Linguistic Intersectionality (Interlinguistics) in the 21st Century: Interpreting the Intricacies and Implications of Language Contact from Bilingualism to Creole

21. Yüzyılda Dilsel Kesişimsellik (Dillerarasılık): İki Dillilik'ten Kreole'ye Dillerarası Etkileşimin Karmaşık Doğasını ve Etkilerini Anlamak

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sinan ÖZYURT

Gaziantep Islam Science and Technology University, Higher School of Foreign Languages, Department of English Translation and Interpretation, sinanzyurt28@gmail.com, Gaziantep/Türkiye.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9366-9322

ABSTRACT

Sociolinguistics stands as a subfield within linguistics that examines the intricate relationship between language and society. Its primary objective is to investigate the influence of internal or external societal factors on language use, considering elements such as the context of communication, characteristics of participants, and prevailing cultural norms. Communication may transpire between individuals who speak the same language or those using different languages. In cases where speakers of distinct languages find the necessity to communicate, they may engage directly as bilingual speakers, sharing language proficiency. Alternatively, they may develop a shared mode of communication. This occurrence, commonly referred to as "language contact" in academic discourse, denotes the phenomenon whereby one language exerts an impact on another. Language contact involves the transfer of linguistic features when individuals with diverse language backgrounds interact. Such interactions can yield varied outcomes, including the dominance of one language over the other, the convergence of languages, or the emergence of entirely new linguistic forms. The current study delves into numerous ramifications arising from language contact, addressing concepts like bilingualism, code-switching, borrowing, language attrition, language transfer, interference, mixed language, pidgin, creole, and interlanguage. In light of these considerations, it is striven in this review article to contribute valuable insights to the extant literature on this intricate subject.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, Language Contact, Bilingualism, Interlanguage, Language Attrition.

ÖZET

Toplumdilbilim, dilbilimin içinde dil ile toplum arasındaki karmaşık ilişkiyi inceleyen bir alt alan olarak durmaktadır. Temel amacı, iletişim bağlamı, katılımcıların özellikleri ve süregelen kültürel normlar gibi unsurları dikkate alarak toplumsal iç ve dış faktörlerin dil kullanımı üzerindeki etkisini araştırmaktır. İletişim aynı dili konuşan kişiler arasında olabileceği gibi farklı dilleri kullanan kişiler arasında da gerçekleşebilir. Farklı dilleri konuşanlar iletişim kurma ihtiyacı duyduklarında, aynı dil yeterliliğini paylaşıyorlarsa bunu iki dilli konuşmacılar olarak doğrudan yapabilirler veya ortak bir iletişim biçimi de geliştirebilirler. Akademik söylemde genellikle "dil etkileşimi" olarak adlandırılan bu olay, bir dilin diğerini etkilemesi olgusunu ifade eder. Dil etkileşimi, farklı dil geçmişlerine sahip bireyler etkileşimde bulunduğunda dilsel özelliklerin aktarımını içerir. Bu tür etkileşimler, bir dilin diğerine hâkim olması, dillerin yakınlaşması veya tamamen yeni dil biçimlerinin ortaya çıkması gibi çeşitli sonuçlar doğurabilir. Bu bağlamda, mevcut çalışma, iki dillilik, kod değiştirme, ödünç alma, dilin yıpranması, dil aktarımı, müdahale, karma dil, pidgin, creole ve dillerarası gibi kavramları ele alarak dil etkileşiminden kaynaklanan farklı sonuçların derinlemesine ele alınmasını amaçlamaktadır. Bu düşüncelerin ışığında, bu derleme çalışmasında, bu karmaşık konu hakkında mevcut literatüre değerli bilgiler katılması amaçlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toplumdilbilim, Dil Etkileşimi, İki Dillilik, Ara Dil, Dil Yıpranması.

1. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of how language is used within various social groups, as well as the interplay between language and society, is a central focus of sociolinguistics. Positioned as an expansive subfield within linguistics, sociolinguistics systematically examines the language phenomenon in

relation to societal dimensions such as social class, educational achievement, age, gender, and other relevant factors. This discipline extensively explores and scrutinizes the complex connections between language and the social context in which it operates, incorporating a variety of theories and models (Zhang & Wang, p. 830).

Following Labov's groundbreaking research in the 1960s, the field of sociolinguistics emerged as linguists endeavored to elucidate the intricacies of language variations within speech communities and their connections to social structures (Kıran & Kıran (Eziler), 2012, p. 272). Nevertheless, the exploration of the relationship between language and society had already been undertaken by various linguists in their earlier studies before the formal establishment of sociolinguistics as an independent discipline in the 1960s (Nazlı, 2016, p. 41). In recent years, sociolinguistics has evolved into a pivotal subfield of linguistics, providing a foundational framework for a multitude of inquiries. In this context, present-day linguistic discussions revolve around language use, attitudes toward language, standard and non-standard language forms, language variations, code-switching, and bilingualism/multilingualism observed in various societies and communities (İmer, Kocaman & Özsoy, 2013, p. 247). To this end, this study offers comprehensive insights into phenomena resulting from the interactions among speakers of diverse languages. It entails aspects such as bilingualism, code-switching (including code-mixing and code-shifting), borrowing, language attrition, language transfer, interference, mixed language, hybrid language, code-breaking language, and the concept of interlanguage (as cited in Atasoy & Ercan, 2022).

