ATTITUDES TOWARDS ORAL CODE-SWITCHING AMONG TURKISH-ENGLISH BILINGUAL SPEAKERS IN NEW YORK CITY

Didem KOBAN KOÇ

Abstract: This study is an exploratory study in which the views of first and second generation Turkish-English bilingual speakers in New York City (NYC) were analyzed with the purpose of finding out their attitudes towards code-switching (CS). Data for this study were mainly obtained through a questionnaire completed by 35 first and second generation speakers living in NYC. Speakers were asked to respond to a variety of statements regarding their perceptions of Turkish and English CS in discourse. The results indicated that the speakers had a neutral attitude towards CS. The results are discussed in relation to concepts such as identity and language maintenance.

Key words: Turkish, code-switching, language attitude, bilingualism, language maintenance.

New York'ta Yaşayan Türkçe-İngilizce İkidilli Yetişkinlerin Dil Değiştirmelerine Yönelik Tutumları

Özet: Bu araştırma New York'ta yaşayan birinci ve ikinci kuşak Türkçe ve İngilizce konuşan ikidilli Türklerin dil değiştirmeye yönelik tutumlarını değerlendirmeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu araştırma için veri New York'ta yaşayan ve birinci ve ikinci kuşak Türkler olmak üzere 35 kişiden oluşan bir grubun cevapladığı bir anketten elde edilmiştir. Katılımcılardan Türkçe'den İngilizce'ye olmak üzere dil değiştirmeye yönelik görüşleri doğrultusunda anketi cevaplamaları istenmiştir. Sonuçlar, katılımcıların dil değiştirme hakkında nötr bir tutum sergilediklerini göstermiştir. Araştırmanın sonuçları kimlik ve dil sürdürümü gibi kavramlar bakımından tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Türkçe, dil değiştirme, dil tutumu, ikidillilik, dil sürdürümü.

Introduction

Although CS by Turkish bilinguals has been the subject of a large body of research, especially in Europe (Backus, 1992, 1996, 1999, 2000; Backus & Boeschoten, 1996; Backus & Van der Heijden, 1998; Boeschoten & Verhoeven, 1987; Pfaff, 1999), relatively little attention has been devoted to the analysis of CS among Turkish English bilingual speakers in the U.S. (Koban, 2013), which has become an ideal place to study the outcomes of language contact between Turkish and English due to the growing number of Turks immigrating to NYC. In addition, most of the studies conducted in Europe are mainly concerned with the structural aspects of CS and children of immigrant families, all of which are not of particular interest to this study. The purpose of this study is to investigate bilingual Turkish speakers' general attitudes towards Turkish-English CS in discourse. This study is expected to contribute to current research on CS

behavior by evaluating CS in the speech of Turkish-English bilinguals from a sociolinguistic perspective.

Before discussing the findings of the previous studies on attitudes towards CS, let me briefly review the definitions of CS in the literature and the reasons of using it in discourse. CS is a linguistic activity commonly used by bilingual speakers in bilingual settings. It is a rule-governed, systematic (Anderson & Toribio, 2007) and conscious behavior (Lipski, 2014) and requires social knowledge that is culturally specific (Toribio, 2002). Different definitions and types of CS have been provided by researchers (Auer, 1998; Gumperz, 1982; Heller, 1988; Milroy and Muysken, 1995; Mesthrie, Swann, Deumart & Leap, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Trudgill, 2000) over the years, yet, it is typically defined as the "alternating use of two or more codes within one conversational episode" (Auer, 1998, p. 1) or "the use of two language varieties in the same conversation" (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 239). According to Poplack (1980, p. 255), CS is "a verbal skill requiring a large degree of linguistic competence in more than one language…" More recently, CS has been defined as the ability to use more than one language within a single utterance, regardless of the level of integration between the languages (Palmer, 2009) or "the ability on the part of bilinguals to alternate effortlessly between their two languages" (Bullock & Toribio, 2009, p. 1). Within CS both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and learning (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012). The following is an example of CS taken from the speech of a Puerto Rican Spanish-English bilingual speaker in NYC. The speaker switches to Spanish in the second part of the conversation.

> 1. I'll tell you exactly when I have to leave, at ten o'clock. *Y son las nueve y cuarto.* "And it's nine fifteen" (Zentella, 1997).

