Code-Switching Varieties in Syrian Community (A Case Study in Syria and Turkey)

Nouran Ali Alfashtakie[1*], Mohammad Umar Muslim[1]

[1]University of Indonesia
*Correspondence: nouranalialfashtakie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main focus of this study is the way code-switching is used in the Syrian community. The study is designed to examine the patterns of code-switching in communication among the young generation and adults as well. It encompasses bilingual and multilingual Syrian participants, young and adult, both in Syria and Turkey. Therefore, factors like migration experience and age will be explored. For this purpose, data are taken from conversations with participants via voice calls; all recorded conversations were transcribed and transliterated to clarify the code-switching patterns. The Mixed Methods Approach to analyze participants' data based on Muysken's code-switching typology and the three-way division is adopted. The findings yielded that 7 participants exhibited no code-switching at all versus 9 who did and that the insertional division is the one prevailing in almost all instances of code-switching. The results suggest that age is a prominent factor in the process of CS, while cultural exposure is not. It is also observed that although a small difference is detected between genders, it is not an affecting one.

1. Introduction

The Syrian community in general, especially in everyday communication, tends to use only Arabic; the colloquial in specific. The Arabic language, alongside its Levantine dialects, is dominant in Syria except for small groups who use their language (Kurds or Assyrians) at times. Even though a large segment of the population is fluent either in English, French, Russian, German, or others, the Syrian society is considered a monolingual one, since the use of a foreign language is not activated except in specific situations. However, some borrowings are seen in language, especially if they have no equivalent in Arabic or in case this equivalent is heavy to be used. Concerning the study at hand, the respondents targeted are those who are bilingual and multilingual, both in Syria and in Turkey. Informants in Syria speak Arabic and English, while those in Turkey speak Arabic, English, and Turkish.

The code-switching field is rich with a considerable amount of research papers that dealt with this phenomenon in diverse contexts. In 2009, a study titled "A study of lexical borrowing and occasional code-switching amongst young middle-class Syrians in Saudi Arabia and Syria. University of Cape Town" was conducted by Mozaic, Z. The author examined two groups of young Syrians in Riyadh and Syria and the results yielded that CS instances are minimal. The influence of culture exposure was clear in the English lexical items presented by the group in Riyadh and no clear CS was detected; however, each member was affected by his/her own experience. In another study "Multilingual identity development in a trilingual setting: A case study of refugee identity and language use" by Ferhat Karanfil and Serkan Demir in 2021, researchers studied the multilingual identity and the development of language use of two refugees siblings raised by multilingual mother. They found that children can adapt their usage of language according to the situation and the CS use is limited to necessity. In the same respect, Hanan Ben Nafa held her study "Code-Switching Among Arabic-English Adult Bilinguals in the UK: Syntactic Structures, and Pragmatic Functions" in 2013. In this study two CS patterns were exhibited; the insertional and the alternational and that was affected by the linguistic competence and age as well as governed by sociolinguistic variables.

Many are the research papers that have been conducted to study code-switching between Arabic and other languages; however, in the case of Syria, they are not a lot. The study at hand is believed to add more to the already existing knowledge in this respect since it talks about the difference between generations in Syria and it focuses on speakers whose parents and background are monolingual. Therefore, factors affecting their language usage, maintenance, and code-switching preference are affected by external aspects. Accordingly, the main purpose of this

paper is to examine patterns of code-switching used among the bilingual and multilingual Syrian speakers and their choice of a specific language over the other in the same conversation, taking into account that he/she masters both/all. The constant mobility of families due to many reasons implies a necessity for their children to build multilingual literacies (Jones and Jones 2001). Therefore, against the background of the many migrations Syrian people have witnessed throughout the last ten years, this paper tackles the influence of this factor on the language usage and choice of bilingual and multi-lingual Syrians in Turkey compared to their peers who have no experience in migration in Syria to reveal whether cultural exposure affects it or not.

2. Theoretical Framework

The demand for examples drawn from this changing environment using multi-disciplinary approaches and alternative frameworks, as well as the concept's rising complexity and multifaceted essence, are driving the expansion of multilingualism. (Wei, 2013). Code-switching (CS) is derived from the existence of bilingualism, and since it is a normal phenomenon in the communication between bilinguals, this makes it necessary to address the issue of bilingualism to understand more about code-switching. Thus, we can differentiate between the bilingual mode and the monolingual mode. In the latter, it is also about bilinguals; however, it is where they activate one language and deactivate the other.

