

## **STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF CODE-MIXING AMONG JORDANIANS ON FACEBOOK**

Eman Alamaren & Dr. Shaidatul Akma Kasuma

### **ABSTRACT**

The main issue of the present aims at investigating the most frequent English categories that Jordanian students tend to use within Arabic discourse on Facebook. Furthermore, the study tries to examine the validity of Polack's universal constraint 'size of constituent' and whether Jordanian students tend to mix small constituents like nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, or they tend to mix large English constituents like clauses and phrases. To this end, a research design involves both quantitative and qualitative approaches was used. The quantitative analysis collected numeric information and used frequency distribution technique. On the other hand, the qualitative analysis collected qualitative data and used thematic analysis technique. The quantitative analysis revealed that Jordanian speakers generally insert both small and large English constituents in their speech; 70% of the inserted English constituents were small while large constituents constituted 29% of the constituents. That means, Jordanians tend to use small English constituents more than large ones. Particularly, nouns are the most frequently used mixed English constituents with (30 %), followed by adjectives which constituted 13% of the mixed English constituents. Accordingly, Poplack's universal constraint of size of constituent is violated. On the other side, the qualitative analysis of the data obtained showed that the size of the inserted English constituents has no effect on Arabic sentence structure and word order, that is, speakers form the sentence according to Arabic language and use constituents that have very limited grammatical restrictions. As a conclusion, Jordanian students use English nouns as the most frequently used English categories. Furthermore, the study provides a theoretical implication that is directed to the Arabic Language Academies in the Arab World. In fact, Arabic Academic are responsible to coin appropriate Arabic categories that meet the need of using English categories. That is, coining new Arabic categories will limit using English categories within Arabic discourse, save Arabic purity, and enrich Arabic language with new terms. Thus, Arabic language have to have new lexicon to develop and stay alive.

**Keywords:** Language contact; Code-mixing; Code switching; Size of constituents constraint; Structural analysis

### **INTRODUCTION**

No Language is completely sufficient by itself. The necessity of communication leads to some kind of language contact. This contact comes out with some changes in languages. Long-term of social and linguistic contact between languages results in a number of linguistic processes, such

as borrowing, code-switching, and interference (Sebba, 1997). In her book, Rouchdy (2002) collected a number of studies which tackled the theme of language contact in one language—Arabic. Rouchdy concluded that three linguistic phenomena occur whenever languages are in contact with one another: codeswitching, borrowing, and interference. As a result of verbal interaction among people in bilingual communities, English-Arabic code-mixing is common in everyday conversations (Aldaw, 2019; Al-Ahdal, 2020; Yassin et al., 2020; Benattabou, 2020).

Code-switching is defined as shifting between two languages, styles, and dialects within the same utterance (Brown and Attardo, 2006). According to Appel and Muysken (2005), there are three different types of code-switching: inter-sentential code-switching which occurs between sentences, intra-sentential code-switching which occurs within sentences (code-mixing), and tag switching which occurs at the end of the sentences.

Consequently, what happens, in Jordanian context, is just a process of insertion English constituents within Arabic talk (code-mixing). Accordingly, the current study investigates the most frequent English categories used. Furthermore, since Poplack's study in (1980) is considered as one of the most salient studies that investigates code-mixing and proposed what claimed to be universal constraints (Redouan,2005), the study also examines the validity of the size of constituent constraint proposed by Poplack. Additionally, the study examines the effect of the inserted English items on Arabic structure. The present research mainly intends to explore the most frequently used English constituents among Jordanian students when they perform code-mixing on Facebook, to examine the validity of Poplack's size of constituent constraint in Jordanian Arabic-English code-mixing performed on Facebook, and to find out the extent to which the used English constituents affects Arabic sentence structure. Accordingly, this study attempts to answer the following questions:

- i. What are the most frequently used English constituents among Jordanian students when they perform code-mixing on Facebook?
- ii. To what extent is the size of constituent constraint applied within Arabic-English intra-word code-mixing performed on Facebook?
- iii. What is the effect of the most frequently used English constituents on Arabic sentence structure?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Grosjean (1982) identified code-switching as a phenomenon that occurs when two languages are used in the same context by the same speaker. Lafont (1990) states that code-switching comes out as a sequence of contact between languages, accordingly, code-switching is tied to language contact. Similarly, Thomason (2001, p. 132) defines code-switching as “the use of material from two (or more) languages by a single speaker in the same conversation”. Therefore, Sinha (2009) asserts that switching is a logical consequence of bilingualism. Brown and Attardo (2006) indicate that code-switching is also called style-shifting. That is, it implies alternation between two distinct styles within the same utterance. Muysken (2005) introduces three types of code-switching:

- i. Inter-sentential code-switching: this type is performed at sentence boundary. In other words, it is applied between sentences. Inter-sentential code-switching has been intensively investigated by scholars (Poplack, 1980).
- ii. Tag switching: this type is applied when the tag element is performed in a different language than the rest of the sentence. This type needs no good command in both languages since it is very simple. Accordingly, the possibility of grammatical and syntactic violations is very rare (Poplack, 1980). Mabule (2015) indicates that attaching a specific element from one language at the tag of a monolingual speech from another language is also called extra-sentential code-switching.
- iii. Intra-sentential code-switching: This type uses two languages within the same utterance, this is often called code-mixing. This type is described as the most complicated, because codemixing requires proficiency in both languages since the possibility of grammatical and syntactic violation is very high (Poplack, 1980).

Because of the existence of overlapping in using inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-switching, scholars concentrate on distinguishing between them. Gerson (1982) asserts that differentiating between inter-sentential code-switching and intra-sentential code-switching is not an easy task. Some scholars suggest that the two terms are used interchangeably and they are closely related (Bader, 2003). For other scholars, code-mixing indicates inserting elements of all linguistic levels such as phrases, words, and affixes from different languages in the same sentence. Muysken (2000, p.3) agrees that code-mixing is "the insertion of an alien lexical item or phrasal category into a given structure", but he states that code-switching is the shifting between languages in the same discourse.

Based on the previously mentioned differences between code-switching and code-mixing, it can be concluded that code-mixing is a widely spread phenomenon in Jordanian society, and then it code-mixing is investigated in the current study. Code-mixing clearly appears in universities setting between young people (Hussain, 1999). Hussain investigated code-alternation (code-switching and code-mixing) performed by college students and the results indicated that the students frequently use English items in their speech. Alazzam (2010: 69) also found that the vast majority of Yarmouk university students use code-mixing moderately in their speech. English is considered one of the most widely spoken languages in the world due to its widespread use in the international arena and large geographical spread.

Code-mixing has often been marked as an incidental behavior comes out from semilegalism or incomplete language acquisition (Grosjean, 1982). However, code-mixing includes elements from two languages with two linguistic systems in the same discourse. Accordingly, many studies state that code-mixing is subject to grammatical and syntactic constraints. Pfaff (1979) indicates that functional and structural constraints cannot be ignored in the realization of code-mixing as well as semantic and communicational constraints. Accordingly, the grammar of the mixed language should be meshed according to a number of constraints. Furthermore, Poplack (1980) confirms that code-mixing is not a hazard phenomenon; rather it is subject to linguistic constraints. Moreover, Auer (1984) and Myres-scotton (1993) assert that code-alternation (code-switching and code-mixing) has to be analyzed from different perspectives;

grammatical, interactional and sociolinguistic. The most important perspective is the grammatical one which is mainly concerned with the syntactic constraints and rules that govern alternation.

Similarly, Taweel and Btoosh (2012, p.2) indicate that code-mixing does not occur in a random manner. "There are no limits to what language may alternate roles, but there are constraints on how this may occur. Code-switching may be motivated by social, pure linguistic or syntactic reasons". In fact, Although Arabic and English have different grammar, code-mixing is "possible at different grammatical levels and discourse boundaries such as noun phrase, verb phrase, prepositional phrase, adjectival phrase, and adverbial phrase" (Alhazmi, 2016 cited in Alamaren, 2021, p. 153). Al-Thunaibat & Singh (2020, p.13031) point out that "Syntactic literature regarding the grammatical structure of code switching is not clear, yet". That means more research needs to be implemented to investigate constraints the control code switching, particularly the syntactic ones. Al-Thunaibat & Singh (2020, p.13030) add that there were sub-gaps in terms of the theories which discuss code switching".

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

As a matter of fact, code-mixing uses constituents from two languages that may have diverse linguistic systems in the same utterance. Hence, many studies affirm that code-mixing is subject to grammatical constraints and "it has the potential to produce utterances that violate the structural properties and rules of one or both languages" (Sauvé, 2000, p.8). Sauvé (2000) points out that there are two influential theories that have been introduced to describe syntactic constraints on code-mixing; Poplack's structural constraints (1980) and Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame Model (1993).

