-Hawsawi (2017). In an already scarce body of research of multilingualism in the Jordanian context, it is hoped that this study will aid that field of research in pedagogy, multiculturalism and sociolinguistic studies.

3. METHODS
3.1. Research Design
This research is unique as it profiles two different Jordanian communities, bilingual Jordanians in their Arabic-centric homeland and trilingual Jordanians navigating in Hungary. It adopts a descriptive correlational research design, seeking to discern variations and similarities between the two participant groups on different multilingual fronts.

3.2. Participants
The participants in this study (table 1) were carefully selected from two distinct groups. The first group comprised of 22 Arabic- English bilingual Jordanians living in Jordan. This group included males (N=9) and Females (N=13), most of which are between the ages of 25-32, mostly Bachelor degree students and were all born in Jordan. The second group consists of 26 trilingual Jordanians (N=17) males and (N= 9) females living in Hungary, this groups speaks Hungarian as a 3rd language in a multicultural setting. Trilinguals mostly ranged in ages between 25-32, most of which are master's degree students, then PhD student, and some of which were born outside of Jordan.

Table 1: Participant groups percentages according to different demographics

		Bilinguals	Trilinguals
Gender	Males	36.4	65.4
	Females	63.6	34.6

		Bilinguals	Trilinguals
Age	18-24	27.3	3.8
	25-32	50.0	76.9
	33-40	13.6	19.2
	41+	9.1	0.0
Place of birth	Jordan	100.0	84.6
	Else	0.0	15.4
Education	BA	54.5	0.0
	MA	27.3	46.2
	PhD	18.2	38.5
L1	Arabic	95.5	100.0
	English	4.5	0.0

3.3 Data Sources and Research Instruments
This study employed a multiple sections questionnaire that involved;
   i.   a subjective proficiency assessment questionnaire to determine participant's overall proficiency levels in their languages.
   ii. a Can-Do questionnaire: This questionnaire adapted from (Clark 1981) explores subjective language abilities in Arabic, English and Hungarian (a subjective evaluation of language skills- i.e. speaking, understanding, reading, and writing).
   iii. a language use questionnaire that includes: a questionnaire of language use with different interlocutors, and a questionnaire of language use for different purposes (Stavans, Olshtain, and Goldzweig 2009).
   iv. a language attitude was utilized to collect data regarding the participants viewpoints on their linguistic repertoires, monolingualism, bilingualism, and multilingualism.

3.4 Research Instruments
1. *Overall Proficiency:* Coding of the self-assessed proficiency data included averages of how competent participant stated she can "speak" in each language by rating it on a scale from (1-4) 1 being extremely poor, 4 being native *like*.
2. *The Can-Do* questionnaire: Was employed to assess the language proficiency of participants in Arabic, English, and Hungarian as they address the 4 language skills in each language prompted by specific actions rather than a general measure. Participants had to rate themselves on a scale from 1 (hardly) to 5 (very easily) how well can they perform a task such as "ask for directions to get somewhere" in each of their languages.
3. *Language Use***:** Language Use with Interlocutors of two socialization contexts (intimate and formal) where participants responded about the use of the languages when addressing different people ranking the use as more/less/equal of one language over another; similarly, the Language Use for purposes (Entertainment (e.g. watching Tv, or listening to music), Business (e.g. responding to emails, or work-related practices) and Sustainability (e.g. conducting errand or shopping) as being carries out more/less/equal in one language over another.
4. *Language Attitude Questionnaire***:** Explores the participants' viewpoints on their linguistic repertoires as regards to monolingualism, bilingualism, and multilingualism whereby their response on a scale of 1-5 (absolutely disagree to absolutely agree with typical statements about language(s) in favor or against multilingualism at the personal and societal level.

3.5 Data Collection Techniques
Participants were contacted via email and social media platforms with online versions of the Questionnaires using google docs. The questionnaire stated that it explores special characteristics of multilingual Jordanians, and that it consists of sections, each containing a different sub-questionnaire addressing typical issues that are unique to multilingual people around the world. Participants described how competent they are at each describe of their languages on a scale from 1-4 (1 being extremely poor, 4 being native *like*), which languages they use with different people, in different situations, and for which purposes. Then they responded to a number of statements that assessed their attitude towards multilingualism. Data were transferred from the docs to different Excel sheets and were organized and grouped to facilitate their analysis.

