European Journal of English Lnguage and Litearture Studies

Vol.2. No.1, pp.1-18, March 2014

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.ea-journals.org)

THE ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING EXPRESSIONS USED BY TRANSLATION STUDENTS DURING THEIR DAILY TRANSLATION AT JADARA UNIVERSITY IN JORDAN

Dr.Mohammad Alshehab

Jadara University

ABSTRACTT: *This study aimed at examining the universal English Code Switches (CSs) used by translation students at Jadara University (JU) in Jordan. It aimed also at analyzing the types and functions of CSs employed by students at the same university. The sample of 100 translation students was selected randomly from the Department of Translation at JU. It was distributed according to gender and resident with 62 males and 38 females. Fifty students were from each urban and rural area. The findings revealed a statistical difference between males and females in using English CSs for the benefit of female students, while there is no statistical difference due to place of residence. Finally, the researcher concluded with some recommendations and suggestions for further research.*

KEYWORDS: English Code Switching, Types of CS, Jadara University, Translation Students.

INTRODUCTION

Bloch and Trager (1982:4) indicate that language is a communication process by using the means of habitually and oral-auditory symbols. Halliday (1984) says that without languages we could not interact, and we cannot articulate our experience. Rommetveit and Balkar (1979) point out that language could generate a picture of ourselves, and regulate our relationship and attachments within society groups. Consequently, language has a communicative and social function that guarantees language to everyone, but with particular forms depending on the place he/she was born, his/her nationality, his/her work, and to whom he/she speaks.

It is worth here to distinguish between language and *dialect*. Trudgill (1975) explains that dialect is a form of language distinguished from other forms of the same language. He points out that a language has a *prestige* which a dialect lacks. It is the non-standard variety of language that depends on the movement between places, the age, and social class. He continues that it is possible to speak the same dialect with different accents with a variety of pronunciations. Hence, the speakers of the same dialect may have different accents. Weinreich (1954) points out that there are a variety of situations that result from language contact, i.e., bilingualism (using two languages), diglossia (speakers using a variety of practices of the same language under various conditions), and Code Switching (CS) in using two or more languages or dialects in one speech situation.

CODE SWITCHING

Auer (1984) argues that bilingual is the control of two languages. Bilinguals have a tendency to use CS when talking to people who understand both their first and second language. Haugen (1956) indicates that CS takes place when a bilingual uses two or more languages in a conversation. It also takes place in the lack of vocabulary in one of the languages, thus the speaker may express the idea by using another language. On the other hand, Cook (2003) states that CS may be integrated into the activities that are used for teaching of a second language. Milroy and Pieter (1995) argue that CS occurs naturally and typically when dealing with two languages.

Definitions of CS

Auer (1998) defines CS as the alternate use of two or more languages in the same speech, it can be in a form of a single word, or a phrase, or a sentence. Cook (2002) defines CS as the phenomenon which occurs when bilinguals switch between two common languages they share in the middle of a conversation. The switch takes place between or within sentences, involving phrases, words, or even parts of words.

Gemperz (1982, p. 59) defines code switching as "the combination within the same speech belonging to two different grammatical systems of subsystems". Myers-Scotton (2006, p. 239) defines it as "the use of two languages in the same conversation". Auer (1999: 310) points out, CS will be reserved for those cases in which the combination of two languages is perceived and interpreted as a locally meaningful event by participants. Skiba (1997) states that CS refers to the alternation between two languages or dialects in conversation between people who share these particular languages and dialects. Skiba adds that CS could be obtained from multi forms including single word switches, phrase switches, and clause switches. Thus, Poplack and Meechan (1998) indicate that CS may be defined as the combination of sentences or sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic rules of its lexifier language.

Gumperz (1999) agrees with Poplack (1980) in arguing that CS differs in accordance with the situation of the conversation, and the metaphorical CS. Under the metaphorical category, Scotton (1983) argues that CS also differs according to discourse function. More specifically, a function of CS is determined in relation to the relative information at a specific point of the current conversation. For example, CS is used to set weight at an exact spot, in other word emphasis, *give me the pen* أعطني القلم**.** Another example, to specify any person,*" ask Hamzah* اذا عايز يخرج**,** it means *"ask Hamzah if he likes to go out".* Nowadays, people use transliteration for the Arabic terms, such as phone text messages; thus, CS can be seen as a natural product of the bilinguals' interaction in two or more languages in multilingual and multicultural communities.

Types of CS

Chomsky (1972) indicates-in his first theory for language acquisition- that as children learn, they realize how to express the underlying universal structure according to their particular culture. Crystal (2000) calls for *sociocultural* linguistics. Similarly, Cook (2003) underpins him in using

the second language for obtaining the needed information. Cook tends to borrow switches to face in all walks of life. As a result, CS is now needed in borrowing and mixing scientific terms and phrases.