Poplack (1980) signifies that the occurrence of code-mixing is restricted by both linguistic factors and extra-linguistic factors. Poplack (1980) is one of the main studies on code-switching and code-mixing that introduced the universal syntactic constraints of size of constituent, equivalence, and free morpheme. Several studies have concentrated on examining the universality of her proclaimed universal constraints (Al hazmi, 2016). Size of constituent constraint is one of the universal constraints proposed by Poplack. According to this constraint, there is a tendency to switch major and main constituents such as sentences and clauses more frequently than smaller ones (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs). Redouan (2005, p.1922) asserts that Poplack's universal constraints "have been subject to controversy when applied to different language pairs".

Kniaż and Zawrotna (2021) investigates Arabic-English code switching. They mainly analyzed Embedded English verbs in Arabic-English code-switching in Egypt; patterns of English verb insertion into Arabi, and the factors affecting them. The research data were collected through interviews with students at the American University in Cairo, the researchers managed to gather 14,414 clauses included Arabic/English code switching. Then, the data were analyzed quantitatively. The findings revealed that patterns of verb insertion in Arabic-English code-switching are consistent with the Matrix Language Frame model. The recurrent patterns of verb insertion are as follows: First, in non-past tense inserted verbs are morphologically integrated with Arabic. Second, most third-person plural verbs in non-past forms show incomplete assimilation lacking the plural suffix *-u*. Third, past forms are inserted as either past forms or bare forms with

the Arabic auxiliary to mark the tense. Fourth, English verbs are never cliticized with Arabic pronoun complements; instead, English pronouns are used.

Accordingly, investigating Jordanian Arabic-English code-mixing and testing the validity of the size of constituent help explore how the size of various syntactic constituents affects Arabic syntactic structure and whether it affects Arabic identity. That is, code-mixing is spreading in Jordan and it is described as a real danger on the pureness of Arabic as well as the national identity (Alazzam, 2010). Based on that, code-mixing has to be grammatically analyzed in order to highlight the consequences of its spreading (Al-Rowias, 2012).

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **The Sample of The Study**

The Participants of the present study are Jordanian undergraduate students studying in Yarmouk University, in Jordan. The data are collected online through Facebook chats, comments, and posts. These chats went on during the period of Corona Virous Pandemic while the students were studying online. Worth noting is that Yarmouk University is one of the biggest universities in the Middle East.

Many Jordanian scholars investigated code-mixing in university settings since it is widely spread among youths (Al-azzam 2010 and Al-Hayek, 2016). During the pandemic of Corona Virous, 25 students are questioned to contact each other online via computer-mediated communications (Facebook). Accordingly, the sample of the present study is purposive. Actually, purposive sampling hopes explore the whole scope of issues. Additionally, the researcher has chosen a sample that is sufficient to her purposes and needs (Cohen, et al., 2000). Another reason for choosing this purposive sampling is proposed by Patton (2002, p.230), who states that purposive sampling intends to go up with “insight and in-depth understanding” of the research. Furthermore, the quality of both the research design and the results of research are not influenced by the size of the sample (Holloway and Wheeler, 2010).

### **Data Collection**

The research data are collected from natural hypothetical context (Facebook chats, posts and comments). In order to find out the most frequent English constituents used in Arabic-English code-mixing, numeric data are gathered from code-mixing instances performed by the students while they are contacting each other via Facebook. Then, analyzing the data provides an answer regarding the validity of size of constituent constraint. Next code-mixing instances are qualitatively analyzed by the thematic analysis technique in order to explore the effect of the inserted English items on Arabic sentence structure.

## Data Analysis

As for the quantitative analysis, frequency distribution is applied to convert disorganized group of categories into a systemized and categorized information. It is “an organized tabulation of the number of individuals located in each category on the scale of measurement” (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008, p.36). Additionally, frequency distribution helps demonstrate the number of frequencies of different English categories inserted within Arabic talk. Both inductive and deductive forms of analysis are used in the current study, inductive forms are applied to generate new identification for the most frequent categories used in code-mixing phenomenon performed on Facebook. On the other side, deductive forms of analysis are used to investigate the applicability of Poplack’s size of constituent constraint in code-mixing. As for the qualitative data, codemixing instances are analyzed qualitatively by thematic analysis technique to provide answer for the third question. Thematic analysis approach helps provide detailed illustration about the phenomenon. Furthermore, the thematic analysis provides a detailed description, identification, and analysis for the phenomenon. Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 78) report that "thematic analysis should be seen as a foundational method for qualitative analysis". It is introduced as "a method of identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organizes and describes your data set in (rich) detail".