Concerning bilingualism, it mostly expresses itself in the form of CS which is deemed a 'central issue in the bilingualism research' (Milroy & Muysken 1995: 7). When it comes to defining bilingualism, many definitions have some differences in terms of proficiency. Therefore, bilinguals have been defined generally as a polyglot. More precisely, a bilingual is described as "a person who understands and speaks two languages, both of which he has acquired by natural experience rather than by school learning" according to Clyne (1967:20). The one definition considered simple and inclusive is a person who "can function in both languages in conversational interaction," by Wei, L. (2000:16). Bilingualism includes many idioms like "dominant" and "secondary" languages; where the dominant is the one used with competence more than the other. Thus, the bilingual mode is a context in which the speaker utilized two languages to create what is called code-switching from time to time.

Linguists' interest in investigating mechanisms behind CS emerged about 4 decades ago (Gardner-Chloros 2009). It started with (Barber 1973) stated in (Grosjean 1982: 130), who urges to examine code choice bilinguals use. We can define code-switching (CS) in general as "the alternation of languages within a conversation" (Matras 2009:101). This practice is a normal phenomenon in the communication functioned by bilinguals and multi-linguals. It is a common situation in most parts of the world where there are more than one language spoken and globalization makes it more frequent since everything moves fast, therefore code-switching practice becomes more common. Despite being such a frequent behavior, attitudes towards code-switching are not that positive. It is considered "impure, lazy or even expedient. (Edwards, 2004).

Consequently, code-switching is not viewed positively, it is rather considered a 'language corruption' (Matras, 2009:101). Some linguists see that this practice has negative effects on the mother language which in turn will have many consequences. In this respect, a reference to the relation between bilingualism and identity is worth mentioning. This relation comes from the fact that the selection of one language over the other by a bilingual reflects his/ her sociocultural background.

Although code-switching, which is best described as the alternation of at least two languages, received many negative attitudes, it has been viewed positively by others. It was described as "rule-governed" and that it requires a high level of competence in both languages (Poplack, 1980; Christodoulou-Pipis,1991).This notion is agreed upon by many researchers who had an interest in both the syntax and the structure of code-switching and they stated that it is a linguistic behavior governed that is rule-governed (Pfaff 1979; Poplack 1980; Hoffman 1991; Myers-Scotton 1993; 1995; Silva 1994; Poplack and Meechan 1998). This phenomenon undoubtedly has many factors to activate it like, expressing identity, clarifying, quoting, excluding someone, expressing solidarity, lexical need, and many others.

According to Muysken (2000), Code-switching is shaped in various patterns and they are classified as to where they take place; the first is the inter-sentential type, where it takes place at the boundaries of the sentences (between two separate utterances or two coordinated clauses belonging to the same utterance). Second is the intra-sentential code-switching in the middle of the sentence and it is used without the speaker being aware of it. Third, extra-sentential which is also referred to as emblematic and tag switching is noticed when a tag from a given language is inserted into another language (between a clause and an extra-clausal element attached to it). The usage of discourse markers and conjunctions borrowed from another language is frequent in this respect (Maschler 2000). Fourth, single word, which is a subcategory of intra-clausal that involves a single switched element, and the last one is the word-internal. Hence, code-

switching, if not deliberately used, is a communicative strategy that is formed in a way that wouldn't be achieved by others. CS patterns come in all sizes starting from one word to a full sentence (Grosjean 1982: 146). Myers-Scotton (1993b: 4-5) classified them also into intra-sentential and inter-sentential CS.

Muysken (2000) likewise proposed a three-way division of the intra-sentential switches could be adopted. In the first case; insertion, here there is a single/ matrix language to which the speaker inserts elements or constituents from other languages. These inserted elements don't affect the overall structure in the matrix language and the switching type, in this case, is asymmetrical since there is one base language. Secondly, the alternation which is a switching type that is symmetrical because the speaker makes a complete switch from one language to another. As for the last one, congruent lexicalization, the basic structure of the overall clause is shared by both languages and individual elements from either language are inserted.

