



Inter and intrasentential code switching among late bilinguals

ID No.55

(PP 237 - 246)

<https://doi.org/10.21271/zjhs.25.6.13>

Barzan Jaafar Ali

College of languages-Department of English / Salahaddin University-Erbil

barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd

Received: 28/07/2021

Accepted: 29/08/2021

Published: 25/12/2021

Abstract

This study investigates intersentential and intrasentential code switching among late bilinguals among the Kurdish bilinguals. enormous studies have been conducted on the impact of age of language acquisition on learning second language, however a little research have been conducted concerning to the influence of age of acquisition on how bilingual speakers code switch and the influence of language proficiency on intersentential and intrasentential code switching.

The result found out that that age of acquisition plays a crucial role in bilingual code switch. Early bilinguals code switch more frequently than the late bilinguals, intersentential code switching is more common among late bilinguals, whilst intrasentential code switching is more trend among the early bilinguals.

Keywords: code switching, intrasentential, intersentential, dominant language, second language (L2)

1. Introduction

Significant studies have been conducted in crucial role of age of acquisition on second language learning (L2). Accordingly, some studies assert that bilinguals who learn their second language in early age, speak more fluently than those bilinguals who acquire their L2 later in life (Ali 2019, Hartshorne, et al 2018). Furthermore, Hartshorne et al (2018) state that the L2 learners who acquire the language in childhood are hard to differ from native speakers, whilst those who learn the L2 in adulthood are usually burdened with conspicuous accent as well as grammatical error. Lenneberg (1969) believes that the bilinguals who have not learned their L2 before puberty, it is unlikely to have native-like proficiency. Moreover, Lipski (1985) believes that early bilinguals more code switch in the level of intrasentential than the late bilinguals, while late bilinguals engage more in intersentential code switching. In addition, Clark (2004) posits that early bilinguals attain native-like fluency in their second language whilst the possibility of achieving native-like fluency for those who learn the second language in post-puberty age is very low. MacSwan (1999) asserts that there is a method of determining bilingual proficiency in which include factors such; language dominance and lose, age of onset of exposure to first language and second language, continued sustained exposure to both languages, functional specificity for each language, general verbal fluency. Despite this, Flege (1999) asserts that there is not a certain age to prevent learners from achieving native-like proficiency when they learn L2.

The term 'code switching' has been largely in use from early 50s by Hans Vogt's (1954) review of Weinreich's languages in contact (1953). Weinreich had used the phrase "switching codes", emerged from observations about language use in multilingual societies. In these societies, speakers in their interpersonal communication use mixing terms from multiple languages into sentences or even into a single sentence (Sankoff 2001:1). Cheng and Butler (1989) posit that code switching happens in bilingual speech depending on the speaker's linguistic background, role in conversation, age and their race. Moreover, Adamou and Shen



(2019) believe that the age which bilinguals acquired their L2 plays a crucial role of the type and frequency of code switching.

Prior to the 1970's and 80's, code switching was apperceived as accidental, likely due to "imperfect language acquisition, interference, or poor sociolinguistic behaviours" (Toribio 2001 203-231). Since the introduction of the concept into linguistics, researchers have been investigating the situations in which code switching happens, as well as the factors restricting code switching in bilingual conversation.

Poplack (1980) is one of the early researchers who has worked on how language acquisition effect bilinguals code switching and what rule govern code switching. She found out that late bilinguals have less tendency towards code switching than early bilinguals. In addition, she figured out that those bilinguals who are highly proficient in L2 tended to code switch intrasententially whilst, the less fluent bilinguals tended to code switch intersententially. As a consequence, Poplack (1980) proposed three types of code switching which are; intersentential code switching, intrasentential code switching and tag. Intersentential code switching is switching from one language to another or/and from one language variety to another outside the sentence or clause level; whilst intrasentential code switching is characterised by switching at the word, sentence and clause level between two languages or between two different varieties of a language. Tag switching is inserting tag elements from L2 into monolingual speech. To describe intrasentential code switching, some researchers preferably use the term 'code-mixing' (DiSciullo, Muysken, and Singh 1986) For example, Muysken (2000:4) uses the term 'code-mixing' to refer to cases where the structural features from two different languages or two different variety of a language appear in a single sentence, while other researchers prefer to use code mixing and code switching interchangeably (Muysken 1995, 2000).