3.5 Data Analysis Techniques
The data analysis process involved conducting correlation and statistical significance tests using SPSS software and calculating descriptive statistics to determine average scores for each category. Initially, correlation tests were performed separately for each group to investigate whether subjective overall competence scores in each language correlated with self-assessed abilities (speaking, understanding, reading, and writing) within that language. Additionally, language usage data were analyzed by computing average scores for bilinguals and trilinguals across two categories: language usage with intimate and formal interlocutors, and language practices for specific purposes. The analysis also included calculating average scores for participants' language attitudes toward bilingualism and multilingualism in general.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Proficiency and Can-Do Spss Statistics

Pearson correlation tests were utilized to examine if overall proficiencies in the languages of bilinguals and Trilinguals correlated with the any of the subjective language abilities (speaking, understanding, reading and writing) in those particular languages. Moreover, an independent samples t-test was used to determine whether the overall proficiency differences across both participant groups were statistically significant.

4.1.1 Correlation Test Results of Bilinguals

The Correlation examined the relationship between overall language proficiency and specific language abilities (speaking, understanding, reading & writing) among bilingual participants, the relationships were strong, positive, and statistically significant. Correlations were observed in both Arabic and English languages (Table 2). Participants' overall scores in Arabic proficiency showed strong positive correlations with their abilities in speaking (r = .945, p < .001), understanding (r = .942, p < .001), and reading & writing (r = .888, p < .001). The p-values, all less than the conventional threshold of .001, underscore the statistical significance of these correlations.

Table 2: Bilinguals' correlation test results

		Arabic total score	Arabic speaking	Arabic understanding	Arabic reading and writing
Arabic overall proficiency	Pearson Correlation	1	.945**	.942**	.888**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
English Overall proficiency	Pearson Correlation	English total score	English speaking	English understanding	English reading and writing
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1	.908**	.916**	.890**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000

Similarly, among bilinguals, significant positive correlations were observed between overall English proficiency scores and abilities in speaking (r = .908, p < .001), understanding (r = .916, p < .001), and reading & writing (r = .890, p < .001).

4.1.2 Correlation Test Results of Trilinguals

Among trilingual participants, the patterns of correlation were consistent with those observed in bilinguals, albeit with an additional language (Hungarian) included in the analysis (Table 3). For Arabic proficiency, strong positive correlations were evident with speaking (r = .945, p < .001), understanding (r = .942, p < .001), and reading & writing (r = .888, p < .001). Higher overall.

Table 3: Trilinguals correlation test results

		Arabic Speaking	Arabic Understanding	Arabic reading and writing
Arabic overall proficiency	Pearson Correlation	.984**	.987**	.978**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
English overall proficiency		English Speaking	English Understanding	English reading and writing
	Pearson Correlation	.929**	.905**	.912**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Hungarian overall proficiency		Hungarian Speaking	Hungarian Understanding	Hungarian reading and writing
	Pearson Correlation	.972**	.890**	.943**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000

Overall English proficiency scores were also found to exhibit strong positive correlations with abilities in speaking (r = .912, p < .001), understanding (r = .929, p < .001), and reading & writing (r = .905, p < .001). Hungarian proficiency scores demonstrated also very strong positive correlations with abilities in speaking (r = .972, p < .001), understanding (r = .890, p < .001), and reading & writing (r = .943, p < .001) among trilingual participants. The p-values, all less than the conventional threshold of .001, underscore the statistical significance of these correlations.

4.1.3 Proficiency Significance in Arabic and English

An independent samples t-test showcased that that there are no statistically significant differences in perceived proficiency in Arabic and English between bilinguals and trilinguals (see Table 4).

Table 4: Arabic and English proficiency significance

		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Arabic Proficiency total score	Equal variances assumed	46	0.755	-0.0541	0.1725
	Equal variances not assumed	44.782	0.755	-0.0541	0.1724
English proficiency total score	Equal variances assumed	46	0.75	-0.0513	0.1597
	Equal variances not assumed	45.09	0.749	-0.0513	0.1593

The p-value (Sig. (2-tailed)) is .755, which is greater than the conventional alpha level of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in Arabic proficiency scores between bilinguals and trilinguals. The mean difference is -0.0541, suggesting that the difference in means is very small and not statistically significant. Similarly, for English proficiency, the p-value (Sig. (2-tailed)) is .750, also greater than the conventional alpha level of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in English proficiency scores between bilinguals and trilinguals.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics
4.2.1 Language Use

The data of language use with interlocutors is categorized based on the language(s) used in both intimate and formal circles (Table 5). Both bilinguals and trilinguals predominantly use their first language (L1). For bilinguals, this constitutes 77.27% of instances, while trilinguals use L1 in 64% of cases. However, trilinguals show a higher inclination towards incorporating their second or third language (L2 or L3) in intimate settings, constituting 32.86% of instances, compared to 22.5% for bilinguals. Additionally, there is a notable trend among trilinguals to use a combination of languages (L1 and L2), and in 28% instances, they utilized all three languages (L1, L2, and L3).

