

Multi-Variety Code-Switching in Conversation 903 of the Køge Project

J. N. Jørgensen
University of Copenhagen

The study of bilingualism often builds on an understanding of the bilingual speakers as individuals who command two separate (or even separated) and different languages. Similarly, code-switching is often understood as the simultaneous use of different languages with emphasis on the difference and the plurality. In this light, bilingualism is *different* from monolingualism, and the interesting side of bilingual behavior is the code-switching (or patterns of code-choice), because this is how bilingual behavior differs from monolingual behavior. Furthermore, code-switches are frequently described with emphasis on difference, as communicative tools that are mainly interesting because they involve two or more different languages. The pragmatic functions of specific bilingual expressions are sometimes described in one-dimensional terms, with focus only on how they differ from monolingual expressions. The use of linguistic material from different languages (i.e. what *some* language users think of as different languages) may in itself be intricate and complicated, but still be considered interesting mainly because it differs from monolingual language use.

In the Køge Project's pilot study we tentatively did find that bilingual grade school students developed their code choice patterns along a comparatively simple line, beginning at a stage where Turkish was clearly dominant. At a later stage, there seemed to be a division of labor between Danish and Turkish, but around the age of 11-12 the students could use code-switching for the same purpose regardless of direction. This line of development, however, was too simplistic, and the variation in code-switching is more complicated (Jørgensen 1993). A similarly advanced development of bilingual behavior in school age children and adolescents has also been observed by Auer (1988) who finds that preference-related switching is more important for younger bilinguals, while "more sophisticated uses of code-switching" appear and become frequent for 13-14-year old speakers (1988, 208).

The language use of teenagers and adolescents, including bilingual behavior, is interesting to the sociolinguist not only for its linguistic characteristics, but also for its social implications within teenage groups. It is also particularly interesting because it draws so much negative attention from adult middle-class speakers. The main work about Scandinavian teenage language, Kotsinas (1994) specifically states that:

The complaints about the language of the youth are not, as it appears,

new, and they are not even unique for the 1900s. On the contrary there have always been complaints about the language of the youth. The young people seem never to have spoken as poorly as “nowadays”, regardless of when this time has been (Kotsinas 1994, 11, my translation)

Kunøe (1991) is a popular introduction to the controversies about youth language, published in the yearbook of the Danish Mother Tongue Society (a conservative organization). Kunøe begins as follows:

Already in King Hammurabi’s days (Babylon, 1800 BC) there were written complaints that children do not obey their parents, and that their language is terrible (Kunøe 1991, 89, my translation)

Kunøe continues with a description of the nature of language change, particularly changes in pronunciation, sound changes. Thus she follows a long-standing sociolinguistic tradition of viewing language as a reflection of changing times, of changing social factors. The differences between adult language use and adolescent language use are merely reflections of the fact that times (and social structures) are changing and always have been. The same view is also present in Kotsinas (1994). She distinguishes between such features of youth language that the young people stop using when they mature, and those features which become part of the standard language of their generation when they grow up. The latter features represent language change:

Many scholars are pessimistic about the possibilities for observing the moment of innovation and the first dissemination of that which at a later stage results in a language change [...] There does nevertheless seem to be a chance of combining at least some oral language innovations with not only the prestige or social category of the speaker, but also with the collective language creativity which we find among young people, and the expressivity which is so prevalent in youth language (Kotsinas 1994, 169-70, my translation).

Kristiansen takes a somewhat different view. He finds that non-adult language use, including creative expressions, is first and foremost a tool in the negotiation of social relations. In his review of Kotsinas (1994) he states that:

As long as expressivity and creativity in language use are seen in the light of their role in group and identity formation processes, these sides of language use are explained by their function: the young people use language expressively and creatively in order to create their own social identity [...] Maturity, on the other hand, seems to me to be a problematic explanatory concept in relation to changes in language use (Kristiansen 1995, 96, my translation)

This is of course an instance of Kristiansen's general view of language change and language variation as being social psychologically motivated. In a 1993 discussion of language awareness among educators and linguists in Denmark, Kristiansen specified that view with respect to language change initiated by young language users, *in casu* the spread of low-SES Copenhagen features into high Copenhagen and the national standard:

It is not the case that sound change marches along its set path, strikes the innocent young and creates a linguistic generation gap. No, it is the other way round, the generation gap creates the victorious march forward of low Copenhagen speech (1993, 94, my translation).