In relation to exploring why CS might be used, researchers have shown that bilingual adults engage in CS for a variety of social and pragmatic reasons (Anderson, 2006; Gross, 2006; Myers-Scotton, 1993). According to Gross (2006), CS is a complex, skilled linguistic strategy used by bilingual speakers to convey important social meanings above and beyond the referential content of an utterance. In other words, CS has social significance. According to Myers-Scotton (1993), the use of a variety over another in a conversation is determined by two factors: speakers' goals in an encounter; and the interaction's social characteristics which include both the social nature of the interaction, the speech of the community as well as the setting. Baker (2006) identified a variety of reasons for CS. Among them are emphasizing a particular point, substituting a word in place of an unknown word in the target language, reinforcing a request, clarifying a point, expressing identity, communicating friendship, easing tension, injecting humor into a conversation, introducing a new topic, and

expressing a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language. In Backus (2002), for example, Turkish-Dutch bilinguals switched to Dutch because certain concepts, especially those related to culture do not have an equivalent in Turkish. Other researchers reported that CS is used for marking emphasis (Montes-Alcalá, 2001; Zentella, 1997), filling linguistic gaps, expressing ethnic identity (Bullock & Toribio, 2009; Hamers & Blanc, 2000) as well as imitating, representing speech, shifting topic, making situational switches, asking a question, insisting, accommodating for turns, and specifying a person (Reyes, 2004).

This article is organized as follows. The following section reviews several studies on attitudes towards CS. Section 3 states the research questions and describes the methodology. Section 4 provides data analysis and results. Finally, the results are interpreted and discussed in the concluding section.

1. Previous Studies of Attitudes towards CS

From a sociolinguistic perspective, extensive research (Bentahila & Davies, 1992) has been carried out in an attempt to find out bilingual speakers' attitudes towards CS. Language attitude refers to the ways in which observers react towards language varieties and their users (Grosjean, 1982; Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner & Fillenbaum, 1960, p. 47). According to Haugen (1956, 95-96) 'wherever languages are in contact, one is likely to find certain prevalent attitudes of *favour* or *disfavour* towards the languages involved'. For example, in most studies (Pena, 2004; Fernández, 1990; Mendieta, 1999; Toribio, 2002) both monolingual and bilingual speakers often saw CS as a low prestige form and a sign of having insufficient knowledge of the languages involved. For instance, Pena (2004) examined the CS attitudes of 98 first and second generation Spanish-Galician bilinguals in London. The speakers were fully competent in both languages. Based on the responses in the interviews and questionnaires, the author concluded that both generations thought of CS as a sign of a lack of proficiency in the languages and therefore, thought of it as highly negative. Especially the first generation speakers had the most negative attitudes because they saw CS as "a symptom of not having competence" in their languages (p. 153).

Bilingual Hispanics living in the U.S. also reported negative atitudes towards CS although they code switched themselves. In her study, Fernández (1990) found that a Mexican-American woman code switched frequently during a sociolinguistic interview although she had reported that CS was not appropriate in formal settings, and that it could be only used if a speaker was not proficient in both languages. In another study, Mendieta (1999) reported that the majority of Mexican and Puerto Rican speakers living in the U.S. saw a difference between the variety of Spanish they spoke and those spoken in Mexico or

Puerto Rico. Half of the speakers who perceived a difference attributed it to interference from English. They described their U.S. variety of Spanish as inferior to or less correct than Mexican or Puerto Rican Spanish. In another study, Toribio (2002) examined the CS practices of four bilingual Mexican-American speakers from Santa Barbara County, California. She found that CS was associated with low prestige, but still remained as a signal of social identity. Regarding Black English (BE), Koch, Gross and Kolts (2001) examined African American adults' perceptions of those who use Black English (BE), standard English (SE), or code switch (CS) between the two. Participants heard an audio taped man speaking BE, SE, appropriate CS (SE in a formal setting and BE in an informal setting), or inappropriate CS (BE in a formal setting and SE in an informal setting). When their opinions were asked, the participants favored the SE and appropriate CS model more than either the BE or inappropriate CS model.

Some studies, however, reported that bilingual speakers had a positive attitude towards CS. Montes-Alcalá (2000) investigated the attitudes of Spanish-English bilingual youths towards oral and written CS. The subjects in the study not only found CS as a positive linguistic activity but they also thought that it reflects their identity, does not lead to language loss and is not a sign of a lack of language proficiency. Similarly, in Fought (2003), speakers evaluated CS positively because they thought that it served as a bridge between Spanish speakers and passive bilinguals. In another study, Hammink (2000) compared the attitudes of 21 adults and 32 fourth-grade students towards CS. The results showed that the whole group had ambivalent-to-positive attitudes about the practice of CS.

Several studies also investigated the relationship between certain sociobiographical variables and attitudes towards CS (Berthele, 2012; Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis & Finnis, 2005; Pena, 2004). For example, Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis, and Finnis (2005) analyzed the effect of education on the language attitudes of Greek Cypriots living in London. The results showed that as the participants became more educated, their attitude towards CS became more negative. A similar finding was reported in a large-scale study that involved 2070 adult multilinguals from different nationalities (Dewaele & Li, 2014). The results of the open-access survey showed that whereas participants who hold a master's or a PhD degree had more negative attitudes towards CS, those with lower levels of education had the most positive attitudes. Another interesting finding had to do with age. The speakers in the Spanish-Galician community in London reported that the older they became, the more CS they used because of the fact that they had become more aware of their linguistic heritage (Pena, 2004). Regarding gender, Dewaele and Li (2014)

found that female participants had significantly more positive attitudes towards CS than males.