Among the aforementioned types of code switching, intrasentential code switching is considered to be the most challenging types linguistically (Ali 2019). Earlier in (1970: 457) Labov, explained intrasentential code switching as 'irregular mixture of two dissimilar systems' argued that no one had postulated any systematic constraint on code switching. Systematic constraints being assumed by end of (1970s) as Pfaff (1979:314) postulated the first study in this regard in which she posited that 'it is not necessary to create third grammar for the utterances in which the languages are mixed rather the grammar of both languages involved in code switching are according to a number of constraints'. Then, Poplack (1980) and Poplack and Sankoff (1981) proposed two structural constraints governing code switching to examine intrasentential code switching, which are; Equivalence Constraints and free morpheme constraint.

The Equivalence Constraint illustrate that code switching takes place when the word orders between the two languages involve in code switching are equivalent and code switching thus does not violate any grammatical rules in either language. Poplack postulated that bilingual code switching produces a 'third grammar' that incorporates the structure of both involved languages in code switching. Under this constraints model, code switching should not occur if the two language have different structure, whilst many counterexamples have been provided to illustrate that code switching occur in bilingual conversation where the two languages had essential structural differences (Nishimura 1986, Stenson 1993, Myers-Scotton 1993, Eppler 2010, Chan 2015, Ali 2019)

According to Poplack's second constraint, the Free Morpheme Constraint, 'code switching may not take place between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the latter has been phonologically integrated into the language of the bound morpheme' (Poplack 1980: 585). For example, code switching may occur between a bound morpheme and a loanword, if the loanword has been phonologically integrated into the host language. For example, in some Kurdish varieties, Pashtu, Farsi ('glass' glass-akan 'glasses', glass-ha 'glasses') but this type of code switching is predicted not to take place (Ali 2019).



Moreover, Gumperz (1982) defines code switching as juxtaposition within the same conversation exchange of two different structural system of two dissimilar languages or varieties (Gumperz 1982:59). Thus, code switching happen between sentences or clauses if the switching between the constituents does not violate grammatical rule of either language. Furthermore, Gumperz states that when the two languages involved in code switching are structurally dissimilar, switching occur between major elements however if the two languages share similar structural system, switches take place almost anywhere. Moreover, Muysken (2000) states that when bilingual speakers code switch from one language to another, they code switch with fluidity, following the syntactic and semantic rules of both involved languages in code switching.

The relationship between the types of code switching and language competency have also been in the favour of the studies on code switching. Poplack (1980) studied code switching among the Puerto Rican speakers in New York, she found out that most balanced bilingual speakers, favour intrasentential code switching whilst those bilinguals who are less competence bilinguals use intersentential code switching. Thus, Poplack (1980) asserts that intrasentential code switching is the most complex type of code switching, this comes from the fact that, in intrasentential code switching bilinguals are required to have a sufficient knowledge of syntactic rule of either language involved in code switching. Accordingly, the more sufficient the bilingual speakers are in both languages, the more they are able to switch from one language into another in the level of intrasentential level.

Over the past few decades, there has been an enormous body of study to code switching but has been less focused to intrasentential and intersentential code switching among late bilinguals. Thus, this study explores to determine whether age of acquisition (early, late) influences code switching particularly in the level of intrasentential and intersentential. Moreover, what type of code switching is more popular among the bilinguals.

2. METHODOLOGY

To investigate the present study, 30 Kurdish-English bilinguals have been chosen. 15 late bilinguals and 15 early bilinguals, ranging age between 18-40 years. Having this balance of participants is to answer the research questions accurately. Recall that according to researchers in bilingualism, there are several types of bilinguals. Due to the nature of the current study, it is to be focused on participants who are classified as balanced and unbalanced bilinguals. This classification has been decided via the participant's questionnaire response to know whether the participants learnt Kurdish via instruction at school or Kurdish was acquired from childhood in the home environment and if so, Kurdish is likely to be the dominant language. Moreover, the early bilingual participants, learnt English from childhood or early age in the community and school environment, thus, English possibly to be their dominant language.

