Code-Switching Among Arabic-English Adult Bilinguals in the UK: Syntactic Structures, and Pragmatic Functions

A dissertation submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of Master of Arts in the faculty of Humanities.

2013

Hanan Ben Nafa

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

List of Contents

Word count: 15,498.

LELA 70000 Dissertation

List of Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
CAUS	Causative
DEF	Definite
IMP	Imperative
NEG	negation, negative
PL	Plural
POSS	Possessive
PRS	Present
PTCP	Participle
SG	Singular

Abstract

This study investigated the Arabic-English code-switching (CS) management of five, Arab, young, bilingual adult in the UK. The data was selectively extracted from tape-recorded informal conversations lasting approximately five to six hours. The grammatical structure and the pragmatic role are two aspects from which the switching between this language pair was examined. Two structural patterns emerged: insertion and alternation. Insertional CS was more frequent than its alternational correlate. This division marks the high status of Arabic as the structurally dominant code into which English units are inserted in this study. However, the few alternations are found to be more significant than insertions, due to the communicative role they play. Whereas insertions draw prominently on several domains to which they act as referential points, alternations work to internally structure and organise segments of bilingual discourse. Specifically, Auer's sequential approach to interactions which include code-switched utterances (1984) is an insightful method through which CS is examined here both turn-internally and across turns. It was concluded that CS is, to a great extent, the unmarked choice for most informants and a conversational means through which they skilfully accommodate each others' turns and promote their self-image. In consequence, the functional rather than the structural approach provided a more comprehensive view of the mechanisms underlying CS. The findings also showed a lack of compartmentalization in the utilisation of the conversational role of the two codes by most informants. Often, the informants considered the two codes to be complementing one another both structurally and more importantly, functionally. Finally, there is a noticeable correlation between the participants' complex switching strategies and some factors: linguistic competence and age. Resultantly, the CS of this group is a conversational process governed by such sociolinguistic variables.

Declaration

I declare that no portion of the work referred to in this dissertation has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Intellectual Property Statement

i. The author of this dissertation (including any appendices and/or schedules to this dissertation) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii. Copies of this dissertation, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made **only** in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has entered into. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trade marks and other intellectual property (the "Intellectual Property") and any reproductions of copyright works in the dissertation, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this dissertation, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this dissertation, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=487), in any relevant Dissertation restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library's regulations (see http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations) and in The University's Guidance for the Presentation of Dissertations.

Introduction

Years of pursuing academic opportunities and considerable contact with English speakers has enabled many young Arabs in the UK to achieve a high level of proficiency in English. Informants in this study are non-balanced bilinguals; most of whom with Arabic as the dominant language. Since there is no one agreed-upon definition for bilingualism, it is defined, for the purpose of this study, as the speaker's ability to produce meaningful discourse in two languages. This is a similar definition to that proposed by Haugen (1969) cited in (Grosjean 1982: 232). Bilingualism mostly expresses itself in the form of CS which is deemed a 'central issue in the bilingualism research' (Milroy & Muysken 1995: 7). CS is generally defined as the act of alternating between two languages in the same interaction.

It is noted by Gardner-Chloros that scholarly interest in the mechanisms underlying CS began about four decades ago (2009: 9). It is a phenomenon whose complexity intrigued many early linguists, such as Barber (1973: 305) cited in (Grosjean 1982: 130), who called for examining the code choice bilinguals use amongst each other. Later, different approaches were employed to investigate CS from both structural and functional angles. There is a group of proponents for each approach, however, there are still many debates over which can more effectively explain the governing factors of CS (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 36). Regardless of such debates, both approaches are of great importance as the communicative ends for which CS is made need to be represented by some kind of syntactic structure. However, to investigate further, a potential line of enquiry would be to examine if there were correlation between specific structural patterns and the function they achieve. It would be interesting to discover if a certain function fulfilled by a CS instance takes a specific structural form that is different from another with a different function.

1.1 Aims of the study

The study will investigate the CS behaviour of a small group of bilinguals while

alternating between Arabic and English. The questions to be pursued are:

1- What are the structural patterns exhibited by the CS of this group? What are the grammatical constraints that govern the switching mechanism between elements of Arabic and English? From which language are these constraints derived?

2- What are the pragmatic functions fulfilled by each of the structural patterns observed? How do bilinguals utilise these patterns for their communicative ends? Are these tasks governed by external or internal factors in relation to the world of the conversation?

3- Is there a division in the structural patterns observed? If so, is this paralleled by another division in the function that each pattern serves?

4- Is there a correlation between the intensity of the informants' CS performance and sociolinguistic factors, such as age and linguistic competence?

5- Is there compartmentalization in the informants' use of the two codes? Is CS their unmarked code choice?

Some models were considered the springboard for analysing the data. For the structural approach, the MLF model and Polack's Equivalence Constraint were relevant and could accommodate the data found here. Gumprz's metaphorical CS and Auer's sequential approach to interactions were utilised to examine the functional/ conversational role of CS. I tested the applicability of these models with the data and discussed any irregular CS patterns or tendencies.

1.2   Significance of the study

This study attempted to enrich the body of knowledge that already exists about CS. One way to do this was to analyse the informants' CS in light of both views mentioned above. It endeavours to contribute to the on-going debate concerning the most determinant factors behind this process. It will mainly investigate whether CS is determined by the level of congruence between Arabic and English structural systems,

or more by the conversational effects CS patterns create.

Moreover, studies which looked at Arabic-English CS as a conversational means is very scarce. In existing studies thus far, the social impact of CS is confined to a number of functions. Abalhassan & Alshalawi, for example, found that English items are mainly inserted to fill a lexical gap or give a cultural connotation that an Arabic word lacks (2000: 186). These only focus on factors external to the conversations, such as the domains from which such items are transferred. In comparison, alternations are not thoroughly investigated. Also, the investigation is limited to the turn's boundaries and is not carried out across consecutive conversational moves. Therefore, part of this study was dedicated to a turn-by-turn analysis of CS and how bilinguals utilise CS to structure their utterances and express themselves.

Chapter two: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Definition of CS

A frequently referenced definition is Gumperz's (1982: 59) in which he defines CS as the speaker's 'juxtaposition ... of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems' of two languages in the same conversation or situation. Chloros-Gardner, however, claims that there is not yet a fixed definition for this phenomenon and proposed definitions so far are only working ones (2009: 11). Such definition also approaches CS from a more social view. Structurally, CS is the subsequent occurrence of two lexical constituents from two different languages. According to Grosjean, constituents can be of any size ranging from one word to a sentence in length (1982: 146). It is categorised by Myers-Scotton and others into: intra-sentential and inter-sentential CS (1993b: 4-5). The former refers to switching within the sentence boundaries, while the latter refers to switching outside the sentence boundaries. For Myers-Scotton, switching in the intra-sentential sense means inserting items from an 'embedded' language into the structure of a matrix language - ML (1993b: 3). Similarly, embedding 'alien lexical categor[ies]' into a dominant language structure is what Muysken calls: 'insertion' or 'code-mixing' (2000: 3; 1). Regarding the language pair under discussion, English content words are usually embedded into Arabic sentences. The English gerund verb *improving* in example (1) is inserted into the sentential structure of Arabic - the ML.

(1) ma- byitkalim-u-š   'arabi ... 'ašan   yi'mil - u - l hum   ***improving*** lil-
     NEG-PRES.speak-3MPL-NEG   Arabic   because PRES.make-3MPL- to 3PL   //   to.DEF-
     English
        //
     '[They] don't speak Arabic to improve their English'   (Othman 2006: 56)

Alternation is the other term used for inter-sentential CS (Muysken 2000: 4-5). It is the switching between two complex constituents, from two different languages. Unlike the simple nature of insertions, an alternation is the switching of an independent clause or

a sentence that includes both grammatical and lexical units (Muysken 2000: 97). One criterion that Muysken (2000: 99) makes to identify an alternation is its occurring 'at a major clause boundary'. Nominal or pronominal subjects, interjections, such as e*mm* (example 2) and coordinators, such as *bas* (example 2) are considered clause boundary markers in this study. The example below illustrates two instances of alternations: the English phrase *like some of them* alternates with *emm* , and the former alternates with the Arabic subordinate clause bas *fī* .

(2) emm *like some of them* bas   fī ...
    emm   //   but   there
    'Emm, like some of them but there is'

In this paper, Muysken's terms (Insertion and Alternation) would be used to refer to intra-sentential and inter-sentential CS. Also, Code-switching will be used as an umbrella term for all different CS patterns observed here.

2.2 CS as a field of research

2.2.1 Structural CS

A large number of studies have been carried out to examine CS from both a structural and a functional view. Scholars' first attempts in 1970s were focused on investigating the grammatical constraints that govern the occurrence of CS. Myers-Scotton calls these attempts: 'local-solution constraints' that were mainly concerned with sites at which switching could occur within a sentence (1993b: 24). Despite his interest in the pragmatic motivations behind CS, Gumperz proposed a number of structural constraints that are based on both authentic conversations and 'substitution frames' (1982: 87). For example, it is unacceptable that subjects and predicates be of two different languages, especially when the subject is a short noun phrase or a pronoun that is not used emphatically (1982: 87-90). Gumperz suggests that the pragmatic unity between these two items and their semantic dependence on each other is the reason behind such constraint. Furthermore, it is claimed that conjunctions are produced in the same code as that of the 'second switched phrase' (1982: 88). Many counter-

examples, however, were later found, as Pfaff's data (1979) yielded examples in which conjunctions were also able to go with the code of the first switched phrase.

Another important constraint is one which considers the syntactic congruence between two languages a determiner of the possibility of switching. After investigating conversations between Spanish-English bilinguals, Lipski (1977: 255) concluded that 'the superficial syntactic structure of X1 and X2 [must] be identical' for an intra-sentential switching to occur. Due to the syntactic equivalence between many Spanish and English constructions, switching generally occurs smoothly, with the exception of few instances of structural incongruence between the two (Lipski 1977: 258). In a later study, Pfaff (1979) elaborates on the importance of identical word order as a pre-requisite for CS. She also discussed sites where CS between the same language pair (Spanish-English) is restricted, such as switching between 'attributive' adjectives and 'head nouns' (Pfaff 1979: 304-306). Since Spanish adjectives follow nouns while English ones precede them, switching between nouns and adjectives is prohibited. Were it not, the switch would result in a mixed phrase which violates the word order of either language. This constraint was then officially coined the 'Equivalence Constraint' by Poplack (1980: 581).

Later studies on different language pairs presented many counter-examples to this constraint. Nartey's study (1982) cited in (Chan 2009: 183) concluded that this structural rule is not motivated for CS between English and some Ghanaian verity. Myers-Scotton (1993b: 24) criticised the proponents of this constraint for the 'inductive' nature of their approach, as they generalise a pattern they found in one language pair and expect all other language pairs and situations to exhibit it. They also focus on the sites at which CS could occur, but do not explain the reasons behind these lists of restrictions. Furthermore, Bentahila and Davies (1983: 310) demonstrated that bilinguals can rely mainly on the rules of one language and violate the other's when switching between languages of different word orders, such as Moroccan Arabic and French. In this case, obeying the linear order of the two participating languages is not essential. Although Arabic adjectives are post-nominal and some French ones are pre-nominal, switching as in example (3) below does occur:

(3) kajn un *autre*   muškil
    there is another problem   (Bentahila and Davies 1983: 319)

It could be argued that this switch only conforms to the syntactic rules of French, but violates those of Arabic. The Subcategorization model indicates that the rules of one language - especially the code-switcher's L1 - sometimes override the rules of the other. Such a model suggests that the two languages' participation in the CS process is not balanced, but hierarchal. These previous studies paved the way for the emergence of Myers-Scotton's MLF model that was mainly based on data from Swahili-English CS (1993b: 35). The concept of an ML was first observed by Joshi (1985), who noticed that system morphemes are highly activated and accessed in one code rather than another in CS situations (Ibid).

Later, the Matrix Language Frame was proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993b) to explain instances of intra-sentential CS. The model's hypothesis states that CS instances occur within the frame of a language that dominantly generates the sentence's abstract structure (1993b: 80). This model is based on two main principles: one is the 'System Morpheme principle', which predicts that function words are supplied by the ML while content words are supplied by the embedded language (EL); and the ML (1993b: 77; 98). This division demonstrates the different extent with which each participating language contributes to the bilingual discourse structure. Later, Myers-Scotton (2002), cited in (Benchiba-Savenius 2011: 81-2), developed the system principle into the 4-M model in which the system morphemes were further divided into three groups: early system morphemes, late bridge system morphemes and later outsider system morphemes. Examples of these are usually plural morphemes, possessive markers and 3rd person singular morphemes, respectively. The other principle is 'Morpheme Order Principle' (1993b: 83), which specifies that EL utterances are embedded according to the word order of the ML regardless of any difference between the ML's and the EL's syntactic surfaces.

The MLF model gives insight into the strategies bilinguals employ when switching at sites where two languages are syntactically incongruent (discussed in Clyne 1987: 745).

One commonly followed strategy, is the insertion of native items to accommodate for some switches. For example, Benchiba-Savenius (2011: 176-7) observes that if an English verb is embedded into the structure of an Arabic sentence, the verb is inserted in its non-finite form. The inflection is then assigned to a native verb that is specifically inserted to solve that structural conflict that would arise because of the two languages' different inflection systems. Although the MLF model is exploited by many studies that investigate CS between distant languages as Chan mentioned (2009: 184), it was heavily criticised as previous theories. For example, Bentahila and Davies (1988: 31) cited in Garnder-Chloros (2009: 100), observes that identifying one ML for an 'interaction containing four sentences dominated by' two different languages, is not possible. This, however, is probably an example of alternational CS that is not discussed by the MLF model. Counter-examples were also found where conjunctions, which were considered system morphemes, were embedded into ML structures. Later, Myers-Scotton, et al. (1996: 13) revised some aspects of the model and changed their classification of conjunctions; taking into account cross-linguistic variations regarding the system-content morpheme dichotomy.

