

On Negative Language Transfer in the Speech of Kazakh-Russian Bilinguals: Post-Soviet and Current Identities

Saule Zhabayeva¹

Abstract

The focus of the current study is on investigating code switching and interference in the oral communication of Kazakh-Russian bilinguals. Particular emphasis is given to exploring the relationships between various types of code switching as interference and their impact on speech. The study collects data from interviews with popular young men and employs componential analysis as the primary research methodology. The paper examines how interference affects both pragmatic and structural changes in speech, and it is argued that social factors are linked to the negative effects of interference and the specifics of code switching in Kazakh-Russian bilinguals' communication. The study reveals that the native Kazakh language underwent morphological and structural alterations as a result of the deliberate selection of code-switching types, and the influence of Russian as a guest language has played a significant role in these changes. Overall, this study sheds light on the complexities of language interactions and the potential impact of bilingualism on linguistic diversity.

Keywords: Bilingualism, Interference, Code Switching, Alternation, Insertion

INTRODUCTION

Language policy concerns in multinational states are always relevant as they touch upon issues of interethnic communication, language development, and the status of languages from a statehood perspective. In the case of Kazakhstan, the history of the Kazakh language as the official language of the country is an important aspect that needs to be briefly summarized.

The Kazakh language has undergone changes throughout history, and during the Soviet era, the intensive promotion of the Russian language resulted in a loss of identity among the Kazakh people. Schools in Kazakhstan started to close, the Kazakh-language press was no longer published, and Russian was used for administrative management. Additionally, various political repressions, such as starvation and ethnic Kazakh emigration, led to a significant decline in the number of Kazakhs in the 1930s, reducing them to a minority ethnic group in their historical homeland.

As a result, the Kazakh language lost its importance, and a uniform education system, primarily in Russian, was implemented. In the 1960s, Russian became the language of scientific and higher education, leading to a decline in the number of schools that used Kazakh as their primary language of teaching. The older generation became responsible for maintaining the Kazakh language by using it in daily conversation and teaching it to the next generation.

Due to this historical development of bilingualism, the majority of Kazakhs are now fluent in both Kazakh and Russian. After Kazakhstan became a multiethnic nation in 1991, Kazakh was declared the official language, and Russian was used for interethnic communication. However, the Russian language has historically held a prominent position and is still widely used today. The availability of information in Russian, including texts from the world's media, science, cinema and television industries, etc., contributes to its continued importance.

The contemporary language situation in Kazakhstan is defined by the simultaneous usage of Kazakh and Russian languages. According to government figures on the degree of Russian language competency, 51% of Kazakhs are proficient in oral communication, and 36% are proficient in writing and reading. The broad adoption of Russian and Kazakhstan's poor language policies has given rise to the phenomenon of mixed

¹ Associate Professor Department of Foreign Philology A.Baitursynov Kostanay Regional University Republic of Kazakhstan, E-mail: zhabayeva_ss@mail.ru

bilingualism and other forms of negative interference. However, the detrimental impact of the Russian language on the purity of the Kazakh language remains a current drawback of bilingualism. Personal competitiveness for citizens depends on their command of the national language as well as fluency in multiple languages. At the state level, it is established that every Kazakh should be able to speak at least three languages, including Kazakh, Russian, and English. Despite this, concerns persist about the Russian language's impact on the purity of the Kazakh language. These concerns were particularly influential in the formation of the linguistic anomaly known as "shala-Kazakh," which is translated as "half-Kazakh." This term suggests that interference is evident and that the speaker is not literate in Kazakh. This paper aims to discuss the intricacies of code-switching among bilinguals, focusing on the benefits and uses of switching in oral conversation and the impact of language interference on the linguistic purity and uniformity of Kazakh.

Bilingualism is a term used to refer to the ability to use two languages effectively in the appropriate communicative contexts while coexisting in the same speech community. It describes the coexistence, interaction, and mutual influence of two different languages in a single communication area. One of the essential factors for the emergence of bilingualism is the existence of a multiethnic state, where people are exposed to and interact with multiple languages. This social setting plays a significant role in how an individual's personality is formed and developed.

As noted by Weinreich (1953), the greater the difference between the language systems, the more complex the learning process and the potential area of interference. This interference occurs when the linguistic structures of one language are transferred to the other language, resulting in errors and deviations in language use. The extent of interference depends on various factors, including the proficiency level in each language, the degree of exposure to each language, and the sociolinguistic context in which the languages are used.

The phenomenon of code-switching is a widely discussed topic among sociolinguists, psycholinguists, and linguists who study language contact. According to scholars many scholars, code-switching presents various challenges in different contexts (Auer, 1995; Gumperz, 1976, 1982; Grosjean 1982, 1992, 1998, 2008; Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002, 2006; Muysken, 1995, 2000; Poplack, 1980, 2015; and Gardner-Chloros, 2009). Myers-Scotton (1993) defines code-switching as "the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded variety in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation" (p. 3). It is essential to differentiate between the concepts of code-switching and code-mixing. Muysken (2000) defines code mixing as "cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence" (p. 1), while code-switching refers to "the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event" (p. 1). Bokamba (1989) states that:

...code mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units, such as affixes (bound morphemes, words (unbound morphemes, phrases and clauses from a co-operative activity where the participants, in order to infer what is intended, must reconcile what they hear with what they understand (p.278).

