

Copyright
by
Kimberly Lynn Dahl
2009

**The Thesis Committee for Kimberly Lynn Dahl
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:**

Audience Design and Code-Switching in Bayside, Texas

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisors:

Lars Hinrichs

Megan Crowhurst

Audience Design and Code-Switching in Bayside, Texas

by

Kimberly Lynn Dahl, B.A.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2009

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Jennifer Lang and Shawn Warner-Garcia, co-conspirators in the Bayside invasion and colleagues whose collaboration and support proved invaluable.

4 December 2009

Abstract

Audience Design and Code-Switching in Bayside, Texas

Kimberly Lynn Dahl, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2009

Supervisors: Lars Hinrichs
Megan Crowhurst

This study casts the code-switching patterns observed among Spanish-English bilinguals in Bayside, Texas within the framework of Bell's (1984) theory of audience design, which is claimed to apply to both monolingual style-shifting as well as bilingual code-switching. The latter part of this claim has been little explored. The intent of this study, then, is to determine if the explanatory power of audience design, as demonstrated in studies on style-shifting, does indeed hold when applied to cases of language alternation.

Analysis of the data from Bayside generally supports Bell's theory as it shows speakers adjusting their use of Spanish and/or English to suit their audience. The study will highlight a less frequently analyzed aspect of Bell's model, i.e., the role of the auditor, and will call for the auditor to be classified as a primary influencer of linguistic choice in bilingual contexts, alongside the addressee.

The code selection patterns exhibited by a pair of Bayside residents in a series of interviews and in conversations videotaped at the local general store will be compared to illustrate the effects of addressee and auditor. A qualitative analysis will demonstrate that differing determinations regarding the linguistic repertoires of the auditors led to contrasting linguistic choices on the part of the study's subjects. The data collected will show that, when selecting a language of communication, as opposed to a register, style, or dialect, a speaker may be more greatly affected by an auditor than by the addressee. The methods used in collecting the data will also support an expansion of Bell's model to include an additional participant category suitable for capturing the effect of the recording device, as per Wertheim (2006).

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Approaches to the Study of Code-Switching	4
2.1	Situational and metaphorical code-switching	5
2.2	The markedness model	7
2.3	The conversation analytic approach	11
2.4	Summary	14
Chapter 3	Designing for the Listener	16
3.1	Speech accommodation theory	16
3.2	Audience design	18
3.3	Applying audience design	23
3.3.1	Youssef	23
3.3.2	Rickford and McNair-Knox	25
3.4	Summary	27
Chapter 4	Code-Switching in Bayside, Texas	28
4.1	Background	28
4.2	Data	30
4.3	Discussion and analysis	33
4.3.1	Metalinguistic commentary	33
4.3.2	Audience design in Bayside	37
4.4	Summary	49
Chapter 5	Conclusions	52
Appendix:	Transcription Conventions	57
References	58
Vita	62

Chapter 1

Introduction

In 2000, there were nearly 10 million Spanish speakers in the southern United States (Shin & Bruno 2003). More recently, an estimated 6.3 million Texans reported speaking Spanish at home (U.S. Census 2008). Border towns such as Laredo, McAllen, and Brownsville, Texas document Spanish-speaking rates of up to 91% of the population (Shin & Bruno 2003). Further north, the number of non-English-speaking households drops, but the relative prominence of Spanish remains. Corpus Christi, Texas, some 230 miles from the Mexican border, reports that over 39% of its population speaks a language other than English at home; a similar rate is found in Bayside, Texas, a further 40 miles from the southern border (U.S. Census 2000).

Owing to this proximity to Mexico, and the resultant sociocultural and economic ties between populations on both sides of the border, many south Texas towns can be labeled as stable immigrant communities. Per Myers-Scotton (1993a), such communities are often found near political boundaries, especially those settled relatively recently. They are frequently characterized by a division of labor for the languages in use in the community: one serves as the medium of communication for official purposes, while another is more widely spoken as a first language in the home. Both recent and long-standing immigrants maintain close ties to the home community and may use language to highlight their dual identities.

Bayside, Texas, which provides the locus for this study, exhibits many of the characteristics of a stable immigrant community, including the widespread use of both Spanish and English in a single conversation. This pattern of code-switching distinguishes Bayside from monolingual communities and is highlighted by residents prompted to describe the typical linguistic behavior of Baysiders. This study analyzes this particular practice as it is demonstrated by two bilingual Bayside residents, with a focus on the factors that motivate them to use Spanish, English, or both in conversation.

A number of linguists have proposed theories that explain the motivations behind code-switching and methodologies that identify the role of code-switching in conversation. Three of the most prominent approaches—those of Gumperz, Myers-Scotton, and Auer—are surveyed in the next chapter. Though drawing on some of the insight from this body of code-switching research, this study employs a model not specific to bilingual speech, but rather one that seeks to explain all instances of style-shifting. Bell's theory of audience design, summarized in chapter three, assumes all shifts in style, dialect, and language to be chiefly motivated by a response to one's interlocutors. This model has served as a sound theoretical framework in a number of studies demonstrating the effect of the audience, especially the addressee, on a speaker's linguistic choices. These studies have, however, focused primarily on cases of monolingual style-shifting or code-switching between varieties of a single language.

The present study offers a new application of the theory of audience design, as it is used to analyze code-switching between two different languages. The study will

show that, when a speaker selects a language of communication, as opposed to a register or style, it is not necessarily the addressee who garners the greatest consideration from the speaker as she makes her linguistic choices; rather, the presence of an auditor, i.e., a conversation participant who is not the direct recipient of the speaker's utterance, may supersede the effect of the addressee. The comparison of code selection patterns exhibited by a pair of Bayside residents demonstrates this little explored component of audience design, which is discussed in detail in chapter four. The study will compare the use (or non-use) of Spanish by the two informants in interviews with three researchers and in conversations recorded in the local general store. A qualitative analysis will demonstrate that differing determinations regarding the linguistic repertoires of the auditors led to contrasting linguistic choices on the part of the study's subjects.

Chapter 2

Approaches to the Study of Code-Switching

Though bilingualism has long been considered a reasonable focus of linguistic research, the particular bilingual speech practice of code-switching faced a plodding struggle to gain legitimacy as something more than a peculiar and idiosyncratic phenomenon. The alternation between two or more linguistic systems in a single communicative exchange was dismissed by researchers as linguistic behavior lacking systematicity and therefore lacking import. As a supposed ‘willy-nilly mixture’ of languages (Lance 1969, cited in Timm 1975), code-switching received little but deprecatory attention until Blom and Gumperz’ (1972) Hemnesberget study pulled the slighted practice to the forefront of sociolinguistic research. A lasting interest in code-switching has since been maintained by scholars of bilingual speech.

Investigations into code-switching have been undertaken by researchers in three primary linguistic subfields. The structural approach seeks to identify grammatical constraints that limit acceptable surface structures of intrasentential switching (cf. Timm 1975; Poplack 1980; and Myers-Scotton 1993a). Psycholinguistic research looks to code-switching as a speech practice that can illuminate the neurological processes active in the bilingual brain (cf. Köppe & Meisel 1995; Bolonyai 2009). The sociolinguistic approach, which this study will take, aims to explain speakers’ motivations to

switch codes within a single interaction and to identify the social meanings conveyed by such choices (cf. Gumperz 1982; Myers-Scotton 1993b; and Auer 1984).

2.1 SITUATIONAL AND METAPHORICAL CODE-SWITCHING

The roots of sociolinguistic research on code-switching lie in Blom and Gumperz' (1972) investigation into the alternation between two Norwegian dialects by speakers in the small community of Hemnesberget. The study presented the first iteration of the situational-metaphorical dichotomy of code-switching. When a speaker responds to changes in the context of an interaction, such as new interlocutors or topic shifts, with a corresponding change in language, this is held as an example of situational code-switching. This response to alterations in situation is crucially linked to the assumption of a 'one-to-one relationship between language use and social context' (Gumperz 1982:61). Gumperz' definition of situational code-switching has been criticized for overlooking the agency of the individual in linguistic choice, when personal volition is active even where societal norms dictate the appropriate language for a given context (Hinrichs 2006).

Gumperz does allow for the speaker's will in a type of alternation he terms metaphorical switching.¹ When language use is conventionalized to such a degree as indicated above, speakers can then exploit these norms to instigate changes in context.

¹ Though later re-labeled 'conversational' code-switching (Gumperz 1982), the original terminology remains prevalent throughout sociolinguistic literature. This tradition will be maintained here.

Through a metaphorical switch a speaker can borrow the flavor of a situation correlated with a particular linguistic variety by adopting that variety in another interaction.

For example, consider a community where language A is commonly used in intimate exchanges with friends and family, while language B is the customary medium of communication in the domains of government and education. Speakers may switch to language B while conversing with close acquaintances to create distance or to lend an air of authority to an argument. Gumperz (1982) presents as an example the case of a disagreement in an Austrian household where a woman breaks custom by speaking German in response to her husband, who is using the usual language of the home, Slovenian. By employing a language symbolic of officialdom, she seeks to portray her position as more legitimate.

Similarly, a speaker in the hypothetical community introduced above might adopt language A in an official context in an effort to reduce the formality of the conversation or to make a personal appeal. Myers-Scotton (1993a) refers to an exchange in a government office where a visitor addresses a clerk in a code associated with friendship and intimacy to evoke sympathy and receive the clerk's assistance in resolving a sensitive matter.

