

A DESCRIPTION OF CODE-SWITCHING PATTERNS AMONG FILIPINO STUDENTS IN SENDAI, JAPAN

Christopher E. Cuadra
Shokei Women's Junior College

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to examine code-switching as used by Filipino students in Japan when they interact in natural conversation. Since this is a minority group living in a foreign country, it would be interesting to see how Japanese can be incorporated into their code-switching patterns.

The aim, therefore, of this study is to discover and describe regularities in their code-switching behavior. By gathering information on this, I hope to find out what happens when bilinguals get together informally, and engage in verbal behavior that results in English-Tagalog contact.

As participants in this community “successfully negotiate and infer social, stylistic or referential meaning” (Heller 1988c: 16) from their code-switched utterances, the information is carried either intersententially, intrasententially, or lexically, i.e. as single-word switches, and it is by investigating their recurrence that the code-switching patterns of this particular community may emerge.

Basically, the research question to be asked is: given that the contextual variables of *person*, *topic*, and *context* (Hamers and Blanc 1990:151)—factors known to “have a considerable...influence on variable patterns of language use” (Milroy 1987:41)—trigger code-switching behavior, how do these constraints affect in-group communication? In other words, how do these extralinguistic variables regulate the code-switching patterns that they use?

To my knowledge, there are no such code-switching studies yet of Filipinos abroad in the literature. This study hopes to take a step in that direction, and is in answer to Bautista's (1975) call for further research in code-switching between English and a Philippine language.

2. SUBJECTS

The subjects in this study are composed of a small group of Filipino scholars, most of whom are doing postgraduate studies in Sendai, a city in northeastern Japan. They belong to an informal association of Filipino students that was formed as a support group to help one another with whatever problems, academic or otherwise, that may arise when studying in a foreign land. This has provided them with the means to socialize; however, due to each person's heavy research load, regular meetings have not been possible.

Six of the informants are female, eight male, and their ages range from a 24-year old man to a 53-year old woman. Of the 14 students, seven spoke Tagalog as a first language; three, Ilocano; two, Chavacano (Philippine Creole Spanish); and one each for Pangasinan and Ilonggo. Of the non-Tagalog native speakers, either English or Tagalog was their second language. All of the Tagalog speakers claimed their second language was English, except for one who said it was Ilocano.

In the course of their daily lives in Japan, all of the students are Japanese. Only two do not actively use English; the rest use English with their professors and foreign classmates, and some of them even teach English on the side to earn extra money. When the group converges, English-Tagalog code-switching is used; Japanese and English are reserved for out-group communication.

3. RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Two tape recorders were used to collect the data. The respondents were not aware of these, as they were hidden from view. Most of the data collection took place on occasions held to celebrate the holidays: Christmas and New Year parties; other small group gatherings, such as birthday parties, were also used as opportunities to observe spontaneous code-switching behavior. All this amounted to about 20 hours of taped discourse.

4. CODE-SWITCHING PATTERNS: DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSES

Long stretches of discourse will be presented in an attempt to draw attention to the type of interaction and the code-switching patterns that exist in this particular bilingual speech community. Following Auer (1995), the discourses are then analyzed from the point of view of the bilingual conversationalist whose communicative competence is displayed through these verbal exchanges, so that a much clearer picture of the code alternation present among these speakers will emerge.

4.1. Person-specific code-switching

In person-specific code-switching, the choice of language used is influenced by “*who* is speaking and *who* [the speaker] is speaking to” (Holmes 1992:12). Thus, when these constraints become salient, such as during inter-ethnic encounters, there is a tendency to use a linguistic variety—appropriate for the situation—that alternates with another code (Myers-Scotton 1993).

In the following extract, taken from a Christmas party, each participant has a preferred code of communication. A, a middle-aged Filipino woman (married to an English-speaking Japanese doctor) who has been living in Japan for the past 26 years, has just entered one of the function rooms at the dormitory where the students are having a party. Perhaps because she comes from a generation that is more fluent and more used to English than Tagalog, and also because she has virtually stopped using Tagalog—until recently when she was asked to become the group’s adviser—her preferred code for both formal and informal talk with the students is English (Sridhar 1996:60), as can be seen in lines 1, 3, 10, 12, 18, & 20.

Example 1

- A: Beer and apples o (see)? Look, there’s plenty of apples o (see)?
 B: Mommy, what are you going to eat?
 A: Nothing, I’ll have to go, I haven’t cooked.
 C: *Magsoup muna kayo, kahit soup lang ho.* (Have some soup, even just soup.)
 5 B: Mommy, *ano* (uh) they’ll be only here up to February.
 A: *Ah so desu ka?** (Is that so?)
 D: *Kilala niyo po si Dr. Furusawa?* (Do you know Dr. Furusawa?)
 B: Doctor...? *Hindi siya nagTohoku kasi kaya ano.* (...He didn’t go to Tohoku University so...)
 D: *Ah.* (Oh.)
 10 A: I’m from Tohoku.
 D: *Ah* (Oh) Tokyo University *nga ano* (right)?
 A: If he is from Tohoku University, then I would know him. *Nakapanood ba kayo ng sine?* (Were you able to watch the movie?)
 15 E: *Oho, ang ganda nga, Ma’am.* (Yes, it was really good, Mommy) Thank you *ho.* *O offer niyo si Mommy ng beer at tsaka ano.* (Somebody offer Mommy some beer and some...)
 A: *O* (Look), very nice atmosphere! *Tignan niyo yung beer!* (Look at that beer!)
 E: *O beer na lang.* (How about some beer instead?)
 A: No, I don’t think. Give me anything cold, please.
 E: *Eto ho?* (How about this?)
 20 A: No, without ice. That’s cold enough.

The switches here are single item code-borrowings and intersentential switches at the level of the sentence. A, who speaks mostly in English, makes use of the tag *o* (lines 1 & 16) to get the group’s attention: in 1, she inserts it at the end of each sentence to emphasize what she has brought (Gumperz 1982:78), and in 16, she inserts it at the beginning of her exclamation.

B, the only person who talks to her in English, inserts the filler *ano* (line 5) after addressing A as 'Mommy' (line 2), which is how she is addressed by a majority of the group (cf. E in line 14: *Ma'am* is short for 'Mommy').

Tagalog borrows the nouns 'soup' (line 4), 'beer' (lines 15 & 16), and 'Tokyo University' (line 11), and the verb 'offer' (line 15). While 'offer' is borrowed in its base form—and used without any change in its meaning—two nouns, one from English ('soup', line 4), and another one from Japanese ('*Tohoku*', line 8), are inflected as *mag-* verbs to form loanshifts.

