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## KEY TO PHONEMIC TRANSCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters , Numbers and Symbols</th>
<th>Phonemes / Sounds Correspondence</th>
<th>Letters , Numbers and Symbols</th>
<th>Phonemes / Sounds Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Un (Fr) = one</td>
<td>k = q</td>
<td>ل = /k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deux (Fr) = two</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ل = /l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(Eng)</td>
<td>to (preposition)</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>م = /m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ن = /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For (preposition)</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>ن = /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>/sk/ e.g. i6= ici(Fr) i.e. here</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أ = /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sept(Fr): synonymously used to mean cette i.e. this</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ب = /p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = h</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ر = /r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Huit(Fr) e.g. n8:nuit i.e. n8:night</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ت = /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = g</td>
<td>ق = /g/</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>أو = /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ه = /h/</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ف = /v/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ِ = /A/</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>و = /w/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ب = /b/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>أكس = /eks/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c = ce = s</td>
<td>س = /s/</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>ي = /j/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ش = /ʃ/</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ز = /z/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>د = /d/</td>
<td>kh = 5</td>
<td>خ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ف = /f/</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>غ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ِ = //]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>plus (Fr) = more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j = ge</td>
<td>ج = /dʒ/</td>
<td>ur</td>
<td>ج = /dʒ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Used before letters to indicate stress
ABSTRACT

The ultimate objective of this study is to investigate the efficiency of using Short Message Service (henceforward SMS) discourse, a type of Computer-Mediated Discourse, which is indeed a hybrid of the spoken and written language varieties and/or dialects in the daily social contact in Relizane Speech Community. The focus of this dissertation project is on the important meanings of language alternation processes via ‘SMS language’ in Relizane.

This work sets out a number of hypotheses which help us to identify some of the distinct structural features of code switching in text messages as well as to discuss those features with reference to a range of sociolinguistics, cultural and psychological factors. Overtly, this scrutiny seems as a departure from the meeting point of looking at the phenomenon of code switching and/or language mixing in contemporary real-life interaction to a critical examination of their use in informal personal written messages in that community.

To attain this, it is compulsory to prop up our investigation to one of the theoretical models on the foregoing area of research that is Muysken’s Typological Approach (2000), which is in fact applied to natural conversation. Moreover, for the sake of analysing, arguing and discussing how and why our participants (mostly the adolescents) use such linguistic genre to perform certain communicative intentions; a self-designed questionnaire - based on Bouamrane (1986) - is used to probe our bilinguals’ attitudes towards the varieties they use today with a particular reference to code switching instances in text messages.

The main deductions from this study are that our bilinguals tend to code switch to signal their personal identities, to show their social belongings as well as to establish solidarity and to maintain affiliation with the other members of their speech community. On the one hand, the study shows to some extent the positive attitudes of our bilinguals towards the prevailing linguistic codes as an indication of their readiness to maintain the stable bilingual situation in Relizane. On the other hand, it reveals the highly positive attitudes of our participants towards the code switching processes in text messages, a new channel of contact, as being a key element to contribute in any of the internal cultural, religious and other developments in the modern society.

Eventually, such written code switching practises appears to open a new area of our potential studies about the structure of written Arabic/French/English code-switching in press, chat rooms, billboards, and shops signs.
RÉSUMÉ

L'objectif ultime de cette étude est d'examiner l'efficacité de l'aide des message couts (SMS) dans le discours qui est en fait un hybride des variétés de langues et/ou dialectes parlés et écrits dans le contact social quotidien à Relizane comme communauté linguistique. L'objectif de ce projet de thèse est de faire une étude sur les significations importantes du processus de l'alternance des langues par ‘langage SMS’ au sein de Relizane.

Ce travail présente un certain nombre d'hypothèses qui nous aident à identifier quelques caractéristiques structurales distinctes de l’alternance de codes de SMS ainsi que pour discuter de ces fonctions avec référence à une variété de la sociolinguistique, les facteurs culturels et psychologiques. Explicitement, cette recherche semble comme un départ à partir du point de rencontre d'observer le phénomène de l’alternance de codes et/ou le mélange de codes en interaction contemporaine dans la vie réelle à un examen critique de leur utilisation dans messages personnels informels écrits de cette communauté linguistique. Pour y parvenir, il est indispensable de soutenir notre enquête à l'un des modèles théoriques sur le phénomène qui précède de recherche qui est l’Approche Typologique de Muysken (2000), qui est en fait appliqué à la conversation normale.

En outre, pour analyser, argumenter et discuter comment et pourquoi nos participants (la plupart des adolescents) utilise ce genre linguistique pour effectuer certaines intentions communicatives; un questionnaire auto-conçu - basé sur Bouamrane (1986) - est utilisé pour sonder les attitudes de nos bilingues envers les variétés qu'ils utilisent aujourd'hui, avec une référence particulière à l’alternance de codes dans les messages courts.

Les principales déductions de cette étude sont que nos bilingues ont tendance à l’alternance de codes pour signaler leur identité personnelle, pour montrer leurs effets sociaux, ainsi que pour établir la solidarité et de maintenir l'affiliation avec les autres membres de leur communauté linguistique. À un extrême, l'étude montre a une certaine mesure les attitudes positives de nos bilingues vers les codes linguistiques dominants comme une indication de leur volonté de maintenir la situation bilingue stable à Relizane. À l'autre extrême, il révèle les attitudes très positives de nos participants vers le code processus dans des messages courts (un nouveau canal de contact) comme un élément clé pour contribuer à l'un des développements culturels, religieux,…etc. et autres dans la société moderne.

Finalement, un tel code écrit ouvre un nouveau domaine de nos études sur le potentiel de la structure écrite en Arabe /Français/Anglais comme alternance de codes dans la presse, les chats, les panneaux publicitaires, et les signes commerciaux.
ملخص

الهدف النهائي من هذه الدراسة هو الكشف عن فعالية استخدام لغة الرسائل القصيرة (SMS) في التواصل ، والتي هي في الواقع مزيج من أصناف اللغات المتنوعة والمكتوبة أو اللهجات المستعملة في شبكة الاتصال الاجتماعي اليومي في غليزان. ويركز هذا المشروع على المعاني الهامة لعملية التناوب أو المزيج اللغوي (Code switching) في غليزان.

هذا العمل يركز على عدد من الفرصات التي تساعدنا على تحديد بعض السمات المميزة لعملية التناوب أو المزيج اللغوي في كتابة الرسائل القصيرة وكذلك لمناقشة تلك الميزات مع الإشارة إلى مجموعة واسعة من النماذج المستعملة في تحليل الظواهر المتعلقة بالسياقات الاجتماعية، والعوامل الثقافية والنفسية المرتبطة بها. يوضح أكثرا، يبدو أن هذه الدراسة هي نقطة التقاط للنظر إلى ظاهرة المزيج أو/والاختلاط اللغوي (Code mixing) في التفاعل الاجتماعي المتطوع إلى الدراسة النقدية في استخدامها في الرسائل الشخصية القصيرة المكتوبة في الشبكة الاجتماعية داخل هذه الشبكة الاجتماعية. لتحقيق هذا، كان الزاميا علينا Muysken تطبيق إحدى النماذج النظرية المستعملة في هذا السياق - المنهج الطوبوغرافي لـ 2000 ، والذي يطبق في الواقع على محاذاة طبيعية.

النتيجة الأساسية لهذه الدراسة أن أغلب المشاركون يميلون لاستخدام هذه الوسيلة التواصلية لإظهار هوياتهم الشخصية، للإشارة إلى اتساعهم للمجموعة اللغوية، وكذلك لإقامة التضامن مع سائر أعضاء المجتمع. من جهة أخرى، أظهرت الدراسة إلى حد ما أن هذا المزيج اللغوي هو مثير على الرغم من الأعراض المتضاربة في الحفاظ على استراتيجيات أذواق اللغة في غليزان ومن جهة أخرى، فإنها كانت على مدار الإيجابية إجراء عملية التناوب أو المزيج اللغوي عن طريق لغة الرسائل النصية، كتقنية جديدة للاتصال بأعمال عنصرية أساسيا للمشاركة في أي من التطورات الثقافية والدينية الداخلية وغيرها في المجتمع الحديث.

في نهاية المطاف، فتحت هذه الظاهرة اللغوية المجال الجديد لدراسات مستقبلية حول بنية التناوب أو المزيج اللغوي بين العربية/الفرنسية/الإنجليزية المستعملة في الصحافة وغرف الدردشة، اللوحات الإشهارية، وعلامات المولات التجارية.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

From a purely linguistic point of view, this dissertation falls within the discipline of sociolinguistics and focuses on an increasingly interesting issue that is code switching (hereafter CS) which has been, in fact, discussed in a number of fields, namely in historical linguistics, contact linguistics and language typology over the past four decades. Since the topic of written CS did not receive much attention by scholars in comparison to that of the oral form counterpart, this study endeavours to indicate the positive features of code switching/mixing processes within Relizane Speech Community (henceforth RSC) as well as the benefits associated with each code in text messages by discussing the societal norms related to the reasons and the motivations for choosing/using one linguistic code over another and/or for switching back and forth between the coexisting language varieties and/or dialects in the communicative behaviour of our bilinguals.

This thesis is entitled the Ideological Beliefs toward Code Switching/Mixing Practices and their Effects on Communication Efficiency via ‘SMS Language’ in Relizane. In fact, the expression ‘ideological beliefs’ is used to refer the speakers/writers’ attitudinal tendencies towards choosing one language variety over another and/or to the socio-psychological motivations or reasons behind using such communicative behaviour in their daily social contact. Moreover, one may ask “What is really meant by ‘SMS Language’?” One possible answer is that the term ‘language’ contained by this thesis is a connotation of the term ‘langage’, which is indeed a French word that stands for the mode of expression/communication that uses mostly colloquial speech or unusual adapted vocabulary words, unconventional abbreviations and distinctive signs i.e. it is no longer considered as a standard language.

The substantial idea that goes behind choosing such title -mainly within a small speech community like Relizane- has started since our theoretical year, as an MA student of sociolinguistics at the University of Oran, in 2009-2010 which is extended over more than two years and half intended for covering up the informants’ interactional strategies while exchanging informal-mixed text messages.
General Introduction

Within this context, we have chosen to focus on informal communication in written text messages for the reason that many of the earlier studies tend to discount looking seriously at this phenomenon and, as far as we know, there have been no previously researches conducted on code switching/mixing processes in text messages within RSC. Thus, we are interested in attaining our personal understanding of the current linguistic situation in RSC through informal mixed-written dialogue. In other words, what motivates us for doing such examination is that we would dare, as members and participants in RSC, to explore in some way the socio-cultural heritage of the wilaya (synonymously used to mean a ‘state’) since there is a great lack and/or a total absence of academic as well scientific research on written CS/CM discourse occasions and/or even very restricted investigation areas within this scope about it. Therefore, this may perhaps contribute to a wider, however, a better understanding of the sociolinguistic situation as well as to expose some of the bilingual features of our speech community since there is also a deficiency in dealing with them, for the most part in the linguistics side (predominantly in English), and mainly to demonstrate the impacts of the socio-psychological factors on the communicative behaviour of our bilingual speakers.

The bulk of this study focuses on the basic aims and objective that follow:

1. To examine and describe the patterns of code switching/mixing practices within RSC and to evaluate their significance in the light of the prevailing contesting arguments and recent studies and developments in linguistics –as far as the different competing models and theories to code switching are concerned - and to identify the interactive functions that these practices perform. That is, to assess the contemporary language attitudes vis-a-vis the coexisted language varieties and/or dialects now exist in RSC.

2. To interpret the socio-cultural dimensions - meanings and values - generated by these codes within RSC through integrating personal critical evaluation of the strengths and/or weaknesses of previous research investigations to these linguistic practices as a whole and via “SMS language” in particular. Overtly, to apply an appropriate model to the CS instances in SMS and to identify the main factors that may influence such language shift in the speech of our participants.
To identify the impact of language planning/management and/or language policies on Algeria’s speech repertoire, besides to recognise the current challenges, the expectations and aspirations of our bilinguals towards the codes they use and mainly to offer recommendations for the maintenance of each and every language variety and/or dialect in RSC.

Aligning with the aforementioned state of affairs, the current thesis is alienated into four basic chapters, puts forward the organizational framework of our study as follow:

The first chapter gives an account to the socio-historical background of the speakers of Algeria as a whole with a particular reference to the cultural co-building of RSC. By retelling the same idea in other terms, this chapter hopes to draw a clear picture about the overall sociolinguistics situation of Algeria where different coexisted language varieties and/or dialects are involved. This linguistic hotchpotch, of course here, constitutes a focal point of discussion as it is devoted to the analysis of one of the most creative linguistic outcomes of language contact phenomenon, that is CS and/or language alternation processes in SMS. The latter is mainly resulted from the long-term of acculturation and the reciprocal relationships between the multiple ethnic groups and their language varieties and/or dialects which now exist in Algeria’s different speech communities including of course RSC.

For the clarity and intelligibility of this dissertation project, the second chapter puts on view the related literature to the development of CS as a research subject matter which has historically taken place in language contact situations – particularly in bilingual studies – since the 1950’s. However, it attempts to shed the light on the various key concepts related to the examination of that issue as well to supply a review to the most governing; yet, contesting models and theories that have been conducted by many scholars and sociolinguists from the 1970’s to the present day as basis sources for analysing language switching/mixing practices from a variety of perspectives (the sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic and structural side). Herein, what is of particular importance is that illustrate the relevance of Muysken’s Typological Approach (2000) to the analyses of CS instances via SMS in RSC.

Above and beyond, it seems of a paramount importance in the third chapter to refer to the research methodology, tools and procedures of our study which is totally based on a self-designed questionnaire which includes five main parts. It is meant to
collect a corpus from four different age groups living in Relizane. The data bank includes individuals’ SMS samples and responses about the choice and the usefulness of the language varieties and/or the dialects on both spontaneous speech and written forms in the various domains in life. The corpus aimed at: firstly, collecting the informants’ opinions regarding the choice/use of one code over another and secondly at measuring their attitudes towards those preferences and mainly about shifting or mixing languages in discourse. Moreover, this chapter endeavours to draw attention to the twofold channels of communication namely speaking and writing, the interrelationships between them, with a particular intention to both types of code switching; especially the one in informal mixed-written messages as being purely linguistic practices that reflect multiculturalism within RSC.

After a while, the last chapter is meant to observe the changing patterns of language use/choice in RSC as a whole and mainly to analyze our individuals’ responses from a statistical point of view together with eliciting their attitudes towards the linguistics processes that are employed at some point in their social contact. In view of that, it gives the impression of being interesting to explore the impact of a range of socio-psychological factors on the distinctive discourse features that characterize mainly CS practices via SMS in RSC. As expected, the study reinforces our hypothesis that the individuals who are normally capable to code-switch when speaking will do so while writing and it ends in a conclusion that code switching instances contained by SMS in RSC serve the same communicative functions as the ones the oral/spoken CS occurrences perform.

Whatever the case might be, code switching/mixing practices’ examinations studies may differ from context to context, situation to situation or circumstance to circumstance; the common features for these practices is threefold. That is to say, the interaction/conversation/negotiation i.e. topics during various social events i.e. settings involving interlocutors i.e. the bilingual speakers who know and/or master more than one language. Undoubtedly, CS deals with languages that come into contact with each other throughout the various historical epochs of humanity in which many millions of people in their daily lives have been acquiring new languages or even losing their own native languages in favour other emerged language varieties, and have been therefore able to switch back and forth someway
comfortably from one language variety to another. Thus, in interactive social situations, CS is the shift back and forth from one language variety to another.

In the course of these common factors of language shift, this dissertation project comes across into revealing the RSC context with special move forward to the various reasons involved for CS while writing SMS at some stage in their social contacts.

Since our interest is based on informal written language alternation by means of SMS, we will attempt to answer questions like these:

What aspects are relevant to switching/mixing and borrowing within RSC? What are the motivations that trigger such codes use/choice? What sorts of social functions do these practices serve? How many ways are there to switch back and forth within the same SMS? What are they? What levels of language do our bilinguals switch between? How do these codes, even though they belong to different language families, fit together syntactically and/or grammatically? Which age group is likely to use that genre of communication? Why is it so important to know about the future of that genre of communication? How far could the co-participants communicate with SMS messages without knowing their lexis? Which approach to code switching can be applied to the examination of the code switching and language mixing practices via “SMS language” within RSC and how far can this approach be applied to the analysis of these written - not oral/spoken - messages? Explicitly, should the same theoretical models and theories to oral code switching production be pressed into service for analyzing these written instances? Does the analysis of SMS messages allow us to tackle questions unanswered up till now?

At some stage in realizing our dissertation project, we, similar to every beginner researchers, have faced so many difficulties, most of which the scarcity of references, books, journals and/or articles about the target speech community. More to the point, the accessible sources were reached by means of barely efforts in a trail to overcome all the possible obstacles and/or barriers that are faced by every researcher in the field of linguistics, particularly language contact discipline. Furthermore, during the practical side; two problems were encountered. Firstly, during the data collection phase; not enough questionnaires were returned from the projected participants of third and the fourth age ranges (as it will be seen in 4.2.1).
Therefore, we were unable somehow to balance how significant the contribution of this group was to language choice and/or use in most communicative situations and/or domains as well as to demonstrate and/or measure the efficiency of language alternation processes via personal informal writing styles in SMS. Fortunately, there were adequate results from the remaining age groups that compensate such lack as well as allow us to answer some of the intended research questions. Secondly, throughout the analysis phase; we were unable at first to decipher some SMS samples. In view of that, we managed to use our own chart of transcription (cf., p, X) to avoid correcting some of the spelling errors, symbols, numbers, etc within the collected data.

Indeed, this dissertation project is merely a tiny personal touch on informal written-mixed language discourse that belongs to Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) and/or Mobile-Mediated Communication (MMC). Attributable to the rapid manifestation of a variety of contemporary technological means of communication, the study of casual written language alternation has become a vast however new fruitful investigative field waiting for those who are interested in multi/bilingual studies as a whole and language contact situations in particular. Undoubtedly, in sociolinguistic studies, new areas under discussion have been released. For example, research of the structure of written Arabic/French/English code-switching in press, chat rooms, billboards, and shops signs are promising areas of our potential studies.

In due course, we hope we could throughout such modest examination to contribute in one way or another to enrich the library shelves of the sociolinguistic discipline in Algeria. Besides, we would like to put into words our sincere apologies to every researcher if we oversight to cite all about sides of the wilaya of Relizane. Moreover, we look forward to hear sooner each and every one’s recommendations and/or suggestions from fellow colleague researchers and/or teachers in the discipline for enhancing this work or amending it in future documentations.
1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overall synopsis of the context of the current investigation. Both Algeria and the wilaya of Relizane will be introduced briefly. In an attempt to consider the convergence between the different historical linguistic sources of Algeria and the new sociolinguistic practices and/or realities that shape RSC, this chapter takes a closer look at the recorded history and the socio-cultural co-building of Algeria in tandem with the wilaya of Relizane and its suburbs. More explicitly, these actualities will function as a smooth transitional phase to the subsequent chapter, which will hopefully pave the way to a more adequate analysis of our collected data (as it shall be seen in chapter IV).

The first two sections of this chapter review the historical background/setting and the development of a number of features of socio-cultural realities in Algeria, which is well thought-out of being as a cauldron of a wide range of language varieties that belong to different language families.

In a more strict sense, we shall focus on the prevailing linguistic diversity and multicultural heritage, which are an upshot of consecutive waves of conquests and/or invasions of the country ever since the break dawn of its recorded history due mainly to its privileged geographic position that made it open to the establishment and expansion of numerous civilisations within the Mediterranean Basin. Moreover, we will refer once more to the different language policies since the second decade of independence.

In last part, we try to consider RSC on which this research is based. As far as this area of research is concerned, one must specify that the current interest is to focus on the framework of the wilaya of Relizane; its etymology, its geographical location, its historical development and its ethnic composition. These territorial informational resources will hopefully serve to check evidence of the available linguistic diversity, as a symptom of multi/bilingualism, that shape the way the coexisted language varieties and/or dialects are used today in this speech community.

A glance around our research context will be presented in due course, which is expectantly intended to make sense for all.
CHAPTER ONE:

The Context of Study

1.2 The Country’s Profile: A General Introduction to Algeria

1.2.1 The Administrative System of Government and the Geographical Location

Virtually in its political frame, Algeria is a parliamentary representative democratic sovereign country, publicly referred to as the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria\(^1\). It is acknowledged as an Islamic, Arab and Amazigh (Berber) country in which there is no differences in religion, language, race, gender or religion\(^2\).

Algeria which is the first most extensive country in Africa\(^3\) with a total area of 2,381,741 Km\(^2\), lies mostly between latitudes 19\(^\circ\) and 37\(^\circ\)N and longitudes 9\(^\circ\)W and 12\(^\circ\)E. It extends across the north-central part of the African Continent.

It is bounded to the North by the Mediterranean Basin; with a coastline of 1200 Km which makes it as a front entrance to Africa. Algeria, which is the central territory within the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU), is bordered\(^4\) by Morocco and Western Sahara on the West, by Libya and Tunisia on the East, by Mauritania and Mali on the Southwest, and by Niger to the Southeast (See Map 01). Its geographical position, for better or for worse, prepared it to be one of the battlegrounds of the forces of conquests, external invasions and colonisations.

Algeria is divided into forty eight wilayas (provinces/departments) (See Map 02). Algiers is the administrative, economic and cultural capital of Algeria. Each wilaya consists of a number of administrative districts known as ‘Daira. These ‘Dairas’, in fact, are subdivided into small local authorities, the basic components of the territorial organisation, which are identified as ‘baladiyats’ i.e. communes or municipalities.

---

\(^1\) According to the first amendment of the Algerian Constitution
\(^2\) According to the second and the third amendments of the Algerian Constitution
\(^3\) After the subdivisions of Sudan on July 9, 2011 into Southern and Northern Sudan
\(^4\) The present boundaries were set during the French conquest in the nineteenth century
1.2.2 The Demographic Situation and Ethnic Composition of Algeria

Algeria’s population lineage consists mainly of Berbers, Arabs and some remains from other minority groups that conquest and/or even occupied the area including: the Phoenicians, the Turks, the Spanish, the Vandals, the Romans and the French. Algeria has witnessed in the course of its exceedingly long recorded historical epochs very high rates of population growth. This process was more accelerated mainly after independence.

Indeed, this intensive demographic evolution differs from one region to another. Nevertheless, one should keep in mind that this incessant dynamic demography may perhaps in turn to many factors including mostly the sustainable educational development. Obviously, these features balance the socio-cultural welfare and the economic growth of Algeria.

1.3 The Historical Backgrounds of Code switching in Algeria

Along this line of thought, we will focus on Algeria’s multilingual settings and recorded backgrounds, which shape to some extent the way the existing language varieties are at work today.

Algeria’s contemporary melting-pot linguistic situation, where both genetically related and unrelated language varieties are mixed up, is highly recognised as being an outcome of both the different conquests and/or invasions of the country and the wide range of ethnic groups that comprise its speech communities.
Aligning with the aforementioned state of affairs, as an integral prerequisite besides a significant perspective within the scope of this study, our own inventive graphic representation underneath best epitomizes the manifold language varieties and/or dialects used today in Algeria.

**Graph 1.1 the various groups of languages existing in Algeria today**

Accordingly, two different but complementary historical perspectives will be taken into account from before the French conquest up to the present day. The first perception is that of the ancient and/or pre-independent era, which imposes its presence in support of qualifying Algeria as an Arab as well as Berber territory; whereas, the second standpoint is that of post-independent Algeria, that falls into a linguistic dilemma and/or clash of either implementing the ‘Policy of Arabisation’ – especially during the early independent epoch – in an attempt to conserve the socio-cultural Islamic values as well to promote the ethnic identity and ideological dimensions of the Algerian society on the one hand, or to acknowledge the

---

5 First preambled to constitution in 1997. Later on president Bouteflika recognized Tamazight as a national language in a constitutional amendment on February 2002.
6 The language variety spoken by Touareg in southern Algeria.
substantial coexistence between Arabic and the various of dialects existing currently in Algeria and/or to introduce new languages as a requirement of globalisation on the other hand.

Thus, in the following sections a brief discussion will be carried out on the evolution of each of the language varieties in further details for tracing a review of the degree of both cultural construction and linguistic diversity used in Algeria.

1.3.1 The Linguistic Situation of Ancient and Pre-Independent Algeria

Hitherto, we have dealt with the language varieties of pre-independent Algeria in such an extremely broad sense. Therefore, it seems of a paramount significance to refer to each one in much more details:

1.3.1.1 Berber

Many of the history books -if not all- attest that the original dwellers of North Africa, including of course Algeria, are Berbers (see Map 03). They occupied and thrived alongside the Mediterranean basin, where they resisted all forms of invasion coming from both the east and the west as well as interacted with the miscellaneous cultures that dominated its banks namely of the Phoenician, Roman, Arabic and European civilizations. They defeated the Egyptian Pharaohs and ascended their throne from about 945 BC until 715 BC.

Linguistically speaking, the concept “Berber” is in essence of Greek origin (barbaros). It was used to denote the speakers of the other languages; that seem foreign to them. Later on, the same term was used by the Romans to refer to the peoples in North Africa who did not speak Latin. In actual fact, the Romans called them so for their strong resistance and confrontation over four centuries. Sadiqi (1997) states that “after the settlement of the Arabs in the seventh century A.D. and the conversion of Berbers to Islam, Arabic started to be used along with the already existing Berber”. In view of that, the mutual recognition which was established amongst the existing Berbers and the Muslims almost certainly in turn to that the arrival of Islam was in a peaceful way in comparison to the previous forms of invasions.
Berbers are also called Amazigh or Imazighen, masculine nouns meaning “the free and noblemen”. As regards the feminine complement Tamazight that denotes only a single language variety; it is in fact the cover term of a number of widely different varieties (see figure 02) of Tamazight which are not entirely mutually intelligible since there are few differences in terms of vocabulary and grammar.

