

ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING AND CODE-MIXING AMONG BILINGUAL
CHILDREN: TWO CASE STUDIES OF SERBIAN-ENGLISH LANGUAGE
INTERACTION

A Thesis by

Jelena Brezjanovic-Shogren

B. B. A., Wichita State University, 2002

Submitted to the Department of Anthropology
and the faculty of the Graduate School of
Wichita State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

July 2011

©Copyright 2011 by Jelena Brezjanovic-Shogren

All Rights Reserved

ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING AND CODE-MIXING AMONG BILINGUAL
CHILDREN: TWO CASE STUDIES OF SERBIAN-ENGLISH LANGUAGE
INTERACTION

The following faculty members have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content, and recommended that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in Anthropology.

Peer Moore-Jansen, Committee Chair

David Hughes, Committee member

Jay Price, Committee member

DEDICATION

To my family

“Mama...ja znam da pričam both English and Serbian”

M.S.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am honored and grateful for all the inspiration, guidance and support from my mentors, Dr. Robert Lawless and Dr. Peer Moore-Jansen, who have helped me in all aspects of my education. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the members of my committee Dr David Hughes and Dr Jay Price, and all my family and friends whose support has helped me complete this work.

ABSTRACT

This research attempts to expose the patterns of language behavior of two five-year old bilingual children through the analysis of the code-switching and code-mixing occurrences in their everyday conversational interactions. The goal of the study is to analyze the code choice and the motivation behind such pattern in order to see whether there are any differences between the two case studies, and most of all, what is causing these differences in linguistic behavior to occur. Data used in analysis was collected during informal conversations recorded in home domain of the two families studied. The recorded data along with the observational notes collected was then analyzed sentence by sentence and separated into several dyads in order to understand the relation between the children's code-switching/code-mixing and the interlocutor.

It is concluded that most common motivation behind their code choice is solidarity – establishing “we code”, referential, directive, and reactive to positive/ negative face and power. The major difference between the two children's language behavior regarding code choice is rather in the patterns of code-switching versus code-mixing. The boy, being a natural bilingual who acquired the second language (L2) simultaneously is more prone to code-switch in certain situations. On the other hand, the girl, who acquired L2 consecutively and therefore adopted the syntax of Serbian language, uses more code-mixing during her conversational interactions. This showed close connection of the linguistic behavior with the linguistic environment exposing essential mechanisms of children's ability to adjust their language skills to their conversational needs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1
2	Background	4
	Language and Bilingualism	4
	Definitions and Descriptions of Bilingualism	7
	Degree of Bilingualism	8
	Domains of language use	12
	Language Acquisition and Bilingualism Among Children	14
3	Code-Switching and Code-Mixing	21
	Theoretical Models to CS and CM	23
	Social and Cultural Factors to CS and CM	26
4	Motivational factors to Code-Switching and Code-Mixing	30
5	Methods	37
	Data Collection	38
	Case Study 1	39
	Case Study 2	42
6	Results	44
	Case Study 1 – conversation analysis	44
	Case Study 2 – conversation analysis	58
7	Discussion	66
	Bibliography	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. One Person – One Language (OPOL)	15
2. Non-dominant Home Language	15
3. Non-dominant home language without community support	16
4. Double non-dominant home language without community support	17
5. Non-native parents	17
6. Mixed languages	17

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CS	Code-Switching
CM	Code-Mixing
L1	Mother tongue – First language acquired
L2	Second language acquired
OPOL	One Person – One Language rule

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present study is to examine language behavior in two bilingual families. A primary focus is placed on the study of two five-year-old children for the specific purpose of demonstrating occurrences of code-switching and code-mixing during spontaneous conversational interactions. The overall objective of this pursuit is to investigate general patterns and motivation behind the code choice of the participants in everyday conversations in two families. By comparison of the two studies it is hoped to be able to determine whether or not the patterns of speech among the two children are similar. If they do exhibit differences in their language behavior, the acquisition background and the immediate environment communicational needs will be considered as the possible cause for the development of different patterns. This study seeks to offer analysis of bilingual children in Serbian and English language. Most prior research has involved either bilingual adults or children from Spanish-English communities (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). Therefore, the theoretical framework considered will help establish better understanding of the language behavior of children acquiring Serbian as mother tongue, and the pattern that is developed in the interaction of the minority language in the English dominated environment.

The study consists of seven chapters. The first chapter introduces the topic and the main goal of the study. In chapter 2, the theoretical part deals with bilingualism and this linguistic phenomenon studied. Furthermore, the degree of bilingualism and

language domain are discussed. Due to the proposed question on language acquisition and its effect on the development of certain linguistic patterns, notions such as *simultaneous and consecutive language acquisition* are discussed in detail. Another concept applied is the One Parent-One Language system, where parents strategically converse in their native tongue with the child in order to separate the two languages used.

In chapter 3, the concept of code-switching and code-mixing is defined to establish a frame which will serve as a reference to the occurrences presented in the study involving categorization such as tag-switching, inter-sentential and intra-sentential type of switching. Further, this section discusses theoretical models such as sociolinguistic and grammatical approach as these are closely related to the data collected. Special attention turned to Gumperz' notion of We Code/They Code, a conversational function of crucial importance that is ethnically specific, where a minority language serves usually as "we code" and is "associated with in group and informal activities" which is the case of both children and the informal home setting where data was primarily recorded.

Chapter 4 deals with the question of motivation behind code-switching and code-mixing. To better understand this aspect of language behavior, Appel and Muysken's (1987) approach is introduced discussing different functions of code-switching such as: referential, directive, expressive, phatic, metalinguistic and finally poetic function. Another approach considered is by Wardhaugh (2002) dealing with the code choice relation to solidarity with the interlocutor. Furthermore, negotiations of power play an

important part in the code choice therefore *statusful* and *interactional* power is included in discourse on linguistic behavior of the bilingual families studied.

Chapter 5 describes the methodology used for this study. Data collection has been recorded mostly in the family setting in home domain during one-year period. The two case studies are introduced separately and discussed applying all the theoretical approaches introduced in chapters 2 through 4. Results are laid out in chapter 6 following the discussion regarding this study and suggestions for further research in chapter 7.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

Language and Bilingualism

As a unique medium for expressing our thoughts, ideas, and emotions, language reveals various aspects of human existence, and it opens the door to the anthropological analysis of many biological and cultural phenomena. Many linguists have described language and its processes based on monolingualism, or the utilization of only one language, which has been erroneously thought of as a dominant form that exists in everyday communication of many communities around the world. This controversial and fractional view dominated in studies from the beginning of 19th to the middle of the 20th century when a great number of linguists viewed bilingualism/multilingualism, utilization of two or more different languages, as having a “detrimental effect on human being’s intellectual and spiritual growth” (Wei, 2000:18). This theoretical approach served well to justify then prevalent nationalistic notions of organic unity of nation-states and the anticipation of, among other things, the cultural and linguistic homogeneity. Bilingualism, seen as a threat to nations and their boundaries, notably of the Romantic languages, was greatly neglected by many sciences (Hobsbawm, 1990). In the early 1960’s, influential work from Weinreich (1953), Mackey (1968), Ferguson (1964), Fishman (1968), Gumperz (1964), et al., marks a radical change and sets the stage for a more positive view. Nowadays, a holistic view is more commonly accepted and, as reflected in Grosjean’s statement, arguing that:

“bilingualism is present in practically every country of the world, in all classes of society, and in all age groups. In fact, it is difficult to find a society that is genuinely monolingual. Not only is bilingualism worldwide, it is a phenomenon that has existed since the beginning of language in human history. It is probably true that no language group has ever existed in isolation from the language groups, and the history of languages is replete with examples of language contact leading to some form of bilingualism.” (1982:1)

Today, an abundant amount of research explores bilingualism and its manifestations both in spoken language and in written texts (Adams et al. 2002), and most researches focus on the significant feature of bilingualism code-switching and code-mixing. These phenomena has been researched by many on a societal level using examples of multilingual speech communities switching between languages, which mostly focused on the role and effects of languages on the socio-political organization. On the other hand, numerous authors examined code-switching and code-mixing on the individual level pursuing to produce knowledge on language switch as a strategy to achieve certain personal goals in everyday communicative needs. The present study will focus on the latter pursuit, examining two five-year-old bilingual children and their families living in the Wichita community in Kansas, and their use of two languages in everyday communication. They employ both English language, which is the official, dominant language of the environment, and Serbian language, minority language in this case and a mother tongue of certain participants.

The holistic view proposed by Grosjean (2008:13) will serve as frame of reference, which posits that “bilingual is an integrated whole which cannot easily be

decomposed into two separate parts". Hence, subjects will not be viewed as two monolinguals combined, rather as a unique structure with its unique features who adopts linguistic strategies to accommodate the communicational needs.

Moreover, bilinguals adapt to the changing communicative environment, which has direct impact on the competence in main language (L1), in this case Serbian, or second language (L2), representing English, but it does not affect their language interactive skills in general. Studies have shown that person's degree of bilingualism or proficiency in L1 or L2 can change, even have a complete shift to one language forgetting the other, based on the needs of the communication (Grosjean, 2008:16). However, a bilingual will never entirely be communicatively incompetent towards the requirements of the environment. An analogy from physical fitness and muscle tonus can aid explaining this situation. Physical fitness has to be achieved through constant physical exercise. The more active the person is the better muscle tonus is present. As the physical activity decreases the muscle tonus decreases, but one will never lose the muscle entirely. It will adjust to the given environment and physical activity needs. As stated by Grosjean (2008) bilinguals, like monolinguals, have innate capacity for language, and are, by essence communicators; they will develop competence in each of their languages to the extent needed by the environment.

In order to pursue discourse on code-switching and code-mixing patterns, it will be necessary to adopt an appropriate definition of bilingualism. Additionally, due to the specific goal of understanding the differences in speech patterns, notions such as *degree of bilingualism*, and the *domain of language use* will be discussed in detail as used by Zivkovic (2006) in a study on CS patterns which this study is framed after.

Lastly, the language acquisition strategies are considered as they play a significant role for the dynamics of linguistic behavior between the two subjects respectively.

Definitions and Descriptions of Bilingualism

It is acknowledged throughout the literature that defining and describing bilingualism has been quite a challenging and controversial issue for decades. Considering factors such as proficiency or function of bilingualism set the stage for viewing bilingualism “in terms of categories, scales and dichotomies such as ideal v. partial bilingual, coordinate v. compound bilingual etc.” (Romaine, 1989:10). Consequently, the attempts to define the proficiency of a bilingual speaker range from one end of the spectrum to the other. Several definitions suggest what resembles Bloofield’s “native-like control of two or more languages” (1933:56). Along these lines, Beardsmore argues that a bilingual is “the person who is capable of functioning equally well in ether of his languages in all domains of activity and without any traces of the language in his use of the other” (1982:7). This idealistic scenario of a bilingual person would be somewhat of a monolingualistic approach, however it would exclude majority of bilingual speakers who are usually more dominant in one language over another (Huttner 1997:8).

