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EFL Learners’ Attitudes toward
Turkish-English Code-mixing

Abstract

The basic notion that has prompted language attitude research in sociolinguistics is that speech is an important mediator in the way people perceive one another. Recent interest in code-alternation (code-switching and code-mixing) in linguistics, which is seen as a distinctive feature of bilingual speech, has led to studies that deal with attitudinal consequences of this behavior. The research on evaluative reactions to code-switching reveal that attitudes toward distinct languages do not always correspond to the attitudes toward the mixed variety of the same languages. Based on these studies, the assumptions that serve as a basis for this study are: (1) listeners' attitudes toward a given speaker are indicative of their attitude toward the language form, (2) code-mixed speech, a type of code-alternation, is a speech style with distinctive characteristics, and (3) people's attitudes toward the code-mixed variety of two languages may be different from their attitudes toward those languages in their distinct forms.

The study investigated the attitudes of EFL learners at different proficiency levels—proficient and non-proficient—toward two types of Turkish-English code-mixing—professional and non-professional. The
hypotheses were that there is a significant difference between listeners' attitudes to Turkish-English code-mixed speech in terms of their level of proficiency in English and that the context where code-mixing appears moderates the listeners' subjective evaluation of the speaker.

The proficient users of English were expected to be more accepting of code-mixing than the users with limited proficiency. It was also expected that code-mixing in a professional context would be perceived more favorably than code-mixing in a non-professional context.

In order to test the hypotheses, an attitude test was administered to a group of undergraduate students selected on the basis of their proficiency level in English. The measure assessed, in quantitative terms, the subjects' responses to two speakers, each representing code-mixed speech occurring in different contexts. Data obtained from the measure were analyzed using analysis of variance, which examined the effect of the two factors in question on attitudes. The results showed that there was not a significant difference between the responses with regard to level of proficiency while context was found to be highly important variable that influenced the listeners' evaluative reactions toward code-mixing.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Goals of the Study

1.1.1. Background

In the field of language teaching it could not be anything but worthwhile to deal with the attitudes of learners and how the target language is seen by the society on the whole, for the general attitude affects the approach of individual learners to language learning. If the general attitude is negative toward a particular language or that culture of the language, or the cultures associated with that language, fewer people will attempt to learn the language and those that might otherwise be eager to learn or use it will feel reluctant to do so, fearing that they will be valued negatively by the society they live in.

The extreme case of negative attitudes is that in some countries foreign languages are seen as a threat to the cultural integrity of the nation. In such contexts, the learning of foreign languages are never likely to flourish even if they are supported at an official level. Moreover, such anti-foreign attitudes, if shared by the majority of the nation can leave no ground to the individual learner who wants to pursue personal enrichment and a horizon-broadening experience. Likewise, Wilkins (1974) writes:

when a comparison is made between language learning achievement in those countries where
the knowledge of one or more foreign languages is regarded very favourably and those where it is regarded with indifference or even hostility, it is clear that social and cultural constraints will have a very deep influence on individual learners. (p. 48)

In Turkey attitudes toward language learning range from negative to positive as they do in any other country. Any generalization about the general attitude of the public would necessitate surveys on a very large scale. Since no such nation-wide investigation of foreign language attitudes has ever been made in Turkey, an overview of the attitudes toward foreign language learning will rely heavily on the national language policy as expressed by the state and on the views of educators as well as on those of individuals expressed through mass media. These issues are often discussed in connection with the attitudes toward the Turkish language and hence often linked to one's political views.

Although opposing views exist on attitudes towards foreign languages and foreign language learning, it would not be erroneous to say that, on the whole, language learning is perceived positively in Turkey. This positive attitude not only manifests itself in the educational policy of the state. A common Turkish saying "bir lisan bir insan", meaning "one language, one man", is evidence of how favorably Turks have traditionally regarded foreign language
speakers (Göktürk, 1981). However, attitudes vary depending on the language or the perceiver. For certain circles that oppose Western ideologies and values for example, hostile attitudes may exist against Western languages.

Historically, in Turkey, Arabic and Persian were two languages that dominated the language instruction during the Ottoman period (Demircan, 1981). The learning of Western languages, such as English, German, and French, came to be equated with "foreign language" in the post-republic period (Demircan, 1988), and today English, especially, is being highly encouraged by the government. In the 1970's more than a million students registered in secondary and higher education were required to learn a foreign language. Consequently, Turkey has become a valuable market for the foreign language teaching industry (Demircan, 1988). Had there been a strong reaction from the public against the teaching of Western languages, the language policy of the state would have changed over the years. Therefore, the general attitude toward foreign languages is very unlikely to be negative.

Although foreign language instruction constitutes an important part of the official objectives of secondary school education, not many Turkish high school graduates are able to communicate adequately in
a foreign language because of deficiencies in foreign language teaching, such as unidentified goals, poorly trained teachers and lack of learner awareness (Göktürk, 1981). There are, however, other institutions where foreign languages are taught more efficiently. Two main types of such institutions are (1) foreign language-medium secondary schools, namely, 'kolej' and 'Anadolu Lisesi', and (2) English-medium universities.

The secondary schools (private and state) are reported to number 221 according to the figures of the National Institute of Statistics issued in 1988. The distribution suffices to show the dominance of English over the other languages, German, French and Italian. Many of these schools (193) are English-medium schools whereas there are only 28 schools that offer instruction in other foreign languages (Demircan, 1988).

In English-medium instruction secondary schools, the pupils receive a full year of intensive English. In these types of secondary schools the science subjects are studied in English during the remaining years. Most private schools are often found in Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir, staffed in part by native speaker teachers. State schools date back to the 1950's, when
there were only five in number, and later they began to be spread all over the country.

The foreign language-medium schools are considered special schools because they are not many in number and therefore are hard to enter. (In 1985 out of 7445 secondary school institutions only 144 were foreign language medium instruction schools.) There is a central examination system through which fifth graders of elementary schools can be admitted to either 'kolej' (private) or 'Anadolu Lisesi' (state). Today, to be able to enter these schools, it is essential that the candidate be provided with private courses or tutoring prior to the admission test, which is highly competitive. Only a minority of families can afford these courses. This means that only children of the wealthy families can go to the schools that provide good English instruction. It is also believed that the graduates of these schools are far more successful in entering a university, which is indeed seen as the only way to acquire a good profession and respectable status in society. The parents' concern for putting their children through special schools reflect the nation's acknowledgement of the widespread role of the English language in today's world. Yet, the efforts spent for this end are overwhelming. There is literally a competition among the parents that is referred to as
"mania" by some Turkish educators (Göktürk, 1981) and columnists of daily newspapers. The common belief is that if a person is proficient in English or speaks the language very well, he has done one or more of the following:

1. has acquired the language in the country it is spoken in (either in Britain or the States, where he went to make a living, the instances of which are rare);
2. is a graduate of a special school, 'kolej' or 'Anadolu Lisesi';
3. is a graduate of one of the English-medium universities which are considered to be top universities (Middle East Technical University/ Bosphorus University/Hacettepe University/ (partially)/Bilkent University);
4. has learnt English abroad (in one of the language schools in Britain or has had his higher education in the States or Britain);
5. (for other reasons) has lived in a country where English is spoken (e.g., father was on a diplomatic mission);
6. is a professional (teacher of English/ tourist guide/executive representative of a foreign company, etc.) who has to use English actively for professional reasons.
Most of these situations indicate that the person had better opportunities than many of his peers. In other words, in Turkey, knowledge of English is viewed as a privilege and is denotative of higher social status and privileged education.

Evidently, the status of English in Turkey is far from that of a second language or lingua franca. Turkish is the mother tongue for the majority of the population (Imer, 1990). About the status of English, Bear (1987) writes:

In Turkey, English is not an official language, a lingua franca, or a second language. It is not a remnant of colonization or the legacy of the missionaries, and though it is taught in the schools, it has never been institutionalized to function as the primary language of higher education. In fact, in those secondary schools where English is used as the medium of instruction, it has been limited to mathematics and science... (p. 24)

It is the Turkish language that is used for daily communication, in government offices and in education. Needless to say, English functions as a foreign language in such a situation and, more often than not, learners of English are instrumentally motivated. There are languages learned as a second language, for example, German and Dutch, by the Turkish guest-workers and their children in the host country but these languages cease to be used when families settle back to the country. Linguistic minorities also exist as they
do everywhere else, yet none of them are English-speaking communities.

All this suggests that we cannot speak of Turkish-English bilingual speech as an act of daily communication since bilingualism is associated with situations where two languages are in contact on a daily basis. Furthermore, a bilingual phenomena, such as code-switching, referred to as code alternation in bilinguals' use of two languages for daily communication and said to be "motivated by a change in the social situation" (Torres, 1989, p. 420), is unlikely to occur in a foreign language context. Code-mixing, which "involves the insertion of elements from L1 and L2 within the same utterance or the speech event" (Torres, 1989, p. 421), is also attributed to bilingual communities (Myers-Scotton, 1989) and is not, then, expected to be found in a foreign language setting, either. This, in fact, accounts for the lack of code-alternation studies in EFL settings. However, as Bhatia and Ritchie (1989) note, the worldwide generality of the English language and its extensive use in certain domains, such as science and technology, results in partial language switches. This being so, the idea that switches at the level of code-mixing can be found among proficient users of a foreign language as well is not groundless.
Such switches do occur, to some extent, when two proficient but non-native speakers of English converse in Turkish. For example Turkish ELT professionals are competent users of English, or in a broader sense, bilinguals, and they have a real need to use English actively on a daily basis, in the classroom, on professional occasions, at social gatherings. This results in switches into English depending on the situation, topic, and interlocutors of the speech event.

These switches may occur at three levels: borrowing, code-mixing, and code-switching, which will be defined at length in Chapter 2. Of all the three phenomena, (code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing) code-mixing at the word level is quite common. Although Turkish remains the base language, there are a considerable number of isolated lexical items of English that are inserted without violating the syntactic structure of Turkish and often maintaining their phonological integrity in English. These word or phrases are often suffixed by Turkish morphemes. Below are a few illustrative sentences which have been recorded from the immediate environment:

(1) Bu **statement** iyi mi sence? *Rewrite mi etsem yoksa?* (Is this statement a good one or should I rewrite it?)
(2) Yanlış **function** keye basmışsındır. Çıkmıyorsan, *reset* et.
(You must have touched the wrong function key by mistake. If you can't exit, reset it.)

(3) Istersen artık bu unitte bir listening passage koyalım. Hic practice vermedik.
(Why don't we put in a listening passage in his unit? We haven't given any practice in that.)

(An atrocious class. Zero participation. No wonder they are remedials.)

(5) Ben aynı fikirde değilim. Bir kere o tür alıştırmalar çok counter-productive.
(I don't agree. First of all, that type of exercises are too counter-productive.)

(6) Onun için British Council Library'ye bak.
(Check British Council Library for that one.)

(7) Page numbering yapmışım ama header koymayı unutmuşum.
(Looks like I did the page numbering but forgot to put headers.)

(8) Essay Çarşambaya mı due?
(Is the essay due on Wednesday?)

(9) Ama onların traditionları bizimkiden çok farklı.
(But their tradition is far different than ours.)

(10) Sana nasıl sound ediyor?
(How does it sound to you?)

(11) Bana tutmuş it's your problem diyor.
(Guess what he says to me: It's your problem.)

(12) Kim bana lift verebilir?
(Who can give me a lift?).

An examination of such segments against the patterns of code-alteration as outlined in Chapter 2 will imply that mixing of isolated items is present among the speech of Turkish-born Turkish-English competent users. This behavior may arise from a lexical need in L1 when the speaker does not know the equivalent for the English word as in the fifth and tenth sentences. Switches may also occur when the lexicon of the base language—Turkish in this case—lacks an equivalent as in the last sentence (lift).
Or, the item in question may be more readily available than the one in L1 as in example (3) *(unit, practice)*. In fact, the Turkish lexicon has equivalents for the words as with *participation* and *rewrite*. Here the speaker apparently switches to L2 because these items are more readily available in that particular situation and more communicative. The speaker does not feel the need to translate or simply cannot afford translation. On the other hand, it could be hypothesized that words, such as *reset* and *function key* have become a part of computer jargon. Therefore, they are likely to be used by computer users, and probably have a wider range of use than *statement*, *rewrite*, or *tradition*, although they are still English words and pronounced as English words. There are other reasons for the occurrence of switches, such as the need to use proper nouns, as in sentence (7). Sometimes the purpose is to preserve or give a metaphorical effect as in (11).

All of the code-mixed words above are also different from loan words, such as "izolasyon" and "spiker", that have been fully assimilated into the Turkish lexicon and are entries in Turkish monolingual dictionaries. Such items, referred to as "language borrowing" (Grosjean, 1982), are outside the scope of this study.

There are other illustrative contexts where
proficient users switch into English. It may be the case that the pupils of English-medium universities and secondary schools also show a similar linguistic behavior. For example, in Ankara, it was noted that college students refer to this phenomenon as "ODTÜ Türkçesi" (METU Turkish). Middle East Technical University (METU) was the first English-medium institution of higher education in Turkey and was founded in 1956, and probably, after entering the university, METU students confront a more relatively established system and readily adopt the METU tradition of mixed speech.