Auer (1999) gives more attention to CS. He divides it into three open fields; linguistics, sociolinguistics, and psycholinguistics. On the other side, Poblack (1980 581-618) identifies three types of CS as follow:

- *Tag switching* involves the insertion of a word or phrasal tag in one language into an utterance in another language.
- Inter-sentential switching occurs at sentence boundary, it emphasizes a particular point uttered in the other language. CS involves switching at sentential boundaries, where one clause or sentence is in one language and the next clause or sentence is in the other.
- *Intra-sentential switching* occurs within a single sentence. It happens at the clause, phrase level, or at word level, specifically in the middle of a sentence, with no disturbance, pause, or gap indicating a shift if no morpho-phonological adaptation occurs.

Poblack's view is underpinned by Scotton (2002), he indicates that the English CSs were classified into; *extrasentential*, *intersentential,* and *intrasentential* CS. These classifications are within the conversational functions that have been written by Reyes (2004), some of them have been adopted here in this study such as *emphasis*, *clarification*, *person specification, discourse marker*, and *insistence with non –command*.

Gumperz (1976) says that the equal proportion of the conversational CSs is only to produce instances of the two languages. Blom and Gumperz (1972) and Auer (1984) indicate that the conversational process is divided into s*ituational* and *metaphorical* CS. The *situational* CS is the process that occurs according to a specific strategy or function compatible with the situation such as transferring to Arabic to encourage an open discussion in English lesson. The *metaphorical* CS is a process occurs according to pre-existing strategy or function in harmony with the social context. Chan (2005) says that *situational* CS could describe how speakers switch according to their social positions, whereas the use of *metaphorical* is to balance the situation, in addition to call the attention of the hearer.

Another classification is set by Nguyen (2008) who reports that there are two approaches for sociolinguistic matter of CS:

- Macro approach that explores language alternatives at a given community level. It measures the social and cultural speaker.
- Micro approach explores language alternatives at an interaction level, and explains the motivations driven by the speakers themselves rather than by the society and culture.

Borrowing (Bw)

Myers-Scotton (1993) asserts the importance of separating CS from Barrowings. Grosjean (1982) indicates that a distinction ought to be made between *language borrowing* and *speech borrowing,* while Poplack *et al*. (1988) distinguish between *established loans* and *nonce borrowing* respectively. Myers-Scotton (2006) indicates that *speech borrowing* is a good account of switching language. She continues that *nonce borrowing* refers to bilingual speakers' use of

elements from language A in a discourse mainly in language B. Borrowing takes a word or phrase from one language and uses it in another language. The borrowed unit can be pronounced according to the sound system of the original language. For example, the loan word *radar* is borrowed from English and transliterated. It becomes a new Arabic term instead of *alraSid* الراصد or *akashof* الكاشوف. Another examples, *buy a Cassette for Mays* اشتري كاسيت لميس, *did you repair the computer?* هل أصلحت الكمبيوتر؟. Here, *computer* and *cassette* are English words that became a part of our language instead of the Arabic ones; *hasoop* and *shareeT* شريط and حاسوب. Here the Arabic renderings are replaced by the new English borrowed words *computer* and *cassette* as they are more common in academic and social levels The academic modern Arabic is enriched by such borrowings to face the vast development in science and technology. These borrowings may be mixed with the original language and become a part of it. At the social level, in the Arab countries, the Lebanese dialect is considered the most borrowing dialect of the current Lebanese Arabic. It often borrows French words and phrases.

Code Mixing (Cm)

Muysken (2000) favors using Code Mixing (CM) as an envelope term to cover the cases of both CS and BW. Myers-Scotton (1993a) prefers the term CS for *inter-sentential* switching, CM is preferred for *intra-sentential* switches. The reason is that only CM (intra-sentential CS) requires the integration of the rules of the two languages involved in the discourse.

Muysken (2000) indicates that CS is used for cases in which the two codes maintain their monolingual features, while CM is used for cases where there is some convergence between the two languages. On the other hand, Myers-Scotton (1993b) differentiates between the two terms, stating that CS occurs when bilinguals alternate between two languages during one interaction with another bilingual person, while CM is the use of words, affixes, phrases and clauses from more than one language within the same sentences. Muysken (2000) indicates that in some cases, there is no difference between code mixing and language mixing. On the other hand, Auer (1999) differentiates between them, as classical CS is alternational, while CM is alternational and insertional. In language mixing, although two languages are used, they are not oriented by participants as separate entities. To exemplify further the difference in CM and CS, a number of illustrations are given below.

a. training after a heavy meal is healthy *bass* بس I have no time
b. training after a heavy meal is healthy *but* I have no time