'*Magsoup...*' (line 4) functions as an imperative (Aspillera 1990:45) that is made polite, and therefore appropriate, by the polite marker *ho* (Leech 1992). While the situation is informal, the politeness of the speakers towards A is also marked by C's *kayo* and D's *niyo* (lines 4 & 7) (Aspillera 1990). They co-occur alongside the polite markers *ho* and *po* (cf. *ho* in line 4, *po* in line 7), and serve as markers of respect.

The proper noun '*Tohoku*' (i.e. Tohoku University) comes out as a result of Tagalog inflectional rules, i.e. change *mag-* to *nag-* and retain the root form of the stem to denote the past tense (Aspillera 1990:45). D shows that she understands this borrowing in lines 9 and 11. That is, since most of them study at Tohoku University, this word-internal switch was comprehended easily.

Up to this point (cf. line 10), A has been using English exclusively, except for the conversational routine '*Ah so desu ka?*' (Richards et al. 1995), an automatic reflex that could be a reflection of her long stay in Japan (line 6). In line 12, she switches to Tagalog (cf. *Nakapanood...sine?*) to address another group of students who are on the other side of the room. In this case, the switch is 'discourse-related' (Auer 1995), in that it "serves to direct the message to...someone standing aside from a group of conversationalists" (Gumperz 1982: 77). She likewise switches to Tagalog in line 16 (cf. '*Tignan...beer*'), as she addresses D and B, and then switches back to English when E offers her something to drink (lines 17-20).

Each student has a preferred code when communicating with her. For example, B is used to speaking to her in English (cf. lines 2 & 5). Compare this with his choice of Tagalog when addressing D in line 8. C and E, on the other hand, prefer to use Tagalog (lines 4, 14, 17 & 19); while D, having met A only once before, chooses the unmarked code (i.e. Tagalog) most suitable for informal interaction.

It is quite noticeable that A sticks to her own language choice, whereas the others, with the exception of B, do not accommodate to her. Despite the divergence, the interlocutors do not consider each other's speech styles as dissociation; on the contrary, their code-switching behavior creates favorable responses within the group. Because of the shared background assumptions inherent in this particular group, A's linguistic stance is not misconstrued as distance and formality—the effect of which would be the opposite if an outsider were to hear her speak.

While code-switching may express oneness with another person, quite the reverse may be implied by the nearly solitary use of English, especially when used by a fellow student to another student. The following exchange transpires at a New Year party: A and B, both men, are engaged in a mock debate, much to the delight of the other students (e.g. C & D), as can be seen by their cheers and laughter (lines 1, 2, 4, 7 & 10).

Example 2

- A: *Hindi ko naexpect na hihirit sa akin ang Lasalista.* (cheers) (I didn't expect that a La Sallite would go against me.)
 B: Excuse me. I'm a pure Atenean. (laughter)
 C: *Hindi pala Lasalista to eh* (So he's not a La Sallite!)
 D: Blue Eagle. Blue Eagle *pala* (So he's a Blue Eagle)! (laughter)
 5 B: Green Archers, *pare* ('man').
 C: *Edwin, isa lang ang laban diyani!* (Edwin, there's only one way you can get back at him!)
 B: I'd like to tell everybody: Ateneo is the one who built my career, *pare* ('man'). (cheers)
 C: How about DLSU?
 10 B: I mean DLSU, it made me into an engineer, Ateneo made me into a physicist. (cheers) It's more fun than being an engineer. (cheers)

In line 1, another example of an English verb inflected the Tagalog way is shown: this time to signify the past tense of a *ma-* verb, i.e. 'expect'—'*naexpect*' (Aspillera 1990:161).

A, an office worker at a Japanese company, utters this line because B, prior to this interaction, had been arguing vehemently with him about the various functions of the different departments (e.g. Production, Quality Control) found in business organizations. In so doing, he cites the fact that they are both alumni of De La Salle University.

However, B (line 2) refutes this and states emphatically that he is a 'pure Atenean', i.e. from Ateneo, where he did an M.S. in Physics, thereby rejecting A's claim of solidarity and brotherhood. This utterance appears to be double-barrelled for the following reasons: firstly, on the surface, the mere mention of 'Ateneo' to a 'La Sallite' evokes their intense athletic rivalry (lines 4 & 5); hence, by doing so, B is keeping his distance from A; and secondly, as can be seen by B's subsequent utterances (lines 7, 9 & 10), his switch to straight English implies that there is now a change in their relationship, with the switch having the affective function of putting "the addressee at a distance" (Holmes 1992:47).

Interestingly, B uses *pare* ('man' or 'brother', lines 5 & 7) as a tag at the end of his utterances. This "address form" (Trudgill 1992:9) is not directed at A (cf. 'I'd like to tell everybody...', line 7), but to the rest of the group, as a signal of solidarity. While addressing A in lines 9 & 10, he leaves out *pare*, as a result, A is being excluded from the group.

This example clearly shows that when a speaker wishes to become very formal, the result will be, most likely, significant stretches of discourse in English. In this situation, English becomes "momentarily [associated] with the out-group" (Heller, 1988b: 83), while Tagalog becomes the language of in-group communication.

4.2. Topic-specific code-switching

Topic refers to “*what is being talked about*” (Holmes 1992: 12). Among bilingual communities, researchers have determined that when the locus of a conversation is marked by a shift in topic, switching may occur (Auer 1995: 120). This is especially apparent when a foreign community has to deal with new concepts that are part of the culture they are in (Grosjean 1982), as shown below (example 3).

A and B are having a friendly chat about Japanese hot springs (*onsen*) at a Christmas party because A, who just arrived, wants to know more about them.