There are two types of data collection selected to attain the target objectives of this study. The first is a questionnaire, the participants were asked questions about their linguistic and relevant non-linguistic backgrounds. The second type of data collection was selectively transcribed recordings of spontaneous speech from the participants who were recorded when having conversation in pairs. Therefore, the present study is to answer the following two research question.

1-Does the age of acquisition influences code switching at the level of intrasentential and intersentential?

2-What type of code switching is more popular among the bilinguals.



3. RESULT

In this section, the findings will be analysed in relation to answer the research questions.

Table 1: Intersentential and intrasentential code switching

insertion	Early bilinguals	Late bilinguals	Total
Intersentential	35	67	102
intrasentential			
Single word	378	218	596
Multi word	167	89	256
Total	580	374	954

The above table illustrates that the number of intersentential code switching among the late bilinguals is more favourable than early bilinguals, whilst intrasentential code switching is much higher among early bilinguals in which for single word insertion (378) times took place in their speech. However, this number declines to (218) single word insertion among late bilinguals. Moreover, occurring multi words in a single speech for early bilinguals is (167) but among late bilinguals is (89). The great majority of those English open class single word insertions into Kurdish are nouns the next most frequent category is adjectives, followed by non-finite verbs and adverbs.

Table 2: Single and multiword insertions

Single words	Early bilinguals	Late bilinguals	Total 852
nouns	203	182	385
adjectives	135	80	215
Verbs	93	54	147
Adverbs	70	35	105
Total	501	351	852

As Table 2 demonstrates that a great majority of English open class single word insertions into Kurdish are nouns (385) in which early bilinguals switching is (203) and late bilingual switching is (185). The next most frequent category is adjectives (215), early bilinguals switching is (130) whilst this number decreases in late bilingual speech to (85) code switching occurrence. Then followed non-finite verbs (147), for early bilinguals the result is (93) and (54) switching in late bilingual speeches. Finally, adverbial insertions are the least favourite type of switching which occurred (105) as (70) code switching occurrence for early bilinguals and (35) switching for late bilinguals.

The following examples are illustrating the switching in the level of intrasentential switching. Example (1) shows English nouns with possessive pronominal clitics inserted into Kurdish matrix language.

1. Duene **exam-m** habw
Yesterday exam-POSS.1SG have.PST.1SG
'Yesterday I had exam'

In example (2) English noun insertion appearing without Kurdish or English bound morphemes.

2. Bayani da-roy-t bo **university?**
Tomorrow IMPF-go-2SG to university?
'Are you going to university tomorrow?'



Example (3) illustrates that English verb is inserted into Kurdish matrix language in the form of bilingual complex verb.

3. La-w bābet-a lalal to **disagree-m**
 in-PRO topic-DET with 2SG. PRO disagree-be. 1SG
 ‘I disagree with you in that topic.’

In example (4) English adjective occurs in Kurdish structure.

4. zor **funny-e**
 very funny-COP.3SG
 ‘She is very funny.’

The following examples show the insertion of multiwords from English into Kurdish structure.

1. **Environment-i** landan zor **multicultural-a**
 Environment-AP London very multicultural-COP.3SG
 ‘London’s environment is very multicultural.’
2. **Apply-m** krdwa bo **job-ek**
 Apply-1SG do.PST.1SG to job-DET
 ‘I have applied for a job’
3. am **weekend-a** b-ro-in bo Brighton **beach-aka-i**
 this weekend-DET SUBJ-go-1PL to Brighton beach-DET- POSS.3SG
 zoor **nice-a**
 very nice-COP.3SG
 ‘let’s go to Brighton his weekend it’s beach is very nice.’ (it has a nice beach)
4. bo **holiday** espania **perfect-a** ham **hot-a**
 for holiday spain perfect- COP.3SG also hot- COP.3SG
 ham **beach-i** xosh-tr-a
 also beach-DET nice-COMP-COP.3SG
 ‘For holiday Spain is perfect as its weather is hot and the beaches are nicer.’

