Code Switching between Turkish and Kabardian

Nuray Alagozlu
Baskent University, Ankara

Introduction

In 1864, following their failure in the fight against Russian hegemony, North Caucassian people were exiled from Caucassia and settled in various parts of Anatolia. Until that date, there had been small-scale voluntary migrations to the Ottoman Empire, but the major mass movement was after 1864. In Anatolia, the area between the towns Pınarbaşı, Kayseri and Kangal, Sivas is known to be Uzunyayla region where most of those immigrants settled and formed 66 Circassian villages in the region, 40 of which are Kabardian. Kabardians in Turkey are known to be "Circassians" , a term used to cover all the people who migrated from the North West Caucassia, sharing a common culture excluding a common language. Uzunyayla region which lies between Sivas and Kayseri involves many Circassian villages. This region is known to be a real bilingual setting because of various Circassian inhabitants and Circassians' apparent devotion to their language and culture. In the region, there are villages of Kabardian (Kabardey or Kabartay), Chechen (Çeçen), Abkhazo (Abaza), Asetin, (Osetin), Kusha (Kuşha), Hatquay. In our study, since the languages of people known as Circassians in Turkey are generally not mutually intelligible and the majority of villages are Kabardian, we felt the necessity to narrow down our research into the Kabardian variety and the study was conducted in Kabardian speaking villages. First settlements after the exile were the villages where Circassians maintained their former life styles in Caucassia. Today, Circassians in the villages still try to keep their traditional lives vital. When looked at the cultural life, it is seen that mother tongue is still widely used within the family. Because traditional closed village life lingers, extended family still maintains. The status of father and the elder people in the family is preserved as the authorities. Growing children and the status of a bride just participated into the family are exposed to Circassian-specific limitations. They place great importance on kinship relations. (Colorusso, 1992; Andrews, 1996; Eser, 1996, Jamoukha, 2001, Alagözlü, 2002)

However, on account of large scale industrial growth, they attempted to keep up with the innovations of the changing world. Migration to cities was inevitable in the pursuit of education and work opportunities. Especially, younger population temporarily migrate to cities, but return to their villages when their schools are closed in the summers. Rural to urban transition seems to have initiated a process of urbanization which means socio-cultural and socio-economic change in the lives of Circassians living in the villages. Temporary leaves from the village might not destroy strong familial bond that unites them to their homeland, providing a permenant traditional life and language maintenance irrespective of where they live. Nevertheless, city dwellers who live in the city for a long time might exhibit different socio-psychological and linguistic configurations. As transition from the rural hinterland to the urban areas triggers an 'urbanization process' which means change in the individual's social universe on the one hand and change in his pattern of behaviour or values on the other (Mayer, 1961; Little, 1990). This change may be either the 'collapse' of the rural dialects in a monolingual setting or codeswitching phenomenon that lead to language shift or maintenance in the bilingual or multilingual environment. Therefore, in rural and urban settings, probable changes with respect to language use are expected and worth investigating. As code-switching is frequently observed in their communication environment as a result of language contact, a change in code switching habits is also probable.

Code switching (CS) has been defined in various ways in the literature. It is generally defined as a change by a speaker (or writer) from one language or language variety to another, which can take place in a conversation when one speaker uses one language and the other answer in different one. A person may start speaking in one language and then change to another one in the middle of his/her speech, or sometimes even in the middle of a sentence (Richards, Platt and Weber 1985).

There has been considerable research on the structure of CS. However, within the past three decades, research on the social meaning of CS has developed and it proceeded along three main lines: a) research within the framework of interpretive sociolinguistics as in Blom and Gumperz (1972); Gumperz (1976; 1982) and Heller (1982), b) work on code choice within the framework of Speech Accomodation Theory (SAT) as in Bourhis (1984; 1985); Bourhis, Giles and Lambert (1985); Genesee and Bourhis (1982, 1988); Giles and Powesland ((1975); Giles and Smith (1979); Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973), and c) work within the Markedness Model of Myers-Scotton (1988; 1993a; 1993b; 1997) (cited in Burt, 1992).

The interpretive sociolinguistics framework takes CS as a part of the speech repertoire of the bilingual speakers, together with other features, such as pause, emphasis and variations of discourse structure. The social meaning of such features is learned by speakers through participation in the speech network of the community which shares norms of interpretation for the choice of feature variants. The interpretive sociolinguistics focuses on the misunderstandings produced when speakers attempt to interpret the speech of members of different communities, whose norms they do not share, or even know (Burt, 1992).

The framework of speech accomodation theory (SAT) specifically deals with the problems of interaction between members of different groups. Genesee & Bourhis (1982) have presented groups of judges with constructed conversations in which CS occurs, and asked the judges for evaluations of the personality characteristics of the speakers (who were bilingual actors). Using the matched-guise technique they have discovered that the speakers tend to be more positively evaluated when they accomodate to the language or linguistic characteristics of the interlocuter. For example, English Canadians are rated more positively when they at least attempt to speak French to French Canadians. Within SAT in general, it is expected that interlocuters will welcome speakers' attempts at convergence or, making one's own speech more like that of one's interlocuter (with some exceptions: convergence in some cases may be seen as patronizing (Burt, 1992)

The approach represented by Myers-Scotton (1988; 1993a; 1993b) uses an explicitly Gricean approach. Several maxims are described for the interpretation of speakers following or destroying them. It is possible to talk about the markedness of code choices for certain situations and configurations of speakers. Codes are not marked *a priori,* but become marked.With markedness, their social meaning is foregrounded. Speakers mutually develop norms for the interpretation of their future conversational choices. It is within Scotton's general framework into which this study is placed.

The aim of this paper is to describe code switching between Kabardian and Turkish based on the speech samples gathered from urban and rural two bilingual settings and analyse them using Myers-Scotton's Model (1993ab). Myers-Scotton's model consists of two aspects: structurally-based **The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model** and socially-based considerations (**The Markedness Theory)** in inter and intrasentential CS, both at the interpersonal level and at the community level.

The Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF Model) proposes that CS occurs within the the morphosyntactic frame set by the matrix language (ML). The ML is the base language which determines the grammatical structure of CS utterances. The embedded language (EL) is the "contributing" language(s) which also participate in CS less frequently. The ML specifies the morpheme order, providing the syntactically relevant morphemes in constituents from both languages involved. It also

determines when constituents showing CS in the sentence boundary must occur entirely in EL. (Myers-Scotton, 1993b). The MLF Model classifies CS instances based on four hypotheses: the ML Hypothesis (with two sub-hypotheses: The Morpheme Order Principle and The System Morpheme Principle), The Blocking Hypothesis, The EL Island Trigger Hypothesis, The EL Island Hierarchy Hypothesis, all of which will be explained in detail along with the analysis below.