Matrix language, which will be referred to as (ML) in code-switching studies, is defined as the dominant language, while the other language (the guest) from which elements used by speakers are derived and inserted into the (ML) is called the embedded language that will be referred to as (EL). According to Myers-Scotton (1993:20), there are two labels for languages in this context 'the base language'; they are called the matrix language (ML) and 'the contributing language/ languages' called embedded language (EL). Chun (2001) mentioned that ML is the essential component in the formulation of the CS because it determines the CS and its grammar controls both the morphology and syntax of the code-switching. In this sense, it is considered the first language of the speaker and it is not possible to have a code-switching instance without the presence of the matrix language. On the other hand, the embedded language is of lesser participation since it helps in completing the code-switching formulating and it could be one or more.

3. Methodology

Data analyzed in this paper are conversation-based. They are taken from voice-recorded conversations with bilingual and multilingual Syrian participants, both in Syria and Turkey. The Mixed Methods Approach is adopted to analyze data and examine motivations and factors.

Participants involved in this study were selected from families with monolingual parents and all of them have an educational background. They are 16 people classified equally into gender, age, and place groups. They are divided into the following:

a. Two young females in Syria versus two young females in Turkey

b. Two adult females in Syria versus two female adults in Turkey

c. Two young males in Syria versus two young males in Turkey

d. Two adult males in Syria versus two male adults in Turkey

Informants in Syria are bilinguals while their peers in Turkey are multi-linguals. Some of the individuals in this study are friends and the rest are friends of friends. All of them have been informed that the interlocutor can speak Arabic, English, and some Turkish. Conversations were held through the WhatsApp application with participants' knowledge being recorded for research purposes.

A public topic is chosen for this paper, which is Corona Virus/ Covid-19, because many new English expressions were inserted into all languages in this regard, so there is a possibility of using these expressions unconsciously. Besides, participants were not informed that this is a linguistic-oriented research because they were supposed to speak spontaneously and to have no monitoring over their language. All informants have advanced levels in Arabic and English in both countries, and in Turkish for those in Turkey with some varieties in some skills. Besides, the educational background of all participants was taken into account since all of them are either university students or graduates.

The study is based on four questions concerning the pandemic situation (Covid-19) and it was conducted in 2020 and 2021; in terms of news about the virus, the procedures, and the vaccine. The language used in all interviews is Arabic (Damascene Syrian dialect). Conversations were voice calls about 5 minutes on average with each of the 16 participants and were recorded by a laptop recorder. Recordings were checked and only examples that involve code-switching were elicited. Additionally, and for more confirmation, other unrecorded conversations were held with all participants to examine their motivations and to inform them about the actual objective of the interviews. Conversations, both recorded and unrecorded, took place informally and started with chit-chat to make sure that speakers feel comfortable and speak spontaneously. Having this atmosphere created, the no-monitored use of language that

respondents manifested during sessions helped in presenting CS examples that could be reliable in discussing CS patterns. It is worth mentioning that out of protecting the privacy of speakers, their names were replaced with symbols.

Data (21 sentences) were transcribed using Word; noting down everything while listening to the recordings. After listening to all conversations, only sentences with code-switching examples were transcribed. The transcription process was based on the mark-up conventions as in table (1).

Table 1. Transcription conventions

Symbol	Meaning
Pauses	Longer pauses are timed to the nearest second and marked with the number of seconds in parentheses, e.g. (1) = 1 second, (3) = 3 seconds.
Lengthening	Lengthened sounds are marked with a colon ":".
	Exceptionally long sounds (i.e. approximating 2 seconds or more) are marked with a double colon "::".
Speaking modes	Utterances that are spoken in a particular mode (fast, soft, whispered, read, etc.) and are notably different from the speaker's normal speaking style are marked accordingly.

Since Arabic is the mother language of all respondents, sentences were transliterated from Arabic to Roman as the following: The Arabic text is in italic, Turkish underlined and English with no specified format. Data were transcribed following the mark-up conventions by only analyzing the CS utterances used by speakers. The quantitative analysis of data was utilized to detect the number of CS patterns in conversations in general and to sum up the times each speaker applied this practice. The qualitative approach was by introducing the code-switching types presented by Muysken's (2000) code-switching typology: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. It was also adopted to indicate what sociolinguistic aspects affected the occurrence of CS. In the analysis process, speakers were ordered from the highest number of CS occurrences to the lowest.

4. Result and Discussion

Table (2) sums up the main results of the analysis as the following.

