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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the constraints on English-Arabic-English Code-switching. It is an attempt to trace the phenomena in terms of matrix/guest language and constraints. It investigates the components of switching with respect to the morphological and structural typological constraints. The present study is important because it provides a better understanding of the constraints of code switching phenomenon. The data in this paper have been collected randomly from spontaneous oral interaction of the Arabic/English users through observation, conversation, in addition to T.V dialogues and mass media then they are analyzed in terms of content. Code-switching is sorted out structurally on the basis of the linguistic level of language. The study hypothesized that English-Arabic-English code mixing is class bound and the matrix language does not mix freely; Mixing is rule governed. This study took place in 2016-2018, a number of utterances from people of different cultural backgrounds have been collected to investigate the influence of the linguistic typology and constraints in the Arabic and English code mixing. The findings of this paper include the structure, frequency and constraints of code-mixing.

INTRODUCTION

One of the dominant phenomena of bilingual and multilingual communities is Code mixing and switching. It can be employed when people use two or more languages to communicate. Code mixing and code switching are generally discussed with relation to one another. English language has found its way to contact among most of the world languages because of its rapid spread and the increasing number of its speakers. English/Arabic code mixing and switching is normal and very common in every day communication as a result of language interaction and contact among people in a bilingual community.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This paper is based on data collected from different casual oral interactions of Arabic/English users in addition to T.V programs. 21 natural spontaneous sentences are collected from (males and females).

It is worth mentioning that, the speakers were not aware that their speech was being recorded. All the speakers in the gathered data were adult Arab from different nationalities in addition to the Indians. The presence of the code switching characterized the speech of those speakers. The Arabic items were written in bold type and their translations into English were provided after each example. Cambridge dictionary defines code as “a system of rules that allow people “to give information in secret form, or a system of numbers, letters, or signals used to represent something in a shorter or more convenient form”. Scholar see code-switching and code-mixing from different views. Crystal (2011) considered code as a system of rules that allow people “to give information in symbolic form”. Hymes (2003) states that code-switching is “a common term for alternative use of two or more languages, varieties of a language or even speech styles”. In his proposal of the typology of code mixing, Muysken (2000) mentioned that his aim is to provide taxonomy, rather than a conclusive account of the relevant data. He suggests that theoretical constraints of code mixing can be defined ‘in terms of four primitives’ namely:

‘a- The potential role of word order equivalence
b- The potential role of categorical equivalence
According to him human language is also a code; a string of lexical items that represent communication. Kachru (1983) defined code mixing as “transferring linguistic units from one code into another”. In his distinction between code switching and code mixing, Hock and Joseph (2009) stated that “while code switching takes place on the syntactic level, code mixing is a lexical phenomenon”. Kachru (1978) agreed on the use of one or more languages but the linguistic transfer of the units between the languages involved in the mixing is rational, and the linguistic mixture is a ‘new restricted’ or ‘not restricted code’ of interaction. Definitions of code mixing and switching vary in their dealings put not apart from one another, Ginging (1974) defines code-switching as “the alternation of grammatical rules drawn from two different languages which occurs between sentence boundaries”.

Wardhaugh and Fuller (2014) went further to say mixing is “...a conversational strategy used to establish, cross or destroy group of boundaries; to create, evoke or change interpersonal relations with their rights and obligations”.

Bhatia and Ritchie (2004) mentioned that code mixing is: 
the mixing of various units (morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases, clauses and sentences) primarily from two participating grammatical systems within a sentence.

Hamers and Blanc (2000) thought that Code-switching is a sign of incompetent speakers. In contrast Poplack (1980) stated that code switching takes place only when the speakers are linguistically competent in more than one language poor or inadequate linguistic knowledge hinders code switching. While Hudson, (1996) considered that code mixing takes place “where a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual changes the language without any change at all in the situation”. As noted by Chan (1998) in the study concerning Cantonese-English found that “Cantonese-English code-mixing most often takes the form of single English words surrounded by Cantonese constituents.” Most of these English words are “content Words”, rather than “function words”. According to Sebba (1998) in switching there are at least four possible strategies responsible for the congruence that determines the ‘common ground’ for the bilinguals who switch between languages. This congruence which is bound to community norms takes place in the mind. These possibilities are; harmonization which refers the treatment of category as identical in both languages. Neutralization refers to category as incompatible in both languages. The strategy of Compromise allows for resulting ungrammatical utterances in matrix or embedded languages. Blocking refers to situations where switching is not allowed. Three universal constraints of code-mixing are constraints are mentioned by Berk-Seligson (1986) they are; the equivalent of structure, size of constituent and free morpheme constituent. The person who uses the code has own reasons for switching from one language to another. Khanna (2017) mentioned that “one of the most fascinating questions in the CS literature is “why people code switch”. He also stated that motivation for code switching can be; syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and psychological but the most basic motivation is psycholinguistic. Saville-Troike (1986) states that switching or mixing languages can be referred to; softening or strengthening a request or a command, lexical need or/and exclusion of some audience.