The Markedness Theory suggests that the speaker is seen as a creative actor and by CS s/he accomplishes more than the conveying of referential meaning (Myers-Scotton, 1993). The socio-psychological factors behind CS phenomena are focused on. Myers-Scotton (1993:151) puts CS instances in two main categories: unmarked choices and marked choices. 'Unmarked' is used to mean that the choice of a particular linguistic variety is expected as the medium for a talk exchange. Marked choices are not usual and they are dis-identifications with what is expected. To Myers Scotton, code switches index a set of rights and obligations, holding between participants in conversations, and they will call forth certain attitudes expressed by rule and obligation sets. The language choices speakers' make may invoke expected rights or obligations, which she calls 'unmarked' choices. Situational features such as gender of participants, locale of exchange, or topic- will evoke unusual or 'marked' choices representing a shift in roles and obligations. Each community interpret all choices in terms of their own markedness metric and assess all code choices as marked or unmarked. Therefore, the markedness of a particular code choice is meaningful only in reference to a specific speech event in a specific community. A certain type of CS might be pertinent to a certain community (Myers-Scotton, 1989). Rather, different speech events within the same community might exemplify different codeswitching types. The markedness model of CS is based on a 'negotiation principle'

> Choose the form of your conversation contribution such that it indexes the set of rights and obligations which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange (Myers-Scotton 1993a: 111).

Myers-Scotton (1993b) proposed that there are certain socio-psychological motivations for the occurence of CS. The premise behind this model is that code choice always indexes an ongoing negotiation between speaker and addresee in an interaction. By means of CS, bilinguals express their shared identity and a rights and obligations balance (unmarked or expected use of CS). Through less expected mode of CS, speakers might convey social messages conciously or unconciously (marked use of CS).

Data

Data for the study were collected from the villages and the cities where bilingual Kabardians resided. Interviews were performed by a bilingual Kabardian interviewer. All interviewees were native speakers of Kabardian in Uzunyayla region and in the cities. Kabardian was the main medium of the interviews. Additionally, 3 hours tape-recorded natural conversations were gathered during informal visits and wedding ceremonies. We also used 12 hours video taped conversations in recreational activities like feasts organized by Caucassian associations annually. In the cities, a Kabardian origined bilingual recorded 7 and a half hours authentic conversations of Kabardian families at their home. The families belonged to his social network.

Methodology

Following Myers-Scotton's framework (1993a, 1993b), CS data were analysed in two steps: structurally based considerations and socially based considerations. First, a structural description of Kabardian-Turkish CS patterns in both millieux was presented in the frame of Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF Model). (Myers-Scotton, 1993b, 1997). Then, observed CS motivations encountered in our corpus data were indicated referring to the Markedness Model by Myers-Scotton (1993b)

Application of the MLF Model to the Kabardian-Turkish Data in the Rural Setting

When structurally considered through the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model, overall CS data from the villages were generally in concordance with the MLF Model (Myers-Scotton, 1993b, 1997). Specifically, in most cases, the Matrix Language (ML) was Kabardian, which is the base language that determines the grammatical structure of CS. Turkish was the embedded language (EL), the "contributing" language participating in CS less frequently. The MLF model classifies CS data in a manner different from other models. It views intrasentential CS as having three forms. Three types of CS constituents identified in the MLF Model within the intrasentential CS are ML islands, EL islands and ML+EL constituents.

a) Matrix Language (ML) Islands
b) Embedded Language (EL) Islands
c) Mixed ML+EL Islands

a) ML islands

ML islands in CS utterances consist only of ML morphemes. They are well-formed according to the ML grammar; they must show internal structural dependency relations. In Examples [1] and [2] "sıt kıgozzemmi yeğh yeşşe" "Halğanehar dığajet" "we used to cook ring-shaped bread rolls" and "Nigi jakuar gaşexaya xahas" meet the ML well formedness conditions.

[1] "sıt kıgozzemmi yeğh yeşşe" is well-formed according to ML structural rules and serves as a ML island.

MAYA	DEĞİL DE	Sıt	kıgozzemmi	yeğh	yeşşe
yeast	not	what	3rd-find sing.-(prefix) find-if	3rd sing Take-PRES.	3rd sing.-Sell-PRES.
maya	değil de	Ne	bulursa	alır	satar

Not (only) yeast, what (ever) he finds he takes them and sells.

[2]

	Dıjit.	NEBİLİYİM.	Halğanehar	dığajet	Nigi	Jaukor	gaşexaya	xa has
fatty	We(prefix) eat-PAST	I not-know-PRES.	ring-shaped bread roll-PL	We-make-PAST	now	Bread-abs.	3rd Pl. Buy-PRES	
Yağlı	Yerdik	Nebileyim	simit	yapardık	şimdi	ekmek	Satın alıyorlar	

We used to eat fatty (meals). I don't know. we used to cook ring-shaped bread rolls. Now they buy breads .

[3]

De	Sıt	Jitami	BOŞs	TAKDİR-İ İLAHİ	Se	Sıgaım	gaguaha

							s
We	What	Say-PAST-if	in vain	Fate! (God appreciates!)	I	I(prefix)-go-PAST- NOT	They-come-3rd. Pl.-PAST-
Biz	ne	Desek	boş	Takdir-i ilahi	Ben	gitmedim	geldiler

What we say is vain. Fate, I didn't go, they came.

"se sıgaım, gaguahas**"** is another example supporting the existence of ML constituents in CS phenomenon.

b) EL islands

EL islands can be defined in line with ML islands. They are composed of EL morphemes only. They are exposed to EL grammatical constraints and show internal structural dependency relations of the guest language.

[4] "Yüzde kırk hasar tespiti yapıldı" and "Fazla bir şey umma" are EL islands meeting EL well-formedness conditions which support MLF hypothesis.

Ğaras	100	DÖNÜMüm	tegoer	BUĞDAY	82500	KDV	HARİÇ	DİYOR.
Be-PRES.	100	Dönüm(a land measurement of 1000 m2)	(Which is) for	Wheat	82500	V.A.T	Excluding	3rd sing.-say-PRES.
odur	yüz	Dönüme	düşen	Buğday	82500	KDV	Hariç	diyor

He says "(the price of) wheat for 100 acres (a superficial measure of 97 square yards) is 82500 excluding VAT (Value Added Tax)".

YÜZDE KIRK	HASAR TESPİTİ	YAPILDI
40 PER CENT	DAMAGE ESTABLISHMENT	DO-PASSIVE-PAST

40 percent damage establishment was made.

ALTI	TORBER	300 KILO	kageoy	jea
Six	Sack	300 kilo	Be-PRES	say-IMPE.
Altı	torbanın	300 kilo	geldiğini	Söyle

Say that six sacks are 300 kilograms.