Table 2. CS patterns

Participant	Age	Gender	Country	Code-switching
A	A	M	T	-
B	A	M	T	-
C	A	M	S	3
D	A	M	S	-
E	Y	M	T	2
F	Y	M	T	1
G	Y	M	S	2
H	Y	M	S	3
I	A	F	T	-
J	A	F	T	-
K	A	F	S	-
L	A	F	S	-
M	Y	F	T	6
N	Y	F	T	1
O	Y	F	S	1
P	Y	F	S	2

In light of the table above, we observe that in both countries, mostly half of the informants, 7 out of the 16 under study used no code-switching versus 9 participants who did. Only 21 examples of this phenomenon were detected, 10 code-switching examples are observed in Turkey compared to 11 examples in Syria. In terms of gender in these 21 examples, 5 males used it versus 4 females in both countries. In Turkey, 2 males (young) and 2 females (young), while in Syria, the CS patterns detected were by 1 male (adult) VS 2 males (young) and 2 females (young). Concerning the age issue, only the young in Turkey used it with no examples exhibited by adults, while in Syria a male adult practiced

CS in 3 instances and the others occurred in conversations with the young respondents. As for the cross-generation issue, it is seen that 8 young used it versus only one adult. And when it comes to the difference between place groups, Syrians in turkey expressed more tendencies to preserve their language even though they are more exposed to using English and Turkey compared to their peers in Syria who rarely have to. Similar findings were yielded in a recent study by Ereş and Arslan (2017) who reached a conclusion stating that Syrian families who migrated to Turkey are keen to keep their culture there.

4.1. Code-Switching Patterns

The dominant linguistic pair in all examples is Arabic & English/ English& Arabic with only one example of Arabic & Turkish. Examples will be ordered by quantity with some remarks on the background of participants.

a. Participant (M) is a young female in Turkey. During the conversation with this participant, 6 code-switching usages were detected as in table (3). This participant is an English instructor and an M.A student as well as she is fond of English. Depending on the educational background of the informant M, factors that affected the CS recurring while conversing with her are clear. Being an English instructor means she is surrounded by the language all the time; students, colleagues, preparations and many others.

Table 3. Participant M's instances

Transliterated text	Type
Hādā il:: official name taba'y This is the my	Intra-sentential
Il (.) :: strangers *hennin* The are	Single word
Il family *wil* friends *biūwlwly swsw* The and call me	Intra-sentential
I am an English teacher *ūw* (.) MA student And	Extra-sentential
I am a good cook (.) *Ūw*: *bḥib irrasim* And I like drawing	Intra-sentential
Anā bsaddi'a innw fi shi ismw virus Corona I believe that in something its name	Intra-sentential

b. Participant (C) is a male adult in Syria. This person has a many traveling experiences. He is a university graduate who works in an international company located in Syria. Throughout the conversation, 3 examples in English were extracted as in table (4) below.

Table 4. Participant C's instances

Transliterated text	Type
Mitlw: *mitil ayyā* virus *tāny* like it same any other	Single-word
Bibidayit il(2) virus *kanū*: *yṣawrū innas 'am yu'a'ū* At the beginning the they were filming people falling down	Single-word
Kan maṭlwb minna il :: il (2) masker *wil*(.): *kammamih* It was required from us the the and the masker	Single-word

c. Participant (H) is a young male in Syria. Examples in the conversation with this person were 3, see table (5). He is a student at a private university where English is mandatory.

Table 5. Participant H's instances

Transliterated text	Type
Halla'a aky:d Covid19 *assar bishakl ikbyr* Now surely affected in a way large	Intra-sentential
Halla'a aktar shi innwū il mask *lazim da*:yman ykwn *maḥṭwṭ* Now the more thing that the must always is put on	Single word
Halla'a bil wave *ittāny*(.) Now in the the second	Single word

d. Participant (E) is a young male in Turkey. He is a university student and he spent about 7 years in Turkey. This informant uses Turkish every day fluently; however, only two code-switching (single word) constructions were detected and surprisingly, they are in English not in Turkish as exhibited in table (6).

Table 6. Participant E' instances

Transliterated text	Type
Irkwb il bus *bilwara'a* Riding the by papers	Single-word
Niḥna hwūn system *mūa'yyan* We here specific	Single-word

e. Participant (G) is a young male in Syria. He is a university student in a state university where English is not compulsory but he has an interest in it learning languages, especially English. Two instances, in the interview with this participant were inferred and both were a single word, see table (7).