2.2.2 Functional CS

The social motivation behind CS utterances is an essential aspect to be explored, in order for a holistic understanding of the CS process to be acquired. Gumperz (1982), claims that bilinguals pay more attention to 'the communicative effect' of their utterances than to the form these utterances take (Gumperz 1982: 61; 84). He supports his claim by highlighting the universal nature of the different functions for which CS is made. Regardless of linguistic background, most bilinguals switch to fulfil similar conversational tasks whereas the format of their CS may greatly differ. His first attempt to examine the functions of alternational CS systematically was the 'we'/ 'they' code dichotomy. Thus, a speaker usually utilises his L1 or the 'we' code, in case of non-balanced bilingualism, to talk about informal matters while they switch to the 'they' code to talk about formal issues. Such a concept was then criticised for its rigidity and its inability to account for cases in which people are climbing up the social

hierarchy. Gardner-Chloros (2009: 58) refers to some studies that looked at groups who would not associate themselves with the 'we' code, but were more likely to prefer adopting the 'they' code and use it more often. Later, Gumperz (1982) himself realised that this division did not accurately describe the speech of bilingual communities, but that of diglossic ones, especially because his data were based on conversations produced by Norwegians who speak both a high and a low variety (Blom & Gumperz 1972).

Other concepts are the Situational and Metaphorical CS oppositions. With the former, the change of a code itself is meaningful, as it signals a change in the situation, topic or interlocutors (Blom & Gumperz 1972: 409). For example, an immigrant uses one code: minority language, when talking to other immigrants and uses another when talking to his kids who are often native speakers of the other code: dominant language. In contrast, the meaning in metaphorical CS is not generated by merely switching the code; instead, the act of alternation receives its meaning from its association with certain values that the speaker attaches for a specific code or variety (Ibid). For the speaker, there is a division between the two codes based on their preference and attachment level (Myers-Scotton 1993a: 55). For instance, one code would be considered the accepted choice for addressing personal topics and another for formal ones. Empirically, however, it is generally argued that interactions are not clearly or rigidly divided into situations in which one code is used for each (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 58-59). Instead, bilinguals consider the two codes as resources that enrich their interaction and assist them in discussing a topic more efficiently.

Another aspect of metaphorical CS is the contrastive effect created by its use of two different codes in alternation. Based on this, Gumperz suggests that bilinguals could utilise this contrast to fulfil several conversational tasks. Some of the stylistic tasks that CS achieves are to highlight a 'quotation', 'reiterate' or 'qualify' a message (1982: 75-80). For example, a quotation can be made more salient by producing it in a code that is different from another code used to produce the rest of the discourse, such as the quotative verb introducing a quotation. After this, the metaphorical CS or what Gumperz calls: contextulization cue, was generally considered the base on which

functional aspects of CS can be investigated, particularly those related to the internal structure of conversational moves.

A prominent method is Auer's sequential approach (1984) that views CS instances from a conversation analytic approach. Successive alternations are considered tools with which meaning is locally constructed (Auer 1984: 13). The difference between Auer's and Gumperz's situational CS approaches is the angle from which each concept approaches CS. Giles and Coupland (1991: 15) cited in (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 70-1) claimed that the former approach considers code switches a result of the speakers' internal planning of their utterances based on their 'subjective ... defin[ition of] the scene'. As a result, speakers switch codes to construct meaning and present a social identity which is not given but negotiated as the interaction flows. In contrast, the approaches of Gumperz and others, such as Myers-Scotton's Markedness Theory (1993a), attribute CS to what Li Wei (2005: 376) describes as the 'external' world of conversations: i.e. societal norms and expectations. Therefore, a speaker switches to one code because it is associated with specific values that are relevant to the current situation. Bilinguals may also switch to a code only because it is the expected one to be used when starting a specific topic. Li Wei (2005: 377) argues that these approaches link a switch with an external motivation that may not say much about speakers' identities, especially when one considers that immigrant bilinguals differ in the values they attach to each code, according to linguistic orientation. Instead, CA practitioners explore the speakers' intended meaning behind their switch, in the contexts in which they are made.

For Auer, an alternation metaphorically organises the discourse, not only through the contrast it generates between two parts of a sentence, but through the speaker's changing 'footing', or stance, in each part (1984: 17). It is usually noted (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 66) that the conversational effect generated by a switch does not depend on a particular direction. For instance, switching to qualify a message produced in Arabic is not a function that is confined to English. Instead, both codes are often used interchangeably to create the qualifying effect. 'Discourse-related CS' is the term Auer uses to refer to CS when it is a device for discourse structuring (Auer

1984: 17). An example of this is 'Sequential subordination', in which switching is made to differentiate one part of an utterance from the other, based on their importance to the speaker (1984: 39). The more important one is used to talk about a main topic, while the other is used to quickly refer to tangents. This effect could be created when the switch is made within a turn or across turns. In addition to 'discourse-related CS', there is 'participant-related CS' in which CS is used as a source for elucidating a speaker's attitude towards another co-participant's utterance and the former's reaction to it (Auer 1984: 6; 21). For example, a speaker may demonstrate his disagreement with another speaker's utterance and respond with an utterance that is produced in a different code to the latter's. Finally, Auer also discusses insertions and divides them into: Lexical transfer 'Transfer L' and participant transfer 'Transfer P' (1984: 6). The former refers to insertions made to fill lexical gaps and the other to those that are purposefully used by a speaker to create cohesion between two subsequent turns (1984: 26).

2.3 Arabic-English CS research

There is a considerable 'lack of ... theoretical foundation' in the current research of Arabic-English CS (Al-Rowais 2012: 23), unlike that of other language pairs. This is true in regard to studies conducted concerning the pragmatic functions of CS. However, CS's syntactic structure has been well tackled in a good number of studies. A recent contribution is Benchiba-Savenius's (2011) comprehensive research concerning Moroccan Arabic-English CS. Its exploitation of the MLF model in analysing the data is very beneficial to this current study. One of the frequent patterns observed in Arabic-English CS is pronoun doubling. Generally, it is not acceptable to switch between a subjective pronoun and a verb and participants thus employ the 'pronoun doubling' strategy to avoid violating the 'language-specific requirements' of both Arabic and English (Eid 1992: 62). For example, to avoid switching between the subjective pronoun *ana* in example (4) and the English verb *was*, the speaker inserts the English pronoun *I* after its Arabic correlate.

(4) ya'ni 'ana (meaning I) *I was ...*   (Eid 1992: 59)

However, doubling in the other direction does not occur, indicating that participants prefer to begin their sentences with a native pronoun, rather than an English one. Based on questionnaires, Taweel & Btoosh (2012) elaborated on Eid's work and attributed this pronoun doubling to the semantic dependency that exists between pronouns and predicates in any language.

Another study is that of Abalhassan & Alshalawi (2000) which investigated the reasons behind the CS of a group of Saudi students living in the US. Similarly, their English switches were limited to fulfil specific functions, such as filling lexical gaps or avoiding inappropriate Arabic terms. The informants' low proficiency in English made it difficult to examine their CS performance compared with that of full bilinguals or advanced second language learners. Another study is Othman's (2006) which examined the language choice of Arab families living in the UK. It was concluded that the CS of parents and older migrants is restricted to basic structural patterns, such as insertions. Generally, such groups insert English words that are associated with specific domains, such as work. An example from the study is the embedding of an English verb *improving* into an Arabic sentence (see example 1 above). This verb is utilised because the speaker regularly uses it and closely associates it with her job as a teacher which requires her to encourage students and improve their skills (2006: 56-7). Moreover, parents insert English items because they consider them a means through which they can accommodate the code of preference of their UK-born children: English (2006: 61). Alternations are very rare and the pragmatic motivations behind their use have not been investigated. The lack of alternations used is usually attributed to the speaker's lack of proficiency in one of the two languages. For example, the CS of the non-balanced bilinguals in Al-Rowais's study (2012) used very few alternations because of their low proficiency in Arabic. Even when they used alternations, they were often expressions that they associate with Arabic, such as sarcastic comments and requests (2012: 44). This was then one of the few studies that examined CS from a sociolinguistic angle and investigated the correlation between speakers' linguistic competence and their CS intensity (2012: 41).

Chapter three: Methodology

3.1 Overview

Eliciting data for CS studies is varied and several methodological means are used (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 8). Since this study is run within a sociolinguistic frame, a traditional and a qualitative approach of data elicitation will be adopted; that is recording of naturally-occurring data. Another qualitative approach that is utilised to elicit information about the informants is a language background questionnaire.

3.2 The Sample

Six female informants participated in this research, including the researcher herself. Five of the participants are originally from Libya where they spent all their lives prior to their move to the UK. Apart from their first language: Standard Arabic, they all speak Libyan Arabic (LA) which is the Arabic variety spoken in Libya. The sixth informant speaks Syrian Arabic (SA) and lived a few of her early years in Kuwait and the UK. Generally, all participants have an advanced command of both Arabic and English

Informants	Age	Occupation	Education	Years spent in UK	Age at immigration
Sub 1	23	Student	BSc (Current)	4 Years	20
Sub 2	23	//	MA (Current)	//	19
Sub 3	32	//	PhD (Current)	4 Years	28
Sub 4	34	House Wife	BA	27 Years	1 & 10
Sub 5	22	Student	MA (Current)	4 Years	18
Sub 6 (Researcher)	24	//	MA (Current)	//	20

Table.1: Informants' profile

with some variations in specific skills. The five Libyan participants are non-balanced

20

bilinguals with Arabic as their dominant language. The sixth participant is also a non-balanced bilingual with English as her dominant language. This sample of respondents was chosen based on three criteria. First, all participants are from a similar age group: early twenties and thirties; second, that they demonstrate high competence in Arabic and English; and finally, that most of them are students and share the same social circle.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

The data was extracted from the conversations of the six participants. Utilising the informants' spontaneous speech can potentially provide a reliable representation of their CS behaviour. However, the data solely elicited using interviews and questionnaires are unlikely to be as reliable (Dabene & Moore 1995: 26-7). The informants' conversations were recorded using Sony PCM-M10 Portable Recorder. About five to six hours of conversations was tape-recorded by the researcher, with around an hour dedicated to each participant. The data was recorded in several sessions which took place in similar, informal settings. For each session, the researcher and one participant were present. Moreover, for the sake of convenience, the recordings also included phone calls. To avoid any inaccurate data that may have resulted from the presence of the researcher, the latter ran group sessions where the conversations between some of the participants were recorded. During those sessions, the researcher tried not to participate, but to solely listen and observe. The aim of these sessions was to examine whether or not the speakers' CS differs from theirs in the separate conversations.

The other way data was collected through a questionnaire that participants completed. The aim was to have an idea about the informants' personal details, cultural background and self-rated proficiency in English. These featured in the first part of the questionnaire; the second consisted of open-ended questions regarding their CS attitudes. The format of the second part was a modified version of the original one used in Othman's study (2006: 76).

3.4 Data Analysis Methods

The conversations were selectively transcribed according to the conventions used by Atkinson & Heritage (1984). The transcription only indicated the speaker's CS utterances, pauses and hesitation, but any overlaps or interruptions were not indicated. Also, the conversations were glossed according to Leipzig glossing rules (Max Planck Institute 2008). The conversations were qualitatively analysed by applying a number of models proposed in the literature of CS: those used for examining structural and functional aspects of CS. The quantitative analysis of the data was to count the total number of occurrences of all the CS utterances made by each speaker. These instances will be coded and classified according to the CS pattern they exhibit and to the syntactic category under which they fall, a procedure similar to those followed in previous studies, such as Poplack's (1980: 599). In addition, the questionnaires were analysed and will be discussed in a later section regarding the sociolinguistic factors behind CS. Any correlation between the CS patterns and such variables will be highlighted (Muysken 2000: 8-10).

3.5 Ethical Considerations

There are many ethical considerations, such as the informants' privacy, the observer paradox and the nature of the sample. The main concern was recording people in informal settings where personal matters could be mentioned. To protect the informants' privacy, the recordings were carefully listened to and segments of sensitive issues were deleted. Vitally, the informants' names were not included in the transcription and were replaced with symbols. Second, the accuracy of the data from one-to-one recordings may be undermined by the fact that the researcher was present in all recording sessions where she may have-accidentally-manipulated the direction conversations took. To avoid this, and indeed any other bias, a large group-recording to which everyone could freely contribute was chosen, as mentioned above. Finally, the sample selected for this research may not seem to make one homogenous group, as it involves two groups with different language dominance. However, a comparison between proficient second language learners and native speakers in CS studies is

usually viable due to the native-like command that some second language learners can have (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 17).

<u>Chapter Four: Results</u>

A quantitative analysis was carried out to gain an overall view of the CS distribution. In total, the recordings yielded approximately 784 CS instances. These were bi-directional: Arabic to English and English to Arabic, although there were exclusively more instances of the former. Based on Redouane's study (2005: 1926), CS utterances are divided according to their size into two groups: single utterances and long utterances. The former group (Table 2) includes one to two word-units, such as nouns, whereas the other includes two to three word units and larger sequences, such as prepositional phrases and clauses.

Syntactic category	Arabic < English	English < Arabic	Total
Nominal Constituents	355	5	360
Adjectival Constituents	102	2	104
Utterance Modifiers	18	38	56
Adverbs	16	6	22
Verbs	9	0	9
Determiners	1	1	2
Relative Pronouns	1	3	4
Total	502	55	557

<u>Table.2: Distribution of short code-switched utterances</u>

* In all tables in the next sections, code-switched instances in the mixed conversations are excluded, because informants do not equally contribute to it. Tables will be confined to represent one-to-one conversations.

Table (2) shows that nouns are the most switched items, then comes adjectives and adverbs. English nouns are considerably inserted into Arabic as they are structurally easier to be integrated, due to being 'grammatically self-contained character[s]'

(Gardner-Chloros 2009: 31). All insertions found in a turn or a sentence are counted. For larger utterances in sequence, such as sentences, only the first instance is counted. Example (5) is an instance of switching to the English noun *timetable* after the Arabic definite article *'il* :

(5) t- šūf - ī   'il **timetable**
    2SG-see-F DEF   //
    'When you check the timetable'

English nouns also occur as predicates to Arabic constructions. Example (5) illustrates the noun *timetable* as the object of the Arabic verb *t-šūf-ī* . Furthermore, switching to English nouns after Arabic prepositions could occur, creating a prepositional phrase (see example 6). However, the opposite seems to be impermissible between these two languages and is never attested. The same rule operates in case of other language pairs: Spanish-English CS that is investigated by Pfaff (1979: 310).

