

Doubling in Wolof-French Bilingual Speech

Dr. Hafissatou KANE 

Department of English studies, Cheikh Anta DIOP University of Dakar, Senegal

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Dr, Hafissatou KANE, **E-mail:** kanehafi@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: March 11, 2021

Accepted: April 22, 2021

Volume: 3

Issue: 4

DOI: 10.32996/jweep.2021.3.4.5

KEYWORDS

Bilingual speech, codeswitching, grammar, doubling, Wolof, French

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis of the phenomenon of doubling in the context of Wolof-French codeswitching where the French subordinating conjunction *comme* “as” and its Wolof counterpart *ni*, often appear in succession. More specifically, the paper analyses the different patterns underlying the structure of these two conjunctions in the mixed sentence. The first observation is that doubling occurs either in the sentence initial position or between the independent clause and subordinate one. This suggests that each double corresponds both languages’ word order in the sense that in both Wolof and French, subordinating conjunctions can occupy the initial and middle position of the sentence. The study also indicates that the Wolof conjunction *ni* always occurs at the beginning of the subordinate clause, otherwise, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. For this reason, we claim that the Wolof conjunction (and not the French one) combines the subordinate clause to the independent one. Also, this is why the French conjunction *comme* may be dropped from the mixed sentence while the omission of the Wolof *ni* makes it ungrammatical. Using the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model to explain the indispensability of the Wolof conjunction, it is shown that this subordinating conjunction is a bridge system morpheme. Like outsider system morphemes, earlies and bridges also come from Wolof, the matrix language in Wolof-French codeswitching.

1. Introduction

A bilingual speech is defined as any clause that includes elements from two or more languages (Myers-Scotton 2006: 234). The elements that make a clause bilingual may be actual surface-level words from two languages. This is called codeswitching. But sometimes, speech is bilingual even though it only has surface-level words from one language. That is, the elements making the speech bilingual come from one of the participating languages are abstract rules, not actual words. In this paper, we refer to the first type of bilingual speech also called codeswitching, involving Wolof and French.

Intrasentential codeswitching is a type of codeswitching in which a speaker utters a sentence containing morphological and/or syntactic materials from more than one language. Studies have shown that when codeswitching occurs within the sentence, only one of the participating languages, the matrix language, provides the morphosyntactic elements of the switched constituents (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002). However, another type of codeswitching occurs in which a grammatical category is expressed twice with equivalent grammatical elements from two languages.

For instance, in example (1) below, the language of the sentence is French since all the lexical and function morphemes are French except the Wolof subject pronoun *man* “I”. In this sentence, the speaker switches from French to Wolof with the integration of the pronoun *man* “I” but immediately after switches back to French, the language of the sentence while repeating the same subject pronoun *je* “I” in French.

Wolof-French

1. En tout cas *man* j’ai fait le constat

In any case PRN.1SG.SBJ PRN.1SG.SBJ have done the observation
'Anyway, I did notice that.' Kane (2020)

This phenomenon of doubling in the switched utterances has several appellations among which, "portmanteau sentences" (Nishimura 1986, 1995), "copy translation constructions" (Poplack et al. 1989), "palindromic switches" (Sankoff et al. 1990), "repetition translations" or "repeat translation constructions" (Sankoff 1998) and "morphosyntactic doubling" (Hicks 2010, 2012) or "doubling". In this study, we will use the term doubling.

The present study examines this codeswitching form with illustrations of subordinating conjunction doubling from Wolof-French codeswitching. The main objective of the paper is to describe the structural patterns underlying the two conjunctions in the mixed sentence. The remaining parts of the work are structured as follows: the following section reviews some previous studies in the existing literature. Section 3 and 4, respectively, present the methodology used to conduct this research and the details of the analysis. Section 5 finally closes the paper with concluding remarks.

2. Morphosyntactic studies on doubling in codeswitching

Several studies have dealt with explanations for why doubling occurs in codeswitching (e.g., Poplack et al. 1989, Sankoff et al. 1990, Azuma 1993, Myers-Scotton 1993, Nishimura 1995, Sankoff 1998, Amuzu 2009). But a structurally-oriented analysis of this phenomenon has later started with Hicks (2012, 2015), Chan 2015, Muto (2015) among others.

