

Introduction

Code-switching has a crucial communicative function. Even in Arabic-speaking countries, children are exposed to code-switching at an early age. Several educational TV animated cartoon series include code-switching. For example, the creators of cartoon TV series such as *Dora the Explorer* and *The Adventures of Manny the Manitas* claim that they could help children under the age of nine learn English; these TV series are marketed to parents and children as educational programs. In addition, the Arabic version of these TV series could even help children to learn Standard Arabic. This is because Standard Arabic is not the mother tongue of Arabic speakers, who speak different varieties of Arabic in their daily lives; the variety they speak varies from one Arabic-speaking country to another.

Dora the Explorer, which is the focus of this study, is broadcast predominantly in Standard Arabic in Arabic countries (English in English-speaking countries). The characters code-switch between Standard Arabic (the first language, henceforth L1) and English (the second or foreign language in our case, henceforth L2) to translate and explain some L2 lexical items.

Few studies have been conducted on code-switching in animated TV shows. Among the existing studies is Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012), which investigated code-switching in *Handy Manny*, focusing on its potential impact on teaching and learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in a Spanish L1 context. Another study conducted by Elbwart (2014) analyzed three popular U.S. children's TV shows – *Dora the Explorer* (Nickelodeon), *Maya & Miguel* (PBS), and *Handy Manny* (Disney Channel) – focusing on their incorporation of different linguistic systems and how languages are alternated to represent Hispanic culture on mainstream television.

The present study focuses on code-switching in the fictional discourse, analyzing a popular children's TV show, *Dora the Explorer*, in terms of incorporating different linguistic systems and how languages are alternated through code-switching. The aim is to determine the patterns and functions of code-switching in the interaction of the cartoon characters. Therefore, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the patterns of code-switching found in the interaction of the cartoon characters in *Dora the Explorer*, and which pattern is the most common?
2. What is the function of code-switching in each pattern?

The significance of this study is that it will provide a deep understanding of the strategies and structures of code-switching used to address children in order to teach them English. Moreover, it will enable us to assess its potential impact on teaching and learning EFL in an Arabic L1 context. The study also contributes to the existing research on code-switching in children's TV series, and to my knowledge, it is the first study on code-switching in Arabic-language children's TV shows.

Literature Review

Bilingualism and Code-switching

In its simplest form, bilingualism can be defined as knowing two languages (Valdez & Figueora, 1994). Bilinguals' level of proficiency varies as some bilinguals are highly proficient in both languages while others are highly proficient in one language, which is the dominant or preferred language, and less proficient in the other. Since the degree of proficiency tends to play a crucial role in determining bilingualism, Mackey (1968) suggested considering it simply as the alternate use of two languages. This definition of bilingualism is associated with language alternation approaches (Elbwart, 2014). Recently, bilingualism has been explained as existing on a continuum, meaning that it fits a variety of individual situations (cf. Grosjean, 2001). Bilinguals can thus be defined as "individuals or groups of people that result from interactions via language in which two or more linguistic codes (including dialects) are used for communication" (Butler & Hakuta 2006, p. 114). This paper focuses on bilingualism in speech communities, specifically on analyzing language choices in a bilingual television show. Therefore, the degree of bilingualism and proficiency in the two languages in play do not need to be assessed.

Bilingual speakers often code-switch between languages, especially when the two languages are used in the same environment. There are several reasons for code-switching, including filling a lexical gap. The current paper aims to discuss code-switching patterns found in an animated TV show which is classified as educational. The goal of code-switching in this context is to introduce English words to Arabic-speaking children aged three to nine years old.

Definition and Theories of Code-switching

Switching between languages may occur "between the turns of different speakers in the same conversation, sometimes between utterances within a single turn, and sometimes even within a single utterance" (Milroy & Muysken, 1995, p. 7). Gumperz (1982) defined code-switching as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (p. 59). Myers-Scotton (1993a) described code-switching as "the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded language (or languages) in utterances of a matrix language during the same conversation" (p. 4). This means that in bilingual or multilingual communities, speakers can use their languages or codes naturally. They switch between languages or codes to fill a lexical gap, such as when they do not know a specific word in one of the codes, or they might switch for another specific purpose (Bassiouney, 2009).