As for intersentential code switching, the corpus contains 954 utterances containing code switching, among those insertions there were 112 instances of intersentential insertions. As the table (3) shows, the more frequent type of intersentential insertion is the subordinate clause. In addition, the most frequent function of subordinate clause insertions is the adverbial function. Complement clause insertions and relative clause insertions take place in very small numbers, and subject clause insertions did not occur.

Table 3: Clausal insertions: coordinate and subordinate

Clausal insertion	Early bilinguals	Late bilinguals	Total
Subordinate clause	32	38	70
Coordinate clause	13	19	32
Total	45	57	102



The above table illustrate the distribution of clausal insertions from English into Kurdish matrix language. The table explains that, despite a slight difference in clausal insertions in favour of late bilinguals, both early and late bilinguals almost similarly prefer intersentential switching. As for subordinate clause insertions, the early bilingual switching is (32) for subordinate insertions while (38) switching among the late bilinguals. Moreover, in coordinate insertions, the differences among both ages remain with the insignificance difference, in which late bilinguals code switch was (38) insertions for coordinate clausal while this number slightly dropped down to (32) insertions.

The following examples illustrate subordinate insertions.

- University library bash-tr-a chwnka la daxly
University library good-COMP-COP.3SG because at accommodation
I just want to eat and sleep.
'library is better because at accommodation I just want to eat and sleep.'

In the following example, English subordinate clause is introduced by the English subordinating conjunction 'because'

- mn chawry na-kho-m because I am on diet
1SG.PRO fatty NEG-eat-1SG because I am on diet
'I don't eat fatty food because I am on diet.'

The second frequent type of intersentential insertion is the coordination clause, they are joined by either Kurdish conjunctions or English conjunctions. However, the English conjunctions appeared rarely and the few cases where this occurred were limited to the English conjunctions *and* and *but*. The more frequent conjunction is the Kurdish expression *balam*, 'but', which joins a clause in Kurdish to the adjacent English clause.

In the following example, the English conjunctive expression 'and' introduces the English coordinate clause.

- Ewa b-ro-n bo bazar but I have to study for tomorrow
2PL.PRO SUBJ-go-1PL to city centre but I have to study for tomorrow
'You go to the city centre, but I have to study for tomorrow.'

In the following example the English co-ordinated clause is linked to the Kurdish clause by Kurdish conjunction *balam* 'but'.

- Espanya xosh-a balam **I don't have visa**
Spain nice- COP.3SG but I don't have visa
'Spain is nice, but I don't have visa.'

The following examples are illustrating the switching in the level of English phrases of intersentential switching.

Example (1) shows that English noun phrase (flight ticket) inserted into Kurdish matrix language.

- Flight ticket** bo espania harzan-a
Flight ticket to spain cheap- COP.3SG
'Flight ticket is cheap to Spain'

In the next example, English verb phrase insertion is inserted in Kurdish structure.

- da-twan-m yarmaty-t b-da-m **to buy ticket**
SUBJ-can-1SG help-2SG SUBJ-go-1SG to buy ticket
'I can help you to buy the ticket.'



In the following example, the English insertion is adjective noun phrase.

3. Exam-i bayani **very hard-a**
Exam-AP tomorrow very hard-COP.3SG
'tomorrow's exam is very hard.'

In following example, the English preposition phrase (for me) is occurred in the topic position.

4. For me, Brighton xosh-tr o cheapt-tr-a
For me, Brighton nice-COMP and cheap-COMP-COP.3SG
'For me Brighton is nicer and cheaper.'

4. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT AND CONCLUSION

The target of the present study was to examine to what extend age of acquisition influences code switching particularly in the level of intrasentential and intersentential. Moreover, what type of code switching is more popular among the bilinguals. Thus, the current study tries to answer the following questions.

- 1- Does the age of acquisition influences code switching at the level of intrasentential and intersentential?
- 2- What type of code switching is more popular among the bilinguals?