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Quantitative Analysis of Code-Mixing

To achieve the first objective, frequency distribution data analysis shows that Arabic-English code-mixing is frequent, common, and familiar among students’ conversations via Facebook. That is, in the current study, 89 examples on code-mixing are found in 6 chats, 49 comments, and 19posts. The data revealed that several English syntactic categories are used. With regard to the overall distribution of the occurrence of code-mixing at particular syntactic categories, the data yield various examples of mixing different syntactic items involving nouns, noun phrases, verbs, adjectives, adjective phrases, adverbs, adverb phrases, prepositions, prepositional phrases, pronouns, and demonstratives. The following examples explain the manners, in which each syntactic category is used:

#### 1. Nouns

- a) ‘an trareeg **groups**’ (Arabic)  
‘Via groups’ (English)
- b) ‘bel **break**’ (Arabic)  
‘In the break’ (English)
- c) ‘endi **discussion**’ (Arabic)  
‘I have discussion’ (English)

## 2. Noun Phrases

- a) 'rohet ala el-**swimming pool**' (Arabic)  
'I went to the swimming pool' (English)
- b) 'bel **hyper market**' (Arabic)  
'In the hyper market' (English)
- c) '. 'shofti **my mum**?' (Arabic)  
'Did you see my mum?' (English)

## 3. Verbs

- a) 'hea **joke** wallah' (Arabic)  
'She is just joking' (English)
- b) 'la **don't come** hon' (Arabic)  
'No do not come here' (English)
- c) 'lama **share** it' (Arabic)  
'Lama shared it' (English)

## 4. Adjectives

- a) 'An jad innk **cute**' (Arabic)  
'you are really cute' (English)
- b) 'lbest lebes **casual**' (Arabic)  
'I wore casual clothes' (English)
- c) 'walla **perfect!**' (Arabic)  
'That is perfect !' (English)

## 5. Adjective Phrases

- a) ' Elfasel **too long**' (Arabic)  
'the semester is too long' (English)
- b) ' hal bent **very hyper**' (Arabic)  
'this girl is very hyper' (English)
- c) ' Alwadee **totally fine**' (Arabic)  
'it is totally fine' (English)

## 6. Adverbs

- a) 'ma Ana **already** baathet el email' (Arabic)  
'I already sent the email' (English)
- b) '**usually**, ana kaslaneh' (Arabic)  
'Usually, I am lazy' (English)
- c) '**once** tkon jahzeh bbathha' (Arabic)  
'Once it is ready, I will send it' (English)

## 7. Adverb Phrases

- a) 'soget **very carefully**' (Arabic)  
'I drove very carefully' (English)
- b) 'wselet **very early**' (Arabic)  
'I arrived early' (English)
- c) 'itsrrafat **very cleverly**' (Arabic)  
'She acts very cleverly' (English)

## 8. Prepositions

- a) 'kont **with** Ali' (Arabic)  
'I was with Ali' (English)
- b) 'wait **for** elsef' (Arabic)  
'I am waiting for summer' (English)
- c) 'enti **over**' (Arabic)  
'you are over' (English)

## 9. Prepositional Phrase

- a) 'fee sale **up to 70%**' (Arabic)  
'there is a sale up to 70%' (English)
- b) 'haket **with her on messenger**' (Arabic)  
'I talked with her on messenger' (English)
- c) 'estnnet kteer **for this**' (Arabic)  
'I wait too long for this' (English)



### 10. Demonstratives

- |                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| a) 'estnnet kteer ashan <b>this</b> ' | (Arabic)  |
| 'I wait too long for this'            | (English) |
| b) ' Shofi <b>this</b> '              | (Arabic)  |
| 'look at this'                        | (English) |
| c) ' <b>this</b> katab kteer mufeed'  | (Arabic)  |
| 'this book is very useful'            | (English) |