The crux of Gumperz' theory lies in the notion that a switch from one code to another carries more than referential meaning. The alternation's social significance is derived from the usage norms established within the community, i.e., the 'direct relationship between language and the social situation' (Blom & Gumperz 1972:424). Through real-world observation of this conventionalized linguistic behavior, speakers

develop the means to interpret the extra-referential meaning of a change in code, or more accurately, they develop the intuition that such a change requires a reinterpretation of the utterance's significance. Code-switching, then, is a 'signaling mechanism' or, to use Gumperz' (1982) well-entrenched term, a 'contextualization cue' that directs recipients to decipher an additional layer of meaning in the conversational turn.

Evident in Gumperz' theory is the view of code-switching as a communicative resource that bilingual speakers can exploit to convey unspoken messages. This creative use of available codes is analogous to a monolingual's use of prosody, diction, and syntactic structure, among other linguistic tools, to construct social significance in conversation. The meanings carried by a switch in language are interaction-specific, and Gumperz makes no claims of universality of meaning or predictability of switches.

2.2 THE MARKEDNESS MODEL

Though Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (MM) also steers clear of claiming predictive capabilities, the theory is indeed proffered as a universal model of code-switching, or quite possibly a model of all multilingual speech practices, as critics assert (Meeuwis & Blommaert 1994). Myers-Scotton has refined and reapplied the MM with regularity since its first appearance in sociolinguistic literature (Myers-Scotton 1983).

The MM is founded upon the notion of a discernible distinction between marked and unmarked codes. According to Myers-Scotton, speakers possess an inher-

ent ability to assess the relative markedness of linguistic varieties for a given context. Through the observation of and participation in community interactions, speakers supply the real-world input that gives this markedness evaluator relevance in that community. Like Gumperz, Myers-Scotton assumes each community is subject to pervasive conventions that dictate which language is appropriate for a particular social situation. Speakers are aware of these norms and are often compelled by societal power distributions to comply with them, even when the desires of the individual conflict (Myers-Scotton 1998).

In adapting Grice's (1975) cooperative principle Myers-Scotton (1983) submits five negotiation maxims as central components of her theory. The deference maxim explains code-switching in instances of favor-requesting or influence-wielding. The virtuosity maxim mandates that speakers will select the code shared by the greatest number of interlocutors. This allows for the suspension of community norms in favor of maximizing participation opportunities. Language alternation resulting from a search for the appropriate variety for a particular situation is explained by the exploratory choice maxim. Such switching is likely to occur where the interaction is not conventionalized, i.e., agreement on the proper code for the exchange is not settled in the community. Also prevalent in non-conventionalized interactions is the multiple identities maxim. Here, speakers may take advantage of the unestablished norm to reveal affiliations with more than one group through the use of multiple varieties, each of which may be associated with a certain population.

The fifth maxim derives its functionality from the marked-unmarked distinction at the core of Myers-Scotton's theory. The unmarked choice maxim directs speakers to adhere to current conventions by selecting the expected code and thereby agreeing to the rights-and-obligations (RO) sets assigned to interactants in a given situation. The real power of this maxim, however, comes from occasions in which it is disregarded. In 'flouting the maxim' speakers attempt to negotiate a new RO set, one not typically associated with the interaction at hand (Myers-Scotton 1983:127). Myers-Scotton claims that use of an unexpected variety is almost always motivated by and received with emotion (*ibid.*). Certainly the selection of a marked choice can be said to reflect a motivation to convey extra-referential meaning. The convergence with Gumperz' metaphorical code-switching is evident. Both a metaphorical switch and the use of a marked code derive their significance from the establishment of linguistic norms, which are disobeyed through these linguistic choices. Also, both types of code-switching offer speakers a resource to enhance or alter the denotative meaning of their utterances.

The most recent formulation of the MM casts it as a rational choice model (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001). The key components of the theory already discussed—the markedness evaluator, RO sets, and negotiation maxims—remain in place, while the origin of code-switching motivations is expounded upon. In a framework of rational choice, the MM holds cost-benefit analysis to be the prime mover of linguistic choice. Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai contrast this proposal with the variationist approach, which grants motivational power to external social factors such

as gender and ethnicity, and the conversation analytic approach, which claims speakers are most influenced by a desire to organize the turns of a conversation. With a nod to the descriptive powers of these approaches, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai assert that a rationally based MM closes the chasm between the two methods.

The updated MM includes a three-step, cognitively based process that leads speakers to select a particular medium for a given communicative exchange. The first step draws upon the linguistic repertoire of the speaker. The desire to communicate an intention is first constrained by the varieties available to the speaker and the societal norms and group preferences that act upon the use of these varieties. Of all the codes at the speaker's disposal, only a select number would be socially acceptable for the interaction; speakers are aware of and, often, obedient to these norms.

The second step calls to action two innate 'architectures' that are supported by real-world experience (ibid, 13). One is the previously described markedness evaluator; the other constitutes the speaker's knowledge of possible outcomes given a particular linguistic choice. The speaker knows which codes are expected and which are marked for the situation at hand. She also assumes, based on prior experience, the likelihood of achieving a preferred outcome through use of a marked versus an unmarked code.

Rational choice constitutes the third and final filter. Through another triadic series of operations speakers decide upon their personal goals, reconcile these with 'prior beliefs,' and select the medium of communication most apt to achieve the original aim (ibid., 14). The focus, then, is on intentionality, as 'actors intend their actions to

reflect goals or attitudes, and observers attribute intentions to actions' (ibid., 12). In contrast with other theories of linguistic choice (e.g., accommodation theory), the focus is on the self, as the speaker's ultimate goal in language selection is to see her own desires fulfilled. Her consideration of the values of the addressee only goes so far as to determine which variety will most likely lead to the addressee's cooperation in meeting the speaker's goals. The speaker weighs the costs and benefits of each code in her repertoire and opts to use that for which the scale is furthest tilted toward benefiting herself.

2.3 THE CONVERSATION ANALYTIC APPROACH

Around the same time that Myers-Scotton was formulating her theoretical approach to code-switching, Auer introduced another method proposed to explain language alternation by bilingual speakers. Though his canon may be less extensive than Myers-Scotton's, his conversation analytic (CA) approach has been applied by a number of scholars (cf. Wei & Milroy 1995; Wei 1998 and 2005; Garafanga 2009; and papers in Auer 1998).

Auer's analysis of code-switching derives its explanatory power from a recognition of the interactional 'tasks' with which interlocutors are charged, namely to organize the conversation and to establish a 'proper language of interaction' (Auer 1984:24). Like Gumperz, Auer identifies a pair of code-switching types, each of which is tied to these conversational duties. The former task may be achieved through what Auer terms 'discourse-related switching,' and the latter through 'participant-related

switching' (ibid., 12). These alternation types are submitted not as discrete categories but as poles on a continuum. Because many instances of language alternation can be shown to demonstrate characteristics of both orders of switching, a fixed delimitation between switches motivated by discourse and those inspired by the individual characteristics of conversation participants is neither practicable nor useful. Having noted this, however, these two code-switching classes can be defined by the characteristics of their furthest removed forms.

Discourse-related switching functions primarily as an organizational device. For example, a change in the language of interaction may serve as a dispreference marker or a repair initiator (Wei & Milroy 1995), or as a means of establishing sequential subordination or double cohesion (Auer 1984). Of notable importance is that these organizational devices are not considered unique to bilingual conversation. The bilingual speaker, rather, may implement them with any of the tools at the disposal of the monolingual speaker—intonation, grammatical structure, lexical choice—as well as through exploitation of the bilingual competence shared with interlocutors.

These devices, and other examples of discourse-related switching, operate similarly to Gumperz' contextualization cues. A change in the language of interaction serves as a strategy to establish a 'new footing' or to guide an addressee to recognize a change in context (ibid., 17). This points to a crucial distinction between the CA approach and the macro-sociolinguistic theory of Myers-Scotton; where the latter sees code-switching as a context-initiated response, the former views the practice as itself contributing to the creation of context.

Participant-related switching often relates personal characteristics about the speaker, namely her language preferences and proficiency levels, rather than interactional intentions. This type of code-switching is motivated by a 'preference for same language talk' (ibid., 23), or for 'same medium talk,' per Garafanga (2009:124), where a bilingual medium is an optional mode of communication. Participant-related switching is often manifested as a language negotiation sequence in which a speaker may use a contrastive language choice to indicate her beliefs about what would be an appropriate language of interaction for a particular situation or to direct her interlocutors to use a variety with which she is most comfortable.

What most distinguishes Auer's approach from other code-switching models is a firm fixation on local meanings and participant interpretations. Though later treatments of the CA model (Auer 1998; Wei 2005) are careful to grant relevance to macrosociolinguistic factors, for Auer an explanation of the motivations behind language alternation is crucially rooted in local, interactional processes. Other approaches are criticized for their reliance upon the extra-conversational knowledge of the analyst that is called upon to explain the linguistic behavior of participants (Auer 1984). The CA approach, on the other hand, sees code-switching as first and foremost a 'conversational event' (Auer 1998:1). Meaning is created, transmitted, and interpreted *in situ*, and as such should be analyzed based upon its impact on the conversation at hand.

The local focus of the CA approach is manifested in part by the primacy of sequentiality in code-switching analyses. An utterance gleans its relevance in large part

from its position relative to preceding and succeeding remarks. This interconnectedness of conversational turns, which is a key component of general CA theory, is particularly salient when the interaction involves more than one language. The code selection for one turn has a significant impact on the options available to, or rather, likely to be employed by, subsequent turn-takers. When language alternation does occur, it is principally the contrast with the previously used variety that points the listener to extra-referential meaning.

