

Codeswitching Practices of Bulgarian-English Bilinguals

YOANA I. DANCHEVA
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

1 INTRODUCTION

Despite the rapid advancement in the field of codeswitching in the past 20 years, little is known about Bulgarian-English bilinguals and their codeswitching practises and attitudes. Most of the literature up to date has looked at Western European languages such as Spanish and English, and there has been little research done on Slavic languages and more specifically Bulgarian. Bulgarian is an Eastern European language spoken mainly in Bulgaria; however, over two million Bulgarians can be found anywhere around the world due to immigration ([Eurochicago 2012](#)). According to recent studies, bilinguals who are avid codeswitchers find codeswitching to be an effortless process ([Gosselin & Sabourin 2021](#)). Additionally, more positive attitudes to codeswitching have been found to be positively correlated with frequent codeswitching ([Brdarević-Čeljo, Ahmetović & Bajić 2021](#)). Bilinguals who are frequently exposed to their second language might find it easier to codeswitch and might do it more often. Therefore, by examining the language practices of bilinguals as well as their attitudes, a clear answer will be found about the relationship between the two parameters.

The current paper examines Bulgarian-English bilinguals' codeswitching practices through a *Map Task* and their attitudes through a questionnaire. The research question at hand is what the role of attitudes in the actions of bilinguals is. The findings show that feelings of judgement might decrease the codeswitching frequency, but overall, participants' attitudes are similar regardless of their codeswitching tendencies. Additionally, the grammaticality of the sentences is kept even when codeswitching.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Syntactic properties of codeswitching

Codeswitching can be categorised in three ways – *insertion*, *alternation*, and *congruent lexicalization* ([Muysken 2000](#)). Insertion uses words in one language in a structure of a second language; alternation uses structures of two separate languages without mixing them in a single sentence, and congruent lexicalization combines words in grammatically appropriate sentences due to their common grammatical structures ([Muysken 2000](#)). [Poplack \(1980\)](#) found that bilinguals manage to keep grammaticality in codeswitched instances regardless of their fluency. In the current study, all participants are fluent English speakers, and therefore the ways in which

they codeswitch is of particular interest. Codeswitching usually happens in places where the grammars of the two languages overlap (Poplack 1980). Bullock & Toribio (2009) additionally found that congruent lexicalization is seen mostly in typologically similar languages. Even though Bulgarian and English are Indo-European languages, they have quite distinct grammars. For example, in Bulgarian, a suffix can be added to the end of nouns depending on their role in the sentence. Under those circumstances, it is of particular interest to examine the way grammar is presented in the speech of Bulgarian-English bilinguals during codeswitching.

According to Gosselin & Sabourin (2021), bilinguals tend to use some constructions more than others. For example, ‘*la* house’ [the house] has been shown to be a more common instance of codeswitching than ‘the *maison*’ [the house] (Gosselin & Sabourin 2021). In a study of Spanish-English non-habitual switchers, however, it was shown that speakers would produce more instances of a Spanish word preceded by an English determiner – for example, ‘the *casa*’ [the house] (Parafita-Couto & Rodríhuez-González 2019). It can be hypothesised that depending on the language used in the majority of the sentence, the grammar of the codeswitch would vary. In the current study, Bulgarian is the main language of communication, in which case bilinguals might be more likely to use instances such as ‘chair-*a*’ [the chair] more often than ‘the *stol*’ [the chair] when codeswitching.

2.2 Attitudes towards codeswitching

Attitudes play a major role in the actions of speakers. If a person believes that they would be judged based on their language usage, they would alter their speech in order to be perceived more positively by their community. In the case of codeswitching, positive attitudes are positively correlated with codeswitching frequency, and speakers with more linguistically and ethnically diverse experience hold more positive attitudes (Brdarević-Čeljo et al. 2021). Younger bilinguals hold more favourable attitudes towards codeswitching (Al-Emran & Al-Qaysi 2017, Khoumssi 2020), possibly due to the different experiences which they have had growing up. Codeswitching can occur in any circumstances, as long as the sociolinguistic context does not discriminate against the phenomenon (Wigdorowitz, Pérez & Tsimpli 2020). Many young bilinguals have been exposed to the internet since they were children, and some have travelled or lived in various places around the world. In the current study, the participants have grown up with the internet, and all of them have lived in English-speaking countries. Therefore, it is possible that they would hold more positive attitudes towards codeswitching and incorporate it frequently into their speech.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