### 11. Pronouns

- |                                |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| a) ' had <b>hers</b> '         | (Arabic)  |
| 'this is hers'                 | (English) |
| b) ' <b>I</b> el-admin'        | (Arabic)  |
| 'I am the admin'               | (English) |
| c) ' <b>you you</b> e bathha ' | (Arabic)  |
| 'you, you send it'             | (English) |

Based on frequency distribution Analysis, the results showed that speakers use English nouns the most. Followed by English adjectives, English noun phrases, and English adjective phrases, respectively. On the other hand, the results revealed that English demonstratives and English verb phrases occupied the last positions, respectively. As a matter of fact, the results indicated that Jordanian students use both small and large English constituents in Arabic discourse. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to mix the small size of English constituents. Thus, the data of the current study show the following results:

- i. The most frequently used English constituents are nouns, and they constituted 30% of the mixed English constituents.
- ii. English adjectives come after English nouns by 13.4% percentage of occurrence.
- iii. Jordanian students tend to use small English constituents like nouns, verbs, and adjectives, more than their large English counterparts; noun phrases, verb phrases, and adjective phrases.
- iv. English Adjective phrases and Noun phrases are used more than the small constituents, such as pronouns, verbs, prepositions, adverbs, and demonstratives
- v. English Prepositional phrases and adverb phrases are preferred to be used more than their small English counterparts; preposition and English adverbs.
- vi. 63 out of 89 English constituents are small constituents while 26 English constituents are large constituents.

Table (1) below presents times of occurrences and percentage of occurrence of each English category used in the current study.

Table1: Times and Percentage of Occurrence of English Categories in Facebook

Number	Category	Times of Frequency in Facebook	Percentage (%)
1	Noun	30	33.7%
2	Verb	6	6.7%
3	Adjective	12	13.5%
4	Adverb	6	6.7%
5	Preposition	5	5.6%
6	Demonstratives	4	4.5%
8	Adjective Phrase	7	7.9%
9	Adverb Phrase	6	6.7%
10	Prepositional Phrase	5	5.6%
11	Noun Phrase	8	9.0%

To achieve the second objective of the current study, the findings of the present study violate the size of constituent constraint proposed by Poplack (1980) that indicates that the speakers tend to mix major constituents like phrases and clause more than the small one. In this study, more than 70 % of the used English constituents are small, while a round 29 % of the used English constituents were large.

### **Qualitative Analysis of Code-Mixing**

Arabic and English are dissimilar in various aspects. Firstly, Arabic and English are from different language families. That is, Arabic is one of the Semitic Asian languages while English is one of European languages (Alduais, 2012). Despite that, they are mixed together in a wide range of sociolinguistic contexts, as noted in Alazzam (2010), Al-Rowais (2012), Abalhassan and Alshalawi (2000), and Owens (2005). Secondly, the main structure that can be influenced during mixing between Arabic-English is word-order system. Arabic has a free-word-order while English has a relatively fixed S-V-O word-order. Thirdly, Arabic and English are dissimilar with regard to the position of noun modifiers. Contrary to English, Arabic nominal modifier (adjectives) follows the noun. Fourthly, according to Khalil (1999) Arabic and English have different possessor-possessed word order, that is, in Arabic the possessed precedes the possessor, while English possessed has to follow the possessor. Finally, contrary to English, Arabic sentences can be formed with no verbs (Khalil, 1999).

To achieve the third objective of the study, the thematic analysis revealed that most of the used English constituents are those have simple constraints, like nouns and adjectives. That is, nouns and adjectives need less grammatical and syntactic demands than other constituents. Furthermore, using English nouns creates a safe manner of mixing in order to avoid grammatical violations in both involved languages. Moreover, the very limited usage of English verbs asserts the fact that the English constituents, that have more grammatical demands, are avoided to be used. That is, using verbs may create grammatical violations either in one language or both languages, as shown in Examples 7, 9, and 23, when the speakers used the English verbs without applying their grammatical demands and violate English grammatical rules. The results indicated that past

tense, gerund, and present tense English verbs are used in the base form when they are inserted within Arabic talk. Furthermore, if the complement of the inserted English verb is a preposition or a pronoun, they are used in English. This is shown in Examples 9 and 23. Moreover, examples 32 is performed without using any verb, and follow Arabic sentence structure.

