

# Code-Switching between the Standard Croatian Language and the Chakavian Dialect

---

**Matetić, Tonina**

**Master's thesis / Diplomski rad**

**2016**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:186:346396>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-01-25**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



Tonina Matetić

**CODE-SWITCHING BETWEEN THE STANDARD CROATIAN  
LANGUAGE AND THE CHAKAVIAN DIALECT**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the M.A. in English Language and  
Literature and German Language and Literature at the University of Rijeka

**Supervisor:**

**Dr Branka Drljača Margić**

September, 2016

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
1.1. Previous research .....	2
2. Theoretical framework .....	3
2.1. Bilingualism.....	3
2.1.1. Vertical Bilingualism .....	4
2.2. Code-switching .....	5
2.3. Language accommodation .....	5
2.4. The sociolinguistic approach to code-switching and language accommodation.....	6
3. Methodology .....	8
3.1. Participants .....	8
3.2. Aims.....	9
3.3. Research methods .....	10
3.4. Research questions .....	11
4. Results obtained from the recorded conversations.....	12
4.1. Topic.....	12
4.2. Proficiency.....	15
4.3. Emotions and jokes.....	15
4.4. Interlocutors.....	17
4.4.1. Addressee specification .....	18
4.4.2. (Non-) accommodation .....	22
4.4.3. Clarification .....	24
4.4.4. Persuasion .....	25
4.5. Quotation .....	26
5. Results of the interviews .....	26
6. Discussion .....	28
6.1. Topic.....	28
6.2. Proficiency.....	29
6.3. Emotions and jokes.....	29
6.4. Interlocutors.....	30
6.4.1. Addressee specification .....	31
6.4.2. (Non-) accommodation .....	33

6.4.3. Persuasion .....	34
7. Conclusion.....	35
Appendix .....	36
References .....	38

## 1. Introduction

A large number of people who live in the east and west Kastav region use both the standard Croatian language and the Chakavian dialect. This often results in code-switching. These speakers switch between the standard language and the dialect on a daily basis, depending on the situation, the topic of conversation, their linguistic attitudes, habits, and other factors. This study aims to describe the reasons why people code-switch, in which situations they do this, and what influences their decision to linguistically accommodate their interlocutors.

It was important to conduct this study because, to my knowledge, no such study has been conducted in Croatia among the speakers of the standard Croatian language and the Chakavian dialect.

According to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (1998), a dialect is “a label used to refer to any variety of a language shared by a group of speakers living in the same place or in close proximity to each other, or belonging to the same socioeconomic or social group.” From the sociolinguistic point of view, Gumperz (2007: 76) points out that one’s native speech is “an integral part of his [or her] family background, a sign of his [or her] local identity.”

The Chakavian dialect, which is one of the three dialects of the Croatian language, together with Shtokavian and Kajkavian, is characterized by the system of phonological, prosodic, morphologic, syntactic, and lexical features (Lisac, 2009). The Chakavian dialect under study is the Northern Chakavian type and belongs to ekavian accent. The main characteristic of this dialect is the interrogative pronoun *čā* (Lisac, 2009). The word order in sentences is relatively free while the words originate mostly from old Slavic terms (Lisac, 2009). The dialect uses the old accentuation, which consists of three possible accents (Lisac,

2009). When it comes to phonologic features, sound *d̥* is replaced with *j*, and sound *m* with *n* at the end of the word (Lisac, 2009).

### **1.1. Previous research**

Since 1971, when Blom and Gumperz conducted one of the first studies that explored the phenomenon, numerous studies that analyze code-switching between two languages have been conducted. However, there are only a few studies that investigate code-switching between a dialect and a standard variety of a language. Blom and Gumperz (2007), who conducted their study in Norway among speakers of the official language Bokmål and the dialect Ranamål, concluded that the speakers clearly separate the two varieties in the following way: the first one is used in conversations with strangers while the second one serves for informal conversations with their friends and family members.

The second study, conducted in Italy by Alfonzetti (2014), investigated the code-switching strategies between the standard language and the dialect which, according to the author, have to do with the age of the speakers. She determined several functions of code-switching among the younger generations: humorous function, reinforcing function, and flagging by explicit commentary and settings where it occurs: in the classroom and at the disco (Alfonzetti, 2014). She also concluded that, when it comes to situational code-switching, there was a great difference between young speakers and the older ones (Alfonzetti, 2014).

Another study took place among speakers of Caribbean Creole English. Holder chose five dialect speakers and investigated the factors that influence code-switching between Standard English and Caribbean Creole English. Her results suggest that there are five main categories into which the motives for code-switching could be categorized: establishing

community life, establishing identity, conveying meaning, unconscious code-switching, and code-switching when the speakers are relaxed (Holder).

DeBose analyzed code-switching among speakers who speak both Black English and Standard English. He confirmed his hypothesis that Afro-Americans chose Standard English for communicating with people they are not familiar with and used Black English for the purpose of reporting the speech of their relatives (DeBose, 1992).

## **2. Theoretical framework**

### **2.1. Bilingualism**

Since there are many different definitions of bilingualism proposed by numerous linguists, only those that are relevant for the present study are chosen and presented here. The main problem in determining which person is bilingual is the level of proficiency in a language. On one hand, Bloomfield (1933: 55) views bilingualism as “native-like control of two languages”, and on the other, Mackey (1962: 52) describes it as “the ability to use more than one language”, without any further explanations. The most suitable definition for the present study is, however, the one by Weinreich (1953), who defines bilingualism as “the practice of alternatively using two languages.”

In addition to the above, four types of bilinguals are important for this study. The first two types are balanced and dominant bilinguals. According to Baker (2006: 9), the former are defined as persons who are “approximately equally fluent in two languages” while the latter are described by Chin and Wigglesworth (2007: 7) as “bilinguals who are dominant in one language.” The second two types are simultaneous (native) and sequential bilinguals. The first are children who “acquire two languages at the same time from birth” (Baker, 2006: 97) while

the second are those who learn one language at home, and then go to elementary school where they learn a second language (Thompson, 2000, as quoted in Baker, 2006).

To sum up, each bilingual during his or her life acquires communicative linguistic competence which is different for each language he or she speaks. Hymes (1979: 30) points out that “a person acquires competence as to when to speak, when not [to], and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner.”

### **2.1.1. Vertical Bilingualism**

Before moving on to the definition of vertical bilingualism, it is important to define the relationship between language and dialect. Myers-Scotton (2006) claims that language as such does not exist in reality, but what exists are dialects which make a language. She also refers to the standard variety of language as “the standard dialect”, and explains that dialects of the same language are sometimes “different enough that they are not mutually intelligible” (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 24) which is the case with the standard Croatian language and the Chakavian dialect.