To examine the first research question, Ali 2019, Hartshorne, et al 2018, state that early bilinguals are more likely to code switch than the late bilinguals particularly at the level of intrasentential code switching. As the result of this study illustrated in the previous section (§.3) early bilinguals code switch frequently than the late bilinguals, whilst intersentential code switching are more common among late bilinguals. The data has shown that (table 1), there is a significant differences between late and early bilinguals in code switching at the level of single word insertion, as the early bilinguals have switched (501) out of (852) code switches, whereas this numbers declines dramatically to (351) among late bilinguals.

In single word insertions, the difference is less, to compare to multiword insertions. For single (one) word insertions, the code switches appeared among early bilinguals were (378) switching while switches occurred among late bilinguals were (218). However, this difference is rapidly increase for multiword insertions in favour of early bilinguals. There are (167) switching among early bilinguals whilst, only (89) multi word insertions appeared among late bilinguals. This approve that, late bilinguals are less capable in multiword switching than early bilinguals. In another word, early bilinguals who learn the second language in an early age are more capable in switching more than one word in their bilingual conversation. Whilst, this difference is less in the level of one-word insertions, this shows that, late bilinguals are capable in one-word insertion level.

At the level of intersentential switching, the late bilinguals have overtaken the early bilinguals slightly in which out of (102) switching, those bilinguals who learnt the second language late, switched (57) times whilst switching occurred among the early bilinguals' speech were (45). This result indicate that age of acquisition was not a momentous factor in determining intersentential switch.

Despite this, the overall result of the data shows that there is a clear evidence that the early bilinguals have supremacy over late bilinguals in code switching in the level of intrasentential switching. Moreover, the responses of the early and late bilinguals to code switches were examined by using more intrasentential or intersentential switching in their spontaneous conversation. As the table (1) illustrated that the number of intrasentential code switching among the early bilinguals is more favourable than late bilinguals, as the table shows that as out of (954) switching, (580) switching occurred in the early bilingual switching whereas this number drops down to (374) switching in late bilingual switching. Moreover, as for the



intersentential code switching, out of (102) insertions, switching at the level of clausal insertions, (67) code switching occurred among late bilinguals, whereas this number decreased to (35) switching among early bilinguals. Accordingly, the result shows that age of acquisition plays an important role in bilingual's code switching as the bilinguals who are highly proficient in L2 tended to code switch intrasententially whilst, the less fluent bilinguals tended to code switch intersententially. Thus, this result adequate with Poplack (1980) studied code switching among the Puerto Rican speakers in New York, she found out that most balanced bilingual speakers, favour intrasentential code switching whilst those bilinguals who are less competence bilinguals use intersentential code switching. Thus, Poplack's study as in intrasentential code switching bilinguals are required to have a sufficient knowledge of syntactic rule of either language involved in code switching. Accordingly, the more sufficient the bilingual speakers are in both languages, the more they are able to switch from one language into another in the level of intrasentential level.

2. What type of code switching is more popular among the bilinguals.

To answer the second research question, the data has shown that (table 2), the great majority intrasentential insertions in the bilingual speech, are nouns, the next most frequent category is adjectives, followed by non-finite verbs and adverbs, in that order.

This analysis explains that there is no significant difference between the early and late bilinguals for the noun insertions, as the early bilinguals have inserted English nouns into Kurdish structure (203) times while late bilinguals have inserted (182) English nouns. This is because nouns are easier for both ages to code switch. But these differences raise in inserting English adjectives to (135) for early bilinguals and (80) insertions for late bilinguals. This difference comes from the fact that, structurally, both Kurdish and English have different structure as Kurdish is noun adjective structure while English is adjective noun structure. Thus, switching can be more problematic from the late bilinguals. For English verb insertions, again, early bilinguals are more capable in inserting English verb in Kurdish matrix language than the late bilinguals. The same differences appear for adverb insertions from English into Kurdish as the early bilinguals switched (70) English adverbs to Kurdish structure, whereas this number decline to (35) insertions. Based on the result, despite that fact that for both ages there is a slight similarity in inserting English nouns into Kurdish matrix language, it was found that late bilinguals to compare to early bilinguals are less likely to engage in intrasentential switching.