In addition to the sociobiographical variables, researchers also analyzed the effects of other variables such as multilingualism, and several personality characteristics (i.e., extraversion and introversion, emotional stability, tolerance of ambiguity, cognitive empathy) on attitudes towards CS. For example, Dewaele and Li (2014) found that tolerance of ambiguity, which has been defined as the way an individual (or group) deals with ambiguous and unfamiliar situations, had a significant effect on attitudes towards CS. According to the authors, participants who stayed in a foreign cultural and linguistic environment had positive attitudes towards CS. Further, authors also found that emotionally stable participants; people who are less anxious, worried and have more potential to empathise with others who come from different linguistic backgrounds also had positive attitudes towards CS. The authors did not report any significnt effects of multilingualism on attitudes towards CS.

2. Method

The present study seeks to evaluate bilingual speakers' attitudes towards CS that are manifested in the speech of Turkish-English bilinguals in NYC, U.S. According to the research conducted by U.S. Census Bureau in 2000, the largest Turkish population in the U.S. is found in NYC, however, little is known about the language attitudes of Turkish-English speakers and their reasons for using certain varieties. This study intends to contribute towards this goal by exploring bilingual Turkish speakers' opinions about CS.

In order to examine Turkish bilinguals' evaluations of their own CS behavior and others who engage in CS, the study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What is the general attitude of Turkish-English speakers towards CS in discourse?

2. What are Turkish-English speakers' perspectives on code-switching?

2.1. Research Design and Context

Survey research is used to collect data. The survey research is a quantitative research method which aims to collect self-report data from individuals. The instrument often used for this kind of research is the written questionnaire, which is often distributed to the participants via email. For example, in their study of different pronunciations of the vowel in the word 'suite' in the United States, Simon and Murray (1999) found that e-mail requests proved to be a convenient way of gathering a considerable amount of data in a short time and participants were more likely to provide detailed responses over the internet.

The participants in the present study received the written questionnaire via email.

2.2. Participants and Sampling

Participants were required to be Turkish-English bilingual adults. The sampling method used for this study is snowball sampling. First, the researcher contacted a few speakers that she had close ties with and then asked these speakers to identify more appropriate speakers. Then speakers were invited to participate in the study through a letter of invitation circulated via email. Out of 40 Turkish-English bilingual speakers, 35 volunteered and were conveniently available. Participants consisted of 18 males and 17 females and were between 24 and 70 years old. Four were identified as second generation speakers who were born in the U.S. and thirty-one were first generation speakers who came to NYC around the age of 20.3 years with an average number of 18.7 years spent in NYC. The whole sample had almost equal proficiencies in both languages. The average proficiency level for Turkish is 4.8 and for English 4.7 (out of 5). Most of the first generation speakers arrived in the U.S. to get college education or get MA or PhD degrees. Therefore, they were immediately exposed to English through classes. Participants mostly worked at financial institutions. Participation in the study was voluntary and participants did not have to provide their names. The following table provides the participants' age, gender, number of years spent in the US, generation and educational level.

Table 1. Participants' socio-biographical data

Participant code	Gender	Age	Years spent in the US	Generation	Schooling completed	Occupation
1	M	37	12	1st	M.A.	Entrepreneur
2	F	42	18	1st	B.A.	Industrial Designer
3	F	29	29	2nd	M.A.	Senior Associate (Finance)
4	M	38	19	1st	M.A.	Software engineer
5	M	24	6	1st	B.A.	Project Finance Associate
6	M	42	17	1st	M.A.	Software Engineer
7	F	39	12	1st	M.A.	Banker
8	M	41	41	2nd	M.A.	Attorney
9	F	39	15	1st	M.A.	Accountant
10	F	36	19	1st	M.A.	Salesperson
11	F	37	11	1st	M.A.	Consultant
12	M	39	17	1st	M.A.	Marketing Manager
13	M	42	20	1st	B.A.	Data Analyst

14	F	38	16	1st	M.A.	Management Consultant
15	M	38	16	1st	M.A.	Banker
16	F	35	12	1st	PhD	Scientist
17	F	32	32	2nd	B.A.	Banker
18	M	32	13	1st	M.A.	Engineer
19	M	40	13	1st	M.A.	Student
20	M	42	42	2nd	M.A.	Attorney
21	M	70	45	1st	PhD	Mechanical Engineer
22	M	36	14	1st	M.A.	Structural Engineer
23	F	39	14	1st	M.A.	Clerk
24	F	48	13	1st	PhD	English Teacher
25	F	44	19	1st	B.A.	Non-profit Organization Manager
26	M	36	16	1st	B.A.	Financial Analyst
27	M	36	9	1st	M.A.	Banker
28	F	37	19	1st	M.A.	Attorney
29	F	38	14	1st	M.A.	Attorney
30	F	46	24	1st	B.A.	Teacher
31	F	36	13	1st	M.A.	Credit Analyst
32	F	35	14	1st	M.A.	Creative Director
33	M	37	14	1st	B.A.	Engineer
34	M	37	10	1st	M.A.	Software Engineer
35	F	37	16	1st	M.A.	Project Manager