Code-switching can take different forms. Muysken (2000) distinguishes between two main types: intrasentential and intersentential switching. Intrasentential switching occurs within a sentence. Muysken identifies three subtypes of intrasentential switching: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Insertion involves the use of "material" (lexical elements or complete constituents) from one language in the structure of another, while alternation entails the "alternation between structures from languages" (Muysken, 2000, p. 3). Congruent lexicalization, on the other hand, involves the use of "material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure" (Muysken, 2000, p. 3).

Myers-Scotton (1993) distinguished between marked and unmarked code-switching. Unmarked switching adheres to accepted standards of behavior and expectations of the listener, whereas marked switching is viewed as deviating from norms or expectations. Understanding the various subtypes of code-switching and whether they are marked or unmarked is crucial to examining how bilinguals use language in diverse social circumstances.

The study of code-switching can be approached from three perspectives: linguistic, internal or psycholinguistic, and external or sociolinguistic. Sociolinguistic elements, such as social identity and social life, have been

discussed by Gumperz (1976), Zentella (1990), Gardner-Chloros (2009), and Heller (1995). Psycholinguistic aspects, particularly the psychological mechanisms of switching, have been examined by Green (2018), Becker (1997), Myers-Scotton (1993), De-Bot (1992), Lipski (2014), and others. The linguistic challenges of bilingualism and language interactions have been explored by Weinreich (1953), Thomason (2001), MacSwan (1999), Haugen (1956), Appel (1986), Mackey (1976, 1977), and other researchers.

The ratio between code-switching and borrowing is significant, and scholars are typically concerned with the question of whether a single word switch or a form of lexical interference known as borrowing has taken place. Code-switching and borrowings are distinct ideas, according to Grosjean (1998):

A code-switch is a complete shift to the other language for a word, a phrase or a sentence, whereas a borrowing is a word or a short expression taken from the less activated language and adapted morphosyntactically (and sometimes phonologically) into the base language (p.137).

A borrowing is a word or a brief expression that is taken from the less activated language and morphologically (and perhaps phonologically) adapted into the base language, as opposed to a code-switch, which is a complete shift to the other language for a word, a phrase, or a sentence (p.137).

According to Myers-Scotton's (1993) method of frequency criterion, words from another language are termed loanwords if they are often used to represent certain notions. According to Haspelmath (2009), who defines borrowings as 'a completed process of language change' (p. 41), a conventionalization criterion needs to be taken into consideration, and 'nonce-borrowings should be called code-switches' (p. 41). Haspelmath (2009) specifically studied loanwords and code-switching as forms of lexical borrowings. According to his findings, code-switching is a type of contact-induced speech behavior rather than a contact-induced language shift (p. 40). Understanding the concept of spontaneous borrowing is crucial for this investigation. Poplack (2012) refers to spontaneous and established borrowings and suggests that 'speakers not only CS spontaneously, but may also borrow spontaneously' (p.645). The recipient's dictionary may include these units. Thus, it can be inferred that speech is involved in communication during code-switching, whereas the language system is involved during borrowing. As a result, borrowing illustrates the linguistic method of code-swapping.

When examining code-switching, it's essential to consider linguistic interference. According to Weinreich (1953), interference refers to deviations from language norms that occur in bilingual speech due to knowledge of more than one language. This can occur at both morphological and phonological levels, with the bilingual often unaware of the interference but mindful of code-switching. Weinreich laid the theoretical groundwork for language contacts by examining how interference is influenced by the linguistic structure and extralinguistic factors in the sociocultural context of language contact.

Interference can be triggered by a range of non-structural elements, including the individual traits of bilingual speakers, the speaking situation, and the sociocultural context of language contact (Weinreich, 1953). According to Haugen (2001), interference occurs when a linguistic unit refers to the systems of two different languages simultaneously. Meanwhile, Appel and Muysken (2005) describe interference as a negative transfer. Native words can be replaced by foreign words due to negative interference, highlighting the detrimental effects of interference on language.

When using elements of one language while speaking or writing in another, interference or negative transfer can occur unintentionally and unconsciously. It's important to recognize the impact of linguistic interference when analyzing code-switching, as it can have significant implications for bilingual speakers and their communication abilities.

Language shift refers to the sociolinguistic phenomenon where a language changes due to political and economic reasons. It can have severe effects on a language, leading to linguistic attrition. Linguistic attrition is the gradual loss of language proficiency resulting from changes in language use. This loss can also lead to cognitive and psycholinguistic changes.

On an individual level, language attrition is linked to cognitive processes such as a lack of native language proficiency. The intensity of interactions with the guest language also plays a role in the level of interference and attrition. Interference occurs when there is a mixing of language systems, which can result in detrimental

effects on both languages. This can be seen in the influence of the native language on the learning of another language, as well as the guest language's influence on the structure of the native language.