(Hicks 2012) reproduces and comments on examples of morphosyntactic doubling found in different studies. For instance, he explains that in each example in the set below, English, which is SVO acts as one source language for the codeswitch. All of the sentences begin with English and at some point there is a switch into a language with a different basic word order. In this case, all of the other source languages (Hindi, Tamil, and Japanese) have a basic word order of SOV. In each codeswitched sentence, the repeated elements are both in bold.

English-Hindi

2. She will not come to me because the hindu system **is** tarah kaa **hai**

She will not come to me because the hindu system is that of is

'She will not come to me because the Hindu system is like that'

Pandit (1986)

English-Tamil Sankoff

3. They **make** candai **poodaraanga**

They make fight make.3.PL.PRES

'They are fighting'

Sankoff (1990)

English-Tamil

4. They **gave** me a research grant **kodutaa**

They gave me a research grant give.3.PL.PAST

'They gave me a research grant.'

Sankoff (1990)

English-Japanese

5. Let's **become** kechi ni **naroo**

Let's become tight become

'Let's become tight'

Nishimura (1986)

For Hicks, two properties of these examples, which also hold for all of the examples of doubling he has found, deserve special attention at this point. The first property relates to the fact that each double is realized in the language whose word order is used. In (2), the first realization of the auxiliary is in English as *is*, and this is the unmarked position for English auxiliaries (immediately following the subject). The second realization of the auxiliary is in Hindi as *hai*; auxiliaries are clause-final in unmarked Hindi word order. The same is true for the other examples: the position of *make* in (3) corresponds to an SVO order, while the position of *poduraaga* corresponds to SOV; the situation is isomorphic in (4) and (5).

The second property is that there is some shared element in each example. By “shared element” Hicks means some constituent which acts as a syntactic complement to two different heads. As an example, consider (4). The constituent “a research grant” is the object of “gave” and also of *kodutaa*. The two realizations of this verb share a complement.

This idea of shared constituent is also recognized in Muto (2015). A portmanteau sentence, he said, is ‘a sentence that has a hybrid structure from two sentences in different languages’ Muto (2015:3). In this type of sentence, a constituent in one language is shared as a constituent in another language. The sentence in (6) below is a typical example.

English-Japanese

6.	We bought	about	two pounds	gurai	katte	kita	no
				about	buy.GER	come.PST	DISC
	S	V	O		V		
	‘We bought about two pounds’.						

Nishimura (1997)

Muto explains that in (6), the English object “two pounds” is shared as a constituent in both English and Japanese, resulting in the symmetrical configuration of (S)V(O)V. This structure is possible due to the opposite word order in both languages (i.e., English is an SVO language, while Japanese is SOV language) as well as the ellipsis of the subject in Japanese, which is very common in informal speech (c.f., Hinds 1982). He, therefore, proposed that at the sentence-final position of such utterance, there should exist a Japanese zero V anaphora semantically corresponding to the preceding English V and that Japanese nominal bound morphemes observed in those utterances should be derived from this deleted anaphoric verb (Muto 2015: 11).

Chan (2015) proposes a combined syntactic and psycholinguistic account of portmanteau constructions in code-switching. He sums up that the syntax side of the account crucially hinges upon the minimalist view that order is an interface phenomenon, but syntactic structures at least, those of a phrase in which a head emerges as a complement, are not specified for order Chan (2015). One other assumption is that a lexical item that enters into a Lexical Array and eventually syntactic derivations is actually a “lexical entry” which is a bundle of various kinds of information about a word. In the case of bilinguals, this lexical item also contains information of a word in two languages. The psycholinguistic side of the account relies on Green and Li’s (2014) model of Cognitive Process of Control in which bilinguals may select one language for output and inhibit another, or they may let the information of both languages be processed further for output. Crucially, projection of a phrase will lead to linearization, and a bilingual may co-activate and process both word orders (i.e., head-initial and head-final) if he or she speaks a head-initial and a head-final language.

Chan also explains that there is some psycholinguistic evidence that forms of cross-linguistic synonyms or translations are co-activated when a certain meaning (or lemma) is activated (e.g., *dog* and *perro* for a Spanish-English bilingual) to the point that a cross-linguistic synonym (e.g., *perro*) facilitates the access and production of *dog* in picture-word-interference experiments (Costa et al., 2000; Runnqvist et al., 2013 in Chan 2015: 1).