2.3. Data Collection Instrument and Procedure

The data for this study come mainly from a questionnaire whose items were adapted from Montes-Alcalá (2000). The questionnaire has three parts. The first part consists of background questions regarding age, gender, occupation, length of residence in NYC, age of arrival in NYC and self-reported proficiency across receptive (listening, reading) and productive (speaking, writing) domains in Turkish and English. Speakers were asked to report on these different skills using a 5-point scale, where one indicates the lowest degree of proficiency and five the highest.

The second part consists of 12 items related to speakers' attitudes towards CS. All items offered three choices as positive, negative, and neutral. The third part requires participants to answer several follow-up questions about their perceptions of CS. The questionnaire was carried out in the summer of 2014 in NYC. The expected time to complete the survey was 15 minutes. After the participants completed the survey, they emailed it back to the researcher.

3. Results

First, descriptive statistics was conducted to determine the overall use of CS in discourse. The analyses included percentage distributions. The results, which can be seen in the Table below shows that the majority of the participants code switch in their conversations.

Table 2. The use of CS in discourse

CS	**N**	Percent
Yes	34	97.1
No	1	2.9
Total	35	100

The second analysis involved participants' attitudes towards CS. Once again, descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data. Recall that the participants' views about CS were assessed using a Likert type scale consisting of 12 statements. On each statement, speakers indicated whether they felt positive, negative or neutral about the given statements related to attitudes towards CS.

Table 3. General Attitudes towards CS

Item 1 *It sounds pretty when people mix Turkish and English in the same conversation.*	
Agree	5.7 %
Neutral	37.1 %
Disagree	57.1 %
Item 2 *It bothers me when people speak Turkish and English at the same time.*	
Agree	11.4 %
Neutral	60 %
Disagree	28.6 %
Item 5 *It looks pretty when somebody mixes Turkish and English in writing.*	
Agree	0 %
Neutral	28.6 %
Disagree	70.4 %

As can be seen in Table 3 above, while the most of the responses were negative for statements 1 and 5, most participants demonstrated a neutral attitude towards statement 2. The following statements on the questionnaire dealt with the relationship between CS and the loss or maintenance of Turkish.

Table 4. CS and Maintenance or the Loss of Turkish

Item 6 *In my opinion, the mixing of Turkish and English leads to the loss of Turkish.*	
Agree	51.4 %
Neutral	28.6 %
Disagree	20 %
Item 7 *In my opinion, the mixing of Turkish and English helps to maintain Turkish.*	
Agree	8.6 %
Neutral	25.7 %
Disagree	65.7 %

Table 4 shows that 51 % of the participants agree with the fact that the mixing of Turkish and English leads to the loss of Turkish and almost 66 % disagreed with the fact that the mixing of Turkish and English helps to maintain Turkish.

Table 5. CS and Identity

Item 8 *The mixture of Turkish and English reflects who I am.*	
Agree	25.7 %
Neutral	22.9 %
Disagree	51.4 %

A separate item asked respondents to indicate their CS behavior by agreeing or disagreeing with the statement "*The mixture of Turkish and English reflects who I am*". The results showed that more than half of the speakers did not believe the fact that CS between Turkish and English reflected who they were.

Table 6. CS and Respect

Item 9 *When I mix languages, I am more respected by my community.*	
Agree	0 %
Neutral	11.4 %
Disagree	86 %

When the relationship between CS and respect is considered, there is an overwhelming majority of negative responses.

Table 7. CS and Integration with or Segregation from the Community

Item 10 *When I mix languages, I feel more integrated with my community.*	
Agree	5.7 %
Neutral	20 %
Disagree	71.4 %
Item 11 (1 missing) *When I mix languages, I am segregated from society.*	
Agree	11.4 %
Neutral	22.9 %
Disagree	62.9 %

Regarding integration with or segregation from the community, again the majority of the participants does not think that mixing languages leads to integration with the community but does not think that mixing languages means segregation from society.

Table 8. CS and Lack of Language Skills

Item 3 *People mix Turkish and English because they do not know either one well.*	
Agree	14.3 %
Neutral	5.7 %
Disagree	80 %

In the Table above, the focus of the item was on the relationship between CS and language skills. According to the majority of the speakers, people do not code switch because of lack of language skills.

Table 9. CS and Understanding Others

Item 4 *It is easy to understand a person who mixes Turkish and English.*	
Agree	60 %
Neutral	25.7 %
Disagree	14.3 %

As the Table shows, the majority of the participants think that it is easy to understand people when they code switch.

Table 10. CS and Intelligence

Item 12 *When I mix languages, others regard me as less intelligent.*	
Agree	5.7 %
Neutral	8.6 %
Disagree	85.7 %

Finally, almost all participants think that mixing languages does not necessarily make a person less intelligent.

Gender

The present study also investigated the differences between females and males with regard to their attitudes towards CS. The following table presents the percentages for both genders' attitudes towards each item related to CS.

Table 11. General Attitudes of males and females towards CS

Item 1 *It sounds pretty when people mix Turkish and English in the same conversation.*	
Agree	F 6 % M 5.6 %
Neutral	F 29% M 44.4%
Disagree	F 65 % M 50 %
Item 2 *It bothers me when people speak Turkish and English at the same time.*	
Agree	F 12% M 11 %
Neutral	F 59% M 61 %
Disagree	F 29% M 28 %
Item 5 *It looks pretty when somebody mixes Turkish and English in writing.*	
Agree	F 0% M 0 %
Neutral	F 18% M 39%
Disagree	F 82 % M 61%

As can be seen in the Table above, males and females showed similar attitudes for items 1, 2 and 5. Regarding item 1, males were more neutral than females and females showed a more negative attitude than males. As for the second item, both males and females had very similar opinions. Finally, more females disagreed with item 5 than males.

Table 12. CS and Maintenance or the Loss of Turkish

Item 6	
In my opinion, the mixing of Turkish and English leads to the loss of Turkish.	
Agree	F 59% M 44%
Neutral	F 18% M 39%
Disagree	F 24% M 17%
Item 7	
In my opinion, the mixing of Turkish and English helps to maintain Turkish.	
Agree	F 18% M 0 %
Neutral	F 12% M 39 %
Disagree	F 71% M 61 %

With respect to the relationship between CS and the loss or maintenance of Turkish, more females agreed with the fact that the mixing of Turkish and English leads to the loss of Turkish more than males. More males showed neutral attitudes than females.

Table 13. CS and Identity

Item 8	
The mixture of Turkish and English reflects who I am.	
Agree	F 35% M 17%
Neutral	F 18% M 28%
Disagree	F 47% M 56%

Regarding item 8, more males disagreed with the statement "*The mixture of Turkish and English reflects who I am*".

Table 14. CS and Respect

Item 9	
When I mix languages, I am more respected by my community.	
Agree	F 0 % M 0%
Neutral	F6% M17%
Disagree	88% M 84%

When the relationship between CS and respect is considered, both males and females showed negative attitudes towards item 9.

Table 15. CS and Integration with or Segregation from the Community

Item 10 *When I mix languages, I feel more integrated with my community.*	
Agree	F12 % M 0%
Neutral	F12% M28%
Disagree	F71% M72%
Item 11 (1 missing) *When I mix languages, I am segregated from society.*	
Agree	F 18% M 6%
Neutral	F12% M 33%
Disagree	F65% M 61%

With respect to integration with or segregation from the community, the majority of the females and males were negative about the fact that mixing languages leads to integration with the community. Most of them, however, disagreed with the fact that mixing languages means segregation from society.

Table 16. CS and Lack of Language Skills

Item 3 *People mix Turkish and English because they do not know either one well.*	
Agree	F35%M11%
Neutral	F18 %M6 %
Disagree	F47%M83%

Regarding CS and language skills, more females agreed with the fact that people mix Turkish and English because they do not know either one well.

Table 17. CS and Understanding Others

Item 4 *It is easy to understand a person who mixes Turkish and English.*	
Agree	F53% M 67%
Neutral	F29% M 22%
Disagree	F18% M 11%

As for item 4, more males thought that it is easy to understand a person who mixes Turkish and English than females.

Table 18. CS and Intelligence

Item 12 *When I mix languages, others regard me as less intelligent.*	
Agree	F 6% M 6%
Neutral	F 6% M 11%
Disagree	F88% M83%

Finally, both the majority of males and females think that mixing languages does not make a person less intelligent.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study considered the Turkish-English bilingual speakers' attitudes towards CS in discourse. As the results showed, CS is used by an increasing number of Turkish speakers in discourse. Considering the fact that most of the Turkish speakers are engaged in CS, it is expected that they show positive attitudes towards CS. However, the results indicated that the participants, in general, possess a neutral attitude towards it. When the items in the questionnaire are considered separately, most of the participants think that CS leads to the loss of Turkish and it does not reflect who they are. However, they hold a neutral attitude about being respected by their communities. In addition, when code switching, most of the participants neither feel that they are integrated with their community nor they think that they are segregated from society. Further, most of them think that lack of language skills is not the reason why people code switch and finally, the majority of the participants does not consider people as less intelligent when they code switch. From this study, it is evident that Turkish-English bilinguals show rather favorable attitudes towards maintaining the status of Turkish, which can be considered as a key value of cultural identity.

The fact that Turkish-English bilinguals show neutral attitudes towards CS does not support the findings of previous studies (Diaz, 2004; Fernández, 1990; Fought, 2003; Hammink, 2000; Montes-Alcalá, 2000; Toribio, 2002). In the present study, the reason why bilinguals show neutral attitudes towards CS might be the fact that the sample consists of mainly first generation Turks who arrived in NYC after adolescence, which means that the time they spent in Turkey may be sufficient for them to be fond of their culture and identity. In addition, the bilingual Turks still maintain close ties with Turkey by traveling there very often. Further, the participants were part of a group of Turkish speakers living in NYC, which may support Labov's (1972) finding that bilingual speakers, in spite of their negative views, may consciously continue CS in their conversations to establish membership in or loyalty to a particular social group.

Another reason may be related to education. As can be seen in Table 1, almost all participants either have a B.A. or an M.A. degree. Previous studies (Dewaele & Wei, 2014; Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis, & Finnis, 2005) have shown that people who have at least a B.A. degree have less favorable attitudes towards CS. The results in the present study seem to confirm the findings of the above-mentioned studies.

The present study also investigated the differences between males and females with respect to their attitudes towards CS. The results showed that except for item 8, females showed more negative attitudes towards CS than males. This result does not support the findings of previous studies (Valerio, 2015; Dewaele & Wei, 2014) which showed that either the female participants had significantly more positive attitudes towards CS or there is no significant difference between females and males regarding attitudes towards CS.

This study has several limitations regarding its participants, materials, and data collection. First of all, the study included a relatively homogeneous group of speakers with high socioeconomic status who came to the U.S. for educational purposes. The reason for choosing such participants was because the researcher has close ties with some of the speakers and they were easily accessible. This limits the degree to which the results of the study may be generalized to all the Turkish-English bilinguals living in NYC. Therefore, further research is needed to investigate the perceptions of other Turkish-English bilingual groups, such as immigrants with low economic status. Another limitation is the lack of independent measure of language proficiency. As mentioned before, participants were asked to self report their level of proficiency in both Turkish and English. Future studies are recommended to use a proficiency test. Finally, data could have been collected via an online questionnaire, which, according to Dewaele and Wei (2014) "permits researchers to reach larger and diverse samples from all over the world through snowball sampling" (p. 243). Besides, studies (Joinson et al., 2008) showed that participants who were asked to fill out internet-based questionnaires were more honest about their responses. Further research along these lines may be helpful to researchers who are interested in CS research.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Scientific Research Unit, which is funded by Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Works Cited

Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Auer, P. and İnci, D. (2000). On the Use of Turkish Routines by Adolescents of Non-Turkish Descent in Hamburg. (A. Holmen and J. N. Jørgensen, Eds.), *Deter Conversation 801, Değil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism* in (pp.157-194). The Danish University of Education, Copenhagen.

Backus, A. (1992). *Patterns of Language Mixing. A Study in Turkish-Dutch Bilingualism*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Backus, A. (1996). *Two in One. Bilingual Speech of Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Backus, A. (1999). The Intergenerational Code-switching Continuum in an Immigrant Community. (G. Extra and L. Verhoeven, Eds.), *Bilingualism and Migration. (Studies on Language Acquisition 14)* in (pp. 261-279). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Backus, A. (2000). The Role of the Lexicon in Alternational Codeswitching. Paper Presented at *7th International Conference on Pragmatics*, Budapest.

Backus, A. and Boeschoten, H. (1996). Turkish-Dutch Codeswitching and Levels of Lexical Structure. Paper Presented at *Linguistic Society of America Annual Conference*, San Diego.

Backus, A. & Van der Heijden, H. (1998). Life and Birth of a Bilingual: The Mixed Code of Bilingual Children and Adults in the Turkish Community in the Netherlands. L. Johanson, in cooperation with (E. Csato, V. Locke, A. Menz and D. Winterling, Eds.), The Mainz Meeting. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, August *3-6, 1994*. (*Turkologica 32*) in (pp. 527-551). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Backus, A. and Van der Heijden, H. (2002). Language Mixing by Young Turkish Children in the Netherlands. *Psychology of Language and Communication, 6*, 55-73.

Bentahila, A. and Davies, E. (1992). Code-switching and Language Dominance. *Advances in Psychology*, *83*, 443–468.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Berthele, R. (2012). The Influence of Code-mixing and Speaker Information on Perception and Assessment of Foreign Language Proficiency: An Experimental Study. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 16*(4), 453–466. DOİ:10.1177/1367006911429514.

Boeschoten, H. and Verhoeven, L. (1987). Language-mixing in Children's Speech: Dutch Language Use in Turkish Discourse. *Language Learning, 37*, 191-215.

Bullock, B. E. & Toribio, A. J. (2009). Themes in the study of code-switching. (B. E. Bullock and A. J. Toribio, Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching* in (pp. 1-17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewaele, J. and Wei, L. (2014). Attitudes towards Code-switching among Adult Mono- and Multilingual Language Users. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(3), 235-251, DOİ: 10.1080/01434632.2013.859687.

Díaz, C. P. (2004). *What do Bilinguals Think about Their Code-switching?*. 20 December 2015, retrieved from Asociación Española de Lingüística Aplicada, AESLA, Dialnet OAI Articles website, http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/fichero_articulo?codigo=1396245&orden=64908.

Fernández, R. (1990). Actitudes hacia los cambios de código en Nuevo México: Reacciones de un sujeto a ejemplos de su habla. (J. J. Bergen, Ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Issues* in (pp. 49–58). Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

Fought, C. (2003). *Chicano English in Context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner-Chloros, P., McEntee-Atalianis, L.J. and Finnis, K. (2005). Language Attitudes and Use in a Transplanted Setting: Greek Cypriots in London. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 2*(1), 52–80. DOİ:10.1080/17501220508668376.

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

Gross, S. (2006). Code-switching. (K. Brown, Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* in (pp. 508--511). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

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

Hamers, J. F. and Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hammink, J. (2000). *A Comparison of the Code-switching Behavior and Knowledge of Adults and Children.* 15 November 2015, retrieved from http://hamminkj.cafeprogressive.com/CS_paper.htm .

Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide.* Montgomery: University of Alabama Press.

Heller, M. (1988). *CS: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Johanson, L. (1993). Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. (G. Extra and L. Verhoeven, Eds.), *Immigrant Languages in Europe* in (pp. 197-221). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Joinson, A. N., C. Paine, Buchanan, T., and Reips, U. D. (2008). Measuring Self-disclosure Online: Blurring and Non-response to Sensitive Items in Web-based Surveys. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(5), 2158–2171. DOİ:10.1016/j.chb.2007.10.005.

Koban, D. (2013). Intra-sentential and Inter-sentential Code-switching in Turkish-English Bilinguals in New York City, U.S. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 1174 – 1179.

Koch, L., Gross, A., and Kolts, R. (2001). Attitudes toward Black English and Code-switching. *Journal of Black Psychology, 27*, 29-42.

Labov, W. (1972). The Isolation of Contextual Styles. (W. Labov, Ed.), *Sociolinguistic Patterns* in (pp. 70-109). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C. and Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50*, 44-51.

Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its Conceptualisation and Contextualization. Educational Research and Evaluation. *An International Journal on Theory and Practice, 18*, 655-670.

Lipski, J. M. (2014). Spanish-English Code-switching among Low-fluency Bilinguals: Towards an Expanded Typology. *SOLS, 8*, 23-55.

Mendieta, E. (1999). El Préstamo en el Español de los Estados Unidos. New York: Peter Lang.

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert A., and Leap, W. L. (2000). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Migge, B. (2007). Code-switching and Social Identities in the Eastern Maroon Community of Suriname and French Guiana. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*, 53-73.

Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (1995). *One Speaker, Two Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montes-Alcalá, C. (2000). Attitudes Towards Oral and Written Code-switching in Spanish-English Bilingual Youths. (A. Roca, Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Issues and Challenges* in (pp. 218-227). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Montes-Alcalá, C. (2001). Written Code-switching: Powerful Bilingual Images. (R. Jacobson, Ed.), *Code-switching Worldwide II* in (pp. 193-219). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Montes-Alcalá, C. (2005). ¡Mándame un e-mail! Cambio de códigos español-inglés online. (L. A. O. López and M. Lacorte, Eds.), *Contactos y Contextos Lingüísticos: El español en los Estados Unidos y en contacto con otras lenguas* in (pp. 173-185). Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social Motivations for Code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Palmer, D. K. (2009). Code-switching and Symbolic Power in a Second-grade Two-way Classroom: A Teacher's Motivation System Gone Awry. *Bilingual Research Journal, 32*, 42-59.

Pena, C. (2004). What Do Bilinguals Think about Their 'Code-switching'?. *RAEL: Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada, 3*, 146–157.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y Termino en Español: Toward a Typology of Code-switching. *Linguistics, 18*, 581-618.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of Code-switching in School Children's Conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*, 77-98.

Schaufeli, A. (1991). *Turkish in an Immigrant Setting. A Comparative Study of the First Language of Monolingual and Bilingual Turkish Children*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Simon, B. L. and Murray, T. E. (1999). How Suite it is: Using Combined Methodologies to Explore Dialect Questions. *Journal of English Linguistics, 27*, 27-39.

Toribio, A. J. (2002). Spanish-English Code-switching among US Latinos. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 158*, 89-119.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. London: Penguin Books.

