

**The Discourse of Text Messaging as a Locus of
Contact-Induced Linguistic Change in Algeria:
The Case of Relizane Speech Community**



Berrabah Ali¹, Benabed Ammar²

¹ Djillali Liabes University of Sidi Bel Abbas, (Algeria),

ali.berrabah@univ-sba.dz

² University of Tiaret, (Algeria), ammar.benabed@univ-tiaret.dz

Summary:

This paper investigates language contact outcomes in the structure of text messaging in the Algerian context. To disentangle language contact outcomes in the discourse of text messaging in Relizane Speech Community (hereafter RSC), a quasi- structured questionnaire was carried out with a random sample of 67 respondents and a content analysis of a corpus of 108 text messages was adopted. The results showed that the highest rates of texters regularly borrow, code-switch, code mix and even transliterate for different reasons to serve multiple communicative functions. At last, the study has opened up numerous of our promising areas of research about other linguistic practices in the discourse of text messaging namely morphological neologism and normative or formative words formation processes.

Keywords: text messaging; contact-induced change; borrowing; code-switching/mixing; transliteration

1. INTRODUCTION

The worldwide distribution of language contact situations has received a huge academic of literature in sociolinguistics. In this vein, the groundbreaking researches in the field (Weinreich 1953, Blom & Gumperz 1972, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001, Gal 1979/1988, Grosjean 1982, Muysken 2000, Myers-Scotton 1993a/1993b/ 1998/2002/2006, Poplack 1980, Romaine 1989, Sankoff & Poplack 1980, Wei 2000, among many others) have demonstrated the impact of such contact

* Auteur correspondant: **Berrabah Ali**, e-mail: ali.berrabah@univ-sba.dz

mainly on the speakers of the substrate languages in terms of language choice, language use and language attitudes.

Given that the outcomes of language contact, including borrowing, code-switching, code mixing, etc are unpredictable, they have been considered as driving forces to contact-induced changes. Undoubtedly, the linguistic changes in the speech of the Algerians are, in essence, of the deep-rooted acculturation between the Arabo-Islamic culture and the ancient civilizations that had passed through the country.

Albeit the oral conversations of such linguistic practices have been shifted to the written interactions with the proliferation of text messaging discourse in wake of the second millennium, we have been obliged, on the one hand, to apply approaches and/or models of the spoken form - herein Muysken Typological Approach 2000 to code switching - to analyze our written data because very rare empirical studies have been carried out to examine such genre of social contact. On the other hand, we relied on those theories to written discourse instead standing on the only fact that "those who borrow or code-switch when speaking will do so in writing" (berrabah, 2014).

Since our attempt is to describe the structural properties and/or the linguistic features of text messaging discourse in RSC - the 48th numbered sub-urban agricultural western Algerian province, which is far away from the capital Algiers of about 250 km-, some basic questions ought to be raised such as:

- 1) What motivates texters in RSC to exploit the diverse contact linguistic outcomes in their interactions?
- 2) To what extent can such linguistic practices structure communication amongst texters in RSC?
- 3) How far can contact-induced change affect the speech behaviour of texters in RSC?

Accordingly, the objectives to be reached in this study are as follows:

- a. To deconstruct the possible language contact outcomes in the discourse of text messaging in RSC.
- b. To uncover the reasons and motivations behind the linguistic practices in texting in RSC.
- c. To attempt to disentangle the impact of such linguistic practices on the speech of texters and their recipients as well.

With regards to the aforesaid research questions and mainly to attain the projected objectives, the following research hypotheses have been put forward:

1. Language contact outcomes, similar to the ones in oral conversations, are rather positive and effective linguistic phenomena in conveying meaningful information via text messages.

2. Texters in RSC purposely exploit the outcomes of language contact to achieve diverse communicative functions.

3. Since the linguistic practices in texting are unlimited and unpredictable, they might lead to the creation of totally new structural and/or linguistic forms.

2. Literature Review

With the intentions of making the study more intelligible, it is of a paramount importance in this section to briefly review some of the key concepts, first, in order for us to ensure a smooth transition from the theoretical to the practical part, and, second, so that to make mainly things clear for the reader. Therefore, recalling some of the prominent scholars' definitions of the concepts language contact, its main outcomes, along with describing the impact of the linguistic melting pot on text messaging discourse in RSC will be taken into account underneath.