Four bilinguals (average age = 22) took part in the current study. They were all native Bulgarian speakers, and their second language was English. Three of the participants had acquired an undergraduate degree while one was still working towards obtaining

one. The average age for when the participants had started learning English was 3.5. All participants claimed that they could speak and understand English perfectly, just like Bulgarian. In their primary school years, all participants claimed to have been taught in Bulgarian, while three out of the four bilinguals stated that the language of their high school was English. All participants moved to English-speaking countries for university, where the language of education was English.

The participants were divided into two groups – Group A and Group B. In each group, there was one participant who was currently residing in Bulgaria and one who was living in an English-speaking country. The participants in Group A were identified as PAR1 and PAR2 and in Group B – as PAR3 and PAR4.¹ Table 1 is a rundown of each of the participants:

Participant	Current residence	Language of high school	Group
PAR1	Bulgaria	EN	A
PAR2	United States of America	BG	A
PAR3	United Kingdom	EN	B
PAR4	Bulgaria	EN	B

Table 1 Summary of the participants (EN – English, BG – Bulgarian).

Two of the participants said that they currently resided in Bulgaria; one stated that they lived in the United Kingdom and one – in the United States of America. The mean age for time lived in Bulgaria was 18.5, and the mean age for time lived in an English-speaking country was 4.25. The mean age for moving to an English-speaking country was 17.25. On average, the participants stated that they were exposed to Bulgarian 38.75 percent of the time, and to English – 65.5 percent of the time. Table 2 shows the percentage of exposure to each language of each of the participants:

Participant	Exposure to EN	Exposure to BG	Other
PAR1	60	35	5 (Spanish)
PAR2	92	30	-
PAR3	70	30	-
PAR4	40	60	-

Table 2 Each participant's exposure to English (EN) and Bulgarian (BG).

PAR4 has a significantly different percentage of exposure to the two languages compared to the rest of the participants. This could be because they had a day job in Bulgaria, in which only Bulgarian was spoken. PAR1, who also resided in Bulgaria at that time, was unemployed and stayed at home most of the time. This could lead to more time being spent online, where English is mostly spoken. Unsurprisingly, the participants who resided in the USA and the UK at that time and attended higher

¹ These abbreviations of the participants will continue being used throughout this paper.

education institutions claimed to be exposed to English significantly more than to Bulgarian.

3.2 Procedures

In the first part of the data collection, the participants were given a questionnaire asking them about their codeswitching practises and attitudes towards codeswitching. The questionnaire was based on two other questionnaires: the *CLiP-Q* created by Wigdorowitz et al. (2020) and the *Bilingual Language Profile Questionnaire* by Birdsong, Gertken & Amengual (2012). The current survey had the following 44 items:

Number of questions	Type of question
4	demographic information
12	language background
6	participants' language usage
3	language beliefs
15	codeswitching attitudes
4	codeswitching practices

Table 3 Questionnaire sections and number of questions in each.

For the second part of the data collection, the participants were divided into pairs (Group A and Group B), and each pair conversed through *Zoom*. The conversations had to be held in Bulgarian, but the participants were told that they could use any language wherever they felt comfortable. They were required to complete the *Map Task* twice – once with the English names of the places written under each of the pictures on the map, and once with Bulgarian translations. During the task, the participants had to collaborate in order to discover the path, which had to be taken, to get from the start point to the finish point. Each task consisted of two maps – one with and one without a path. The places found in each map were similar but not the same – some places were missing from one map but were found in the other, and the opposite. The goal was to figure out which places were missing in each map and what the path, which needed to be taken, was. One participant was given the map with the path the first time, and the other – the second time.