Example 3

- A: *Ilang* (How many) degrees *ba yung* (is an) *onsen*?
 B: *Mga* (Around) forty...
 A: Forty? Forty celsius. *Hindi ba para kang nag-oofuro?* (...Isn't it like taking a bath in an 'ofuro?')
 B: *Oo ganon pero mas mainit ng konti. Masarap yan pagbumabagsak na yung yuki.* (Yes, it's similar, but it's a bit hotter. It feels so good when 'yuki' is falling.)
 5 A: *Anong yuki?* (What's 'yuki?')
 B: *Yung snow. Tapos nandon ka sa labas, rotenburo, yung open air, sarap!* (It's snow. Then you're outside, the 'rotenburo', the open air one, great!)
 A: *Oo.* (Uh-huh.)
 B: *Don mo talaga maffeel...* (That's when you'll really feel...)
 A: *Hindi siya nag...? Di ba natural yung onsen?* (It doesn't...? Isn't an 'onsen' natural?)
 10 B: *Mmm.* (Yes. It's) Natural.
 A: *Hindi siya nag-iisnow? ...Hindi siya nagiging...* (It doesn't snow? ...It doesn't turn into...)
 B: *Hindi kasi galing siya sa ilalim. Talagang hot springs talaga, galing sa bundok so kahit bumagsak siya bali yung kapaligiran mo talagang maputi. T'as doon mo maaappreciate talaga yung onsen pag wintertime.* (No, because it comes from underground. They're really hot springs, from the mountains, so even if it falls, it's like all your surroundings are really white. That's when you'll appreciate 'onsens,'
 15 *when it's wintertime.) May* (There are) outdoor, *may* (there are) indoor. *Maganda yung sa* (There's a beautiful one in) *Sakunami. Nakapunta ka na...* (Have you been to...)
 A: *Sakunami?*
 B: *Oo, bali* (Yes, it's like) west of Sendai, *papuntang* (going to) *Yamagata. Meron rin doon, may onsen siya, outdoors din siya pero may parang wooden na roof t'as nasa tabi siya ng river. Yon kaya open air din siya, bali may roof lang na wooden.* (It has one also, an 'onsen', it's also outdoors but it has like a wooden roof, and it's next to a river. There, so it's also like open-air, it only has a roof that's wooden.)
 20 A: *Ah.* (Oh.)

- 25 B: *Tapos pag nag-snosnow, pagpunta mo don ang snow bumabagsak sa river. Talagang exposed ka sa lamig yung natural cold talaga pero pagbabad mo mainit. Doon mo talaga maaappreciate...ang sarap talaga. Yan ang must talaga, onsen.* (Then when it is snowing, when you go there the snow is falling on the river. You're really exposed to the cold, real natural cold, but when you dip yourself, it's hot. That's when you'll really appreciate...it feels so good. That's a real must, an 'onsen'.)

Among the code-borrowings available to the bilingual speakers here, particularly B, are nouns, as evident throughout the text; two adjectives (lines 10 & 20); verbs, which have mostly been transformed by Tagalog morphology; a lone conjunction ('so', line 13); and the occasional phrase.

As the conversation progresses, B uses two Japanese words to express the idea of 'onsens', i.e. 'yuki' ('snow', line 4), and 'rotenburo' ('outdoor hot spring', line 6). As a result, a significant amount of related English words and phrases, some of which are 'open air' (line 6), 'wintertime' (line 14), and 'wooden...roof' (line 20), come to the surface. All these words are associated with each other, such that mere mention of the word 'onsen' to English speakers in Japan would most certainly activate many of the words that appear in this text (Richards et al., 1995).

The Japanese words that come in the discourse (i.e. 'ofuro', 'yuki', 'rotenburo') when talking about 'onsens' seem unavoidable, as these are "new realities and new distinctions" (Grosjean 1982: 311) to these Filipinos. Being in a foreign land with a lot of things Japanese, only the original language may be adequate enough to refer to the new surroundings.

The word 'onsen', for example, is used to distinguish it from hot springs in the Philippines, which are entirely different; on the other hand, a 'rotenburo' is the outdoor bath that dots Japan's countryside. Since Tagalog does not have an equivalent for 'snow', 'yuki' seems to be more appropriate, as it symbolizes 'snow' in a Japanese context.

A's use of the noun 'ofuro', the ubiquitous Japanese hot tub, as a *mag-* verb is quite remarkable, considering that she has just arrived and is already using it actively as a loanshift. 'Ofuro' becomes the verb 'nag-oofuro' [nag*o*o*fu*`ro] to denote habitual action (line 3).

The verb 'snow' appears twice: first as 'nag-iisnow' (cf. A in line 11), and then as 'nag-snosnow' (cf. B in line 24). There is a plausible explanation for why /i/ has been reduplicated in A's utterance, and why it is missing in B's. In Tagalog phonology, loanwords with the initial two-consonant cluster /s/, followed by either /n/, /p/, or /k/, e.g. 'snow', 'spelling', 'school', are sometimes pronounced with the vowel phoneme /i/ before this cluster, as in [i*`snow], [i*`spe*ling], [i*`skuwl]. This may be due to the influence of Spanish, which does not permit this consonant cluster in initial position, e.g. the Spanish *escuela* (*eskwela*, 'school') and *estudiante* (*estudyante*, 'student'). However, because of English-Tagalog contact, these consonant clusters can also be pronounced without this vowel-initial phoneme.

The diphthong /ow/ in monosyllabic 'snow' may be looked at by Tagalog speakers as a pure vowel, and therefore pronounced as /o/, without the glide /w/ to indicate upward tongue movement towards the back of the mouth (Prator and Robinett, 1986: 10), when forming the reduplicated syllable for this particular verb. It is only when the root, i.e. 'snow', is formed at the end that it is pronounced fully with the glide present, e.g. [nag*sno*`snow].

Thus, /i/ and /sno/ here can be said to be in free variation, i.e. "one sound [is substituted] for another in a given ENVIRONMENT, with no consequent change in the word's MEANING" (Crystal 1994:143). This free variation, in turn, interacts with the morphophonemic rule for forming the present tense of *mag-* verbs; hence, the occurrence of 'nag-ii snow' [nag*i*i`snow] and 'nag-sno snow' [nag*sno*`snow] in the same context (Fromkin and Rodman 1988).

'Feel' and 'appreciate' are treated as *ma-* verbs (cf. lines 8, 14 & 26). In the former, the reduplicated /fi/ to form the future form 'maffifeel' (i.e. *ma-* + repeated first syllable of the root) is subject to similar constraints as the formation of /sno/ above. Tagalog inflectional morphology does not allow the inclusion of a consonant phoneme at the end of the syllable that will be reduplicated. Instead of saying, for example, 'mafeelfeel' [ma*fiyl*`fiyl], which is very unnatural, a Tagalog speaker would say 'maffifeel' [ma*fi*`fiyl]. In the latter, since 'appreciate' starts with a vowel sound, it becomes 'maaappreciate' [ma*a*a`priy*siy*eyt] as a result of the same rule.

