

Spanish-English Code Switching in Montgomery County Classrooms: Peer Group Interaction
and Jockeying for Status

By Kathryn A. Wade

B.A. in Spanish, May 2007, Georgetown University

A Thesis submitted to

The Faculty of
The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
of The George Washington University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

August 31, 2011

Thesis directed by

Alexander S. Dent

Professor of Anthropology

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincerest thanks to Alexander S. Dent and Joel C. Kuipers who made this thesis possible. Not only have I had the fortune to benefit from their direct support and guidance regarding my own research but I have also been moved by their passion and humility as scholars and educators and by their individual contributions to the field of linguistic anthropology.

I also wish to thank my parents and brothers for their constant support and encouragement. They have taught me that life is an adventure and that complacency is weakness. There is always more to learn and experience.

Abstract of Thesis

Spanish-English Code Switching in Montgomery County Classrooms: Peer Group Interaction and Jockeying for Status

This research analyzes selective, code switching performances among a group of bilingual adolescents in suburban Washington, DC using data collected through a five- year study initiated in 2003 known as the "Scaling up Curriculum for Achievement, Learning, and Equity Project" ("SCALE-uP Project"). More specifically, it explores what the alternation between Spanish and English in talk itself reveals about the strategic, social functions of code switching among its practitioners in order to further understandings of the phenomenon and its implications within the bilingual, classroom environment. Study findings show that while code switching practices are unique to individual speakers, some conversational functions can be isolated, including alternating to gain power and popularity status, to defy established boundaries or to index ethnic affiliation in the classroom. These interactional achievements speak to larger social issues such as the implications of bilingual students being uniquely resourced in the classroom environment.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract of Thesis.....	iii
Do things just <i>suena mejor</i> (sound better) in Spanish?	1
Conversational code switching: details matter to rid the bad rep- and broaden understandings.....	5
Code switching as exploitation: what speaking two languages- can do for you in the classroom.....	12
<i>Code switching as an opportunity to be exclusionary.....</i>	12
<i>Code switching to push and defy boundaries of expected talk- (gossip versus school) and beyond.....</i>	16
<i>Code switching as a “we code”</i>	22
<i>Code switching for interpersonal relationship building, preference- and passion.....</i>	28
Four examples, one code switching lesson about unpredictability.....	30
Annex 1 – Key to Transcription Conventions.....	36

14 M: Eh! *yo nunca te he oído hablando en español... ¿hablas? ¿En español?*

[I've never heard you speaking in Spanish...do you talk? In Spanish?]

15 R: Who ↑me? You're a disgrace... ((Walking away from table))

Demasiado:: (.5) °Ojalá que te mueras°...

[Too much (.5) I hope you die]

16 M: ((Looking in Raul's direction)) ¡HABLA EN ESPAÑOL!

[SPEAK IN SPANISH!]¹

Do things just suena mejor (sound better) in Spanish?

Maria and Raul are classmates in a middle school in Montgomery County, Maryland. Another thing they share in common is that they are both native Spanish speakers. Maria calls Raul over to the table where she is sitting with three other female, Hispanic classmates. The girls have been laughing behind Raul's back about how he sounds like such a "gringo" (white guy) when he speaks English. When Raul gets over to their table, Maria, addressing him in Spanish, comments that she never hears him speaking in Spanish and provokes him by asking if he does at all (when she full well knows that he does). Raul refuses to respond in Spanish, calls Maria a disgrace in English, and begins to walk away from the table. Before he gets too far, he switches to Spanish and says quietly (to Maria): "I hope you die."

¹ This excerpt was taken from audio-video data transcribed by the researcher. The researcher titled the conversation: "Last Words." All names used throughout the paper are pseudonyms. The research reported in this paper is based on data collected in middle schools in Montgomery County, Maryland through a five-year study initiated in 2003 known as the "Scaling up Curriculum for Achievement, Learning, and Equity Project" ("SCALE-uP Project"). A team of George Washington University researchers from the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Department of Teacher Preparation and Special Education and the Columbian College of Arts of Sciences' Department of Anthropology conducted the study. It is thanks to one of the principle researchers, Dr. Joel Kuipers, of the Department of Anthropology, that I was directed to the project's data and allowed access for my own research.

Why is it a big deal to the girls that Raul sounds white when he speaks English? And why do they want to hear him speak Spanish? Why does Raul concede and decide to switch from English to Spanish to wish death upon Maria as he walks away? Was it an unconscious or conscious choice? What did it help him to achieve (if anything)?

The answer to all these questions lies in detailed analysis of the phenomenon of code switching, or the use of two or more languages in the course of one speech exchange (Gumperz 1982; Bailey 2000). Quite frankly it *is* a big deal that Raul sounds like a “gringo” and does not use Spanish in the classroom because these facts somewhat separate him from his other bilingual, classmates who in part, define themselves by their dual language abilities. It is also a big deal that Raul ultimately decides to prove to Maria that he can and does speak Spanish.

In order to truly understand Raul’s motives and ultimate language choices, and those of other bilingual speakers, this paper will analyze selective, code switching performances among a group of bilingual adolescents in suburban Washington, DC using data collected between 2003 and 2008.² More specifically, it will explore what the alternation between Spanish and English in

² For the SCALE-uP study, samples of audio-video data were collected for selected class periods over multiple years in order to investigate the effectiveness of three middle school science curriculum units that were being tested for potential scale-up in Montgomery County’s diverse public school system (Lynch 2008: 11). In describing instances of code switching in this research, the focus is on the ways that code switching is employed for social purposes in peer to peer interactions and is no way related to evaluating the effectiveness of the curriculum.

Much of the data collected through video for SCALE-uP, focused on tables within classrooms made up of students of different ethnicities and language abilities. For example, data from two distinct classrooms focused on a table with two bilingual, Hispanic students and two other English, monolingual students. In both cases, the bilingual, Hispanic students were sitting side by side across the table from the two monolingual English speakers. In another data set, the focus was on a table also made up of two bilingual, Hispanic students and two monolingual students; however, the bilingual Hispanic students were seated diagonally across the table from one another. In another case, data was collected from a table of four, bilingual Hispanic students. For this study, all data with instances of code switching across classrooms and over multiple year periods were analyzed. The intention was not to analyze switching change over time. The focus of the analysis is to highlight the ways in which students involved in conversational code

talk itself reveals about the strategic, social functions of code switching among its practitioners. Already researchers studying code switching across contexts and ethnic groups have successfully challenged Einar Haugen's (1953) notion that "necessity is the mother of bilingualism" (Valdés Fallis 1978: 8) by identifying some of the creative, discourse-related functions of code switching (such as shifting topics, conveying precise meaning or responding to characteristics of a setting) (Valdés Fallis 1978; Woolard 2004). Researchers have also demonstrated how code switches can and do serve as identity markers and are used to express solidarity between two speakers of the same community or ethnic background (Kyratzis et al 2009; Zentella 1997; Jorgensen 1998; Bailey 2007; Valdés-Fallis 1978; Auer 1998). What has been less clearly established is how code switching is used within diverse communities (such as classrooms) to negotiate social status particularly by defying boundaries, challenging social roles and using tactics of inclusion and exclusion.