In contrast, code-switching refers to the intentional switching of languages, where the language code is completely replaced. Code-switching is a conscious behavior, whereas interference is typically unintentional. It's important to understand both code-switching and interference when analyzing the complexities of bilingualism and language contact. Code-switching is a complex linguistic phenomenon that can be categorized into three main types: structural-grammatical, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic. In order to better understand the dynamics of language control and code-switching, researchers such as D. Green (2018) have investigated the cooperative and competitive language controls within each type. Other studies, such as those conducted by G.J. Kootstra (2015), have examined the effects of lexical triggering and interactive alignment on bilinguals' likelihood to switch between languages.

Cognitive linguistics researchers have also proposed different models to explain the mechanisms of code-switching, such as the Bilingual Interactive Activation Model (BIA) (Heuven, Dijkstra, & Grainger, 1998). This model distinguishes between a decision subsystem (the task decision subsystem) and an identification subsystem (the identification system) to explain how language nodes choose the language code, which depends on the level of competency in the second language.

Myers-Scotton (1993) proposed the Matrix Language Frame Model, which takes into account structural, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic factors. This model is based on a structural-psycholinguistic approach and helps to explain how bilinguals use their two languages in different contexts.

The functions of code-switching have been extensively studied by various researchers. Chirsheva (2001) identifies several functions of code-switching, including the address function, esoteric function, subject-thematic function, phatic function, self-identification function, quoting function, humorous function, emotional-evaluative function, impact function, and language-saving function. Appel and Muysken (1986) differentiate between the referential function, which involves a lack of knowledge or facility in one language on a certain subject; the directive function, which excludes certain persons from a conversation; the expressive function, which shows mixed identity; the phatic function, which attracts attention through metaphorical switching; and the metalinguistic function, which demonstrates linguistic competence in both languages (p.118-119).

Gumperz (1982) uses a turn-by-turn sequential analysis to derive the conversational meaning of code-switching and lists several discourse functions, including quotations (reported speech), addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization vs. objectivization. Auer (1995) examines the pragmatic problems with code-switching and highlights the difficulties in language negotiation while choosing a language. According to Auer, language choice may be related to individual preferences, linguistic competencies, personal linguistic biographies, and complex matters of bi-cultural identity.

The two categories of pragmatic functions of code-switching are those intended to influence the addressee and those intended to deliver information on a particular issue. The first group conserves language resources, while the second group includes functions such as empathic, emotionally evaluative, addressable, funny, ornamental, and self-identification. This article will discuss the pragmatic roles of code-switching, which take many forms and have unique implementations in bilinguals' speech.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The main purpose of the article is to investigate code switching as the result of Kazakh and Russian languages contacts. For the analysis of the selected material, componential analysis was used, which allowed us to investigate the content plan of significant units and identify the signs characterizing the signs of code switching. Functional and pragmatic methods were also used to analyze the switching functions in speech, as well as to study the effect of interference on speech production. In the focus of pragmatic analysis of code switching is the attempt to find out the reasons and environment aspects influencing the choice of models, leading to negative language transfer. The results are systematized and presented in tables. Since the purpose of the article

is to study code switches in spontaneous speech, video-recordings of interviews with young Kazakhstanis presented on the *You-tube channel* were selected as material for analysis. Various interviews of online communication were selected and analyzed for various code switches. The bilingual participants are famous Kazakhstani artists, singers, journalists and bloggers and interviews are of the last five years. According to F.Grosjean (1998), interviewers and participants should 'belong to the same bilingual community' and interact 'in mixed language'. The interviews were held in the 'relaxed non-normative atmosphere', both the interviewer and participants are bilinguals. The data corpus was classified and analyzed according to the selected typology of code switching.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of code-switching patterns is based on the typology of code-switching. According to Muysken (2000), code-switching can be divided into two categories: intra- and intersentential. Intrasentential code-switching includes alternation, insertion, and congruent lexicalization. It is worth exploring some examples of code-switching patterns in more depth.

Muysken (2000) defines a type of code-switching where a constituent from Language A, consisting of words from that language, is followed by a constituent from Language B that does not contain any elements from Language A, as a form of code-switching (p.230). These changes can occur at the phrase or clause level.

It's worth noting that alternation can also be used by non-fluent bilinguals who lack proficiency in their mother tongue. In such cases, code-switching is used to maintain communication when the speaker is unable to convey their thoughts effectively. This phenomenon is particularly prevalent in northern Kazakhstan, where bilingualism is widespread due to the proximity to Russia and active use of the Russian language and code-switching. Alternation can be seen as a way to overcome linguistic barriers and realize the referential function: e.g. Әрдайым *пришлось доказывать*. (lit. Always *we had to prove it*). Олар *представляют наш народ*. (They *represent our people*).

Based on Muysken's (2000) analysis, alternation is a prevalent phenomenon in stable bilingual societies. However, there are instances where the pattern of alternation is atypical, as seen in the following examples where borrowed words are used at the beginning of the utterance before switching to the speaker's original language. This suggests that, in terms of linguistic proficiency, the speaker may be more comfortable using their L2. Furthermore, linkers such as habitual words, pronouns, adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions may also serve as reasons for code-switching; e.g., *Когда әңгіме айтасын*. (lit. *When you will talk*). *Әто үже почти екі ай қалды*. (It is almost two months left). *Үже сонда*. (Even then). *Потому что сен қатты билемейсін*. (Because you don't dance well). *Ну, где-то жарты жыл*. (Well, for a about half a year). *Работодатель жилье береді*. (The employee will give accommodation). (Stan.KZ., 2020). In these instances, the original language transforms into a guest language while the second language performs the role of a matrix language. The morphological and syntactic structure is put together using the second language's norms. Such models are not regarded as patterns of linguistic interference.

According to Muysken (1995), insertion is the introduction of a newly added clause in a sentence where the native language is dominant. This phenomenon is common in daily conversations and interviews. Muysken also notes that "matrix order dominates" (p. 303) in the case of insertion. Constituency is one of the factors that influence which pattern predominates in bilinguals' speech, and insertion can consist of a single element or "multiple contiguous insertions" structurally (p. 303). In addition, insertion is considered an example of lexical interference. Haspelmath (2009) suggests that "insertion refers to cultural borrowings" when direct cultural loans are involved (p. 49).

Here are examples of typical inserted grammar structures:

Inserted Object Between Subject and Predicate

Мен *шутка* айтам. (I will tell *a joke*).

Маған *поддержка* берді. (They gave me *support*). (Stan.KZ., 2020).

Introductory word between subject and predicate:

Саған, *по-моему*, құсайды. (*To my mind*, he takes after you). (Stan.KZ., 2020).

Attribute before the defined word:

Әр *успешный* адам (Every *successful* man). (Stan.KZ., 2020).

Object between interrogative pronoun and predicate in interrogative sentences:

Қандай *выгода* бар? (What is the *benefit*?). (Stan.KZ., 2020).

Adverbial modifier before predicate:

Онда *точно* болады. (Then it will *definitely* be). (Satzhan., 2022, 10.12.)

The analysis of cases with insertion reveals that the morphosyntactic frame of the Kazakh language is influenced by the Russian language, particularly through the insertion of Russian morphemes in the complement function. The use of code-switching components is subject to certain criteria, which implies that certain elements, such as exclamations, interjections, and adverbs, are more prone to being switched. Interestingly, bundle words, interjections, pronouns, and adverbs were commonly inserted in the speech of the interviewees, indicating the salience of these elements in bilingual communication. For instance: *уже* (*already*), *также* (*also*), *поэтому* (*therefore*), *потому что* (*because*), *потом* (*then*), *значит* (*it means*), *или* (*either*), *конечно* (*of course*), *например* (*for example*), *всегда* (*every time*), *только* (*just*), *все равно* (*all the same*), *сразу* (*immediately*), *еле-еле* (*hardly*), *по-моему* (*in my opinion*):

Өзіміз *еле жүрміз* (We can *hardly* move). (Stan .KZ., 2020).

Commonly inserted elements, referring to adverbs, conjunctions, pronouns include *уже* (*already*) with the function of a coordinating element:

Уже екі ай қалды (It's been two months now); (Stan.KZ., 2020).

Өйткені *уже* отбасым болған соң (Since I had a family). (Satzhan, 2022, 03.12).

It is generally inserted unconsciously and compensates the Kazakh equivalent which is expressed by two constituents: *қазірдің өзінде*. It is obvious that such insertion is exploited for saving speech efforts in the flow of communication.

The usage of slang words from the colloquial language is a sign of lexical interference in the speech of young bilingual Kazakh-Russian. Bilingual young people in Kazakhstan frequently utilize slang. For example: *халыва* (*freebie*), *давай* (*come on*), *в шоке* (*shocked*), *конкретный* (*definite*), *игнор* (*ignore*), *братан* (*bro*), *тупо* (*stupid*), *прикол* (*joke*), *тема* (*a good deal*). Kazakh youth may use code-switching to showcase their proficiency in both the vernacular and literary language. Moreover, the audience or interlocutor may interpret code-switching as a form of humor. In addition, the "cultural" inability to translate obscene and slang phrases in the Russian language could also contribute to this phenomenon. Interestingly, some claim that using obscene language in a foreign language seems less degrading and harmful than in Kazakh. Furthermore, the speaker's emotional state can play a significant role in the use of slang. It is possible to identify terms with positive connotations that convey acceptance and a positive attitude: *круто* (*cool*), *короче говоря* (*in short*), *ужасно* (*awesome*), *давай* (*come on*), *пойдет* (*that's ok*), *блин* (*damn*), slang expressing a negative assessment: *тупо* (*stupid*), *офигеть* (*to be shocked*), *в шоке* (*shocked*), *ничё* (*nothing*) related to the characteristics of a person: *лох* (*sucker*), *поптовщик* (*show-off*), *крутой* (*cool*), *братан* (*bro*). Additionally, they might perform the phatic role in the speech:

Тупо телефон алмады. (*Stupidly* didn't answer the phone). (Satzhan, 2022, 03.12).

The use of code-switching and insertion, though common in bilingual speech, can be viewed as a potential threat to the integrity and purity of the mother tongue. It is possible that some bilinguals resort to interlacing words and phrases due to a lack of language proficiency or the inability to recall the appropriate term in their native language.

However, it is important to note that code-switching and insertion can also serve a practical purpose. In situations where both languages are equally active, inserting a word or phrase from the other language can save the speaker time and effort. This relief plan is often employed by bilinguals who quickly recall the first equivalent term, especially if it is shorter.

Despite the potential benefits of code-switching and insertion, it is crucial to consider the impact on the mother tongue and strive to maintain its fundamental makeup and purity. Dual inclusions, where both languages are used interchangeably within a single phrase or sentence, can further complicate the situation and lead to confusion for the listener:

То есть мен как еркек. (That is me like a man). (Satzhan, 2022, 03.12).

Congruent lexicalization is a type of code-switching that involves using similar grammatical structures shared by two languages, either partially or fully (Muysken, 1995). Another term for this phenomenon is integration. Grammatical interference, on the other hand, refers to the mutual influence and penetration of two contacting languages at the morphological and syntactic levels. It results in deviations from the grammatical norms of one language under the influence of the other or the transfer of grammatical functions from one language to another. Per Weinreich (1953): “grammatical interference occurs when the rules of arrangement, coordination, selection or mandatory change of grammatical units included in the system of the S language are applied to approximately the same chains of elements of the C language” (p.9), or in situations in which the speaker's bilingualism is developed to the extent that the L2 has an impact on the grammatical functions of the L2.

A bilingual uses the grammatical structure of a matrix language when speaking in both languages. But occasionally, the simultaneous employment of both languages' grammatical structures can be observed in a single phrase. This is true for both languages' morpheme usage. When grammatical codes are mixed, a new morphosyntactic structure is produced. The ability of a bilingual to use two languages and swiftly modify the structure of a matrix language may be the primary cause. Muysken (1995) defines this type of congruent lexicalization as a “word-internal borrowing phenomena that result from shared grammar” (p. 242). For languages with comparable grammar, this was true. However, Kazakh and Russian are not comparable languages. Furthermore, they are members of separate typological groups: Kazakh is an agglutinative language, whereas Russian is a synthetic language. In this view, congruent lexicalization examples display an unconventional form of intrasentential switching. Following his study on congruent lexicalization, Lipski (2009) argued: “Code mixing might however be a precursor of attrition” (p.4).

Congruent lexicalization can be split into three broad categories:

A single constituent (determiner phrase), e.g., Кедейлік зона-сы-нан қалай шығамыз? (How will we get out of the poverty zone?).

Structures with several constituents (embedded clause): “*Ну все равно, мен творчество –ға кетем*” (*Anyway, I will go into creativity*).

Non-constituent models: Олар соны *никогда не говорили*. (They never said that). (Stan.KZ. 2020).

The examples presented above demonstrate that the matrix language, which establishes the structure of the utterance, is the dominant language. In each case, insertions are subordinate to the agglutinative grammatical structure of the matrix language, which is Kazakh.

Morphological analysis of congruent lexicalization methods has revealed that certain parts of speech are particularly susceptible to grammatical modifications. One common type of morphological insertion is verb insertion. Wohlgemuth (2009) classified verb insertions into direct insertion, indirect insertion, light verb strategy, semantic borrowing, and paradigm insertion. Forker's (2021) study examined the Russian verb insertion techniques into the languages of the former Soviet Union, focusing on grammatical, areal, and sociolinguistic features. The study found that one of the key relationships among semantic borrowings was a morphological type. Direct insertion with the use of the Russian verb stem+Kazakh suffix *a*: rus. *звонит* (to ring) – kaz.: *звонда* (call me). The argument was put forth that a suffix attached to the borrowed words 'has been categorized as a reflex of the native Turkic verbalizing suffix' (p. 250). This inserted modified form

“*zvonda*” (derivatives: *zvandady* (called me), *zvandaidy* (he /she will call me), *zvandaim* (I will call you) has become a common colloquial form; however, forms of this nature constitute a violation of the speech norm.

Intrastructural attribution is a common practice where congruent features with the guest language are named or transferred. Kazakh and Russian belong to different language groups, with Kazakh classified as agglutinative and Russian as inflectional and synthetic morphologically. Bilinguals often create grammatical meanings by adding inflection to the base of a word, particularly in the accusative and creative cases where nouns are frequently inflected. This demonstrates grammatical interference, where native language grammatical standards are transferred during code-switching. Examples of inflected inclusions show the use of suffixation by adding Kazakh word-formation suffixes to the root of the Russian term. The following are some examples of inflected inclusions in use: *Халыва-НЫ жақсы көрет.* (They like freebie). The suffix *-ны*, which is added grammatically, forms the accusative case; prepositional case, second person, plural: *Поток –та жүресін.* (You go in the *stream of people*); possessive case *Қыу –ініз* кім? (What is your surrounding?) (Satzhan, 2022, 10.12).; ablative: *звук –пен* (With the sound). The frequent use of inflected inclusions can be attributed to the bilingual speech generation mechanism, where the nomination of an object establishes syntactic relations and expresses grammatical meaning. In the examples given, the nomination was expressed through various cases of the Kazakh language. This process occurs consciously and automatically for speakers and is not difficult. Psycholinguistic factors also play a significant role, as morphemic switching occurs at the conceptual level. The matrix language remains dominant, and this pattern requires a high level of language competence in two languages to build a sentence structure with proper grammar. However, the use of such forms can lead to language loss in the normal functioning and development of the language.

In addition, there is a tendency to borrow blog names with some modifications.

For instance: the blog titled “Мамский әңгіме» (*Mothers' Talk*). This name was derived from the Russian blog 'Мамский форум'. *Форум* (forum) was replaced with Kazakh *әңгіме* (talk).

The following example is of a radical structural borrowing—a modification to the grammatical structure in line with the type of guest language: *Қыздар-ек-уи нарек* (*girls' hint*). The phrase structure N+suffix+N communicates attributive relationships. These inclusions serve to provoke a sense of humor and irony. The allusion to the motivating word's conventional affiliation is where the irony lies. The inclusion of the Russian suffix *ек+уи* fulfills the role of injecting humor and, thereby, attracting the audience's attention.

The humorous function of code-switching is characterized by the use of foreign language speech units to create jokes and generate laughter. Bilingual speakers employ linguistic building blocks such as morphemes and words from two languages to generate multilingual puns that are intended to be funny and entertaining. Intersentential code-switching refers to the use of entire sentences or phrases from one language in the midst of another. The examination of examples has revealed a variety of intersentential switching patterns. In oral communication, speakers frequently use preceding phrases and expressions to convey emotions or emphasize a point. For instance, in the following example, the speaker uses a line from the Hollywood movie "A Good Cop, A Bad Cop" as a preceding phrase to engender a humorous effect: 'Үйдегі жаман полицейский сен ба?' (Are you a bad cop at home?) – “Иә. Плохой полицейский –это я!” (Yes. A bad cop is me'). (Mamskiy angime, 2022). Such switching demonstrates the realization of the self-identification function, as the speaker stresses their proficiency in a second language and may be trying to impress their listener.

The expression of emotion through the employment of common exclamations of agreement, assent, and adoration: e.g. *Ужас!* (Horror!); *Как круто!* (It's cool!); *Как это здорово!* (How great is that!); *Я в шок!* (I'm shocked!); *Без проблем* (No problem); *Ничего страшного.* (It's not a big deal). The process of code-switching affects the creation of spoken utterances and requires significant linguistic effort from the speaker. After forming a motive and an internal program of utterance and communicative intention, the choice of lexical and grammatical tools in the second language is the final step. This conscious transference of codes demonstrates the theory that linguistic deviations, particularly the use of predetermined phrases and spoken clichés, may lead to harmful interference.

Standard colloquial clichés are widely used in mass communication, including newspaper writings, public discourse, and everyday speech, and serve as quotation marks. They have become increasingly prevalent, and bilinguals incorporate them into their daily lives. The presence of written materials in both Russian and Kazakh languages reflects the simultaneous operation of both languages, which is sometimes required due to Russian being declared the official language in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The availability of governing, legislative, legal, and business documents in both languages is necessary for effective communication. Many bilinguals find it easier to speak without relying on translations in Kazakh because they have memorized commonly used speech clichés from the social realm and can automatically reproduce them in speech situations. For instance, in the example presented below, the economic term «не рентабельно» (not cost-effective) is used. Phrases and clichés of this nature are stored in the speaker's memory. As such, the speaker does not need to invest effort in reproducing the speech stream within a given context; e.g., “Үкімет ақша салу керек. *Это может быть не рентабельно.* Бірақ ол біздің жастар киноға барады” - (The state should invest money. *It can be unprofitable.* Our youth will go to cinemas.). (Satzhan, 2022, 10.03).

The usage of vocabulary from social networks and blogs in Russian is also evident in bilingual speech. This is likely due to the lack of translated equivalents for these terms in Kazakh. One such example is the prevalent term "like" used in social media platforms, which has become widely recognized and used in both languages. Bilinguals are able to seamlessly incorporate these terms into their speech without any difficulties: e.g., *Качество жизни, диймыз.* (We call it *the quality of life*). (Satzhan, 2022, 10.03).

To incorporate quotes or aphorisms from another language into speech, bilinguals may utilize the quote feature of code-switching. This technique involves quoting comments or portions of them in a different language. Such switches can serve several critical functions, including emotional emphasis, expression, and idea amplification. In interview talk, instances of quotations being repeated are referred to as reported speech. For instance: ‘Мен ойладым: *Я должен написать песню!*’ (I thought: *I must write a song*). The speaker's use of direct inclusion serves the purpose of presenting an accurate depiction of the circumstances.

Thus, the analysis of examples allows presenting a systematic table of specific features of the three types of code-switching. The diagnostic values were proposed by P. Muysken and R. van Haut (1995) with supplemented features worked out in this research:

Table 1. The types of code-switching.

№	features	insertion	alternation	Congruent lexicalization
1.	single constituents	+		
2.	several constituents	+	+	
3.	non-constituency			+
4.	peripherality		+	
5.	nested a/b/a	+		
6.	non-nested a/b/a		+	+
7.	selected element	+		
8.	linear equivalence		+	+
9.	tag-switching		+	

Muysken (2000) proposes that patterns of insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization in code-switching can be explained by both psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic processes. According to Muysken, psycholinguistic aspects are related to the degree of "activation of components of both languages in speech production" (p. 8). Additionally, Muysken identifies the types of code-switching that are related to various social bilingual groups based on sociolinguistic characteristics. Analysis of code switch instances has shown that sociolinguistic factors significantly affect the type of switching and the way that functions are implemented.