B's use of borrowed lexical items in lines 12-27 may appear sporadic, at first glance. Upon closer inspection, however, it is clear that, aside from exploiting the semantic relations that underlie the surface of the discourse, it is the skillful embedding of the single items which serves his communicative ends (i.e. persuading her to try an 'onsen').

This is evident in the following:

- a. ...*doon mo maaappreciate*...(that's when you'll appreciate...) 14
Doon mo talaga maaappreciate... (That's when you'll really appreciate...) 26

Here the verb 'appreciate' is repeated and inflected the same way in both lines.

- b. *May* (There are) outdoor, *may* (there are) indoor. 15
 In this line, there is the contrast (Auer 1995) of 'indoor' as an antonym of 'outdoor' (cf. e below).

- c. ...outdoors *din siya pero may parang wooden na roof*...20
 (...it's also outdoors but it has a wooden roof...)

...open air *din siya, bali may roof lang na wooden*. 21 & 22
 (...it's also open air, the only thing is it has a roof made of wood.)

The reiteration (Gumperz 1982) is supported by the synonyms 'outdoors' and 'open-air', while the Tagalog frame realized in the clauses *pero*...and *bali*... makes it possible to interchange 'wooden' and 'roof' on either side of the ligature *na* (Aspillera 1990: 154-155).

- d. ...*pag nag-snosnow, pagpunta mo don ang snow bumabagsak...*24
 (...when it snows, when you go there the snow is falling...)
 'Snow' is first used as a verb to introduce the topic, and then used as a noun to qualify his message (Romaine 1995: 163).
- e. *Talagang exposed ka sa lamig, yung natural cold talaga...*25
 (You're really exposed to the cold, real natural cold...)

While there is a contrast between *lamig* and its equivalent, 'cold', the phrase *yung...talaga* is a reiteration "in somewhat modified form" of the previous clause (Gumperz 1982: 78), because it is a clarification of 'being exposed to the cold'.

The overall message that B is trying to convey reaches its climax in his last statement (lines 26 & 27), when he says '*yun ang must talaga, onsen*'.

In the next example (example 4 below), two friends talk about a rumor, which has been going around the Internet, involving the fashion designer, Tommy Hilfiger, who allegedly made some racist remarks, specifically against Filipinos, in a popular talk show in the US.

Example 4

- A: *Pare, yung pinag-uusapan natin dati kay Hilfiger nasa bagong 'Time' ngayon. Doon sa kalikod-likuran, nandoon.* (Hey, man, about that Hilfiger issue we were talking about before, man, it's in the latest issue of 'Time'. It's at the very end, it's there.)
- B: *O talaga? Tungkol sa Pinas? (Oh really? About the Philippines?)*
- 5 A: *Hindi, wala sa (No, nothing about the) Philippines, pero sinabi doon (but it said there), "There's been a lot of e-mail discussion about the..." - yung sinabi ni Hilfiger about ano ang mga minorities, yung mga ganyan. Yung mga Blacks ganon. (- what Hilfiger said about minorities, people like that. Blacks, for example.)*
- B: *Ah talaga ha? Hindi na lang minention ano? (Oh, really, huh? It just wasn't mentioned, right?)*
- 10 A: *Yun pa naman ang tinatarget daw ng line niya. Kasi pagnakita mo doon sa picture yung mga models ng ano niya, pare, hindi mga puti eh. (They're the ones who are being targeted by his line. Because if you look at the picture of his models there, man, they're not white.)*
- B: *Ah parang (Oh, like) Benetton, yung mga (they're) international.*
- A: *Oo, yan. (Yes, you're right.) Tapos, (And then) "There was so much e-mail discussion about it" ganyan na (it said, that) "people started calling the company" na (that) "and asking if it's true." Sinabi niyang ganyan. (That's what it said.)*

- 15 B: *Ah yung remarks niya.* (Oh, about his remarks.)
- A: *Oo (Yes), about Oprah, yung (the) racist? Tapos ang huli doon* (Then, there at the end), “The truth is”, *pero hindi siya ang nagsabi, yung ‘Time’ na* (but he didn’t say this, ‘Time’ did), “he has never met Oprah.” *Yan ang nakalagay don, ganon.* (That’s what it said.)
- B: *Yun ang mahirap sa e-mail. Talagang pwede kang mag-rumor monger.* (That’s the thing about e-mail. You can really become a rumor monger.)
- 20 A: *Kaya nag-ano rin sila* (So they had to), *kaya (so)* “the company decided to” *ano (uh) to parang (like)* “to fight back.”

The switches that occur here appear to be much longer than the ones in the last three examples (cf. lines 5, 12-14, 17, 18, 20 & 21). These are instances of intersentential code-switching because the code alternation happens at clausal boundaries (Romaine 1995).

For example, after A informs B that this issue has reached ‘Time’ magazine, A begins to quote it almost verbatim (cf. line 5), in the language it appeared in—a pattern which recurs in the aforementioned lines.

Before switching entirely to English, A explicitly says ‘...*pero sinabi doon...*’ (‘but it said there’, line 4) as a discourse marker to prepare B for the switch that comes next. Although A pauses after having said this string entirely in English before switching back to a Tagalog construction that contains the preposition ‘about’ and the nouns ‘minorities’ and ‘Blacks’ (line 6), this is not a ‘false start repair’—a kind of reformulation strategy which “could mean that the speaker is accommodating to the recipient’s language preference” (Auer 1995: 121). Instead, the alternation here functions as a parenthetical remark (120) aimed at his interlocutor, in which he explains that the rumor pertained to other people as well, not just to Filipinos.

If you look closely, line 12 (cf. ‘...There was so much...’) is a repetition of line 5 (cf. ‘...There’s been a lot of...’), but since A and B have already constructed the “shared frames of reference within which their communicative behavior makes sense” (Heller 1988c: 15), the former (i.e. lines 12-14) goes on smoothly without any pauses, except that within the English utterance, *ganyan na* (‘it said, that’) and the linker *na* (‘that’) appear.

A foregrounds the next piece of new information again in lines 17 and 18, but breaks it up after ‘...The truth is...’ with another long parenthetical remark (*pero..na*) to stress that he is quoting ‘Time’ and not Hilfiger himself. After doing so, he delivers the punch line, i.e. ‘...he has never met Oprah’. This leaves B incredulous (cf. line 19), in which he forms the loanshift ‘*mag-rumor monger*’, to emphasize the far-reaching effects of spamming on the Internet. Finally, A delivers the last piece of information (lines 20 & 21), in which the space fillers *ano* and *parang* occur, stating that ‘...the company decided to...fight back’.