The CA approach and its locally based focus is also characterized by an ‘emic perspective’ on conversational meaning and implicature (Garafanga 2009:117). To attach extra-referential meaning to an instance of code-switching, the analyst must be able to point to participant ratification of the supposed intention. For example, a linguist may claim that a speaker has adopted a new language of interaction to catch the attention of a previously unresponsive interlocutor; however, unless the assumption of this intention is supported by the actions of the participants—success in garnering a response, perhaps—it stands as little more than the analyst’s external imposition of meaning.

2.4 SUMMARY

The above summary of theoretical approaches to code-switching, though not an exhaustive depiction of research in the field, presents an overview of the principal actors in the development of code-switching as a worthy focus of linguistic research. Though the contrast between Myers-Scotton’s and Auer’s models, the two most

prominent proposals stemming from Gumperz' seminal work, is evident, one shared feature is equally salient: In both theories, as well as in Gumperz' analysis, the practice of code-switching is grouped with those linguistic resources utilized by monolingual speakers to convey extra-referential meaning. Thus, language alternation does not constitute a separate category of contextualization cue; rather it functions similarly to linguistic tools such as intonation, accent, and lexical choice. The difference, of course, is that the particular tool of code-switching is only available to speakers proficient in multiple codes. It should be made explicit, however, that these monolingual resources are also at the disposal of the bilingual speaker; language alternation simply represents another option, along with language-static syntactic, lexical, and prosodic choices.

The linguists surveyed in this chapter have thus drawn the analogy of bilingual code-switching to monolingual style-shifting, which is a stance well supported in sociolinguistic research. Analyses of the alternation between two dialects of a single language, for example, have been undertaken by both code-switching and style-shifting researchers (cf. Blom & Gumperz 1972; Beebe 1981; and Bucholtz 1999). Code-switching, then, is viewed as a type of bilingual style-shifting. This sub-classification allows scholars to look beyond the body of code-switching research for explanatory models of language alternation. The following chapter will do just that, looking to one particular model of style-shifting, Bell's audience design, to explain the motivation behind some instances of code-switching.

Chapter 3

Designing for the Listener

3.1 SPEECH ACCOMMODATION THEORY

Stylistic variation refers to the dynamic use of language exhibited by individual speakers according to the situation. Speakers may adjust their rate of speech, for example, or may vary the frequency of certain morphosyntactic, lexical, and phonological features. A number of factors have been said to influence a speaker's style selection, including topic, setting, and the level of attention paid to speech. The last of these factors long dominated the results in studies employing Labovian interview techniques designed to elicit increasingly casual styles on a continuum of levels of attention paid to speech (cf. Labov 1966). Some years later, Giles and Powesland (1975) developed a socio-psychological framework called accommodation theory that focused on the effect of the listener rather than the self-monitoring of the speaker.

According to accommodation theory, speakers adjust their speech in an effort to gain the approval of the listener. To do so, the speaker is apt to adopt a style that more closely resembles her interlocutor's speech patterns, whether accurately assessed or based on imperfect assumptions; this process is called convergence. In a claim evocative of a rational choice model, accommodation theory contends that speakers evaluate the potential costs and benefits of such adjustments to their audience. Where costs outweigh the rewards, speakers will maintain their baseline speech patterns or

may diverge from those of their co-conversants. In some cases, a speaker will converge on some features while diverging on others in a practice termed 'speech complementarity' (Thakerer, Giles, & Cheshire 1982:218).

Of central importance to the theory of speech accommodation is 'the influence of the receiver' (Giles & Powesland 1975:136), whether as individuals or perceived representatives of a group (Thakerer et al. 1982). A number of subsequent studies issued support for Giles and Powesland's analysis, demonstrating that variation may occur in response to a number of addressee characteristics, including ethnicity (Beebe 1981), gender (Valdés-Fallis 1977), socioeconomic status (Coupland 1984), and race (Rickford & McNair-Knox 1994).

Though submitted under the heading of a 'speech style' theory and often applied to cases of monolingual stylistic variation, accommodation theory indeed encompasses bilingual shifts in code, reaffirming the classification of code-switching as a form of style-shifting. Giles' own work on the evaluation of language selection by English and French Canadians, as well as Simard, Taylor, and Giles' follow-up study (as cited in Giles & Powesland 1975), provide much of the data used in the original development of accommodation theory. Valdés-Fallis (1977) also applied accommodation theory to a bilingual context, looking at gender-based accommodation in participants' alternations between Spanish and English.

3.2 AUDIENCE DESIGN

In a theory sharing much with that proposed by Giles and his colleagues, Bell's (1984) audience design model seeks not to promote the primacy of the audience, but rather its exclusivity in influencing linguistic choice. Audience design has replaced previous style-shifting models, such as Labov's attention-to-speech continuum, for its ability to 'account for such diverse behavior as bilingual code-switching, politeness strategies, and caretaker speech' among other types of linguistic variation (Wertheim 2006:712).

Neither the concept of audience design nor the term originated with Bell's work on style-shifting. The concept, of course, had already been proposed through Giles et al.'s development of accommodation theory, while the term is found in Clark and Carlson's (1982) illocutionary acts hypotheses. Just as in Bell's framework, Clark and Carlson's model involves several categories of conversant roles, including speaker, participant, which subsumes the roles of addressee and side-participant, and over-hearer. This earlier version of audience design claims that speakers design their speech based on what they assume their hearers 'know, believe, and suppose' (ibid., 342). Clark and Carlson were not, however, concerned with stylistic decisions made by speakers; rather, their application of audience design was of a more conversation-analytic approach, as they looked at hearers' roles in particular illocutionary acts called informatives.

Bell's formulation of audience design, on the other hand, is solely focused on stylistic variation. He proposes to answer one of the elemental questions of sociolin-

guistics and to address the primary concern of style research: '*Why did this speaker say it this way on this occasion?*' (Bell 2001:139; original emphasis). For Bell, the answer is that the speaker is influenced by her audience.

One of the core propositions of Bell's theory is that stylistic variation has its roots in social variation. This intra/interspeaker link had been observed in many sociolinguistic studies preceding Bell, including Labov's foundational style-shifting research in New York City (1972). As certain linguistic features come to be associated with certain groups, speakers can exploit the evaluations of these groups and their stereotypical language practices to add meaning to their own utterances. These associations and evaluations create linguistic norms that speakers can adhere to or disregard, a notion examined earlier in Blom and Gumperz' (1972) metaphorical code-switching and Myers-Scotton's marked code choices (1983).

Another of Bell's propositions and the essence of the theory is that 'speakers design their style primarily for and in response to their audience' (Bell 2001:143). This audience is modeled as several concentric circles, each one representing a category of hearer defined by her status as (un)known, (un)ratified, and (un)addressed by the speaker, who is the assigner of hearer roles (Bell 1984). The speaker stands at the center of the model, indicating her position as the conveyor of a message delivered to multiple recipients and representing her susceptibility to the influence of each audience level. The distance between the circle representing a participant category and the center corresponds to the strength of the potential influence that participant will have on the speaker's linguistic choices.

The addressee is typically the most influential co-conversant by virtue of being the most salient, i.e., known, ratified, and addressed. Addressees have an even greater effect on the speaker than her own self-monitoring, as seen in Mahl's (1972; as cited in Bell 1984) 'deaf' speaker study, from which Bell derives convincing evidence for the audience design model. Mahl's experiment revealed that his subjects' speech was more greatly affected, as judged by level of formality, when the interviewer was visually absent than when the speaker lost the ability to hear her own speech.

At the next level of audience is the auditor. Auditors are both known and ratified, but not addressed (Bell 1984). They are roughly equivalent to Clark and Carlson's (1982) side-participants in that auditors are indeed part of the interaction at hand. Though the speaker's utterance may be directed only at the addressee, she is still likely to take into account the characteristics, beliefs, and speech patterns of the auditor, whom she knows will be a recipient of her statements.

The outer two audience levels consist of overhearers and eavesdroppers. Neither is addressed nor ratified; the presence of overhearers, however, is known to the speaker (Bell 1984). Though overhearers and eavesdroppers are not invited participants in the conversation, it is possible that they may still possess some clout in determining the selected style of a speaker, who may be concerned about the accurate interpretation of her utterances.

The order in which the four hearer roles are listed above corresponds to their respective levels of influence on the speaker's linguistic choices. This influence often, though not necessarily, corresponds to physical proximity to or orientation toward the

speaker. As one moves to each further removed hearer role, a progressively weakened effect on the speaker is expected. Not surprisingly, then, applications of audience design have tended to focus on the impact of the addressee on speakers' styles, as this is usually the most conspicuous.

Bell does acknowledge that other, non-personal factors, such as topic and setting, may also play a role in motivating stylistic variation (Bell 1984). He asserts, however, that shifts occurring seemingly in response to topic or setting are actually instigated by 'the underlying association of topics or settings with typical audience members' (Bell 2001:146). A canonical example is of a speaker discussing a topic drawn from within the domain of education; this speaker is likely to adopt a style associated with the typical addressee for this topic, presumably an educator. This was exemplified by the code-switching practices of university students in Blom & Gumperz' (1972) Hemnesberget observations, where these informants switched to the Bokmal dialect associated with education and an out-group identity. In this way, speakers design their utterance for an audience not necessarily present in the moment of the exchange.

This practice of adjusting style for an absent audience is further explicated in the presentation of the sub-theory of audience design known as referee design. (Bell 1984). Where audience design is primarily responsive, referee design captures the initiative dimension of style-shifting, i.e., the ability of a speaker to renegotiate the social and linguistic conventions dictating the appropriate style to be used with the

current audience. Again, the similarity to the concepts of metaphorical and marked code-switching, which instigate such negotiations and redefinitions, is conspicuous.