On average, each of the two parts of the task took 15 minutes to complete. This type of data collection was chosen since it allowed the participants to converse on a topic, which was interactive and encouraged them to use their most authentic language. The reason why an English task was used once and a Bulgarian one the second time was to identify if there would be a difference between the frequencies of codeswitching. It was hypothesised that in the presence of Bulgarian words, the participants would not codeswitch as much due to the presence of clues. Additionally, it was suggested that the presence of English words would elicit codeswitching since the participants would not be provided with the Bulgarian equivalents.

3.3 Data analysis

The audio data from the *Map Task* was firstly transcribed. The software used for transcribing the audio files was *CLAN* and the transcriptions were then exported to *Microsoft Word* in order for the English translations and glosses to be added. The data was then analysed based on the codeswitched instances in each interview. The questionnaire data was collected with the software *Qualtrics*. The collected data was exported to *Microsoft Excel* and afterwards, the data was analysed with *Stata*. The data analysed with *Stata* concerned the attitudes of the participants. An ANOVA was used, which allowed for the results from all four participants to be analysed simultaneously. The null hypothesis was that there was no difference in the mean values of the attitudes of the participants in each of the two groups, which could have led to similar codeswitching behaviour during the task. One participant answered with a 0 on some statements instead of inputting the minimal score of 1 (maximum – 5); therefore, when analysing the data, these answers were assumed to be a 1.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Language usage

On the question, what percentage of the time the participants used Bulgarian with their friends, the mean was 46, and for English it was 57 percent. Interestingly, when asked how much they talked in these languages with their families, on average, the participants said that they spoke in Bulgarian 75 percent of the time, and in English – nearly 34 percent. On average, the participants stated that they used English in their work or university 66.7 percent of the time, and Bulgarian – 33 percent. One person did not respond, since they did not currently have a job. On average, the participants claimed to think in English 40 percent of the time, and in Bulgarian – 60 percent. Similarly, on average the participants said that they counted in Bulgarian 79 percent of the time, and in English – 28 percent. Due to the difference in residence of the participants, [Table 4](#) shows the reported answers of each of the bilinguals on the above-listed statements:

Participant	Current residence	Communication with friends		Communication with family		Language at work/ university		Thinking/ making decisions		Counting	
		BG	EN	BG	EN	BG	EN	BG	EN	BG	EN
PAR1	Bulgaria	80	20	100	0	-	-	50	50	50	50
PAR2	USA	20	93	10	92	0	100	91	10	100	0
PAR3	UK	5	95	95	5	0	100	50	50	85	15
PAR4	Bulgaria	80	20	95	4	100	0	50	50	80	20

Table 4 Frequency of usage of English (EN) and Bulgarian (BG) in different situations.

4.2 Language attitudes

All participants claimed to feel extremely comfortable using English, but Bulgarian was rated a bit lower – 95 percent. All participants stated that it was important for them to use both English and Bulgarian like native speakers, but while all stated that they wanted others to think that they were native speakers of Bulgarian, for English the percentage was 73.

In Group A, there was no significant difference between the two participants, and the p value was higher than 0.05 – 0.056, which confirms the null hypothesis (see [Figure 1](#)). Therefore, the two participants had similar attitudes towards codeswitching and agreed on most statements. Nevertheless, one claimed that they did not tend to codeswitch within a conversation. When asked why, they stated that they did not wish to speak in such a manner, claiming that speaking in only one language was their preferred method of communication.

Interestingly, there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the participants in Group B. The p value in this group was significantly lower than 0.05 – 0.001, which rejects the null hypothesis (see [Figure 2](#)). The participants had similar attitudes towards some of the statements, but their answers did not match in the rest of the items.

[Figure 3](#) shows the mean of each participant on all 15 questions asking about their codeswitching attitudes. The data shows that PAR2, PAR3, and PAR4 had similar attitudes, as the dispersion is somewhat the same, but PAR1's mean was a bit different to everyone else's. Nevertheless, statistically, all participants had the same answers to the questions, which can be seen in the p value which is 0.77 and significantly higher than 0.05. This once again confirms the null hypothesis.