Once again, there are the inevitable single switches, such as nouns (e.g. 'line', line 9; 'remarks', line 15; 'e-mail', line 19) and, for the first time in this corpus, the infix *-in-* attached to a verb (cf. 'inⁱⁿention', line 8), which is used for the past tense of *-in* verbs (Aspillera 1990).

Another interesting example of ellipsis is when—after lines 12–14—A mentions the name of the talk show host, Oprah Winfrey, in whose program the alleged remarks were made. He qualifies the statement with the elliptical '...about Oprah, *yung* racist?', which, if said in a monolingual conversation, would point to Oprah as being the one who is racist (cf. line 16). The full utterance could have been '...about Oprah, *yung* racist *na* remarks?' Here A is referring to the 'remarks' as being racist (cf. line 15).

The most important point to be learned here, and one that could possibly account for the appearance of intersentential code-switching, is that this example shows that switching for quotation is not only used to quote what someone has said, but also to report what someone has read—this last point seems to be missing in Gumperz's (1982) original examples of quotation.

4.3. Context-specific code-switching

I will use the term 'context' to refer to the "social [setting] of the interaction [, i.e. where]" the conversation is taking place (Holmes 1992:12), the participants and their role relationships, the topic, the "nature of the ongoing activities" that the participants may be engaged in, and so on (Crystal 1994:318).

Consider the following conversation, which takes place between husband (A) and wife (B) at the dinner table (example 5 below). They are talking about a new discount service offered by a telephone company, in which one pays a fixed amount every month for an unlimited number of calls made to two preregistered telephone numbers.

Example 5

- A: *Ibig sabihin, nine rin ang hahanapin natin?* (You mean, we'll also have to look for numbers with nine in them?)
 B: *Hindi, sila ang nakakaalam ng zoning ng telephone mo.* (No, they know the zoning that your telephone belongs to.)
 A: *Zoning ng telephone. Eh pano kung hindi siyushoot yung server?* (The telephone's zone. What if the server doesn't fall within our zone?)
 B: *Pupunta ka naman doon eh. Anong hindi siyushoot yung server?* (You're going there anyway. What do you mean "the server won't shoot"?)
 5 A: *Paano kung wala sa area mo ang server dito?* (What if the server falls outside your area?)
 B: *Di hindi ka mag-aapply niyan.* (Then you can't register it.)
 A: *Talo, tsong. Pero, sa tingin ko, okey lang basta nandito sa Sendai. Lokal, panglokal phone call lang to. Kasi, regardless of the distance, parepareho ang binabayaran niyo, di ba? Ang*

- 10 adjacent *lang*, *ibig sabihin nasa labas, kunyari nasa ibang place, di ba?* (What a bummer, man. But I think it's OK as long as it's here in Sendai. This is for local phone calls. Because, regardless of the distance, we pay the same amount right? What they mean are places adjacent to, or outside Sendai; for example, another place, right?)

A brief look at example 5 tells us that most of the conversation is conducted in Tagalog with a few English loanwords and phrases inserted within utterances (e.g. 'nine', line 1; 'zoning...telephone', line 2; 'server', line 5; 'regardless of the distance', line 8; 'adjacent', line 9).

The informality of the language used is marked by *mo* (lines 2 & 5), and *ka* (lines 4 & 6) (Aspillera 1990). Another marker of informality in this example is the use of the slang expression *talo, tsong* (line 7, roughly translated as 'what a bummer, man'), which is very informal (Trudgill 1992: 66), especially since *tsong* should only be used to address men, not women (sort of equivalent to calling a woman 'dude', instead of 'babe').

In line 3, A says '*...hindi siyushoot yung server*' (literally "the server won't shoot"), a question in which 'shoot' is conjugated as an *-um-* verb. This is especially thought-provoking because, according to Bautista, it is generally the case that the affix used for English verbs in actor focus is *mag-* and not *-um-* (perhaps because it is easier to use a prefix than an infix)" (1990: 27).

However, we have here an English verb that contradicts this statement. In this example, 'shoot' has been transformed into 'shumoot', and then, to conjugate it for the future tense, *-um-* is removed, and the first syllable (excluding the consonant-final phoneme, if there is any) is reduplicated (Aspillera 1990), e.g. 'shumoot' [ʃu* muwt] becomes 'siyushoot' [ʃu* ʃuwt].

It is clear that A's use of '*siyushoot yung server*' is a form of speech borrowing (Grosjean 1982) because B responds by asking the clarification question '*Anong hindi siyushoot ang server?*' (line 4). She is not really sure what A meant by that switch, so he rephrases the question and uses 'area' and 'server' to refer to the zone (line 5).

'Apply', aside from being used as a *mag-* verb, is also a loanshift (line 6)—instead of the verb 'register', which would have been used by a monolingual in this particular situation, 'apply' has been used in its place. 'Register' would have been inappropriate because it has connotations of formality and is used when referring to certain "official" contexts (e.g. voter and vehicle registration). The fact that A reacts to B's use of 'apply' with *Talo, tsong* (line 7) means that it is in common usage ('apply' refers to the act of filling in a form in order to join a club, as in, for example, becoming a member of a CD/video rental shop).

It should also be pointed out that example 5 could also be, secondarily, under person-specific (because they are intimates), or even, thirdly, topic-specific code-switching (due to what they are talking about). Indeed, many of the examples in this study could be governed by all three variables, although one would almost always be dominant (McClure and McClure 1988).

This type of conversation would approximate the type of switching between Tagalog speakers at home. Hence, I have categorized it under context-specific code-switching. The categorizations here are, therefore, not totally mutually exclusive.

In the following example, four female students are having a chat in A's apartment. They are making fun of a letter written by a Japanese man, Mr. Yusa, who wants to learn English from A. In it, he mentions the existence of swans in wetlands north of Sendai.