As was assumed under Giles and Powesland's presentation of accommodation theory (1975), Bell affords his model the ability to explain both monolingual style-shifting as well as bilingual code-switching. He states that:

...the processes which make a monolingual shift styles are the same as those which make a bilingual switch languages. Any theory of style needs to encompass both monolingual and multilingual repertoires—that is, all the shifts a speaker may make within her linguistic repertoire (Bell 2001:145).

Bell lives up to this statement by culling evidence for audience design from several studies involving multilingual language alternation (cf. Maori/English in Bell 2001; English/Gaelic in Dorian 1981; and Buang/Tok Pisin/Yabem in Sankoff 1980). In one of his later treatments of audience design, Bell (1999) draws upon bilingual variation frameworks, such as those proffered by Blom and Gumperz (1972) and Myers-Scotton (1993b), and groups them with monolingual approaches like that of Coupland (1996; cited in Bell 1999) as theories all seeking to explain the same processes of linguistic variation.

Bell's model has not been uncontroversial in its attempt to offer an explanatory theory of style-shifting. In particular, his ideas about shifts related to non-personal factors, e.g., topic and setting, and the notion of referee design have drawn some skepticism. Even those who concede that audience possesses powerful influence over a speaker's linguistic behavior find some difficulty in drawing unquestionable proof of

these theoretical components. With these caveats in mind, however, it is possible to find compelling evidence in favor of Bell's propositions.

3.3 APPLYING AUDIENCE DESIGN

Several studies, both preceding and succeeding Bell (1984), have documented the effect audience has on a speaker's linguistic choices. This section will summarize the findings of two particular post-Bell studies: Youssef (1993) and Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994).

3.3.1 Youssef

Youssef's (1993) work looks at the code-switching practices observed among three Trinidadian children of preschool age. She recorded the children in interactions with their caretakers, family members, peers, and researchers. Her focus was on distinctive elements of the Trinidadian Creole (TC) verb phrase as compared to the use of Standard English (SE) verbal constructions. Youssef's data consistently illustrates the effect of the audience on her informants' speech.

The children adjusted their speech styles based upon their interlocutors, using more SE features with the researchers than they did with caretakers, siblings, and peers. As familiarity with the researcher grew—Youssef regularly collected data over a period of at least two years—one child moved closer to a TC style of speaking in those interactions. Youssef submits this as a case not entirely accounted for in the model of audience design, claiming instead that the child recognized the social value of TC as a language of intimacy, and that it was the adherence to this societal norm that

motivated the change in the child's speech patterns. The same situation can, however, be viewed in light of audience effect, as Bell lists the relationship between speaker and addressee as one of the audience characteristics to which a speaker may respond (Bell 1984). Over years of regular contact with the researcher, the child would be likely to redefine the relationship as something more familiar and less formal than interviewer-subject, an example of Bell's initiative shift.

Youssef's study also substantiated Bell's approach to topic-influenced variation. One of the young subjects seemed to favor SE in narrative, even in conversation with his caretaker, with whom he generally spoke TC. The act of storytelling was associated with—indeed learned in—the child's nursery school, where SE dominated. One of the narratives observed was, in fact, a retelling of a story heard at school, and the child submitted to the influence of a typical but absent audience, his teacher.

One particularly interesting observation in Youssef's study, and one that will be discussed further in relation to the data from Bayside, is the sometimes dominant influence of the outer levels of audience. Youssef found that one child seemed to always design her speech for her mother, with whom SE predominated, whether the mother was an addressee, auditor, or even overhearer. Addressees with whom TC was expected for this child, peers for example, would find themselves addressed in SE in the presence of the child's mother. In contrast, another child maintained the predicted primacy of addressee, as he used TC with peers whether or not SE-requiring adults were present.

3.3.2 Rickford and McNair-Knox

Rickford and McNair-Knox's (1994) well-known sociolinguistic study also champions the model of audience design through the analysis of stylistic variation by an African American teenager, Foxy Boston. The authors find that Bell's 'bold hypotheses and predictions' warrant a classification of audience design as 'one of the most theoretically interesting works to emerge in the study of style-shifting' (ibid., 241). They seek to illustrate the viability of those hypotheses through a quantitative analysis of their subject's use of African American English (AAE) features in a series of interviews conducted when she was eighteen years old.

One of the interviews was conducted by Faye, an African American researcher known to Foxy outside of the context of the study. Also present at the interview was Faye's teenaged daughter. In a later interview, Foxy spoke with a young, white researcher, Beth, with whom she had no previous contact. Many of the topics of discussion in the two meetings were similar, thus allowing for a focus on the influence of audience on Foxy's linguistic choices.

The differences in Foxy's speech with Faye and with Beth were salient and significant, as her use of AAE forms in the first interview exceeded those in the second. Rickford and McNair-Knox suggest that Foxy adjusted her speech in response to the race of her audience and to her level of familiarity with the addressee. The data also shows that she may have been accommodating to her addressees' own speech style.

Just as in Youssef's study, topic-influenced shifting is detected in the data collected by Rickford and McNair-Knox. Though the data did not provide compelling

evidence to corroborate Bell's hypotheses on this particular item, neither did it disprove the audience-central approach. Bell holds that such shifts will not exceed those inspired by the addressee. The topic-related variation exhibited by Rickford and McNair-Knox's subject, however, was only constrained within the limits set by audience-related variation when a thirty-token threshold of frequency was imposed. The authors could also not confirm Bell's suggestion that style-shifting by topic was motivated by associations with a typical addressee. Again, the hypothesis is not discredited, but the study lacked a baseline comparison, i.e., the observation of Foxy's speech with those typical addressees, to offer credible validation of the claim.

Bell's initiative shift is, however, tenably demonstrated in a retrospective analysis of Foxy's earlier interviews in comparison with those providing the data for the present article. The addressees, Faye and her daughter, were the same as in the first of the later interviews. Her use of AAE features, though, more closely resembled the frequency levels observed in her interview with Beth. Rickford and McNair-Knox explain this unexpected pattern as an attempt by Foxy to renegotiate her identity in the exchange with Faye and her daughter as a member of the mostly white community of her new high school and to lay a corresponding 'claim to intellectual authority' (Bell 1984:182). Alternatively, she may have been redefining her relationship with Faye as co-members of a new community related to Faye's status as a researcher at Stanford University and Foxy's recent participation in a summer program at the same institution. Both are plausible explanations, and both exemplify the initiative component of Bell's audience design model.

3.4 SUMMARY

Though not all of the tenets of Bell's audience design have been manifestly upheld by the two studies summarized above, none were crucially invalidated by the data presented. Rather, the theory withstood the application of both quantitative and qualitative analyses and served as a reliable framework for explaining observed patterns of linguistic variation. Furthermore, the two studies reveal the application of audience design to different types of variation: Rickford and McNair-Knox look at a case of monolingual style-shifting, whereas Youssef analyzes code-switching between varieties of a single language. Observations from a Spanish-English bilingual community in south Texas allows for the application of audience design to a case of code-switching between two different languages, an under-explored application of the theory. The data will thus be presented and scrutinized through the lens of audience effect in the following chapter.

Chapter 4

Code-Switching in Bayside, Texas

4.1 BACKGROUND

Bayside is a small town of under 400 residents located in south Texas. True to its name, it sits on the edge of Copano Bay, surrounded by long stretches of farmland. The local economy consists primarily of three resident-owned businesses: a plant nursery, a café, and a small general store. Combined, these companies employ around fifteen Baysiders; the majority of the working population makes a living in nearby towns or on the farms and ranches on the outskirts of Bayside. The closest 'big city' is Corpus Christi, a beach town some 25 miles away with an estimated population of 270,000.

Development in Bayside has been slow and historically sporadic. Copano Bay at one time boasted of a busy port, which was leveled by a hurricane and never rebuilt. The Bayside School, founded in 1912, was eventually closed and converted to a community center; all schooling is now conducted in nearby districts. Bayside's annual Independence Day parade, a once treasured tradition, has not been held in 15 years, and a handful of small businesses have closed their doors. More recently, though, Bayside has experienced some growth with a newly built post office, the construction of a bayfront park, and the installation of a sewer system.

Many Baysiders have deep roots in the area and have not strayed far from the small towns of Refugio County. Bayside fits the mold of small-town America, where everyone knows each other and anonymity is mostly impossible. An unfamiliar face never goes unnoticed. Even an unknown car turning off of State Highway 136 onto a side street catches curious looks.

Fishing and farming culture dominate in Bayside. The former is mostly a recreational pastime, though it also contributes to the local economy; the general store profits from sales of fishing equipment, and some waterfront homes are rented out to visiting fisherfolk. In recent years, Bayside's reputation as a fishing hotspot has been bolstered by the state-funded rebuilding of a pier destroyed decades ago by a hurricane-produced storm surge.

Just under one-third of the Bayside population is Hispanic, and one-quarter speak a language other than English at home, with that language being Spanish in nearly all cases (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). A large number of migrant workers² from Mexico also reside in Bayside throughout much of the year, mostly working in the surrounding fields. Immigration sweeps in recent years have reduced this number a bit as have droughts that have left many fields barren. The cultural and linguistic impact of this population, however, remains prevalent. Though Spanish-English bilingualism is reportedly on the decline, according to several residents, the use of Spanish and Spanish-influenced English are both characteristic of Bayside speech.

² Because many are undocumented, the exact number cannot be determined.