The definitions of bilingualism in most cases include two languages and very rarely dialects of a language. The situation when a person speaks both the standard variety of a language and one of its dialects is defined as vertical bilingualism which “obtains when a standard language, together with a distinct but related dialect coexists within the same speaker” (Pohl, 1965, as quoted in Beardsmore, 1986: 5).



## **2.2. Code-switching**

Gardner-Chloros (2009: 11) describes code as “an umbrella term for languages, dialects, styles etc.” Code-switching is, just like bilingualism, defined in many different ways by many different linguists. Gumperz (1982: 59) defines it as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.” Myers-Scotton (2006: 239) describes the phenomenon simply as “the use of two language varieties in the same conversation.”

What brings us to the problematic issue, when talking about code-switching, is Poplack’s definition (1980: 583): “Code switching is the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent.” She differentiates between inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching (Poplack, 1980). Inter-sentential switching, according to Myers-Scotton (1993), is the switching between sentences where one or more sentences are produced in one language before switching to the other one while intra-sentential switching occurs within the same sentence. Unlike Poplack and Myers-Scotton, some other linguists differentiate between code-switching and code-mixing. For example, Bhatia and Ritchie (2007: 337) refer to the former as “the use of various linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses, and sentences) primarily from two participating grammatical systems across sentence boundaries within a speech event” while the latter one is defined as the mixing of the same linguistic units, but within the sentence (this term will be used in the present study).

## **2.3. Language accommodation**

In order to better understand the phenomenon of code-switching, it is important to define the term accommodation and discuss its implications in the context of switching

languages/dialects. Kaur (2011: 2705) states that in the process of accommodation “speakers modify their communicative behavior to mirror that of their interlocutors.” The first attempts to clarify the reasons, i.e. the motives for speech accommodation, were made by Coupland in the 1970s when the Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT) was developed. This theory was revised in the 1990s by Coupland and Giles and resulted in the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT). According to this theory, there are three basic motives for speech accommodation: “evoking the addressee’s social approval, promoting communicative efficiency between interlocutors, and maintaining a positive social identity” (Beebe and Giles, 1984). The most important terms, introduced already in the SAT and revised later in the CAT, are convergence, divergence, and maintenance. The first one is defined as “strategy by which speakers adapt to each other’s speech and other communicative behaviors, for instance, by modifying their accent or lexis toward other speakers” (Rogerson-Revell, 2010: 434). The second one stands for “the way speakers emphasize differences in speech” (Rogerson-Revell, 2010: 434) while the last one refers to signaling distance from the interlocutors or maintaining one’s own identity through maintaining one’s own speech (Rogerson-Revell, 2010).

#### **2.4. The sociolinguistic approach to code-switching and language accommodation**

The present study investigates the specific aspect of human communication which is, according to Gumperz (2002: 1), characterized as “a social activity requiring the coordinated efforts of two or more individuals.” These efforts sometimes include code-switching. The sociolinguistic approach to the research of code-switching concentrates on “the social motivation for its use” (Lowi, 2005: 1393), on the discourse function of code switching, and on constructing social meaning through its use (Boztepe, 2003).

In order to better understand the factors which influence code-switching and code-mixing, it is necessary to clarify several important terms. The identity which, according to Bialystok (2001), is formed by the language we speak is one of the most important factors that influence our language choice. Language is, as Salzmann (1993) points out, a marker of one's ethnic identity and his or her uniqueness.

When it comes to domains and varieties used in these domains, Fishman (1972) identifies the following ones: family, friendship, religion, education, and employment. He also stresses (Fishman, 1972) that these domains determine the language which is spoken. Moreover, Hoffman (1991) in addition to Fishman's categorization proposes three other domains: person, place, and topic. All these domains could be related to two different codes that a bilingual person can opt for when communicating with others. They are called *we* and *they* code and their primary function is solidarity. Gumperz (1982) relates the former to in-group relations and informal activities and adds that it is connected with informality, intimacy, and emotions. The latter is defined by Gumperz (1982: 66) as "the majority language that often serves as the communication tool for out-group relations with the mainstream community." The Hoffman's domains could also be connected to the Markedness Model introduced by Myers-Scotton in 1983. She distinguishes between two different choices: marked and unmarked, both depending on the speaker's own goals (Myers-Scotton, 2006). She explains that unlike marked choice, which belongs to our communicative competence, and if a speaker opts for it, "he or she is causing no social ripples because participants expect such a choice, based on experience", marked choices are unpredictable (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 159).

It is worth mentioning that the same motives that account for switching between two languages also account for the switching between dialects (Gumperz, 1978). Different linguists categorize these motives/factors differently. On one hand, Fishman (2000) defines

three broad categories: group membership, situation, and topic. On the other, Gumperz (1982) proposes more specific categories: quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization versus objectivization. Similarly, Auer (1998) differentiates between: reported speech, change of participant constellation, side comments, reiteration, change of activity type, topic shift, language play, and topic/comment structure. The last categorization, proposed by Holmes (2000), includes: code-switching used to show solidarity, topic change, and code-switching used to persuade audience. What should be added to these classifications is a distinction between situational and metaphorical code-switching, proposed by Blom and Gumperz (1971). They stress that the first type “assumes a direct relationship between language and social situation” while the second one “relates to particular kinds of topics or subject matter rather than to change in social situation” (Blom and Gumperz, 1972: 88).

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1. Participants**

The sample consisted of 18 participants, both males and females. Three of them spoke only the standard Croatian language. The first one, Josipa, is in her late 60s and was born in Pula, Croatia. She lived in Pula for 25 years and in Berlin, Germany, for a few years, and then she moved to Zvoneća, where she lives today. The second one, Jelka, is 24 years old, was born in Rijeka, Croatia, and has lived in Lovran, Croatia, from birth. The last one, Kate, was born in Slavonski Brod, Croatia, is 25 years old, and has lived in Rijeka for six years now. When it comes to education, Josipa has a Master’s and Jelka, and Kate a Bachelor’s degree.

The rest of the participants use both the Chakavian dialect and the standard Croatian language. Six participants were aged 24-30, seven were aged 50-60, and two were in their late 60s. The first group comprised both males and females named as follows: Ivo, Franjo, Rudo, Branko, Marija, and Jenka. All of them were born in Rijeka. Ivo, Franjo, and Jenka have lived from birth in Zvoneća and Branko in Rupa. Rudo lived for 30 years in Viškovo, but moved three months ago to Zvoneća. Marija lived in Permani, but when she was 18 years old she moved to Ljubljana (Slovenia). Ivo, Franjo, Rudo, and Branko finished high school while Marija and Jenka have a Bachelor's degree.