On the other hand, Haugen argues that bilingualism is present “at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language” (1956:10). If this was the case, many of the monolingual societies would consider themselves to be bilingual even if they could only utter a few words in

another language and their communicative needs inadequate. Even though this view has been characterized as “too inclusive” (Huttner 1997:8), it would serve as starting point for the analysis of the beginning stages of second language acquisition (Mackey 1968:555).

The middle ground point, as reflected in Mackey’s discussion on bilingualism, is that bilingualism is considered to be completely relative to each case, since there is such difficulty to determine firm and clear borders. He defines bilingualism (including multilingualism) simply as the alternation of two or more languages. This definition along with the holistic view of bilingualism, proposed by Grosjean (1995), will serve well for the purpose of this study in a sense that every bilingual has a specific and unique configuration, blending the knowledge of two different languages and adjusting to different communication environments.

Degree of bilingualism

The crucial step in defining subjects bilingualism, is to define the degree of their bilingualism (Mackey, 2000:27). For this purpose, it is necessary to consider when did the subjects learn second language, how fluent they are and what function does second language serve in everyday communication. Many bilinguals will underestimate their fluency and proficiency in their second language. This closely reflects the monolingual view which suggests that only ones who have acquired second language as children and have mastered each to the point that no grammatical or stylistic mistakes are made, one can then be labeled as the “real”, the “pure”, the “balanced” or

the “perfect” bilingual (Grosjean, 2010:20). According to Einar Haugen, mastering each language to the point of perfection is impossible to achieve as he writes:

“Is it possible to keep the patterns of two (or more) languages absolutely pure, so that a bilingual in effect becomes two monolinguals, each speaking one language perfectly but also perfectly understanding the other and able to reproduce in one the meaning of the other without at any point violating the usage of either language? On the face of it one is inclined to say no. Hypothetically it is possible just as a perfectly straight line or perfect beauty or perfect bliss as theoretically possible, but in practice it is necessary to settle for less.” (1969:9)

For this reason, the degree of bilingualism of the subjects will not be evaluated based on their fluency only, rather based on their language use in everyday communications. A notion of the *degree of bilingualism*, and terms corresponding to the “functional specialization of language usage” will be therefore applied to each participant (Beardsmore 1982:8).

As mentioned previously, this study consists of seven subjects. All of the participants, with the exception of the boy’s father, have different degree of bilingualism. The boy represents the *natural bilingual*, who learned both English and Serbian at the same time, defined by Beardsmore, due to “force of circumstances” (Beardsmore 1982:8). He learned Serbian from his mother and English from his father, which can also be defined as a *compound bilingual* referring to the acquisition of L1 and L2 in a bilingual home from infancy on (Lambert 1972: 308 in Beardsmore 1982:24).

On the other hand, the girl was exposed at home only to Serbian from birth and up, and English through instruction after she started going to school, which Beardsmore defines as *secondary bilingualism* (1982:8). She can also be considered to be a *coordinate bilingual* since she “learned the second language at some time after infancy, usually after ten years of age, and usually in a setting other than the family” (Lambert 1972: 308 in Beardsmore 1982:24). Even though Lamberts definition does not correspond with the girls age when she acquired L2, for the purpose of this study she will be considered as *coordinate bilingual*. All of the other participants, are also classified as coordinate bilinguals since all of them acquired L2 outside of the home, through educational later on in their lives. However, of the subjects observed, except the boy’s father who is monolingual, could be considered to be *balanced bilinguals*, meaning they have comparable “mastery of two languages” (Breadsmore, 1982:9).

The children’s proficiency in Serbian language is high, due to fact that both mothers stayed home since the children were born. They both spoke to them in Serbian language exclusively, which reflects Harrison and Piette (1980) reasoning that the “mother’s influence is probably the major one in families where parental roles divide along traditional roles” (1980:227) and that “children are greatly influenced by the language addressed to them” (1980:221).

The boy’s mother, the author of this study, purposely used *One Parent One Language* principle (which will be elaborated upon later on) and addressed the boy only in her native Serbian language. Her command of Serbian language is dominant but she is equally proficient in English since her higher education was exclusively in English and has lived in the United States for twelve years. On the other hand, girl’s mother is also

bilingual, dominating in her native Serbian language but not equally proficient in English language. Her command of English language slowly improved since her arrival to the United States. Upon her arrival, according to the observations, she could be described primarily as *receptive* or *passive* bilingual, implying that she could comprehend English but with very low ability to speak (Beardsmore, 1982:13). Her progress depended primarily on the environment and the media because she only spoke Serbian at home with her husband who is native of Serbia as well.

In addition, both children spent significant time in Serbia, where they interacted with their maternal family members. They also spent time playing with the children on the playground, and were exposed to various media in Serbian. Moreover, both maternal grandmothers visit them every year in the United States and spend on average two to three months with the family.

The Fathers' role differs, comparatively. The boy's father is monolingual and his native language is English. During his presence, he converses with the mother exclusively in English and addresses the boy in the same manner. The boy has been exposed therefore to both languages since the infancy. However, it is worth mentioning that amount of exposure to both languages was not equal, rather Serbian was dominantly used, since the mother stayed home with the boy from infancy until he was three years old. Father spent on average three to four hours during the weekdays and all day on weekends. On the other hand, the girl's father is a native of Serbia. He is a balanced bilingual. At home, he addresses his wife exclusively in Serbian language and has been communicating with the girl since the infancy in their native tongue as well.

Overall, the greatest influence on the level of language abilities and proficiency of the children, as the main subjects, has been highly affected by the amount of exposure to the L1 and L2, as well as linguistic behavior of the interlocutors, their family members. Generally, one would consider dominant language to be the one of the environment, which is English in this case, but for the purpose of the study the main language that is being marked as L1 is Serbian because it was the first language presented to the children since infancy. As the children are getting older the language behavior and dominance of L1 is shifting to L2. This is noticeable mostly through code-switching and code-mixing, however, L1 still serves important functions fulfilling certain needs of the speakers.

Domains of language use

Following the study of the concept of domains of language served appropriate function in the discourse of language use. Two different domains will be discussed in this study as evidence of shifting language behavior:

- 1) Family domain – where most of the observation and recording has been performed, capturing exposure to Serbian language,
- 2) External domains – where interlocutors are exclusively native English speakers, and include school mainly, but also any location or situation that is outside their home setting.

To illustrate this point, the boy's family domain employs two languages for everyday conversations Serbian and English. Outside the home English is the only code choice except when the two families observed interact with one another. The Serbian

community is very small, consisting of only three families who have young children, therefore socializing and communicating in Serbian is limited. However, two of the children attend the same school and have the opportunity to interact on a daily basis on the playground.

On the other hand, the girl's family domain differs as the family employs only Serbian language. It is interesting to mention that as the girl's English improved, mother started to code-switch and code-mix frequently during the conversations, but never quite speaks to the girl in English only. Therefore, the girl is exposed to English only outside the home.

Fishman (1980:255) explains the domains of linguistic choice as the "classes of situations" suggesting that for each situation there is a variety that is preferred which can be observed directly through occurrences of code-switching.

Even though observations were performed in both family and external domains, all of the recorded material, which will be analyzed, has been captured in the home setting. Hence, it is appropriate to turn the issue of the family domain and the importance of the role relations within the family. Accordingly, Fishman argues that "multilingualism often begins in the family" (Fishman 1986:443). Furthermore, he stresses that the importance of *role relations* rather than just a individuals preference of the code, extending it to the fact that specific language behaviors in linguistic communities are "expected to (if not required) of particular individuals vis-à-vis each other" (Fishman 2000:95).

Applied to the data in the study, it is evident that that the role relation plays an important part on the language choice, which will be presented in the practical section of this research.

Language acquisition and bilingualism among children

Language acquisition among children is directly related to domains of language use. Studies have shown that besides our innate ability for a language, socialization through adult interaction plays a significant role during the process in which child learns a language (Moerk 1976). As mentioned before, there are few different ways to acquire a second language, e.g. *simultaneously*, as in the case of the boy's family where he was exposed since birth to both Serbian and English language. Swain (1972) considers this instance as "bilingualism as a first language". Similarly, MacLaughlin (1978) extends this notion and points out that a child that has been exposed to more than one language by the age of three should be acknowledged as a simultaneous acquisition. Another scenario in place, appropriate for this study, is when an individual acquires the second language after the age of three or during the adolescence, *consecutively*. This can be directly applied to the girl since both of her parents spoke exclusively Serbian with her from her birth and on. It was not until she started school at the age of 2.10 and started learning English.

To elaborate upon the different degrees and types of language separation and its functions in the language, it is appropriate to mention Romaine's (1995:183-185) six categories of language behavior in bilingual families, with a specific focus on the

children’s linguistic development and the results of the previous studies (see table 1-6 below).

TYPES OF BILINGUAL ACQUISITION IN CHILDHOOD (Romaine, 1989:166-168)

TABLE 1 “ONE PERSON –ONE LANGUAGE”

Parents: The parents have different native languages with each having some degree of competence in the other’s language.				
Community: The language of one of the parents in the dominant language of the community.				
Strategy: The parents each speak their own language to their child from birth.				
Author:	Language:	Mother:	Father:	Community:
Ronjat (1913)		German	French	French
Leopold (1939-49)		English	German	English
Taeschner (1983)		German	Italian	Italian

TABLE 2 “NON-DOMINANT HOME LANGUAGE”

Parents: The parents have different native languages.
--

Table 2 (Continuing)

Community: The language of the one of the parents is the dominant language of the community.
Strategy: Both parents speak the non-dominant language to the child, who is fully exposed to the dominant language only when outside the home, and in particular in nursery school.

Author:	Language:	Mother:	Father:	Community:
Fantini (1985)		Spanish	English	English

TABLE 3 “NON DOMINANT HOME LANGUAGE WITHOUT COMMUNITY SUPPORT”

Parents: The parents share the same native language.				
Community: The dominant language is not that of the parents.				
Strategy: The parents speak their own language to the child				
Author:	Language:	mother:	father:	community:
Haugen (1953)		Norwegian	Norwegian	English
Oksaar (1977)		Estonian	Estonian	Swedish/German
Ruke-Dravina (1967)		Latvian	Latvian	Swedish
Pavlovich (1920)		Serbian	Serbian	French

TABLE 4 “DOUBLE NON-DOMINANT HOME LANGUAGE WITHOUT COMMUNITY SUPPORT”

Parents: The parents have different native languages.				
Community: The dominant language is different from either of the parents' languages.				
Strategy: The parents each speak their own language to the child from birth				
Author:	Language:	mother:	father:	community:
Elwert (1959)		English	German	Italian

TABLE 5 “NON-NATIVE PARENTS”

Parents: The parents share the same native language.				
Community: The dominant language is the same as that one of the parents.				
Strategy: One of the parents always addresses the child in a language which is not his/her native language.				
Author:	Language:	mother:	father:	community:
Saunders (1982)		English	English/German	English

TABLE 6 “MIXED LANGUAGES”

Parents: The parents are bilingual.				
--	--	--	--	--

Table 6 (Continuing)

Community: Sectors of community may also be bilingual.				
Strategy: Parents code-switch and mix languages.				
Author:	Language:	mother:	father:	community:
Tabouret-Keller (1962)		French/German	French/German	Fr/Ger
Ellul (1978)		Maltese/English	Maltese/English	Malt./Eng.
Smith (1935)		English	English	Chinese
Burling (1959)		English	English	Garo

The first type, applicable to the boy's family, was first introduced and enforced by Ronjat (1913) where the parents spoke their own different native language to the child since the birth. This concept is now called OPOL – “*One Person One Language*”. As mentioned previously, the boy's parents are natives from two different countries speaking two different native languages. Parents, for the purpose of the study, intentionally employed OPOL principle when communicating with the boy. Mother spoke Serbian language and father English language. Even though they have been consciously teaching bilingualism, there has been some code-switching rather both intentional and unintentional. Intentional served for observation purposes to see how much influence interlocutor has when leading a conversation. However, the unintentional one, if prolonged, led to certain output that eventually reflected what Dopke (1992:1-16) described:

“The very fact that families who follow this principle tend to belong to the higher socio-economic classes and that they raise their children bilingually by choice rather than out of necessity, produces very specific problems. These families are usually well integrated into the mainstream society and isolated from other bilingual adults and children. Consequently, the children’s exposure to the minority language is limited to a few interlocutors, often only the parent who speaks the minority language. Depending on their personal reasons for speaking the minority language in the home and their determination to transmit it to their children, parents may or may not continue with it. In the latter case, the children will soon forget whatever bilingual proficiency they had acquired up to that point”.