(6) hiyy-a ḥilw-a lamma t - abd - a   fī **group**
     it - F   nice-F when   3SG-seem-F in   //
    'It is nice when you work in a group'

English adjectives are also inserted after Arabic nouns and prepositions. In (7), the adjective *typical* is embedded after the Arabic negation marker *miš* ; functioning as its complement:

(7) la ... **miš** *typical* fham - t - ī ?
    no   not   //   understand-2SG-F?
    'No, he's not typical, you know'

Utterance modifiers, a term coded by Matras (1998) cited in (Matras 2009: 137), which include conjunctions, fillers and discourse markers were also highly switched in both directions. They are the most freely inserted items regardless of the different constraints governing each language (Poplack 1980: 596). The Arabic filler *yaʕnī* is

inserted after (example 8) or in the middle of English sentences:

(8) *I'm not gonna live there* **yaʕnī**

                    //   means

     'I'm not gonna live there, I mean'

According to long utterances, code-switched English full sentences are more than
code-switched English phrases. Clauses mostly occur at clause boundaries flagged by
conjunctions while sentential switches are not. The next example illustrates a switched
Arabic coordinated clause *fa bi-fūt- ī* :

(9) *you can't make a decision now* **fa bi- t - fūt - ī**   'il   *offer*?

                    //   so FUT-2SG-refuse-F DEF   //

     'you can't make a decision now, so you'll refuse the offer?'

Independent clauses and sentences are classified as main clauses (table 3), whilst
(clauses) include instances of dependent clauses, such as coordinated and
subordinated clauses.

Syntactic category	Arabic < English	English < Arabic	Total number of switches
Main Clauses	141	15	**156**
Clauses	21	19	**40**
Phrases/ constituents	23	8	**31**
Total	**185**	**42**	**227**

Table.3: Distribution of long code-switched utterances

Chapter five: Discussion

5.1 Structural Approach to CS

Listing sites of switching neither explains the motivation behind such switches nor it elucidates how elements from the two languages interact. This means of analysis lends itself to the traditional approach adopted by the constraints models' proponents, such as Pfaff (1979) and others who mainly relied on generalisations in analysing CS. This chapter presents a qualitative analysis of the switching patterns observed in chapter four. The majority of CS instances can be accommodated by relating them to previous proposals. One of these is the foremost model: Myers-Scotton's MLF. Another is Poplack's Equivalence Constraint, an observational proposition which examines CS between languages of different linear orders. Finally, Muysken's distinction between insertional and alternational CS is also utilised. Instead of strictly imposing these approaches on the data, they were only be deemed starting points that could facilitate the analysis. In looking at a different language pair, this discussion could benefit from going beyond earlier theories and explaining why a rigorous application of them may not work.

5.1.1 Surface word order in Arabic and English

The tables in the fourth chapter showed that instances of code-switched adjectives are noticeably lower than these of nouns although both are content words. Based on Poplack's Equivalence Constraint (1980: 581), it is stated that, for switching between their elements to occur, a parallel in the word order of two languages is required. Similar to many studies mentioned before, there are instances here that counter Poplack's observation. Switches between Arabic nouns and English adjectives and vice versa do occur although Arabic adjectives are post-nominal while the English ones are pre-nominal.

(10) zay 'il   *project* **kāmel**
     like DEF   //   complete
     'It's like a complete project'

(11) **ḥāja**   hikkī   *minor*
    thing   like   //
    'It's something minor'

In (10 & 11), the rules by which the two nouns and adjectives mix are derived from Arabic as the two adjectives occur post-nominally. However, the English syntactic rule is only violated when an adjective like *minor* modifies a preceding Arabic noun like *ḥāja* (example 11)*.* The English syntactic rule is also violated in example (10) as the English modified noun should occur after and not before the modifying adjective. Such examples contradict Poplack's hypothesis because a switch is made in consistence with the rules of one language, not both. This observation could be explained in the frame of the Subcategorization model (Bentahila & Davies 1983). Switching where the syntactic surface of Arabic and English is not equivalent cannot be totally precluded, as this pattern is actually found in the current study's data, similar to what was previously exhibited in data from Moroccan Arabic-English CS (Bentahila & Davies 1983: 326).

A detailed survey of the data, however, suggests that violating English rules is refrained from whenever possible. A cursory look at table (4) below implies that the number of mixed noun phrases is low. Also, the researcher made most of the switches that led to these mixed phrases, making the data less reliable. It is, however, a point that is worth considering, as this type of switch is made eleven times and sounds acceptable. Interestingly, the switches made between Arabic nouns and English adjectives could still be falsified. The adjective *homeless* in example (12) is embedded according to the rules of Arabic, as adjectives follow the head noun they modify in terms of (in)definiteness. However, such adjectives could be also considered nouns in Arabic as nouns may function as complements, similar to the function of adjectives.

(12) 'in - **nās**   'il - *homeless*
    DEF - people DEF   //
    'The homeless people'

Speakers	(A. n+ E. Adj)	(E. n+ A. Adj)	English constituents (adj+n/ adv+adj)
S.1 / S.6	0-2	1-3	1-5
S.2 / //	-	1-0	3-5
S.3 / //	2-3	0-4	4-0
S.4 / //	1-0	0-1	3-1
S.5 / //	0-6	-	0-4
Total	3-11=**14**	2-8=**10**	10-14-**24**

Table.4: Distribution of English code-switched nominal phrases

The fact that the embedded English nouns bear some of the grammatical markings of the Arabic nouns is also a borrowing strategy that monolinguals adopt when integrating nouns. However, nouns here are integrated with no change in their original inflection or phonology (Matras 2009: 172). Thus, such a switching process could be called 'integration' as well as 'insertion', as the English nouns are not simply embedded but are morphologically incorporated within the ML system: Arabic. Moreover, the third instance (example 13) where the English adjective occurs post-nominally is argued to be a 'nonce borrowing' according to Sankoff, et al. (1990). What may make this adjective an instance of borrowing is that it is a cultural form and does not have an equivalent in Arabic. However, it is beyond the scope of this paper to argue against this term, especially that there are not clear criteria for what a nonce borrowing is. More importantly, however, this does not mean that switches at this point are not possible. Actually, this switch is made by a bilingual while it is far unlikely for such an adjective to be available for monolinguals (Matras 2009: 106).

(13) ba-staʕmil   ṭahīn *self-raising*
     PRS-use.1SG   flour   //
     'I use self-raising flour'

In comparison to the number of mixed phrases, those of only English constituents where English adjectives are combined with English nouns or adverbs are higher. Poplack (1980: 603) also rightly points this, in spite of the fact that she dismisses switching which results in mixed phrases. The high number of the switched

constituents compared to the mixed ones could be therefore a compromising strategy in which informants avoid violating English rules when English adjectives are used to modify Arabic nouns. Likewise, Sridhar & Sridhar claimed in their Dual structure principle that a 'guest constituent' can be inserted if it does not violate the rules of the 'host language' (1980: 412). In addition, there is a difference in the positions adjectives assume in relation to adverbs. Adjectives precede adverbs in Arabic while they follow them in English. Nevertheless, there are few instances where the English word order is violated and adjectives are positioned before adverbs. In example (14), the Arabic adverb *halba* modifies the English adjective preceding it. Generally, informants tend to have a preference for the English constituents to avoid the word order incongruence.

(14) n - ḥis   fī-hom *strict*   **halba**
    1SG-feel   in-3PL   //   much
    'I think they're very strict'

A final way in which Arabic rules govern how CS occurs is the switching between English nouns and Arabic demonstratives. Although demonstratives in LA and SA occur both before and after nouns, they only occur before nouns in English. Participants seem to freely switch between the two elements as they have two options at their disposal, following both Arabic and English word order (examples 15 & 16, respectively). This strategy shows that violating the rules of either language is the least favoured by bilinguals.

(15) bi - il   *pace* **hāda**
    with-DEF   //   this
    'At this pace'

(16) 'aw *abuse* **hād-ī** 'il   *relationship*
    or   //   this-F DEF   //
    'Or abuse this relationship'

The application of Poplack's Equivalence Constraint led to interesting observations regarding English noun insertions and adjectives into the Arabic system. The analysis,

however, was mostly limited to nominal constituents as they are one site where the Arabic and English word order differs. As discussed above, switching between two elements from two languages with non-equivalent syntactic surfaces is possible. This section has provided evidence to support and challenge Poplack's observation. Where Poplack's proposition did not hold and English rules were violated, it was shown that Arabic rules are prioritised over English ones. Also, it provided some insight into the typological motivations behind the particular switching sites of nouns and adjectives. Nevertheless, this proposal does not explain all CS instances and utilising a more comprehensive model, such as the MLF, is important.

5.1.2 Relationship between Arabic and English morphemes: MLF

Another way in which CS instances could be further examined is to view elements from both languages in relation to each other. The high number of insertions into Arabic sentences implies the existence of an asymmetric relationship between the two languages as the role of English is confined to supplying content morphemes. Despite the high number of English content words, English does not play a great role in the sentences' abstract construction. Instead, the grammatical frame of a sentence is determined by Arabic. The role Arabic plays here is mostly that of the ML which governs the mechanisms by which two languages mix. The data were analysed according to the MLF model; taking into account any variations or exceptions and the light they shed on the syntactic congruence between Arabic and English. The previous section demonstrated that the word order of elements within constituents is that of Arabic, which is one of the criteria with which an ML is usually defined.

Since there is not yet a definite criteria for identifying an insertion, edited existing criteria were followed here. Thus, insertions are short linguistic units whose meaning depends on the sentence in which they are inserted. Table (5) below lists the number of insertions of each participant compared with the ones made by the researcher. The Arabic-English insertions take the form of content words and prepositional phrases whereas insertions in the other direction are very few, mostly insertions of utterance modifiers.

(A> E)	S.1 - S.6	S.2 - S.6	S.3 - S.6	S.4 - S.6	S.5 - S.6
Insertions	(45-75) **40% - 60%**	(57-38) **67% - 33%**	(65-64) **51% - 49%**	(21-32) **34% - 66%**	(14-48) **30% - 70%**

Table.5: Distribution of Insertional CS among informants

5.1.2.1 English insertions into Arabic:

English nominal constructions constitute the majority of insertions. In contrast, Arabic nouns are very rarely inserted into an English sentence, let alone after English articles. Example (17) shows Arabic as the ML and this is marked by the Arabic verb ʕṭ - **ū** - **kum** as the sentence's main verb, which bears person and number inflections signalled by the highlighted clitic pronouns. In addition, the definite article *'il* is an early system morpheme that ML usually provides.

(17) ʕṭ - ū - kum ... **'il**   *feedback*
    Gave-3PL-2PL   DEF   //
    'Did they give you the feedback?'

Not all instances of nominal insertions are morphologically integrated, as some are merely inserted. In example (18), *word limit* is inserted and could be considered a predicate to the main verb *t-fakkr-ī* .

(18) t - abd - ī   t - fakkr -ī ***word limit***
    2SG-become-F   2SG-think-F   //
    'You think about the word limit'

Moreover, embedded English nouns are linked together in the same way as Arabic nouns. The LA, possessive marker *mtaʕ* is a late bridge system morpheme (see example 19 below). This morpheme is a counterpart to the one attested by Benchiba-Savenius (2011: 83) - *dyal* - in Moroccan Arabic - English CS.

32

(19) *file* kbīr hma   'illī   *spine* **mtaʕ-ah**   γlīḍ
     //   big those that   //   of - 3SG.M thick
     'Those bog files with thick spines'

Adjectives are also either integrated or are merely inserted as predicates. Below, the English adjective *original* functions as a predicate to the mixed noun phrase: *'il research* (example 20) and *pre-verbal* is a predicate to the Arabic existential morpheme *fī* (example 21). Interestingly, the adjective *pre-verbal* is a shortcut to a full constituent: *pre-verbal stage*. However, the noun here does not exist, but is implied, and could only be contextually understood. Arabic adjectives also could be both nouns and adjectives without any difference in their nominal inflections. Therefore, this creates a construction that is exclusively used in LA as it is ungrammatical to only use adjectives to convey a similar meaning in English: *There are new*.

(20) 'il   *research* **original** ...
     DEF   //   //
     'The research's original'

(21) fī   **pre-verbal** fī 'il   *stage two*
     there   //   in DEF   //
     'There is a pre-verbal pattern in stage two'

English adverbs are incorporated in relation to Arabic verbs as in example (22) where the adverb *somewhere* modifies the Arabic verb *n-imš-ī* . Also, they may be only inserted, thus they are not structurally assimilating into the maximal projection of Arabic (Example 23).

(22) n-imš-ī   **somewhere** ...
     1-go-SG   //
     'I go somewhere'

(23) y-gul-ū-l-hum   'inna **electronically** ...
     3-say-PL-to-3PL   that   //
     'They ask them to submit things electronically'

The final type of insertions to mention is that of verbs. Similar to other Arabic-English CS studies (Othman 2006: 46), verb insertions were also rare in this study. Apart from the low number of verbal insertions shown in table (2), most of these instances are mitigated insertions. These verbs are not directly inserted with their original inflections: their finite from. Instead, they are inserted in their non-finite form whether that was a gerund, infinitive or present participle. Verbs are embedded through the use of the native verbal construction *dar* , which bears Arabic inflections instead of those of their English counterparts that would have originally appeared on the English verb. Due to the structural similarities between Libyan and Moroccan Arabic, this pattern was also salient in Benchiba-Savenius's study (2011: 176-180). Instead of directly incorporating the verb *prepare* in its imperative form in example (24), it is introduced through the imperative form of the verb *dar* . This is achieved through assigning the clitic pronoun, *ī* which refers to the feminine second person, to the verb *dar* .

(24) 'i-ktb-ī   **dīr - ī**   *preparing*
    IMP-write-2SG   make-2SG.F   //
    'Write, do some preparing'

The same strategy is adopted in the SA variety by S.4. The equivalent native verb for *dar* is *ʕimil*. Instead of inserting the verb *home-school* in its present tense form, the verb is used in its gerund form (example 25). Instead of using the English verb conjugations, an inflected Arabic verb is used to which the personal, present tense prefix *be*, is attached. However, *home-schooling* could also be considered a noun. Thus, the verb *home-school* is not only embedded through a native verb, but is also reduced to its nominal form *home-schooling*.