The means of the answers to each question of all participants is being compared in [Figure 4](#). The p value (0.0031) is significantly smaller than 0.05, which rejects the null hypothesis. Therefore, it can be concluded that due to the statistically significant difference between the means, the probability of the answers of all four participants to be different is quite high.

Overall, the participants stated that they did not feel like they would be judged by their friends if they codeswitched, but some strongly agreed that they would be judged by their family members (see [Figures 1 and 2](#), questions 1 and 2). However, it is surprising that the participants who expressed such views were from Group B and codeswitched more often than the participants in Group A. One possible conclusion as to why the participants in Group B codeswitched more often is because once one participant started to codeswitch, the other followed. This could additionally be supported by the findings from Group A, which showed that since one of the participants refused to codeswitch, the other did not do it either. Nevertheless, PAR2, who was in Group A, was one who did not go to an English-speaking high school, which could additionally lower their codeswitching frequency. This can also be seen in [Table 2](#), where their answers regarding the language in which they thought and counted varied significantly in comparison to the other participants'. On the other hand, the participants in Group B had both studied in English-speaking

Summary of answers of Group A			
Questions	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
1	5	0	2
2	5	0	2
3	3	2.828	2
4	4	1.414	2
5	4	1.414	2
6	2	1.414	2
7	4.5	.707	2
8	4.5	.707	2
9	5	0	2
10	2	1.414	2
11	1	0	2
12	3.5	.707	2
13	2	1.414	2
14	3.5	.707	2
15	3.5	.707	2
Total	3.5	1.503	30

Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob >F
Between groups	45	14	3.214	2.35	0.0559
Within groups	20.5	15	1.367		
Total	65.5	29	2.259		

Bartlett's test for equal variances: $\chi^2(10) = 3.497$ Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.967$

Figure 1 ANOVA results between participants in Group A – p value (0.056) higher than 0.05.

Summary of answers of Group B			
Questions	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
1	5	0	2
2	2.5	.707	2
3	1	0	2
4	5	0	2
5	5	0	2
6	4.5	.707	2
7	2	1.414	2
8	4.5	.707	2
9	4	1.414	2
10	5	0	2
11	4	1.414	2
12	5	0	2
13	1	0	2
14	4	1.414	2
15	4	1.414	2
Total	3.767	1.547	30

Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob >F
Between groups	57.867	14	4.133	5.39	0.0012
Within groups	11.5	15	.767		
Total	69.367	29	2.392		

Bartlett's test for equal variances: $\chi^2(7) = 1.103$ Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.993$

Figure 2 ANOVA results between participants in Group B – p value (0.001) significantly lower than 0.05.

Summary of answers			
Participant	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
1	3.267	1.831	15
2	3.733	1.100	15
3	3.733	1.438	15
4	3.8	1.699	15
Total	3.633	1.518	60

Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob >F
Between groups	2.733	3	.911	0.38	0.766
Within groups	133.2	56	2.379		
Total	135.933	59	2.304		

Bartlett's test for equal variances: $\chi^2(3) = 3.812$ Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.282$

Figure 3 ANOVA summary of the mean results of each participant on the 15 questions regarding their attitudes.

Summary of answers			
Questions	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
1	1	0	4
2	2.25	1.5	4
3	3	2.309	4
4	4.5	1	4
5	1.5	1	4
6	3.25	1.708	4
7	3.25	1.708	4
8	4.5	.577	4
9	1.5	1	4
10	3.5	1.915	4
11	2.5	1.915	4
12	4.25	.957	4
13	1.5	1	4
14	3.75	.957	4
15	3.75	.957	4
Total	2.933	1.645	60

Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob >F
Between groups	76.233	14	5.445	2.93	0.0031
Within groups	83.5	45	1.856		
Total	159.733	59	2.707		

Bartlett's test for equal variances: $\chi^2(13) = 10.0687$ Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.688$

Figure 4 ANOVA summary of the mean results of participants on the 15 questions regarding their attitudes.

high schools, which could have prompted them to adopt codeswitching into their daily speech.