[5]

PARAvıy	Didey	Komtın	yorri.	FAZLA	BİR ŞEY	UMMA	aas.
Money-good	To us	3rd pl.Give-PRES-negative	I swear to God it is true	much	something	NOT-Expect-	ay-3rd Pl.-PAST-
İyi para	Bize	vermezler	vallaha	fazla	birşey	umma	ediler

They don't pay so much money. I swear to God it is true. They said "do not expect too much money"

c) ML+EL constituents

These include any number of ML morphemes and (generally) single lexeme EL forms. These switches can also be defined as 'intra-word switches'. The EL lexemes are arranged according to the overriding rules of the ML. The movements of the EL system morphemes are constrained.(System morpheme principle) The Turkish word "CAM" in [6] is embedded in the ML affixes. It is inflected by the Kabardian prefix for third person singular possessive pronoun "yi"and the plurality suffix "har". The noun "kurabiye" (cookie) takes an inflectional suffix (şige-making) and the plural ending "har".

[6]

Winneham	yiCAMhar	KÖŞELİhayyoa	goabjeyaa	dagehaoy	yirrağajahas.
Houses	3rd poss.Pro.-window-Pl.	Angled-as	Very much	beautifully	Build-3rd Pl. PAST
Evlerin	camlarını	köşeli olarak	çok	güzel	yaptırdılar.

They built the windows of the houses as angled very beautifully.

[7]

Nigi	KURABİYEşigehar	gaşexur.
Now	Cookie+to make+plural	3rd PL.-Buy-PRES.
Şimdi	kurabiyeleri	Satın alıyorlar.

Now they are buying cookies

"PAZAR ÇANTA (SI)"in [8] is affixed by the ergative-oblique case marker (M: to, into-e/a in Turkish), which also includes some meanings of dative, genitive, accusative and prepositional cases of English (Colorusso, 1980).

[8]

PAZAR ÇANTAM.	yızuyre	Pitlejti
a bazaar bag	Fill-used to	Hang-used to
Pazar çantasına	Doldurup	asardık.

We used to fill in a bazaar bag and hang it.

The noun "ÇEŞİT" in [9] is inflected with a suffix from the ML, expressing function, which forms another well-formed ML+EL constituent.

[9]

Ar	ÇEŞITu	Yajir
It	Sort-as	ϕ 3rd per.sing.Make-PRES
Onu	Çeşit olarak	Yapıyorlar

They are cooking it as a sort

In the act of CS, using bare forms, EL morphemes without inflections, or modifying function words from either language, is common. So far, bare EL lexemes inflected by the ML affixes have been observed, which does not violate the MLF Model. Kabardians are more likely to use Turkish (EL) verb stems taking the past form suffix "-mış", which is syntactically inactive, before they are inflected by the ML system morphemes as illustrated in the examples [10], [11], [12], and [13].

In the examples [10], [11], [12], [13], the Turkish verbs NİŞANLA [MAK] (to arrange an engagement ceremony), BELİRT [MEK], (to specify) YERLEŞTİR[MEK] (to place), TAKLA AT [MAK] (to turn upside down) are embedded in the ML environment.

[10]

Nobe	nıjebe	NİŞANLAMIŞdızunus
Today	tonight	do an engagement ceremony(PP in Turkish)-1st PL.-FUTURE
Bugün	Bu akşam	Nişan yapacağız

Today, tonight, we will do an engagement ceremony

[11]

Nigi	BELİRTMİŞbıjinus.
Now	Specify (PP in Turkish) – 2nd Sing. FUT.
Şimdi.	Belirteceksin

Now, you will specify (that)

[12]

Dayorre	YERLEŞTİRMİŞzirrbjir?
How	Place (PP in Turkish) QUES-2nd Sing. FUT.
Nasıl	yerleştireceksin?

How will you place it?

[13]

Şıhapırıguyrra.	TAKLA ATMIŞyijas
Rolling down	Turn upside down (PP in Turkish) 3rd. Sing. PAST
Yuvarlanarak	takla attı.

Rolling down, it turned upside down.

As a counter-example to the hypothesis, instead of using bare forms, inflected EL morphemes in EL-ML islands are seen. Kabardians are more likely to use Turkish (EL) verb stems taking the past form suffix "-Mış", which is syntactically inactive, before they are inflected by the ML system morphemes as above.

After focusing on the structure of the CS constituents, we will consider and test **the central hypotheses of the MLF Model** in Kabardian-Turkish data, which are The ML Hypothesis (with two sub-hypotheses: The Morpheme Order Principle and The System Morpheme Principle), The Blocking Hypothesis, The EL Island Trigger Hypothesis, The EL Island Hierarchy Hypothesis.

1- The Morpheme Order Principle

This principle states that the morpheme order does not violate the ML morpheme order. In ML+EL constituents, which consist of singly occuring EL lexemes and any number of ML morphemes, surface morpheme order (reflecting surface syntactic relations) will be that of the ML.

According to this principle, when a lexeme from EL is inserted, it does not violate the ML order. Word order in Kabardian is rather flexible due to the fact that it is an agglutinative language like Turkish. Therefore, Turkish and Kabardian show a congruency pattern in terms of syntactic sequence (both are SOV languages). The examples [14], [15], [16] support the hypothesis that the ML is the source of morpheme order. In all of them, verbs are in the final position. Nouns are placed before the verbs although flexible word order allows them to appear anywhere in the sentence boundary.

[14]

MIDE	yuz	yiatt	AYRIYETEN	yiBÖBREKharri	yiğabijaa	yiBÖBREKham mi	yeyaass
Stomach	ache	There be-PAST	in addition	3rd sing.-Kidney-Plu.nominative case marker	3rd. Sing. -Catch cold-PAST	3rd personal pro.Kidney-ergative-oblique case	∅-3rd sing.-spread-PAST
Mide	ağrısı	vardı	ayrıyeten	böbreklerini	üşütmüş.	Böbreklerine	vurdu

He had a stomachache. In addition his kidney has been affected by the cold

HÜKÜMETtim	yor ettiri	BELİRLİ ziMİKTARIr	kıratıjir.
Government-ergative-oblique case marker .	Give-PRES.	Certain-a (n) amount-nominative case marker (r)	Return-PRES
Hükümet	veriyor	belirli bir miktarını	Geriveriyorlar

The government gives (them). They return a certain amount of it.

2-The System Morpheme Principle

The System Morpheme Principle proposes that all "active" system morphemes like quantifiers, determiners, possesive adjectives, copula, tense, and aspect as well as certain adverbs must come from the ML in mixed constituents. This principle necessitates a brief explanation on the features of content and system morphemes. The system morphemes are those

with a plus setting for the feature [Quantification]. Categories with the feature [+Quantification] modify individuals or events. These prototypically include quantifiers, specifiers, and inflectional morphology. Morphemes with the feature [-Quantification] are potential content morphemes. To qualify as a content morpheme, a morpheme must have two other features [Thematic Role-Assigner] or [Thematic Role-Receiver]. Thematic roles (or theta roles) refer to semantic relationships between verbs and their arguments. Prototypically most verbs, prepositions, nouns, and descriptive adjectives will be content morphemes (Myers-Scotton, 1993:6-7).