The second group consisted of five males and two females named Vinko, Jože, Zvonko, Mate, Mirko, Ivanka, and Anka. They were all born in Rijeka, but now Jože, Zvonko, and Mirko live in Matulji, Vinko in Zaluki, Mate in Brešca, and Anka in Rubeši. Ivanka lives in Zvoneća, but lived for fifty years in Opatija before that. Vinko, Zvonko, and Mirko finished high school, Jože and Mate have a Bachelor's, and Anka and Ivanka a Master's degree.

In the last group, there were two participants: Vice and Danica. They were both born in Rijeka and have a Master's degree. Vice lives in Zvoneća and Danica in Matulji.

### **3.2. Aims**

The main aim of the study was to determine which factors influence code-switching and code-mixing between the Chakavian dialect and the standard Croatian language. A related aim was to examine whether the formality of the situation has an impact on the occurrence of code-switching and code-mixing. Another aim was to investigate if the people who use both the Chakavian dialect and the standard Croatian language accommodate to people who speak

only the standard language and, if so, why they do that. Moreover, the study also aimed to examine if people used only the standard language in formal situations.

### **3.3. Research methods**

According to Wolcott (1994), qualitative research includes “developing a description of an individual or setting, analyzing data for themes or categories, and finally making an interpretation or drawing conclusions about its meaning personally and theoretically, [...] and offering further questions to be asked.” This kind of data analysis will be used in the present study. In order to analyze the data, the participants’ characteristics, and settings where the conversations took place will be related to the recorded conversations, which will be then discussed and interpreted by using theoretical framework, previous research, interviews with five participants, and the researcher’s personal experience.

The majority of the data was collected in two ways: the greatest part was recorded by using a voice recorder and the rest was collected from the video-sharing website You Tube. Parts of the conversations were transcribed using Jeffersonian Transcription Notation (Jefferson, 2009). Recordings took place in formal and informal settings. In formal settings, three situations were recorded: the first one was the conversation between a patient and a doctor about medical issues, the second one involved a conversation in which a volunteer and a headmaster made arrangements for voluntary work in school, the third formal recording consists of short passages taken from the different sessions of the Council of the municipal district Matulji, which were recorded and posted on You Tube. In an informal setting, the researcher, who took part in conversations herself, recorded conversations in the following places: in a restaurant, in a pub, at the researcher’s home, at the homes of two different participants, in the car, and over the phone. All participants in informal situations were the

researcher's friends. They were all informed that the conversations would be recorded and that the study investigated the use of the standard Croatian language and the Chakavian dialect. They also had to sign the consent form which guaranteed their anonymity, the exception being the members of the Council of the municipal district Matulji. To protect their anonymity, the names of all participants were changed.

In order to investigate the phenomenon of code-switching more thoroughly, five participants were interviewed. At the beginning of the interview, they were asked to provide their reasons for code-switching. After that, they listened to several audio excerpts from the conversation they took part in and reflected on them. They were also asked if they used more dialect or standard variety in their everyday life and if they felt differently when they used the Chakavian dialect and the standard Croatian language. At the end of the interview, they expressed their opinion about the future of the dialect and its intergenerational transmission.

### **3.4. Research questions**

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Which factors influence code-switching and code-mixing between the standard Croatian language and the Chakavian dialect?
2. Which factors cause code-switching and code-mixing in formal situations and which in the informal ones?
3. Which are the reasons why the participants sometimes do not accommodate when talking to people who use only the standard language?
4. Do the participants in formal situations communicate exclusively in the standard Croatian language, which would be the expected linguistic behavior?

## 4. Results obtained from the recorded conversations

The results of the conversations will be divided into five main categories (topic, proficiency, emotions and jokes, interlocutors, and quotation) and four subcategories (addressee specification, (non-) accommodation, persuasion, and clarification) which were both determined according to the different classifications of factors that influence code-switching. In these categories and subcategories, the short passages from the recorded conversations, where it is obvious that code-switching/code-mixing occurred because of the mentioned factors, will be provided and discussed. Words, phrases, and sentences where code-switching and code-mixing occurred are written in bold.

### 4.1. Topic

The following examples show code-mixing caused by the choice of the topic. In the first set of examples, the volunteer, Jenka, talks to the headmaster of the school, Ivanka, about voluntary work with the pupils. They both usually use the Chakavian dialect, although in passages where the headmaster talks code-mixing occurs all the time, i.e. she inserts words and phrases from the standard Croatian language. In both examples, the headmaster talks about the educational issues and arrangements she usually talks about in the standard language, but because of her interlocutor she chooses the dialect, which results in code-mixing.

(1) Ivanka: (hhh.) tako da bi tu (.) mogli zet jedan dan u **tjednu** [(.)] kad je najviše **učenika**

Jenka: [mhm]

Ivanka: na **čuvanju** [i sa] s **jednim dijelom ustvari** [(.)] evo da ti delaš njemač[ki] jezik i



Jenka: [mhm] [mhm]

Ivanka: da in daš ne[ke] **osnove** da se ne zgube [kad budu šli va njemačku] ili austriju

Jenka: [mhm] [da da da]

(2) Jenka: da (1.0) mislite da bi to više bili **učenici**:: (.) nižeh razredi ili: o[vi:: stare]ji

Ivanka: [ne ne]

Ivanka: od petega do: osmega

Jenka: ali mislin dob[ro] sedmi osmi razred ili ovi::

Ivanka: [dã]

Ivanka: ma čak više peti do sed[mi os]mi imaju **ispunjeniju satni[cu]** (.hhh) i **zbilja** već  
su **u srednjoj školi**

In the following examples, the patient, Jenka, talks to her doctor, Anka, about medical issues. As in the previous set of examples, while the parts where code-mixing occurs are in the standard Croatian language or even in the form which is somewhere between the standard variety and the dialect (e.g. *tvojon probavon*), the base language is Chakavian. Since the doctor usually talks about medicine in the standard variety, it is probably unusual for her to use Chakavian in such situation which is why code-mixing occurs.

(3) Anka: **no** ja mislin da **svega** tega (.) zapravo (.) sa **tvojon probavon** ne bi ni bilo da da

ipak (.) ni dokazana ta:: upalna [**promjena**] va tvojen [creve] tako da je to

Jenka: [ja ja] [normalno]

(4) Jenka: a mi morete dat za:: ovo tu isto godišnju uputnicu [se more]

Anka: [a:: ovako]

Anka: **da** godišnju bin ti (.) bin ti mogla dat ako:: a: će ti pregledi bit vrlo **učesta[li]** nači

Jenka: [da]

Anka: ako je ambulatno **liječenje u [smi]slu** (.) kontrola pa kontrola stolice pa kontrola

Jenka: [aha]

Anka: ga- **kolonoskopije**

The next passages show the conversation between two friends (Danica and Josipa). While Josipa uses mostly the standard variety with a few words and phrases in Chakavian, Danica switches and mixes during the conversation. They talk about two related topics, faith and religion. In the first case, Danica uses the Chakavian dialect and in the second one the standard Croatian language. This happens probably because faith is part of her identity while religion is topic which does not have particular emotional value for her.