As mentioned earlier, the present research analyses the structural configurations of double subordinating conjunctions in Wolof-French codeswitched sentences. For that, we need to answer the following questions:

1. What are the positions of each conjunction in the switched sentence?
2. Do these positions change from Wolof and French monolingual sentences to the mixed ones?
3. What other patterns underlie the structure of each conjunction doubling?

Based on previous research on “Grammatical aspects of codeswitching: a case study of Wolof-French in Senegal and Wolof-English in The Gambia” Kane (2020) identifies Wolof as the matrix language in Wolof-French CS, it can be predicted that the position of the doubled conjunctions conforms Wolof sentence structure. The literature review of this study also indicates that

there will be rules governing the occurrence of each conjunction in the mixed sentence. But, it can be hypothesized that such rules will always determine the Wolof conjunction as the more indispensable morpheme for the well-formedness of the mixed sentence.

3. Methodology

The methodology employed to collect the data used in this research is to tape-record various direct conversations and other discussions on different TV stations and videos from YouTube. The following transcription and translation convention are followed:

- French items are in bold.
- An interlinear gloss appears on the line below each of the switched sentences.
- The full English translation is given in single quotation marks.
- The two conjunctions relevant to the current discussion are italicized and underlined for easy identification.

4. Findings and discussions

The observation of the data shows three patterns of the subordinating conjunction doubling in Wolof-French CS. These are discussed in subsections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

4.1 Both conjunctions appear in their unmarked positions

The first observation is that the French conjunction *comme* and its Wolof counterpart *ni* “as” can be juxtaposed either in the sentence-initial position or between the independent clause and subordinate one. This is exemplified in (7) and (8) below.

Wolof-French

7. Senegal ***comme ni*** mu defoon **contre** Pologne ñu ni mooy am **victoire**
[Senegal **as as** 3SG.SBJ.FOC do-PST against Poland]
[1PL.SB say 3SG.IPFV have.INF victory]
'Everybody believed that Senegal was winning the match as they did against Poland'.
8. **Dans un milieu d'insécurité *comme nin*** ko waxe day xaw a tëju
[In an environment of insecurity as as-2SG OBJ.3SG say-Mann]
[AUX.3SG.IPFV seem PRT close-REF]
'In a situation of insecurity as you said, the child tends to withdraw'

Kane (2020)

The analysis shows that the two conjunctions arrive in their respective positions. That is, both in Wolof and French languages, the subordinating conjunction can occur in the initial position of the sentence or between the independent and subordinate clauses. Note that each sentence in (7) and (8) has two equivalents in the two languages. (a) and (b) are examples of Wolof, while French sentences are in (c) and (d).

The set below shows 4 monolingual sentences corresponding to the mixed sentence in (7). (7.a) and (7.b) are Wolof while (7.c) and (7.d) are French.

7. a Senegal ***ni*** mu defoon ci kanamu Pologne ñu ne mooy jël ndam li.
b. ñu ne Senegal mooy jël ndam li ***ni*** mu ko defewoon ci kanamu Pologne.
- c. *Le Sénégal, **comme** il l'avait fait contre la Pologne, on disait qu'il allait gagner*
- d. *On disait que le Sénégal allait gagner **comme** il l'avait fait contre la Pologne*

In both (7a) and (7c), the French conjunction *comme* “as” and the Wolof *ni* come in the initial position of the sentence, right after the subject ‘Senegal’. In the same monolingual sentences in (7b) and (7d), the conjunctions *comme* and *ni* occur between the independent and subordinate clauses. As in example (7), the sentence in (8) also has two corresponding forms in Wolof, (8a) and (8b); and two other equivalents in French, (8c) and (8d). The Wolof conjunction in (8a) which is bound with the reduced form of personal pronoun *nga* “you”, occurs at the beginning of the Wolof monolingual sentence. Similarly, the French word *comme* also appears the initial position in the French corresponding sentence in (8c). Examples in (8b) and (8d) respectively show a Wolof and French equivalent sentences in which the subordinate conjunctions *ni* and *comme* are between two clauses.

8. a ***Nin*** ko waxe xale bi day xawa tëju bu la ñimewul.