Here in the above sentence, only the Arabic term *bass* **بس** is mixed into the English sentence. To compare with CS, look at c and d examples below, the speaker starts speaking in English, then he switches to Arabic to complete the sentence.

a. if the weather becomes better, *sawfa athhab lizeyaret Sadeeqy* سوف اذهب لزيارة صديقي
b. If the weather becomes better, *I will visit my friend.*

To sum up, CS takes place between bilinguals as a structure of a single word, phrase, or sentence/s while receiving and sending the message. In other words, you start talking in Arabic, and then you throw English words, phrases, or even full sentences; for example, *please* أعطني الكتاب, here is a full Arabic sentence with one term in English.

Several studies deal with grammatical and linguistic limitations of CS process such as the study of Sankoff and Poplack (1981). Other studies focused on syntactic sites that disclosed the spots of CS, without paying any attention to their social and cultural factors such as the study of Bailey (2001), which fails to understand the sociolinguistic issues associated with the process of CS. On the other side, the study of Nguyen's (2008) has dealt with CS as a multifunctional process; it involved various practices and functions crossing cultures, communities, and societies.

At the Arab level, most of the studies are coping with Standard Arabic (SA) and Dialectal Arabic (DA) such as the studies of (Albirini, 2011; Baoueb, 2009). Albirini's (2011) focuses on social functions of CS between SA and DA, he uses thirty-five audio and video recordings to obtain data in the domains of religious lectures, political debates, and soccer commentaries, while Baoueb (2009) focuses on social constraints of CS between SA and DA in the one side, and on the other side, between French and English. He uses various tools such as recorded conversations, observations, interviews, and questionnaires. The finding of Albirini's (2011) reveales a high code of importance, complexity, and seriousness to SA. The low code was with less important, less serious and accessible topics to DA. Baoueb' study presents the complex linguistic situation in terms of the different motivations for CS between in-group members, and also with foreign colleagues and clients. In contrast, the study of Dewaele and Edwards (2007) cope with English, French, and local Arabic Lebanese between a mother and her daughter. Quantitative and qualitative analysis for CS in both conversations show significantly different uses of switching for mother and daughter across a number of features, including relative frequency of different switch types.

At the national level, Riyad (1999) investigates the Jordanian university students' attitudes toward CS and CM. The study aims at finding out the most frequent English expressions that they used in Arabic discourse. A questionnaire was developed and distributed to 352 students to measure students' attitudes toward CS/CM in relation to English, toward CS/CM in relation to Arabic, and toward CS/CM in relation to language users. The study shows negative as well as positive attitudes toward CS/CM with English in Arabic discourse. The results also show the reasons for CS, e.g., the lack of Arabic equivalents for English terms or expressions. Dewaele and Edwards (2007) study is clearly relevant to my own work in collecting and analyzing data. The relevant of Riyad's (1999) study is in using a questionnaire for students' CS and CM. On the other side, this study investigates the types of CS and some of its functions within students' translation and conversation.

Research Problem

Nationally, the functions of CS within students' translation remain unclear. In spite of the lack of studies regarding this subject, a number of published papers were found dealing with students' attitudes towards CS, e.g., the study of Riyad's (1999. As an instructor of translation at a number of universities in Jordan, the researcher noticed the phenomenon of English CSs among translation students. They used to switch when translating from English into Arabic and vice versa. Hence, delving into this rare subject, and for the fact that this area of study has not been discussed before. It becomes an important issue from the researcher point of view to be discussed and analyzed. Consequently, the gap resulting from the absence of CS studies will be bridged.

Research Objectives

This research has the following objectives:

a. Examining the universal English CS expressions used by translation students at JU in Jordan.
b. Analyzing the conversational types and functions of CS/ CM employed by students during their daily translation and conversation at JU in Jordan.

Research Questions

To achieve the previous objectives, the researcher has set up the following questions:

Q1: What are the types and functions of English CSs employed by students at academic and social levels at Jadara University in Jordan?
Q2: What are the universal English CSs used by translation students at Jadara University in Jordan?
Q3: Are there statistical differences between male and female students in using English CSs at Jadara University in Jordan?
Q4: Are there statistical differences between rural and urban students in using English CSs at Jadara University in Jordan?

The Limitation of the Study

The study is limited to 100 translation students that were chosen from English Department and Translation at JU in Jordan. The study deals with analyzing Scotton's (2002) types of CS and five conversational functions only. Finally, the questionnaire is only limited to 65 English CSs.

METHODOLOGY

The researcher dealt with the following methods to verify the study's objectives and to answer its questions.