Yet, within the French colonisation period, Tamazight was marginalised and even despised. This is clearly pointed out by Chaker Salem (1999:12):

n’était qu’une illustration particulière d’options générales, déjà mises en œuvre au sein du territoire Français: la centralisation absolue et la liquidation des particularismes régionaux. Au delà de la phraséologie, l’État Français ne pouvait avoir que mépris pour les dialectes berbères sans tradition écrite et diversifiés à l’extrême. La seule perspective qu’il pouvait concevoir à leur sujet était leur lente disparition.

Last but not least, it is noteworthy to point out the fact that both the concepts Berber language and/or Tamazight are, now more than ever before, used for all political intents and ideological purposes to disregard the sociolinguistics validity and the cultural co-building of the speakers of that language.

1.3.1.2 Arabic

In actual fact, the term Arabic comes into view to refer to the language spoken by the Arabs. When first appeared in the Arabian Peninsula, Arabic is used to denote only the Classical Arabic, which was revealed later throughout the Holy Koran (Qur’an). Nevertheless, for better or for worse, this dead variety of language was substituted by two new varieties: Modern Standard Arabic (henceforth MSA) and Dialectal Arabic (hereafter DA).

The MSA is used particularly in formal written as well as spoken settings. It gives the impression to be easier and simpler in terms of its vocabulary words and grammatical rules in comparison to that of the CA. It emerges in favour of the Fourth Estate’s purposes and educational intents. Quite the opposite, the DA is mostly brought into play in informal and/or spontaneous communicative/oral situations.

---

As far as the earlier area of research is concerned, one should bear in mind that the current DA spoken in all over the Arab world and also in Algeria alongside MSA has created diglossic situations, the concurrent existence of two language varieties that are, of course, genetically related within a speech community level.

As a core subject, the history of launching the Arabic language in Algeria is dated back to the seventh century when Oqba Ibn Nafi and Musa Ibn Nusayr, leaders of the Islamic movement, guided troops to the northern part of the African continent to compel the native dwellers of the area to presume Islam as a religion and acknowledge Arabic as a language. At that point in time, the Berbers of Algeria adopted Islam; on the other hand they preserved their mother tongue (Tamazight). This accordance amongst the two splinter groups was basically owing to the peaceful advent of the Arabo-Muslims to the country.

It comes into sight from the exceeding discussion that up to the seventh century, the expansion of Arabic (CA, MSA, ADA) alongside Berber had continued, but this spreading out had been confronted by a number of awkward moments (as we shall see in the following sections) during the Turkish rule and mostly throughout the French colonization. In the face of such circumstances, Arabic had resisted for preserving its status over the Algerian territory.

1.3.1.3 Turkish

In fact, the introduction of Turkish within Algeria’s speech repertoire resulted from the crusade wars amongst the Christian and Muslim worlds in North Africa in the late of the 15th century. The existence of the Christian Europeans threatened the Muslims of the Central Maghreb, including of course the Algerians, from practising their religion. Thus, they asked the Ottoman Empire, the greatest Islamic power at that time, for support. In 1504, Algeria became a part of the empire and was governed by “a day” (a Turkish governor). This rule lasted until Oct, 20th, 1827.

From a purely linguistic point of view, Mostari (2005:41) clearly states that “despite the long occupation by the Turks; their linguistic impact upon the population was almost nil”. Definitely, this fact is attested by the total absence of

---

8 In Bouamrane.A, 1986 (Chapter I).
9 The wreckage of the Algerian Navy in The Battle of Navarin. This led to the French colonisation three years later.
such variety within RSC (as we shall see in 4.3.5). Therefore, both Arabic and Berber were maintained to be used in Algeria. Of course, this usage varied from one region to another as well as from one speech community to another.

1.3.1.4 French

In this respect, we will endeavour to refer to the manifestation of the French language (henceforward Fr) within the Algerian societal speech repertoire. Such appearance has pointed out a profound impact on both the sociolinguistic and cultural dimension and/or has originated a paramount change mainly in the economic as well as political levels at the post independent era of that speech community.

The initiation of Fr in Algeria is dated back to July 05th, 1830, when the French authority broke into the fortress of Algiers. This, however, put an end to Turkish rule over the territory. From that time on until July 05th, 196210, Fr became the dominant and the official language to be used in all life’s domains. This status is sought by the French authority to entail its supremacy of economical, socio-cultural aspects upon the Algerian speech community. In view of that, such situation tries to split off the Arabs and the Berbers besides it was a tool of eradicating Algeria’s identity, culture and Islamic values.

Indeed at that earlier point in time, the colonial administration succeeded to generate Fr and its socio-cultural norms. This was achieved all the way through using all potential means that could fight and/or restrict the traditional Koranic (or Qur’anic) religious schools. Moreover, implementing an adequate educational environment seemed to be the only measure to prioritise Fr over the existing language varieties.

However during the 1930’s, and for the aforesaid reason, the French authority passed a law, which to an extent estimated both Arabic and Berber as optional and/or foreign languages. Yet, the latter considered Fr as the only language of instruction in all domains; while, both CA and Berber were well thought-out of being symptoms of illiteracy and could hardly be used in religious practices.

10 Algeria’s Independence Day.
In such circumstances, conscious national tendencies and movements such as the Association of Algerian Muslim Scholars (commonly known as ‘Ulama’, a group of national reformists, which consists of a lot of elites, most of whom are religious men and teachers like: Abdelhamid Ibn Badis, El Bachir El Ibrahimi and others), FLN (National Liberation Front) led by many nationalist leaders and activists such as Ferhat Abbass, Messali El-Hadj, etc. They demonstrated an immense hostility toward the extension of Fr, ignorance and illiteracy within the Algerian society. Thus, they assumed the following slogan:

"L’Islam est notre religion, l’Algérie notre patrie, la langue arabe est notre langue."

(Islam is our religion, Algeria is our homeland, and the Arabic language is our mother tongue.)

Ultimately, they hasted to amend that language policy in a trail to recover the Algerians socio-cultural co-building, national identity and the Islamic values. Therefore, they struggled to adopt CA as the main, if not the only, language that shape the Algerian cultural identity as well the purely efficient means to fight French colonialism. This linguistic choice was strongly encouraged through the foundation of free private schools, commonly known as Zaouia schools (rural Koranic schools), where CA have to be taught for restoring the pre-colonial personal identity together with Arabo-Islamic culture.

In the light of the aforementioned discussion, it can be concluded that up to 1962 Fr had been the language of a minority of Algerians. Thus, it should be noted “that French was never imposed on the Algerian people as it has often been claimed by Algerian officials” (Bouamrane, 1986:40). In view of that, Fr becomes, particularly in the wake of Independence, absolutely recognizable that a large majority of people use\(^\text{11}\) it willingly in their daily communication, even by the uneducated ones.

\(^\text{11}\) The use of either standard Fr and/or the process of creating new language forms being enriched both at the level of vocabulary and of syntax through: borrowing, language switching or mixing...
1.3.2 The Post-independent Sociolinguistic Environment of Algeria

Within this scope of study, it seems praiseworthy to give a brief overview about the sociolinguistic situation of post-independent Algeria; under the clash involving the existence of a wide range of language varieties that belong to different language families on the one hand, and the problem of language management and language policies, that have been adopted then imposed on the citizens by the Algerian political authority since the wake of Independence on the other hand. This dilemma is due to the initiation of an official language policy (commonly known as the ‘Policy of Arabisation’) to strengthen the position of Classical Arabic in the different fields of public life. Such policy implementation has created a complex institutional framework for language use, as it will be seen in much ins and outs in what follows.

1.3.2.1 Uni-Polar Institutional Framework: Demands for Retaining Arabic across weakening French

As a matter of fact, the departure of the linguistic problem in Algeria appeared, at some point in such tidal circumstances, immediately after its independence from the foreign French rule which lasted over 132 years (1830-1962). More precisely, once the post-independent authority, during the mandate of president Ben Bella (1965-67), declared the implementation of the ‘Policy of Arabisation’, as a tool to fade away French from the Algerian society in one way or in another as an anti-colonial disdain of all that is French, throughout passing its first constitution in 1963 and later on the principle constitution in 1976 during the term office of president Boumédiene (1965-78) assuming Classical Arabic as the national and official language of all Algerians.

Despite the fact that the Algerian sociolinguistic profile is renowned for ranking the Arabic language as the national and official language of all Algerians, up till now the most amazing thing is that the term Arabic here is still fuzzy since it does not point out whether the dead CA is valid or MSA have to be used within formal settings.

---

12 The 03rd Amendment of the Algerian Constitution
In any case, it can be seen at the outset of launching the ‘Policy of Arabisation’ that the virtual principles of its implementation are to encourage studying the Arabo-muslim culture as well as to strengthen the national mood of the Algerians that is to say that the decision makers at that time assume that society needs to cease the use of French with the purpose of maintaining their Algerian cultural identity. Besides, some fundamentalists go even further to claim that French is the language of the enemy and refuse to use it.

In the face of this state of affairs, the above assumption of imposing CA and/or MSA as the only language that represents Algeria’s identity, culture and religion -Islamic values- seems to be as a total contradiction with the sociolinguistics, socio-cultural and ideological dimensions of the Algerian society. Furthermore, the above claim regards Algeria as a monolingual country and such consideration ignores the linguistic richness, the various speech communities and the different ethnic groups that comprise the Algerian society i.e. this denies the reality of qualifying Algeria as a bilingual country or even deserving to be called as being a multilingual one.

Thus, it is necessary then to put the previous proposals into question since it seems quite a challenging task to put away the heavy linguistic heritage of Algeria due to the long term of the linguistic contacts and the coexistence of three major groups of languages, alongside with CA and/or MSA, that belong to different families (branches) of languages (cf., Graph 1.1 p, 10).

Subsequently, the Algerian political power/leaders should bear in mind such linguistic diversity in the course of promoting an official language policy so as to conserve the patterns of individual language use as well for maintaining the relevance of the coexistence of Algerian Dialectal Arabic, Berber and French and the imposed CA and/or MSA as real successful linguistic practices within the Algerian society in the future.

Nowadays, Arabic language, mainly ADA, takes the lion’s share within the Algerian speech communities, as a medium of communication, where $80\%^{13}$ of the whole population utilizes it in their daily conversation/interaction alongside with the imposed CA and/or MSA that remains only as a medium of instruction in certain domains such as: the primary and secondary schools, law, etc. meanwhile, fails in

---

13 In Boucherit, A.2002 (La Situation Actuelle p.56)
other domains where French keeps its partially and/or widely usage for practical reasons: due to either to the personal linguistic preferences especially by the educated Algerians such as: doctors, teachers and university lecturers, engineers, administrators, lawyers, etc who received their education in French or due to the priority of the French language, for better or for worse, and its ability to suit the modern scientific research involving the availability of the technical expressions and the accessibility to the required scientific references and other sources of knowledge; in the intervening time, CA and/or MSA fails to fulfil the above requirements and to be updated with modernity and technology, for one reason or for another, in certain spheres of civic life where the French language is still prevailing such as in: medicine, banking, insurance, telecommunication, press, etc.

From the above vantage point, Akila (2001:01) within the same framework states that:

“Le français est devenue une langue élitiste, symbole de la réussite sociale et reste omniprésente dans les secteurs ‘de la banque, de l’économie et de l’ouverture sure universel’. Elle n’en reste pas moins la langue de l’acinien colonisateur.”

(French has become an elitist language, symbol of social success and remains omnipresent in the fields ‘of the bank, of economy and the opening up on the universal.’ It does not remain only the language of the former colonizer.)

Commenting on the earlier quotation, the proclaimed measures within the institutional policy of Arabisation have shown their implicit underlying principles. This, on the one hand, has given supremacy to the elite, prestigious or high positioned people in authority, and their children over the main domains of life. Undeniably, this actuality can be obviously seen wherein the privileged groups are likely to enrol their children in French schools and/or private schools with bilingual programmes in order to be proficient enough in French.

On the other hand, the aforesaid pronouncements have exposed the veracity that such imposed policy is in essence intended for the poor and/or unprivileged people. In other words, the execution of the ‘Policy of Arabisation’, from that time onwards, has demonstrated once more its inaptitude to fulfil the Algerian job markets’ demands for the reason that the Arabized students even if with higher university degrees are less likely to find posts in comparison to their French-educated counterparts.
CHAPTER ONE: The Context of Study

Moreover, in the face of the negative attitudes towards the existence of French, the Algerian authority through its continuum language managements and/or language policies from independence up till now fails to eradicate or even reduce its usage among the Algerian.

Therefore, it is high time for the Algerian decision makers to recognize that eradicating French from the Algerian speech repertoire over night is easier said than done and unreasonable because French becomes a part that make up the socio-cultural component of the Algerian identity due to the long process of acculturation imposed on the Algerian by the French colonization that lasted over more than a century and a quarter.

So far the most amazing thing is that, in spite of the fact that the Algerian government demonstrated for more than half a century after its independence the hostility towards the existence and the dominance of the French language in certain domains of public life, Ministry of National Education has incorporated French (taught as the first foreign language) into its national educational curriculum since 2003 onwards (as a requirement of its Educational/Schooling System Reform) as a basis of ‘bilingualism’ from the second year -as early as children are taught written CA and/or MCA- rather than the fourth year of primary education.

In view of that, this however shows again the substantial coexistence between Arabic language and its regional varieties and the French language in Algeria as an integral part that reflects the deep socio-cultural dimension that originates and obtains it roots from the contact over the whole period of colonization.

To recapitulate, then, it is worthwhile to note that French has never ever lost its status as being a lingua franca in Algeria where people feel free to alternate/switch regularly and sometimes fluently-especially by the elders-back and forth between Arabic and French as a strategy whereby they exchange their personal interests for pointing out their social attitudes, ethnicity and/or solidarity.
It is a truth universally acknowledged that the implemented language policy has created apparent imbalanced positions of one language variety over the others. Moreover, as a consequence, it leads to the raise of language conflict especially by the minoritised language communities, notably Berbers, who feel that their mother tongue will disappear in favour of the widely dominant arabised groups.

As a core subject and regardless both CA and/or MCA as being the only national/official language and Fr as the first foreign language, Berber has a specific socio-cultural position within the Algerian speech repertoire. This status was obtained due to its priority to the existence thousand years back within the region - Kabyle- (see Map 03). This variety is spoken by “a minority of 20% of the whole population.” (Boucherit, 2002:56).

Thus, for ideological reasons, the dilemma of the transnational Berber/Tamazight socio-cultural movements in Algeria started as a reaction to the continuous political decrees and ordinances aiming at extending the use of Arabic in all public domains since the early 1970’s.

The execution of such laws seems for the Berbers as a prejudice against their cultural identity as well a social ostracism from Algeria. The later standpoint is clearly stated in Grandguillaume, G (1996:11):

“Pour les Berbères, cette loi ‘scélérée’ a pour but non seulement d’accélérer et d’intensifier le processus de l’Arabisation mais surtout de supprimer définitivement le Berbère.”

(For the Berbers, this scoundrel law aims at not only accelerating and intensifying the Arabisation process but also at suppressing definitely Berber.)

Therefore, in trail of recovering their cultural recognition and linguistic status amid the other language varieties within the Algerian speech repertoire, Berbers strongly opposed these configurations throughout massive manifestations, strikes, protests and sometimes violent uprisings. Actually, these demonstrations pick up the pace since the late 1990’s.

As a fairly concession for Berbers, the Algerian government in September 1996 agreed to join the Haut Commissariat à l’Amazighité (High Commission for
Berber Identity\textsuperscript{14}). This was the first time; the authority recognizes Tamazight as socio-cultural as well as linguistic heritage and promises its usage both in education and mass media.

By 1997, the Algerian government promises preambles to its constitution in order to recognize Tamazight as being a defining element of Algeria’s character, alongside Islam and Arabism (i.e. without modifying the cited amendments of the constitution -art2/art03). From that time onwards, “the universities of both Tizi Ouzou and Bejaïa were offering Algeria’s first ever degree courses in Berber language and culture, and Algerian TV offered a short daily newscast in Berber”\textsuperscript{15}.

On February 2002, President Abdul-Aziz Bouteflika recognized Tamazight as a national language\textsuperscript{16}, alongside Arabic, in a constitutional amendment. Since 2003 onward, Berber has been introduced to the Algerian educational/schooling system as a compulsory subject matter in primary schools in Tizi Ouzou and Bejaïa.

To go over the main points, then, the unconscious and/or deliberate language management/planning and language policies in Algeria since the wake of independence onward have created a complex institutional framework for language use. This is clearly pointed out in Grandguillaume, G (1997: 3):

La politique linguistique des autorités algériennes aurait pu aboutir, pour les parlars arabes, à une solution «à l'égyptienne»: un mélange subtil d'arabe classique et de langues locales. Mais les parlars berbères? Leur vice premier, c'est qu'ils témoignent d'une Algérie antérieure à la conquête arabe. De surcroît, il n'y a pas d'intercompréhension avec les parlars arabes. Leur disparition était donc programmée par la logique même de l'arabisation, mais aussi du fait des pratiques du pouvoir. Avec un résultat redoutable: des fractions importantes de la population, pour lesquelles les langues locales représentent un support identitaire, se sentent exclues de la nouvelle construction nationale.

In view of above states of affairs, as well on the basis of the current relationships among the languages in Algeria and their social functions, none of the continuum language managements and/or policies that have been implemented have yet been able to change the situation of minoritised languages and/or rank imbalance between the different languages.

\textsuperscript{14} It was founded in May29, 1995 to defend the linguistics rights of Berbers
\textsuperscript{15} Algeria-Language and Toponymy 2003- p.05
\textsuperscript{16} Amending Ordinance N° 35/76 of the1976 Constitution
1.3.2.3 The Introduction of New Languages as a Requirement of Globalisation

Over the late of the 20th century and at the onset of the 21st century, a great importance of foreign languages learning and/or teaching is conceded in Algeria since ‘Arabisation’ is not able to meet the needs, the world’s new challenges and the management of public life (such as health, education, human security, etc.) that have been posed by the so-called globalisation.

At both the political as well as economic levels, ‘Arabisation’ did not seem to satisfy the job markets. Thus, for the previous proposal, the Algerian authority seeks to fasten together to the world’s train through its curriculum designers. The educational decision makers, then, set up certain parameters that determine the educational standards and the teaching opportunities. The best solution was the introduction of new languages such as: French, English, Spanish and/or German respectively.

To begin with, as it has been mentioned earlier Fr was widely used as a major force of instruction in the educational system and strongly implemented in political and economic fields, especially in the early and the late of the first two decade of independence. This is due to its priority of existence within the country for the long term of acculturation during the whole period of colonization. However, French was replaced by Arabic, which becomes the language of instruction later, with wake of the Arabisation process in the late of the 1970s. From that time onwards, Fr has been regarded as the first foreign language to be taught in all educational levels in Algeria.

Secondly, the widespread of the English language calls for increasing demands in favour of English language proficiency in today’s global socio-economical environment as well as technical and scientific movements. This is clearly stated in Bouhadiba (2002:16) that “English is gaining dominance in the oil sector, computing, and in the scientific and technological documentation.”

To a greater or lesser degree, the weight of learning and/or teaching English and the fact of mastering it even for the literate people, now more than ever before, within this globe can be avowed in Burshfield: “any literate, educated person on the face of the globe is deprived, if he does not know English”. (Quoted in Louznadji 2003:78)
Accordingly, in the early 1990s, a political debate was conducted as regards whether to replace French by English (regarded as the second foreign language) in the educational system or not, as being an indispensable means of commercial communication with Western countries as an alternative of French. In view of that, within the same framework Miliani (2000:13) states that “In a situation where the French language has lost much of its ground in the sociocultural and educational environments of the country; the introduction of English is being heralded as the magic solution to all possible ills-including economic, technological and educational ones.”

Therefore, in 1992 the government decided to preserve French while English was introduced in some primary schools on an equal footing with French as a first foreign language.

From the exceeding vantage views comes a need for well-trained teachers of English as a Second or Foreign Language (ESL/EFL). Algeria, as many countries all over the world, is establishing bachelor and master degree programmes for non-native speakers of English in the field of Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL). Although many specialists in the field of English Language Teaching claim that only native English speaking teachers are better suited to teach English, these new graduates are required to fill in the growing demands for English teachers in the various stages of the Algerian educational system (middle schools, secondary schools and even universities) through mastering both the oral and aural skills.

Finally, as regard as the remaining two languages: Spanish and/or German which are considered as the third foreign language within the Algerian curriculum (to be taught either at preference starting from the second year at secondary schools-only for Foreign Languages Stream- or willingly at the university level).

To sum up, one may possibly claim that both the phenomenon of globalization and the ongoing technological progression are framing out the linguistic choices made by people when using a particular linguistic medium of communication over another. More overtly, globalization necessitates, for better or for worse, the mastery of more than one foreign language to gather with the world’s new changes.
1.4 Relizane: The Context of the Present Investigation

1.4.1. A Geographical Overview

Relizane (Arabic: القيازان Tifinagh: Ḥil Iżan) is a domestic sub-urban agricultural Algerian province. The wilaya of Relizane is situated in the western part of Algeria; it is far away from the capital Algiers of about 250 km. It extends on a limited territorial area of about 4,870 km$^2$. It stretches out mostly between latitudes 35°44′N 0°33′S and longitudes 35.733°W 0.55°E. It is bordered by Mostaganem and Mascara on the northwest, on the south by Tairet and to the northeast by Chlef and Tissemsilt (See Map 04). It is cleaved from the city state of Mostaganem in 1984. Accordingly, it is designated as the 48th numbered province in Algeria\textsuperscript{17}.

The ethnic ancestry of the population of Relizane is composed of Berbers, Arabs and other ethnic groups from different origins. According to the last census of 2008, the density of the population of Relizane estimated 733,060 people (about 1505/km$^2$ (389.9/sq mi). However, the distribution of inhabitants over its territory is unequal.

\textsuperscript{17} According to the official order of the Algerian provinces (from 01 to 48)
The wilaya of Relizane consists of 38 Communes/municipalities (See Map 05), which are grouped into 13 main districts (daïras) as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communes/ Municipalities</th>
<th>Districts (Daïras)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relizane</td>
<td>Relizane 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Daoud</td>
<td>Relizane 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Aouda</td>
<td>El-Mattmer 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belassel Bouzegza</td>
<td>El-Mattmer 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Khettab</td>
<td>El-Hmadna 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mattmer</td>
<td>El-Hmadna 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellel</td>
<td>Yellel 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Saada</td>
<td>Yellel 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain Errahma</td>
<td>El-Hmadna 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Kalaa</td>
<td>Djidioua 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Hmadna</td>
<td>Djidioua 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oued El-Djemiaa</td>
<td>Oued Rhiou 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djidioua</td>
<td>Oued Rhiou 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Hamari</td>
<td>Oued Rhiou 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouelad Sid El-Mihoub</td>
<td>Mazouna 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oued Rhiou</td>
<td>Mazouna 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Merdja Sidi Abed</td>
<td>Mazouna 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouarizane</td>
<td>Mazouna 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahlaf</td>
<td>Mazouna 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazouna</td>
<td>Mazouna 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Guettar</td>
<td>El-Hamadi 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediouna</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Zentis</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammi Moussa</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Oueldja</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouelad Aiche</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Hassi</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain Tarek</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Echekkala</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er-ramka</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souk El-Had</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendas</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Lezrek</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oued Selam</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemmoura</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Derguon</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar Ben Abdellah</td>
<td>Sidi Mhamed Ben Ali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1. The administrative organisation of the wilaya of Relizane
1.4.2. A Historical Glance of the Wilaya

1.4.2.1. Etymology and History

The outstanding history of the wilaya of Relizane extended from The Stone Ages Era\(^{18}\). The native dwellers of the wilaya were originally Berbers (the name the Byzantines called the inhabitants of Northern Africa). At that point in time, it was dubbed ‘Mina’ according to the valley that it lies on its banks, where the primitive men settled, built their shelters, lived in caverns and used to manufacture tools from stone, granite, crystal rock, etc. The vital life in the region is clearly obvious in the tombs of Dolomite, rock paintings and Neolithic engravings within a lot of its caves such as Mount Bomengel and the cavern of Messrata in El-Kalaa, the valley of Tamdha in Mazouna, Mount of Sidi Said in Sidi M'Hamed Ben Ali and the Cave of Er-rettaymia in Oued Rhiou, etc. So, these remains/ruins have yield as much information as we need in order for us to have a clear picture of what life used to be like in the prehistoric times of Relizane, that is to say, each significant event corresponding to the development of the state will be examined in turn in what follows.

To begin with, most historians agreed that the history of the wilaya dated back to Numidian Kingdom Era\(^{19}\) between the years of 203-213 BC. It is said that the Berber name of the wilaya “Ighil Izan” means “hot hill/plain” is the descendant name of ‘Mina’. The forerunner name was, in fact, given by a Berber tribe known ‘El-Alweens’ around 40 BC. That period also witnessed successive waves of conquests and invasions; however, weak struggles with the indigenous dwellers.

The Romans expanded and flourished from the plains of Chlef and Mina up to the Atlas Mountains, where they, firstly, erected their tents within ‘Brosdan plain’, currently called Yellel. The Roman period, which lasted over five centuries, was characterised by agricultural refreshment owing to the wilaya’s wide fertile territory and commercial exhilaration that was clearly recognised through the establishment of huge urban cities. During that period, the Berber remained as the spoken language of the indigenous peasants of ‘Mina’; whereas, Latin appeared as the official language of the new comers.