Gumperz (1982) referred to code-switching not as a phenomenon resulting from the speaker's language deficiency in one of his/her languages but as an additional resource through which a range of social and rhetorical meanings are expressed. He noted that the alternation of languages has an expressive function and pragmatic purpose. He also stated that non-linguistic

aspects of the speech situation could affect code choices, such as the social relationships of the speakers, their social roles, conversation type, type of international exchange, audience design and occasion, and topic. In addition to these factors, Bentahila, Davies, and Owens (2013) noted that the languages involved in the switching should all be part of the regular oral communicative repertoire of the community engaged in the code-switching.

It is essential to distinguish between two kinds of code-switching, i.e., inter-sentential code-switching and intra-sentential code-switching, the latter of which could be termed code-mixing or intra-sentential code-mixing (Muysken, 2000). Inter-sentential code-switching occurs at clause boundaries, whereas intra-sentential code-switching (or mixing) occurs within the domain of a clause (Mejdell, 2006). Some analysts prefer the expression “alternational code-switching” for switching between stretches of speech belonging to different codes/languages/varieties. In contrast, insertional code-switching or code-mixing (Muysken, 2000) denotes single items of one code occurring in stretches of the other code. Some sociolinguists have proposed reserving code-switching to describe socially meaningful changes of code in conversational interaction (Auer, 1995, 1998).

Code-switching includes different phenomena (Lawson & Sachdev, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1992). According to Milroy and Muysken (1995):

The field of CS (code-switching) research is replete with a confusing range of terms descriptive of various aspects of the phenomenon. Sometimes the referential scope of a set of these terms overlaps, and sometimes particular terms are used in different ways by different writers. (p. 12)

This problem has also been outlined in Clyne (1987). Among the issues in question is whether code-switching and code-mixing are the same or different phenomena.

As well as differences regarding the location of switching, code-switching can be either situational or metaphorical (Blom & Gumperz, 1972). The former refers to a shift that results from external changes, such as a change of participants or setting (i.e., speakers move from one domain into another and change their codes as a result). In contrast, the latter refers to a shift in the emphasis of the topic, such as when the speakers change codes in the middle of a situation. However, Bassiouney (2009) criticized Gumperz’s division of code-switching into situational and metaphorical code-switching, arguing that this division is not always easy to identify in practice and that it assumes different motivations for each type of code-switching.

Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) model is based on the notion that the languages or codes involved in code-switching have equal status and play different roles in the mix, which consists of a Matrix Language (ML) and an Embedded Language (EL). The ML alone sets the morpho-syntactic frame

for the clause and provides the system morphemes and most of the content morphemes. On the other hand, the EL may provide the constituents and single content morphemes which are inserted into the ML base. Her model has inspired many studies, such as those by Boussofara-Omar (1999, 2003) and Bassiouney (2006). It has also been met with “critique and counter-evidence and is constantly developed, to the extent that it has lost its initial simplicity and thus for many scholars its attractiveness” (Mejdell, 2012, p. 31). Both Bassiouney (2006, 2009) and Boussofara-Omar (1999, 2003) highlighted several problems when applying this model to their data.

In the TV show which the current study focuses on, Arabic functions as an ML, whereas English is the embedded, less frequently used language.

Code-switching and Code-mixing

Code-switching and code-mixing constitute the most controversial area of debate in the analysis of language contact phenomena. Linguists and researchers have overlapping views and hold different opinions on code-switching and code-mixing (Muysken, 2000).

Clyne (1991) argued that both code-switching and code-mixing refer to the same phenomena in which “the speaker stops using language ‘A’ and employs language ‘B’” (p. 161). Romaine (1995), furthermore, viewed code-switching as a phenomenon that occurs in a continuum where both inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-alternation take place.

Other researchers have differentiated between code-switching and code-mixing depending on the place where the alternation occurs. For instance, Wei (1998) stated that if code-alternation occurs at or above the clause level, it is considered code-switching, but if it occurs below the clause level, then it is considered code-mixing. Similarly, in differentiating between code-switching and code-mixing, Bokamba (1989) associated code-switching with inter-sentential code-switching and code-mixing with intra-sentential code-switching.

Mazraani (1997) argued that there is a difference between code-switching and code-mixing. In her perspective, code-switching usually has a discourse function. It is defined as a phenomenon where “sections in one code are followed by sections in another one in the same conversation” (pp. 8–9). She noted that code-switching could affect most of the linguistic levels, i.e., syntactic, morphological, phonological, and lexical. On the other hand, she defined code-mixing as “the mixing of different varieties within a single utterance or even within a single word” (pp. 8–9). In contrast to code-switching, she contended that code-mixing does not have to affect all linguistic levels. However, Bassiouney (2009) asserted that Mazraani’s definitions of code-switching are still vague, arguing that Mazraani did not clearly define the words “sections” and “utterance.”