In the verbs in [10], [11], [12], [13], the inflections showing tense, aspect, voice, mood come from Kabardian, that is; from the ML so as to attain well-formedness in the Kabardian morphosyntax.

Because Kabardian is ergative, that is, there is a FORMAL parallel between the object of a transitive verb and the subject of an intransitive one (i.e. they display the same case) and these are referred to as "absolutive; the subject of the transitive verb is then referred to as "ergative".(Crystal, 1991: 1,2). In Examples [16] and [17], the inflections to the noun and the verb are from the ML. The Turkish words BIDON and KAZA are in instrumental-directional case (ke) and in absolutive cases (r) respectively completely in concordance with Kabardian grammar. Example [17] demonstrates an original statement. Despite EL lexemes from Turkish, plurality (-har) and past tense marking (-t) and possesion (yi-) were realized in accordance with the Kabardian morphological rules.

[16]

BIDONuşxue txexbakım	kaxbat	AMA NASIP	Ma	KAZAr	Kıdexbuleri
Plastic container+ with happen+ past	bring+3 per.pro.+past	But+fate	That	accident+ absolutive	
Bidonla	getirmişlerdi	ama nasip olmadı	O	Kaza	başımıza geldi.

They had brought (it) with a plastic container, but I was not destined to (taste it). That accident happened.

[17]

yiKASAhar	SAĞLAMt
3rd sing-poss.pro. Safe- plural	Sound- be-PAST
Kasaları	Sağlamdı

The safes were sound.

The Blocking Hypothesis

The ML blocks the appearance of any EL content morphemes which do not meet certain congruency conditions with ML counterparts. In ML+EL constituents, a blocking filter blocks any content morpheme which is not congruent with the ML with respect to three levels of abstraction regarding subcategorization. Congruency, which means a match between an ML morpheme and an EL morpheme, is achieved in two ways:

First, this hypothesis applies to instances in which a syntactic category is a system morpheme in one language but a content morpheme in another. Pronouns, for example, may represent such cases: one language may have pronominal forms which are agreement clitics (system morphemes) while the other may have free-form pronouns (content morphemes). If, for example, the ML has pronominal clitics, then no EL free pronoun may be substituted for a clitic in CS constituents.

[18]

Tabi ki	habı	yijir	yiYEŞİLLİKir	YiDAĞır .	koads
Of course	its	3rd sing.Poss.-land	3rd sing.Poss–green-nominative case marker	3rd sing.Poss mountain-nominative case marker	.many/much-be-PRES
Tabi ki	oranın	arazisi	yeşilliği	dağı	çoktur

Of course it (that country) has many mountains and lands as well as much green

In our case, both ML and EL are of agglutinative nature and they have clitics for possesive pronouns; Kabardian has pronominal, whereas Turkish postnominal clitic for possesive pronoun. The dominant role of ML is strongly felt in mixed ML+EL constituents as in [18]. Third person possesive pronouns in Turkish(-ı) is a clitic suffixed to the noun and therefore, a system morpheme. It seems that the appearance of third person possesive pronoun of Turkish (-ı) is blocked by Kabardian third person possesive pronoun (yi) in mixed ML+EL constituents, strengthening the System Morpheme Principle.

Secondly, in order for an EL content morpheme to appear, it should be congruent with its ML counterpart in terms of subcategorization features in ML+EL constituents. Semantic relationships, that is, thematic roles assigned to the lexemes in both languages must match in CS constituents. Otherwise, the lack of congruence concerning either their match with an ML morpheme or their thematic role structure prevents some EL content morphemes from appearing at all in ML+EL constituents.

All the examples presented in this part illustrate EL lexemes appearing as codeswitches and meet the congruency conditions in terms of subcategorization restrictions. ML slots can be filled only by EL lexemes of the same subcategory. The ML blocks the appearance of any EL content morphemes which do not meet the certain congruency conditions with ML counterparts. The Blocking Hypothesis limits the set of EL content morpheme permitted. There is congruence between Kabardian and Turkish in terms of nouns in most CS instances. This is because there are so many singly occuring switches. If there is no matching counterpart from the EL, CS is avoided.

The EL Island Trigger Hypothesis

The EL Island Trigger Hypothesis predicts when an obligatory EL island may appear. Whenever an EL morpheme not permitted under the ML Hypothesis and Blocking Hypothesis (that violates the ML morpheme order and is incongruent) appears, the constituents containing it must be completed as an obligatory EL island.

EL islands may be produced in two ways:

1-If an EL morpheme implicating EL morpheme order in a constituent is accessed as the initial element in a constituent, this triggers processing of the entire constituent in the EL, thereby forming an EL island. If an adjective in an EL comes before its head, then the adjective and its head must belong to the EL. This hypothesis predicts that the head-first order in such a case is impossible.

In Example 19 "ne yitirdinde ne arıyorsun" is such an EL island.

[19]

NE	YİTİRDİNDE	NE	ARIYORSUN?	fekas axer	dese.
what	Lose-PAST	what	Look for-PAST	Pass-PAST -3rd Plural	My son
Ne ?	yitirdinde	ne	arıyorsun	geçti onlar.	Yavrum

What have you lost? What are you looking for? it all have passed my son.

2-If an EL system morpheme or an EL content morpheme not corresponding to an ML content morpheme is encountered, ML processes are inhibited.and the entire constituent of which the EL morpheme is a part must be produced as an EL island.

[20]

Kıdumgunnumma.	nigi	BELİRTMİŞbijinus
Buy-	now	Specify-2nd sing.-FUT.
Almayacaksan.	şimdi	Belirteceksin

If you don't buy, you will tell them, now.

ONA GÖRE	ONUN DA	TAZMİNATI	VAR
Accordingly	It-genitive case-too	indemnity	Have-poss.

Accordingly, It has indemnity for it, too.

In example 21, the EL island "**ONA GÖRE ONUN DA TAZMİNATI VAR"** illustrates that this sub-hypothesis can be applied to Kabardian-Turkish CS. The Turkish verb inflected by Kabardian suffixes "triggers" the EL island, "**ONA GÖRE ONUN DA TAZMİNATI VAR"**, the presence of which supports this hypothesis.