(25) **be-ʕmil** *home-schooling* ...
    1SG-do   //
    'I home school my kids'

The complexity of the Arabic verbal structure, its inflectional system, and its resistance to integrate English verbs into its format shows a lack of compatibility between the

two languages' structural systems. Here, it is not only that Arabic inflections are never attached to embedded English verbs, but the original English conjugations are not allowed on the English verbs. This could be attributed to the structural conflict and distance between the two languages. It is not clear, however, if this can be traced back to the informants' level of bilingualism. For example, in Benchiba-Savenius's study of the CS of second and third generations of Moroccans born in Britain, it was attested that the Arabic clitic pronoun *ih*, referring to the masculine third person-singular, is suffixed to the English verb *text*. In contrast, this strategy is avoided by all informants in the current study, including S.4 who could be considered a second generation member. Instead, she utilises ʕimil construction and does not assign Arabic inflections to English verbs: **prepar - ī - ha* 'prepare it'.

(26) *text* - ih
    text   him
    'send him a text'   (Benchiba-Savenius 2011: 179)

The data found here is consistent with what Myers-Scotton (2002: 10) cited in (Benchiba-Savenius 2011: 73) calls 'classic code-switching'. However, instances of the integration of Arabic bound morphemes into English ones (example 26) only appear in what she calls 'composite code-switching' (Myers-Sctton 2002: 105) cited in (Benchiba-Savenius 2011: 88). The lack of constant exposure to Arabic rather than the level of bilingualism, could have triggered the composite CS. Thus, a CS pattern may depend on the speakers' orientation to both languages. Also, the assignment of inflections of one language to the other language verbs might occur in case of full bilingualism according to Igla (1996) cited in (Matras 2009: 184).

5.1.2.2 Arabic insertions into English:

Arabic insertions into the English grammatical frame are more infrequent than in the case of English into Arabic. According to Muysken's definition of insertional CS (2000: 75), insertions usually operate in one direction, a pattern which is upheld here. This could be traced to the fact that Arabic is the dominant language of most informants,

and it is thus the language which controls parts of conversations which include insertions. Some of the few Arabic insertions into English are those of utterance modifiers. Nevertheless, they are very few; *'inna* is one example:

(27) ... *I was investigating* **'inna** *people's choices*
              //   like   //
     'I was investigating people's choices'

 All previous examples comply with the hypothesis of the MLF model, that is, languages do not equally participate in CS. Interestingly, even S.4, with English as the dominant language, similarly inserts English elements into Arabic sentences, not the opposite. The next section, however, discusses some examples which suggest that there could be more than one ML in a bilingual conversation.

5.1.3 Muysken's concept of alternation:

5.1.3.1 Arabic and English in alternation:

So far, insertional CS embodies a large part of the data. It, nonetheless, cannot explain all patterns previously observed. A good amount of data could be explained through using the term: alternation, which was not dealt with by the MLF model. It describes a series of switches with no single underlying base language (Muysken 2000). Instead, separate Arabic and English sentences alternate each other. Example (28) demonstrates that alternational CS usually operates between two languages of a similar word order. The Arabic verbal clause alternates with the English independent clause *I don't know*.

 (28) *I don't know,* **n-ḥiss   fī-h-a** *...*
              //   1SG-feel   in-3SG-F
     'I don't know, I think it's'

Although English clauses use SV order and Arabic mostly has VS order, alternational CS occurs. This could be explained through the anaphoric pro-nominal subject cliticised to the beginning of the Arabic verb, thus giving SV instead of VS order. Nevertheless, this

is only a probability since alternations occur even when the implicit pronominal subject is attached to the end of the verb (example 29):

(29) ḥassee-**t**-ah   *it was* nice
　　　felt-1SG-3SG.M   //
　　　'I felt it was nice'

Participants alternate between Arabic and English constituents at many syntactic points, but most of the English alternations relate either to the main clause or are sentential. Dependent clauses which start with a conjunction only make a small proportion of the total number of alternations. This pattern seems to be associated with the nature of Arabic and English conjunctions (Eid 1992: 56). English conjunctions

Alternations	S.1 - S.6	S.2 - S.6	S.3 - S.6	S.4 - S.6	S.5 - S.6
(A> E)	(16-11) 59% - 41%	(22-13) 62% - 38%	(8-2) 80% - 20%	(20-15) 57% - 43%	(28-19) 59% - 41%
(E> A)	(8-6) 57% - 43%	(7-5) 58% - 42%	(6-1) 85% - 15%	(16-6) 72% - 28%	(17-10) 62% - 38%
Total	**22-17**	**29-18**	**14-3**	**36-21**	**45-29**

Table. 6: Distribution of alternational CS among informants

can only integrate elements of the same code: English, (Gumperz 1982: 88) whereas Arabic conjunctions can integrate English elements as in (30). This may also be something to do with the state of Arabic as the language which provides system morphemes. Here, the coordinator *bas* governs the English clause *she doesn't mind* and specifies its adversarial relationship to the previous one *she gets bored*.

(30) *she gets bored*, **bas** *she doesn't mind*
　　　//　　　　　　but　　　　　//
　　　'She gets bored, but she doesn't mind'

5.1.3.2 Variations and Exceptions

Coordinated constituents are deemed instances of alternations by Muysken (2000: 100-1). This entails that switched elements will start with a coordinator, but this is rarely attested here. Example (31) shows how the English adjective *presenting* in the present participle form parallels the Arabic adjective *wāgf-a* which is also an adjective that is derived from the LA verb *yūguf*. Here, the two adjectives are structurally parallel which is likely to be an alternational instance. The English adjective, in spite of this, is integrated into the Arabic coordinated clause; making it also an instance of alternation:

(31) 'ane wāgf-a   we   *presenting*
    I'm stand.PRS.PTCP-F and   //
    'I'm standing and presenting'

The previous paragraph demonstrated that there are many examples in which there is not a clear-cut distinction between insertions and alternations. Furthermore, the adverb *subconsciously* in (32) is a clefted element which Muysken considers an instance of alternation (Ibid). However, the adverb does not seem to form an independent meaning but is modifying the Arabic verb following it *t-dīr* . This implies that there are always exceptions to any model that rigidly classifies instances of spoken language.

(32) *subconsciously*   t-dīr   fī-h-a
           //   3SG.F-do   in- 3SG-F
    'She subconsciously does it'

Moreover, it is not clear whether the ML is Arabic or English in (33) below. English could be the ML since it is the language of the main verb *is* , yet the first early system morpheme of the sentence, a morpheme usually supplied by the ML, is Arabic. It could be argued that Arabic is used here to only set the scene since it is the native language of S.2:

(33) 'il   *Lecture **is** actually 50 minutes it's not 4 minutes* qaṣd-i
        DEF   //   meaning.POSS-1SG
        'The lecture's actually 50 minutes, it's not four minutes, I mean'

5.1.4 Other CS patterns:

There is also another pattern that is usually called pronoun doubling (Eid 1992). This construction occurs repeatedly in the data. In several examples, such as (34), the Arabic pronoun is used at the beginning of a sentence, then its English counterpart is inserted, followed by an English verb:

(34) **'ane** *I usually start …*
        I   //
        'I usually start'

Eid (1992: 59-61) observes that this pattern is unidirectional as it does not occur when the sentence starts with an English pronoun. Participants seem to have an English verb in mind, yet they start with an Arabic pronoun, not an English one. Since it is prohibited to switch between a pro-nominal subject and a verb (Gumperz 1982: 87), informants use an English pronoun which is grammatically required by the English verb. Thus, due to the different inflectional systems of each language, the switch is not possible. Thus, *ane start* is unacceptable as the verb *start* can only be preceded by English subjects or particular personal pronouns. Also, a present tensed, Arabic verb following '*ane* is usually inflected with the clitic pronoun *n-* assigned to its beginning: *ane n-start* 'I start'.

Even if the Arabic pronoun here is used for emphatic purposes, it should not be problematic to insert an Arabic verb after it. However, this does not seem to be the case and an English pronoun is inserted instead. Unlike the view of Myers-Scotton, et al. (1996), who stated that speakers have an Arabic verb in mind in this case, this doubling strategy shows that an English verb is intended and, thus, the pronoun is inserted as a suitable environment for the English verb. Apart from the structural aspect of it, Taweel & Btoosh (2012: 10) view this strategy as a way to 'initiat[e] the in-

group code'. It also could be argued that those who utilised this strategy have a good command in Arabic, but prefer to express themselves in English more.

To conclude, this chapter analysed the grammar of Arabic-English CS in light of particular approaches. The applicability of such models demonstrated that Arabic is mostly the dominant language which governs the switching process. This was firstly demonstrated by the fact that it was shown to determine the surface order of insertions from both languages. Second, the embedding of some English elements was not straightforward and was mitigated through Arabic constructions. Muysken's alternational CS, however, highlighted some examples in which either language could be argued to be the ML as both alternate each other and no one to be identified as dominant. Thus, and unlike many previous studies that dealt with Arab immigrants, Arabic in this study is not always the base language throughout the conversations.

The analysis yielded some structural trends that are clearly noticed. The first regularity was that short constituents, such as nominal ones are highly code-switched, and many of them function as complements. Second, the verbal insertions are very rare which may be related to the structural incompatibility between Arabic and English. For larger sequences, English sentences are not switched to directly, but are usually introduced by an Arabic conjunction or a pronoun that structurally frames the English sentence. These observations, nevertheless, give only one side of the story. Although CS is characterised by having a particular format governing how it occurs, meaning is still needed to be assigned to this format. The communicative motivations behind switching a single item or a complex sentence (Insertion & Alternation division) have more potential in providing the full picture.

5.2 Functional approach to CS:

It can be deduced from the previous section that observing only the structural patterns of CS still cannot explain the CS mechanism. This section carries out an investigation of the communicative role that various CS instances play within a conversational context by implementing social and pragmatic approaches. Despite the different angles from which these theories deal with CS, they are all, to a certain degree, useful when

exploring the forces driving bilinguals to code-switch. The theories that will be specifically exploited are: Gumperz's metaphorical CS (1972; 1982) and Auer's sequential approach to interaction (1984).

5.2.1 Motivations behind single insertions:

Most insertions were unable to be directly explained using theories proposed thus far. Apart from Auer's concept of transfer, all other approaches are only designed to explain the function of the subsequent use of two codes: alternational CS. Noticeably, a tremendous number of content words, single insertions, work as referential points (Auer 1984: 9) which the participants considered an available reference to be associated with particular domains or settings. Moreover, some insertions perform some conversational tasks, such as reiteration or highlighting a quotation within a conversational turn, making them comprehensible within Gumperz's metaphorical CS. A very small number, however, of these insertions has the potential to contribute to the topical cohesion of a conversation.

The first function single insertions fulfil is that of referential point. Bentahila (1983: 234-5) found that some French nouns are extensively embedded in Moroccan-Arabic discourse, and most of these are technical or institutional expressions. Words are transferred from the speaker's experience in a situation, such as that of work or academia, to the setting of the conversation's setting. Due to the speakers' constant exposure to them, these words become readily accessible. The five participants are university students in the UK and a large number of their insertions evokes their experience as students in an English-speaking environment. This is related to English being the sole code for communication and educational attainment at university. The insertion of certain items is made in English and not Arabic because of their unmarked status as speakers only encounter them in English. In (35), S.3 talks about her academic experience, recalling some terminology that is regularly used at her school, such as the name of her specialty area *oral cancer.*

(35) b-n-udrus   'il ***oral cancer*** li'ann‑ī   gree-t   halba ***papers*** ʕan 'il
     FUT-1SG-study DEF   //   because-1SG studied-1SG many   //   about DEF

oral cancer   //
'I'll study oral cancer because I read many papers about it'

The absence of pauses or hesitation while making these insertions clearly indicates the
ease with which insertions are made. Although there are Arabic equivalents to many of
these words, the English ones are preferred as the informants' continuous exposure to
them helps to quickly retrieve such words. Also, both speakers and listeners may have
found them easier to be activated and processed than their Arabic counterparts. This
idea can be associated with the principle underlying Mysers-Scotton's Markedness
Theory (1993a). The aforementioned insertions could be the accepted choice speakers
make when there is a need to express a meaning that one of these words convey.
However, recalling such English words is not necessarily confined to a particular
situation, but will probably even be activated in others. The use of these English words,
therefore, sufficiently expresses the intended meaning, and possibly reduces the
potential effort speakers may make when selecting the equivalent Arabic word.

Another domain in which English is dominant is shopping where the names of products
are mostly expressed in this code. Moreover, English is utilised in internet transactions
(example 36). Here, S.6 uses specific English technical terms, such as the verbs *reply*
and *forward,* that are widely used in this context. The lack of the referential force of
verbs compared to nouns elucidates why verbs are less frequently inserted.

(36) ɣarīb-a   maʕ'ann-ī ... dir - t   **reply** we   der - t - l - ik   *forward* ...
       strange-F although-1SG   made-1SG   //   and made-1SG-to-2SG   //
       'That's strange, I actually replied, and forwarded it to you'

There are also words which are not associated with a particular situation, but are
referential to the speakers' everyday experience in the UK, such as the general English
verb *offer* (example 37 below). In addition to being a referential point in commercial
and educational contexts, it is also a generally efficient term as it accurately expresses
the intended meaning which the Arabic word *furṣa* may fail to denote.

(37) ḥaṣṣel-t **offer** we waḥid ...
 got-1SG   //   and stuff
 'I got an offer and everything'

According to Auer, there are words that are mainly used to fill lexical gaps: transfer (L). It is rarely attested here, however, that an item is embedded to serve only this purpose. This may be to do with the informants' high competence, which enabled them to use English insertions to fulfil more advanced pragmatic functions. Although the two words *lectures* & *tutorials* are in parallel positions in (38), each is produced in a different code. This is because there is no equivalent, specialised word in Arabic to refer to the term *tutorials* while there is one to refer to the general term *lectures*. Apart from being a gap-filler, it could also be referential to the speaker's academic experience.

(38) 'ane garri - t - nī   fī 'il **tutorials** miš fī 'il   muḥādar-āt
      I   taught-3SG.F-1SG in DEF   //   not in DEF lecture-PL
    'She gave me tutorials, not lectures'

Furthermore, there are English words which are specifically used for their cultural connotations. The word *cosy,* for example, which refers to both a warm and a comfortable place, is widely used in England. However, there is no expression in Arabic that combines these two meanings in one word. This is probably because of the hotter or different weather circumstances in places where Arabic is widely used. In (39), S.2 is asking S.6 about her living room and how cosy it feels. Although there is no evidence in the conversation that this was the reason behind using the word, the analyst relies on her in-group membership with the participants and her knowledge of both languages. Although this procedure is not valid according to the practitioners of Conversational Analysis (Li Wei 2005: 381), it is not always easy to demonstrate the way in which a switch is understood or why it is made.