\(^{18}\) In El-Mokaddima of Ibn Khaldune.
\(^{19}\) The kingdom extended from Carthage, in present day Tunisia, to Mauritania on the Atlantic coast.
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The Roman domination of the area continued until the emergence of the Great Islamic Subordinations in 681 BC. The arrival of Muslim conqueror Moussa Ibn Nossayer to North Africa in the year 720-719 BC led the tribes of Relizane to convert the Islamic religion. The new faith changed nearly all the character of region where the Arabic language was introduced to the Berber inhabitants who demonstrated their tribal allegiance, alliance and mutual recognition. The state witnessed a huge flowing of many new tribes such as ‘Houara’ in 671 AD alongside with other ‘Idrissids tribes’ that descended into the province immediately after the fall of Tlemcen and tribes from ‘Kotama’ near Setif. The Long-lasting harmony and peaceful coexistence among Berber inhabitants, Muslim invaders and the new tribes came to an end with the arrival of Fatimids. The appearance of Fatimids in the area created everlasting disputes and hostility towards their neighbours and, however, sometimes led to bloody battles.

Things remain that way within the territory at that period. Nevertheless, Relizane was well thought-out of being a crossroad to join the neighbouring cities through the establishment of a ‘Binding Passageway’ inside the city's wide fields and beautiful gardens leading to ‘Tiahrt’ present day Tiaret.

By the year 1517, the Turks (Ottoman Empire) reached the city under the leadership of Arroudj to release it from the Spanish rule yet to preserve Islam. Saadallah (1998) refers that the Turks assumed Mazouna, one of the oldest and most important cultural centres in Algeria at that time, as the capital of the west. Citizens of Relizane participated in many battles against the Spanish, led by Sheikh Sidi M’hamed Ben Aouda. In Bey Mohammed El-Kabir Era (1602 -1752 AD) the inhabitants of Relizane participated alongside with the Turkish aiming at occupying Morocco, the rest of Northern parts of the African continent as well as the Mediterranean basin.

However, Relizane remained as a Turkish protectorate until its fall in the hands of the French occupation on April 04th, 1843. The same year on the one hand witnessed the foundation of “the Popular Resistance/Confrontation” in Relizane, which became later more and more organised; while, on the other hand the French forces appointed lieutenant Bolivias as the leader of this region, where he set up three

20 Cited in El-Bakri's book *The kingdoms of the tract* "in Arabic: ممالك المسانك" (quoted in Ibn Khaldune)
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military corps and four flocks known as “line 88” (88 ligne). Moreover, the citizens within that year declared their pledge of allegiance to Amir Abd-el-Kader.

In 1853, the first group of settlers reached the city; among which 1845 French colonists and 1000 of whom were Spanish and Jewish. They spent their first night in “The Courtyard of Colonel Dronoua” (present day Courtyard of Resistance). They captured large fertile fields and shared more than twenty farms. The era was also characterised by resistance and popular uprising, notably the ‘Uprising of Dahra’ and ‘Revolt of Flitah’ led by Sidi Lezrag Belhadj, nicknamed Bouhmama, in 1864. These rebellions were, however, followed by several other uprisings. Accordingly, the French Authority called an immense concern over that issue by sending her famous leader, Napoleon III to Relizane in 1865 to settle the circumstances. Napoleon III confronted there with population anger, discontent and violent demonstrations led to bloody accidents. This worsened the situation there in which, of course, he found it too difficult to resolve.

By 1873, France set up exceptional managing regulations in which the first municipal elections took place and the first mayor of Relizane, called Agara, was appointed. He was known by his extreme detest for the Algerians. In-between the years 1871 and 1956, the reclamation of more than 85% of agricultural land had released and the name of "California of Algeria" was given to the wilaya due to the fertility of its territory. Relizane in that period had given the honour of embracing the idea of setting up the well-known party ‘Star of North Africa’ under the leadership of Messali Hadj and Hadj Ali Kalai Relizani was appointed as the president over this political movement in Rlizane.

With the outbreak of the Algerian Revolution of Liberation in 1954, the inhabitants of Relizane, like in the other neighbouring wilayas, responded to the call of the armed confrontation against the French Colonisation and, however, participated in several attacks and decisive battles. Both “Cherrata” and “Ouancharisse” were selected as headquarters to lead the Fourth Region. In conclusion, the previously cited chronology can acknowledge the contribution of Relizane in recovering of the national sovereignty.

To put in a nutshell, then, there is no doubt that the successive waves of conquests and invasions of the wilaya of Relizane over its very stretched historical epochs had created a heavy cultural contact which to some extent shape the linguistic richness/diversity, where both genetically related and unrelated language
varieties are involved. In fact, these varieties constitute the various social structures that contribute greatly in the choice and/or use of the codes within RSC.

1.5 Conclusion

This chapter opens to the elements the substantial motives that go behind the melting-pot linguistic situation existed currently in Algeria. This linguistic richness, diversity and/or complexity of the Algerian speech repertoire are due mainly to the heavy socio-cultural contact among multiple language varieties that belong to different language families on the one hand. Besides, on the other hand, the continuum language planning/management and/or policies that have been adopted by the Algerian regime during the early post independent era also play a key role in shaping Algeria’s contemporary linguistic situation.

Admittedly, the long-term of acculturation, the reciprocal relationships stuck between these languages as well as the different language planning or policies have created, to an extent, sociolinguistic conflicts amid the various language varieties that make up the linguistic miscellany of the country. Yet, they have caused salient linguistic features (such as bilingualism, diglossia, language switching/mixing and lexical borrowing, etc) that cannot be underestimated.

To a greater or lesser degree, these linguistic processes have an effect on Algeria’s different speech communities as well as their speakers. Therefore, it is high time decision makers be acquainted with these focal practices and should appreciate, maintain and take advantage of rather than discard.

In the subsequently chapter, a focus will be on the aforementioned linguistic features in much more details with a particular reflection to language switching/mixing as a vital component of the target speech community (RSC).
2.1 Introduction

The present chapter seeks to highlight additional awareness to this dissertation as a primary investigation means whereby the theoretical foundation can be accomplished in accordance with what we attempt to demonstrate upon for the clarity and intelligibility of this thesis research.

The first section of this chapter, Conceptual Framework, is devoted to defining some important keywords - notions - standing basically on our understanding and perception of how recent conceptualizations of researchers and scholars’ explanations and descriptions have incorporated into the treatment of the salient features of the various linguistic outcomes of language contact situations.

Whilst the second part, Issues Surrounding Code-switching Studies, is shaped in order to explore the interrelationships between the different outcomes of the phenomenon of language contact such as multi/bilingualism, code switching, code mixing, and borrowing. These subject matters have pointed out the awareness of a wide range of researchers and students within various worldwide bilingual speech communities.

The earlier parts will hopefully operate in third together with the fourth constituent, The Social Analysis and The Psycholinguistic Analysis respectively, as integral procedures to examine the language choice/use in the midst of the speakers as individuals as well as vigorous members in the society they live in. Afterwards, to interpret the bilinguals’ attitudes, motivations, social factors such as gender, socio-economic status, age, ethnic group and other purposes that go behind that selection which may influence these continuous dynamic linguistic processes. More explicitly, this will help us to draw a clear picture about both the sociological and psychological perspectives about the entire targeted speech community and the bilingual speaker alone in particular.

The last section attempts to deal with the linguistic perspective of these practices i.e. the structural side - morphosyntactic patterns and the grammatical features of language(s). The first sub-segment in this section, The Structural Levels of Code switching alludes to two necessary key concepts – intra-sentential and inter-sentential levels of language switching, which will be employed while analysing and discussing our collected data structurally.
While the second sub-element, *The Major Competing Structural Models and Theories to Code-switching Studies*, spotlights the various prevailing analytical and, however, critical models and theories that have dominated the sociolinguistics dimension of code-switching research; Besides, undertakes how far the contemporary contesting and/or even complementary to one another approaches can be applied for conducting the current study in an Algerian – particularly within RSC– context all the way through discussing the core assumptions of these models. Ultimately, we will attempt to illustrate our choice of Muysken’s Typological Approach (2000) to CS over the other existing theories and models.

### 2.2 Conceptual Framework

At this point, we would like to focus on four interrelated key concepts that have been, in some way, fundamental concerns of the current research. These notions will hopefully allow us to address the role of language(s), most of the time, in reflecting cultures, establishing solidarity within communities as well as (re)constructing social identities on the one hand. Moreover, on the other hand to be acquainted with the basic terminology (to stay away from the confusion) related to the topic of language switching and mixing processes as dynamic communicative strategies resulting from the various possible language contact situations alongside with other psychological or socio-economic factors in shaping the basic social principles while exchanging interpersonal relationships in the course of revealing individuals’ attitudes, exhibiting their behaviours, negotiating their social status, etc during conversation/interaction.

In view of the above states of affairs, these concepts will help us to understand the occurrence of these linguistic phenomena within their theoretical orientation at first and then enable us to overcome the problems associated with the idea of applying them during the methodological examinations later. That is to say to be capable of making an apparent distinction between the various theoretical explanations/justifications and their applications in real situations or contexts.
2.2.1 Bilingualism

At present, globalisation, the mass media and the ongoing technological innovations rule our contemporary world. Therefore, the tendency of being a bilingual rather than a monolingual speaker, undoubtedly, within this twisted world has turned out to be more than a prerequisite.

Records have exposed that ‘bilingualism’ is well thought-out amongst the various privileged forms of language contact situations; yet, it is acknowledged as the oldest and most frequent term for what the linguist Uriel Weinreich (1953) referred to as “the contact of two languages”. Accordingly, the term ‘bilingualism’ currently has been given more attention by wide range of linguists, researchers, students, pedagogues and so on.

Despite the fact that a great number of analytical discourses and discussions have been spread and so many books and articles published to treat and analyse the real causes and the vital linguistic outcomes of the widespread of that phenomenon among whole societies - speech communities – and/or even particular individual; scholars and sociolinguists are still, up till now, unable to provide an accurate or a common definition or to share a considerable explanation concerning the notion ‘bilingualism’. This is simply for the reason that it is a relative concept that may possibly represent or mean different things to different people.

Approaching the general public, undoubtedly, specialists in the sociolinguistics discipline demonstrate a discrepancy to share an exhaustive definition of how the notion ‘bilingualism’ should be defined and who a bilingual is; even it gives the impression of being a familiar concept for them - everyone knows what bilingualism is and who deserves to be called a bilingual speaker. This difference amongst scholars and sociolinguists about defining the term is may perhaps be in turn to: “the degree of bilingualism, functions, alternation and interference within the bilingual interaction/conversation”.  

The degree of bilingualism is mainly referred to the level of linguistic proficiency that must be accomplished by an individual in both languages to be considered as a bilingual (of course, this does not necessarily mean a high level and a total control of the involved varieties or a native like proficiency in both languages). Functions lay emphasis on the language choice (use) in the

---

21 Mackey 1968 (quoted in Romaine, 1989:11)
.miscellaneous domains of life in different settings and situations such as schools, media, army, work, family etc. Alternation is mostly associated with the individual’s need to move simultaneously from one variety to another to negotiate or exchange his/her personal interests. To the extent that the last requirement – interference - is concerned, it has to deal with the bilingual speaker’s decision to exploit and/or keep the languages separated or combined.

Bilingualism is defined by Susan Gal as “the use of more than one language by a single individual or community.”\textsuperscript{22} ; while, quite the opposite, René Appel and Pieter Muyken (1987:3) advocates that “the term bilingual and bilingualism apply to situation where more than two languages are involved.”; Whereas, Li Wei (2007:7) states that “the term bilingual primarily describes someone with the possession of two languages…” and adds “…the possession of individuals who do not live within a multilingual country or speech community.”

However, the amazing thing is that all the foregoing definitions come into view to be more universal and extremely broad for the reason that they do not take into their consideration to set the issue of degree (linguistic proficiency) with the intention of meeting the criterion when and how an individual or a society deserve (s) of being called a bilingual/ism. This claim is apparently perceived in François Grosjean’s book \textit{Life with Two Languages} (1982) in its preface:

Contrary to general belief, bilinguals are rarely equally fluent in their languages, some speak one language better than another, others use one of their languages in specific situations and others still can read and write one of the languages they speak.

Accordingly, Grosjean advocates, on the one hand, that the bilingual speaker develops competency and proficiency in his/her languages standing mainly on the communicative needs required in each context or situation all the way through daily real contact; and stresses on the other hand that the real bilingual may well have the ability to read or write at least one of the languages s/he speaks.

With reference to all the preceding definitions and throughout the examination of a variety of other descriptions and explanations concerning the notion ‘bilingualism’, one could rather prefer using Bouamrane’s definition (1986:15) “the use by an individual, a group or nation of two or more languages in

all uses to which [they] put either” which gives the impression, for the most part, as being the most significant one for the reason that it combines several scholars’ definitions.

2.2.2 Code
The large majority of scholars if not all in the linguistic field –predominantly in the discipline of sociolinguistics - have equated the concept code with language. This means that the notion code, here, is typically used to refer to any kind of language style or system.

Specifically, Arabic (Algerian Arabic - AA- and Classical Arabic - CA), French (Fr), English (Eng), Spanish (Sp) are codes. Moreover, the transliterated words where Romanized Arabic - spelling Arabic words in Roman letters- brought into play in SMS (more than ever by the younger generation) are also codes, and/or even the smallest characters - the morphophonological adaptation then adoption of certain words (such as ‘b1’ for ‘bien’ i.e. good) or numbers that are employed instead of some letters (such as ‘sba7’ for ‘sbaħ’ i.e. morning) or the abbreviated words where sometimes a vowel or a consonant is crossed out (such as ‘slt’ for ‘salut i.e. hi) are all codes.

As far as this area of research is concerned, the term code is herein essentially used to refer to all the different coexisted language varieties that are used by the interlocutors within RSC via SMS as a dynamic communicative strategy whereby they state interpersonal interests, exchange information and/or share their private experience.

2.2.3 Code-switching
Up till now, the term code-switching has been used in such a very broad common sense. That is why; it seems worthwhile to turn up at discussing the concept in much supplementary ins and outs.

Code-switching (sometimes written code switching) also known as code alternation, is considered as one in the midst of the various fruitful fields of investigation in the linguistics field, predominantly the sociolinguistics discipline, as well as an appealing phenomenon in the sphere of language contact situations which has occupied the curiosity of a wide range of scholars and sociolinguistics who have
endeavoured to define the term code-switching in several ways, of course with slight differences.

Amongst the scholars who have a propensity to delineate the concept code switching, one can quote: John Gumperz (1982:59) who defines it as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to tow different grammatical system or subsystems”. In addition to Gumperz’s definition, Carol Myers-Scotton (1993a, vii) provides the following definition to the same term as “the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn.” However, in the intervening time, the same concept is defined in the Longman Dictionary (p.101) as “a change by a speaker (or writer) from one language or language variety to another one.”

Making an allowance for the above definitions, then, CS can be defined as the free conscious simultaneous movement, shift back and forth, between various language varieties usually within discourse by the speaker or writer particularly at a phrase level to fill in either speech and/or writing gaps.

In essence, the phenomenon of CS can and does occur in bilingual speech communities where speakers or even writers use it most of the time to play with diverse language varieties. This means that, CS is used as a dynamic communicative device to get either rhetorical affects or to manifest ethnical identities. CS has been happening for centuries in many socio-cultural contact situations. Therefore, the ideas which go with the view that it is a sign of a lack of linguistic competency and/or leads to the destruction of cultures and languages seems to be an absolutely mistaken claim for the reason that there is no concrete evidence that such destructive force has occurred.

It is increasingly clear, in fact, that there are lot of proofs, against the previously cited assumptions, that language switching is a creative force that is being frequently used in different domains to accomplish effective language communication. Therefore, people are obliged to cross all the boundaries between languages to understand as well as communicate straightforwardly with one another. Evidently, they are not disposed to go entirely in one language to do so since they are not living their lives just in one language or just one culture.
2.2.4 Text Messages (SMS Language)

The expression “text messaging” and the terms “texting” or just “messaging” are, over and over again, used to refer to the epigrammatic and almost brief discourse which may obtain in the form of typed, however, mixed informal written codes/languages that are sent and/or received using the Short Message Service through cellular phone.

The Short Message Service allows these messages to be sent or received from one user to another via a Short Message Service Centre (hereafter SC). The latter is responsible for storing and forwarding short messages. The SC is provided by the worldwide well known network: the General System for Mobile Communications (GSM): (see Figure 01)

In spite of the fact that SMS language has unique style, lexicon and a form of language that is totally mismatched with the normative grammar and natural processing of the spoken and written languages⁴ (this may possibly be in turn to its restricted expression and limited content⁵), it does serve different communicative functions and perform special meanings in the sense that its content enables the two users even far away from each other to greet, exchange information and share their private experience or interpersonal interests.

---

Graph 2.1 the system of sending and receiving messages provided by GSM

---

²³ Refer to the formal style of language.
²⁴ Each message supports up to either 160 characters in length when Latin alphabets are used or 70 characters in length when non-Latin alphabets such as Arabic and Chinese are used.
2.3 Issues Surrounding Code switching Studies

The coexistence of different varieties of languages in situations of language contact, mostly in bilingual speech communities, has produced some common and/or critical sociolinguistic consequences. The most widely accounted significance of these contact situations is language switching / mixing and lexical borrowing.

Taking into consideration the definitions in (2.2) and with regard to most of scholar’s contesting distinctions, either splitting up or connecting the issue of CS from other language contact phenomena; this however remains as a highly debatable subject matter that should be referred to, now and then, in most linguistic contact situations studies. Bearing in mind the above-mentioned requirement, the following sections will attempt to undertake how far this distinction can be made involving these salient features of contact.

2.3.1 Code-switching and Bilingualism

In the light of recent studies in contact linguistics, it seems relatively expected in any research or discussion on the subject of bilingualism to incorporate the term *code-switching* in view of the fact that it becomes tremendously prevalent in any bilingual atmosphere or environment for bilingual participants to shift, more often, freely and simultaneously for a minute or minutes from his own language to (an)other language(s) looking for either isolated words, idiomatic expressions, proverbs, or even larger stretches of words such as phrases and sentences while engaging in a particular topic in their everyday personal lives to show mainly either their bilingual proficiency and/or to perform different functions depending on situations or contexts.
2.3.2 Code-switching and Borrowing

As a matter of fact, countless studies carried out on CS in the sociolinguistics field tend to devote at least a short section to demarcate code-switching from borrowing or to signal a wide range of distinct suggestions concerning the two concepts.

Since code switching and borrowing are ordinary phenomena in language contact situations and bilingual contexts in which the distinctions or even the splitting up between the two terms is highly debatable and yet relevant, many scholars consider and discuss them as divergent phenomena and attempt to draw boundaries between them standing on the fact that; one of the most major strengths to do so is that CS requires speakers to be competent bilinguals whereas borrowing does not fulfil that requirement.

Therefore, the previous claim, then, come into view to be avoidable in recent discussions on bilingualism for the concrete relationship, as it will be referred to below, between CS and borrowing is clearer enough than that.

Borrowing is defined by Gumperz (1982:66) as “the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one language into another.”

Unlike CS, as defined beforehand, which takes place in stretched units of language, borrowing usually involves the adoption then, most of the time, the adaptation of single words into morpho-syntactic and phonological system of the other language without taking into consideration their sources. This means, the integration of foreign words into the recipient -or host- language as if they belong to its native language system- or guest language. In other terms, CS is regarded to have a slight difference from that of borrowing in the sense that the first repeatedly involves the use of larger stretches such as phrases and sentences from (an)other language(s); whereas, borrowing concerns only the use of isolated words within another language.

In spite of the fact that a lot of sociolinguists have made great efforts to characterize the term borrowing in a specific manner, all the provided explanations of the conception as opposed to CS in all their studies remain an open-ended subject matter. This means that it has been proved, once more, that it seems quite a challenging task to draw a line between CS and borrowing and that the distinction between the two concepts is not relevant at all for the only reason that every CS process starts life as borrowing practice.
As far as both the structural and code alternation approaches are concerned, borrowing an isolated word or sometimes idiomatic expressions and proverbs (insertions) or stretches of words, sentences and phrases (alternations) in their occurrences in interaction are considered as two forms of CS that cannot be distinguished from each another.

In a few words, taking into consideration the above distinctions between the two concepts; it is reasonable to state that it is easier said than done to draw lines (boundaries) between the two terms since the description and/or even the distinction between them is noticeably established.

2.3.3 Code-switching and Code-mixing

Very often the term code-mixing (henceforward CM) is synonymously used to mean metaphorical code-switching (as we shall see in 2.4.1.1.2). This phenomenon frequently occurs as soon as a bilingual speaker tends to shift from one language variety to another while conversing through using a few words from the first language, than alternating to the second language, after that coming back to the first and so on.

Disimilar views have come into vision regarding the two concepts - CS and CM - that have been regarded as prominent subject matters in the domain of contact linguistics. Some linguists, on the one hand, argue that they are two different paradigms standing on the fact that the first one arises at an inter-sentential level whereas the second one takes place at an intra-sentential level (as we shall see in 2.6.1) On the other hand; some scholars consider them as a two sides for the same coin.

In this respect, the term CS is used as a cover term to demonstrate all the linguistic alternations on both sides which may obtain within bilingual interactive contexts/situations. Therefore, taking into consideration the previous assumptions and arguments; it is, however, logical to keep away from disconnecting the two concepts from each other.
2.4. The Social Analyses of Code switching: Codes Selection, Social Norms and Identity

Albeit so many different features of CS have received attention, a great number of scholars in the field have focussed, for the most part, on the deepest significance of social relationships and the importance of social meaning of language alternation in every language contact situation; trying to identify the specific discourse functions CS serves through explaining why bilingual speakers talk the way they do. That is to say they attempt to investigate the substantial motives behind the language choice in each discourse or situation, then demonstrate the influence of switching and mixing processes on speakers as individuals and as active members of the group (how far can this code choice contribute and/or help the bilingual speakers to signal their ethnic belonging, loyalty or allegiance to the group/speech community).

In this respect, we will attempt to infer both the individual and social dimensions pointed out by code-switching and code-mixing practices in bilingual speech communities in general standing on Blom and Gumperz analyses towards these codes choices.

2.4.1 The Emergence of the Phenomena of Code-switching

John Gumperz’s ground-breaking work on code-switching has remained as the pioneer to deal with that phenomenon and the most influential one in the field of sociolinguistics. Lots of his earliest studies were carried out on Hindi and its wide range of dialects in which he gives us an overall idea about the selection of one language variety over another where he emphasises also that this occurrence depends on the domain, topic as well as inter-relationships amongst the bilingual speakers (participants) themselves.

Gumperz also states that the speakers in these bilingual regions live in situations of “rapid transition where traditional inter-group barriers are breaking down and norms of interactions are changing” (Gumperz 1982:64). Accordingly the language choice/use within these speech communities is governed by means of social norms alongside with individual ones.
2.4.1.1 Types of Code-switching

Records revealed that one of the most outstanding studies about CS is that of Blom and Gumperz in 1972 in Hemnsbeget, a small settlement in Northern Norway where they extended their analysis of the functions and the use of the two dialects, standard literary Bokmål and local Ranamål in which they describe the two varieties as distinct codes. Their work was regarded by several scholars as being a reference in multilingual matters on the whole and in CS and CM studies in particular.

The research was pursued in collaboration with the local teachers who are required, in fact, to deliver their lectures using the standard literary Bokmål as a language of instruction. But they are, unfortunately, for one reason or another tend to alternate to the regional variety Ranamål to encourage an open debate and promote a dynamic turn taken system in class. The latter is considered as a separate different social setting from that of the treated lecture itself, the lessons as it must be presented in class. Accordingly, Blom and Gumperz confirmed that CS can and do transmit a social meaning. As a result, they categorized two broad types of CS:

2.4.1.1.1 Situational Code-switching

The shift back and forth between the standard literary Bokmål and the regional variety Ranamål is called by Blom and Gumperz situational code-switching (also known as diglossic code-switching) in which the bilingual speakers tend to shift/switch from one topic to another within a changed social setting. Situational code-switching involves a direct relationship between code use and observable factors of the situation:

Distinct varieties are employed in certain settings (such as home, school, work) that are associated with separate, bounded kinds of activities (public speaking, formal negotiation, special ceremonials, verbal games, etc.) or spoken with different categories of speakers (friends, family members, strangers, social inferiors, government officials, etc.). (Gumperz 1982: 60)

In this vein, we can make a distinction between two central subcategories of situational code-switching:

The first is called addressee based code-switching where the participants can change language they employ according to the person (s) they are speaking to and this happens very often or can be observed amongst family members and friends, in cafeterias, at schools or universities, offices etc.
The second sort of situational code-switching is known as the topic based code-switching where the participants can change or shift to other language(s) because the language itself is associated with a particular topic. For a representative illustration to that instance, one can refer to Holmes’ example (2000) in which she refers to Chinese students living in England who use their native language (Cantonese) while cooking at home and then they go back to do their homework in English because they study economics in English and are obliged to switch to English for that particular topic or semantic field.

As a consequence, situational code-switching can, however, come about at a social dimension that is why situational code-switching has been considered to be normative.

2.4.1.1.2 Metaphorical / Conversational Code-switching

Blom and Gumperz (1972) have also pointed out, on the other hand, within the same corpus another type of CS which is regarded and distinguished from the first one to be more individual, non-normative. Therefore, the notion of metaphorical code-switching, as many sociolinguists prefer to call, is used to take into consideration the language alternation of the language systems for specific purpose(s) which may obtain within the same discourse and setting. That is to say, metaphorical code-switching or what Hudson has called (1980:53) conversational code-switching, or also what is called currently CM can be explained as the ability, strategy and capacity of the competent bilingual speaker to alternate from one language variety to another or to use the two varieties within a single setting.