The EL Hierarchy Hypothesis

The EL Hierarchy Hypothesis predicts optional EL islands. They are generally formulaic or idiomatic or peripheral to the main grammatical structure of the sentence (Myers-Scotton, 1992, 1993)

An implicational EL Hierarchy Hypothesis has two sub-hypotheses:

1- The more peripheral a constituent is to the theta -grid of the sentence (to its main arguments) , the freer it is to appear as an EL island.

2- The more formulaic in structure a constituent is, the more likely it is to appear as an EL island. Stated more strongly, choice of any part of an idiomatic expression will result in an EL island.

When EL items are classified according to their loci within the sentences in our corpus data, it is seen, in full concordance with this hypothesis, that formulaic expressions and idioms, time and manner adverbials, numbers, days of the week, months frequently appear as EL islands.

[21]

Ar	xacet	zıwaufejirti	15-20 GÜNge	Sağatırt
it	Add-PAST	Wrap-PAST PROG.	15-20 days-during	stay-PAST
Onu	katıp	sarıyorlardı	15-20 gün boyunca	Duruyordu

They used to add it (a mixture of spices) and wrap (with a piece of cloth). It would stay for 15-20 days.

[22]

Saveri	Yist	BİR HAFTAke
groom	3rd sing--Sit-PAST CONT.	A week-during
Damat	Oturuyordu	BİR HAFTA boyunca

The groom was living there for one week.

[23]

Yorri	KASIMım	sımıgoamme	MARTım	sıgoannum
By God, I swear it's so	November-in	1st sing. -Negation-GO-PRES.-If	March-in	1st sing.-GO-FUT.
Vallaha	Kasım'da	gitmessem	Mart'ta	gideceğim.

By God, I swear it's so, if I cannot go in November, I will go in March

Application of the MLF Model in the Urban Setting

To a great extent, CS phenomenon was in concordance with the MLF Model in the cities. There quite a lot instances supporting all sub hypotheses of the MLF Model. However, frequent instances of CS where matrix language is Turkish, which are counter examples to the ML hypothesis, were also observed. Witihin the viewpoint of the Markedness Model , these were deemed to be marked use of CS in the urban setting.

[24]

ÖYLE BİYERim	wudısunus Kİ	higebzhar	gıtedisegau	şıplağunhas	
In such a place	2nd sing. SIT-FUT.-that	Girls	in rows	sitting	2nd sing. SEE- FUT
ÖYLE BİR YERE	Oturacaksın K İ	kızları	sıra sıra	oturmuş	göreceksin

You will sit down in such a place that you will (be able to) see the girls in rows.

[25]

YOKSA	NE	wuverşerim	NE	wuşegaım	zı şoft gıgin.
Otherwise,	neither	the meeting	nor	your visit	
Yoksa	ne	oturumdan	ne de	oturmaya gittiğinden	

Otherwise,you enjoy neither the meeting nor your visit.

Motivations for Kabardian-Turkish CS: The Markedness Model

Code choices are interpreted as "marked" in a given community by virtue of the salient features which in a specific exchange will determine the expected rights and obligations balance between specific participants for that exchange (a specific speech event). Naturally, to elaborate a thorough taxonomy of CS motivations is not an easy task. As stated by Poplack (1980), it is the overall pattern of switching that is significant in the communities observed. However, it is not necessary to view each switch as fulfilling a specific function or a specific message. Each switching is not socially meaningful on its own. From

the four markedness types, only marked and unmarked CS were included, inspired by Goyvaerts et al. (1992) viewpoint, since they are most relevant to any intersection of structurally motivated constraints on CS as Myers-Scotton (1993c) did in her article "Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching". The term "unmarked" stands for the "expected" while "marked" is the deviation from the expected in order to indicate a social function such as power, solidarity, social distance, deference, the desire to heighten one's own status or to lower the addressee's status, and so on.

As we have limited our investigation of CS to CS as a marked choice and CS as an unmarked choice, the structural features of these two types, as stated by Myers Scotton, should be focused on.

CS as an Unmarked Choice

Unmarked CS generally includes a good deal of intrasentential switching in addition to intersentential and intraword switches. This switching takes two forms: constituents composed of morphemes from both languages, or embedded language 'islands' (such as formulaic expressions).

Another structural feature evident in unmarked CS is the fact that one of the two codes is selected as the matrix language or main language, the other being the embedded language. Assigning one code as the matrix language carries critical importance in that the matrix language may change from one conversation to another, based on the socio-psychological variables or in different environments (Myers-Scotton1993a:125).

CS as a Marked Choice

The structural characteristic of marked choice, to Myers-Scotton (1993a), is structural flagging, occuring at several levels.

1-The content of a marked choice is often a repetition of what has already been said in the unmarked medium of the exchange: alternatively the marked choice might come first, with the message repeated in the unmarked choice. In both cases the speaker conveys the referential meaning through the unmarked medium then using a marked choice indexes his move from the set of unmarked rights or obligations towards a new set.

2-Marked choices are very typically phonologically flagged. A marked choice is generally produced with a higher pitch than surrounding utterances or with emphasis.

In our data corpus, CS samples in several speech events, which were thought to have remarkably salient features, were picked out and presented.

Setting [1]

A rural setting, an old woman is speaking about the traditional life of Kabardians with a younger man at home.
Young man: *Zıxalxbar xuawer?*
Neler yapıyorlardı?
What did they use to do?
Old woman: *Apxuediyu xabze sıati.* NE YİTİRDİN DE NE ARIYORSUN *dese fekas axer.*
O kadar (çok) adet vardı.Ne yitirdin de ne arıyorsun yavrum geçti onlar.
'There were so many traditions. What have you lost ? what are you looking for?
my son, It all (being Circassian or Adighe) has passed away'

Setting [2]

A rural setting, a young woman asks how they used to prepare maxima (a special Kabardian drink).
Young woman: Maxima fsıret?
Maksima yaparlar mıydı ?
'**Did you use to make maxima (in the wedding ceremonies)?'**
Old woman: Maxıma yawırt maxima zırawıry.
Maxima yapıyorlardı. Nasıl mı yapıyorlardı?
'**They were making maxima Are you asking how they were making it?'**
Young woman: Maxima fsiret yigi?
Şimdi maksime yapıyorlar mı?
'**Are they making maxima, nowadays?'**
Old woman: Maxbımem Alıh yigi yamıwıs ya atıjas Apxudu adigağe DEYİP GEÇME adiğağeşxue wiamiges.
Maximayi şimdi yapmıyorlar. Öyle Adigelik deyip geçme. Büyük adigelik varmış
'They do not make it any longer. Do not underestimate Adighes (Circassianship). (Once)There was a great Circassianship.'

Setting [3]

A rural setting: Two old woman talks about their brides while cooking outdoors.
First old woman: Pwıjım yijer jaema niser tegt.
Kayınpederin adı geçtiğinde gelin ayağa kalkardı.
'When the name of the father-in-law was uttered, the bride used to stand up.'