Primarily, two types of switches have been proposed: intra-sentential and inter-sentential. Some linguists prefer the word code-mixing to be used only for intra-sentential and intra-clausal switches and have used code-switching as a cover term for all types of switches (Grosjean, 1996; Myers-Scotton, 1993b, 2006; Poplack, 1993). Some other linguists, for instance, Clyne (2011), have used the word “transference” to cover mixing at all linguistic levels: phonological, morphological, and syntactic. According to Muysken (2000), intra-sentential code-mixing “refers to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence” (p. 1). This takes place through three different processes: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Muysken claimed that code-switching is suitable for only the alternational type of mixing in a single speech event between turns or utterances. Muysken (2000) argued that the word code-switching suggests the meaning of alternation, and it separates code-mixing from borrowing and interference. For these two reasons, he avoided describing the general process of mixing as code-switching.

Unlike Muysken (2000), Poplack (1993) used code-switching as a cover term for both the intra-sentential and inter-sentential mixing of two languages when she suggested that code-switching should contain switches at all levels of linguistic structure: “Code-switching may occur at various levels of linguistic structure (e.g., sentential, intra-sentential, tag) and it may be flagged or smooth” (p. 255). In Grosjean’s (1996) definition, the cover term is code-switching, which involves switching at the word, phrase, and sentence level. Myers-Scotton (2006) included both inter-sentential and intra-sentential switches as instances of code-switching. She defined inter-sentential switching as “containing complete sentences in the clause boundaries.” She preferred the expression intra-clause switching to intra-sentential switching because intra-clause switching involves switching within one clause rather than switching between two clauses.

On the other hand, Auer (1995) referred to the alternating use of two or more languages as code-alternation or language alternation. He used the word “alternation” to cover “all cases in which semiotic systems are put in a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in a position to interpret this juxtaposition as such” (p. 116). Auer (1998) proposed a continuum of language alternation or code-alternation phenomena, “which spans out between three well-documented cases (conceived as prototypes) which will be labeled code-switching, language mixing (LM) and fused lects (FLs), with code-switching and FLs representing the polar extremes of the continuum and LM a point in between” (p. 1). In his study of code-switching and code-mixing in Welsh bilinguals’ talk, Musk (2010) referred to code-switching and code-mixing as code-alternation, indicating that code-alternation acts as a general cover term for different outcomes of language contact.

The current study is based on Poplack (1993), Grosjean (1996), and Myers-Scotton’s (1993b, 2006) definitions and classifications of code-switching. However, intra-sentential code-

switching parallels Muysken's approach of intra-sentential code-mixing as he focused on switching within the same sentence. Therefore, both intra-sentential code-switching and intra-sentential code-mixing describe the same linguistic phenomena. The current study will highlight both types of code-switching with a special focus on inter-sentential code-switching, as the author noticed that it was the most common type of code-switching when analyzing the data.

Strategies for Language Choice in Animated TV Shows

Elbwart (2014) discussed two major strategies of language choice in animated TV shows. The first strategy is translation, which has always been a prominent strategy in second/foreign language acquisition and can be seen as a basic skill of bilinguals. Although translation strategy was banned from foreign language teaching contexts for the past centuries, it is now considered as a legitimate pedagogical technique (Ellis, 1997; Popovic, 2001) to promote learning. Children's TV shows are usually targeted at pre-schoolers or young children, and use translation techniques to present the meaning of words (Elbwart, 2014). Therefore, it is important to analyze whether translated words and phrases appear contextualized or tend to be isolated and thus draw attention to aspects that would otherwise go unnoticed (Popovic, 2001, p. 3). In fact, translation creates an opportunity for the acquisition and learning of a foreign language. Popovic (2001) defined it as "using the first language as a base for understanding and/or producing the second language" (p. 4).

Within the context of children's animated TV programming, translation strategies are used as a means of verifying comprehension and accuracy (Cordero, 1984). Translating single words or phrases, it ensures that the viewer understands the utterance and follows the storyline so that he or she can avoid problems of comprehension. Translation is not limited to introducing lexical items; although children's programs mainly use it to introduce their viewers to new vocabulary, it also facilitates comprehension, as can be seen in the TV show *Dora the Explorer*. Translation appears to be one of the learning strategies which facilitates comprehension. Additionally, television pictures, which back up the linguistic content, are another helpful tool to convey the message.