Within modern industrialized societies, and all of the Nordic nations belong to them, there seems to be a pervasive agreement among the gatekeepers about the ugliness and sloppiness of youth language. The adolescents who are going to take over society and prevent us from starving and freezing in our old age, not only pronounce sloppily and inarticulatedly, but they also seem to possess a remarkably small active vocabulary, most of which consists of curses and four-letter words. They show little respect for decency and experience, and their language use is a clear indication of how our societies are rotting from inside, getting us further and further down a cultural slide towards the total breakdown of our national cultures. And there are various calls for the schools, the courts, the military, the cultural elite, and others to help shape up our societies.

We all recognize this view of youth language. It is an extreme version of the *deficit* view of variation. This view is, when it comes to sociolects and dialects, slowly being repealed from educational institutions all over Scandinavia. But the deficit view seems to be alive and kicking, hard, when it comes to teenage language. This of course gives the young generation an easy way to manifest itself as different from the adult generation – we shall return to that.

Generally sociolinguists describe teenage language in terms of creativity, originality, and of course identity-negotiation concepts, as we have seen. Some sociolinguists, Kotsinas among them, take the so-called *difference*

view of the specific linguistic variation that young speakers represent. The young speakers simply talk in a different way, just as people at all times talk differently from the previous generations. If we are lucky, we may see new features being born, or at least being disseminated over a generation of young speaker, but the change more or less happens, and that is how it is.

Kristiansen goes one step further and maintains that changes are deliberately created by young speakers to *establish* the differences that traditional sociolinguistics observes. Others agree with him that social psychological processes are certainly involved (although perhaps not as the sole determiner of change and variation). But it is obvious that the provocation built into linguistic behavior explicitly and repeatedly denounced by teachers and gatekeepers is valuable to the young generation as a signal of group identity and perhaps solidarity.

Sociolinguists thus offer two views of the language use patterns of teenagers. Both see youth language as subversive, but they do so in different ways. Firstly, according to the difference view the norms for language use change in the young speakers' societies. The teenage language features, or some of them, become household features a generation later. There is no specification of the reason or motivation for change. Secondly, in the social constructivist-inspired view, the teenagers react to their particular powerlessness in industrialized societies by transgressing a range of cultural norms, thereby taking a particular cultural field in possession for their own. They create social situations through and with language use which is particular, marked, and often condemned by the surrounding adults. And they do so exactly to achieve the effect of drawing borders between themselves and the adults.

In both views, adults – including sociolinguists - have no direct access to the situations in which change originates, and we can only hope to get a glimpse of their unfolding when we are very lucky with our sociolinguistic data collection methods. We may observe teenage language use, both in group interaction and in outgroup interaction, and bilingual conversation is a particularly fruitful field, because the norms are so clearly against the young speakers.

The basic normative idea about bilingualism is that of *double monolingualism*:

persons who command two languages should at any given time use one and only one language, and they should use each of their languages in a way that does not in principle differ from the way in which monolinguals use that same language (Jørgensen & Holmen 1997, 13)

We have plenty of evidence of the double monolingualism view. In the NISU study (Boyd et al 1994) we interviewed parents of language minority school beginners. Many parents express quite precise expectations that their children learn to speak a “pure” mother tongue which is not polluted by the majority language. It is obviously a widespread notion that different languages should be spoken without any mixing, each in its proper place. Nevertheless, several parents realize that this is not how the real world is, often the parents mix themselves. We could get remarks such as “I cannot teach my children our language because nowadays I myself mix the languages terribly”. The same view of double monolingualism is prevalent among teachers, even teachers who fully accept that the students’ mother tongues have a place in the majority school.