- b. Xale bi bu la ñiwul *niñ* ko waxe day xawa tëju.
- c. **Comme** tu viens de le dire l'enfant tend à se renfermer dans un milieu d'insécurité
- d. Dans un milieu d'insécurité **comme** tu viens de le dire l'enfant tend à se renfermer.

This section has shown two examples in which a conjunction is realized both in Wolof and French. The position in which each realization occurs conforms to the word order properties of the two languages. This corroborates Hicks (2012: 45) who explains that morphosyntactic doubling are materialized as follows: the first occurrence of the element appears in the unmarked (expected) position for that element in one source language, while the second occurrence appears in the unmarked position in the other source language. In conjunction doubling in Wolof-French codeswitching, each conjunction occurs in its expected position, either initial or between the independent and subordinate clauses.

Next, consider the two examples below, showing that even if the conjunctions are semantically equivalent, the position of the Wolof one is critical in the sentence structure.

4.2 The Wolof conjunction always occupies the second position

The second observation is that the Wolof conjunction *ni* always occurs in the second position in a well-formed mixed sentence. In example (9), the French conjunction *comme* precedes its Wolof counterpart *ni* in the switched sentence. The same pattern is observed in (10) where the Wolof *ni* follows the French *comme* just after the noun *góor* "man".

Wolof-French

9. Dañ ciy dem ba jeex **comme** *ni* ko sama càmmiñ yi di defe
[AUX.1PL.SB ACC.IPFV until finish as as ACC.SG]
[POSS.1SG.SG brother DEF.ART.PL AUX.PRF do-MANN]
'We are always working hard as our male colleagues do'
10. Jigéen ay takk sër **comme** *ni* góor *ni* muy takke tubéy
[woman FOC-IPFV tie loincloth as man as FOC.IPFV tie pants]
'Like men, women are also doing great job'

Kane (2020)

The structure of both sentences in (9) and (10) shows that the French conjunction *comme* is first realized in this codeswitching doubling.

This raises the question of "What happens with the reversed order?"

For instance, in example (9 a) below, the Wolof conjunction *ni* precedes the French equivalent morpheme *comme*. What has been noted is that this makes the sentence ungrammatical. The same pattern emerges in (10 a), where the French *comme* follows its Wolof counterpart *ni*. It should be noted that in this example, the two conjunctions are separated by the Wolof noun *góor* "man" as shown in (9a) and (9b).

9. a *Dañ ciy dem ba jeex *ni* **comme** ko sama càmmiñ yi di defe.
- b. *Jigéen ay takk sër *ni* góor **comme** muy takke tubéy

Then we can claim that even if both conjunctions have a same function which consists in introducing the same subordinate clause, *sama càmmiñ yi di defe* "my male colleagues do", the second-position of the Wolof one is more critical in the well-formedness of the sentence. The analysis shows that the French conjunction *comme* never appears at the beginning of the subordinate clause. Otherwise, the sentence would become ungrammatical. This is both observed when the language of the subordinate clause is Wolof as in (9a) and (10a) or when it is French as illustrated in (9b) and (10b) below.

10. a *Dañ ciy dem ba jeex *ni* **comme** mes frère collègues le font
- b. *Jigéen ay takk sër *ni* **comme** l'homme noue le pantalon

It is worth mentioning that in (9 b) and (10 b), the sentences would be grammatical if the Wolof conjunction *ni* was dropped, and the French conjunction *comme* directly introduced the French clause. It means that in the case of conjunction doubling, the French *comme* does not combine the two clauses. This suggests that in a Wolof-French codeswitched sentence showing subordinate conjunction doubling, Wolof is the language of the unmarked conjunction, as opposed to the French language.

This unmarkedness criterion of the Wolof conjunction is detailed in the following section where the French equivalent morpheme can be dropped while the omission of the Wolof conjunction would make the sentence ungrammatical.

4.3 Only the French conjunction can be dropped

The third observation about the patterns in codeswitching doubling relates to what happens when either conjunction is dropped. While the French conjunction *comme* can be dropped and the sentence remains correct, the omission of the Wolof equivalent *ni* leaves it ungrammatical. This is illustrated in examples (11) and (12) below and is even true for all the sentences in (7), (8), (9) and (10) discussed above. Note that while the (a) example of each pair of the set is acceptable when only *ni* is present, the (b) form of each of them is unacceptable because only *comme* is present.