4.2 DATA

Data collection in Bayside was originally conducted by a research team consisting of the author and two fellow linguists, Jennifer Lang and Shawn Warner-Garcia, under the aegis of the Texas English Project,³ which seeks to document dialectal variation across Texas. Our contribution to the Texas English Project was to be a short documentary film cataloguing the use of a particular Texas speech variety. We selected Bayside as a location suitable for the observation of Chicano English. Shortly after the project was underway, however, we found the bilingual situation in the community to provide a far more compelling focus for the documentary. We collected approximately eight hours of footage over three weekend visits in fall 2008 with this new target in mind. The final cut of the documentary, *Bilingualism in Bayside, Texas*, can be viewed on YouTube.⁴

The use of video in data collection was selected in conjunction with the original film project, rather than for the purposes of the present study. This method proved valuable for the subsequent linguistic analysis, however, as it allowed for the observation of gaze direction as a means of determining addressee, the entrance and exit of audience members, and the racial and ethnic phenotype of conversation participants. Since much of the data was collected in the absence of researchers, as will be discussed in 4.3.2, video afforded a much more accurate analysis than would have been possible with audio recordings alone.

³ www.texasenglish.org

⁴ www.youtube.com/watch?v=bTFds-BQjUc

The footage consists of a series of videotaped interviews with four Bayside residents, one interview each,⁵ along with more naturalistic, observational filming. The interviews were primarily conducted by one member of our team, Shawn. Two of the sessions took place at the informants' places of business, one at the interviewee's home, and one was a walking interview conducted during an informant-led tour of Bayside. Topics of discussion were varied, but consistent across the interviews. They included childhood experiences, daily life and pastimes, immigration, and local wildlife. Language-related topics included bilingual education, differences between Bayside Spanish and Mexican Spanish, and contexts for the use of Spanish and English.

The observational footage, constituting several hours of data, was collected in the general store. The store was selected as the principal setting for naturalistic data collection because of its local importance as the commercial and social heart of the town. Though comparable in size to a typical urban convenience store, Bayside Grocers stocks its shelves with all the staple foods and household products that most residents require. It also sells children's toys, gasoline, and hardware; offers storage, check-cashing, and DVD rental services; and operates a washeteria in a building in back. With the nearest similar businesses 17 miles away, the store is an indispensable part of the town.

Many Baysiders begin and end their days at the store, and some pass hours on end there chatting with employees and other residents. It is the footage of such conver-

⁵ Two interviews were conducted with one of the subjects, but technical difficulties forced the first to be cut short and rendered the footage unusable.

sations between employees and customers and among Bayside residents, along with the scheduled interviews, that constitutes the data analyzed for this study, which will focus on the linguistic choices of two particular Baysiders.

The first is a man of Hispanic and Apache descent in his early fifties. David works as a foreman for the county office, volunteers for the Bayside Fire Department, and serves on the city council. He is well known and respected certainly in Bayside, but also in the neighboring towns. He was born in Bayside and has lived there his entire life, working as a farmhand from the age of fifteen until his mid forties. He is a regular at the general store, where a patch of tile in front of the register is referred to as 'David's spot.'

Diola is a Hispanic woman also in her early fifties who works as a cashier at Bayside Grocers. She grew up in nearby Gregory, Texas, and had lived in Bayside for eight years at the time of the study. Through her employment at the store, she is also well known in the town. Both subjects are balanced Spanish-English bilinguals who learned Spanish at home and English in school.

The research team consisted of three white, female graduate students in their twenties. Neither our physical appearance nor our out-group status inspired any assumptions of Spanish competence on our part. David, however, was aware that both the author and one co-researcher, Jenny, possessed fluent or near-fluent proficiency in the language. The third researcher, Shawn, knew very little Spanish. Diola was given no information on the linguistic repertoires of the researchers, which will prove to be an important detail in explaining her linguistic behavior.

4.3 DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

4.3.1 Metalinguistic commentary

A significant portion of the interviews focused on our subjects' perceptions of language use in Bayside. This provided metalinguistic commentary that could be compared with independent observation of actual language use, both during filming and throughout the author's ten years of personal involvement in the town.

One of the first observations offered by both David and Diola was the recognition of a generational shift toward English. Younger Bayside residents either lack proficiency in Spanish or possess passive skills only. English has displaced Spanish as the language of the home, as is commonly the pattern in immigrant communities, where a shift from monolingualism in the minority language to bilingualism and finally to monolingualism in the dominant language can occur in just a few generations (Hamers & Blanc 2000). The intermediate stage of community bilingualism tends to persist where strong bonds are maintained with the home community (*ibid.*). The shrinking population of migrant workers in Bayside may have loosened ties to Mexico, thus weakening the forces that would promote Spanish proficiency alongside English. David, however, believes the shift stems from an increasingly common position regarding the social importance of English, presumably to the detriment of Spanish. Furthermore, because the older, bilingual generations in Bayside learned English at school, the language has naturally come to be associated with education and, consequently, advancement. This may have cultivated an unbalanced focus on teaching younger residents English.

A second common observation noted by our informants refers to the general linguistic behavior of Bayside bilinguals. David and Diola both reported that Baysiders usually speak ‘half and half’ and that they ‘go back and forth’ between Spanish and English. Commentary from the other two interviewees⁶ also frequently referred to the ‘mixing’ of Spanish and English in Bayside. When David and Diola were asked directly to explain why they communicated in this manner, neither listed any particular motivation for the code-switching pattern, seeming somewhat amused or baffled by their ‘improper’ language practices while taking a that’s-just-how-it-is stance. David describes a typical conversation between two Bayside bilinguals as follows: ‘We say two or three sentences in Spanish and *next thing you know* I’m going to English’ (emphasis added). The phrase ‘next thing you know’ hints at a quality of randomness. Even David, as a participant in such conversations, attaches no specific explanation or meaning behind the alternation.

Thus, in Bayside we find a pattern of code-switching described by both Myers-Scotton and Auer. For Myers-Scotton (1993), Baysiders are adhering to the ‘code-switching as an unmarked choice’ maxim, which is common in situations as described below:

...when speakers have social profiles encompassing the identities associated with two languages, and have the desire to signal these identities, then [code-switching] itself may become their unmarked choice. (ibid., 481)

In Bayside, Spanish indicates ties to Mexico, while English separates recent immigrants from native-born citizens. The use of both languages positions Bayside residents

⁶ Two women in their fifties: one Hispanic bilingual, one white anglophone

where these identities overlap, defining them as American-born members of a Hispanic community with longstanding connections across the border.

Auer describes this practice of frequent language alternation as a ‘habitualized form of talk’ (1984:84). Each switch from one language to another no longer conveys extra-referential meaning. He maintains, however, that:

Code-switching remains functional because of the contrastive effect it has, but this effect isn’t any longer the consequence of calling into question or deviating from a base language. (ibid.)

Auer’s locally based approach, which analyzes every switch from one language to another, is not applicable where, as in Bayside, it is the overall pattern of switching, or lack thereof, that bears meaning. Garafanga (2009) addresses this in his recognition that the ‘code’ used in conversation need not constitute one language; rather, a pattern of frequent switching may serve as a bilingual medium. Thus, in Bayside, where such a bilingual medium is the dominant mode of communication, greater significance lies in situations where one language or the other is maintained throughout the conversation.

The dominance of the bilingual medium and the assumptions regarding local linguistic conventions in general have been established in part through the self-reporting of informants. This commentary describes code-switching as characteristic of bilingual Baysiders’ speech. The linguistic behavior recorded during data collection supports this depiction. Nevertheless self-reporting is not always a reliable source of information, and the observer’s paradox calls into question the credibility of data collected by a linguistic fieldworker. Steps were thus taken to successfully minimize the effect of the researcher; these steps are discussed further in 4.3.2. In addition, the

author's experience in the town extends far beyond the timeframe of this study. Observation of and participation in numerous Bayside exchanges, then, corroborates the informants' claims regarding linguistic norms.

David and Diola did offer some possible explanations for instances in which a deviation from their usual linguistic practice of code-switching may occur. Diola reports that her language choice is primarily constrained by that of her interlocutor: 'If they talk to me in Spanish, I talk to them in Spanish; if they talk to me in English, I talk to them in English.' This adheres to Auer's expectations of a 'preference for same language talk' (1984:23). It does not, however, capture language selection in exchanges initiated by Diola, and it does conflict with her choices in some recorded conversations, as will be shown below.

Diola also claims to engage in what would be categorized by Auer (1984) as language negotiation sequences and by Myers-Scotton (1993) as exploratory choices. As Diola says of her adoption of Spanish at work: 'Sometimes I play around with my customers, and I like to know if they know what I'm telling them.' She uses language selection to determine whether an interlocutor shares her bilingual proficiency and, by extension, the dual identities common among Baysiders.

David attributes departures from his typical code-switching pattern principally to the competence of his addressee. He code-switches less or not at all when speaking to younger Baysiders and recent immigrants. In reference to his preference for code-switching, he states that, 'the only time...we keep it fully English is when we're talking to somebody that does not understand [Spanish].' This deference for addressee com-

petence is neither unexpected nor unusual, and it was regularly observed in Bayside. This consideration for language competence, however, does not apply to the addressee only; the linguistic repertoire of both actual and potential participants, i.e., hearers at the further removed levels of Bell's audience framework, is also be taken into account by our Bayside informants.