The second strategy introduced by Elbwart (2014) is repetition. Similar to translation, the strategy of repetition was banned from language learning contexts due to the rejection of audiolingual drills and approaches (Duff, 2000). Through the process of repeating and reproducing words or phrases, learners proceed "from highly controlled language use to more automatic or spontaneous production of internalized forms" (Duff, 2000, p. 109). Furthermore, repetition is used to provide cohesion and signal discourse topics while helping learners to attend to new vocabulary and grammar (Duff, 2000). In children's television, these features may help viewers to easily follow the bilingual discourse. By repeating and revoicing numerous utterances, understanding of new words is facilitated. The following is an example from *Dora the Explorer*:

دورا: هل ستقولون ؟Be careful butterfly

الأصدقاء معاً: Be careful butterfly

"Dora: Will you say be careful butterfly?"

Friends: Be careful butterfly!”

Comprehension of bilingual discourse in children’s programming appears to be supported by certain language use strategies such as translation and repetition, which help children learn new linguistic structures.

Pragmatic Expressions

Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012) conducted a study on *Handy Manny*, finding formulaic and appraisal expressions among the different types of L2 target utterances introduced during code-switching in characters’ conversations. Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012) stated that the literature lacks a full account of formulaic expressions; however, these expressions are now widely accepted as part of the process of language learning and teaching. This area has become a fast-growing research issue in its own right (Wray, 2006). Formulaic language “has been most recently blossoming as a major focus of attention” (Wray, 2006, p. 592).

It is now widely accepted that speakers’ capacity for linguistic novelty is far less than originally thought. As Coulmas (cited in Gregori-Signes & Alcantud-Diaz, 2012, p. 66) argued:

[C]onversation is a structured activity and as such a large part of it consists of enacting routines. We greet and say goodbye to one another, we introduce ourselves, we thank, we apologize, we make requests, we exchange good wishes, we give advice, we seek information, etc., - all of these are conducted within a large range of conventionalized, pre-patterned expressions.

Different languages have different patterns and routines with regard to conversational practices such as requests or opening and closing conversations.

Formulas or formulaic sequences “exist in so many different forms that it is difficult to develop a comprehensive definition of the phenomenon” (Schmitt & Carter, 2004, p. 4). This is consistent with Wray (2008), who admitted that these discrepancies have caused “considerable scope for discussion about what should and should not be counted” (p. 35). Formulaic expressions may consist of single or multi-word units. The criteria used for classifying formulaic sequences by different authors are “institutionalization, fixedness, [...] non-compositionality and frequency of occurrence” (Schmitt & Carter, 2004, p. 2). Schmitt and Carter focused on multi-word sequences, while Wray (2002) also included single words and morphemes as examples of formulaic language. Wray (2006) stated that “for most researchers, the expression “formulaic language” refers to two or more words which may or may not be adjacent and which have a particular mutual affinity that gives them a joint grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, or textual effect” (p. 953). She acknowledged the discrepancies between child language acquisition, sociolinguistics, literary style, phraseology,

grammar, discourse, and psycholinguistics, each with a different conception of the purpose of formulaic language; and proposed a holistic definition:

Formulaic language is a generic strategic solution to a recurrent challenge for us as humans:

how to promote our own interests. The rationale for this proposal resides in the way that humans use language to manipulate others. Manipulation entails persuading another person to think, feel, or act in some way that you desire. Selecting linguistic material that enables you as a speaker to fluently express your message and enables your hearer or hearers to easily decode it supports this self-promotional goal (Wray, 2006, p. 593).