2. CROSS-LINGUISTIC INTERACTION PATTERNS

Within the context of linguistic communication, cross-language interaction occurs when two or more groups of people, often hailing from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, engage in the communicative process (Duranti, 2004, p. 48). The term "cross-language interaction" encompasses a range of phenomena, including code-switching, borrowing, mixed language, interlanguage, language attrition, and other behaviors associated with bilingual speech (Jdetawy, 2011, p. 103; Nguyen, 2004, p. 11). Influential factors such as trade, education, religion, and migration exemplify the forces contributing to language interaction (Ennin & Afful, 2015). Described as the "impact occurring on one language system due to another language system" (Borges, 2014), cross-language interaction entails both the processes through which languages interact with each other and the outcomes of one language influencing another (Glovacki-Bernardi & Jernej, 2004). Diverse definitions of cross-language interaction abound in the literature. Some studies characterize it as the use of two or more languages within the same social group and the subsequent interaction between these languages (Weinreich, 1974, as cited in Liu & Ren, p. 411). Others define it as the simultaneous use of multiple languages in the same place and time (Thomason, 2001), or as interaction arising between different languages due to various social factors (İmer et al., 2013).

The interaction between languages gives rise to a multitude of intricate linguistic processes and outcomes (Thomason, 2001). In the domain of sociolinguistics, certain scenarios, such as the potential dominance of one language over another or the simultaneous use of two languages in a variable manner during interaction, have been identified (Fishman, 1989, as cited in Dweik & Al-Obaidi, 2014). Furthermore, language interaction has the capacity to bring about specific linguistic changes and even structural similarities between languages over time (Swain, Adams & Janse, 2002). The dynamics involved in the interaction between languages and language communities have consistently intrigued linguists (Walczyński, 2012). Examination of phenomena evident in interlanguage interactions indicates that studies on this subject date back to the late 19th century, although it wasn't until the 1950s that a systematic theoretical framework was established (Muhvić-Dimanovski, 2005).

The engagement between languages and language communities has consistently been a focal point of interest for numerous linguists (Walczyński, 2012). The early stages of this interest can be traced back to the late 19th century, where various studies were undertaken to explore phenomena arising from interactions between languages, underscoring the enduring curiosity surrounding this area. It was only in the 1950s that the potential for a systematic theoretical framework became apparent (Muhvić-Dimanovski, 2005).

As argued by Hasselblatt et al. (2010), in the present era, language contact serves as a global phenomenon influencing languages across the world. Languages exposed to such contact may undergo modifications over time due to the impact of interaction (Siemund, 2008; Huehnergard, 2013). The examination of language contact falls within the domain of contact linguistics, exploring various language phenomena arising from these interactions. This field delves into the interaction between languages or language variations in multilingual communities where two or more languages are spoken. It systematically examines and scrutinizes language phenomena resulting from the convergence of languages within the realm of sociolinguistics. This field represents a dynamically evolving area of study that investigates the mechanisms by which languages undergo change and the role societal factors play in this transformation, along with the manifestations of these contributions (Ennin & Afful, 2015, p. 427; Gilquin, 2015, p. 4). It endeavors to answer inquiries regarding the alterations languages undergo under the influence of other languages, the societal factors that contribute to these changes, and the presentation of these contributions (Walczyński, 2012). It is a clear fact that a pivotal concept within this context is the notion of a contact language.

The term "relationship language" denotes languages that commence development within the dynamics of interaction among distinct language groups, resulting in linguistic forms like pidgin, creole, mixed language, and others (Frank, 2007; Thomason, 2001). The distinguishing characteristic of relationship languages lies in their not being evolved versions of preexisting languages; rather, they emerge subsequently through the interaction of different language groups, with identifiable times of emergence (Frank, 2007). In the present study, the phenomena of interlanguage interaction and the emergence of languages within the context of contact linguistics and relationship languages are thoroughly examined in the subsequent sections.

3. BILINGUAL IDENTITY AND THE MULTIFACETED NATURE OF LANGUAGE INTERACTION

Bilingualism, as explored within the field of sociolinguistics, emerges as a significant process in the context of language interaction, fundamentally expressed as the "ability to use two languages in daily life" (Messiliti, 2017). Upon examining the general content of the concept of bilingualism, various definitions and approaches become evident. For instance, Grosjean's (1985) definition of bilingualism encompasses the "regular use of two or more languages." According to Bloomfield (1933), individuals who control two languages at a level close to their native language are considered bilingual (as cited in Marini, Urgesi & Fabbro, 2012, p. 740). From a usage perspective, it becomes apparent in the literature that the concept of bilingualism encompasses both bilingualism and multilingualism (Bican, 2017; Ataş, 2017). In this context, bilingualism or multilingualism is defined as the "competent use of two or more languages in a communicative context" (Ercan, 2021). According to the contemporary understanding, being labeled as bilingual does not necessitate equal proficiency in two languages. Indeed, the crucial aspect is an individual's ability to use both languages in their daily life (Yılmaz, 2014). This diversity highlights that the concept of bilingualism is characterized by a flexible and personalized perspective (Akdemir & İlhan, 2019; Atasoy & Ercan, 2022).