There was a period, between age of four and five, when the boy’s proficiency in Serbian language declined as he started spending more time in school and less with the mother. It was evident that he had hard time retrieving words he already knew, and it was harder for him to construct sentences in Serbian. If the mother corrected him during the conversation, he would express his frustration, which supports Harrison and Piette’s (1980) notion that young children who are spoken to in L1 constantly (prolonged time in the study) are “moved to anger or amusement” if the interlocutor switches suddenly to L2. This situation changed when maternal grandmother moved in to live with the boy’s family and addressing him exclusively in Serbian.

In contrast, the girl’s family speaks only one language at home, their native Serbian language, reflecting type three language acquisition (see table 3). Girl acquired L2 from the environment, mostly as she started school when she was 2.10 years old. Dominance of L1 is evident in language behavior of both parents and the girl. After the

girl became proficient in L2, parents would code-switch frequently outside the home to identify with the environment. However, the girl, which showed to be consistent with the other studies (see Oksaar 1977:303), was exhibiting transfers on the syntactic and morphological level, which will be discussed in chapter 6.

CHAPTER 3

CODE-SWITCHING and CODE-MIXING

Code-Switching (CS) and Code-Mixing (CM) are most important features and well studied speech processes in multilingual communities. Definitions vary, but both utilize the term “code” which was adopted by linguists from the field of communication technology (in Gardner-Chloros, 2009:11), referring to “a mechanism for the unambiguous transduction of signals between systems”, analogous to what switching of language signifies a system used by bilingual speaker-hearer in everyday communication. Therefore, term “code” is frequently used nowadays by the linguists as an “umbrella term for languages, dialects, styles etc”. (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:11). Further, term “switching” refers to alternation between different varieties used by the bilingual/bidialectal during the conversational interaction. This phenomenon can be examined from various angles, but the important part of this study is to illustrate the conscious and unconscious patterns of such language behavior and the motivation behind it. On the other hand, *code-mixing* refers to “embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes) words (unbound morphemes, phrases and clauses that participants in order to infer what is intended, must reconcile what they hear with what they understand (Bokamba, 1989).

Code-switching and code-mixing have been used interchangeably throughout literature, however in this study they will be separately defined and used to signify two very different patterns of code utilization by the subjects studied.

Code-switching will be applied to the patterns described by Gumperz (1982:59) as the “juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems”. It is important to note that the usage of a different code in this case ties semantic structure of the conversational act, not to be equated with diglossia, as described by Ferguson (1972), where utilization of two codes have a specific function within a social context employing the two codes separately. Even though the similarity between code-switching and diglossia is evident in the fact that the speaker must know and utilize two codes, diglossia represents one-to-one relationship between codes, whereas code-switching ties the sentence or the conversation together. Accordingly, one of the important aspects of code-switching discussed in the study will focus on describing it as a dynamic discourse strategy (Romaine, 1989:111).

The formal categorization, according to Poplack (1980:605), defines three types of CS:

- *Tag-switching*
- *Inter-sentential switching*
- *Intra-sentential switching*

Tag-switching refers to insertion of tags such as ***you know*** and ***I mean*** in sentences that are completely in the other language. According to Romaine (1995), tags are “subject to minimal syntactic restrictions”, therefore the insertion into a monolingual utterance does not violate syntactic rules. This implies that inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching reflects higher language proficiency, unlike in the case of tag switching. This pattern was common occurrence with both subjects from the study. They

would tag-switch in both languages, most commonly in English with the tag “you know” when explaining events.

Inter-sentential switching “involves switches from one language to other between sentences: a whole sentence (or more than one sentence) is produced entirely in one language before there is a switch to the other languages” (Myers-Scotton 1993:3).

On the other hand, *Intra-sentential* switching occurs “within the same sentence or sentence fragment” (Myers-Scotton 1993:4). This type of switching will be considered most frequently for the analysis of the language behavior in the study due to the consideration of morpho-syntactic patterns.

Theoretical models to code-switching

One of the approaches that will be applied to this study is sociolinguistic approach. One of the main questions regarding the patterns of CS and MS is why they occur in the first place. What is the motivation or the driving factor(s) behind bilingual language behavior. Hence, the sociolinguistic approach will be considered applying two models. The first one, proposed by Gumperz (1982), will aid distinguish between two types of code-switching:

- *Situational switching*
- *Metaphorical switching*

The situational code-switching is driven by a particular situation where a speaker uses one code for one situation and another code for another situation. On the other hand, in metaphorical code-switching, the topic is the driving factor in determination of which language will be used, e.g. a speaker will use two different languages for two

different topics. This direct correlation between languages and the social situation, as mentioned by Gumperz, signifies the “definition of each other’s rights and obligations” (1982: 424). Additionally, he argues that the relationship between the language and the social context is quite complex and that “participants immersed in the interaction itself are often quite unaware which code is used at any one time” (Gumperz 1982:61).

Another model relevant for the study under consideration was proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993:75), known as the *Markedness Model*, in which he notes that a bilingual individual has a sense of *markedness* (1993:75), in regard to the relationship with the interlocutor who essentially the one choosing the code in the conversation. In such situation, the speaker is perceived as a *rational actor* who can make either the *unmarked* choice, the more secure and the more expected choice, often used by the speakers, or the *marked* choice which is generally unexpected in interaction (Myers-Scotton 1993:75). Nevertheless, it is essential to mention at this point that the concept of the social importance of language choice should be applied with a dose of caution to the speech of children in general as they do not play the same role in society as adult speakers. Thus, this model will be interpreted later in the research paper according to the specific pragmatic needs of the children who are examined in the data.

In contrast to Gumperz’ claim that bilingual speakers are most often not aware when they code-switch, Myers-Scotton argues that generally speakers are aware of the effect of their switch, e.g. what the consequence of making the *marked* and the *unmarked* choice is (1993:75). Even though both of these models can be applied to the data with the respect of different situations, Myers-Scotton’s remark is perhaps more appropriate to the subjects studied since generally they seemed not to be aware of their

code-switching or code-mixing. As rational actors, their pragmatic needs seem to dictate switching accordingly.

The other, conversational approach, will appropriately be considered in this study as well. Considering that the data has been collected during informal conversations between family members and children, the role that code-switching and code-mixing play in it is quite important and it is often “employed by discourse participants to achieve rhetorical, stylistic and other pragmatic effects” (Archan, 2000:28).

Even though Gumperz (1972) was the first linguist to research and define conversational functions of code-switching, Peter Auer’s approach will be more adequate for the discourse analysis conducted in this study.

According to Auer (1998:3) the two main approaches to code-switching are, as already discussed, *sociolinguistic* approach which defines code-switching as the symbol “of group membership in particular types of bilingual speech communities”, and the *grammatical* view which regards “syntactic and morphosyntactic considerations which may or may not be of a universal kind” (1998:3). Though he mentions these two views, he adopts yet a different perspective in the analysis of code-switching, arguing that these two leave a gap since “local processes of language negotiation and code selection” are disregarded (1998:3). Therefore, in his view code-switching is considered as a part of verbal action, being a part of both the communicative and social function (1998:1). In this context, patterns of code-switching are seen as a *conversational event* and as “alternating use of two or more *codes* within one conversational episode” (1998:1), which in essence brings light to participant’s interpretation as well as the “use of code-switching to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional

meaning of particular utterance” (1998:4). In other words, the close correlation exists in a conversation where two or more codes are used with the alternation of those codes and this pattern performs a particular function in discourse. Additionally, discourse-related switching of codes reflects pattern that goes “beyond the sentence” since it is related to wider contexts and cultural factors which usually influence discourse (1998:3). Hence, bilingual participants in conversation have an extra-conversational knowledge, and consequently an established pattern of code-switching, defined as *preference-related* switching.

During this study, a high relevance to this pattern has been noted during conversational interactions between participants, reflecting the influence of their linguistic preferences. Accordingly, language preferences allude to the “interactional processes of displaying and ascribing predicates to individuals”, reflected individually and socially (1998:8). In conclusion, according to Auer, language preferences of bilingual individuals regarding code-switching in discourse largely depend on the “wider social, political and cultural context of the interaction at hand” (1998:8).

Social and Cultural Factors to CS and CM

Analogous to Gumperz’ notion of *We Code/ They Code*, a conversational function of crucial importance that is ethnically specific, a minority language serves usually as “we code” and is “associated with in group and informal activities” (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:56). He argued that correlation between patterns of linguistic and non-linguistic context is not direct. It is quite rare that one code is solely appropriate, and

“elsewhere a verity of options occur, and as with conversations in general, interpretation of messages is in large part a matter of discourse context, social presuppositions and speakers’ background knowledge” (Gumperz, 1982:66).

Since the main goal of this research is to analyze particular aspects of spoken discourse within two family domains, it is important to include the effect of “we code” and “they code” during the language interactions and its motivational factor for code choice. Respectively, the code choice of the bilingual speaker is not only determined by linguistic, but also by *extralinguistic elements*, such as cultural and social factors. In the examples used, Gumperz assigns “we code” to the corresponding language used in the family domain where it functions as the group loyalty, solidarity and intimacy (1982:73). In contrast, the “they code” corresponds with the more formal language use, e.g. in the public domain and the communication with the “outsiders”, coming from other speech communities. Additionally, according to Gumperz, switch can occur in parts of speech like *quotations or reported/direct speech, addressee specifications and interjections* (1982:75), providing that the “we code” passages are often perceived as *personalized*, on contrary to the “they code” which stand for *objectification* (1982:83). The level of the influence of mentioned code choice dynamics is considerably high not only during conversations between the family members and the children but the children themselves.

