



ELSEVIER

Journal of Pragmatics 32 (2000) 1305–1341

Journal of  
**PRAGMATICS**

www.elsevier.nl/locate/pragma

## Parallel patterns? A comparison of monolingual speech and bilingual codeswitching discourse

Penelope Gardner-Chloros<sup>\*,a</sup>, Reeva Charles<sup>a,1</sup>, Jenny Cheshire<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Applied Linguistics, Birbeck College,  
University of London, 43 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0PD, UK*

<sup>b</sup> *same Department as above*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Linguistics, Queen Mary and Westfield College,  
University of London,  
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK*

---

### Abstract

The extensive work done on the structure of monolingual discourse is now paralleled by a strong tradition of studies of the conversational functions of bilingual codeswitching (Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Auer, 1998a). So far, however, no direct comparisons have been made between the two.

In this paper we compare the way in which four common conversational functions are realised (a) monolingually and (b) through codeswitching by members of a Punjabi and English-speaking network in London. The samples are thus ideally matched – the same speakers in the same context – and we establish that codeswitching may be used in two ways within these conversations. On the one hand it may take the place of monolingual ways of marking significant moves in the conversation (e.g. emphasis, change in voice quality), or add itself to these to reinforce the effect. On the other hand it can be used as a further dimension to the monolingual means which are available, allowing the speakers to introduce structural contrasts, manage the conversational ‘floor’, or highlight the different connotations of each variety as a counterpoint to the referential meaning of their utterance. © 2000 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Codeswitching; Bilingualism. Discourse. Conversation

---

<sup>1</sup> Address mail for R.C. to P.G.-C.

\* Corresponding author. Fax: +44 20 7383 3729; E-mail: p.gardner-chloros@app-ling.bbk.ac.uk

## 1. Introduction

An extensive literature has shown how monolingual discourse is structured. For example Labov (1972) first developed an analytical model on the widely-used genre of narrative within natural conversation. He identified six main stages or segments which are commonly used by speakers to structure their narrative: abstract, orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution and coda. Each of these segments of a conversation would normally be marked by the speaker through a variety of discourse means, which may be lexical, temporal, intonational, prosodic or paralinguistic.

Models for the interpretation of conversation management have been well-documented for monolingual speech, e.g. Sacks et al. (1974) with the 'turn taking system', and Beattie's (1983) classification of interruptions and smooth speaker switches. They have been further extended to account for the collaborative floor found in the talk of Coates' women friends (1994) as well as to miscommunication and 'involvement strategies' (Tannen, 1984, 1989).

Work of this type has been successfully extended to the study of conversations between bilinguals, and in particular those involving codeswitching, or the alternate use of two or more varieties in conversation (hereinafter CS) (Gumperz, 1982; contributions in Heller, 1988a; Romaine, 1995). Indeed, along with the many attempts to discover the grammatical regularities underlying codeswitched discourse (Muysken, 1995), one of the most productive lines of enquiry about codeswitching has been the investigation of the discourse functions which are accomplished through or in association with CS. Woolard (1988) shows for example how CS is an essential part of the structure of the jokes told by a comedian using Catalan mixed with Castilian, Nishimura (1995) examines the complex interactional, discourse structuring and stylistic functions of CS among second generation Japanese in Canada, and Halmari and Smith (1994) propose that CS is a marker of register shift amongst English-speaking Finnish children.

Gardner-Chloros (1991: 180, here reproduced as Appendix) compared the lists of common functions of CS proposed by Gumperz (1982), Saville-Troike (1982) and Valdès-Fallis (1977), and highlighted numerous similarities between the functions identified by these authors, many of which were also exemplified in the French-Alsatian CS in Strasbourg which was the subject of the 1991 study. To name but two common examples, CS is often used to quote a third person's speech in a conversation, or to lend particular emphasis to a part of a sentence or utterance; the change of language helps to mark a contrast between what comes before and what comes after. The lists in the Appendix include functions which are also marked in monolingual discourse either lexically or by intonation, pauses, stress or other paralinguistic means.

The following example, taken from a rapid conversational interchange between some office workers discussing the unreasonableness of their boss, Kleinmann, who did not like them going out to the lavatory, illustrates this function of CS.

- (1) ... *Noh het ... mich het er emol g'fröjt ... noh het ... noh het'm de Mey ... De Kleinmann het mi g'fröjt, schon widder? ... Ich bin zwei Mol drüsse g'sinn,*

ob's ... 'Vous pensez que c'est nécessaire?' ... *Noh het de Mey g'saat, 'Ecoutez, Monsieur Kleinmann, wenn er doch de Durichfall het, muess er doch nüss uf's cabinet!'*

[... Then ... he asked me once ... then ... then Mey (said to him) ... Kleinmann asked me, (must you go) 'again?' ... I'd been out twice, (he asked) whether ... 'Do you think it's necessary?' ... Then Mey said, 'Listen, Mr.Kleinmann, if he has diarrhoea then he certainly has to go out to the lavatory!']

(Gardner-Chloros, 1991: 143)

The speaker starts quoting Kleinmann in the elliptical question "Again?" without switching from Alsatian to French. But he then quotes both Kleinmann and the beginning of Mey's reply in French, thereby making it clear who was speaking to whom as well as enhancing the vividness of his story.

Auer (1991) has argued that CS is the most significant discourse marker in bilingual conversation, and that it takes the place of a range of markedness features found in monolingual conversation: these might include pauses before delivery, discourse markers (*but, well*), token agreements, apologies and qualifiers. Gumperz first treated CS as a 'contextualization cue', that is a "verbal or nonverbal cue that provides an interpretive framework for the referential content of a message" (1982: 131). Support for this view of CS may be found in Auer (1995: 123) and Li Wei (1994: 163). The latter analyzes the productions of Chinese English bilinguals in terms of Preference Organization. Example (2) shows how Li Wei's subjects mark dispreferred responses by pausing and codeswitching at the same time:

(2) (B, a 12 year-old boy, is playing with a computer in the living-room. A is his mother.)

A: Finished homework?

B: (2.0)

A: Steven, *yiou mo wan sue?*

[want to review your lessons]

B: (1.5) I've finished.

The dual use of CS and pausing shows how CS can be used to complement or reinforce discourse structuring devices which are available to monolinguals. This reinforcement function of CS parallels the use of such devices in combination with one another in monolingual speech: for example the use of a discourse marker like *well* in English is frequently accompanied by a pause – both before and after – as well as a change in voice quality.

So far, therefore, we may postulate two, or effectively three, possibilities. The first is that CS may be used *instead* of other discourse markers in bilingual conversation, as suggested by Auer. The second is that it may be used in itself as a further type of discourse marker *on top of* those markers available to the speaker through their cumulative knowledge of two monolingual varieties. In the latter case, CS could be employed either simultaneously with other markers in order to reinforce their effect, as in the example above, or – this being the third possibility – in alter-

nation with the other resources available, within the same conversation. What we cannot say, without considerable further investigation, is what makes speakers choose to deploy their bilingual skills at the service of the pragmatic meaning which they wish to convey at some junctures in the conversation or utterance but not at others.

These possibilities run counter, however, to a view of CS espoused, for example, by Poplack (1988), on the basis of a comparison between the CS in Ottawa-Hull, Canada and that of Puerto-Ricans in New York. This view holds that the apparently 'arbitrary' CS of the Puerto-Ricans – i.e. that which is *devoid* of discourse functions – is 'true' CS. In a sense Poplack is saying that the ideal codeswitcher is exactly the opposite of Weinreich's much quoted 'ideal bilingual', who "switches from one language to another according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc) but not in an unchanged situation, and certainly not within a single sentence" (1963: 73–74). For Poplack, it is precisely the random nature of CS in the sentence which marks it out as the preserve of the fluent bilingual and distinguishes it from other marks of language contact, in particular from borrowings.

The view that true CS is intrinsically arbitrary in its appearance provides a convenient, if obviously unsatisfactory, 'explanation' for many instances of switching with no clear motivation which are at first sight puzzling to the researcher. This arbitrariness concerns on the one hand the use of individual lexemes, which may appear, within a short stretch of speech, first in one language and then in the other (see e.g. Gardner-Chloros, 1991: 136), thereby eliminating the possibility that the switching is due to a competence problem. Valdès-Fallis (1977) also referred to 'random switches of high frequency items' as one of the CS categories which she identified. On the other hand it refers to the unpredictability of the point in the sentence at which a switch occurs. Interestingly, in spite of the difficulties of finding a grammatical model which fits all the facts observed, no-one has yet suggested that the locus of CS is arbitrary at a grammatical level.

The principal attempt to integrate this arbitrary quality of CS into a more general theory at the pragmatic level is that made by Myers-Scotton (1983; 1988), who relates CS to markedness theory (1993a). Whereas in some instances of CS, switching to a different language can be regarded as a marked choice carrying particular connotations, in other contexts the use of either language monolingually stands out as unusual and is therefore a way of making a statement about the relevant rights and obligations which pertain. In such cases the 'neutral' strategy is to codeswitch in a way which, Myers-Scotton claims, is haphazard in terms of the locus of the switch points – though not in terms of the underlying grammatical rules governing where the switches occur, which she explores elsewhere (1993b; 1995). Scotton calls this use of CS as a compromise speech mode CS as an unmarked choice.

These proposals, which concern the CS mode overall rather than individual switches, provide a useful explanation for many instances in the research literature where speakers fall into a CS mode, and the choice of that mode appears more significant than the individual switches. In Alsace, for example, there are few contexts overall where using pure French or pure Alsatian is (a) appropriate and (b) sounds anything but contrived, so CS is indeed the unmarked choice.

What we must ask ourselves is how likely it is that, even within a variety the selection of which is itself unmarked, micro-level choices carry no significance. Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998: 42) proposes that the term codeswitching should be (a) “narrowed in order to exclude socially or interactionally meaningless variety-alternation” – the opposite of Poplack’s approach – and (b) “broadened in order to include phenomena of monolingual speech (such as prosody and the deployment of speech markers) which recontextualize talk by signalling the onset of emerging frames by virtue of the codes associated with them”. Franceschini (1998) also considers that mixed codes comprising non-functional alternation between two varieties can be distinguished from pragmatically meaningful CS.

The problem with this is that it involves proving a negative. It is not surprising, given the complexities of conversational interaction, if the pragmatic effect of some CS is not immediately visible to outside observers or indeed easily rationalised by the speakers themselves. It is true that the outside observer’s view that speakers are drawing on two different varieties needs to be checked, as the two may be part of a single system for the speakers, at least at some levels. But there are many levels to consider. The discovery of the underlying meaning of individual codeswitches involves a catholic methodological approach, taking in both the micro-level and the macro-level. For example, one would need to adopt a micro-level approach in order to understand how codeswitched repetition may be used as a form of self-repair on realising that one is not using the interlocutor’s preferred language. But as Heller (1988b) has pointed out, we also need to understand the functioning of the community’s overall repertoire in order to understand CS. Furthermore, the two levels interact, and in order to understand that we are dealing with a self-repair we may need to know who speaks what in the community (Auer, 1998b: 11).