In a previous study of a particular lab table of students who are part of the present research population, Kuipers et al (2008) highlighted the "diversity of students' personal experiences in the classroom" and the ways in which "the social dynamics among the students greatly influence the lab procedures" (Kuipers et al 2008: 241, 259). While Kuipers et al (2008) were focused on documenting the students' experiences with a reform science curriculum, they built an evidence base for further research of the communicative practices of this multiethnic student body and, specifically, the ways in which language choice impacts the "ever-shifting" social dynamics among students (Kuipers et al 2008: 261). Kuipers and Massoud (2008) also

switching were concerned with the communicative effects of what they were saying particularly as related to their social status in the classroom and position in peer groups. All code switching conversations were transcribed in order to aid micro analysis of code switching in peer interaction.

examined manifestations of objectification and how students' identity formation can include connections to objects. At the same time, they pointed out that much of middle school discourse is devoted to: "differentiating one's identity from that of others, a sort of discursive self-creation by contrast" (Kuipers and Massoud 2008: 11). Detailed analysis of code switching in action among these students reinforces the import Kuipers et al (2008) and Kuipers and Massoud (2008) give to: 1) paying attention to the diversity of personal experiences in the classroom; 2) accepting that social dynamics have a permanent place in learning environments; and 3) considering differentiation as an important element of identity construction among adolescents. It also goes beyond to show how bilingual students (like Raul and Maria) are uniquely resourced in the classroom -- a highly charged and transformative environment due to the new situational resources it presents to students (Wortham 2004: 165) -- and utilize English and Spanish as linguistic resources to serve their distinct social purposes. These social purposes can include: exclusion of peers, construction of alliances and jockeying for popularity status through demonstrated bilingual talent or taunting but must never be assumed.

Code switching uses are not standard; in fact, they are quite unrehearsed and therefore, the meaning of any particular switch is most adequately deciphered through analysis of its emergence in interaction. Doing detailed, turn-by-turn analysis will reveal how distinct social actions such as jockeying for status are "brought about" through the uses of code switching techniques among participants (Wei 1998: 171). Furthermore, looking at how commonplace code switching practice can be (for example, when it just comes about based on the preference of the speaker) may help to quell the controversy that surrounds the topic.

The very fact that bilingual students are using code switching to achieve social ends in the classroom feeds into larger debates regarding bilingual language education. In the United

States in 1981 when U.S. language policy declared English the official language of the country, by default, negative attitudes towards bilingualism in the classroom have prevailed among educators (Zentella 1997; Kyratzis 2009). Nevertheless, studies are continuing to show that “acknowledging the appropriateness of non-standard dialects and code switching for specific situations” may lead to increased opportunity for learning among bilinguals (Zentella 1997: 280). With an ever increasing Latino population in the United States, understanding the way that bilinguals employ language in the classroom to position themselves in interaction whether academic or social seems critical to expanding understanding of the way forward for engaging ever diverse groups in learning. For example, understanding and accepting that bilinguals are switching between their native language (Spanish) and the official classroom language (English) creatively and not restrictively to negotiate popularity status among peers and construct new boundaries for classroom talk might lead to more exploration of applications of their chosen style to academics. Beyond the education arena, continued studies of code switching as it happens among specific populations, will further enlighten global understandings of the phenomenon. Because while we do know that code switching is related to identity and that it provides bilinguals with discursive opportunities such as the ability to redirect conversations, we do not know as much about the uses of code switching among adolescents to challenge and jockey for popularity or power status positions among peers in the classroom.

Conversational code switching: details matter to rid the bad rep and broaden understandings

As mentioned code switching has not always been viewed as a resource. In fact, one of the greatest code switching debates has been whether the practice of alternation is a

communication resource or an example of language deficiency. While code switching is observable all over the world, the majority of studies of the code switching phenomenon have looked at its usage among adolescent peer groups and in particular among members of minority groups (Franceschini 1998: 53). Quite unfairly, there is often a charge that this generation's type of bilingualism is unacceptable or represents a lack of language proficiency (Zentella 1997: 115; Elgin 2000: 16).

In order to dispel stigma and (theory) about code switching as a sign of language deficiency, it is important to examine its uses in action among different local populations as its functions can then be globally compared. Montgomery County, Maryland is 17% Hispanic according to the 2010 United States Census Bureau report. The Hispanic population there has grown steadily since an initial wave of Hispanic immigrants came into Maryland in the 1980s and subsequently, the school system in Montgomery County is becoming increasingly diverse. According to Montgomery County Public School records, between 1998 and 2010 Hispanic enrollment increased by 90% or 15,950 students. The multilingual classroom setting in Montgomery County presents an ideal opportunity to study the functionality of code switching among a unique population of adolescents, in the same way that New York City's El barrio (East Harlem) provided ethnographer Ana Celia Zentella (1997) a distinct occasion to study the phenomenon among Puerto Ricans or the way the small English territory of Gibraltar allowed ethnographer Melissa Moyer (1998) to study bilingual conversations among speakers highly proficient in both Spanish and English.

Both Moyer (1998) and Zentella (1997) successfully argue that code switching is not a result of language deficiency. Ana Celia Zentella (1997) contends that the practice of code switching among El Barrio's Puerto Ricans is most often a signal of speaker resourcefulness and

a way for producing interactional meaning. She does so by demonstrating that the children of Puerto Rican immigrants are knowledgeable of both Spanish and English grammars and highlighting the complexities of their code switching practices. Zentella (1997) is also concerned with the ways in which bilinguals use language(s) to construct and display multiple identities. This issue of identity construction in particular as it relates to language ideologies or attitudes towards language is an important area of focus as code switching characteristically arises in groups sharing common identities.

One of the most challenging and rewarding things about studying a language phenomenon such as code switching is that language today is seen as a fundamental element in social action (Salzmann and Zdenek 2004; Foley 1997; Barker and Galasinski 2001; Goodwin and Duranti 1992; Agar 1994). Yet at the same time, language use is both premeditated and happens automatically or unconsciously; speakers are not always aware of their speech choices (Gumperz 1982: 61). When it comes to code switching as part of verbal action, bilinguals themselves have expressed that alternation is something that happens naturally (Zentella 1997). Meanwhile, alteration among languages is also about language choice and how that reflects power (Wooffitt 2005; Jorgensen 1998).

As a result of its complexity, there has been increased “emphasis on code switching as a routine practice in everyday conversation” (Rampton 1998: 309) and the particulars of its occurrence in conversations. That way, scholars studying code switching behavior consider both intentional factors and factors beyond speakers’ consciousness. Through careful analysis of the conversations or interactional episodes in which code switching occurs, researchers successfully have broadened understandings of bilingual talk and its social purposes in different speech communities (Auer 1998: 2). This paper includes within the spectrum of social purposes of code

switching, jockeying for status among peers while emphasizing the improvisational aspect of the practice and rejecting the conception that the meaning of particular switches can be derived from broader understandings of the social world and its “objective, irreducible structure that constrains individuals in interaction” (Sawyer 2003: 47).