Bilingualism can manifest on both individual and societal scales. Individual bilingualism denotes the usage of two or more languages by an individual. Thomason (2001) emphasizes that in

a meaningful cross-linguistic interaction, speakers of different languages don't necessarily have to be fluent bilinguals or multilingual individuals; however, some level of communication is imperative among these individuals. Conversely, societal bilingualism is observed within linguistic communities where two distinct languages can be employed in various interactional processes, and a significant number of individuals in the community are bilingual (Hamers & Blanc, 2000). The root cause of bilingualism in this context often lies in cross-linguistic interactions within communities where two or more languages are spoken (Giatno, Wisman & Gafari, 2019). Bilingualism is evident in numerous countries and societies globally. For example, Kazakhstan, characterized by the widespread use of Kazakh and Russian, stands as a bilingual country (Duisembekova & Özmen, 2020). Both languages hold official status in Kazakhstan (Asanova, 2006). Canada serves as another illustration of a bilingual country, with English and French constitutionally acknowledged as official languages (Smart-Carvalho, 2018). In Malta, a unique case, Maltese, formed from a blend of Semitic and Romance languages, serves as the national language, while English holds the position of the second official language (Borg & Lauri, 2008).

The concept of bilingualism can be classified into two categories: early bilingualism and late bilingualism, based on the timing of acquiring the second language. Early bilingualism refers to the scenario where an individual acquires both their native language and a second language in the early stages of childhood. Conversely, late bilingualism is characterized by the acquisition of a second language long after the acquisition of the native language (Marini & Fabbro, 2007). In early bilingual individuals, the process of language acquisition occurs unconsciously, resulting in a second language proficiency that closely mirrors their native language. In contrast, late bilinguals consciously and formally exert effort to learn a second language (Kheder, 2019).

Another distinction within the realm of bilingualism revolves around societal status, manifesting itself in the dichotomy of elite bilingualism and popular bilingualism (Mahomoudi & Mahmoudi, 2020). Elite bilingualism, as implied by the term 'elite,' is observable in individuals deemed 'privileged' within society, embodying a bilingual state acquired through personal choices. It serves as an indicative marker of elevated socio-cultural and educational levels (Süverdem & Ertek, 2020). Notably, bilingualism resulting from formal language education in educational institutions falls under the purview of elite bilingualism (Karantzola & Athanassiadis, 2006, p. 19).

In contrast, popular bilingualism entails individuals becoming bilingual out of a necessity to engage in work and integrate within the societal framework (Kostoulas-Makrakis, Karantzola & Athanassiadis, 2006). This form of bilingualism naturally emerges as an integral part of the societal fabric (Mahomoudi & Mahmoudi, 2020) and is particularly evident among minority language groups. Minorities, pressured by societal expectations to learn the dominant language, find themselves compelled to acquire another language alongside their own (Ovu & Anyanwu, 2019). Consequently, popular bilingualism is entwined with various sociocultural factors that may impede the development of authentic or balanced bilingualism, often due to attitudes such as negative biases towards the use of minority languages and discriminatory practices (Diaz, 1983).

Another dimension in the study of bilingualism revolves around the active or passive utilization of the four language skills, leading to the distinction between active bilingualism and passive bilingualism (Ercan, 2021; Atasoy & Ercan, 2022). In passive bilingualism, individuals encounter substantial difficulties in employing the second language and articulating themselves in that language (Mrva, 2018). Within this context, individuals may comprehend and read in the second language but refrain from speaking or writing in it (Baker, 2001). Termed as receptive bilingualism, this passive form involves individuals relying more on their knowledge of the first language due to limited proficiency in the second language (Mrva, 2018). In contrast, active bilingualism enables individuals to comprehend, speak, write, and listen in the second language by engaging all four language skills (Takkaç & Akdemir, 2015; Ercan, 2021).

4. UNDERSTANDING THE DYNAMICS OF CODE SWITCHING IN SPEECH

The comprehensive term for code switching, encompassing both code mixing and code shifting, is a notable outcome resulting from interactions between languages (Ennin & Afful, 2015). The phenomenon of code switching, emerging from the influence of bilingualism or multilingualism, represents a significant linguistic event in the interactive processes of individuals proficient in more than one language (Asanova, 2006; Todorova, 2019). In general terms, code switching involves the utilization of multiple languages within a single communication episode. The term "code" refers to any system of symbols employed by two or more individuals for communication purposes (Eldin, 2014). In Turkish literature, various terms like code changing, code shifting, language shifting, and making alterations between language structures are used interchangeably with the term code-switching (Akdemir, 2016; Yaman & Ekmekçi, 2018).