In an interview setting, one of the variables that could prompt a bilingual person to switch to a guest language is the conversational topic. The language used, and the subject-thematic function are both influenced by the topic of communication. In Kazakhstan, active bilingualism denotes the active use of two languages in speech, with the speaker transitioning between the two languages automatically and according to the communication's context, even though they both have the same level of linguistic proficiency.

Code mixing is the practice of including or emphasizing the distinctive speech of the communicant while a substitutive action is carried out through switching. Muysken (2000) also notes that the execution of code-switching's communicative-pragmatic function involves the addressee and discourse orientation, with the speaker establishing interpersonal connections by projecting their attitude toward the interlocutor and the subject of discussion. Muysken identifies designated switching as achieving an emotional function and focusing on expressive antagonism and metaphorical switching as serving a referential function when a term or slang has no counterpart.

Recent trends in Kazakhstan show an active blending of Kazakh and Russian languages due to various socioeconomic circumstances. The declaration of Russian as the language of interethnic communication is an effect of official reforms in language policy. The usage of Russian student jargon as a technique of intercultural communication is prevalent in the context of young students.

Kazakh society can be divided into two groups based on their educational background: Those who completed their education in Kazakh and those who did so in schools where Russian was the primary language of instruction. This geographical stratification also plays a role, with the population in the north of the country, where a larger proportion of people speak Russian, experiencing more aggressive linguistic interference. In contrast, the south of Kazakhstan is more uniform and predominantly speaks Kazakh, which leads to less interference in bilingualism. Furthermore, the development of information has influenced active bilingualism, as seen through the widespread usage of bilingual literature, including manuals, pamphlets, information sheets, and reference materials. This has helped to strengthen and equate cultural foundations. Summing up the survey of factors influencing the choice of code-switching type we can conclude the following:

Table 2. The factors, influencing code-switching types

Code- switching type	Linguistic aspects	Social and extralinguistic aspects
Insertion	Domination of the syntax of the matrix language.	Stable bilingual community, socially and historically associated
Alternation	Matrix models with discourse markers, linkers.	Unconscious transference in spontaneous speech, tradition of languages mixing; high language bilingual competence.
Congruent lexicalization	Typologically different languages, but the use of grammar adjustment of morphological structures	Kazakh and Russian languages are equal for interlocutors and exploited in daily speech.

Language contacts lead to various modes of code switching. Negative language transfer issues are topical for Kazakh language community. Nevertheless, recent years have seen the Kazakh language gain greater importance, with the government's "Rukhani Zhangyru" program for spiritual renewal placing a strong emphasis on elevating the status of the Kazakh language, which in turn promotes cultural identification among members of the population.

CONCLUSION

Through a comprehensive examination of code-switching, including various switch types, this article presents the following hypotheses. First, language choice is affected by psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors, as well as the unique personalities and linguistic considerations of the communicants. The phenomenon of bilingualism in Kazakhstan is a result of historical, political, and social factors and is characterized by distinctive code-switching patterns, including grammatical interference and the use of unique morphological inclusions. This has led to the development of a distinct code-switching mechanism and unique language interactions between Kazakh and Russian.

One particular type of code-switching is the creation of new spoken words through the use of foreign language inflections, which is attributed to the active influence of the guest language. Interjections, slang expressions, quotes, precedent statements, and colloquial phrases are all actively used in oral communication as intersentential inclusions. Our analysis indicates that speakers do not encounter difficulties when utilizing intersentential switching and that switching is always intentional, serving as an emotional assessor. This is due

to the ability to intersperse without significantly modifying the grammatical structure of the sentence while preserving its logic and meaning.

Sociolinguistic variables are integral to understanding active bilingualism in Kazakhstan. Following independence from the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan adopted a moderate approach to language policy. Russian retained its status as the primary language for administrative and institutional purposes, reflecting the current language policy in the country. However, the broader Kazakhstani society holds varying views on this policy. Some radical movements seek to eliminate Russian as a medium of communication, particularly in the southern regions of the country where the Kazakh language is more uniform. Legislators from the south of Kazakhstan, who predominantly speak Kazakh, are notably distinguished by their uniform Kazakh speech. It is important to note that code-switching is used in specific situations to carry out particular speech functions. This is especially evident among young people who use code switches, such as slang terms, interjections, and jargon, to convey emotional evaluation and amusement.

According to Appel and Muysken (2005), “Language shift and language loss go hand in hand. The community loses a strong symbol of identity which will influence the social-psychological conditions and the social life considerably” (p.46). To protect the linguistic identity of Kazakh and prevent the influence of Russian that leads to morphological and structural breaches, it is crucial for the Kazakh language community to take action. The study demonstrated the detrimental impact of interference on linguistic structures, uniformity, and effective communication. The congruent lexicalization techniques used during code-switching have led to the deterioration of spoken speech, grammar simplification, and language loss.

These types of code mixing discussed in this article are not exclusive to the language interactions examined and may contribute to language erosion, along with the drawbacks of interference. Therefore, it is important to promote the use of the Kazakh language and encourage language maintenance activities, such as language classes and cultural events, to prevent language loss and ensure the preservation of linguistic diversity in Kazakhstan.