In the case of the boy’s family, it would be useful to extend this notion to a micro level allowing better understanding of code differentiation between the mother and the child and the father and the child accordingly. More specifically, mother and child established a more intimate relationship from birth and on not only because of the

nature of their relationship but also because of the amount of time spent together, adopting “we code” for the basic care needs and intimate home setting conversations. To achieve the same effect the father usually code-switched to Serbian with a small amount of phrases familiar to him. On the other hand, English was used when conversations were more formal reflecting “they code” dynamics. It is reasonable to state that the code choice designation is dynamic itself, e.g. pattern changed overtime notably several times. The first change came when the boy started school and “we code” almost fused with “they code” by preference of English language. However, when the boy’s grandmother came to live with the family, the strong “we code” was reestablished marking Serbian to be intimate (home) language. It is reasonable to say that Serbian language represents the language of solidarity and bonding between the mother and the child, especially when exposed to the English speakers. Furthermore, English is “we code” in the relationship between the mother and father since that is the only mutual language both can utilize considering the father is a monolingual English speaker. He, as mentioned previously, is only familiar with very few phrases he learned after the child was born.

For the girl’s family “we code”/“they code” had a clearer, more static pattern since both parents speak the same language. During the home setting from birth and up, Serbian represented “we code” and English “they code”. During the first 2.10 years girl was not often exposed to English language in conversational interactions as she was spending most of her time with her mother and father at home or in company of the other family studied, mostly around the boy and the mother who all conversed exclusively in Serbian language.

Finally, the English language is the dominant language in the Wichita speech community, and now that children are proficient in English functions as “we code” respectively, reestablishing their bicultural identity.

Parallel to Hofer’s findings (2005:8), the preliminary results of the study show how complex the realization of the *we code/they code* principle can be. As previously mentioned, the fuzzy border between these two factors is created due to the influence of the specific role relations between the family members studied and their code choice.

In order to apply this concept of we code/ they code vis-a-vis the spoken discourse of the family, it is necessary to divide the conversations between family members and the child and children themselves into sub-groups, e.g. dyads which will allow better understanding of the function of the two languages in their everyday language use. Additionally, this will expose which language is used as the language of intimacy and which as the language of power and control within the home setting, and consequently, describing the position of the two languages in the family, with regard to the particular role relation as well.

CHAPTER 4

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS TO CODE-SWITCHING AND CODE-MIXING

The next major question posed in this study is: why this pattern of switching occurs, what is the motivation behind it, and is there a difference between the language behavior of the boy and the language behavior of the girl? Combining different approaches will allow better understanding of motivation for code-switching and code-mixing.

The first approach appropriate for consideration is proposed by Appel and Muysken (1987), who used Jakobson's (1960) and Halliday's (1964) work as their basis. This approach acknowledges six different functions where code appropriate switch occurs and is quite useful for the analysis. These are defined as follows:

1. The *referential function*, according to which a switch occurs because of the "lack of knowledge of one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject" (1987:118).
2. The *directive function* "involves the hearer directly", hence a participant in a conversation can be excluded/included by employing the language familiar/unfamiliar to the speaker (1987:119).

3. In the case of the *expressive function*, discussed by Poplack (1980), the speakers switch code in order to express their “mixed identity” (1987:119).
4. The “change of tone of the conversation” may be explained by the *phatic function*, also known as the *metaphorical function*, which has already been discussed in this paper (1987:119).
5. *Metalinguistic* code-switching is usually employed when the speaker makes direct/indirect comments on the languages used in conversation, usually to “impress the other participants with a show of linguistic skills” (1987:120).
6. Finally, the *poetic function* is involved in “switched puns, jokes”, etc. (1987:120).

Another prolific explanation for code-switching is defined by Wardhaugh (2002). His approach to the motivation for switching represents an essential factor in the code choice and that “solidarity with listeners, choice of topic, and perceived social and cultural distance” (2002:103) all together plays an important role in the speaker’s choice. Furthermore, it can be argued that participants in interaction appear as “rational actors” who additionally “engage in code-switching as an intentional act to achieve certain social ends” (Gross 2000:1283). Gross (2000:1284) furthermore argues that “individuals negotiate positions of power through their linguistic choices. How they do this is not necessarily a conscious act, but what emerges from such interactions is a social hierarchy that depends on the interaction between the participant’s personal statuses and linguistic skills.”

Since the conversations studied are spontaneous ones recorded in the home domain, the focus will be on *interactional power* (Gross 2000: 1284). According to Gross “the markedness of an utterance depends upon the specific social frame created by the interaction. The properties of this frame depend upon a number of variables including the interactant’s relationship, the setting, the topic and the purpose of the interaction”.

This notion of interactional power will be analyzed throughout the data collected in order to see by whom and in which particular situation and setting does this occur. The fact that a speaker makes a marked choice as a part of an “interactional act that has social consequences” (Gross 2000:1284) including the “audiences ability to identify the speaker’s intentions” (2000:1284), brings to conclusion that each speaker participant is quite aware of who has the power in an interaction and who does not. Hence, the interactant who has the *interactional power* also has the power to “determine the outcome of an interaction by controlling the floor, by setting the agenda, or by highlighting one’s expertise and experience” (2000:1285). Therefore, the speaker who has *interactional power* also has the power when it comes to the code choice, in which case the participants in the conversation (hearers) may accept that choice either to identify with the dominant “powerful” speaker, or to show *solidarity dimension* (Wardhaugh 2002:110).

According to Gross, the linguistic skills might serve a speaker as a tool for establishing the control in case they do not enjoy enough *statusful power* (2000:1285), stating that persons who are less powerful exploit their linguistic expertise to control the interaction by using marked code choices. CS as a marked choice is precisely the kind of linguistic resources available to the fluent bilingual with little *statusful power*”.

Another important factor, due to the nature of this study and the participants age, it is the concept of face-threatening act (FTA), proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Body language, in this case facial expressions, is just another way of taking control in the interaction, hence establishing the code choice.

The face, accordingly, has abstract notion and it has two basic aspects: positive and negative, leading to the conclusion that each participant has a *positive* and *negative* face (1987:13). If the speaker wants to be accepted, approved and positively viewed by others he/she will use a *positive face*. In contrast, if the speaker wants to be “unimpeded” in his/her “actions”, he/she will use the *negative face* (Brown and Levinson 1987:13).

The use of positive/negative face notion was clearly observable during the research sessions. The power was not in the same hands at all time, however different linguistic skills of the informants seem to have special importance in power shift, in other words some of the family members use their language skills to assert power, although their *interactional* power is usually weak. Accordingly, *interactional* power does not belong to the same interactant at all time. Additionally, the *power shift* in the case of the interactants from this study depends on the language skills of the speaker and the actual situation in which he/she decides to use their dominant language. To illustrate this, both mothers and the girl’s father use Serbian when they want to insert power to exercise authority or give order to their children, e.g. to use etiquette at the table or clean up their playroom. In other words, some family members from the corpus use face-threatening acts by making a marked code choice in order to achieve various goals in their conversations with the other participants.

Turning to the relation between code-switching and topic change, Fishman (1986) notes that topic should be perceived as a “regulator of language use in multilingual settings”, arguing that the change of topic frequently leads to the change of code in bilingual conversations (1986:439). He states that “certain topics are somehow handled “better” or more appropriately in one language than another”, or that a bilingual will just spontaneously develop a habit of utilizing one code for one topic and another for another topic (1986:439). This is observable in the data analyzed as both children developed a habit, for example, to speak in English when they talk about school and Serbian when it comes to their family trips to Serbia/ Republic of Serbia. This is just one example of many instances where this pattern is recorded. This reflects Fishman’s claim that “each domain can be differentiated into role relations that are specifically crucial or typical of it” (1986:443). One of the aspects in the study is to make a connection regarding simultaneous change of the code and the topic in spontaneous conversations. Also analysis will include the function that the two languages fulfill in the role relations between the members of the family and, the analysis to determine whether or not two families differ in the pattern of code choice and what is the reason behind this pattern.

Finally, considering the fact that the two participating families have different linguistic background, and the fact that children acquired languages at the different times, it is appropriate to discuss grammatical analyses of code-switching. This approach has been developed independently of sociolinguistic and pragmatic/conversational analytic models and has not been the primary focus of the code switching studies (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:10). However, as Gardner-Chloros

mentions, this approach has been one of the most prolific one in study of code switching.

The patterns of speech quite accurately reflected what Muysken (1995) states that “when sentences are build up with items drawn from two lexicons, we can see to what extent the sentence patterns derive from the interactions between these two lexicons” (1995:178). The weight of this research will fall mostly on this approach since the variance of the speech patterns of the boy and the girl seems to be most reflected in their CS and CM choice. To be more specific, there is a clear difference between their syntax, e.g. the boy’s code switching reflects English grammar and syntax, adapting Serbian to English in which case Serbian seems as a vulnerable language. On the other hand, the girl frequently code-mixes and uses English words which are then adjusted to fit Serbian grammatical rules and syntax, making English a more vulnerable language in that case.

This approach has been a controversial one for several reasons but most importantly, because code-switching and mixing is variable and the definition of grammar that the speaker is using can be highly subjective. Gardner-Chloros brings up three potential problem areas when it comes to defining “grammar” and “language” in a context of code-switching and code mixing:

- 1) First, the inability to apply grammatical rules to the analysis of the spontaneous speech,
- 2) The issue of “Base” or “Matrix” Language (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:92), as stated “a misplaced faith in the role of the Matrix Language underlies the failure of many grammatical proposals to account fully for CS data”,

- 3) The assumption that a bilingual person switches from one language to another in some meaningful way between two different sets of rules of these languages.

Disregarding the difficulties proposed regarding the grammatical approach, it is nevertheless observable and undeniably present in the data collected. Besides many variations of grammatical models, the one of interest is described by Poplack (1980) where she analyzed *the free morpheme constraint* where switch can occur and more frequently reflects the girl's patterns of speech. She proposed that two constraints dictated switch patterns, first *the free morpheme constraint* and, second, *the equivalence constraint*. The first one deals with a universal predictability of phonologically modifying a word in order to blend it with the language in use, e.g. adding suffix to English word "sleepala" (Serbian ending for past tense of the infinitive "spavati", past tense "spavala" - Eng. "to sleep" - designating female gender). According to Poplack, if this did not occur, switch would not be prohibited.

The latter one is with regard to the switch not being able to occur if "the surface structures of the two languages differ" (in Gardner-Chloros, 2009:96). The applicable example for this would be when word order is acceptable by one language but not by the other, therefore adjustment would be necessary.

CHAPTER 5

METHODS

Code-switching and code-mixing could be studied through many different approaches that could yield more or less productive results, depending of the context. Prior to discussing the methods used, one cannot underestimate some issues that arise when conducting a research with the bilingual children. Gardner-Chloros (2008) discusses some issues regarding studies on bilingual children, and brings up the fact that most of the cases studied represent “elite bilinguals”, as many of them are “offspring of the linguistic researchers or their acquaintances, studied longitudinally over a period of months or years in the family context” (Gardner-Chloros, 2008:143). The negative side of it is, as she describes, that the children observed are usually at the “top end scale, both cognitively and socially”. Hence, the majority of the studies have involved the bilingual children who represent the minority since most of the bilingual children belong to “ordinary, working class” families (Mejia, 2002, in Gardner-Chloros, 2008:143).