According to Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012), formulaic expressions in *Handy Manny* may assist children to improve their conversational skills and pragmatic competence in English, as:

[A]utomatic retrieval of words and fixed expressions undoubtedly contributes significantly to smooth performance and normal paced delivery [...] [since] [t]he extremely high frequency of occurrence of such chunks in native-speaker and expert-user conversation reveals their regular, fixed forms and the pragmatically specialised functions they have acquired over many millions of utterances. (McCarthy, 2010, p. 4)

Many of the formulaic expressions Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz's corpus (2012) may be classified as appraisal or evaluating devices, which should be viewed as belonging to the field of interpersonal semantics (Eggins & Slade, 1997). Appraisal refers to the attitudinal colouring of talk among dimensions such as certainty, emotional response, social evaluation, and intensity. As reported by these authors, appreciation, affect, judgment, and amplification are four main categories that should be included in appraisal analysis. Eggins and Slade (1997) defined each as follows: appreciation indicates "the speaker's reactions and evaluation of reality," while affect is "the expression of emotional states both positive and negative" (p. 125). The judgment includes "the speaker's judgments about the ethics, morality or social values of other people." Finally, amplification is "the way speakers maximize or minimize the intensity and degree of the reality they are negotiating" (p. 125). In the corpus of the present study, formulas and formulaic appraisal expressions perform the pragmatic function of helping to regulate the relationship between the fictional characters. Appraisal expressions convey positive emotional states and judgments of the situations the characters get involved in, thus creating solidarity, friendship, and group membership

Methodology

The Sample The data for this study consists of six randomly selected episodes of *Dora the Explorer*, which were obtained from YouTube. The quality of the videos is generally good, and each episode is 23 minutes in duration.

Dora the Explorer is by far the most popular bilingual children's television program, and ever since it was first aired, it has been among the top-rated preschool programs. It was first broadcast in the USA on the Nickelodeon TV channel with English as a matrix language and Spanish as an embedded language. Since 2000, a dubbed version into Standard Arabic with code-switching into English has been broadcast through MBC Nickelodeon TV channels to the Arab world. The series centers around Dora Marquez, a seven-year-old Latina girl, who has adventures with her friend Boots (Moozo in the Arabic-English dubbed version), a five-year-old monkey. Usually these adventures relate to problem-solving strategies and activities, during which the team is supported by their Backpack, providing all necessary tools, and their Map, the useful helper for directions. In almost every episode, the fox Swiper appears and tries to steal an item belonging to either Dora or her friends. Dora and her friends then have to retrieve the lost item during the show. Through its interactive computer style, viewers are asked to join Dora and help her to solve the tasks. According to the producers of the show, *Dora the Explorer* not only introduces new words but also encourages movement and asks viewers to be confident in order to overcome challenges. Most episodes have a similar pattern and start with the theme song after which Dora and Moozo greet their viewers.

Instrumentation

The data of this study were obtained from YouTube and Excel was used for quantitative analysis. Each occurrence of code-switching into English with or without translation into Arabic in each of the six episodes was counted and classified into the five code-switching patterns suggested by Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012). The percentage of occurrence of each pattern was then calculated to determine which pattern was the most common.

Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis were used to account for the use of code-switching in *Dora the Explorer*. The methodology used in this study was adopted from Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012). The quantitative analysis addresses the presence of L2 (English) in the analyzed episodes, which are mainly broadcast in L1 (Standard Arabic). On the other hand, the qualitative analysis assesses the pragmatic function of the different types of code-switching units in the corpus: permanent and context units. If the lexical items are present in most of the episodes and represent the hallmark of the series, such as its song or the names of characters, they are considered permanent. On the other hand, context lexical items are more episode related and can be classified as formulaic and non-formulaic and evaluative expressions. Formulaic units are "vocabulary or expressions that are related to the topic of the episode" (Gregori-Signes & Alcantud-Diaz, 2012, p. 69). Formulaic and evaluative expressions that work on the pragmatic level help to express the characters' attitudes towards the situation and towards other characters. This study aims to clarify the function of these items that result from code-switching. In the quantitative analysis, five types of code-switching are considered:

- a) Type one consists of L1 + L2
- b) Type two consists of L2 + L1
- c) Type three consists of L2 without translation
- d) Type four consists of translation (L1 + L2) in two different turns
- e) Type five consists of metadiscursive code-switching (L2 + L1), which involves the use of a definition formula.

The qualitative analysis includes the classification of the lexical items into two types:

- a) Permanent units such as the song of the series and the names of the characters.
- b) Context units which are dependent on the topic of each episode. Thus, two main categories emerge: non-formulaic and formulaic expressions.

Results and Discussion

In this section, the results of both the quantitative and qualitative analyses are discussed.

Quantitative Analysis

A total of 343 L2 lexical items were found in the corpus. Proper names of the characters were excluded from the analysis apart from those with lexical meaning, such as *Quackers* and *Backpack*. Terms of address (Mr., Mrs., etc.) were also included. Table 1 illustrates the percentages of L2 lexical items according to the different types of code-switching mentioned above. Similar to the findings of Elbwart (2014), it appears that there are differences in the quantitative occurrence of code-switching in each episode.