Table 7. Participant G' instances

Transliterated text	Type
Innas hwūn mw ktyr (2) <low> friendly </low> People here not much	Single-word
Awwal ma ballash il virus *innas ma 'aṭū ktyr ahamiyyih* The first when started the people not they gave much attention	Single-word

f. Participant (P) is a young female in Syria. She is a university graduate preparing for her MA and works in a private institution where English is used. During the whole conversation, only 2 examples of code-switching (extra-sentential) were detected as in table (8).

Table 8. Participant P's instances

Transliterated text	Type
Ma ḥada dar balw 'almawdw'a and *intashar* No one cared about the topic spread	Extra-sentential
l'ain ma ḥada dar balw, so *intashar bshakil kty::r ikbyr* Because no one cared spread in a way much large	Extra-sentential

g. Participant (N) is a young female in Turkey; a university graduate who takes Turkish courses in one of the language institutes in Turkey. The only example found in this interview is shown in table (9).

Table 9. Participant N's instances

Transliterated text	Type
Bikhṣwṣ mawdw'a virus Corona (.) Concerning topic	Intra-sentential

h. Participant (O) is a young female in Syria. Although an English literature student with a good command of Turkish, only one code-switching from English is formed and it is also a single word, see table (10).

Table 10. Participant O' instances

Transliterated text	Type
Iltazmt bshakil <slow> *kty::r* </slow> *ya'ny* (3) serious I committed in a way much means	Single-word

i. Participant (F) is a young male in Turkey. This is the only conversation that contains an Arabic & Turkish pair, see table (11). The participant here moved to Turkey when he was six years old and he is a university student now. He masters the Turkish language as a native speaker.

Table 11. Participant F's instances

Transliterated text						Type
Ūw	*kaman*	*mshan*	*il* (3) <u>Sağlık için</u>			Intra-
And	also	for	the	health	issues	sentential

It is inferred from the tables above that the dominant type is the subcategory of intra-clausal (Single word) that appeared in (11) alongside (7) times occurrence of intra-sentential examples as well as (3) instances of extra-sentential type. In light of Mayusken's Three-way Division, we can notice that the division is mostly the insertional one in which no effect at all takes place in the structure of the matrix language (ML), that is Arabic in this study. The ways used in most conversations were only inserting words from the embedded language (EL); either English or Turkish. Therefore, the inserted word or phrase was merged with the original structure of the ML and accustomed to its rules since it didn't derive its structure from the EL. So, the Arabic language as implied to be the matrix/ base language is the one that governs the word order in sentences that compass CS examples. Elements borrowed from English as EL into Arabic as ML were nouns in general and it is noticed from the findings that no verbal insertion was selected by the speakers; a notion that could be attributed to the different word order in both languages that makes it difficult for participants to control the verbal borrowing from English and cope it with the Arabic structure.

4.2. Insertion from English into Arabic

In Poplack's Equivalence Constraint (1980: 581), it is mentioned that for switching between languages elements to occur, there should be a parallel in the word order of the two languages. However, it is clear that some of the instances in this paper contradict this statement when English is inserted into the Arabic text, but the contrary happens when Arabic is inserted into English. Most borrowed terms from English followed the Arabic structural order and most of them are nouns with an exception of an adjective as in the example of the speaker (O). The findings also suggest that there was no verbal insertion in all conversations which could be attributed to the difference in structure between Arabic and English. This case is repeated in many other Arabic-English Code-switching studies (Othman 2006: 46), where verbal insertions were rare.

(1) *Anā bsaddi'a innw fi shi ismw* virus Corona

I believe that in something its name

'I believe that there exists something called Corona Virus'

(2) *Bikhṣwṣ mawdw'a* virus Corona (.)

Concerning topic

'Concerning Corona Virus'

These two examples (1) and (2) are classified as intra-sentential and were used without the speakers' awareness; they just inserted it in the middle and force it to the Arabic word order. When the speakers inserted the word *virus,* as in (1) and (2) they used it in the Arabic structure (ML). The CS instance here used the name of the virus C*orona* after the noun *virus* which is the Arabic order in contrast with the English word order where it should be *Corona* first then *virus.*

(3) *Mitlw*: *mitil ayyā* virus *tāny*

 <nou> <adj>

Like it same any other

'It is like any other virus'

(4) *Halla'a bil* wave *ittāny*(.)