One of the criticisms of conversation analysis has been that it narrowly focuses on the “micro” details of verbal interaction at the expense of an analysis of the wider social and political context in which interactions are taking place (Wooffitt 2005:2003). But this critique is unfounded. One scholar, Celia Kitzinger, whose main focus is feminist conversation analysis argues well that attending to the detail of the organization of talk (turn taking, how participants come to say things, when elements from different languages occur, etc) is critical to understanding what people are saying to one another because analysts must engage in the same level of detail that speakers themselves do (Wooffitt 2005: 203).

Michael Silverstein (2003) also emphasizes the importance of not neglecting the more spontaneous and less rule driven aspects of conversation (Silverstein 2003: 7). Silverstein (2003) argues that everyday conversation is more like “improvised dialogue” and therefore is “negotiated, flexible, collaborative, and in play...” (Silverstein 2003: 6). The most basic features of unstructured conversations such as topic, speaking rights and turn taking are open to negotiation (Silverstein 2003: 7); and, without embracing this idea – that while external context may be relevant to individual speakers, certainly they are not fully constrained in interaction (Sawyer 2003: 47) – conversations can be misunderstood.

In fact, it is in analyzing the minutiae of conversation that more “macro” social and political issues are unveiled. In essence the idea is that the “meaning of any particular code switch can only legitimately be ascertained in the context of conversational interaction” (Stroud

1998: 322). Rather than abstract meaning from social circumstances, studying actual talk in interaction is the best means to understanding the uses of code switching.

Deborah Tannen (1993) offers the concept of framing as an appropriate and productive theoretical basis for analyzing conversation. Tannen's notion of a frame draws upon the earlier work of Bateson (1972), Hymes (1974), Frake (1979), Goffman (1974), R.N. Ross (1975) and Bartlett (1932) all of whom in one way or another get at the connectedness of utterances – that is – to the personal and social past and present. Speakers must always balance the fact that they are at once individuals and social creatures (Tannen 2005: 24). Tannen (2005) discusses the notion of framing as necessary for understanding interactional strategies by showing that messages cannot be appropriately interpreted without signals as to how they are meant. More simply put, speakers send cues to listeners, which let them know the gist of what they are about to say. In academic terms these cues are known as metacommunicative frames (Tannen 2005:33). There are a number of ways of doing this using different speech features such as pitch, intonation and topic. When it comes to multilingual speakers, framing can often be more complicated because cues are not always understood across cultures. In order to analyze code switching conversations, the concept of frames will be applied in particular with respect to speech topic and shared rapport created through frames. Frames are a critical concept because they “take language and culture and make them inseparable” (Agar 1994: 132). When speakers understand each other's ways of signaling or share the same expectations, this provides good evidence of shared background and context (Tannen 2005: 36).

When it comes to conversation analysis, another important concept is performance. In fact, framing is only part of understanding speech. A speaker requires the set up of a frame within which the communication will be understood, but the ensuing performance is what brings

social life into being. Richard Bauman's (1986) performance framework makes a strong case for the performance event as the key to understanding the interplay between discourse, competence and speaker objective within particular contexts. According to Bauman, the performance event, is what actually "direct[s] attention to the conduct of artistic verbal performance in social life" (Bauman 1986: 3). Speakers, as performers must use stylized speech depending on their audience and the context of the speech event. When two languages in particular are used within one conversation, it becomes particularly important to consider all elements of speech and performance allows for a "very critical reflection on communicative processes" (Bauman and Briggs 1990: 60).

The performance of code switching can be about challenging norms. For example, it has been demonstrated that bilingual adolescents "employ code switching as a marker of individual bilingual identity in opposition to adult norms or to the norms of other groups of adolescents, or both" (Jorgensen 1998: 249). It is also about language choice and an ability to manipulate conversations as performers who are at once intensely aware of the everyday talk they are engaging in and unconsciously influenced by other determinants, such as existing conventions. Actually, it seems that there are two types of code switching: one type where the switch is personally motivated and the speaker is the "most salient determiner" of the alternation and another type where other norms are more significant determiners (Jorgensen 1998: 239).

Bilingual speakers, like all speakers, are rational actors who are in a position to make linguistic choices; these choices may either "conform with the prevailing social norms and pass as 'unmarked,' or alternatively, redefine the current set of 'rights and obligations' (Gardner Chloros 2009: 69). Applying a performance framework to conversation analysis will help to expose what elements of speech are "rooted in community" and what is unique to the individual

[speaker] (Bauman 1986: 77). It will also help to highlight the ways in which code switching is used as a tool to negotiate social status, purposefully defy expectations and enter exclusionary social realms.

The literature on the social purposes of code switching is growing. Since Gumperz (1982) offered that one of the most frequently found switch patterns was that members of a minority groups speak their native tongue at home, while using the majority or dominant language at work and when dealing with members outside of their group (Gumperz 1982: 64), other studies have highlighted additional purposes of code switching. For example, a number of studies have focused on code switching as a marker of identity (Zentella 1997; de Fina 2007; Heller 1995) and that includes establishing a unique identity or trying to differ from others (Franceschini 1998; Moyer 1998).

As noted, code switching as a tool within diverse classrooms to negotiate social status particularly by defying boundaries and using tactics of inclusion and exclusion has not been thoroughly investigated. The classroom is a highly fragile social context. It is a fluid space where adolescents have room to develop unique identities apart from those they carry at home within a transformative social context (Wortham 2004: 165). As a result of this knowledge, the analytic framework employed to analyze instances of code switching among bilingual, adolescent students in Montgomery County is one that draws upon the concepts of performance and framing which emphasize local, discursive production of meaning. It is only through local studies of code switching in action that we can contribute to broader understandings of the ways that code switching is means for individuals to create identify, form or break relationships and to negotiate social status among peers. And actually, although patterns do emerge from analysis of the ways in which alternation is used, the nuances of every interaction in which code switching is

concerned are incredibly vast. So vast in fact that the phenomenon needs to be understood as having an intensely personalized nature as much as it can serve as a group identifier.

Code switching as exploitation: what speaking two languages can do for you in the classroom

As evidenced by in depth analysis of data, code switching is highly dependent upon procedural consequentiality (Schegloff 1992), relevance (Wei 1998), negotiation, “overall interactional goals” (Wei 1998) and the preference of the individual performer. In the Montgomery County classroom environment, code switching serves different functions related to social status. Consequentially, of all data analyzed, four unique conversations (performance events) representative in different ways of critical, context specific uses of code switching were selected for more in depth analysis. Each conversation demonstrates a distinctive functionality of code switching related to peer-to-peer social interactions in the classroom setting. Michael Silverstein writes about the functionalist perspective of communication. In this perspective, communication events are a means of “re-enforcing the interpersonal social arrangements of categories of people in society, recruited to communicative roles” (Silverstein 2001: 71) That is to say that language use “functions” as the primary channel of social organization (Silverstein 2001: 71) In the following conversations, code switching practice does in fact often re-enforce the social arrangements among classmates.