The Population and the Sample of the Study

The researcher selected the Department of English Language and Translation at JU to be the scope of this study. The population consisted of 300 of the English undergraduate students who were enrolled in the first semester (2010-2011) from various levels. The sample was selected randomly to examine the universal English CSs used by translation students. It was distributed according to gender and resident. It was 100 translation students with 62 males and 38 females. Fifty students were from each urban and rural group. They represent 33.3% of the study's population (See Table 1)

Table1: The Distribution of the Sample

Sex	Frequency	%
Male	62	62.00
Female	38	38.00
Total	100	100.00
Resident	Frequency	%
Rural	50	50.00
Urban	50	50.00
Total	100	100.00

Data Collection

This study dealt with expressions of English CS during students' translation and conversation. The following tools were used:

Records

To expand students' ability in translation, and to know more about the phenomenon of CS, the researcher made a weekly ten minutes competition in oral translation at the end of the lecture between translation students. In this way students' participation could help them in expanding their ability in oral translation. In this connection Shiyab (2013) says: "class participation facilitates students' engagement in classroom arguments and discussions. It helps them improve their communication skills. After all, translation involves not only reading and writing, but also speaking in the case of interpreting" (p.46).

The researcher determined the scope of questions to be about themselves, exams, current English course, and technological devices used. One of the students asked his/her colleague English question to be answered into English; then, another student was chosen to translate the answer into Arabic. The researcher observed their answers, and then recorded their translation. The following suitable questions were selected:

a. How are you now?
b. How did you know your friend's news?
c. How many exams do you have in the semester?
d. What is your favorite exam?
e. How did you do in the first exam?
f. How did you raise your levels in the exam?
g. Is there any chance to repeat the exam?
h. What did you do to save your work in the computer?
i. Is the English book *General Translation* an easy course?
j. Does it need more study?
k. How did you find the presentation?

Reports and Questionnaire

For the purposes of the research, the researcher asked his students to print their daily facebook page with chatting if it is available. The reports were set up and given to the researcher every day. Moreover, the researcher wrote the daily notes committed by 'translation group' at facebook, which was initiated by his students.

The answers and the reports were investigated and analyzed, the English switches were extracted and computed, the frequented terms and expressions were taken into consideration, while the terms of less frequency were ignored. A list of 80 English terms and expressions was set up. To insure the validity of the list, it was given to a "panel of judges" at Irbid National University (INU) and JU in Jordan to set their comments and views in details. Their comments and views were taken into account; they have nearly the same opinion in deleting some of English terms and expressions. The judges acknowledged the validity of the list to examine students' switches in Arabic. Finally, a questionnaire was made with 65 English expressions. Finally, the students' questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section exposed personal data on sex and

resident. The second section exposed data on English switches. To answer the list, the student should put the sign (x) in the specify space under its categories (often, rarely) with 1 and 0 grades respectively, as shown in Appendix A.

To achieve the internal consistency reliability, "split half reliability" was used between the two halves for all members of the students' sample. The correlation coefficient was 0.70, followed by Spearman-Brown prophecy formula equation to correct the shortened length of the split halves, and estimate the reliability of the whole test. The reliability coefficient was 0.82.

DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative and qualitative analysis were adopted in this study**.** Quantitatively, the data from the questionnaire was tabulated by using SPSS program to calculate the means and standard deviation for students' answers. For answering the second and the third questions, percentages and mean scores were computed, followed by T-test to demonstrate the differences between the means of males and females on the one side, and to demonstrate the differences between the means of urban and rural students on the other side. Qualitatively, the researcher investigated and analyzed their switches during their translation, chatting, and reports in details. The result of the analysis was categorized into three types; extrasentencial, Inter-sentential switching, and Intra-sentential switching as Scotton's (2002) categorization. Moreover, five functions were investigated, e.g., discourse marker, emphasis, clarification, person specification and insistence.

Variables

This study dealt with the following variables:

- Independent variable: daily oral translation, and sources of internet such as facebook and chatting.
- Dependent variable: acquiring different English switches.
- Moderate variable: sex and resident.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study reveals the following results:

For answering Q1: *What are the types and functions of CS employed by students at academic and social levels at JU in Jordan?*

The analysis of the recorded students' translation, reports and chatting revealed more of English switches. They are categorized regarding Scotton's (2002) criteria as follows:
Firstly: *Extrasentential* CS here includes CM and BW. Code mixing may involve a single word such as زاد download يبدو ان ال *it seems that the download has increased*. The analysis of students' oral translation reveals the following English extrasentential switches:

a.	*We were too late, bye now*	لقد تأخرنا كثيرا bye الان
b.	*Praise to Allah, I'm fine now*	الحمد لله انا fine الان
c.	*My favorite is an open book exam*	احسن امتحان عندي open book

d. *Make share for picture* اعمل share على الصورة
e. *It is better to make cancelation for the file* الافضل تعمل cancelation للملف
f. *I bought a cassette for dana* اشتريت cassette لدانة
g. *Talk with me; ok my dear* احكي معي ok ; يا عزيزي
h. *Of course; I will come to the university* سوف أحضر الى الجامعة ; of course
i. *We went to the Mall because there was a* sale ذهبنا الى Mall *لانه فيه تنزيلات*

Al *Mall* here means a big market (Al Souq) in Arabic; they transliterated it **as** in English language.