In fact, no violations in the structural rules of Arabic language are found in the current study, and all the used English constituents are used with no harmful effect on Arabic sentence structure. That is, the inserted English constituents are used in the same order as their equivalent Arabic constituents are used. Examples 11, 13,14, and 15 inserted the English adjective after the noun it modifies and follow Arabic sentence structure (Khalil, 1999). Nevertheless, these examples violate English structural rules.

Several studies raise to examine this size of constituent constraint and support the current study findings. Myers-Scotton (2002, p.76) asserts that verbs occur with lower frequencies than other word classes. Thus, verbs are described as “they are [+ thematic role assigner] and therefore carry more ‘syntactic baggage’ than nouns, meaning their fit with the recipient language may be harder to make”. Similarly, Bentahila and Davies (1983) and Redouan (2005) support the current study findings and highlight those nouns constitute the majority of the mixed items (Bentahila & Davies, 1983 cited in Redouan, 2005). Forslund (2009) also goes with this end and considers nouns as freer constituents than other word classes. He indicates that nouns occurrence is not grammatically restricted as other constituents. Rezaeian (2009) and Al-Rowais (2012) assert that there is tendency toward using smaller structures. They show that speakers tend to use syntactic constituents in which they find it easier to mix the grammar of the two languages and to keep away from grammatical violation. They indicate that using small items such as nouns, adjectives and large constructions prevent breaking rules. In other words, students insert English constituents that are secure to mix regardless of its size. Al-Rowais (2012) also states that nouns constitute the majority of the mixed constituents and make up the body of code-mixing process. She states that nouns often appear in the same syntactic slit and therefore they are smoothly mixed. Al-hazmi (2016) asserts that Arab speakers in Australia prefer to use nouns with noun phrases the most on Facebook and radio. According to Al hazmi (2016), nouns are used most often with a great frequency of occurrences because of many reasons. That is, nouns are relatively free of syntactic constraints, while other word classes such as system morphemes and verbs carry more syntactic constraints including tense, gender and number inflections and they demand a grater grammatical agreement.

On the other side, the large constituents of noun phrases and adjective phrases are used more often than the short constituents like verbs, demonstratives, coordinates, pronouns, and adverbs. As a matter of fact, using major constituents is sometimes considered as a way of avoiding violation of the structural rules of the involved languages. That is, Arabic and English differ in their word order of possessed and possessor, and noun and adjectives. Accordingly, insertion of a whole English phrase is a way of safe mixing that prevents violation of word order in either language.

## CONCLUSION

Frequency distribution analysis of code-mixing on Facebook revealed that English nouns are the most frequent used categories. Adjectives ranked the second position and followed by adjective phrase, and noun phrases. Frequency distribution analysis found that small constituents like nouns, verbs, and adjectives are used more than the large constituents noun phrases, verb phrases, and adjective phrases. On the other side, the large constituents noun phrases, and adjective Phrases are used more than small constituents like demonstratives, pronouns, adverbs, and verbs. Furthermore, it is found that the large constituent preposition phrases are used more than their small counterpart prepositions. Moreover, adverbs are used as frequent as adverb phrases. Accordingly, Jordanian speakers use both small and large English constituents, nevertheless, nouns are the most highly mixed English syntactic categories among all the mixed English syntactic categories. Furthermore, 29% of the constituents were large while 70% of the constituents were small. English large constituents except noun phrases and adjective phrases have low frequency of occurrence.

As a sum, since most of the used English constituents are small, the current study findings violate size of constituent constraint that indicates there is a tendency to mix major constituents more than the small ones. Furthermore, since most of the English-inserted elements in the Arabic-English code-mixing are nouns, code-mixing does not carry any negative influence on Arabic structural rules. That is, nouns are freer of syntactic restrictions than other word classes, verbs and system morphemes.

## REFERENCES

- Abal hassan, K. M., & Alshalawi, H. G. (2000). Code-switching Behavior of Arab Speakers of English as a Second Language in the United States. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 10(1), 179- 188.
- Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2020). Code Mixing in Arabic conversations of college students: A sociolinguistic study of attitudes to switching to English. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(1), 6-19
- Alamaren, E., Tengku, S., and Kasuma, S. (2021). Analysis of Arabic–English Code-Mixing Within NP. *Asian ESP Journal*, 17, (4.2),147-168.
- Alazzam, S. (2010). *Functions of code-mixing in Yarmouk University students' speech* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Aldaw, H. (2019). Constraints on code-mixing and code-switching in Arabic and English in Arabic-speaking community. *International Journal of Development Research*, 9, (01), 25496-25500.
- Alduais, A. M. S. (2012). Simple Sentence Structure of Standard Arabic Language and Standard English Language: A Contrastive Study. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(4), 500-524.
- Al Hayek, R. (2016). *Arabic–English code-mixing by Jordanian university students*. PhD Thesis, Western Sydney University.

- Alhazmi, A. (2016). Linguistic aspect of Arabic-English code switching on Facebook and radio in Australia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 5(3), 184-198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.3p.184>
- Al-Rowais, H. (2012). *Code-switching between Arabic and English, social motivations and structural constraint* (M. A. Thesis). Ball State University, Indiana, USA.
- Al-Thunabat, M. & Singh, M. (2020). Syntactic constraints of Arabic-English code switching. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 13026-13039
- Auer, J.C.P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bader, Y. (2003). Some characteristics of codeswitching to Arabic among non-English foreign nationals in Jordan. *Damascus University Journal*, 19(3+4), 35-52.
- Bentahila, A., & Davis, E. E. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua* 59, 301-330. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(83\)90007-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(83)90007-4)
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Brown, S., & Attardo, S. (2006). *Understanding language structure, interaction, and variation: An introduction to applied linguistics and sociolinguistics for nonspecialists* (2nd ed.). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Btoosh, A., & Taweel, M. (2012). *Syntactic Aspects of Jordanian Arabic-English Inter-sentential Code-switching*. Academic writing. *Linguistica ONLINE*. Published: May 7, 2012 <http://www.phil.muni.cz/linguistica/art/taweelbtoosh/tab-001.pdf> ISSN 1801-5336..
- Cohen, L. Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge-Falmer.
- Forslund, K. (2009). *Aspects of bilingualism: Code-switching, syntactic and semantic development in a bilingual child* (Doctoral dissertation, Halmstad University)
- Gravetter, F. J., and Wallnau, L. B. (2008). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Holloway, I. and Wheeler, S. (2010). *Qualitative research in nursing and healthcare*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Hussein, R. (1999). Code alternation among Arab college students. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 281-289. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00141>
- Kniaż, M. & Zawrotna, M. 2021. Embedded English verbs in Arabic-English code-switching in Egypt. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 25(3), 622-639.
- Khalil, A. (1999). *A contrastive grammar of English and Arabic*. Jordan: Jordan Book Centre.
- Khalil, A. M. (2010). *A contrastive grammar of English and Arabic*. Jordan: Jordan Book Centre.
- Lafont, R. (1990). *Codeswitching et production du sens*. In Rodolfo Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon* (pp.71-83). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Mabule, D. (2015). What is it? Is it a code switching, Code-mixing or alternating. *Journal of Education and Social Research*, 5(1), 339-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2015.v5n1p339>

- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford, England: Oxford U Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics : bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-switching*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press
- Owens, J. (2005). Bare forms and lexical insertions in code-switching: A processing-based account. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8(01), 23-38.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pfaff, C. (1979). Constraints on language mixing. *Language*, 55, 291-318.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish termino en espanol. *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.
- Redouane, R. (2005). *Linguistic constraints on codeswitching and codemixing of bilingual Moroccan Arabic-French speakers in Canada*. In ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism (pp. 1921-1933).
- Rezaeian, F. (2009). *Structural and social aspects of codeswitching among Iranian/Canadian bilinguals* (Doctoral dissertation, Dept. of Linguistics-Simon Fraser University).
- Rouchdy, A. (2002). *Language contact and language conflict in Arabic: Variations on a sociolinguistic theme*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Sauvé, V. (2000). *Grammatical constraints on child bilingual Code-mixing* (Published PhD. Dissertation), McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Sebba, M. (1997). *Contact languages: Pidgins and creoles*. New York: ST. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Sinha, S. (2009). Code switching and code-mixing among Oriya trilingual children a study. *Language in India*, 9, 274-283.
- Thomason, S. (2001). *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

### **EMAN ALAMAREN**

PhD student at the School of Languages, Literacies and Translation  
Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM)  
Eman\_amareen85@yahoo.com

### **DR. SHAI DATUL AKMA ADI KASUMA**

School of Languages, Literacies and Translation  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
Shaidatul@usm.my