As this holds true for the present study, it is necessary to argue that the positive side of this method is that children are recorded and observed in a natural setting by the observer who is familiar with their linguistic behavior and has been witnessing their language development from the beginning (Gardner-Chloros, 2008:143). To illustrate this point, the author had access to daily communicative interactions between the family members and the two children observed since infancy until present. The advantage

could also be evident in the amount and the consistency of data collected, and ability to follow changes that occurred during the period from infancy to five years of age in children.

Selected families each have a five-year-old child who is bilingual in both Serbian and English language and has operating vocabulary of approximately 13000 words (Nowak, 2000). The study was conducted in Wichita, Kansas, from 2005-2010, where Serbian community remains relatively small counting no more than ten families (three of which have five year old children). Hence, the exposure to Serbian language is primarily through parents and their children. All of the material analyzed was from 2010 when children were five years old due to their degree of bilingualism. Another family was considered for the study that has a multilingual five-year-old child; however, they were not available for recording sessions and due to the lack of material were excluded from this study.

Data collection

In order to describe the patterns and the motivation of code-switching and code-mixing phenomena in language varieties, data was gathered through a large sample of informal conversations which was collected through audio/ video recording and observation that started since the children were born until they turned five. The domain examined has been primarily the home setting and informal interaction between the speakers-hearers during lunch, dinner, or leisure time. The conversations were recorded also during playtime between the two children on the playground and at

school. The fact that conversations were recorded in two different settings implies that the language behavior of the participants is influenced by two different environments. Further, during all of the observational and recording sessions both mothers were usually present. The children were always actively involved in conversations with the interlocutors. Some conversations were recorded solely between mother and the boy. Both fathers were rarely present, but long enough to see the difference in speech patterns of the children when another parent was present, especially for the boy who switched always to English language, the father's native tongue.

To ensure quality of recordings, as well as quick transfer of data, special recorder was used which has a flash drive and the ability to transfer data to the computer file storing and organizing all conversations chronologically since they began in 2005 when children started uttering the first words up until they turned five in 2010 (before their sixth birthdays). Since these recordings took place during informal home setting, children usually after a short period forgot about the device and interacted naturally and spontaneously. To avoid observer's paradox, a recorder was usually activated discretely after fifteen minutes in to the conversation, which seemed to work well for the children.

Case study 1

Research subject MS is a five-year-old male, referred to as "the boy" in the study, who has been exposed to both Serbian language (L1) spoken by the mother and English (L2) spoken by the father, from birth on. The mother is of Serbian descent and is balanced bilingual. The father is monolingual and speaks few words of Serbian

language, but converses with the subject's mother exclusively in English. They both use what is known as Grammont's Law (1902) which advocates that each parent exclusively exposes child to their mother tongue, or today known as *One Parent One Language* (OPOL) rule (Barron-Hauwert, 2004), and have been exposing the child to their languages equally. This approach maintains certain control over language acquisition, and even though most of the parents whose children have been taught this way are the ones being involved in the research of code-switching and code-mixing themselves, they certainly represent minority of the bilingual world (Chloros-Gardner, 2008). Even though parents of subject the boy use OPOL, there have been instances of code-switching and code-mixing among the parents themselves. The intention of OPOL among this family was to keep the languages separate, as Lanza states: "Bilingual awareness is implicitly defined as formal separation of the two languages" (1992). The explanation for this language behavior was that it could possibly prevent code-switching and code-mixing, or at least reduce the interaction between the languages which would inadvertently reduce switching or mixing of the two.

From birth, the mother, also the author of this study, spent most of the day with the child at home therefore exposing child only to Serbian language. For the purpose of this study, it is appropriate therefore to mark Serbian language as (L1) as this language represents the language of primary needs and the more dominant language due to the hours of exposure and the primary care given by the mother. The child was mostly exposed to English for three hours per day in the afternoon, after his father returns from work. At the age of three, the boy started attending preschool two days a week for three hours a day. At the school, subject was exposed exclusively to English language. At this

level child already operated with the basic English vocabulary, at the level of an average three-year-old child, being on target 90% time with grammatical rules (Nowak, 2000). The boy's comprehension was also at the level of an average three-year-old.

At the age of four, the boy attended preschool three days a week, three hours per day. At this level, according to the observations, he could communicate in English, operating as an average four-year-old English speaker. Finally, at the age of five, he was going to school every day, Monday through Friday, three hours per day.

As previously mentioned, the author is the boy's mother, and has had a privilege to observe the process of language acquisition and speech development patterns from the time when he was born. The boy was eleven months old when he uttered first words. The first few words (besides "mama" and "dada") were in Serbian language: "daj" (Eng. "give"), "kako" (Eng. "how"), "ajde" (Eng. "let's go"). All of the observations were recorded in a journal and or recorded by camera at that time. Mother spent all day long with the boy interacting exclusively in Serbian language until he turned three. This period is marked by more exposure to English language, even though the boy was learning English from his father. As mentioned, parents were using OPOL system, which helped differentiate the two languages.

At this time audio recording of informal everyday conversations proceeded. He was recorded in a home setting, mostly during playtime, mealtime or when interacting with subject two, the girl.

Audio recording was randomly used on weekly basis, each session lasting about 15-20 minutes each. The total number of workable data recorded adds to 6.5 hours.

Besides the audio recordings, observational notes were used for capturing particular instances of code-switching and/or CM patterns.

Case study 2

The first research subject was selected on a non-random basis, by acquaintance with the family. Subject was suitable for the study due to the age group and the degree of the bilingualism and usage of the Serbian and English language.

The subject B.M. is a five-year-old female, who has been exposed to Serbian language (L1) since birth and is referred to as “the girl” in the study. Mother and father are both of Serbian descent and speak Serbian language at home. The child has been exposed mainly to their native language. At the age of three, the child started preschool at the local school where she was exposed only to English language. The first year, she was attending school three times a week for three hours. She started learning English through simple vocabulary recognition. At this level she was able to recognize colors, objects, numbers (1-10), name days of the week, months, distinguish between weather phenomena (rain, cloudy, sunny etc.). The following year her attendance increased to five days a week, three hours per day. The progress in her English acquisition increased where she was uttering simple sentences, but understood most of the daily commands by the teacher (work assignment, behavior expectations, etc.). At the age of five, she can speak and understand English language at the level of average five-year-old child who is a natural English speaker. The observation and audio recording used in the study are from this period.

Through continuous monitoring her language behavior indicated patterns of CS and CM. For the purpose of the analysis of these patterns, her conversations between her parents and the first subject were recorded. Every recording lasted between 15 and 25min with a hand-held recording device, which stores data in a chronological manner. The subject was familiarized with the recording device and was aware that recording is being performed, but after approximately five minutes into recording would forget about the device and would carry on with informal conversation. This improved the quality of the data avoiding the *participants paradox* of altering speech patterns. Recordings were performed once a week for a year. Extractions of conversations will be analyzed in the discussion section 7. It is important to mention that mother was present during almost all recording and observation sessions, and was very dominant in the topic choice.

In order to collect data that reflect several aspects of code-switching and code-mixing phenomena, the author often participated in the conversations acting as an interlocutor. Such samples will show whether interlocutor, or the participant in the discourse, influences language choice or causes switch from one variety to another.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS

The main goal of the study was to analyze language behavior of two bilingual families, particularly their children and to define motivation and function behind occurrences of code-switching and code-mixing in their everyday conversation. Accordingly, the proposed hypothesis in this study is that there is a difference in speech patterns between the children due to the difference in L2 acquisition and the strategy employed by parents in L1 and L2 instruction.

Case study 1 – conversation analysis

According to theoretical background used in the analysis of the connection between code-switching and code mixing could be due to the several different factors. First, the focus of the analysis will be concerned whether or not topic change had high influence on the code choice. Furthermore, it will be taken in consideration whether or not the subjects studied make use of a marked language choice in order to identify with the group, i.e. whether they employ the marked code to establish bonding with other speakers or to establish power in communication. This will shed light on “we code” and the “they code” in the interaction between the family members, who are trying to express solidarity towards the other participants in the conversation or to establish domination.

According to Bublitz (1988) the discourse topic establishes a connection between the contributions of the participants thus making the conversation coherent. This is relevant for this study considering participants are always “talking about something”, focusing on the “description of the topic” will answer directly what is the topic of the conversation. Turning to the patterns of the participants language behavior regarding code-switching and code-mixing, the Markedness Model proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993b). Additionally, a list of code-switching functions proposed by Appel and Mysken (1987) is regarded in an attempt to discover the actual motivation of the subjects to code-switch and code-mix.

Example 1: Boy (B) – Mother (M) conversations

The boy and his Mom are creating a project by drawing with glitter glue on the paper. The mom is prompting the boy to tell her what he is doing. She is trying to inspire the boy to describe each movement, color, and picture, etc. The boy is enthusiastic to tell the story which he is making up as he is drawing. This spontaneous conversation is recorded in the home setting between the mother and the boy. In this conversation, the mother and the boy are conversing in Serbian, however mother at one point switches purposely to test the influence of the interlocutor code choice and its effect on code-switching or mixing in the conversation.

The boy is drawing a volcano and the pirate ship and he is describing what he is drawing to his mother who is prompting questions.

- 1 M: **Kazi mami sta to crtas?** { *tell mommy what are you drawing* }(.)
- 2 B: **Svasta nesto** { *all kinds of stuff* }(.) **Pirate koji traze blago i onda ce ova vatra da eksplodira skroz i da ide dole...**{ *pirates who are looking for gold and then the fire is going to explode and then it will go down* }(.)
- 3 M: **a sta ce pirati da urade** { *and what are pirates going to do* }(?)
- 4 B: **samo ce da se popnu** { *they are just going to claim* } **and then back on the ship, but they threw an anchor that...they threw a bridge**(.)
- 5 M: **kako se to kaze na srpskom?** { *how do you say that in Serbian* }(.)
- 6 B: **most** { *bridge* }(.)
- 7 M: **A kako se kaze anchor?** { *and how do you say anchor* }(?)
- 8 B: **ne znam** { *I don't know* }(.)...**I onda ima ovo sto se drzi i onda se oni popnu i onda idu za blagom** { *and than it has this that holds so they can climb up and go search for gold* }(.)
- 9 M: **a sta ce da rade sa blagom?** { *what are they going to do with the gold* }(.)
- 10 B: **da uzmu i idu kuci** { *to take and go home* }(.)
- 11 M: **a sta ce im?** { *what do they need it for* }(.)
- 12 B: **pirates love gold** (whispering)(.)
- 13 M: **glasnije!** { *speak up* }(.)
- 14 B: **Pirati vole blago**(.) **Zato sto su to pare** { *pirates love gold* }(.)
- 15 M: **pa sta ce sa njima da rade?** { *what are they going to do with it* }(.)
- 16 B: **nista** { *nothing* }(.)...**onda kupe stvari** { *they buy stuff* }(.)...**now we get a little bit of this on the gold**(.)