Example 6

- A: *Mag-aaral nga sila ng English. Mag-iEnglish sila.* (They're going to study English.)
 B: *Sino?* (Who?)
 A: *Si Mister Yusa, pero member ata...* (Mr. Yusa, but I think he's a member of...)
 C: *Yusa?*
 5 B: *Hapon? Parang mezurashii na namae ano? Ilan sila?* (Japanese? That's an unusual name, don't you think so? How many are they?)
 A: *Tatlo daw. Dalawang lalake tapos siya.* (He said three. Two more men and him.)
 B: *Pupunta dito? Di magugulat yan makikita yung buong pamilya mo nandito.* (They're coming here? Then he'll be surprised to see that your whole family is here.) The whole family is here. (laughter)
 10 D: *My brother and my brother, my brother...*(laughter)
 B: *Tatlo silang lalake?* (They're three men?)
 A: *Oo, pero matanda na ata may asawa na gusto lang ano, palagay ko mga sixty plus.* (Yes, but I think they're old and married and they just want uh, I think they're about sixty plus.)
 D: *O eh baka may anak. Balibaliktarin mo yung grammar Hapon pa rin.* (Well, maybe they have sons. Even if you turn the grammar around it'll still be Japanese.)
 15 A: *Kaya sabi ni Tom pag nandito siya pag inimbata daw tayo doon, pumunta tayo.* (That's why Tom said that if he comes and invites us over to his place, let's go.)
 C: *Lahat!* (laughter) *Lahat!* (Everyone! Everyone!) (in chorus)
 D: *Dala ang buong pamilya.* (With the whole family.)
 C: *Kore wa Firipin stairu desu.* (This is Philippine style.)
 B: *Firipin stairu.* (laughter) (Philippine style.)
 20 A: *Eto daw* (This is what it says), "D'swans is come from Russians." (laughter)
 B: *Russians. Parang* (As in) *spy eh.*
 A: "Well, we have swan museum."
 B: *Ano?* (What?) *Swine?*
 A: *Swan. May swan daw.* (It says there are swans.)
 25 B: *Akala ko baboy.* (I thought he said pigs) *Swine, swine eh.* (laughter)

While the interaction is conducted in the base language of Tagalog, two instances of intersentential code-switching come to the surface: a switch to English in lines 8 & 9, and Japanese in lines 18 & 19. Since the whole sentences that appear in quotation marks in lines 20 & 22 are taken from the letter, they will not be considered as code-switching.

Before we discuss the meaning of the intersentential switching, in this example, let us first look at the lexical items that come out in their utterances.

There are a few English-origin words, such as 'grammar' (line 14), and some others that are concentrated in lines 21-25 (i.e. 'Russians', 'spy', 'swine'). The Japanese-origin items that come out, on the other hand (with the ligature *na* connecting them) are '*mezurashii...namae*' ('unusual name', line 5).

Only one switch at the level of the phrase occurs, and that is 'sixty plus' (lines 12 & 13). This can be accounted for by the fact that despite the use of Spanish loanwords for people's ages (e.g. 'sixty' - *sesenta*), they are slowly being replaced by English.

One particular switch that merits attention is in line 1: 'English' is used as a *mag-* verb to express the future tense. This particular loanshift is interesting because it exists side by side with its 'monolingual' equivalent whose propositional content is the same—a phenomenon which does not visibly appear in the other examples.

Consider the first utterance:

	<u>Verb</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Object</u>
1a	<i>Mag-aaral...</i>	<i>silá</i>	<i>ng English.</i>
	'They're going to study English.'		

In this sentence, we can see that the object is English. However, in the second utterance:

	<u>Verb</u>	<u>Subject</u>
1b	<i>Mag-i English</i>	<i>silá.</i>
	'They're going to study English.'	

'English' replaces *aral* ('study') to become '*mag-i English*' [mag**i** ɪŋ*gliʃ], and its meaning, in this context, now includes the object of study that is acting as an intransitive verb (i.e. 'going to study English'). Its intransitiveness is the result of the loanshift from 'English' as proper noun and object of the first utterance, to 'English' as verb in the second. What has happened here is that, by virtue of the loanshift, what was once the narrow semantic space occupied by *aral* has been replaced by 'English', whose meaning has been extended and transformed through Tagalog morphological rules. In other words, 'English' in this context contains the verb *aral* as part of its new meaning.

Another interesting thing worthy of attention is that the second utterance functions as a reiteration of the first; that is, in Gumperz's words: "Frequently a message *in one code* is repeated *in the other code*, either literally or in somewhat modified form. In some cases such repetitions may serve to clarify what is said, but often they simply amplify or emphasize a message" (1982: 78) (my emphasis).

However, in his original typology of the conversational functions of code-switching (75-81), of which 'reiteration' is one, the passages from his data reveal higher order switches that begin at the level of the phrase, not at the level of the single lexical item.

In one example of 'reiteration' in a study of Tagalog-English bilinguals, Marasigan's data (1983), on the other hand, show the presence of a noun ('legs') and an English verb ('stretch') that takes on the inflectional morphology of Tagalog, as shown below:

- ...A felt uncomfortable in the car because of the position of B's legs.
 A: *Ate Christy, you stretch your legs.*
 B: *Ano (what)?*
 A: I said, "You stretch your legs."
 B: *Ano (what)?*
 C: *Darling...Ate Christy does not understand English.*
 A: *Ah! Ate Christy, i-stretch mo ang legs mo.*
 C: (Laughing)...*"You speak in Tagalog." Tagalog ba yan (Is that Tagalog)?*
 A: *Oo, sabi ko naman i-stretch nya ang legs nya, ah (Yes, I told her to stretch her legs). (1983:79)*

These two lexical items (line 6 above) appear in a Tagalog grammatical structure as a reiteration of line 3, which is entirely in English (cf. "...stretch your legs."). But unlike Marasigan's data, my example reveals that 'reiteration' can happen without a change in code *per se*, i.e. it can happen through lexical borrowing. Although both utterances are said in one code (i.e. Tagalog), the repetition, albeit at the level of the single lexical item, is provided by the contrast in the clever use of the loanshift, i.e. from *mag-aaral* to '*mag-i-English*'.

The next batch of lexical items, i.e. 'Russian', 'spy', 'swine', 'swan', cluster within the utterances found in lines 21-25. It can be argued that all of these words were reactions to the stimulus that was provided by the letter. Word association comes into play when spies are somehow connected with Russian (Richards et al. 1995: 407), and uttered without regard to the factual content of Mr. Yusa's message (cf. line 20).

Lines 23-25 are the result of language play (Auer, 1995): 'swine' is a pun on 'swan' and its humor relies not only on the difference between the vowel sounds of the two words, but on the absurdity of having a museum devoted to pigs (as if a museum for swans was not enough to add to the general atmosphere of mirth).

After A stresses 'swan' in reaction to 'swine', B provides a contrast, this time by using the word *baboy* ('pig'), and then making the connection to 'swine' in her subsequent utterance (cf. 'Swine, swine eh', line 25).