Table 1 *Percentages of L2 lexical items according to the different types of code-switching*

Episodes	L2	L1 + L2	L2+ L1	L1+ L2 (2 turns)	L2+ L1 (2 turns)	Total
1	57	7	3	7	4	78
2	24	6	3	2	0	35
3	36	6	5	1	1	49
4	49	5	10	1	3	68
5	48	6	3	4	2	63
6	37	5	3	2	3	50
Total	251	35	27	17	13	343
Percentage	73%	10%	8%	5%	4%	100%

It could be concluded from Table 1 that, in line with Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012), code-switching into L2 without translation (Type 3) accounts for the highest percentage (73%) of L2 lexical items. However, even though the percentage is high and a high number of L2 lexical items are introduced in the series, in qualitative terms most instances are repetitions of the same word. Also, certain expressions are repeated several times throughout the series, such as various greetings (e.g., *Hi*, *Welcome*), and words of encouragement such as *come on*, and *let's go*.

271

Hello, Goodbye, Bye, and Goodnight are among the most common. Other formulaic expressions are directives such as *take care* and *let's go*, apologies such as *I'm sorry*, and evaluating or appraisal expressions such as *fantastic, correct, good, brave, excellent, and delicious*. Non-formulaic items include nouns such as *girl, friends, duck, and book*, which are examples of common everyday words.

Discussion and Implications

Results indicate that L2 lexical items are introduced through code-switching in each episode, including several basic formulaic and non-formulaic expressions in English. Code-switching into English is sometimes followed by a translation into Arabic, and sometimes the lexical item is said in Arabic followed by L2 items, which are equivalent to the Arabic lexical item in meaning. Previous studies (McCarthy, 2010; Schmitt & Carter, 2004) indicated the importance of formulaic language in applied linguistics and pragmatics and how it may improve learners' pragmatic competence. The formulaic expressions fulfill some pragmatic functions such as greetings, thanking, apologizing, requesting, identifying, and evaluating through appreciation, judgment, and amplification. Other formulas are interjections and discourse markers.

In line with Gregori-Signes and Alcantud-Diaz (2012), qualitatively positive pragmatic expressions are more prevalent than negative ones. Most of these expressions are introduced by the main character, Dora. Since the goal of this series is educational, Dora's discourse is polite and introduces basic lexical items such as those for greetings, expressing appreciation, and apologizing. These expressions could be useful for young learners to master the process of language learning.

One drawback of such a series is that the characters in the Arabic version are voiced by Arabic speakers (i.e., in this TV series, the speakers are Egyptian: their mother tongue is Egyptian Arabic, and they speak Standard Arabic). Their L2 pronunciation reflects minor mistakes resulting from the influence of their L1 on L2. Moreover, most of the L2 lexical items introduced seem to be random. Some are repeated across the six episodes analyzed such as those for greetings (such as *Welcome my friends, Hi, Hello, Goodbye, Bye, Goodnight*), agreement (such as *yes, of course*), apologies (such as *I am sorry*) and appreciation (such as *fantastic, wonderful*). However, some other items are mentioned once or twice in each episode and thus will not enhance learning them, such as nouns (e.g., *giant, queen, bee*).

The non-formulaic expressions found in the episodes analyzed include common verbs (e.g., *wait, look, let's go*). Similarly, basic nouns and adjectives are introduced, which are suitable for young children to learn (e.g., *girl, good, correct, wonderful, excellent*). Nouns occur frequently in the episodes.

Conclusion

This study investigated the structure and functions of code-switching in *Dora the Explorer*. Different patterns of code-switching were analyzed according to the order in which L1 and L2 were combined. Though L2 lexical items without translation account for the highest percentage of code-switching in the episodes, most of these items are repeated and are considered basic lexical items. In addition, translation into Arabic seems unnecessary in some instances where the meaning is clear, such as when the main character Dora points at the things she refers to or performs. Formulaic expressions with pragmatic functions in the conversation are useful for improving young children's pragmatic competence. Basic lexical items were introduced, such as those for the purpose of greetings, expressing appreciation, and apologizing. These lexical items could be useful for young learners to master the process of language learning.