But minority students are not the only ones who are subjected to the double monolingualism normativity. The mother tongue speakers of Danish are to a large extent bilingual from perhaps the age of 10-12, as they hear and read English every single day, also outside the classroom. Many children at that age also write English in interactive computer programs. In short the notion of a monolingual adolescent is fast becoming obsolete. This gives two possible ways of language mixing involving Danish:

1. The interweaving of English words and phrases into the everyday conversation of L1-Danish speaking teenagers. This phenomenon is not very well described, but it has attracted quite a bit of attention, and animosity, and it is regularly attacked in the public debate.
2. The simultaneous use of L2-Danish and a range of other languages, e.g. Turkish among Turkish-speaking bilingual grade school students. This is regularly presented as "double semi-lingualism", and it continues to exist among minority members, much to the concern of the guardians of true Danish culture. Not only do they consider it a nuisance in itself that it is possible to grow up in Denmark and have Danish as a "second" language, but they also reject the idea that Danish can be spoken properly without being exactly the *rigsmål* standard version of Danish.

This introduction over the past one or two decades of a new way of alienating the middle-of-the-road gatekeepers has come as a welcome new breeding ground for linguistic creativity among adolescents. This new way of pushing our nation further down the slide to cultural annihilation is the code-mixing patterns we find with both L1- and L2-users of Danish.

The gatekeepers, the teachers, parents, and sour old men in the public debate, all think of *languages* as entities which can be nicely separated from each other, and also should be. The problems of defining dialects and languages notwithstanding, we can grant them that it is usually not very difficult to distinguish between the old Scandinavian languages and the new mother tongues, such as Turkish, Arabic, Punjabi, Tagalog, and Somali. This is not the problem. The problem is the notion that is overwhelmingly presented to the students in the educational systems: namely that the languages must be kept separated. Either one speaks Somali, or one speaks Swedish, not both at the same time.

This concept of *Kulturelle Reinheit* is a monster which only our adolescents are really in a position to bring down. Precisely by transgressing the norms of the gate-keepers, our adolescents can take the languages into their own possession and develop them further. As of now, this is only possible when the adolescents do it outside the control of adults. Adolescents are in a position to achieve this because of their position between child life and adult life. Flexible group constellations provide opportunities for experimenting with ingroup and outgroup signals, and a growing sense of age identity adds the incentive to develop, or at least use, linguistic signals of group membership. But this is not all. Like everybody else children and adolescents play with language. Crystal (1998) remarks that

Plainly, there is a lot of ludic linguistic behaviour about; and it is difficult to escape the conclusion that language play is a continuing feature of development, as children progress through school. Dylan Thomas was one who spotted it, commenting on the 'tumbling and rhyming' of children as they spill out of their classrooms. It is so obvious there, indeed, when we take the trouble to look, that it is surprising so little mention is made of it and that so little research has been done on it (1998,178).

Crystal continues to argue that language play is important to development by the same argument as language awareness is. Both presuppose that the speaker "steps back" and observes the language or language activity as an object. Therefore language play, including creative and expressive variation of adult language, may also serve purposes which are not strictly social psychological. Playing with language may have cognitively important

functions. But this does not change the fact that language play is simple fun, and that adolescents get involved in language play because they enjoy it for its own sake.

The fun that our teenagers enjoy together, may then again of course have social psychological consequences – the young people realize that they have fun together, and therefore they are attracted to the ingroup members with whom they have already had all this fun. This is not the same as saying that they play with language only or primarily to build the social relations with the others. Fun can be a purpose in itself.

Nevertheless, fun can also be used as a tool, for instance as a power tool in conflicts. And linguistically creative contributions to group conversations often enjoy the same positive reception as other expressive addresses in group interactions. There is value in terms of social accept, and perhaps even of enhanced status, of a positive group action to an inventive expression. The purpose of such *performance* can therefore also to a certain extent be understood as a social psychological phenomenon. Bauman defines performance as:

a mode of communication, a way of speaking, the essence of which resides in the assumption of responsibility to an audience for a display of communicative skill, highlighting the way in which communication is carried out, above and beyond its referential content. From the point of view of the audience, the act of expression on the part of the performer is thus laid open to evaluation for the way it is done, for the relative skill and effectiveness of the performer's display. It is also offered for the enhancement of experience, through the present appreciation of the intrinsic qualities of the act of expression itself. Performance thus calls forth special attention to and heightened awareness of both the act of expression and the performer (Bauman 1986, 3)