We now turn to the two cases of intersentential switching that appear in the text (lines 8 & 9, and 18 & 19). In the former (i.e. line 8), since Mr. Yusa and company are about to arrive for their English lesson at the same time that the students are in A's apartment (cf. line 7), B cannot resist switching to English, to reiterate her previous statement (i.e. *Di...nandito*). D follows it up in jest, introducing first the 'boys' in the 'family', as if directly speaking to Mr. Yusa.

In the latter (i.e. lines 18 & 19), C switches to Japanese, in reaction to the thought of everyone, as a 'family', going to Mr. Yusa's place if he invites them over for a visit. B repeats C's switch and stresses it even more, thereby evoking a lot of laughter.

In both cases, the switches are metaphorical, as they express "a 'comment' on the situation" (Milroy and Muysken 1995a: 9). The switch to English was perhaps triggered by the idea of Mr. Yusa being in an English-speaking environment for his lesson, while the switch to Japanese was perhaps triggered by the idea of being in a monolingual Japanese home. Entertaining the thought of a possible crosscultural encounter with the explanation that Filipinos visit homes together as an extended family—and that that is 'Philippine style'—only served to add to the already pervading sense of amusement in the room.

4.4. Synthesis and Discussion

The most obvious result of English-Tagalog contact is in the area of lexicon (Bautista 1986), particularly the occurrence of English nouns and noun phrases in Tagalog syntactic frames. For instance, English-origin items fit snugly after Tagalog articles (e.g. '*ng*/the beer', '*ang*/the server') and demonstrative (e.g. '*yung*/that racist'). The versatile preposition *sa* comes before English items in Tagalog constructions (e.g. '*sa*/next to river', '*sa*/at picture'). Nouns and verbs easily fit into sentences of negation also, which usually have the negator *hindi* ('not') at the beginning (e.g. '*Hindi siya nagTohoku...*'/'He didn't go to Tohoku...'; '*Hindi ko na expect...*'/'I didn't expect...').

Thus, depending on the context, lexical items that have paradigmatic relations with each other (i.e. be they nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) may be theoretically inserted into the slots in which they may fit, according to the rules of Tagalog syntax (Sridhar and Sridhar 1980). Since the sequencing of each unit in relation to the other units in the sentence is maintained, the code-switched utterances that come out are syntactically well formed, i.e. they "can be generated by the RULES of [the bilingual's internal grammar]" (Crystal 1994:378). This, in effect, ensures the preservation of each utterance's grammaticality.

Tagalog morphology also plays an important role in contributing to the well-formedness of the utterances. Due to the ease with which Tagalog affixes attach themselves to borrowed stems, the results are word-internal switches that are morphologically well-adapted, thereby allowing for the successful integration of the guest constituents into the base language. This is evident in the appearance of English verbs as *mag-*, *in-*, *-um-*, and *ma-* verbs in the examples.

Of these, one particularly noteworthy feature is the verb prefix *mag-*, which is particularly susceptible to the formation of loanshifts. It is practically "restructuring...the [Tagalog] verb system and ...[creating] a number of 'new' verbs which form part of [Filipino] code-switched discourse" (Romaine 1995: 131).

Mag- is an operator (Leech 1992) which plays a vital role in constructing morphologically integrated verbs from nouns and noun phrases in the bilingual's other languages. The process can be described as follows: since *mag-* carries with it a meaning which emphasizes the doer or action, itself, in a sentence (Fromkin and Rodman 1988), it first acts as a derivational morpheme that affixes itself to a noun, say '*ofuro*', to derive the verb '*mag-ofuro*' ('take a bath'). *Mag-*, in effect, takes the meaning of the verb that normally goes with the noun it borrows (i.e. in this case, *mag-* becomes 'take'), a condition which is highly dependent on the context. For example, the imperative '*mag-spaghetti ka*' could either mean 'cook spaghetti' or 'eat spaghetti', depending on the situation.

Next, according to the internal inflectional processes that go with the formation of *mag*-verbs to indicate tense, '*mag-ofuro*' can be changed to '*nag-ofuro*' ('took a bath') for the past tense, '*nag-oofuro*' ('taking a bath') for the present, or '*mag-oofuro*' ('going to take a bath') for the future.

In the utterance '*Mag-iEnglish sila*' (line 1, example 6), it is evident that this type of loanshift serves as a verbal strategy to eliminate the object of the sentence by integrating it within the word-internal switch dictated by *mag-*. At the same time, the noun stem affixed to *mag-* includes the meaning of the verb that goes with it, thereby compressing "the most essential and pivotal element of [the] clause" (Leech, 1992: 117) within that switch. It is perhaps for reasons of verbal economy and conciseness that this strategy is actively being used by Filipino bilinguals.

Of course, the bilingual does not just string guest constituents together at random when forming code-switched sentences. They are there for a purpose, and that is to convey meaning. The availability, therefore, of the open set of lexical items from English provides the vocabulary necessary to express meaning. Thus, at various levels, each switch—from the smallest constituent (i.e. the loanword) to the larger (i.e. the sentence)—may be utilized, depending on the extralinguistic situation, for referential, affective, propositional, pragmatic, and/or metaphorical effect (Crystal 1994).

The use of intersentential code-switching influenced by the variable person can be exploited for various reasons. Firstly, it may be the personal choice of certain speakers because it is the code they are most comfortable with, and with which they can express themselves more clearly, and secondly, it may be used as a rhetorical device to signify hostility or create distance between interlocutors. In all these cases, the Tagalog elements that are inserted into the English sentences consist of function words, tags, and clitics (i.e. mostly closed sets), as they do not violate English syntax.

Given the variable of topic, it is clear that lexical insertions can consist of new concepts, or 'culture-specific items' (Romaine 1995), particularly Japanese words, for which there are no Tagalog equivalents, e.g. '*yuki*' ('snow'), '*ofuro*' ('hot tub'), '*onsen*' ('hot spring'). If the topic is scientific or business-related, many English-origin items will also be used to fill lexical gaps. At the level of intersentential switching, when the intention of the speaker is to report, in English, factual information that has been read, seen, or heard, there will be a tendency to use function words from Tagalog, such as the linkers *na* ('that'), *ganyan* ('it said'), and *kaya* ('so').

The intersentential code-switching regulated by the variable of context, in informal situations, will most likely be metaphorical. English or Japanese may be considered as 'they codes' (as opposed to Tagalog, the 'we code'): The former is for outsiders, particularly other foreigners, who interact with the group, while the latter is reserved for the Japanese, who comprise the majority. Thus, these notions can be exploited for social and discursal effect, as they are metaphors for the social meanings each language symbolizes (Heller 1988c).