Code switching, observed in multilingual communities, has been the focus of numerous studies, resulting in various definitions for this linguistic phenomenon. Hymes (1971) describes code switching as a general term for the alternative use of two or more languages, language varieties, or even speech styles within the same discourse (Mabule, 2015). Grosjean (1982) defines code switching as the alternative use of two or more languages within the same utterance or speech context (Mohammadi, 2014). Typologically, different researchers have categorized code switching in diverse ways in the literature. For instance, Poplack (1980) classifies code switching into three types: tag switching, intra-sentential switching, and inter-sentential switching (Al Heetia & Al Abdely, 2016). On the other hand, Blom and Gumperz (1972) categorize code switching into situational and metaphorical types (Eldin, 2014). In the present study, alterations made within the same sentence are denoted as code mixing, while changes made between clauses are identified as code shifting.

4.1. Code Shifting in Speech

Code shifting, also recognized as code switching, denotes the phenomenon where a speaker of a language transitions to another language during speech or alternates between different dialects or accents within a language (Yaman & Ekmekçi, 2018, p. 149). These shifts may take place between two distinct utterances or within dependent clauses belonging to the same sentence (Muysken, 2011). In the literature, researchers have provided diverse definitions for code shifting, occasionally also termed as inter-sentential code switching. To exemplify, according to Demiray (2015, p. 27), code shifting is the observable occurrence when intentional or unintentional transitions from grammatical or lexical structures in Language A to Language B take place in bilingual or multilingual individuals. Another definition characterizes code shifting as the pattern of transitions between different variables or codes across sentence or clause boundaries (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 116). Heavily investigated as one of the prominent speech processes, code shifting stands out as a noteworthy feature among multilingual communities (Brezjanovic-Shogren, 2011).

4.2. Code Mixing in Speech

Code mixing, a linguistic phenomenon involving the simultaneous presence of elements from interacting languages, is a concept frequently explored alongside code switching in scholarly works. The relationship between code mixing and code switching is a significant aspect of this examination. Generally, in the literature, code mixing and code switching are often used interchangeably (Brezjanovic-Shogren, 2011; Atsız Gökdağ, 2011). Additionally, many researchers regard code mixing as a phenomenon falling within the broader scope of code switching (Demiray, 2015). The use of the umbrella term "code switching" to encompass code mixing is not uncommon in this context (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 116). Some scholars in the literature tend to treat the concept of "code mixing" as synonymous with "intra-sentential code switching" and investigate it accordingly. Nevertheless, certain researchers argue that the distinctions between code mixing and code switching are discernible enough to justify separate consideration. In this context, code mixing

typically denotes variations or shifts between variables or codes occurring within a clause or phrase (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 120). According to Poplack, code mixing involves variations within the boundaries of a single sentence, constituent, or word (2001). These variations transpire within the grammatical framework of the matrix language towards a second language or language variety. In this form of variation, words or phrases from both languages are embedded within a sentence and conform to the grammatical rules of the sentence they are part of (Brice & Anderson, 1999; Nerghes, 2011). The language from which these elements originate is termed the embedded language (Holmes, 2013).

5. LANGUAGE BORROWING AND ITS DISTINCTION FROM CODE SWITCHING

Borrowing, which is distinct from code switching, plays a significant role in interlinguistic interactions (Poplack, 2001). When examining the reasons for realization, both in code switching and borrowing, the integration of specific elements from the lexical inventory of one language into the grammatical structure of another language occurs to fulfill the speaker's expressive needs (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 156). In situations involving frequent interaction between two languages, it is common for one language to borrow lexical items from the other and assimilate them into its own lexical inventory (Otsuka, 2005). Borrowed linguistic units often share a notable resemblance to units obtained through code switching, taking the form of a single lexical item. Since many transformations happen through a single word, distinguishing between code switching and borrowing is not always straightforward (Muysken, 2011; Myers-Scotton, 1998). However, when words are borrowed from an external source into a language, if considered as borrowing, they assimilate the morphological, syntactic, and often phonological features of the language they become a part of. In contrast, words borrowed through code switching do not undergo such assimilation (Poplack, 2001). In both English and Turkish, a multitude of words have been adopted from diverse languages, including examples like "rational," "academy," and "musician," which are only some instances of borrowing from French and Italian as two other European languages (as cited in Atasoy & Ercan, 2022).

6. LANGUAGE ATTRITION AS A GRADUAL WEAKENING OF BILINGUAL PROFICIENCY

Language attrition, or loss of language, represents an interlinguistic phenomenon observed in certain bilingual individuals, indicating a decline in proficiency in one of the languages. Over time, individuals experiencing language attrition exhibit a gradual loss of consistency in grammatical structures or lexical production in one or both languages (Myers-Scotton, 1998). Myers-Scotton (1998) defines language attrition as the non-pathological regression of proficiency in a language previously acquired by an individual (cited in Park, 2018, p. 1). Köpke and Genevska-Hanke (2018) propose that language attrition results from changes in language dominance. Researchers argue that continuous exposure to the second language in the individual's environment leads to an increased influence of the second language on the native language, causing a shift of dominance from the native language to the second language. Conversely, returning to an environment where the native language is spoken results in a shift of dominance from the second language back to the native language (Köpke & Genevska-Hanke, 2018, p. 2). Consequently, language attrition occurs depending on the spoken environment, either in the native language or the second language. Myers-Scotton (1998) argues that language attrition observed in a bilingual speech context shares similarities with code switching. Initially, speakers demonstrate proficiency in producing well-structured sentences in both languages, creating components in either a monolingual or a mixed form. However, as one of the languages undergoes attrition, individuals start using the language in which they remain proficient when constructing grammatical structures, diverging from the language undergoing attrition (Myers-Scotton, 1998). In fact, this distinction sets language attrition apart from code switching.