Second old woman: Adigeğa siaj yigi xun'a ŞİMDİ ?
Adigelik kaldı mı şimdi ŞİMDİ ?(repetition)
'Is there something like Circassianship now?'
First old woman : NEBİLİYİM NEBİLİYİM adijage şiij.
'I DON'T KNOW I DONT KNOW adigheanship does not exist (any more)'

Setting [4]

A rural setting, in a meeting in which the young get together and chat (traditionally this meeting is called "werzere"). P and E are university students.
P- BANKAm sigahannus
Bankaya gireceğim
I will work in a bank.

E-BANKAm yugahaffım vıs yaoy.. PARAvıy kotıns
Bankaya girebilirsen iyi yav iyi parada verirler.
If you can, well, they pay good money.

P- PARA u didey komtın yorri. FAZLA BİR ŞEY UMMA jaas. İKİYÜZ MİLYON koatins.
O kadar para vermezler valla. Fazla bir şey umma dediler. İkiyüz milyon verirler.
They don't pay so much money. I swear to God it is true. They said "do not expect too much money" They (may) pay two hundred millions.
E- GERÇİ DEVLET BANKASI İSE ÖYLE.
Actually if it is a state bank, yes, they don't
P-İŞTE ONUN KÖTÜ BİR TARAFI VARSA (O DA) NEREDE AÇIK VARSA ORAYA GÖNDERİYORLAR
If there is only one disadvantage of it, it is that they send you where there is a vacancy.
…….
E-ASKERRim sıgonnus.
Askere gideceğim
I will join the army (for military service)
P-aoyy! (Yaa?)
Really?
E-yorri KASIMım sımıgoamme MARTım sıgonnum.
Valla, Kasımda gitmezsem martta gideceğim.
If I can not join in November, I will, in March.
P-Lo dayrre? ÖĞRETMENuy yuzrigonnur?
Ne nasıl öğretmen olarak mı gideceksin?
What? How? Will you join as a teacher?
E- ÖĞRETMENuy dağagoım de LİSE ÖĞRETMENharas yağagor. KISA DÖNEMiy dideharri PEK yağagoım.
Öğretmen olarak göndermiyorlar bizi. Lise öğretmenlerini gönderiyorlar. Bizi kısa dönem olarak pek göndermiyorlar.
They don't (send) accept us as a teacher. They accept high school teachers. They do not accept us for short term participants.

Setting [5]

A urban setting: from a meeting in the Caucassian association bureau. The speaker (T) is a senior student at the university.
T- ÖYLE BİYERİM wudısunus Kİ higebzhar gıtedisegau şıplağunhas YOKSA NE wuverşerim NE wuşegaım zı şoft gıgin.
ÖYLE BİR YERE oturacaksın Kİ kızlar sıra sıra oturmuş göreceksin Yoksa ne oturumdan ne de oturmaya gittiğinden bir şey çıkar.
You will sit in such a place that you will (be able to) see the girls sitting in rows. Otherwise, you value neither the meeting nor your visit.

Setting [6]

A urban setting : At home
An old man: Se zıgore şıjızunumDE TAMıvu SAATışge soğupsışe GERÇİ jizanur sışoğupsır AMA GENE DE we gupşise sışıns.
GERÇİ Ben bir şey söyleyeceğimDE (zaman) TAMamen üç SAAT boyunca düşünüyorum. AMA GENE DE sen düşün derim.
When I say something, I am (generally) thinking for exactly three hours. But, again I tell you to think. (I recommend you thinking)

Setting [7]

A rural setting: K is an ex-villager who has recently graduated from university and come to visit his villagers. He lived in the city during his education.
M- Goammi ğar nakıfs. HALBURge ğagodizir pgoğakabzen?
Yavaşsa da o daha iyi. H(k)alburla o kadarını temizleyebilir misin?
Even if it is slower, that is better. Can you sift that amount with a sieve?
K-Yorri, NE jezğaleifin NE sit.
Valla ne temizleyebilirsin ne bir şey.
By God, I swear it is so, you can neither clean (by sieving) nor (do) anything else.
A-Yoa get jeğalel gıbjeziar
Sana kim h(k)alburla diyor.
Who tells you to sieve?

Setting [8] :

A rural setting
.....
H-Mustafay kagoas, se mo MAKİNEr SANAYİ HATım pısjenurre sığalejenus.
Mustafa da geldi. Ben şu makinayı sanayi hattına bağlayacağım.
Mustafa has come, too I will link this machine to that industry (electric) line
A-Dayo pıbjennu?
Nasıl bağlayacaksın?
How will you link it?
H-Yorri, DİREKim yudemigyoa mikunu
Valla direğe çıkmadan olmayacak.
By God I swear it is so, it will not be possible to link without climbing the post.
H- Yorri, KABLO kagoayğkom pitjennum
Valla gelen bütün kablolara bağlayacağız
By God I swear it is so, we will link it to all cables.

A-Lo ğar zitepğuvennur?
Onu neyin üzerine koyacaksın?
Where will you put it on?
H-Ğaoy ze lojeme deplins SELEKTÖRri SANAYİ HATsi GİRİŞ ÇIKIŞ yıaım. SELEKTÖRrim yer kırağalağunu jaatti, kırağalağoaım.
Geçici olarak bir kere çalışırsa bakacağız. Selektörde sanayi hattı giriş çıkışı yok. Selektörünkini göstereceklerini söylemişlerdi. Göstermediler.
Temporarily, if it works once, we will go on. There is no entrance-exit to the industry electricity line in the selector. They had told that they would show the entrance of the selector. They did not.

CS as marked choice

Vitality Discourse in the Rural Setting

In our corpus data, implicit and explicit references to vitality were common especially in the speech of the old. That is; the volume of vitality discourse (Harwood, et al.,1994: 194) was quite large. In such situations in which vitality is a prominent topic, CS is witnessed frequently. As is demonstrated in the examples [1], [2] ,[3], Kabardian ladies' ways of CS seem to follow a systematic manner in talking about the current status of Circassian culture and traditions. Whenever they mention Circassian (Adighe) traditions and culture, they imply that their continuity and vitality have come to an end and they make a switch into Turkish. Likewise, the repetition of the word ŞİMDİ in [3] as an EL lexeme can be taken to be the sign of structural flagging, given one of the features of marked use of CS (Myers-Scotton, 1993b, 141,142). The topic here is vitality again. Within the terms of Harwood et al. (1994), the tone of vitality speech might be said to be low as perceived by those old ladies.