Code switching as an opportunity to be exclusionary

The ability to speak two languages is significantly empowering. When bilingual speakers find themselves among monolingual speakers, they are automatically advantaged by the fact that if desired, they can be selective or exclusive with their audience. They can say things that will

not be effectively interpreted by those who do not share their second language ability. In the example that follows, four students are working together on an experiment. Two of the students are Hispanic, bilingual girls and they are seated diagonally across the table from one another. The other two students are males. One is a black, monolingual student, and the other is a Hispanic, bilingual male. In the event, one of the bilingual girls and the black, monolingual boy are the main participants. They are arguing over the appropriate procedures for the experiment. The interaction ultimately demonstrates a female student challenging the status and assumed leadership taken on by her male classmate. To her, she triumphs at the end of the confrontation through her ultimate ability to exclude him, and say something to a friend that he is incapable of understanding. She has the last word, in Spanish, and he has no opportunity for rebuttal.

Example 1 – “Last Words”

P= Phillip: Boy, black, monolingual

M= Maria: Girl, Hispanic, bilingual

U= Ursula: Girl, Hispanic, bilingual

01 P: °We should have let it finish.° Oh::: We should have let it finish, =

02 M: [What are you do:::i:ng?]

03 P: ...and then that's... ((Reaching out to middle of table))

04 M: You stupid retard... ((Reaching out to middle of table))

05 P: Then you push zero.

06 M: [STOP]

07 P: Let me figure it out first...THEN

08 M: You retard.

09 M: >°Let go of my fucking hand... °

10 P: I wasn' (.5) I wasn' holding your hand... idiot=

>you were holding my hand... ((Phillip gets up, and walks away from table)) (30)

11 M: ((Phillip comes back and sits down again)) °He has no control over his fingers. ° ((laughing))

12 P: If I had no control over my fingers, why could I do this? ((Spinning pencil in one hand))

13 M: 'cause your retarded...

14 P: °no°

15 M: ((looking across the table at Ursula)) *Milagro de Dios*=

[Miracle of God]

por la misericordia de Dios ((laughing))

[Because of the mercy of God]

In this example, alternation provides a means for Maria to “win” her status (and racial) battle with Phillip by ultimately having the final word through exclusion. Phillip emerges as the table leader, through his efforts to control the experiment in the middle and display his knowledge of what is going on. In line 01, he expresses awareness that the group made a wrong choice with the experiment and reaches towards the middle of the table to correct it. Maria challenges this, interrupting him in line 02, to ask what he is doing as he reaches out. She does not want Phillip to assume responsibility for the project, perhaps due to a lack of trust. Phillip disregards her outcry, and continues to explain where they went wrong and what they should do next. Before he can get too far, Maria takes advantage of a pause and calls him a stupid retard in line 04. Phillip continues to ignore her, and carries on with his explanation when Maria interrupts him again in line 05, and yells at him to stop what he is doing. He pushes her out, showing that he does not see a value to her interruption by saying assertively “let me figure it out first.” At this point, Maria is getting frustrated, and calls him a retard again in line 08, and then tells him emphatically but softly in line 09 to let go of her “fucking hand.”

Philip responds by denying that he was holding her hand; and continues the bickering by suggesting that she was holding his hand. Both students are annoyed at each other and Phillip gets up to walk to another table. He is only gone briefly and as he approaches the table to sit down again, Maria says jokingly to the other two classmates at the table, “he has no control over his fingers.” She says it loud enough so that Phillip will hear. Phillip’s reply this time consists in showing off and in line 12, he asks, “if I had no control over my fingers, why could I do this?” and begins spinning his pencil like helicopter wings in his fingers in one hand for everyone at the table to see. Maria’s response is to continue to belittle his intelligence and for the third time in the conversation, she calls Phillip a retard. There is a pattern of repeated name-calling and interruption pointing to Maria’s effort to establish a voice in the dialogue. Phillip counters this with a quiet “no” and rather than further provoking Maria, settles on that as a sufficient final word.

Maria, at this point, takes advantage of her bilingualism and turns to one of the other bilingual speakers at the table, a girl sitting diagonally across from her, to get in her own last words. In line 15, she says to Ursula: “*milagro de Dios* (miracle of God), *por la misericordia de Dios* (by the mercy of God).” She is generating her own response to Phillip’s inquiry as to why he is able to spin a pencil in his fingers if he has no control over them. And her answer is in the form of a joke -- that it’s a miracle that he can; it’s thanks to God’s mercy. By excluding Phillip through her use of Spanish, not only is she able to get in her own last words and “win” the back and forth between the two of them, demonstrating in front of their other table mates that she is ultimately the dominant peer; but she is also able to achieve other things. She pokes fun at Phillip through her sarcastic remark that it’s a miracle of God that he can spin his pencil bumping up her popularity status among the other students. Marjorie Harness Goodwin writes extensively on one

of the favorite pastimes of girls being to provide “commentary on features of their social landscape by evaluating people and events.” (Goodwin 2005: 190) This is precisely what Maria is doing in this context; she is evaluating Phillip and attributing his success to something elusive because she is ultimately trying to put him down. She also builds rapport with Ursula, not only through use of Spanish, which excludes Phillip and recognizes their shared linguistic background, but also through her choice of religious terminology, demonstrating knowledge of their shared cultural and racial background as well. Code switching in this conversation is a tool that Maria uses to gain control. She separates Phillip from the other bilingual speakers and lets her own viewpoint on the particular situation be the deciding one because she creates a scenario where he has no options but to ignore what she said. In other conversations, bilingual students use code switching for exclusionary purposes beyond just making personal gains. One of these purposes is to push the recognized limits of classroom talk and expand the scope of topics by keeping gossip to an in-group of Hispanics.

Code switching to push and defy boundaries of expected talk (gossip versus school) and beyond

In the classroom environment, English is the expected language of communication and unless the teacher otherwise indicates that students are free to discuss whatever they wish, classroom talk should be related to the lesson that the teacher is conducting. In the next example, two Hispanic, bilingual girls seated side by side are supposed to be engaging in an activity with their other table mates (who happen to be monolingual speakers). Instead, when another monolingual speaker approaches their table to hand out papers related to a classroom exercise, they initiate gossip talk with her, and then further the gossip when she leaves pushing the boundaries of what is permissible in the classroom. By switching to Spanish, the two girls fearlessly conduct their own, school inappropriate conversations because they are quite certain

that their chatter is safe from anyone who they would not want to hear it. Ultimately, they use code switching as a tactic to “upset the notion of performance errors by contravening and rewriting the expected rules” (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 18). They are not performing “wrongly” or “poorly” in the classroom because they establish their own realm for gossip through use of code switching from English to Spanish.

