BELASKRI Khadidja
Department of English
University of Saida
Belaskri.k@gmail.com

1.1. Language choice

It may be thought that language use is not rule-guided; however, in whatever context, speaking requires first a decision to be made by the speaker about which linguistic variety should he or she select from the linguistic varieties available in his or her linguist repertoire to communicate appropriately his or her thoughts .

1.1.1. Linguistic repertoire

Members of whatever society possess various linguistic varieties, codes and ways of speaking that form what Gumperz (1977) calls 'the communicative repertoire' of a speech community and defines as 'all varieties, dialects or styles used in a particular socially-defined population, and the constraints which govern the choice among them.' (*in* Saville-Troike, 2003 : 40).

To communicate, individuals choose one or more of the available codes and sometimes switch from one code to another under some personal or contextual constraints. This linguistic phenomenon of moving from one variety to another remains highly debated in sociolinguistic research.

1.1.2. Code switching

Weinreich (1963: 73) suggests that 'the ideal bilingual switches from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc.), but […], […] within a single sentence' with faith to the structuralism's integrity of each language.

Indeed, later on, a number of researchers suggest that there exist grammatical, social and psychological rules that govern switches between codes within sentences. This research is not concerned with the grammatical constraints of code switching (henceforth CS), hence, in what follows a discussion of only sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic dimensions of CS will be made.

BELASKRI Khadidja
Department of English
University of Saida
Belaskri.k@gmail.com

1.1.2.1. Sociolinguistic dimension of CS

One of the in depth pioneering investigations in the function of social factors in CS is that of Blom and Gumpez (1972) who suggest that code choices are 'patterned and predictable on the basis of certain features of the local social system.' [(Blom and Gumpez, 1972: 409) in. Devic, 2007: 10] They introduce two distinct types of CS , 'metaphorical CS', in which speakers switch from one language to another according to changes of topics under discussion , and 'situational CS' where the code changes as a result of changes in the situation , (the status of interlocutors, the setting of de conversation or the topic of conversation).

Later on, Gumperz(1982:60) associates situational switching in which 'speaker's choice of language is constrained by factors external to her/his own motivation.' (Mey, 2009: 68) to 'diglossia' a situation prevailing in some speech communities that have two distinct codes which manifest a clear functional separation and specialization; that is, one code is used in one set of circumstances and another in a different one - (Fishman 1972) - and contrasts it with metaphorical CS which he expanded and modified in terms of 'conversational code switching' (1982: 60).

Likewise, Heller (1988: 05) points out that situational CS is 'rooted in a social separation of activities (and associated role relationships), each of which is conventionally linked to the use of one of the languages or varieties in the community linguistic repertoire'. Yet, Gumperz made a distinction between 'we' and 'they' codes. The 'we code' is usually associated with home, family, peers (in group) and reflects values of solidarity and closeness, while the 'they code' is associated with outsiders (out-group) and reflects power and authority.

In conversational CS Gumperz explains that the relationship between language usage and social context is more complex. According to him, speakers may codeswitch to create a metaphoric effect to communicate 'information about how they intend their words to be understood'(1982: 61). He proposes six discourse functions for conversational CS: qualification, and personification, interjection, reiteration, message qualification, and personification vs. objectification (cf. Gumperz 1982:75-84). In spite

BELASKRI Khadidja
Department of English
University of Saida
Belaskri.k@gmail.com

of the overlap and lack of clarity in the definitions of metaphorical and situational CS, Gumperz's investigation and views have influenced many studies such as Myers-scotton's (1993), Auer's (1998).

1.1.2.1.1. The markedness model

The markedness model proposed by Myer-Scotton (1991, 1993, 1999) can be used to examine the social meanings of CS. Code choice is deemed to be a way of communicating the desired group membership and interpersonal relationship. According to this model, a speaker's choice of a code indexes 'negotiation principles' which implies that he or she selects the form of his or her utterances depending on a rights-and-obligations set. Myer-Scotton (1993b: 478) expounds on her view as follows:

> Humans are innately predisposed to exploit code choice as negotiation of 'position'. That is speakers use their linguistic choices as tools to index for other their perceptions of self, and of rights and obligations holding between self and others

Therefore, speakers will alternate or mix codes when they wish to convey certain meanings, a specific social identity or group membership. Myers–Scotton puts on examples of CS in terms of two categories unmarked vs. marked choices: the first category is employed by a speaker to mean that their linguistic choice is expected by the addressee, whereas the use of the second category is unusual and unexpected, therefore, a marked code choice is meaningful only to members of a specific group (or speech community) in a specific speech event.

Other CS researchers, such as Auer, view Myers- Scotton's Markedness model too simplistic because it accounts for fixed sets of social information (such as topic, setting and participants.). Auer suggests viewing CS from another angle, in which speakers' linguistic choices are not influenced by those contextual features. He investigates CS by adopting Gumperz interactional perspective and makes use of the conversational analysis (CA) dimension. He introduced his sequential approach which interprets CS meaning in relation to its position in the conversation 'any theory of

BELASKRI Khadidja
Department of English
University of Saida
Belaskri.k@gmail.com

conversational code-alternation[1] is bound to fall if it does not take into account that the meaning of code-alternation depends in essential ways on its 'sequential environment'.' (Auer, 1995:116)[2] To put it simply, Auer's sequential theory interprets CS meaning with regard to the preceding and following utterances. He also claims that the social meaning of code switching is constituted locally, it is 'sufficiently autonomous' from grammar and the societal (i.e., macro-sociolinguistic) level (Auer, 1998:04)[3]. In addition to these systematic approaches, there is another psycholinguistic approach to CS that is carried out by Michael Clyne, though, it has not yet received much consideration.

1.1.2.2. Psycholinguistic Dimension of CS

According to Clyne (1991), there are lexical items, which he calls 'trigger words' that stimulate psycholinguistically-conditioned CS. Clyne (1991:193) define these trigger words as 'words at the intersection of two language systems, which, consequently, may cause speakers to lose their linguistic bearings and continue the sentence in the other language'. He believes that these trigger words are similar in, and belong to, both languages of bilingual speakers or bilingual speech communities. Unlike the sociolinguistic and the structural aspects of CS, Clyne (2003) considers the 'trigger words' as the cause of the CS phenomenon, due to the trigger impact they make on language use in a particular conversation, as they evoke and call for other items of the other language of the bilingual speaker. Besides, Clyne stresses that 'trigger words' should not be accounted for as CS items, because they belong to both languages.

---

[1] Auer uses the term 'code-alternation' as a cover term.
[2] Quoted in Boztepe (2008: 12)
[3] Quoted in Avalösch (2007: 32).