Perhaps the difficulties of providing a plausible explanatory framework for micro-level switches is one reason why so much of the research carried out on CS so far has been centred on its grammatical make-up. Now however, our understanding of conversational structure is being refined thanks to new work by discourse analysts, and patterns may thereby appear where there appeared to be chaos. Moyer (1998) discusses the mapping of different grammatical configurations of codeswitching onto their conversational functions.

We may ultimately come to consider the transitions between one part of a conversation and another to be as significant at a structural level as changes of interlocutor or topic were for Weinreich, and therefore every bit as appropriate as loci for CS.

## **2. Monolingual and bilingual conversational functions**

This work is based on two premises: (1) that bilingual codeswitchers and monolinguals accomplish basically the same conversational functions with the different means at their disposal, and (2) that it is more likely that individual switches are functional than non-functional.

(I) The first point (i.e. that bilingual codeswitchers and monolinguals must accomplish basically the same functions with the means at their disposal) has been

made with reference to monolingual style shifting and bilingual language choice by Bell: Bell writes, for example: “having two discrete languages available rather than a continuum of styles simply throws into sharper focus the factors which operate on monolingual style shift. The social processes are continuous across all kinds of language situations” (Bell, 1984: 176). We assume that this point also applies to the discourse structuring that all speakers, whether bilingual or monolingual, need to do, though until now this has been studied separately for bilingual codeswitched speech (see the references given in section 1) and for monolingual speech (to give just two examples, Schifffrin, 1987, analyses the functions of discourse markers such as ‘oh’, ‘you know’ and ‘I mean’ in American English, and Tannen, 1989, analyses repetition and reported speech).

Among the discourse *functions* which all speakers must realise in order to communicate effectively are pragmatic acts such as ‘respecting face’ or observing conventions of politeness, and perhaps most basically of all conversational management strategies – to communicate effectively in any language we all have to structure our utterances.

(II) Although it is true that monolinguals and plurilinguals of all kinds use their resources to express a similar range of conversational meanings, some consequences must ensue from the fact that different languages express particular meanings more or less economically and/or aptly.

At a lexical level, one need not be a very accomplished bilingual in order to resort at times to using a word from a second language, or an expression, which constitutes the *mot juste* – *mot juste* being a case in point! The same is true of discourse-structuring devices, some of which may become second nature to speakers of particular varieties, sometimes regardless of the language they are using. In Alsace even young people to all intents and purposes monolingual in French would often use *gel* ‘right?’ at the end of every other sentence. Apart from the symbolic aspect of using this typical Alsatian expression, another factor is that the nearest French equivalent, ‘n’est-ce pas?’, is comparatively cumbersome and correspondingly less used, even by French monolinguals. Not all discourse markers transfer with equal ease from one language to another. Whereas in English suddenly starting to speak more quietly might indicate emotion or gravity, to a Greek such a device might merely indicate that one was talking to oneself and that others need not pay attention. It has been observed that the discourse features associated with such functions are often the most difficult and evasive part of learning a new language – hence the abundant literature on ‘miscommunication’ (Gumperz, 1982; White, 1997).

(III) Thirdly, we allow for the possibility that CS in discourse provides possibilities additional to what could be accomplished monolingually.

a. A few of the discourse functions for which CS is typically used could only with difficulty be performed with monolingual means. From Gumperz’s list, one example is personalization vs. objectification. A striking example of this is provided below (example 10), when a Punjabi-English bilingual switches into English to comment on the loss of Punjabi traditions in Britain. Other functions which can much less easily be accomplished monolingually are *addressee specification* from Gumperz’s list and *exclusion of other people within hearing* (i.e. monolinguals) on Saviile-Troike’s

list. The monolingual equivalents, which might be whispering or taking one's interlocutor aside, are far more likely to be seen as aggressive or impolite acts. Certain types of *avoidance strategy* (e.g. avoiding making a choice between *tu* and *vous* by switching to a language which does not make the distinction) also seem particularly relevant to CS. So while the majority of functions of codeswitching overlap with those of equivalent monolingually expressed devices, some of them may be in addition to, rather than instead of, those functions.

b. There is a further way in which the contrast between the two languages can be used as a significant discourse tool in CS. This has to do with exploiting the languages' different connotations for their speakers. Gumperz (1982: 66) talks of this in terms of a *we-code/they-code* distinction. The minority variety, associated with intra-group, informal activities generally serves as a 'we-code', whereas the majority language, or 'they-code', is associated with out-group relations and is felt to be more formal. Trilinguals also report using their three varieties for different types of talk, which gives them the opportunity to mark the transition from one to another. An example of this is given in Sneddon (forthcoming): a woman trilingual in Gujarati, Urdu and English said: 'You see, English is a much better language to have a row in. It is an egalitarian language. None of this showing respect. You can really have a go at each other. Then, when you want to work out what you are arguing about and sort it out, you talk in Gujarati, because it's our language and we can reason better in it. Then, when we're making up, we speak Urdu. Urdu is a gentle language and it is very poetic. It is good for pillow talk'.

c. Finally, the contrast per se between the two different varieties provides an additional means of *framing* (Goffmann, 1974). "The mere fact of juxtaposing two codes can have a signalling value of its own, independent of the direction of code-alternation" (Auer, 1995: 119).

The fact that this contrast is functional can be illustrated in relation to codeswitching used to mark off quotations, as in example (1) above. Of particular interest is the fact that speakers are not always quoted in the language they actually spoke; similarly in monolingual discourse, though one might choose to quote someone by imitating their voice and/or accent dialect, one could also indicate a quotation by changing one's accent or voice quality in a more or less arbitrary manner, simply in order to signal a contrast or transition. Both monolingual and bilingual examples of this are provided below.

An important point is that it is only possible to take advantage of the contrast between the two languages to the extent that they are indeed different entities for both speaker and interlocutor. When there has been a merging of the languages or where we are dealing with loans rather than codeswitches it is not possible to take advantage of the difference, though it may still be possible to take advantage of certain connotative qualities of the loan. Thus when English speakers use French loans such as *joie de vivre* or *gourmet* they may take advantage of the connotations of Frenchness which are relevant to these concepts. Conversely, if we are able to show that the contrast between two varieties is being exploited for discourse purposes, this would demonstrate that the latter retain a psycholinguistic distinctiveness for their speakers (Auer, 1998b: 13).

### 3. The current comparison

Up to now, to our knowledge, no systematic empirical comparison has been made between the functions of bilingual codeswitching and monolingual discourse structuring devices, though each has been studied extensively in its own right. The reason for this, we assume, is one of methodological awkwardness: one would need to match samples of bilingual and monolingual speech, not only in terms of the speakers but also the type of conversation, degree of formality, topic, etc. While such matching can be achieved in an experimental context (Grosjean, 1998), where one is relying on naturally occurring data it poses considerable problems. It seemed to us that the only way of getting round this problem of matching samples was to take advantage of the fact that bilinguals are also, by definition, monolinguals at the same time, and in the same conversation may at times resort to codeswitching and at other times speak monolingually. By comparing codeswitched and monolingual *passages within the same conversations*, it should be possible to compare the way in which particular conversational effects are realized monolingually and through CS. If the same speakers sometimes use codeswitching and sometimes rely on monolingual means to achieve a desired effect, then one can seek the differences between the two sets of circumstances in a maximally targeted way. We can try to establish whether they resort to a codeswitching mode at times precisely because it allows them to achieve conversational effects which they cannot achieve monolingually. In order to match the codeswitched and monolingual passages as closely as possible, it is important to concentrate on speakers who could be expected to be able to express a range of meanings through monolingual means in both languages. Some of their reasons for codeswitching at certain times and not at others may well remain imponderable; they may be connected with the linguistic preferences of their principal addressees, and they could be expected to be addressing some people more than others at different times in the same conversation. Speakers could for example be affected in their language choice by what they were talking about, being used to discussing certain topics in a particular language. One would therefore expect there to be a range of reasons why they chose to codeswitch or not at particular moments, and that these reasons would not always be connected with the fact that CS allowed particular conversational effects to be achieved. The best key to understanding the patterns is therefore the participation of a researcher with a thorough knowledge of the linguistic characteristics, personality and personal history of the subjects, in this case Reeva Charles.

Our strategy here was to take a sample of authentic, natural conversations between a small number of subjects, Charles being a participant observer. These conversations were between members of a close family/friendship network; its members were bilinguals, of varying degrees of dominance in English and Punjabi, and habitual codeswitchers. We planned to compare how certain discourse functions were realised both with the help of CS and without it, in order to highlight any specific aspects of the codeswitched instances.

### 3.1. The speakers and the recordings

#### 3.1.1. Sikh Punjabi speakers

The conversational data used in this study were the basis of a study on language use and codeswitching within the Sikh Punjabi community (Charles, 1995). This ethno-linguistic group is dispersed across Britain, but the subjects of the present study are drawn from West London.

The bulk of immigration to Britain of the Sikh Punjabis, from a largely rural background, took place in the late 1950s to early 1960s, when, initially only men arrived to pursue the widely-advertised employment opportunities. Once established in accommodation and employment, they were soon joined by their wives and any children. The religious affiliation of speakers of Punjabi has been specified because speakers of Punjabi can commonly fall into one of three religious-ethnic groups: Sikh, Muslim or Hindu.<sup>1</sup>

Although the three groups have distinct languages of literacy, there is a high degree of mutual intelligibility between spoken forms of Punjabi. Within the Punjabi-speaking ethnic groups however there are further variations in dialect. The commonest distinction of dialect which is made within the Sikh Punjabi group is between the dialect from the Doaba region and that which occurs in the Malvi region. Although the differences may be negligible for many British Asian second and third generation Sikh Punjabi speakers, the dialectal (and subtle cultural) differences are instantly recognisable (and often the source of jocular derision) for those raised in India in the state of Punjab. The present study is concerned with speakers from the Malvi region.

#### 3.1.2. The recording

The subjects of the present study were a group of Sikh Punjabi women aged between 32 and 65. The women are part of a familial and social network who have lived within the Punjabi community in West London for a substantial period of time (on average about 25 years). The women who are not related to each other are bound together through a history of working for one airline in particular (but others also) which employs many British Asians living in the south-west quarter of London. In terms of life-style, family, clothing, and so on the women largely adhere to the cultural norms of the community in terms of fulfilling the traditional expectations of women in this community.