Example 2 – “Flat Chested”

A=Ana

S= Sally

I= Ignacia

01 A: OH Sally, tell Ignacia what you call Casey

02 S: huh::: ?

03 A: Tell her whatchu’ call Casey

04 I: Whatchu call Casey?

05 S ↑>oh that word you taught me (.5) in English? ((looking at Ana))

06 A: In English?.

07 S: I’m gonna’ pronounce it wrong and I’m sorry ((putting pointer finger up))

tetas (.5) de (.5) cartón ((moving pointer finger up and down slowly as saying words))

[Literal translation: “cardboard boobs”; interpretation: flat chested]

08 A: >*tetas de cartón* ((while looking at Ignacia))

09 I: () ((Laughing)) *¿y por qué (le enseñaste) esto?*

[and why did you teach her that?]

10 I: () ((laughing turns to look behind her at another table to say something to someone else))

tetas de cartón

[Flat chested]

Ella lo dijo antes ((pointing to where Sally stood when she said it))

[she said it before]

11 I: ((to Ana)) ()

12 A: No... *porque*... how do you say when somebody like (stuffs their self)

13 I: °*tetas de cartón*°

[Flat chested]

14 A: ()

15 A: no (.5) pero: (.5)...es que (.5)... a: Ashley (1.5)=

[no but it's that towards Ashley]

>Casey le dijo a Ashley...que ella tuvo sexo con los hispanos

[Casey said to Ashley.....that she had sex with Hispanics]

16 I: ¿y:? déjala...hispanos are better... HAHA

[and? Let her be.....hispanics]

17 A: °hispanos are better°

18 I: oh YAY we get to look in the magazines ((Reaching to pick up magazines in the middle of the table related to school work))

At the onset of the conversation event, a white, monolingual speaker (Sally) who is a friend of one of the Hispanic girls at the table (Ana) comes over to the group to hand out classroom paperwork. When Ana sees her, she remembers something funny, and tells her to tell her other friend (Ignacia) seated at the table what she calls a different white girl (Casey). Ana creates a frame for the conversation that is about to ensue through reference to a past event. Sally hesitates, as she is not sure what Ana means right away; she either did not hear her well enough or heard her well and wanted some sort of affirmation that she was going to proceed appropriately and thus, Sally replies by saying “huh.” Ignacia, catching on that what Sally is going to say might be good, further goads her by repeating (and clarifying) Ana’s request by

asking it directly in a question in line 04: “whachu call Casey?” At this point, Sally is catching on; she remembers she was taught how to say something about Casey. Only when she tries to confirm if this is what Ana is talking about, she gets something wrong. In line 05, addressing Ana, she asks: “oh that word you taught me in English?” What she meant to say was “oh that word you taught me in Spanish.” After Ana points this out through a gentle reminder in the form of a question that the word is in Spanish, Sally concedes to saying it aloud so that Ignacia can hear. Not only does she give in to the request but also before doing so, she offers that she is probably going to pronounce it wrong. She is acknowledging that she is aware of Ana’s reference but also creating a new frame to go forward in. She is putting a safety net around her own speak in order to inhibit potential embarrassment and she realizes that, she will go from innocent bystander to performer quite quickly.

Sally sees that all eyes are on her now (Ignacia and Ana) because she has been asked to perform in a language other than her own (and to say something funny) and she embraces the attention. While waving her pointer finger up and down to embellish her delivery of her expression, Sally says aloud, pronouncing each word slowly: “tetas,” “de,” “cartón” which literally translates to mean “cardboard tits.” Based on further analysis of the conversation, the expression can be interpreted as flat chested. The girls immediately begin to giggle, prompted by Sally’s pronunciation of the insult in Spanish.

This exchange exemplifies how Ana used her dual language abilities to teach a monolingual student a bad word about another classmate in order to achieve status through humor and “showing off” by talking about someone else behind her back. When the joke or rumor then gets passed along to another bilingual student seated at a different table behind Ignacia who overheard part of the conversation, Ignacia capitalizes on the opportunity to gain

peer recognized status for herself. In line 10, Ignacia does just that. She turns around to the Hispanic peer who heard bits of the conversation to repeat what Sally said to the other classmate. Now she is partly responsible too for spreading the rumor about a monolingual, girl and in the click with Ana and Sally. This is attention grabbing given that just one line previously; Ignacia asked Ana why she taught Sally to call Casey, “*tetas de cartón.*” Without even knowing the answer, she was spreading the rumor to ensure her participation in something that was potentially going to create popularity status.

Ana, in line 12, then begins to explain why she chose this insult for Casey. Without much of a contextual signal, she begins in Spanish, and switches to English. This could be a result of any number of different reasons. It could be because the conversation had been happening already in both Spanish and English and she was continuing the pattern. This is a case where the topic, and the speaker and the setting are all common and yet Ana chose to change the code in the middle of a sentence. Gumperz and Hymes (1972) would say that this is an instance where “both codes are equally admissible” (since Ana’s audience was Ignacia, another bilingual speaker) and that her switch could have been a matter of “momentary inclination” (Gumperz and Hymes 1972: 316). Even so the alternation carries meaning; “stylistic ethnicity markers” are one explanation (Gumperz and Hymes 1972: 316). Ana could have simply been demonstrating her effective control of both languages and generating an interpersonal relationship with Ignacia who she was sharing a bilingual conversation with.

As the conversation goes on, and the subject matter gets even more gossipy and inappropriate to talking about sex that happened among particular classmates, Ana chooses Spanish as the language of expression because the institutional context (being at school) does not allow for chatter in the subject matter. She explains to Ignacia in line 15, that Casey told another

girl, Ashley, that she had sex with Hispanics. This topic (sex) is completely inappropriate for the classroom environment, and knowing this, Ana is sure to use Spanish to exclude the other monolingual, table mates from the gossip as well as perhaps, the monolingual teacher. Marjorie Harness Goodwin (1980) writes extensively on the difference between the social concerns of girls and boys and the cultural procedures for the construction of gossip. According to Goodwin, “girls talk about and concern themselves with their appearance and the forms of relationships they can be seen to maintain with others, especially boys and older females” (Goodwin 1990: 675). This conversation initiates with the threesome of girls (cross cultures) making fun of the appearance of another classmate who they consider to be flat chested and who they rumor stuffs her bra. It ends with an even more intimate conversation between Ana and Ignacia about the same girl having sex with Hispanics.

This is a charged topic both because it goes beyond the boundaries of expected (and permissible) classroom dialogue and because it presents an opportunity for Ignacia and Ana to comment on people of their own ethnicity. At the end of the conversation both Ignacia and Ana confirm, “Hispanos are better” shifting the frame of the conversation from gossip about a targeted, particular girl to a conversation about identification with an ethnic group. Although they are referring to Hispanos being better in terms of sexual partners, the statement can be interpreted as a general commentary on Hispanics. Both Ignacia and Ana stated --“Hispanos are better” -- in English no longer excluding the other two table mates. Although not addressing them directly, the fact that they allowed them in to the end of this intimate, gossip talk by switching to English meant that, directly or indirectly, they wanted them to hear how they felt about Hispanics. At the very end of the conversation in line 18, Ana, perhaps realizing that they had pushed the boundaries too far, redirects their conversation towards the task at hand: the

group work that had been handed out. Code switching then in this conversation provided a number of different opportunities. It allowed for the girls to create an exclusionary realm in which they could discuss topics otherwise not allowed in the classroom, which led to a heightened sense of ego and ultimate shared affirmation of their Hispanic identity.

