UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Code-Switching as an Evaluative Device in Bilingual Discourse

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1037r35p

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 4(1)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Halmari, Helena

Publication Date
1993

DOI
10.5070/L441030723

Copyright Information
Copyright 1993 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at https://escholarship.org/terms

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Code-Switching as an Evaluative Device in Bilingual Discourse

Helena Halmari
University of Southern California

For bilingual speakers, code-switching can serve various discourse functions. In this paper, the evaluative component in bilingual discourse will be examined, in order to show that for the purpose of evaluation the bilingual often switches from one language to the other. This switch of code gives emphasis to the evaluative comment and, due to the in-group nature of code-switching behavior, adds to the overall interspeaker involvement. While the notion of the evaluative component has been developed in the framework of the narrative template, it will be shown that in unplanned natural bilingual conversation the evaluative component can also be distinguished and this evaluative component often tends to be accompanied by a switch of code. I will look at spontaneous stories, unplanned short narratives, and conversational exchanges as they have occurred in the recorded speech of two Finnish-English bilingual children. About 42% of all evaluative comments in the data were code-switched, and out of all code-switches 23% were evaluative in nature. The question of the metaphorical significance of the direction of switching will also be addressed.

INTRODUCTION

A considerable amount of research has proliferated around the notion of code-switching, "the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode" (Heller, 1988). The literature on code-switching can roughly be divided into two broad categories: studies on code-switching as a sociolinguistic phenomenon on the one hand, and studies which investigate code-switching from the viewpoint of formal syntax. The studies belonging to the first category contribute to answering the classic question, formulated by Fishman as "*who* speaks *what* language to *whom* and *when*" (1972). This line of inquiry has produced an enormous body of knowledge on the sociolinguistics of code-

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273
© Regents of the University of California
Vol. 4 No. 1 1993 91-118

switching (e.g., Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Ferguson, 1959; Gumperz, 1976; Haugen, 1973; Scotton & Ury, 1977).

The second category, a somewhat more recent approach to the phenomenon, attempts to determine the syntactic constraints to which code-switching is subject (e.g., Clyne, 1987; Di Sciullo, Muysken, & Singh, 1986; Joshi, 1985; Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1980; Stenson, 1990; Woolford, 1983).

Both research approaches, the more pragmatic and the more syntactic one, have attempted to *explain* code-switching by answering the questions of why it happens and what constraints, either discourse or syntactic, regulate its occurrence in bilingual competence. Although code-switching is probably never entirely predictable, it can often be explained[1] in terms of such *external* factors as changes in the topic of discourse, interlocutors, setting, or activity (Gumperz, 1982; Hatch, 1976).

While code-switching can be explained in terms of the above mentioned external factors, such factors cannot account for all switches, and sometimes the explanation for a switch lies in *internal* factors having to do with "various emotive devices" (Hatch, 1976). These discourse functions of code-switching are many. Code-switching can be employed for emphasis, contrast, parenthetical remarks, affection, or humor (Hatch, 1976). Code-switching is a strategy which is often employed "for more effective communication" and "better story-telling" (Hatch, 1976). Olshtain and Blum-Kulka have pointed out the function of code-switching as a dramatizer in narratives (1989); also Gal (1979) and Timm (1975) note its use as a stylistic or rhetorical device.

The purpose of the present paper is to explore one specific rhetorical function that code-switching can have: evaluation. As noted by Hatch, code-switching "may relate to an 'evaluation' function in discourse--that is, changing from one language to the other serves to involve the listener in the interaction or lends dramatic effect to the story line" (1992). Gal (1979) also notes the "validating" function of code-switching in Hungarian-German data. Explicit evidence for the evaluative function of code-switching has been given by Alvarez (1989) in her study of the distribution of code-switching in narratives by the bilingual members of a Puerto Rican speech community in New York. In her study Alvarez reports on a relationship between code-switching and evaluation in oral narratives.

Tannen (1989) believes that evaluation as an involvement strategy applies not only to narratives, but to nonnarrative discourse as well. However, since naturally occurring spontaneous conversations differ in many respects from elicited narratives, folk tales and other more or less organized and planned forms of story-telling, I propose the following questions: Can evaluation–an integral part of the narrative genre–be identified in the genre of spontaneous bilingual conversation and, if so, can any patterns be detected in terms of its relation to code-switching, a built-in feature in bilingual in-group conversation?

Within the framework of discourse analysis, recorded spontaneous conversations by two Finnish-English bilingual children were examined. It was found that not only was the evaluative component clearly identifiable but also it was often realized as a switch of code. What turned out to be a teasing issue was the question of the directionality of the switch.

The contribution of the present study to the understanding of bilingual discourse is to establish a relationship between evaluation and code-switching in spontaneous bilingual conversation, a genre within which the evaluative function of code-switching has not yet been extensively examined. In addition, by addressing the controversial question of whether the Gumperzian (Gumperz 1982) analysis of minority and majority codes as the low-prestige "we-code" and high-prestige "they-code" respectively could–or indeed should–be applied to the interpretation of bilingual discourse, the study invites and lays a basis for deeper inquiry into the area of bilinguals' use of their minority and majority codes.