4.3 Map Tasks

4.3.1 Task 1: Bulgarian

In this task, Group A codeswitched only twice throughout the entire conversation. In the first instance, the codeswitched instance is an example of *alternation*, as a whole sentence is used in English in a majority-Bulgarian conversation:

- (1) too bad for you. (PAR2)

In the second instance, PAR1 used the word ‘sorry’ in their sentence, which is a form of *insertion*:

- (2) *sorry gorn-iya lyav ugul.*
sorry upper-DET.M.DAT.SG left corner
‘Sorry, in the upper left corner.’ (PAR1)

The participants used an abundance of loanwords such as ‘okay,’ which was shown to be a word adopted in the Bulgarian language sometime after 1973 (Andreichin, Georgiev, Ilchev, Kostov, Lekov, Stoikov & Todorov 1973). In an official Bulgarian dictionary from 2012, the word ‘okay’ already appears as part of the language (Murdarov, Aleksandrova, Stancheva, Cheralozova, Dimitrova, Viktorova, Lakova, Kostadinova, Tomov, Paskalev, Stoilova & Atanasova 2012a). It is possible that the word ‘sorry’ would be adopted in the future as well, since words such as ‘super’ have become part of the language sometime before 2012 but do not appear in dictionaries around 1973 (Andreichin et al. 1973, Murdarov, Aleksandrova, Stancheva, Cheralozova, Dimitrova, Viktorova, Lakova, Kostadinova, Tomov, Paskalev, Stoilova & Atanasova 2012b).

Group B codeswitched more than Group A but still not a lot. Most of their codeswitches were short sentences rather than insertions:

- (3) I see. (PAR3)
I’ve never seen this word. (PAR4)

A couple codeswitches, which appeared within the Bulgarian sentences, presented words that were not found anywhere in the *Map Task* – ‘locations’ and ‘U-turn.’ There were exactly four instances in which the English equivalents of the Bulgarian translations were said by both PAR3 and PAR4. An example of this is the following:

- (4) *kakto e parche-to zemya i yacht club-at*
 like is.3.SG.PRS piece-DET.NOM.N.SG land and yacht club-DET.M.NOM.SG
posle imam flight museum
 then have.1.SG.PRS flight museum

‘After the piece of land and the yacht club, I have a flight museum...’ (PAR3)

In this sentence, ‘yacht club-*at*’ [the yacht club] is one of the subjects of the sentence. In Bulgarian, there are two ways to express whether a masculine noun, such as this one, is the subject or the object of the sentence – through the insertion of the suffix *-at* (for a subject) or *-a* (for an object). In this case, ‘yacht club-*at*’ [the yacht club] is the subject of the sentence; therefore, unless the noun phrase takes the suffix *-at* to indicate its main position, the sentence sounds odd and grammatically incorrect. The noun ‘flight museum’ takes the position of an object, but instead of adopting the Bulgarian grammar and undergoing a grammatical change, it adopts the English grammar. If the phrase were to undergo a grammatical change, it would appear as ‘flight museum-*a*’ [the flight museum]:

- (5) *posle imam flight museum-a*
 then have.1.SG.PRS flight museum-M.ACC.SG

‘Then I have the flight museum.’

The noun phrase ‘flight museum-*a*’ takes the suffix *-a* since it is the object of the sentence. The sentence is grammatically correct in either case – in the first instance, it follows the grammatical constraints of the Bulgarian language, thus adopting a suffix to demonstrate the role of the word in the sentence. In the second, the example demonstrates the *insertion* form of codeswitching, in which the grammaticality of English is maintained in the codeswitched instance.