---

<sup>1</sup> Speakers of Punjabi commonly fall into three main religious-ethnic groups:

(1) *Sikhs*, who live in (or originate from) the Indian state of Punjab. The Sikh scriptures are written in Gurmukhi script and Punjabi is used in the home and for formal purposes. The numbers of Sikh Punjabis in Britain are estimated at 400,000 upwards (Mobbs, 1985).

(2) *Muslims*, who live in (or originate from) Pakistan, which was previously part of the state of Punjab in India, but whose language of literacy is Urdu, written in Perso-Arabic script. The numbers of Muslim Punjabis are estimated at a possible 200,000.

(3) *Hindus*, who live in (or originate from) the Indian state of Punjab or Haryana. Hindus however are also more likely to speak Hindi and will write Hindi, using the Devanagri script. The demographic presence of this group is difficult to quantify.

All of the participants were known to Charles, who was raised within the community, maintains strong ties and is a fluent second-generation Punjabi speaker. The recordings of the conversations were made during the course of routine social visits to the homes of the participants. When the fact of recording was revealed, subjects sometimes engaged in conversations about ‘language and culture’. The recording used in the present study took place during one three-hour session and the five subjects involved can be briefly described as follows:

- Umi: ‘Umi’ is 41 years old and works for a major airline in the catering trade. She is married with four children, of which two still live at home, and two daughters who are now married and settled in Canada. Umi was born in India and has lived in England for approximately 25 years.
- Amrit: ‘Amrit’ is 51 years old and also works for a major airline in the catering trade. She is divorced and has 2 children, of whom 1 still lives at home. Amrit was born in Burma, but moved to India when young and has lived in England for approximately 33 years. Amrit is a good friend of Umi’s.
- Renu: ‘Renu’ is 32 years old and works in an administrative job. She was born and brought up in London. Renu is Amrit’s daughter.
- Mindi: ‘Mindi’ is 46 years old and also works for a major airline in the catering trade. She is married with one young son. Mindi was born in India and has lived in England for approximately 30 years. Mindi is Umi’s sister.
- Bebeji: ‘Bebeji’ is 67 years old and is a retired widow. She is Umi and Mindi’s mother. Bebeji was born in India and divides her time between England and India, living mostly in England over the last 6 years or so.

### 3.2. Transcription of recordings

In our examples, Punjabi is transcribed in Roman script. In the absence of a readily-available and standardised method of doing this, we have adopted a self-styled system for transcription which aims to be as phonetic as possible and which incorporates a consistent style for representing particular Punjabi phonemes which have no correspondence in English.

For the examples given in the discussion below, utterances in English have been transcribed in normal type and utterances in Punjabi in *italics*. Word for word glosses are given immediately below the utterances within square brackets. Free translations are given immediately below each example between slashes. The words/sections originally spoken in English remain in normal type in the translation. The difference between borrowing and CS was not a focus of this study, so borrowed words have been put in normal type just like codeswitches simply to flag them up (cf. ‘cabinet’ in example 1 above). The distinction between these two categories being much-disputed, we have simply opted to avoid basing our analysis on switch-points which coincide with borrowing phenomena rather than CS.

### 3.3. Number of discourse features in each language

We chose to compare the use of discourse features in bilingual and monolingual conversations by concentrating on four common types of transition, which one would expect to be marked both in monolingual and codeswitched conversational contexts. These are: (1) asides, (2) quotations, (3) reiterations and (4) the contrastive conjunction 'but'. The occurrence of each of the four features was noted and then classified as either 'monolingual discourse' or 'codeswitched discourse' according to whether the feature occurred within a monolingual language environment or whether the feature coincided with a change in language. The numbers of each of these discourse features identified in each conversational context are shown in Table 1 below. The table is an indicative one as there are a number of problems in compiling such quantitative data from natural conversation which need to be acknowledged. Firstly, even prior to beginning analysis of the data, is the transcription process – the transcription of speech events is, despite the best intentions of the transcriber, a subjective process in which decisions have to be made, for example, with regard to such phenomena as rapid overlapping or concurrent speech. Such decisions will affect the number of overall possibilities in which any particular discourse feature can occur.

Secondly there is an interpretive element involved in the identification of the discourse features themselves. Some features are more easily identified than others – for example, identifying the presence of the conjunction 'but' sits at the easier end of the continuum, whereas other features such as 'asides' involve more interpretation. This difficulty can affect the overall number of features identified.

Thirdly, even the classification of examples as either monolingual or codeswitched requires careful consideration of the principles involved. The basic criterion used was whether the feature occurred within a monolingual language environment or whether the feature coincided with a change in language. However we found it necessary to refine this criterion for some examples and this is clarified in the discussion of examples later (e.g. see the section on quotations).

Although Table 1 below is therefore operational, rather than definitive, it nevertheless shows the broad pattern of discourse features found in each discourse mode.

Table 1

Discourse feature	Monolingual discourse	Codeswitched discourse	Totals:
Asides	1	5	6
Reiteration	12	9	21
but/ <i>par</i>	23	9	32
Quotations	15	24	39
Totals	51	47	98

Hence, according to the criteria used, 98 individual instances of the four discourse features were classified according to whether the feature occurred within a monolingual language environment or whether the feature coincided with a change in language.

Five instances of asides were identified which made use of a change in language whilst one occurred in the same language (English) (as shown in example 3 below).

Reiterations were classified as either monolingual or codeswitched, according to whether a switch in language occurred between the original utterance and the subsequent reiteration. If a switch in language did not occur, then the example was classed as monolingual, whereas if a switch occurred, whether between or within repetitions, then it was included in the codeswitched category.

Overall, 32 instances of the occurrence of 'but' in English or Punjabi were found – 23 of these instances occurring within or between monolingual clauses and 9 of them occurring on a language switch site (i.e. within or between clauses in which a language change occurs).

In keeping with the nature of informal extended conversations between close family members or friends there were many narrative sections in the conversations, with a large number of instances of direct speech being reported.

Although there are variations between the four discourse features in the extent to which speakers make use of CS (e.g. more monolingual examples of 'but' were found (23) than codeswitched ones (9), whereas speakers more often than not chose to code switch for quotations), no conclusions were drawn from this owing to the difficulties of 'counting' these features already mentioned above.

### 3.4. Direction of switching

Alfonzetti (1998) distinguishes between switches where the direction of the switch is significant and those where it is merely the contrast which codeswitching allows which counts. Although this distinction is borne out in our data, owing to the limited size of our sample, we have chosen to interpret the direction of CS on a case by case basis here. Speakers switched sometimes within a turn from English to Punjabi, Punjabi to English and also from codeswitched modes to monolingual English or Punjabi modes and vice versa. The picture was also complicated by the same speakers at other times indulging in such directional variety across the turns of different speakers. We found that in a majority of cases in our data the direction of switching from one particular language to another was not as significant as the contrastive effect. The recordings took place continuously between speakers who knew each well and involved no change in setting or the introduction of new speakers. One would therefore expect any CS to be strongly related to the content of the topic under discussion and/or the speaker's own stance in relation to it. We identified this as a factor in some examples but not in others. For these reasons a quantitative analysis of directionality was not thought to be meaningful and examples in which the direction of the switch was considered to be relevant are instead highlighted in the discussion of examples below.

Although we have only discussed four types of discourse marker in detail, we were also particularly attentive to cases where we felt the switches were indicating the expression of particular *attitudes* to the culture associated with each language. Examples (10), (18) and (28) show a use of CS in which the associations carried by each of the languages are significant.

Examples from the data of each of the discourse features are discussed below.

#### 4. Discussion of examples

##### 4.1. Asides

In monolingual conversation, speakers may mark off ‘parenthetical’ parts of their utterance by a change of voice – in English often to a lower pitch – which may be accompanied by other paralinguistic features such as a gesture, facial expression or change in the direction of their gaze.

The following example taken from our data illustrates a monolingual aside in English:

- (3) (Context: talking about one of the participant’s future son-in-laws)  
 1 RENU: What does he do? – to ask the usual question

The aside (underlined) is spoken in a different tone. The speaker is marking a metaphorical change in addressee, as the aside is a metalinguistic comment addressed, if to anyone, to herself. The way in which such a device may be used to mark the change from speaking to an interlocutor to thinking aloud (and thus addressing oneself) can equally be seen in the following bilingual example:

- (4) (Context: talking about the speaker’s son’s friend)  
 1 UMI: *saada na*, Charanpreet’s friend and er  
 [our now Charanpreet’s friend and er]  
 2 *orna dtha munda siga*  
 [their of boy was]  
 3 how old is Davan now?  
 4 eleven? So he’s about twelve

*/now our Charanpreet’s friend, they had a son, how old is Davan now? eleven? So he’s about twelve/*

The speaker uses English and Punjabi in lines 1 and 2, and then switches to English to express the aside (normal type) in line 3. This is marked by a change in voice just as in the previous, monolingual example. Here the aside also serves a ‘fact-checking’ function, in which confirmation may or may not be implicitly sought from the interlocutor. Our data contained four examples of the use of an aside in this way, to step momentarily outside the overall proposition and speculate on a fact. In several cases the fact in question was a number, as in both the previous and following example:

- (5) (Context: discussion about the speaker’s sister having a son after being married for many years)  
 1 UMI she was mar – my sister was married for (drawn-out syllable)

- 2 *pundthra sorla saal?*  
 [fifteen sixteen years?]
- 3 AMRIT *pundthra sorla saala bardth married bardth hoya*  
 [fifteen sixteen years after married after it-happened]
- 4 RENU *ucha?*  
 [really?]
- 5 AMRIT first child, only one child
- 1 UMI /My sister was married for/  
 2 /fifteen, sixteen years?/  
 3 AMRIT /It happened after fifteen, sixteen years of marriage/  
 3 RENU /Really?/  
 4 AMRIT /First child, only one child/

Umi starts talking in line 1 in English, then switches to Punjabi on dropping into the aside on line 2. Another speaker takes the floor (line 3) and continues in Punjabi answering the speculation within the aside.

In examples (4) and (5), the fact that the aside is in a different language does not, at first sight, seem to add anything further in terms of framing than the change in voice quality exemplified in example (3). A change in voice quality is *also* a feature of the bilingual examples. It seems very unlikely to be a coincidence that the switches coincide perfectly with the asides in examples (4) and (5), and one may therefore tentatively conclude that the change in language is an additional device used by the speaker, who by exploiting the contrast between the two languages marks the different conversational ‘status’ of the aside.

We note that in example (4) a switch occurs from Punjabi to English to express the aside whilst in example (5) the switch occurs from English to Punjabi. The switching therefore cannot be attributed to, for example, a preference in counting numbers in a particular language because they are expressed in both English and Punjabi. In these examples therefore the direction of the switch is not as significant as the contrastive value of the switch.