2.1 Text Messaging Discourse and Language Contact Outcomes in Algeria

Crystal (2008) used the terms “texting or text messaging (or simply txt or txtng)” to refer to any short informal typed text that has been sent and/or received via mobile phones using Short Message Service (SMS) since the early 1990s. It is regarded as a hybrid form of both informal spoken and written discourse in the sense that “texts communicated by pagers were replaced by text messages (Crystal, 2008, p.4) to serve multiple communicative functions using an idiosyncratic style of language or structure due mainly to the fact that “the maximum size of the message is 160 characters. If more complex symbols are to be represented (as in Chinese or Japanese writing), then... that reduces the size of the message to 70 characters.” (Crystal, 2008, p.6).

In the Algerian context, investments into the sector of mobile services were quite late in comparison to the neighbouring countries and the entire world. The official launching of the earliest of the three competing mobile operators Djezzy on February 2002 has opened a new era of distance communication whereby users have been able, by choice or by force of circumstances, to communicate either in real time (synchronously) or via texting (asynchronously).

It is universally acknowledged that since 1953, when the concept language contact (aka contact linguistics) made its appearance in Uriel Weinreich's *Languages in Contact*, considerable attention of a wide range of scholars within various bilingual speech communities worldwide has been drawn to the discipline and thus it has caused much ink to flow in the sphere of sociolinguistics. In fact, the phenomenon of language contact has not only been resulted from direct contact via conquests, invasions, mixed marriages, immigration or emigration, etc but it has also been born of indirect contact owing to humans' needs of interpersonal communication and cultural exchange in the light of the hustle and

bustle of today's technology-driven life.

Up to this point, the notion language contact have been dealt with in broader sense, it is now time for reviewing some pioneering definitions in the field. Let's start with Thomason (2001) who claimed that "language contact is the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time." Precisely, the term language contact is used to refer to situations where groups of people who speak very similar varieties are in contact with people who speak rather different varieties (cf. Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001, p.2). In fact, "language contact situations have sometimes led to the creation of totally new varieties of languages besides resulted in a myriad of (socio)linguistic outcomes such as: diglossia, borrowing, code-switching, code-mixing, etc," (Berrabah & Benabed, 2021, p.137). Therefore, this "creative activity is an important part of contact-induced change, as is well-known and described in many studies in which informants are portrayed as "unpredictable speakers" (Thomason 2001) or "language builders" (Hagège 1993)." (Léglise & Chamoreau , 2012, p.3).

By the same token in many other counties around the globe, linguistic outcomes of language contact have become fruitful areas for investigations within the Algerian environment. The simultaneous coexistence of many language varieties resulted from language contact in Algeria has given rise to diverse linguistic practices, which have attracted considerable attention of a wide spectrum of research activities. Unfortunately, the large majority -if not all- of them (Bouamrane 1998, Benali 2007, Benhattab 2004 & 2011, Berrabah 2014, Berrabah & Benabed 2021 to cite but a few) were conducted on the spoken form of language.

Undoubtedly, the lack of willingness to investigate the outcomes of contact linguistics in informal written discourse in the Algerian context as a whole and in particular in the structure of text messaging was, as mentioned earlier, mainly attributed to the absence of the data-based language until the early beginning of the second millennium. Since then, asynchronous communication has revolutionised the interpersonal communication mainly amongst texters as well as has brought noteworthy linguistic practices in the speech repertoire of the country and its different communities including of course RSC.

Amongst of the easily noticeable outcome in any intercultural linguistic contact situation is lexical borrowing, which can be said to have begun with Einar Haugen's article 'The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing' (1950). Hoffer (2002) described borrowing as "the process of importing linguistic items from one linguistic system into another, a process that occurs any time two cultures are in contact over a period of time."(p.2). Accordingly, borrowing can be defined as the lexical adoption of structurally isolated and/or single words from other languages (known as guest/donor languages) alongside their semantic and phonological levels of course to be inserted the host language as a part of its linguistic system.