7. UNDERSTANDING LANGUAGE TRANSFER AND INTERFERENCE IN USER LANGUAGE

Language transfer holds a fundamental position in applied linguistics and the acquisition of a second language (Selinker & Mascia, 2001). Selinker (1972) characterizes language transfer as "the influence of the knowledge an individual typically has about their native language on behaviors, processes, and constraints associated with it" (cited in Selinker & Mascia, 2001, p. 37). Unlike code switching, which involves the observation of grammatical structures in two different languages, language transfer encompasses the impact of a singular set of grammatical rules (Poplack & Meechan, 1998). Another essential concept in the domain of cross-linguistic interactions is interference. Interference is delineated as the "unintended influence of one language on another" (Grosjean, 1988, cited in Demiray, 2015, p. 28) or the "appearance resulting from the speaker's relationship with their own language in foreign language instruction, due to the distinctions of the language being learned" (İmer et al., 2013). In essence, interference is frequently observed in bilingual individuals or those learning a second language, representing the impact of one language, typically the native language, on another.

8. MIXED LANGUAGE AS A COMBINATION OF LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

Mixed language, a distinctive linguistic genre, arises from the combination of two distinct languages within the context of bilingualism (Meakins & Stewart, 2022). It results from the intricate process where the grammatical structures of one language intertwine with the vocabulary of another. The interweaving of these two separate linguistic systems gives rise to a mixed language that defies classification under a single origin, forming a linguistic amalgamation (van Gijn, 2009). Within mixed languages, novel structures emerge that are not evident in the parent languages (Meakins & Stewart, 2022). Frequently observed during periods of significant societal changes, mixed languages serve the dual purpose of expressing either a new identity or preserving an existing one. According to Atasoy and Ercan (2022), examples of languages classified as mixed languages include Angloromani, Barranquenho, Callahuaya, Chindo, Gurindji Kriol, Jenisch, Lekoudesch, Media Lengua, Mednyj Aleut, Michif, Shelta, and Wutun languages (Meakins, 2013, pp. 161-164).

Concerning the classification of mixed languages, Bican's (2015) tripartite classification is noteworthy. Mixed languages are broadly categorized into lexicon-grammar mixed languages, where the grammar of one language combines with an extensive vocabulary from another; structural mixes, involving abundant linguistic and lexical elements from both languages; and converted languages, where the lexicon of one language is retained while undergoing structural transformation towards another language (Meakins & Stewart, 2022, p. 2). Before Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) study, mixed languages were not acknowledged as a distinct entity but rather began to be explored as a form of contact language in the context of interactional linguistics (Meakins, 2013). The duration required for the emergence of mixed languages can often be as lengthy as the historical development of natural languages, and bilingualism is not a prerequisite for their emergence (Muysken, 2011). Comparisons between mixed languages, pidgins, and creoles reveal both similarities and distinctions. While the absence of a single parent language and emergence through societal interaction are two shared features, mixed languages stand out due to the dynamic interaction of two languages. In comparison to creoles, mixed languages present a more uniform appearance owing to reduced personal and interpersonal variability (van Gijn, 2009).

9. PIDGINS AS A MEDIUM IN COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Pidgin languages, arising from interactions between local communities and frequent travelers, fishermen, or traders in specific regions, represent linguistic expressions molded by these

encounters (Kıran & Kıran (Eziler), 2012). Stemming from the necessity to communicate and the informal learning of language, these languages are always rooted in a foundational natural language. As a pidgin language develops, the vocabulary, grammar, and intricate/irregular features of the underlying natural language undergo simplification (İmer et al., 2013, pp. 176-177). Consequently, pidgin languages often demonstrate simple morphosyntactic characteristics and incorporate vocabulary from two distinct languages, often referred to as mixed languages (As cited in Atasoy & Ercan, 2022). Pidgin languages cannot attain the status of a native language since they are intended to serve as a second language for individuals (İmer et al., 2013, p. 176). Indeed, the lifespan of pidgin languages is typically limited to around fifteen years. For example, Tok Pisin stands out as a well-documented case in the realms of pidgin and creole languages. In Papua New Guinea, a region boasting over seven hundred languages, Tok Pisin holds a significant position as a widely utilized pidgin language (Zimmermann, 2011).

10. CREOLE LANGUAGES AND INTERLANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF INTERLINGUAL INTERACTION

Creole languages have their roots in the colonial era, which is marked by interactions between indigenous languages and European languages during the period of colonization. Meakins and Stewart (2022, p. 5) suggest that Creole languages developed within indigenous communities brought from Africa, displaying morphosyntactic features from local languages but incorporating vocabulary from European languages like English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese. These languages are characterized by their simple structure, which is designed for everyday communication. The transition of a native Creole speaker to Creole status is a common occurrence as the language evolves or develops (Muysken & Smith, 1994). With prolonged use, Creole languages undergo structural transformation by becoming more intricate over the course of time. When children in regions where these languages are spoken acquire them as their native language, the mixed language evolves into a Creole language (Polome, 1971; Özüorçun, 2014). Examples of Creole languages that have undergone this transition include Tok Pisin, Nigerian Pidgin English, and Sango (Muysken & Smith, 1994).