#### 4.2. Reiteration

Repetitions, by which we here mean exact or word-for-word repetitions, and reiterations, i.e. near repetitions or close paraphrases, whether of one’s own words or someone else’s, serve a number of important discourse functions in conversation (Tannen, 1989). For example, a speaker may, most obviously, repeat a portion of their turn to ensure that his/her interlocutors have heard and/or understood the point being made; another common function is to lend emphasis to the words which are repeated or reiterated. Their functions may also include, among others, providing clarification, adding a further nuance, foregrounding or emphasis, being a floor-holding or -retrieving device and repair.

Commonly, a reiteration entails the repetition of the broad grammatical structure of the original utterance whilst deleting, changing or expanding some lexical entries. Our data contained 21 examples of reiteration, in 12 of which speakers used one lan-

guage (monolingual) and in 9 of which they switched language to coincide with the reiteration (bilingual).

The following example from the data begins with an utterance in English (line 1). The utterance is then reiterated (line 2) but the first clause is repeated in a combination of English and Punjabi whilst the second clause remains in English (the reiterated expressions are in bold type):

(6) (Context: talking about waiting with a friend during an overnight delay at an airport)

1 RENU ... and she was sleeping all over the place, so I had to stay awake

2 **digdthi-firdthi si everywhere**, so I had to stay awake

[falling-around-she was]

*[she was falling around everywhere, so I had to stay awake]*

One function of the repetition seems to be to give the hearers more time to take in and understand the meaning expressed (see Tannen, 1989: 49–50). Changing language, in addition to fulfilling this function, may be a further focusing device: if you have to understand something in two languages, you will understand it more thoroughly than through one alone.

The interesting thing about the change of language, however, is that it means that the speaker, *even if they do repeat word for word, in translation terms, what was said in the other language*, is still not using the same words as before. Exact repetition is comparatively rare in conversation. People who actually repeat themselves word for word are either considered bores, or may be making an additional point which goes beyond a desire to clarify or emphasize the original statement. Teachers, for example, may repeat themselves word for word in order to test whether a pupil is listening, or to imply that they are not. It is therefore no surprise that in our data only two examples of exact repetition were found.

In the above example, the English verb ‘was sleeping’ (line 1) is reiterated in Punjabi (*digdthi-firdthi-si*, line 2) by using a verb compound which translates as ‘was falling around’. The reiteration enables the speaker to have another go at describing a fairly amusing scene (someone falling around at the airport because they were so sleepy), and the language switch allows her to make use of a more expressive term than was used in the English original. The reiteration of the second part of the phrase (‘all over the place’, line 1) is maintained in the same language but condensed to ‘everywhere’ (line 2), thus providing lexical variety within English. Finally, the word-for-word repetition of ‘so I had to stay awake’ acts as a counterpoint to the variety introduced before. The contrast between paraphrase in one part and exact repetition in the other can itself be seen as a further structuring mechanism and as an illustration of the ‘poetic’ nature of ordinary talk (Coates, 1996: 230). The poetry is enhanced by the interplay of the two languages. With regard to the direction of switching, one might say that the utterance in line 1 occurs in English and that the speaker uses a combination of Punjabi and English in line 2 to repeat the first part of line 1 and then switches to monolingual English for the second part of the reiteration. The direction of the switch from English to a codeswitched mode in this exam-

ple is not due to a change in content or speech activity, but provides a further opportunity for the speaker to make her point.

The three examples which follow demonstrate further the discourse features and functions of the use of reiteration and language change. They show the use of reiteration in turn-taking conventions, particularly as a ‘floor-holding’ device.

(7) (Context: talking about Umi’s daughter dancing at a wedding)

1 AMRIT *or naal song vi orve, bothi pyaari lugdthi*  
[that with song also like-that, very sweet looks-she]

2 UMI *it’s like she’s floating*

3 AMRIT *bothi pyaari kuri a*  
[very sweet girl is]

1 AMRIT */she does the song the same as well, she looks very sweet/*

2 UMI */it’s like she’s floating/*

3 AMRIT */she’s a very sweet girl/*

In example 7, the reiteration itself is monolingual, although there is codeswitching within the conversation. A two-phrase utterance begins in line 1 in Punjabi, though it includes the codeswitched word ‘song’. A second speaker, Umi, then takes the floor in line 2 for one clause uttered in English. Then Amrit, the original speaker, in line 3 reiterates her last clause from line 1, again in English, phrasing it slightly differently this time. This reiteration in line 3, and Amrit’s continued use of English in spite of Umi’s intervention in Punjabi, coincides with Amrit’s retention of the floor; the underlying message seems to be ‘I have not finished yet, allow me to continue’.

The exact repetition of ‘very sweet’ (*bothi pyaari*) gives lexical cohesion to the reiteration. At the same time, the cataphoric expansion of the pronoun (i.e. the inferred subject ‘she’) to a noun (‘girl’) gives the speaker the bonus of referring to the same object without repeating themselves exactly, while maintaining the referential cohesion between phrases, even when they are separated by another speaker’s turn, as they are here.

The reiterated pair in example 8 below shows many of the strategies demonstrated in example 7, but includes the additional feature of a language switch accompanying the reiteration. It has therefore been included in the bilingual category of our data.

(8) (Context: talking about going to Umi’s daughter’s wedding in Canada)

1 UMI *edthe thenu vyaa the naal leke chulunge usi tha*  
[hers to-you wedding on with take will-go we (stress)]

2 AMRIT *hun Sati dtha vyaa kurna orthe, edtha vi orthe*  
[now Sati of wedding do there, hers also there  
engagement hogaya  
engagement happened]

3 UMI **I’m gonna take you with us, there** *mum nu tha leke junna*  
[Your mum of (stress) take go]

UMI */we’re going to take you to her wedding/*

AMRIT */now Sati’s getting married over there, she got engaged there too/*

UMI /I'm gonna take you with us, we're going to take your mum any way/

Umi starts talking in Punjabi. A second speaker, Amrit, then takes the floor in line 2, also in Punjabi, though she does use the codeswitched noun 'engagement'. The first speaker then returns in line 3 to reiterate her original utterance, this time switching to English. A parallel can be seen here with example 7 in the use of a reiteration as a turn-taking device. As in example 6 the direction of the switch from one language (Punjabi) to another (English) between the reiterated pair does not seem as significant as the opportunity to reiterate the point. The direction of the switch is also made difficult to interpret here due to the intervening turn by another speaker

Cohesion between the two parts of the reiterated pair is provided by repetition of the verb group ('going to take') and the object ('you'). The lexical elements which are altered in the reiteration in line 3 are the subject (from 'we' in line 1 to 'I' in line 3) and the prepositional phrase (from 'to her wedding' in line 1 to 'with us' in line 3). The lexical change within the prepositional phrase is an anaphoric contraction and, as in example 7, this deictic strategy allows the speaker to avoid an exact repetition while focusing the interlocutor's attention on this aspect of the content. The main effect of the reiteration seems to be to underline the strength of purpose, the definiteness of the plan. Despite the language switch, the speaker's two utterances are integrated, cohesive and can contain seamless deictic references; this suggests strongly that codeswitching is an integral part of the discourse planning.

Example 9 below is another example of a reiteration within which codeswitching plays an integral role:

(9) (Context: talking about Umi's daughter's aunt's house in Canada)

1 UMI this is her *pooa*'s house  
[*dad's sister's*]

2 AMRIT Canada *dthe vich a*  
[Canada *of in is*]

3 UMI *pooa dtha kar*  
[*dad's sister of house*]

1 UMI /this is her *dad's sister's* house/

2 AMRIT /it's in Canada/

3 UMI /*dad's sister's* house/

Umi begins her utterance in English, though she includes a Punjabi kinship term for which there is no direct lexical equivalent in English, i.e. *pooa* 'father's sister'. Amrit then takes the floor in Punjabi. Umi then repeats part of her first utterance, but this time in Punjabi. As in examples 7 and 8, we see a reiteration (in line 3) being used as a 'floor-retaining' device. The reiteration here may also be for clarification since it provides a translation of the Punjabi word.

In the following example a codeswitched utterance in l.1 is followed by a monolingual utterance incorporating repetition – one of the few examples of *exact* repetition – in line 2; this combination is particularly potent, embodying as it does the

speaker's attitude to the loss of the Indian culture. This example is relevant to the issue of *we-code/they-code* transitions, mentioned above. Here the speaker's sad comment on the passing of an era starts in Punjabi and ends in English:

(10) (Context: talking about the likely loss of Punjabi culture in Britain)

- 1 Umi culture *tha aapna ... rena tha hayni*  
 [culture (stress) *our ... stay (stress) is-not*]  
 2 we know it, **we know it, we know** it's coming

*/our culture is not going to last/  
 /we know it, we know it, we know it's coming/*

The last example of reiteration we will give in this section is particularly striking. In spite of its brevity, example 11 is made up of a 'triple' reiteration. It achieves this without any impression of boring repetition by exploiting the different word order (SVO/(S)OV) of English and Punjabi:

(11) (Context: explaining what the family usually did for Christmas Day)

- 1 We usually have er special lunch *bunorndthe hundthe*, **we cook special**  
 [*we-make do*]  
**lunch**

*/We usually have special lunch we make, we cook special lunch/*

The utterance may be seen as made up of three constituents:

1. English: 'We usually have er special lunch';
2. English/Punjabi codeswitching: 'special lunch *bunorndthe hundthe*'. This is a complete Punjabi sentence as the object precedes the verb and Punjabi, as a pro-drop language, allows the (implicit) subject 'we' to be inferred;
3. English: 'We cook special lunch'.

Only the verbs differ slightly each time ('have', 'make', 'cook'), the referential focus ('special lunch') remaining the same, and the whole utterance comes across as a frame to place the idea of special lunch in the foreground. The rapid and subconscious manipulation of the word-order differences between the two languages, which is subservient to the overall rhetorical effect, is particularly symptomatic of the codeswitcher's ability.

Reiterations, as Tannen (1989) has shown, are complex and multifunctional aspects of conversational technique, and their impact is different and more varied than that of word-for-word repetition. The additional resource of codeswitching multiplies the possibilities available: as we said above, a word-for-word repetition, if it is in a different language to the original utterance, is by definition no longer literally a word-for-word repetition; and the introduction of another language can carry a variety of further meanings. Furthermore, codeswitching can, as we have seen above, be used *within* a reiteration as well as at the point where the reiteration starts;

in this way, the point at which the switch occurs can itself introduce additional pragmatic meanings into the discourse.

#### 4.3. Quotation

Informal conversations of some length amongst groups of friends commonly include instances of reporting conversations with third parties or between third and fourth parties. The speech of others may be reported either directly or indirectly. This section is concerned with ‘direct speech’ in which speakers quote someone’s words directly as opposed to ‘indirect reported speech’.