- 17 M: **OK. A zasto** {OK. But why}{.} **Da izgleda kao pravo blago** {to look like the real gold}{.}
- 18 B: **because some of the yellow looks like gold. I have glitter on my hands**{.}
- 19 M: **nema veze** {it doesn't matter}{.} **A kako se kaze glitter** {and how do you say glitter}{.}
- 20 B: **ne znam** {I don't know}{.}
- 21 M: **sljokice, sjaj** {sequence, glitter}{.}
- 22 B: **Sjaj** {glitter}{.} **Kao blago neko** {like some kind of treasure}{.} **Blago se zove sjaj**.{treasure is called glitter}{.} **Ooh I took out green. But that's ok**{.}
- 23 M: **pazi da ne poseces rukicu na tu plastiku** {watch so you don't cut your hand on that plastic}{.}
- 24 B: **Dobro** {very well} {.}
- 25 M: **Bravo** {great job}{.}
- 26 B: **punchy boy, I have to color up**{.}
- 27 M: **mislim da moras da odvrnes malo tu kapicu** {I think you have to unscrew that cap a little}{.} **Cepic, sta li je** {cap, however you call it}{.}
- 28 B: **it's OK, you can call it HAT**{.}
- 29 M: **Ako hoces da izadje malo vise lepka, onda moras da odvrnes malo vise, znas?** {if you want it to flow more, you have to unscrew it more, you know?}{.}
- 30 B: **hocu vise** {I want more}{.}
- 31 M: **aha, znaci moras da odvrnes** {aha, that means you need to untighten more}{.} **E tako, sad ce da izadje 3 kilograma** {there you go, now 3 kilograms

- are going to come out}{.}) **Koje sve tu boje sad imas** {which colors do you all have now}{.})*
- 32 B: **zuto** {yellow}{.}) **Hmm pirate imaju mapu.** {hmm pirates have a map}{.})
- 33 M: **zasto imaju mapu** {why do they have a map}{.})
- 34 B: **da znaju da nadju blago** {so they know how to find treasure}{.}) **Oh(.) I'm getting glitter all over my hand(.)**
- 35 M: **Nema veze, opraces ruke** { that's ok. You 'll wash your hands}{.})
- 36 B: **yes(.) That's ok(.)**
- 37 M: **jel ti pravis tortu sa bojom**(.)
- 38 B: **tako treba, sad je all messed up(.)**

The sequence 1 can be described as follows: from line 1 to line 22, the mother and the boy are talking about what he is drawing. In the first sentence, the mother is asking in Serbian language what is he drawing, and the boy is immediately responding in Serbian see in line 2. Using the same code as his mother, the boy shows solidarity with his mother. This can also represent “we code” as this is the time of bonding between the mother and the boy spending time together by discussing pirates through his drawings. The first intra-sentential switch occurs in line 4, where the boy reflects his code choice to the knowledge gained previously from the book his mother read to him. The boy was so impressed with this book that most of his drawings that week included pirates and pirate ships. The book is written in English language, and the boy was familiar with the terminology of the pirate ship, pirates, and pirate treasure etc. in

English even though mother translated to him some parts of the book in order to expand his Serbian vocabulary.

To check whether this switch had anything to do with the lack of vocabulary knowledge, in line 5 mother asks whether he knows how to say all that in Serbian language. The boy immediately translates the last word to her in line 6, however when he was asked in line 7 how to say “anchor” in Serbian, the boy did not know. This switch obviously occurred due to the lack of vocabulary in L1 reflecting referential function proposed by Apple and Muysken (1987) arguing that code-switch occurs when there is lack of vocabulary on certain subject.

The next inter-sentential switch occurs in line 12 where the boy switches to English due to the story he was familiar with, as previously mentioned, repeating the same exact sentence read from the book in the same paralinguistic manner he heard it. However, as the mother gave instruction to speak up using positive face, the boy switches back to “we code” using Serbian language. In line 16, the motivation for intra-sentential switch roots in topic change regarding color he was using to paint gold/pirate’s treasure. Here, the boy starts talking about the colors he is using. The most activities that he is involved in that include coloring he associates with his school where he uses exclusively English language. Furthermore, even though his mother as the interlocutor uses Serbian to ask him a question to potentially switch him back to Serbian, he replies again in line 18 in English, as the topic about color remains the same. Continuing with line 19, the mother reassures the boy that it is ok to have glitter on his hands, changing the topic again and asking the boy whether he knew a Serbian word for “glitter”. In line 20, the boy confirms that this switch occurred due to the lack of

vocabulary, and the reason, reaffirming that that knowledge came from the school where they use glitter in art projects. The mother translates “glitter” to him, and, as seen in line 22 the boy repeats the equivalent word in Serbian, associating it to the treasure, as he was describing this word. However, in the same conversation he switches the topic from defining a word to what he was coloring, using again English associating this topic to school activities. In line 23, the mother shows care, alerting the boy to sharp plastic edge where he could cut himself, motivating the boy to switch to “we code”, responding in Serbian, showing his mother solidarity and comfort that he will be safe. To brighten up the atmosphere the boy throws in a joke which, again, reflects poetic function (Apple and Muysken, 1987) explaining the code choice and the switch.

In line 27, the topic changes again. The mother points out to the pen the boy is using which contains glitter glue and she points out to the boy that he needs to unscrew the cap in order for glue to come out more. However, since the mother struggles for a moment to find an appropriate word in Serbian, the boy offers the English equivalent to make the situation “easier” for his mother, reflecting his knowledge in English, which is a dominant one. If the boy cannot express himself well, he frequently switches to English language, reflecting expressive function. The tone of voice in line 29 becomes firmer as the mother is repeating what she said in line 27, trying to get the boy to unscrew the cap so more glue can come out. In this case, mother’s code marks power, the boy immediately switches back to “we code” and shows solidarity with his interlocutor. Serbian continues to be the code of choice until the next topic change turning attention from the pirates map back to the glitter, a word he associates with school and English language therefore using that language as a code choice. The sequence ends with line

38 and the intra-sentential switch where the boy switches to English as he refers to glitter being all messed up since he squeezed out too much and has smudged it over his drawing with his fingertips.

This sequence exemplifies OPOL strategy by the mother employing Serbian or L1 consistently throughout the conversation even when the boy switches to English. She also takes two opportunities to check the boy's knowledge or to switch him to Serbian language. Throughout the conversation it is obvious that the boy accepts "we code" and establishes bond with his mother through Serbian language, however, the situations where he switches to English have more to do with the lack of vocabulary, associations to certain knowledge acquired from school where English is dominant, and as a joke.

Example 2 – Conversation between grandma (G) and the boy (B)

- 1 B: **to je kamion** {This is a truck} (.) **Ovde je izgoren** {it's burnt here}(.) **Ej bako vidi, kost pa onda mac, kost pa onda mac** {hay, grandma, look, bone and then sword, bone and then sword}(.)
- 2 G:**sta ima u posti** {what is in the mail}(.)
- 3 B: **mmm puno slike** {many pictures}(.)
- 4 G: **kakve** {what kind}(.)
- 5 B: **o neke lepe**{oh some nice ones}. **Imamo neke eksplozije** {we have some explosions}(.)
- 6 G:**Kakve** {what [explosions]}(.)

- 7 B: **Velike** {big ones}...**velike, ovom alienu izgorelo dupe**{big,this alien's butt burned}. **Bako, ovom alienu izgorelo dupe** {Grandma, this alien's butt burned}{.}
- 8 G: **dobro** {very well}{.}
- 9 B: **i onda ovaj eksplodira** {and then this one exploded}{.}
- 10 G: **dalje** {go on}{.} **I sta jos** {and what else}{.}
- 11 B: **a vidi ovo je snega iz helicopter** {and look this is snow from the helicopter} (.). **Jel se secas onaj crveni nindza koji smo gledali tamo na onaj moj** {do you remember that red ninja that we wathed on my}{.}
- 12 G: **DVD?**{DVD}{.}
- 13 B: **jel znas ovaj covek je super hero, ali super hero koji je na vatri kad je na kozi onda ne moze da leti ali kada je na vatri onda leti** {do you know this guy is a super hero, but a super hero that is on the fire, when it is on the skin he cannot fly, but when he is on fire he flies} (.). **imamo Superman, Spajderman, Nindze i Batman i Surfer Surfer i Flash i Ninzda opet i imamo** {we have superman, spiderman, ninjas and batman and surfer surfer, and flash and ninja again, and we have...}{.}
- 14 G: **a taj zeleni?**{and that green one}{.}
- 15 B: **taj zeleni je Aquaman, on pliva u vodi, i ovaj je Green lantern, i ovaj**{that green one is the Aquaman, he swims in the water, and this one is the Green Lantern, and this one...} **ne znam, ja se ne secam kako se zove ali on moze da se stretch up...evo ga jos jedan, vidi Spiderman, I imamo ovaj Venom** {I

- don't know, I don't remember his name but he can stretch up, there is one more,
look Spiderman, and we have Venom}{.}
- 16 G: **pa svi su tu.** {so they are all here}
- 17 M: **kako se kaze stretch up na Srpskom** (how do you say stretch up in
Serbian){.}
- 18 **Ne znam**{I don't know}{.}**its stretchy**{.}
- 19 M: **pa kako se kaze na Srpskom** {well, how do you say it in Serbian){.}
- 20 B: **I don't know**{.}
- 21 G:**Restegnuti** {stretch up}
- 22 B: **ok rastegnuti** {ok, stretch up}. **Jel mozes ovo sve da vratis** {can you put this
all back}{.}
- 23 G:**cekaj da dohvatim**{wait so I can reach it}{.} **Dalje pricaj mi** {go on, tell me
more}{.}
- 24 B:**vulkan** {volcano}{.}
- 25 G: **to je zivi vulkan** {that is alive volcano}{.}
- 26 B: **vatra je** {there's fire}{.}
- 27 G: **zato sto je jos uvek aktivan** {because it is still active}{.}
- 28 B: **a vidi ovaj** {and look at this one}{.} **Imamo dinosaurusu** {we have a
dinosaur}{.} **Ovaj hoce da ga pojede** {this one wants to eat it} (.) **a sta jos** {and
what else}{.}
- 29 G: **ne znam, treba da vidimo** {I don't know, we have to see}{.}
- 30 B: **Ninza se bori na aput** {ninja is fighting on the highway}{.}