To recapitulate, metaphorical code-switching comes about without any observable change in the physical situation:

The context in which one of a set of alternates [codes] is regularly used becomes part of its meaning, so that when this form is then employed in a context where it is not normal, it brings in some of the flavor of this original setting.

Blom & Gumperz’ (1972: 425)

In view of the aforementioned statement, in such type of language mixing/switching; the situation does not determine the language choice but the language itself identifies and describes the situation. So, conversational code-switching is not directed and/or controlled only by social norms, but also governed
by means of special individual communicative purposes, objectives and rationale that denote his/her ethnic belonging and/or dependability to the speech community.

2.4.2 Auer’s Pragmatic Approach

Peter Auer’s Pragmatic Approach, appears in 1984, is also well thought of being as a central model to the analysis of code alternation in multi/bilingual studies. Auer perceives that CS is much more than a rule-governed phenomenon in view of the fact that it is associated with the sociological representation of ethnic attitudes and conversational analysis framework of bilingual behaviour standing on the fact that “any conversation involving different varieties is by definition a conversational event” (Auer1998:1). Conversational analysis is mainly intended to describe the organisation of talk in interaction. Moreover, it serves understanding the turn taking system all the way through interpreting the wider socio-cultural motivations that lead bilingual speakers to alternate or shift back and forth between languages/codes at some stages in conversation. This means that the analyst is obliged, then, of “reconstructing the social processes of displaying and ascribing bilingualism” (Auer 1995:115).

Auer’s approach is a regarded as a pragmatic one because it takes into account, besides the socio-cultural parameters, the essential ways of sequential development where some of conversational/verbal cues such as pauses, interjection, hesitations, gestures etc are involved in an interaction during the conversational analysis.

Adopting such approach brings about the integration of extra conversational means within the analysis of the same conversation. Accordingly, Auer outlined a variety of distinctions between alternations (points of interaction), transfer (units of interaction), and discourse related functions (the consistent use of CS by means of contextual verbal cues/activities in speech) which characterise the participant’s performances.
2.4.2.1 Discourse Related Switching

In this process of language alternation, CS is related to specific language means whereby the participants tend to organise their usage of different available language varieties in interactions where, occasionally, different topics are tackled. In such conversations, repair initiators such as ‘what? hm? who?’ may be used and termination will be signalled by terms such as ‘I see’ and ‘aha’ (Auer1984:42). This means that the bilinguals produce these indicators/cues as a strategy, which may obtain to maintain the context as well as to attract the attention of addressees of what they say. They may possibly use this conversational device as a means to stress further emphasis to their messages.

2.4.2.2. Participant Related Switching (Preference Related Switching)

According to Auer (1984), the study of bilingual talk from the participants’ perspective requires a disagreement on a common language being used by the involved speakers. ‘Switching of this type is marked by a speaker’s preference of one language over another and conveys the interactional function or meaning of using two languages with a participant’ (Auer 1984:47). This preference may perhaps be in turn to the different implications when the same participants use/choose different languages within the same message. Accordingly, this form of switching differs from the discourse related in the sense that switching regarding the latter form points out that all participants involved in interaction share the same norms towards the language to be used.

Despite the fact that the previous assumption assigns the linguistic incompetence of the co-participants, the different preferences for using the two languages demonstrate and signal the persistence of the bilinguals’ language divergence choice within the same interaction.

2.4.2.3 Transfer

According to Auer (1984), transfer does not correspond to language contact and/or second language acquisition. From a broader sense, transfer is considered neutral with respect to the negotiated language of interaction. This means that code switching is a manifestation which is aroused from wider social and cultural contexts where, from time to time, the bilingual have a propensity to transfer freely
from one language variety to another then come back to the first variety and so on an so forth while interacting.

2.5 The Psycholinguistic Analyses

The psychological analyses of many language issues, like bilingualism, CS, CM, etc, have been regarded as focal points of interest to a range of linguists ever since the earliest period of the scientific research in contact language phenomena. In what follows, we will try to demonstrate the impact of the psychological side on the bilinguals’ productions. Therefore, we shall refer to Grosjean’s theory in an attempt to answer how does language processing mechanism take place in the bilingual brain when shifting back and forth between language varieties or producing mixed utterance and what are the substantial factors that may influence every mixed production by a bilingual?

2.5.1 Grosjean’s Theory

Going over abundant psychological studies that are carried out in language contact situations/contexts, scholars have acknowledged that the processing of languages within bilinguals’ brains is highly organised and that the choice, the switch back and forth or mixing codes or even lexical borrowings from other languages in the course of bilinguals’ discourse do not occur in a haphazard manner. More explicitly, these language processing systems are rule-governed phenomena.

Accordingly, the sociolinguist François Grosjean (1982:341) puts forward that “language borrowing is the legacy of those who live with two languages”. He strongly advocates, contrary to monolingual views, that the bilingual’s fluency in each language reflects the needs for that skills in that language. These latter vary according to the situation, topic and the interlocutor where the bilingual will use the available language varieties “for different purposes and with different people and often one of the two languages will be their more familiar, more personal code...” Grosjean (1982:256)

In the recent years, we have witnessed increased attention being given to the language processing mechanism within the bilingual’s brain which is obviously revealed in his/her productions and utterances. This processing and/or performance can be studied from two different angles: the monolingual and the bilingual modes. The first mode takes place where hypercorrection, interference, simplification and
overgeneralization come to mind all the way through discourse whereas the second one becomes obvious where CS, CM and borrowing appear during the participants’ interaction.

According to Grosjean (1995:261) bilinguals travel along a ‘situational continuum’ where at one end bilinguals are ‘restricted’ to be monolingual counterparts and at the other end, they can be bilingual with their counterparts i.e. bilinguals are obliged to ‘restrict’ themselves to the monolingual mode when they are among monolingual speakers. In such instances, the language of the bilingual is characterised by many ‘language deviations’ (hypercorrection, interference, simplification and overgeneralization) as a result of the deactivated language.

Thus, Grosjean stresses that these ‘language deviations’ facilitate the identification of language processing mechanism that takes place in the brain of the bilingual rather than of the bilingual mode standing on the fact that the bilingual can “extend the meaning of a word from the language he or she is speaking under the influence of other language” Grosjean (1982:308).

In reaction to recent studies, Grosjean provides a psycholinguistic interpretation to CS in which he focuses on the importance of the ‘base language’ in the course of bilinguals’ speech productions. However, the choice and/or use of a ‘base language’, which is identified as ‘the main language’ Grosjean (1995:262), can be influenced by certain decisive factors such as topic, interlocutor and situation. Sometimes, it is obviously seen that “bilinguals also switch back and forth between languages within one domain” Grosjean (1982:321). To this extent, determining the ‘base language’ becomes difficult to every mixed production by a bilingual: “Determining a base language used is far from easy except in most straightforward cases such as tag switches or single noun switches” Grosjean (1982:321)

Grosjean also observes that within the same conversation that the bilingual may well decide to switch the base language, the already chosen base language. This decision is identified as the “language choice” Grosjean (1995:363) of the bilingual. Subsequently, CS happens whenever the bilingual decides to integrate other new language elements to the ‘base language’. It must be noted, however, that this observation lays emphasis on both the internal alongside with the external variables.

---

25 Single word elements (either code switches or borrowings depending on the phonological effect of the base language on the word).
that may perhaps influence the bilingual’s choice of the base language on every occasion of interaction with another bilingual.

In the light of the above affirmation, Grosjean’s psycholinguistics analysis of CS highlights the meaning of a ‘situational continuum’ in bilingual language use, and shows up the distinctions between monolingual and bilingual modes as well as language deviations of the bilingual. The latter may perhaps contribute to the analysis of the language processing mechanism of the bilingual mind. Moreover, he clearly states the importance of the choice of a ‘base language’ in interpreting language switching/mixing practices as special forms of skilled behavioural components in the course of bilinguals’ interaction.

2.6 The Linguistic Analysis: Structural Aspects of Code switching

In addition to both the social and the psychological analyses, the linguistic analysis (the formulation of structural constraints) has also been recognised as a fundamental feature of language switching and mixing which has begun to be studied more scientifically only in the second decade since the earliest studies of a wide range of scholars in the sociolinguistics field.

The formulation of structural constraints on code-switching, where the structural side (morpho-syntactic patterns and the grammatical features of languages) is involved, attempts to test out whether these linguistic constraints are universal for all CS incidents at any bilingual situation or not. More to the point, to identify how far their validity can be applied as far as the Algerian context is concerned and mainly to recognize if the rules governing code-switching and code-mixing practices via SMS language within RSC are only linguistic, social or complementary to each other.

In view of the above reason, we will try to provide an analytical structural; yet, critical interpretation to a variety of mixed data -SMS- in a range of situations and contexts to put forward an appropriate model to explain the presence of such code-switching/mixing practices within RSC. To attain the earlier objective, we will focus in what follows on miscellaneous models and theories such as of Poplack (1980), Myers Scotton’s (1993) and Muyesken (2000).

26 From the 1980’s to the present day (the first decade was of the 1970’s).
Before starting our structural analyses, it seems quite important, from a linguistic point of view, to refer to the two levels or forms of CS that bilingual speakers may well use in interaction.

2.6.1 The Structural Levels of Code switching in SMS

As it is mentioned earlier, there are two levels (forms) whereby the speakers in the worldwide bilingual speech communities and in RSC, as a confined sample from Algeria, switch back and forth between the different varieties of languages: *intra-sentential* and *inter-sentential levels* of switching. With the advent of electronic communication via blogs, emails, text messages, etc; these two levels of switching in written productions, in fact, have become recurrent.

In the face of the structural divergences between the two levels, the ability of our bilinguals to alternate between the coexisted varieties within the same SMS is ample in my corpus:

2.6.1.1 Intra-sentential Code-switching

This form of CS becomes observable at the clause, phrase level or even at a word level. This type has a propensity to exclude any sort of morpho-phonological adaptation. This sort of switching is called by Poplack *flag code-switching*. Therefore, this type of switching is characterised by including pauses (commas, semi-colons…) and interruption (interjections).

Poplack (1980) states that this kind of switching is much more complex standing on the fact that it entails that the speaker has to be competent and/or proficient enough in the two language systems. That is to say, he must have a total knowledge and control of the grammatical systems of both languages to do so. The section below demonstrates some examples from my data of this kind of switching:

(1) *Slt, j’espère rakom bekheir, saha remdankom ntoma tani.* (FA CS)

(Hi, I hope that you are alright, happy Ramadhan for you too.)

(2) *Sm Ali, wech rak.nechallah bekheir w dar tani. Merci pour le msg. b.année w kol 3am wenta bekheir.b8.* (FA CS)

(Peace be upon you Ali, how are you, I hope that you are good and your family too. Thanks for the message. Happy New Year and every year you are well, good night.)
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(3) Bnjr, rani mehtadj flash disk urgent. Quant tu viens jibahli me3ak S.T.P rani fe’ddar. (FA CS)

(Good morning, I am really in need of a flash disk. Please, bring it with you when you come. I am at home.)

2.6.1.2 Inter-sentential Code-switching

Quite the opposite to the preceding form, this sort of code-switching takes place at the sentence level. The section underneath exemplifies this kind of switching:

(4) Désole mabgalich lcredit 2main sba nechallah ne3a’yetlek gn8. (FA/Eng CS)
(Sorry I do not have enough credit, I will call you tomorrow morning, good night.)

(5) Wach Mohamed esku kayen seminar 2main we’la la. (FA CS)
(Hi Mohamed just want to know if there is a seminar tomorrow or not.)

(6) Merci bl Ali sama 3idek toi-même et ta famille. (FA CS)
(Thanks a lot Ali happy feast for you and for your family too.)

2.7 The Major Structural Competing Models and Theories to Code switching Studies

Herein, we would like to draw attention to the various prevailing approaches to CS presumed by a range of structural and sociolinguistic tendencies/trends that attempt to point out their insights to early CS investigations that constitute distinctive approaches. These approaches try to provide potential explanations and suggestions and consider the usage of numerous terminological concepts to be proposed as the basis of determining and identifying the substantial differences involved in analysing language switching and mixing within the same bilingual discourse.

Underneath, we shall then refer to some of the earliest and most prominent competing models and theories; yet, complementary to one another that have taken over the sociolinguistic dimension of CS research that seeks to put in plain words why bilingual speakers talk the way they do, why writers confirm in writing the technique they perform, and what specific discourse functions CS serves above and beyond the structural approaches that concern mainly the grammatical features of
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language - morphosyntactic patterns. In view of that, we will focus particularly on the countless code-switching and code-mixing practices used by the bilingual participants within the RSC via SMS language.

Ultimately, we will try to put in plain words my choice of Muysken’s typological approach to CS over the other prevailing models. This approach seems to be relevant, for the time being and fits better the purpose of the current examination, in analysing all the incidences of language switching/mixing processes involving the coexisted language varieties in RSC for the reason that it takes into account the different structural, psychological and social constraints i.e. it comes into view to be an eclectic approach that combines, without exception, all the theories to CS studies.

2.7.1. The Grammatical Constraints on Code-switching

Shana Poplack’s paper “Sometimes I’ll Start a Sentence Spanish Y Termino en Espagnol” published in 1980 is well-acknowledged of being one of the most significant studies that revolutionised the linguistic aspects of CS, aiming at explaining the structural/grammatical principles (word-order requirements) between the languages involved in code-switching and code-mixing processes in bilingual contexts.

Accordingly, she formulates two main constraints to govern the interaction of the integrated language systems within the same discourse: The Free Morpheme Constraint and The Equivalence Constraint which she strongly claims to be accounted for the analysis of all instances of CS without exception i.e. as a universal appropriate description for all CS occurrences at any bilingual context:

**The Free Morpheme Constraint:**

*A code switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the letter phonologically integrated into the language of the bound morpheme...*  
(Poplack 1980:585)

**The Equivalence Constraint:**

*Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language...*  
(Poplack 1980:586)
Poplack’s grammatical constraints that concern the formal structure of switching within bilingual contexts contributed significantly to an early insight to CS research. Nevertheless, these two constraints were extensively criticised by a range of researchers who suggested counter examples from different languages within various bilingual speech communities challenging her consideration of the universality of both constraints i.e. asserting that these constraints can be applied for all languages.

Thus, Poplack later revises her theory in which she introduces the concept ‘nonce borrowing’ that is defined as an intermediate form between switching and borrowing.

At this point, we shall give examples from our own corpus in Fr/Eng CS via SMS to illustrate somehow certain drawbacks that stand against her approach:

(7) Sba7 elkheir, netme’na tkoun be5eir. versitlek drahmek elbareh l3chi’ya.smahly 3la retard. Merci infiniment.by (FA/Eng CS)

(Good morning, I hope you are ok. I paid in your money yesterday afternoon. I apologise your forgiveness for being late. Thanks a lot. Bye)

In example (7) above, the FA word ‘versitlek’ which is composed mainly of the French stem verb ‘verser’ (pay in) and the Algerian affixes ‘it’ (I) and ‘lek’ (you). The latter affixes appear here to behave like bound morphemes to be affixed to the French stem verb in which this sort of switching is unacceptable in terms of Poplack’s *Free Morpheme Constraint*. In addition, the comparison between the categories of the involved languages mainly the word order seems to be problematic at this point for the reason that switching back and forth from Algerian Arabic to French violates the grammatical system of the latter language. In the light of that view, it must be noted that this type of switching is, once more, unacceptable in terms of Poplack’s *Equivalence Constraint*.

Thus, the notion *constraint*, however, cannot be applied as far as FA code switching is concerned because the two language varieties are typologically remote and this again appears as strong evidence against Poplack’s claim for the universal validity.
In spite of the fact that Poplack’s approach faced countless criticism, it paved, in any way or in another, the way to many approaches and models that emerge as implements of analysing the widespread ideas in current structural development.

2.7.2. Carol Myers Scotton’s Model

Carol Myers Scotton’s groundbreaking work on CS has been recognized by a lot of scholars as the most influential one in the sociolinguistics discipline. This is, however, due to the heavy impact of her well-known models, the Matrix Language Frame model (henceforward MLF) and the Markedness Model (hereafter MM), on the current studies and researches on code switching for providing countless occurrences to strengthen her claims i.e. supporting her initial claims of universal validity by linguistic evident. The above models will be discussed briefly below as far as CS instances via SMS within RSC are concerned.

2.7.2.1 Matrix Language Frame Model

The foundation of Mayers Scotton’s MLF model is based on wide-ranging field work carried out in 1988 in Nairobi and is described then discussed thoroughly for the first time in her 1993’s book Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-switching.

The MLF model is mainly created to scrutinize the intra sentential code switching occurrences in bilingual circumstances. This model is well-recognized as being an insertional one for the reason that it stands on the fact that in any instance of code switching there is what is called a hierarchy between the languages involved in which one language has power over the other one as quoted here; “The matrix language (ML) is the main language in CS utterances in a number of ways, while the embedded has the lesser role” (Myers-Scotton, 1993b:4). Accordingly, the relationship between the matrix language (ML) and the embedded language (henceforth EL) is that the matrix language dominates the mixed clauses according to the subsequent principles:

(1) The Morpheme Order Principle:
In ML + EL constituents consisting of singly occurring EL lexemes and any number of ML morphemes, surface morpheme order (reflecting surface syntactic relations) will be that of the ML. (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:83)
(2) The System Morpheme Principle:

In ML + EL constituents, all system morphemes which have grammatical relations external to their head constituent (i.e. which participate in the sentence’s thematic role grid) will come from the ML. (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:83)

(3) The Blocking Hypothesis:

In ML + EL constituents, a blocking filter blocks any EL content morpheme which is not congruent with the ML with respect to three levels of abstraction regarding sub categorization. (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:120)

As far as the first principle is concerned, the matrix language determines and governs the elements in ML+EL constituents and that the system morphemes (e.g. inflectional or derivational affixes, articles, prepositions…) dominates the content morpheme (e.g. noun, verb, adjective…). The second principle requires that function morphemes can be only drawn from the matrix language. Finally, the Blocking Hypothesis restricts the role of the embedded language even more by allowing only certain embedded language content morpheme to occur in mixed constituents.

This model takes into its account, in addition to the social side, the psychological aspects of code switching occurrences in bilingual contexts. Accordingly, it is apparently seen as being an extension to her Markedness Model. Example (8) below from our corpus will be explained as far as Mayers Scotton’s insertional approach Matrix Language Frame model (MLF) is concerned:

(8) Slm, rani kha’ilitlek l msg f’l boita ta3ek, tu doit le lire maintenant. (FA CS)

(Peace be upon you, I left a message for you in your e-mail box, you have to read it now.)

Assuming for the moment that Scotton’s MLF model can be applied to examine the incidence of the AA/Fr switching via SMS language in RSC; it is, however, self-evident from the exceeding example that the expression ‘f’l boita’ which is composed of the French content morpheme ‘boite’ (box) and the Algerian Arabic system morphemes respectively: ‘f’ (an Arabic preposition of place means in), ‘l’ (denotes in Arabic the definite article the) and ‘a’ (that stands for gender-feminine in Arabic) confirm that the presented content morpheme is dominated by the Algerian Arabic system morphemes.
Nevertheless, “the notion of ML is often too rigid, the definition of system morphemes is problematic, it is difficult to find an appropriate definition of congruence, and the psycholinguistic processing model assumed is not fully explicit” (Muysken 2000:18).

From the above vantage point, then, the notion ML, which to an extent, is strongly attached to her universality claim; reveals one of the main negative aspects that arise in opposition to her MLF model in view of the fact that it went further in proposing the conviction that the bilingual speakers have to be more fluent in one of the two codes he/she uses. On the other hand, the most amazing thing is that this principle pays no heed, in some way, to the linguistic proficiency of some bilinguals who may possibly use the two codes in such perfect way that it turns out to be impossible to recognize neither the ML nor EL language all the way through their interaction. Two such examples from our data to illustrate the previous postulation would be:

(09) Slm, ana Mohamed, 3a‘yetlek plusieurs fois mis tu n pas repodu.3la l’appartement yla rak baghi tekriha ou pas. Seyed 9alek 9oli chehal tekder. Rodli + tot possible allah ye‘hafdek. (FA CS)

(Peace be upon you, I am Mohamed, I called you several time but you did not reply. It is about the flat whether you want to lease it or not. The owner wondered how much you can pay. Answer as soon possible as you can may God protect you.)

(10) slt, mama gatlek rwahi 3andena ,chehal machefnakech, t ns manque beacoup + k t imaginer. (FA CS)

(Hi, my mother would like you to come, it seems so long we did not see you; we really miss you more than you imagine.)
2.7.3 Muysken’s Typological Approach (2000)

In an attempt to characterise then generalise a currently vast yet confusing discussion of code-switching/mixing practices, Pieter Muysken (2000) portrays CS patterns in bilingual contexts from typologically different languages (genetically unrelated) as well as similar one (genetically related). In view of that, he identifies three main types of CS strategies in both inter-sentential and intra-sentential levels namely insertional CS, alternational CS and congruent lexicalization (henceforward CL):

2.7.3.1 Insertional CS

The characteristics of insertional CS according to him are usually single, selected content words from language (B) such as nouns, adverbs, adjectives, etc which are morphologically integrated into language (A) in which they became as a part of it. This means that, borrowing of single elements from (B) then inserting them into (A) as belonging to it. We may put forward, then, examples (11) and (12) below taken from our corpus which may well illustrate the above assumption:

(11) Slt, matenssach bach tjibli me3ak sujeyat stp .netlakaw 3la 6.30, ghadi njiblek les k7 video ta3 l3ers avec moi (FA CS)

(Hi, do not forget to bring the subjects with you, please. Meet you at 6.30; I will bring you the wedding’s party video types with me.)

(12) a dem1 n’challah .w matenseich la carte nationale ’ta3ek w lconvocation.bn8 (FA CS)

(See you tomorrow if God wills. And do not forget your national -identical- card with you plus the recall/summon. Good night.)

As far as this area of research is concerned, Muysken’s Insertional switching confirms, once more, Myers-Scotton’s MLF model validity in analysing many of the worldwide code switching incidences and, however, acknowledges its analogy to that of Auer’s concept of transfer.
2.7.3.2 Alternational CS

Unlike insertional CS as described earlier, Muysken demonstrates that alternational CS is a strategy of several language varieties mixing where the languages remain separate in the bilingual utterances. This means that the involved varieties will be used interchangeably in which (a) constituent(s) from the first language (A) is pursued by (an) element(s) from the second language (B) and so forth; then coming back to (A) within the same discourse.

The example (13) that follows from our data describes some structural features of alternational CS used in RSC:

(13) Azul, j’esper q vs allez b1,kirak dayer m3a remdan. Envoi moi numero 2 Kamel ila 3ndek ok. Saha f toundek, tha’la f rouhek. bye. (FA/Ber/Eng CS)

(Hi, I hope that you are good. How are you doing with Ramadhan? Send me Kamel’s phone number if you have ok. Have a good lunch. Take care. bye)

Accordingly, it is apparently seen that it is not that simple to identify and/or specify the dominant language.

As a result of Muysken’s alternational CS framework, however, one can noticeably recognize that he, over again, validates Poplack’s (1980) flagged code switching as well confirms Auer’s (1984) preference related switching.

2.7.3.3 Congruent Lexicalization

As far as theory of CL is concerned, Muysken suggests that this type of switching occurs only amid languages or varieties that largely share convergent grammatical systems; yet, the vocabulary is divergent or comes about between genetically related languages or with a low and high standard language variety. More to the point in CL, language mixing of all categories including function words are switched as there is no matrix language.

Subsequently, this type is not relevant to my survey in view of the fact that the RSC, as a confined sample from Algeria, comprises a wide range of language varieties that belong to different language families.

As a matter of fact, Muysken’s typological approach clearly states that these three strategies of language switching processes are governed by means of different structural, psychological and social constraints.
In view of the above statement, it is obviously put on display through table 2.1 underneath that best summarizes the abovementioned sight towards CS practices and, however, compares his approach with other models:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muysken</th>
<th>Poplack</th>
<th>Myers-Scotton</th>
<th>Auer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insertion</strong></td>
<td>□ (Nonce) borrowing</td>
<td>□ Matrix Language + Embedded Language constituents</td>
<td>□ Transfer □ (CS from Lang X to Y then X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Constituent insertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternation</strong></td>
<td>□ Flagged switching</td>
<td>□ Embedded Language – islands</td>
<td>□ Code-switching (from Lang X to Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Code-switching under equivalence</td>
<td>□ Matrix Language – shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congruent Lexicalization</strong></td>
<td>□ Code-switching under equivalence</td>
<td>□ Matrix Language – shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ (Style Shifting)</td>
<td>□ Matrix Language - turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ (Style shifting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Muysken’s typology compared with Poplack, Myers-Scotton, and Auer (Comparison with Myers-Scotton and Poplack taken from Muysken 2000: 32 Figure 1.3, comparison with Auer is described in Muysken 2000: 4)

To put it briefly, then, this analysis does not advocate one approach over another, rather than initiating valuable insights towards how CS/CM practices, as a landmark of multilingualism, can be investigated and/or interpreted in a theoretical framework. Thus, one should notice that all the aforementioned approaches and models are not in contradiction, but complementary to one another in which it is up to the researcher himself to make his mind up which one of them is compatible to his/her investigation.
2.8. Conclusion

To go over the main points, then, this chapter attempts to bring together the current sociolinguistic works on bilingualism along with a critical review of the prevailing models to CS research in an exclusive creative mode. This mode stands on a conscious choice/use of language(s) alongside a peculiar innovative style of switching/mixing codes and symbols integration which have been employed all the way through witting SMS messages, as fresh dynamic communicative social processes that involve some psychological features, in which their limited contents enable their users even far away from each other to greet, exchange their interpersonal interests, signal their social status, ethnic belonging, solidarity, loyalty or allegiance to the group/speech community (as it will be seen in chapter IV).