An utterance which reports speech will typically contain a ‘reporting clause’ which contains a subject and a quotative verb (e.g. say, yell, go, or more recently ‘be like’ – see Romaine and Lange, 1998), followed, in the majority of cases directly by the speaker’s reported words, hereinafter called the ‘quote’. These clauses serve to signal and frame the forthcoming quote, alerting the listener to what is going on at each stage of the interaction. The speaker then assumes the ‘voice’ of the speakers whose words are being quoted. In most cases, of course, there is no attempt at an exact reproduction of the speech that is quoted, and ‘constructed dialogue’ is perhaps a more appropriate term than the conventional term ‘direct speech’ (see Tannen, 1989: 110). A change in voice usually accompanies the quote, sometimes involving mimicry of the original speaker’s voice or tone. More often however, there is just a slight change in voice quality to mark off the quote, which may be combined with other features such as the use of lexical items typical of the reported speaker. Alfonzetti (1998) gives examples of quoting which coincides with a change of variety without necessarily reproducing the variety originally spoken.

Let us consider the following monolingual English example from the data:

- (12) (Context: discussing the nationality allegiances of British Asians who emigrated to Britain from Kenya)
- 1 UMI When it came to fourth generation ... (short attempted
  - 2 interruptions) ... they said, ‘we are British, we are Kenyan’, now
  - 3 they’re Indian (pause) right? Their forefathers was from India,
  - 4 but you ask any person who comes from Kenya, they will not say
  - 5 that they’re Indian, they will say they’re Kenyan, but when it come
  - 6 to fourth generation, they gonna say, ‘we’re British, my mother
  - 7 was British’.

The first ‘reporting clause’ occurs in line 2 (‘they said’) followed immediately by the first quote ‘we are British, we are Kenyan’. The second reporting clause occurs in line 6 (‘they gonna say’), followed by the quote ‘we’re British, my mother was British’. The speaker marks her change in perspective or ‘change of hat’ most obviously by her use of pronouns. In the first reporting clause/quote pair (line 2) she uses ‘they’ in the reporting clause but switches to ‘we’ within the quote. In the second reporting clause/quote pair (lines 6–7), the same pronoun change occurs with the additional use of the pronoun ‘my’.

A clear case of mimicking the voice of the reported person occurs in example 13 below. Here the speaker imitates a child's high voice for the quote – interestingly thereby dispensing with a reporting clause.

(13) (Context: talking about the speaker's five year old grandson at his aunt's engagement ceremony)

- 1 UMI he's just standing there and he's looking at Sati *maasi*, 'what are  
[aunt]  
2 they doing to *maasi*?'  
[aunt]

It is also open to monolingual speakers to mark off quotes by mimicking accents or by switching dialects, as in the following example from Edwards (1988: 49) from a study of the speech of British Black women in Dudley, West Midlands:

(14) 1 ... And then she goes, 'Lord God, I so hot'. Now she'll be sitting there right  
and  
2 she'll go, 'It's hot isn't it?', you know, and you think which one is he [her son]  
3 going to grow up speaking?

As Edwards herself notes: "[The speaker] switches frequently between 'English' and 'Patois' in codeswitching behaviour reminiscent of speakers in stable bilingual communities in many parts of the world ... she is a highly competent speaker with an extensive linguistic repertoire which she uses to some considerable effect".

In example 15 below, a framing effect results from a very different voice tone being used to mark off the quote.

(15) (Context: speaker making the point that despite considering herself to be culturally progressive, she expects her children to adhere to Indian cultural norms)

- 1 UMI it's very easy for them and they find 'oh I got a modern mother'  
2 so that's fine, they get whatever they want, but on the same thing,  
3 I tell them that you got to stay with the culture

It is clear that monolinguals can and do use a whole range of devices to mark off quotes in their speech. When examining the conversations of bilinguals, the possibilities appear more complex due to the additional possibility of codeswitching, as we see from the next four examples in this section.

(16) (Context: Umi relating what her daughter, Sati, has told her about her conversations with her fiance in Canada)

- 1 UMI *ugay Sati husdthi si kendthi si* 'your phone bill  
[before Sati laughing was saying was]  
is gonna move up'  
2 *kendtha* 'that's alright I do a bit of extra work on the side'  
[he-said]

*before Sati was laughing saying 'your phone bill is gonna move up and he said 'that's alright I do a bit of extra work on the side'*

The speaker starts in Punjabi. A switch to English then coincides exactly with the first quote ('your phone bill is gonna move up'). The speaker then switches back to Punjabi for a second reporting clause (*kendtha* in line 2) and reverts to English to give the final quote. In addition to the structuring devices available to her as a monolingual, we see here how the speaker is able to take advantage of codeswitching as an additional or alternative resource to differentiate her own speech from that of the person she is quoting. The two quotes are in English while the surrounding or framing language is Punjabi, giving an ABAB alternation pattern.

This may seem a very obvious device where the speaker consistently uses language A and is quoting a speaker who consistently uses language B. The reality in bilingual situations is, however, usually more complicated, as both the speaker and the quoted speaker may be codeswitchers. We therefore need to look at the full range of patterns which may occur.

In analysing the data it was often the case that one speaker turn would contain multiple quotations. We therefore devised a table (see Table 2 below) to represent the various codeswitching possibilities which we found. The basic unit on which this is based is a combination of a reporting clause (cf. *supra*) and a quote. Initially, we identified these units or pairs as either monolingual or bilingual in a straightforward manner: if both members of a pair were in the same language, they were classified as monolingual, and conversely, if they were in different languages they were deemed to be bilingual. We then found a number of cases, however, where the picture was not that simple. Switching in the environment surrounding the reporting clause/quotation pair quote could take a number of different forms, as is shown in example (17).

(17) (Context: talking about a nephew who the speaker considered to be ill-mannered and gruff, but whom she considers now to have 'reformed')

- 1 UMI *edtha* before he used to say 'alright aunt'  
[like]  
(another speaker: few short overlapping phrases in Punjabi)
- 2 *hun kendtha* 'auntie-ji Coke *pisugdtha?*',  
[now he-says 'aunt (honorific) Coke can-drink?']  
Mean what's the difference?

*/like before he used to say 'alright aunt', now he says, 'dear aunt, may I have some Coke please?' Mean what's the difference?/*

With the exception of one codeswitched focus marker (*edtha*, here meaning 'like'), the first reporting clause is in English ('before he used to say'), followed by a quote in the same language ('alright aunt') (line 1). Umi then switches to Punjabi for a second reporting clause (line 2), giving the quote also in Punjabi ('Auntie' and 'Coke' may be considered as loan words rather than codeswitches). Thus our initial criteria would classify this as two instances of monolingual quotations, respectively A A and B B.

But a different interpretation seems appropriate for these patterns if one considers them as part of a single conversational unit. The linguistic environment surrounding the immediate reporting clause/quote pair is as important for its interpretation as the fact that the two members of the pair are, or are not, in the same language. Auer (1998b: 11) comes to similar conclusions.

For example, the combination of a monolingual ‘pair’ as defined above with pre/post- utterances in the other language appeared highly significant in the structuring of the discourse overall:

- First, in line 1 above, the first reporting clause and quote are followed by a second such pair in Punjabi. This change in language clearly contributes to segmenting the different portions of the utterance.
- Secondly, the time/place deictic references – i.e. ‘before’ and *hun* [now] – are contrasted by a language switch, giving further emphasis to the change in the boy’s behaviour.
- Thirdly, the second quote in Punjabi (line 2) is followed by another language switch for the final sentence of the turn (‘Mean what’s the difference’). This final switch shows the remark to be a comment on the story overall. Such broader discourse-structuring functions of codeswitching were identified several times in the data.

Our definition of a quotation involving codeswitching was therefore extended to take in those instances where there was switching in the immediate vicinity of the reporting clause and the quote.

Table 2 below lists the various patterns which could theoretically occur, taking account of the language immediately preceding and that immediately following the reporting clause and the quote itself, and indicates our classification of examples as either monolingual or codeswitched.

Table 2

	Slot 1 Preceding Phrase	Slot 2 Reporting Clause	Slot 3 Quote	Slot 4 Following Phrase	Classification
1	Language A	Language A	Language A	Language A	= monolingual
2	B	B	B	B	= monolingual
3	B	A	A	A	= codeswitched
4	A	B	B	B	= codeswitched
5	B	B	A	A	= codeswitched
6	A	A	B	B	= codeswitched
7	B	B	B	A	= codeswitched
8	A	A	A	B	= codeswitched
9	B	A	A	B	= codeswitched
10	A	B	B	B	= codeswitched
11	A	B	A	A	= codeswitched
12	B	B	B	A	= codeswitched

Therefore if any of the three slot-boundaries involved a language switch, it was counted as a bilingual or codeswitched instance of quotation. In the event of the reporting clause *or* quote occurring on a turn boundary, slots 1 and 4, as appropriate, were accorded a ‘zero entry’ and the classification made on the basis of whether or not any switching occurred between the remaining slot boundaries.

According to this classification system example (14) would be analysed as follows:

	Slot 1	Slot 2	Slot 3	Slot 4
line 1	— (turn boundary)	<b>E</b> before he used to say	<b>E</b> ‘alright aunt’	<b>P</b> <i>hun kendtha</i>
line 2	<b>E</b> “alright aunt”	<b>P</b> <i>hun kendtha</i>	<b>P</b> ‘aunti-ji Coke <i>pisugdtha</i> ?’	<b>E</b> Mean what’s the difference?

This pattern whereby the speaker does not switch languages between the reporting clause (slot 2) and the quote (slot 3) in either of the two quotations was, it emerges, fairly typical. An analysis of the data revealed that in 66% of instances speakers did not switch between slots 2 and 3. However, out of those 66% of instances, a language switch did occur in either or both slots 1 and 4 in 50% of cases. This raises two questions – firstly, why do speakers choose not to switch between slots 2 and 3 in the majority of cases, and secondly, why do speakers almost equally often instead choose to switch in the clauses immediately surrounding the quotation? There are several possible explanations.

While we noted in example (17) that a codeswitch for the reporting clause serves to mark off and contrast that clause, at other times speakers may be motivated by other factors which take priority and which are therefore more influential in determining the structure and language of the discourse. For instance speakers may sometimes be engaged in ‘forward triggering’ in which they anticipate, in the reporting clause, the language in which they intend to quote – this in turn often being motivated by wishing to report the quote in the original language. This is actually the case in example (17). There, the use of first one language, then the other for the quotes themselves is crucial to the point being made: that, the boy used to speak to her ‘casually’ in English but now he acts and speaks politely to her and in the favoured Punjabi. Anticipatory ‘forward triggering’ takes place, making slots 2 and 3 more integrated for the speaker. Finally in slot 4 (‘Mean what’s the difference?’) the speaker uses a further codeswitch to mark the end of the ‘dramatic stage’, bringing the listener back to the present and at the same time expressing her own position. The utterance coheres because the interlocutors share sufficient background knowledge (about their minority culture, cross-generational relations, etc) to interpret the final evaluative remark. Even in a monolingual context, coherence is not just a linguistic construct but a social and cultural one and one which draws on inferential processes (Widdowson, 1978).