In fact, many examples can be found in the collected corpus to demonstrate the existence of such a linguistic phenomenon in texting in RSC. Among them one can cite in the list below:

French: bnjr/bonjour (hello), bnsr/bonsoir (good afternoon), slt/salut (hi), bn8 = bonne nuit (good night), mrc/mr6/mer6/merci (thanks), etc

English: ok, gn8 (good night), ltr (later), tmrw (tomorrow), by/bye, thnx (thanks), sorry, hi, etc

Berber: Azul (Hi/Hello), yennayer (January), assegas amegaz (happy New Year), etc

Spanish: Buenos dias (Hi/Hello), Hola (Hi/Hello)

Italian: Pizza

Since code-switching (hereafter CS) is a widespread communicative behaviour in bilingual communities, it has occupied the lion's share in the field of contact linguistics, and thus has been defined differently in different contexts. The notion 'switching codes' was first coined by Hans Vogt in 1954 in his review of Weinreich's book and has later on been used interchangeably to mean the same as 'code switching'. Poplack (1980) defined CS as "the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent." (p.7). In the same line of thought, Wei (2007) stated that code switching is:

an ability to select the language of preference according to the interlocutor, the situational context, the topic of conversation, alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation, and to change languages within an interactional sequence in accordance with sociolinguistic rules and without violating specific grammatical constraints. (p. 337)

Thereupon, CS or language alternation means the morpho- syntactic adaptation, which may involve too the phonological and the semantic aspects, at sentences level (aka inter-sentential CS). In other words, it is the mixture of two language varieties that belong to two different language families within the same production (oral or written). In point of fact, every code switching instance starts life as borrowing i.e. code-switching processes cannot occur without borrowings since speakers, first and foremost, borrow or adopt single isolated words from the donor languages, which are, then, inserted either as they are or they are adapted morphologically or just phonologically or both so that they can be used in (a) sentence(s) or (an) utterance(s) in the host language. In this regards, we have chosen some linguistic evidence amongst the ample examples that had been provided by respondents to better illustrate the way texters switch back and forth between the different language varieties to convey their messages to their recipients:

(1) Fr/Ar CS : Qu'est tu? Varaiment tu me derange, rabi yehdikom (who are

you? Really, you bother me. May Allah guide you on the right path)

(2)Fr/ADACS:Defa3li.lexetri.derole.me3ak.ta3i.aw.ta3e.papa.nekawi.rahome .tama.yedaf3o.3elal8 (apply for me a copy of the tax certificate [notice of assessment] together with my father. Our birth certificates are there. The applications start at 8.)

(3) Eng/Fr/ADA CS : Hi my teacher wach rak cv? Et ton fami w lekhadma jspr b1 darolna 2eme langue khayert ongli lisoncial lah ywafkak d3ili m3ak cè name by bon journè (Hi my teacher, how are you? I hope your family and your work are ok. We had to be examined in a second language; I chose English. May Allah bless you, pray for us. It's-a girl name- bye, have a nice day)

(4) Fr/ADA CS: slt, inchalah ykouno farho b lè cadeau w 3ajbouhom (Hi, insh'Allah [God willing] they rejoiced in the gift and it won their admiration)

(5)Fr/ADACS:Be3atli.fagera.fiha.3.setora.en.fransi.kach.ivanment.seratelek.r ani.dakhel.darewak.lexama (Send me a three-line paragraph in French about an incident that happened to you. I'm going to take the exam now)

In a slightly different way from code switching, “code mixing is the use of elements of one language in another language. It is the transition from using linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses, etc) of one language to using those of another within a single sentence.” (Hamers and Blanc, 1989, p.35). In view of that, code-mixing (henceforth CM) occurs at a sentence boundary whereby speakers tend to switch back and forth between elements (words, phrases or clause) of the same sentence. It is noteworthy here to point out that many socio/linguists have promoted the concept ‘intra-sentential CS’ to be used synonymously with CM. Here are some selected examples of code-mixing instances in texting from our corpus: (6) Fr/ADA/Eng CM: Sayi rani flixitlek 100da, verfi ok (it's ok, I topped up [loaded the chip with money] your balance/mobile phone credit with 100 dinars, check ok)

(7) Fr/ADA CM: rani f lagence (I am at the bus station)

(8)Fr/ADA/EngCM:AnaKarder.0770.mahich 3andi.3ayeteli.fi.0790.ok.bon.8. (I am Kader, I don't have 0770 now. Call me on 0790 ok, good night)

(9) Fr/ADA CM: Slm, j espere rak mlih, 3ayetli c urgent (Hi, I hope you are doing well, call me it's urgent)

(10) Fr/ADA CM: salem bipili b jezzy rani mehtajek (Make a beep sound via Djezzy, I need you.)