Code switching as a “we code”

As noted, characteristically, code switching “arises in groups sharing common identities” (Franceschini 1998: 53). Based on close analysis of the conversation event that follows, the idea emerges that there are differences across genders (within the same cultural group: Hispanics) as to how Spanish should or should not be employed in the classroom. The girls seem to think that being Hispanic and speaking English with a very “gringo” (or white) accent is a funny or bad thing. This practice indicates proximity to white people, as just like language, accent is a defining characteristic of ethnicity. Meanwhile, one Hispanic boy demonstrates his reluctance to use Spanish at all but then ultimately uses it to avoid social rejection by those who share his identity. Therefore, it can be argued that code switching is employed as a “we code” among Hispanic students who desire to separate themselves from the rest of the monolingual speaking classroom; bilingualism is an indication of otherness, positively construed.

In the scene, four Hispanic, bilingual girls are sitting together at a round table talking. They are talking about a classmate, Raul, who sounds like a “gringo” when he speaks English; that is to say that his pronunciation is quite aligned with that of other white guys, and not with that of his other Hispanic peers who may speak in English with a heavy accent.

Example 3 – “You could not tell he was Spanish”

A = Adriana

M = Marisol

D = Daniela

L = Lucia

R = Raul

((All four girls at the table are giggling))

01 A: Do you know, if you talk to him on the phone,
you could not tell he was Spanish...

02 M: Who Raul? You talk to him on the phone?

03 D: [he, he would...]

04 A: NO. ↑If you did...

05 D: wha, wha, what?

06 A: Its like... cuz he's like WH↑AT? He still says...

07 M: [He sounds so gringo]

08 M: *él suena tan gringo cuando habla en inglés*

[He sounds so White when he speaks in English]

09 M: RAUL!

10 R: NO!

((All four girls at table giggling))

11 M: ((Looking in Raul's direction, waving him over with hand)) Come (1.5)

Hey Raul, *venid, tengo que dec-no te voy a decir nada malo*

[Come, I have to sa- I'm not going to say anything bad to you]

12 R: ((Raul appears next to table standing at a good distance))

13 D: Hey

14 M: Eh! *yo nunca te he oído hablando en español... ¿hablas? ¿En español?*

15 R: Who ↑me? You're a disgrace... ((Walking away from table))

Demasiado:: (.5) *Ojalá que te mueras...*

[Too much (.5) I hope that you die]

16 M: ((Looking towards Raul now away from table)) *HABLA EN ESPANOL...*

[Speak in Spanish]

17 R: ↑ *No!*

18 M: ((mocking)) ↑ *No!*

19 A: ((mocking)) ↑ *No!*

20 A, M, D, L: (((laughing)))

21 M: *Que vergüe::nza... BAYU::NCO...hijo de puta, BAYUN- que malo ()*

[How embarrassing...CRAZY...son of a bitch...CRAZ- how bad]

22 D: *eh, mira* ((picking up something on the table and showing it to Marisol))

23 M: *Uuuffff* ((All four girls laughing))

24 D: Some of them don't know Spanish

25 A: yeah but they have a translator

26 L: [They get a translator]

27 D: I always call them *ojos de culo del mono*

[eyes of a monkey's ass]

((All giggling))

This example demonstrates how conversation, or speech itself, not only influences different ideologies about language but also constructs identities. The girls at the table are employing code switching and using their Spanish abilities as a “we code.” The boy, Raul, does not want to speak Spanish, demonstrating that he has his own personal views as to when and where Spanish should be spoken. For him, he prefers to speak the dominant language, English, in the classroom.

The conversation starts in English when one of the girls gossiping about Raul, Adriana, comments that if you were talking to him on the phone (and not able detect his ethnicity visually)

you wouldn't know that he is Spanish. In line 02, Marisol jumps in to confirm who is being talked about: "who Raul?" And then she furthers the conversation by provoking Adriana a little bit and asking her if she talks to Raul on the phone. Adriana emphatically says, no, and emphasizes her qualifier: *if*. Then she explains further and begins to mock the way Raul speaks in English (with a gringo accent). In line 06 she says: "Its like... cuz he's like WH↑AT?" trying to give an exact impression of Raul's non Hispanic accent while exaggerating a bit for comedic affect. Before Adriana can continue to give impressions of Raul, Marisol comes in, and tries to take the lead of the group interrupting Adriana's next thought. At the same time, she does so in a way that she gains rapport by recognizing Adriana's point. Marisol offers in her own words that Raul does not sound like your average Hispanic when speaking English. Specifically, in line 07 she says, "he sounds so gringo," which confirms what Adriana was saying earlier. Then, to really assert herself and take control, Marisol switches to Spanish and repeats her point. In line 08, she says: "*él suena tan gringo cuando habla en inglés* (he sounds so white when he speaks in English). The switch helps her to achieve more than just establishing her status as the table leader; she also demonstrates to her peers that she herself is comfortable speaking both languages, which is important for the ensuing interaction. In essence, she uses code switching to create a new frame and an opportunity to draw Raul over to the table in order to move from gossip behind his back to direct taunting.

Marisol's very next utterance is to shout at Raul who shouts back, "no," because he does not want to have anything to do with whatever Marisol is about to say to him. Taken out of context, this refusal could be because Marisol has picked on Raul in the past or because he overheard the girls talking about him and has anticipated the topic of conversation. Marisol then urges Raul to come over, coaxing him in Spanish, telling him that she isn't going to say anything bad to

him. Raul comes over to the table and says “hey” to the girls. His greeting in English is direct defiance of the established Spanish code that Marisol has set by calling him over using Spanish. He is reframing the conversation in English, the language he desires to proceed in.

Marisol then begins taunting Raul in front of the other girls to speak in Spanish. More specifically, in line 08, she says: “*Eh! yo nunca te he oído hablando en español... ¿hablas? ¿En español?* (eh! I never have heard you speaking in Spanish...do you speak? in spanish?)” Marisol is clearly teasing Raul’s patience because she knows that Raul speaks in Spanish. She would not have addressed him in Spanish and he would not have demonstrated understanding by walking over to the table if he did not. Raul’s response to Marisol again is defiant. He replies, in English, “who, me?” and then calls Marisol a disgrace in front of the other girls and walks away. He is clearly not interested in being taunted or in demonstrating his ability to speak Spanish. But then, as he gets away from the table, he says to Marisol: “*demasiado...Ojalá que te mueras...* (too much...I hope you die).” By switching to Spanish in this instance he is avoiding complete cut off and isolation from his Hispanic peers by ultimately demonstrating his bilingual abilities while at the same time remaining expressive of his own preference to speak in English. He indicates that he is comfortable with his position and wants to be left alone about it by insulting Marisol and telling her that her taunting is too much. He is not letting her win this one.