Following on from this, examples (18) and (19) below, while discussed here under the heading of quotations, are equally noteworthy for the way in which the use of codeswitching parallels contrasts which are being drawn between Indian and British cultural issues.

(18) (Context: talking about cooking in India. The speaker was pleased to be asked to make chips by her nephew in India and is critical of the lack of adventurousness of her female family members in India in cooking even simple English foods)

- 1 UMI I made chips out there a couple o' years back  
 2 RENU yeah  
 3 UMI *judthor me argi na, edthe thai dtha munda*  
 [*when I came see her uncle of son*]  
 4 *Sati dthe thai dtha munda*  
 [*Sati of uncle of son*]  
 5 he's er, he's er, twenty-five, twenty six year old and  
 6 he comes up to me and he goes 'charchi', ma kya 'ha' kendtha  
 ['aunt', I said 'yes' he-said]  
 7 'thusi merli or bunarke tho aloo-arle jere usi  
 [*you for-me those make do potato-ones which we ate*  
*kudthe si'*  
*did*]  
 8 that's the stupid thing!  
 UMI /I made chips out there a couple o' years back/  
 RENU /yeah/

UMI [*when I arrived, her uncle's son, Sati's uncle's son, he's twenty five, twenty six year old and he comes up to me and he goes 'auntie', I said 'yes', he said, 'will you make me those potato things which we ate?'*, that's the stupid thing!]

In this example, the first reporting clause ('he goes' in line 6) is in English and a contrastive language switch then takes place to Punjabi for the quote, beginning 'charchi' 'auntie'. The speaker continues in Punjabi for the remainder of the quote, but switches to English both to mark the end of reported speech and to serve as a final comment on the story.

Three reporting clause/quote pairs occur in all, giving the following language alternation (Table 3) according to the scheme set out in Table 2 above:

Table 3

	1	2	3	4
Quotation 1 (line 6)	E	E	E	P
Quotation 2 (line 6)	P	P	P	P
Quotation 3 (line 6–7)	P	P	P	E

In line 6, framing occurs in both English and Punjabi in different clauses which report the same speaker's speech: 'he goes' and *kendtha* [he said] respectively. What significance can be assigned to this?

We would propose two possible ways of looking at it: 1. The first has to do with the interplay between linguistic and sociolinguistic factors. These factors are: (1) the framing of the quote, (2) the original language of the reported speaker and (3) a triggering effect:

- Continuing the language used so far in her utterance the speaker first frames the quote in English ('he goes');
- She then reports the speech in the likely original language of the speaker (i.e. Punjabi) and continues in that language, which she would have also used with him.
- The first reported quote includes the Punjabi kinship term *charchi* (meaning dad's brother's wife) for which there is no direct English equivalent and which may have a triggering effect in continuing to quote in Punjabi, until the final comment, which is highlighted as such by a further codeswitch.

2. The second way of looking at this is in terms of typical features of conversational narratives. The first reporting clause uses the 'historical present' ('he comes up to me and he goes'), which has often been described as a device for dramatizing the events of a story (Quirk et al., 1985) – using the immediacy of the present tense to retell past events. Schifffrin (1981) examined the use of tense in narratives and found that the 'historical present' tense tended to cluster within the segments of narratives which relate the 'complicating' event (see the discussion of Labov's narrative categories below in example 19). It helps to heighten the drama and brings the listener directly into the action. Having used this device, speakers often contrastively return to the past tense. The monolingual speaker uses such contrasts as 'performance devices' (Wolfson, 1982; Bauman, 1986) for dramatic nearness/variety, but the bilingual has the further option of reinforcing them/ drawing attention to them with a codeswitch. This seems to be what happens here when the speaker uses *kendtha* [he said] in Punjabi straight afterwards.

Finally, the use of English for 'I made chips' – an 'English' activity – and for the final comment, indicating disbelief for the Indian relatives' professed ignorance of this art, serves to frame the story which itself takes place in a Punjabi-speaking context.

(19) (Context: talking about a British Asian boy who did not speak Punjabi when he visited India and the comments made about him by family in India)

1 UMI and when he used to go back, the *orthe Punjabi boldtha ni siga*  
[and there Punjabi speak not did]

2 *e kurke boldtha siga*, they all used to say  
[like-that did speak was]

3 '*bi a munde nu sikaya ki a?*'  
[well this boy to taught what is]

[and when he used to go back, and he didn't speak Punjabi there, he used to speak it oddly, they all used to say, 'well what is it that you've taught this boy?']

There is a strong logic to the speaker's codeswitching here. The quote, which is in the language which the original speaker(s) would have used, is framed by the contrasting language, English. This switch to English in slot 2 connects/refers back to the opening sentence in English; furthermore the structure of the two English parts is similar ('used to' is the main verb in both cases), providing a further source of cohesion between the two. The comments about Punjabi are in Punjabi, indicating the speaker's allegiance with the Punjabis' views on this issue. So the switching on the one hand gives structure to the story; but also shows once again the importance of looking at the wider context, beyond the individual quote.

Several of the main stages or segments of a typical narrative, as identified for example by Labov (1972) (see Introduction), were identified within the narratives in our data. We found that speakers used a rich range of markers and structuring devices to segment the stages (i.e. abstract, orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution and coda) which occurred. The speakers' ability to codeswitch provides them with a further tool with which to structure their narratives. For instance examples (17), (18) and (19) make use of the combined devices of quotation and codeswitching alone in order to explain the 'complication', that is the point of the narrative without any further explanation. Each of these examples ends with a final phrase which serves as the speaker's 'evaluation' of the story. The evaluation closes the narrative. In addition to the information conveyed, the fact of codeswitching for the evaluation is itself indicative. We have seen that it provides an additional means of framing and of showing one's attitudinal stance or 'evaluating'. It thereby adds a further dimension to the intrinsic duality of language, which always both conveys a message and conveys a message about the message (Bateson, 1972).

#### 4.4. *Contrastive conjunctions*

This section examines the use of the conjunction 'but' as a discourse structuring device within monolingual and bilingual modes of conversation. It has been noted that such conjunctions serve a number of discourse functions – for example Halliday and Hasan (1976) point to their role in 'conjunctive relations' as a cohesive factor between and within sentences, and to their use in relation to notions of contrast, result and time. More specifically, Schiffrin (1987) describes how the conjunction 'but' can be used (a) in a contrastive environment where two or more ideas are being opposed and (b) as a point making device. 'But' operates to structure discourse within and between clauses, and also marks a range of different types of contrast within the wider discourse structure. Oesch Serra (1998) shows how the French and Italian words for 'but' are used complementarily in an emerging, mixed system by Italian migrants in Switzerland.

Example (20) shows the use of 'but' as a contrastive device in a monolingual extract from our data.

(20) (Context: talking about a boy who was sent to India for schooling)

- 1 UMI he says he misses us, and he missed his friends but on the whole he
- 2 says he needed to go to India.

Here in monolingual mode, the speaker combines the use of ‘but’ with the adverbial expression ‘on the whole’ to contrast the boy missing London with his need to go to India. In example (21) below, the same speaker reinforces the contrast by codeswitching at the contrastive site:

(21) (Context: talking about a single-parent family)

- 1 UMI it’s nice when you’ve got a er good job and good money coming in
- 2 *par jidthor* you haven’t got a nice job and much money  
[*but when*]  
coming in then
- 3 trying to make a living on one of you is very hard isn’t it?

*It’s nice when you’ve got a er good job and good money coming in but when you haven’t got a nice job and much money coming in then trying to make a living on one of you is very hard isn’t it?!*

In line 2 the switch to Punjabi on the conjunction ‘but’ is followed by the further conjunction ‘when’, also in Punjabi. The conjunctions are thus highlighted by being the only Punjabi words in the sentence, and the contrast between the two situations which are described on either side of them is reinforced. Such an effect could, for example, be achieved in a monolingual context by a marked use of stress and intonation on the same words.

Codeswitches at the contrastive site can also occur before or after the conjunction without the conjunction itself being the only element affected, as can be seen in the examples below:

(22) (Context: Umi talking about her mother’s language abilities)

- 1 UMI *Hindi vi* mum *sumjendthi*, English *sumjendthi*  
[*Hindi also* mum *can-understand*, English *can-understand*  
*a par*  
*is but*]
- 2 when she wants to say it, she can’t say it
- 3 RENU yeah
- 4 AMRIT *ha*  
[*yes*]
- 5 UMI and she probably say the wrong word anyway

*/Mum can understand Hindi, she can understand English but when she wants to say it, she can’t say it, (other speakers: yeah, yes) and she probably say the wrong word anyway!*

A switch to English occurs after the Punjabi word for ‘but’ (*par*, line 2) which continues over the remainder of the speaker’s utterance. The switch assists in highlighting the most important parts of the utterance (line 2 and line 5), the information which the speaker regards as being new to her interlocutors. Interestingly, in switching as she does, the speaker is doing exactly what she is saying her mother cannot – a very apt mapping of form and meaning, made possible by codeswitching.



Example (26) presents a similar case in monolingual Punjabi in line 3:

(26) (Context: talking about how unhappy the speakers feel when they have to visit India without taking their children with them)

- 1 UMI you know their grandmother, *or aap kuvi jaaye*  
[she herself saying kept]
- 2 phone *kurke a nyaane-nu*  
[phone go-do is children-to]
- 3 BEBEJI *par ne Amrit, je arvdthe nyaane ethe suchee ni dthil lugdtha*  
[but no Amrit, if your children here really not heart stays]
- 4 AMRIT haa  
[yes]

UMI /you know their grandmother [in India], she herself kept saying go and phone the children/  
BEBEJI /but no Amrit, if you're children are here [in London], you really don't feel happy/  
AMRIT /yes/

In examples (25) and (26) the use of 'but' in turn-initial position serves as an attention-seeking strategy or 'turn gambit' – the speaker signals her intention to speak.<sup>2</sup> Such function words may also make connections across speaker turns.