<noun> <adj>

Now in the the second

 'During the second wave'

(5) *Niḥna hwūn* system   *mūa'yyan*

We here specific

'We have here a specific system'

The CS pattern in examples (3, 4 and 5) is single word, where the shift took place by inserting only one word into the ML. Participants in the three above instances (3, 4 and 5) when applying the CS, they used the inserted elements without using their structure in English (EL) where adjectives come first followed by nouns; however, they followed the Arabic word order (ML) where adjectives come after the noun. Adjectives *tāny* 'other', *ittāny* 'the second' and *mūa'yyan* 'specific' come first followed by inserted nouns *virus, wave* and *system.* It is worth mentioning that these expressions are used in the Arabic language in the same English pronunciation. Consequently, Arabic rules the sentence structure and the order of CS.

(6) *Iltazmt bshakil <slow> kty::r </slow> ya'ny* (3) serious

I committed in a way much means

'I seriously followed the instructions'

In instance (6), the CS pattern is single word since only one element *serious* is inserted from the EL into the ML. The speaker used the inserted adjective *serious* from English (EL) in a place of an adverb *bshakil serious* which means 'seriously' to complete the sentence in Arabic (ML) and here the English word order is violated because the adjective is used without a noun after it as well as is used in totally different function. The borrowed English adjective in this example was located at the place of the adverb in the structure of the ML.

(7) *Hādā il::: official name taba'y*

This is the my

'This is my official name'

In example (7) by participant (M), the CS pattern exhibited is intra-sentential. The borrowed expression *official name* from English as the EL keeps its original word order from its origin where adjectives come before nouns. applying this expression to the Arabic structure, taking into account that Arabic here is the matrix language, the way it should have been used, would be 'name official' that corresponds to the Arabic expression 'ismy irrasmy.' By this, it is different from other instances where Arabic governs the structure, especially for adjective and noun relationship. On the other hand, the speaker used the possessive pronoun *taba'y* which means 'my' after the noun based on the Arabic word order. So, the participant did not restrict herself to a certain structure in the conversation, but she kept switching Arabic and English structures spontaneously. It is noticeable that this informant in specific is the one that expressed the largest number of CS instances; this could be linked to her work and educational background that enabled her to talk this way.

4.3. Insertion from Arabic into English

Participant (M) is the only one who used English as a matrix language and Arabic as an embedded language.

(8) I am an English teacher *ūw* (.) MA student

and

'I am an English teacher and an MA student'

(9) I am a good cook (.) *Ūw: bḥib irrasim*

And I like drawing

'I am a good cook and I like painting'

In instance (8), the respondent applied extra-sentential CS pattern, where it occurred as a switching tag. The CS pattern in example (9) is the intra-sentential one since the speaker shifted unconsciously to the other language.The speaker in both examples (8) and (9) used English as the matrix language (ML) and Arabic as the embedded one (EL). The structure in these instances follows the English word order and the Arabic order as well since the conjunction *ūw* that means 'and' is inserted between two independent sentences. In example (9), the participant switched from English

(ML) to Arabic (EL). The first sentence is full English with no insertions and the shift occurs by the use of conjunction *ūw* rather than its English equivalent 'and' and the sentence following in Arabic with no English elements.

As a whole, we can notice that Corona Virus terms were rarely used; terms as sanitizing, social distancing, lockdown and others. The only mentioned ones are masker, virus, covide-19, and wave. It was evident during conversations that when participants were about to utter the English expression, they stopped to think and replace it with the Arabic one as clarified in the examples with the symbols (.) for a pause for a second, (2) for two seconds pauses, and (3) for three seconds pauses:

(10) *Bibidayit il*(2) virus *kanū*: *yṣawrū innas ʻam yuʻaʻū*

At the beginning the they were filming people falling down

   'At the beginning of this virus they were filming people falling down'

(11) *Kan   maṭlwb   minna   il :: il (2)* masker *wil*(.): *kammamih*

   It was required from us the the   and the masker

   'We were required to wear the masker and the masker'

(12) *Innas   hwūn   mw   ktyr* (2) <low> friendly </low>

   People   here   not   much

   'People here are not that friendly'

(6) *Iltazmt   bshakil* <slow> *kty::r* </slow> *yaʻny* (3) serious

  I committed   in a way   much   means

   'I seriously followed the instructions'