Rohali (2011) mentions that factors that cause switching and mixing as ‘(1) relationship among speakers, (2) subject of speech, and (3) presence of a third speaker’. As for the function of code switching and mixing, consists of ‘(1) effectiveness of communication, (2) conceal the information, (3) familiarity, and (4) formality, (4) casual / non-formal’. The following parts of speech are prone to mixing ‘(1) noun, (2) verb, (3) adjectives, and (4) adverb’.

Concerning Conjunction and definite article constraints, Rammal (2012) in the extract he has analyzed has concluded that, no example violating the conjunction constraint has been found, but there is a violation of the definite article constraint. Milroy and Muysken (1995:600-602) proposed the constraints of code mixing as follows:

- ‘The Free-morpheme Constraint’ where code is not allowed between bound morphemes
- ‘The Equivalence Constraint’ where the code obeys the rules of the languages involved in the code-mixing.
- ‘The Closed-class Constraint’ where the functional words cannot be code-switched.
- ‘The Matrix Language Frame’ where matrix and embedded languages involved in the mixing are distinguishable.
- ‘The Functional Head Constraint’ where the switching between functional heads and its complements is not allowed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

English and Arabicbelong to different language families still code mixing is a natural phenomenon. The followings are spontaneous conversation collected from different sources. They have been analyzed to examine the research hypothesis.

- **Lamma tkhall is please give back the paper** (please give back the paper) (لمّا تخلص)
*When you finish, please give back the paper.*

- **Law samahta what is the time now please.** (law samahta is what is the time now please?)
*If you please what is the time now please?*

In (1and2) above the code-switching is inter-sentential. The Arabic subordinate clause ‘Law samahta’ is replacing the English one (if you please).The meaning of the English sentence is complete. The Arabic switching is extra to the sentence it is only an emphasis; a repetition for the request. The repetition constitutes a violation of code-mixing constraints.

- (Recover ‘bardu’ possible.) (Recover ‘بَرِضُو’ possible).
*Recover is also possible.*

The above example (3) shows that the matrix language is English. The Arabic conjunction 'bardu' is used to compensate for the English conjunction 'also'. The code mixing here takes
place between the verb to be and its complement but is not equivalent to the Arabic counterpart. Grammatically, it does not suit the matrix language as the verb to be (is) is omitted (Recover is ‘bardu’ possible). This violation is due to the absence of the verb (be) in the Arabic sentence structure.

- Still baggi ten minutes (Still (بَعْضٌ) ten minutes). Still ten minutes are left.

The matrix of the above switching example (4) is English and the Arabic noun ‘baggi’ is used with the adverb (still) is to complete the lexical gap for the English phrase ‘are left’. It is inter-sentential switching. The code size is not equal and the word (still) here, needs to be followed by a present form of the verb which is not the case above so that it does not suit the context, in addition the verb (be) is omitted. Elements of the switched language violated the syntactic rules of the matrix language.


In the above inter-sentential code-switching (5), the matrix language is English, the Arabic prepositional phrase ‘allarai almathal’ is used instead of ‘According to the proverb’ that is grammatical and equivalent in meaning to the English phrase rather than in lexical content. There is no violation of the code mixing constraints.

- Ammalna a road map-litusaidana fii tawheed alkhawatw. (عملنا خارطة طريقة موحد (a map road)

We have madea road map to help us in unifying the steps. The above example of inter-sentential mixing (6) shows that the matrix language is Arabic and the English compound noun ‘map road’ is used for the Arabic one ‘’خارطة طريق’. The Arabic compound is equivalent in meaning to the English one, both compounds are (N+N) but there is a structural shift as the phrase (road map) is replaced by (map road) the head is brought before its modifier. Following the rules of the matrix language the indefinite article ‘a’ of a road map is dropped. There are violations of word order and indefinite article constraints.

- Ma-fi time. (لا timeouts) There is no time.

In the above inter-sentential example (7) includes only one free morpheme ‘time’ so that English is the matrix language. The interjection ‘ma’ and prep ‘fi’ that make the phrase literary means ‘not there’ are used instead of the phrase ‘there is no’. That is not equivalent to English; besides, the phrase is made of (ma and fi) which are both close-class morphemes. There is a violation of bound morpheme constraints.

- Hi, amma-na you are also included. (هَيَّ، أَمْمَا نِّآ إِلَيْكُمْ) Hi, Uncle you are also included.

In the above inter-sentential switching English the matrix language, the Arabic phrase ‘amm’ (uncle) and the bound morpheme ‘na’ (our) are used as switching. The host language dropped the inflectional morpheme ‘na’ and included only the free morpheme but the sentence is still grammatical. The switched phrase included the English interjection ‘hi’. There is a violation of size of constituent and interjection constraints.

- He made a very nice tea (He made a very nice tea harrara ziadah) He made a very nice tea, over heated.