Moreover, the increasing indirect intercultural contact due chiefly to modern-life technological requirements has too led to the appearance of another unpredictable contact-induced linguistic changes such as transliteration, which is “the act or process of writing words using a different alphabet.”(Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus, 2021). Some illustrative examples about transliterating in texting, mostly from Arabic into Latin characters, from our

collected data are presented below:

(11) Gadan nadhab ma3an (tomorrow, we will go together)

(12) slm osstad rani hab nihki m3ak 3la tta3n (Peace be upon you sir/teacher, I would like to talk to you about the appeal)

(13) Aid mabarek khoya la3ziz lik wila kol l3aila lah ydawam sa3at lhna alikom (Happy feast dear brother for both you and your family, Oh Allah, last long such good moments on you all)

In fact, transliteration in texting might be used when the sender himself and his recipient are passive bilinguals whereby the first can comprehend foreign languages but cannot speak nor write them, and knows that the second understands only his native language but is able to decipher messages written in Romanized lettering. Such a process can be also deliberately exploited by texters either to speed the typing process to save time or overcoming characters' limit to save money since the messages written in Arabic letters require less characters than the ones typed in Latin script. Besides, what obliges many texters to avoid using the Arabic lettering while texting might be the fact that either their or recipients' cellular phones lack language settings, where the Arabic language is always displayed either in block letters (known as printscript) or in forms of squares.

3. Methodology, Participants and Data Collection Procedures

For the sake of matching the main objectives of the study accompanied by reaffirming some of our earlier conclusions on the prevailing CS instances in SMS messages in RSC (cf, berrabah, 2014), a mixed model research design was used combining: First, a qualitative quasi-structured 13 item questionnaire, including open-ended and close ended questions, was designed. It was intended to probe respondents' perceptions on text messaging usage, frequencies, preferred language varieties, language alternation processes and the reasons behind them or the demotivating factors for their uselessness.

The questionnaire was handed out to a random mixed-gender sample of 100 respondents of all age ranges and different educational levels from different regions in Relizane during one month. Unfortunately, just 82 questionnaires had been returned back on time. When we started classifying the results of our collected data, we found that 15 questionnaires were not filled out i.e., they contained very few or no responses that's why they were also discarded. At last, only the sum of 67 samples was taken into account.

Second, a qualitative content analysis of 108 provided samples of text messages, two each of the 54 respondents who claimed that they frequently use text message, in the last section of the questionnaire. In fact, the implemented approach had a two-side objective. On the one side, the approach was used

mainly to identify and/or classify texters' different language outcomes and, on the other side, to corroborate the findings of the data collected through the questionnaire.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

Since the better the data analysis of any research is done the better its reliability is, we focused, first, on providing concrete scientific evidence whereby the respondents' answers of all items in the questionnaire were grouped together and statistically represented in tables to be rigorously interpreted so that the reader can easily understand and/or assess the texters' motives behind shifting from using the outcomes of language contact in real conversation into informal style of short-texts. Second, throughout Content Analysis Approach (CAA), we endeavoured to deconstruct the respondents' text messages (cf., examples 1-13 in 1.1) to corroborate the linguistic practices that those texters claimed their use via their responses and also to prove that text messaging is a by-product to reflect Algeria's linguistic reality whereby the outcomes of contact linguistic are not only prevalent in the conversations but also in the written interactions of the Algerians. In point of fact, both data analysis approaches were deliberately chosen aspiring to answer the research questions, validate or refute the formulated hypotheses of the study.