Marisol, quite shocked by Raul’s comeback, tries to regain power and status among her girl Group by re-addressing the issue of Raul’s lack of usage of Spanish; she feels threatened by his individual, embrace of English over Spanish, and yells out to him: “**HABLA EN ESPAÑOL!** (SPEAK IN SPANISH!)” Once again, Raul stays grounded and does not give in to Marisol’s demand. He yells back, “no,” and both the refusal and spacial distance that he created indicate he is out of the conversation altogether.

Marisol then needs to regain her status among her girl-friends because her attack on Raul was unsuccessful. To do so she mocks the way Raul says “no!” to indicate that the original point made – that he sounds like a “gringo” (white person) – is still valid. Two of the other girls acknowledge her regained stance by repeating the high-pitched “no,” endeavoring to mock Raul as well. Then, in complete self defense and to continue positioning herself as a dominant, female and not phased by Raul’s resistance, she begins a streak of outbursts against Raul in Spanish: “*Que vergüen::nza... BAYU::NCO...hijo de puta, BAYUN- que malo ()* (how embarrassing... “crazy” in Salvadoran slang...son of a bitch, CRAZ..how bad).” Doing this Marisol at once asserts herself as a proud bilingual speaker undeterred by Raul’s preference for English and establishes an in-group with the other girls at her table as others who also view it as a good thing to speak in Spanish. In putting down Raul through her choice of negative name calling in Spanish she at once builds up her own reputation as a bully and also makes her position on the use of Spanish language quite clear.

One of the other girls at the table, Daniela, recognizes this and wants to make sure Marisol knows that she agrees with her stance that demonstrating your ability to speak Spanish is a good thing. Daniela makes reference to some other students who do not speak Spanish and Adriana suggests that they have a translator. This segment is unclear but they could be referring to other students who do not speak Spanish but have translators in other bilingual classmates. All the same, it seems that Daniela is making an effort to seal the bond that the four of them have just established through the interaction as bilingual speakers, a bond that Raul does not share as someone who does not embrace this difference as they do. In this sense, the entire speech exchange has contributed to the construction of a shared identity for the girls, through use or acceptance of a “we code.” Raul, on the other hand, is forging his own path. He clearly

associates use of Spanish in the classroom with stigma and although he does switch to Spanish to make a point that he is not an outsider, he also makes an effort to define himself in his own unique way; as someone with bilingual capacities who prefers to speak English. This is not the only instance where code switching practice is interpreted ultimately as a function of relationship building or creating social bonds.

Code switching for interpersonal relationship building, preference and passion

It has become clear that language mixing is a way of demonstrating control and of creating interpersonal relationships. Code switching can cause surprise but it also simply creates association. In the example to follow, four students sharing lab table are filling out a worksheet to record findings in an experiment. All of the students are wearing lab goggles. After the professor walks by to show the table a jar with crystal that had dissolved, two Hispanic girls who are seated side by side begin having their own conversation about the marks goggles leave on their faces.

Example 4 – “Goggle lines”

G=Gloria: Girl, Hispanic, bilingual

M=Miranda: Girl, Hispanic, bilingual

01 G: ((turning to her friend seated to her right and lifting her goggles off her face a little bit and touching her forehead with her hands))

¿Tengo las líneas aquí?

[Do I have lines here?]

02 M: Mmmmhmmmm ((nodding))

03 G: ↑Ahhh!

04 M: *Todos los tenemos hasta yo los tengo, mira* ((lifting goggles off face))

[All of us have them including me, look]

05 M: *Me siento como* I got bad sunburn or somethin'

[I feel like]

06 M: >I remember my uncle at the beach once he had sunglasses on...

Those big ones ((gesturing at the area around her lab goggles))=

And then he fell asleep with those ↑big black ones on like the.=

And then he got up, it was so:: funny ((laughing puts her head down on her arms on table then quickly comes back up))

>*Todo su cara estaba roja y aquí* (.5) ((signaling where the glasses were)) (*mu:y blanco*)

[All of his face was red and here](.5)

[really white]

07 G: ↓I hate when that happens.

Gloria initiates the conversation by lifting her goggles off her face and asking her classmate Miranda, in Spanish, if she has lines. She is using Spanish to talk about something personal, her appearance, and excluding the other two monolingual, students seated across from them from understanding her inquiry. Miranda confirms that she does in fact have lines on her face, and then says to Miranda that they all have them – including her.

In order to keep on topic with what Gloria started, Miranda dives right into her own speech about the goggle lines, saying in line 05 that she feels as if she has bad sunburn or something. In line 05, Miranda starts her commentary in Spanish, but then switches mid sentence to English. As noted in another example, this is a case where the subject, speaker and context have not changed yet a switch is occurring. In this case the alternation has to do with preference and framing. Miranda feels that the rest of what she has to say is going to go over better in English and switching to English from Spanish allows her to move away from answering Gloria's initial question and into a storytelling frame where she tells Gloria a story about her

uncle getting a bad glasses shaped sunburn on the beach one time.

While the switch from English to Spanish, allows Miranda an opportunity to take the lead and become a storyteller, mid story she decides to switch back to Spanish to express something in particular. She delivers the punch line, or what is supposed to be humorous about the story (the description of the funny shaped glasses sunburn her uncle got), in Spanish. The switch back from English to Spanish for the key part of the story provides Miranda an opportunity to express excitement and passion by using the other code. Using both languages she also demonstrates to Gloria her ability and confidence to transition smoothly between English and Spanish, disregarding the other students at the table. It provides an opportunity to be stylistic and Miranda, as with others, capitalizes on this.

Gloria responds to Miranda's punch line in English. She says in line 07, "I hate when that happens." It is her opportunity to demonstrate that she got the story – and the English – and to further develop the bond she began with Miranda when she asked her if she had lines on her face. She makes a point to tell Miranda that despite the fact that she approached her in Spanish, she speaks English too and furthers their interpersonal relationship. The switches employed by both in this conversation were critical in only that they carried the meaning of furthering the intimacy of their casual side conversation in the midst of a lesson.

Four examples, one code switching lesson about unpredictability

As seen through analysis of the four examples, code switching serves multiple social functions among a group of Montgomery County adolescents who use English and Spanish craft and transform social relations by using their language abilities practically. Code switching emerges uniquely among different speakers; yet, the various switching strategies allow for the isolation of some conversational functions of code switching including achieving power and

popularity status while indexing or challenging an ethnic affiliation in the classroom.

Often studies of code switching have begun with ideologies about dominant languages, and then endeavored to understand switching in light of those. This study exemplifies how one should begin code switch analysis with finding out what participants (in this case, students) in action using code switching understand themselves to be doing with the action, and what sort of social reality and interaction they are constructing. Without taking this approach, it is easy to confuse social categories that are negotiated through language with other institutions that affect speakers in concrete, everyday life situations. Embracing a performance model and Silverstein's (2003) notion of everyday conversation as somewhat improvised," negotiated, flexible, collaborative, and in play..." allows for the focus of studies of code switching in interaction to be on how switches emerge and not on what "macro" issue, however relevant, might be influencing a speaker to alternate (Silverstein 2003: 6).