Arabic is the matrix language in the above mixing. The noun ‘charisma’ is used instead of the noun ‘jazibeia’ and that goes grammatically with the matrix language. The Arabic definite article ‘al’ is attached to the English noun ‘charisma’. In addition, to denote that the noun ‘charisma’ is feminine, the inflectional pronoun (a-) is attached to adjective (almatloob-a). There is a violation of definite article free morpheme constraints.

- Team-na almatch. (نُعلاَقَاء الحَمْل) Our team played a nice match.

In the above code mixing example, the matrix language is Arabic the English nouns ‘team’ and ‘match’ are used for the Arabic one ‘‘حَمْل’’. It is interesting that the adjective (hillo) meaning ‘nice’ follows the rules of the matrix language; it comes after the noun. The Arabic inflectional morpheme ‘na’ which is a Plural marker, is attached to the English noun team ‘team-na’ and this is a violation of the free morpheme constraint.

- Law bithutti flash color mmumkin takhdi alakhedar ala drajatu allthania, mumkin takhdeeh inno yakuun very light ashan yubai’in jamal alalainen. (لَوْ بَحْتُي بُحْتَي حَأَلَّاء الصَّبْرِ مَمْكُونَ تَكْدِيْهَةُ عَلَى ذَرَائِعَ النَّاسِ مَمْكُونَ تَكْدِيْهُ عَلَى نَحْرِ اَلْعُيْنِ) If you put flash color you can take the green at different degrees. You can use it a bit dark, and you can use it very light so to as show the beauty of the eye. In the above example of mixing is intra-sentential. The matrix language is Arabic and all the code-mixed constituents are compounds which are switched spontaneously and accurately. The compounds ‘flash color’ is noun and adjective stand for the Arabic compound ‘laun sati ‘while’ very light ‘stand for’ khaafeef jiddan. The switched codes are complete, grammatical and equivalent to the matrix language with no constraints.
Matrix language of the code mixing is Arabic. The English noun ‘technique’ is embedded into the Arabic sentence and the Arabic definite article ‘al’ is attached to the English noun ‘technique’. There is a violation of definite article constraints.

- Law can shareethak zain can fasbacta bilmajjan.

If your SIM card was Zein you could use the face-book freely. Matrix language in the above context is Arabic and the embedded mixed code is English. The English phrase ‘face-book’ is used as a verb and fully shifted and conjugated as Arabic ‘fasbacta’. The possessive clitic pronoun ‘k’ is added as a suffix to the English noun compound “face-book” and the pronoun ‘t’ is to compensate for ‘you’ and this a violation of class shift and free morpheme constraints.

- When one story finished still a new story was necessary.

In the above example (20) the matrix language is English, the Arabic free morpheme (adj) (المكان) is embedded into the English sentence to mean ‘[was] necessary’ but ‘was’ was missed. The code-mixing has violated the rules of English grammar. The structure is not grammatical and not equivalent because the adjective is attributive it must be preceded by a verb. To be there is size of constituent constraints.

- Inta English maloom?

Do you speak English?

The above inter-sentential code-mixing (20) shows that the speaker is not competent in either English or Arabic but according to the text the matrix language is Arabic the noun (English) comes directly after the subject and the sentence lack the verb. The structure of the example under question is ill formed. The speaker used intonation instead of the interrogative form to convey the question. Constraints of word order and syntactic rules are violated. The examples show that code-switching is not random but rather rule governed and that it has a communicative purpose, the researcher also noticed that Arab speakers tend to use their own vernaculars so that colloquial Arabic is used. The present study investigates the constraints of code switching and mixing in the English/Arabic and the Arabic/English text with respect to constituent type, size and structure. By examining Examples in which Arabic and English- as syntactically different languages- are mixed or switched. Most of the examples under-investigation are inter-sentential. The data revealed that the most frequent violations of switching are the definite article, free morpheme constraints. Full words are more frequent than empty words. Arabic inflectional morphemes such as the first person plural personal pronoun ‘na’ possessive pronoun ‘k’ and the article
'al' are switched to English free morphemes. The size of the constituent of the matrix language is not always equal to size of the constituent of the embedded language and sometimes the grammatical structure is violated due to the typological differences. Among the structural violations there is a phrasal shift from VP into NP and that the elements of the switched language violated the syntactic rules of the matrix language. It is found that switching can take place between the verb to be and its complement and English verbs can be conjugated according to the Arabic rules. An existing word or phrase from the matrix language can be repeated in the other language for emphasis or request. There are also violations of interjection, size of constituent, word-class/order shift constraints. Although English and Arabic are not the same family, the study revealed that switching is possible across the typological boundaries. These are congruent with Alrowais (2012), Alhazmi (2016) Taweel and Btoosh (2012). The phenomena of code switching are very broad and this study is limited linguistic typology and constraints of code switching. Many fields are beyond the scope of this study and the researcher is hopeful that they will be explored in the future.

Abbreviations used in the study
N noun
V verb
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