4.3.2 Audience design in Bayside

The linguistic behavior documented in our study support David and Diola's claims that they are influenced in their language selections by their addressee, as predicted by the theory of audience design. When the direct recipient is a fellow Bayside bilingual, code-switching is the typical medium of communication. One such interaction that exemplifies this pattern is transcribed below. The participants are Diola (DT), a Hispanic male customer (KV), and, briefly, a white female customer (C1). At the beginning of the conversation all three are present at the front counter. In this and all subsequent transcriptions, plain text will be used for utterances in English, bold for those in Spanish, and italics for translations.⁷

(1) OBSERVATIONAL FOOTAGE: DIOLA & BILINGUAL CUSTOMER

- DT: Eight thirty-six is your change
KV: Thank you
DT: Thank you
KV: **Me das una bolsita por favor?**
Will you give me a bag please?
5 DT: Yes sir
(8.0)

⁷ See appendix for additional transcription conventions.

- C1: Looks like a balanced lunch
 KV: Hhh. Well s- this is for my wife, this is for me. Hhh
 DT: (3.0) Thank you and you have a nice day
 KV: **Todavía no me voy**
I'm not leaving yet
- 10 DT: Oh, okay you're not through
 KV: ((Walking away)) I'm not through yet.
 ((DT completes transaction with C1, who then leaves))
 ((KV returns))
 KV: **Chequéame a ver si estos, si no me das (todo lo que como quiera)**
Check these for me, to see if they don't give me all that I want
 DT: (7.5) Two dollars
 KV: Two dollars. **Dame dos de estos también**
Give me two of those too
- 15 DT: Hold on hold on hold on
 KV: **Ay cuando tengas chanza** (8.0) ((sings)) Dadadadada
Ah, when you have a chance
 DT: Okay you want this right?
 KV: Yes (.) Cash five for tonight
 DT: (8.0) Okay you owe me one dollar
- 20 KV: **Y un otro- entres-?**
And another- You rang up-?
 DT: **Estos son dos esto es de tres pesos** (1.0) () **es dos=**
These are two this is three dollars is two
 KV: **=Sí, sí sí ya sé**
Yeah, yeah, yeah I know
 DT: **Y esto es tres pesos**
And this is three dollars
 KV: **Sí quería tres no problema. Okay son siete** (.)
Yes, I wanted three, no problem. that's seven
Déjame ver si traigo otra para que me des dos number fours **y dos**
Let me see if I brought another so you can give me two and two
 number threes
- 25 DT: (5.0) **Dos** number fours
Two
 KV: Two number three
 DT: (3.0) Eight dollars
 KV: On the money

DT: Thank you sir you have a nice day

KV: Thank you **y tu también**
you too

The conversation contains some intrasentential switches and a number of alternations that occur in response to no discernible situational factor, such as topic or setting; these contextual elements remain constant throughout the exchange. Neither conversant's reactions to the switches ratify any extra-referential meaning, as would be required by the conversation analytic approach. The alternating use of Spanish and English is simply the bilingual medium expected for this dyad of Spanish-English bilinguals. A significant number of the recorded exchanges between Diola and other bilingual Baysiders, including David, follow this same pattern.

Diola adjusts this behavior, however, when required by her addressee, as shown in the following episode. Here, Diola is conversing with the author (KD) and a co-researcher (JL) when two young Mexican men (C2, 3) enter the store. Diola's alternations between English and Spanish mark the boundaries of the two overlapping conversations and serve to identify her intended addressee.

(2) OBSERVATION FOOTAGE: DIOLA & MEXICAN CUSTOMERS

DT: ((to KD and JL)) Here look here comes my friends from Mexico (3.0)

These are my little friends (1.0)

((to C2, 3)) **Buenos días**=
Good morning

C2: =[**Buenos días**

C3: =[**Buenos días**
Good morning

DT: **Cómo amanecieron?**
How did you sleep?

- C2: **Muy bien**
Very well
 ((C2, 3 walk away))
- 5 DT: (1.0) Hhhhhh (3.5) Hhhhhhhhh
 ((to KD and JL)) Nobody wants thei- to take pictures of them. They're trying to hide. Hhhh
 (2m30s)
- DT: ((to C2, 3)) **No más un café?**
Just a coffee?
- C2: **Dos ()=**
Two
- DT: **=Dos cafés?**
Two coffees?
 (5.0)
- C2: **(Gracias)**
Thank you
- 10 DT: Okay. **A- nos vemos (.) Buenos días**
See you later Good morning

Diola's language alternations in this exchange represent the category of code-switching in Gumperz' (1982) functional typology known as addressee specification. She considers the appropriate language to use with each possible recipient and selects contrastive codes to identify who she intends that direct recipient to be. Auer (1984) also discusses this type of switching as a response to or initiation of a change in participant constellation. In such cases, 'the switch of addressee is highlighted by the switch of language' (ibid., 35). Both addressee specification and participant constellation-motivated switches are captured by the addressee effect of Bell's theory. Diola uses language in an initiative manner, i.e., she redefines one aspect of the context—audience—by selecting a language associated with that matrix of contextual

factors. Her selection of Spanish or English, however, is principally a response to the person or persons to whom she assigns the role of addressee.

David exhibits similar consideration for his addressee's preferred language as he switches from a conversation with a co-researcher, Shawn, to an exchange with Diola. The first conversation takes place exclusively in English, as David knows that Shawn does not speak Spanish. When that conversation is interrupted, David turns to Diola with an immediate switch to Spanish. In these interactions David demonstrates addressee effect in the same manner that Diola did in (2), as his language selection is linked to the direct recipient of his utterances.

(3) OBSERVATIONAL FOOTAGE: DAVID (DV), SHAWN (SW) , & DIOLA

- DV: ((to SW)) So wh-when we're driving at night right there we'll see that blue hydra- that blue (.) reflector and we know there's a hydrant in that area right there.
- SW: [That's nice [yeah
- DV: [That's what we d- [yeah
- KD: Shawn, can I ask you something?
((SW walks away))
- 5 DV: ((to DT)) **Cuánto tiempo tienen aquí?**
How long have they been here?
- DT: Huh?
- DV: **Que cuánto tiempo tienen aquí?** ()
I said how long have they been here?
- DT: **A las diez y media**
Since ten-thirty

These exchanges exhibit linguistic choices expected under the propositions of Bell's audience design model. The speakers are seen to switch from one language to another, and either maintain that language or engage in frequent alternations, de-

pending upon whom they are addressing. Conversations with other bilinguals mandate the bilingual medium of Spanish-English code-switching; monolinguals—whether actual or perceived—motivate sustained use of one or the other language, as appropriate. The addressee effect, then, is clearly active in Bayside.

Of greater interest, however, is the apparent influence of audience members further removed from the speaker, which seems to override the documented influence of the addressee. Though Bell (1984) acknowledges that speakers may adjust their speech under the influence of an auditor, and other researchers have documented this effect (cf. Youssef 1993), it has most frequently been submitted as an exception to the expected primacy of the addressee. The data below suggests a reinterpretation of this rule is appropriate for bilingual situations.

The auditor effect was first suggested when comparing David and Diola's use of Spanish in their respective interview sessions. Recall that David knew of the Spanish proficiency of two of the researchers; Diola was not informed of this and, seemingly, assumed that such proficiency was not held by anyone on the crew. As a result, not a single word of Spanish was uttered in her interview, even when the topic of conversation was particularly suited for it. Consider the extract below, where Diola is explaining to Shawn the differences between Mexican Spanish and Bayside Spanish.

(4) INTERVIEW: DIOLA

DT: So (.) it's like-like some w- some (.) like the food and all that it's different. They got different uuh names to it. The fruit and all that they call it something else and we call it something else (.) So

SW: Interesting. Why do you think that is?

- DT: I don't know (3.5) Like there's some fruit I don't even know what they're namin- they say (.) different you know and I say (.) what's that? (.) you know (2.0) And they tell what it- it's some kind of uuh fruit. (2.0) Say I didn't know that's the name of it I didn't even know what the name was=
- SW: =Mm. So there are two different names for the same thing [depending on who you ask?]=
- 5 DT: [Yeah
=Yeah
- SW: Huh
- DT: It's th- different words to different (.) food and all that

Rather than illustrate her comments with examples of the different words, Diola simply repeats her statement that the words for various food items are not identical in the two Spanish dialects. This, of course, is simply another example of addressee effect. When we compare Diola's strategy to that of David's, however, he seems to be taking into account the competency of auditors of the interview.

(5) INTERVIEW: DAVID

- SW: How is that different from Mexican Spanish?
- DV: Uuh (.) uh it's just uh (.) it-it's just the words (.) Uuh we can say like uh (3.0) if you look in the in the what a stop sign (.) in Mexico it means **alto** (.) where we would say **párate** you know. It's a slang word for **alto** you know (.) Uh (.) 'listen' if you say 'l-listen' we say **óyeme, me oyes, oyes** and they- (.) **escuche**

Though David's addressee is the same as Diola's was, a recipient with no proficiency in Spanish, and the topic of conversation was identical, David's response is marked by the inclusion of several Spanish terms. The difference between the two exchanges was that in the first, Diola was communicating under the assumption that

both addressee and auditors possessed English-only competence; David's audience, though in actuality the same, included a monolingual addressee and two bilingual auditors. David's choices reflect the influence of these auditors. Alternatively, David's non-avoidance of Spanish can be said to stem from the fact that he is defining each of his terms in English, so competence is not an issue. This is a perfectly reasonable explanation, but the following exchange between David and Diola indicates that the former is an equally appropriate analysis, as David exhibits similar behavior once again in (6).