Türker, E. (2000). *Turkish-Norwegian Codeswitching. Evidence from Intermediate and Second Generation Turkish Immigrants in Norway*. Oslo: Unipub Forlag.

Tyler, A. and Toribio, A. J. (2007). Attitudes towards Lexical Borrowing and Intra-sentential Code-switching among Spanish-English Bilinguals. *Spanish in Context, 4*, 217-240.

United States Census Bureau. (2008). *American Community Survey: People Reporting Ancestry*. November 8, 2016 retrieved from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2011/tables/11s0052.xls.

Valerio, T. B. M.A. (2015). Filipino – English Code-switching Attitudes and Practices and their Relationship to English Academic Performance among Freshman Students of Quirino State University. *International Journal of English Language Teaching, 2*(1), 76-98.

Van der Heijden, H. and Verhoeven, L. (1994). Early Bilingual Development of Turkish Children in the Netherlands. (G. Extra and L. Verhoeven, Eds.), *The Cross-linguistic Study of Bilingual Development* in (pp. 51-73). Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up Bilingual*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Appendix

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to find out your views about the mixing of Turkish and English in conversations. Mixing of two or more languages in the discourse of bilingual speakers is called **Code-switching**. Code-switching is a linguistic phenomenon, which can be at the word or sentence level. The following examples of code-switching are taken from the speech of Turkish speakers living in the US. The words and sentences that are code-switched are in bold.

1) Ücretsiz **delivery** yapılıyordu.
2) Hiç ingilizce konuşmasını bilmiyordum. Onun için birkaç ay çok rahatsız oldum okuldayken, yani, **there was almost no communication**.

The questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first part consists of background questions such as age, gender and occupation. The second part consists of the main survey questions itself. You can write your answers in Turkish or English.

Please answer all questions. This is not a test and there is no right or wrong answer. All personal information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for the purpose of this study.

PART I

Background information

1. Age:
2. Gender: M__ F__(Please put an X)
3. Occupation:
4. What is your country of birth?
5. What is your native/first language?
6. How old were you when you arrived in the US?
7. How many years have you been in the US?
8. Briefly explain why you came to the US:

_____

9. Education background (Please put an X next to all that apply):

Elementary school: in Turkish____ in English____ in another language____
High-school: in Turkish____ in English____ in another language____
College/university: in Turkish____ in English____ in another language____
Graduate school: in Turkish____ in English____ in another language ____

10. How old were you when you began to learn English?

11. How many years did you study it? (please put an X next to a range)

1-3 years 4-6 years 7-9 years 10-12 years 13+ years

12. Please use the chart below to indicate how well you speak, read, write, and understand English. Please put an X under the number that best represents your proficiency from 1 (poor) to 5 (very good).

	1 Poor	2 Passable	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Very Good
Speaking					
Reading					
Writing					
Understanding					

13. Please use the chart below to indicate how well you speak, read, write, and understand Turkish. Please put an X under the number that best represents your proficiency from 1 (poor) to 5 (very good).

	1 Poor	2 Passable	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Very Good
Speaking					
Reading					
Writing					
Understanding					

PART II

Code-switching

1. When speaking Turkish, do you ever switch to English? (Do you ever use English words or sentences in conversations?) Please put an X next to an option.

Yes ___ No___

2. **If yes**, how often do you switch to English? Please put an X next to an option.

Always___ Often___ Usually___ Rarely___

3. Please put an X next to the option that best represents your opinion.

1. It sounds pretty when people mix Turkish and English in the same conversation.

   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___

2. It bothers me when people speak Turkish and English at the same time.

   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___

3. People mix Turkish and English because they do not know either one well.

   Agree ___ Neutral _X__ Disagree ___

4. It is easy to understand a person who mixes Turkish and English.
   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
5. It looks pretty when somebody mixes Turkish and English in writing.
   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
6. In my opinion, the mixing of Turkish and English leads to the loss of Turkish.
   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
7. In my opinion, the mixing of Turkish and English helps to maintain Turkish.
   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
8. The mixture of Turkish and English reflects who I am.
   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
9. When I mix languages, I am more respected by my community.
   Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
10. When I mix languages, I feel more integrated with my community.
    Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
11. When I mix languages, I am segregated from society.
    Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___
12. When I mix languages, others regard me as less intelligent.
    Agree ___ Neutral ___ Disagree ___

4. What is your perception of code-switching? Please put an X next to an option.

Positive _____ Negative_____ Neutral_____

5. Do you consider yourself Turkish, American, Turkish/American or neither of these? _____

6. **If both**, how do you feel about belonging to different cultures? Please put an X next to an option.

Positive _____ Negative_____ Neutral_____

Feel free to explain.

Thank you for your cooperation

Please email this questionnaire to dkoban2@gmail.com or dkoban@gc.cuny.edu