5. CONCLUSION

I have found that the code-switching patterns that this group of students in Sendai use are characterized by single-word (i.e. lexical) switches that are embedded in the syntactic frame of Tagalog. The recurrence of this pattern suggests that this is the unmarked code of interaction, and any shift away from this pattern will mainly depend on the communicative intention of the speaker. This finding is in line with Gumperz's (1982: 68) observation that "bilingual speech is highly receptive to loans", and is corroborated by Gardner-Chloros in a more recent statement: "in many communities, single-word switching is the commonest kind, and...any bilingual data-set contains examples of loans" (1995: 73).

Forays into the marked code give rise to instances of intersentential code-switching, as an additional strategy to encode stylistic or social meaning. In this type of code-switching, Tagalog elements that are incorporated into the English frame consist mostly of tags, clitics, interjections, and function words.

It is clear that Tagalog draws upon the lexicon of English in order to fill lexical gaps that otherwise cannot be filled by Tagalog's open set of lexical items. This strategy ensures smooth interpersonal communication among participants in this group, owing to the fact that all of them were educated in English and continue to do their research in Japan in English.

A noteworthy feature of English-Tagalog contact is the receptiveness of Tagalog morphology to lexical items from both English and Japanese that produces numerous morphologically well-adapted word borrowings overlaid in a Tagalog syntactic frame.

The Tagalog *mag-* morpheme, particularly, stands out as a catalyst in the formation of loanshifts in the Filipino bilingual's speech. Due to the derivational and inflectional processes inherent in the nature of *mag-* as a verbal prefix, it is, in effect, a morphological hybrid, in that it is capable of instantaneously transforming borrowed nouns into verbal elements. This characteristic is exploited to the full by the Filipino, and by virtue of the interlocutors' linguistic and schematic knowledge, such shifts are easily comprehensible.

A DESCRIPTION OF CODE-SWITCHING

The ease with which small constituents (i.e. words and phrases) fit into the borrowing language can be said to be the bilingual's strategy in the preservation of grammaticality in naturally occurring code-switched discourse. Thus, the code-borrowings in this language pair (including Japanese) correspond to lexical or phrasal insertions that are not affected by word order constraints (Romaine 1995). This means that elements from the other language are inserted at an appropriate place in the sentence without interfering with its syntax.

Overall, this general pattern holds true for person-specific, topic-specific, and context-specific code-switching within this closed, social network. Since the students are short-term residents in a foreign culture, the contexts in which they get together are informal, which explains the asymmetrical code-switching patterns that have surfaced. That is, there are more occurrences of English-origin items embedded in Tagalog than the other way around, unlike the symmetrical patterns gathered by some Filipino linguists (Bautista 1975; Marasigan 1983; Pascasio 1984).

This asymmetry is the prevailing norm of interaction, or the kind of verbal behavior that forms the linguistic etiquette of this speech community in informal contexts, wherein English is almost totally excluded (Gardner-Chloros 1995). However, once long stretches of English, or even Japanese, surface, they serve to fulfill different functions.

This study does not claim that it has described all the possible patterns and discorsal motivations present in this speech community, nor does it maintain that these same patterns will be found in other Filipino communities in Japan. This is perhaps only the beginning of research aimed at the sociolinguistic behavior of Filipinos overseas, and it is my hope that future code-switching studies will go in this direction.

The findings of this study lead to the following recommendations. First, that a quantitative and more comprehensive study be made of other Filipino communities abroad (i.e. both short-term and migrant), using the results here as the basis for hypotheses in investigating the linguistic consequences of English-Tagalog contact; and second, that studies be expanded to include code alternation involving other Philippine languages (e.g. Cebuano, Ilonggo, Ilocano) and English, in contact with yet another language (Asian or European), so that structural similarities and/or differences between these language pairs and English-Tagalog—plus a third language—may be established. In this way, a clearer picture of these phenomena will make itself available for other researchers in this field. This may serve as a springboard for further research on the interrelationships between language, culture, and society.

REFERENCES

- ASPILLERA, P. S. 1990. *Basic Tagalog for Foreigners and Non-Tagalogs*. Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle.
- AUER, J. C. P. 1995. The Pragmatics of Code-switching: A sequential approach, In Milroy L and P. Muysken (eds.), 115-135.
- BAUTISTA, M. L. S. 1975. A Model of Bilingual Competence Based on an Analysis of Tagalog-English Code Switching. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 6.1:51-89.
- _____. 1986. English-Pilipino Contact: A case study of reciprocal borrowing. In Viereck, W. and W. Bald (eds.), 491-509.
- _____. 1990. Tagalog-English Code-switching Revisited. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 21.2:15-29.
- CRYSTAL, D. 1994. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- FROMKIN, V. and R. RODMAN. 1988. *An Introduction to Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- GARDNER-CHLOROS, P. 1995. Code-switching in Community, Regional and National Repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In Milroy, L. & P. Muysken (eds.), 68-69.
- GROSJEAN, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge: HUP.
- GUMPERZ, J.J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- HAMERS, J.F and M. H. A. BLANC. 1990. *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: CUP.
- _____. 1988b. Strategic Ambiguity: Code-switching in the management of conflict. In M. Heller (ed), 77-96.
- _____. 1988c. Introduction, In M. Heller (ed), 1-24.
- HOLMES, J. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- LEECH, G. 1992. *Introducing English Grammar*. London: Penguin.
- MARASIGAN, E. 1983. *Code-switching and Code-mixing in Multilingual Societies*. Singapore: SUP.
- McCLURE, E. and M. McCLURE. 1988. Macro- and Micro-sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code-switching in Vingard (Romania). In M. Heller (ed.), 25-51.
- MILROY, L. 1987. *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- _____ and P. MUYSKEN. 1995a. Introduction: code-switching and bilingualism research. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), 1-14.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. 1993. *Social Motivations for Code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: OUP.
- PRATOR, C.H. and B.W. ROBINETT. 1986. *Manual of American English Pronunciation*. New York: CBS.
- RICHARDS, J. C. PLATT, J. and H. PLATT. 1995. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- ROMAINE, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SRIDHAR, K.K. 1996. Societal Multilingualism. In McKay and Hornberger (eds), 47-70.
- SRIDHAR, S.N. and K.K. SRIDHAR. 1980. *The Syntax and Psycholinguistics of Bilingual Code-Mixing*. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 10.1, 203-215.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1992. *Introducing Language and Society*. London: Penguin.