Regarding interlanguage, as a term coined by Selinker (1972), it is suggested to be closely linked to the phenomenon of second language acquisition (Wu, 2017, p. 163). Interlanguage refers to a hybrid language system that emerges during the learning process of a foreign language student. Specifically, it denotes an independent language system created uniquely by an individual in the ongoing process of learning a second language, which ultimately positioning itself between the native language and the target language in terms of structure (Wu, 2017, p. 166). When code-switching is considered not only as a concept related to morphemes from multiple languages but also associated with grammatical patterns from these languages, the close relationship of concepts like second language acquisition, Creole language, and interlanguage with code-switching becomes more apparent (Myers-Scotton, 1998).

11. CONCLUSION

The contemporary era, which is profoundly influenced by increased global mobility, cross-border migrations, and the transformative power of the internet, has ushered in a new era of expansive opportunities for individuals hailing from diverse cultural backgrounds to engage in multifaceted interactions. Consequently, speakers of different languages find themselves on a collective quest to forge a common mode of communication, thus giving rise to a myriad of cross-linguistic interaction phenomena. Within the expansive field of sociolinguistics, this study delves deeply into the nuanced facets of these phenomena, examining the intricate tapestry of language interactions. A meticulous exploration of these cross-linguistic interaction phenomena reveals a rich landscape that encompasses bilingualism, code-switching (encompassing both code-shifting and code-mixing), borrowing, language attrition, language transfer, interference, mixed language,

pidgin language, creole language, and interlanguage terminologies. Each of these dimensions is subjected to thorough scrutiny, presented under distinct headings replete with elucidations, references, and illustrative examples to ensure a comprehensive understanding.

Embarking on an examination of the sociolinguistic domain, the study initially situates itself within the macro-area of sociolinguistics, as a field within linguistics that scrutinizes language phenomena through the multifaceted lenses of social class, educational level, age, and gender. Subsequently, the study elucidates the intricate processes through which diverse languages interact, driven by specific social factors. It meticulously examines the profound impact of one language on another within this interactive context, delineating the consequences of such linguistic interplay and comprehensively covering the expansive domain of cross-linguistic interaction. This study, as it unfolds, places a central focus on the outcomes spawned by these interactions, categorizing them as cross-linguistic interaction phenomena. It furnishes pertinent concepts and definitions, providing a structured framework for understanding the intricate dynamics of linguistic events arising from cross-linguistic interaction. The overarching aim of this article is to serve as a comprehensive reference for individuals keen on delving into the dynamic and complex nature of language, particularly within the context of cross-cultural and inter-societal interactions in our ever-globalizing world. Through this examination, it is aimed to contribute to the evolving discourse surrounding the linguistic dimensions of interactions in a world marked by cultural diversity and globalization.

12. REFERENCES

Akdemir, A. S. (2016). Willingness to Communicate WTC in L2 An Affective Construct of Language Learning Process. *Atatürk University Journal of Social Science Institute*, *20*(3), 839–854.

Akdemir, A. S., & İlhan, B. (2019). EFL Instructors Majors and Their Speaking Activity Choices for Informal Oral Assessment. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International - Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *9*(1), 1–26.

Al Heetia, N. H., & Al Abdely, A. A. (2016). Types and functions of code-switching in the English language used by Iraqi doctors in formal setting. International Journal of Advanced Research and Review, 1(8), 10-18.

Asanova, J. (2006). The impact of the Asian Development Bank on educational policy formation in Kazakhstan. Central Eurasian Studies Review, 5(1), 7-10.

Atasoy, İ. O. & Ercan, G. S. (2022). Language and society: Language contact and related concepts. *The Jour-nal of Kesit Academy,* 8 (31), 565-586.

Ataş, Ş. (2017). Mardin'de çok dillilik ve ana dili Arapça olan çok dillilerde kod değiştirimleri [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Baker, C. (2001). Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (3. Baskı). Multilingual Matters.

Bican, G. (2017). İki dilliliğin tanımlanması: Kuramsal tartışmalar ve güncel dilbilimsel yaklaşımlar. Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi, 5(2), 353-366. http://dx.doi.org/10.16916/aded.298779

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Northern Norway. J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.) Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication (ss. 407-434). Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). Language. Holt.

Borg, J., & Lauri, M. A. (2008). DTV in Malta. van den Broeck, W., & Pierson, J. (Eds.), Digital television in Europe, (ss. 143-152). VUB Press.

Borges, R. D. (2014). *The life of language: Dynamics of language contact in Suriname* [Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi]. Utrecht University.

Brice, A., & Anderson, R. (1999). Code mixing in a young bilingual child. Communication Disorders Quarterly, 21(1), 17–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/152574019902100103

Demiray, F. (2015). İkidillilik bağlamında düzenek değiştirme olgusu temel dil çerçeve modeline göre incelenmesi. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6(2), 26-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1501/sbeder_0000000100

Diaz, R. M. (1983). Thought and two languages: The impact of bilingualism on cognitive development. Review of Research in Education, 10, 23-54.