(6) OBSERVATIONAL FOOTAGE: DAVID & DIOLA

- DV: **Fueron a pescar aquellos?**
Did they go fishing?
- DT: This morning (.) early in the morning
- DV: I thought uuh (3.0) uh what's his name? (2.0) Pascual he said they were going last night (.) **anoche**
last night
- DT: They went last night Pascual didn't go. He probably went somewhere else
- 5 DV: Maybe **con** Robert. **Me dijo** () **pescar**
with He told me fishing
- DT: Well Robert called Vicente told Vicente that he was gonna take some guys (.) fishing in there
- DV: Oh this morning? They went j-
- DT: =No yesterday=
- DV: =Yesterday?
- 10 DT: That he was gonna take 'em=
- DV: =Oh he was gonna take them over there? Yeah I guess that's where Pascual was going **allí**. **Me** () **Pascual**
there

This conversation took place at the store, where David was spending a good part of his day, as per usual. Diola stood behind the register with David before her in 'his spot.' Shawn was absent, while Jenny and the author stood some distance away from the subjects operating the camera and sound equipment. We had not been conversing with David and Diola for some time; in fact we were more often engrossed in the operation of the filming equipment, signaling and whispering to each other from time to time about the sound quality and camera position. We were no longer addressed by the speakers, but remained known and ratified, and our presence was clearly influencing our subjects' speech.

In this entire exchange, and for several subsequent turns, Diola uses English only when addressing David. This is unexpected as her usual language of communication with David is a bilingual Spanish-English medium. Furthermore, Diola is apt to adopt the language used by her interlocutor, as we discovered both through her self-reporting and through our own later observations. She does not follow David's selection of Spanish, however, at his initiation of the conversation. Instead, our presence as auditors prompted Diola to use a language that she believed to be common among all audience members, just as she did in the previously taped interview.

David, on the other hand, knew both Spanish and English to be a shared language among the conversation participants. His linguistic repertoire was therefore not constrained as was Diola's, and he does not hesitate to address her in Spanish, just as he did not eliminate Spanish in the interview session. He does appear to accommodate to Diola's use of English in this exchange, though, switching to Spanish far less

than is typical, while through periodic, minimal switches he maintains the expected bilingual medium in a somewhat 'reduced' form. There is a sort of tension in David's language choices, as he does not identify, like Diola, a need to alter his usual practice of frequent code-switching. He does so, however, in a less exaggerated way in reaction to Diola's conspicuous avoidance of Spanish. This hints at a correlation between auditor influence and consideration for intelligibility. The latter is a concern for Diola, and so she yields to the auditor effect; it is not for David, thus his speech is primarily affected by that of his addressee.

We collected data in this fashion only briefly, as it became clear that our presence, as inconspicuous as we may have hoped to be, was minimizing our ability to capture the speech patterns previously observed. To minimize the observer's paradox, we switched to a method of unattended cameras. We set up two: one aimed at Diola, and the other positioned to capture the area in front of the register, where either customers would stand during a transaction or David would loiter during his visits to the store. We then stayed at the back of the store or outside of it, remaining out of sight and, we hoped, out of mind.

This new data collection method did indeed yield different results. We captured many conversations between David and Diola in which they returned to their usual mode of Spanish-heavy code-switching. Similar exchanges were observed between Diola and other bilingual customers. It was, then, clearly our influence in the role of auditors that affected Diola's code selection, and in turn David's, in exchange (6).

In the exposition of his model of audience design, Bell poses an important question: 'What is it in the addressee (or other audience members) that the speaker is responding to?' (1984:167). Bell suggests three possibilities: personal characteristics of the audience, the speech of the audience members, or the presence of specific linguistic variables in the audience members' speech. Our data suggests that it is the first, the personal characteristics of the auditors, to which Diola is responding.

Several characteristics set us apart from our subjects and, in some cases, from the majority of the Bayside community. We were of a younger generation, the same generation in which both David and Diola had observed a strong preference for English in their community. We had comparatively extensive educational backgrounds, and the association of English with education was indicated by our informants several times in our interviews. It was our ethnicity, however, that seemed to be the dominant factor to which Diola responded. This stands as the common characteristic between us and other auditors to whom Diola accommodated, as in (7) below.

The exchange in transcription (1) shows Diola again submitting to the influence of an auditor. Both the beginning and the end of the entire conversation are characterized by a series of predominantly Spanish turns on the part of both participants, Diola and KV. The beginning of the interaction, not previously presented, is transcribed below:

(7) OBSERVATIONAL FOOTAGE: DIOLA & BILINGUAL CUSTOMER

- DT: Hello
- KV: Hello. **Cómo está?** ((walks away))
How are you?
- DT: ((to another customer)) Hello.
- KV: ((returns)) () **Vas a-**
Are you going to-
- 5 DT: =()=
- KV: **=vas a salir en la película?**
You're going to be in a movie?
- DT: **Es para la escuela para las muchachas (.) están haciendo-**
It's for school for the girls they're doing-
- KV: **Bayside, era con Bayside**
It's about Bayside
- DT: **Que es lo que hace la gente aquí**
About what people do here
- 10 KV: **Voy a cerrar la camisa (aquí, por si tiene la cámara tanto tiempo)**
I'm going to button up my shirt then, since the camera's going to be here this whole time
- DT: Hhhhh
- KV: **No la había visto. () (y cómo será el autógrafo)**
I didn't see it. And what about autographs
- Y cuándo lo van a enseñar?**
When are they going to show it?
- DT: **No, no va a salir en la TV. No más en la escuela**
No, it's not going to be on TV. Just at school
- KV: **Oh, en la escuela?**
at school?

At the end of this early portion of the interaction until the discussion of KV's lottery tickets in line 20 of (1), Diola switches to the exclusive use of English. Her alternations between Spanish and English occur within a few turns of the entrance and exit of two white customers (one of which, C1, is seen in (1)), who, at different times, join KV at the front counter. At that point they fill the role of auditors, and Diola

adjusts her speech under their influence. KV, on the other hand, does not switch from Spanish to English until these women move from auditors to addressees. This is seen in line 6 of (1), where KV's English response to CI's comment is sandwiched between two Spanish utterances directed at Diola.

Like David, KV does not eliminate Spanish as a medium of communication in the presence of the auditor. Not enough is known about this speaker, his usual behavior in such contexts, or the auditor to assign an explanation, but two possibilities may be submitted. KV may have been personally familiar with this auditor and knew she possessed some measure of proficiency in Spanish, and so his choices can be explained just as David's were earlier. Or KV simply may not have felt compelled to consider the linguistic repertoire of the auditor in selecting a code with which to address Diola. He may have assigned her to the role of overhearer, which would have presumably reduced her influence on his speech style; or social factors related to power distributions, status, and social networks may have erased or minimized the obligation to accommodate apparently felt by Diola.

4.4 SUMMARY

Audience design has been tested most commonly through the effect of the addressee, whose influence on the speaker is expected to be most salient. As Bell states, 'At each remove from the speaker the sharpness of linguistic differentiation is reduced,' by as much as half, according to his analysis (1984:174). For most speakers auditors serve as 'second-class addressees' (ibid.). Bell does allow for exceptions,

however, specifically pointing to language choice in multilingual contexts as a case in which the 'auditor's effect on language choice was as categorical as the addressee's' (ibid., 176).

Along these lines, Dorian found that 'interlocutor etiquette' motivated speakers in East Sutherland, Scotland to use English when non-Gaelic-speaking auditors and overhearers were present (1981:79). For example, one of a pair of Gaelic speakers felt compelled to request permission of an English-speaking overhearer to continue her conversation in Gaelic. This level of deference did not hold in all cases, however. Dorian also observed a group of Gaelic speakers dismiss a request from a co-patron in a local pub to switch to English. Dorian attributes the contrastive responses in these two situations to the effect of power in numbers. In the second situation, the conversants comprised a group of bilinguals speaking among themselves near a single monolingual English-speaker. They therefore paid no deference to the excluded overhearer.

Bell (1984) considers special attention to the outer levels of audience in bilingual communities to be a result of the exaggeration of linguistic differences between distinct codes as opposed to different styles, registers, or dialects. As the use of a language unintelligible to an auditor or overhearer essentially 'defines that person out of the audience' (ibid., 176), the speaker is compelled to select a code that maintains the potentiality of participation by further removed hearers.

Though Bell clearly acknowledges the possibility of auditors being granted special consideration in bilingual situations, these cases are discussed as though they

are exceptions to the basic formulation of audience design, in which the addressee exerts greatest influence. Examples of the auditor effect superseding that of the addressee, however, occur with such frequency in bilingual situations that it is unreasonable to define them as exceptions. It may hold that the dominance of the auditor effect is unusual in monolingual style-shifting, but it appears to be the norm in bilingual code-switching, as shown in Bayside as well as other studies, such as Dorian (1981). In both, situations in which interlocutor deference was not demonstrated served as the exception. Bell's audience design thus requires a small adjustment to maintain the explanatory power demonstrated in monolingual style-shifting; in bilingual code-switching, the auditor effect should be expected to have equivalent or greater influence on a speaker's linguistic choices as that of the addressee.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

This study has shown that Bell's (1984) theory of audience design provides an apt framework to explain the linguistic behavior observed among bilingual subjects in Bayside, Texas, though one adjustment to the theory would enhance its explanatory powers. The audience and the assumed linguistic repertoires of its members led to either the maintenance of local linguistic conventions or the deviation from these norms in an effort to accommodate potential co-conversants. The Spanish-English code-switching recorded and observed shows examples of addressee effect as well as the influence of outer levels of audience, i.e., auditors. When linguistic variation involves the alternation between multiple languages, as opposed to monolingual style shifts, the normally weakened effect of the auditor often stands as equivalent to that of the addressee. In our Bayside data, the auditor effect, when the auditors were assumed to possess English-only competence, was actually found to exceed that of the addressee, who was a known bilingual; that is, where the addressee was expected to elicit a particular code or bilingual medium, this linguistic convention was overridden by 'interlocutor etiquette' (Dorian 1981:79). Bell suggests such cases of influence reversal are 'not hard to recall,' though he submits no examples to document this effect (1984:175). Such data has been presented here and has indicated the need to raise the

auditor effect in bilingual situations from secondary to primary, alongside addressee effect.