Performance as a relevant concept of the linguistic behavior of grade school students has been demonstrated by Rampton (1999) in his description of Inner London school boys' use of seemingly unrelated scraps of German arbitrarily picked up from German lessons. Firstly, the German material used by (and probably available to) these boys was indeed very limited. Secondly, the identity function of its use involved both a solidarity and a power dimension. Rampton characterizes the use of German as "productively related to ritual, music and performance" (1999, 496), although he also warns that performance as a concept may open a way to understanding routine linguistic production, but "it isn't a free space where cultural materials and social identities are infinitely malleable" (1999, 499).

In the following I will document some of the ways in which the

languages, or varieties, are taken into possession by the young speakers and made their own. I will illustrate how they play with language, in particular switches between codes, both as contributions to social negotiations and as pure performance. I use material from a group conversation between four male bilingual students in the last grade of the Danish public school system. The young people have Turkish as their mother tongue, and Danish is their L2. By grade 9, they have had several years of experience with English, and almost all of the students have had two years of German. The conversation is a part of the Køge material (see Turan 1999). The four boys were asked to create a collage or a picture series with free post cards and glue them on a large piece of cardboard. The theme of the collage was to be “My worst nightmare”. The conversation lasts about half an hour, and all four boys participate actively in the conversation. The conversation has been transcribed according to the CHILDES conventions (MacWhinney 1995), but I have simplified them slightly for the excerpts I give in the following. In the excerpts, Turkish is italicized. The lines beginning with *%eng* give translations into English. Lines beginning with *%com* give background information or comments to the transcript.

From the outset there are several proposals as to what “My worst nightmare” should mean. In the first half of the conversation there are frequent references to “My worst nightmare”. The words *mit værste mareridt* are used in 23 utterances. Shortly before the conversation is half way, the participants get involved in discussions of other matters. The primary source of new issues to discuss is the stack of postcards made available to the group, and a string of digressions are caused by the motives of the different postcards. An otherwise unrelated issue was the grade sheets which they were about to receive from their teachers the week that the recording was made. A theme which pops up several times in the second half of the conversation is women and girls, and how they look. The nightmare theme does appear intermittently in the second half, altogether in 6 utterances.

The young speakers’ simultaneous use of elements from different languages is complicated, and by no means reducible to just two languages, Turkish and Danish. Several more are involved, including varieties of Danish. The code-switching practice of this conversation has been described by Havgaard. She finds that the speakers use “at least four different languages or varieties, namely Turkish, Danish, English, and Perkerdansk” [Stylized immigrant Danish] (Havgaard, *forthc.*, my translation). In fact she finds at least one more variety: stylized Asian (Indian) English. We will return to that later. Havgaard concludes that:

In one and the same conversation among adolescents with this age

(about 15 years) there are many different functions of code-switching. I found code-switches which can be explained from the conversation alone, e.g. when the speakers code-switch to emphasize a statement, attract attention through a joke (performance), or generally play with language. On the other hand there are also switches which are better understood if one includes outside social factors. These switches signal that the adolescents express and to a large extent explore their ethnic identity and the borders between the two cultures (Havgaard forthc., my translation)

Excerpt 1.

Erol: mit største mareridt er Atlantis.
 %eng: my worst nightmare is Atlantis.
 %com: pronounced in stylized immigrant Danish
 Hüseyin: ha Atlantis.
 %com: Hüseyin laughs

In this utterance, Erol uses a highly marked pronunciation characteristic of stylized immigrant Danish (see below). This is not Erol's usual intonation, and his attempt at marking his utterance does not go unnoticed – Hüseyin laughs in appreciation of the pointed reference. The word Atlantis refers to one of the postcards which advertizes a musical titled Atlantis. This is one of the cases where the nightmare theme is brought up, triggered by a postcard. This is also the case with the utterance in excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2.

Erol: mit værste mareridt er at bolle hende der.
 %eng: my worst nightmare is to fuck her.
 %com: Erol and Hüseyin laugh.