Table1 : Text Messaging Usage, Frequencies, Preferred Language Variety (ies) and Co-participants

Abbreviations and acronyms:

- Algerian Dialectal Arabic (**ADA**), Modern Standard Arabic (**MSA**), Berber & its varieties (**Ber**), French (**Fr**), English (**Eng**), Spanish (**Sp**)
- Always (**A**), Often, (**O**), Sometimes (**S**), Rarely (**R**), Never (**N**)

| Dichotomies | | Percentages | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|--|-------------|
| Frequencies | | | | | |
| QQ | 1. Do you text message? | 2. How often? | | 3. Which variety(ies) do you use in SMS? | |
| Answers | Yes | A | 23 (34.32%) | ADA | 22 (40.74%) |
| | | O | 14 (20.89%) | MSA | 8 (14.81%) |
| | | S | 11 (16.41%) | Ber | 1 (1.85%) |
| | | R | 6 (8.95%) | Fr | 12 (22.22%) |
| | 54 (80.60%) | | Eng | 10 (18.51%) | |
| No | N | 13 (19.40%) | Sp | 1 (1.85%) | |
| Total | | 67 (100%) | | 54 (100%) | |

It is obvious from Table 1. that the respondents involved in the study were active text-messaging users since the large majority of them 54 (80.60 %) positively assured, via replying with 'Yes', that they regularly text message with varying frequencies ranged as follows: 'always' 23 (34.32%), 'often' 14 (20.89%), 'sometimes' 11 (16.41 %) and 'rarely' 6 (8.95 %); whereas, only 13 respondents

(19.40 %), whose responses were negative ‘No or Never’ that might reflect either their unwillingness or inability to use such medium of contact.

The highest absolute rates of the prevalence of text messaging among the selected sample proved that texting has remained a dynamic communicative strategy in the speech of the Algerians even though there have been an array of alternative social networking sites. Besides, the table clearly demonstrates that those who text message might use various language varieties in differing degrees, viz. ‘ADA’ (40.74%), ‘MSA’ (14.81%), ‘Ber’ (1.85%), ‘Fr’ (22.22 %), ‘Eng’ (18.51 %) and ‘Sp’ (1.85%), to convey the required topics to their wished-for recipients. It should be noted that such variation in the numbers of recipients and proportions of language choice / use in text messaging could be attributed to priority or importance of the language variety itself among users and/or in society.

Table2: Attitudes towards Language Alternation in Text Messaging

| QQ | | Dichotomies | | Total |
|----------------|--|-------------|---|--|
| lge = language | | Yes | No | |
| Answers | 4. Do you alternate from one language to another in your SMS? How often? | Always | 21 (38.88%) | 54 (100%) |
| | | Often | 12 (22.22%) | |
| | | Sometimes | 7 (12.96%) | |
| | | Rarely | 8 (14.81%) | |
| | | 48 (88.88%) | | |
| | 7. Does alternating in SMS means you are proficient in languages? | 39 (72.22%) | | 15 (27.77%) |
| | 8. Does alternating in SMS means bring of national identity and/or social belonging? | 18 (33.33%) | lge maintains affiliation with the members of any speech community 6 (11.11%) | Contact outcomes are everywhere 5 (9.25%) |
| | | | lge is a feature/pillar of any nation/state 5 (9.25%) | Cannot develop in total isolation 6 (11.11%) |
| | | | lge establishes solidarity among people of the same nation 4 (7.40%) | Helps cultural exchange 9 (16.66%) |
| | | | lge signals loyalty/allegiance to the nation 3 (5.55%) | More expressive & concise 16 (29.62%) |
| | 11. Do you stop texting if you feel it makes your native lge corrupt/loss? | 52 (96.29%) | | 2 (3.70%) |

Table2. is a recap of statistical data related to respondents' at attitudes towards language alternation while text-messaging and an assessment of the level of awareness and the extent such linguistics behaviour might impact on their social belonging and/or cultural identity. First, 48 respondents (88.88 %) positively answered the question whether they alternated from one language to another while texting. The rates of recurrences while doing so were ranked as follows: ‘always’ 21 (38.88%), ‘often’ 12 (22.22%), ‘sometimes’ 7 (12.96%) and rarely 8