Duisembekova, Z., & Özmen, K. S. (2020). Analyzing language learning beliefs of English student teachers: A cross-cultural study across Turkic republics. Bilig, (94), 51-73. https://doi.org/10.12995/bilig.9403

Duran, L. (1994). Toward a better understanding of code switching and interlanguage in bilinguality: Implications for bilingual instruction. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 14, 69-88.

Duranti, A. (Ed.). (2004). *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Blackwell.

Dweik, B. S., & Al-Obaidi, T. A. (2014). Language contact, use and attitudes among the Chal-do Assyrians of Baghdad, Iraq: A sociolinguistic study. *Journal of Advances in Linguis- tics*, *3*(3), 219-232. https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v3i3.5212

Eldin, A. A. T. S. (2014). Socio-linguistic study of code switching of the Arabic language speakers on social networking. International Journal of English Linguistics, 4(6), 78-86. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v4n6p78

Ennin, T., & Afful, I. (2015). Stylistic significance of code switching and code mixing in three African novels. *The English Literature Journal*, *2*(4), 426-434.

Ercan, G. S. (2021). Dil gelişimi. Siyez, D. M (Ed.)Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi: Çok Boyutlu Bir Bakış, (ss. 306-335). Pegem Akademi.

Fishman, J. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Multilingual Matters.

Giatno, G.,Wisman, H., & Gafari, M. O. F. (2019). Morphological interference in the form of Malay language affixation Panai Dialect in the use of writing language (Narrative Text) in 5th grade of primary school No. 112202 in Middle Panai District. Budapest Internati- onal Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal, 2(2), 100-114. https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v2i2.279

Gilquin, G. (2015). At the interface of contact linguistics and second language acquisition research: New Englishes and learner Englishes compared. English World-Wide, 36(1), 91- 124. https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.36.1.05gilFrank, 2007;

Glovacki-Bernardi, Z., & Jernej, M. (2004). On German-Croatian and Italian-Croatian language contact. *Collegium Antropologicum*, *28*(1), 201-205.

Gökdağ, B. A. (2011). Doğu Karadeniz'de konuşulan diller ve Türkçe ile etkileşimleri. Karadeniz Araştırmaları, 31(31), 111-134.Demiray, 2015

Grosjean, F. (1982). Life with two languages. Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6(6), 467-477.

Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). Bilinguality and bilingualism. Cambridge University Press.

Hasselblatt, C., de Jonge, B., & Norde, M. (2010). *Langauge contact: New perspectives*. John Benjamins.

Holmes, J. (2013). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Fourth Edition. Routledge.

Huehnergard, J. (Ed.). (2013). *The Semitic Languages*. Routledge.

Hymes D. (1971). On communicative competence. University of Pennsylvania Press.

İmer, K., Kocaman, A. ve Özsoy, A. S. (2013). *Dilbilim sözlüğü*. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Jdetawy, L. F. A. (2011). Arabic-English code-switching among Arab students at UUM, Malaysia. *Language in India*, *11*(5), 102-117.

Kheder, R. M. (2019). The pros and cons of bringing children up bilingually. Journal of University of Human Development, 5(3), 73-78

Kıran, Z. ve Kıran (Eziler), A. (2012). *Dilbilime giriş*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Kostoulas-Makrakis, N., Karantzola, E., & Athanassiadis, E. (2006). Attitudes towards bilingualism: The case of two Greek islands. Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies. 11(2), 17-34.

Köpke, B., & Genevska-Hanke, D. (2018). First language attrition and dominance: Same same or different?. Frontiers in psychology, 9, 1963.

Liu, H., & Ren, Q. (2017). The language contact status of Kanbun Kundoku in East Asian languages. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *142*, 411- 413. https://doi.org/10.2991/icelaic-17.2017.91

Mabule, D. R. (2015). What is this? Is it code switching, code mixing or language alterna- ting?. Journal of Educational and Social Research, 5(1), 339-349.

Mahomoudi, F. ve Mahmoudi, A. (2020). İki dillilik: Dil ve biliş. Türk Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1(1), 14-19. https://doi.org/10.51242/SAKA-TJER.2020.3

Marini, A., & Fabbro, F. (2007). Psycholinguistic models of speech production in bilingualism and multilingualism. A. Ardila ve E. Ramos (Eds.), Speech and language disorders in bilinguals (ss. 47-67). Nova Science.

Marini, A., Urgesi, C., & Fabbro, F. (2012). Clinical neurolinguistics of bilingualism. M. Faust (Ed..), The handbook of the neuropsychology of language, (ss. 738-759). Blackwell.

Meakins, F. & Stewart, J. (2022). Mixed languages. Mufwene, S., & Escobar, A. M. (Eds.), The Cambridge Handbook of language contact. Cambridge University Press. (Yayın aşamasında).

Meakins, F. (2013). Mixed languages. Bakker, P., & Matras, Y. (Eds.), Contact languages: A comprehensive guide, (ss. 159-228. De Gruyter Mouton.

Messiliti, H. (2017). The study of code-switching/mixing in Algerian universities [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. The University of Abdelhamid Ibn Badis Mostaganem.