31 G: **jel to sve** {is that all}{.} **Ajde da spakujemo sada postu** {lets pack and put away all the mail now}{.}

32 **Sve da spakujemo ok** {pack all of it, ok}{.}

In this conversation, the interlocutor is the boy's grandmother who is a passive bilingual, therefore speaks exclusively Serbian with the boy, building the intimate language and marking "we code" only Serbian. The conversation takes place at home in the boys room where they were looking at the book of superheroes, and some random ripped out pages which they are referring to as the "mail" and the boy is explaining to his grandma who is who and why are they so special. The topical development can be described as follows: the boy is holding a book and some pages he collected from different magazines, which he pretends is his mail, and is showing his grandma who is all on in the pictures on various pages. First, he is pointing with a finger to a picture with a truck that is burning containing pictures of bones and swords on it. In order to comply with his conversational interests, grandma changes the topic to ask him what is in the mail he received. He follows to reply in Serbian that there is all kinds of pictures in the mail, and then starts going through various pages naming who or what is on them. The first code-mix occurs due to the lack of knowledge in line 7, describing an alien, however he adds suffix -a to adjust it to Serbian grammatical rules of noun cases. The topic continues until line 10 where Grandmother tries to change the topic so the boy moves on with the conversation. The response to the dominant interlocutor code continues to be Serbian with one intra-sentential code-switch mentioning "helicopter" which is in question because the word in Serbian is the same except the case is

missing. Therefore, this could be just grammatically incorrect word rather than the code-switch. As the boy continues to look through the pictures, he switches to a new topic of super heroes, and uses that word due to his knowledge attained in English, hence, when he is mentioning the names of the superheroes, he uses their names in English as there are no translations in Serbian. One interesting point here is that as he is talking to his grandmother he pronounces these names with a Serbian accent line 15, rolling all of the “R’s” as if she would understand him if he changes accent to adjust to the Serbian language. As the conversation continues, in line 15 there is a referential code switch as the boy struggles to say in Serbian “stretch up”. As the mother hears the boy code-switch, she asks whether he knows how to say that in Serbian language. The boy immediately responds in Serbian in line 18, however, when the mother repeats the question, he repeats his answer in English. Hence, the boy code-switches to L2 and uses it as the marked code to make his utterance effective enough. The rest of the conversation, the boy continues in L1 to maintain “we code” bond he has with the grandmother.

Example 3 : conversation between the boy (B) and the girl (G)

1. G: **draw it on your face (.)**
2. B: **it’s OK(.) do you know how to draw a star(.)**
3. G: **Yeah(.)**
4. B: **Then draw me one(.) so, so, so big(.)a sea star(.) that’s not a star(.)**

5. G: **yes it is(.) that's how my mama showed me how to draw a star(.)**
6. B: **it doesn't look like a star(.) can anyone draw me a big star(.)**
7. G: **No(.)**
8. B: **Please would you(.)**

Boy leaves the room

9. B: **molim te jel mozes da mi nacrtas veliku zvezdu(.)** {please, can you draw me a star}{(?)}
10. Boy's Granma: **ajde tamo crtajte**
11. B: **ajde bako** {come on grandma} **(.) ali nemoj unutra da stavis zvezdu** {don't put the star inside}{(.)} **Nemoj tako** {not like that}{(.)} **Samo ovako** {only like this}{(.)}

Boy returns to the playroom with his Grandma

12. G: **nacrtala sam je i ja** {I drew it also}{(.)} **I know how to make it(.)**
13. B: **I drew one when I was a baby(.) hey did you know when I was a baby I lived in a trashcan(.)**
14. G: **<laughing> for real(.)**
15. B: **no, not for real(.)**
16. G: **Hey look(.)**
17. B: **Yes, it's like under the sea(.)**
18. G: **yes its dark like you are in the paper(.)**
19. B: **zeeee(.)**
20. G: **Yea. More paper(.)**
21. B: **Ja sam ispod vode**{ I am under the water}{(.)}

22. G: I want to klizem se {skate}{.} wanna watch me dance(.)
23. B: Monster(.)
24. G: Wanna watch me dance(.) Ajde na kauc {let's go on the couch} (.) Look what I can do(.)
25. B: I cannot dance(.)
26. G: why not. Look at me. Look what I can do(.)

Unlike sequence 1 and 2, this conversation starts in English (L2). The boy and the girl, as main subjects of this study, are playing in her playroom during one afternoon. As they are drawing, the girl point out to the boy's cheek, and tells the boy to draw something on his face. The boy switches topic and attention from his face and asks the girl if she know how to draw a star. The girl immediately responds in "we code" L2 which for them represents language they use in school and with their playmates. The L2 represents for them school, play role establishing code that is more powerful and the code of preference. The first brief code-switch occurs when the girl mentions her mother in line 5 since she relates all domains of the home to her L1 where nobody in the household uses English word for *mother*.

The first intersentential switch occurs when the boy leaves to get his grandmother to draw him a star since he did not like how the girl was drawing it. He uses "we code" with his Grandmother, L1. In line 10, the boy's grandmother directs the boy to go back to the room and continue playing there, but also escorts him to the room. To bond with the Grandmother, the girl also performs an inter-sentential code-switch to L1 to establish approval and gain attention. Further, she switches back to L2 as she

addresses the boy to let him know she also knows how to draw a star. The code of preference in the conversation remains to be L2 until the boy in line 21 turns to everyone and says that he is under the water. The audience is dominantly using L1 as a code of choice, therefore the children switch to L1 to establish bond. To turn away attention from the boy to herself, the girl changes the topic and wants to show off her dancing. Hence, her intra-sentential code-switch has directive function, as she is aware of everybody's language skills. In line 23, the boy feels like he has lack of attention, therefore changes the topic again and screams "monster". However, the girl switches topic one more time to regain attention she was wanting. There is another instance of intra-sentential switch to L1 since the kids moved to the room where L1 speakers were sitting and she wanted to show her other identity and gain full attention from the adults as well. In this sentence, her linguistic behavior shows expressive function, showing her mixed identity. It is clear that in this sequence, the children bond and language of solidarity is English and they occasionally perform a switch when other speakers are in close proximity and their attention needs to be gained.

Case Study 2 – conversation analysis

Example 4: Conversation between the Girl (G) and girl's Mother (M)

- 1 M: **Pravicemo "crumb cake", jel vazi** {we'll make a Crumb Cake, deal}{?}
- 2 G: **Yay!**

- 3 M: **vidis, to je sa cimetom** {you see, that is with cinnamon}{.} **donecemo dve stolice da mozes da dohvatis**{we will bring two chairs so you can reach}{.}
- 4 G: **jel mogu ja to da mixam** {can I mix that}{.} **Ja sam to doala** {I did that}{.}
- 5 M: **This looks yummy**(!)
- 6 G: **it smells like Cinnamon**(.)
- 7 M: **polako sacekaj** {easy, wait}{.}
- 8 G: **dobro** {good}{.} **A sta je to** {and what is that}{.}
- 9 M: **sporet** {oven}{.}
- 10 G: **Ja sam did this** {I did this}{.}
- 11 M: **sta si to radila** {what did you do}{.} **Zagrnila svog druga** {gave a hug to your friend}{.}
- 12 G: **da** {yes}{.} **jel ovo plastic** {is this plastic}{.}
- 13 M: **jeste** {yes it is}{.}
- 14 G: **mozem ja da brejkam jaja** {can I break the eggs}{.} **Ja znam da brejkam jaja** {I know how to break the eggs}. **Ali moram prvo da operem ruke jer su eggs dirty** {but first I have to wash my hands}{.}
- 15 M: **polako, sacekaj** {easy, wait}{.}
- 16 G: **dobro** {ok}{.}
- 17 M: **sad cemo da procitamo recept** {now we'll read the recipe}{.}
- 18 G: **I want to do this**(.)
- 19 M: **budi strpljiva** {be patient}{.} **Jel mozes da sacekas** {can you wait}{.}
- 20 G: **mogu** {yes I can}{.}
- 21 M: **izvoli** {here you go}{.}

- 22 G: **hocu ja to da radim** {I want to do that}(.)
- 23 M: **lepo pricaj kao velika devojica** {talk nicely like a big girl}(.) **Jel vazi**
{deal}(.)
- 24 G: **Dobro** {very well}(.)**vazi** {deal}(.) **ovo tejsta kao Gingerbread** {this tastes like
the gingerbread}(.)
- 25 M: **e a sada da ukljucimo rernu I da stavimo da se pece** {and now we are
going to put it in the oven to bake}(.)
- 26 G: **a kad cemo da jedemo** {when are we going to eat}(.) **Ovo smells like**
strawberries {this smells like strawberries}(.) **Jel mogu jednu ovu da pojedem**
{can I eat one of these}(.)
- 27 M: **mozes** {yes you can}(.)
- 28 G: **ja nisam nista haveala** {I didn't have any}(.)
- 29 M: **uzmi jednu, ajde** {go ahead, take one}(.)
- 30 G: **woow**(.)
- 31 M: **eto sad cemo da cekamo da se ispece** {there now we are going to wait for it
to be baked}(.) **Idi opera sad ruke** {go and wash your hands now}(.)
- 32 G: **dobro** {very well}(.)

Sequence 4 is an excellent representation of the girls language behavior and her code-switching and code-mixing patterns. The mother opens the conversation by announcing that they are going to cook together. This is a bonding time between the girl and the mother. In this conversation the “we code” is L1 and the mother clearly establishes powerful code choice. To establish solidarity, the girl uses Serbian as well acting as a rational actor, providing that she has a sense of markedness (Myers-Scotton

1993b). Mother is the first one to code-switch in line 1 as she mentions what they are going to make. The girl immediately responds with joyful exclamation “yay” as all of the exclamations are uttered in English, somewhat reflecting tag-switching. However, as soon as the mother introduces new topic the girl continues to respond in L1. The first code-mix that occurs in line 4 seemingly represents referential function of the code choice, however this is erroneous because she often uses these words like “mesati” (to mix) “raditi” (to do) etc. The girl L1 acquisition, as proposed before, is correlated with the adjustment of L2 vocabulary to L1 morpho-syntactic rules. The girl starts getting impatient and wants to start mixing the ingredients together. The mother code-switches to L2 to get the girl excited about the cake they are making. It is intentional code-switch, causing the girl to immediately show solidarity with her mother switching to L2. However, as the girl is looking at all the ingredients and tools on the table she starts taking them trying to put all of them together. The mother tries to slow her down by placing her hand over some of the utensils, but the girl continues to be impatient. Even though they switched to L2, the mother uses negative face and reinforces power through switching to L1. As she prompts her to slow down and wait in line 7, the girl responds, confirms her obedience in L1, and switches the topic by asking her mother about something. At this point the “we code” is reestablished. The mother in this moment goes back to positive face and continues to educate the girl. In line 10 the girl introduces another topic showing with her arms to her Mom that she hugged a boy in school. Associating this to school she performs a code-switch to L2 as she is associating this to her experience where the dominant code is L2. She makes another intra-sentential switch in line 12 turning the attention to the dishes used for their

cooking. Line 14 shows again code-mix patterns when she is adding suffix to accommodate English word and make it fit into L1 morphosyntactic rule. She also makes intra-sentential code-switch as she explains that she has to wash her hands because eggs are dirty. This is a topic they mention in school so the switch could have occurred for referential reasons or situational where association to her knowledge comes from the environment where L2 is dominant language used. Line 15 and 16 are parallel to 7 and 8 where mother changes and reinforces power by correcting the girl in L1. In line mother changes the topic by saying they are now going to read the recipe. The girl replies in English. However, another instance of correction the girls behavior switches the girl back to L1. The conversation continues in “we code” L1 maintaining the sense of bonding time between the girl and the mother. Line 24 shows another code-mix as the girl associates taste and Gingerbread with L2. The girl switches to L2 in line 26, however switches back to mother’s L1 in order to achieve her goal to eat a piece of food knowing that her mother told her to wait. The girls language choice also illustrates the pragmatic code-switching since it serves the speaker’s conversational goals. Following with another code-mix, the girl attempts to accommodate L1 and continues to identify with her mother’s conversational dominant code choice.

The pattern of code mixing is a frequent occurrence in the girl’s speech. Eight out of total of thirteen switches are reflecting CM. Regarding her CS, in some cases, these words have referential function (Appel and Muysken, 1987) due to the lack of knowledge in Serbian language regarding the terminology she learned in school. However, in contrast to boy’s language behavior, the girl performs code-mixing by

adding suffixes to the verbs (most commonly) not as much code-switching as reflected in the boy's language behavior.

Example 5: Conversation between the Girl (G) and the Father (F)

- 1 F: **cao duso** {ciao/hi sweetheart}{.}
- 2 G: **tata** {daddy}{.}
- 3 F: **kako si, kako je bilo u skolici** {how are you, how was school}{?}
- 4 G: **super** {super}{.} **Tata vidi sta sam paintala u skoli** {daddy, look what I painted in school}{.} **To je cvetic** {it's a flower}{.}
- 5 F: **super** {super}{.} **Bas lepo** {very nice}{.}
- 6 G: **ja sam prvo paintala, a onda se slika susila** {I painted it first, and then it had to dry}{.}
- 7 F: **bravo** {bravo}{.} **Jeste isli napolje danas da se igrate** {did you go outside to play today}{?}
- 8 G: **jesmo** {we did}. **isli smo na rock playground, I ja sam se swingala i slaidala** {we went to the "Rock" playground, and I swung and I slid}{.}
- 9 F: **odlicno** {excellent}{.} **danas je bio lep dan** {today was a nice day}{.}
- 10 G: **tata hocemo da idemo da vozimo bicikal** {daddy, are we going to go ride the bicycle}{?}
- 11 F: **hocemo** {we will}{.} **Samo da tata jede nesto pa idemo, vazi** {daddy just needs to eat something and then we can go, deal}{.}
- 12 G: **ok**

13 F: **ajde** {come on}{.} **Idi se ti spremi pa cemo da idemo** {you go get ready and we'll go}{.}

14 G: **jupi** {yay}{.}

Father leaves the room

Father reenters the room

15 F: **jesi se spremila** {did you get ready}{?}

16 G: **jesam** {I did}. **Ali ne znam gde mi je helmet** {but I don't know where is my helmet}{.}

17 F: **tamo je u garazi** {over there in the garage}{.}

18 G: **ja ne znam gde je** {I don't know where it is}{.} **ti mi nadji** {you find it for me}{.}

19 F: **necu ja** {not me}{.} **Sama pronadji** {find it by yourself}{.}

20 G: **please**{.}

21 F: **idi sama do garaze i uzmi sa police** {go by yourself to the garage and take it from the shelf}{.}

22 G: **I don't want to**{.}

23 F: **ok** {OK}{.} **neces imati onda helmet** {than you are not going to have the helmet}

24 G: **ok** {OK}{.} **idem da nadjem** {I'll go find it}{.}

This brief conversation between the father and the girl occurred after the father came back from work. The girl ran to hug him at which point the father greeted the girl in Serbian and the girl responded with L1 establishing solidarity with her father as “we code”. As the father introduces the topic of school to the girl, she performs a code-mix, and adds suffix to the word “to paint” to adjust it to the L1 morphosyntactic rules. As

soon as the father ask about the school the girl code-mixed utterances have referential function. This applies to line 16 as well where the girl code-switches due to lack of knowledge in Serbian language. As the girl is not willing to go look for her helmet in the garage, the father inserts power through L1, which the girl accepts and uses as code of choice until she wanted to change tone of the conversation and therefore perform a code-switch asking her father “please” in L2, which serves as metaphorical function (Appel and Muysken, 1987). At this point, the father lowers his voice and instructs her to go by herself and get her helmet by herself from the garage. However, the girl is not satisfied with the outcome of her request and attempt to use her metaphorical code-switch, so in line 22 she responds in L2 distancing herself from her father and expressing her dissatisfaction. The tone of conversation changes again as the father inserts his power in conversation showing her that he will not go find her helmet and just will not have it than. To show solidarity and reestablish obedience, the girl switches back to L1. Again, evident in this conversation is tendency for CM where the girl code-mixed six words out of eight total switches she made during the conversation.

CHAPTER 7

DICUSSION

The samples extracted from the data collected are consistent representations of speech behavior and patterns developed between the two main subjects studied, the boy and the girl, and their families in the family domain. The study dealt with data collection primarily in the home setting of two households and the subject of investigation was the dyad parent-child, parent-child-grandmother, and the conversation between the main two subjects, the children. The primary interest was to test whether there were differences among the two subjects' speech patterns in regards to L1 and L2 choice, which in deed showed to be evident. The main factors considered to influence these differences were the subjects' age and the order of language acquisition and the immediate environment conversational needs. Results seem to be closely related to whether "we code"/"they code" was affecting code choice in order to establish solidarity with the interlocutor.

To summarize, after all of the data collected was compared, the following conclusions were made: all of the family members, with the exception of the boy's father, use L1 as a "we code" with the children. However, the boy shifts "we code" from L1 to L2 depending on the situation, being that he is bicultural and a natural bilingual, acquiring both languages from birth. In many cases, his speech patterns show that he has adopted English syntax and it is easier for him to code-switch to L2 due to several reasons. These are illustrated in example 1, where he switches to L2 due to referential function, where he is simply lacking vocabulary, and/or directive function in cases where

the interlocutor is monolingual in L2. Some of the main motivational factors to use L1 is “we code”, or the fact that a child wants to show solidarity with the parent/grandparent, response to authority established through positive/negative face, and interlocutor’s code choice. The boy has tendency to code-switch solely with conversational participants who are bilingual in L1 and L2. He avoids this pattern when talking to L1 monolinguals.

In contrast to the boy, the analysis has shown that the girl shows greater tendency to code-mix rather than code-switch, reflecting the acquisition of L2 after the age of 2;10, and sole exposure to L1 until that time. Her syntax reflects the L1 rules, which she uses as a frame for the words she mixes from L2. This confirms Poplack (1980) notion of free morpheme constraint, where the suffix allows the word from L2 to be modified in order to fit the grammatical rules of L1. Most often the girl code-mixes verbs, adding suffixes designating gender differentiation. It can be stated that her code-mixing is closely related to the family domain dominant language and her need to identify with her parents code choice. The motivation behind her code-switching, is similar to the one of the boy. One of the main differences in code-switching in her case is that the girl uses L2 to either disassociate herself from the interlocutor or to express her dissatisfaction, as she does not use L2 as “we code” and has clear boundary between the L1 and L2, as the intimate versus formal code.

Furthermore, both children act as rational speakers choosing an appropriate code to fit the needs of the conversational participants. Even though they are five years old, they are aware of their bilingual skills and aware of linguistic rules and needs to satisfy cultural norms. One such observation in the boy’s speech patterns is that he rarely code-mixes or code-switches when he is talking with his maternal grandmother,

adjusting only his accent to fit the Serbian one, rolling his “r’s” believing it would be more intelligible to his passive bilingual interlocutor.

Since there is an observable difference in patterns developed by each child further research should be done to describe in more detail whether or not this can be applied universally. In addition, a more detailed analysis of the free morpheme constraint element should be preformed, which might show which elements of the sentence were more vulnerable in which language.

Furthermore, the analyses of the external domain should be considered, as the results could potentially be utilized for performance evaluation in schools attended by the Serbian/English bilinguals. This regards to the overall shift in language behavior as the children become more proficient in L2, which might expose many important elements regarding the ability of the speaker (children in particular) to fine tune their linguistic skills in order to adjust to the environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Appel, R. and Mysken, P. 1987. Language contact and bilingualism. London: Edward Arnold.*
2. *Auer, J.C.P, 1984 – Bilingual Conversation. Johns Benjamins Publishing Company*
3. *Beardsmore, Baetens. 1982. Bilingualism. Basic principles. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.*
4. *Bloomfield, L. 1935. Language. New York: Holt.*
5. *Brown, Gillian. Yule, George. 1983. Discourse analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
6. *Brown, Penelope. Levinson, Steven C. 1987. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
7. *Bublitz, Wolfram. 1988. Supportive fellow-speakers and cooperative conversations. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.*
8. *Cook, Vivian, 2003 – Effects of the Second Language on the First*
9. *Ferguson, Nicola. 1977. “Simultaneous speech, interruptions and dominance”, British Journal of Social and Clinic Psychology 16: 295-302.*
10. *Fishman, Joshua.A. 1971. The Sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. In Advances in the Sociology of Language. 1976. vol.I. Monton: Hague.*

11. *Fishman, Joshua.A. 1986. "Domains and the Relationship between Micro-and Macrosociolinguistics". In Gumperz, J. Hymes, D. Directions in Sociolinguistics. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.*
12. *Fishman. Joshua. A. 2000. "Who speaks what language to whom and when?". In Wei, Lee. The Bilingualism reader. Routledge:London.*
13. *Gardner-Chloros, Penelope, 1991 – Language Selection and switching in Strasbourg. Clarendon Press. Oxford.*
14. *Gardner-Chloros, Penelope, 2009 – Code-Switching. Cambridge Press.*
15. *Grosjean, Francois, 1982 – Life with two languages. Harvard University Press*
16. *Gross, Stephen. 2000. "Intentionality and the markedness model in literary code switching", Journal of Pragmatics 32: 1283-1303.*
17. *Gumperz and Dell Hymes (Eds.) Directions in sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.*
18. *Harrison, G.J. Piette, A.B. 1980. "Young bilingual children's language selection", Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 1: 217-230.*
19. *Haugen, E. 1953. The Norwegian language in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.*
20. *Hawkins, Roger, 2001- Second Language Syntax. Blackwell Publishers.*
21. *Johnson, Donna M., 1991 – Approaches to research in Second Language Learning. Longman, NY and London.*

22. Mackey, William. 2000. "The description of bilingualism". In Wei, Li. *The Bilingualism Reader*. Routledge: London.
23. MacSwan, Jeff, 1961 – *A Minimalist Approach to Intra-sentential Code*. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York 1999.
24. Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. *Social motivations for codeswitching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
25. Ochs, Elinor, 1988 – *Culture and Language Development*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Pavlenko, Aneta, 2006 – *Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression and Representation*.
27. Poplack, Shana. 1980 - *Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching*. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
28. Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
29. Vaid, Jyotsna 1986 – *Language Processing in Bilinguals: Psycholinguistic and Neuropsychological Perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. London
30. Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2002. *An Introduction to Linguistics*. (4th ed). Malden Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
31. Zivkovic, M. 2006. *Spoken discourse in bilingual family: focus on the simultaneous speech, code-switching and topic change*. Thesis