REFERENCES

- Appel, R., Muysken P. (2005) *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Amsterdam Academic Archive.
- Auer, P. (1995) The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In: Milroy, L., Muysken, P. (Eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross Disciplinary perspectives on Code –Switching*, 115-135. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York.
- Becker, K.R. (1997) Spanish/English bilingual code-switching: A syncretic model. *Bilingual Review*, 22 (1), 3-31.
- Bokamba, E. (1989) Are there Syntactic Constraints on Code-mixing? *World Englishes* 8(3), 277-292.
- Chirsheva, G.N. (2008) Code switching in Russian students’ communication. // *Yazyk, kommunikatsiya I sotsialnaya sreda*. Issue 6. doi: //https://www.academia.edu/2558105/
- De-Bot, K. (1992) A bilingual production model: Levelt’s “Speaking” model adapted. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 1 –24.
- Dijkstra, T., van Heuven, W.J.B., & Grainger, J. (1998) Simulating cross-language competition with the bilingual interactive activation model. *Psychologica Belgica*, 38, 177-196. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03201121
- Forker, D. (2021) The late success of Soviet language policy: The integration of Russian verbs in languages of the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. Vol.25(1), 240-271. http://doi:10.1177/1367006920947168.
- Gardner-Chloros P. Sociolinguistic Factors in Code-switching. DOI: https://www.academia.edu/12045892/Sociolinguistic_Factors_in_Code_switching
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009) *Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, D. (2018) *Language Control and Code-switching*. doi: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper
- Grosjean, F. (1998) *Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues*. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. 131-149. Cambridge University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1992) Another view of bilingualism. *Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals*. Edited by R.Harris, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Grosjean, F. (2008) *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1976) Conversational code switching. In: Gumperz, J.J. (Ed.), *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 59-99.
- Gumperz J.J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, M. (2009) Lexical borrowing: Concepts and Issues. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the world’s languages: A comparative handbook*, 35-54. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugen E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americas: A bibliography and research guide*. Alabama.

- Haugen E. (2001) The ecology of language. The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology and environment, 57-66.
- Heller, M. (1995) Code-Switching and the Politics of Language. In Milroy, L. & P. Muysken (eds.) One speaker, two languages. Cambridge University Press, 158 – 173.
- Hernandez A., Li.P., MacWhinney B. (2005)The emergence of competing modules in bilingualism.// Trends in Cognitive Sciences, Volume 9, Issue 5, 220-225.
- Kootstra, G.J. (2015) A psycholinguistic perspective on code-switching: Lexical, structural, and socio-interactive processes. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346879.39>
- Li Wei. (2000) Dimensions of bilingualism. In *The Bilingual Reader*, ed. by Li Wei, 2–21.London/New York: Routledge.
- Lipski, J. M. (2014) Spanish-English code switching among low-fluency bilinguals: Towards an expanded typology.// *Sociolinguistic Studies*. Equinox Publishing.Vol.8.1, 23-55. <http://doi:10.1558/sols.v8i1.23>
- Lipski, J.M. (2009) 'Fluent disfluency' as congruent lexicalization: A special case of radical code-mixing. doi: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233596772>
- Mackey, W.F. (1977) A description of bilingualism // *Reading in the sociology of language*. Ed. J.A.Fishman. Den Haag: Mouton.
- Mackey, W.F. (1976) A typology of bilingual education // Cordasco F. *Bilingual schooling in the United States: A sourcebook for educational personnel*. N.Y.
- MacSwan, J. (1999) A minimalist approach to intrasentential code-switching. New York: Garland.
- Mamskiy angime. (2022, August 03). YouTube. <https://youtu.be/a4YZ6lXqmAg>
- Muysken, P., Roeland van Hout. (1995) Insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, corpus-based approaches to bilingual speech. // *Journal of Creole and Pidgin Languages*, January, 302-306.
- Muysken, P. (2000) *Bilingual speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. "Three processes of borrowing: borrowability revisited".Radbout Reposotory.doi: <http://core.ac.uk>.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993) *Social motivations for code-switching:evidence from Africa*. Oxford.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006) *Multiple Voices: An Intro to Bilingualism*. Blackwell Publishers, Malden, MA, Lexical borrowing, 208-232 (Chapter 8).
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002) *Contact linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Poplack, Sh. (1980) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7-8): 581-618.
- Poplack, Sh. (2012) What does the Nonce Borrowing Hypothesis hypothesize? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(3), 644-648.
- Poplack, Sh. (2015) *Code Switching: Linguistic*. Elsevier.DOI:[http:// www.sociolinguistics.uottawa.ca](http://www.sociolinguistics.uottawa.ca)
- Satzhan,D. (2022,March 10). YouTube. <https://youtu.be/ypSkCHmupM4>
- Satzhan, D. (2022, December 03). YouTube. <https://youtu.be/oLhPqL8Io40>
- Satzhan, D. (2022, December 10). YouTube.<https://youtu.be/o-RBRUcU4JU>
- Stan.KZ. (2020, February 19). YouTube. <https://youtu.be/DwG4ml41sY>
- Thomason, S. G. (2001) *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Weinreich, U. (1953).*Languages in Contact*. The Hague:Mouton. .
- Wohlgemuth, J. (2009) *ATypology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zentella, A. C. (1990). Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in the study of bilingual code switching. In E. H. Bendix (Ed.), *The use of linguistics*, vol. 583, 75-92. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.