As for intersentential code switching, the more frequent type of intersentential insertion is the subordinate clause. Moreover, the most frequent function of subordinate clause insertions is the adverbial function. Complement clause insertions and relative clause insertions occur in very small numbers, and subject clause insertions did not happen. The second frequent type of intersentential insertion is the coordination clause. the most frequent function of subordinate clause insertions is the adverbial function. Complement clause insertions and relative clause insertions occur in very small numbers, and there are no subject clause insertions.

In conclusion, it was figured out that age of acquisition plays an essential factor in bilingual code switch. The findings are adequate with Muysken (2000) study in which asserts that the more balanced the proficiency, the greater the occurrence of intrasentential code switching. Moreover, both ages are capable in noun insertion switching from English into Kurdish, however, this difference increases for verb, adjective and adverb insertions in the favour of early bilinguals. In addition, early bilinguals have a great capability in inserting more than one single word in their bilingual speech to compare to late bilinguals.

Despite this, as it was expected, late bilinguals are more capable in clausal insertions than early bilinguals.

Accordingly, the result showed that that age of acquisition plays a crucial role in bilingual code switch. Early bilinguals code switch more frequently than the late bilinguals, intersentential code switching is more common among late bilinguals, whilst intersentential



code switching is more trend among the early bilinguals. this means that, the more the bilinguals are fluent in the second language the more the more intrasentential code switching they use in their bilingual speech, and the less they are influence in second language is the more intersentential code switching they use in their bilingual speech communication. this result is in agreement with Poplack's study (1980) that intrasentential code switching requires balanced bilinguals unlike intersentential switching are more in favour for unbalanced bilinguals.

To have better understand of the concept of the intersentential code switching and intrasentential code switching among bilinguals especially the impact of their social variables like, topic of conversation, social relationship, the settings and the role of home environment; further research investigation is needed.

REFERENCES

- Ali, Barzan Jaafar (2019) Grammatical aspect of code switching in Farsi-English bilingual speech. University of Sussex, UK. PhD thesis
- Chan, B. and Hock-Shing. (2015) A diachronic-function approach to explaining grammatical patterns in code-switching: Postmodification in Cantonese English noun phrase. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. Sage publication.
- Cheng, L. and Butler, K. (1989) Code-switching: A natural phenomenon vs. language 'deficiency.' *World English*.
- Di Sciullo, A., Muysken, P., & Singh, R. (1986) Code-mixing and government, *Journal of Linguistics*.
- Eppler, Eva. (2010) *The Syntax of German-English Code-Switching*. Braumüller.
- Evangelia Adamou and Rachel Shen (2019) There are no language switching costs when code switching is frequent. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, SAGE Publications.
- Flege, J. E. (1999) *Age of learning and second language speech*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hans Voggt. 1954. *Language Contacts*. Word
- Hartshorne, J.K, Tenenbaum, J. B, Pinker. S (2018) A critical period for second language acquisition: Evidence from 2/3 million English speakers." *Cognition* vol. 177: 263-277.
- Labov, W (1977) *Language in the inner city: studies in the black-English vernacular*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lipski, J. M. (1985) *Linguistic Aspects of Spanish-English Language Switching*. Arizona State University Center for Latin American Studies.
- MacSwan, J (1999) *minimalist approach to intrasentential codeswitching*. New York, Garland Publishing
- Muysken, P (1995) *Grammatical concepts in code-switching. One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspective on code-switching*.
- Muysken, P (2000) *Bilingual speech: A typology of code mixing*. Cambridge university press.
- Myers-Scotton, C.1993. *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in code switching*. Oxford: clarendon press.
- Nishimira, M (1986) *Intra-sentential code-switching: The case of language assignment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Pfaff (1979) *Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English*.
- Poplack, S (1980) Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching1'. *Linguistics*, vol.18.
- Sankoff, D, and Poplack, S (1981) *A Formal Grammar for Code-switching* 1. *Linguistics*, vol. 14.
- Sankoff, G (2001) *Linguistic outcomes of language contact*. *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Stenson, N (1990) *Phrase structure congruence, government and Irish- English code switching*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Toribio, A.J (2001) *On the Emergence of Bilingual Code-Switching Competence*. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, vol. 4.
- Weinreich, U (1953) *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton

گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي له ناو رسته و له سه ر ئاستي رسته له تيوان درهنگ فيربواني زماڻي دووهم**بارزان جعفر علي**

کۆلتي زماڻي به شي زماڻي ئينگليزي / زانکۆي سه لاهه دين هه ولير

Email: barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd

پوخته

ئهم ليكۆلپنه وهيه له گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي (Code Switching) له ناو رسته و له سه ر ئاستي رسته له تيو ئه و دوو زمانه كوردانهي كه درهنگ فيري زماڻي بوويه، دهكۆلپنه وه. چه ندين ليكۆلپنه وه له باره ي كاريگه ري ته من له سه ر فيربووني زماڻي دووه م ئه نجامدراوه، به لام به ده گمه ن ليكۆلپنه وه له باره ي ئه وه ئه نجامدراوه كه چۆن ته من كاريگه ري ده خاته سه ر كه سي دوو زمانه ن له كاتي گۆرپني زماڻي، و كاريگه ري توانستي زماڻي چيه له سه ر گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي له ناو رسته و له سه ر ئاستي رسته.

ئه نجامي ئه م ليكۆلپنه وه يه ئه وه دره خات كه ته من پۆليكي گرنگ ده گيرپت له گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي. ئه و دوو زمانه نانه ي كه زوو فيري زماڻي بوونه زياتر له كاتي قسه كردندا زمانه كان ده گۆرن وه ك له و دوو زمانه نانه ي كه درهنگ فيري زماڻي بوونه. گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي له سه ر ئاستي رسته زياتر باوه له تيو ئه وانه ي كه درهنگ فيري زماڻي دووه م بوويه. به ينجه وانه وه، گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي له ناو رسته زياتر له تيوه ئه و كه سانه ي كه زوو فيري زماڻي دووه م بوونه، باوه.

وشه سه ره كيبه كان: گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي، گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي له تيو رسته، گۆرپني جيگرهوهي زماڻي له سه ر ئاستي رسته، زماڻي سه ره كي/زال، زماڻي دووه م

ظاهرة التناوب اللغوي داخل الجمل وضمنها بين متحدتي اللغتين في عمر متأخر**برزان جعفر علي**

كلية لغات-قسم اللغة الانكليزية / جامعة صلاحدين-أربيل

Email: barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd

ملخص

تبحت هذه الدراسة التناوب اللغوي بين الجمل وداخل الجمل بين الذين تعلموا لغتين في عمر متأخر وخصوصاً بين الكورد المتحدثين لغتين أو ثنائيي اللغة الكورد. (على الرغم من أن هناك دراسات مستفيضة تم إجراءها حول تأثير العمر على اكتساب اللغة في حقل اكتساب اللغة الثانية، إلا أنه تمّ البحث بشكل يسير عن تأثير العمر في الأكتساب و كيفية إجراء تناوب اللغة من قبل ثنائيي اللغة للمتحدثين بالكوردية إضافة الى تأثير الكفاءة اللغوية على التناوب اللغوي بين الجمل وضمنها.

وتوصّل البحث الى أن عمر أو فترة الأكتساب يلعب دوراً أساسياً في التناوب اللغوي عند ثنائيي اللغة حيث يتناوب في اللغة ممّن تعلموا لغتين بصورة مبكرة بصورة أكثر تكراراً من مجيدي اللغتين والذين تعلموها بصورة متأخرة. كذلك فإنّ التناوب اللغوي بين الجمل هو الأكثر شيوعاً بين متعلمي اللغتين بعمر متأخر، بينما التناوب اللغوي داخل الجمل هو الأكثر رواجاً بين متعلمي اللغتين في عمر مبكر.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التناوب اللغوي، داخل الجملة، بين الجمل، اللغة السائدة، اللغة الثانية.