In these three examples (10), (11), and (12), alongside the repeated example (6), participants exhibited the same CS pattern which is single-word. They inserted in each wxample only one word *virus* in (10), *kammamih* in (11), *friendly* in (12) and *serious* in (6). Informants in these instances hesitated when they inserted the English (EL) words into the Arabic (ML) text and this is detected from the pauses they had before the English terms are inserted. Each speaker paused for 2 seconds before using the English expressions; before *virus* in example (10), before *masker* in (11) and before *friendly* in (12). However, in the instance (6) the speaker paused for 3 seconds before inserting the English word and even whispered it with a low sound. In the instance (11) here from the conversation with speaker (C), the respondent hesitated before inserting the word *masker* and he even used the Arabic equivalent *kammamih* right after the English element in a reference to what is called doubling (Eid 1992).

4.4. The use of Definite Article

It is noticeable in the whole sentences including CS patterns that whenever there was a need to use a definite article, informants refrain from inserting the English article 'The' where the inserted element is in English. They rather used the Arabic article *il* and after it inserted the element from English as in examples (4), (10) and (11) repeated below.

(4) *Hallaʻa   bil*   wave   *ittāny*(.)

  Now   in the   the second

  'During the second wave'

(10) *Bibidayit   il*(2) virus *kanū*:   *yṣawrū innas ʻam yuʻaʻū*

   At the beginning the   they were filming people falling down

   'At the beginning of this virus they were filming people falling down'

(11) *Kan   maṭlwb   minna   il :: il (2)* masker *wil*(.): *kammamih*

   It was required from us   the the   and the   masker

'We were required to wear the masker and the masker'

In instance (4), the CS occurred when the respondent inserted the word *wave* from English as EL into the sentence in Arabic as the MA; however he did not use the definite article 'the' from English, he rather precedes it using the Arabic one *il.* In sentence (10), before the insertion of the word *virus*, the participant resorted to the same technique where he used the Arabic article *il* from the ML before applying the CS then he used the word *virus* from English as the EL. In the last example here (11) the same practice is exhibited when the speaker (C) double used the article *il* from the ML (Arabic) before he inserted the word *masker* from the EL (English). However, although the participant used *kammamih* as a translation to the word *masker*, still he used the Arabic *il* from the ML and did not replace it with 'the.'

In the only instance where the CS is in Turkish, the respondent did the same when the insertion is derived from English. The Turkish language has no equivalent to the article 'the'. Speaker (F), before the switch, used the article *il* from the ML (Arabic) and then inserted the Turkish expression *Sağlık için* as the EL.

(13) *Ūw   kaman mshan il* (3) <u>Sağlık için</u>

　And   also   for   the health issues

'This is also for health issues'

In example (13), speaker made shift from Arabic as ML into Turkish *Sağlık için* as EL in an intra-sentential pattern, where he inserted the Turkish expression spontaneously without being aware of that.

5. Conclusion

This paper examined code-switching (CS) patterns in the Syrian community cross generations based on data taken from recorded conversations. Throughout the participants' interactions, the dominant division according to Muysken's three-way division (2000) is the insertion. In almost all instances, Arabic is the matrix language (ML) while English and Turkish are the embedded ones (EL) with an exception in one conversation where English is implied as to the base language. It is also observed that the participants' usage of CS, when Arabic is the (ML), was not spontaneous as it should be; an observation that reveals being uncomfortable when inserting foreign elements into their mother language.

In general, all participants showed fewer tendencies to apply CS, especially adults with only one exception from the 8 adult informants. It is also noted that the migration experience is not largely affecting the language usage amongst Syrians there, especially the adults. This can't but be connected to their desire and eagerness to maintain their and their children's national identity in a safe place. Adults in Turkey showed a highly positive attitude towards their language even though in their everyday life and all interaction forms they use Turkish in an attempt to cope with the atmosphere they live in. For them, using Turkish is out of necessity and to adapt to the situation they are in, but using Arabic is more preferable since they fear the attrition of Arabic that their children are suffering from.

Although participants in Syria exhibited a bit more comfort in using a foreign language, it was clear that Arabic is preferable for them also. On the other side, the cultural exposure that Syrians in Turkey experienced did not have the expected effect on their language. This is not only exhibited in adults' interactions, but also in those of teenagers who, at times, face kind of discrimination when they do not use Turkish due to their situations as refugees. Therefore, this preservation of the mother tongue was reflected in hesitation before borrowing and trying to think about the Arabic expression instead of the common foreign one.