In this excerpt the issue of girls is also brought into focus. Erol uses an expression which would be taboo in the adult world, and thereby refers to the border between the age group represented in this conversation on one side and adults on the other side. He is rewarded with Hüseyin's laughter, and the two share the joy of the moment. The reference in this excerpt, however, is entirely in Erol's usual slightly Sealand flavored Danish. The function of the code-switch in excerpt 1 is not reserved for code-switches – it can be achieved by other means also. This calls for an understanding of code-switches as pragmatic-linguistic tools on the same level as all other pragmatic-linguistic tools. Code-switches do not need to be considered as exceptional features that we happen to find in bilingual behavior. They are not outstanding as linguistic features, and in reality they are not reserved for

bilinguals in the classical sense (see e.g. Rampton's 1995 account of code-switches by both multilingual and monolingual adolescents)

Esdahl has also worked with, among other material, conversation 903 (see Esdahl, this volume). She has categorized the individual utterances according to code. This categorization has been carried out twice, by Esdahl and by me. There is more than 95 % agreement in each conversation that we have scored, including conversation 903. The categories that we have used were not very complicated, and by and large there is little in common between Danish and Turkish which could lead to unclear cases, so there is no surprise in the similarity of our categorizations.

In conversation 903, the majority of utterances are either Danish-based (40 %) or Turkish-based (47 %), including utterances with loans. The use of English is not nearly as frequent: 7 % of the utterances are English-based. That leaves us 11 % of the utterances which are mixed, i.e. they contain an intrasentential code-switch, typically between Turkish and Danish, but in a couple of cases English is involved, e.g.

Excerpt 3

Erol: *goril dedi sana vallah* where are you going tonight [//] tonight xxx
ben de.

%eng: *he said gorilla to you* where are you going tonight [//] tonight xxx
me too

But this categorization does not distinguish between varieties of the involved languages, and in a couple of cases there is clearly a switch into stylized immigrant Danish. Excerpt 4 has an example of this.

Excerpt 4

Erol: *ah bak kim var* halal og farvel.

%eng: oh look who is there halal and goodbye

%com: Erol laughs and talks in stylized immigrant Danish

The last three words of excerpt 4 which form a joking goodbye greeting, are pronounced in mockingly accented Danish, a stylized immigrant Danish. This stylized variety appears now and then in the conversations. Havgaard also mentions a couple of examples of this use. She also cites an instance of stylized Asian English:

Excerpt 5

Erol: where are you going today.

This utterance is pronounced with the retroflex stop and the front tongue r-

sound which - at least according to stereotypes prevalent in Denmark - signal Indian-accented English. This is probably not an idea Erol picks out of the blue. One of the postcards used for the group task shows a picture of an Indian-looking taxi driver (actually with a Sikh headwear) asking where his customer wants to go. In some cases the text of a postcard is read – or sung - out, as in excerpt 6.

Excerpt 6

Erol: always Coca Cola.

%com: Erol sings

Later Erol adds on and develops the theme of "Always Coca-Cola" by substituting tequila for Coca-Cola: A reference to alcohol is a (slightly) exciting reference to something forbidden, by the adults, and Erol does also receive a favorable reaction from Hüseyin who breaks into laughter:

Excerpt 7

Erol: always Tequila.

%com: Erol sings

*HUS: Tequila.

%com: Hüseyin laughs

So there is of course little doubt that the boys are aware of variation within the languages they use. A large part of the uses of stylized varieties is, however, triggered by specific identifiable postcards. In the case of excerpt 4 the trigger is most likely a postcard which advertizes a group of comedians known as Tæskeholdet (The Gang of Thugs). In a series of radio and TV programs, this group for a while had a "halal and goodbye" routine. In excerpt 8 Erol expands on this routine, receiving again a favorable reaction from Hüseyin. Hüseyin's pronunciation of the word is standard Danish, but Erol's following repetition of the word Tæskeholdet is entirely in stylized immigrant Danish. He continues with a reference to another theme which is non-appropriate in adult conversations: Murat's purported fart. This time, however, he is not rewarded with a favorable reaction from any of the others, and he reacts inconspicuously to Bekir's request for the Thug Gang postcard.

Excerpt 8

Erol: *ah bak kim var* halal og farvel.