The evaluative component of narrative template

In their seminal study of the narrative structure, Labov and Waletzky (1967) define evaluation as that part in a narrative where narrators express their attitudes towards the narrative's contents. Often the evaluation sections can be formally defined according to their location between complicating action and the resolution; however, evaluation can occur throughout the narrative, it can be repeated in the coda as a moral (Hatch, 1992), or merged with the result (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). Since the sequential placement of the evaluative section within the narrative is not completely predictable, Labov and Waletzky emphasize the importance of semantics in the definition of evaluation.

In the narrative, the function of the evaluative component is to highlight the point of the story, its importance, and its meaning (Labov, 1972). Getting the audience involved is a sign of a good storyteller, and skillfully employed evaluation helps the storyteller to reach this goal (Hatch, 1992).

Evaluative devices can be non-verbal or verbal. For instance, gestures, intonation, and laughter can be used as evaluative devices to involve the listener. Verbal means may include intensifying expressions, repetition, direct quotes, and rhetorical questions (Hatch, 1992; Labov & Waletzky, 1967).

Evaluative comments may have certain identifiable grammatical characteristics. The shift in the use of tense is often typical when the monolingual narrator moves from the general story-line to evaluation (e.g., Hatch, 1983). This tense-shift is a device which helps to emphasize the content of the evaluative component, and it thus helps in highlighting the point of the story. For bilingual speakers, not only tense-shift but also a total shift of code is available as an emphatic device to involve the bilingual listener.[2]

For bilingual speakers, code-switching is a powerful means to carry out evaluation in narratives. It can be combined with tense-shift to give an added emphasis to the evaluative component. Code-switching in itself is often an in-group signal of bonding behavior, and its availability as an evaluative device adds to the cumulative effect it has in interspeaker involvement, which is probably the ultimate goal of the evaluative component in the narrative template.

METHOD

Clearly, the notion of evaluation can be understood in an extremely broad sense, from gestures and laughter to explicit value judgments about the content of the narrative. In this paper, the assignment of the comments to the category "evaluation" represents the present writer's interpretation. The notion of evaluation has been understood as restricted only to those clauses where the attitude of the speaker towards the topic at hand has been explicitly expressed in an utterance which summarizes or concludes the topic discussed, with a more or less explicit value judgment[3], as for

example the English comment "She's stupid!" (25)[4] after a conversation in Finnish about a friend's negatively valued behavior. For the quantitative analysis of evaluations, co-constructed evaluations–when one of the subjects gives an evaluation of the topic at hand and the other subject immediately agrees (or gives her version of evaluation)–have been counted as one co-constructed evaluative comment.

The definition of code-switching in this study includes all turn-internal switches (both intrasentential and intersentential), plus switches between turns. Defining what is a switch between turns in multi-party, multi-lingual conversation is not always an easy task; the following criteria have been consistently followed here. 1) The turn starts with a code-switch, if the language of the starting turn matches *neither* with the language of the previous speaker *nor* with the language which the beginning speaker used last, if she has spoken within the past ten turns. 2) The turn is not code-switched, if the language matches the language of the previous speaker, *or* the language which the current speaker used last. (These two criteria for defining an inter-turn code-switch were necessary in order not to count as code-switches such instances where one speaker consistently across turns uses only one language, while the other interlocutors may use another language. For example, long conversations were carried out with the mother speaking Finnish and the subjects speaking English, and even though English thus interspersed with Finnish, each new English turn spoken by the subjects was not counted as code-switched.) 3) If the speaker has not spoken for ten turns and starts with a language different from that used by the previous speaker, this has been counted as a switch. (Ten turns were chosen arbitrarily, the rationale being that if a person has not spoken for many turns and starts by using a different language than one used by the previous interlocutor, this should be regarded as an instance of re-establishing the use of a different language, i.e. a code-switch.) 4) If the previous speaker's turn included the use of the two languages, the matrix language of the last sentence is compared with the language of the following turn. 5) The initial turns of the speakers in the beginning of each recording session were never counted as code-switches, even though the language did not necessarily match the language of the previous speaker.

When the relationship between evaluation and code-switching is examined, a host of other factors need to be taken into

account as well. Code-switching is a multi-functional feature in bilingual discourse: it may have occurred because of the change of interlocutor, topic-shift, or some other change in the speech situation. It could signal distancing behavior ("I'm not with you; I'm even speaking a different language"), it could be dictated by quicker access to certain concepts in one or the other language, or it could simply be due to the current preference or whim of the individual speaker. When a code-switched utterance in this study has been interpreted as evaluative, the other possible explanations for the switch of code have by no means been ruled out; it is the strikingly frequent co-occurrence of evaluation and code-switching that is emphasized.

Subjects

The data come from naturally occurring conversation by two Finnish-English bilingual sisters who, at the point when the data collection started in November 1990, had resided in the United States for one year and five months. The ages of the two sisters at that point were 9;2 for Subject 1, and 8;1 for Subject 2. The subjects had arrived in California at the age of 7;9 and 6;8, respectively. During their 17-month residence in California, both had become fully fluent in English. The English proficiency tests at school in September 1990 indicated that neither of the subjects was in need of ESL instruction. While the use of English had started to be preferred especially by S2, the younger subject (Halmari, in press), both girls were still able to carry out lengthy monolingual conversations in both languages, according to the needs of the situation (e.g., in Finnish with monolingual Finnish relatives and visitors).

Data

The data were recorded between November, 1990 and March, 1991 in two different situations: when the girls were playing together in their room, and during breakfast or snack time with other members (usually the mother) of the family. The recordings consisted of eight and a half hours of spontaneous conversation. The data were transcribed and, according to the above described criteria, all evaluative comments in the two siblings' speech were counted, as well as all their code-switches.

Table 1 shows the total number of code-switches (from switches of single words and phrases to switches of turn- and sentence-length), and the distribution of evaluative switches in contrast with all other switches.

Table 1. Distribution of evaluation across all code-switches

	n	%
Code-switching with evaluation	156	(22.6)
All other code-switches	533	(77.4)
Total number of code-switches	689	(100)

Out of the 689 code-switched segments, the total of 156 (almost one fourth) could clearly be identified as evaluative in nature. Example (1) is an illustration of a typical evaluative switch.

(1) Joo. Siellä oli ensiks- joo ja tota (LAUGHTER)
'Yeah. There was first- yeah and well'
sen weather uutisissa (LAUGHS) siellä näytettiin
'in its weather forecast (LAUGHS) they showed'
aina mitä tuli! (LAUGHTER)
'always what came!' (LAUGHTER)
→ It was real funny. (49)

Table 2 shows the distribution of code-switched and non-code-switched evaluative comments.

Table 2. Distribution of code-switching across all evaluations

	n	%
Code-switched evaluations	156	(41.6)
Non-switched evaluations	219	(58.4)
Total number of evaluations	375	(100)

As Table 2 indicates, more than forty percent of all evaluative comments were code-switched. Table 3 shows the numbers of evaluative switches from Finnish to English (A), from English to Finnish (B), and the numbers of evaluative comments without switching, both within English (C) and Finnish (D) discourse.

Table 3. Evaluative comments, according to language

	n	%
A. From Finnish to English evaluation	129	(34.4)
B. From English to Finnish evaluation	27	(7.2)
C. Evaluation in English, no switching	157	(41.9)
D. Evaluation in Finnish, no switching	62	(16.5)
Total number of evaluations	375	(100)

Switches from Finnish-based discourse into English for the purpose of evaluation, as in example (1) above, constituted roughly a third of all evaluative switches. 7.2 percent of all evaluations were switches into Finnish from English-based discourse, as in example (2).

(2) S2: You have to wear long- long underwear.
S1: Uh-huh.
S2: And [stockings-
→ S1: [Musta ne VILLAhousut on hirveitä.
'I think those WOOLLEN underpants are awful.'
→ S2: Niin on!
'So they are!' (LAUGHTER) (97)

The general feature of the data that were recorded when the girls were playing in their room by themselves, was that they were speaking either predominantly Finnish, only with occasional switches to English, or predominantly English, depending on the topic of the talk or activity. When the dominant language was

Finnish, the topic of the recorded conversation in the girls' room was the children the subjects frequently played with, and the genre of the conversation is here characterized as "people talk." The choice of language for "people talk" (Finnish), could probably best be explained as an instance of bonding. The girls were talking about children they at that moment wanted to picture in a negative light, and the choice of Finnish might symbolize togetherness: we two are different from these "stupid kids," we even have a different language. This is an interesting phenomenon, since the more automatic language choice was English.[5] At this point in their bilingualism, S2, the younger subject, seemed to lean more towards speaking English, whereas speaking Finnish came somewhat more naturally to S1, the older subject.[6]

I want to emphasize the fact that the data consist of spontaneous, unplanned conversation and, as such, also contain a few exchanges where the mother explicitly asks the subject to tell her about something specific (e.g., example 5 below). While this may seem more like an instance of elicitation, I argue that these instances are a typical, unplanned part of natural conversation between a middle-class mother and her children, and even though the child's answer is elicited by the mother's question, the data themselves remain spontaneous.

DISCUSSION

Stories

While naturally occurring conversation may at first sight seem to be full of topics that are started but never completed, it was nevertheless possible to find one more or less complete conversational "episode" (Tannen, 1984), or "story" after another. According to Tannen, stories are typical of high-involvement style, a style also represented by the present data of in-group conversation between the two siblings and other members of the family.

In the data presented here, stories stood out clearly from the surrounding speech, which could often be characterized by either phatic communion ("bye" (34) to an older brother leaving for school), strictly functional discourse ("Stop playing with that chinese jumprope or I'll get mad!" (26)), or short conversations

made out of question-answer adjacency pairs, as in example (3).

(3) S2: Remember to see me at the recess then.
S1: Uh-huh. Which recess?
S2: Lunch recess. (36)

The stories are fluently embedded in the surrounding discourse. They are often triggered by the current discourse topic, which happens to remind one of the interlocutors about an incident she wants to share. Bridges from one topic to another seem to develop easily. Only in a few cases does the mother initiate a topic by asking the subjects to tell her something, for instance about school.

The first research question–whether evaluative comments can be found at all–was quickly answered. Whenever stories occurred, evaluative comments could often be found as well. The speech situation itself also triggered evaluation (Example 11, below). The second question–whether code-switching seems to go together with the evaluative component–also received an affirmative answer: code-switching often occurred in the evaluative comments (about 42 percent of all evaluations were code-switched), and about 23 percent of all code-switches were evaluative in nature (Tables 1 and 2 above).

Code-switching for the purpose of evaluation

As pointed out above, possible reasons for code-switching can be numerous. In these Finnish-English data, the two subjects code-switch for various reasons: discourse topic (e.g., talk about the Finnish grandmother triggers a switch to Finnish, but school-related topics are discussed in English), lexical gaps in one of the two languages, an attempt to distance oneself (e.g., during arguments; cf. Gal, 1979), a need to directly quote someone (cf. McClure & McClure, 1988), or a change of interlocutor (e.g., the father is always addressed in Finnish). Stories may begin and be told in one language, but a switch to the other language tends to occur at the coda in the form of an evaluative comment. In example (4) below, S2 is telling a story about a neighbor's girl, who had "spat on the steps"–an act that received severe criticism by the two subjects.

(4) 1 S2: Ja tiäksää kusse tuli-
'And you know when she came'
2 niin mää näin sen että että se niin tota
'so I saw her that that she well like'
3 sylkäs meijän rappusille.
'spat on our steps.'
4 S1: SYLKÄS!
'SPAT!'
(22 LINES OF DETAILED DESCRIPTION IN FINNISH)
5 S2: se tulee täältä näin ja
'she comes from here like this and'
(S2 PRETENDS TO SPIT)
→ 6 S1: Uh!
7 S2: Si- eli siihen misson niinku- tässon kukat
'Ther- so there where there's like- here's the flowers'
8 ja sitten siihen siihen mistä
'and then there there where'
9 missä kävellään ylös rappusille.
'where we walk up the steps.'
→ 10 S1: She's stupid!
L
→ 11 S2: I know. (24-25)

The dominating language here is Finnish, a fact that also needs to be taken into account. As I have pointed out above, the reason for the choice of Finnish here might be the fact that the subjects, being engaged in "people talk" about an English-speaking playmate, find Finnish as a symbol of bonding–a true instance of Gumperzian "we-code"(1982). The story describes an event which is evaluated on lines 10-11 by both subjects, and this evaluation is marked with a switch to English. It is interesting that while the dominating language of the story has been Finnish, both subjects switch to English when they evaluate the protagonist's behavior. Also the verbalization "uh!" on line 6, where S1 expresses her disapproval of the spitting, is typical of English discourse, not Finnish.[7]

As has been noted above, the fact that code-switching here takes place for evaluation does not mean that it is a predictable feature of evaluative comments in bilingual discourse. During the story, some evaluative comments are also given in Finnish (e.g.,

Hyi! 'Phew!' and Ei sitä oikeesti sais tehdä täällä 'One shouldn't really do it here'). It is interesting, however, that at the end of the story a switch does take place. This finding is parallel to what Alvarez (1989) found in a bilingual Puerto Rican community; in their Spanish stories, Spanish-English bilinguals tended to switch to English at the very end.

In the following conversation the mother (M) asks S1 to tell her something that had happened in school. A "wedding" had taken place during lunch recess; a boy had married several girls simultaneously in a ceremony with a "priest" and "invited guests." S1 had been one of the "brides."

(5) 1 M: A:i. No mitäs tapahtu sitten?
'O:h. Well what happened then?'
2 S1: Well. Siinä kylläkin sitten Brian
'There actually Brian then'
3 se oli se joka kanto ne- sormukset
'he was the one who carried the- rings'
4 mm. Mun sormus kerran putos ja sittem me etittiin
'mm. My ring fell once and then we looked for'
5 ja mää /tota/ onneks löysin seh. Huh! ..
'and I /well/ luckily found it. Hh! ..'
(THE CONVERSATION GOES ON IN FINNISH FOR 9 TURNS)
6 S1: Sitten pihalla oli hirvee möly
'Then there was an awful noise on the yard.'
7 ja kaikki o-
'and everyone wa-'
→ 8 and everyone was unhappy about it. (31-32)

During this Finnish conversation the only actual switch to English takes place for the purpose of evaluating the "wedding" in the coda; the "wedding" was not a success because it was too noisy, and "everyone was unhappy about" the whole thing (lines 7-8).

The above story about the "wedding" was told exclusively by S1, the interlocutor's role being only that of asking questions and backchanneling. Often in spontaneous conversations stories are told as a collective activity where all participants contribute to the outcome. In the following example (6), the two daughters

along with their mother recollect how some old folks in Finland drink coffee.

(6) 1 S2: Mää oon nähny aikuisten Suomessa että että
'I have seen adults in Finland that that'
2 jos niiltä menee sitte kupista alas [niin
'if they spill then from the cup so'
3 M: [Niin?
'Yes?'
4 S2: niin ne ottaa seh ja sit niitte
'then they take it and then from their'
5 (INHA[LES) lautasesta!
'from the plate!'
6 S1: [(LAUGHS)
7 S2 (LAUGHS)
8 S1 Mites ne hampaattomat naiset jua juakaan sitä kahvia?
'How do those toothless women drink drink that coffee?'
9 S2 Nehän /?/
'They, you know /?/'
10 S1 /?/ siä niitten talossa ne teki-
'/?/ there in their house they did-'
L
11 M: Ja ne pistää
'And they put'
12 sokeripalan tähän suu- huulien väliij ja-
'a piece of sugar here mouth- between the lips and-'
13 kaataa kahvia asetille ja, ryystää näin (INHALES)
'pour coffee on the plate and, drink like this'
14 S1&S2 (LAUGH)
15 M: Sen sokeripalan läpi kun se menee-
'When it goes through the sugar it goes-'
16 se kahvi siinä.
'the coffee there.'
L
17 S1: Mhm.Mhm.
→ 18 S2: Heh-heh. /?/ Funny. (35)

It is noteworthy that here S2 does not switch to English before she introduces the evaluative comment (line 18), despite her strong preference for frequently switching to English elsewhere. All her turns before the final evaluation on line 18 are in Finnish (lines 1-2, 4-5, 9). A story is somehow identified as a complete whole, during which code-switching is preserved for evaluative (and possibly other emphasizing or dramatizing) purposes.

In example (7) below the subjects are planning their mutual participation in a "collection show" at school. All the planning happens in Finnish (except for the single noun stage on line 3, and a direct quote on line 6).[8] For the outcome of the planning--consisting of an evaluation of how S2 would feel if she had to go to the stage instead of S1 (line 9)--the code is switched from Finnish to English.

(7) 1 S2: Mää en käsitä-
'I don't understand-'
2 S1: No näät sitte.
'Well you'll see then.'
(7 TURNS IN FINNISH)
3 S1: Ethän sää sinne stageille tuu?
'You won't come to the stage, right?'
4 S2: En!
'No!'
5 S1: Joo. Mää vaan sanon että mm
'Yeah. I'll only say that mm'
6 "my sister is in this collection too." ...
7 M: Joo. Hyvä ...
'Yeah. Good.'
8 Ekkö sää haluis Irene mennä?
'Wouldn't you like to go Irene?'
→ 9 S2: No: .. I'd be embarrassed. (37)

In example (8), M asks a question in Finnish (line 1), the answers are provided in Finnish (lines 2-5), and S1 tells a story about meeting the person in question in Finnish (7-14), but a switch to English takes place when S2 provides the evaluative comment on line 16.

(8) 1 M: Muistatteks te sitä- Tyrväisen tätiä?
'Do you remember her- Aunt Tyrväinen?'
2 S2: Joo.
'Yeah.'
3 S1: Ker- [kyllä mä oon kerran nähny.
'once- yeah I have once seen (her).'
4 S2: [Joo, mää muistan.
'yeah, I remember.'
5 Kerran nähny.
'(I have) once seen (her).'
6 M: Joo. Se on ihan kiva täti.
'Yeah. She is quite a nice aunt.'
7 S1: Tota, kerran se tuli Jukalle ja Ailalle,
'Well, once she came to Jukka's and Aila's (house)'
8 ja tota- tota- no sitte kusse lähti,
'and well- well- like when she left,'
9 mää menin tota, mää kysyin Ailalta
'I went like, I asked Aila'
10 että kekä SE oli.
'that who SHE was.'
11 Ja tota Aila sano etta mun äiti.
'And well Aila said that my mother.'
12 Ja tota,
'And well,'
L
13 Nih?
'Yes?'
14 Sittem me oltiin ihan että, OLIKO?
'Then we were all like, WAS (SHE)?'
15 M: Mhm. (LAUGHTER)
→ 16 S2: She doesn't look like Aila's mom. (98)

An evaluative conclusion can trigger a switch in the code used, as in (9).

(9) 1 S2: Äiti .. Iita luulee /että jos/ Jaakko tekee
'Mom .. Iita thinks /that if/ Jaakko does'
2 sille Iitalle näin niin Iita luulee että
'to Iita like this so Iita thinks that'
3 että siitä tulee tällaseks. [Kaulattomaks.
'that she becomes like this. Neckless.'
4 M: [Jaa.
'Oh.'
L
5 S1 Tulee.
'Yes, it happens.'
6 Yks tut- .. Avec sano sen isoveli oli kertonu
'One frien- .. Avec said his big brother had told'
7 sille että että että jos et näin tekee toiselle-
'him that that that if you do this to someone-'
8 M: Nih?
'Yes?'
9 S1: niin siittä tulee semmonen
'so one becomes such'
10 M: Toisesta tulee kaulaton?
'The person becomes neckless?'
11 S1: Joo.
'Yeah.'
12 M: [(LAUGHS)
13 S1: [/?/ sen isoveli on yheksäntoista
'/?/ his big brother is nineteen'
→ 14 S2: <u>But I don't believe that</u>.
→ 15 S1: <u>I do</u>. (105)

In addition, the language of the initial evaluation can sometimes match the language of the preceding discourse; however, the final, concluding evaluation tends to be code-switched. In (10), both remarks by S2 evaluate the same event–something surprisingly nice done by the big brother, but the latter example is code-switched.

(10) S2: Oli mukavaa Jaakko. ..
'That was nice Jaakko. ..'
→ <u>I don't believe you did it</u>. (119)

A code-switched exclamation can also serve as an evaluation. In the following example (11), S2 sees the situation of mother being afraid of a little worm as funny.

(11) S2: Täällon mato menes- menemässä tossa. Mato!
'There's a worm going- going there. A worm!'
M: Mitä!?
'What!?'
S2: Pieni [mato (LAUGHTER)
'A little worm'
M: [Hyi kauheeta!
'Phew yucko!'
→ S2: (LAUGHS) Oh my gosh! (135)

The following short examples show the clear tendency of the evaluative component to occur in a language different from the dominating language of the preceding conversation. In all these cases the switch happens to be to English. The evaluations may state an opinion about a current discourse topic: something or someone is boring as in (12), funny as in (13), or weird as in (14).

(12) M: Onks Andrew vielä .. yhtä mukava kun ennen?
'Is Andrew still .. as nice as before?'
S1: Kun kekä?
'Like who?'
M: Yhtä mukava kun ennen?
'As nice as before?'
→ S1: No- .. He has started being BORING.
'Well-' (163)

(13) S1: tottakai .. well it looks so funny!
'of course' (113)

(14) S1: Sää haluut panna sen pyykkiin heti.
'You want to wash it right away.'
→ It's so weird. (112)

The following code-switched evaluation by S1 concludes the preceding narrative told by S2.

(15) S2: Sitten me mentiin toiseen juttuun.
'Then we changed the subject.'
S1: Oh, mihinkä juttuun?
'to which subject?'
S2: Emmää muista.
'I don't remember.'
→ S1: Oh, well who cares about THAT. (23)

In general, the structure of the code-switched evaluation often tends to consist of a copula, and an NP containing an adjective or an adjectival phrase (16-17).

(16) M: Eiks o mukava mennä taas Loma Lindaan?
'Isn't is nice to go again to Loma Linda?'
→ S1: Joo. That's my favorite school I've ever been to.
'Yeah.' (111)

(17) M: Irene, otaksää tätä kakkua?
'Irene, do you want this cake?'
S2: Emmää tykkää cheese cakestä.
'I don't like cheese cake.'
M: Ota sitten tosta toi- eilinen leivos.
'Take then that- yesterday's pie.'
→ S2: Yes. It's better. (80)

The verbs of the code-switched evaluations are often verbs of emotion: I like (18) or I love (19).

(18) S1: Joo. I like this picture.
'Yeah.' (101)

(19) S1: Ai se mun harmaa? I loved her.
'Oh the grey [kitten] of mine?' (109)

All of the above examples clearly show the robustness of code-switching as evaluation in discourse. I will next discuss whether these data should or should not be interpreted as supportive of the view of high- versuys low-prestige metahpor for English and Finnish respectively.

Direction of switching: A metaphor?

With the exception of example (2), all of the above evaluative codeswitches have been from Finnish to English. As shown in Table (4) below, more than 80 percent of all evaluative switches were switches away from Finnish to English, while only about 17 percent of the evaluative switches were in the direction of Finnish.

Table 4. Switches into English versus Finnish for Evaluation

	n	%
Finnish discourse into English evaluation	129	(82.7)
English discourse to Finnish evaluation	27	(17.3)
	156	(100)

In discourse literature, associations of authority and power tend to be associated with the high-prestige code (see e.g., Blom & Gumperz, 1972, for bilingualism in Norway; Gal, 1979, for German versus Hungarian in bilingual Austria). Gal (1988), however, emphasizes that the majority code is by no means always the "symbol of power and prestige" (pp. 246-247). Auer (1984) has explicitly argued against the Gumperzian view of code-switching where switches to or from a language are seen as metaphors of what those languages represent to the bilingual speaker. According to Auer, "there is no logical necessity to attach semantic values (meaning potentials) to the two languages" (Auer, 1984: 91). If this view is adopted, the switch itself should be important and should alone fulfill the rhetorical function of evaluation, no matter the direction of the switch.

How do these interpretations translate to our examples of English evaluative comments within Finnish discourse by the subjects? Is English (the majority code) for them a "metaphor" of prestige more suitable than Finnish to sum up a conversation, to underline the point, and to emphasize one's opinion on the matters? The above examples of code-switching would seem to support the

high- versus low-prestige metaphor for English and Finnish respectively. If the children 83 percent of the time resort to English when they switch codes for the purpose of evaluation, they must somehow attach English with more authority and prestige. However, this interpretation does not hold to all the cases. In 17 percent of the evaluative switches Finnish is the language of evaluation, as illustrated in example (20). S1 is trying to remember an English song. She sings it in English, but switches into Finnish to evaluate her performance.

(20) S2: Iiris, sing Puff the Magic Dragon in the first verse.
S1: (SINGS:) Puff the Magic Dragon lived by the sea
and frolicked through the autumn mist
to a place called /?/
S2: Hey mom, sing it again so mom can hear it.
M: /?/
→ S1: Mää en oikeen osaa sitä vielä.
'I don't quite know it yet.'
S2: Well do it!
S1: Okay. (44)

In (21) S2 is telling about kindergartners and firstgraders in her school and the reasons why their participation in the "collection show" (see example 7 above) should be restricted. In an example of evaluation she states in Finnish that they are "somewhat younger and stuff," whereas the beginning of the sentence and also the repeated and right-dislocated subject NP are in English.

(21) Now first the kindergartners and the firstgraders /?/
'cause ..
→ *ne on sellasia .. nuorempia vähän ja sellasta ..*
'they are such .. somewhat younger and stuff ..'
firstgraders and kindergartners
MOSTly kindergartners. (53)

In (22) S2 re-tells a somewhat questionable joke which she had told to her friend about a Finn's adventures in the sauna. The point of re-telling the story is the fact that her friend liked it, to the point that "she could never stop laughing." While this is a statement of fact, it at the same time functions as an evaluative

device: the joke S2 just re-told should be considered a great one, because the previous listener liked it.

(22) S2: and .. it's a little hot place
and you go there and first you have to go
to the shower and then to the sauna and then go back
and wash yourself. Well. (...)
er- there was Finnish guy,
Norway guy and an English guy.
(...)
there's these holes /?/ that you sit on,
on the top and,
his balls got stick in there!

→ *Se ei se ei ikinä pystyny lopettaan naura/mista/!*
'She could she could never stop laughing!' (137)

The following exchanges are discussions about the school lunch menu. They are carried out in English; however, to give an evaluation of the taste of hot dogs in example (23), S2 code-switches to Finnish. In (24) the children's reaction to beans is discussed in English but a code-switch to Finnish takes place when an evaluative description of the beans is given. Example (25) is a Finnish comment on what chocolate pudding looks like.

(23) S1: Chili .. dog .. on a bun
S2: Phew but I'll still [take it
S1: [I mean-
[chili chili /cheese dog/
S2: [It's only a hot dog
It's only a hot dog

→ *mutta se maistuu rasvasemmalta kun oikee hoddari.*
'but it tastes greasier than a real hotdog.' (142)

(24) S2: everyone always [says
S1: ["no beans no beans no beans."
S2: Some beans a-

→ well *ne on sellasia jotka /?/ tällasia uh!*
'they are such that /?/ like this yuck!' (143)

(25) S2: (English)
→ *niin se on se näyttää kakalle.*
'so it is it looks like poo.' (165)

From the above examples (20-25) it becomes clear that it is not exclusively English that can convey the rhetorical function of evaluation. Even though switches to Finnish are considerably rarer, they serve exactly the same evaluative function of conveying the speaker's attitude toward the topic discussed, or of pinpointing or emphasizing the contents of the message. Based on the quality of the evaluative switches (both Finnish-English, as well as English-Finnish) I would argue, along the lines implied by Auer (1984), that the direction of the switch does not matter and the use of English is not necessarily a metaphor of prestige and authority. However, the high frequency of English evaluative switches over Finnish ones renders this view somewhat questionable. Why would these subjects so much more often resort to English to give an evaluation if they felt that both languages were equal in authority?

The answer to this question could be quite simple. The more stories and conversation we have in Finnish, the more switching to English for the purpose of evaluation there will be. In these data, all the "people talk" segments were predominantly in Finnish and the presence of the Finnish speaking mother and other family members in the breakfast table conversations clearly shaped the overall distribution of the language used to the favor of Finnish. In this case, the only direction left to switch into was English.

Although the absolute number of evaluative switches to Finnish (27) is small if compared to the number of evaluative switches to English (129), in each language the percentages of code-switched evaluations indicate the following: while a considerable number of evaluations are code-switched (in Finnish 30 percent, in English 45 percent), more than half of all evaluations in both languages (70 percent in Finnish and 55 percent in English) remain un-switched (Table 5).

Table 5. Code-switched and non-switched evaluations in English and in Finnish.

	Evaluative comments					
	In English		In Finnish		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Code-switched	129	(45)	27	(30)	156	(42)
Without a switch	157	(55)	62	(70)	219	(58)
	286	(100)	89	(100)	375	(100)

Example (26) is one of the 219 evaluative comments where code-switching did not occur.

(26) S2: You know lemme show you something
this is what Miah once did on the recess time
when we went to /five-four pencils/
You- he he s- stuck the two of them in his nose
and took that (MAKES A FUNNY NOISE)
(LAUGHTER)
S1: /Sick!/ Who did that?
S2: Miah! (LAUGHTER)

→ Poor Matthew. He sits by him.

→ And Ashley has to sit by him too.

→ [Phew!

→ S1: [Phew! (147-148)

In (26) no switch of code takes place in the evaluation. However, a switch of tense from the past to the present does take place. This shows that what is important in the evaluative comment for the achievement of the rhetorical effects of emphasis and hearer-involvement is crucially entailed in the switch; whether it be a tense-switch or a code-switch is not important for the outcome. For a bilingual, both means are available.

CONCLUSION

In this paper a description of the evaluation patterns in bilingual spontaneous conversation has been given in order to show that a favored strategy for concluding evaluations in bilingual discourse is code-switching from one language to another.

Because the discourse functions of code-switching are numerous, and because discourse factors themselves often dictate a change in code, it is often impossible to determine the real or primary reason for a switch of code. Other factors, for instance a need to speak in the same language as one of the interlocutors to whom the comment is addressed, rather than a need to evaluate effectively, might be the primary reason for code-switching. However, the numerous examples cited above give some indication that one of the functions of code-switching is indeed evaluation. Again, no predictions of the use of code-switching for this purpose can be made, but the need to evaluate the discourse content can clearly explain many instances of bilingual code-switching behavior.

Whether the switch itself or its direction to an assumed high-prestige code is important is a question open to debate. Even though the prevalence of switches to English in the present data could support the view of English as a metaphor of authority, I argue that since switches to Finnish also take place, and since switches to English are the only possibility if the prevailing language of conversation is Finnish, it is not the direction of switching which matters; the fact that a switch (of any kind) has taken place is the important feature of the evaluative component, not only in the genre of narrative but also in spontaneous discourse.

Since this paper is based on restricted data of two child bilinguals, it would be necessary to look at the co-occurrence of code-switching and evaluative comments, and especially the direction of evaluative switches in a larger bilingual population to determine whether code-switching really is an essential strategy for evaluation in bilingual discourse and whether an equal amount of switching to both directions will take place if the languages are better balanced than in the current data. This preliminary project, however, indicates that code-switching, indeed, is an important evaluative device.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Evelyn Hatch for her encouragement and comments on an early draft. I also want to acknowledge the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions during the preparation of the paper. The flaws that remain are mine alone.

NOTES

[1] For examples of unpredictable but explainable switches, see Hatch, 1976, p. 202-203.

[2] I am indebted to E. Hatch (personal communication) for pointing out the parallel between tense-shift and code-switching as evaluative devices.

[3] For instance in these data laughter often clearly functions as an evaluative device. However, since laughter can serve other functions as well, it deserves to be separately accounted for and falls outside the area of the current paper.

[4] The numbers after the examples refer to the pages in the original transcript.

[5] In other instances when the girls were left alone with the tape-recorder while they were playing with dolls, they spoke predominantly English. Code-switching was used, however, and it revealed an interesting pattern recurring consistently in doll-play: when the girls were speaking "in character" (in the voices of the dolls), they used only English. However, they almost always switched to Finnish when they stepped out of character and started to plan the play (Halmari & Smith, 1992).

[6] Code-switching patterns may also reveal a starting/on-going language loss (Halmari, in press). This is also one factor that needs to be considered when analyzing the data to see patterns in evaluation. The preferred language for S2 was clearly English. The analysis of the favored code-switching patterns of the subjects indicated that 32 % of S2's all turn-internal switches (n=109) were language assignment shifts from Finnish to English (the turn or sentence was started in Finnish but a switch to English took place before the end of the turn). This might also influence her potential use of code-switching for evaluation. For S1, no such preference at that point of time could be detected: Finnish-English language assignment shifts constituted only 6 % of all her turn-internal switches (n=164) (Halmari, in press).

[7] These short verbalized back-channels have not been included in the count of switches.

[8] Code-switching for quotation to dramatize the narrative has been noted in the literature (e.g., Hatch, 1976; McClure & McClure, 1988; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1989). Hatch (1992) classifies mimicking and direct quotes as evaluative devices. Since in my data all direct quotes consistently occur in the actual language in which the sentence was uttered, I will not look at quotes as part of evaluative

devices in this paper, even though their function often is to dramatize the story, and thus involve the interlocutor. The exchange in example (7) illustrates also an instance of a third type of switching: on line 3, S1 uses an English lexical item stage instead of the Finnish one. In the literature this type of switching is often called mixing or borrowing. Even though I consider these switches code-switching proper (Halmari, 1993), the discussion of their distribution is outside the focus of the present paper.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, C. (1989). Code-switching in narrative performance: A Puerto Rican speech community in New York. In O. García & R. Otheguy (Eds.), *English across cultures: Cultures across English: A reader in cross-cultural communication* (pp. 373-386). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Auer, J. C. P. (1984). On the meaning of conversational code-switching. *Ergebnisse und Methoden moderner Sprachwissenschaft, 20*, 87-112.

Blom, J.-P. & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston..

Clyne, M. (1987). Constraints on code switching: How universal are they? *Linguistics, 25*, 739-764.

Di Sciullo, A. M., Muysken, P. & Singh, R. (1986). Government and code-mixing. *Journal of Linguistics, 22*, 1-24.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15*, 325-340.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). The relationship between micro- and macro-sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 15-32). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Gal, S. (1988). The political economy of code choice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 245-264). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gumperz, J. J. (1976). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. In J. Cook-Gumperz & J. J. Gumperz (Eds.), *Papers on language and context* (Working papers of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory No. 46, pp. 1-46). Berkeley: University of California.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halmari, H. (1993). *Code-switching or borrowing?: Explaining Finnish-English bilingualism.* Paper presented at the 13th Annual Second Language Research Forum, Pittsburgh, PA.

Halmari, H. (in press). Code-switching strategies as a mirror of language loss: A case study of two child bilinguals. In D. Staub (Ed.), *Papers in Applied*

Linguistics Michigan. Michigan: Michigan State University.

Halmari, H. & Smith, W. (1992). *Pragmatic code-switching in conversation: A case study*. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Vancouver, BC.

Hatch, E. (1976). Studies in language switching and mixing. In W. C. McCormack & S. A. Wurm (Eds.), *Language and man: Anthropological issues* (pp. 201-214). The Hague: Mouton.

Hatch, E. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, E. (1973). Bilingualism, language contact, and immigrant languages in the United States: A research report 1956-1970. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics: Vol. 10.* (pp. 505-591). The Hague: Mouton.

Heller, M. (1988). Introduction. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 1-24). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Joshi, A. K. (1985). Processing of sentences with intrasentential code switching. In D. R. Dowty, L. Karttunen & A. M. Zwicky (Eds.), *Natural language parsing: Psychological, computational, and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 190-205). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts: Proceedings of the 1966 annual spring meeting of the American Ethnological Society* (pp. 12-44). Seattle, WA: American Ethnological Society.

McClure, E. & McClure, M. (1988). Macro- and micro- sociolinguistic dimensions of code-switching in Vingard. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 25-51). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Olshtain, E. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Happy Hebrish: Mixing and switching in American-Israeli family interactions. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Vol. 1: Discourse and pragmatics* (pp. 59-83). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pfaff, C. W. (1979). Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language*, *55*, 291-318.

Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en español*": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, *18*, 581-618.

Scotton, C. M. & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *13*, 5-20.

Stenson, N. (1990). Phrase structure congruence, government, and Irish-English code-switching. In R. Hendrick (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 23. The syntax of the modern Celtic languages* (pp. 167-197). San Diego, CA:

Academic Press.
Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Timm, L. A. (1975). Spanish-English code-switching: El porqué y how-not-to. *Romance Philology*, *28*(4), 473-482.
Woolford, E. (1983). Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *14*, 520-536.

Helena Halmari is a doctoral student in linguistics at the University of Southern California.