The Bayside study also sheds light on the well-known pitfall of sociolinguistic fieldwork that is the observer's paradox. The paradox recognizes the supposedly inherent impossibility of collecting 'natural' speech data. The presence of the researcher and the informant's knowledge of her observation inevitably influence the subject's linguistic choices. This study showed, as did Wertheim (2006), that the researcher's effect need not always be viewed as an insurmountable obstacle to collecting speech data that lends to a valid analysis of variation. Rather, the researcher fits into the framework of Bell's audience design, and the speech styles of the subject can then be correlated with the roles filled by the investigator in the various contexts established during data collection. In Bayside the accommodation observed in the presence of the researchers mirrored that seen to be motivated by other conversation participants with shared characteristics. It was thus most certainly natural speech for our subjects in that context.

In Wertheim's work in Tatarstan, she found that she was able to observe a wide variety of speech styles depending upon her role within Bell's participant framework. Her presence as an addressee or auditor often evoked the use of 'pure' Tatar by her informants. As an overhearer or, of course, eavesdropper, she was privy to less performed exchanges in Russian-influenced Tatar as well as Russian-Tatar code-switching. Wertheim's fieldworker identity was defined in part by her classification as a certain type of outsider, i.e., one 'completely alien' who belongs to neither the

majority nor the minority groups of the community (*ibid.*, 713). In Bayside, we were outsiders to the local community, but members of the larger society in which it was situated. Our interactions with our subjects were then cast within this shared societal framework. This, perhaps, contributed to Diola's assumptions about our linguistic repertoires, as she drew upon the ethnicity-language ties active in the broader community of which we were all members.

The effect of the ethnicity or race of the fieldworker has been demonstrated in earlier sociolinguistic studies, including that of Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994), presented in 3.3.2. There we saw the informant style-shifting in response to her interviewers, one of whom was African American, and one of whom was white. Cukor-Avila's follow-up experiment did not corroborate Rickford and McNair-Knox's conclusions, but rather saw race as 'one of a constellation of factors that can have a significant effect on results' (2001: 268). The latter interpretation seems reasonable for the effect of the researchers in Bayside, as there were many characteristics—out-group membership, education, socioeconomic status—that set us apart from our subjects. It was our non-Hispanic ethnicity, however, that was the feature shared with other audience members who inspired similar patterns of accommodation by Diola. Ethnicity, or rather the perceived link between ethnicity and language skills, was the salient feature influencing her linguistic choices.

Wertheim's expansion of Bell's audience design model allows us to account for the changes in our subjects' linguistic behavior when we were physically removed from the context, while our recording equipment remained in place and visible to partici-

pants. She proposes an additional level of audience, the end-listener. The end-listener is represented by the camera or other recording device and fills the role of an audience member who is unknown, ratified, and may or may not be addressed. The effect of the end-listener is less predictable than the effect of other audience members; it depends upon the speaker's definition of this recipient. Wertheim offers three possible definitions that speakers may assign to the end-listener: the investigator, the investigator along with other linguistic researchers, or some other entirely unknown addressee. Youssef (1993) found one of her subjects to clearly define the end-listener, represented by an audio recorder, as Youssef herself. This subject even went so far as to address Youssef by name when 'speaking to' the recorder in the investigator's absence. Wertheim (2006) found evidence of a similar definition, as one of her subjects later confessed that a Tatar folksong was performed entirely for Wertheim's benefit when she left a recorder with a group of Tatar speakers. Their collective belief that the investigator served as the end-listener, as revealed by the informant's subsequent report, explained the sustained use of 'pure' Tatar by the group, where Russian-Tatar code-switching would have been expected.

Our Bayside informants apparently did not define the end-listener in the same way. Had the camera been seen to represent the researchers, we would have expected Diola to maintain her atypical use of English only in interactions with Bayside bilinguals. This did not occur, however, so it is reasonable to assume that Diola regarded the end-listener as an entirely unknown addressee. She was informed about our original project and knew of our plans to screen the documentary among our

colleagues and other members of the university community. This audience may have been simply too broad, diverse, or ill-defined for Diola to make any assumptions about the personal characteristics that, if known, would have had the potential to influence her code selections.

Appendix:

Transcription Conventions

plain	English
bold	Spanish
<i>italics</i>	Translated text
(.)	Turn-internal pauses under one second
(2.0)	Longer pauses; length indicated in seconds
-	Cut-off speech or self-interruption
=	Latching
?	Rising intonation
Hhhh	Laughter
<u>underline</u>	Stress or emphasis
()	Unintelligible speech or uncertain transcription
[Overlapping speech
(())	Transcriber's comments

References

- Beebe, L. M. (1981). Social and situational factors affecting the communicative strategy of dialect code-switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 32, 139-149.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13, 145-204.
- Bell, A. (1999). Styling the other to define the self: A study in New Zealand identity making. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3(4), 523-541.
- Bell, A. (2001). Back in style: reworking audience design. In P. Eckert & R. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blom, J. P. & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Bolonyai, A. (2009). Code-switching, imperfect acquisition, and attrition. In B. E. Bullock & A. J. Toribio (Eds.) *Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching* (pp. 253-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (1999). You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3(4), 443-460.
- Bullock, B. E. & Toribio, A. J. (2009) Themes in the study of code-switching. In B. E. Bullock & A. J. Toribio (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching* (pp. 1-17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. H. & Carlson, T. B. (1982). Hearers and speech acts. *Language*, 58(2), 332-373.
- Coupland, N. (1984). Accommodation at work: Some phonological data and their implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 46, 49-70.
- Cukor-Avila, P. (2001). The effects of the race of the interviewer on sociolinguistic fieldwork. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(2), 254-270.
- Dorian, N.C. (1981). *Language death: The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Douglas-Cowie, E. (1978). Linguistic code-switching in a Northern Irish village: social interaction and social ambition. In P. Trudgill (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic patterns in British English* (pp. 35-51). London: Edward Arnold.

- Garafanga, J. (2009). The conversation analytic model of code-switching. In B. E. Bullock & A. J. Toribio (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching* (pp. 114-126). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H. & Powesland, P.F. (1975). *Speech style and social evaluation*. London: Academy Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamers, J.F. & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism* (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinrichs, L. (2006). *Code-switching on the web: English and Jamaican Creole in e-mail communication*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Köppe, R. & Meisel, J. M. (1995). Code-switching in bilingual first language acquisition. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 276-301). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lang, J. & Warner, S. (2009, April 11). Bilingualism and audience design: Some issues in data collection. Paper presented at the Symposium About Language and Society-Austin XVII, Austin, Texas.
- Meeuwis, M. & Blommaert, J. (1994). The 'Markedness Model' and the absence of society: Remarks on codeswitching. *Multilingua*, 13(4), 387-423.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 44, 115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society*, 22, 475-503.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social motivations of code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). Code-switching. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 101-104). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). A theoretical introduction to the Markedness Model. In C. Myers-Scotton (Ed.), *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties* (pp. 18-38). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). Frequency and intentionality in (un)marked choices in code-switching: 'This is a 24-hour country.' *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(2), 205-219.
- Myers-Scotton, C. & Bolonyai, A. (2001). Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society*, 30(1), 1-28.
- Poplack, S. (1980). 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino el español': Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Rickford, J. R. & McNair-Knox, F. (1994). Addressee- and topic-influenced style shift: A quantitative sociolinguistic study. In D. Biber & E. Finegan (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register* (pp. 235-276). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shin, H. & Bruno, R. (2003). *Language use and English speaking ability: 2000* (U.S. Census Bureau publication C2KBR-29). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-29.pdf>.
- Thakerer, J. N., Giles, H., & Cheshire, J. (1982). Psychological and linguistic parameters of speech accommodation theory. In C. Fraser & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *Advances in the social psychology of language* (pp. 205-255). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Timm, L. A. (1975). Spanish-English code-switching: El porqué y how-not-to. *Romance Philology*, 28(4), 473-482.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *American FactFinder fact sheet*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2008). *2006-2008 American Community Survey*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=ACS.
- Valdés-Fallis, G. (1978). Code-switching among bilingual Mexican-American women: Towards an understanding of sex-related language alternation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 17, 65-79.
- Wei, L. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (Ed.) *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 156-176). London: Routledge.
- Wei, L. (2005). 'How can you tell?' Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 375-389.
- Wei, L. & Milroy, L. (1995). Conversational code-switching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 281-299.
- Wertheim, S. (2006). Cleaning up for company: Using participant roles to understand fieldworker effect. *Language in Society*, 35, 707-727.

Youssef, V. (1993). Children's linguistic choices: Audience design and societal norms.
Language in Society, 22, 257-274.

Vita

Kimberly Lynn Dahl was born in Buffalo Grove, Illinois to Vicki Vega and Kenneth Dahl, joining sister Kelly and brother Jason. During her childhood, Kimberly's family divided their time between Corpus Christi, Texas and the suburbs of Chicago, Illinois. After graduating from Corpus Christi's Mary Carroll High School in 1999, Kimberly moved to Austin, Texas, where she completed a Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics and Spanish at the University of Texas. She worked in the College of Liberal Arts and the Department of Middle Eastern Studies before entering UT-Austin's graduate program in linguistics in 2007.

Permanent address: 10413 Garbacz Dr
Austin, TX 78748

This thesis was typed by the author.