Wolof-French

11. Nañu def seen liggéey **comme** *ni* ko góor ñiy defe
Foc.1PL.PFV do POSS.PL.SG job as as ACC.SG man 3PL.IPFV do.MANN
'They just have to do their job correctly like men'
11. a Nañu def seen ligéey **ni** ko góor ñiy defe
b *Nañu def seen liggéey **comme** ko góor ñiy defe
12. **Comme** Adja *ni*-m ko waxe nii **match nul** bi **c'est un bon prix**
[As Adja as-3SG.SBJ ACC.SG say-MANN ADV.PROX match null DEF.ART.SG]
[this is a good price]
'As Adja said this draw is not too bad'
12. a *Ni* ko Adja waxe nii **match nul** bi **c'est un bon prix**
b ***Comme** Adja waxe nii **match nul** bi **c'est un bon prix**

Kane 2020

The acceptability of (a) as opposed to (b) means that only *ni* is mandatory in the subordinate sentences. This is the reason why the presence of *comme* is redundant from the point of view of grammar. This is in line with previous studies such as Azuma (2009: 155) who put forth that in the double plurality in Ewe-English mixed NPs, only the presence of *wó 's'* is critical while the English *-s* is redundant. So from the view of these findings, we may claim that in bilingual doubling, only the morpheme of the host (matrix) language is critical (grammatically obligatory), while that of the guest (embedded language) is redundant.

The explanation of this pattern can be based on what Myers-Scotton's 4-Model stipulates: that there are four types of morphemes in human languages (Myers-Scotton and Jake 2001 and Myers-Scotton 2002). Amuzu (2009) reproduces them as follows:

- a. **Content morphemes:** nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and a few others;
- b. **Early system morphemes:** grammatical elements that have conceptual affinity with their content morpheme heads, e.g. verb satellites (e.g. INTO in LOOK INTO meaning 'to consider'), the pluralizer of nouns, demonstratives, intensifiers, etc.
- c. **Late bridge system morphemes:** elements that provide grammatical links between two units, e.g. copulas and possessive linkers.
- d. **Late outsider system morphemes:** critical grammatical elements, e.g. tense, modal, and aspect (TMA) markers, agreement inflections, case markers, etc.

Basing on this morpheme classification, conjunctions are bridge system morphemes or bridges. Recall that these morphemes join elements together to create a larger constituent. According to the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model, late outsider system morphemes only come from the matrix language in classic types of codeswitching. However, studies further confirm that besides outsiders, the other types of system morphemes, including (earlies and bridges), also come from one language, the matrix language. For instance, in her unpublished thesis on Wolof-French and Wolof-English CS, (Kane, 2020: 304), she concludes that all the system morphemes largely come from Wolof, the ML.

Since Wolof is the matrix language in Wolof-French CS, this suggests that while subordinating conjunction doubling occurs in this type of codeswitching, Wolof conjunctions are the grammatically obligatory. However, it is important to note that in Wolof-

French CS, not all conjunctions come from Wolof. For instance, coordinating conjunctions come from both Wolof and French. For instance, it is common to hear people alternating the French *mais, et, donc, car*, etc. with their Wolof counterparts *waaye, ak, koon, ndaxte* etc. without changing the grammar of the sentence.

5. Conclusion

This paper has discussed the phenomenon of subordinating conjunction doubling in Wolof-French codeswitching. This analysis first shows that the French conjunction *comme* "as" and its Wolof counterpart *ni* arrive in succession either in the sentence initial position or between the independent and subordinating clauses. It has been shown that these two positions conform the structures of both participating languages.

Scrutinizing the data also shows that even if both conjunctions introduce the same subordinate clause, the Wolof one is always closer to the subordinate clause. Otherwise, the mixed sentence would become ungrammatical. This makes us assume that there is a connection between the Wolof conjunction and the grammaticality of the sentence.

This Wolof conjunction *ni* 'as' is so critical for the well-formedness of the mixed sentence. For this reason, its presence is mandatory. It is shown that while the French conjunction *comme* can be dropped and the sentence remains grammatical, the omission of the Wolof equivalent *ni* would make it ungrammatical. The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model briefly explained that subordinating conjunctions are bridge system morphemes in Wolof-French CS. Studies show that Wolof-French CS is a classic type of codeswitching where system morphemes, including bridges, tend to come from Wolof, the matrix language (with few exceptions). That's why even in case of doubling, Wolof as opposed to French, is the unmarked language of these morphemes.