Table 5: Language use with interlocutors' results

Interlocuters	Language(s) used	Bilinguals	Trilinguals
Intimate circle	L1	77.27	64
	L2 or L3	22.5	32.86
	L1 and L2	30	29.23
	L1, L2 and L3	0	28
Formal circle	L1	37.2	36.67
	L2 or L3	60	66.36
	L1 and L2	49.6	50
	L1, L2 and L3	0	50

In formal circles, both groups predominantly use their first language (L1). Bilinguals use L1 in 37.2% of instances, and trilinguals in 36.67%. Interestingly, trilinguals show a higher tendency to incorporate their second or third language (L2 or L3) in formal settings, constituting 66.36% of instances, compared to 60% for bilinguals. Similar to intimate circles, both groups show patterns of using a combination of languages (L1 and L2) in formal contexts. Notably, a substantial portion of trilinguals, 50%, utilizes all three languages (L1, L2, and L3) in formal circles, highlighting the complexity of language choices in professional interactions.

The analysis of language use for specific purposes (table 6) illuminates distinct patterns between bilinguals and trilinguals in various contexts. In terms of entertainment, bilinguals predominantly employ their first language (L1), while trilinguals exhibit a higher inclination to incorporate their second or third language (L2 or L3). Both groups demonstrate patterns of using a combination of languages (L1 and L2), with trilinguals showcasing slightly lower percentages than bilinguals. Additionally, a small portion of trilinguals utilizes all three languages (L1, L2, and L3) for entertainment.

Turning to sustainability discussions, both groups mainly use their first language (L1), but trilinguals show a higher tendency to incorporate L2 or L3. Similar patterns emerge in the usage of a combination of languages (L1 and L2), with a significant portion of trilinguals utilizing all three languages (L1, L2, and L3). In the business context, bilinguals predominantly use L1, while trilinguals display a greater inclination to incorporate L2 or L3. Both groups exhibit patterns of using a combination of languages (L1 and L2), with a smaller portion utilizing all three languages (L1, L2, and L3).

Table 6: Language use for specific purposes results

Other Purposes	Language(s) used	Bilinguals	Trilinguals
Entertainment	L1	24.43	9.62
	L2 or L3	29.55	47.6
	L1 and L2	46.02	37.02
	L1, L2 and L3	2.84	6.25

Other Purposes	Language(s) used	Bilinguals	Trilinguals
Sustainability	L1	58.4	47.42
	L2 or L3	45.88	46.6
	L1 and L2	60.45	45.92
	L1, L2 and L3	0	55.33
Business	L1	13.64	11.54
	L2 or L3	38.64	56.73
	L1 and L2	39.77	25
	L1, L2 and L3	6.82	6.73

4.3 Language Attitude

The language attitude results, detailed in (Table 7), provide data concerning participants' perspectives on statements that are considered con or pro bilingualism (Arabic and English) in our studies' case, and con or pro multilingualism (Arabic, English and Hungarian). This table shows the attitudes from both participant groups. Concerning bilingualism, both groups express favorable

Table 7: Bi/Trilingualism attitude averages between the participant groups

	Attitude	Bilinguals	Trilinguals
Bilingualism	Pro Bilingualism	3.64	3.77
	Con Bilingualism	2.49	2.42
Trilingualism	Pro Trilingualism	3.02	3.19
	Con Trilingualism	2.24	2.26

Attitudes Concerning Arabic and English, both groups express favorable attitudes, as evidenced by high scores in "Pro Bilingualism" (3.64 for bilinguals and 3.77 for trilinguals). Trilinguals, in particular, display slightly stronger positive attitudes toward bilingualism compared to bilinguals. Regarding trilingualism, participants from both groups generally hold positive attitudes, as reflected in high scores for Pro statements concerning Arabic, English and Hungarian (3.02 for bilinguals and 3.19 for trilinguals). However, trilinguals show a slightly more positive stance toward those languages compared to bilinguals.