The remaining extracts exemplify similar patterns of usage but combine several significant features. Firstly, as before, the conjunction 'but' occurs in a turn-initial position whether in English or Punjabi. Secondly, they show that when 'but' occurs in a turn-initial position, it is often the subject of an overlap with the previous speaker's last word(s). This again shows its function as a turn-seeking gambit. Thirdly, the turns starting with 'but' in these examples feature a switch in language from the previous speaker:

The brackets < > indicate words in overlapped speech:

(27) (Context: Renu regretting that pictures of family in India were not evident in a home video made by some of her British Asian relatives who recently visited India)

- 1 RENU *me kya ki saria nu fir dthek sugdthi*  
[I said that everyone to then see can]
- 2 kutho I haven't been to India for a long time  
[because]
- 3 UMI oh yeah so they didn't take the <family>
- 4 RENU <par> *kisi dthi family dthi ni eye vich*  
[but anyone of family of not come in]

<sup>2</sup> 'Bidding for the floor' and attention seeking does not necessarily imply competition, in a win-lose sense but may simply mean that the speaker wants to contribute to 'melding the floor'. Coates (1996) has shown how all-female groups particularly are skilled in 'uncompetitive' conversation management – they build collaboratively, rather than competitively.

RENU *// said [to myself] that I'd be able to see everyone  
because I haven't been to India for a long time/*  
 UMI */oh yeah, so they didn't take [ie. take pictures of] the family/*  
 RENU */but nobody from the family was in it [ie. in the video]/*

Renu begins her utterance in Punjabi and then in line 2 carries on in English. Umi then takes the floor in English. Then in line 3, the first speaker overlaps with Umi's last word ('family') and switches to Punjabi, signalling her reclaiming of the floor with the Punjabi *par* [but]. Renu reinforces the transition between speakers by codeswitching. At the same time, the use of 'but' in this position ties her utterance to her preceding turn, continuing the story about how, because she had not seen the relatives in India herself for a while, she was disappointed that they are not included in someone else's home video. The language switch is therefore at the same time both contrastive and cohesive. The following example demonstrates similar techniques of conversation management, but with the language switch occurring in the opposite direction:

(28) (Context: discussing future employment prospects in Britain)

1 AMRIT *es country hun joba <dtha both>*  
           *[this country now jobs of very]*  
 2 MINDI *< but > this country*  
 3 AMRIT *it finish*  
 4 MINDI *it won't last, it won't last twenty years*

AMRIT */jobs in this country now are very/*  
 MINDI */but this country/*  
 AMRIT */it finish/*  
 MINDI */it won't last, it won't last twenty years/*

Mindi's turn-initial use of 'but' in line 2 overlaps with the last two words of the previous speaker (Amrit, line 1) and coincides with a language switch.

Finally, example (29) below includes a rich pattern of switching and again clearly illustrates the use of 'but' as an attention seeking device:

(29) (Context: discussing the effect of language and the media on retaining a minority culture)

1 RENU *do you think as long as we keep on, keep our languages all the  
time matlav e <xxxx>*  
           *[meaning is (undecipherable) ]*  
 3 AMRIT *<but> you know, jeve hun a na Renu jeve hun a*  
           *[like now these see Renu like now is]*  
           *aapne Indian (erm) programme both hundthe aaj-kul*  
           *[our Indian (erm) programmes lots are these-days]*

RENU */do you think as long as we keep on, keep our languages all the  
time, I mean, xxxx/*  
 AMRIT */but you know, like now, Renu, like now you have lots of our  
Indian programmes these days/*

Renu begins in English and then, within her turn, switches to Punjabi for a potential, and in the event unrealised, expansion. Her last word is overlapped by Amrit in line 3 with an English 'but' (the overlap makes Renu's final word difficult to decipher, though it sounds like Punjabi). Amrit then 'buys floor time' with the use of 'you know', partial introductory phrases (*jeve hun a'*), meaning 'like now') and recourse to her interlocutor's name ('Renu') before making her point about the effect of Indian programming on language maintenance. Background knowledge of this speaker reveals that her dominant language is Punjabi, but we can see here that she is prepared to interject in English if she feels that this will increase her chances of being listened to, though she returns to her preferred Punjabi to make her actual point.

Thus the use of the conjunction 'but' can be seen to fulfil a number of discourse functions in these conversations. Examples (20) to (24) show how it can be used contrastively, whilst examples (25) to (29) demonstrate its use as an attention-seeking device. In this latter usage it appears that the same feature in English and Punjabi fulfils the same discourse function (i.e. it is a turn-initial, attention seeking device). One might speculate on the potential universal role of this conjunction – how many other languages also utilise this conjunction for this particular discourse function?

Goffman (1967: 13) has described the use of such strategies as the 'traffic rules of social intervention'. The additional 'vehicle' of codeswitching allows speakers to steer their way through the conversation in such a way as to reinforce or compound particular effects.

## 5. Conclusion

The main question that we set out to address was whether CS is used instead of other contextualization cues or whether it is used in addition to them. Although the bilingual speakers whose speech we have analysed here sometimes seemed to achieve the same discourse functions through their use of CS as in the monolingual portions of their conversations, the effect of CS was almost always over and above what could be achieved monolingually.

Asides were perhaps the least noteworthy of the features that we analysed: as we said earlier, here CS could be seen as equivalent to the change of voice quality or pitch that typically marks a monolingual aside. Even here, however, the fact that in asides CS coincided with a change in voice quality meant that the conversational status of an aside was effectively marked twice over. This in turn suggests that the doubly marked asides could be important points in the conversation, and it is perhaps no coincidence, therefore, that four out of five of the asides in our corpus had the function of fact-checking and were uttered with a questioning intonation. This intonation metaphorically invites the interlocutors to help check the facts in question, explicitly involving them in the joint construction of the discourse (see, on involvement, Chafe, 1982; Tannen, 1989). Studies of monolingual discourse have shown how speakers use a range of linguistic features to involve their addressees whilst they

have the floor. For example, Cheshire (1989) illustrates the use of positively polite forms such as swearing, intensifiers and the address form 'mate' in friendly arguments between friends and in the orientation sections of narratives (where the speaker intends to take an extended turn). CS, then, when used in conjunction with a change of voice quality or another prosodic feature, can take its place amongst the range of linguistic features that can function to create interactional involvement.

The dual marking of a discourse function by the use of CS was also seen in our analysis of reiteration. Reiteration in monolingual discourse has been shown to be multifunctional (Tannen, 1989; Coates, 1996). At its simplest level, it allows speakers to gain time and therefore to produce fluent speech. The mirror of this is that listeners are helped to process the utterance – particularly, of course, when there is repetition of a function word at the beginning of a clause or a clause constituent, which helps them to identify a syntactic frame (Grosjean, 1980; Jucker, 1993). Typically, however, repetition and reiteration achieve a number of additional discourse functions simultaneously. We saw that in our corpus the functions included emphasising or clarifying certain stretches of an utterance, and acting as a floor-holder. These are functions that have been identified for reiteration in monolingual discourse; when reiteration coincides with CS, however, the functions are, of course, marked twice over. Furthermore, although the reiteration was multifunctional, as would be expected, it sometimes seemed to highlight one of the functions. Thus in example (11) the syntactic hybrid emphasised the constituent occurring in both the Punjabi and the English halves of the construction, whereas in examples (7) and (8) the role of reiteration in the turn-taking mechanism of conversation was the function that appeared to be highlighted.

When CS occurred in quotation sequences the additional dimension it can bring to discourse was often very clear. As we have seen, sometimes CS helped to frame a quote – but the quote was then framed twice over, once with its quotative verb and then with the change in language. Similarly, in narratives a tense contrast between the simple past and the historic present was marked twice over when a change of language coincided with a change of tense: the involvement potential of the use of the historic present was doubled, then, by the creative display of the two languages shared by the speakers. In addition, we could sometimes identify a more global cohesive function (for example, in 19, where the framing verbs were in the same language as the story opener). On other occasions the use of CS not only marked the boundary between the quotative verb and the quote, but also gave speakers another 'voice' in which they could encode expressive meanings. This was very clear when they used Punjabi while discussing the Punjabi language or when recounting events that had taken place in a Punjabi-speaking context (this was not, of course, confined to quotes). This is the metaphorical use of CS we mentioned in the Introduction. In monolingual discourse, as we said, this function can be achieved by using a higher proportion of a specific phonetic variant. In addition to the Detroit example cited in the Introduction, Eisikovits (1991) shows how adolescent boys in Sydney use the nonstandard 'don't' variant when portraying themselves as rebellious, and the standard 'doesn't' variant when describing their more conformist behaviour; similarly, Holmes (1995) describes a female speaker's increased use of the variant when con-

structing a stereotypically gendered persona for herself through her talk. The Detroit example was mentioned earlier (Eckert, 1996). A subtle change in the use of a single phonological or morphological variant, however, although in essence comparable to the use of CS as a ‘we-code’, must be less salient to interlocutors than a change of language.

Finally, ‘but’ and *par* are quintessential examples of the way that the speakers in this study could mark textual connections within and across their utterances twice over – once with the contrastive conjunction itself and, simultaneously, with a contrast in language. We know from work on monolingual discourse, that speakers are attentive to the need to highlight structural connections for their listeners. In English, for example, speakers mark words that are becoming grammaticalized as conjunctions with the word ‘that’ until the new conjunction has become established in the language (Cheshire, 1996): ‘but’ itself, originally a preposition meaning ‘outside of’ originally occurred as ‘but that’ when used as a conjunction. ‘Seeing that’ and ‘provided that’ still occur with ‘that’ (Beal, 1988). Using CS together with a conjunction can be seen as a similar strategy to using that, allowing bilingual speakers to highlight the conjunction and the structural connections they are making within and between clauses. This was not always, apparently, necessary: just as English-speaking monolinguals do not use ‘that’ when structural connections are clear, so the bilingual speakers in these conversations use CS less frequently with ‘but’ and *par* than for the other discourse functions that we analysed. When CS did occur with the ‘but’ or *par* conjunctions, however, we could often observe an additional effect of CS. There was a wide range of such effects, depending on the context, including a precise mapping of form and content in example (22), implying a habitual action in contrast to a single event in (23), or playing a role in turn-taking, as in (25) to (29). ‘But’ can also have these roles in monolingual discourse, of course: the point is that the function is doubly marked when CS occurs and, presumably, doubly salient to interlocutors as a result. Context-dependent meanings and multifunctionality are typical of spoken language. Researchers analysing monolingual discourse have shown this to be the case for English tag questions and pragmatic particles or discourse markers, including ‘sort of’, ‘y’know’, ‘I mean’, ‘oh’ and ‘well’ (Holmes, 1995; Schiffrin, 1987; Coates, 1987). Schiffrin (1987) has demonstrated how discourse markers can simultaneously have local functions within an utterance and more global functions within the larger discourse structure. In this respect, then, CS simply displays the characteristics that one would expect of a phenomenon that is a characteristically spoken form of language.

In the same way, then, that some languages can directly encode the relationship between interlocutors through the range of available second person pronoun forms (such as the *tu* and *vous* forms in French), so there are certain functions that seem to be achieved more readily via CS than by other means (such as expressing allegiance to topics that are clearly part of the culture associated with one or other of the languages; or by highlighting one of a range of simultaneous discourse functions). Often, though, CS simply constitutes an extra possibility for speakers to use, as in the ways that we have described in this paper. In this case, although the discourse functions achieved by CS can also be achieved monolingually they are

more salient, we assume, when they are marked by CS, because they are marked twice over.