(5) Danica: čuj ako si ti vjernik tebe j lagje (.) vjera je nadanje vjera je utjeha vjera je spas a kamo ćeš ti čin ti počneš sumnjat ti nisi vjernik (.) kamo ćeš ti nego [znaš]

Jospia: [i danas]

Josipa: to baš na zapadu (.) u tradicionalinim društvima to postoji

(6) Danica: pazi osim nekih re- u [nekim religijama gdje je da ali recimo] imaš ti religije gdje

Josipa: [ali on govori o zapadnom čovjeku]

Danica: su fanatici [(.)] gdje u: ime ne znam ti opet lagano ideš u smrt

Josipa: [mhm]

## 4.2. Proficiency

In the next example, it is possible that code-mixing occurs because of the poor command of the standard Croatian language. The participant is one of the members of the Council of the municipal district Matulji, Zvonko, and he talks about energy efficiency. It is obvious that inserting words and phrases from the Chakavian dialect into the sentences which are in the standard Croatian language occurs throughout the whole speech without a particular pattern.

(7) Zvonko: apsolutno ne **vidin** neki problem (.) načelnik ima pravo potpisa za nešto (1.0) ako neko **išće** od nas da mu damo još potpore da još nešto potpsuje ja apsolutno ne **vidin::** nikakvog problema (1.0) europa to **išće** mi u erupu moramo **poć** energetska učinkovitost mora bit prema tome apsolutno držim da to je (posljedica enormna)

## 4.3. Emotions and jokes

In the following excerpts, the participants either use Chakavian or switch to it when expressing anger or joking. In the first example, one of the members of the Council, Branko, expresses dissatisfaction with the way money is spent in the municipal district Matulji and switches from the standard variety to Chakavian.

(8) Branko: mjesni odbor jurdani je potrošio dvadeset i osam posto više nego šta im je dodijeljeno (1.0) pa me zanima kamo bi došli kad bi svi potrošili dvadeset i osam posto više nači imali su četiritisućepetstosedandespet potrošili su

petosanstosedandesdevet **da znan ako moremo mi kako pa ćemo mi ovo leto malo više (5.0)**

Unknown participant: ma to su miće cifre ej branko

Branko: **dobro miće miće sad ćemo prit na veće**

In the second passage, one of the participants, Ivo, expresses anger because he was late for the meeting of a carnival group where he was supposed to choose a carnival costume. Since Franjo and Jenka usually use the dialect, he uses it all the time. He even speaks the dialect with Jelka, who usually speaks only the standard Croatian language because he is angry.

(9) Franjo: i (.) ke meri si zel

Jelka: mi smo se izmjerili

Ivo: **e:: kako ću in srat samo neka još ča progovore (1.0) nikega ni bilo nikega ni bilo**

Franjo: ja pa č-

Ivo: [uru vremena budi tamo]

Jelka: [znači došao si u devet] (.) kad je bilo mjerenje↑u kolko sati

Franjo: ma uru vremena::

Ivo: uru vremena moru bit (.) ću in ja platit pijaču

Jenka: a ča ako ni tamo pol uri nikega:↑

Franjo: piše ti lepo na osan (.) da si pravi biš na sedan i pedeset tamo bil

Ivo: puši mi kurac (.) do osan i deset san delal

Franjo: jebiga (.) do osan i deset si delal

Jenka: pa ćeš poč drugu štemanu

Franjo: pošalji meri na: na fejsbuk

Jelka: da ja sam ti uzela (šta sve moraš)

Ivo: a:

Jelka: ne moraš ni ić

Ivo: **ma ja:**

In the next example, although he usually uses the standard Croatian language when talking to her, Ivo jokes with Jelka in Chakavian. This happens because Ivo is more used to joking in Chakavian than in the standard variety.

(10) Jenka: pa ona ih je skinula ljuta sigurno

Kate: i ostala je tri minute duže zbog tebe

Jenka: da morala je odljepljivat ono dole

Ivo: vu du dol jelka (1.0) **z metlun ono h::**

Jelka: s onim moćom za prat pod

#### 4.4. Interlocutors

In the first two formal situations, where the patient talks to her doctor and the volunteer to the headmaster of the school, the standard Croatian language would be more appropriate; however, the participants use the dialect, with a few instances of code-mixing. This is due to the fact that they have known each other for years.

(11) Anka: o znači ovako (3.0) ce er pe krvna slika mislin da njoj je to dovoljno ča ne↑ (1.0)

niš posebno [nije iskala] jako (2.0) že[lezo:] ajmo (još na) diferencijalno železo

Jenka: [mislin da ja]

[železo]

Anka: (2.0)da vidimo kako to izgleda↑ (2.0) i uputnica za kontrolu (.) pa ćeš onda ju pitat da vidimo (.) koliko bi tih kontroli bilo i (.) jer ona ti tako niš ako ti njoj nalazi jer ako i: gre ta de uputnica onda bi ti trebala kod nje vadit i krf i sve kod [nje storit razumeš]

(12) Jenka: a mislin planirate ko škola morda:: njemački ili to ni uopće va neken oven

Ivanka: pa ne evo nažalost pred puno let smo mi nudili njemački kao izbornu nastavu i niki se ni javil

#### 4.4.1. Addressee specification

The next set of excerpts shows the addressee specification, i.e. here “the switch serves to direct the message to one of the several possible addressees” (Gumperz, 1982: 77). The following example indicates that in the sessions of the Council, where the standard Croatian language is usually spoken, one of the members of the Council, Jože, suddenly switches to Chakavian when talking to one of the interlocutors, Zvonko, because this is the variety the members of the Council usually use among themselves in informal situations.

(13) Jože: otvaram raspravu po prvoj podtočki pete točke (5.0) **ćeš ti**↑

Zvonko: ča sad↑

Jože: JA (12.0)

In the next few passages, the friends talk about different topics in informal situations: in pubs and at one participant’s home. They all, except Jelka, usually use both the standard Croatian language and the Chakavian dialect. The first excerpt shows switching from the

standard language to Chakavian because Jenka suddenly starts talking to Franjo with whom she usually uses Chakavian.

(14) Jenka: kakav ping pong pa di ćemo igrat na rođendanu ping pong

Jelka: ma ne ona igra riječima ping pong

Jenka: što je to↑

Franjo: jen dva i ono

Jelka: da::: (viš samo naučiš)

Ivo: nećemo komentirat tu igru↑ ((laughter))

Jelka: ono s rukama (1.0) to si ti (?)