In the Example [1], switching which is of the marked type is intersentential. [2] illustrates an intrasentential switching, which Myers-Scotton contends that such switching typical of non-sequential switching of the unmarked choice type [3] demonstrates the repetition of the word "ŞİMDİ" in both languages, the example of which Myers-Scotton calls structural flagging

Change in the ML in the Urban Setting and in theSpeech of the Educated in the Rural Setting

The choice of the ML specifies another "marked" phenomenon emerging out of rural-urban shift. In the rural area the ML is generally Kabardian, whereas urban dwellers are inclined to assign the role of the ML to Turkish as in the examples [5], [6]. The "ne....ne.... (neither...nor...) construction and the suffix belongs to Turkish syntactic frame in [5] and [7]. The use of Turkish morphosyntactic frame is also accessed in the rural millieu especially if the speaker has a lenghty educational background and a prolonged city life as in the example [7]. All considered, being urbanized may seem to play a role in the selection of the ML. The appearance of Turkish suffix "Kİ" ("that" in English), employed to perform nominalization [5] and the suffix "DE" ("when" in English) employed for adverbialization in Turkish [6] also exemplify the use of Turkish syntactic frame as the ML.

The change in the choice of the ML in the urban environment might as well be regarded to be unmarked as discussed by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 125-126) since it is reported to be the case for communities where one code is the ML for some topics and speakers and the other for other topics and speakers. Accordingly, CS phenomenon in the urban environment does not exhibit a consistency in the choice of Turkish as the ML. Therefore, when(ever) Turkish turns out to be the ML as in the examples [5], [6], and [7], it becomes possible to view such a switch in the ML indexical of a social message or a psychological state whether concious or not.

The example [8] exhibits an overall unmarked phenomenon. It constitutes conventionalized exchanges in which CS is expected for all participants. A good deal of intrasentential CS is the messenger of this sort of CS. In addition, the matrix language (Kabardian) supplies all the system morphemes (i.e. inflections and function words) for intrasentential constituents with morphemes from both languages, signalling dual identities (Myers-scotton, 1993b, 125).

Summary and Conclusion

In this paper, CS data were analysed in two steps: structurally based considerations through the Matrix Language Frame Model and socially based considerations at the interpersonal and community level through the Markedness Theory. Briefly, when structurally considered, CS phenomena in the rural and urban speech communities showed profound evidence for the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF Model). Nevertheless, when the "Markedness" comes into play, it was observed that there were deviations from what is proposed or indicated as structural constraints of CS in the MLF Model. At the community level, urban speech has exhibited a variety of such deviations, whereas rural speech, regarding the maxims suggested in the Markedness Model, had "CS as an unmarked choice", which is normative. Rural dwellers employ "CS as an unmarked choice" maxim through which they could negotiate identities (Myers-Scotton,1993a,b) since they could easily encode CS patterns already established. The employment of this maxim does not hinder the appearance of the marked use of CS, which might be encountered in different settings as shown above. However, when speech events are considered, at the interpersonal level, marked CS configurations are encountered in the rural area as well. Above all, in the rural arena, no language is preferable other than Kabardian.

In general, structurally based analysis revealed that the code-switching data obtained from both speech communities provided evidence for the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF Model). To start with, the three types of constituents; Matrix Language (ML) Islands (Examples [1]-[3]), Embedded Language (EL) Islands ([4] and [5]), and Mixed ML+EL Islands ([6] -[9]) were observed in Kabardian-Turkish code-switching. However, we faced several counter examples in which EL lexemes inflected in Turkish were inflected by the ML affixes. Precisely, EL lexemes inflected by syntactically inactive Turkish suffixes were seen to be re-inflected by Kabardian system morphemes. (or suffixes) (Examples [10] and [13]). Although such a construction reminds us of the phenomenon called "Double Morphology" by Myers-Scotton (1993), it is different in that in Double Morphology the lexemes are inflected by the system morphemes of both languages with the same function.

Code-switching data confirmed the central hypotheses in the MLF Model, which set constraints on the code-switching phenomenon, the Morpheme Order Principle, the System Morpheme Principle, the Blocking Hypothesis, the EL Trigger Hypothesis in the MLF Model.

The ML Hypothesis together with the Blocking Hypothesis is closely related to the determination of the matrix language, defined as "the language which projects the morphosyntactic frame for the utterance in question and the language which supplies relatively more morphemes in a discourse sample of a minimum of two sentences" (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). The selection of the matrix language in an intergroup setting formed a striking dissimilarity between urban and rural code-switching

behaviours in our study. This difference might be taken as the effect of urbanization on language use. Rural dwellers tend to prefer Kabardian as the matrix language rather than Turkish, whereas urban dwellers prefer Turkish to Kabardian in the selection of the matrix language (Settings [5], [6], and [7]) in contrast to Examples [10], [11], [12], [13] in which the inflections showing tense, aspect, voice, mood, etc. are from Kabardian morphosyntax.

As regards the Blocking Hypothesis, as explicated before, it proposes the ML filters the appearance of EL morphemes not congruent with ML counterparts in terms of semantic relationships and syntactic subcategorization. Our findings revealed that all examples presented exhibit EL lexemes appearing as codeswitches meeting the congruency conditions as illustrated by Example [18] in which Kabardian possesive pronoun is used. Possessive pronouns in both languages Turkish and Kabardian are clitics. Kabardian has a pronominal clitic, whereas Turkish has a postnominal clitic for possesive pronouns. Due to this mismatch or incongruency, in ML+EL constituents only Kabardian possesive pronoun [yi-] occurs while Turkish possesive pronoun is blocked. Further, all EL content words which appear in ML+EL constituents in our CS data have counterparts matching Kabardian.

Examples [19] and [20] support the view that the appearance of an EL triggers appearance of other embedded language lexemes in the form of EL islands. This is totally due to the assumption that the appearance of an EL calls for processing of the entire constituent in the EL, thereby an EL island, in line with what the EL Island Trigger Hypothesis puts forward.

The EL Hierarchy Hypothesis predicts optional, i.e. idiomatic, formulaic, or peripheral EL islands. When our data were scanned to test the validity of this hypothesis, we have also observed that the more peripheral and formulaic a constituent is, the most frequently it appears as an embedded language lexeme. Among a plenty of supporting examples, Examples [21], [22], and [23] are the most representative ones.

In the urban context, the use of Kabardian seems to be undermined. When they attempt to speak their language, for example in the gatherings of Kabardian origined people or kins, this attempt is generally resulted in the change in the selection of the ML. The ML turns out to be Turkish with a limited number of Kabardian words. The change in the ML is also evident in the speeches of the urbanized and the educated (Examples 6 and 7).

As regards the marked use of CS, whether conciously or not, it was observed that the volume of vitality discourse is quite large. The tone of vitality discourse, as far as it is observed in this study, generally occurs at the negative endpoint. CS into Turkish was envisaged when the topic of the discourse is shifted into vitality (Examples 1,2,3) and when they wish to emphasize their dual identity. Switching into Turkish might be considered as a subtle desire for social integration in the pursuit of power (Example 7).