Researchers working on monolingual discourse came relatively late to an understanding of the discourse functions of forms that occur only in speech: it is not so long ago, for example, that ‘you know’ and ‘I mean’ were considered to be mere fillers and fumbles, terms reflecting the view that speakers used them only to keep the floor while planning and producing their utterance. It was only after careful analysis of their use in their discourse contexts that researchers recognised that although this may be one of their functions there are other functions with an equal or greater importance in discourse, which a single form may achieve simultaneously. In the same way, although the discourse functions of CS – another characteristically spoken phenomenon – have long been recognised, it is not until its occurrence in a discourse context is analysed that we can begin to see exactly how these functions relate to the features that occur in monolingual speech. It is unfortunate, we feel, that the analysis of monolingual variation and the analysis of bilingual CS have tended to proceed independently from each other, so that the insights achieved in one field of study have not always informed the other (see, however, Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros, 1998). Our analysis of monolingual and bilingual discourse has, we hope, shown some of the results that can be achieved by investigating the parallels that exist between the two.

## References

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna, 1998. The conversational dimension of codeswitching between Italian and dialect in Italy. In: Auer, ed., 1998a, 180–214.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, Celso, 1998. From ‘switching code’ to ‘codeswitching’: towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes. In: Auer, ed., 1998a, 29–51.
- Auer, Peter, 1991. Bilingualism in/as social action: A sequential approach to code-switching. In: Papers for the Symposium on Codeswitching in Bilingual Studies: Theory, Significance and Perspectives, Barcelona, 21–23 March 1991, 2: 319–352. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.
- Auer, Peter, 1995. The pragmatics of codeswitching. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken, eds., *One speaker, two languages*, 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter, ed., 1998a. *Codeswitching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, Peter, 1998b. Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In: Auer, ed., 1998a, 1–24.
- Bateson, Gregory, 1972. *Steps to the ecology of the mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Bauman, Richard, 1986. *Story, performance and event*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beal, Joan, 1988. Goodbye to all that: The history and present behaviour of optional that. In: G. Nixon and J. Honey, eds., 49–66. *An historic tongue: Studies in English linguistics in memory of Barbara Strang*. London: Routledge.
- Beattie, Geoffrey, 1983. ‘Talk: an analysis of speech and nonverbal behaviour in conversation’. Milton Keynes: Open Univ. Press.
- Bell, A., 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 145–204.
- Bhardwaj, Mangat Rai, 1995. *Colloquial Punjabi*. London: Routledge.
- Chafe, Wallace, 1982. Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In: Deborah Tannen, ed., *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*, 35–54. Norwood, NJ Ablex.
- Chana, Usha and Suzanne Romaine, 1984. Evaluative reactions to Punjabi/English codeswitching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6: 447–473.

- Charles, Reeva, 1995. Codeswitching in the Punjabi-English community in Britain: A mixed code. MA dissertation, Department of Applied Linguistics, Birkbeck College, London.
- Cheshire, Jenny, 1989. Addressee-oriented features in spoken discourse. *York Papers in Linguistics* 13: 49–83.
- Cheshire, Jenny, 1996. *That jacksprat*: An interactional perspective on English *that*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 369–393.
- Cheshire, Jenny and Penelope Gardner-Chloros, 1998. Codeswitching and the sociolinguistic gender pattern. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 129: 5–34.
- Clyne, Michael, 1967. Transference and triggering: Observations on the language assimilation of post-war German-speaking migrants in Australia. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Coates, Jennifer, 1988. Gossip revisited. In: J. Coates and D. Cameron, eds., 94–122. *Women in their speech communities*, . New York: Longman.
- Coates, J., 1994. 'No gap, lots of overlap: turn-taking patterns in the talk of women friends'. In: David Graddol, Janet Maybin and Barry Stierer, eds., *Language and Literacy in Social Context*. Clevedon Multilingual Matters.
- Coates, Jennifer, 1996. *Women talk: Conversations between women friends*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eckert, Penelope, 1996. (Ay) goes to the city: Exploring the expressive use of variation. In: G.R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin and J. Baugh, eds., *Towards a social science of language*, vol. 1: Variation and change in language and society, 47–68. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Edwards, Viv, 1988. The speech of British Black women in Dudley. In: J. Coates and D. Cameron, eds., *Women in their speech communities*, 33–50. New York: Longman.
- Eisikovits, Edina, 1991. Variation in subject-verb agreement in Inner Sydney English. In: J. Cheshire, ed., *English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives*, 235–255. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franceschini, Rita, 1998. Codeswitching and the notion of code in linguistics: proposals for a dual-focus model. In: Auer, ed., 1998a, 51–75.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope, 1991. *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, Erving, 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, Erving, 1967. On face work. In: E. Goffman, ed., *Interaction ritual*, 5–46. New York: Anchor Books.
- Grosjean, François, 1980. Temporal variables within and between languages. In: H. Deckert and M. Raufauch, eds., *Towards a cross-linguistic assessment of speech production*, 39–53. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Grosjean, François, 1998. Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1(2): 131–149.
- Gumperz, John J., 1982 *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J., 1984. Communicative competence revisited. In: D. Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, form and use in context: Linguistic applications* (Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics), 278–289. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan, 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halmari, Helena and Wendy Smith, 1994. Codeswitching and register shift: Evidence from Finnish-English child bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 427–445.
- Heller, Monica, ed., 1988a. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, Monica, 1988b. Strategic ambiguity: codeswitching in the management of conflict. In: Heller, ed., 1988a: 77–96.
- Holmes, Janet, 1995. *Women, men and politeness*. Harlow: Longman.
- Jucker, Andreas, 1993. Irrelevant repetitions: A challenge to relevance theory. Paper presented at 7th SAUTE Symposium, Repetition in language and literature, Zürich, May 7, 1993.
- Labov, William, 1972. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In: W. Labov, ed., *Language in the inner city*, 354–397. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Li Wei, 1994. Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mobbs, M., 1985. *Britain's South Asian Languages*. London: Regent's College, Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

- Moyer, Melissa G., 1998. Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In: Auer, ed., 1998a, 215–234.
- Muysken, Pieter, 1995. 'Code-switching and grammatical theory'. In: One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching, eds., Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken Cambridge, CUP.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol, 1983. The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code-choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44: 432–443.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol, 1988. Code-switching as Indexical of Social Negotiation in Heller, M, ed., Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol, 1993a. Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol, 1993b. Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nishimura, Miwa, 1995. A functional analysis of Japanese/English codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 157–181.
- Oesch Serra, Cecilia, 1998. Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: The case of an emerging Italian-French mixed code. In: Auer, ed., 1998b, 101–122.
- Poplack, Shana, 1988. Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In: Heller, ed., 1988a, 215–244.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik, 1985. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman.
- Romaine, Suzanne, 1995. Bilingualism. Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Romaine, Suzanne and D. Lange, 1998. The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thought: A case of grammaticalization in progress. In: J. Cheshire and P. Trudgill, eds., *The sociolinguistics reader*, vol. 2: Gender and discourse, 240–278. London: Arnold.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emmanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel, 1982. *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1981. Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57(1): 45–62.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sneddon, R., forthcoming. *Language and literacy in the multilingual family*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Birkbeck College, London.
- Tannen, Deborah, 1984. *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, Deborah, 1989. *Talking Voices: repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valdès-Fallis, G., 1977. Codeswitching among bilingual Mexican-American women: Towards an understanding of sex-related language alteration. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 17: 65–72.
- Weinreich, Uriel, 1963. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- White, R., 1997. Back channeling, repair, pausing and private speech. *Applied Linguistics* 18: 315–344.
- Widdowson, H.G., 1978. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolfson, Nessa, 1982. *CHP: The conversational historical present in American English narrative*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Woolard, Kathryn A., 1988. Codeswitching and comedy in Catalonia. In: Heller, ed., 1988a, 53–76.

**Appendix: Functions/patterns/principal factors in selection and switching**

Gumperz (1982)	Saville-Troike (1982)	Valdès-Fallis (1977)	Gardner-Chloros
A. Quotations	A. Softening or strengthening of request or command	(i) <i>Switching patterns which occur in response to external factors</i>	(1) <i>Speaker's competence</i> (Saville-Troike E, Gumperz B, Valdès-Fallis G)
B. Addressee specification	B. Intensification/elimination of ambiguity (repetition)	A. Situational switches	(2) <i>Perception of the interlocutor</i> (Gumperz B, Saville-Troike F, Valdès-Fallis M)
C. Interjections	C. Humorous effect/direct quotation/imitation	B. Contextual switches	(3) <i>Characteristics of the particular conversation</i> (Gumperz F, Saville-Troike C, D, G, H)
D. Reiteration	D. Ideological statement	C. Identity markers	(4) <i>Characteristics of spoken language</i> (Gumperz A, C, D, E, Saville-Troike A, B, C, G, Valdès-Fallis H, J, L)
E. Message qualification	E. Lexical need	D. Proper nouns	(5) <i>Deeper reasons</i>
F. Personalization v. objectivization	F. Exclusion of other people within hearing	E. Quotations and paraphrases	(i) Individual characteristics (Valdès I);
	G. Avoidance strategy	(ii) <i>Switching patterns occurring in response to internal factors</i>	(ii) language change;
	H. Repair strategy	F. Random switches of high-frequency items	(iii) ethnic compromise (Valdès F);
		G. Switches which reflect lexical need	(iv) social behaviour (Valdès N).
		H. Triggered switches	
		I. Preformulations	
		J. Discourse markers	
		K. Quotations and paraphrases	
		L. Metaphorical switches	
		M. Sequential switches	
		N. Associative responses	

From Gardner-Chloros (1991: 180)

**Penelope Gardner-Chloros** is Lecturer in the Department of Applied Linguistics at Birkbeck College, London. She has carried out research on codeswitching in Alsace and in the Greek-Cypriot community in London. Her publications include *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg* and, as co-editor, *Vernacular Literacy*, both published by Oxford University Press.

**Reeva Charles** is a researcher and visiting lecturer. Her research interests include sociolinguistics, codeswitching, conversation analysis and Punjabi. She has carried out research on codeswitching amongst the British Sikh Punjabi community in London and within the British Asian media.

**Jenny Cheshire** is Professor of Linguistics at Queen Mary and Westfield College, University of London. Her research interests are in sociolinguistics, especially language variation and change, spoken grammar, and language and gender. Recent books include *Taming the Vernacular*, with Dieter Stein, and a two volume *Sociolinguistics reader*, with Peter Trudgill.