4.3.2 Task 1: English

PAR2 codeswitched significantly more than PAR1 in the second task. The most common switches were ‘old mill,’ ‘abandoned cottage,’ and ‘triggered point.’ In most of these instances, the English noun phrases were left unchanged, following the English grammar rather than the Bulgarian one, thus showing a clear example of *insertion*:

- (6) *ot pokriv-a na tozi abandoned cottage trugvash*
 from roof-DET.M.ACC.SG of this.M.ACC.SG abandoned cottage go.2.SG.PRS
nadolu
 downwards

‘Go downwards from the roof of this abandoned cottage...’ (PAR2)

However, there were instances, especially when the single word ‘cottage’ was used, where the syntax of the word was altered to fit the Bulgarian grammar, thus becoming ‘cottag-*a*’ [the cottage]:

- (7) *tryabva da stignesh otgore na cottag-a.*
 have to reach.2.SG.PRS above of cottage-DET.M.ACC.SG

‘...you have to get to above the cottage.’ (PAR2)

The addition of the suffix *-a* to the end of the noun signals that the word is the object of the sentence, and therefore the grammaticality of the Bulgarian sentence is kept. A reason why ‘abandoned cottage’ stays unchanged in the example above is the determiner ‘*tozi*’ [this] which has been added in front of it. Bulgarian grammar allows the noun to stay unchanged since the determiner for masculine words demonstrates the word’s role of an object of the sentence instead.

PAR1 codeswitched only in one sentence, where they used the phrase ‘farmed land.’ In the rest of the task, the participant managed to translate all of the necessary words and did not repeat any codeswitches despite the repeated English instances by PAR2. The fact that the participant stated that they disliked using codeswitches in their speech could have prompted them to stick to a single language, regardless of their task partner’s codeswitching.

In comparison to Group A, Group B codeswitched significantly more. PAR4 codeswitched a bit less than PAR3 but they both showed similar codeswitching patterns. Both participants used full English sentences when replying to one another (a form of *alternation*), for example:

- (8) I’m assuming there is a forest there, yes. (PAR3)

No, I don’t. (PAR4)

At the same time, just like in the case of Group A, the participants codeswitched where the English words were used on the map. Interestingly, the participants did not seem to alter the syntax of the codeswitches when using them in the Bulgarian sentences:

- (9) *imash -li mezhdu fenced meadow i abandoned cottage*
 have.2.SG.PRS -Q between fenced meadow and abandoned cottage
neshto?
 something

‘Do you have anything between the fenced meadow and the abandoned cottage?’ (PAR3)

In such cases, it seemed like the nouns followed the English grammatical rules rather than the Bulgarian ones, in which case there would have been suffixes added to the words in order to show their roles of objects of the sentence. An example of a codeswitch, which followed the grammar of the Bulgarian language instead, was the following:

- (10) *minavash tochno nad trigged point-a.*
 go.2.SG.PRS right above trigged point-DET.M.ACC.SG

‘You go right above the trigged point.’ (PAR3)

In this instance, just like in the example with ‘cottage’ from Group A, the noun ‘point’ adopted the Bulgarian rule for objects, and took the suffix *-a* becoming ‘triggered point-*a*’ [the triggered point].

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The used quantitative analysis examined the attitudes of the participants towards codeswitching and their beliefs about their language usage. Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that their codeswitching attitudes are similar regardless of their language usage beliefs. Additionally, the participants’ language usage reported in the questionnaire aligned with the findings from the qualitative analysis – the participant who stated that they did not like to codeswitch did in fact continue to effectively not codeswitch during the task as well. The participants stated that they codeswitched mainly at home and with their friends, but all of them believed that their friends would judge them less for codeswitching than their family. Half of the participants shared that peer pressure and judgement from others played a role in their codeswitching practices, which confirms the findings of [Wigdorowitz et al. \(2020\)](#) that the sociolinguistic context matters in the frequency of codeswitching. Additionally, based on the qualitative analysis derived from the results from the *Map Task*, it could be concluded that if one participant codeswitched more, the other would follow. In Group B, PAR3 codeswitched since the beginning, which could have prompted PAR4 to start codeswitching more as well. It is highly probable that since PAR1 stated that they did not wish to codeswitch, PAR2 felt required to adhere to only Bulgarian as well.