This study confirms Bhareh (2017)'s analysis of Korean-English intrasentential codeswitching who deduces that the codeswitched language is a single language with its own unique grammar rather than a mix of two languages. As Wolof-French bilinguals, we observe that this type of subordinate conjunction doubling only occurs in codeswitching. Neither in French nor Wolof monolingual speeches do these morpheme double. However, it would be crucial to know why this is only acceptable in CS and not in monolingual speech.

References

- [1] Amuzu, E. K. (2009). Double Plurality in Codeswitching: *Legon Journal the HUMANITIES*, 20(1), 151-180.
- [2] Azuma, S. (1993). Word order vs. word class: portmanteau sentences in bilinguals. In: Patricia M. Clancy (Ed.). *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 2*. Center for Study of Language and Information, Stanford.
- [3] Bahareh, S. (2017). Korean-English Codeswitching explained by the Double Switch Constraint Explains WH IN-SITU, *Generative Grammar in Geneva*, 10(1) 153-164.
- [4] Barbiers, S., Olak, K., Marik, L., & Margaret van der Ham (eds.). (2008). *Syntax and Semantics 36: Microvariation in syntactic doubling*. Bingley: Emerald.
- [5] Chan, B. H. Shing. (2015). Portmanteau Constructions, Phrase Structure, and Linearization: *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(1851), 1-16.
- [6] Glaser, Elvira & Nastascha, Frey. (2006). Doubling in Swiss-German dialects, <http://www.meetens.knaw.nl/projecten/edisync/>, retrieved (January 2021).
- [7] Green, D. W., Li, W. (2014). A control process mode of codeswitching. *Language Cognition. Neuroscience*. 29(1), 499-511.
- [8] Hicks, Caleb. (2010). *Morphosyntactic Doubling in Code Switching*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina MA thesis.
- [9] Hicks, C. (2012). A dual-structure analysis of morphosyntactic doubling in code switching: *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working Papers*, 44-57.
- [10] Hinds, J. (1982). *Ellipsis in Japanese*. Carbondale: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- [11] Kane, H. (2012), "Morphological and syntactic analysis of code switching: A contrastive study of Wolof-French and Wolof-English cases". Master's thesis, U.C.A.D, Dakar.
- [12] Kane, H. (2020), "Grammatical aspects of codeswitching: a case study of Wolof-French in Senegal and Wolof-English in The Gambia". Unpublished dissertation, U.C.A.D, Dakar.
- [13] Muto, Teruaki. (2010). The morphosyntax of Japanese / English code-switching: An Optimality-Theoretic Approach. *LSO Working Papers in Linguistics* 8. 54-70.
- [14] Muto, T. (2015). Portmanteau Construction and Bound Morphemes in Japanese / English Code-Switching, <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1443/00007712/>, retrieved (January 2021).
- [15] Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- [16] Myers-Scotton, C., Jake, J. (2001). Explaining aspects of codeswitching and their implications. In Janet Nicol (ed), *One Mind, Two Languages: Bilingual Processing*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [17] Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- [18] Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*, Blackwell Publishing.
- [19] Nishimura, Mira. (1986). Intrasentential code-switching: the case of language assignment. In: Jyotsna Vaid (Ed). *Language Processing in Bilinguals: Psycholinguistic and neuropsychological perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale.
- [20] Nishimura, M. (1995). Afunctional analysis of Japanese / English code-switching: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23(1), 157-181.

- [21] Nishimura, M. (1997). *Japanese/English Code-Switching: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Berkeley insights in linguistics and semiotics. New York: P. Lang.
- [22] Poplack, S., Wheeler, S., Westwood, A. (1989). Distinguishing language contact phenomena: evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. *World Englishes*, 8(3), 389-406.
- [23] Pandit, I. (1986). *Hindi English code switching: mixed Hindi English*. Datta Book Centre, Delhi.
- [24] Sankoff, D., Poplack, S., Vanniarajan, S. (1990). The case of nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change*, 2(1), 71-101.
- [25] Sankoff, D. (1998). The production of code-mixed discourse. *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, August 10-14, 1998: 8-21.*