5. DISCUSSION

This study investigated the multilanguage dynamics of two distinct groups: bilingual Jordanians residing in Jordan and trilingual Jordanians in Hungary. Various aspects, language proficiency assessments, language abilities, language use analyses, and attitudes were investigated.

First, our study revealed that for both bilingual and trilingual participants, strong relationships existed between overall language proficiency and particular language skills including speaking, understanding, reading, and writing. These results are consistent with the body of work that already exists and emphasizes the complexity of language competency assessment (Cummins, 2005). Notably, there were no significant differences between the bilingual and trilingual groups in these correlations, suggesting that the interconnectedness of language skills and their contribution to overall proficiency is consistent across different levels of multilingualism. This observation underscores the unified framework for assessing language competence, as both bilingual and trilingual participants demonstrated similar patterns in how their specific language abilities contributed to their overall proficiency.

An independent samples t-test further supports this interpretation, showing no significant differences in perceived proficiency in Arabic and English between bilinguals and trilinguals, with p-values of 0.755 and 0.750, respectively, both greater than the conventional alpha level of 0.05 (Table 4). The mean differences of -0.0541 for Arabic and -0.0513 for English proficiency indicate that these differences are negligible and not statistically significant. The absence of differences supports Grosjean's (2010) concept of multicompetence, which posits that bilingual and multilingual individuals possess a unique, integrated language system. Consequently, the consistent relationships between language skills and overall proficiency across both groups reinforce the need for inclusive and flexible language assessment tools that accommodate varying levels of multilingualism.

Such findings provide empirical evidence that the same principles of language proficiency apply to both bilingual and trilingual individuals, adding to the body of research advocating for the interconnected and multifaceted nature of language competence (Cummins, 2005; Canale & Swain, 1980). The absence of significant differences between the groups in both perceived proficiency and the correlations among language skills suggests that the unified nature of language competence transcends the number of languages spoken, supporting a holistic approach to language assessment and education.

The observed language use patterns among bilinguals and trilinguals align with findings from studies such as those by Gumperz (1982) and Wei (2013). These studies emphasize that in intimate circles, bilinguals predominantly use their first language (L1), while trilinguals frequently integrate their second (L2) or third language (L3), often combining all three—a phenomenon known as code-switching. In formal settings, both groups primarily use L1, but trilinguals show a greater tendency to incorporate L2 or L3, demonstrating their adeptness in navigating complex social interactions with a broader linguistic repertoire. Additionally, research by Lambert (1975), Fishman (1991), and Jessner (2006) supports the observation that trilinguals are more likely to use L2 or L3 and often utilize all the languages at their disposal in enhanced cultural engagement, cognitive flexibility, and strategic communication skills. These arguments back up the more apparent and diverse language use mixture among trilinguals in contexts such as entertainment, sustainability discussions, and business.

The Language attitude questionnaire aimed at showing both participant groups attitudes toward their two and three languages. The data reveals that both bilinguals and trilinguals exhibit positive attitudes towards bilingualism, with trilinguals showing slightly higher support (Pro Bilingualism: 3.64 for bilinguals, 3.77 for trilinguals). The opposition to bilingualism is relatively low for both groups, with trilinguals again showing slightly lower opposition (Con Bilingualism: 2.49 for bilinguals, 2.42 for trilinguals). These findings align with Dewaele and Wei (2012), who found that multilingual individuals often have positive attitudes towards their languages and can switch between them based on emotional and contextual needs. This suggests that Jordanian bilinguals and trilinguals recognize the cognitive and social benefits of bilingualism, such as enhanced communication skills and cultural understanding. However, comparing the attitudes of both groups, it becomes evident that the trilingual group exhibits slightly higher positive attitudes towards both bilingualism and trilingualism. This may be due to the multilingual environment in Hungary, which likely reinforces the advantages of knowing multiple languages. Baker (2006) supports this observation, noting that multilingual individuals often demonstrate greater linguistic flexibility and adaptability, which may lead to more positive attitudes towards multilingualism.

In the Jordanian context, similar findings occurred in a study by Dweik and Qawar (2015) who examined Arab participant attitudes toward Arabic, French, and English, as well as the factors that influence language use. The researchers recruited a sample of (100) Arab respondents who live in Quebec, Canada, representing various age groups, genders, and educational levels. The study found that Arabs in Quebec-Canada had positive sentiments towards Arabic, English, and French. They freely utilize Arabic at home, with family, in worship, and when listening to the radio. Additionally, they use English and French in government offices, formal applications, and educational institutions.

CONCLUSION
These findings provide a deeper understanding of how bilingual and trilingual Jordanians engage with multiple languages. In addressing the first research question, the study underpins correlations between overall language proficiency and specific skills *like* speaking and writing, revealing how these abilities are interconnected. Despite these findings, the absence of statistical significance between both groups' proficiency scores in Arabic and English answers the second research question, suggesting the need for further exploration in the multilingual body of research in that area. The study also examined how bilinguals tend to favor their first language in personal contexts, while trilinguals often mix languages, especially in formal settings. This aligns with broader research on language use and proficiency, offering valuable perspectives on multilingual behavior in Jordan. Additionally, the positive attitudes towards multilingualism observed in both groups, with slightly stronger support among trilinguals, reflect the cultural and linguistic applications in contexts *like* Hungary. Overall, this study adds important knowledge to our understanding of multilingualism's impact on language, use, abilities and attitudes. As language studies progress, this effort contributes significantly to the growing body of knowledge in the discipline. While acknowledging these contributions, it's essential to consider study limitations, and future research could further explore the multilingual research in a scarce Jordanian context.

REFERENCES
- Alomoush, O. (2015). Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of urban Jordan (Doctoral dissertation, University of Liverpool) https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.658103.
- Altarriba, I. J., & Heredia, R. R. (2008). *Bilingual Research Methods*. In *An Introduction to Bilingualism: Principles and Processes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2993-1_1.
- Aronin, L. (2015). Current multilingualism and new developments in multilingual research. In: Learning And Using Multiple Languages: Current Findings From Research On Multilingualism. *Cambridge Scholars Publishers*.
- Aronin, L., & Hufeisen, B. (2009*). The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L3, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition* (Chapter 4).
- Aronin, L., & Jessner, U. (2015). Understanding current multilingualism: what can the butterfly tell us? In U. Jessner-Schmid & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 271-292). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614512165-013

- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2012). Affordances Theory in Multilingualism Studies. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 2*(3), 311-331. https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v7i1-2.191.
- Barakat, H. (1993). The Arab World: Society, Culture, and State. University of California Press, Berkeley, 184.
- Barnawi, O. Z., & Al-Hawsawi, S. (2017). English education policy in Saudi Arabia: English language education policy in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Current trends, issues and challenges. *English language education policy in the Middle East and North Africa*, 199-222. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-46778-8_12.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: evidence from the Simon task. *Psychology and aging*, *19*(2), 290. DOI: 10.1037/0882-7974.19.2.290.
- Boumeester, M., Michel, M. C., & Fyndanis, V. (2019). Sequential multilingualism and cognitive abilities: Preliminary data on the contribution of language proficiency and use in different modalities. *Behavioral Sciences*, *9*(9), 92. DOI: 10.3390/bs9090092.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 339-343. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41262370.
- Costa, A., Hernández, M., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2008). Bilingualism aids conflict resolution: Evidence from the ANT task. *Cognition*, *106*(1), 59-86. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2006.12.013.
- Cruz-Ferreira, M. (2010). *Multilingual norms* (chapter 2). https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-00478-6.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2009). The effect of multilingualism/multiculturalism on personality: No gain without pain for third culture kids? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *6*(4), 443-459. DOI: 10.1080/14790710903039906.
- Dweik, B. S. I., & Qawar, H. A. (2015). Language choice and language attitudes in a multilingual Arab Canadian community: Quebec–Canada: A sociolinguistic study. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, *3*(1), 1-12. Doi: https://doi.org/10.37745/bjel.
- Europeia, C. (2012). Europeans and their Languages. *Special Eurobaro-meter*, *386*. http://data.europa.eu/88u/dataset/s1049_77_1_ebs386.
- Fasya, M., & Sari, D. G. (2021, November). Sociocultural factors that determine language choice in a multilingual society. In M. Fasya & D. G. Sari (Eds.), *Fifth International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2021)* (pp. 412-418). Atlantis Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. (Chapter 5).
- Fitriati, A., & Wardani, M. M. S. (2020). Language attitudes and language choice among students in Yogyakarta: A case study at Universitas Sanata Dharma. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS)*, *3*(2), 239-250. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v3i2.2226.
- Franceschini, R. (2009). The genesis and development of research in multilingualism. *The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L*, 3, 27-61. https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.6.03ch3.
- García, O., & Lin, A. M. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 117-130. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_9-1.
- Hammarberg, B. (Ed.). (2009). *Processes in Third Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748635122.
- Harris, R. (2006). *New ethnicities and language use*. Springer. (Chapter 4).
- Harrison, W. (1975). English-Language Policy Survey of Jordan. A Case Study in Language Planning. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:67682536.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2001) Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross-Cultural Adaptation. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Kurata, N. (2007). Social and contextual factors influencing L1/L2 use in learners' social network contexts: a case study of learners of Japanese in Australia. In H. Marriott, T. Moore, & R. Spence-Brown (Eds.), *Learning Discourses and the Discourses of Learning* (pp. 15.1 - 15.19). Monash University ePress. https://doi.org/10.2104/ld070015.
- Li, D. C. (1996). Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain. In Li Wei (Ed.), *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain* (pp. 147-151). Clevedon, UK & Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters. http://theses.ncl.ac.uk/jspui/handle/10443/284.
- Lüdi, G. (2007). The Swiss model of plurilingual communication. *Receptive multilingualism: Linguistic analyses, language policies and didactic concepts*, 159-178. https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.6.10lud.
- Luk, G., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Bilingualism is not a categorical variable: Interaction between language proficiency and usage. *Journal of cognitive Psychology*, *25*(5), 605-621. doi: 10.1080/20445911.2013.795574.
- Luk, G., De Sa, E. R. I. C., & Bialystok, E. (2011). Is there a relation between onset age of bilingualism and enhancement of cognitive control? *Bilingualism: Language and cognition*, *14*(4), 588-595. DOI: 10.1017/S1366728911000010.
- McCrae, R. R., & Allik, J. (Eds.). (2002). *The Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Cultures.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-0763-5.

- Meyer, B., & Apfelbaum, B. (Eds.). (2010). Multilingualism at work: From policies to practices in public, medical and business settings (Vol. 9). John Benjamins Publishing. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404512000930.
- Navracsics, J., & Molnár, C. (2017). Multilingualism, teaching, and learning foreign languages in present-day Hungary. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education| IRJE|*, 29-42. https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v1i1.4337.
- Ningrat, H. K. (2019). Language Choice in Multilingual Society A Sociolinguistic Study of Tanjung Luar Community. *Jurnal Penelitian Tarbawi: Pendidikan Islam dan Isu-Isu Sosial*, *4*(1), 38-55. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37216/tarbawi.v4i1.162.
- Parasher, S. V. (1980). *Mother tongue-English diglossia: A case study of educated Indian bilinguals' language use*. *Anthropological Linguistics, 22*(4), (pp. 151-162). https://www.jstor.org/stable/i30027767.
- Pavlenko, A. (2006). *Bilingual Selves. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 56*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050608668656.
- Pavlenko, A. (2006). Bilingual selves. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (Vol. 56, pp. 1-19). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598746-003.
- Perani, D., & Abutalebi, J. (2005). The neural basis of first and second language processing. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, *15*(2), 202-206. DOI: 10.1016/j.conb.2005.03.007.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell. 384.
- Romaine, S. (2006). Language policy in multinational educational contexts. *Concise Encyclopedia Of*, 466. DOI: 10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00646-5.
- Romaine, S. (2013). Politics and policies of promoting multilingualism in the European Union. *Language Policy*, *12*(2), 115–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-013-9277-8.
- Romaine, S. (2013). Politics and policies of promoting multilingualism in the European Union. *Language Policy, 12*(2), 115–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-013-9277-8.
- Saidat, A. M. (2010). Language attitude: The case of Jordan. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 2(6), 235-243.
- Sumarsono. (2013). Sosiolinguistik. Yogyakarta: SABDA & Pustaka Pelajar.
- Tao, L., Marzecová, A., Taft, M., Asanowicz, D., & Wodniecka, Z. (2011). The efficiency of attentional networks in early and late bilinguals: the role of age of acquisition. *Frontiers in psychology*, *2*, 123. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00123.
- Taqavi, M., & Rezaei, A. (2019). Language choice and identity construction of Azerbaijani bilinguals in family and friendship domains. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *42*(4), 383-397. DOI:10.1080/01434632.2019.1699564.
- Weber, J. J., & Horner, K. (2012). The trilingual Luxembourgish school system in historical perspective: Progress or regress? *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 25*(1), 3-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2011.653054.
- Zaharna, R. S. (2009). An associative approach to intercultural communication competence in the Arab world. *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*, 179-195.