Regardless of the ways in which the bilinguals codeswitched, they tried to keep the grammar of the sentences flowing. The grammaticality of the sentence was kept during insertion. This kind of codeswitching was seen in most codeswitched instances, but almost all bilinguals switched to English for certain short sentences during the task as well. Since English has become a commonly used language for communication ([McClure 2011](#)), its influence can be seen in Bulgarian as well. Words such as ‘yes’ and ‘sorry’ are being used frequently by Bulgarian speakers, and some, such as ‘okay,’ have even become part of the lexicon. An abundance of examples of codeswitches was found; however, Group A codeswitched significantly less than Group B. Finally, unless the task prompted them to codeswitch due to the presence of English words, the participants spoke almost entirely in Bulgarian. This proved that depending on the stimuli, codeswitching would either be supported or not.

Due to the time constraint for this project, the participants did each task once. Because only English titles for the places were available in the second task, the participants codeswitched more; however, since one participant had to present the path in Task 1, and the other – in Task 2, one participant was always assigned the English version, and the other – the Bulgarian one. Therefore, it is highly probable that if one participant codeswitched more than the other, it was because they were the one leading the English task. For future studies, at least four tasks need to be prepared – two in English and two in Bulgarian, and each participant would have

to present one of each. This way the findings would be more accurate and it would be clearer whether the person influences the frequency of codeswitching or the language of the task does.

REFERENCES

- Al-Emran, M. & N. Al-Qaysi. 2017. Code-switching Usage in Social Media: A Case Study from Oman. *International Journal of Information Technology and Language Studies* 1. 25–38.
- Andreichin, L., L. Georgiev, S. Ilchev, N. Kostov, I. Lekov, S. Stoikov & T. Todorov. 1973. *Bulgarski tulkoven rechnik*. Nauka i izkustvo, Sofia 3rd edn.
- Birdsong, D., L. M. Gertken & M. Amengual. 2012. Bilingual Language Profile: An Easy-to-Use Instrument to Assess Bilingualism <https://sites.la.utexas.edu/bilingual/>.
- Brdarević-Čeljo, A., E. Ahmetović & E. Bajić. 2021. Variation in attitudes towards codeswitching and codeswitching frequency among multilingual speakers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1–16. doi:10.1080/01434632.2021.1983580.
- Bullock, B. E. & A. J. Toribio. 2009. *Themes in the study of code-switching* 1–17. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Eurochicago. 2012. Broi na bulgarskite grazhdani v chuzhbina. <https://www.eurochicago.com/2012/04/v-tchuzhbina/>.
- Gosselin, L. & L. Sabourin. 2021. Lexical-semantic processing costs are not inherent to intra-sentential code-switching: The role of switching habits. *Neuropsychologia* 159. 1–14.
- Khoumssi, K. 2020. Attitudes of Young Moroccans towards the Use of Code-switching in their Facebook Interactions. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics* 5. 469–493.
- McClure, E. 2011. *The relationship between form and function in written national language–English codeswitching: Evidence from Mexico, Spain, and Bulgaria* 125–150. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin. doi:doi:10.1515/9783110812190.125.
- Murdarov, V., T. Aleksandrova, R. Stancheva, K. Cheralozova, M. Dimitrova, K. Viktorova, M. Lakova, P. Kostadinova, M. Tomov, N. Paskalev, I. Stoilova & A. Atanasova. 2012a. *Okay* 433. Prosveta, Sofia.
- Murdarov, V., T. Aleksandrova, R. Stancheva, K. Cheralozova, M. Dimitrova, K. Viktorova, M. Lakova, P. Kostadinova, M. Tomov, N. Paskalev, I. Stoilova & A. Atanasova. 2012b. *Super* 600. Prosveta, Sofia.
- Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Parafita-Couto, M. C. & E. Rodríhuez-González. 2019. Do all bilinguals switch the same way? Testing patterns of non-habitual Spanish-English code-switchers. *Espacios en evolución: confluencias lingüísticas y culturales* 105–127.
- Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18. 581–618. doi:10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581.

Wigdorowitz, M., A. I. Pérez & I. M. Tsimpli. 2020. A holistic measure of contextual and individual linguistic diversity. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 1–19.

Yoana I. Dancheva
University of Cambridge
yid20@cam.ac.uk