We saw through Raul's verbal interaction with Marisol and her cohorts that he used code switching to create his own individualized classroom identity (and status) as a Hispanic who chooses English in the classroom among his peers over Spanish. He marks himself socially as an enigma among his Hispanic peers. We also see how the rationale behind switching is not always clear, even through detailed conversational analysis and that extra-linguistic context seemingly does have consequences for conversational interaction. In the case of the "flat chested" conversation, it starts out as a triadic exchange between Sally, Ignacia and Ana. Code switching initially was a means for name calling another student. But then code switching allowed for the audience to be narrowed (to just Ana and Ignacia) and its functionality was to expand the boundaries of classroom talk to include gossip. Without boundaries, code switching may not have been employed. That is to say that context and conventions matter. In the "Goggle lines"

example, code switching was about speaker preference and story telling. It was not until Miranda got to the punch line in her story and realized that her friend, Gloria, also a bilingual speaker would appreciate the line if delivered in Spanish. “Goggle lines” was also about interpersonal relationship building between two classmates who have the ability to switch back and forth fluidly between Spanish and English. And in the “last words” example, code switching allowed for a female student, to triumph over a male classmate while bonding with another female, Hispanic classmates.

The ultimate lesson is that although no assumptions can be made as to why speakers switch languages (because any particular switch depends upon the involved participant) switches do “achieve certain interactional affects at specific points during a conversation” (Poplack 1979: 69). In turn, these interactional achievements speak to larger social issues such as the implications of bilingual students being uniquely resourced in the classroom environment. As seen through the examples presented, code switching enables speakers to present and transform identities and create and transform relationships and social status. It also allows speakers opportunities to challenge social norms. And perhaps most notably, assigning significance to code switches is impossible without studying the switch as it happens in context due to the fact that switches are at once improvised and strategic and the very meaning of code switching itself is constructed in interaction.

Bibliography

- Agar, Michael 1994 *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: Perennial.
- Alvarez-Caccamo, Celso 2000 Codes *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1-2):28-31.
- Auer, Peter (Ed.) 1998 *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, PP 1-24.
- Bailey, Benjamin 2000 Switching. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1-2): 241-243.
- Bailey, Benjamin 2007 Heteroglossia and boundaries. In Monica Heller, (Ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social approach*. Basingstroke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barker, Chris and Darivsz Galasinski 2001 *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bauman, Richard 1986 *Story, Performance, and Event*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, Anna 2007 Code-Switching and the Construction of Ethnic In a Community of Practice. *Language in Society* (36): 371-392.
- Elgin, Suzette Haden 2000 *The Language Imperative*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Foley, William A. 1997 *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Franceschini, Rita 1998 Code-Switching and the Notion of Code in Linguistics: Proposals for a Dual Focus Model In Peter Auer (Ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, PP 51-75.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope 2009 *Code-Switching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Charles and Alessandro Duranti 1992 *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 2006 *Hidden life of girls: Games of Stance, Status, and Exclusion*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gumpertz, John J. 1982 *Discourse Strategies*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J and Dell Hymes, (Eds.) 1972 *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Jorgensen, Norman J 1998 Children's Acquisition of Code-Switching for Power Wielding. In Peter Auer (Ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, PP 237-261.

Kuipers, J. C, Viechnicki, G. B., Massoud, L.A., and Wright, L.J 2008 Science, Culture and Equity in Curriculum: An Ethnographic Approach to the Study of a Highly-Rated Curriculum Unit. In K. Richardson and K. Gomez (Eds.), *Talking Science, Writing Science: The Work of Language in Multilingual Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, PP 241-262.

Kyratzis, A, Ya-Ting T., and Koymen, S.B. 2008 Codes, Code-Switching, and Context: Style and Footing in Peer Group Bilingual Play. *Multilingua* (28): 265-290.

Lynch, S. J. (2008, March). "Second generation" science inquiry materials in a large, diverse school district: An introduction. In S. J. Lynch (Chair), C. Pyke, & J. Kuipers, *Characteristics of effective middle science curriculum materials: Results and implications of a 6-year interdisciplinary study*. Symposium conducted at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Moyer, Melissa G 1998 Bilingual Conversation Strategies in Gibraltar In *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, ed, Peter Auer. London: Routledge, PP 215-236.

Poplack, Shana 1979 Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos-CENTRO Working Papers*. New York: Research Foundation of the City University of New York.

Rampton, Ben 1998 Language Crossing and the Redefinition of Reality. In Peter Auer (Ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge,, PP 290-320.

Salzman, Zdenek 2004 *Language, Culture, and Society*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Silverstein, Michael Functions 2001 In Alessandro Duranti (Ed.), *Key terms in Language and Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Stroud, Christopher 1998 Perspectives on Cultural Variability of Discourse and Some Implications for Code-Switching. In Peter Auer (Ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, PP 321-349.

Tannen, Deborah. 2005 *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Valdés-Fallis, Guadalupe 1978 Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher Language in Education. *Theory and Practice* (4). Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wei, Lei 1998 The 'Why' and 'How' Questions in the Analysis of Conversational Code-Switching. In Peter Auer (Ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, PP 156-179.

Wooffitt, Robin. 2005 *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 2004 Codeswitching. In Alessandro Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Wortham, Stanton 2004 From Good Student to Outcast: The Emergency of a Classroom Identity. *American Anthropological Association Ethos* (32)2: 164-187.

Annex 1 – Key to Transcription Conventions

(0.5)	The number in brackets indicates a time gap in tenths of a second.
(.)	A dot enclosed in a bracket indicates pause in the talk less than two tenths of a second)
((Smiling))	A description enclosed in a double bracket indicates a non-verbal activity.
-	A dash indicates the sharp cut-off of the prior word or sound.
::::	Colons indicate that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or letter. The more colons the greater the extent of the stretching.
()	Empty parentheses/brackets indicate the presence of an unclear fragment on the tape.
(guess)	The words within a single bracket indicate the transcriber’s best guess at an unclear fragment.
.	A full stop indicates a stopping fall in tone. It does not necessarily indicate the end of a sentence.
<u>Under</u>	Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis
↑↓	Pointed arrows indicate a marked falling or rising intonational shift. They are placed immediately before the onset of the shift.
CAPITALS	With the exception of proper nouns, capital letters indicate a section of speech noticeably louder than that surrounding it.
° °	Degree signs are used to indicate that the talk they encompass is spoken noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk.
> <	More and less signs indicate that the talk they encompass was produced noticeably quicker than the surrounding talk.
=	The ‘equals’ sign indicates contiguous utterances.
[]	Square brackets indicate the speech is concurrent with the line above it indicating the onset (and end) of a spate of overlapping talk.
<i>Italics</i>	<i>Any Spanish utterances are italicized.</i>
[]	<i>Italicized brackets contain the translated language</i>