Therefore, this chapter considers a number of theories acknowledged in the literature of CS examination in real oral conversations in which it reveals Muysken’s (2000) typological approach relevance to the analysis of the current investigation. More to the point, this literature review appears as a primary attempt to bridge the gap between oral and written code switching processes analyses standing, for the time being, on the only fact that those individuals who are normally predisposed to code-switch when speaking will do so when writing (as we shall see in chapter III).

In the light of the same line of thought, reasonable personal opinions and descriptive theoretical considerations were provided to expose how far this research can contribute to the fields of language contact and, however, to obtain further measures about written code-switching, in particular, in a less-investigated area such as RSC, as a sample bilingual speech community from Algeria, where divergent language varieties that belong to genetically related and even unrelated languages are used interchangeably within the same SMS.

In the next chapter, we will focus on the research methodology (tools as well as procedures) in a trail to cover up and/or interpret the patterns of language-switching at both intersentential and intrasentential levels in text messaging via cellular phones as used by RSC on the one hand. Moreover, on the other hand, it will highlight valid analyses of the results of such informal written practices as an increasingly new medium of communication within the target speech community.
3.1 Introduction

This chapter is intended for presenting the research methodology that has been adopted in our examination as well as the research tools brought into play to carry out our analytical study towards the new widespread interactional strategy, which uses a peculiar innovative informal written style of switching/mixing codes, via SMS messages as used by the Algerians as whole and the speakers of the target speech community in particular. Moreover, it also tries to give further explanation for the choice of the design and the research tools and procedures used to accomplish our investigation.

3.2 Type of Research

3.2.1 The Twofold Channels of Communication: Speaking and Writing

Since this study comes across into revealing the common factors as well the various substantial reasons involved at some point in the social contacts within RSC; first and foremost, it is noteworthy to put on view the different sights towards people’s interactive social situations in general with a particular intention to both types of code switching, which are obviously avowed through the linguistic practices exposed within the target speech community.

Accordingly, this section is devoted to bring up the widely structural similarities and/or differences between the twofold modes of the communicative process in people's daily lives in general. These modes of course have been always considered as equally important means of communication besides as the central keys that facilitate the way language is used, understood and/or comprehend. In this respect, Sperling, 1996; quoted in Weigle (2002: 17) states: “...to talk of written and spoken language differences is to consider the range of communicative purposes to which either writing or speaking is put.”

Aligning with the abovementioned idea, table 3.1 beneath compares the abundant distinctions between the dual emergence of oral (spoken) and written communication as well endeavours to demonstrate both the linguistic aspects (such as register use, language prestige, politeness, gender specific use of language, and language attitudes) and the non-linguistic factors (such as bodily movements, facial
expressions, gestures, voice quality, etc) that shape the two different media of communication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Oral (spoken)</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instant reactions:</td>
<td>A. Rely on spontaneous speech.</td>
<td>Distant reactions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Does not have rules and characterised by using informal language (jargon, slang)</td>
<td>1. Based on sophisticated writing styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Requiring the existence/presence of both interlocutors face to face.</td>
<td>2. Have grammatical rules and formal vocabulary (highly codified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Speakers involved in a conversation have certain expectations about their exchange (sharing the same topic(s) of interaction).</td>
<td>3. Remoteness of both participants (sender and recipient) of the message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Bring into play of simplicity of language and clarity of sentences and (using short words and short sentences, focussing on repetition of keywords, typical words choice, etc), body language (facial expressions, gestures, clothes, the way the speakers stand or walk, their glasses, their haircut, etc), voice quality (articulation, intonation and stress, speed, pitch and volume and even sometimes silence).</td>
<td>4. Participants involved in a discourse have no expectations about their exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Necessitate a precise and concise message since it is mostly limited by place and time.</td>
<td>5. Necessitate that the message has to be complete, intelligible, clear and comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Immediate reciprocation and momentous feedback (responding to questions, demonstrating critical thinking and stating view points, justifying their positions and defending their arguments...)</td>
<td>6. The text or the message has to be coherent, cohesive and written in well structured format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. impossible and/or Ineptitude of coming back; revising, checking or correcting mistakes, etc</td>
<td>7. It must arouse the recipients’ reflections-(feelings and emotions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Understanding and/or Interpretation may perhaps differ from a person to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Possibility of rehearsal, stopping, re-reading or re-arranging ideas, revising, checking then correcting mistakes, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 a comparison: oral versus written communication
3.2.1.1 The Interrelationship between Oral Discourse and Written Message

By and large, human beings from childhood are predisposed to develop an oral communicative skill as being their own native language and may possibly follow the same procedures in acquiring other foreign languages. These spoken languages have been intensively recognized as the primary means of interaction as well as foundations for literacy.

In addition to speech, educational researchers and linguists consider writing as the formal sophisticated medium of communication that reflects speech sounds through using conventionalized symbols and graphs. Within this framework Crystal (2006:257) points out that: “Writing is a way of communicating which uses a system of visual marks made on some kind of surface. It is one kind of graphic expression.”

Because of our interest is based on written messages rather than spoken discourse, we intend to expose some significant features that empower writing over speaking:

First and foremost, the writer through his/her productions tries to express his/her thoughts, feelings or points of view towards a specific topic. This, however, calls for great mental efforts, in which a typical language (involves an adequate diction choice) should be included as well as conscious planning besides appropriate arrangement of ideas is presented. In this context, Rivers and Temperley (1978: 263) state that: “To write so that one is really communicating a message isolated in place and time, is an art that requires consciously directed effort and deliberate choice in language.”

Secondly, quite the reverse to speech performance where speakers use body language, facial expressions, gestures and change in their voice quality; writers mostly employ mechanics (capitalisations and punctuation conventions) instead. Moreover, the highly codified language styles, the well structured written format and possibility of re-reading or re-arranging ideas, revising, checking then correcting mistakes look as if it were an opportunity for writers to have supplementary occasion that enables them to make their messages complete, coherent, clear and comprehensible for their readers. Within the same states of affairs, Brown 1994; cited in Weigle (2002: 15-16) affirms that: “Writers generally have more time to plan,
review, and revise their words before they are finalized, while speakers must plan, formulate, and deliver their utterances within a few moments if they are to maintain a conversation.”

As core subject matter and regardless the above vantage point, the writer is mostly remote from his reader or even unknown for him. It is this absence of a shared context among the interchanging participants that makes an ineffective interaction. Since the turn taken system is absent and there is no expectation about their exchange, the writer finds himself obliged to wade into further details to make sure that what has been written is fully understood or well interpreted by the co-participant without others’ help. Within this scope Crystal (1994: 179) clearly states that:

Speech is time-bound, dynamic, transient-part of an interaction in which, typically, both participants are present, and the speaker has a specific addressee (or group of addressees) in mind. Writing is space-bound, static, permanent-the result of a situation in which, typically, the producer is distant from the recipient—and, often, may not even know who the recipient is (as with most literature).

3.2.2 Written versus Oral Code switching

Since the early 1970’s, a great many studies have been conducted and/or published on code switching by many specialists including Blom, Gumperz, Auer, Poplack, Myers Scotton, etc, most of which are concerned with conversational/oral CS as the foremost focal point.

Albeit some of these studies have a propensity sometimes incorporate few additional sources of written data, the latter type of investigation remain relatively under research or even unpublished. These records are usually referred to as ‘written code switching’.

Furthermore, the area of written CS within sociolinguistics studies have been extensively neglected and/or marginalised since there have been no specific models or theories developed in favour that genre of language alternation in comparison to that their oral-mixed language discourse counterpart. Thus, later on written language alternation studies have therefore become obliged to apply all the key concepts of the written type standing on the only facts that:
a) Written language switching/mixing practices share many substantial interactional features with the oral/spoken language alternation processes - as it has been clearly illustrated in the foregoing section.

b) Those individuals who are normally capable to code-switch when speaking will do so while writing.

Making an allowance for the previous arguments, this lack in written code switching research area throughout the previous decades may perhaps be in turn to the scarcity of informal mixed written messages and/or casual typed data in comparison to that of the current available corpus.

Admittedly, now more than ever before, the emergence of this genre of study has become possible besides relevant to be dealt with owing to the rapid manifestation of an assortment of globalisation’s tools including advertising (billboards, shop signs, etc), web pages, newspapers and magazines. Besides, the evolution of a wide range of modern technological means of communication such as computers and the Internet through the World Wide Web empowers its users - internauts- to send or receive emails through its wider research engines including Hotmail, Gmail, Face-book, Twitter, Yahoo, Messenger, etc, and predominantly all the way through using Text Messages via cell phones.

As a matter of fact, the extensive use of cell phones and other mobile devices in Algeria over the last decade “…over 33.5 million mobile phone subscribers…93 % of the population”\(^\text{27}\) has led to the creation of a new channel of communication mechanism, commonly known as Text Messages. This device, however, is launched by the customers’ of the three main competing leader operators of cell phones in Algeria respectively (Djezzy, Mobilis and Nedjma).

Irrespective of their social status, gender or educational level, messaging has become the common, the cheapest, the fastest as well as the most convenient medium of communication amongst the users of the cell phones in Algeria - first and foremost by the current generation- through using the Short Messaging Service (SMS) that is supplied by means of the GSM which permits the messages to be sent

\(^{27}\) According to a report announced by the Algerian Post and Telecommunication Ministry on August 23\(^\text{rd}\), 2010 on TV.
and/or received via a Short Message Service Centre (SC) which is responsible for storing and forwarding Short Messages.

3.3 The Research Tools and Procedures

Since we need to move beyond simple descriptive data of our ongoing investigation, the current section constitutes an important part of the study as it is devoted to demonstrate the research tools as well procedures used in this survey. The methodology that we present in this dissertation wishes to release valid analyses and interpretations of the results.

3.3.1 The Methods of Data Collection

With the intention of conducting such a study of language switching/mixing, it seems mandatory to gain access to a huge corpus of infinite number of SMS samples. The data bank of our corpus is collected from a quite smaller virtual bilingual community, previously referred to as RSC.

The period of data collection extended for nearly one year and a half. The devoted points in time attempt to cover up the informants’ attitudinal tendencies towards the choice of language varieties used in their SMS samples.

The prevailing data and statistics within the scope of the present study were generated from a mixed-up corpus of obviously occurring informal natural text messages, compiled from writing and/or transcriptions of a peculiar innovative casual style of switching/mixing codes within the target speech community.

In line with the objectives of the current examination, we endeavour to bring together the relevant information standing on:

a) Our perceptions of the available references (or documentary evidence), which is all-encompassing within the literature review.

b) Through mainly a questionnaire survey method.
In point of fact, many scholars argue that the questionnaire fails to expose considerable data about human subjects standing on the fact that:

...The respondents are not always available and cooperative. Furthermore, books, periodicals and other documents tend to be less biased in their collection and interpretation than interviews and other data collection procedures (Ibid: 113).

The aforementioned view seems to be relatively improper since the questionnaire do sometimes provide unexpected information and/or demonstrate ideas that the qualitative documentations fail to disclose.

In view of that, a self-designed questionnaire is set up following Bouamrane’s technique (1986). The questionnaire was expected to be answered by a random sample of 500 informants of the target speech community. However, unfortunately, the result was that out of the projected number only 316 questionnaires were returned. The questionnaires were distributed as far as possible to the different geographical areas where the speakers of the target speech community reside. The informants belong to different educational backgrounds, sexes, social settings and ages, most of whom are secondary school pupils, university students and teachers. Therefore, the stretched questionnaires were come back with either through in-class or take-home check. Nearly all the employed SMS within the filled questionnaires were transcribed with a focus on cases of code-switching/mixing to be identified and extracted from the individuals’ reciprocity.
3.3.1.1 The Objectives of the Questionnaire

The ultimate purpose of the collected data obtained from the questionnaire, which is designed as an integral part of our survey about the use of ‘SMS language’ as a peculiar innovative style/means of communication used within the speech community of Relizane, is:

a) To measure the effect of language contact in general on people’s attitudes towards choosing and/or using one language variety over another. This means, to expose the linguistic outcomes of the coexistence of different language varieties within the target speech community as well as to put in plain words their impact on the bilingual speakers in Relizane.

b) To investigate some of the major possibly beneficial dimensions of language switching/mixing practices in bilingual societies as a whole and to assess/evaluate their significance in communication efficiency in the light of recent studies and developments in linguistics, predominantly the sociolinguistics discipline. Particularly to assert that code switching and language mixing are acceptable forms of communication via SMS within the previous speech community.

3.3.1.2 The Use of a Questionnaire Survey Method

One of the focal key uses during data collection while conducting our empirical investigation is that the use of a survey questionnaire. Admittedly, the questionnaire has always been regarded as a tool of a paramount importance to be used by the researcher to capture the maximum data about a selected topic in just a very limited period of time as well as it enables him to obtain a quantitative description of the different issues surrounding the topic.

The designed questionnaire is structured in relation to what we endeavour to display upon for the clarity and intelligibility of my dissertation project. It contains 41 questions which are grouped under six major sections. It is meant to gather data about the personal characteristics, motivation and attitudes of the speakers of the target speech towards language use in general and the process of language
switching/mixing in particular, and their expectations about the future of SMS language usage in Algeria and their state.

As it has been mentioned earlier, there are mainly six sections within our premeditated questionnaire which are sub-divided as follow: The first set, namely personal information, is designed to obtain the basic informational resources about the respondent. The second section, the status of languages (linguistic heritage), is devoted to demonstrate the linguistic diversity and/or competency of the informant. The third part, language (s) use and attitudes towards language(s) choice, tries to consider the informant’s personal impetus that go behind selecting a language over another in interaction/conversation. The fourth segment, the attitudes towards language alternation and code switching, attempt to examine the speaker’s personal attitudes towards code switching in general. As a core subject matter, the penultimate fragment, SMS language usage and attitudes towards language switching/mixing practices through it, tends to investigate the respondents’ beliefs headed for that widespread interactional strategy via SMS inside RSC as well to reach their prospects for the future of using such genre of communication in Algeria and their state. While the last component, SMS samples, is meant to accumulate a corpus of countless number of SMS to be interpreted and/or analysed for a better over-generalisation of end results.

Accordingly, in the direction of achieving the set objectives of the questionnaire, a combination of two kinds of survey questions is used, notably open-ended and close-ended survey questions. In this survey, the previous two types of questions will explain, to some extent, the relevant factors that determine the choice of language(s) by the participants in certain settings. These factors help us to categorize each response as the best way of addressing the efficiency of language choice in interaction. Ultimately, the current scrutiny is meant to measure the effect of the socio-psychological borders (interlocutor, topic, setting and/or situation) on the respondents for obtaining otherwise changing their attitudes towards the language they use in each particular situation.
3.3.1.2.1 Open-Ended Survey Questions

Overall, such research technique needs an interpretation or explanation from the informants by asking them questions which commonly begin with words such as “what,” “why,” “how,” “describe,” or “explain.” Open-ended questions enable the potential respondents to express themselves freely as well provide the researcher with wide range of relevant information. The responses to the open-ended questions offer various answers in a number of ways which are sometimes unexpected but guiding ones while arguing or giving suggestions.

Even though this kind of questions supply a lot of useful information and sometimes contribute to provide new ideas to the researcher, most scholars agree that the only limitation associated with such category of questions is that they are so difficult to be analysed especially when the answers are unpredicted or undesirable.

From the above state of affairs, unfortunately, in this paper there were extremely short answers that often lack proper grammatical structure and sometimes empty spaces or yes or no. Therefore, we intend to take into our consideration—as a challenging task—only the fully expressed, well-formulated or fine justified responses.

3.3.1.2.2 Close-Ended Survey Questions

Such type of questions provides precise and concise answers rather than open-ended questions responses do since they are mostly guided and selective. In close-ended questions, the area under discussion has been already planned with a clear purpose in mind. In view of that, the informant is likely to choose the appropriate answer among the multiple suggested possibilities each time just to confirm the researcher’s doubt about the question (i.e. they don’t add new information).
For a better accumulation of data, a unique questionnaire sample was handed to the informants. The questionnaire was presented either in French or in Arabic (at preference\textsuperscript{28}) due to their familiarity to the target group of speakers.

In the fullness of time, the revealed facts riffled through the questionnaire will be transformed into numerical figures so as to smooth the progress of the interpretation of the findings (as we shall see in the next chapter).

3.4 The Importance of Probing People’s Attitudes toward Language Choice/Use in SMS

As it has been already indicated, the questionnaire attempts to elicit and/or facilitate the perception the speakers’ attitudes of the RSC toward language choice, use, and the efficiency of language switching in communication as a whole and code switching/mixing in SMS in particular. Accordingly, this section provides in sequence the importance of attitudes, as a key assumption in probing the individuals’ motivations or related beliefs towards that selection.

So far, we have frequently applied the expression attitude in such a broad common sense. Thus, it seems worthy to include a definition within this scope. According to \textit{Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary}, attitude is “A feeling or opinion about something or someone, or a way of behaving that is caused by this.”

Therefore, it is a commonly held postulation that the term attitude refers to human beings’ psychological states perceptions in life. These attitudinal tendencies can be understood by interpreting one’s feelings or emotions, analysing individuals’ ideas, judgements or opinions about a particular issue and/or observing peoples’ actual behaviour in a specific social situation.

\footnote{I intentionally asked which type of language they prefer to use in filing their samples just to get prejudgements as well to probe one of the main attitudes towards language choice in RSC.}
As a general rule, researchers usually presume that attitudes are typically composed of three main components which are mainly:

a) The **cognitive component** which is considered as the broadest part. It is made up of the thoughts and beliefs that people hold about the object of the attitude. This may either include stereotypes, prejudice or discrimination toward the members of a group or involve ambivalent social judgments.

b) The **affective component** consists of the emotional feelings stimulated by the object of the attitude.

c) The **behavioural component** consists of predispositions to act in certain ways toward a specific issue. Attitudes tend to be stable over time, but a number of factors can cause attitudes to change.

In a more strict sense, this research proposes an assessment of people's attitudes toward languages during our practical work. This is because our dissertation project is intended to gain some measures of their appreciation toward the choice of one language variety over another. In order to attain our practical objectives, we shall probably find it useful to look at attitudes with regard to the language itself.

In fact, the sociolinguistics studies today tend to incorporate the phrase “*language attitudes*” to make a distinction between the general attitudes and the ones related to language in the sense of including a variety of behaviour concerning language. In view of that, Fasold (1983) suggests that attitudes towards a language are often a reflection of attitudes towards members of various ethnic groups.
3.5 The Significance of Language Attitudes’ Measurements in Social Studies

One reason this section requires to devote as much time to attitudes’ measurements is the complexity of measuring people’s attitudes in general and specifically the analysis of the speaker’s motivations towards choosing one linguistic variety over another during their interaction. As far as this area of research is concerned, we look forward to test then generate valid and reliable descriptive inferences about the attitudes of the speakers of the target community toward the language(s) they use to fully express themselves while negotiating one of the various subject matters within their private lives.

Indeed, language attitudes measurement is regarded amongst the most complicated issues in the recent sociolinguistic discipline studies. Within the same framework Fishman & Agheyisi (1970:138) proclaim: “...validation of attitude studies is particularly problematic because of the very nature of attitude as properties of the psychological or mental process.”

Accordingly, this difficulty is owing to the temperamental description of attitudes since they are tremendously subjective and remarkably self-defining characteristics that cannot be observed at a distance. More to the point; attitudes, as abstract mental processes, cannot be perceived directly, but they have to be deduced throughout observing peoples’ actual behaviour in social situation in which the survey is conducted.

Last but not least, the best criteria of addressing the attitudinal tendencies of our target sample will be determined through a fairly displayed indirect test by the use of a set of questions. Within this test, the emphasis will be on bringing our critical thinking while analysing the informants’ behaviour as well as their motivations towards language choice/use which may obtain in discourse, wherein we can deduce the existence of both the general and common positions in addition to personal views headed for that shift back and forth from one language variety to another.
3.6 Conclusion

Taken in its broadest meaning, this chapter bridges the gap between the two manifolds of communication i.e. it argues that both spoken and written messages are important issues in discourse and text analysis in recent social sciences. However, in its stricter sense, it focuses on mixed-written messages as being purely linguistic practices that reflect multiculturalism within bilingual communities. More to the point, it goes further that the analysis of the phenomenon of language alternation in informal written discourse is somehow difficult as well as different from oral-mixed language mode counterpart. At one extreme, such difficulty is attributable to the specific linguistic properties of that genre in which the co-participants of these messages (the senders and the recipients) are remote as well as the message itself mismatches the normative grammar of the formal written languages. At the other extreme, the specific creative informal lexis, unconventional acronyms and codes sometimes seem to hinder the social contact amongst the bilingual users who encounter - in many instances - a number of difficulties to decode such messages.

Despite the fact that this chapter hopes to provide particular theoretical models and analytical tools that are typically designed for informal mixed-written messages only, there are great challenges of bringing critical approaches to such linguistic genre due to the previously enormous investigations in spoken CS mode at the expense of the written style counterpart. In actual fact, the scarcity and/or the total absence of theoretical accounts in the field of written language alternation was caused by the deficiency of informal mixed written discourse and/or typed data in comparison to that of the current available corpus. Such great lack in productive analytical models in favour that area of research has led us to the application of one the approaches of the spoken mode (Muysken’s Typological Approach 2000). Such suggestion is based on the only fact that both CS types involve the same attitudes, motivations and/or purposes for enhancing the bilingual speakers’ inability of expressions in variable social contact situations (as it shall be seen in the subsequent chapter).
4.1 Introduction

The last chapter aspires to bridge the gap between the theoretical framework and the practical side in-between hands. More to the point, it attempts to reconcile seemingly divergent approaches to the study of code switching/mixing processes within RSC that occur during the social contact via SMS amongst its interlocutors. The practical side of this current examination through the integrated titles, tables, charts, graphs, discussions and/or comments in this stage endeavour to draw a clear picture of the hierarchy of our work.

For the sake of answering the projected research questions, the current chapter sketches the major research findings in our study (i.e. the analyses of the results of the quantitative study of language choice/use in our collected data) as well as seeks out to reveal the evidence that support our claims and interpretations. Moreover, it discusses the research findings in reference to relevant related literature to gain further insights towards the significance of language choice and/or use in most communicative situations as well as to demonstrate and/or measure the efficiency of language alternation processes via personal informal mixed writing styles in SMS as it is used in RSC today.
4.2 The Analysis of the Questionnaire Findings

On the whole, the analysis of our collected facts and/or statistics, which are obtained from the different main parts of our designed questionnaire, is accomplished on the basis of interpreting the subsequent graphs and tables that will provide us with an assortment of percentages that expose the informants’ choice and/or use of a linguistic variety over another. The latter, of course, will enable us to elicit the respondents’ attitudes towards that language selection. Moreover, it will allow us to consider the significance of language alternation and/or code mixing processes in communication within RSC as a whole as well as to assert the efficiency of these linguistics practices via SMS as new however dynamic medium of communication to be used by the bilingual speakers - interchanging participants - of that speech community.

4.2.1 The Respondents’ Personal Information

This section initially reveals our informants’ ages, gender and educational levels. The rates of recurrence of our respondents are apparently put on display through tables (4.1 and 4.2) underneath:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Numbers and percentages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>05.69%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 the distribution of informants by age and gender
As clearly indicated in table 4.1, the total number of the respondents included within this survey reached 316 resident informants. Our respondents belong to different sexes, ages, educational backgrounds as well as various occupation groups. There are 170 females, who represent 53.80%, and 146 males with an average rate of 46.20%. The imbalanced number amongst the two categories in our questionnaire may possibly in turn to the only reason that female applicants are more cooperative than their males’ counterpart.

From the same table we can also see that dissimilar age groups have been incorporated. Our informants are aged between thirteen and sixty years old. They are divided into four groups as follow:

- **Group 1**: \( \leq 15 \) years old (27 informants = 08.54%)
- **Group 2**: 16-30 years old (218 informants = 68.98%)
- **Group 3**: 31-45 years old (44 informants = 13.92%)
- **Group 4**: >45 years old (27 informants = 08.54%)

In view of the above states of affairs, it can be noticed that the greatest number of participants whom the data is based on belongs to the second group. There were two main reasons behind that sum. The first was that we thought, however we found, it undemanding besides relevant for us to collect our questionnaire samples rapidly as well for the informants’ instant willingness to fill in them. Secondly, we managed to corroborate the general popular stereotype proclaiming that the SMS is almost used by younger generation.

As regards the third age range that occurs secondly in position while sampling our respondents, we have not received enough questionnaires _as it was expected_ from its participants. This was an additional impediment to our dissertation progress, someway; since we could not absolutely weigh up how significant the contribution of this group was while measuring their attitudes headed for language selection in interaction, language alternation processes during conversation and particularly vis-a-vis code switching and/or mixing practices via SMS as a new medium of communication.
Concerning both the first and the second groups, there were unexpected coincidences of results in terms of the number of applicants. Unfortunately, both rates come into view of being insufficient for the only reason that the researcher has not got so many contacts with both age groups. Moreover, several attempts to accumulate the adequate statistics had been made, mostly by the help of our closer informants, but no way. Even though the process was frequently repeated, it failed many time over. Therefore, we intended to consider that amount instead of wasting much more time about the continual negative responses throughout waiting for retuning the questionnaires’ samples.

### Educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>The rate of recurrence of the informants</th>
<th>Total Numbers and percentages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>07.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Arts/Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/Sci</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2 the grouping of informants according to their educational levels**

Since the educational level of individuals plays a momentous role in the linguistic diversity of any speech community, it seems valuable to analyse our respondents’ informative levels standing on the statistics that are displayed in table 4.2. From the previously presented facts, we can deduce as an overall reality that females’ score, which is of about 53.80%, is better than their males’ counterpart (which equals only 46.20%). This certainty may perhaps in turns to so many new
socio-psychological factors within the Algerian speech communities (these factors are up till now still unidentified and/or are under research).

Admittedly, the rate of literacy within Algeria has been increasing due to the fact that the government is ensuring general access to primary education as a prior effective means to train highly qualified educated persons in all domains. This transformational process, for better or for worse, will shape the Algerians’ characters and their performance in the future.

As far as this area of research is concerned, our informants have been exposed to choose one of the main educational stages provided by the Algerian government that fits their levels. Our findings show that amongst the available 316 informants, over 171 participants have the Secondary Education level (with an average rate of 54.11%); whereas, variable proportions have been presented concerning the remaining levels.

Although both the middle schools and the primary education levels’ rates, which represent 06.01% and 03.79% respectively, seem to be extremely limited in comparison to that of the previously mentioned grade, they therefore attest the RSC inhabitants’ accessibility to schooling even for those whom were previously deprived of.

More interestingly, it can be noticed in this examination that university students’ number and/or percentage appears in the second position while sampling our informants with a rate of about 18.03%. This is somehow an optimistic symptom of literacy improvement within the target speech community.

As for the holders of higher education degrees notably: Bachelor of Arts/Science, Engineers, MA/science, it is noted that there are asymmetrical however unbalanced hierarchy in terms of the graduated persons’ scores that correspond to 11.39, % 04.43% and 02.21% respectively. By this token, RSC proves once more its aptitude to fasten together to the other Algerian speech communities’ train through its continuum informative processes.

Strangely enough, there are no PhD title-holders within our sample. This is conceivably in turn to the only fact that the wilaya is still a fresh one in comparison to that its neighbouring departments in the sense that it has just recently started to
provide by its own university degrees through its new university centre (which is nominated in 2004).

To come to the point, it must be noted that in addition to the formal schooling, one should bear in mind that with the growing globalisation process, there is a tendency of not limiting the concept ‘education’ to formal schooling only. In this vein, countless new educational means have emerged to cope with the traditional means of learning, especially for obtaining higher proficiencies in foreign languages; such accessing to the various social networks for instance chat rooms. The latter, undoubtedly, has led to the creation of new informal styles of communication (either in oral or written forms). These genres of social contact have incredibly extended within the Algerian speech repertoire particularity by the youngsters (as it shall be seen later). Since the use of SMS language via cell phones has incredibly emerged amongst RSC speakers as being the most convenient medium of communication, we have focused our interest on investigating the multiple motivations behind the use of informal mixed written messages and how these messages serve in achieving effective communicative functions (specific social meanings).

4.2.2 The Status of Languages (The Respondents’ Linguistic Heritage)

This section is devoted to reveal the current societal linguistic pattern within RSC. Of course, the following table will point up the linguistic competency as determined by the sex and the age of the speaker and/or writer.

As a matter of fact, table 4.3 underneath gives the impression of being strong indication that supports the melting-pot linguistic situation that exists today in Algeria as a whole and within RSC in particular.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Ber</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Mlv</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤15</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>07.91%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>15.82%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>05.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤15</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.32%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>02.35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>05.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.78%</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>08.86%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>39.24%</td>
<td>07.59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 the current societal linguistic pattern
For a start, we have previously asked our respondents about their mother tongue or their original language. All of a sudden, each and every one of them has claimed that ADA is his/her mother tongue. Their proclamations have a propensity of being reasonable since it is the most useful language variety within the informal setting notably at home and amongst friends. However, it fails of being so -as we shall see later- in formal setting such as at workplaces or even at documentations in view of the fact that it lacks the norms of being a standard language (it has no alphabet but an oral character only).

Since this area of research is intended for informal mixed language discourse, we have intended to scrutinize how the RSC’s speakers manage to bring into play different language varieties within conversation to accomplish their communicative needs. In this scrutiny, it must be noted from the forgoing table that 124 respondents (39.24%) have a tendency to mix different language varieties during their day-to-day conversational interactions.

More to the point, it is clear enough -as a general consensus- that our youthful informants, who belong to the second group, most of whom are female speakers demonstrate a greater tendency to use mixed varieties (with an average rate of about 15.82% ) rather than their male counterpart with just 13.60% to signal their status, predominantly for prestige. One piece of evidence that support this line of thought in our findings about the fact that women in general and particularly within RSC are likely to express themselves overtly more than men usually do, one can refer to Peter Trudgill (1974) who lays emphasis on that women reveal higher tendency to be status-conscious to their sensitivity to the notion of overt prestige, whilst men are said to favour the concept of covert prestige. Aligning with this idea, it is necessary to put forward the outstanding relationships between gender and code choice. Needless to tackle this aspect for the time being since is not one of our main research area apprehensions. Thus, we are going to avoid such discussion in view of the fact that the imbalanced number of both sexes within our sampling does not allow us to measure or even to evaluate this sociolinguistics trend.
4.2.3 The Language (s) Use and the Attitudes towards Language(s) Choice

4.2.3.1 The Language (s) Use

Taken in its broadest meaning, language choice and/or use vary from one society to another as well as from an individual to another and even from one situation to another. These linguistic preferences can be determined by many factors. Linguistically speaking, language use domains (such as: the family, the playground and the street, the school, literature, the press, etc) have been considered as the main features of language selection. Such weight of the term ‘domains’ was referred to by Fishman (1972:19): “Domains are the major clusters of interaction situations that occur particular multilingual setting”. Besides, the previous concept was submitted by Crystal, D (1980:121) that “the term refers to a group of institutionalized social situations typically constrained a common, set of behavioural rules, e.g. the domain of the family is the house, or religion is the church.”

In view of the above states of affairs, one can deduce that the term ‘domain’ involves the participants (or interlocutors), topics, settings and situations. All these elements play crucial roles in shaping people’s linguistic choices and/or uses. In other terms, this language selection depends on both the situational contexts and the co-participants the individual bilinguals encounter in their daily interactions. Aligning with this idea, the later domains are basically meant to measure the efficiency of language contact as well its dynamic outcomes notably in informal language switching and/or mixing processes to attaining effective communicative intents and serve certain functions in a conversation within RSC.

Thus, in constructing this part, we intend to group questions (1-6) within the third section of the questionnaire. The responses to these questions are exposed in the subsequent detailed comparative tables (4.4 - 4.10) respectively:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>20.88%</td>
<td>27.84%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlv</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>04.74%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 language use at home
### Table 4.5 Language use amongst friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ma</strong></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fe</strong></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA/ADA</strong></td>
<td>0.284%</td>
<td>16.45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0.284%</td>
<td>55.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA/MSA</strong></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.235%</td>
<td>0.284%</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ber</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fr</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eng</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>12.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mlv</strong></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) used with closer/intimate friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mlv</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 language use amongst friends
### Table 4.6 Language Use at Work (Formal Settings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- languages used at school / at work...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlv</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | Ma  | Fe    | Ma    | Fe  | Ma    | Fe    | Ma    | Fe    |       |
|          | 01.58% | 01.26% | 06.01% | 12.02% | 02.53% | 01.58% | 0.94% | 0.31% | 26.26% |
|          | 01.26% | 01.58% | 06.96% | 13.60% | 02.84% | 01.58% | 02.21% | 0.94% | 31.01% |
|          | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%   | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    |
|          | 0.63% | 0.63% | 06.96% | 06.01% | 01.58% | 01.26% | 01.26% | 0.94% | 19.30% |
|          | 0%    | 0%    | 02.53% | 03.48% | 0.31% | 0.31% | 0%    | 0.31% | 06.96% |
|          | 0.63% | 0.94% | 06.01% | 05.37% | 0.94% | 0.94% | 0.94% | 0.63% | 16.45% |

Table 4.6. Language use at work (formal settings)
## CHAPTER FOUR: Research Findings (Analysis and Discussion)

### Table 4.7 Language Choice in Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
<td>23.41%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 language choice in reading
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>05.06%</td>
<td>06.32%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>04.74%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlv</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>06.64%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 language use in writing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>18.67%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>07.91%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlv</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Language preference in watching TV programmes
### Table 4.10 Language Preference in Listening to Radio Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>06.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>0.189%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05.06%</td>
<td>05.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlv</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08.22%</td>
<td>05.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Language preference in listening to radio stations
4.2.3.2 The Attitudes towards Language(s) Choice/Use

The aforementioned statistical facts give us an overall idea about the local individuals’ language choice and/or use at home with family members, closer friends, people at workplaces and other settings that may interfere with that selection. One should also bear in mind that not all the coexisted language varieties within bi/multilingual communities have parallel prestige, power and vitality.

As a core subject matter, language alternation practices within RSC are highly perceived, as dynamic symptoms which may obtain within the overall sociolinguistics status of Algeria resulting from the various langue contact situations. One piece of evidence that support this line of thought in our findings about the fact that RSC’s speakers and/or writer, particularly in informal settings, use code-switching (previously referred to as Mlv) is to construct, define or manifest ethinical identities and to signal group solidarity. In support of that as well for the sake of eliciting how RSC’s bilingual speakers cross all the boundaries between languages to accomplish effective communication, it seems as of a paramount importance to concentrate on approaching the sociolinguistic patterns of code switching with a succinct check of language choice/use in a number of different situations and/or ‘domains’.

To start with, in stressing the connection between the setting, the co-participant and the topic in informal contact situations; we have asked our respondents about the linguistic variety or varieties they use at home and with their friends. As it is noticeably put down in tables 4.4 and 4.5, in fact, there is an excessive use of ADA at domicile or even amongst friends in our findings - its usage reaches 64.87% and 55.06% respectively.

Undeniably, as a popular stereotype ADA itself is full of borrowed words from other languages. In support of this, we have asked so many speakers about defining that variety; all of them hesitate to identify it as a truly or accurately Arabic because, they told me, it contains lots of loanwords from Berber, Turkish and even Spanish and mostly so many French adapted lexical items (generally referred to as ‘Français cassée’). By retelling the same point in other words, this shares the same view point with Bouamrane (1988) that Arabic is one of the languages characterised
by Ferguson (1959) as being diglossic. Such situation ranks ADA as being the low variety (L). The speakers of that variety cannot not entirely eliminate of integrating mainly adapted French lexical items within the phonological and morphological systems of Arabic as an apparent socio-cultural motivation brought to Algerian speech repertoire with the French colonisation.

Above and beyond, in both the above cited informal settings 12.65% and then 17.72% respectively of speakers in our sample are likely to mix various language varieties. This use may perhaps in turn to their desires of negotiating a multiple of subject matters within the same interactional phase. Moreover, the two rates provide strong evidence in illustrating the existence of shared understanding amongst the users besides acting as an expression of solidarity among them.

In light of the evidence from the informants’ responses concerning language use in formal setting, here at work or even at school, which are best represented through table 4.6, it seems fairly clear that the speakers of target speech community employ mostly CA/MSA which scores highly 31.01%. This rate somehow seems to be ordinary since it is considered the only language to be used in all formal domains of life; however, at the other extreme it comes into view of being extremely inadequate to fulfil the ‘Arabisation Policy’ stresses (cf. 1.3.2.1).

More to the point, it can be also seen within this scrutiny that the hierarchy of language varieties within the aforementioned domains gives us an idea about the importance of the coexisted linguistics multiplicity within RSC outstandingly foreign languages Fr and Eng, which score 19.30% and 06.99% respectively. The first rate, at one extreme, corroborates Akila (2001) and Benhattab (2004) viewpoints that Fr has become an elitist language, symbol of social success if not a language of modernity, or at least as a language for modern needs. By the same token, the second percentage attests Bouhadiba (2002) and Miliani (2000) standpoints that Eng has turned out to be the most significant device that fits the ongoing technical and scientific movements in today’s global socio-economical environment besides an indispensable means of commercial communication with Western countries as an alternative of French.
Strangely enough, table 4.6 reveals that RSC’ speakers are likely sometimes to code-switch even in formal domains. The shift to the other varieties may possibly in turn to that CA faces difficulties in finding the correct referential terms by its own. Undeniably, here, CA has demonstrated its failure of being updated with modernity and technology or in proving its usefulness at least in formal settings. To say in other terms, the effort of implying the CA equivalence of some technical terminologies instead of shifting to the real foreign referential words has caused misunderstanding amongst the users. Thus, it would be better to adopt these technical expressions or scientific referential terms to prevent any predictable confusion later.

As far as language choice in reading, which is shown in table 4.7, where we have asked our respondents to score the rate of recurrence of their read languages. It is resulted that there are three leading languages to be used within this sphere of influence particularly CA, Fr and Eng. They represent 54.43%, 39.55 and 06.01 correspondingly. The supremacy of these languages over the other coexisted varieties within RSC is clearer enough since they are considered the only standardized linguistic codes, which are highly codified and mostly use conventionalized symbols of graphic expression that the remaining varieties do not.

As a focal point of significance in the current study, we have to take in for questioning our informants’ linguistic abundance while producing different pieces of writing in general. One possible explanation for my avoidance of referring my respondents to formal and informal registers in their writings is to re-confirm as well to provide further insights into the possibility that RSC’ speakers more actively engage in written, rather than spoken, code switching. A closer look at the statistics displayed in table 4.8 give us an idea about the fact that mixed varieties ,which correspond to 14.87%, are used in an equal footing with even the so called standardised languages such as CA, Fr, Eng and other languages, which represent 36.39%, 20.88%, 05.37% and 06.01% in that order. This certainty has a tendency to reveal the manifestation and more importantly the effectiveness of using such linguistic genre - even in formal written discourse - as a strategy whereby the bilingual speakers perform some interactional functions. Praiseworthy, the study of
language mixing within formal written discourse even it is somehow limited within this research framework but it could generate our interest in further research.

Moreover, the remaining tables 4.9 and 4.10 within this section are dedicated to analyse our participants’ responses in which we have asked them to denote their favourite language(s) in entertainment - while watching preferred TV programmes or listening to radio stations. As it can be seen from the available data, there is a hotchpotch of linguistics codes. Anyway, CA holds the lion’s share within this domain in terms of language choice (attains highly 44.93% and 36.39% correspondingly). These results, of course, have reflected the Algerian political oppression of that variety over the formal domains, here in mass media, since the late of 1970’s. Yet, like their mother tongue, in this scrutiny our speakers actually demonstrate their possibility of exploiting the other coexisted varieties such as Ber, Fr, Eng or Even Mlv or other foreign varieties with different variable percentages.

Last but not least, what is important is that all the previously mentioned domains have presumed that the RSC deserves of being nominated as a bilingual community. Besides, the fact the speakers of that speech community expose their ability to use, speak, write, read or even understand the prevailing linguistic codes highlights its stable bilingual situation. Hence, this situation should be maintained for a better transmission for the next generation and taken advantage of rather than discard in favour of the future of bilingualism within the community.
4.2.4 The Respondents’ Opinions a propos the Coexisted Language Varieties

As it has been indicated earlier, the *stable bilingual situation* in that speech community may persist providing that Arabic—both CA and AA—continue to be used alongside with the other coexisted language varieties. For the sake of eliciting whether the speakers of our sampling wish for maintaining such situation or not, we have grouped tables 4.11, 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14 to be examined. These facts will hopefully help us to probe our respondents’ attitudes towards the languages they use today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/ADA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>03.7%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/MSA</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>06.96%</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.4%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 the respondents’ opinions concerning their linguistic competence
### Table 4.12: The Respondents’ Opinions on the Subject of Languages Easiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinions</strong></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>07.59%</td>
<td>11.07%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>04.74%</td>
<td>07.59%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>04.74%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>08.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: The respondents’ opinions on the subject of languages easiness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinions</strong></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Which one do you think is the most important/practical?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 the respondents’ opinions about their linguistic codes importance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>06.96%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 the respondents’ opinions a propos the coexisted codes expressiveness
Broadly speaking, the recorded data within this part, which is best displayed through tables 4.11-4.14 above, once more reveals important information about the linguistic ability of the speakers and/or the writers of RSC and mainly their attitudes towards the varieties they use or prefer in their daily contact.

At the onset, tables 4.11 and 4.12 point out our respondents’ attitudes towards the varieties they use in terms of ‘competency and easiness’. In fact, the hierarchy in which the linguistic codes are ranked in both cases provides evidence that our informants are reliable in their responses. By this token, the speakers of RSC are likely to corroborate the results of language use and/or choice in informal daily interactional domains outstandingly at home or amongst friends. Accordingly, it is obviously noticed that they demonstrate that ADA is the most prevalent language variety within their milieu of living in which it highly scores in both database 49.68% and 44.93% in that order.

Additionally, the second variety to be positioned by our informants within this area of research is that CA (25.63% and 25% respectively). The great differences between the two items ‘competence’ and ‘easiness’ in both tables (24.05% and 19.93% correspondingly) indicates its useless in their daily social interaction.

As far as this area of research is concerned, our findings mismatch Bouamrane’s hypothesis (1986), which is conducted on majority groups and their attitudes towards languages in Algeria in which he claimed that the speakers have a tendency to reveal positive attitudes towards the official language, Classical Arabic. Strangely enough, albeit the current scrutiny is carried out towards majority groups, the attitudinal tendency towards the official language is not the case of our speech community.

As for the remaining linguistic varieties which are best put on view within the previously cited tables which correspond to: Fr (18.98% and 15.82%), Eng (09.17% and 06.01%) and other foreign varieties (02.84% and 01.89%) in that order. These percentages certainly demonstrate their heavy linguistic contact with Arabic—both ADA and CA.
So far, the most amazing thing within the current examination is that the extremely low rates of Ber in comparison even with the other foreign varieties. In terms of language use, it does not overreach 01% in all cases. In a more strict sense, these diminutive scores appear as strong evidence that this variety is regarded as a minority language which has a propensity of being mutually unintelligible to RSC’s bilingual speakers.

In view of the above states of affairs, one can advocate that ADA is the most positively viewed by our respondents whereas Ber the most restricted one (cf., table 4.3 on page 79, table 4.4 on page 82, table 4.5 on page 83, table 4.6 on page 84, table 4.7 on page 85, table 4.8 on page 86, table 4.9 on page 87 and table 4.10 on page 88). Hitherto, our survey gives us an idea about our participants’ quite negative attitudes towards their official and national language, CA. Such unenthusiastic thoughts may be in turn to the fact that CA is regarded as a difficult language due to its complicated grammatical rules and its hard vocabulary words or can be interpreted as the large majority of our informants have lower educational levels since the schools are the most adequate atmosphere where CA can be used. Quite the reverse, the current examination displays to a certain extent the positive attitudes towards the foreign language varieties mainly Fr and Eng standing on the fact that the scores are someway closer even to ones that stand for their mother tongue or to the imposed language. To say it in other terms, the average differences in terms of rates between the coexisted varieties - apart from Ber - within the target speech community are not great.

In light of the evidence from the informants’ opinions concerning linguistic codes ‘importance’ and ‘expressiveness’ which are best displayed on tables 4.13 and 4.14 respectively, one can go further and confirm that the great sums of CA (34.17% and 48.10%) may reflect the speakers’ loyalty and allegiance to their official language owing to its Islamic cultural values. Besides, these rates indicate their common sense of national identity and their gratifying belonging to the Algerian ethnicity. Regardless the great differences among the two varieties of Arabic in this stage, the earlier tables illustrate once more our informants’ reasonably positive attitudes –especially in terms of expressiveness- towards their mother tongue which amounts 08.22% and 21.51% correspondingly. Herein, these proofs attest
Bouamrane’s view point (1986) concerning the positive attitudes of majority groups in Algeria towards their official language over the other varieties.

Surprisingly, this area of research stresses our respondents’ positive attitudes towards Fr which scores 18.98% in both situations. This percentage demonstrates yet again our respondents’ consistency in their answers. At one extreme, the slight differences between the percentages of Arabic varieties and Fr attest someway our hypothesis that Fr is a lingua franca within Algeria’s different speech communities including of course RSC. Besides, at the other extreme, this rate corroborates once more Benhattab (2004) standpoint that Fr has become a symbol of social success if not a language of modernity, or at least as a language for modern needs within the Algerian speech repertoire.

As far as the second foreign language, Eng, in Algeria is concerned, our respondents exhibit to a certain extent positive attitudes towards it in which it scores 08.22% in term linguistic expressiveness. Strangely enough, in terms of linguistic codes practicality and/or importance; Eng highly scores 37.34%. This unexpected rate, which overreach the entire varieties (even the most positively viewed, AA, spoken in fact by the majority within RSC), expresses a universal concurrence that Eng has become an indispensable means of intercultural exchange. In support of that, this clearly shares bouhadiba (2002), Miliani (2000) standpoints in favour of Eng importance in today’s global socio-economical environment.

To put it briefly, whenever languages come into contact with each other, the bilingual speakers are predisposed to reveal either positive attitude in favour of one language variety over the existing one(s) or negative outlook as a symptom of hostility towards the varieties involved in interaction. Since peoples’ attitudes towards languages is one of the foremost factors which lead to language maintenance, change and/or loss; the negative attitudes towards every language or any variety may represent a threat to its maintenance - here it is the case of Ber. Fortunately enough, in this survey the highest mother tongue and CA retention rates are basically of a general nature however they have a greater chance of being maintained and well transmitted to the subsequent generations in that speech community.
4.2.5 The Attitudinal Tendencies towards Language Alternation and/or Code Switching

Whatever the case might be; the linguistic patterns of code switching or languages mixing provide the basis for us to understand the structural aspects of such language contact phenomenon. In this analysis, the spotlight is not basically on how these structures are used but on how our respondents perceive their own linguistic practices. To say differently, this section hopes to examine the speakers’ motivations, the purposes of these linguistic processes and how they are used to achieve the various communicative intents.

In view of that, the graphs (4.1- 4.4) underneath, which are accompanied with detailed proportional tables, have been grouped together in order to observe our respondents’ regularity of codes switching and/or languages mixing and the motives behind these practices:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>09.17%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>30.69%</td>
<td>05.06%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>39.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>12.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.96%</td>
<td>60.12%</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
<td>05.69%</td>
<td>84.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>08.86%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Do you alternate/shift from one code/language to another during your interaction?

![Graph 4.1 the respondents’ frequency of language switching](image-url)
### Graph 4.2: The Respondents’ Reasons for Code Switching

#### Table: Age Group and Opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To fill in speech/writing gaps</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>41.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prove their mastery of the codes</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To juggle with the languages</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not know</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>08.86%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question:

4) Why do you think many people alternate/switch regularly back and forth between languages?

**Graph 4.2** the respondents’ reasons for code switching
### Age Group Opinion regarding Code Switching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>23.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>34.17%</td>
<td>05.69%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>45.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not know</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>04.43%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>31.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Do you think that alternating from one code to another means that you are proficient enough in both languages?

Graph 4.3 the respondents’ opinions regarding code switching occurrences in communication.
### CHAPTER FOUR: Research Findings (Analysis and Discussion)

#### Table 4.1: Age Group Opinions on Personal Identity and Social Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group Opinions</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>22.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>43.98%</td>
<td>06.96%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>56.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>11.39%</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>20.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graph 4.4: The Respondents’ Opinions a Propos Personal Identity and Social Belonging while Switching

6) Does alternating from one language to another in interaction mean losing of identity and belonging?

Graph 4.4 the respondents’ opinions a propos personal identity and social belonging while switching
Admittedly, countless studies have reported that CS often happened spontaneously and subconsciously (cf., 2.2.3 on page 34). By retelling the same point in other terms, CS has been always seen as a purposeful activity, that is, there are functions and intentions assigned to this behaviour (Gumperz, 1971; Grosjean, 1982; Buamrane, 1986; Myers-Scotton, 1993, Benhattab, 2004; Benali Mohamed, 2007). Aligning with the aforementioned state of affairs, the graphs that have been devised in this section epitomise our informants’ performances of language alternation as dynamic mode of communication within RSC.

Overtly, graph 4.1 demonstrates that the large majority of our speakers frequently code switch back and forth between the coexisted varieties in which 84.81% of them do so, most of whom are young people (aged between 16-30 years) with a score of about 60.12%. At one extreme, in spite of the slight differences in terms of rates amongst the frequency of code switching usage in their daily social interaction -‘always’ (15.18%), ‘sometimes’ (39.55%), ‘very often’ (17.08%) and ‘rarely’ (12.97%), the total sum gives the impression of being a strong argument that code switching has become a prominent communicative device in the speech of our informants.

However, at the other extreme, the feeble score within the remaining speakers’ responses (15.18%) reveals to a certain extent negative attitudes towards CS occurrences. The later can be interpreted by the fact that our respondents consider the linguistic shift phenomenon as a threat to the maintenance of their mother tongue and/or their national official language if not they assume that they live in a community where there are so many illiterate people who may possibly hinder the communicative process since they lack the proficiency in understanding or mixing codes. This can be clearly perceived through graph 4.2 in which 13.92% of them ignore to state their reasons for switching by choosing simply ‘I do not know’. Once more, the tiny differences between the two negative responses in both cases (just 01.26%) indicate our respondents’ consistency in their answers.

Based on Grojean’s (1982:152) listing of the various reasons for switching during conversation as well Grosjean’s (1982:256) people’s different purposes of doing so, the data in graph 4.2 provide strong evidence in illustrating our participants’ reasons for switching during a variety of contexts during interaction.
To begin with, 41.77% of the respondent state that they often shift back and forth between varieties ‘to fill in speech gaps’ as a strategy whereby they organize conversation. Besides, 25% of them do so ‘to prove their mastery of the codes’ to signal their social status or for prestige. Yet, the remaining respondents in our sampling are likely to alternate between codes ‘to juggle with the languages’ as a sign of linguistic proficiency particularly in other foreign languages. In support of that, the current examination shows that CS is not a random phenomenon and it is “rather spontaneous and even unconscious” (Benali Mohamed, 2007: 64). In view of that, CS, then, is seen an effective device to achieve the communicative intents and serve certain functions in a conversation.

In light of the evidence from our informants’ responses while determining whether alternating between codes is a symptom of linguistic proficiency in both varieties or not in graph 4.3, one can notice that 23.41% of them have answered ‘Yes’ and 45.25% replied ‘No’ while the remaining respondents gave null answers (31.32%) which are simply referred to hereby ‘do not know’. On the one hand, the first rate constitutes strong evidence that CS is a creative medium that is being frequently used in different domains by our bilingual speakers to accomplish effective language communication. Obviously, on the other hand, the second percentage may possibly qualify CS as a sign of a lack of linguistic competency. In this context, these negative responses reflect, one way or another, the negative attitudes towards CS in RSC. At this point, our findings approach Benhattab (2004:110) viewpoint that “these negative attitudes towards code switching have been noticed in many bilingual situations”. As far as the last score is concerned, our speakers’ neutrality can be explained by the fact that they are more proficient in the other codes such as AA, CA and/or Fr (cf., table 4.3 on page 79, table 4.4 on page 82, table 4.5 on page 83, table 4.6 on page 84, table 4.7 on page 85, table 4.8 on page 86, table 4.9 on page 87 and table 4.10 on page 88).

Additionally, graph 4.4 is set-up to determine our informants’ reactions concerning whether CS process is a symptom of identity and/or belonging quitting or not. Undeniably, identity and belonging have been always regarded as leading key concepts in the study of the relationships between micro- and macro-dimensions of sociolinguistics, that is to say, they can be mutually associated with macro-
ethnicity, solidarity, power) and micro- factors (topic, negotiation, conversational structures, and setting). In this scrutiny, the respondents have been asked to answer a yes/no question whereas those who seem to be neuter by simply ‘do not know’. As not expected, CS is not seen as a sign of ethnic identity loss and/or a lack of social belonging since 45.64% of our informants answered ‘No’ while those whose answers were ‘Yes’ (only 22.46%) consider it so. Although the remaining respondents’ leanings are not clear enough (20.88%), one may claim that they share a similar tendency with those whose answers were ‘No’ for their neutrality. These scores appear as a total contradiction with our own assumption made in the previous question concerning our speakers’ negative attitudes towards CS as being a sign of a lack of competency in the involved languages. Therefore, this attests once more our respondents’ positive attitudes towards this social contact behaviour, which highly signals our group solidarity.

Ultimately, what is important in this section is that our speakers put on view a general fact a positive attitudinal tendency towards the code switching processes they use in their daily interaction. Thus, this communication strategy is “not purposeless since it may signal a change in mood, status or attitude of the speaker.” (Benali Mohamed, 2007: 64). In support of that, CS, as a skillful interactive device, is meant to provide mainly continuity in speech to compensate for and/or to enhance the bilingual speakers’ inability of expressions in variable social contact situations.

4.2.6 The ‘SMS Language’ Usage and Attitudes towards CS Practices through It

In an attempt to reach an accurate examination, this section, at one extreme, hopes to support our hypothesis that those individuals who are generally predisposed to code-switch when speaking will do so while writing, especially here in their SMS. That is to say, it desires to draw an analogy between the oral and the written code switching as being dynamic communication behaviour whereby our bilingual speakers exploit to accomplish their interactive intentions. However, at the other extreme, it seeks to examine how both the linguistics and the non-linguistics factors may affect the development of this phenomenon in contemporary RSC.

For the sake of arguing such assumptions and/or characterizing some of the current growing conventions concerning the dynamic interplay between the existing language varieties via SMS language in that speech community, the present section
has grouped the graphs (4.5-4.13) that follow together to be discussed or interpreted (they are of course accompanied with detailed comparative tables). This examination hopes to highlight how these peculiar written however innovative informal styles of switching/mixing codes serve in accomplishing diverse communicative functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>09.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>04.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>09.49</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>08.22</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>62.34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>06.64</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.5 the respondents’ rate of recurrence of ‘SMS language’ usage
### CHAPTER FOUR: Research Findings (Analysis and Discussion)

#### Table 4.6: Respondents’ reasons for switching in SMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For convenience</strong></td>
<td>04 01.26%</td>
<td>76 24.05%</td>
<td>11 03.48%</td>
<td>07 02.21%</td>
<td>98 31.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>to save time</strong></td>
<td>07 02.21%</td>
<td>59 18.67%</td>
<td>12 03.79%</td>
<td>08 02.53%</td>
<td>86 27.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for fun</strong></td>
<td>04 01.26%</td>
<td>18 05.69%</td>
<td>05 01.58%</td>
<td>04 01.26%</td>
<td>31 09.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for prestige</strong></td>
<td>03 0.94%</td>
<td>25 16.45%</td>
<td>07 02.21%</td>
<td>02 0.63%</td>
<td>37 11.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>to save money</strong></td>
<td>09 02.84%</td>
<td>40 12.65%</td>
<td>09 02.84%</td>
<td>06 01.89%</td>
<td>64 20.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27 08.54%</td>
<td>218 68.98%</td>
<td>44 13.92%</td>
<td>27 08.54%</td>
<td>316 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2) Why do you use SMS language-your purpose?

![Graph 4.6](image)

Graph 4.6 the respondents’ reasons for switching in SMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group Opinions</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot express my ideas clearly</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since a lack of proficiency in other languages</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have common symbols and abbreviations</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deteriorates and distorts languages</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, why do some people dislike using SMS?

Graph 4.7 the respondents’ opinions vis-à-vis avoiding SMS writing
### Chapter Four: Research Findings (Analysis and Discussion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>45.56%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.87%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03.48%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Do you alternate/shift from one code/language to another while writing your SMS messages?

![Graph 4.8](image-url)

Graph 4.8 the respondents’ regularity of switching while writing SMS
CHAPTER FOUR: Research Findings (Analysis and Discussion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>01.26</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>04.43</td>
<td>03.48</td>
<td>25.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>01.58</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>04.11</td>
<td>02.21</td>
<td>39.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>05.69</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>05.37</td>
<td>02.84</td>
<td>34.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>08.54</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>08.54</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Do you think that alternating from one code to another while writing SMS messages mean that you are proficient enough in both languages?

Graph 4.9 the respondents’ opinions regarding code switching occurrences in SMS
### Age Group Opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>43.98%</td>
<td>06.96%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>57.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>19.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4.10** the respondents’ opinions a propos personal identity and social belonging while writing SMS

8) Does alternating via SMS mean losing of identity and/or belonging?
### CHAPTER FOUR: Research Findings (Analysis and Discussion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03.48</td>
<td>40.18%</td>
<td>05.37%</td>
<td>03.16%</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.53</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
<td>04.74%</td>
<td>02.84%</td>
<td>28.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.53</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>19.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) Would you stop using SMS language if you feel that it makes your native language corrupt or loss?

Graph 4.11 the respondents’ opinions as regards losing mother tongue in favour ‘SMS language’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>26.58%</td>
<td>04.11%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>35.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
<td>01.89%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>03.79%</td>
<td>02.21%</td>
<td>22.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>06.32%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>01.58%</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>09.17%</td>
<td>02.53%</td>
<td>01.26%</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>08.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) SMS language is considered as youths’ language

Graph 4.12 the respondents’ opinions concerning SMS users
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group Opinions</th>
<th>≤15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It will be a common language</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02.21 %</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>37.02 %</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be forgotten one day</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02.21 %</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>07.27 %</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be standardized</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02.53 %</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.24 %</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01.58 %</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.44 %</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>08.54 %</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>68.98 %</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) What do you think is the future of SMS language in Algeria and your state? Or what is your opinion about the future of using SMS language in Algeria and your state?

Graph 4.13 the respondents’ predictions about the future of ‘SMS language’ usage in Algeria and RSC
By and large, the aforementioned graphs constitute the most important empirical evidence supporting our current examination’s assumptions as they are devoted to observe how far these short messages, as hybrid forms of both the spoken and written discourse, can fulfil the demands of different social situations within variable contexts.

First, the data in graph 4.5 appears as a corroborating evidence of the incredibly extensive use of SMS within RSC (cf., 3.2.2), as a new channel of social contact. At this point, our informants have been asked about whether they regularly use SMS or not. Surprisingly, our findings show that 85.44% of them frequently do (most of whom are young with a score of about 62.34%) while just 14.55% do not. In other words, even though the highly positive score (85.44%) is here subdivided ('always' (39.55%), ‘sometimes’ (16.76%), ‘very often’ (12.34%) and ‘rarely’ (16.77%), one should bear in mind that the total amount of these responses reinforces again our line of reasoning that SMS messages have become an indispensable communication behaviour in the speech of our informants.

Above and beyond, the statistical facts in graph 4.6 are basically meant to demonstrate our informants’ purposes for using SMS language in which 31.01% of them answered that they do so ‘for convenience’. This result may be in turn to the deep connections between the involved codes, the contexts in which they take place and the co-participant’s ability of understanding such codes. Further, 09.81% and 11.70% of them assumed that they use it ‘for fun’ or ‘for prestige’ respectively. These scores can be explained by the facts that SMS might be used as a means to strengthen the relationships between the participants as well to establish the social norms and/or to manifest power. Quite the reverse to the previous linguistic aspects, the non linguistic purposes ‘to save time’ and ‘to save money’ which represent 27.21% and 20.25% in that order can be interpreted by the modern life’s requirements for attaining and/or exchanging the high speed information in lower prices. To put it briefly, SMS has become the easiest and the cheapest correspondence strategy in RSC. Thus, this mutually beneficial device enables its users to signal their ethnicity, their identity or belonging to the group, their solidarity or it may possibly categorize their social status.
More interestingly, the data in graph 4.7 disclose our informants’ opinions concerning people’s objection against SMS usage. According them, 31.10% dislike using such device since it ‘cannot express their ideas clearly’. This answer can be interpreted by the fact that some people think that circumlocution (prolix) is the only best way for conveying ideas appropriately. In addition, 21.83% and 28.48% are supposed to keep away from exploiting such fresh interactive mechanism since ‘a lack of proficiency in other languages’ or they feel that it ‘deteriorates and distorts languages’. The first argument can be explained by means of their lower educational levels since they sometimes lack the capability even to write their national and official language (cf., table 4.2 on page76); whereas, the second evidence seems to reveal one way or another the highly negative attitudes towards such medium of interaction. Moreover, 18.76% of them believe that most people avoid using that genre of social contact for it ‘does not have common symbols and abbreviation’. This postulation may be in turn to the system of incorporating unconventional acronyms and codes within SMS in which some users may possibly encounter a number of difficulties to decode.

By analogy with our respondents’ attitudes towards conversational CS instances (cf., table 4.1 on page 74, table 4.3 on page 79, table 4.4 on page 82), the graphs 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 have been devised as an implicit technique to check their consistency in answering questions as well mainly to substantiate our hypothesis that written CS instances which may obtain in SMS messaging within RSC are purely further extensions to the spoken CS habits of its bilingual speakers. In support of that, and likewise the questions in the foregoing section that have revealed our participants’ attitudes towards oral CS; we have asked them whether they mix up codes while producing SMS, if these processes are signs of linguistic competency, how far these practices can affect individuals’ affiliation to the group and to what extent they can be considered as identity and/or belonging abandonment.

As far as the first question in this area of research is concerned, the majority of our informants (57.59%) are likely to shift between the involved codes and of about 24.68% do not while the remaining bilinguals (17.72%) keep neutral. Similarly to oral CS instances, our findings demonstrate our informants’ tendency to shift back
and forth between codes at some point in their SMS to achieve some interactional functions. Additionally, the results in graph 4.9 demonstrate our participants’ answers about whether CS in SMS denotes their linguistic proficiency in the involved varieties or not. As it is clearly seen, 25.94% of them have answered ‘Yes’ and 39.87% replied ‘No’ while the remaining respondents provided no answers (34.17%) which are here simply referred to by ‘do not know’. Obviously, these scores illustrate once more our informants’ views consistency, and likewise they expose the same attitudes or motivations as the ones in conversational CS (cf., table 4.3 on page 79). Furthermore, the graphic representation 4.10 is meant to measure our informants’ responses about whether CS process via SMS is a sign of identity and/or belonging abandonment. Obviously, the majority of our respondents (57.59%) answered ‘No’ and just 22.78% of them replied ‘Yes’ while the rest (19.62%) did not provide decisive opinions, here they are referred to by ‘undecided’. Similar to conversational CS instances (cf., table 4.4 on page 82), the above facts illustrate that CS in SMS is not considered as being a mark of identity loss and/or a lack of social belonging at all amongst its users. At one extreme, these scores reveal our informants’ analogous highly positive attitudes towards both CS occasions. Whilst, at the other extreme, the equation in terms of results in both cases support our assumption that both forms of CS have many considerable characteristics in common in view of the fact that written processes in general are merely further extension to spoken ones.

In the same vein of thought, the recorded data in graph 4.11 focuses on our applicants’ outlook on their mother tongue while writing SMS i.e. it seeks to probe their attitudinal tendencies towards ADA. In support of that, we have enquired about whether they would stop using that genre of communication if they feel that their native language would be corrupted or lost. Obviously, the statistics in this area of research have suggested that they are adopting a rather defensive posture in which 52.21% responses are positive (Yes) and just 28.16% are negative (No) while the rest (19.62%) provide no answers, which are here referred to by ‘undecided’. More to the point, the great difference between the two rates reflects our informants’ positive attitudinal facts towards their mother tongue. This loyalty and allegiance to ADA demonstrates again our speakers’ social solidarity, their communal belonging to the
same speech community and most of the time their common sense of national identity.

Ultimately, as focal points of significance in the current scrutiny; the last graphic representations (4.12 and 4.13) within this section seek to answer two of the most important intended research questions. At this point, we have asked our informants about the age group that mostly uses that genre of communication and about their expectations and/or predictions a propos the future of that mode of interaction within the speech of their community. In fact, our main interest is:

(a) to attest our assumption that SMS is conventionally the language of the younger generation and,

(b) to demonstrate how these informal messages, which incorporate exceptional symbols or codes, unconventional however morphologically adapted vocabulary words and non-normative grammatical rules, succeed in establishing solidarity, accomplishing diverse communicative functions and serving in shaping the future of individual as well social group identities of RSC.

In light of the evidence from our informants’ opinions concerning the widespread popular stereotype that SMS language is principally used by youngsters, graph 4.12 hopes to illustrate how far this genre of social contact can be characterized and/or considered as being mostly of the teenagers. Herein, our findings show that 35.12% and 18.03% of our informants demonstrate affirmative accord -via ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ respectively-, and 22.15% and 10.44% of them express their negative ‘agreement’ or ‘strongest disagreement’ towards our postulation while the remaining informants (about 14.25%) provide no responses, here are referred to by ‘undecided’. This neutrality can be elucidated by the only fact that they, to some extent, agree with that universal stereotype. At one extreme, these results point out our respondents’ consistency in their answers (cf., graph 4.5 on page 83 and graph 4.8 on page 86). Moreover, at the other extreme, the total positive empirical facts (67.40%) in our findings stand as a piece of evidence that support our line of thought about the fact that the current generation particularly within RSC is
likely to use more this new social contact mechanism than other age groups usually do.

On top of everything, the last question, which is best represented by means of graph 4.13, constitutes a vital point of discussion in this chapter in view of the fact that up till now it is not quite clear enough for both the researcher as well as the informants to predict the future of using such writing style in SMS.

Within this context, one may perhaps ask “Why is it so important to know about the future of that genre of communication? And how far the co-participants could communicate with SMS messages without knowing their lexis (i.e. unconventional codes) or learning about their rules (i.e. codification); (cf., graph 4.7 on page 85)” in view of that, we thought it might be interesting by now to discuss whether this style of writing would be a common and/or a standardized one day, and if so what advantages such standardised language could bring to that speech community.

Admittedly, language and language standardization are debatable topics that need to be dealt with carefully since they can bring their examiners to political, social and cultural controversial issues.

By far, language is mainly used to shape the culture of any speech community besides the culture itself influences the form of that language. This means that language and culture are interrelated issues in view of the fact that they are acquired simultaneously. Aligning with this idea, Wardaugh (1986:218) states that “the close relationship between language and culture, maintaining that they were inextricably related so that you could not understand or appreciate the one without knowledge of the other one.”

However, from a purely linguistic point of view “language standardization is the process by which a vernacular in a community becomes the standard language (SL) form. This carries implicit elements of prestige (whereby the SL vernacular is valued more highly than others), stability, and common usage. Alternative variations are either eliminated and/or stigmatized.” (Graham Hall 2005)

In view of the above states of affairs as well basing on Haugen’s Theory of Language Standardization (1966), which suggests a four-stage model for the
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development of language standardization (its selection or common usage, its codification or elaboration, its prestige or power, its stability or acceptance.), herein we hope to extend our examination towards the potential beneficial socio-cultural dimensions that such genre of communication can generate if it would be nominated a standard language.

Obviously, graph 4.13 demonstrates that the large majority of our informants (49.05%) think that this mode of social contact ‘will be a common language’ and 19.93% of them believe that it ‘will be standardized’. By these tokens, our findings corroborate once more our informants’ acceptance of messaging as being indispensable communication behaviour in their daily contact(cf., graph 4.5 on page 83 and graph 4.6 on page) besides as a constructing device of the social cohesiveness of RSC. By contrast, 16.45% of our applicants feel that it ‘will be forgotten one day’ while the rest (of about 14.55%) keep neutral, herein is referred to by ‘do not know’. In fact, these rates can be elucidated by the only fact that the process of standardization of such creative contact medium cannot happen overnight in view of the fact that it requires a careful Language policy implementation and/or a subtle language planning/management.

Undeniably, the standardization of such genre of social contact has become a challenging area under discussion for the reason that it may possibly lead to uncomfortable questions mainly in the political aspect i.e. such process, as a specific type of language change, will become an integral part of a complete language planning and/or language policy which may perhaps reshape Algeria’s speech repertoire. Therefore, the suggestion of standardizing that vernacular informal-written version will serve as a unifying force to establish the relationships among the individuals in particular and between societies as a whole. Of course, this will categorize the identity of a speech community vis-a-vis the others as well provide a certain prestige to each one. As a matter of fact, in spite of the dialectal and the regional variations amid the different speech communities of any nation, the standard language allows the bilingual speakers and/or writers to use their own colloquial speech. Therefore, unlike the regional dialect; the standard language enables its users to contribute in any of the internal cultural, religious and other developments in the modern society and makes them involved with the worldwide
intercultural exchange i.e. it helps them participate in the international ongoing technological advance through using a newly standardized linguistic code.

As a final point, it is clear by now that the conditions and/or purposes of using text messaging as well the shared understanding and acceptance of its structural properties, at least for the time being, would be contributing factors in bringing new socio-cultural developments however linguistic harmony within that speech community.

4.3.7 The SMS Samples Collection

Clearly, graph 4.14 underneath epitomizes the findings of last question within our questionnaire as it is dedicated to SMS samples collection. This component constitutes a significant area of discussion to the whole survey in view of the fact that it exposes the unexpected melting-pot linguistic codes to be used within our treated messages (SMS).

Graph 4.14 the different language varieties used in the collected messages (SMS)
Quite the reverse to the analysis of CS processes that occur in real natural conversations, the term code-switching contained by this section covers up language switching and/or mixing at both interasentential and intrasentential levels (cf., 2.4.1.1) in which the units of examination within the scope of the current examination are, of course, sentence (informal mixed written SMS).

On the whole, the data bank of this dissertation project is made up of 607 Short Text Messages. These SMS were randomly collected from 316 informants, mostly two each, consisting one of the main language varieties and/or dialects within the target speech community: AA (or ADA), CA (or MSA), Ber, Eng, Fr, FA, AA/Eng, Eng/Fr, Eng/FA, Ber/AA.

The results of the quantitative study of language choice and/or use in our collected data have led to the conclusion that the RSC’ inhabitants, as bilingual speakers, frequently use slightly different codes in their exchangeable messages. These codes usage can be explained as regards the foregoing presented chart as follow:

For a start, the pie chart undoubtedly states that our informants use significantly more FA while exchanging their messages (36.42%) rather than using their own mother tongue Algerian Arabic, which scores only 14.83%. Admittedly, FA CS has become a prominent linguistic marker for the Algerians (even within RSC). This reality can be observed even in their real conversations as well as inferred from our participants within RSC. Aligning with this idea, this code choice/use is probably due to the fact that FA is regarded amongst the most practical linguistic varieties due to prestigious reasons (cf., table 4.3 on page 79). This might be illustrated by real examples from our corpus such as:

(14) *salam, n’challah tkon bien, trassemt fe l 14,natlako fi seminar* (Peace be upon you, I hope you are fine, I was assigned the 14th. Meet you at the seminar)

(15) *Sbah lkhir,go’li njiblek lmikro triglo yla rak ga3ad* (Good morning, if you are free, tell me to bring you the Personal Computer to repair)

(16) *Akhir ajal fi mostaganem le jeudi w’l’examen le 21/10* (The deadline at Mostaganen will be on Thursday and the exam will take place on October 21st)
Additionally, the first foreign language variety (Fr) imposes itself on the second position - even superior than AA and CA - in writing SMS. This again gives us an idea about its status of being a common language within RSC with an accepted rate of 18.12%. This score puts on view that the informants almost certainly use Fr in their SMS due to either fashionable reasons or for prestige (cf., tables 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10). As for this type of language choice/use, let us reveal these code switching instances from our collected data:

(17) *Bonne année! Kel soit riche 2 joie et 2 gaité, kel déborde 2 bonheur et 2 prospérite et ke ts les vœux formules devient réalité!* (Happy new year, which will be rich of joy and cheerfulness, which overwhelmed with happiness and by prosperity and all your intended wishes become a reality!)

(18) *bnjr jé essayee 2 taplé mer6 pr le sms bon fét ke du bonheur dan ta vi a bientot* (good morning, I tried to call you. Thank you for the message. Happy feast which may bring happiness to your life, see you soon)

(19) *mer6 b1 pr le sms, c’est trs getil 2 ta part.je vs souhaite une très bonne année, plein 2 prosprite, bn sante & que dieu soit avec toi, ke la lumière soit devant toi, ke les anges soit autour de toi, et que ta vie soit joie sur joie* (Thanks a million for the message, It is so kind from your part. I wish for you an extremely Happy Year, plenty of prosperity; good health and that God will be with you, that the light will be in front of you, that the angels will be around you, and that your life will be joy over joy.)

One can also notice that AA (or ADA) represents only 14.83% within our informants’ messages (this rate is less than both FA and Fr respectively). Theoretically speaking, AA (or ADA) is considered as the most useful as well the largely practical variety within the Algerian speech repertoire as a whole and amongst RSC residents specifically since its priority in daily conversation and social interaction (cf., tables 4.4, p 82 and 4.5, p 83). However, this failure in preserving such rank in written discourse can be explained by its reliance on spontaneous speech only, the malfunctioning and/or the total absence of ADA in documentations (cf., table 4.7on page 85).
All of a sudden, as if it compared to that of the aforementioned language varieties, the classification of CA (or MSA) appears fourthly according the hierarchy of language choice/use while writing SMS within RSC with a score of only 09.56%. This score seems unsatisfactory since it is intended to be the only language of instruction within the Algerian speech and/or written repertoire on the one hand. However, on the other hand, this rate comes to reflect its importance within RSC in view of the fact that the difference between the two percentages (AA minus CA) is not great (represents only 05.27%). This value can be rationalized by its constitutional status as being the only written language (standard) to be used within the various formal setting (the highly codified language i.e. the richest in terms of vocabulary words as well as grammatical rules). This percentage may be also possibly linked to the RSC inhabitants’ Islamic cultural heritage. Therefore, this usage may obtain its connection to their religious documentations. This is apparently shown in their messages in which CA is mostly used during their sacred ceremonial occasions and/or religious events such as: Ramadan or El Aids. Three such examples from my corpus of data to illustrate the previous postulation would be:

(20) 3indama tâsal allaha el’dja’na fi hadihi ellayali alfadila doma ismi ilayka fa inni ohibo modjawarâtaka ðiha. jama3ana allaho ma3a nabiin w chohada. (Whenever you ask for i.e. preach paradise from God in these honourable nights add my name to yours because I would like to be your neighborliness in it. May God join us to the Prophets and martyrs.)

(21) saha 3idokom wa kol 3ame wa antom b1000 kheir (Happy Feast and every year you are in thousandth goodness.)

(22) takabala *lah siyamakom wa kiyamakom wa 3id mobarak wa said inchaallah wa kol 3am wa antom bealf kheir wa saha wa 3afia (May Allah accept your fasting and you prayers and an extremely beatific Happy Feast – It is God's will- and every year you are in thousandth goodness and health and wellness)

As far as the remaining language varieties are concerned, it is noticed that they are obviously used in dissimilar fractions. This discrepancy can be attributed to the informants’ variable linguistic competences, which permit them to write SMS with almost no FA, Fr, AA, and CA.
In fact, the excessive use of English within the provided SMS samples was unexpected (about 8.90%). At one extreme, this rate comes to reveal its importance of being as a language of modern needs mainly in written issues. Therefore, at the other extreme, this reality stands as a strong proof against its uselessness in spoken interaction within the Algerian speech communities. In support of that, it is believed that it is difficult for the participants to use English, their second foreign language, in real spoken interaction. As an English language learner and teacher myself, I am aware of the anxiety regarding the use of such foreign language. Such anxiety is likely to hinder the flow of thoughts and ideas and prevent second or foreign language learners from articulating what they actually want to convey. We may put forward, then, the examples below from our corpus which may well illustrate the above assumption:

(23)  *Hi Ali, I hope you are fine. Please, could you send Marsha’s e-mail? Thanks bye* (Hi Ali, I hope you are fine. Please, could you send Marsha’s e-mail? Thanks bye)

(24)  *Hi, I am sorry I could not send anything because I had no time. Thank you for everything. I wish you the best, see you tomorrow* (Hi, I am sorry I could not send anything because I had no time. Thank you for everything. I wish you the best, see you tomorrow)

(25)  *G.evnn, hw ru? I hp u r fin, this is miss .........., ur lst time guest, wld lk 2 thank u 4 ur hospitality* (Good evening, how are you? I hope you are fine, this Miss............., your last time guest, would like to thank you for your hospitality)

Undoubtedly, the appearance of some unexpected mixed codes in our data such as Eng/FA (5.11%), Eng/AA (1.48%), Eng/FR (0.66%) and Ber/FA/Eng (0.16%) is a strong indication that RSC really deserves of being called a bilingual society that hopes to gather with the world’s new changes via introducing and/or using foreign codes even in informal written discourse. As for these types language of alternation instances, we may provide some examples from our data for a better illustration:
In the fullness of time, the above data even if it seems somehow insufficient to generalise the findings of this case study on Algeria’s whole speech communities but it provides strong evidence in illustrating the efficiency of text messaging, as a new medium, to frame communication in RSC.

4.3 Conclusion

Upon completing the analyses and discussions of our empirical study about CS instances as whole and the ones in written SMS in particular within RSC, one finding is strikingly counter-intuitive and surprising. Contrary to our long-held belief that the analysis of oral/spoken CS is widely divergent from the ones in written discourse, the data provide strong evidence in illustrating that the bilingual speakers in RSC release similar attitudinal tendencies in both switching occasions. Therefore, written CS can also be seen as a tool to indicate the social relationships among the participants. This means that the regular use, choice and/or preference of CS in SMS would be to consolidate solidarity, power, or to establish certain relationships with other interlocutors as well to show membership and affiliation to the group in RSC.
GENERAL CONCLUSION

To go over the main points, then, the phenomenon of code switching has become one of the various privileged forms and an extraordinary vital linguistic outcome of language contact situation in RSC, which to some extent leads to the creation of new forms of linguistic varieties and, more often than not, induces to language change. Of course, these linguistic processes involve some psycholinguistics features and structural constraints that affect the exploitation of the coexisted language varieties and/or sometimes create certain difficulties in decoding such creative varieties. In view of that, it is high time linguists look for new insights into bilingualism, the typology as well as structure of languages in the current Algerian context.

This study is a fact that our bilingual individuals, especially the young generation, possess the sufficient linguistic and cultural knowledge which are obviously revealed in their writings, herein via SMS. This fresh dynamic communicative strategy exposes specific social and stylistic functions similar to those attested in oral/spoken code-switching i.e. these text messages do fulfill exceptional communicative functions. So, one can claim that the same theoretical models and theories to oral code switching production can be used for analyzing these written code switching instances.

More to the point, one should bear in mind that albeit the text messages are quite concise, precise and use peculiar innovative informal style of switching/mixing codes, which indeed belong to genetically related or unrelated languages, their contents enable the co-participants even far away from each other to greet, exchange information and share their private/interpersonal experience.

At long last, our examination clearly illustrate the way our bilinguals use ‘SMS language’ to organize, enhance and enrich their social contact all the way through code-switching strategies as a means whereby they signal their social relationships (identity and status) and affiliation with others (ethnicity and solidarity). By retelling the same idea in other words, such written linguistic practices in RSC seem also to play a key role in framing discourse through maintaining appropriateness of context, besides in conveying its bilinguals’ cultural heritage, retaining their personal identities and showing their social belonging via expressive messages.
The Questionnaire in English

NB: Please, answer the questions below carefully throughout either:
- Ticking (√) the right box (es) that fit (s) to your opinion,
- Or: using the provided space.

A) Personal information

1) Sex:
   - Male ☐
   - Female ☐

2) Age:
   - ≤15 ☐
   - 16-30 ☐
   - 31-45 ☐
   - >45 ☐

3) Education:
   - Primary Education ☐
   - Middle School Education ☐
   - Secondary Education ☐
   - Student ☐
   - Engineer ☐
   - Bachelor of Arts/Science ☐
   - Master of Arts/Science ☐
   - PhD ☐

4) Occupation/profession:
   ........................................................................................................................................

B) Status of Languages (Linguistic Heritage)

1) Mother tongue: .................................................. ..........................................................

2) Spoken language(s):
   - Algerian Arabic ☐
   - Classical Arabic ☐
   - Berber ☐
   - French ☐
   - English ☐
   Cite other(s) if there is/are: ...........................................................

3) Where did you acquire or learn it or them? Write the number(s) that correspond(s)
   to the selected language(s) –next to the box-as follow:
   - Algerian Arabic (1)
   - Classical Arabic (2)
   - Berber (3)
   - French (4)
   - English (5)
   - Algeria ☐
   - .../.../...
   - abroad ☐

4) If you acquired/learned it or them abroad, cite the place: ..........................................................

5) How did you acquire or learn it or them?
   - At home-through family ☐
   - Private schooling ☐
   - Formal teaching-public schools ☐
   - Other ☐

C) Language(s) Use and Attitudes towards Language(s) Choice

1) Which language(s) do you use at home (with you family members)?
   - Algerian Arabic ☐
   - Classical Arabic ☐
   - Berber ☐
   - French ☐
   - English ☐
   Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ...........................................................

2) Which language(s) do you use with you closer/intimate friends?
   - Algerian Arabic ☐
   - Classical Arabic ☐
   - Berber ☐
   - French ☐
   - English ☐
   Cite other language(s) if there is/are: .............................................................
3) Which language(s) do you use at school / at work?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................

4) Which language(s) do you prefer using to read newspapers, magazines, books, etc?
Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................

5) How often do you read them?
Always □ very often □ sometime □ rarely □

6) Which language(s) do you prefer using to write/produce pieces of writing?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................

7) Which language(s) do you prefer in watching your favourite TV programmes?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................

8) Which language(s) do you prefer in listening to your favourite Radio stations?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................

9) Which language(s) do you think you are more competent in?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................

10) Which language do you think is the easiest?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................
Why?

.................................................................................................................. ..................................................................................................................

11) Which one do you think is the most important/practical?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................
Why?

.................................................................................................................. ..................................................................................................................

12) In your opinion, which language is the most expressive?
Algerian Arabic □ Classical Arabic □ Berber □ French □ English □
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: ......................................................
Why?

.................................................................................................................. ..................................................................................................................
13) Would you encourage your children/pupils/neighbours to study other language(s), apart from their native language, at public/private schools?  
Yes ☐  No ☐

14) Which language(s) would it/they be?  
Classical Arabic ☐  Berber ☐  French ☐  English ☐
Cite other language(s) if there is/are: .............................................................

**D) Attitudes towards Language Alternation and Code Switching**

1) Do you alternate/shift from one code/language to another during your interaction?  
Yes ☐  No ☐

2) If Yes: how often: always ☐  sometime ☐  very often ☐  rarely ☐

3) When do you alternate/shift from one code/language to another?  
……………………………………………………………………………………………………....

4) Why do you think many people alternate/switch regularly back and forth between languages?  
To fill in speech/writing gaps ☐  to prove their mastery of the codes ☐
To juggle with the languages ☐  do not know ☐

5) Do you think that alternating from one code to another mean that you are proficient enough in both languages?  
Yes ☐  No ☐  do not know ☐

6) Does alternating from one language to another in interaction mean losing of identity and belonging?  
Yes ☐  No ☐  do not know ☐

**E) SMS Language Usage and Attitudes towards Language Switching/Mixing Practices through It.**

1) Do you use SMS language?  
Yes ☐  No ☐

If Yes: how often: always ☐  sometime ☐  very often ☐  rarely ☐

If No; why not ............................................................... (Optional)

2) Why do you use SMS language-your purpose?  
For convenience ☐  to save time ☐  for fun ☐  for prestige ☐  to save money ☐

3) If you have other purpose(s), please mention it/them:
……………………………………………………………………………………………………....

4) In your opinion, why do some people dislike using SMS?  
Cannot express their ideas clearly ☐  since a lack of proficiency in other languages ☐

Does not have common symbols and abbreviations ☐  deteriorates and distorts languages ☐
If you have other suggestion(s), please mention it /them:

5) Which language(s) do you prefer using in SMS?
   Algerian Arabic☐ Classical Arabic☐ Berber☐ French☐ English☐
   Cite other language(s) if there is/are:……………………………………

6) Do you alternate/shift from one code/language to another while writing your SMS messages?
   Yes☐ No☐ undecided☐

7) Do you think that alternating from one code to another while writing SMS messages mean that you are proficient enough in both languages?
   Yes☐ No☐ do not know☐

8) Does alternating via SMS mean losing of identity and/or belonging?
   Yes☐ No☐ undecided☐

9) SMS language is considered as youths’ language:
   Agree☐ strongly agree☐ disagree☐ undecided☐ strongly disagree☐

10) Would you stop using SMS language if you feel that it makes your native language corrupt or loss?
    Yes☐ No☐ undecided☐

11) What do you think is the future of SMS language in Algeria and your state? Or what is your opinion about the future of using SMS language in Algeria and your state?
    It will be a common language☐ it will be forgotten one day☐
    It will be standardized☐ Do not know☐

F) SMS Samples:

   01) Please, could you provide us with samples of your own written SMS (at least (02))?
   NB: write them the way they are.
   1. ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   2. ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   3. ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   4. ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

   Thank you very much for your assistance and support.
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C) **Renseignements personnels**

1) Sexe:
   - Masculin
   - Féminin

2) L’âge:
   - ≤15
   - 16-30
   - 31-45
   - >45

3) Niveau scolaire:
   - Primaire
   - Moyen
   - Secondaire
   - Universitaire
   - Ingénieur
   - Licence
   - Master/Magistère
   - Doctorat

4) Profession:
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

**D) Bagage linguistique**

1) la langue maternelle :
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

2) **Langues parlées:**
   - Dialecte
   - Arabe classique
   - Kabyle
   - Français
   - Anglais

D’autres langues :
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

3) Lieu d’acquisition et d’apprentissage:
   - Mentionner le numéro de la langue a cote :
     - Dialecte (1)
     - Arabe classique (2)
     - Kabyle (3)
     - Français (4)
     - Anglais (5)
   - Algérie
   - Algérie
   - Algérie
   - Algérie
   - Hors pays
   - …/…/…

4) Comment l’avez-vous acquise:
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

   - Domicile
   - Ecole privée
   - Ecole publique
   - Autre

**C) Utilisation De La Langue/Les Langues Et Les Cas Dominantes Chez La Plupart Des Membres Envers Ce Choix**

1) La langue utilisé à la maison ?
   - Dialecte
   - Arabe classique
   - Kabyle
   - Français
   - Anglais
   → D’autres langues si c’est possible : …………………………………………………

2) La langue utilisé avec vos amis ?
   - Dialecte
   - Arabe classique
   - Kabyle
   - Français
   - Anglais
   → D’autres langues si c’est possible : …………………………………………………

3) La langue parlée au milieu scolaire ?
   - Dialecte
   - Arabe classique
   - Kabyle
   - Français
   - Anglais
   → ……………………………………………………………………………………………

4) La langue des journaux, magazines et les livres que vous lisiez ?
   - Arabe classique
   - Kabyle
   - Français
   - Anglais

5) Combien de fois?
   - Quotidiennement
   - Souvent
   - Parfois
   - Rarement

6) La langue utilisé pour l’écriture :
   - Dialecte
   - Arabe classique
   - Kabyle
   - Français
   - Anglais
   → D’autres langues si c’est possible : …………………………………………………
7) La langue des chaînes regardées?
   Dialecte □ Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □
   → D’autres langues si c’est possible : ...................................................

8) La langue préférée pour écouter le radio?
   Dialecte □ Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □
   → D’autres langues si c’est possible : ...................................................

9) La langue maitrisée par excellence?
   Dialecte □ Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □

10) La langue la plus facile?
    Dialecte □ Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □
    → D’autres langues si c’est possible : ...................................................

11) La langue la plus importante/beaucoup utilisée?
    Dialecte □ Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □
    → D’autres langues si c’est possible : ...................................................

12) La langue la plus expressive à votre avis?
    Dialecte □ Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □
    → D’autres langues si c’est possible : ...................................................

13) Encourager vous, vos enfants, voisins et vos élèves à apprendre d’autres langues dans les écoles privées ou public ?
    Oui □ Non □

14) Quelle est cette langue (ces langues)?
    Arabe classique □ Kabyle □ Français □ Anglais □
    → D’autres langues si c’est possible : ...................................................

D) Les cas dominants chez la plupart des individus envers (l’usage des plusieurs langues) ou (le passage d’une langue à l’autre) lors d’une discussion

1) Utilisez-vous plusieurs langues ou vous passez d’une langue à l’autre lors d’une discussion?
   Oui □ Non □

2) Si Oui combine de fois:
   Tous les jours □ Parfois □ Souvent □ Rarement □

3) Quand utilisez-vous ce mélange des langues?
   ..........................................................................................................................

4) À votre avis pour quelle raison les gens utilisent ce changement (mélange) et confusion des langues?
   ..........................................................................................................................

5) Le passage d’une langue à l’autre montre une connaissance et une bonne maîtrise des deux langues?
   Oui □ Non □ Je ne sais pas □
6) L’usage de plusieurs langues lors d’une discussion est considéré comme une perte ou négligence de votre identité?

Oui ☐ Non ☐ Pas vraiment ☐

E) L’usage De Le langage Des SMS (Messages Courtes) Et Les Cas Dominants Chez La Plupart Des Individus Envers La Confusion Des Langues Ou Le Passage D’une Langue à L’autre

Utilisez-vous le langage des SMS (messages courts)?

Oui ☐ Non ☐

1) Si Oui combien de fois?

Tous les jours ☐ Parfois ☐ La plus part du temps ☐ Rarement ☐

3) Utilisez-vous plus d’une langue pour écrire un message court(SMS) ?

Oui ☐ Non ☐ Pas vraiment ☐

4) Considérez-vous que l’usage de plusieurs langues pour écrire ces messages est une connaissance et une bonne maîtrise des deux langues?

Oui ☐ Non ☐ Je ne sais pas ☐

5) La langue utilise pour l’écriture de vos(SMS) (lettres courts) ?

Dialecte ☐ Arabe classique ☐ Kabyle ☐ Français ☐ Anglais ☐

→ D’autres langues si c’est possible : …………………………………………

6) Pourquoi utilisez-vous le langage des(SMS) pour quelle but?

Pour la simplification ☐ Pour s’amuser ☐ Imposer le respect ☐ Pour garder de l’argent ☐

7) D’autres but si vous avez?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8) Pourquoi vous n’utilisez pas le langage des SMS (messages courts)?

Elle n’exprime pas correctement vos idées ☐ Vous ne maîtrisez pas d’autres langues ☐

Elle n’a pas les mêmes codes et abréviations ☐ Elle fait perdre le charme de la langue maternelle ☐

9) Avez-vous d’autres propositions :

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10) La plupart des gens trouvent que le langage (SMS) messages courts est pour les jeunes uniquement :

Je suis d’accord ☐ Je suis complètement d’accord ☐ J’objecte ☐

J’objecte complètement ☐ Pas vraiment ☐

11) Arrêtez-vous d’écrire et d’utiliser le langage des (SMS) messages courts si vous sentez que cela négligée et exclue la charme de votre langue maternelle?

Oui ☐ Non ☐ Pas vraiment ☐

12) A votre avis quel est l’avenir de l’écriture et de l’usage de le langage des(SMS) en Algérie et surtout dans votre wilaya?

Elle va devenir une langue commune ☐ Elle sera oubliée ☐

Elle va se développera ☐ Je ne sais pas ☐
F) Quelques Exemplaires Des (SMS) Messages Courts

1) Pouvez-vous présenter quelques exemples de vos (SMS) : De préférence de présenter les deux derniers messages courts.

   Remarque : Recopiez les (SMS) messages courts comme ils sont sur votre portable avec les mêmes codes et expressions.

1. ..............................................................................................................................................
2. ..............................................................................................................................................
3. ..............................................................................................................................................
4. ..............................................................................................................................................

Merci d’avance pour votre aide.
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استبيان:

ملحوظة هامة: تكون الإجابة على الأسئلة المقدمة على الشكل الآتي:
- إما: بوضع علامات (√) في الخيار أو الخيارات التي تناسب إقتراحك
- أو إجابتك.
- أو: استعمال الفراغ المتاح للإجابة عن بعض الأسئلة.

/ المعلومات الشخصية

(01) الجنس:

ذكر □ أنثى □

(02) السن:

30-45 □ 45-60 □ 61-75 □ 75 + □

(03) المستوى الدراسي:

الابتدائي □ الثانوي □ الوسطي □ البكالوريوس □ الماجستير/ الدكتوراه □

(04) المهنة:

/الحالة اللغوية أو/والرصيد اللغوي

(01) اللغة الأم:

اللغة المنطوقة: □ العربية □ الإنجليزية □ الضامن □ 法 □ إسبانية □ فرنسية □ المغربي □ أمازيغي □

اذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

(02) الدراسة في:

الدار (1) □elor □ الجزائر □ خارج الوطن □

(03) أين اكتسبتها أو تعلمتها:اذكر رقم اللغة بجانب المربع:

الدار (1) العربية الفصحى (4) الإنجليزية (5) الفرنسية (3) الإسبانية (2)

(04) إذا اكتسبتها أو تعلمتها خارج الوطن،اذكر:

البلد:

(05) كيف اكتسبتها أو تعلمتها: هل في:

المدارس الخاصة □ المدارس العامة □ المدرسة العابسة □ البيت □

/استعمال اللغة أو اللغات في المواقف العامة السائدة عند أغلب الأفراد اتجاه هذا

الاختيار

ما هي اللغة أو اللغات التي تستعملها في المنزل (مع أفراد أسرتك)?

الدار (1) العربية الفصحى (4) الإنجليزية (5) الفرنسية (3) الإسبانية (2)

اذكر لغة أخرى أو لغات أخرى إن أمكن:
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ما هي اللغة التي تستخدمها مع أصدقائك المقربين؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

ما هي اللغة التي تستخدمها في الوسط المدرسي/في العمل؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

ما هي اللغة التي تستعملها لقراءة الصحف، المجلات، الكتب...الخ؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

ما عدد المرات أو إلى أي مدى?

نادر □
أحيانًا □
في أغلب الأحوال □
 دائمًا □

ما هي اللغة التي تستعملها لكتابة أو تحريك شيء ما؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

ما هي اللغة التي تفضلها لمشاهدة القواعد أو البرامج التلفزيونية؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

ما هي اللغة التي تفضلها لسماع المحطات الإذاعية؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

ما هي اللغة التي تشعر بأنك تتقلها جيدًا؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

ما هي لغة رايك، ما هي أسهل لغة؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

لماذا؟

ما هي اللغة الأكثر تعريباً في نظرك؟

اللغة العربية الفصحى □
اللغة الإنجليزية □
اللغة الفرنسية □
اللغة الأمزاجية □

لا يمكنني ذكر لغة أخرى إن أمكن:

لماذا؟

هل تشجع أولادك، طلابك، لغات أخرى...بالخ على تعلم لغات أخرى في المدارس الخاصة أو العمومية؟

لا □
نعم □
(14) ما هي هذه اللغة أو اللغات؟

العربية الفصحى  [   ]
العربية الإزامي  [   ]
الإنجليزية  [   ]
الأمازيغية  [   ]
الفرنسية  [   ]

تذكر لغة أو لغات أخرى إن أمكن:

د/ المواقف العامة السائدة عند اغلب الأفراد اتجاه الخلط أو المزج بين اللغات أو الانتقال من وليا لغة أخرى عند التخطيط

01 هل تتجا إلى الخلط أو المزج بين اللغات أو الانتقال من وليا لغة أخرى عند التخطيط.
لا  [   ]
نعم  [   ]

02 إذا كان جوابك ”نعم“، ما عدد المرات أو إلى أي مدى؟
لا  [   ]
أحيانا  [   ]
دائما  [   ]

03 متى تتجا إلى الخلط أو المزج بين اللغات؟
لا  [   ]
أحيانا  [   ]
دائما  [   ]

04 في رأيك، لماذا يلمج الكثير من الناس إلى الخلط أو المزج بين لغتين أو أكثر عند التخطيط؟
لمال الفراغات اللغوية في الكلام والكتابة  [   ]
للإشراف البراعية في تنقل اللغات الأخرى  [   ]
لا أعرف  [   ]

05 هل تعتقد أن الانتقال من وليا لغة أخرى يعتبر الممارسة اتقانا ومعرفة كلية. باللغتين؟
لا أعلم  [   ]
لا  [   ]
نعم  [   ]

06 هل الانتقال من وليا لغة أخرى عند التخطيط يعتبر تضييع أو تقريبا في هويتك أو انتفاص للمجتمع؟
لا  [   ]
أحيانا  [   ]
دائما  [   ]

ه/ استعمال لغة ”الرسائل القصيرة“ والمواقف العامة السائدة عند اغلب الأفراد اتجاه الخلط أو المزج بين اللغات أو الانتقال من وليا لغة أخرى عن طريقها

01 هل تكتب أو تستعمل لغة”الرسائل القصيرة“؟
لا  [   ]
نعم  [   ]

02 إذا كان جوابك ”نعم“، ما عدد المرات أو إلى أي مدى؟
لا  [   ]
أحيانا  [   ]
دائما  [   ]

(غير إزامي)

03 هل تنقل من وليا لغة أخرى عن طريقة ”الرسائل القصيرة“(تمزج أو تخلط لغتين أو أكثر)?
لا  [   ]
أحيانا  [   ]
دائما  [   ]

04 هل تعتقد أن الانتقال من وليا لغة أخرى عند كتابة ”الرسائل القصيرة“ يعتبر الممارسة اتقانا ومعرفة كلية. باللغتين؟
لا أعلم  [   ]
لا  [   ]
نعم  [   ]

05 أي لغة/ لغات تفضل استعمالها لكتابة ”رسائلك القصيرة“؟
الدارجة  [   ]
العربية الفصحى  [   ]
الأمازيغية  [   ]
الإنجليزية  [   ]
الفرنسية  [   ]

تذكر لغة أو لغات أخرى إن أمكن:
هل الانتقال من وإلى لغات أخرى عند كتابة "رسائل القصيرة" يعتبر تضييعاً أو تقريباً في هويتك أو انتماك للمجتمع؟
لا ☐ غير مقبول فيه ☐

لماذا تستعمل لغة "رسائل القصيرة"؟ ما هو هدفك أو غايك؟
لتلبسي أو التيسير ☐ ربحا للوقت ☐ الحفاظ على المال ☐

إذا كان لديك هدف / أهداف أخرى (ى)، ذكرها؟

لماذا لا تستعمل لغة "رسائل القصيرة"؟
لا تعبير عن الأفكار بوضوح تمام ☐
ليس لها نفس الرموز والاختصارات ☐

إذا كان لديك اقتراح أو اقتراحات أخرى، ذكرها؟

الكثير من الناس يعتبر "رسائل القصيرة" لغة الشباب فقط؟
موافق ☐ موافق بشدة ☐ معارض بشدة ☐ معارض ☐ غير مقبول فيه ☐

هل تتوقف عن كتابة أو استعمال لغة "رسائل القصيرة" إذا شعرت أن ذلك يショー ويفسد شكل وجمالية لغتك الأم ويؤدي إلى زوالها؟
لا ☐ غير مقبول فيه ☐

في رأيك، ما هو مستقبل كتابة أو استعمال لغة "رسائل القصيرة" في الجزائر والأخص في ولائك؟
ستتحول إلى لغة موحدة ☐ ستتطور وتقتن غير مقبول ☐

و/ أو ماذا تلقى من "رسائل القصيرة"؟
هل يمكنك تقديم بعض النماذج من "رسائل القصيرة"، من الأفضل أن تكون 02 الأخرى على الأقل؟
ملاحظة هامة: حاول أن تكتبها (رسائل القصيرة) كما هي دون تغيير - بنفس الرموز والمصطلحات.

شكرا جزيلا مسبقاً على تعاونكم.
Map 01: Algeria: Political Borders
Map 02: The Provinces of Algeria Numbered According to the Official Order
Map 03: Berbers in Africa and Algeria
Map 04: Map of Algeria Highlighting Relizane
Map 05: Relizane: Communes and Districts
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“We are entering a phase of global English which is less glamorous, less news-worthy, and further from the leading edge of exciting ideas. It is the ‘implementation stage’, which will shape future identities, economies and cultures. The way this stage is managed could determine the futures of several generations.”

(David Graddol)
ABSTRACT

This study investigates the efficiency of using Short Message Service (SMS) in Relizane Speech Community (RSC). It sets out a number of hypotheses to identify some of the distinct structural features of code switching in text messages. This seems as a departure from the meeting point of looking at such phenomenon in contemporary real-life interaction to a critical examination of their use in informal written messages in the speech of our bilinguals. To attain this, it is compulsory to prop up our investigation to Muysken’s Typological Approach (2000), which is in fact applied to natural conversation. Moreover, a self-designed questionnaire - based on Bouamrane (1986) - is used to probe our bilinguals’ attitudes towards the varieties they use today with a particular reference to code switching instances in text messages. The results confirm that our bilinguals code switch to signal their identities, to show their social belongings, to establish solidarity and to maintain affiliation with the other members of their community. On the one hand, the study shows the positive attitudes of our bilinguals towards the prevailing linguistic codes as an indication of their readiness to maintain the stable bilingual situation in Relizane. On the other hand, it reveals their highly positive attitudes towards the code switching processes in text messages, a new channel of contact, as being a key element to contribute in any of the internal cultural, religious and other developments in the modern society.
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