The study has highlighted drawbacks in the implementation of code-switching in this TV series: careless pronunciation of L2 by L1 native speakers, and the learners not having enough exposure to specific L2 lexical items as they appear as context lexical items.

Future research needs to be conducted on code-switching in other educational TV animated series in other languages. Moreover, in this study, there is frequent code-switching to nouns in L2; thus, additional studies are needed to determine which part of speech is the focus of switching. In addition, given the presence of both inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-switching, further studies need to be conducted on the constraints of intra-sentential code-switching.

About the Author:

Dr. Majedah Abdullah Alaiyed is Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language and Translation, College of Sciences and Arts in Arrass at Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. Her PhD is in Sociolinguistics from Durham University, United Kingdom and her current research interests focus on sociolinguistics, code-switching, code-mixing, and pragmatics. (ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2009-8685>).

References

- Auer, P. (1995). The Pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy, L. & P. Muysken, P. (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Crossdisciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *Interaction and Linguistic Structures*, 6, 1–26.
- Bassiouny, R. (2006). *Functions of code-switching in Egypt*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bassiouny, R. (2009). *Arabic sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Bentahila, A., Davies, E., & Owens, J. (2013). Codeswitching and related issues involving Arabic. In J. Owens (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*, 336–347. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J.J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Codeswitching in Norway. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, 407–434. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bokamba, E. (1989). Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing? *World Englishes*, 8(3), 277–292.
- Boussofara-Omar, N. (1999). *Arabic diglossic switching in Tunisia: Applying Myers-Scotton's frame model* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Boussofara-Omar, N. (2003). Revisiting Arabic diglossic switching in light of the MLF model and its sub-models: The 4-M model and the abstract level model. *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition*, 6(1), 33–46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728903001032>
- Clyne, M. (1987). Constraints on code-switching: How universal are they? *Linguistics*, 25, 739–764.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. (2011). Multilingualism, multiculturalism and integration. In J. Jupp & M. Clyne (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and Integration: A Harmonious Relationship*. 53–72. Canberra: The Australian National University, ANU E Press.
- Cordero, A. D. (1984). The role of translation in second language acquisition. *The French Review*, 57, 350–55.
- Duff, P. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J.K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *The development of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation*. London: Cassell Equinox Publishing.
- Elbwart, K. (2014). *Language choice in children's animated TV shows* (unpublished Master thesis).
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: OUP. F
- Gregori-Signes, C., & Alcantud-Diaz, M. (2012). Handy Manny: the pragmatic function of code-switching in the interaction of cartoon characters. In M.D. Garcia-Pastor (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Foreign Language: Proposals for the Language Classroom*, 61–81. Valencia: Perifèric.
- Grosjean, F. (1996). Processing mixed language: Issues, findings, models. In A. de Groot, & J. Kroll (Eds.), *Tutorials in Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, 225–254. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawson, S., & Sachdev, I. (2000). Codeswitching in Tunisia: Attitudinal and behavioural dimensions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(9), 1343–1361. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00103-4
- Mazraani, N. (1997). *Aspects of language variation in Arabic political speechmaking*. London: Routledge.

- McCarthy, M.J. (2010) The festival incident. In D. Nunan, & J. Choi (Eds.), *Language and Culture* (pp. 140–146). New York and London: Routledge.
- Mejdell, G. (2006). Code-switching. In K. Versteegh (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. I: A–Ed* (Vol. I, 259–269). Leiden: Brill.
- Mejdell, G. (2012). Diglossia, code switching, style variation, and congruence: Notions for analyzing mixed Arabic. *al-‘Arabiyya, Journal of The American Association of Teachers of Arabic*, 44–45, s29–39.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-Disciplinary perspectives on codeswitching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Comparing codeswitching and borrowing. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(1-2), 19-39.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1992.9994481>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1996). Code-switching. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 217-237. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to Bilingualism*. Malden and London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Poplack, S. (1993). Variation theory and languages contact. In D. Preston (Ed.), *American Dialect Research*, 251–286. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Popovic, L. (2001). The place of translation in language teaching. *Bridges* 5, 3-8.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.) Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schmitt, N., & Carter, R. (2004). Formulaic sequences in action: An Introduction. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *Formulaic Sequences*, 1–22. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wray, A. (2008). *Formulaic language: Pushing the boundaries*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Wei, L. (1998). The ‘Why’ and ‘How’ Questions in the analysis of conversational codeswitching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 156–176. London: Routledge.