Some examples recorded from the speech of METU students are

(1) ODTÜ'de her dönem için bir cumulative tespit edilmiştir. Dönem cumulative'in bu limitin altında olursa warning alırsın. Bir dönem sonra dismiss olursun.
(At METU a cumulative limit is pre-defined for each semester. If your cumulative is below that, you get a warning and the next time you are dismissed.)
(2) Alttan dersim var bu dönem, irregular oldum, istediğim section'dan ders alabilirim.
(I have a course to take from the last semester. I've been irregular. That means I can take courses from any section.)
(3) Hoca attendance alıyor mu?
(Does the teacher take attendance?).

There is no doubt that the addressees of these sentences are all METU students that are familiar with this jargon. The speaker obviously resorts to the more available version of the concept in mind to be able to
communicate the meaning, i.e., the new concept was learned in English, or, he finds it hard to retrieve the Turkish word or simply does not know and did not happen to learn the equivalent. Seen in this light, this kind of code-mixing may appear quite functional for a METU student since it is an indispensable part of his daily verbal interaction.

In general, bilinguals or proficient users of a foreign language do not code-mix when they are addressing a monolingual, knowing that their speech will not be understood. However, they may do so when addressing people who share the same second code with them. Sometimes such proficient users of a foreign language find themselves in situations where they somehow indicate that they speak a foreign language well, that is to say, they code-mix in the presence of monolinguals. This they do consciously or unconsciously, at different rates, in different contexts. The overhearer may seldom be aware of the stimulus that triggers code-mixed speech, but the use of English words, phrases or sentences, even though used sparingly, invariably shows that the speaker knows the language.

In an EFL, or more specifically, in a Turkish context, code-switching or code-mixing behavior necessarily indicate that the speaker knows a foreign
language. Certain social connotations seem to be attached to this behavior. It may lead to certain social evaluations on the part of the participant or overhearer, especially if the language in question is English, i.e., that the speaker had some privileged educational opportunities and belongs to a particular social class. An emotional response may co-occur with the social judgement. For example, even though the overhearers may not have a negative attitude toward the language, they may see it as an act of snobbery and value the speaker negatively on the basis of his speech, especially if they do not identify themselves with the social group.

On the other hand, proficient L2 users may be more accepting toward code-mixed speech. If they are using their foreign language actively on a daily basis, they cannot avoid partial switches, although they may be against "mixing languages". It is also possible that they abstain from using code-mixed speech because they predict how it will be viewed by their social environment. That is to say, there may be variation among them, too. Yet, in general they are presumed to be more tolerant and accepting of code-mixing. Certainly, it is equally important to take the context into account because the attitudes may vary depending on the context of the speech event. This study has
been designed to find out whether code-mixed speech is viewed differently by Turkish proficient speakers of English and non-proficient ones and whether the attitudes change in accordance with the context in which the switches occur.

1.1.2. Goals

The underlying idea behind this study is that the speakers' social environment has a deep influence and that general attitudes can be a determining factor in shaping one's linguistic behavior. The social context that the EFL learner or user finds himself in can be an important factor in influencing to what extent he uses the language and how he uses it. By comparing the attitudes of proficient and non-proficient users of English toward code-mixed speech, this study will also provide some insights into attitudes toward code-mixed speech—which may or may not be different from attitudes to English—and, further, as to the attitudinal consequences on the part of the user.

1.2. Research Question

1.2.1. Problem Statement

Does the respondents' level of proficiency in English—proficient versus non-proficient—affect their attitudes toward fluent speakers' using Turkish-English code-mixed speech and is this relationship moderated by the type of context in which code-mixing occurs—non-
1.2.2. Operational Definitions

Proficient respondents: Proficient respondents are Turkish-born speakers of English whose native language is Turkish and who rate themselves as highly or fairly proficient in English. Though they consider English as their foreign language and do not have native-like fluency in English, they are all advanced learners and use the language at least in one domain (school) on a daily basis.

Non-proficient respondents: Non-proficient respondents are Turkish speakers who are beginning level English students and who rate themselves as having little or no knowledge of English or a foreign language.

Code-mixed speech: Code-mixed speech refers to Turkish speech containing English lexical items that are pronounced as English words.

Code-mixed speech in professional context: Code-mixed speech in professional context refers to the type of Turkish speech containing English jargon words that clearly occur in an educational or occupational domain.

Code-mixed speech in a non-professional context: Code-mixed speech in non-professional context
refers to the type of Turkish speech with English words occurring in a daily context. (For a full definition and discussion of the term code-mixing, see section 2.3).

1.2.3. Expectations

In this study, it was expected that proficient and non-proficient listeners would react differently to code-mixed speech. The proficient group was expected to respond more favorably to code-mixing on the whole than the non-proficient group. Another expectation was that code-mixed speech used in a clearly non-professional domain would be less well-accepted than the one in a professional context by both proficient and non-proficient respondents, with the non-proficient group being less accepting than the proficient group.

1.2.4. Limitations

Basically, there are three limitations to this study. First, time constraints restricted the number of subjects that participated in the study. The sample to whom the attitude test was assigned was controlled for age and educational level. This affects the generalizability of the results. Besides, the rationale of the study itself is strictly limited to a Turkish context. Any conclusions that have been drawn will apply only to the attitude of Turkish people; the social connotations attached to code-switches may be
different across speech communities. Another limitation lies with the instrument used in the data collection procedure. The audio component of the attitude test was prepared without professional assistance and with limited technical facilities. The limited number of texts and voices in this component may also have affected the validity of the measure.

1.3. Hypotheses

1.3.1. Null Hypotheses

(1) There is no significant difference between respondents' level of proficiency in English and their attitudes toward Turkish-English code-mixed speech.

(2) There is no significant difference between respondents' attitudes toward code-mixed speech in a non-professional context and toward code-mixed speech in a professional context.

1.3.2. Experimental Hypotheses

(1) There is a significant difference in respondents' attitude toward Turkish-English code-mixed speech in terms of their level of proficiency in English.

(2) There is a significant difference between respondents' attitudes toward code-mixed speech in terms of the context in which the code-mixing occurs.

1.3.3. Variables

The two independent variables of the experimental design were (1) level of proficiency in English--
proficient versus non-proficient, (2) context in which code-mixing occurs—professional versus non-professional. The dependent variable was the attitude toward code-mixed speech. Three control variables were age, level of education, and attitude toward English.

1.4. Overview of Methodology

1.4.1. Setting

The research was conducted at Hacettepe University (HU). For data collection, subjects were chosen from students at the School of Foreign Languages and three different faculties in HU, the Faculty of Letters and the Faculty of Administrative Sciences, and the Faculty of Fine Arts. The data for the attitude test was collected at the School of Foreign Languages in the same university.

1.4.2. Subjects

Two equal-size groups of respondents, thirty proficient and thirty non-proficient speakers of English, were selected on the basis of three parameters: age, educational level and attitude toward English. All of the subjects were between 18 and 23 years of age. They were second and third year students at Hacettepe University with a positive attitude toward English.

1.4.3. Instruments

A screening questionnaire was prepared for the
selection of subjects (see Appendix A). The questionnaire inquired about subjects' age, gender, level of education, level of proficiency in English, foreign language background, and their attitudes toward English.

The experimental device was an attitude test, consisting of a stimulus-tape and a subject-questionnaire. The stimulus material comprised two audio-taped segments, recorded by two different female speakers (see Appendix B for transcripts). One of the segments was on a non-professional topic while the other was on a professional topic. Each segment was in the form of a monologue, with one speaker conversing from beginning to end. The subject-questionnaire (see Appendix C) was the measurement instrument based on the Likert Scale developed in 1936. The measure consisted of sixteen adjective pairs laid on five-point scales, with each pair representing personality characteristics. The respondents were asked to rate each speaker immediately after hearing the recordings.

Subjects also responded to a post-experimental questionnaire (see Appendix D) which investigated background variables, with a number of demographic and language items. The information obtained from the questionnaire was partially used in data analysis.
1.5. Overview of Analytical Procedures

The following analytical procedures were used in order to interpret and process the data obtained: First, the main body of data was obtained by recording the scores assigned by each subject to each speaker of the attitude test on the subject-questionnaire. Then, the data obtained from the post-experimental questionnaire was coded into numerical data by using a coding scheme developed by the researcher. Finally, the two sets of data were analyzed using the ANOVA (analysis of variance) procedure to test the null hypotheses.

1.6. Organization of Thesis

This introductory chapter sets the stage for the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature on language attitudes and attitudes to code-switching together with a comprehensive section including definitions and a discussion of terms. In Chapter 3, the procedure followed in the preparation of instruments and the data collection procedures are described in detail. Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the findings, the comparison and discussion. The final chapter contains the conclusions, assessment of the study, further discussion of results, suggestions for future research, and pedagogical implications.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Purpose

The purpose of this review is to present the theoretical background to code-mixing and attitudes to code-mixing with reference to relevant research. The review is structured in three parts. The first part briefly overviews language-attitudes research from past to present and reports on findings of some research studies carried out to measure attitudes toward language choice and code-switching. The second part includes the conceptual definition of code-mixing within the framework of code-alternation theories found in the literature to illustrate where the operational definition stands. The third part involves three discussions. Since code-alternation is presumed to be an important part of the issues relating to bilingualism, a brief discussion of the definition of bilingualism and that of the connection between bilingualism and code-switching is provided. Different attitudes toward code-switching are also discussed. The salient points discussed in the chapter are outlined in the summary section.

2.2. Overview of Language-attitude Research

Language attitudes have been an area of substantial interest to the researchers that deal with the social aspect of language. These studies can be
grouped chronologically. In this review they will be discussed under two periods, pre-1970 and post-1970, because the period in which a given study belongs is also an indicator of the focus, aim, and method of that particular research.

The impetus for early research was the idea that, on the basis of speech, persons can make judgements of the speakers because language triggers evaluations and beliefs in social interaction contexts, especially if the interaction is initial, i.e., it occurs in contexts of mutual unfamiliarity (Bradac, 1990). For example, a number of studies conducted in the 1930's and 1940's in Britain and the U.S.A. attempted to correlate speech and judgement of speaker characteristics and personality attributes (Cantril & Allport, 1935; Pear, 1931; Taylor, 1934). These early studies, which were conducted by dialectologists and were partially descriptive in nature, had the other aim of showing which varieties were stigmatized and which were prestigious. The pre-1970 period aimed to discover evaluative reactions to "accents and dialects which exhibited adherence and non-adherence to valued norms" (Bradac, 1990, p. 394). Language-attitude research, roughly between 1960 and 1970 was also concerned with attitudes toward dissimilar language varieties, speech produced by both culturally different
and geographically different groups. Two of the significant studies were conducted by Lambert et al. in 1960 and Lambert, Anisfeld & Yeni-Komshian in 1965. The former examined the evaluative reactions to English and French while the latter assessed attitudes to Arabic and two dialectical variants of Hebrew.

The post-1970 period explored the consequences of variation within accent, namely, mild and broad regional accents (Brennan, Ryan & Dawson, 1975; Giles, 1972; Ryan, Carranza & Moffie, 1977). In this period, the focus shifted toward "between-group differences", which means lexical, stylistic, etc. variation within the same language, such as gender-linked language differences. This interest grew out of a deeply influential theory known as SAT, Speech Accommodation Theory, which was developed by Giles in 1973. Recently, that is to say in the 1980's, studies such as Giles and Sassoon's (1983) and Bradac and Wisegarver's (1984) began to combine accent, dialect and dissimilar language with other linguistic features such as lexical diversity. Research in this period "attended to relatively subtle effects of gradations in between-group speech and language varieties and to effects produced by one linguistic variable in conjunction with another" (Bradac, 1990, p. 392).
2.3. Research on Attitudes toward Language Choice and Code-switching

Research on code-switching developed as an extension of studies that deal with language choices during cross-cultural encounters. These studies investigated the evaluative consequences of language choice in connection with ethnolinguistic group attitudes. Since language is assumed to symbolize the speaker's ethnicity, use of a particular language in a multi-/bilingual setting may elicit certain stereotyped responses from others. For example, in the study conducted by Lambert et al. in 1960, where the true ethnolinguistic identity of the speakers was hidden, it was found that bilingual speakers were evaluated more favorably when heard using the more socially prestigious variety of their languages than when heard using the less prestigious one (Genesee and Bourhis, 1982).

Perceptions of the listener were found to depend not only on the social prestige of the language variety but also on the type of the trait that respondents were asked to judge the voices on. For example, use of less prestigious language is associated with more favorable ratings on traits related to personal integrity and social attractiveness while use of more prestigious language accords more favorable ratings on traits
related to personal integrity and social attractiveness (Genesee and Bourhis, 1982).

Genesee and Bourhis (1982) note that empirical evidence demonstrates that code-switching in both intra- and inter-group interaction can be influenced by a variety of factors such as status, sex, and age of the interactants. Other than these characteristics of interactants, there are situational determinants such as the topic, the purpose of the conversations and social setting (private vs public) that influence language variation (Hymes, 1972) and hence code-switching behavior of bilinguals. However, not all of these internal and external variables were incorporated into the experimental studies that deal with evaluative reactions to code-switching. As Genesee and Bourhis note (1982), there is not adequate systematic empirical evidence that would support the conceptualizations. The reason is that the research on code-switching proliferated only of late, and attitudes toward code-switching is quite a recent area of interest within the framework of language attitude studies.