(39) y-ḥiss   fī-h-a **cosy** walla ḥāja?   ... ma-lī-h-ā-š   ʕlāqa   b- il **cosiness**
    3SG-feel in-3SG-F //   or   something? NEG-has-3SG-F-NEG relation with-DEF //
    'Does he feel it's cosy or something? it has nothing to do with cosiness'

This dissertation will now demonstrate the way in which bilinguals exploit two codes to construct a meaningful discourse based on the contrastive effect their use creates, and not on a situation or topic shift (Gumperz 1982: 81). A few instances of single insertions can potentially perform what Gumperz (1982) calls: conversational tasks. In example (40), S.3 directly quotes her supervisor and highlights this quote by choosing the most important word of it and producing it in English. This technique marks the adjective *general* distinct from the rest of the Arabic discourse. Resultantly, CS is used here as a resource to frame the quotation and makes it more recognisable. Instead of only stressing it through the Arabic quotative verb *gāl-l-ī* , as monolingual do, bilinguals can doubly frame a quotation with a code change as a supplementary resource for organising the discourse (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 75). Furthermore, the adjective can be considered to be qualifying the message preceding it *'ḥne tawwa* . CS here is therefore a cue which emphasises the main message of the other voice S.3 brings into her utterance.

(40) gāl - l - ī   'ḥne   tawwa ***general*** ma n-aʕrf-ū -š   *which way we're going*
    said.3SG.M-to-1SG we   now   //   NEG 1-know-PL-NEG   //
    'He told me it's still general now, we don't know which way we're going'

Moreover, English nominal insertions are used to reiterate a noun which has already been produced in Arabic. In example (41), *space* is a literal repetition of the Arabic word *farāɣ-āt* , although the former is singular and the latter is plural.

(41) marrā-t   y-abd-a   ʕind - ī   farāɣ-āt . ***Space*** ...
    sometime-PL 3SG-seem-M have-1SG space.PL   //
    'Sometimes I've spaces in between'

The conversational tasks that insertions achieve make different parts of a sentence meaningful within turn boundaries. However, applying Auer's sequential approach to CS helps to perceive the latter as a conversational or a negotiation process. Thus, a switch can be best considered a response to what precedes it, and a following turn can also provide insight regarding to how this switch is responded (Auer 1984: 6). In

example (42), S.1's insertion of the adverb *straightforward* is a reformulation of the Arabic expression she used in her preceding turn *ma ... ʕind-ī-š mašākel* . Again, the reiteration is a modified translation and not a literal one, an example of 'pseudo reformulation' (Auer 1984: 89-90). This is an example of an insertion or transfer (P) whose conversational motivation would not be understood without utilising Auer's approach and looking beyond the turn level in which it takes place. Thus, it is only through examining S.1's first turn and S.6's response to it that the occurrence of the switch is meaningful. S.6's enquiry about the meaning of the utterance impelled S.1 to rephrase what she said; resorting to English that may have more potential in conveying the intended meaning. S.6's answer *'eh* confirms that the switch achieved its purpose.

(42) **S.1:** law ... ma ... ʕind - ī - š   mašākel ...
            if   NEG ... have-1SG-NEG   problems
        'If I don't have problems'

   S.6: mašākel   šinī?
        Problems what?
        'What problems?'

   S.1: law ... māšy-a   ***straightforward*** ...
         if   go.PRS.PTCP-F   //
        'If everything's going straightforward'

  S.6: 'eh
         yes
        'yes'

Auer's 'Anaphoric Transfer' (1984: 26) is another way to demonstrate the use of insertions for communicative purposes. In (43) below, S.3's insertion of the word *snow* is a repetition of its first appearance by S.6. This strategy helps to tie the two turns together and make them sound coherent. S.3's back reference to *snow* implies that she agrees that it is the right word to be used especially with her use of the interjection *'ah* which indicates her grasp of the meaning of S.6. Moreover, inserting *snow* here can be a gap-filler, because there is no equivalent to this word in Arabic. This is clear in S.3's first turn where she shows her surprise at S.6's use of word *tilj* in the context of weather, with which it is rarely associated; the expression, in fact, usually refers to ice cubes.

(43) **S.3:** šin   'it - tilj?
          What DEF - snow?
          'What ice?'

   S.6: 'il *snow*
          DEF   //
          'The snow'

   S.3: 'ah 'il *snow*!
          ah DEF   //
          'Oh, the snow'

It has been demonstrated thus far that single items are mainly switched to for their referential function. Since they mostly draw on an external world to the conversation, their role in producing a free-flowing conversation or linking different turns together is trivial. Their occurrence within turns, as referential points, is more noticeable than theirs between turns, known as anaphoric transfers. The following section focuses on the communicative forces behind alternations and how they differ from the functions insertions fulfil.

5.2.2 Pragmatic functions of alternations (turn-internal):

The juxtaposition of complex units: sentences and clauses, has more potential in generating meaningful segments that are made up of two parts and two codes. Unlike insertions, a large number of alternations are used for the special conversational effects they form. A sentence could be used to reiterate, qualify or contrast a preceding one. In (44), the sentence *we actually ...* is not only in contrast with the preceding turn *badal ...* in terms of code, but the contrast is also demonstrated in the message behind each sentence. S.2 uses two different codes to list two ways with which she and her colleagues could approach their work.

(44) 'il *work* ...   badal   ma   n - iktb - ū:- h   *we actually talk about it*
     DEF //   instead what 1- write- PL-3SG.M   //
     'Instead of writing down the work, we actually talk about it'

In addition, example (45) below shows how the use of Arabic and English can be used

to indicate two different levels of the speaker's engagement with the matter: 'personalization' vs. 'objectivization' (Gumperz 1982: 80). S.1 uses English to describe her emotional state and momentary confusion regarding her exams schedule. She then switches to English to talk about a fact: the actual period of her exams. It is important to mention that this contrast is not directly related to what each code is usually associated with (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 66). Example (46) counters (45) as English in the former is used to give a neutral account of what happened and Arabic is used in stating S.1's reaction to it.

(45) la la   ... *I am confused now* ... **'imtiḥān-āt-ī   kull-hum fī xamsa**
     No no   //   exam-PL-POSS.1SG all-3PL   in May
     'No, I'm confused now, all my exams are in May'

(46) *what I received last time ... just like attachment but empty* -**ma n-aḥsabi-k-š**
                //   //   NEG 1SG-think-2SG-NEG
     'inna
      that
     'What I received last time was an attachment, but empty I didn't think that'

Nevertheless, informants noticeably used English more to lend their utterances a tone of formality and reliability. In the next example, S.2 asserts her opinion in Arabic, and then switches to English to state a fact: lectures are usually long.

(47) **S.6:** we 'aṣlan   fī 'il *lectures*, hāda 'int-ī   *for your interest ...*
          and actually in DEF //   this you-2SG.F   //
          'Actually, in lectures, this is for your interest'

   S.2: bi-ẓẓabṭ we 'aṣlan   ***it is supposed to be long***
          by-exact and actually   //
          'Exactly, and actually it's supposed to be long'

Unlike the contrastive effect that an alternation creates, there are occasions where two alternations are pragmatically complementary to each other. For example, a sentence or a clause can be used to complement a nominal or a verbal construction

made in another code. In (48), the English sentence completes the meaning initiated

by the Arabic verb *t- ḥiss-ī* , which makes the two parts into a meaningful sentence:

(48) lama   t-xošš-ī   fī   'il   taxaṣuṣ maẓbūṭ t-ḥiss-ī   yaʕnī ***you're enjoying it***
     when 2SG -get-F in   DEF area   really 2SG -feel-F means   //
     'When you really get into your area, you feel you're enjoying it'

In addition, the English sentence *don't you have a social life?* in (49) is used to

elaborate on what was expressed in the Arabic sentence preceding it *'eeh   t - agr - ī*

halba . S.5 is utilising English to make a sarcastic comment targeted towards those who

only study and do not socialise. Interestingly, what may have propelled the

employment of such alternation, besides the reiteration purpose it serves, is the

formulaic nature of the English sentence which increased the chance of utilising it.

Overall, English sentences usually come second and mostly qualify what has been said

in Arabic sentences. Thus, the large number of alternational switches to English, not to

Arabic (See results chapter) is not arbitrary for it can be attributed to the function each

code fulfils as shown here.

(49) maʕnā-h-a   *negative* hād-ī *geek* …'eeh t - agr - ī   halba lakin … ***don't***
     meaning.POSS-3SG-F   //   this- //   yes 2SG- study-F much but   //
     you have   a social life?
       //   //
     'Geek has a negative meaning, yes, you study a lot but, don't you have a social
     life?'

So far alternations, as discussed above, seem to be exploited to create a special

conversational effect. Also, there are alternational instances which achieve a

discourse-structuring task. Speakers use two different codes with which they show

their different alignment to two interrelated parts of a sentence, a process that Auer

(1984) calls: discourse-related alternation. In (50) below, S.5 refers to two activities

which are different in importance, and produced in two different codes. The code

change is an additional strategy, besides the usual use of a high pitch, to mark a start

of a new topic, superordinated Sequence, and an end to a previous one: subordinated

Sequence (Auer 1984: 39).

(50) 'eh   'il   muhimm, ***how was your day?***
     yes   DEF   important   //
     'Yes, anyway, how was our day?'

This informant is one of the very few informants who considers each code as important as another. At many times, she would produce two interrelated sentences in two different codes, forming one meaningful long sentence. Similarly, S.4 in (51) talks about a problem she is facing with the council regarding admitting one of her children to school. It seems that there is no specific reason for choosing English for the first part of the conditional clause and Arabic for the second. This implies that CS, specifically alternational CS, is the unmarked choice for this particular informant and that switching at such points is made on the basis of the two codes, not only Arabic, as the case of insertions.

(51) ***it all depends on X***, law axadu   X   bi-y-sīr   Y   ktī::r 'ilu.h   'iḥtimāl
              //   if   took-3PL // PRS-3SG.M-be // much has-POSS.3M possibility
     'It all depends on X. If X got a place, there'll be a big chance for Y'

5.2.3 Pragmatic functions of alternations (Across turns):

Discourse-related alternational switching, can take place within a turn, as has been shown in the last few examples, or between turns. In comparison to the conversational function of insertions between turns, that of alternational switching is even more significant. The turn-by-turn analysis of alternations showed how the meaning behind a code change is established (Auer 1984: 11). Auer suggested that one way in which CS is utilised is when highlighting a change in a speaker's 'constellation' (1984: 32). In (52) below, the researcher is showing her photos to S.4's child with whom she mostly uses English. However, her last turn includes two separate utterances; one in Arabic and another in English. This may reflect the consideration she gives to constructing her discourse and how she should direct two utterances that each is relevant to only one addressee. Her specification of two addressees is indexed by her using the English

49

expression *yeah* with the kid and an Arabic one with the mother *ʕrafn-ī*. Sufficiently, CS enabled the speaker to simultaneously include one listener and exclude another. Instead of addressing the mother with her name, S.6 attracts S.4's attention by using Arabic at which they are both fluent. Because of the child's low competence in Arabic, he is probably only a bystander during the second part of the sentence.

(52) **S.6:** (to the kid) ... *I wanna show you something* ...

   kid: *over there* ...

   S.6: *yeah* (laughter) - (to the mother) **ʕrafn-ī**
        //   knew.3SG.M-1SG
        'Yeah .. he knew me!'

Also, a detailed examination of each conversational move made by each speaker helps to gain insight into how they present their identity and how they wish others to perceive it: 'participant and discourse-related switching' (Auer 1984: 71). A speaker's choice of a code at a particular turn gives clues as to his perception of a message formulated in a specific code in a preceding turn (Auer 1984: 6). In (53), S.1 is arguing that S.6 met her father before while S.6 does not remember and disagrees with her:

(53) **S.1:** *in person*?

   S.6: la miš *in person* ...
        no not   //
        'No, not in person'

   S.1: *Are u sure*?

   S.6: la
        no
        'No'

   S.1: *Are u sure*?

   S.6: 'eh 'eh li'anna ...
        yes yes because
        'Yes, because'

   S.1: ka-'anna ... gabel ...
        as- that   before

'As if, before'

S.6: *ah all right ...* ṣaḥ   ṣaḥ ... *sorry*
               //   right right   //
'Ah alright, that is right, sorry'

During the first six lines of the conversation, each is sticking to a code that is different from the one used by the other. This difference could be just a matter of preference, but this insistence on a code choice that is different from one another, is a strategy in which each speaker presents her identity and indexes her opposing viewpoint. Since it is in S.1's interest for S.6 to remember, the former compromises in the last line and switches to Arabic, ascribing to S.6's code choice. This switch demonstrates a change in her alignment and acceptance of how her co-participant wishes to be perceived, hence she uses an attractive code for the other. After S.1's switch to Arabic, S.6 remembers and the argument is resolved. Therefore, what looks, on the surface, like a random CS is actually a rational choice of codes made by bilinguals. Example (54) further shows how participants negotiate power relations through making particular code choices at successive conversational moves. Next, S.5 and S.6 are arguing whether a friend of theirs code-switches or not. In S.6's first turn, she uses a different code: English, to that used in S.5's preceding turn to flag her disagreement with the former's claim. However, S.5 in her next turn rejects S.6 and attempt to override her. This is done through S.5's adoption of a different code to the one she used in her last turn and instead similar to that of S.6. In contrast to (53), S.5's code change in (54) is not an acceptance of the other's stance, but a sign of rejection. With this, she is negotiating power relations between herself and the other speaker, and presents herself as equal to S.6 by replicating her code choice:

(54) **S.5:** X ḥatta hiyya
          X even her
          'Even X'
           (...)

  S.6: *she doesn't code switch*

  S.5: ***she does,*** ...

When speakers' opinions are disagreed with, they do not always change their code to challenge other speakers. In example (55), S.2's correction of S.6's unfinished statement is made in another code to highlight her different footing to S.6's. This could be viewed as a face threatening act to S.6 which impelled her to stick to her code as a way in which she defends herself. Such example is similar to what Auer calls 'defensive code-switching' (1984: 71), yet, this example is different in the sense that S.6's disregard of S.2's repair is not accompanied by a code change. Instead, she continues using the same code to justify her point by uttering *'eh lakin* .

(55) **S.6:** law film   y-itḥawwil   li ktāb ...
          if   movie 3SG.M-change to book
          'If a movie is made into a book'

   S.2: *they don't do that* ...

   S.6: 'eh lakin ...
          yes but
          'Yes, but'

The final section focuses on the communicative function of utterance modifiers, discourse markers, which are switched to frequently in conversations (see results section). The Arabic utterance modifiers are inserted both into English discourse and are found at clause boundaries, while their English counterparts are only found at the periphery of a sentence. Each occurrence correlates with the task these kinds of utterances achieve within an interaction. First, informants insert Arabic ones into English discourse to indirectly give themselves time to think or recall a word. In (56), S.2 inserts the filler *yaʕnī* to fulfil what Maschler (Auer 1998: 128) calls a 'metalingual', function to refer to the function discourse markers fulfil in his study of Hebrew-English CS. By using this filler, S.2 indicates that she has not yet finished her turn and wishes to continue her speech.

(56) 'il   *medications he is taking* **yaʕnī**   *very strong ...*
     DEF   //   means   //
     'The medication he's taking is very strong'

According to Matras (2000: 516), this is a strategy with which a speaker directs his co-participant's response and prevents any potential interruption on the latter's side (Matras 2000: 516). Moreover, the insertion of utterance modifiers may be utilised to signal that an alternation to English is about to occur. The interjection *qaṣḍ -ī* in (57) prepares the listener to the following English sentence *I don't feel* ... . The interjection therefore, implies that the speaker experiences a loss of words and seeks another code for a suitable expression.

(57) xāṣṣatan   tawwa **qaṣḍ -ī**   *I don't feel like I belong*
     especially now   meaning.POSS-1SG   //
     'Especially now. I mean, I don't feel like I belong'

When found at clause boundaries, Arabic utterance modifiers are more likely to have a directing purpose. In (58), the interjection *bah* has a contrasting relationship with the rest of the turn, in terms of its code and the meaning it serves. Using *bah* suggests S.2's partial agreement with her listener - interlocutor - and suggests that her footing in the turn's second part is going to be different to that in the first part. This was a tool with which the speaker could structure her talk and make her viewpoint clear to the hearer. This replicates Matras's observations (2000) about the contrast between the function of a marker and that of the rest of the turn. One code is therefore used for organising the turn and 'directing' its meaning, whereas another is utilised for the 'talking' purpose (Matras 2000: 516).

(58) **bah** *what's the alternative way*?
     ok   //
     'Ok. What's the alternative way?'

Unlike Arabic markers, English equivalents are rarely used to direct the hearer's response towards the conversation. Instead, they are frequently switched to at the end of an Arabic unit and before the start of an English one (example 59 below). This is similar to the behaviour of English markers Mashcler (1998: 129) observed in his study.

The filler *yeah* mediates the transition from Arabic to English which indicates that alternation to English does not directly occur without such facilitators.

(59) kān fī   ... ***yeah*** *there was like ... deadline ...*
       was there   //   //
       'There was like, for example, deadline'

Thus far, utterance modifiers have been shown to not only be switched to because they can be easily integrated, but also because of their communicative role in structuring the bilingual discourse. For Matras, mixing two codes where one is used for talking and another for directing is a strategy made to 'reduce the cognitive load' that may result from bilinguals' attempt to stick to one language for one long term (2000: 517). Having the flexibility to utilise the marker which comes to mind, regardless of its compatibility, or lack thereof, with the code currently in use can considerably help bilinguals manage their conversations. Unsurprisingly, the least advanced informant rarely exploited discourse markers for this pragmatic purpose in a similar vein to her restricted utilisation of the conversational impact of other switching patterns.

To conclude, this section showed that CS is a systematic process which is socially significant and used to create conversational effects in bilingual interactions. Apart from the minor communicative effects of single insertions, alternations are heavily exploited to internally structure informants' utterances whether that was turn-internally or across turns. Generally, all informants aside from S.3, highly utilised CS to index their identity. This is especially the case with S.4 who has been exposed to both languages, although not to the same extent, since childhood. Also, S.5 repeatedly used English to deliberate humorous effect, so the association of English with such positive values elucidates the bilinguals' exploitation of it to express themselves. Also, there does not seem to be compartmentalization in most of the informants' use of the two codes, whereas this would probably be the case with recent and older migrants (Othman 2006: 63). Informants in this study are all relatively young, fluent speakers in both languages, and most of them consider English an attractive linguistic option. Nevertheless, Arabic repeatedly serves as the unmarked code when talking about

food, funny anecdotes, weddings and illness; this is particularly clear when looking at parts of the conversations where either code is exclusively used. In contrast, English is rarely used solely to express a whole topic, and one instance is illustrated in (60) where English sentences are switched to address a study-related issue:

(60) **S.6:** šin ...   'il   *LFG*..?
          What   DEF   //
          'What is LFG?'

   S.2: *... a framework through which you analyse* ...

   S.2: *I'm gonna be analysing* ...

Here S.2 is explaining to S.6 the concept she is working with in her thesis; a long turn that is only produced in English.

Chapter Six: Sociolinguistic factors

Before looking at such factors, it was important to consider the group conversations that were recorded to ensure the data is as accurate as possible. After investigation, it appeared that these conversations exhibited the same patterns as those found in one-to-one sessions. Another step that could help eliminate bias regarding the researcher's participation in conversations was to include the number of her code-switched utterances beside those of each informant. This was to check whether the informants or researcher are, in anyway, converging with each others' CS behaviour (see table 5 in chapter five). The number of insertions made by the researcher is very close to those of S.3 (64 & 65, respectively). This suggests that S.6 sometimes accommodates the CS density and the patterns preferred by informants. This is also because S.3 is the informant who makes the highest number of insertions. However, S.6 does not clearly converge on the informants' style in the case of alternational CS. Generally, the number of the investigator's code switches is high and is sometimes higher than those of participants. These may be due to the researcher's desire to encourage participants to code-switch more.

Now, we turn to the possible correlation between the informant's level of English and their CS behaviour. It was observed in this study that a CS strategy is indeed associated with the participants' English language proficiency level. The one informant who makes a high number of insertions: S.3, is the one who specifies that her speaking skills are less advanced than other skills, such as writing. This makes more sense when one considers the minor conversational and communicative functions of her insertions. However, this does not mean that the other two who made relatively numerous insertions (45 & 57) are less proficient. Instead, these significant figures are made by S.1 and S.2 whose speaking skills are very advanced. The two remaining informants: S.4 & S.5 made a high number of alternations: 36 & 45, compared with their insertions. This corresponds well with Muysken's hypothesis concerning the utilisation of alternational CS. Although S.4 is not a balanced bilingual and does not live in a bilingual community, her CS behaviour is believed to be characteristic of such communities. This could be traced back to her native-like command of English and good speaking skills in

Arabic that had continued to improve until recently. S.5 is the other informant whose alternations are high and this can be accredited to her preference of English: a fact that was prevalent in her questionnaire answers. It is worth mentioning that the correlation between CS and linguistic competence is not solely based on the structural complexity of CS types. It is correct that alternations are only utilised by advanced speakers, but this is not solely because of alternations' syntactic complexity. Instead, it can be attributed to the pragmatic functions for which alternations are often utilised. The current study showed that such correlation is also based on the speakers' ability to use CS patterns for the communicative roles they play within interactions.

Furthermore, age is a factor that Poplacks believes has implications on the participants' switching behaviour (1980: 609). S.3 is the oldest of the five whose first language is Arabic. She spent her first 28 years in Libya and received most of her education in Arabic-speaking country. In contrast, S.1, 2, 5 and 6 arrived in the UK at a younger age, giving them a better chance to assimilate into the English-speaking environment. In considering all these different factors together, it was plausible to conclude that the structural regularities observed are a representation of how informants utilise CS for its social/ pragmatic significance. Also, these pragmatic functions could therefore be determined by the informants' linguistic orientation, and their age. This is because these factors can have an impact on their attitudes towards the two codes and the extent to which they value each code.

Interestingly, there seems to be a discrepancy between the informants' frequent use of switching and their reserved attitude towards it in the questionnaires. Although their performance demonstrated a high level of bilingualism that assisted them in utilising the two codes in their conversations, none seems to approve highly of it. For example, two informants did not have any positive or negative views of it. The remaining two implied that they only code-switch with specific people with whom they are comfortable. Despite this, their perspective to CS is still different from what Chloros-Gardner (2009: 15) reported about the code-switchers' general disapproval of this phenomenon.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

This study investigated the Arabic-English CS behaviour of a group of five Arab bilinguals living in the UK. The analysis was based tape-recorded conversations of this group of around five to six hours in length, recorded in informal settings. The focus was twofold: structural and pragmatic.

Structurally, two switching patterns: insertion and alternation were exhibited in the informants' interactions, the former proving most prevalent. Arabic is implied to be the base language in most conversations, especially due to the fact that English usually contributed with single insertions. Despite the small number of alternational CS instances, this CS pattern was found to be more important in terms of the communicative functions it fulfils when compared to insertions. Because of this, it was concluded that the structural patterns of CS do not give the full picture of the CS mechanism, and the meaning behind its use needs to be investigated.

The conversational functions of CS could provide more insight into the informants' switching dynamism than a syntactic observation in isolation. The role of insertions was confined to minor functions, such as being referential points which evoke particular domains with which some insertions are associated. Interestingly, the structural division between insertions and alternations paralleled another division regarding the different functions each fulfils. This is because alternations, whether they were found turn-internally or across turns, were heavily exploited for their conversational effects and the way in which they structure bilingual discourse and perform speech activities. Informants considered this pattern as a medium through which they expressed their attitudes towards others, and accommodated their needs. Examining the data from a pragmatic approach demonstrated that the communicative ends of CS were the foremost factor that governs the CS process. Another finding was the lack of compartmentalisation in the informants' use of Arabic and English. The use of the two codes was rather complementary at several situations. Generally, CS seemed to be the unmarked choice for most of the participants. With this, the present study is one of the very few ones that tackled Arabic-English CS from a conversational

or pragmatic approach.

Another observation was the clear correlation between the participants' CS and their linguistic competence as well as their age. The high fluency in English as L2, besides the young age of three of the informants, contributed to their complex switching strategies. This further showed that CS is mainly a conversational process that is also governed by sociolinguistic factors.

Two limitations of this study is the small size of the sample and small amount of recorded data. Further research is thus needed to study a larger sample of bilinguals conversing for longer hours. By analysing longer chunks of conversation, there is more chance of carrying a turn-by-turn analysis and examining CS's impact on the local construction of meaning. This could be very enlightening, as CS across turns did not occur here as much as it did turn-internally. Finally, it would be interesting to examine whether bilinguals' CS behaviour differs from one situation to another, especially as this study was confined to conversations in only informal settings.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Abalhassan, Khaled M. & Hamdan G. Alshalawi. 2000. Code-switching Behavior of Arab Speakers of English as a Second Language in the United States. *Intercultural communication studies* 1, 179-188. Available online at <http://www.uri.edu/iaics/content/2000v10n1/16%20Khalid%20M.%20Abalhassan%20&%20Hamdan%20G.%20Alshalawi.pdf> [Accessed Feb 2013].

Al-Rowais, Hawazen. 2012. Code switching between Arabic and English, social motivations and structural constraints. MA Research Paper. Ball State University, Indiana. Available online at < http://cardinalscholar.bsu.edu/bitstream/123456789/196186/1/Al-RowaisH_2012-3_BODY.pdf> [Accessed Feb 2013]

Atkinson, Maxwell J. & John Heritage (eds.). 1984. *Structures of social action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Benchiba-Savenius, Najat. 2011. *Structural analysis of Moroccan Arabic and English intra-sentential code switching*. München: Lincom Europa.

Bentahila, Abedlali. 1983. Motivations for code-switching among Arabic-French code-switching. *Language and Communication* 3, 233-243.

Bentahila, Abdelali & Eileen D. Davies. 1983. The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua* 59, 301-30

Blom, Jan-Petter & John J. Gumperz. 1972. Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code Switching in Northern Norway. In Gumperz, John J. & Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, 407-430. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Chan, Brian H-S. 2009. Code-switching between typologically distinct languages. In Bullock, Barbara E. & Almeida J. Toribio (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*, 182-198. Cambridge/ New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael G. 1987. Constraints on code-switching: How universal are they? *Linguistics* 25, 739-764.

Dabene, Louise. & Daniele Moore, D. 1995. Bilingual Speech of migrant people. In Milroy, Lesley & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching,* 17-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eid, Mushira. 1992. Directionality in Arabic-English code-switching. In Rouchdy, Aleya (ed.), *The Arabic language in America: A sociolinguistic study of a growing bilingual community*, 50-71. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. *Code-Switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, François. 1982. *Life with two languages: an introduction to bilingualism.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lipski, John M. 1978. Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In Paradis, Michel (ed.), *Aspects of Bilingualism*, 251-264. Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam Press.

Li Wei. 2005. ''*How can you tell*?'': Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(3), 375–389.

Maschler, Yael. 1998. On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In Auer, Peter (ed.), *Codes-witching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity,* 125-149. London: Routledge.

Matras, Yaron. 2000. Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(4), 505-528.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. 2008. *Leipzig Glossing Rules.* Available online at <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php> [Accessed Mar 2009].

Milroy, Lesley & Pieter Muysken. 1995. Introduction: Code-switching and bilingualism research. In Milroy, Lesley & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching,* 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993a. *Social Motivations For Codeswitching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993b. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol, Janice L. Jake & Maha Okasha. 1996. Arabic and Constraints on Codeswithcing. In Eid, Mushira & Dilworth B. Parkinson (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics: Papers from the Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics* IX, 9-43. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Othman, Mohamed F. 2006. Language choice among Arabic-English bilinguals in Manchester. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Manchester. Available online at: <http://mlm.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/reports/Fathi%202006_Language%20ch oice%20among%20Arabic-English%20bilinguals%20in%20Manchester.pdf> [Accessed Jan 2013].

Pfaff, Carol W. 1979. Constraints on language mixing. *Language* 55, 291-318

Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.

Redouane*,* Rabia. 2005*.* Linguistic Constraints on Codeswitching and Codemixing of Bilingual Moroccan Arabic-French Speakers in Canada. *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 1921-1933. Mass: Cascadilla Press.

Sankoff, David, Shana Poplack & Swathi Vanniarajan. 1990. The case *of the* nonce loan in Tamil*. Language Variation and Change* 2(1), 71–101.

Sridhar, Shikaripur N. & Kamal K. Sridhar. 1980. The Syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual codemixing*. Canadian Journal of Psychology* 34, 407-16.

Taweel, Abeer Q*. & Mousa A. Btoosh. 2012. Syntactic aspects of Jordanian Arabic-English intra-sentential code-switching. *Linguistica Online* 13, 1-21. Available online at <http://www.phil.muni.cz/linguistica/art/taweelbtoosh/tab-001.pdf> [Accessed Mar 2013]**.**

Secondary Sources:

Barber*,* Carroll G*. 1973. Trilingualism in an Arizona *Yaqui Village*. In Turner, Raul R. (ed.), *Bilingualism in the Southwest,* 295-319*. Tuscan: University of Arizona Press*.

Giles, Howard. & Nikolas Coupland. 1991. *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1969. *The Norwegian language in America: A study in Bilingual Behavior*. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press.

Igla, Birgit. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara. Deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eine Zigeunerdialekts.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Joshi, Aravind K. 1985. Processing of sentences with intrasentential code-switching. In Dowty, David R., Lauri Karttunen, & Arnol M. Zwicky (eds.), *Natural Language Parsing: Psychological, Computational, and Theoretical Perspectives*, 182-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron. *1998*. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36, 281–331.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nartey, Jonas. 1982. Code-switching, interference or faddism? Language use among educated Ghanian. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24, 183-192.

Appendix (A): The questionnaire

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Arabic-English Bilingual code-switching: Linguistic Background information

Please provide some additional information about yourself. Your answers are completely anonymous and will not be associated with your name.

Section A: Linguistic competence:

1. Sex: ( ) M   ( ) F

2. Age: _____

3. Country of origin: _____

4. Your mother tongue: _____

5. What is your second dominant language? _____

6. Age you started learning English: _____

7. How long have you spent in this country?/ The age you first came here ----

8. What was the purpose of your trip? ( ) Study   ( ) Work   ( )

Asylum Seeking

9. What is your educational background (What courses have you done so far)

_____

10. Mark with an "x" the box that you think best reflects your level of proficiency in English for
each skill:

	Elementary	Intermediate	Advanced	Native-Like
Reading:	------------	---------------	--------------	-------------
Listening	------------	---------------	--------------	-------------
Speaking	------------	---------------	--------------	-------------
Writing	-------------	---------------	--------------	-----------

11. Would you consider yourself an Arabic- English bilingual? At least in

Speaking Skills: --

Bilingualism is 'the point where the speaker of one language can produce *complete, meaningful utterances* in the other language'. (Haugen, 1969: 6-7).

12. Do you think your ability in both language is balanced or not? Which is the dominant one?

Section B: Attitudes towards Code-switching:

Code switching is the use of some linguistic elements of two languages in one sentence and in the same conversation.

1- Do you code-switch?

2- What do you think of code-switching? Is it a good/ bad habit?

3- What language do you speak the most with your family members?

4- Which language do they often use when they talk to you?

5- Do you use Arabic or English when speaking to your friends who can speak English?

6- Which language do you use when a non-Arab person is present while you are having the conversation?

7- Do you use Arabic or English at university/ work place?

8- What language do you speak when you meet an Arab colleague at university?

9- Which language do you use when you discuss university work with them?

10- Which language do you use when speaking with Arab colleagues from a different Arabic country from yours?

11- What is the language used in the TV channels you usually watch? What about the language of newspapers, movies and songs?

12- What language do you use when you are shopping with an Arab friend?

13- Are you immersed in activities (e.g., religious rituals) that require the use of Arabic daily?

14- Which language do your children use the most (with you)? Arabic or English?

15- Which language do you use with them?

Appendix (B): Sample of transcribed Data

Conventions: reproduced from Atkinson & Heritage (1984: ix-xvi).

Symbol	Meaning
...	Ellipses talk omitted from the data segment (same topic)
(...)	Ellipses talk omitted from the data segment (different topic)
(.)	A dot enclosed in parentheses indicates a short, untimed silence, generally less than two-or three-tenths of a second
STOP	All-uppercase letters represent noticeable loudness
Oh:	Colons indicate an elongated syllable, the more colons, the more the syllable or sound is stretched
Wait a min-	A hyphen shows a sudden cut-off of speech
( )	Empty parentheses indicate that some talk was not auditable

Conversation 1 (Researcher and Subject 1):

S.6: ʕṭ - ū - kum   'il: - 'il. *feedback* mtāʕ 'il- 'il: *first term*? ...
　　　Gave-3PL-2PL DEF DEF 　// 　of DEF DEF 　//
　　　'Did they give you the feedback of the first term?'

S.1: emm *like some of them.* bas fī   'inna mazāl ma-n - aʕrif - š ʕlāš mʕaṭl-īn
　　　　　　//　　　　but there that not.yet NEG-1SG-know-NEG why late-PL
　　　'emm! like some of them but I don't know why the others are late'

　　　...

S.1: 'eh   tawwa *Like. yye:ah like at the moment I've got two group works I'm working*
　　　yeah now　　　　　　　//

　　　the same time
　　　　//

　　　'Now, like yeah, like at the moment I've got two group works I'm working on in the same time'

S.1: koll   waḥid 'inna zay 'il: ʕraft - ī   'inna ...
　　　every one   that like DEF knew-2SG that
　　　'everyone, is like ... you know'

S.6: *You work individually*

S.1: ʕraf-tī   'inna zay 'il *project* kamel   ʕraf-t-ī   'inna
knew-2SG that like DEF   //   complete knew-2SG-F that
'you know, it is like a complete project, you know'

S.6: n-ḥib   'il: n-ḥib   'eš- šuɣul hwa
1SG-like DEF 1SG-like DEF- work   this
'I like the ... I like this kind of work '

 ...

S.1: hiyy-a ḥilw-a lamma t-abd-a   fī *group*. hikkī. ... Matalan   *discussions* miš
it.F   nice-F when 3SG-seem-F in   //   like.this for.example   //   NEG

ʕarf-a   šinī
know.PRS.PTCP-1SG.F   what

'It is nice when you work in a group. For example, discussions and I don't know what'

...

S.6: n-akrah   'il *presentations* 'ane
1SG-hate DEF   //   I
'I hate presentations'

S.1: 'akrah ḥāj-a   ʕind-ī 'il *essays* ... t- abd - ī   t-fakkr-ī   *word limit* ...
worst thing-F to-me DEF   //   2SG-become-F   2SG-think-F   //
'the worst thing for me is essays, I always think about word limit'

S.6: ma t- etḥašm - ī- š maʕnā-h-a   ʕādī   willa?
NEG 2SG - shy.away-F-NEG meaning.POSS-3SG-F   normal   right
'You don't shy away from it then, right?'

S.1: 'ah la la   bi - l - ʕaks ...   'ane wāgf-a   we *presenting*
// no no by -DEF-opposite.. I'm stand.PRS.PTCP-F and   //
'ah no no it is actually the opposite, I am standing and presenting'

(...)

S.1: law 'ane ma ... ʕind-ī-š   mašākel ...
if   I NEG   have-1SG-NEG problems
'If I don't have problems'

S.6: mašākel   šinī?
Problems what?
'What problems?'

…

S.1: gul-t-l-ik   law 'ane 'inna   māšy-a   *straightforward* we. 'inna miyya
said-1SG-to-2SG if   I   that go.PRS.PTCP-F   //   and like   100%

miyya …
100%

'I said, if everything is going straight forward and.. I mean perfect'

S.6: 'eh
yes
'yes'

…

S.1: ḥaṣṣel-t *offer*   we waḥid …
got-1SG   //   and stuff
'I got an offer and everything'

…

S.1: la: 'ane gāʕd-a n-fakker   kīf   n-ḥaṣṣil   *placement year*
no   I   still-F   1SG-think how 1SG-get   //
'No. I'm still thinking how to get the placement year'

(…)

S.1: n-ḥis … msāk-īn 'il bn-āt 'illi   ʕind-hum xūt   'akbir min-hum …
1SG-feel poor-PL DEF girl-PL who have-3PL   brothers older from-3PL
'I feel that the girls who have older brothers than them are poor'

S.6: la .. miš *typical* fham-t-ī?   Miš *typcial Libyan brother*
no not   //   understand-2SG-F? Not   //
'no, he is not typical, you know. Not a typical Libyan brother'

(…)

S.1: y-abd-a   ʕindī   farāɣ-āt . *Space* … 'i-ktb-ī   dīr-ī   preparing
3SG-seem-M have-1SG space.PL   //   IMP-write-2SG make-2SG.F   //
'I tend have spaces in between, but I have to write and do some preparation'
…

S.1: X bima' anna *top university* … fī 'il   *food* we waḥid … momekn … had-a 'il reason
// since that   //   in DEF //   and stuff   maybe   this-M DEF //

n-ḥis   fī-hom *strict* halba …
1SG-feel in-3PL   //   much

'Since X is a top university in food and stuff, may be this is the reason that they are
very strict'

S.6: fī   'il *term* 'il waḥid n-agr-u   *four modules*, *em* . X t-agra   fī *two*
there DEF //   DEF one   1-study-PL   //   // 3SG.F-study in //

modules matalan ...
      //   for.example

'In the first term, we did four modules while F does two'

<u>**Conversation 2 (Researcher and Subject 2):**</u>

S.6: la la marra ... legee-t-h-a   *third year PhD student*
no no once   found-1SG-3SG.F   //
'I once found out that she's a third year phD student'

S.2: 'ah

S.6: marra xašeʕ - t   'il *personal profile* mtaʕ-h-a
once   checked-1SG DEF   //   of-3SG-F
'I once checked her personal profile'

...

S.2: 'ane garri - t - nī   fī 'il *tutorials* miš fī 'il   muḫādar-āt
      I   taught-3SG.F-1SG in DEF   //   not in DEF lecture-PL
'She gave me tutorials before, not lectures'

S.6: 'eh 'eh la   n-aʕrif-h-a
yes yes no 1SG-know-3SG.F
'Yes, no I know her'

(...)

S.2: *You could tell* 'inna *he is from* ...
         //   that   //
 'you could tell that she's from'

...

S.2: *I don't know*, n-ḥiss   fī-h-a   *it's sweet to be like that* qaṣd-ī   'il
      //   1SG-feel   in-3SG-F   //   meaning-POSS.1SG   DEF

waḥid y-kūn   ʕle ṭabīʕt-ah
 one   3SG.M-be on   nature.POSS-3SG.M

'I don't know, I feel like, it is sweet to be like that, I mean one should be himself'

S.6: 'eh 'eh la ʕārf-a
yes yes no know.PR S.PTCP-1SG-F
'Yes, I know'

(...)

69

S.6: la qaṣd - ī   šin   bi-t-dīr-ū ... ?
no meaning.POSS-1SG what FUT-2-do-PL
'No, I mean what you're doing?'

...

S.2: 'il *work* 'illī   dir-nā-h   badal   ma   n - iktb - ū: - h *we actually talk about it*
DEF   //   that did-2PL-3SG.M instead what 1-write-PL-3SG.M   //

ʕraf-t-ī-nī   kīf?
knew-2SG-F-1SG how

'Instead of writing what we've done, we actually talk about it, you understand?'

S.6: *Ah that is interesting*

(...)

S.6: hāda 85 ... y-jī   *frequent* bi-ṭarīṭq-a   miš ʕādiyy-a
this //   3SG.M-come   //   with-way-F NEG normal-F
'The bus 85 comes very frequently'

...

S.2: 'il muškil-a   lamma t-šūf-ī   'il *time tables* t-alg-ī
DEF problem-F when 2SG-see-F DEF   //   2SG-find-F
'The problem is that when you check the timetables, you find'

(...)

S.2: lamma ḥsab - t - h - a   fī 'il hoš   we bi - 'il   *pace* hāda ...
when considered-1SG-3SG-F in DEF house and with-DEF   //   this
'when I considered it at home and at this pace'

...

S.6: min   'il 'awwil   der-t   'inna *very little details* we ʕṭee-ṭ   *examples* ...
from DEF first   made-1SG that   //   and gave-1SG   //
'From the beginning, I put very little details and examples'

...

S.6: fa ḥassee-t-ah   *it was nice*
so felt-1SG-3SG.M   //
'so, I felt it was nice'

...

S.2: ḥatta fī 'il   *language change, we had to do a presentation last week* , fa kull
even in DEF   //   //   so every

waḥid y-dīr   *handout*
one   3SG-make   //

'Even in Language Change, we had to do a presentation last week, so everyone prepares a handout'

…

'il *Lecture is actually 50 minutes it is not 4 minutes* qaṣd-i   *you don't*
DEF   //   meaning.POSS-1SG   //

compare, you don't
            //

'The Lecture's actually 50 minutes it's not 4 minutes. I mean, you don't compare, you don't'

S.6: we 'aṣlan   fī 'il *lectures*, hāda 'int-ī   *for your interest*
and actually in DEF   //   this you-2SG.F   //
'Actually, in lectures, it is for your interest'

…

S.2: bi-ẓẓabṭ   we 'aṣlan   *it is supposed to be long*
by-exact   and actually   //
'exactly, and it is actually supposed to be long'

(…)

S.2: fī 'il *stage one* y-kūn   fī   *pre-verbal* bas fī 'il *stage two* fī   *pre-verbal*
in DEF   //   3SG.M-be there   //   but in DEF //   there   //

we *post- verbal*
and   //

'In the first stage, there is a pre-verbal pattern but in the second one, there are pre-verbal and post- verbal patterns'

…

ween   'il *intermediate stage*?
Where DEF   //
'Where's the intermediate stage?'

(…)

Conversation 3 (Researcher and Subject 3):

S.3: grūb-na …   ya-tbaʕ   'il *dental school   funded by dental school* ʕraf-t-ī …

71

group.POSS-1PL   3SG.M-follow DEF   //   knew-2SG-F

'Our group follows the dental school, funded by the dental school, got it?'