%eng: *oh look who is there* halal and goodbye

%com: Erol laughs and talks in stylized immigrant Danish

Hüseyin: Tæskeholdet.

- %eng: The Gang of Thugs
 Erol: hi hi hi halal og farvel Tæskeholdet.
 %eng: hi hi hi halal and goodbye The Gang of Thugs.
 %com: Erol parodies
 Erol: Murat har lige slået en skid # *o adamın xxx aynı senin gibi.*
 %dan: Murat just farted # *that man's xxx is like yours.*
 Bekir: Tæskeholdet'u *bir bana ver hele.*
 %eng: *give me* The Gang of Thugs
 %com: Bekir asks for the postcard
 Erol: *al len senin olsun istiyor musun.*
 %eng: *take it, man, it can be yours, do you want it.*

Another postcard which attracts their attention, is a picture of a British TV comic character, Mister Bean. Hüseyin has found a postcard with Mister Bean, and now Erol is also looking for one, but he can not find it.

Excerpt 9

- Erol: Mister Bean where are you come here.
 Bekir: *niye bøsse müsün.*
 %eng: *why, are you gay?*
 Erol: *bir tane daha bulursanız bana verin ha bir tane daha bulursanız.*
 %eng: *if you find one more then give it to me, man, if you find one more*
 Hüseyin: *düşünüyoruz.*
 %eng: *we will think about it*
 Erol: ah halalla farveller *istiyor musun lan hava halal.*
 %eng: oh halalla goodbyes *do you want it, man, air halal.*
 %com: Erol plays with the words
 Hüseyin: Tæskeholdet.
 %eng: The Gang of Thugs

Erol's first remark in excerpt 7 is fictitiously addressed to Mister Bean, and he gets a teasing reaction from Bekir. Erol explains his wish, and Hüseyin goes along with Bekir's teasing, although in a different direction. Erol falls back into his routine with the Thug Gang, elaborating further on the routine by playing with the words in a mixture of Turkish and Danish. *Halal* as a word in Danish signals Islam, halal butchers in the major cities, and a host of other stereotypical immigrant features. At the same time it sounds close to the Danish word *Hallo* which is a welcome greeting or an attention getter. *Halal og farvel* is therefore in its original context a pun that transcends the border between Danish and Turkish, and it is a statement against common stereotypes about immigrants in modern urban Denmark. In excerpt 7, Erol

take sit even further, introducing or at least hinting *lal* which means foolishness or foolish behavior. *Farveller* which is a colloquial Sealand goodbye greeting, and *hava* the Turkish word for air or weather. At the same time Hava is a girl's name. So in this wordplay Erol brings a lot of linguistic features into play, he alludes to several standpoints regarding the position of minorities in Denmark, and he refers to a decidedly youth-related popular phenomenon, the Gang of Thugs. Again he receives Hüseyin's appreciative reaction.

With these examples it should be obvious firstly, that Erol's code-switching and code-mixing certainly involves language play in Crystal's sense. But this is not just a ludic adolescent fooling around with words. Secondly, Erol's oscillations are namely also statements about himself and the others in the group. The references to youth phenomena, the group of comedians, the attraction to alcohol, etc., function as statements of ingroup youth status. Hüseyin's reactions show us that Erol's word juggling is also taken as such, at least by him. This is not as much the case with the other two boys:

Excerpt 9

Erol: mit største mareridt er at fange muser *Musa*.

%eng: my worst nightmare is to catch mouses *Mousa*.

%com: Hüseyin laughs, Mouse is a name for a boy in Turkish

Hüseyin: *Musa* fange muser.

%eng: *Mousa* catch mouses

%com: Hüseyin laughs

Bekir: *eşeklik yapma ya*.

%eng: *don't be stupid now*

Name \ IR	New Init.	Resp + Init	Other
Erol (N=128)	11 %	75 %	16 %
Hüseyin (N=101)	8 %	89 %	3 %
Murat (N=62)	22 %	68 %	10 %
Bekir (N=95)	18 %	72 %	11 %

Table 1. Percentage of utterances which are new initiatives, responses + initiatives, and other types, respectively, for each of the four participants in conversation 903. N= total number of utterances by the individual speakers.