In tackling with the Markedness Model, a preliminary taxonomy of social motivations for Kabardian–Turkish CS was elaborated. Following Goyvaerts et al. (1992), as we have narrowed down our research into two basic CS types: marked and unmarked CS (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 1993b, 1997), eight speech events representative of a large corpus, are selected to represent marked and unmarked CS from rural and urban environments. Naturally, not all switches convey a social and psychological meaning. CS in the selected speech events were assessed as indexical of vitality and ethnicity. It is also important to note that salience and indexicality are the conditions which show dynamic quality from one community or one interaction type to another

A major finding of the study was the proposition that code-switching can be viewed as marking the tone of vitality discourse. In our study, we have traced implicit and exlicit references to vitality. Especially in the speeches of the old, there was quite a large body of vitality discourse (Harwood et al (1994: 194). In Settings [1], [2], [3], the informants were observed to code-switch to the outgroup language systematically when the tone of vitality discourse is generally low. Each time the informants speak of an assumed end of continuity of traditions etc and/or vitality, they switch into Turkish. They either go on conversation in Turkish or restate what they have expressed in Kabardian by using Turkish (structural flagging with the terms of Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 1993b).

In Settings [5], [6], [7], a secondary finding was a change in the ML. It is commonly agreed that urbanization has an effect on language use. In this study, urbanization might be proposed as one factor in the assignment of one language as the ML because the change in the ML was part of urban speech norm. The choice of the ML specifies a "marked" phenomenon emerging out of rural-urban shift. In the rural area the ML is generally Kabardian, whereas urban dwellers are inclined to assign the role of the ML to Turkish as in the examples [5], [6]. The use of Turkish morphosyntactic frame is also accessed in the rural millieu especially if the speaker has a lenghty educational background and a prolonged city life as in the example [7]. All considered, being urbanized may seem to play a role in the selection of the ML.

A need for expressing ethnicity might have an effect on the determination of the ML. Since urban people are far away from rural environment where their culture is experienced more vividly, they might want to show solidarity by using Kabardian words in their use of Turkish. In a different viewpoint, using Turkish morphosyntactic frame in their speech might indicate the importance of dual identities (although Myers-Scotton (1993a, 1993b) claims that dual identities are emphasized by CS as the unmarked choice as in Example [8]) or an attempt to narrow the social distance with the out-group members (Myers-Scotton, 1991). The study of Giles et al. (1979) offers a fine explanation for the issue. They report many linguistic strategies or ethnicity markers in speech for making oneself psychologically and favourably distinct from out-group members in search of a positive ethnic identity. This process of enhancing ingroup speech markers for achieving a positive intergroup status is termed " psycholinguistic distinctiveness". Illustrations of this are code-switching to an ingroup variety, the use of phonological, grammatical, paralinguistic/prosodic and lexical markers in the out-group language, and the emphasis on the in-group language or divergence from the out-group language.

In our case, the change in the ML can be taken as a sign of divergence from ethnic group identity to a more positive sense of outgroup identity, an attempt to narrow the social distance with the out-group members or/and a desire for social integration, which could be accounted for by Giles' (1979) Accomodation Model, classifying the ethnic groups in three interethnic contact situations: Language choice situation, in which one language is agreed upon as a means of communication in multilingual communities, accomodation situation where speakers have often chosen to be bilingual so as to function more effectively in the out-group language but maintained its own group tongue diglossically for within-group interactions, which is represented in our study to some extent. Finally, assimilation situation where the speakers shifted from their in-group language to the language of the out-group language. Whatever the reason is, we can conclude that urbanization might be proposed as one factor in the assignment of one language as the ML as the change in the ML was part of urban speech norm.

References

ALAGOZLU, N.K. (2002). Code-Switching Patterns and Underlying Socio-psychological Configurations in Kabardian Speech Community: The Probable Effects of Urbanization. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences.

ANDREWS, P.A. (1992). *Türkiye'deki Etnik Gruplar.* (Ethnic Groups in Turkey) translated by .Mustafa Küpüşoğlu) Istanbul: ANT- Tümzamanlar Yayıncılık

BURT, S.M. (1992)"Codeswitching, Convergence and Compliance: The Development of Micro-Community Speech Norms". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol.13, Nos 1&2.

COLORUSSO, J. (1992). "*Grammar of the Kabardian Language*. Calgary, Canada : University of Calgary Press. .

CRYSTAL, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GENESEE, F. and R.Y.BOURHIS (1982). "The Socio Psychological Significance of Code Switching in Cross-Cultural Communication". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 1. No.1

GILES, H. (1979). "Ethnicity markers in Speech". In K.R. SCHERER and H.GILES (eds) *Social Markers In Speech.* Cambridge: Cambridge Press. 251-290.

GOYVAERTS, L.G. and Z. T. ZEMBELE (1992). "Codeswitching in Bukavu". *Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 13: N.1-2.

ESER, M. (1996). *Uzunyayla Bölgesindeki Çerkes Köylerinde Sosyo-Kültürel Değişme*. (Socio-Cultural Change in Circassian Villages in Uzunyayla) Ankara: Kaf-Der Yayınları. 55-141

HARWOOD, J; H. GILES, and R.Y BOURHIS (1994). "The Genesis of Vitality Theory. Historical Patterns and Discoursal Dimensions". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.* 108. 167-206.

HELLER, M. (1982). "Negotiations of Language Choice in Montreal. J.J. GUMPERZ (ed.) *Language and Social Identity*. 108-126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

JAMOUKHA, A. (2001). *The Circassians*. London: Routledge.

LITTLE, K. (1990). *Urbanization as a Social Process*. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

MAYER, P. (1971). *Townsmen or Tribesmen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1989) "Codeswitching with English: Types of Switching, Types of Communities". *World Englishes*. Vol.8, 3: 333-346.

(1991) "Making Ethnicity Salient in Codeswitching." J.R. DOW (ed.) *Language and Ethnicity*. Vol. II. Iowa State University

(1992) "Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* Vol.13 No. 1&2. 19-39

(1993a) *Social Motivations for Code Switching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

(1993b) "Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Code Switching". *Language in Society*. 22, 475-503.

(1995)"A Lexically-based Model of Codeswitching". *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Codeswitching*. L.MILROY and P MUYSKEN (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(1997) *Duelling Languages*. Clarendon Press. Oxford.

(2000) "Codeswitching as Indexical of Social Negotiations". *The Bilingualism Reader*. In Lee Wei (ed.)London: Routledge.

POPLACK, S. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol." *Linguistics.* 18: 581-616.

TÜRKDOĞAN, O. (1997). *Etnik Sosyoloji*. (Ethnic Sociology) Istanbul:Timaş Yayınları.