X ma   huwwa-š *dentist* X *scientist*
// NEG he - NEG   //
'X isn't a dentist, he is a scientist'

…

X mutaxaṣṣiṣṣ   fī 'il *stem cells*
 // specialised.M in DEF   //
'X is specialised in stem cells'

t- aʕrf - ī   'il xalāya 'il jadʕ-iyya?
2SG-know-F DEF cells   DEF stem-adj
'Do you know stem cells?'

 …

S.3: mā lī-h-a   'ay   ṣifa
    NEG to-3PL-F any feature
    'They don't have any feature'

S.6: t-abd-a   gāʕd-a *neutral*
    F-like-3SG   still-F   //
    'it is like neutral'

S.3: … t-ṭallaʕ-l-ik   'il *white blood cells* 'il *red blood cells*
    3SG.F-produce-to-2SG   DEF   //   DEF   //
    'It produces white and red blood cells'

    …

    min   'il *placenta* . 'il mašīma
    from DEF   //   DEF placenta
    'from the placenta, from the placenta'

    …

    ma   t-ūjad-š   fī 'il 'insān   'il *adult*
    NEG 3PL.F-exist-NEG in DEF human DEF //
    'It does not exist in the adult human'

    …

S.6: y-ṣīri-l - h - a   *activation* …
    3-happened-to-SG-F   //
    'It gets activated'
    (…)

S.3: ɣeer 'ane *oral cancer* we hiyya *breast cancer*
but I // and she //
'Mine is about oral cancer and hers is about breast cancer'

(…)

S.3: 'il ʕulb-a 'illī fī-h-a 'il 'ašyā' … 'il *kit*
DEF basket-F that in-3SG-F DEF things DEF //
'The basket with things in, the kit'

S.6: 'eh
yes
'yes'

…

S.3: ma n- aḥsāb - iš … *two tubes are the same* n-aḥsā-b *they're different* …
NEG 1SG-consider-NEG // 1SG-consider //
'I didn't think the two tubes were the same, I thought they were different'

…

gul- t - il - h - a *I used one micro litre from this and five micro litre from that*
said-1SG-to-3SG-F //
'I told her: I used one micro litre from this and five micro litre from that'

mšee gali - t - l - ī *they are the same*
then said-3SG.F-to-1SG //
'Then she told me: they are the same'

…

'ane *it is my fault*
me //
'it's me, it's my fault'

(…)

(They talk about life style and properties in Libya and England in Arabic)

S.3: 'in - nās 'il *homeless* 'illī y-ugaʕd-ū fī 'iš - šwāraʕ
DEF-people DEF // that 3-stay - PL in DEF - streets
'The homeless people who stay in streets'

…

S.6: miš fī *benefits*?
Not there //
'Are not there benefits?'

S.3: 'eh!

yes
'yes'

(...)

S.3: gāl - l - ī   'ḥne tawwa *general* ma n-aʕrf-ū-š   *which way we're going* ...
said.3SG.M-to-1SG   we   now   //   NEG1-know-PL-NEG   //
'He told me that it is still general, we don't know which way we are going'

...

ta'tīr-ah   fī 'il *cancer* šin   huwwa?
effect.POSS-3SG.M in DEF   //   what   he
'what its effect is on the cancer?'

...

S.3: 'iḥne n-ibb-ū   *more specific*
we   1-want-PL   //
'we want to be more specific'

S.6: šin   bi-t-qadm-ī   ... 'il *contribution* mtāʕ-ik?
what FUT-2SG-present-F   DEF   //   of-2SG
'What are you adding? What's your contribution?'

…

S.3: 'aywa   šin   huwwa 'in-*novel*
exactly what   3SG.M   DEF- //
'Exactly, what's it that's novel?'

(…)

Conversation 4 (Researcher and Subject 4):

S.6: lamma t-dīr-ī   *plain cake* sahel 'inn-ik   'int-i   *you mix it* ...
when 2SG-make-F   //   easy   that-2SG you-SG.F   //
'when you make a plain cake, it's easy to mix'

(...)

S.4: sahel li'ann ... *plain*
easy because //
'it's easy because it's plain'

...

ba-staʕmil ṭahīn *self-raising*
PRS-use.1SG flour   //

'I use self-raising flour'

(...)

S.4: 'ittaṣal-ū   maʕ-ī ...   'il *council*
contacted- 3PL with-me   DEF   //
'The council people contacted me'

...

'āl - ū - l - ī   'innu *basically we offered him a place*
said-3PL-to-1SG   that   //
'They told me that, basically, we offered him a place'

S.6: 'ah fī 'il   madersa ...
 // in DEF school
'Ah, in the school'

S.4: bʕīd-e. 'illī   *they offered me a place for him to go to*
far-F   that   //
'It's far the one they offered me a place for him to go to'

...

you rejected it, therefore, yaʕnī *we're going to fine you* ... Kīf   'int-ī   'āʕd-e
                     //   means   //   how you-SG-F   still-f
'you rejected it, therefore, means we're going to fine you … how are you still'

...

S.6: ka-'anna ma ʕindi - k - š   ḥag
as - if   NEG have-2SG-NEG   right
'As if you don't have the right'

...

S.4: law X ṭliʕ - l - uh   makān, Y *will go up very high in the waiting list*
if // appeared.3SG-to-3SG.M place,   //   //
'If X gets a place, Y will go up very high in the waiting list'

...

bi-y-sīr   ʕand-u   *priority*
PRS-3SG.M-be have.POSS-3SG.M   //
'he'll have a priority'

S.6: y-kūn   ʕind-ah   'awlawiyy-a
SG.M-be have-3SG.M priority-F
'He'll have a priory'

...

S.4: fa bi-t-sīr   *his case much better* yaʕnī
    so PR S-3SG.F-be   //   means
    'So, this means that his case will be much better'

...

S.6: ka-'anna maḍmūn-a ..
    as - if   guaranteed-F
    'As if it's guaranteed'

S.4: *it all depends on* X law axad-u   X bi-y-sīr   Y ktī::r 'ilu-h   'iḥtimāl .   kbīr
        //   if took-3PL X PRS-3SG.M-be Y much has.POSS-3M possibility big
    'it all depends on X . If X got a place, there will be a big possibility for Y to be admitted'

(…)

S.4: *How to mix* it halla' *this is the important bit*
        //   now   //
    'How to mix it, now, this is the important bit'

S.6: 'eh
    Yes
    'yes'

S.4: b-ḥi-ṭ   'is -*speed* ʕ- al - wāṭī ... mumkin, *medium speed*
    PRS-put-1SG DEF - //   on - DEF - low   maybe   //
    'I put it low, on the minimum speed, maybe'

    'inno *chocolate*, bi-t-ḥiṭṭ-ī   maʕla'a ... 'il *coco powder* ...
    like   //   PRS-2SG -put-F spoon   DEF   //
    'like chocolate, you put a spoon of coco powder'

S.6: *oh ok*

(…)

S.4: la kin-na   sɣār   lamma
    no were-1PL children when
    'No, we were kids when'

...

    you inherited it bi-y-samm-ū-h - a ...bāba ʕand-u *British passport* ... miš ... brīṭān-ī
        //   PRS-3-call - 3PL - SG-F dad   has-3SG   //   not British-adj
    'it is like you inherited it. My dad has the British passport, but he's not British'

S.6: *okay*

…

S.4: huwwe *he inherited it off me* … law miš mitzawwij waḥd-e *British passport holder*
  he   //   if   not married   one-F   //
  'He inherited it off me, if he is not married to someone with a British Passport'

  (…)

S.6: ma yi - gder - š
  NEG 3SG.M- can-NEG
  'he can't'

Conversation 5 (Researcher and Subject 5):

S.6: we: . *how is his course going*?
  And   //
  'And how is his course going?'

S.5: *ooh my God, I have to write my essay. I have to get started … like seriously*!

S.6: (laughter)
  miš ʕale-ik   'int-ī,   s'al-t-ik   ʕle   X
  not about-2SG you-2SG.F   asked-1SG-2SG about X
  'Not about you, I asked you about X'

S.5: *Ohh sorry*

S.6: la   la (not clear) That was one of …
  no no   //
  'No, that was one of'

S.5: *I would be offended, but I am*

S.6: la … n-asal- ū ʕle   'il *peripherals* … baʕdeen n-axd-ū 'il *main*
  no   1 -ask- PL about DEF   //   later   1-take-PL DEF //
  'No, I ask about the peripherals first, then the main ones'

S.5: ḥee *What does peripheral mean*?
  ohh   //
  'Oh, what does peripheral mean?'

S.6: *peripheral* maʕnā-h-a   ḥāja   hikkī *minor*
        //   mean.POSS-3SG-F thing   like   //
  'Peripheral means something minor '

S.5: *ah ok*

  (…)

S.6: *Ah ok*. lākin *geek* … maʕna   *positive* 'inna ya-gr-a   halba willa?

//   But   //   meaning   //   that 3.M-study-SG much   right?
'Ah, ok. But geek's meaning is positive, someone who studies a lot'

S.5: eeeeee, maʕnā-h-a   *negative* hād-ī *geek* … 'eeh t-agr-ī   halba lākin …
     //   meaning.POSS-3SG-F   //   this-F   //   yes 2SG -study-F much   but

don't she have a social life?...
           //

'Emm, geek has a negative meaning, yes, you study a lot but don't you've a social life?'

S.6: *well*!

(...)

S.6: 'eh   we   'int-ī   *how was your day at uni, let's start*.
Yes   and   you-2SG.F   //
'And you! How was your day … at uni, let's start'

S.5: *my day, how was my day? Hmm I don't know- it was good, it was really nice* …

S.6: *ah good*

S.5: *yeah*

S.6: baʕd   'il   muḥāaḍarah?
After   DEF   lecture?
'After the lecture?'

S.5: *Yeah*

   …

S.6: yeah 'aṣlan   hiyya *by the way* gal - it - l - ī…
   //   actually   she   //   told- 3SG.F - to - 1SG
'yeah actually, she told me by the way'

   …

ka-'nna *she is* … t-kūn   *in contact*, … ka'anna   hiyya *she is living* yaʕnī   *in a*
as-if   //   3SG.F- be   //   as-if   she   //   means   //

world on her own
      //

'As if she wants to be in contact! Oh, as if she's living, I mean, in a world of her own'

S.6: (laughter)

S.5: bas   yaʕnī …   la   hiyya . *she wants* yaʕni   *to have friends, to spend time with* …
but   means   no   she   //   means   //
'But it is like, no, she actually wants to have friends and spend time with'

S.6: 'emm

    ...

S.5: ṣaḥ *she gets bored*, bas *she does not mind* …
right   //   but   //
'It's true that she sometimes gets bored, but she does not mind'

S.6: 'eh 'eh
yes yes
'Yes yes'

    (...)

S.6: ah *ok* ah xalāṣ   maʕnā-h-a   *you know your way* … 'ane *I usually start* …
    //   that's.it mean.POSS-3SG-F   //   I   //
'Ok that's it. So, you know your way. I usually start'

    ...

S.5: yeah … baʕid ma t-kaml-ī   'il *reading*,
    //   after that 2SG -finish-F DEF   //
'Yeah, after you finish reading'

S.6: *yeah*

S.5: *how do you start, like with your notes* …

S.6: 'awwil ḥāja, *I usually read very very little* we n-dīr   *draft* … 'il *article* hād-a
first   thing,   //   and 1SG-make //   DEF // this-M
'First thing, I read very little and make a draft. This article'

    ...

lakin … mumkin *my way is a bit . annoying*
but   maybe   //
'But my way might be a bit annoying'

    (...)

S.5: 'eh 'il *research original*, lakin miš 'il *ideas* …
yes DEF   //   but not DEF //
'Yes, the research is original but not the ideas'

S.6: y-kūn   *gap* fi 'il *research* 'int-ī   t-aml-ī   'il *gap* hād-ī
3SG.M-be // in DEF   //   you-2SG.F 2SG-fill-F DEF // this-F
'There is usually a gap in the research and you fill this gap'

    (...)

<u>Conversation 6 (Mixed): Researcher and Subjects: 2, 3 & 4:</u>

S.4: 'il   yōm   fi'i-t   *I was like* eff mustaḥīl   'aṭlaʕ   min 'il   beet
    DEF today woke.up-1SG   //   impossible go.out.1SG from DEF house
    'I woke up today, I was like, there's no way I can go out of the house'

S.3: 'eh 'eh
    yes yes
    'Yes'

    (...)

S.2: 'ane ma-ʕind-ī-š   *biscuits* fī 'il   ḥoš
     I   NEG- have-1SG-NEG   //   in DEF house
    'I don't have biscuits at home'

    ...

S.3: la   īnt-ī ...   ma ʕindi-k-š   wala *biscuit*
    no you-2SG .F NEG have-2SG-NEG   any   //
    'No, you don't have any biscuits'

S.2: 'abadan
    Never
    'Never'

    (...)

S.4: lamma ken-t   ʕam be-ʕmil *homeschooling* la X, ken-t   mistamtʕ-a ...
    when   was-1SG like 1SG-do   //   for X, was-1SG enjoy-PRS.PTCP-F

    mrakz-a   ʕale - h   we X kān   *baby*
    focus. PRS.PTCP-F on-3SG.M   and X   was.3SG (M)   //

    'When I was homeschooling X, I used to enjoy it. I was focusing on him and X was baby'

S.3: hmmm

    ...

S.4: ḍallee-na   fatra   mnīḥ-a bas 'ana we X   we Y 'inno *it was fine*, *it was fun* ...
    stayed-1PL period good-F   just   I   and X and Y, that   //
    'we spend tome good time three of use, it was fine, it was fun'

    ...

    baʕdeen ... ṣār   *too much distraction* ... ʕibi'   'aktar 'inno *I'm enjoying it*
    later   became   //   burden more that   //
    'Later, there became much distraction and it started to be a burden and not something I'm enjoying'

S.3: 'eh   'eh

yes yes
'Yes'

...

S.4: bi- l - madrase   kill-on   bi-ye-s'al-ū-h   :   *Which school did you go to?*
in-DEF-school   all-PL   PRS-3-ask- PL-3SG.M   //
'Everyone in school asks him: which school did you go to?'

wahid   sahb-u   'al-l-u: *your mom must be really good* ...
one   friend.POSS-3SG.M   said.3SG.M-to-3SG.M   //
'A friend of his told him: your mom must be really good'

'ana ma ktīr   darras-t-u
  I   NEG much   taught-1SG-3SG.M
'I didn't teach him much'