Jenka: **ma ča nismo mi ono kad ste ti i marija bili va lignje onu neku igru igrali pa smo igrali pa smo se napili gore (1.0) neku marijina ono moraš na neparan broj**

Franjo: mi se i bez igri napijemo

The next example shows Ivo's switching from the standard Croatian language to the dialect because he does not speak only to Jelka anymore but to the whole group.

(15) Ivo: a najbolja ona (.) tanjur ovako kao ravan i sad ono a u biti dubok je samo ne skužiš i

onda jelka vidi vidi

Jelka: a ivo e tako može

all: ((laughter))

Ivo: [pa da] (1.0) **naš kad ja nisan pojil do kraja**

In the next example, Jenka asks Ivo about the toothpick he lost in his car. He starts replying in Chakavian and then continues to retell the story from the beginning to Franjo and Jelka, but when Jenka tells him that Franjo was with him when he lost the toothpick, he suddenly switches to the standard Croatian language. This happens because Jelka, with whom he usually speaks the standard variety, is the only one left who was not there when the incident happened. After retelling the whole story, he switches back to Chakavian to conclude the story. As expected, with the change of the interlocutors, i.e. when there are no more speakers of Chakavian in the audience, Ivo switches to the standard language.

(16) Jenka: si našal bil onu čačkalicu va aute

Ivo: ne (1.0) pazi ja i ona se [vrnjamo z badisa i] ((laughter)) **vraćamo se iz badisa**

Jenka: [pa bi::l je s nami]

Ivo: ja

Franjo: i ča j onda bilo jo::j ivo

Ivo: i sad imam čačkalicu i sad došao sam upalio auto ovo ono odjedanput padne mi

čačkalica (1.0) ja govorim di je nabost ću se na nju sto posto (1.0) i tražim i tražim i vozim

Jelka: i kopaš i kopaš

Ivo: (jebo te) i dođem doma sve svjetla sv- nema ništa (1.0) **i još je nisan našal (1.0)**

**neman pojma (1.0) morda mi j pala van tamo pred foreston**

The next passage shows Marija's switching from Chakavian to the standard Croatian language triggered by Jelka's question in the middle of the conversation.

(17) Marija: ja se spametin kako se j pupa volela ful ful (1.0) ono kako bi znala bi bit kako

san se ja tuširala i onda mi j otprla vrata od



Jenka: ma ja↑

Marija: ja

Jelka: ko

Marija: **moj a::**

Jelka: prvi pas

Marija: **da ne drugi je bio**

Jelka: dobro

Marija: i otvorila bi vrata s njuškom ku[žiš]

In the following conversation, Jelka talks to Ivo on the phone, but has problems explaining to him where the meeting of the carnival group will take place. In one moment, Franjo tells Jelka that he wants to talk to Ivo and asks her to give him the phone in Chakavian. Code-switching from the standard language to Chakavian occurs because Franjo wants to speak with Ivo, with whom he usually speaks Chakavian.

(18) Jelka: ma ne vjerujem da su otišli

Franjo: **daj mi ga (.) ja ću mu**

Jelka: evo ti franju (.) on će ti bolje objasniti

In the next excerpt, Jelka, Franjo, Jenka, and Ivo make arrangements for the weekend. Jelka talks about the weather forecast, but Ivo, instead of replying in the standard Croatian language, uses Chakavian. This probably happens because Franjo and Jenka, with whom he usually uses Chakavian, are included in the conversation.

(19) Jelka: sandej je sunce s oblakom (1.0) onda onda tamo:: subota (1.0) da kiša je onaj

tamo

Ivo: **onda bi to rabilo ovaj vikend**

Franjo: ja pa ti govorin

At first, Franjo does not accommodate to Jelka by using Chakavian instead of the standard variety, because he wants to include Jenka and Ivo in the conversation. Later, however, when he directs his message exclusively to Jelka, he switches to the standard Croatian language.

(20) Jelka: ajme hodaju po po žaru

Franjo: **to ne moren skužit**

Jelka: mislim da mislim da to zapravo i ne peče kolko misliš da peče (.) ozbiljno

Franjo: ti ja otvorim peć pa ti istresem žar

#### 4.4.2. (Non-)accommodation

This chapter concentrates on the parts of the conversations where the participants (do not) accommodate to their interlocutors. In the first case, Rudo speaks to Jelka and uses the standard Croatian language throughout the whole conversation because he thinks that she does not understand Chakavian. In the second conversation, he talks to Josipa and does not accommodate to her, but instead uses the Chakavian dialect all the time, because he knows that she understands the Chakavian dialect.

(21) Jelka: šta ima

Rudo: ma niš (1.0) spremam ručak

Jelka: šta radiš↑

Rudo: mislim jenka radi ručak (.) ali naš kako to ide kod nas

Jelka: šta ćete jest zanimljivo

Rudo: piletina

Jelka: dobro↑

Rudo: gljive (.) mrkva (.) tikvice (.) paprika

(22) Rudo: ča govori baka (.) bi prišla semo

Josipa: pa mislim sad mi je ova situacija odgovara (1.0) sad ništa ne govorim (.) sve se smirilo ono sam mislila baš da ću je morat dovesti ali ako ovako potraje pazi

Rudo: ma mislin i ovako i onako

Josipa: ma meni je puno lakše

Rudo: je

Josipa: puno lakše (.) i sad sam bez brige jer kad ja znam da je ona dobro i da je ta žena uz nju i:: to je okej žena ima iskustva dosta je u italiji radila (.) sama je udovica je tako da (1.0) može spavat kolko god hoćeš kod mame (.) naš ono neke žene idu petnajst dana doma petnajst dana rade i tako ono baš (?)

Rudo: dobro lagje vami (1.0) poč tamo dva puti na mesec

Josipa: lakše je ići da

In the third and fourth example, Vice, Josipa's husband, and Vinko, their friend, talk to Josipa. They do not accommodate to her, although she speaks only the standard Croatian language, because they have known her for many years and they know that she understands Chakavian.

(23) Josipa: a ja [ma ne] ma inače brioni mi dođe deset pet- ovisi od kud- kuda krećem i gdje kupujem kartu ako unutra

Vinko: [kot i cameo]

Josipa: u kurijeri kupim mi je recimo a a sedamdeset a a (.) za autotrans ili

šezdesetidevet a a pedeset mi je brioni pula (3.0) [opatija-]

Vinko: ča pedeset [povratna]

Josipa: ne [ne opatija] pula (1.0) dakle velika razlika

Vice: [ne povratna]

Vice: čekaj skuplje j poč va pulu nego va zagreb (1.0) dobro al to j popust specijalni

Josipa: al to je meni popust na godine

(24) Vice: si l ča ponutila ljuden

Josipa: se- san evo vidiš dobili su- dobili su što su htjeli

#### 4.4.3. Clarification

The following set of examples presents parts of two informal conversations where Ivo switches for the moment to the standard Croatian language because one of the interlocutors, Jelka, asks for clarification.