2.4. Code-alternation

Code-alternation is the alternative use of two or more distinct languages by bilinguals. It is the umbrella term used to refer to code-switching and code-mixing and is interchangeably used with the more common
"code-switching". Code-switching has been defined as "the alternation of two languages" by Valdes Fallis (1976) and according to Di Pietro (1977), code-switching is "the use of one or more languages by communicants in the execution of a speech act" (p.145). Scotton and Ury (1977) define code-switching similarly: "the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation or interaction" (cited in Grosjean, 1982, p. 145).

Code-switching occurs when a bilingual speaking a base language shifts completely into a second language using the grammar, syntax and pronunciation of the second language. In linguistic terms, code-switching occurs at all linguistic levels--lexical, syntactical, morphological, and phonological (Grosjean, 1982). Based on these definitions, some examples of code-switching are:

(1) A Spanish-English bilingual speaking Spanish, switching to English:

Cuando yo la conoci "Oh, this ring, I paid so much" y que todo lo que compran tienen que presumir.

(When I met her she said "Oh, this ring, I paid so much", everything they buy they have to show off.) (Reyes, 1982)

(2) A Swahili-English bilingual speaking Swahili:

Baba alijenga kibanda kidogo--just a shed and started kazi yake mwenyewe ya kuuza makaa. Wengi walichukua kazi hii kuwa dirty and bad for health. Lakini huyu mzee wangu a-li-choose to risk his life to do this work.
(Father built a little shed—just a shed and started his work himself of selling charcoal. Many took this work to be dirty and bad for (the) health. But my father chose to risk his life to do this work.) (Myers-Scotton, 1989).

(3) A Chinese-English bilingual speaking Chinese:

Ta huei software. Bu huei hardware Ta iong disc. Ye you disc drive.
(He knows software. He doesn’t know hardware. He also has the disc drive.) (Cheng & Butler, 1989).

2.4.1. Types of Code-alteration

Although the recent trend in sociolinguistic research is to concentrate on the total communicative effect rather than on the formal aspect of code-alterations and thus to avoid making distinctions among kinds of code-alteration, there is, nonetheless, a large body of literature on defining code-switching and code-mixing, particularly at the descriptive level (Pakir, 1989; Tay, 1989). Code-alteration is generally viewed as occurring at three different levels: code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing.

2.4.2. Code-switching versus Code-mixing

Common to code-switching and code-mixing is that two grammatical systems of the languages interact. Although the definitions of the two concepts somewhat overlap, they are often regarded as two distinct types of code-alternation. With respect to the distinction drawn between code-switching and code-mixing, two approaches exist: functional and formal (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1989).
According to Torres (1989), the term code-mixing in the functional sense, introduced by Kachru in 1978, "refers to the transference of linguistic units from one language into another language...the linguistic units involved could be words, phrases, clauses or sentences". However, in code-switching, "a change in the social situation motivates the alternation of codes" (p. 420). In Kachru's words, code-switching denotes "the functional contexts in which a multilingual person uses two or more languages" and code-mixing is "the use of one or more languages for consistent transfer of linguistic units from one language into another, and by such a language mixture developing a new restricted—or not so restricted—code of linguistic interaction" (Kachru, 1978, p. 28).

On the other hand, the formal approach makes the distinction on the basis of language units, viewing both code-mixing and code-switching as switches that occur within the same speech event. It follows that this position does not distinguish between the two types of switching on the basis of social context. For example, Bokamba (1989) argues that code-switching and code-mixing are two different linguistic phenomena of a speech event. Whereas the former occurs across sentence boundaries, the latter occurs within the same sentence. He writes:
code-switching is the mixing of words phrases and sentences from two distinct grammatical (sub-)systems across sentence boundaries within the same speech event. In other words, code-switching is intersentential switching. Code-mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical (sub-)systems within the same sentence and speech event. That is, code-mixing is intrasentential switching. (p. 278)

The functional approach focuses on the social situation that triggers the choice of code. In this respect, code-switching requires the shift from one language to another according to the social context whereas code-mixing may occur within the same speech event where switches may vary from words to sentences. The formal position assumes that it is the sentential relation that determines whether a switch is code-mixing or code-switching.

While the functional approach may be more pertinent to the bilingual context where two languages need to be used, the formal approach appears to be more relevant to a non-bilingual context such as the one for this study. Bilinguals who actively use two codes in different speech communities or who have to use a superimposed code other than their native one, may feel the need to switch according to the social context, but no such external effect exists when one of the codes is a "foreign" language. For this reason, for the present study, it is not necessary to distinguish between code-
mixing and code-switching on the basis of social context. Nonetheless, a formal approach is to some extent relevant because, as argued in Chapter 1, the mixing occurs with words within sentences.

2.4.3. Code-mixing and Code-switching versus Borrowing

A more crucial distinction to this study is the one between code-switching/code-mixing and borrowing. While borrowing is generally said to fill in gaps in the language, code-mixing does not fill gaps in the host language as it is not restricted to a limited set of utterances in the sense that the code-mixer has the entire second language system at his disposal. Another point is that phonological and morphological assimilation of the code-mixed elements are not necessary whereas borrowings, or loan-words, are fully assimilated into the host language. Borrowing can occur in the speech of both mono- and bilinguals, but code-mixing characteristically occurs in the speech of bilinguals (Tay, 1989).

The definition of code-mixing as a distinct feature from borrowing for this study assumes the characterization of borrowings put forth by Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) as outlined by Bhatia and Ritchie (1989):

(1) They fill lexical gaps in the host language,
(2) they are restricted to single words,
(3) they are restricted to a more or less limited set accepted by the community of the host language (whereas the entire lexicon of the guest language is available for mixing/switching, 
(4) they are assimilated into the host language by regular phonological and morphological processes, and 
(5) they are known in general by monolingual speakers of the host language. (p. 262)

Therefore, the definition of code-mixed speech in this study excludes loan-words which have been fully assimilated in the host language (Turkish) and which are recognized as Turkish words by the monolingual speakers of the language.

2.5. Bilingual and Bilingualism: Definitions

As indicated earlier, whether speakers with a high mastery of a foreign language can be referred as bilinguals is obviously an issue closely connected with the present study because code-switching behavior is attributed to bilinguals' verbal interaction in a second language setting. This particular approach to code-switching is, in effect, linked to the definition of bilingualism. The term is still open to question since there is not a consensus among researchers and scholars interested in bilingualism as to the definition. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), various existing definitions can be categorized as depending on the criteria used: competence, function, and attitude. He notes that at one extreme Bloomfield, Brown, Haugen, Oetreicher and Halliday took competence
as the primary criterion, focusing on the native-likeness of bilingual ability in each language. These "rigorous" and narrow definitions gave way to broader, flexible ones such as Haugen's definition in 1953, which held bilingualism to start "at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language". Halls, Pohl, Diebold and McNamara extended the definition to mean "having at least one language skill even to a minimal degree" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981, p. 82). At the other end was Gumperz's definition (1969) that included the command of different varieties of the same language.

The functional view of bilingualism developed as a consequence of the attempts to redefine competence and contrast it to performance. Since the emphasis was on communicative performance, bilingual behavior would be the demonstration of this performance in "real situations" and "for authentic purposes" (Mackey, 1970). Thus, this point of view ultimately excluded the foreign language context. Definitions based on attitudes focus on: (1) "the speaker's own view of what is her native context", (2) "other people's assessment of the speaker" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981, p. 88).

In other words, a person is bilingual to the extent that he feels he uses both languages and fulfills the
demands of both cultures. When deciding whether a person is bilingual or not it is equally important to see whether he is "accepted as a native speaker by both communities" (Malmberg, 1977, cited in Skutnabb-Kangas, p. 135).

That definitions are many and varied suggests that, as Grosjean (1982) states, "describing a person's bilingualism is thus a difficult enterprise" and it cannot be explained solely with level of fluency since "the bilingual's language history and domains of language use are just as important as the fluency factor" (pp. 239-40).

In addition to diverse definitions of bilingualism, there exist hypothetical typologies for kinds of bilingualism such as natural, school, cultural, elite, folk, adult, child, true, coordinate, compound and subordinate bilingualism. These distinctions also concentrate on how, at what age, and in which domain the bilingual acquired and uses his second language. Natural bilingual refers to "an individual who has learnt two languages without formal teaching in the course of her everyday life as her natural means of communication" and has often learned them relatively young, because either the family or the community speaks different languages (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981, p. 95). School bilingual, on the other hand,
refers to foreign language learners who have learned the language at school through formal instruction and have had very little opportunity to use it in a natural environment with native speakers. Cultural bilingualism, which is quite similar to school bilingualism in terms of the context in which it is acquired, implies prestige. It is the term often used to refer to "adults who have learnt a language of culture" which is often associated with "major Western languages" for professional or other reasons. (Skutnabb-Kangas, p. 96). A parallel distinction is drawn between elite bilingualism and folk bilingualism. "Elite bilinguals are usually highly educated and some part of their education has been in foreign languages with some opportunities to use the language naturally" (Skutnabb-Kangas, p. 97). Folk bilinguals usually come from minority backgrounds and learn a language different from their mother tongue, that is they are forced to learn and use the dominant language of the community they live in. Adult bilingualism and child bilingualism, as the terms indicate, refer to the age that the second language was acquired. The terms compound, coordinate, and subordinate are associated with the psycholinguistic aspect of bilingualism that deals with how the bilingual mind operates and is
related to the linguistic domain in which the languages are acquired and/or used.

2.6. Bilingualism and Code-switching

An important dimension to code-alternation is that it is manifested in the speech of bilinguals. In contrast to monolinguals, who have one code (language) at their disposal, bilinguals have the command of two separate linguistic systems which they can use alternately. Phofl (1986) cites Grosjean's model of the modes of the bilingual. According to this, bilinguals have two different modes: the monolingual mode and the bilingual mode. In the former, they "adopt the language of the interlocutor and deactivate" the other language, though rarely completely, whereas in the latter they "use various elements of one language while speaking the other, base, language" (p. 17). In other words, when the addressees are monolingual, the bilingual uses the monolingual mode; that is, he chooses one of the codes in his linguistic repertoire. However, when the addressees are bilingual, he uses the bilingual mode where he does not necessarily restrict his choice to only one code. In the latter mode, he may alternate codes; that is, he code-switches or code-mixes. This idiosyncratic capacity of bilinguals stems from their ability to alternate codes. Language scholars agree, as Grosjean (1982) and Cheng and Butler
(1989) put in identical words, that "code-switching is a very important aspect of bilingualism" (p. 145 and p. 294, respectively). The reason put forth is that code-switching serves a particular function; it is a useful communication resource that is resorted to by the bilingual. On code-switching Poplack (1985) writes: "code-switching is an integral part of the community repertoire that functions as a mode of interaction similar to monolingual use" (p. 30).

Code-switching does not occur randomly. Linguistic and situational constraints determine the why, with whom, when and the how of this behavior (Tay, 1989). Linguistic constraints refer to the formal characteristics of the two languages that interact when the speaker is code-switching. Alongside these factors that determine how code-switching occurs, there are a number of extralinguistic constraints that explain why, with whom, and when bilinguals code-switch. Code-switching is characterized by such factors as the setting, context, topic, domain, and speaker roles (Valdes Fallis, 1976). In this respect, two types of code-switching are metaphorical switching and situational switching (Gumperz, 1982). The former occurs when a change of the topic requires a change in the language. In this case, even though the topic can be discussed in either languages, the choice of code
depends on the bilingual. On the other hand, the latter implies a change of codes according to the situations that the conversants find themselves in (Wardhaugh, 1986).

Language dominance of the bilingual is another important factor that affects the extent of code-switching. As Chaika (1982) points out, it has been acknowledged that there are different degrees of bilingualism and there are very few individuals that are equally proficient in both or all of their languages with the ability to use them interchangeably in all domains. Because people develop languages according to the extent they need them, they rarely achieve equal fluency in both languages (Phofl, 1989). Bilinguals may be highly proficient in one of the languages in a particular domain but may not perform just as efficiently as they do in the same domain in the other language. When the situation and context requires the use or the bilingual's preference of one language over the other, he chooses one or code-switches according to the need.

Another motivation for code-switching is concerned with the distinction drawn between conscious and unconscious switching, which is also related to the why of the issue. Unconscious switching refers to the situations where bilingual speakers shift to the other
language when addressing another bilingual. Bilinguals are often unaware that they code-switch. Because "their main concern is with communicating a message or intent" (Grosjean, 1982, p. 149), they may not be able to report which code they have used for which topic (Wardhaugh, 1986). Conscious code-switching implies a deliberate switch. This type of switching is often related to the situational and contextual constraints. It is also probable that bilinguals sometimes "wish to indicate the fact that they 'know' a second language well" especially if it is a language of "prestige" (Naval, 1989, p. 348). Such behavior is attributable to elite or cultural bilingualism.

2.7. Attitudes toward Code-switching/Code-mixing

Attitudes toward code-switching can be examined from two perspectives: (1) from the standpoint of the monolingual and (2) from that of the bilingual. These attitudes are reflected in the attitudes of the community toward bilingualism. A major factor determining attitudes to all manifestations of bilingualism is the setting, that is, whether the bilingual lives in a bilingual/multilingual, diglossic, or multidialectical community. In countries where speaking two or more languages is the norm, attitudes toward code-switching are hardly negative, for it is presumably a part of communities' verbal
interaction. However, in countries where one language is dominant, the general attitude tends to be negative and code-switching is a highly controversial issue. On the whole, monolinguals tend to be critical of code-switching as they disfavor bilingualism. For example, in the U.S and Canada, code-switching is seen as a language deficiency or interference by many people, especially language purists who have very strong negative attitudes toward code-switching, believing that it spoils the purity of languages. Individuals that code-switch are referred to with derogatory terms, such as semilingual or nonlingual, and are believed to have no perfect mastery of one language. Wardhaugh (1986) writes: "Monolinguals are likely to be very critical of code-mixing. They may even use derogatory terms to describe the perceived results, e.g., Franglais, Spanglish, or Tex-mex " (p. 104). This group includes many educators, teachers, and linguists who are usually monolinguals. Despite the opposing views on the these issues, linguists on the whole tend to speak favorably of code-switching as they see it as a natural outcome of being a bilingual (King, 1983) and as a communicative device that enables the speaker to express meaning more precisely.
2.8. Summary

Code-mixing and code-switching, the alternative use of the two or more languages in the linguistic repertoire of the bilingual, is a primary area of interest of descriptive linguistics. Empirical research into the attitudes toward code-alternation has a very short history and is lacking in experimental evidence. Studies that dealt with the evaluative reactions to language choice and code-switching has signalled that a multitude of internal and external factors co-affect people's attitudes toward individuals that code-switch. Code-alternation, often referred to as code-switching, has three levels: code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing. The distinctions between these types of code-alternation are not clear-cut since definitions vary. Two major approaches which distinguish between the code-switching and code-mixing are based on functional and linguistic criteria. According to the linguistic position, code-mixing differs from code-switching in that it is restricted to sentential boundaries. Code-switched speech is fundamentally perceived to be a bilingual phenomenon and is rule-governed; that is, it is not an arbitrary mixing or switching of languages, but is determined by linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Attitudes toward code-switching often reflect the attitudes
toward bilingualism. Whether the attitudes toward bilinguals are favorable or unfavorable depends on the context and kinds of bilingualism. Contrary to the common view held in monolingual societies, code-switching is a very important aspect of bilingualism and is a unique mode of interaction that is perfectly functional in conveying meaning.
3.1. Introduction

The purpose of the present study is to explore the relationship between the level of proficiency in English and attitudes toward Turkish-English code-mixed speech. The hypothesis is that the proficiency level of the listener is a factor that influences his attitude toward the speakers using English words within a Turkish conversation. Whether the context of the code-mixed speech, that is, the domain in which the code-mixing occurs, has a role in the evaluative reactions of the respondents was also a focus of this study.

As indicated in the initial chapter, all of the known code-alternation studies have been conducted in multi- and bilingual settings. Also, the studies that center on attitudes to code-switching or code-mixing have considerations specific to the speech and speakers of bilingual or multilingual communities. In such second language settings, attitudes are dependent on many variables that do not exist in a foreign language situation. For this reason, the theoretical foundations of previous studies dealing with attitudes to code-switching may not apply to an EFL context. This major difference with respect to context eliminates the possibility of replicating a similar
study done in a second language setting. However, research methods associated with attitude assessment have implications for the methodology of the present study. In the following section, different methodological approaches in the attitude assessment tradition will be presented. The rationale for the methodology of the present study will be mentioned prior to the presentation of the procedure.

3.2. Assessment of Language Attitudes

The theories developed for the assessment of attitudes are linked to how attitude is viewed as a construct. The methodology of attitude research in general, and hence in language-oriented research of attitudes in particular, reflects this theoretical basis. For this reason, it is worthwhile to overview two major conceptualizations of attitude and their implications for the assessment.

As Ditmar (1976) points out, measurement of attitudes are based on two different theoretical standpoints: the behavioristic and mentalistic position. The behavioristic position regards attitudes as a dependent variable that "can be determined statistically by observing actual behavior in social situations" (p. 181). The extreme behaviorists "locate attitudes in actual overt behavior or responses", "defining attitudes in terms of observable behavior"
(Giles, Hewstone & Ball, 1983, p. 82) whereas mentalists assume that attitudes "cannot be observed directly, but must be inferred from the subject's introspection" and that they "serve to explain other forms of behavior by the same organism" (Fishman & Agheyisi, 1970, p. 138). Despite the disagreement on the conceptual definitions of attitude, the researchers seem to be unified in terms of how they carry out their studies. That is to say, their operational definitions are quite similar. In fact, the language attitude research builds upon the behavioristic position as it regards attitude as an observable concept. Giles, Hewstone and Ball (1983) point out that many researchers interested in attitudinal studies have overlooked or overcome the conceptual problems associated with operationalization and thus proceeded apace by means of a variety of perspectives and methods.

Since each discipline that deals with attitudes has distinct research features (sociology, political science, psychology), they adhere to different approaches with little overlap. The methodological approach of attitude studies has been typified by five different approaches: description, measurement, polls, theories and experiments (Oskamp, 1977). While one discipline subscribes to a descriptive approach and is
less concerned with quantification, another may concentrate on experiments that produce attitude change. The main interest of social psychology, for example, lies in "measurement" techniques.

Because language attitude research mainly uses measurement techniques, it falls within the social psychology focus in terms of method. Indirect assessment of attitudes is a significant feature of social psychology methodology that came to be widely used in language attitude research.

According to the framework put forward by Ryan, Giles and Sebastian (1982), there are three distinct approaches within the language attitude research methodology: "social presentation" of language varieties, "direct" assessment and "indirect" assessment. The first approach concerns the representation of socio-political and socio-historical factors, with its primary source of information being public views about language varieties. The techniques used in this approach is quite distinct from social psychological studies of language attitudes. The second method of measurement, direct assessment, involves questionnaires bearing explicitly on language evaluation, language preference, desirability and reasons for learning a particular language, evaluation of social groups who use a particular variety, etc.
The third type, the indirect assessment, is the method that represents the social psychological perspective on language attitudes. It is based on elicitation of listeners' subjective reactions to different speech styles, accents, dialects and languages on an audio-tape. The most widely used instrument, the matched-guise technique, developed by Lambert et al. in 1960 is considered to be valuable as a measure of group biases in evaluative reactions and reveals the unconsciously held attitudes (Giles, Hewstone & Ball, 1983). This instrument assessed listeners' subjective reactions using taped voices of the same bilingual/bidialectical speaker reading passages in two or more guises. Subjects rate each speaker on a number of parameters—on a series of rating scales—without realizing that they are in fact evaluating the same person (Chaika, 1989). Thus, "since the only factor that is varied is the language or dialect used, the responses provide group evaluations of speakers of those languages and dialects..." (Wardhaugh, 1986, p. 109).

Some studies on attitudes toward code-switching also made use of the indirect method. For instance, Genesee and Bourhis (1982), in their series of studies, carried out to explore observers' reactions to code-switching assessed attitudes indirectly by using audio-taped material of simulated dialogues. The subjects
indicated their impressions of the speakers on rating scales. Similarly, Ramirez and Milk (1986) used audio-taped material with the matched-guise technique for observing teachers' reactions to varieties of English and Spanish which included English-Spanish code-switching.

Since the present study assumes that attitude is observable and can be measured in quantifiable terms, the method followed is that of "measurement". As can be seen from the instrumentation, the technique used is based on the "indirect" assessment method. The main instrument, that is the subject-questionnaire developed for this study, aimed to elicit the subjective evaluations of the respondents as favorable, unfavorable or neutral.

3.3. Subjects

Sixty subjects who volunteered to partake in this study were selected from the student population studying at various departments at Hacettepe University (HU), in the Faculty of Letters, Administrative Sciences, Fine Arts, and the School of Foreign Languages (SFL). The distribution of subjects according to their major field of study is presented in Table 3.1 below:
The sample group consisted of Turkish students who all had a Turkish L1 background. While selecting the subjects, three variables other than proficiency level in English were taken into consideration: age, educational level, and attitude toward English. These variables were controlled through the screening process where subjects took a screening questionnaire (see Appendix A). Age and grade were controlled by selecting the subjects from two class levels: second and third years. The age range of the subjects were 18 to 23. Their attitude toward English was also investigated in the selection procedure since an overtly stated negative attitude to English was presumed to have a direct effect on subjects' reactions.
to Turkish-English code-mixing. Subjects who expressed an explicit disfavor for English were eliminated.

Part of these subjects were chosen prior to the attitude test by means of a screening questionnaire (see Appendix A) which controlled for these variables (age, educational level, attitude toward English). However, since the convenience sampling technique had to be used in part for data collection—not all of the available population readily volunteered to participate—some subjects took the screening questionnaire subsequent to the attitude test. Those who did not meet the pre-defined criteria were eliminated from the analysis.

A total of ninety-three subjects took the attitude test. Eleven of them were eliminated because they did not satisfy the criteria explained above. Twenty-two of them were excluded due to the unfavorable conditions in which the test was administered.

The proficiency level of the participants—the independent variable in this study—was determined on the basis of their major study at HU. Half of the subjects, (subjects studying Linguistics, English Language and Literature, American Culture and Literature, and Translation and Interpretation) were considered as being proficient speakers of English while the other half who are currently taking a basic
English course at the SFL were considered to be non-proficient respondents.

The proficient group respondents receive all of their departmental courses in English, except for the Translation and Interpretation students, who partially have to use Turkish, as the name suggests, whereas the non-proficient respondents take all of their courses in Turkish. All of the subjects in the former group self-reported having a "fairly good" or "good" command of English while the latter rated themselves as having "little" or "very little" knowledge of English (see Appendix A).

3.4. Materials

3.4.1. Attitude Test

In addition to the screening questionnaire that inquired about the subjects’ major field of study, age, grade, attitude toward English and knowledge of another foreign language, two types of materials were used for conducting this study. The first one was the attitude test composed of two instruments; the stimulus-tape and the subject-questionnaire. The stimulus material, which was two spoken segments on an audio-tape, were based on actual conversations of recorded speech data. The stimulus-tape was developed using the following procedure: first, a number of casual conversations that took place in different domains (home and school) were
recorded from the immediate environment of the researcher (After each recording, the conversants were debriefed). Second, part of these 120 minute recorded conversations were transcribed and edited, and finally, eleven texts were formed. These texts were all in the form of monologues. Yet it was apparent, from the contextual clues within the monologue, that the fragment was actually a turn of a dialogue where the speaker is addressing another person nearby. The texts were piloted among a group of 25 subjects in order to identify which were perceived to be on a non-professional topic and which on a professional topic. For this, three questions were asked on each text: (1) What is the topic?, (2) Who are the participants? (indicate profession) (a) speaker (b) addressee, and (3) What is the speaker's relation to the addressee? These first pilot-group subjects were also asked to order the texts from most professional to most non-professional so as to determine which two of the eleven texts fell at each end. These two texts were then recorded on a separate audio-tape by two different female speakers (see Appendix B).

The texts were balanced for length and rate of mixing. Text 1 was on a non-professional topic where the informant is engaged in an informal conversation with her friend, relating an event that took place in
the kitchen while cooking with two of her friends. Though it is not evident in the text that the physical setting is not Turkey, it can be inferred that one of the participants was American and for that reason, the actual conversation was in English and that at some points the narrator is simply "not translating" part of her friend's turn. The other text, Text 2, was on a professional topic, specifically, on statistics and the informant was an economics major from Middle-East Technical University. He was explaining the logic of the t-test to his friend who was, as can be inferred, less knowledgeable on that particular subject.

The other half of the experimental material was the response-component of the attitude test. This was a subject-questionnaire, which was essentially a "visual attitude scale" with 32 adjectives arranged in pairs of opposites, such as well-educated/poorly-educated, sensitive/insensitive, considerate/inconsiderate, etc. (see Appendix C). (It should be noted that some meaning is lost after the translation of the questionnaire. When two versions of the questionnaire are compared, it can be seen that the English version does not always truthfully reflect the original version. For example, bilinçli was translated as sensitive, for it was estimated to be the nearest in meaning).
The respondents were asked to rate each of the two taped segments on the personality characteristics of the speaker. At each pole of the scale a positive or a negative adjective was placed. All the positive adjectives represented socially desirable attributes and all the negative adjectives represented undesirable attributes. For each speaker 16 scales were provided, with 5 denoting the most positive and 1 denoting the most negative choice. Subjects marked their ratings by circling the appropriate number on each scale. Despite its different graphic format, this measure was based on the Likert scale as used in previous language-attitude research.

3.4.2. Post-experimental Questionnaire

The other instrument used in this study was a post-experimental (background) questionnaire, which provided self-reported data from each of the respondents. The purpose was to elicit demographic and language-oriented characteristics of the sample, such as regional background, parents' educational level, level of income, and L2 background. (See Appendix D.)

3.5. Procedures

The data collection procedures included the following stages: (1) pilot study, (2) selection of subjects, and (3) implementation.
3.5.1. Pilot Study

The three instruments prepared for this study were piloted before they were actually implemented. For the preparation of the audio-tape, originally four voices were used. Three of the cooperating speakers simulated one text, one of them simulated both. This material with four voices was informally tested with several listeners from the researcher’s home and college environment. The aim of this piloting was to determine whether accents show noticeable variation (i.e., do any of them sound non-standard) and to decide which two of the voices were close in tonal quality. Whether the texts were rendered in a plausible tone was also questioned as it was felt that the conversational effect had to be preserved in the recordings. Two voices were selected according to the feedback and finally copied on a separate audio-tape to be used as the stimulus material in data collection.

A period of piloting was also devoted to developing the subject-questionnaire. The initial list for the adjective-pairs were formed using the model from similar studies in the literature. Since most of the studies with similar focus were conducted either in the U.S. or Canada, the literature was available primarily in English. It was found that the socially desirable attributes in these studies are not
necessarily socially desirable attributes in a Turkish context. For instance, although *well-educatedness* is perceived to be a positive attribute in both Turkish and Western cultures, characteristics, such as *professionalism* and *extroversion* are not necessarily highly favored qualities in the Turkish culture. Also, the translation of appropriate adjectives from English to Turkish proved difficult. This was probably due to the fact that connotations attached to a given word in one language do not correspond to the connotations of its equivalent in another language, which also stems from cultural variation.

To overcome this problem, *Kavramlar Dizini* (The Index of Concepts) issued by the TDK (Turkish Language Institution) in 1985, which provides lists of synonymous attributes in Turkish, was used in forming the preliminary list of adjective pairs. After the list was formed, they were tested for verbal appropriacy and expressiveness in two steps: first, a second pilot-group was chosen and asked whether they thought the given pairs of adjectives were antonyms. The responses showed that some of the adjective pairs were not perceived to be the exact opposite of one another. Some of the problematic pairs were eliminated, leaving 29 pairs for the pilot instrument. Next, for the piloting, a third pilot-
group, 20 prep students from the Department of Basic English of the School of Foreign Languages, were asked to participate. The subjects listened to the audiotape and rated the two speakers on the 29 items. Twelve of these adjective pairs were very close in meaning, and some referred to the same attribute but the negatives were worded differently, e.g., good-looking/not good-looking and good-looking/ugly, so as to see if subjects contradicted themselves in their ratings of the seemingly identical pairs. The answers were tallied for comparison. The results showed that there was no apparent preference of one over the other. All the other answers were also tallied and eventually the number of the adjective-pairs was reduced to 16 for the actual measure. The same respondents were interviewed on their overall perception of the scale; specific questions as to the clarity of instructions and the wording of the items were asked. Since the limited number of pilot-subjects made an item analysis impossible, the validity of the measure could not be tested by formal means.

3.5.2. Selection of Subjects

At the outset, subjects from a parent population at various faculties and departments at Hacettepe University were asked to participate in this study. This was done by having students respond to the
screening questionnaire which was distributed by their classroom teachers. Because of this procedure, the exact size of the initial pool is unknown. Seventy-nine students returned the questionnaire, and from this secondary pool, those who satisfied the criteria were identified and asked to volunteer for the study. The upcoming procedure was briefly described to the volunteers and a date and time were set for the attitude test. The period between the selection of the subjects and the scheduled time varied from one day to one week.

However, this procedure did not provide enough subjects. The majority had to be selected by convenience sampling, which did not allow a pre-inquiry of the required characteristics in the sample. With the cooperation of the teachers, other volunteering students were chosen by more practical means. Some of them set a date and time themselves, some took the attitude test immediately after they were asked to, together with the screening measure and post-experimental questionnaire. They were excluded or included according to the criteria specified earlier (see section 3).

3.5.3. Implementation

The data were collected over a period of two weeks in the School of Foreign Languages, Department of Basic
English at Hacettepe University. The subjects took the attitude test either individually or in groups of three to seven. Since the rooms where the test was given were small in size, special attention was given to the seating arrangement in order to prevent subjects from influencing each other. After oral instructions were given by the researcher, the subjects were provided with the response sheets which had the same instructions in written form. On the front page, where the instructions were written, an example was also provided (see Appendix C). Subjects were told to listen carefully as each dialogue-turn lasted only about 30 seconds and it was explained that they would be allotted some time after hearing each speaker to indicate their choices. At the end of the procedure, the post-experimental questionnaire based on subjects’ self-report of social and linguistic background, was also administered.

3.6. Variables

The dependent variable of the study was attitude toward code-mixing while the two independent variables were level of proficiency of the respondent, proficient vs non-proficient, and the context of the switching, non-professional vs professional. The control variables were respondents’ age, educational level, and attitude toward English.
3.7. Analytical Procedures

In the attitude test, each subject's rating for each trait was in the form of a numerical index for each speaker; numbers were assigned from 1 to 5, 1 denoting the most negative, 5 the most positive. To analyze the data, these two sets of scores, each representing subjects' responses for two different speakers, were recorded. The subjects' proficiency level in English was also codified together with background variables selected from the post-experimental questionnaire. The obtained values were processed using the "Statistical Package for Social Sciences" (SPSS). An ANOVA (analysis of variance) was run on the SPSS to test the null hypotheses and for additional analyses.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

4.1. Overview of the Study

This study investigated differential attitudes toward Turkish-English code-mixing. The attitudes of two separate groups were compared to find out whether respondents proficient in English react to code-mixing differently from the non-proficient ones and whether the context of the switching has an effect on the perception of the respondents. To collect data, the attitudes of proficient and non-proficient EFL learners were measured.

For measurement of attitudes, an attitude test was given to sixty students at Hacettepe University who were screened for knowledge of a foreign language, level of proficiency in English, age, grade, and attitude toward English. The number of subjects—proficient and non-proficient—were equal, thirty subjects for each group. Both groups were presented the attitude test, which they took either individually or in groups. This measurement instrument, which consisted of a stimulus-tape and a subject-questionnaire, asked the respondents to assess each of the speaker's personality in terms of sixteen characteristics.
4.2. Overview of the Analytical Procedures

The main body of data consists of attribute ratings elicited in order to determine evaluative reactions to the two speakers. A secondary set of data was collected through a questionnaire on subjects' background information and used in additional analyses.

The statistical analysis was made at two stages. The first stage concerned the investigation of the research question in statistical terms. At this stage, the main body of data, that is, scores of each respondent on two different speeches were computed and analyzed using the "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS). The statistics, the two-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) run on the SPSS, allowed the investigation of the effect of two variables, level of proficiency and the context of the code-mixed speech, on the dependent variable, attitude. It further provided the co-effect of the independent variables on attitude. This analysis was made at two levels: global and specific. While the global analysis treated the sum of the scores, the specific analysis dealt with each of the items in the attitude test.

The second stage concerned the additional analyses. At this stage, the secondary set of data, which was obtained from the post-experimental questionnaire, was used jointly with the main body of
In other words, the same procedure was followed, this time with different independent variables that the questionnaire provided. The effect of two language background variables was tested by carrying out additional ANOVA analyses in order to see whether they had an effect on the dependent variable.

The next section of this chapter presents the ANOVA results and the testing of the hypotheses. The means that the ANOVA analysis gave are discussed under another section, primarily in descriptive terms. Both sections contain global and specific levels of analysis, and treats the independent variables and the relationship of the two in turn. The last section that precedes the conclusions describes some background variables and the additional analyses.

4.3. Results of the Attitude Test

4.3.1. Results of the Global Analysis

The data were analyzed using a two-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) in order to test the null hypothesis that is there is no difference between the attitudes toward code-mixing in terms of respondents' level of proficiency and that context has no effect on the attitude of respondents. Analysis of variance examined the extent of the influence of the two independent variables--level of proficiency and context--on attitudes toward code-mixed speech, which
are called "main effects". It also examined the joint
effect of the independent variables, which is referred
to as "interaction".

Since the overall F value in the analysis was
27.110 (p < .01) as shown in Table 4.1, the main
effects were examined. The effect due to the "context"
was found to be significant (Fct.m= 53.817), but the
effect due to level of proficiency was non-
significant (Fct>«= .197). The effect due to
interaction of these main effects was significant
because the F value for LP (level of proficiency) X
context is 11.196 (p < .01). These values indicate the
subjects' responses differed significantly according to
the type of code-mixing. However, the proficient and
non-proficient groups did not differ significantly in
their ratings of the speakers.

Table 4.1
Results of Two-Way ANOVA (Global)
(n= 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Fobs</th>
<th>Signif of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>6070.525</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30235.26</td>
<td>27.110*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of prof.</td>
<td>22.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.007</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>6025.456</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6025.465</td>
<td>53.817*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP x context</td>
<td>1253.581</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1253.581</td>
<td>11.196*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual(error)</td>
<td>12427.86</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19751.965</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fcrit= 4.98 (df= 2) *p < .01
Fcrit= 7.08 (df= 1)
Note: MS= Mean of squares, SS= Sum of squares, df= degree of freedom.
According to these results, the first null hypothesis of no significant differences between group reactions must be accepted (see section 1.3). That is to say, it cannot be claimed that the respondents’ level of proficiency in English had an effect on how code-mixed speech was perceived.

On the other hand, the main effect for the context variable was significant since the F value was 53.817 ($p < .01$). This indicates that the evaluation pattern of raters differed in terms of the second variable, that is context. In other words, it is the second independent variable or the moderator variable in this study that was more influential with respect to attitudes to code-mixed speech. These findings mean that the second null hypothesis, that is, context does not have a significant effect on the attitudes toward code-mixed speech, should be rejected.

4.3.2. Results of the Specific Analysis

In addition to the analysis of variance of global ratings, an analysis for individual items in the test was made for both of the variables; level of proficiency—proficient and non-proficient—and context—professional and non-professional—according to the sixteen personality characteristics. The results have been presented in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. below:
Table 4.2
Results of Analysis of Variance for Individual Items
by Level of Proficiency
(n = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F&lt;sub&gt;obs&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>2.169</td>
<td>2.169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F<sub>crit</sub> = 7.08

Note: MS = Mean of squares, SS = Sum of squares, df = degree of freedom.

When the F values are examined, it is clearly seen that variance does not exist in any of the items because all of the F<sub>obs</sub> for individual items fall out of the range of F<sub>crit</sub> (= 7.08) and all the F<sub>obs</sub> for the characteristics above are lower values than F<sub>crit</sub>. This means that the proficient group evaluated the speakers not significantly differently from the non-proficient group on any of these personality characteristics and vice versa.
Table 4.3
Results of Analysis of Variance for Individual Items by Context
(n= 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{obs}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>37.727</td>
<td>37.727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.612*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>48.571</td>
<td>48.571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.671*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>27.591</td>
<td>27.591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.995*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>26.616</td>
<td>26.616</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.170*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>20.803</td>
<td>20.803</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.093*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>7.008</td>
<td>7.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td>24.300</td>
<td>24.300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.881*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td>21.675</td>
<td>21.675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>47.768</td>
<td>47.768</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.242*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>41.843</td>
<td>41.843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.353*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>46.162</td>
<td>46.162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.551*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>54.675</td>
<td>54.675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.491*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>44.408</td>
<td>44.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.052*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
$F_{crit}$ = 7.08

Note: MS= Mean of squares, SS= Sum of squares, df= degree of freedom.

In terms of the context variable, the values found indicate that respondent perceptions are significantly (p < .01) different in thirteen of the sixteen items when the context of switching is considered. The observed values of $F$ clearly suggest that the effect of the two different monologues, which have been analyzed independent of the LP variable, show variance at the level of p < .01. except for three characteristics: sensitivity, likableness, attractiveness. In other words, there was a significant difference in the listeners' ratings of the two different speakers.
The interaction between level of proficiency and context has also been investigated for each of the dimensions. The significant variables related to the listeners' ratings of the two speeches according to dimensions are presented in Table 4.4:

Table 4.4
Variables That Interact (by Item)
(n= 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>LP x context</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>6.716*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td>LP x context</td>
<td>16.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.133</td>
<td>12.515**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>LP x context</td>
<td>15.475</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.475</td>
<td>11.287**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>LP x context</td>
<td>6.171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.171</td>
<td>4.698*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard wor.</td>
<td>LP x context</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td>5.266*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 (Fcrit= 7.08) ** p < .01 (Fcrit= 4.00)

Note: MS= Mean of squares, SS= Sum of squares, df= degree of freedom, LP= Level of Proficiency.

The overall interaction between level of proficiency and context as presented in 4.2.1 was found to be significant. The table above presents the five dimensions, for which an interaction effect was found at two different significance levels (p < .01 and .05). The results suggest that the overall interaction is attributable to the interaction on these particular dimensions.

4.4. Descriptive Comparison of Mean Ratings

This section presents a comparison of mean scores in descriptive terms. All the figures in the tables are based on the means that the ANOVA gave, some of
which slightly differ from the raw means or the means that the t-test provided.

4.4.1. Comparison at Global Level

4.4.1.2. Level of Proficiency

The global rating is the sum of the mean ratings for sixteen personality characteristics. When the figures in Table 4.5 are examined, it can be seen that they are 53.61 and 52.36 for proficient and non-proficient groups, respectively. Although the mean ratings assigned by the proficient group was slightly higher than those assigned by the non-proficient group, the values suggest that overall responses of the two different groups are not significantly different from one another. This explains why no significance was found for the main effect for level of proficiency in the ANOVA test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5</th>
<th>Global Means by Level of Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.3. Context

The global means assigned to non-professional and professional topic speakers were found to be 45.79 and 60.30, respectively as shown in Table 4.6. This indicates that the two speakers were perceived very differently. As can be seen, the PT speaker received
an higher overall rating and therefore was perceived more favorably than the NPT speaker. Again, these values explain the ANOVA results, which suggested that there was a main effect for the context variable.

Table 4.6
Global Means by Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPT Speaker</th>
<th>PT Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean*</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>60.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NPT= Non-professional topic, PT= Professional topic.

4.4.2. Comparison at Specific Level

4.4.2.1. Level of Proficiency

Table 4.7 provides the mean ratings by level of proficiency, which allows a comparison between the evaluation of proficient and non-proficient groups. The examination of the mean ratings that the speakers received overall on individual items confirm the findings obtained from the analysis of variance. These figures explain why there is insignificant variance with respect to level of proficiency. As seen in Table 4.7, the mean scores obtained from the ratings assigned by both proficient and non-proficient groups, are close values. As presented earlier, the global ratings (\( m \) total), which have been provided at the end of the columns in the Table, is the sum of the mean ratings for sixteen personality characteristics. The mean of these total scores gave 3.30 and 3.27 (\( m \)).
Table 4.7
Mean Ratings by Characteristics by Level of Proficiency
(n =60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m total</td>
<td>53.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*prof. = proficient  **non-prof. = non-proficient

Also, the overall ratings that the speakers received on the characteristics do not exhibit a totally consistent pattern. Yet, on the whole, the non-proficient group assigned lower ratings than the proficient group except for knowledgeableness, sensitivity, well-educatedness, likability and attractiveness.

In Tables 4.8 and 4.9 the mean ratings assigned by proficient and non-proficient groups, respectively, have been presented in ranked form. According to the ranking, the ratings of the proficient group range between 4.20 and 2.66 (Table 4.8) while those of the
non-proficient group range between 4.23 and 2.32, which are almost the same (Table 4.9). The ranking suggests that both groups rated the speakers most favorably on the first three characteristics: well-educatedness, knowledgeableness and hard-workingness. Respectful is another characteristic that ranks the same for both groups. The means assigned by both the proficient and the non-proficient group for this trait ranks tenth. It is seen that on attractiveness rankings differ widely.

In order to decide whether rankings of the two groups differ statistically significantly, the Spearman rank-order correlation was applied to the data. The analysis gave a coefficient of 0.94. Thus, there is a high correlation between the two rankings which is significant at the .001 level. Therefore, although the range of the means did not differ for the groups, the ranking did.
Table 4.8
Ranking of Characteristics by Mean Ratings of the Proficient Group
(n= 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>polite</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>humble</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9
Ranking of Characteristics by Mean Ratings of the Non-proficient Group
(n= 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>polite</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>humble</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.2. Context

Table 4.10, which is also a descriptive presentation of the subjects' ratings of two different speakers, confirms the statistical interpretation of results; there is an apparent difference in the subjects' perception of the two different speakers. It is worth noting that except for two characteristics (likeable and good-looking) the NPT speaker was perceived as more negative on all characteristics. That is to say, in fourteen of the sixteen characteristics, the NPT speaker was rated lower.

Table 4.10
Mean Ratings by Characteristics by Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristics</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m total</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>60.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NPT= Non-professional topic, PT= Professional topic.
In some of the characteristics, such as good-mannered, knowledgeable, sensible, hard-working the mean ratings indicate that responses differ widely. While the highest rankings for the NPT speaker were in well-educatedness and good-lookingness (3.80 and 3.62 respectively) the PT speaker was rated above 4.00 on six characteristics, with well-educatedness (4.63) being the nearest value to 5.00, the highest rating in this study. She received the two lowest ratings in humbleness and likableness, 2.95 and 2.81 respectively. These two ratings are the only two below 3.00. On the other hand, the NPT speaker was rated mostly below 3.00; only in five characteristics was she rated above 3.00 and these figures range between 3.05 and 3.80. The highest rating for the NPT speaker was 3.80, which was in well-educatedness.

Similarly, when subjects' mean ratings of each speaker are examined in terms of ranking, it is seen that (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12 below) both speakers were favored most on well-educatedness. While the NPT speaker received the second highest ranking on good-lookingness the PT speaker was rated much lower (thirteenth) on this attribute. Both speakers were ranked sixth on intelligence. The mean ratings given to the other items do not suggest a high discrepancy in terms of ranking except for good-lookingness,
likableness, concernedness and patience. Yet, it is seen that the ratings fall between the range of 3.30 and 2.05 for the NPT speaker and 4.50 and 2.81 for the PT speaker, which is again illustrative of higher variance than between that of group ratings.

The Spearman rank-order correlation was run to interpret the data statistically. The analysis gave a coefficient of 0.56, that suggests a high correlation between the two rankings which is significant at the .02 level. This indicates that the two speakers rank significantly differently in terms of the personality characteristics they were judged on.

Table 4.11
Ranking of Characteristics by Mean Ratings Assigned to Non-professional Topic Speaker (n= 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>polite</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>humble</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12
Ranking of Characteristics by Mean Ratings Assigned to Professional Topic Speaker
(n= 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>polite</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>humble</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3. Cross-comparison of Mean Ratings

4.4.3.1. Global

Although the statistics run clarified whether there is interaction between LP and context both in global and specific terms, and the results have been discussed in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2., a cross-comparative explanation of responses in connection with type of respondent and context will be more revealing for this study.

According to Table 4.13 below, the sum of the mean ratings that the proficient group assigned to the NPT speaker was 42.86. The non-proficient group rated the NPT slightly higher: 48.53. As to the ratings received by the PT speaker, the proficient group was more positive than it was to the NP speaker, assigning her a total score of 64.00. The other group also rated the PT speaker higher than the NPT speaker. The total score that the non-proficient group gave to the second speaker was 56.46.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPT Speaker</th>
<th>PT Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proficient</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>56.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PT= Professional topic, NPT= Non-professional topic.
For the investigation of the group responses in statistical terms, two separate t-tests were run in order to see whether there is a significant difference in group responses to the NPT speaker and to the PT speaker. As presented in Table 4.14 the mean differences for the NPT speaker was not found significant ($t_{obs} = 1.89 < t_{crit}$). That is to say, the proficient and the non-proficient groups did not respond to the NPT speaker significantly differently. On the other hand, the t-test results suggest a significant difference between means for the PT speaker since $t_{obs} = 2.98 > t_{crit}$ ($p < .05$). This suggests that the two proficiency groups perceived the PT speakers significantly differently.

Table 4.14
Results of t-test Comparison of Group Responses to NPT Speaker and PT Speaker (n= 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-proficient</th>
<th></th>
<th>$t_{obs}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT Speaker</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Speaker</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>56.46</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>2.98*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t_{crit} = 2.704$

*p < .05

Note: M = Mean, SD = Standard deviation, NPT = Non-professional topic, PT = Professional topic.
4.4.3.2. Specific

The ratings that two different groups assigned to NPT and PT can be examined from various perspectives. Table 4.11 provides mean scores of each group to each speaker, which allows a cross-comparison on each of the item. For each item a four-cell mean was provided. In general terms, the PT speaker was perceived more positively. The figures presented in the table show that in ten of the sixteen characteristics the PT speaker was given a mean score above 4.00. However, the non-proficient group favored the same speaker equally on only four of the items. Evidently, the NPT speaker was rated less favorably by both of the groups but there is not a distinctive pattern as there is for the PT speaker; the mean scores are close values, ranging between 1.87 and 3.87. This also shows that the highest rating that the NPT speaker was given was 3.87, which is on well-educatedness and is given by the non-proficient group. The lowest rating is on humbleness and is given by the proficient group.
Table 4.15
Mean Scores Assigned to NPT and PT Speakers by Both Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/speaker</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Non-proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good-mannered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NPT= Non-professional topic, PT= Professional topic.
4.5. Other Variables

As pointed out at the beginning of the chapter, an additional set of data was collected which provided information on subjects' social and linguistic background. The aim of this part of the study was to see whether variables other than the independent variable in the present research might have had an effect on the dependent variable. In order to realize this second level of analysis, the social and language background information self-reported by the subjects was analyzed. When the frequencies were tabulated it was found that the sample group is quite homogeneous in terms of social class, regional background, and other demographic factors. As to the foreign language background variables, interesting findings came up. Although, initially, the proficiency level of the participating subjects had been identified and controlled, it was found that the proficient subjects differed in terms of their functional use of English, i.e., fifteen of them use English in other domains than school. It was also found that the two of the non-proficient group subjects know a Western language other than English. Fourteen of the proficient group subjects reported having another foreign language and five of these were child bilinguals. Consequently, the effect of two other variables than LP—use of English
in other domains and knowledge of another foreign language were investigated. However, the ANOVA analyses run for these did not yield statistically significant differences.

4.6. Conclusions

The first level of analysis tested the hypothesis that there is a systematic relationship between the listener's level of proficiency in English and their attitude toward code-mixing, and that this relationship is moderated by the context of the code-mixing. In the light of the findings of the data analysis, no significant difference in attitudes was found with respect to proficiency level in English. In other words, the respondents' level of English was not found to be a significant factor in how they reacted to code-mixed speech. However, the context where the mixing occurs was significantly different. In fact, "context" was found to be the actual cause of the overall difference in evaluations of the respondents. When group responses were compared using a t-test, it was seen that the non-proficient group perceived code-mixing in the non-professional and professional contexts almost the same but the proficient group favored the code-mixing in the professional context more.
The means obtained from the specific level of analysis allowed a descriptive analysis and further interpretation of the statistics applied. From the findings of this particular phase of the analysis, it can be concluded that the topic of speech played a major role in the responses given, for impressions of a speaker were formed according to the topic of the speech as well as other factors which could not be controlled in this study. These evaluations differed at some points, in accordance with the type of attribute, for example, it was observed that when one speaker was rated very high on a particular characteristic, she may have received rather low ratings on another. Interestingly, it was observed that both speakers got the highest ranking on the same characteristic: well-educatedness. This is probably due to code-mixed speech itself. Code-mixing suggests that the speaker has a good command of English, which ultimately is an indicator of well-educatedness.

A final series of analysis investigated the effect of two of the variables that concern listeners' foreign language knowledge and use. Yet, neither of them was found to be significant.
5.1. Summary of the Study

The present study aimed at investigating whether a relationship exists between learners' level of proficiency and their attitude toward code-mixing. Another concern was to find out whether the context where the code-mixed speech occurs moderates the impression formation of the hearer toward a given speaker. The study focused on the sociolinguistic aspect of code-switching with the assumptions that code-mixed speech is a particular speech style and that the attitudes toward a given speaker are indicative of his attitudes to the language form. The study was restricted to a Turkish context, to Turkish learners of English and to Turkish-English code-mixing. In spite of the favorable attitude toward English in the country, it was assumed that a mixed code of Turkish and English would not be viewed favorably by the Turkish listeners especially in a non-professional context.

The experimental hypothesis proposed that there is a significant difference between respondents' attitudes to code-mixing in terms of their level of proficiency in English and that the context where code-mixing appears has an effect on the attitudes of perceivers. In other words, the effect of two independent
variables—level of proficiency and context on the dependent variable—attitude toward code-mixing was tested. Both of the independent variables had two levels: proficient and non-proficient for level of proficiency and non-professional and professional for context.

For hypothesis testing, the measurement of attitudes was realized in quantitative terms, through an attitude test consisting of a stimulus-tape and a subject-questionnaire. The subjects ratings on the questionnaire was analyzed using a two-way analysis of variance. Along with the testing of the hypothesis, some of the internal variables that the subjects brought to the research situation were looked into. These were identified through a demographic questionnaire responded to by each of the subjects after the test. Part of this was subsequently used and tested with the aim of providing insights as to whether there were other factors responsible for the variance caused by the main effects. Yet, it was found that there was no significant effect of these later-tested variables.

Though the hypothesis was constructed non-directionally, the expectation was that proficient listeners would react to code-mixing more favorably than non-proficient users. It was also expected that
the overall reaction to code-mixing in a professional context would be more positive than in a non-professional context, with proficient users being more accepting than non-proficient ones.

Contrary to the expectations, the level of proficiency of the respondents was not found to be an influential factor, meaning that the proficiency level of listener-subjects did not play a role in how they evaluated the speakers. However, it was found that there was a significant variance in terms of context; that is, the two speakers who represented two different types of code-mixing were rated significantly differently.

The descriptive analysis of data revealed that the code-mixing in a professional context was perceived more positively by proficient respondents (see section 4.4.3.1). The non-proficient group were slightly more positive to code-mixing in a professional context than in a non-professional context. On the other hand, the proficient group were much less accepting of the latter than they were of the former. In other words, their attitude toward code-mixing in a professional context was positive relative to that of the non-proficient group whereas their attitude toward code-mixing in a non-professional context was less positive than that of the other group. Therefore, the expectation was not
met with respect to proficiency level but in terms of the context variable it was.

5.2. Discussion of Results

An examination of the results against the attitude scale used for this study provides insights as to how code-mixing behavior is viewed as favorable or unfavorable by learners at the two extremes of language proficiency and how evaluations differ in terms of context.

First, the overall mean, which was found to be 3.31, shows that the overall attitude toward speakers using code-mixed style was neither distinctly positive nor negative. (On the Likert scale used for this study, 5 represents the most positive rating while 1 is the most negative). This result can be interpreted to mean that the attitude of the subjects toward speakers who code-mix was between neutral and positive. Second, the attitudes of the groups—proficient and non-proficient—were not found to be significantly different. This means that the sample group, who were all young adults, perceive Turkish-English code-mixed speech more or less the same regardless of their proficiency level in English. That the averaged mean ratings, \( m \) total, (see Table 4.7) of the proficient and non-proficient groups fell into the range from 3 to 4 (3.35 and 3.27 respectively) suggests that the subjects
do not disfavor code-mixing. On the contrary, their reaction is nearer to the positive end than to the negative, with the proficient group being more positive. Therefore, in global terms, code-mixing has not been perceived negatively within the experimental situation of this study.

The second factor under analysis, context, showed that the averaged mean ratings fell into the range from 2 to 3 for the non-professional topic (NPT) speaker and from 3 to 4 for the professional topic (PT) speaker, 2.87 and 3.76 respectively (see Table 4.10). While a total mean of 2.87 implies a weakly negative attitude, the mean of 3.76 for the PT speaker implies a somewhat positive attitude. Therefore, relatively speaking, the speaker who delivered the dialogue-turn on the professional topic was perceived more positively than the speaker who talked about a non-professional topic. Therefore, both groups of subjects were more accepting of speakers that code-mix for professional purposes.

A possible explanation that may account for this difference in perceptions is that listeners see code-mixing as more natural when it is motivated by professional or educational reasons, such as in the speech sample used in this study. In the PT fragment the speaker is talking about statistics, or more precisely, explaining how to construct and test
hypothesis in statistical terms. Though no background information was provided prior to the listening, the listener-subjects might have correctly guessed that the PT sample belongs to a student who received the instruction on statistics in English. In fact, the speaker who did the recording of the PR text was a female, 31 by age, and yet, the actual conversation belonged to a male student at METU who is currently studying economics. It is probable that the PT speaker's switches were reacted to more neutrally or positively than the NPT speaker who was relating a personal event that took place while cooking in the kitchen.

In this respect, the pilot study carried out for text selection provided responses worth mentioning. At that stage, the pilot-group subjects were asked to identify the profession of the speaker, the addressee and topic of the dialogue-turn (see section 3.3.1). There might have been discrepancies between the perceptions of the pilot-group subjects and the listener-subjects of the attitude test that resulted from the presentation of the text because the study sample was in the form of audio-taped speech and the pilot sample was in the form of a transcribed text of the same piece of discourse. Nonetheless, the responses elicited from the pilot-group subjects
reflected the actual context that the conversations took place. The answers given as to the profession of the speaker of the later-selected PT turn were maths teacher, mathematician, researcher, statistician, public opinion surveyor, physicist, student, teacher, engineer, and computer programmer. The answers to this preliminary research also showed that each respondent was able to label the profession of the speaker or came very close, i.e., all of them could conceive of the speaker as being related to a profession or occupation that makes use of statistics. The addressee of this speaker was identified as a student or a colleague. Some of the answers given to the item that questioned the relation of the speaker to the addressee vary in terms of status: teacher-student, specialist-trainee, student-student, economist-economist, etc.

The other sample, the NPT was rated less favorably on the whole. The pilot-study responses for the NPT text revealed that some of the subjects failed to identify the profession of the speaker. Some stated that the speaker is a student, teacher, housewife, a person who knows good English or simply, a person. As to the relation of the interlocutors, the answers were friends, roommates, students who share the same apartment, etc. These answers suggest that the NPT speaker was clearly addressing a friend of hers, which
was actually the case with the original recordings. All this suggests that listeners in fact pay attention to the context, and this may be to some extent responsible for their evaluation of the speaker.

The cross-comparison of means revealed that the PT speaker was rated higher by the proficient group than she was by the non-proficient group. The reason may be that the former are more accepting of this type of code-mixed speech. Since the subjects in this group are in an English instruction medium, taking all of their field courses in English, it is highly likely that they code-mix in the school domain when talking about their classes. Besides, according to the data on background variables, 50% of the proficiency group subjects stated that they use English outside the school domain. This means that half of the proficient subjects use English across a wider range of domains than the non-proficient subjects. This self-report also revealed that five of the subjects in the proficient group were child bilinguals for whom code-switching is probably much more acceptable.

It is interesting that the proficient group which may be expected to be more accepting of code-mixing in non-professional context were in fact less accepting than the non-proficient group. The NPT speaker was rated by the proficient respondents lower on fourteen
of the sixteen characteristics. This speaker received slightly higher ratings only on two characteristics: good-manneredness and patience. The lowest mean scores were on the characteristics humble for both groups, yet the results indicate that the proficient group rated the NPT speaker significantly lower on this trait. These results may suggest that Turkish-English code-mixing when talking about a daily topic may be seen as an act of "snobbery" by both groups, but more so by the fluent speakers of English than those who have little English.

5.3. Assessment of the Study

There are a number of strengths of the study in terms of the materials used and the procedure followed. First of all, the stimulus material was based on genuine code-mixed speech elicited from highly competent Turkish speakers of English. The texts that were used for the stimulus material were chosen systematically and neither the subject-questionnaire nor any of the other instruments presented any problems, which allowed the data to be collected without difficulty. Also, the data was collected by administering the actual test repeatedly with a small number of subjects each time since after the piloting, the physical conditions, especially room acoustics, turned out to be an important factor. Another strength
was that the subject-questionnaire of the attitude test, which was developed out of a series of pilot instruments, took cultural variation into account as discussed in section 3.3.2. This contributed to the face validity of the instrument. In fact, part of the success of the data collection procedure, and thus, that of the study was due to the care with which the instruments were prepared and the amount of piloting that enabled the researcher to predict and overcome problems.

Also, the analysis of the results was facilitated by means of the inferential statistics. This statistics allowed the investigation of the effects of two factors—the effect of level of proficiency and the effect of context—and then interaction effect created by the combination of two factors on the single dependent variable—attitude. The use of ANOVA was functional in that it provided a variety of perspectives in the interpretation of the obtained data, both at global and specific levels.

There are, however, other possibilities that could have enhanced the study. The most outstanding limitation of the study was that the number of subjects was limited. As indicated previously, the age range of subjects and their educational level were controlled. This means that generalizations can be made only with
reference to the particular age group (young adults) and educational level (university students). For the results to be more reliable and generalizable, a wider range of subjects representing various age groups and educational levels could have been used. This could not be realized due to the limited period within which the study had to be conducted.

Had there been more subjects to participate in the study, it would then be possible to examine the effects of background variables such as sex, social class, educational background. In experimental studies that deal with attitude measurement, the usual pattern is to look into a multitude of variables, such as gender, ethnicity, and linguistic background, so as to see the interaction among the variables that the respondents bring to the experiment situation. Since in such quantitative research studies, the basic technique involves the use of an oral component where attitudes are measured less overtly than, for example, political attitude surveys, the background variables are included in language attitude studies to be able to arrive at more tangible conclusions as to the underlying reasons for the subjects' attitudes. In the present study, however, the attitudes were tested against only two independent variables. Although the demography of the sample group was available, it was not included into
the statistical analysis due to (1) time limits, (2) a small number of subjects, and (3) the apparent homogeneity of the sample group. The research design and hence the selection of subjects could have been done to allow the exploration of a wider range of variables, but, given the circumstances this was by no means feasible.

Another option that was avoided, partly for analytical reasons, was the use of dialogues as the stimulus material. Although the texts of the simulated recordings were not based on an extensive ethnographical study of code-mixing behavior in these particular settings, the data obtained from the recording of natural speech suggests that conversation is the speech form where code-mixing occurs. The recorded data collected for the texts to be written and piloted were all in the form of dialogues. Most of the dialogue-turns chosen for the pilot texts were originally fairly short, often interrupted and full of turn-takings. These had to be modified to some extent to fit the instrument; that is, the most lengthy and rich-with-switch parts of the exchanges were chosen and converted into a monologue. However, the conversational nature of the material was inherent in the monologues, since all of them, as the pilot study showed, were perceived to be one turn of a dialogue
where the speaker is addressing another person. From the recorded material it was also observed that the actual occurrence of a switch was constrained by factors such as situation, topic, interlocutors and their level of intimacy or relation to one another. For these reasons, the use of a conversational stimulus would be more true to the nature of code-mixing. Such stimulus would sound more natural and provide more valid and reliable results.

Another pitfall of the study was the lack of sophisticated facilities and professional support. When the effect of context is to be measured, there is no way of controlling the semantic and syntactic variation. However, it is possible to minimize the vocal and phonological effects by using several voices and by designing the oral component accordingly. If these are combined with the use of sophisticated technical facilities and equipment, an elaborate measuring devise can be constructed.

There were two texts spoken on tape by female voices. In other words, only female voices were used. The norm in language attitude studies, especially in those with the matched-guise technique, is to include an equal number of male and female voices in the oral component. In the methodological design of this study, male voices were excluded for pragmatic purposes; that
is to say, this particular variable was controlled. Undoubtedly, gender could have been a source of variance in the responses in this study.

Despite the considerable amount of piloting for the preparation of the instruments, it was observed that more extensive piloting is needed in such studies. A formal item analysis for the selection of adjective pairs can be carried out when the subject population is higher. Moreover, in the selection of the monologues, the use of recorded speech instead of transcribed text would be more appropriate.

5.4. Future Research

The assessment of the present study has a number of implications for future research. First, similar studies can be conducted on larger samples to be able to reach more conclusive results as to the attitudes toward individuals that use code-mixed speech. This also necessitates the inclusion of social and linguistic background variables. A multivariate analysis will show how these variables interact with subjects’ subjective evaluations. In particular, the effect of age, social class and educational level in particular are some of the essential points that need to be investigated, for, in a Turkish context, such sociological variables are probably closely connected with attitudinal consequences of code-mixing behavior.
Second, the research can be designed differently to obtain more generalizable results. In the present study, a control text of the non-mixed version was excluded from the research design and hence from the instrument so as to avoid subject expectancy. This makes it hard to guess whether subjects reacted to the switches or to other speech features or voice quality. Although the present study did not aim to contrast code-mixed and non-code-mixed speech, the limited number of voices and the other uncontrolled factors described in the previous section reduces the generalizability of the results. An alternative research design may be one that contains the use of several code-mixed and non-code-mixed dialogues categorized as occurring in a professional context and in a non-professional context. This will enable the researcher to contrast the responses given to the mixed and non-mixed versions in both contexts across several voices.

The methodological procedures will also need to be improved depending on the new design. With regard to the stimulus of the measurement material for instance, more texts in the form of dialogues would have to be included. This would reduce the effect of syntactic and semantic variation. Each of the dialogues would need to be spoken on tape by several pairs of voices,
both male and female, in order to control for phonological variation and voice quality. Alternatively, more overt subject-questionnaire could be used which includes the questions that would measure the reactions to linguistic features of the speakers. For attitude measurement, an item analysis should be made before the actual subject-questionnaire is prepared to check for the validity and reliability of the produced instrumentation.

An alternative research paradigm for similar studies is one that involves both qualitative and quantitative data elicitation techniques. While the attitude test gives us results in quantifiable terms, allowing the use of inferential statistics that lead to the conclusions, it does not explain the "why" of the question. To exemplify, if a respondent's reaction was found to be negative, it would never be known what caused him to disfavor the speaker. Yet, with an interview module the relevant responses as to the reasons can be elicited after the text has been taken. Furthermore, from the results at hand it is not possible to guess accurately what kind of motivations the respondents thought the speaker had to code-mix. To conclude, the potential insights that such devices offer should be taken into account. Furthermore, a combined use of these research techniques may yield
more revealing results especially with small sample groups.

Doubtlessly, for better studies to be designed on the same area, it is vitally important that the researcher have adequate resources in terms of previous research. The present study, which was conducted in a Turkish setting, has two major implications in this respect. First, research studies in Turkey in the field of sociolinguistics are limited. Nor is there a large body of literature in foreign language instruction and attitudes toward English. This suggests that such studies are bound to be devoid of a substantial basis. More importantly, no code-alternation studies have yet been conducted in foreign language settings. It should be noted, though, that code-mixing, in its recently defined form, is not only a bilingual phenomenon, it may apply to settings other than bilingual communities, especially if a broader sense of bilingualism is adopted. Due to its extensive use all over the world, English is apparently interacting with many languages in the world as the number of its users increases. This will result in code-switching of English with other languages at different levels, which presents a new area for research.
Another point is that a linguistic basis is crucial to code-alternation studies that deal with the sociolinguistic or psycholinguistic aspects of the code-mixing behavior. Therefore, an ethnographical body of data defining the linguistic and pragmatic constraints is needed in whichever setting the study will be conducted.

5.5. Pedagogical Implications

Since the present study was sociolinguistically oriented, the conclusions do not allow for implications for language teaching pedagogy that are directly applicable to classroom use. However, the findings have implications that may contribute to learner and teacher awareness. The study confirms the idea that Turkish-English code-mixing exists as a linguistic phenomenon in a Turkish context and is responded to in a certain way. It is clear that code-mixing accords social status to its user, for both of the speakers were perceived to be well-educated, knowledgeable and intelligent. This is probably due to the fact that code-mixing necessarily implies a good command of English. This lends support to the view that English is associated with an esteemed educational background. On the other hand, the study showed that, especially on humbleness, the speakers were perceived less favorably (see section 4.4.2). This suggests that speakers who
code-mix are not equally favored on certain traits, i.e., on inherent characteristics that are associated with interpersonal relations, such as sensitive, likeable, considerate, etc. Therefore, code-mixing does not always assign high credit to its user. It is likely that the learners or speakers of English, who code-mix will sound well-educated, knowledgeable and intelligent but snobbish. How they are perceived will greatly depend on the linguistic context in which they code-mix. All these inferences have implications as to the motivations of the learners. Perhaps EFL teachers can gain a better understanding of their students' motivations for learning and using English, mixing English words into their speech and in which context they would safely reveal their knowledge and to what extent they would want to use their English.
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Appendix A: Screening Questionnaire
Turkish Version

Adı-Soyadı:

Öğrenci numarası:

Yaş:

Cinsiyet: ______ E ______ K

Üniversite:

Fakülte:

Bölüm:

Ana Bilim Dalı:

Sınıf:

Bildiği yabancı diller: Derecesi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oldukça iyi</th>
<th>İyi</th>
<th>Orta</th>
<th>Az</th>
<th>Çok az</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. ................... ______________________________________

2. ................... ______________________________________

3. ................... ______________________________________

1. İngilizce öğrenmenin gerekli olduğuna inanıyorum.  
   ______ EVET _______ HAYIR

2. İngilizce öğreniyorum olmaktan hoşnutum.  
   ______ EVET _______ HAYIR

3. İngilizcemi ilerletmek istiyorum.  
   ______ EVET _______ HAYIR

4. İngilizce’yi çok iyi bilmek ve konuşabilmek isterim.  
   ______ EVET _______ HAYIR

5. İngilizce’yi öğrenmek zorunda olduğum için öğreniyorum.  
   ______ EVET _______ HAYIR

6. İngilizce’yi istedigim için öğreniyorum.  
   ______ EVET _______ HAYIR
Appendix A: Screening Questionnaire  
English Version

Name:
Student ID number:
Age:
Sex: ______ M ______ F
University:
Faculty:
Division:
Department:
Class:

Foreign language(s) you know:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Fairly Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Very little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I believe it is necessary to learn English. ______ YES ______ NO
2. I am glad to be learning English. ______ YES ______ NO
3. I want to improve my English. ______ YES ______ NO
4. I would like to know and speak English very well. ______ YES ______ NO
5. I am learning English because I have to. ______ YES ______ NO
6. I am learning English because I want to. ______ YES ______ NO
TEXT 1: NON-PROFESSIONAL TOPIC


TEXT 2: PROFESSIONAL TOPIC

Appendix B: Texts
English Version

TEXT 1: NON-PROFESSIONAL TOPIC

We were cooking in a friend's kitchen with Bülent. We had invited April for dinner. Anyway, I was making the salad. Something like lettuce salad. I mean lettuce, cucumbers, sweet corn, which I learned from you. I used some that packet type of thing, uncooked. First I defrosted it of course. Anyway I added the sauce in the end. I had to mix it of course. So, I was busy mixing it. all of a sudden I spilled it, in a very funny way. A piece of that was gone, like, you know "plop". Then I said "Oh, my God" at that moment. Then, April and Bülent.. they are also preparing something else in the kitchen. April turned round and said "Look at her she says oh my God" but we do it everyday, don't we?" I guess she found it rather extraordinary. She says we "do it everyday". As a matter of fact, I get when..er..when, I mean, cleaning up, kind of, I don't know why..in a strange way, clumsy.

TEXT 2: PROFESSIONAL TOPIC

We are analyzing one of the resulting equations that we have at hand. When we are analyzing one of the equations --we are analyzing this particular equation, for example, let's say the data that we got from this equation, the standard variation of a lot of data that we have found, the average of the data we have found. According to the data we have found, with this very simple calculation we find a number called t to it. P means probability. Yes for this statement of yours, we are given a p. This p is, say, smaller than 2. From there we find a figure and put it in the T-table.
ACIKLAMALAR

Biraz sonra teypten iki ayrı konuşmacı dinleyeceksiniz. Daha sonra bu konuşmacılıarı kişilik özellikleri açısından değerlendirmeniz istenecektir. İlişikte her konuşmacı için birer değerlendirme formu verilmiştir. Değerlendirmenizi, her konuşmacıyı dinledikten sonra, örnekte görüldüğü gibi uygun rakam daire içine alarak yapınız.

Formdaki maddeleri sırayla ve atlamadan işaretlemeniz gerekmektedir. Her maddeyi diğerlerinden bağımsız olarak düşünmeniz ve önceki veya sonraki maddelere bakmadan değerlendirme formu, çalışmanın güvenilirliği açısından önemlidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, sizin konuşmacılar hakkındaki ilk izlenimlerinizi öğrenmektedir. Bu nedenle her bir maddeyi mümkün olduğuunda hızlı ve aynı zamanda dikkatle yanıtlayınız.

örnek:

5 4 3 2 1
anlayışlı anlayışsız

Dinlemiş olduğunuz konuşmacının anlayışlı biri olduğunu düşünüyorsanız 5’i, anlayışsız biri olduğunu düşünüyorsanız 1’i işaretleyiniz. 2, 3 ve 4 verebileceğiniz ara değerlerdir. 3 ortayi, 4 “anlayışlı”ya yakın ve 2 “anlayışsız” a yakın değerleri göstermektedir.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sıra</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>görgülü</td>
<td>görgüsüz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bilgili</td>
<td>bilgisiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>zeki</td>
<td>zeki değil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>düşünceli</td>
<td>düşünsesiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>duyarlı</td>
<td>duyarsız</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>iyi öğrenim</td>
<td>iyi öğrenim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>görmüş</td>
<td>görmemiş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>güzel</td>
<td>çirkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>alcakgönüllü</td>
<td>kendini beşenmiş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>kibar</td>
<td>kaba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bilincili

saygili

sempatik

sabirli

çekici

ilgili

çalışkan
FORM II - İKİNCİ KONUSMACI

5 4 3 2 1
görgülü görgüsüz

5 4 3 2 1
bilgili bilgisiz

5 4 3 2 1
zeki zeki değil

5 4 3 2 1
düşünceli düşünsesiz

5 4 3 2 1
duyarlı duyarsız

5 4 3 2 1
iyi öğrenim iyi öğrenim
görmüş görmemiş

5 4 3 2 1
güzel çirkin

5 4 3 2 1
alçakgönüllü kendini
begenmiş

5 4 3 2 1
kibar kaba
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sıra</th>
<th>Üze</th>
<th>Üzümsüz</th>
<th>Sıra</th>
<th>Üze</th>
<th>Üzümsüz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilincili</td>
<td>bilincisiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saygili</td>
<td>saygisiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sempatik</td>
<td>antipatik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabırlı</td>
<td>sabırsız</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çekici</td>
<td>itici</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilgili</td>
<td>umursamaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çalışkan</td>
<td>tembel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Subject Questionnaire
English Version

INSTRUCTIONS

In this test you are required to evaluate two different speakers you hear on tape. Please rate the speakers on the following personality characteristics. You are provided with a different form for each of the speakers. After listening to each of the segments, indicate your choices by circling the appropriate number as in the example.

Rate each characteristic on each of the sixteen scales in order and do not omit any. Please do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you check other items. Work at a fairly high speed throughout this test. It is your first impressions, the immediate feelings about the speakers, that we want. Make sure that you respond carefully, for it is equally important that you reflect your true feelings.

Example:

5 4 3 2 1
understanding not understanding

If you feel that the speaker that you have just listened to is an understanding person, mark 5; if you perceive her to be the opposite, mark 1 on the scale. 2, 3 and 4 are the values in between. 3 represents the middle value; 4 represents a value near to "understanding" while 2 represents a value near to "not understanding".
FORM I - FIRST SPEAKER

5 4 3 2 1
good not good-mannered

5 4 3 2 1
knowledgeable unknowledgeable

5 4 3 2 1
intelligent not intelligent

5 4 3 2 1
considerate not considerate

5 4 3 2 1
sensitive insensitive

5 4 3 2 1
well-educated not well-educated

5 4 3 2 1
good-looking ugly

5 4 3 2 1
humble arrogant

5 4 3 2 1
polite rude
sensible

not sensible

respectful
disrespectful

likeable
not likeable

patient
impatient

attractive
repulsive

concerned
indifferent

hard-working
lazy
FORM II - SECOND SPEAKER

5 4 3 2 1
good not good-mannered

5 4 3 2 1
knowledgeable unknowledgeable

5 4 3 2 1
intelligent not intelligent

5 4 3 2 1
considerate not considerate

5 4 3 2 1
sensitive insensitive

5 4 3 2 1
well-educated not well-educated

5 4 3 2 1
good-looking ugly

5 4 3 2 1
humble arrogant

5 4 3 2 1
polite rude
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>not sensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>not likeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>repulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lazy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Background Questionnaire
Turkish Version

1. Yaş: __________
2. Cinsiyet: ________ E ________ K
3. Doğum yerı (merkez ilçe değilse, hangi il ile bağlı olduğuunu belirtiniz): __________________________
4. Annenizin doğum yerı: __________________________
   Babanızın doğum yerı: __________________________
5. Halen ailenizin oturduğu yer: ________
   Ailenizle mi oturuyorsunuz? ________ Evet ________ Hayır
   Hayırsa kim/kimlerle oturuyorsunuz? __________________________
6. Anneniz hayatta mı?: ________ Evet ________ Hayır
   Babanız hayatta mı?: ________ Evet ________ Hayır
   Annenizin öğrenim durumu, mesleği: __________________________
   Babanızın öğrenim durumu, mesleği: __________________________
7. Uzun süre anne-babanız’dan ayrı kaldınız mı?: ________ Evet ________ Hayır
   Evetse kaç yaşındayken, ne kadar süreyle anne ve/veya babanızdan ayrı kaldınız: __________________________
8. Mezun olduğunuuz
   a) ilk öğretim kurumunun bulunduğu il: __________________________
   b) orta öğretim kurumunun bulunduğu il: __________________________
9. Ailenizde Türkçe’den başka dil konuşuluyor mu?: ________ Evet ________ Hayır
   Evetse hangi dil/diller olduğunuuzu yazınız: __________________________
10. Annenizin bildiği yabancı dil/diller: __________________________
    Babanızın bildiği yabancı dil/diller: __________________________
    Diğer aile fertlerinin bildiği dil/diller: __________________________
11. Bildiğiniz yabancı dil/dilleri nerede öğrendiniz ve öğrenmeye başladıınızda kaç yaşındaydınız?
    Yabancı dil  Yaş  Ülke
    Birinci: __________________________
    İkinci: __________________________
    Üçüncü: __________________________
12. İngilizceyi ya da bildiğiniz diğer yabancı dil/dilleri okul dışında kullanıyor musunuz?
    ________ Evet ________ Hayır
    Evetse nerede ve ne siklikla olduğunuuzu yazınız.
13. Şimdiye dek yurt dışında bulundunuz mu?
    ________ Evet ________ Hayır
    Evetse hangi ülke/ülkelerde ve ne kadar süreyle belirtiniz.
    ülke  Süresi
14. Gelir düzeyiniz (yüksek/orta/dar) veya aylık geliriniz: __________________________
    Aileniz ya da size ait konutlar var mı?: ________ Evet ________ Hayır
    Kiracı iseniz aylık kira giderinizi belirtiniz: __________
Appendix D: Background Questionnaire

English Version

1. Age: _________
2. Sex: _____ M ________ F
3. Place of birth (indicate province): ______________
4. Your mother’s birthplace: ______________
   Your father’s birthplace: ______________
5. Where does your family live?: ______________
   Do you live with your family?: ______ Yes ______ No
   If not, whom do you live with?: ______________
6. Is your mother alive? ________ Yes ________ No
   Is your father alive? ________ Yes ________ No
   Your mother’s level of education: ______________
   Your father’s level of education: ______________
7. Have you ever lived away from your parents?:
   ______ Yes ________ No
   If yes, how old were you then and for how long?:
   ______________
8. Which schools did you graduate from and which city were they in?
   Name of school City
   Elementary school _______________ _____
   Secondary school _______________ _____
9. Are there any languages spoken in your family other than Turkish?
   ______ Yes ________ No
   If yes, specify which language(s): ______________
10. Foreign language(s) your mother knows:______________
    Foreign language(s) your father knows:______________
    Foreign language(s) other family members know:_____ 
11. Where did you learn the foreign language(s) you know and how old were you then?
    Foreign language Age Country
    First: ____________ _______ _______
    Second: ____________ _______ _______
    Third: ___________ _______ _______
12. Do you use English or/and other foreign language(s) you speak outside the school?
    ______ Yes _________ No
    If yes, indicate how often: ______________
13. Have you ever been abroad?
    ______ Yes ________ No
    If yes, indicate which country(s) and how long:
    Country Duration
14. Your level of income (high/average/low) or monthly income: ______________
    Do you or your family own(s) an apartment?
    ________ Yes ________ No
    If you are a tenant, what is your monthly rent? : __