(14.81%). Quite the opposite, 6 respondents only with a very low percentage of 11.11 % replied 'Never' to the previous question. To justify their choice, 2 respondents affirmed that they avoided language alternation while texting 'to demonstrate modesty' (3.70 %), 3 declared that 'some people were unfamiliar with such alternations like illiterate or aged people' (5.55 %) and only 1 insisted that 'some varieties succeeded in conveying the exact meaning by their own' (1.85%). Second, when respondents were asked if alternation in SMS meant you were proficient in languages; 39 of them answered 'Yes' with a proportion of 72.22 % and just 15 with a percentage of 27.77 % replied with 'No'. Thus, on the basis of the highest statistical evidence in QQ 9 and 10, it can be inferred that language alternation, as a prominent outcome of contact linguistics in Algeria, is too prevalent in text messaging discourse in RSC. Respondents' opinions were greatly divided as far as question 11 is concerned; it is clear that only 18 respondents (33.33%) agreed with idea that alternating in SMS meant losing of national identity and/or social belonging; while, 36 of them (66.66%) totally opposed that. The supporters' views were justified in that manner; 6 respondents with the percentage of 11.11% stated that language maintained affiliation with the members of any speech community, 5 of them (9.25 %) declared 'language was a feature/pillar of any nation/state', 4 (i.e. 7.40 %) claimed 'language established solidarity among people of the same nation' and the rest 3 (i.e. 5.55 %) argued that 'language signalled loyalty/ allegiance to the nation'. However, the opponents' arguments were provided as follows: 5 (9.25 %) argued that language 'contact outcomes are everywhere' and 6 (11.11%) asserted language 'cannot develop in total isolation'. By the same token, 9 respondents (16.66%) maintained that language alternation 'helped cultural exchange' and 16 of them (29.62%) claimed that 'more expressive and concise'. As far as the question whether texters stop texting if they felt their native language would be corrupted/lost is concerned, 52 participants (96.29%) responded with 'Yes'; whereas, only 2 respondents (3.70%) answered 'No'. At long last, in between the clash of the positiveness of language alternation in texting and its negative impacts on the speakers' linguistic and cultural identity; none can refute the fact that language alternation, as any of the outcomes of language contact, is an unpredictable phenomenon since it is mostly imposed on speakers for either historical facts or technological requirements and its beneficial consequences have been proved in many societies around the world, herein the case of RSC.

Table3 : Linguistic Practices and reasons behind Language Alternation in Text Messages

| | Reasons | Percentages | Reasons | Percentages |
|---|---|-------------|---|-------------|
| Q | 12. What Does your alternation between language varieties in SMS involve? | | 13. Why do you alternate in SMS? | |
| Q | | | | |
| ANSWERS | The adoption of single word(s) from other variety(ies) | 13 (27.08%) | Fill in written gaps | 17 (35.41%) |
| | The mixture of different language varieties within sentences | 9 (18.75%) | prove your mastery of the codes | 5 (10.41%) |
| | The mixture of different varieties within words, phrases or clauses | 19 (39.58%) | show off/for prestige | 2 (4.16%) |
| | The mixture of two varieties of the same language | 7 (14.58%) | attract the recipients for instant reaction | 13 (27.08%) |
| don't find equivalent terms in my native language | | | 11 (22.91%) | |
| Total | 48 (100%) | | 48 (100%) | |

Since amongst the ultimate objectives of this study is the examination of the different linguistic practices that texters might use in RSC, question 12 in graph 3 illustrates respondents' possible alternation strategies while texting in which 13 respondents (27.08%) said they were likely to 'adopt single word(s) from other variety(ies)' (i.e., borrowing), 9 of them (18.75%) suggested 'mixing different language varieties within sentences' (i.e. CS), 19 with the proportion of 39.58 % declared that they 'mixed different varieties at words' level, phrases or clauses' (CM) and the remaining 7 participants (14.58 %) stated that they 'mixed two varieties of the same language' (Diglossia: H /L Varieties). When respondents were asked to specify the reasons for their alternation in SMS, 17 participants (35.41%) said simply to 'fill in written gaps', 5 (10.41%) declared to 'prove their mastery of the codes', 2 (4.16 %) stated to 'show off/for prestige', 13 (27.08 %) expressed in order to 'attract the recipients' instant reaction' and the rest 11 (22.91 %) declared that they 'didn't find equivalent terms in their native language'. It can be noticed from both questions' proportions in graph 5 that texters are inclined to manipulate various linguistic alternation processes to accomplish a number of different purposes while texting and that switching back and forth between language varieties emphasizes the cultural heritage diversity and linguistic richness in the speech of the Algerians including, of course, the speakers of RSC.

4. CONCLUSION

To cut a long story short, then, text messaging has remained the most easiest and efficient communicative mechanism amongst the Algerians, herein in the speech behaviour of lot of speakers in RSC, irrespective of the widespread of many alternative social networking sites including Facebook, Viber, Messenger, Instagram, etc. Similar to daily oral conversations, texting encompasses many purposeful contact linguistic outcomes like borrowing, code switching and code

mixing alongside transliteration to serve different social and linguistic functions. Such linguistic practices and other creative and/or unclassified aspects of language in texting, which are in fact the forerunner of the current available linguistic processes throughout the social networking sites, might be a model to generate further promising areas of research especially in the arena of contact-induced morphological change.

5. References:

- 1- Benali-Mohamed, R. (2007). A sociolinguistic investigation of Tamazight in Algeria with a special reference to the Kabyle variety. [Unpublished Ph.D Thesis]. Oran University. Algeria
- 2- Benhattab, A. L. (2004). Aspects of code switching, code mixing, and borrowing in the speech of Berber speakers in Oran. [Unpublished Magister Thesis], Oran University. Algeria
- 3- Benhattab, A. L. (2011). Aspects of languages in contact: the case of the Mzabi and Kabyle minorities In Oran. [Unpublished PhD Thesis], Oran University. Algeria
- 4- Berrabah, A. (2014). The ideological beliefs towards code switching/mixing practices and their effects on communication efficiency via 'sms language' in Relizane: a critical discourse analysis. [Unpublished thesis of Magister]. University of Oran. Algeria
- 5- Berrabah, A. & Benabed, A. (2021). Contact-induced phonological change of the phoneme /s/ in the speech of EFL learners and teachers in Algeria: a case study. *International journal of linguistics, literature and translation (IJLLT)* IV-2, pp. 136-143.
- 6- Blom J-P. & Gumperz, J.J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: code switching in Norway. In J.J. Gumperz .& D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. pp.407-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston
- 7- Bouamrane, A. (1986). Aspect of the sociolinguistics situation in Algeria, [Unpublished PhD Thesis], Aberdeen University. Great Britain.
- 8- Bouamrane, A. (1988). Arabic/French code switching in Algeria. *Etudes et Recherche en linguistique et sociolinguistique*. Document N° 08 – CRIDDISH: Oran. Algeria
- 9- Bown, C. (2008). *Linguistic Field Work: A Practical Guide*. Houndmills & New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

- 10- Chamoreau, C. & Léglise, I. (2012). A multi-model approach to contact-induced language change. *Dynamics of Contact-induced language change*, pp.1-15, Mouton de Gruyter
- 11- Crystal, D. (2008). *Txtng: The gr8 db8*. (E. McLachlan, Illustrator). Oxford University Press.
- 12- Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press
- 13- Gal, S. (1988). The political economy of code choice. In Monica Heller (ed.) *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 243-261. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- 14- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 15- Hoffer, B. L. (2002). Language borrowing and language diffusion: an overview. *Intercultural communication studies XI:4*, pp.1-37.
- 16- Hoffer, B. L. (2005) Language borrowing and the indices of adaptability and receptivity. *intercultural communication studies XIV-2*, pp. 53-77.
- 17- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.
- 18- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford University Press
- 19- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social motivations for code switching: evidence from Africa*. Oxford University Press
- 20- Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). *Codes and consequences: choosing linguistic varieties*. Oxford University Press
- 21- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 22- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- 23- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes i'll start a sentence Spanish y termino en Espanola: towards a typology of code-switching. *Working papers in the centre for Puerto Rican studies N°4*, New York, City: University of New York
- 24- Romaine, S. 1989. *Bilingualism*. Basil Blackwell.
- 25- Sankoff, D. & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code-switching. In *Papers in linguistics 14.2*. pp.3-45.

26- Sankoff, G. (2002). Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In *The handbook of language variation and change*, J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill & N. Schilling-Estes (eds), 638-668. Oxford: Blackwell.

27- Thomason, S.G. (2001a). *Language contact: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

28- Thomason, S.G. (2001b). Contact-induced typological change. In *Language typology and language universals, Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien*, Volume 2, 2. Halbband, Tome 2, M. Haspelmath, E. Koenig, W. Oesterreicher & W. Raible (eds), 1640-1648. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

29- Thomason, S.G. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

30- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.