Contrary to the study of Mozaic, Z (2009), where the mobility factor and the cultural exposure played a prominent role in expressing more CS instances compared to their peers who do not have this experience, informants in our study did not. However, findings in this paper are similar to those in the research by Karanfil, F & Demir, S (2021), in which it was observed that children are more flexible to adjust their language use to the situation they are in and more importantly, as the study at hand, they only use it when necessary. As for the results of the research by Ben Nafa. H (2013), many similarities are inferred; Arabic structure is dominant, age has its influence on the application of CS, the insertional has prevailed and the author suggested that CS examples are governed by sociolinguistic variables.

This study is limited because the sample size is a small one that could not be generalized and that is potential to have gaps that could be filled when the amount of participants is increased. Besides, conversations held with informants need to be a bit longer to investigate the possibility of expressing more instances of CS and to make them feel more

comfortable. Since such studies are not plenty in the Syrian community, it would be interesting to add more to this field other research about CS of Syrians all over the world since they are now all over the world speaking multiple languages.

References

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

Christodoulou-Pipis, I. (1991). *Language use by Greek-Cypriots in Britain*. Nicosia: Diaspora Books.

Chun, E. (2001). The Construction of white, black and Korean. A merican Identities through African American Vernercular English. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 11(1) 127-128. doi: https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2001.11.1.52

Clyne, Michael G. (1987). Constraints on code-switching: How universal are they? *Linguistics* 25, 739-764. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1987.25.4.739

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage

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.

Edwards, J.V. (2004). Foundations of bilingualism. In T.K. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (7-31). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

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

Eres, F., & Aslan, F. (2017). Analysis of Leisure Time Activities of Syrian Children in Turkey as an Adaptation Process. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(15), 76-84.

Fishman, J. A. (1997). *Reversing Language Shift*. (1st Ed). Clevedon, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

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

Hoffman, C. (1991). *An introduction into bilingualism*. London: Longman.

Jones, M., & Jones, K. E. (Eds.). (2001). *Multilingual literacies: Reading and writing different worlds* (Vol. 10). John Benjamins Publishing.

Karanfil, F., & Demir, S. (2021). Multilingual identity development in a trilingual setting: A case study of refugee identity and language use. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies,* 17(3), 866–883. doi: https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.904078

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mesthrie, R. (ED.). (2011). *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Mugo, K. C. (2017). Forms of Matrix Language + Embedded Language Formula in Code Switching instances. *nternational Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,* 7(1), 61–71. doi: https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i1/2572

Muysken, P. (2000). Code-mixing, bilingual speech and language change. *Bilingual Speech_ A Typology of Code-Mixing,* 1995, 250–262. doi: https://10.1017/S0022226703272297

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. and Jake, J.L. (1995). Matching lemmas in a bilingual language competence and production model:evidence from Intrasentential Codeswitching. *Linguistics,* 33 :981-1024.

doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1995.33.5.981

Myers-Scotton C. (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounter and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Nafa, H. Ben. (2013). *Code-Switching Among Arabic-English Adult Bilinguals in the UK : Syntactic Structures , and Pragmatic Functions.* (Master's thesis). The University of Manchester, England.

Nilep, C. (2006). "Code Switching" in Sociocultural Linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics, 19*(6), 1–22.doi: https://doi.org/10.25810/hnq4-jv62

Othman, A. (2006). Language choice among Arabic-English bilinguals in Manchester. (Unpublished MA dissertation). University of Manchester, England.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spansih y termino en español: Towards a Typology of Code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618. doi: https://10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Pfaff, C. (1979). Constraints on language mixing: intrasentential code switching and borrowing in Spanish/ English. *Language* 55, 2, 291 – 318. doi: https://10.2307/412586

Silva, C. (1994). *Language contact and change*. New York: Clarendon press.

Wei, L. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational codeswitching. In P.Auer (Eds), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 156-176. London: Routledge.

Wei, L. (2000). *The Bilingualism Reader*. London: Routledge.

Wei, L. (2013). Conceptual and methodological issues in bilingualism and multilingualism research. *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 2, 26-53. doi: https://10.1002/9781118332382.ch2