(25) Jelka: klimaju mi se↑

Jenka: mo::lin (.) ma to odi samo da ti zavidaju ove vidice

Jelka: ma to će meni tata u baraci

Ivo: imam ti ja šaraf za to (1.0) sad san si kupil za pedeset kun (.) sad iman si mogući

nastavci za kompjutori rastavljat

Jelka: za↑

Ivo: **za za laptop i te gluposti rastavljat (1.0)** sad komać čekan da mi: da iman jedan

dan vremena da moren stavit laptop na prosti faktori

(26) Ivo: na- na- najgore mi je bilo:: a: va pu- pule kad san bil zela onega breka (.) i onda si

pogotovo ove prijateljice

Jelka: šta si uzeo psa u puli↑

Ivo: **da: imao sam ga tjedan dana ((smijeh)) a:: uzeo sam ga kao da pomognem**

**udrugi udruzi toj kao da ga čuvam ja**

Jelka: to privremeni smještaj bio↑

Ivo: da (.) e al mislin pas je mane odličan bil samo ni bil za stan od (1.0) dvaj[set

trejset] kvadrati neka je

#### 4.4.4. Persuasion

In the next passage, a member of the Council, Mate, mixes codes throughout his whole speech. He delivers his speech in the standard Croatian language, but occasionally inserts phrases from Chakavian. He does so to persuade other members, the majority of whom speak Chakavian, to make the right decision.

(27) Mate: dva dijela (.) pada odluka (1.0) pada odluka koja ima dva dijela (1.0) pada odluka

(.) nači opet ćemo morat donosit jednu (1.0) predlažen da recimo donesemo sad

odluku o skidanju tog javnog statusa tog javnog dobra a da (1.0) za sljedeću

sjednicu se pripremi zaključak (1.0) o (1.0) **ovo ča j rekal matić** i da s tim prema

zaključkom idemo hrvatskim cestama gradu opatiji **i ne znan kemu e** (1.0) **dobije**

**se lufta** da se provjeri mogućnost prema kome **poć** (.) i da idemo

## 4.5. Quotation

This section presents passages where code-mixing was employed for quoting. In the first example, Vice quotes Josipa because he negates the exact words she said in the sentence before. Here, he switches from the Chakavian dialect to the standard Croatian language.

(28) Josipa: e nakon toga on će sjesti tu s čašom vina (.) ustati uzeti dva keksa

Vice: a ne ne to kad ni niš (.) **ne s čašom vina** nego ako mi ostane od (obeda)

In the second case, Franjo talks about certain political matters. When quoting a politician, he switches from Chakavian to the standard variety.

(29) Franjo: jutra si moru ovi dva dat ruku i složili smo se oko reformi i evo (1.0) pa onaj

karamarko govori kao **neće nama nikakvi mostići**

Jenka: ja ja ja

## 5. Results of the interviews

After the recording, five participants were interviewed: Franjo, Ivo, Marija, Rudo, and Vice. These findings will be used later for the discussion of the results. In the first part of the interview, the participants were asked why they code-switched. All of them answered that they code-switched because the interlocutor did not use or even understand the Chakavian dialect and because they were forced to switch to the standard variety. If they continued to use Chakavian with someone who used only the standard variety, it would probably lead to misunderstandings in communication.

In the second part of the interview, the participants listened to a few recorded passages where they and other participants code-switched or code-mixed. They had to determine the cause of code-switching/code-mixing. For the majority of the participants, it was easy to explain why they switched to another variety. Only in a few cases, the participants said that they did not know what caused code-switching.

In the last part of the interview the participants were asked five more questions. The first one was: How often do you use the Chakavian dialect/the standard Croatian language? Franjo and Marija said that they used mostly the dialect. Rudo and Ivo use the standard variety more often than Chakavian because they rarely use the dialect at work. Vice explained that he used mostly the standard language because he spent most of the time with his wife Josipa to whom he spoke only the standard language.

The second question was: How do you feel when you use the Chakavian dialect/the standard Croatian language? For Rudo and Franjo it is easier to speak the dialect, but the feeling is the same. Marija and Ivo feel better when they use the dialect and for Vice it is the same.

To the third question all participants answered the same: they prefer using the dialect and use the standard variety only when they have to, for example, when the interlocutor does not use or understand the dialect.

The last two questions were related to language preservation and its intergenerational transmission. They all agreed that it would be nice to preserve the Chakavian dialect. Ivo, Franjo, and Rudo want their children to use both the standard variety and the dialect. Marija would like her children to use the Chakavian dialect, Slovenian and German, and the standard Croatian language only if they live in Croatia. Since Vice already has two children who speak both the standard language and the dialect, he explained that he was glad that his children spoke both varieties.

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1. Topic

First observations of the transcripts (1), (2), (3), and (4), where the volunteer and the headmaster, and the patient and the doctor talk to each other, reveal that, although the setting is formal, the conversation takes place predominantly in the Chakavian dialect. Occasional code-mixing includes words from the standard Croatian language that have their substitutes in the dialect (e.g. *tjedan* instead of *ćedan/šetemana*), words that fill lexical gaps (e.g. *satnica*), which Myers-Scotton (2006) describes as words in one language that may refer to a concept or object that does not exist in the home community of the other language, and finally prepositional structures such as *sa tvojon probavon* instead of *s tvojun probavun*. Medical and educational issues are probably better handled in the standard Croatian language. Fishman notes that “some multilingual speakers may ‘acquire the habit’ of speaking about topic *x* in language *X* partially because that is the language in which they were *trained* to deal with this topic.” However, both the doctor and the headmaster have known Jenka for many years and they are aware of the fact that she speaks the Chakavian dialect, along with the standard variety. One of the interviewees explained it as follows<sup>1</sup>:

*“I use the Chakavian dialect with everyone who uses it.”* (1)

Excerpts (5) and (6) illustrate two conversations about related topics, faith and religion, in an informal setting. Danica talks about faith in Chakavian, although her interlocutor Josipa speaks only the standard variety, and about religion in the standard

---

<sup>1</sup> All the participants' comments were originally written in Croatian. They were then translated into English by the author.



Croatian language. She therefore switches code “within a speech event to discuss a particular topic” (Holmes, 2000). She probably chooses the dialect to discuss topics that are in a way part of her identity. Related to this, Grosjean (1996) and Spolsky (1998), as quoted in Bialystok (2001: 7), also came up with the notion that “adults who are bilingual count and prey in the language in which they first learned these behaviors.”

## **6.2. Proficiency**

The analysis of excerpt (7), where Zvonko delivers a speech in the sessions of the Council of the municipal district Matulji, reveals that the whole speech is delivered in the standard Croatian language, but with the Chakavian accent. There are also a few parts of the speech where he code-mixes, i.e. he seems to lack particular terms in the standard register (e.g. *išće* instead of *traži*). Hredia and Altariba (2008) pinpoint that the reason for code-switching could be the need to compensate for limited language proficiency, i.e. the bilingual could be weaker in one language and has to switch to the other in order to continue the dialogue.

## **6.3. Emotions and jokes**

The analysis of examples (8) and (9) reveals that a reason for code-switching could also be expressing emotions, in our cases, expressing anger. In the first example, Branko becomes angry during the speech and therefore switches to the dialect, knowing that (almost) all other members usually use the dialect. One of the members of the Council replies to him also in Chakavian and after that Branko continues to use it. In the next example, Ivo joins his friends Franjo, Jenka, and Jelka in the pub and he is very angry. He uses Chakavian all the

time, even when talking to Jelka. This supports the view of Malik (1994), who states that usually when bilinguals are not tired or angry, they can find an appropriate word or expression in the base language. Although Ivo has learned both the dialect and the standard variety from birth, he finds it more natural and easier to express his emotions in dialect. Similarly, Holder reveals in her study that Caribbean Creole English speakers switch to dialect when they are extremely angry.

Again, in transcript (10), it is Ivo who switches to dialect, when joking with Jelka. For him it is, like in the above example, more natural to joke in Chakavian than in the standard Croatian language. Ivo stated in the interview that he feels *ko doma* ('at home') when speaking Chakavian. Additionally, he says:

*"This joke is funnier in Chakavian."* (2)

#### **6.4. Interlocutors**

In examples (11) and (12), the conversations take place in formal setting, nevertheless, the participants communicate in Chakavian. It appears here that that "the rule of the interlocutor" is stronger than "the rule of the setting", as they are aware of the fact that they both use the Chakavian dialect. Myers-Scotton (2006: 43-6) states that "participants' roles and the dynamic of their relationship play a crucial role in bilingual's unconscious agreement or disagreement on language choice." She also claims that agreement upon the obligations and rights of the participants "reflects the nature of their perceived social relationship" (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 43-6).

### 6.4.1. Addressee specification

In excerpt (13), Jože, after he opened the session, directs the message to one specific member of the Council, Zvonko, and because of that switches to the dialect. In informal situations he usually communicates with Zvonko in Chakavian, which could be the reason for code-switching in this case. Appel and Muysken (1987: 119) refer to it as directive function, which “involves the hearer directly”.

In example (14), the participants Jenka, Jelka, Franjo, and Ivo talk about a game they could play. They all use the standard variety until the moment when Jenka switches to the dialect in order to ask Franjo about the game they played a few years ago. The switch happens probably because of the fact that they are used to talking to each other exclusively in the dialect. According to Baker (2006: 6), if one bilingual is already known to the other bilingual, as a friend, and “a relationship has usually been established through one language”, they have a possibility to switch to the other language (to include other participants in the conversation), but “old habits die hard”.

In the conversation between Ivo and Jelka (15), they use the standard variety, but at one moment, Ivo switches to Chakavian to explain to others, who all usually speak both the dialect and the standard variety, except Kate, how big the portions of the food were. He explains this code-switching in the following way:

*“At this moment I talked to you, who know me and who know that I would eat everything [...] you understand me better than Kate.” (3)*

In the following example (16), Ivo switches from Chakavian to the standard Croatian language because he realizes in the middle of the conversation that all participants, except

Jelka, were with him when he lost his toothpick. To conclude the conversation with the facts that are unknown to all participants he switches back to Chakavian. These findings also suggest that Ivo is very skillful at code-switching. Alfonzetti (8) notes that “the complex, grammatically diverse, frequent, smooth back and forth unfunctional mixing requires indeed good mastery of both linguistic systems.” Similarly, Poplack (1980) finds that fluent bilinguals usually switch within the sentence.

In transcript (17), Marija talks about her dog to Franjo, Ivo, Jenka, and Jelka. She starts the story in Chakavian because the majority of the interlocutors usually speak both varieties. According to Bell (1984), this phenomenon is called audience design and represents the way of speaking dependent on one’s interlocutors, i.e. one’s audience. After a while, Jelka asks a question and Marija, who usually talks to Jelka in the standard variety, switches to the standard Croatian language in order to answer the question.

Part of the conversation (18) takes place over the phone. Franjo wants to talk to Ivo, who speaks on the phone with Jelka in the standard variety, and says to Jelka: “*Give me the phone. I will explain it to him*” in Chakavian, although he usually uses with her the standard Croatian language. The reason might be the fact that Ivo is on the phone, who also usually speaks Chakavian, and Franjo is already ready to talk to him. Ivo, who listened to the recording, explain this case as follows:

*“It is probably because it is not a longer conversation [...] probably it was said spontaneously.”* (4)

Another reason for not accommodating to Jelka could be the fact that, as he explained in the interview, Franjo considers it to be more natural to talk in Chakavian and that his Chakavian

somehow always interferes with the standard variety when he speaks the standard Croatian language.

In the next passage (19), Ivo talks in Chakavian, although Jelka is part of the audience, because he wants to say something to the whole group, including Franjo and Jenka. Ivo describes it as follows:

*“It depends on who is making arrangements [...] for example, you (the interviewee) are the person in charge of this arrangement [...] then I will accommodate to you.” (5)*

In the last example, (20), Franjo talks to Jelka about walking on hot coals. Jelka starts the conversation in the standard Croatian language, but Franjo replies in Chakavian. It appears that Franjo talks to all participants (Ivo and Jenka) who are there and not only to Jelka, but later, he accommodates to her and starts using the standard variety because he directs the message only to Jelka. This nevertheless suggests that “speakers tend to accommodate their speech to persons whom they like or whom they wish to be liked by (convergence)” (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 131).

#### **6.4.2. (Non-)accommodation**

The analysis of the examples (21) and (22) reveals that Rudo speaks in one way with Jelka and in another with Josipa, who both usually speak only the standard Croatian language. With Jelka he uses the standard Croatian language and with Josipa the dialect. He explains that in the first case he uses the standard variety because he thinks that Jelka would not understand him if he spoke Chakavian, and for the second example he says that he is sure that

Josipa understands him when he speaks Chakavian. An advanced reason for such linguistic behavior is that speaking in standard is more demanding.

Probably for the same reason, Vice in passages (23) and (24) does not accommodate to Josipa and instead of talking to her in the standard Croatian language, he chooses Chakavian. He knows that she understands Chakavian and, as he explains in the interview, he uses Chakavian with every person who understands it.

*“I know that she understands Chakavian because she lives in the region where Chakavian is spoken.”(6)*

### **6.4.3. Persuasion**

First observations of the transcript (27) reveal that code-mixing occurs throughout the whole speech. Mate switches from the standard variety to Chakavian in order to persuade his audience to support him. He inserts short Chakavian words and phrases in his speech because the majority of the members of the Council usually uses the Chakavian dialect. For example, in part of the text *ovo ča j rekal matić*, Mate refers to what particular member of the Council said and in this way attracts attention of other members. Myers-Scotton (2006: 155) makes the point that “wishing approval and therefore trying to build solidarity is clearly a motive for changing one’s speech.”

## 7. Conclusion

The results of the study show that there are different factors that influence code-switching and code-mixing between the Chakavian dialect and the standard Croatian language. While several are characteristic only of one of these contexts, some of them are evident in both formal and informal settings. The first group comprises the following factors: topic, emotions, interlocutors, and addressee specification. The factors that influence switching and mixing only in informal settings are jokes, (non-)accommodation to the interlocutors, clarification, and quotation while proficiency and persuasion influence the language of conversation in formal situations. The study shows that the reasons why the participants do (not) accommodate to their interlocutors, who use only the standard variety, are expressing emotions, joking, and avoiding misunderstandings. The analysis of the results also reveals that the reason why the participants opt for the dialect instead of choosing the standard variety could be the fact that the use of the dialect is less demanding. For others, the dialect is integral part of their identity, and they tend to use it whenever possible (and context-appropriate), sometimes even when their interlocutors only understand the dialect, but do not use it. It can also be concluded that the participants in the informal situations do not communicate exclusively in the standard Croatian language, but switch and mix codes because of the factors already mentioned above.

The present study opens opportunities for further research, which could focus more on the grammatical and/or phonological aspects of code-switching and code-mixing between the Chakavian dialect and the standard Croatian language.

## Appendix

COGS102B \* Cognitive Ethnography \* Winter 2009

### TRANSCRIPTION

Jeffersonian Transcription Notation includes the following symbols:

Symbol	Name	Use
[ text ]	Brackets	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Equal Sign	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single interrupted utterance.
(# of seconds)	Timed Pause	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	Micropause	A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.
. or ↓	Period or Down Arrow	Indicates falling pitch.
? or ↑	Question Mark or Up Arrow	Indicates rising pitch.
,	Comma	Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.
-	Hyphen	Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.
>text<	Greater than / Less than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	Less than / Greater than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.
°	Degree symbol	Indicates whisper or reduced volume speech.



ALL CAPS	Capitalized text	Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.
Underline	Underlined text	Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech.
:::	Colon(s)	Indicates prolongation of an utterance.
(hhh)		Audible exhalation
? or (.hhh)	High Dot	Audible inhalation
( text )	Parentheses	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.
(( italic text ))	Double Parentheses	Annotation of non-verbal activity.

Jeffersonian Transcription Notation is described in G. Jefferson, "Transcription Notation," in J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Interaction*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

## References

- Appel, Rene & Pieter Muysken. 1987. *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam academic archive.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. "Bilingual conversation revisited" in Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge, 1-25.
- Alfonzetti, Giovanna. 2014. "Age-related variation in code-switching between Italian and the Sicilian dialect." *Athens Journal of Philology* 1-14.
- Baker, Colin. 2006. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism: fourth edition*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters ltd.
- Beardsmore, Hugo Beatens. 1986. *Bilingualism: Basic principles*. Clevedon: Multilingualism matters ltd.
- Beebe, Leslie M. & Giles Howard. 1984. "Speech accommodation theories: A discussion in terms of second language acquisition." *International journal of the sociology of language* 43: 5-32.
- Bell, Allan. 1984. "Language style as audience design." *Language in society* 13: 145-204.
- Blom, Jan-Petter & John J. Gumperz. 2007. "Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway" in Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader: second edition*. Oxon: Routledge, 75-96.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1993. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Boztepe, Erman. 2003. "Issues in code-switching: competing theories and models" *Working papers in TESOL and applied linguistics* 3: 1-27.
- Bialystok, Ellen. 2001. *Bilingualism in development: language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

- Chin, Ng Bee & Gillian Wigglesworth. 2007. *Bilingualism: an advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.
- DeBose, Charles E. 1992. "Codeswitching: Black English and Standard English in the African-American linguistic repertoire" in Carol M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters ltd, 157-167.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1972. "Varieties of ethnicity and varieties of language consciousness" in Anwar S. Dil (ed.), *Language and socio-cultural change: Essays by J. Fishman*. Stanford: Stanford university press, 179-191.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2000. "Who speaks what language to whom and when?" in Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader: second edition*. Oxon: Routledge, 55.-69.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. "The conversation analytic model of code-switching" in Barbara E. Bullock & Almeida Jacqueline Toribio (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 114-126.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1987. "Dialect and conversational inference in urban communication." *Language and 7*: 393-409.
- Heredia, Jeanette & Roberto R. Heredia. 2008. *An introduction to bilingualism: Principles and processes*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Holder, Junette. *An investigation of the code-switching behaviours of five dialect speakers of Caribbean Creole English*.
- Hoffmann, Charlotte. 1991. *An introduction to bilingualism*. New York: Longman.
- Holmes, Janet. 2000. *An introduction to sociolinguistics: second edition*. Wellington: Longman.

- Hymes, Dell. 1979. "On communicative competence" in K. Johnson and Christopher Brumfit (eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Kaur, Jagdish. 2011. "Rising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca." *Journal of pragmatics* 43: 2704-2715.
- Lisac, Josipa. 2009. *Hrvatska dijalektologija 2.: čakavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga.
- Lowi, Rosamina. 2005. "Codeswitching: an examination of naturally occurring conversation" in James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, & Jeff MacSwan (eds.) in *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> international symposium on bilingualism*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Mackey, William Francis. 1962. "The description of bilingualism." *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 7: 51-85.
- Malik, Lalita. 1994. *Socio-linguistics: A study of code-switching*. New Delhi: Anmol publications pvt. ltd.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. "Social motivation for code switching. Evidence from Africa." *Language in society* 24: 302-305.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple voices: an introduction to bilingualism*. Carlton: Blackwell.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching." *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
- Rogerson-Revell, Pamela. 2010. "Can you spell that for us nonnative speakers?" *Journal of business communication* 47: 432-454.
- Salzmann, Zdenek. 1993. "Language, culture, and society: an introduction to linguistic anthropology." *Language* 70: 354-356.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wolcott, Harry F. 1994. *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Wolfram, Walt & Natalie Schilling-Estes. 1998. *American English*. Malden: Blackwell.