Meyerhoff, M. (2006). Introducing sociolinguistics. Routledge.

Mohammadi, S. M. (2014). Code switching as a robust catalyst; a useful way to become a more strategic language user. International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 2(5-1), 47- 55. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.s.2014020501.17

Mrva, J. (2018). Passive bilingualism within the Iberian Peninsula. Revista Colombiana de Educación, (75), 215-242.

Muhvić-Dimanovski, V. (2005). Languages in contact. A. Sujoldžić (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology* (ss. 52-62). EOLSS Publishers.

Muysken, P. (2011). Code-switching R. Mesthrie (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics, (ss. 301-314). Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. C. & Smith, N. (1994). Introduction. J. Arends, P. Muysken, & N. Smith (Eds.), Pidgins and creoles: An introduction, (ss. 3-14). Benjamins.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). Code-switching. F. Coulmas (Ed.), The handbook of sociolinguistics, (ss. 149-160). Blackwell.

Nazlı, E. H. (2016). Toplumdilbilime genel bir bakış. *SBArD Sosyal Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi*, (28), 37-66.

Nerghes, A. (2011). The impact of code-switching on persuasion: An elaboration likelihood perspective [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Wageningen University & Research.

Nguyen, T. (2014). *Code switching: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Anchor Academy Publishing.

Otsuka, Y. (2005). History of Polynesian languages. Linguistics, 345, 267-296.

Ovu, B., F. & Anyanwu, Q. E. (2019). Bilingualism problems in Nigeria: Implications for ESL pedagogy. Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies (JOLLS), 8, 13-21.

Özüorçun, F. (2014). Language varieties: Pidgins and creoles. LAÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 5(2), 114-123.

Polome, E. (1971). Pidginization and creolization of languages. Cambridge University Press.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y Termıno en Español: toward a typology of code-switching. Linguistics, 18(7-8), 581-618. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Poplack, S., & Meechan, M. (Eds.). (1998). Instant loans, easy conditions: The productivity of bilingual borrowing; Special issue of the international journal of bilingualism. Kingston Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10(3), 209-231.

Selinker, L., & Mascia, R. (2001). Interlanguage speech recognition by computer: Implications for SLA and computational machines. Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies, 1(1), 19-55. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209

Siemund, P. (2008). Language contact: Constraints and common paths of contact induced language change. P. Siemund, & N. Kintana (Eds.), *Language Contact and Contact Lan- guages*, (ss. 3-11). Benjamins.

Smart-Carvalho, C. (2018). The enactment of Bill 5, The Francophone community enhancement and support act: A proud moment for Manitoba. Manitoba Law Journal, 41(1), 479- 510.

Süverdem, F. B. ve Ertek, B. (2020). İki dillilik ve iki kültürlülük: göç, kimlik ve aidiyet. The Journal of International Lingual Social and Educational Sciences, 6(2), 183-207. https://doi.org/10.34137/jilses.826142

Swain, S., Adams, J. N., & Janse, M. (2002). *Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact* Walczyński, M. (2012). The study of pidgins and creoles and society- and culture-related fields of linguistics. İçinde Bryll, A., Sikora, I. & Walczyński, M. (Eds.) *Philological inquiries: Festschrift for Professor Julian Maliszewski honouring his 40 years of scholarly activity and his 60th birthday*, ss. 194-213. Nysa: Oficyna Wydawnicza PWSZ w Nysie.

Takkac, M., & Akdemir, A. S. (2015). Defining listeners in second language (L2) listening: investigating the Characteristics of language learners as listeners. International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 6(2), 116-141.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact*. Edinburgh University Press.

Todorova, B. B. (2019). Bulgarian-English code-switching in Internet forum communication: The BG-mamma case. Open Linguistics, 5(1), 121-135. https://doi.org/10.1515/opli- 2019-0008

Van Gijn, R. (2009). The phonology of mixed languages. Journal of Pidgin and Creole languages, 24(1), 93-119. https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.24.1.04gij

Weinreich, H. (1974). The structure of moral reason. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *3*(2), 135 - 143.

Wu, X. J. (2017). Error analysis of interlanguage in English writing. DEStech Transactions on Social Science, Education and Human Science, (mess). https://doi.org/ 10.12783/dtssehs/mess2017/12107

Yaman, İ. ve Ekmekçi, E. (2018). İngiliz dili eğitimi alanında yaygın bir şekilde kullanılan bazı terimlerin Türkçe'ye aktarımı sorunu. Diyalektolog Sosyal Araştırmalar Hakemli Dergisi, (18), 143-167. .https://doi.org/10.22464/diyalektolog.212

Yılmaz, M. Y. (2014). İki dillilik olgusu ve Almanya'daki Türklerin iki dilli eğitim sorunu. Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 9(3), 1641-1651. https://doi.org/ 10.7827/TurkishStudies.6216

Zhang, H., & Wang, N. (2016). Sociolinguistics and English teaching in China. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(4), 830-834. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0604.21

Zimmermann, J. L. (2011). The increasing Anglicisation of Tok Pisin: An analysis of the Wantok Corpus [Yayımlanmamış Doktora tezi]. The University of Regensburg.