In several cases Erol's puns or ideas are not too well received by Bekir. This leads to our third observation, namely that Erol's word play is also part of an in-group jockeying for position among the four boys. In this connection, Erol's performance is exactly - performance, in Kaufman's terms. There are other indications that the boys position themselves differently - and sometimes conflictory - within the group and in relation to the task. An analysis in initiative-response terms, but reduced in number of categories (see Madsen, this volume, for similar analyses of other Køge conversations) yields the differences which we see in table 1.

It is clear from table 1 that Murat takes a little less part in the flow of the conversation than Erol and Bekir, and clearly less than Hüseyin. Murat has the lowest number of utterances, and percentagewise he has fewer responses + initiatives than the others. This does not mean that he is outside the conversation or has no influence. This will be clear from table 2.

MULTI-VARIETY CODE-SWITCHING

Name \ Init. receipt.	+	-
Erol	72 %	11 %
Hüseyin	72 %	24 %
Murat	82 %	5 %
Bekir	80 %	6 %

Table 2. Reception in percentage of initiatives taken by each participant in conversation 903. Column 2 (marked +) represents initiatives which have received a reaction, and column 3 (marked -) initiatives which have received no reaction from the other participants in the conversation.

Table 2 shows us that Murat's initiatives by and large are taken into account by the others. He seldom says anything that is ignored. Contrary to this, every fourth initiative by Hüseyin does not lead to any reaction from the others. Bekir and Murat exert more control over the conversation than Erol and Hüseyin do when we see it in this light, although Erol and Hüseyin produce more utterances. We have already noticed that Hüseyin backs up Erol's performance utterances, while they do not seem to be rewarded similarly by Murat and Bekir.

A third quantitative measure of conversational dominance is the number of times each participants attempts to attract the attention of another participant by addressing him by name, see table 3.

Addrs	Erol		Hüs.		Murat		Bekir		
	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	
Erol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Hüse	0	2	0	0	4	1	3	5	15
Murat	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5
Bekir	3	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	13
Total	4	3	4	1	11	1	3	6	36

Table 3. Number of times each speaker (rows) in conversation 903 addresses another participant (column) by name. Positive or neutral addresses are scored with +, negative or confrontational addresses by -. Erol receives 4 positive and 3 negative addresses.

Table 3 shows us that Murat is addressed by name more often than the others, and he is particularly often addressed positively. It is also interesting to observe that Erol exclusively addresses Bekir, and only negatively. Hasan, and particularly Bekir, direct most attention to Murat. All these quantitative measures reveal that Murat is relatively centrally positioned in the group. The others are aware of his presence, and although he does not say very much, he is certainly not ignored.

Murat's status is also easy to notice in table 4. He has more Danish-based utterances than the others, and he uses no English and very little mixing. In fact he has also only one construction with a loan word. These figures yeild a picture of Murat as one who does not particpate very much in the performance exercises. He seems to be centrally positioned in the group, and this is further supported by the figures for intersentential code-switching. For both Erol, Hüseyin, and Bekir, 66 % of their utterances are followed by utterances in the same code, while 34 % of their utterances are followed by an intersentential code-switch. For Murat the figures are 73 % and 27 %. The others simply do not switch as often when they follow Murat – or more precisely: the group tends to follow Murat's code choice more than the others'. And it is not because he himself gets less involved in intersentential code-switching. Following Bekir, he is the most frequent intersentential code-switcher: 39 % of Bekir's utterances are code-switched from the preceding utterance. The figure for Murat is 34 %, for Erol 30 %, and for Hüseyin 28 %.

MULTI-VARIETY CODE-SWITCHING

Name\Code	Danish	Turkish	English	mixed
Erol	32 %	52 %	5 %	10 %
Hüseyin	40 %	51 %	0	9 %
Murat	55 %	39 %	0	4 %
Bekir	42 %	42 %	1 %	14 %

Table 4. Distribution of utterances on codes. Danish includes Danish with loanwords, etc. Mix covers utterances with intra-utterance code-switching.