Example (g) and (h) indicate for function of *discourse marker*, they are linguistic elements that do not necessarily add to the content of the utterance, but act as markers of the context in which the utterance is taking place.

Barrowing is set up within CS and sometimes CM. It deals with the Arabicization of the English scientific terms to become an Arabic one. Examples:

a. *I do not have credit* ما معي credit
b. *I made chatting with him.* عملت معه chatting
c. *Open the computer to meet at facebook* افتح الكمبيوتر لنلتقي على facebook
d. *I sent him a message by Mobile* بعثت له message على Mobile
e. *I bought a cassette for Dana* اشتريت cassette لدانة

More barrowings are set up within Arabic scientific words, e.g., *computer*, *net*, *mobile*, and *phone* or *mobile* that are widely used instead of *Hasoop* حاسوب , *Shabakah* شبكة, *Nagal* نقال, and *Hatef* هاتف in Arabic language.

Secondly: *Intersentential* code switching involves switching at sentential boundaries, where the first clause is in one language, and the next clause is in the other language. For example;

a. *There is no need to study but if you like to focus more on, it is up to you.*
ما فيه داعي ندرس لكن اذا بدك تركز اكثر it is up to you
b. *I don't know, I don't know* أنا لا أعلم I don't know
c. *Ask Dana if she has a flash memory* اسال دانة اذا معها flash memory
d. *We took a test, the second exam* اخذنا امتحان second exam
e. *We went to the Mall because there is a sale offer* ذهبنا الى المول لأنه فيه sale offer
f. *The presentation was logic and good* كان التقديم logic and good

The above example (a), and the example (d) below have an *emphasis* function, in which CSs *I don't know* and *no chance* are used to put emphasis on a specific command. On the other hand, the above examples (d) and (f) are within *clarification* function, in which CS gives more information to clarify an idea or a message, the CS *logic and good* as well as CS *second exam* give more about the presentation and the test respectively.

Thirdly: *Intrasentential* code switching takes place within the clause boundary, such as:

a. The Doctor gave us an easy homework to raise the level.
أعطانا الدكتور easy homework لرفع المستوى
b. It is better to cancel the file يفضل ان تعمل cancel for the file

c. *His way in presenting confused the students* confused the students طريقته في الالقاء
d. *No chance, no chance to repeat the exam* لإعادة الامتحان no chance ما فيه فرصة

Moreover, example (a) below signifies for *person specification* function by referring in CS to another person during their conversation.

a. *Who has a flash? Ask Dana if she has* اذا معها Ask Dana؟ من معه فلاش

Analyzing the following examples, CS signifying a determination in a specific idea. Hence, they are ascribed to *insistence (non-command)* function.

a. *Let us go, let us go* Let us go دعنا نذهب
b. *In the way, by the way, take me with you* بطريقك by the way خذني معك
c. *Please wait a minute, please* please, اذا سمحت wait a minute
d. *I miss you, miss you* miss you افتقدتك

To sum up, the analysis shows three types of CS such as *extrasentencial, Inter-sentential* and *Intra-sentential.* It displays also five CS functions; *discourse marker, emphasis, clarification, person specification* and *insistence.*

For answering Q2: *What are the universal English CS expressions used by translation st- udents at JU in Jordan?*

The analysis of the previous English sentences, facebook chatting, and reports revealed also more English switches. These switches are tabulated into social and academic categories. Social category includes 38 items, while academic and scientific category includes 27 expressions. The entire mean score of using English CS terms in Arabic is 67.66 percent and the standard deviation is 14.8. Table 2 exposes the percentages and standard deviations of social CS expressions, the mean score is 65 percent and the standard deviation is 5.2. The highest mean score is for the CS *sorry* اسف with 89 percent. The English CSs; *ok* حسنا ,ماشى, *hi* مرحبا , *bye* مع السلامة , *please* سمحت اذا , *thanks* شكرا , *like* بلغة الفيس *اعجاب*/, have scored above 80 percent. The lowest mean scores are for the English items; *open day* يوم مفتوح, *at least* على الاقل, *hi girls/ boys* مرحبا يا بنات, شباب , *ok darling* حسنا عزيزي, *please my dear* اذا سمحت عزيزي, they are achieved under 50 percent.

These social CS are used by a good number of the Jordanian people, particularly students at universities. As most of students cope with internet devices such facebook and Skype, they handle such terms because they are common in use. It is worthy to mention, students switch in order to save time, and to have fun in their conversation. They focus on expressing ideas more brightly, and to show off themselves.

Table 2: Means and Standard Deviation for Social CS terms and expressions

no	Term & Expression	Mean	%	St.D
1	Sorry	0.89	89	0.314
2	Ok	0.86	86	0.349
3	Please	0.86	86	0.349
4	Thanks	0.85	85	0.359
5	Hi	0.82	82	0.386
6	Like	0.82	82	0.386
7	Bye	0.80	80	0.402
8	See you (later)	0.79	79	0.409
9	Special	0.79	79	0.409
10	Miss u	0.79	79	0.409
11	No problem	0.78	78	0.416
12	Shoes	0.76	76	0.429
13	Shopping	0.76	76	0.429
14	Hello	0.75	75	0.435
15	Wait a minute	0.73	73	0.446
16	Maybe	0.71	71	0.456
17	Share	0.71	71	0.456
18	It's up to you	0.71	71	0.456
19	Let us go	0.70	70	0.461
20	Busy	0.67	67	0.473
21	Thanks (a lot)	0.64	64	0.482
22	Welcome	0.64	64	0.482
23	No comment	0.63	63	0.485
24	Hello how are you	0.62	62	0.488
25	Chance	0.59	59	0.494
26	Fine thanks	0.57	57	0.498
27	It's up to you	0.57	57	0.498
28	I don't know	0.53	53	0.502
29	Fine	0.53	53	0.502
30	By the way	0.52	52	0.502
31	Of course	0.52	52	0.502
32	Open day	0.49	49	0.502
33	At least	0.49	49	0.502
34	Hi girls/ boys	0.42	42	0.496
35	Sale offer	0.42	42	0.496
36	Ok darling	0.37	37	0.485
37	Darling	0.37	37	0.485
38	Please my dear	0.28	28	0.451
Mean		0.65	65	5.20

Table 3 shows the English academic and scientific switches used in Arabic. The mean score and standard deviation of this category are 71 percent and 6.9 respectively. The highest values are for the term *Mobile* موبايل. It has achieved the highest mean score that is 94 percent. The English terms *Computer* حاسوب and *save* حفظ have achieved above 90 percent, while the English expressions; *first exam* الامتحان الاول and *second exam* الامتحان الثاني have achieved above 80 percent. The lowest mean scores are for the terms *incomplete* غير مكتمل and *microphone* ميكروفون , they have scored under 50 percent.

Here, CS as scientific term is not an intentional action all the time. It is a short way for students who have difficulty in dealing with scientific expressions, and unable to express their thoughts in the Arabic language. Appendix A shows all English CSs.

Table 3: Means, percentages and Standard Deviation for CS Terms and Expressions (Academic and Scientific)

n	Expression, term	Mean	%	Std. D
1	Mobile	0.94	94	0.239
2	Computer	0.92	92	0.273
3	Save	0.90	90	0.302
4	Second exam	0.84	84	0.368
5	First exam	0.82	82	0.386
6	Files	0.78	78	0.416
7	Message	0.78	78	0.416
8	Quiz	0.78	78	0.416
9	Flash memory	0.77	77	0.423
10	Taxi	0.77	77	0.423
11	Cancel	0.76	76	0.429
12	Download	0.76	76	0.429
13	Lab	0.74	74	0.441
14	E-mail	0.73	73	0.446
15	Exam	0.73	73	0.446
16	Search in Google ,net	0.71	71	0.456
17	Scan	0.71	71	0.456
18	Final exam	0.68	68	0.469
19	Presentation	0.65	65	0.479
20	Sign in	0.64	64	0.482
21	Sign out	0.61	61	0.490
22	Wall	0.59	59	0.494
23	Course	0.59	59	0.494
24	Assignment	0.57	57	0.498
25	Open book	0.53	53	0.502
26	Incomplete	0.48	48	0.502
27	Microphone	0.45	45	0.500
Mean %		0.71	71	6.900
Total mean from 60		43.98	43.98	9.650
Total mean %		67.66	67.66	14.80

For answering Q3*: Are there statistical differences between male and female students in using English CS expressions at JU in Jordan?*

Frequencies and percentages were used for computing CS expressions, followed by finding the mean scores regarding male and female students. T-test was used to see the differences between males and females. Table 4 shows the result of these statistical methods. The computed *t* is 4.39, while the critical *t* at α =0.05 level is 1.99, thus there is a statistical difference between males and females for the benefit of female students as they achieved 75.30 percent, while the males have achieved 62.98 percent.

Table 4: T-test for Male and Female Students' Mean Scares

Sex	n	Mean	St.D	t	df	Sig.
Male	62	62.98	13.116	4.386	98	.05
Female	38	75.30	14.463			
Total	100	67.66	14.844			

The highest level for female students may be ascribed to the orientation of the females towards prestige. They like to use such CS expressions in Arabic language during communication in their daily life. Although males have achieved a fair level, but they are less in using such switches. They tend to be more serious in using their standard language, and sometimes they switch towards local expressions. Some of them considered a silly situation to use other than their locals.

For answering Q4: *Are there statistical differences between rural and urban students in using CS expressions at JU in Jordan?*

Table 5 shows an equal level in their mean scores, rural students have achieved 67.35 percent, while urban students have attained 67.97 percent. The computed *t* is 0.206, while the critical *t* is 1.99. Thus, there were no statistical differences by resident in the students' acquisition of English CS.

Table 5: T-test for Rural and Urban Students' Mean Scares

Resid	N	Mean	St.D	t	df	Sig.
Rural	50	67.35	14.917	.206	98	.05
Urban	50	67.97	14.915			
Total	100	67.66	14.844			

The equal level in the mean scores for rural and urban students signifies to similarity in their environments. Villages in the north of Jordan have an opened connection in technological devices as well as in cities. This reflects their English switches in coping with internet devices, e.g., Facebook, Skype, Yahoo Messenger and Emails. Moreover, further of rural people have the superiority in their access to higher education.

IMPLICATION TO RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

This study is considered the first attempt in trying to analyze and investigate the daily English CSs. Furthermore, these English CSs were dealt by translation students at their academic level. The study is expected to provide a significant background about English CSs. It is an important key for qualitative and quantitative research as it uses a verity of methods for collecting data in this field of study. It is hoped, this study will help in studying and analyzing English and Arabic CSs with its all types and functions. Moreover, this study will benefit postgraduate students and scholars in conducting similar researches.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In the situation of CS and to improve translation skills, translation students ought to be involved in CS to reduce the social distance between languages. The researcher recommends for outdoor activities dealing with CS types and functions as a serious issue to be searched and analyzed. It is also recommended for conducting translation training focuses on bilingual of English and Arabic skills. Moreover, the researcher suggests more practical researches on Arabic and English CS using various tools, e.g., observations, recorders and interviews

CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that CS could be a power means for learners to explore their ideas. CS is not only typical, but also a valuable tool within translation and conversation context.

This study is a new challenge at the research yard. It coped with the types and functions of English CSs used by translation students at JU in Jordan. The students used a variety of social and scientific English CSs in their daily translation and conversation. Students' oral translation and the daily conversations were recorded, collected and analyzed. The results revealed statistical differences between male and female students for the benefit of females, while no statistical differences ascribed to resident. The result showed a better level for English scientific CSs than a social one. Qualitatively, CS's types and functions were analyzed and investigated. In the light of these results, a number of recommendations and suggestions for further researches were set up. It is hoped, this study could present a bit of contribution to the vast of knowledge in the field of CS. .

REFERENCES

Albirini, A. (2011). The sociolinguistic functions of code switching between Standard Arabic and Dialectal Arabic. *Vol. 40* (5), p537-562.

Auer, P. 2003 "Crossing" the language border into Turkish? Uses of Turkish by non-Turksin Germany. In: L. Mondada and S.P. Doehler (eds.), *Plurilinguism\ Mehrsprachigkeit\ Plurilingualism*, 73–94. Tübingen: A. Francke.

Auer, P. (1999). From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3: 309–332.

Auer, P. (ed.) (1998). *Code switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Co.

Bailey, B. (2001). "The Language of Multiple Identities among Dominican Americans." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 10*(2): 190-22

Bloch,B and Trager, e.G. (1982). *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. *Linguistic Society of America*. Baltimor

Blom, J and Gumperz, J. (1972). "Code-switching in Norway". In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics"*. NewYork: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.407-434.

Baoueb, Lamia. (2009). Social factors for code-switching in Tunisian business companies: A case study. *Multilingua.* 2009, *Vol. 28*, Issue 4, pp.425-458.

Chan, B. (2005). "Conversational code-switching and Relevance Theory.", *Paper presented at the 9th Conference of International Pragmatics Association (IPrA9)*, Riva Del Garda, Italy.

Chomsky, N. (2000). *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Chomsky, N. (1972). *Problems of Knowledge and Freedom*. London: Fontana.

Cook, V. (2003). Introduction: The changing L1 in the L2 user's mind. In: Vivian Cook (ed.), *Effects of Second Language on the First*, 1–18. Cleved Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V (ed.). (2002). *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language Death.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewaele, J and Edwards, M. (2007). Trilingual conversations: A window into multicompetence. *International Journal of Bilingualism.Vol. 11* Issue 2.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge,Mass: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1976). Conversational Code Switching:*in Discourse Strategies*. Gumperz, J. (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, New York.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Gumperz, J. (1999). On interactional sociolinguistic method. In: Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts *Talk. Work and Institutional Order*, 453–472. Berlin:Mouton de Gruyter.

Haugen, E.(1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Publication of the American Dialect Society 28. University of Alabama Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1984). *Learning How to Mean*. London: Longman Press.

Milroy, L and Pieter M(eds). (1995). *One speaker, Two Languages*. Cambridge: University Press.

Muysken, p. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A typology of Code-mixing*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. & Bolonyai, (2001). Calculating speakers: Code-switching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society 30*. 1_28.

Myers-Scotton, Carol and Janice L. Jake (eds). (2000). Testing a model of morpheme classification with language contact data. *Special Issue of the International Journal of Bilingualism*. 4 (1): 1–9.

Myers-Scotton, C and Bolonyai, A. (2001). Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice Model. *Language in Society* 30: 1–28.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes.* Oxford: Oxforiod University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). *Code-switching.* In: Florian Coulmas (ed),: 205–217.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*, Blackwell.

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

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social Motivation for code switching: Evidence from Africa*, Oxford: Claredon Press.

Neuman, W.L. (2005). Social Research Methods: *Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, (6th edn.), Allyn & Bacon Pearson Education, USA.

Nguyen, T. (2008). *The Sociolinguistic Dimension of Code Switching,* University of Duisburg-Essen.

Poplack, Sh. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino enespaćol*: Towards a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics 18*: 581–618.

Poplack, Sh and Meechan, M (eds.) 1998) Instant loans, easy conditions: the productivity of bilingual borrowing. Special Issue of the *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2 (2) :127-234.

Poplack, S, Sankoff, D, and Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of Lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistic 26*(1): 27-104.

Reyes, I. (2004).Functions of Code Switching in school children's Conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28, pp.83-96.

Riyad , H. ((1999). Code-alteration among Arab college students, *World Englishes, Vol 18* (2): 281-289. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Rommetveit, R and Blakar, R. (1979). *Studies of Languages: Thought and Verbal Communication. London*: Academic Press.

Sankoff, D & Poplack, S. (1981)."A formal grammar for code-switching", *Papers in Linguistics, vol. 14,* pp. 3-46.

Scotton, C. (1983). Negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code - switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44, pp. 115–136.

Shiyab, S. (2013). Translation Quality Assessment: A Perspective on Pedagogy, *AWEJ Special issue on Translation*. (2): 42-50, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerlan.

Skiba, R. (1997). Code Switching as a Countenance of Language, *The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.3*(10).

Trudgill, P. (1975). *Accent, Dialect and the School*. London: Arnold.

Weinrech, U. (1954). *Lnguage in Contact.* New York: Mouton.

Appendix A
The Students' Test

Dear Students
In your hands a test includes 65 English terms and expressions that are switched by students for measuring the range of your Code Switching (CS), you are asked to answer all those items by setting up the suitable option.
Please mark an X in one of the two columns to each English terms or expressions you frequently use in Arabic.
Sex: Male …… Female**……**
Resident: Rural…… Urban**…….**

No	Terms	Often	Rarely
1	Final exam		
2	Presentation		
3	Sign in		
4	Sign out		
5	Wall		
6	Course		
7	Assignment		
8	Open book		
9	Incomplete		
10	Microphone		
11	Quiz		
12	Flash memory		
13	Taxi		
14	Cancel		
15	Download		
16	Lab		
17	E-mail		
18	Exam		
19	Search in Google		
20	Scan		
21	Please my dear		
22	Mobile		
23	Computer		
24	Save		
25	Second exam		
26	First exam		
27	Files		

28	Message		

29	Fine		
30	By the way		
31	Of course		
32	Open day		
33	At least		
34	Hi girls/ boys		
35	Sale offer		
36	Ok darling		
37	Darling		
38	Thanks (a lot)		
39	welcome		
40	No comment		
41	Hello how are you		
42	Chance		
43	Fine thanks		
44	It's up to you		
45	I don't know		
46	No problem		
47	Shoes		
48	Shopping		
49	Hello		
50	Wait a minute		
51	Maybe		
52	Share		
53	It's up to you		
54	Let us go		
55	Busy		
56	Sorry		
57	ok		
58	Please		
59	Thanks		
60	hi		
61	Like		
62	Bye		
63	See you (later)		
64	Special		
65	Miss u		