Both the quantitative data and the qualitative analysis of the excerpts have showed us that there is indeed both a jockeying game going on inside the group and confirmation of the social bonds keeping the group together. The individual code-switches, including the mixed utterances, can often not be seen as single-purpose statements. A short exchange with two or three utterances may contain both pure ludicrum linguae, performance, ingroup marking, and internal jockeying for position - in the same expression.

We have also been able to see that code-switching is only one aspect of the interaction taking place in a conversation such as 903. But the code-switches, or in some cases perhaps more precisely: the code choices, are so integrated with the other mechanisms and tools at the speakers' disposal, that it makes almost no sense to isolate the functions of the code-switches, as if they were in any way special. They contribute to the fun of playing with language. They contribute to the concept formation of the language users. They certainly contribute to the construction of social relations among the speakers, both in ingroup marking and in the struggle for status in a hierarchy.

The multivariety behavior of these adolescents proves in my mind beyond doubt how meaningless it is to expect *sprachlige Reinheit* from multilingual language users. With Rajagopalan (personal communication) I would like to propose that we give up classifying speakers as monolingual, bilingual, trilingual or whatever, until we have once and for all determined that we are all languagers. We use language as a human facility, and we are the only species with such a facility. The ways in which we use them are so intricately integrated, and perhaps so universal in their structure, that it is of less importance that some people only understand some of what this I can produce with language. There are always others who can understand the other things that this I can do with language. And the first group of languagers are not in any way entitled to degrade what they can not understand, they have no right to forbid me to employ my skills.

Once we have established firmly that we are all language users, and therefore more similar than different, we can discuss differences, but they are all of secondary importance. What really matters is that we think of our language capacity as one, integrated, deeply human facility.

References:

- Auer, J. C. Peter. 1988. 'A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer,' in Monica Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 187-214.
- Bauman, Richard. 1986. *Story, performance, and event. Contextual studies of oral narrative*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Boyd, Sally, Anne Holmen & J. Normann Jørgensen (eds.). 1994. *Sprogbrug og sprogvælg blandt indvandrere i Norden. Bind I-II. Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed* bind 22-23, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, København.
- Crystal, David. 1998. *Language Play*, Penguin, London.
- Havgaard, Merete. forthcoming. 'Pragmatiske funktioner med kodeskift hos tosprogede unge,' in J. N. Jørgensen (ed), *Studier i flersprogethed hos unge*, Akademisk Forlag, København.
- Holmen, Anne & J. N. Jørgensen. 1997. *The Development of Successive Bilingualism in School-Age Children. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism vol. 27*, Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen.
- Jørgensen, J. N. 1993. 'Children's Code Switching in Group Conversations,' in *European Science Foundation Network on Code-Switching and Language Contact*, European Science Foundation 1993, Paris, pp. 165-181.
- Kotsinas, Ulla-Britt. 1994. *Ungdomssprog: ord och stil*, Hallgren & Fallgren, Uppsala.
- Kristiansen, Tore. 1993. 'Sidste nyt fra kampen mod de unge tunger,' in Karen Risager, Anne Holmen & Anna Trosborg (eds.), *Sproglig mangfoldighed – om sproglig viden og bevidsthed*, Foreningen for anvendt sprogvidenskab i Danmark, Roskilde, pp. 88-97.
- Kristiansen, Tore. 1995. 'Anmeldelse af Ulla-Britt Kotsinas: Ungdomssprog,' in *NyS, Nydanske Studier & almen kommunikationsteori* 20, Dansk lærerforening, København, 91-102.
- Kunø, Mette. 1991. 'Ungdomssprog,' in *Sprogene i sproget. Modersmål-Selskabets Årbog 1991*, C. A. Reitzel, København, pp. 89-96.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 1995. *The CHILDES Project. Tools for Analyzing Talk. Second Edition*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing. Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*, Longman, London.
- Rampton, Ben. 1999. 'Deutsch in Inner London and the animation of an instructed foreign language,' *Journal of Sociolinguistics* Volume 3 no. 4, 480-504.
- Turan, Fadime (ed). 1999. 'A Text of Turkish-Danish Bilingual Grade School Students' Conversations,' *Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, the Køge Series*, vol. K6. Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen.