

**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE**

**FAKULTA HUMANITNÍCH STUDIÍ**

Katedra Obecné Antropologie

**Zuzana Terry**

**Code-switching a code-mixing Česko-Anglických bilingvních dětí v České Republice**

**Code-switching and Code-mixing of Czech-English-speaking Children in the Czech Republic**

*Diplomová práce*

Vedoucí práce: **PhDr. Marek Halbich Ph.D.**

Praha 2017

## Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval/a samostatně. Všechny použité prameny a literatura byly řádně citovány. Práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu

V Praze dne 30.6.2017

Zuzana Terry

**Abstract 5**

**Key words 6**

**1. Introduction 7**

**2. Theoretical approaches 10**

2.1 Bilingualism 11

2.1.1 Different approaches 11

2.1.2 English language 12

2.1.3 Bilingualism and children 13

2.1.4 Socialisation through the use of language and to use of language 14

2.1.5 Parents strategies to socialise their children as bilingual 15

2.2 Speech community 15

2.3 Code-switching 17

2.3.1 Code-switching versus code-mixing17

2.3.2 *Code-switching* and *code-mixing* in children17

2.3.3 Analysing *code-switching* and its social meanin19

2.3.4 Situational and metaphorical *code-switching* and *code-mixing*20

2.3.5 Myers-Scotton markedness model 21

2.3.6 Conversational analysis 22

2.3.7 Indexicality as an analysing tool 23

**3. Methods 24**

3.1 Research question24

3.2 Analytical tools and used theories 24

3.3 Qualitative method 26

3.4 Three Bears 27

3.4.1 Pre-schoolers 29

3.4.2 First year school children 32

3.5 Researcher position 34

**4. Code-switching at Three Bears 36**

4.1 Pre-schoolers 6

4.2 First grade school children 47

4.3 Conclusion 48

**5. Code-mixing at Three Bears 51**

5.1 Pre-schoolers 52

5.2 First grade school children 56

5.3 Conclusion 58.

6. **Conclusion - Children and code-switching** 61

**Used terms** 66

**Transcription characters** 69

**Bibliography**70

## **Abstrakt**

Ve své diplomové práci ukazuji, v jakých modelech bilingvní děti střídají mezi svými dvěma jazyky češtinou a angličtinou v České Republice. Modely přepínání studuji na dvou rozdílných typech přepínání jazykových kódů: *code-switching* což je přepnutí z jednoho jazyka do druhého v ucelených myšlenkách, ucelených tématech, zatím co *code-mixing* je vložení slova nebo fráze jazyka A do promluvy jazyka B. Typy a modely jazykových přepínání *code-switching* a *code-mixing* jsou v této práci studovány na dvanácti nahrávkách a pozorování třídy předškolních dětí na každotýdenních aktivitách anglické školy a čtrnácti nahrávkách a pozorování třídy školních dětí, pokračování předešlého roku při jejich jednotýdenní odpolední aktivitě v anglické škole. Všechny ze zkoumaných dětí se účastní českého státního vzdělávání, absolvují mateřskou a později základní školu. Rodiny dětí mají obvykle, až na tři výjimky, jednoho rodiče Čecha a druhého rodiče cizince ze státu kde se mluví anglickým jazykem. Výzkumem modelů dětského přepínání mezi ovládanými jazyky jsem také analyzoval, jakým způsobem socializace skrz dva jazyky ovlivňuje sociální kompetence těchto dětí. Způsob jakým bilingvní děti přepínají mezi svými jazykovými kódy je formován jak řečovou komunitou anglické školy, tak řečovou komunitou jejich rodin, v práci jsou naznačeny oba typy. Výsledky naznačují, že děti již mají některé společensky nápomocné sociální kompetence socializací dvěma jazyky zniterněné, také se ukázaly zajímavé modely *code-mixing* spojené s určitým typem her.

## **Abstract**

My diploma thesis shows patterns of alternation by bilingual children between their two mother tongues, Czech and English. The patterns are studied in two different types of language alternations; *code-switching*, meaning switching between language codes in whole ideas and discussed topics, and *code-mixing*, meaning inserting a word or phrase in language A into speech in language B. The *code-switching* and *code-mixing* types and patterns were studied on basis of 12 recordings and observations of a class of pre-school children during one morning of English school activities per week and 14 recordings and observations of a following year class of first-year school children during their after-school English activities. All children attended state education, pre-school nursery and the following year Czech state primary schools. Most of the children's parents are a combination of a Czech and an immigrant from an English-speaking country (with three exceptions) and they both speak with

the children exclusively in their respective native languages. By studying the patterns of children's alternation between the languages, I also analyse how socialisation through the use of two languages influences social competences. The rules of the *speech community*, the school, as well as the family *speech communities* are forming the children's behaviour concerning language code alternations in the children's speech. The findings suggest that the children have already internalised some socially important behaviour through socialisation and also some interesting patterns in *code-mixing* during certain types of game.

### **Klíčová slova**

Bilingvismus, *code-switching*, *code-mixing*, sociální kompetence, řečová komunity, strategie neutrality, indexicalita

### **Key words**

Bilingualism, *code-switching*, *code-mixing*, social competence, *speech community*, indexicality

## 1. Introduction

In my work I study bilingual, Czech/English-speaking children in Prague, Czech Republic. Most of them have one parent Czech and one parent American or British. The parent strategy for teaching their children two languages is usually communicating in language A by one parent and language B by the other parent: *one person one language* – one person one language (Barron-Hauwaert 2004<sup>1</sup>). All of the children I researched attend Czech state school or preschool and at the same time they attend English classes at an English language community centre, pre-schoolers aged between five and eight and first year schoolers aged six to seven years old. I was observing one class of pre-school children; these children attended their English class one morning a week. The following year I was observing the same children, but a rather smaller number of them, when they were in their first year of school. During that year they attended English activities at the English-speaking community centre one afternoon a week for about two hours.

When researching bilingual communication and especially bilingual children communication in their development, it is important to make clear what the understanding of the term bilingual is as there is not one clear definition used and agreed by all. I describe in my work referencing definitions from Cantone (Cantone 2007: 2-6) and set the definition of the term bilingual used for this work. At one end of the spectrum, the word is sometimes used very loosely for anyone who speaks two languages and at the other end of the spectrum a “true” bilingual means exclusively someone who can speak perfectly without a foreign accent in both languages and who has a similarly wide vocabulary in both languages (which would leave next to no one in this category). In this work I use the term bilingual to describe able and frequent communicators in two languages, people who have been exposed to two languages since birth (Cantone 2007: 11).

In my study I also describe important aspects of uniqueness of the English language in bilingual people. English language is not only the lingua franca of Western civilisation, but also of most of the rest of the world, and so the English/Czech bilingualism in children is viewed as being very advantageous. English proficiency is seen very useful not only by their

---

<sup>1</sup> BARRights and obligation balances setN-HAUWAERT, Suzanne. *Language strategies for bilingual families: the one-parent-one-language approach*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, c2004. Parents' and teachers' guides, no. 7.

parents but also the majority of the community as it is ascribing higher status to those children who speak English well (Auer 1998:123-124), it opening doors to better job opportunities and education. Therefore the parents knowing that, makes it a lot of effort for their children to use all the advantages of English fluency and learn as well as they can their non-majority but prestigious language. Knowing that, the researched children's parents are not only socialising their children in the use of the language at home but they also want their children to be institutionally socialised in English language use, to be able to use it not only in everyday life but also on an academic level (Ochs, Schieffelin 1986: 164). My research is conducted in such an institution, an institution that socialises English/Czech children in the non-majority language - English.

I recorded how the children code-switching and *code-mixing* in their speech, analysing why they *code-switching* and code-mixing in that way. I distinguished between these two terms and use the term *code-switching* when a bilingual person switches between their two languages in whole sentences or whole expressed ideas or topics, whilst I use the term *code-mixing* when the speaker speaks in language A, inserting just one word or phrase of language B into the speech in language A.

In my work I also describe different approaches towards analysis of *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. Still bearing in mind that these are children in their *bilingual first language acquisition* (Cantone 2007: 6-11), they are still learning to use both of their languages, while at the same time learning to be bilingual. The children are socialised to use the language as well as being socialised through the use of language (Ochs, Schieffelin 1986: 163-164). The bilingual children have something to learn not only towards speaking English and speaking Czech but also speaking two languages, managing to deal with two languages and that involves development. The children's bilingualism influences their social competences and has a great impact on formation of each child's identity.

Those bilingual children in the six to eight years old age group with very similar competence in both languages *code-switching* mostly to make their conversational partner comfortable and *code-switching* according to the other person or people's presumed preferences so there is not the sense of social distance in their *code-switching* that other researchers are talking about (e.g. Auer 1998). They do not *code-switching* unless there is a speaking partner who shows preference of speaking the other code, for example when they are speaking to an English parent in English language and the other, Czech-speaking parent comes into the room and

they start to talk to them, they switch immediately into Czech. Those young children almost never code mix. They *code-mixing* when they do not know or there is not an adequate word in the code presently being spoken, so only if they have no other alternative or when playing a game that they are used to playing with children of the other spoken language; in other words there is no intentional *code-mixing*. This common phenomenon of utilising both of their codes in bilingual speech communities was not found in the researched children. The children of preschool age and early school age are still developing and internalising their two languages and their bilingualism. Their parent's attitude towards *code-mixing* is strictly negative.

Another question arises when researching bilingual speech: whether to approach the bilingual community as a *speech community* or individual bilingualism within a society where people generally speak just one language. In my research I raise the question, whether the children spend a sufficient length of time together in the wider community where they develop a *speech community* with its own rules? Or rather, are they individual bilinguals who occasionally get together? In this research case it is not easy to decide between these two possibilities as described in Cantone (2007: 2) and I will describe the situation in broader terms in the chapter Speech Community and later when describing the research itself.

## 2. Theoretical approaches

In this chapter I will describe the most relevant theories and definitions connected to my study of *code-switching* and code mixing bilingual children. I first I will define the notion bilingualism as used in this study than I will state the uniqueness of the English language and its implications. I will also briefly show the finding of study on *bilingual first language acquisitions* and *code-mixing* of bilingual very young children. I will describe Schieffelin and Ochs description of language socialisation (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986). I will also describe the popular parental strategy of bringing up bilingual children one person one language strategy. Then I will move to describing the term *speech community*. At the end I will cover the most relevant and most influential theories of *code-switching* analysis according to mostly Cantone 2007, Duranti 2004 and Auer 1998 is including Myers-Scotton markedness model and its *strategy of neutrality*, conversation analyses and indexicality.

Many sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologist have conducted research on bilingualism in order to understand how bilingual and multilingual people organise their linguistics resources and since then the concern seems to be becoming even bigger. *Code-switching*, *code-mixing* and their social meaning, motivation and functions also attract immense interest amongst linguistic anthropologists. My interest in bilingual *code-switching* and *code-mixing* is how very young speakers (five - eight years old) use the languages available to them in specific situations in a children's *speech community* and how they use them as a cultural resource in their social interactions and in the construction of their self and of the *speech community* Garrett (Duranti, 2004: 49).

This work investigates these issues, taking into account the following: *bilingual first language acquisition* (Cantone 2007) in small children, the specificity of English as a minority language (Auer 1998), socialisation in using and through the use of language (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986) and parents' strategies of socialisation through use of language, the differences between *code-switching*, *code-mixing* and also borrowing and *tag switching* (Woolard, Duranti 2004; Cantone 2007; Wei 2000) and speech communities, using not only *social and metaphorical code-switching* and *code-mixing* (Gumperz 1972), but more importantly Myer-Scotton's markedness -*strategy of a neutrality* model and *rights and obligation balances sets* for analysing the data.

## 2.1. Bilingualism

Bilingualism has been a focus of interest for a wide range of researchers, linguists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and educators since the 1950s. However there is no consensus in the definition of the notion. There is a considerable rift in understanding of this widely researched and studied phenomenon. For research of *code-switching* and *code-mixing* within Czech/English bilingual children it is highly important to describe how the notion of bilingualism is applied in order to clarify the interpreted data and data interpretation. However I found no questioning of the notion of bilingualism by any contributors to *Code-switching in Conversation* (Auer 1998); they presume that the notion is clear and does not need to be described in detail. Furthermore, when talking about child bilingualism and also bilingualism in a country where bilingualism at an early age is commonplace or the norm as it is in my research, I believe the notion deserves a little investigation.

With the aim of clarifying her own research on *bilingual first language acquisition*, Cantone investigates the notion of bilingualism closely: the most broad, informal understanding of the notion is that a person who can use more than one language is bilingual / multilingual not matter how well they speak it or when they learnt it and at the other end of the spectrum we could cite Bloomfield's definition (1935: 56<sup>2</sup>) which describes bilingualism as "native-like control of two languages" also not a very exhaustive definition.

Although there is no fixed definition of bilingualism and its categories, there are more people in the world that speak more than one language – let us call them bilinguals or multilinguals – than there are monolinguals.

### 2.1.1. Different approaches

When clarifying the term bilingualism we have to take in account several issues. 1, Whether we are talking about community bilingualism – communities where everyone is able to speak and uses two (or more) languages such as French/English in Quebec, which are categorised; or if we are talking about the bilingual individual - a person brought up bilingual in monolingual community, who can use two (or more) languages with people speaking the language, but is not living in a group where there is a community which speaks those two languages i.e. an English-speaking person in the Czech republic. The speaker's customs and use of their two languages will be very different especially when

---

<sup>2</sup> BLOOMFIELD, Leonard. 1935. *Language*. London: Allen & Unwin.

researching habits of *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. 2, Whether we are talking about an individual's ability to use more than one language i.e. a person who learns her/his second language at school or as an adult; or if we research a person whose ability to speak two (or more) languages starts at the time of acquisition, meaning someone who learned and socialised bilingually since birth or at a very early age – Cantone mentions that it is possible for a child of one year (Cantone 2007: 2-4).

Garrett (Duranti 2004: 53) makes a similar distinction with respect to the above mentioned issues and he also suggests that there is as very important distinction between a full speaker and, as he describes it, a “semi-speaker” – a person who understands but cannot speak the language, who has passive understanding of the language – all these can be by Garrett still described as bilingual. Differing levels of language fluency in bilingual children is very probable as they do not use the language in a balanced manner, i.e. they do not use both languages identically in the same situations or in the same environments. Also the level of fluency in one or the other of the languages a bilingual governs can change in the course of his/her life (Wei 2000: 2-6).

Different definitions are also related to different research topics. Linguists usually research one of the following two: methods of classifying bilinguals by their language choice and language use, competence and proficiency, and how the languages are “stored” in the brains of bilinguals, and whether or not they interact. Also an important research topic concerning bilingualism is how bilinguals acquire their two languages (Cantone 2007: 1).

### 2.1.2. *English language*

The socio-political status of languages is also very important when talking about bilingualism and *code-switching* and *code-mixing* in bilingual children. In many parts of the world where English is not the first language, knowledge of English is very often linked to professional success as well as to higher social status and to a cosmopolitan orientation (Auer 1998: 124). For English-speaking immigrant to Israel, this high status means that the pressure to adapt to Hebrew is relatively minor, and English is even used outside the home with children and mixing English and Hebrew among adults and in English-speaking settlers' communities is increasing (Rafel Ben 1994).

The situation of Czech/ English bilinguals is definitely not the same as in case of Hebrew/English, since we do not have so many English-speaking immigrants even in the

capital of the Czech Republic, Prague and the community in Czechia has been forming since 1990 at earliest, so not very long and the second generation are still young.

However, something of what Auer observed in Israel can also be seen in the Czech Republic Hrdličková (Bittnerová, Moravcová 2012: 47-50) – the high status of English language which means that immigrants from English-speaking countries are less pressured to adapt to the language of majority, Czech. The extreme *code-mixing* as in Auer's (Auer 1998) work was not evident. The high social status of English language also means that children's fluency and proficiency in English is highly important for English-speaking immigrant parents in the Czech Republic. English-speaking immigrants exert great efforts to get their children into specialised English schools to help them reach proficiency level of their academic skills in English, academic meaning reading and writing because only at school can children learn to use language in more explicit way, without assuming shared knowledge like in the domestic family speech environment.

### 2.1.3. *Bilingualism and children*

Researches on bilingual children are often conducted to establish how the children use and organise their languages. And also how children become bilingual, in other words: what roles are played by external factors, such as language input, language community and the strategies applied by parents, in becoming bilingual. Cantone (Cantone 2007) researches *bilingual first language acquisition* in very young children (1-5 year-olds) and her main goal is to prove that the acquisition of two languages in bilingual children is comparable to that of monolingual children. The difference is, of course, that bilinguals develop two language systems instead of one.

Many studies in the past were also concerned with bilingual children *code-mixing* (mixing codes within one sentence) compared to language switching in adulthood and usually explained it as evidence of confusion in the sense that the two languages are not acquired separately but start out as a single language. Current research is still mostly concerned with the interplay of the two languages in bilingual children though the understanding in present studies is that linguists suppose the two languages develop separately from the start (Cantone 2007: 1-2). In her work, (Cantone 2007: introduction) demonstrates that there is no relation between the development of grammar in a child's speech and the quality of his/her language mixing and that the data shows that it is more likely individual choice.

I studied older children during my research at the stage in their development when they are already fluent in both of their languages and I can only confirm that there is no strong evidence of frequent *code-mixing* in the data. My research is more anthropological and I aim to find out how and why children in certain social positions *code-switching* and code mix, how are they use their two languages, why and also how the *code-switching* and *code-mixing* influences the children's social competencies.

#### 2.1.4. *Socialisation through the use of language and to use language*

Language is a major source of information for children learning the ways and world views of their culture. Language socialisation starts from the moment of birth in human beings, if not before. Language and social structures and processes are interdependent. Conversation activities involving small children vary in such a way that systematically relates to culture believes, values and social order. A parent's or child minder's main concern is to teach their children the behaviour appropriate to the social situation and one of the main means for that is language (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986: 183). As children acquire language structure and use, they also acquire social knowledge (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986: 161-165).

However, socialisation is an interactive process and even a child is not a passive recipient of sociocultural knowledge but rather an active contributor to the meaning and outcome of interactions with other members of a social group. Individual children are seen not as automatically internalising other's views but as selective and active participants in the process of conducting the social world (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986:.165).

There is a difference between language socialisation and language acquisition. However, processes of language acquisition and the process of language socialisation are integrated. Understanding of what constitutes linguistic competence at different developmental points is the goal for studies of language acquisition, whilst the study of language socialisation is at its goal the understanding of how persons become competent members of social groups and the role of language in this process. We can examine how language is a medium or tool in the socialising process or we can investigate acquisition of the appropriate uses of language as a part of acquiring social competence. Language is a socialising tool and the organisation of language use is a powerful socialising tool. Other studies have examined the role of language in forming social events and social activities (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986:167).

As my aim is to find out how *bilingual socialisation through the use of language and socialisation to use the language* influences the *social competences* of the researched children, with respect to language socialisation (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986) I analyse how the children acquire appropriate usage of the language or languages in question or, more precisely, appropriate usage of *code-switching* and *code-mixing* between their languages.

#### 2.1.5. *Parents' strategies to socialise their children as bilingual*

It is a well-known strategy among parents of bilingual children to socialise their children in two languages the *one person one language* also known as *one person one language* strategy described for the first time by Grammont in 1902 and many times after, lately in popular bilingual parent handbook *The One-Parent-One-Language Approach* (Barron-Hauwaert 2004). The strategy means that each parent speaks to the child who they want to raise bilingual in one language. The important thing is for one person not to speak to the child in two different languages, in other words not to *code-switching* or code mix. It is usual recommended to speak in that person's own language, so when one parent is native Czech he or she speaks to the child Czech and other parent is native English he or she speaks to the child in English.

There were claims that the strict keeping to this rules will resolve in no *code-mixing* but Wei (Wei 2000: 326) refuses to consider the strict use of *one person one language* as reason of no *code-mixing* in children's speech.

## 2.2. **Speech community**

An important element in research of *code-switching* and *code-mixing* is the concept of speech communities as the way of switching between languages depends to a great extent on the *speech community*, as I have already mentioned above. The *speech community* concept does not simply focus on groups that speak the same language but rather means that language represents embodied constructs and constitutes meaningful participation in society and culture. It is within the *speech community* that identity, ideology and agency are actualized in society. One *speech community* is distinct from another *speech community* and they can vary from nation states to chat rooms. They come into collective consciousness. Membership of a *speech community* includes local knowledge of the system of language choice variation, including *code-switching* and *code-mixing*, and discourse represent generation, occupation, politics, social relationships, identity and more (Morgan, Duranti 2007: 4-12).

A *speech community* cannot be defined by a static physical location as membership can be experienced as part of a nation state, neighbourhood, village, club, on-line chat room, religious institution and so on. Furthermore, people have more than one *speech community*. Gumperz (Gumperz 1972 b: 219) definition of *speech community* is “any human aggregate characterised by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off similar aggregates by significant differences in language uses.” According to Gumperz they form a system because they are related to a shared set of social norms.

Speech communities are central to understanding human language and meaning-making because it is a product of prolonged interaction among those who operate within a shared belief and value system regarding their culture, society and history as well as their communication with others.

Switching between languages only makes sense in a *speech community* where the two, or more, languages are shared and thus can understand not only both languages but also the way of *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. Especially mixing varies in use in different speech communities, in some speech communities *code-mixing* is not used at all.

Bilingualism can also be a possession of members who do not live in a bilingual country or even within bilingual *speech community*. People, like in the case of my researched group, can be bilingual because one or both of their parents speak a different language to the majority language. It is important to realise that different people use their different language for different purposes and do not typically possess the same level or type of proficiency in each language (Wei 2000: 6).

In Czech/English bilingual children, when the children attend regular Czech state schools, as is the case of the researched group, the children can be bilingual at a level of every day family speech but not at a level of academic use of language, in this case the parents are trying to equalise their bilingualism in the English-speaking community in the school. However, we can presume that they are not as proficient in English – in academic but also other fields – as children attending schools with English as the tuition language. The same can be for example at child to child interaction level, if the children are accustomed to playing only with children using Czech language, they will not have the right vocabulary in the this field.

As the *speech community* here described I define the group of children I researched as a special *speech community*. A *speech community* in the sense that the children are all

Czech/English bilingual living in a Czech speaking community with their one or both parents using English language with them, although presumably at different levels of proficiency in various fields; they all attend English language school at the English community centre and socialise and learn English together, spending full mornings together, approximately five hours every week. The children and their families also meet within a greater group of other classes several times a year at various festivity celebrations i.e. Easter egg hunt, hibernation celebration, Santa Claus visit etc. Therefore they have regular and frequent interaction within the group (Gumperz 1972) and in a certain small group way they also have some shared belief and value systems regarding their group culture and also rules of communication with others in the group. Of course it is one of several speech communities for the children and much stronger speech communities have developed within each family group and the sense of shared values among the children will not be that strong.

### **2.3. Code-switching**

*Code-switching* can be defined as the use of two or more language varieties in the same speech event or exchange Woolard (Duranti 2004: 73-74). As Woolard speaks about language varieties it is clear that *code-switching* can not only be seen in bilingual speech communities but also in other situations, e.g. switching between dialects, styles, levels of politeness etc. However, in this work codes are languages, *code-switching* means switching between codes of the two languages Czech and English.

#### *2.3.1. Code-switching versus code-mixing*

There are two types of language alteration in bilingual conversation. In my paper, I use the term *code-switching* for switching in two different codes of languages with their rules and limitations, when one code is used for forming whole complex and meaningful statements in whole sentences, then alternating with sentences in a second code, also described in literature by the term intersentential (e.g. Woolard, Duranti 2004). Whilst by *code-mixing* I mean switching between two different codes of languages in one sentence, one word or phrase is expressed one language/code whilst speaking in other language/code (intrasententially) as described also in Auer (Auer 1998, Introduction).

#### *2.3.2. Code-switching and code-mixing in children*

In *bilingual first language acquisition* there are two different approaches (Cantone 2007: 7-10). The common idea formulated in the studies up until the 1980s is that bilingual children who acquire two languages simultaneously start out with two linguistic systems one for each language (Genesee 1989: 161-179, Meisel 1989: 13-40). However there are also new researches which express doubts as to whether the languages in bilinguals are separated from a very early age (Volatera, Taeschner 1978:311-326). According to this approach children are said to be bilingual only gradually, establishing two different systems for their languages in three stages. The following researchers have found no evidence for this model. Children distinguish the two languages from very early on and can use them appropriately according to interlocutor or situation (Cantone 2007: 7-11). Also Wei Li (Wei 2000) supports the doubt about a one language system at an early stage of child development.

As Auer (Auer 1998: 3) indicates, many researches demonstrate that *code-mixing* is indicative to group membership (speech communities). The regularities of the alternation of use vary in different communities. For example not all communities that allow *code-switching* allow also *code-mixing* (intrasentential switching). It is usually argued that in adulthood *code-mixing* is used only when the conversational partner is also bilingual, or at least can understand (Cantone 2007: 57).

However, Cantone demonstrates that bilingual children's *code-mixing* utterances should be analysed in the same way as adult mixing. She also shows that *bilingual first language acquisition* is organised in the same way in children as in adults and grammatical development should not explain different types of switching. He claims that there is no relation between the development in a child's speech and the way a child code mixes and that it depends more on child's individual choice. She shows her findings on five Italian/German children in (age 1-5). Some errors may occur until fluency is reached, but the languages are developed separately (Cantone 2007: introduction; 234-235).

Some researchers also use the term tag-switching and borrowing: tag-switching refers to a mix involving an utterance and an interjection (tag) (e.g. ...you know, by the way); borrowing a word or expression that has been adapted into the base language, some authors claim that borrowing involves only a certain types of words namely those with specific cultural meaning or prestige. Also borrowing can be due to semantic reasons, such as when the equivalent word does not exactly reflect the desired meaning (Cantone 2007: 58). These definitions of terms

can be found in the work of Cantone (2007: 57-58, 218) and are not totally unified with other researchers' definitions i.e. Auer, Duranti. For my work I will use them as above.

### 2.3.3. *Analysing code-switching and its social meaning*

Garrett (Duranti 2004: 53) argues that only a small percentage of bilinguals keep their languages "ideal", whereby the individual speaker keeps their languages entirely separated. *Code-switching* is related to and indicative of group memberships – speech communities. *Code-switching* is a part of a verbal action and as such it has and creates its own communicative and social meaning (Auer 1998: 1). Central research of *code-switching* addresses how language choice reflects social power, inequality, or is an object of *rights and obligation balances set* and the second tradition is on syntactic constraints from within a framework of a particular grammatical theory (Auer 1998: 3). *Code-switching* is verbal behaviour which can shed light on the formation of group identities and ethnic boundaries.

*Code-switching* and *code-mixing* by pre-school and early first - school children between two languages informs us how the phenomenon of bilingualism develops. How bilingualism develops as an internalised, unconscious ability to analyse and interpret two codes, bilingualism as competence and performance (Chomsky 1965).

As I have already mentioned in preceding chapters, important factors in *code-switching* and *code-mixing* are also external: the attitude to the language mixing, function of speech and context and also internal factors: – language proficiency, interaction between languages, degree of formality and intimacy (Cantone 2007: 2). Different principles of language choice have been found to predominate in different bilingual communities and also the degree to which they mix their languages or leave them strictly compartmentalized - Woolard (Duranti 2004: 73).

Machler has some bold suggestions: there are two types of language alternation in bilingual conversation and with transitions and interactions between them; on the one hand, we find the case of *code-switching* —the use of two languages ad hoc, and on the other hand, we find the case of a mixed code —using two languages in such a way that a third, new code emerges (Auer 1998: 125).

Here I describe the most influential approaches to social meaning of *code-switching* and *code-mixing* by Woolard (Duranti 2004: 74-80). *Code-switching* has been accepted as systematic, skilled and socially meaningful since the 1970s, which was in stark contrast to previous beliefs that *code-switching* is evidence of a speaker's incomplete control of the languages. So linguists have been trying to demonstrate that even switching in one sentence can be orderly and grammatical (Duranti 2004: 75). *Code-switching* has enriching communicative potential and is a communicative resource.

#### 2.3.4. *Situational and metaphorical code-switching and code-mixing*

The distinction between situational and metaphorical switching (Bloom, Gumperz 1972) is still one of the analytical points argued the most. Situational *code-switching* means a change in the definition of a speech event involving clear changes in the participant's definition of each other's *rights and obligation balances set*. Situational *code-switching* does not necessarily have to be triggered by a change of context, but may actually create a change of context. Situational *code-switching* is usually not *code-mixing*, i.e. intrasentential switching.

Metaphorical switching, also dubbed conversational *code-switching*, means change in language that does not signal change in a fundamental speech event, participants merely refer to different relationships that they also hold – use of a language as a “metaphor” for another social relationship regularly associated with it. This was later characterized by Gumperz as two points on one spectrum (Duranti, 2004: 75).

The “we/they” approach is following the above approach, Gumperz, associates *code-switching* with identity- we/they. When bilinguals two languages signal the contrasting culture standards of the minor community and majority society to which they are associated (Duranti, 2004: 76), meaning the minority language is the “in group” or “we code” associated with familiarity, solidarity etc. while the majority language is the “they code” which is formal, stiffer, less personal. The majority language metaphorically gives greater authority onto speaker.

Not all researchers agree that *code-switching* always means such a contrast in identities. Discourse related *code-switching* shows that switching codes can also have an interactional and rhetorical effect in the same way as the contrast in volume, pace and pitch. It can also be

used for its discourse function indicating a change in narrative, flagging a punchline. This approach is described (Auer 1984, p. 78, 79) and I will address it later in the chapter Conversational Analysis.

### 2.3.5. *Mayers-Scotton Markedness model*

For Myers-Scotton, speakers in their *code-switching* negotiate “positions in the rights and obligation set” - *rights and obligation balances set*, where code choices are indexical and explains the social motivations of *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. The markedness model (Myers-Scotton 1993: 60) is intended to be more systematic and universal.

A formal markedness model consists of four main principles:

1, “The negotiation principle”: Choose the form of your conversation contribution so that it indexes the set of *rights and obligation balances set* which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange. 2, The “unmarked-choice maxim”: Make your code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked *rights and obligation balances set* in speech exchanges when you wish to establish or affirm that *rights and obligation balances set*. 3 The “marked-choice maxim”: Make a marked code choice which is not the unmarked index of the unmarked *rights and obligation balances set* in an interaction when you wish to establish a new *rights and obligation balances set* as unmarked for the current exchange. 4, The “exploratory-choice maxim”: “When an unmarked choice is not clear, use *code-switching* to make alternate exploratory choices as candidates for an unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an *rights and obligation balances set* which you favour.” (Myers-Scotton 1993: 113-142).

She argues that the particular social meaning of specific code-switching is an unmarked expected *rights and obligation balances set* and a marked one. The code choices are indexical and explain the social motivations of *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. Knowledge of unmarked *rights and obligation balances set* is a normative device that unites the *speech community* and it also gives linguistic varieties to its repertoire of their indexicality. Speakers in a *speech community* know that certain linguistic choice will be normal, unmarked from an expected *rights and obligation balances set* for a particular conversation exchange, and others will be marked because it is indexical of something other than the expected *rights and obligation balances set* (Myers-Scotton 1993: 85).

Myer-Scotton herself accepts Gumperz's situational switching but not metaphorical switching. A switch to a second code is a form of marking that can activate a contrast - Woolard (Duranti, 2004: 79-81). *Code-switching* can be also explained as a *strategy of neutrality*; in their endeavour to be socially neutral, a speaker tries to find an appropriate and acceptable code for a given situation. It is in a context of Myers-Scotton markedness model, marking the *strategy of neutrality* (Myers-Scotton 1976: 914-941). However, Woolard (Duranti 2004: 83-90) suggests that *code-switching* is not always a conscious, strategic and deliberate choice. She also questioned if her concept might not be indexicality (Duranti 2004: 81), that her codes are always socially indexical.

### 2.3.6. *Conversation analysis of code-switching*

Auer does criticise markedness model for not adequately taking into account the speaker's perception of their own behaviour. He argues that in switching codes, speakers do not make reference to a pre-existing normative model but in fact actively create social meaning.

Auer's conversational analysis is based on Harvey Sacks conversation analysis of speech (Silverman 1998). The basis of the analytical approach is similar to Myers-Scotton's functional and non-functional *code-switching* and mixing. Auer has used this approach to data in which two or more languages are used alternately and in which this alternation in codes is employed as a resource for the construction of interactional meaning. Studies are investigating in detail the structures of code alternation in a variety of speech communities. It focuses on how *code-switching* and *code-mixing* is structured and managed in conversational interactions, how language choice affects speaker and also hearer. Conversation analyses concentrate on the meaning the *code-switching* or *code-mixing* creates (Auer 1984: 6).

Auer uses a framework derived from conversational analysis to account for the ways in which speakers use *code-switching* either to manage social relations or to accomplish discourse objectives. *Code-switching* and *code-mixing* is used to establish various kinds of marks, which provide the basis of conversation to be intelligible. Peter Auer (Auer 1984 a) does not agree that all the *code-switching* and *code-mixing* is meaningful and views the Gumperz approach as excessively macrosociological as it assumes that ethnic contrast is always relevant and evokes *code-switching*. Auer insists on local production of meaning.

### 2.3.7. *Indexicality as an analysing tool for code-switching and code-mixing*

Silverstein's (2003) development of C. S. Pierce's conception of indexicality can be brought to bear to capture the dynamisms that critics were missing in existing models of *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. The social indexicality that is mobilised by *code-switching* is not simply a matter of brute statistical correspondence of linguistic and social forms but Rather a relationship of association must be noticed and interpreted in order to signify (Duranti 2004: 88).

Indexicality is meant not just as a given fact but a dialectical process of extrapolation of meaning from use and use from meaning. If a specific form presupposes a special social context, then use of that form later may create the perception of such a context where it did not exist before. For example if a certain linguistic code is associated with authority, the classroom or the court, when the code is used elsewhere it is received as authoritative code. Its use in a different context can then itself signify authority, in a creative form of indexicality (Woolard, Duranti 2004: 88).

The indexical value of a linguistic form can be transferred ideologically not just from context to context, but from context to speaker or vice versa and can be transformed in the process. The projected relationship can be partial, false, misrecognised, distorted etc. but in this kind of created projection, it becomes real in the way that all performative projection can be real (Woolard, Duranti 2004: 88).

Participants can view the code differently and associated it with anger, femininity, vulgarity or anything that indexes in their previous experience or assumptions. In this way we can analyse all *code-switching* even where it is not seen as meaningful at first glance. *Code-switching* and *code-mixing* may be unconscious, but it can index some subconscious meaning.

### 3. Methods

Chapter three describes the research question and also covers the definitions of terms I will use and the analysing tools used in the empirical part. Then I will describe the researched sample in detail, first the community and then the children from both classes. At the end of this chapter I will describe the researcher position.

#### 3.1. Research question

My interest lies in *bilingual first language acquisition* and in my work I aim to find out how and why bilingual Czech/English pre-school and first year school children switch between their two languages and how bilingual *code-switching* and *code-mixing* influences young Czech/English children's social competences.

- In what situations do the children code switch?
- In what situations do the children code mix?
- Why do the children *code-switching* and *code-mixing* in each different situation?

#### 3.2. Analytical tools and used theories

In my research the search for the right analysing tool took some time. At first I adopted the Myer-Scotton markedness model which could describe very well my researched data of the children *code-mixing* in order to please and not make any rights and obligation changes. I described this type of *code-switching* of the bilingual children according to Myers-Scotton's *strategy of neutrality*. However, other types of *code-switching* and especially *code-mixing* of bilingual children are not that well suited to the markedness model.

The markedness model indexes one code as marked and the other one as unmarked because of the perceived importance of a language. On the basis of my data I argue that there are many more types of differentiation and the marked code can have many more reasons to be the marked than merely its position *in rights and obligation balances* and that there are much more reasons to *code-switching* and *code-mixing* that force alone. I argue that the reasons for *code-switching* and *code-mixing* are negotiated bilingual speeches in speech communities and that when looking closer at microsocial ethnographic data, the switching can have various reasons.

I agree with Auer's view that Myers-Scotton's markedness model does not take in account the will of the speakers. Auer's conversation analysis leaves much more space for the participants' own negotiation and leads researchers to more precise and more detailed analysis, as we can analyse the entire spectrum of reasons for *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. It does not aspire to explain motivation, but analyses the situation itself and how *code-switching* and *code-mixing* forms a conversation, what impact it has, not so much what motives, although these do not necessarily have to be the same and the meaning can be also negotiated during the speech event. Conversation analysis seems to be well suited to my research data, but I was still lacking the right tool to closely analyse my data in detail. Woodard's theory of indexicality is derived from Silverstein's indexicality who rewrote Pierces' indexicality and Woodard uses it for explaining *code-switching* and *code-mixing*. I find her approach very rich and perfect for my data analysis. Woodard's indexicality has a lot in common with Myers-Scotton markedness model. The marked and unmarked codes can be described as nothing else but indexical. However, indexicality is a much looser explanation tool for giving reasons of indexing or where indexing leads to. In other words Woodard's indexing has greater potential to explain the switch than just the "rights and obligation balances". Woodard's indexicality also prescribes the speaker and hearer the agency to negotiate their reasons. With this analytical tool, like with Auer's theory, it is possible to explain the identity change and also relationships change. Similarly to Auer's communication analysis, we can also approach each conversation as unique and without presumptions of identity from different conversations. In my opinion it leaves us all the advantages of Auer's conversation analysis.

Indexicality, on the other hand, gives us a strong tool to analyse how *code-switching* and *code-mixing* refers to any attributed meanings. *Code-switching* can index any meaning the speaker attributes it to e.g. not only authority but also domestic or public behaviour, intimacy, game time or playing time etc. The range of what the language is indexing is unlimited. The speaker and hearer can also negotiate the indexicality that the *code-switching* or *code-mixing* refers to, it does not have to be always understood and perceived by both speaker and hearer in the same way. However the closer the *speech community*, the more we can presume mutual understanding of what *code-switching* and *code-mixing* indexes.

I am using the notion bilingual in sense of a person whose acquisition of two languages started at birth or at very early stage of life. In my work I researched bilinguals who are being

brought up bilingually in a more-or-less monolingual society. Although the term monolingual may be a little questionable as educated society in Prague tends to be bilingual in sense that a second language learning at schools is at a reasonably high level and also since the families involved in my research associate with other bilingual families. However, the majority society is not bilingual or at least not bilingual since birth. The proficiency in both languages among my researched sample varies, some of the children use English more and therefore are more proficient in that language and some of them use Czech more; the children also uses their languages in different situations from each other and presumably have wider vocabulary in one language for certain things e.g. playing football, than for others, but this varies from field to field. However all of the children actively use both of their languages every day at home and at least every week, but usually much more frequently, outside the home with their peers. The high status of English is important to consider in data analysis.

I have described Cantone's research question and findings in order to support my claim that there is no evidence that young bilingual children *code-mixing* because of confusion of their two languages. The children in my research are older and have completed a considerable part of their *bilingual first language acquisition*, and they do not do much *code-mixing*. I actually question why they *code-mixing* that little. Schieffelin and Ochs' language socialisation theory, where they claim that, as children acquire language structure and use, they also acquire social knowledge, could help me explain my research question: How does bilingual *code-switching* and *code-mixing* influence young Czech/English children social competences? The notion of *speech community* described in Morgan (Duranti 2004) and also in Wei (Wei 2000) is of central importance for my work, because I describe the *code-switching* and *code-mixing* usage of children in a certain *speech community* and analyse it referring to the *speech community*. I use the term *code-switching* and *code-mixing* separately as I have observed some significant differences in the use of these two code alternations in the observed children and would like to point that out in the analyses and describe them separately.

### **3.3. Qualitative research**

My work is based on qualitative research, which allows me to describe the circumstances of speech in detail and holistically. By applying this method I can analyse and describe the background of the speech as well as the speech alone. It is always difficult to speak about participant observation with small children as it is difficult to participate as an

adult in children's interactions and not disturb them. However, it was possible to conduct in the first year of my research with a group of preschool children where there was a playing area and parents and other child minders were also present. I was helping in the playing area and with snack times. I also was a participating observer on whole day trips with the preschool children and could see their behaviour in unstructured time in public.

In the other half of my research, participant observation was more difficult because it was only me and the children in the classroom and I could only observe, listen and record. The teacher told the children that I was there to observe them, as there was no better way of getting them to understand; she told them that I wanted to find out how good they are at learning and how well they behave. The children knew me from the previous year and knew that I am a part of the crew and so they did not pay any attention to me. Somehow through the year I became a distraction for one of the children and I was forced to terminate research.

For the first part of my research I was a participant /observer, however for the second part I was just an observer, I was not participating in the children's interactions or their interactions with the teacher. No parents involved at this time.

I also conducted informal interviews with the parents and at the end a half-structured interview with a parent.

### **3.4. Three Bears**

The English-speaking community or school called Three Bears (I have changed the name for anonymity) was founded by a group of mothers from bilingual families, foreign or Czech, whose strategy towards their children's bilingualism was to bring them up attending Czech formal state education (pre-school, basic school) while attending a private English school for bilingual children. They, however, were not prepared to pay horrendous sums of money which are associated with most English-speaking schools. Therefore, in 2007 they decided to establish a non-profit organisation, Three Bears, and organise classes for preschool children and first school children and other activities, such as a book reading club, a creative writing club, a drama club etc. and also annual or one-off events such as an Easter Egg hunt, a Christmas party, a hibernation celebration, summer camp etc. As you can see above, the school is more of a community centre where children and their parents congregate not only to learn language but also to socialise in this English/Czech speaking centre and create a

bilingual community. The parents decided to set up the school of English for their bilingual children, so the children can socialise in an English-speaking community and as well as to master their English language on academic level as if they were in the English-speaking country.

The community centre is a children's centre rented for every Friday and is located in a residential area in the wider centre of Prague. The facilities include an entrance hall with coat hooks, one classroom with two changing rooms, one large room with a bar with Czech-speaking staff in corner by the door where you can buy snacks, hot and cold drinks and which staff speak Czech, a large play area with many attractions for children such as a play kitchen, a trampoline, a Lego desk, a slide with platform, a play house, a little pool full of plastic balls, there are also dolls and prams etc. to play with and in this large room is also an eating area with 5 tables with chairs and one table with computer for parents to use while they are waiting. Behind this room there is small kitchen which the staff and parents are free to use and toilets.

Three Bears is a non-profit organisation and is run by the mothers as volunteers and therefore can be cheaper than other possibilities available. Many of the mothers help actively and some of them also teach in the school. The teachers are paid from the course fee. There are activities for children from toddlers through to pre-schoolers and primary schoolchildren up to about 8<sup>th</sup> graders (13 years old), the age-groups for classes vary.

My research consisted of three months of observing and recording regular, undisturbed conversations of a group of 13 preschool children in their all-morning English community activities from April to June 2015, that is 12 mornings (about four and half hours) of recordings. The following academic year 2015/16, I was observing the same class but only five children in their first year of Czech primary school. I observed them for five months for two hours, one afternoon a week, amounting to 14 afternoons of recordings. At this point in time the children had two hours of after-school English community activities. The other eight children from the previous year did not continue this activity in their first year of school, so the sample of participants was much smaller. The recordings and observation were made in the English-speaking community centre/school with classes held in the centre of Prague.

The first year I listened, observed and recorded bilingual children in the English-speaking community school where the children had lessons, played, ate and visited places of interest.

Some of the younger, pre-school children usually had their mothers present with them at the club - not in the classroom but in the playing and eating area - where the children spend a considerable period of the morning, the mothers or some other child minders are sometimes there all morning, sometimes part of the morning, working on the computer chatting etc.

Because 13 children is a big group to manage to listen to and take notes of, I selected six of the children from the preschool group which usually attended the community centre the longest and their mothers also spent time with them.

I also conducted informal interviews with six of the active mothers of the pre-school children in the first year and semi-structured interview with one of the mothers and the child in the second year in a home environment, when the child was in first year of Czech primary school.

Children come to the multilingual community centre for English education. They first have play time before the lesson starts and all the children arrive. Then their lessons are divided into two parts: on carpet preparation of lesson topics and some writing at their desks and then in another room they have a more relaxing time singing and dancing and being read books by their teachers. After these lessons they have a snack break and some play time – which is the most interesting time for observation as they can speak freely in any language they like. After the break they have some more speaking and writing and then shorter break and art and crafts with a different teacher. Then most of them have some free time again in the play area where they are also free to speak as they wish.

#### *3.4.1. Pre-schoolers*

The children attend a Czech nursery during the week and on Friday they visit the English-speaking community centre for their English activities. Activities took place on Friday from 8 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. and children could come as early as 7:30 a.m., having to be picked up by 1:30p.m. The time was divided into two English lessons, a snack and play break of 20-25 minutes, another short play break of about 10 minutes and one singing and reading activity and one art and crafts lesson; the art and crafts lesson was conducted by a different teacher. Some children also play in the playing and eating area for some time after the “English morning activity” finishes. Some of the mothers/minders are present and participate in communication too. The children speak together, with their minders / teachers, their parents in the class and play and eating area. I also had a chance to observe and record them when on a trip to the natural science museum reached by public transport. I observed their interaction

in public space; I recorded and observed the children speaking together, as well as with their minders, their parents and occasionally with the public on this trip. I was also observing and recording their interaction with the guide in the museum, a Czech man who was struggling to find for words to speak to them in English and lastly with the wider public in a playground outside the museum.

The children come from mixed Czech/American and Czech/Scottish families or from families where both the parents are Czech but the children were born in the USA, spent three to six years of their life and attended a pre-school education there. This means that some of them had been socialised in English outside of the home in educational institution for long periods of their life and the others were socialised in English in private at home and in the observed minority community centre.

*Family strategies to maintain their children bilingual (the names have been changed)*

*Emily* has a Czech father and an American mother. She was six years old at the start of my research. *Emily* arrived in the Czech Republic two years ago and the family speaks English at home. The parents are practising the one person one language strategy. The mother does not speak Czech very well. The girl attended Czech pre-school education and on Fridays she attended full morning English tuition for pre-school children. *Emily* prefers English language and is more fluent in it (as her mother told us). The family tries to visit the USA once every two years to see their relatives living there. *Emily* also continued to classes for first-years. *Emily's* mother usually spends her mornings in the community centre and is the teacher of the arts and crafts lesson.

*Hermione's* has mother who is Czech and her father is Scottish. She had just turned seven when attending pre-schooler classes. *Hermione* was born in the Czech Republic. Both parents speak both languages, but practise the *one person one language* strategy. But they do not practise this strategy too strictly; I have observed the parents sometimes also speaking the other language to her, especially the mother. *Hermione* attended Czech pre-school education and on Fridays she went to the full morning English tuition for pre-school children. *Hermione* did not continue to classes for first-year schoolchildren. *Hermione's* mother was a coordinator in the Three Bears and was always there all mornings, helping to keep everything running smoothly, preparing tables for snacks etc.

*Brian* – Brian has a Czech father and an American mother, he was six years old. Brian has two brothers. Brian was born in the Czech Republic and so were his brothers. Both of Brian's parents speak both languages but practise the *one person one language* strategy. Brian was attending Czech preschool Mondays to Thursdays and Three Bears on Fridays. Brian prominently stronger language was, at the time of research, English, his mother tongue. They do not visit the USA very often. Brian's mother was usually not there at the community centre. Brian continued to first-year classes.

*Alan (Adam)* - he has a Czech mother and his father is from the USA, he was six years old. Alan was born in Czech Republic and visit USA regularly. The parents also practise the one person one language strategy. Alan does not show signs that either language is stronger. Alan has no siblings. Alan went to Czech pre-school and he also continued to first-year classes.

*Magda* – her mother is from the USA and her father is Czech. Magda is six years old, she attends Czech nursery school and on Friday she attends all-morning English tuition. Magda's parents are practising the one language one parent strategy.

*Jimi* - Jimi has a Czech mother and his father is from the USA; Jimi is nearly seven years old. He attends Czech nursery and on Fridays all-morning English tuition. Jimi's parents practise the one language one parent strategy.

*Jana* has Czech parents. She was six years old at the beginning of conduction of the research; she was born in the USA and lived there for three and a half years attending pre-school education in English while in the USA. Jana has one older and one younger sibling. The parents speak to her in Czech, she had one friend with whom she came into regular contact who spoke only English. Jana used to speak English to her older brother at home for a long time after arriving from the USA. However, at the time of research she strongly preferred Czech. In the Czech Republic she attended pre-school education in Czech, and on Fridays she went to the all-morning English tuition for pre-school children. Jana did not continue to the next year of classes.

*Neli* – both her mother and father are Czech. Neli is seven years old; she was born in the USA and lived there for four years. She is doing her first grade home studies at the moment, but she attended Czech pre-school education and now is receiving her compulsory Czech state schooling at home in Czech language; she also attends some extra-curricular activities

conducted in Czech. Both parents speak to her in English although they are Czech. On Friday she goes to the all-morning English lesson for pre-school children (for a second time round).

*Alex* - is Neil's younger brother. He is five and was born in the USA but he lived there only two years. He attends Czech pre-school education and attends all-morning English tuition for pre-school children on Fridays.

I am aware that Jana, Neli and Alex are a bit of a different case than the rest of the children as they have a different background. Their parents are in both cases both Czech. In case of Jana they both speak Czech to her at home, so her fluency in English is from another source, from learning in the Three Bears, being in USA big part of her life and from spending time with English speaking friend of same age. At the time of my research she is fluent in English and did not *code-mixing* any more than the other children. In class she speaks in English as required, and she has a lot to say as well. However during free time and if unattended she code switched to the Czech language.

Neli and Alex are both being spoke to in English by her parents although they are Czech, however Neli has a home school and she is being taught Czech curriculum, when necessary, for example with Czech language and literacy she is taught by her mother in Czech language etc. Alex is not at school yet. The family is planning to leave the Czech Republic and therefore it is very important for them to speak English language and to be strong user of the language.

*Teacher* – Czech with a British husband and bilingual children, not in this class. She is a professional English language teacher. She has been an English teacher for many years. The teacher also lived in Great Britain for couple of years and she taught English there too. She also taught the children the following year.

#### 3.4.2. *First-year school children*

I also watched, listened and recorded five first-year school children from October to February the following year. It was the same class which was supposed to continue, but only five of the parents decided to keep their children in the class. It was explained to me that the parents want their children to concentrate on their first year at Czech primary school. All of the children in this school attended Czech state schools and visited the English-speaking community lessons one afternoon a week. The activity took place on Wednesday afternoons from 1:30 p.m. until 3:15 p.m. There was considerably less time for playing; the children had two 45-minute lessons with a 15-minute break in between when they began with a snack in

the meantime and only started playing having eaten their snack. These classes were held in a different place than pre-school classes, it was in a rented class room of a regular primary school in the middle of the city. All interaction took place in one class in Czech. There were only the five children, the teacher and me.

*The family strategy to keep their children bilingual (the names are changed)*

*Emily* has a Czech father and an American mother. She was six years old at the start of my research. Emily arrived in the Czech Republic two years ago and the family speaks English at home. The parents are practising the “one person one language” strategy. The mother does not speak Czech very well. She attended Czech pre-school education and on Fridays she attended full morning English tuition for pre-school children. Emily prefers English language and is more fluent in it (as her mother told us). The family tries to visit the USA once every two years to see their relatives living there. Emily attended also the previous pre-schoolers class and continued to the classes for first-years.

*Brian* – Brian has a Czech father and an American mother, he is six years old. Brian was born in the Czech Republic. The parents speak both languages but practise *one person one language* with the children. Brian has two smaller brothers and mother is at home with them. He attends Czech school.

*Alan* - he has Czech mother and his father is from the USA; he was six years old. Alan was born in the Czech Republic and visits the USA regularly. The parents also practise the one person one language strategy. Alan does not show signs of which language is stronger. Alan has no siblings. Alan went to Czech school and he also attended pre-schooler classes.

*Dany* – he has an American mother and a Czech father. Dany is six years old. His parents practise *one person one language* and he goes to Czech school. Dany did not attend pre-schooler classes.

*Adam* – he has Czech mother and his father is from the USA. Adam was six years old. His parents practice one person one language strategy. Adam was attending Czech school at the time of research. Adam’s parents try to visit USA every two years. Adam has one younger brother. Adam also attended pre-schooler classes.

*Teacher* – Czech with a British husband and bilingual children, not in this class. She was teaching the class the previous year too.

### 3.5. Researcher position

I am the mother of two bilingual children, my daughter who is 13 and son 10 years old. I am a Czech mother with an English husband, father to my two children. We practise the one person one language strategy although not strictly; my husband speaks to our children in English language and I speak to my children in Czech when without my husband and in English when my husband is present. The children are accustomed to that speech behaviour though my son and (in past also) my daughter speak back to me strictly in Czech. My children attend Czech state school. The stronger language Czech for both of my children is Czech, although they are fluent in English too. I would say their fluency has improved in recent years.

I knew the English community/school for some time before my research. I had found out about the school and started to attend their events with my children in order find out more about the people, their strategies for bringing up bilingual children and also in order to give my children the chance to participate in a community of children in the same position as theirs.

My children attend some of the activities in the English-speaking community although not weekly classes. My son is in the year above the researched group and occasionally socialises with them, while my daughter used to go to the classes and clubs and still joins few of the activities that the community/school organises.

As I have bilingual children in a very similar position (one parent Czech one parent English-speaking immigrant), I sometimes compare my experiences with my children with my experiences with the researched children as to speaking behaviour and I believe I have a comprehensive understanding of the issue and can refer to my home bilingual family knowledge. However I do not include my children in the research, mainly as they are not part of the class and so not in the specified *speech community*. If I reference the speech behaviour of the researched children with my own children's speech behaviour I will always reflect it in the analysis.

In my bachelor's thesis I also conducted research on the English-speaking community in the Czech Republic. The research was anthropological but not linguistically anthropological; I researched the integration of long term adult immigrants from English-speaking countries in the Czech Republic. Among other things, I found that most of these people do not find

themselves speaking Czech even after living for ten years in Prague, which was approximately the length of time that all of my research subjects had been living in the Czech Republic, all of them content and with the intention staying in the Czech Republic forever. They do not speak Czech although they had been trying to learn it for a considerable time. I was interested to establish how these immigrants would bring up their children. In my present research I have found that they all have Czech spouses or most probably the ones that do not have Czech spouses do not use the strategy of attending Czech state schools and English afterschool activities.

## 4. Code-switching at Three Bears

In this chapter I will describe the patterns of *code-switching* in the afterschool activity in English school Tree Bears. I will show *code-switching* first in the class of pre-schoolers and then class of first-year schoolers. I will briefly describe the class environment in both classes as it is in the different locations. I will show the most interesting and typical *code-switching* and under each example I will also indicate the interesting points and why I have chosen that particular speech part. After that I will explain my interpretation, the reason why I claim that *code-switching* happens in the presented case according to Gumperz (1972), situational or metaphorical switching and switch in the *rights and obligation balances set* (Myers-Scotton 1993:60) and where I claim code-switching indexicality (Woolard, Duranti 2004: 88).

### 4.1. Pre-schoolers

The play area and eating area are connected and usually some of the parents wait in the eating area for some or all the time their children spend in the centre. I saw and heard interaction not only among children themselves but also with their parents when they ask them for help or when the parents lecture them etc. The children have many activities to choose from and they are usually playing in pairs, alone or in groups of three. Very often girls are play in the playhouse together while the boys are on the trampoline, slide or in the children's kitchen together. Other times they are playing in all parts of the playrooms.

The first type of *code-switching* is with a new conversation. The new conversation can start in the midst of other conversation but with a different person Example 1 and 4, with new different definition of *rights and obligation balances set*

Example 1.

Three girls are by a table in the eating area of play room and one is eating a big piece of cake.

1. Jana: “*Už je tady Miss Katerina a přesouvá židle.*”  
*Miss Katerina is here and she is moving chairs.*
2. Jana: “*Můžu dostat kousek?*”  
*Can I have some?*
3. Hermione: “*Proč? Tak si objednej. Tak si objednej.*”

Why? Order some. Order some.

4. Jana: “Ale to musíš platit.”

But you have to pay.

5. Neli: “Když šaháte na peníze, víte kolik na ně šahalo lidí? ...a tak si musíte umýt ruce po peníz, po poněžích.”

When you touch money, do you know how many people have touched it before you? ... so, you have to wash hands, after mon, after money.

6. Hermione: “Ale já jsem neměla v rucích peníze.”

But I haven't handled money.

7. Jana: “Já taky ne.”

Me neither.

8. Neli: “No...”

Well..

9. In background – Emily: “Brian's coming”

10. Neli: angrily “Brian's here!”

11. Hermione: “Kdo to byl?”

Who was it?

12. Neli: “To byla Hermione.”

It was Hermione.

13. Hermione: “Coo? Jaká Hermione?”

What? What do you mean, Hermione?

14. Neli: “Hermione. Err, Emily.”

Hermione, Err, Emily.

15. Emily: “Brian's coming.”

16. Neli: “I know. I've saw him.

17. Hermione: “Neli, hlídej mi to.”

Neli, keep an eye on it for me.

Teacher enters and starts to speak in English.

18. Teacher: Good morning every one. Oh, are you having breakfast?

19. Hermione: “Yeah”.

20. Teacher: “OK, let's, get your backpack and get you started. ...”

There are four situational types of *code-switching* in this situation. The three girls are speaking in Czech together while in the background someone is shouting in English and Neli (line 10) is *code-switching* to answer the background shouter in the same language, and then instantly code switches back to speak to the girls in Czech. Again when in line 18 the teacher starts speaking in class language, and turns to Hermione, up to then speaking only Czech, this makes Hermione speak English although she did not say much. This typical situation occurs frequently. The children *code-switching* to the language the person who starts the conversation chooses. I am not questioning the chosen language here at the moment but the switch from one language the child was talking in interaction with one speaking person or group to another language for new interaction.

I have two possible explanations for this persistent and quite common situation: 1, the children are taught from the moment they are born (or most of them) to use their language through the one person one language strategy and it is embedded in their use of language, therefore unconscious. 2, they are practising the *strategy of neutrality* – they are making effort to comfort, they want to integrate and not want to cause any disruptions, do not want the other person to feel uncomfortable by speaking to him/her in a different language that they have started to use. It may be the case that both explanations are right. The new speech means new definition of *rights and obligation balances set*, and as is the case in lines 8 to 11 between another *rights and obligation balances set* of speech. It may make the person who starts the conversation feel uncomfortable if the second speaker does not follow the set code. It would have some significance and would index something outside the speech itself if Neli (line10) were not to follow the code spoken by Emily (line 9) and Hermione (19 line) were not to follow the teacher's (18 line) chosen code. The embedded habit of speaking to one person in one language makes just this behaviour more unconscious.

It is very unusual for the children to *code-switching* within one interaction. When one interaction starts in one language it will follow through in the same language. This is the case also when a new child comes and wants to join in a game with children already playing together. The newcomer will start automatically speaking the language used by the children originally playing together. Although there can sometimes be a mistake, when a child has not heard or registered which language is being used and the child may start speaking in the “wrong” language. But that will immediately change if the original children continue to speak in their set language.

## Example 2.

Hermione and Jana are playing in the playhouse with dolls in a break between lessons.

1. Hermione: “*Ona je stale nemocná, musíš jí dát do postele.*”  
*She is ill, you have to put her to bed*
2. Jimi: “Hello, can I play with you?”
3. Hermione: without any hesitation “*Ano, můžeš být tatínek. Máme nemocné dítě.*”  
*Yes, you can be daddy. We have sick child.*
4. Jimi: a bit swiftly “*Dobře, musíme mu dát nějaký lék.*”  
*Right, we have to give it some medicine.*

In this case Jimi makes a mistake, attempting to join in a conversation in the wrong code, but and immediately code switches to the language of the interaction already in progress. His reaction seems to be even a little too quick in order to correct his mistake. Though, Hermione does not even seem to register that Jimi is speaking in a different language than a set definition. She seems to be so settled in the set code that she totally ignores that Jimi made a mistake, or perhaps deliberately ignores the fact that he spoke in a different language and pushes on him the right definition of speech event, pushing the right index that she associates for playing with dolls, since Jana and Neli quite often played in the playhouse, always using the Czech language. In this case, the index is playing with dolls, which means Czech language, or perhaps more dollies playing with Jana – Czech language<sup>3</sup>.

Most of the time at the playhouse the game is as follows:

## Example 3

The girls are playing in a toy house. They are speaking Czech. Other children who they interact with are also speaking Czech.

1. Hermione: “*Tohle je Ela*”  
*About doll, “This is Ela.”*
2. Jana: “*Já mám kamarádku Elu ve školce.*”  
*I have a friend called Ella at kindergarden.*
3. Hermione: “*Budeme si hrát v domečku.*”  
*Let’s play in the playhouse*

---

<sup>3</sup> Czech language.

4. Jimi: “*Já si tady budu odpočívát.*”  
*I will be resting here. (Jimi is lying right behind playhouse.)*
5. Hermione: “*Žádný takový hračky.*”  
*Not toys like this!*

As the Example 3 c shows, girls are playing in Czech language and everyone around speaks to them in Czech language. When the *rights and obligation balances set* is are once settled in one language, it is hard to make the children code-switch back, even the index, i.e. overall environment, is trying to make them code-switch and it is usual place, time and settings for the other language. The definition of the speech event is set and they could not see the indexes for them to switch.

#### Example 4

At class, children are sitting around three tables and are writing in their exercise books

1. Teacher: “Circle vehicles, things that can carry people from one place to another. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten.”
2. Alex: “*One two three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten.*”
3. Jana: “*Jeden, dva, tři, čtyři, pět, šest, sedm, osm, devět, deset, jedenáct, dvanáct.*”  
*One, two three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve*
4. Hermiona: starts after a bit, “*Jeden, dva, tři...*”continues until ten  
*One, two, three...*
5. Alan: “*Jedna, dva ...*”  
*One, two...*
6. Alex: “*Musíš si napsat jméno.*”  
*You have to write your name.*
7. Jana: “*Já to nechci.*”  
*I don't want it.*
8. Alex “*Můžu si půjčit Tvoji propisku?*” (“*Can I borrow your pen?*”) shouting “Finished!” to the teacher immediately afterwards.

.....  
Children are circling objects in the picture in their exercise books and then counting them. Teacher demonstrates. Jana does as she should but counts in Czech

language (also circles all the objects and therefore it is 12 not ten as with the others) – suddenly all tables counts and speak in Czech. Conversation in Czech follows for a few minutes.

Teacher comes to them:

9. Teacher: “Jana, you count them!”
10. Jana: “One, two, three...”
11. Teacher: “Is that a thing that can carry people? Jana, Jana is that something that can carry people?”
12. Jana: “No.”...
13. Alan: “I’m finished.”

The children are at English class, with their English teacher; the teacher is speaking and telling them what to do; she repeats herself over and over, so the children would be able to follow if she lost their attention for a few seconds. The teacher is clearly indexing them to use their English language<sup>4</sup>. But the person that is closer to them, Jana, strongly prefers Czech language and the children associate her with Czech language and Czech language indexicality, when she starts speaking they code-switch also into Czech language, taking the interaction as new. The teacher then made all speaking group to *code-switching* back to English language. This can be described as new definition *rights and obligation balances set*; the teacher used *rights and obligation balances set* to make the children switch to the language associated with her teaching. It is clear that the appropriate language with the teacher is English; the socialised custom to speak to one person one language is helping the teacher to keep the rules and the children to follow them with her. It needs the teacher stronger indexicality to come closer and speak directly to one person – the one who made the *code-switching* in to her *rights and obligation balances set*. When the teacher comes and speaks to Jana, this makes them *code-switching* immediately to the language the teacher indexes - English language. The teacher was not closer just because she came to the table but because she directly spoke to Jana. She came closer in sense of socially closer; the literal significance of physical distance may have not been so powerful by itself. Reduction of social distance was in my opinion more important, although physical distance certainly has some impact. This observation may support the hypothesis that the socially and physically closer the index, the more powerful the index.

---

<sup>4</sup> English language.

Or even the need to give some information to the teacher makes Alex (line 6) to code-switch to English – the teacher is strongly indexing in English, but the conversation at the table continues in Czech. There are two different sets of conversation for him each with a differently defined speech event in a different language code. Even the topic, work in the given exercise in book, seems to be same.

That the children understand the speeches as different set of *rights and obligation balances set* is clearly demonstrated by Alex in the line 8. He code-switches into the English language indexical to the teacher with the teacher while second earlier he was using Czech language indexical to the conversation at table with Jana.

This code-switch I witnessed on many other occasions, regularly enough to generalise it as the children's pattern of behaviour. Another illustration is

Example 5.

Long discussion about stinky eye, stinky brain etc.

1. Brian: „Your name is Mr. Stinky eye.“
2. Alan: “Your name is Mr. Stinky brain.”
3. Brian:”Your name is Mr. Stinky eye.”
4. John: “Your name is Mr. *Smradalavej bobek*.“

*Your name is Mr. Stinky poo.*

5. Alan: “*Smaradlavej zub*.“

*Smelly tooth.*

6. John: “*Ty se jmenuješ smradlavý prase. Podívejte, podívejte.(.) To lítá...“*

*You are a smelly pig. Look, look.(.), It's flying...*

At the first sight, this a situation different from the above, and on line 4 one child code-switches to Czech language without apparent reason. If a listener did not know the background, they might say that this goes against my presumptions that children do not switch easily and basically only with new definition *rights and obligation balances set* of different speech. Alan followed the code-switch in line 5, he decided to code-switch to a different set of *rights and obligation balances set* but there is no obvious reason as in the other examples. However, it can be clearer when knowing a bit more about this *speech community*. There are few children who are not very sure in English language and although they understand, they

will prefer to speak in Czech language. This is the case with Jana and her brother John, who is not in the class but sometimes comes to the playroom and takes part in some Three Bears activities. The children lived in the USA and attended school there, but parents are Czech and do not speak to the children in English language, their English language is not very strong. Alan knows that. Alan can choose between ignoring John's mistake and following the pattern shown in the Example 3 or follow the Example 4, where Jana made everyone to code-switch to Czech language by being closer. Alan decided to code-switch and set new *rights and obligation balances set*. It seems to me that this has multiple reasons; Alan wanted to integrate John into conversation and decided to use the *strategy of neutrality*, what made him also to decide in this way is that he wanted to include John into the conversation and as some finding in *code-mixing* implicates that it came about in the heat of the game. The boys were playing a game of exchanging rude jibes and when one is playing good game one may totally forget the *rights and obligation balances set*. I will go back to support this implication again in the chapter Code-mixing.

Another instance demonstrates a perfect example of *code-switching* according to *strategy of neutrality*, and in the same way corresponding with the one definition of speech and *rights and obligation balances set* that should be followed when you do not want to make any social mistake. Sometimes when an active child is playing on the slide and speaks to one child in English language, he then runs into the playhouse to join other children they may speak Czech language without hesitation if indeed the children in the playhouse are speaking in Czech language and if the speaking child then goes to the ball pool where children are screaming unintelligibly, he may again decide to switch to English language or stay in Czech language code.

#### Example 6

Alex shoots down the slide, runs to the playhouse on the other side of the room and then jumps to the pool full of balls:

1. "Pozóóór, jedúú. (0,2) Hello, what are you playing? (0,2) Splosh"

Look oooout, here I gooo.

Between Hermione's mother and Hermione are frequent cases of *code-switching* which I can observe with other children and their parents which are Czech. With Hermione's mother it is very prominent

### Example 7

On the way natural history museum, it looks like nearly all the children had birthday the previous weekend

1. Magda: “*Já jsem měla narozeniny.*”

*It was my birthday.*

2. Supervisor Hermiona’s mother: “Oh, was it your birthday too? Oh my goodness:”

3. Magda: “Yes.”

4. Emily: “I was seven. And I know someone who is eight.”

5. Hermione: “*Mami kolik jí je?*”

*How old is she?*

6. Supervisor Hermione’s Mother: “Sedm let - *seven years old.*”

7. Hermione: “*Já budu až za rok.*”

*I’ll be seven next year.*”

8. Supervisor Hermione’s Mother: “*Za 11 měsíců.*”

*In 11 months.*”

Hermione’s mother is a coordinator at the Three Bears she helps with running the classes, supervising trips, looking after money of the association and she is always in the play during Friday’s classes. Hermione’s mother is Czech and they practise *one person one language strategy* in the family. However in the centre it seems strange when she speaks to everyone in English language and then in Czech to her daughter. However, this is the outcome of a strict *one person one language strategy* which is believed to be important for the consistency and the child’s bilingual development. The strategy says that it is important to speak to the child constantly in one language although it is perceived not to be a problem when the parents speak together in one or the other language. Quite the opposite, it would be very wrong any other way e.g. one parent speaking in language A and the other answering in language B. In the line two we can see that Hermione’s mother is correcting Magda for speaking in Czech language by repeating her sentence in English language, but when her daughter speaks to her in Czech language (Line 5) she slips into Czech language in the next line.

Another example of this was also at the museum. The mother explains things to her daughter in Czech language while giving other kids commands in English language.

### Example 8

1. Museum guide: "Now I will show you something, something less dangerous. (2) If you all staying here."
2. Supervisor Hermione's mother: "Less dangerous."
3. Supervisor Emily's mother: "Everybody stays here. (2) Magda! Patrick! All stay here"
4. Museum guide: "But they are NOT dangerous. Domestic animals"
5. Supervisor: "Ohh, what's heeere."
6. Museum guide: "It's one most common snake in captivity. It has lots of colours. For example this snake is like in nature, the colour, and this one is albino. They are coral snakes. "
7. Alan: "Can I touch it?"
8. Museum guide: "Yes, you can, if you put your hand like this..."
9. I can hear Hermione and his mother talking to Hermione explaining things.
10. Hermione: In the background "*Co to je? Můžem na to šahat mamí?*"
11. Supervisor Hermione's mother: "To je had, který není nebezpečný, korálovec, takové hady lidi chovají doma."
12. What is it? Can we touch it mummy?
13. Museum guide: "The snakes are not slimy."
14. Supervisor: "Not slimy."
15. Museum guide: "It smells with its tongue."
16. Supervisor: "Does it tickle Alan?"
17. Alan: "Yes."
18. Supervisor: "Magda and you go back?"
19. Museum guide: "Do you know what do they eat? What they eat?"
20. Brian: "Mice."
21. Museum tour guide: "Yes, mice, rats."
22. Supervisor Hermione's mother: "Do you want to touch it? Hermione and Alex haven't touched it yet."
23. Supervisor Hermione's mother: "Do you wanna hold it?"
24. Alex: "Yes."
25. Museum tour guide: "OK, now we can play outside."
- Many people speak after each other; it is not possible to hear.
26. Hermione: "Mummy, I want to hold it."
27. Supervisor Hermione's mother: "No tak, pojd', musíš jít tam,"

Well, come you have to go there then.

Many people speak after each other; it is not possible to hear.

28. Supervisor: “Look, look at its eyes.”

29. Hermione: “I! I want to hold it.”

30. Many people speak after each other; it is not possible to hear.

In the tram to the natural history museum it was *confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel*, I show short example here:

#### Example 9

Mish-mash on the tram going to the museum.

1. Alan: “I will drive a metro C and that’s even cooler.”

2. Brian: “And I will have flying metro, flying metro in the sky.”

3. Hermione: “*Támhle je policista.*”

*There is a policeman over there.*

4. Brian: “First it will go underground and then it will go up.”

5. Jana: “Vidíš ty šediví dveře? Tak tam bydlím já.”

*Can you see that grey door? I live there.*

6. Hermione: “*Fakt?*”

*Really?*

7. Jana: “*Tam jsou dveře a tam.*”

*There are doors and there.*

It sounded like lots sentences mingled together but many different speech events were taking place, all with different *rights and obligation balances set*. There were groups of children speaking in English language and groups of children speaking in Czech language. The children did not look confused at all and were joining in the conversations in the right language English language or Czech language with ease.

In the last example I will show the parent who was just leaving on one of the morning.

#### Example 10

1. Supervisor: “Here is the paper.”

2. Father: „*Děkuju.*, Ok! Bye.“

*Thank you. to the teacher, bye to the child.*

This example is very typical bilingual family *code-switching* at the beginning of a day. The bilingual parent is using the one person one language strategy so close to an utterance in Czech that it is almost like a one sentence with *code-mixing*, but this is not the case - there are two different speech events, one to the supervisor and one to the child.

#### **4.2. First-year schoolchildren**

The first-year school classes were held in a different building in a different but nearby part of Prague. It was in a primary state school building, with a doorman who let people in and out, when a person came he/she had to give him his/her name and reason of visit. The parents did not go in, but dropped children off in front of the building and picked them up there after school. The teacher collected the children in front of the building and took them upstairs to the classroom and later went with back downstairs them again after the lesson. Three Bears had to inform the school that I will be as well coming to the class with the teacher. The class was typical school classroom in an old, purpose-built building; there was board, rows of desks with chairs and at the back space with carpet and wooden cupboard full of games. There were only five children and it was easier to follow the conversations than at the pre-schoolers classes where was many conversations took place at once. However, there was although much less space for free talk. The children had two 45-minute lessons, which consisted of reading and writing at desks and discussion on the carpet and 15-minute break when they had snack and then usually played on the carpet together for about 5 minutes.

All the children in the group had strong English language and a fundamentally new situation arose, but no reason to code-switch. There was a little time to openly speak without the teacher whose indexicality is strongly to English language. The whole environment was an English class with English language indexicality. Even when the parents were picking the children up, there was no code-switch as the parents who were picking the children up were those who had English language as their mother tongue therefore they again had indexicality to English language. As the teacher pointed out, the children are strong in their language, in the pre-schoolers the code-switch was often a child with stronger Czech language and weaker English language, in this class there was no one with weak English language.

At all of the lessons that I was observing children in their first year of primary school no *code-switching* took place. For all 14 afternoon lessons there was no *code-switching*. This might be explained by the fact that there was no reason to code switch, no indexicality to

Czech language; the teacher's English language indexicality, the class, the environment English language, parents English language and the children themselves English language. There was also not too much free time to come up with a topic that would have Czech language indexicality. The reason is that indexicality to the other language code was not there. This all again implies that the main reason for these children to *code-switching* is the *strategy of neutrality*, because there is no one who would strongly prefer Czech language over English language, and there is no reason to integrate anyone by switching codes. However that does not mean that there no *code-mixing* occurred.

### 4.3. Conclusion

Through describing *code-switching* observed in children in their extra-curricular learning activity, activity in order to reinforce their English language as the language of their minority but also as a language of prestige and higher social status I have claimed a few findings based on the data. So far I have found six possible reasons for the children to code-switch and these are: the children *code-switching* to the person who started new set of conversation<sup>5</sup>, they *code-switching* by mistake when the person who switched does not notice which language is settled<sup>6</sup>, they also code-switch if a person who is closer to them has indexicality in the different language and is speaking in a different language than previously settled<sup>7</sup>, children understand the speech as two different interactions/speech events with their unique definitions of *rights and obligation balances set*<sup>8</sup>, they code-switch with a parent which has the other language indexicality<sup>9</sup>, they code-switch to join different conversations with different *rights and obligation balances set* and parents also code-switch for the same reason<sup>10</sup>. I claim that the *strategy of neutrality* lies behind the first type of *code-switching*. It is the strongest reason, emphasized by the embedded custom of the families' strategy of one person one language. The *strategy of neutrality* can be in some degree applied to all of the mentioned interactions except for the people who strongly prefer Czech language, or when some game or interaction for the speakers is strongly associated with and so has strong indexicality to the other language. The second reason for *code-switching* is a mistake which is quickly corrected with the other participants keeping the set *rights and obligation balances set* and not *code-switching* according to *strategy of neutrality*. The third reason is *code-switching*

---

<sup>5</sup> Example 1 line 2

<sup>6</sup> Example 2 line 2

<sup>7</sup> Example 4 line 4, 5

<sup>8</sup> Example 1 line 10, Example 4 line 8

<sup>9</sup> Example 7 line 5, 6, Example 8 line 10

<sup>10</sup> Example 9 line 3, 7, Example 10

to a socially or/and physically closer person who, for some reason, prefers for the interaction different code than was settled in *rights and obligation balances set*, a person whose indexicality is the other language. Again such *code-switching* is due to the *strategy of neutrality* towards the socially and/or physically closer person. When the children understand the speech events as different interactions, they understand them as a different definition of *rights and obligation balances set*, different conversations can have different language due to different indexicality and this applies even if the conversations are within one time line. The children are capable of speaking at the same time to child A in English language, because that child A started in English language and to child B in Czech language because child B started in Czech language provided that the conversations are separate. The parents try hard to keep the one person one language strategy, and it is important for them to keep doing so even in a bilingual speech environment, and so Hermione's mother, who has indexicality to Czech language, speaks to Hermione in Czech language. With the rest of the children the environment has the indexicality to English language, they are there to learn English language so she speaks in English language like all the other adults. The last case can be again explained with the one person one language and *strategy of neutrality*. The person is indeed trying to be polite as that means maintaining the *strategy of neutrality* – not to upset the co-speaker and be friendly.

I have as well showed that the children are not very willing to switch there and back on any occasion for no good reason, once they have settled *rights and obligation balances set*, they must have good reason to resettle it. The implications work best if they are multiple, for instance if there is *strategy of neutrality* and indexicality to a place or person who is associated with the switched-to language. Nearly all the children are used to speaking to one parent in one language and to the other parent the other language *one person one language strategy*; there is no reason to think that they do not practise that rule with other people too. In fact I suggest that these small children are primarily socialised by using one parent one language strategy and it is embedded in the children much more firmly than any other code switching strategies. When one child insists on only speaking Czech one day, it causes the entire table to switch into a different language in order to be socially neutral. It shows that the social competences are very well settled in these children when one embedded strategy supports *strategy of neutrality* which helps the children easily integrate within a group.

The children's socialisation through the language teaches them to change the language according to the *strategy of neutrality* to make the people in their social group feel

comfortable and to integrate well. Changing the language to a person who prefers the other language (than being used) because of social and/or physical closeness and also, as shown by Hermione in Example 2, the self-confidence that stops her from *code-switching* when her friend made a mistake. All that behaviour shows the children's important knowledge of conversational skills, and social competences. The socialisation through the language is also making the children being more socially sensitive. Here I claim that the children's social competences are strengthened through socialisation to use the language.

## 5. Code mixing at Three Bears

In the following chapter I will describe *code-mixing* in the bilingual children at after-school activities for bilingual children in Prague. First I will describe *code-mixing* with the class of pre-schoolers and then class of first-year school children. I am not going to describe the environment again as it is the same as in the previous chapter, classes are the same, only the researched situation is different. I will briefly explain again what the difference between *code-switching* and *code-mixing* is and why I believe it is worth researching it separately. Here I will also explain my preliminary conclusions and clarify them. Then I will show examples of *code-mixing* in the children, I will state what is interesting in each example and explain my interpretation, the possible explanations for the *code-mixing* in certain distinguished situations.

Although not all researchers of *code-switching* think it necessary to research *code-switching* and *code-mixing* separately, they all distinguish between the two terms, even if they do not come to total consensus on the term definition. Some of the researches also use intersentential and intrasentential (e.g. Auer 1998) for a similar phenomenon. The difference between *code-switching* and *code-mixing* is that *code-switching* means changing languages in entire individual thoughts and always in whole sentences and therefore changing the *rights and obligation balances set*, whilst *code-mixing* means inserting a word or a phrase of one language into utterances in a different language. I see this as two very different speech alterations. When the whole speech is changed by code-switch it means defining new *rights and obligation balances set*, while code-mix only quickly indexes to certain associations that have strong indexicality in the other language in order to inform the hearer of certain index, a certain connotation, and certain association to make the information richer. Code-mixing is a way of adding extra information by saying just one word or phrase in different language in order to make a point which otherwise may need to be explained using many words which is unnecessary in the given *speech community*. It is as within schoolmates indexing to the teacher with lisp by talking for few seconds as if they have a lisp. The lisp has indexicality to the person and the classmates associate the speech with the teacher more quickly than when his/her name is said. However, I do not claim that all of the *code-mixing* is for such indexical reasons.

Here I would like to mention that people code-mix only in certain speech communities where firstly the set rules or custom is that people can code-mix and that the mutual understanding

of the *speech community* is that the *code-mixing* enriches the speech. There is always a reason for *code-mixing* in bilingual people. Although I admit that there might sometimes be caused by a momentarily insufficiency of vocabulary of speaker but again it happens only in a bilingual *speech community* and therefore is no lack of fluency as the person could find another way to say it if necessary.

When I started to listen to the bilingual children at the Tree Bears I was surprised that they extremely rarely code-mix. They do not use Czech words/phrases in their English conversation and do not use English words/phrases in their Czech conversation. They do not have any habits of using any *tag switching* as is “*you know*” or “*kind of*” etc. in the manner that Maschler describes it (Auer 1998: 123-146). I heard much *code-switching* when the children changed the person spoken to, but I heard very little *code-mixing*. The children indeed do not code-mix very much, not like, for example, the immigrants from English speaking countries in Israel as described by Auer (Auer 1998, 123-146) or like students in Brunei (Xu 2014). There was not a case of mixed code using two languages so that a third new code emerges (Auer 1998: 125) as I was hoping or expecting to hear. But after analysing why this was not happening and comparing it to the two mentioned works I came to the conclusion that it is just one type of bilinguals *speech community* behaviour and that for it to happen I would have to research a much larger bilingual *speech community* where a larger socio-geographical element is bilingual and perhaps also older children. However, I also can see in my own life, that fully bilingual older children and adults use more *code-mixing* than these children. Here I would like to only make quick reference to my own children and especially the older child who similarly to the researched children also rarely used to code- as I will describe below, but now at the age of 13, an adolescent, she is *code-mixing* much more and meaning especially *tag switching*.

### **5.1. Pre-schoolers**

In a *speech community* consisting of only bilingual people, they are familiar, meeting regularly and know each other; they have rules known to all members, in such a *speech community* that allows *code-mixing* in different ranges of intensity. This can only happen in bilingual *speech community* where the rules allow the members to code-mix. Different speech communities may have defined different rules concerning why and how code mixing is acceptable. It seems that in this *speech community* it is not well tolerated, but in extreme and rare occasions it is possible. In fact it looks like it is only allowed to code-mix to index special

cultural contexts associated with the Czech Republic. I have heard only very little *code-mixing* and I will describe all the types below.

#### Example 1

At the class, when Jana is describing what she did during her week. She is taking directly to the teacher answering her question.

1. Jana: “I went to Fun Park and my mum bought me ... er, er... How do you say *králíček?*”

diminutive for *Rabbit*

2. *Teacher*: “Bunny rabbit”

The teacher asked a few children in the class about their past week and they happily answered. In this situation Jana could not find the right word due to being put on the spot at the centre of class attention and the teacher asking her questions, she decided to say it in Czech language in the end after some hesitation.

Here I give a similar example. It is also in the class environment, talking to the teacher and the child says a Czech word in English conversation with a little hesitation.

#### Example 2

1. *Teacher*: “Did you do this at home?”
2. Neli: “Yes I did it at home.”
3. *Teacher*: “But you did it at Kindy last year. “
4. Neli: ”But I did er *překreslit.*”

To draw over already drawn

5. *Teacher*: „You did go over it? “

Neli is in a similar situation, being questioned by the teacher and accused that she did not do something and she wants to quickly explain what has happened. She started the sentence and she realises she does not know how to finish it and she used her other language to finish the sentence, hesitating, knowing that it is wrong. Neli is stuck in middle of a sentence and uses Czech language which is promptly corrected by the teacher without making point about it. There arises a question if in both of the Examples 1 and 2 would the girls also code-mix or if she would try to explain what she meant other way. I can only presume they would not as they

use the other language to help make themselves understood, not just to say something. However I can only speculate on that.

Another example of what might be the same situation of *code-mixing* I present below. One of the Fridays the children went for a trip to natural history museum some of the mothers were there too to help look after the children in public and some of them came there a bit late to pick the children up.

### Example 3

1. *At museum while on class trip*
2. Magda: “Mummy, mummy I want the *ubrousek* nooow.” Very urgently.  
*Napkin* (the world mummy and Czech word mami means and sounds the same)
3. Mother: “It’s OK, you don’t need your *ubrousek*.”  
*Napkin*

This time Magda code-mixes with her mother using the Czech word for napkin without any perceptible hesitation. There are also different conditions; the girl is not speaking to a teacher, she is not been put in stress of speaking in front of a class, she is demanding something from her mother. Magda’s mother repeats the word on the next line. I think this might be also a possible borrowing from the Czech language. The family might use the word *ubrousek* in Czech language napkin even in English language; used as *borrowing* a word which in the family is for some reason used only in this form in Czech language. Magda is not Czech so it is not probable that she wouldn’t remember the right English word. This situation is actually not really happening within the Three Bears class *speech community*, but within the community of family where such strict rules not to code-mix might not apply. The child is clearly demanding the mother to do something. She is a bit upset, perhaps a little stropy. The mother might use the word as well in an effort to comfort her or in order not to upset her even more, and so she keeps her daughter’s *code-mixing* instead of correcting it in her sentence. I cannot be sure which explanation is correct one in this case; I would have to know more of Magda’s background.

Here I show another example, which is a classic borrowing with all its attributes. It is after the classes in the food area when some children had already left for home and some were playing or eating, most of the children who are there have their parents there as well and they are talking.

### Example 3

Emily and her mother are talking about food.

1. *Emily: "I want one more kobliha mummy I love kobliha.*

Which is type of doughnut but it is a ball looking fried pastry with jam filling injected into its middle.

2. *Mother: "I know you like kobliha. That's why I bought it."*

The word *kobliha* has specific cultural meaning when the American English equivalent does not reflect exactly the same thing. The word is not in the American English vocabulary as such and the North American people living in Prague use the word for specific food that is available here and often used here but not in all countries where is spoken English. The word has indexicality to Czech language only. It is only used where the cultural connotation acquires, it does not to have an American English equivalent, although I am sure tourists will happily use the word doughnut. Another good example of such a borrowing is *chlebiček*. Both of these words are also used in our family.

The next case is not a borrowing. This code-mix happened during the break between the two lessons, shortly after the lesson had finished, and the children started to eat their snacks.

### Example 4

At big table teacher and all children, a child is trying to explain something with its mouth full.

1. Teacher: „Do not speak with your mouth full. “

2. Neli: „ Because you can spit and all that. “

3. Brian: „*Fuj!* “

*Yuk!*

This example shows code-mix, when the mixed in word is an interjection, in order to make bigger effect. The code-mixed word could be used as a high effect response to a previous utterance (Duranti 2004:234). As I have already mentioned Brian has stronger language English, which is my observation, as I did not hear him at any time speaking in Czech language in the Three Bears. His stronger English language was also confirmed by the teacher and the mother unwillingly as she inclines to see him as perfect bilingual with both languages

equally strong. So it would not be that Brian cannot remember the word yuk, but might have used the Czech word to make a higher effect response.

In the fifth example we have two boys playing game of football. They made a football goal from some toys and one is shooting the ball into it while the other one is trying to catch it.

#### Example 5

1. Alex is playing football with Brian:
2. Alex: “Come one! Shoot at me! *Mimino! Mimino!*” In a mocking way.  
*Baby, Baby!*
3. Brian: Shoots and then Alex give him back to ball to shoot at the goal again.
4. Alex: After that first shot: “Come on play! *Baby, Baby!*” In a mocking way.

Alex code-mixes two words in Czech language in an otherwise English language conversation. Brian has stronger English language so his indexicality would not be to switch into Czech language. I would not describe it a borrowing as Alex is changing it next time into English. A possible explanation for this *code-mixing* might be that he usually plays football with his Czech friends. I spoke about this with his mother, who was there at that day and she supports this possibility, saying he was playing football the weekend before this happened with a group of Czech friends. The way Alex uses it and says it in a mocking way supports the premise that he was using it before in similar situation involving football but now playing it in English environment he did not translate at first as a quick response to the situation but when he uses the taunt again he realises that it was not right *rights and obligation balances set* and translates the same phrase into English. There is another possible explanation of this case or rather supporting explanation of it; as this happen during a ruled, active game which is also played in various environments; it might be the case of *code-mixing* in the heat of the game. Both explanations actually point to the same conclusion – in the excitement of a ruled, active game which the child plays in the other code, he/she accidentally code-mix.

### **5.2 First-year school children**

In the following academic year I was wondering if I would see the same patterns of *code-mixing*, as I already mentioned there was no *code-switching* in the second year. I expected that when the children started going in to state schools where they will be pressured to learn Czech language in depth, including Czech style handwriting and where they play Czech games all the time with Czech friends, also not spending that much time with their

English speaking parent and at the Three Bears, they will more inclined to Czech language and therefore code-switch and code-mix more. The opposite was true; the children did not code-switch at all and code-mixed less. It is true that there was not that much space for it as in the first year. There were only a few different types of *code-mixing* that I witnessed while observing the first-year schoolchildren.

The first case is the type of excitement experienced in the heat of the game connected with games played with Czech friends at school. Adam was sitting on the carpet by himself while other children were still eating their snacks and he finds one of the collecting cards that are very popular with children these days. It was the game of Scrolls and the child started to play with them.

#### Example 6

1. Adam: “And here we go. *Mám to.*”

*I got it.*

In this example it is again a heat of the game situation as in the pre-schoolers last example. Adam is playing by himself in English language but uses one phrase in Czech language. He knew this game; he seemed to be very happy, when he found it in the cupboard. He most probably plays this game at school with Czech classmates so he is accustomed to playing the game in Czech language. In the fact the game has a strong indexicality to Czech language for Adam and it is only the strong indexicality of the environment of the class which is making him still play it in English language. It has to be said that he also played it in English language, as after short while other children joined him and they all began playing the game in English language without hesitation.

Brian’s mother also told me her observation that the only times that Brian code-mix is when playing some games with settled rules. She gave me an example of playing catch or “It”. In Czech when you catch someone you say: “*máš jí*” “*you have her*”, but in English it is “You are it.” She is saying that Brian is confused with this and uses the Czech way.

Another frequent case of *code-mixing* or maybe just a mistake was when the children were learning phonics and spelling.

#### Example 7

1. Teacher: “Find word with <ock>.”
2. Brian: “Like *Okoř*”.

*a castle near to Prague*

#### Example 8

1. Teacher: “Tell me what can we grow that starts with <c>.”
2. Adam: “We can grow like *kukuřice*. Oh.”

*sweetcorn*

I ascribe this *code-mixing* to just an association in trying hard to think of something that starts with a right sound. These cases again did not happen very often, it was just few cases during the whole of my observation time. The children were trying to quickly come up with some good word and it came out before they could rethink it, realising the second they said it that they had made a mistake. I could see on Adam’s face that he was regretting saying it before anyone else noticed. Brian is a joker and he might even realise and then say it anyway as a joke, as in a way he is right.

### 5.3 Conclusion

I have shown that the *code-mixing*, in terms of inserting one word or phrase in language A into an utterance in language B, happens for very different reasons than *code-switching*. There are listed five types of *code-mixing*; could not remember the right word<sup>11</sup>, mistake when trying to find words containing a sound<sup>12</sup> borrowing<sup>13</sup>, interjection used as a marker of strong sentiment<sup>14</sup> or in the heat of the game<sup>15</sup>. The first type of code-mix is admittedly with the girls whose are inclined to code-mix and also code-switch the most. Jana and Neli have both Czech parents and neither of their parents applies the *one person one language strategy*. However they are trying and are clearly not happy about their *code-mixing*; there were also in stressed situations. That indicates that this is not a *speech community* where this type of *code-mixing* is condoned. A mistake when trying to find a word starting in certain sound is an interesting case as it is not really a mistake, they are trying to think of a word starting with the sound and they did, it shows that at that time both their languages are at alert. Borrowing is

---

<sup>11</sup> Example 1 line 4

<sup>12</sup> Example 7 line 2, Example 8 line 2

<sup>13</sup> Example 3

<sup>14</sup> Example 4 line 3.

<sup>15</sup> Example 5 line 3, Example 6

typical *code-mixing* in contact languages, as the word indicates, it is a word borrowed from language A to language B and adopted in that language. *Borrowing* can become a part of the language B in some case; in here it is presumably part of the Emili's family English language. Use of interjections in a different code is an interesting usage, typically used as a marker, similar to raising the voice or using a different voice pitch. However the most interesting code-mix in my opinion is in the excitement of a game. It is showing a certain pattern of use of *code-mixing* in a structured, ruled, game. There are two possible reasons again working together to this result. The one is the heat of the game when the children are unconsciously saying the first thing that comes into their mind. Secondly it is because they usually play the game or recently played the game in the other language that they speak now and therefore the game has indexicality to that other language. One or the other reason alone would probably not be strong enough. This pattern of *code-mixing* occurs the most during the both years and was confirmed by the parents too, and one of the mothers suggested me this reason behind her son's *code-mixing* without me indicating it.

Indexicality towards Czech language occurred in the case of games, as the games with Czech language associations, it would be very interesting to study these findings in greater depth to establish if it is only a slight inclination or if structured, ruled games make people switch more, being probably less conscious when very excited. It might also be that the interjection has the same source of *code-mixing* as a high excitement marker. But there is not enough data to make any conclusions. There were no more cases of this type of *code-mixing*. The use of interjection in the case of Brian<sup>16</sup>, although it may not be the case, looks like a conscious intention.

Code-mixing was more usual in than *code-switching* in the second year, with the children attending their first year of school. It was surprising that the children do not code-mix actually more as they were now in much greater contact with the Czech language, but on the other hand it was only the first half of a school year and it could possibly change later in the year and in the following years. It could be interesting to see this.

The Three Bears *speech community* is not a community where *code-mixing* would be tolerated, the children feel guilty when accidentally *code-mixing* and most of the *code-mixing* is accidental. There is the only *code-mixing* of borrowing which is explicitly allowed in the

---

<sup>16</sup> Example 4

*speech community* and it is also the one which is actually introduced by the parent<sup>17</sup>. There is another possible borrowing<sup>18</sup> which happened also with the parent and which is allowed in the family *speech community* but would probably be rejected in the Three Bear community itself. That the *speech community* of Tree Bears is actually strongly against *code-mixing* is not surprising as it is a school which is supposed to deepen their academic English as opposed to their everyday language used in the family (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986: 163-164). As described it indicates that family speech communities are more open to *code-mixing* and that it is again according to the Schieffelin and Ochs theory (ibid.:164).

The pattern of *code-mixing* shows it as an extra tool for social behaviour that children have and that is the marker of social skills as the children are showing the marker of excitement – in the case of using interjections<sup>19</sup> in the different language than spoken. They also are able to use and they understand the reasons for borrowing a word from one language and that it is acceptable in some situations and at the same time that *code-mixing* is not good behaviour and one has to be very cautious when to use *code-mixing* and when not. The children are acquiring important social competences through learning the use of two languages.

---

<sup>17</sup> Example 4

<sup>18</sup> Example 3

<sup>19</sup> Example 4

## 6. Conclusion

In the presented diploma thesis I introduced the patterns of bilingual children *code-switching* and *code-mixing* between the Czech and English languages while in a small bilingual *speech community* of an English language school. On the base of observed and recorded 12 uninterrupted speeches, four and half hours each of 13 children in class of preschool children and 14 uninterrupted speeches of two and half hours each of five same school children, I have attempted to explain how bilingual children alternate between their two languages and I outlined the possible reasons for the alterations and how their bilingual identity influences their social competences.

The study is divided into six chapters, after the introduction I summarised the most relevant theories and described their outcome and possible use, the third chapter describes the progression of my work, the studied sample including a description of the schoolchildren's background and the school background; in next two chapters I covered the empirical evidence and its possible explanations.

In the first empirical chapter I analyse *code-switching*, I have showed six reasons for why the children code-switched. All the reasons are situational switching and the most prominent shown pattern is *strategy of neutrality*, the children code-switch between their two languages in the observed *speech community* for the social reasons; to be integrated and to integrate into the community. They code switched when a new conversation started (Example 1 line 2) and the person set a new right and obligation balances set (*rights and obligation balances set*), along with the *strategy of neutrality* this result may be explained by the internalised strategy of one person one language. I also suggest that the children also code-switched because the person closer to them socially and perhaps physically too has code-switched and again in order to follow *strategy of neutrality* they code-switch to their *rights and obligation balances set* even the indexicality was originally oriented towards the other language (Example 4 line 4, 5). The code-switch could have been also mistake when they have not registered the right *rights and obligation balances set* (Example 2, line 2). For the observer, the most amusing is the fourth type if *code-switching* when the children are speaking in two different languages with two or more people. It looks or sounds more interesting than the explanation, which is simple and dull: the children are actually having two different conversations in one timeline (Example 1 line 10, Example 4 line 8). The parental *one person one language strategy* s is the reason behind one of the supervisors *code-switching* to Czech language but making the

other child switch to English language (Example 7) when she started a conversation with her in Czech language. The mother was strongly intoxicated by the English language environment of the school with all children but her own, with whom she was practising *one person one language strategy*. The typical time in the Three Bears when children had free time was as described in the Example 9, at the first glance both languages together but in fact each interaction had its own language code with its own *rights and obligation balances set* negotiated at first and not changed. When taking their children to school, the parents also code-switch according to the each interaction *rights and obligation balances set* with the strong *strategy of neutrality* and most of the time sticking to the *one person one language strategy* too. Code-switching is mostly situational and usually has indexicality to the person who starts the new speech in a new language or the environment – situation dictates. In one case it is a person who indexes the other language because of her strong preferences (Jana) and in the other situation it is the teacher with her class authority or the school environment. In both of these cases are well illustrated in the examples. Contrary to expectations, in the second year, when the children were already attending regular Czech schooling, the study did not find more Czech language mixing into the children's English. In fact there was no *code-switching*. However, the first half of the first year at the school might have been too soon for this change of behaviour to occur and it would be interesting to come back to the children in later years and especially to see how they use their languages in their way to adulthood once they reach double figures in age. The children demonstrate an important knowledge of social behaviour with the neutrality strategy and adapting to a socially closer person and also ignoring the misuse of *rights and obligation balances set*. The children's socialisation through the language makes them not only speak two languages but also being socially sensitive. The use of the language as described above teaches the children to use their languages according to the person they are talking to and therefore teaching important social behaviour possible to use also in different circumstances, important social competence.

In the second empirical chapter I describe *code-mixing*, inserting words or phrases of language A into language B, and its analysis. There was much less *code-mixing* than *code-switching* in both classes, but there were more variations. I have found five different types of *code-mixing*. The first one is when the child could not find the right word (Example 1 line 4; Example 2 line 4), under pressure, the children forgot the right word for thing they wanted to say, in one case it was a noun in the other case a phrase or verb. It happened in the class, was breaking the rules of the *speech community* and the children knew it but, they could not

remember and had no choice but to code-mix, after which the teacher corrected them. During my entire period of observation, this only happened these two times that I have described. Another type of *code-mixing* I witnessed was when the children were learning phonics and the children said words which started with the right sound but not in right language (Example 7 line 2, Example 8 line 2). This is just a mistake and the children again showed that they realised that it is wrong. It implies that it is internalised in them not to code-mix in this way. Although I suggest it showed that both languages were on the alert too at the time and that the other language system is not totally separated in the bilingual mind. There are also interjections (Example 4 line 2), the use of interjections in the other language than is the speech perhaps serves as a marker of stronger emotions, the child in order to sound even more disgusted (in this case) uses the other language as is also described by Goodwin (Duranti 2004: 234). A different type of *code-mixing*, which is allowed in this *speech community*, is borrowing – borrowing of a word with specific cultural meaning indexing to one language for its geographical or/and cultural meaning (Example 3). The last and most interesting type is the heat of the game, a possible explanation to this type is that in the excitement of playing a ruled and structured game (i.e. football, card game), children concentrate so much on their game that they forget what language they are using and may use the language they used last time when playing this game or the language they are accustomed to playing it in (Examples 5 and 6). This was the most prominent *code-mixing* which has happened enough times for me to dare to suggest to generalise in that a ruled, exciting and structured game which is usually or was last time played in the other language than is being spoken at the moment may lead to unconscious *code-mixing*, because the game has indexicality to the other language. There is strong sense of the rule not to code-mix in the observed *speech community*, there was only very little *code-mixing* and in most cases they were seen, by the speakers, as lapses. There is only one type of *code-mixing* that is tolerated and that is borrowing of words that its equivalent does not reflect exactly same meaning i.e. *kobliha*, *chlebiček* (typical type of doughnut, typical type of open-face sandwich made with a baguette). There was a little bit less of *code-mixing* observed in the older children than in the pre-schoolers but not significantly; the reason could be because there was less time together in the classes and also there was not so much free time.

While the children use *code-switching* mostly in the *strategy of neutrality* to integrate with the group so as not to look bad; the observed code-mix happened mostly as a mistake or break of rules. It should not be surprising, since the purpose of all this school is to teach the children

not to use the both languages in one speech event and generally to use the English language well. The *speech community* also shows the children that although they know the two languages it is not right to use them even just as an index to something associated with the other language. The children's competences in both languages are not the same but the social competences work through them both. Their bilingualism does not make their social competences in any way worse; on the contrary their sensitivity for the one person one language is actually making their social competences stronger. The socialising through their two languages is supporting their social skills.

In my thesis I have not problematized in depth the few children that prefer the Czech language and why they start a conversation in the language not preferred in the environment. Instead I wanted to describe in detail the patterns in the response. In the *speech community*, the children were subject to different parental strategies for bringing up bilingual children. I have included those children in the research however I have paid more attention of what the causes than to their behaviour itself and this relates to my previous point: the children or one of the child who had prioritised the Czech language was the one who has no parent speaking to her in English language, and I indicate that this has some connection. I was also focusing on the parents strategies of their children's *bilingual first language acquisition* (Cantone 2007: 6-11) and its influence on their code-switching and code-mixing behaviour. Perhaps I could go more in depth in the background of the families' strategies.

Further research on the hypothesis concerning children in adolescence that I mentioned in the fourth chapter could reveal whether the change occurs or not and how *code-switching* and *code-mixing* develops in the bilingual children through their study on Czech state school and later in their life. A longitudinal study would be able to show patterns of the children's bilingual development in their *code-switching* and *code-mixing* and confirm some of the findings outlined in my study, in particular the suggestion that bilingual children are socialised through the language especially with the *one person one language strategy* to be more social sensitive and are able to use well some helpful social tools. It would be marvellous to find out if bilingualism in sense of *bilingual first language acquisition* (Cantone 2007: 6-11) demonstrates strong social competences throughout puberty and adulthood Another interesting area for further research would also be a study on domestic speech communities of bilingual families who practise *one person one language strategy* to see if in that small family community people tend to use more *code-mixing* than in these case of Three Bear school *speech community* as I suggested in the fifth chapter.

The most useful tool for the analysing I find the rights and obligation set balances (Myer-Scotton 1993) which along with the Gumperz (1982) and also the social and metaphorical types of *code-switching* and *code-mixing* used by Scotton-Myers allowed me to point out that each new speech starts with new rules that have to be newly negotiated and that so some cases are code-switches because it is actually a new or different speech event. I have also found the indexicality as described by Woolard (Duranti 2004: 90) as fine way how of demonstrating show what was not possible to demonstrate with the markedness model (Myer-Scotton 1993) alone. It allows us to demonstrate what associations cause code-switches and code-mixes.

I hope that this study managed to expand a little on the phenomena of bilingual *code-switching* and *code-mixing* in children.

## Used terms

*Speech community* – a concept of *speech communities* is concept that states that communities that uses same language same way have rules for the use of the language. Concept does not simply focus on groups that speak the same language but rather means that language represents embodied constructs and constitutes meaningful participation in society and culture. It is within the *speech community* that identity, ideology and agency are actualized in society. One *speech community* is distinct from another *speech community* and they can vary from nation states to chat rooms. They come into collective consciousness. Membership of a *speech community* includes local knowledge of the system of language choice variation, including *code-switching* and *code-mixing* , and discourse represent generation, occupation, politics, social relationships, identity and more (Morgan, Duranti 2007: 4-12). Further in chapter 2.2.

*Code-mixing*- switching between two different codes of languages in one sentence. One word or phrase is expressed one code of language whilst speaking in other code of language. The view of researcher on the use of term is not settled, for some researcher the terms code-mixing and code-switching are interchangeable. Term intrasentential describes the same in Auer (Auer 1998, Introduction) or also Woolard (Woolard, Duranti 2004. Further in chapter 2.3.1.

*Code-switching*- is used for switching in two different codes of languages with their rules and limitations, when one code is used for forming whole complex and meaningful statements in whole sentences, then alternating with sentences in a second code. ). Term intrasentential describes the same in Auer (Auer 1998, Introduction) or also Woolard (Woolard, Duranti 2004. Further in chapter 2.3.1.

*Borrowing* - a word or expression that has been adapted into the base language, some authors claim that borrowing involves only a certain types of words namely those with specific cultural meaning or prestige. Also borrowing can be due to semantic reasons, such as when the equivalent word does not exactly reflect the desired meaning (Cantone 2007: 58). These definitions of terms can be found in the work of Cantone (2007: 57-58, 218) and are not totally unified with other researchers' definitions i.e. Auer, Duranti. For my work I use use them as above. See pages 19-20.

*Rights and obligations set* – the term used with the Gumperz definition of situational code-switching. When the context, situation of speech is changed in situational switching, a change

of language signals a change in the definition of the speech event, involving “clear changes in the participants’ definition of each other’s rights and obligation” (Blom and Gumperz 1972: 424). This term uses also Myers-Scotton in her conception of markedness model. Code choices are indexical and explain the social motivations of *code-switching* and *code-mixing* (Myers-Scotton 1993: 60). Further on pages 20-22.

*Markedness model*- A formal markedness model consists of four main principles:

1, “The negotiation principle”: Choose the form of your conversation contribution so that it indexes the set of *rights and obligation balances set* which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange. 2, The “unmarked-choice maxim”: Make your code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked *rights and obligation balances set* in speech exchanges when you wish to establish or affirm that *rights and obligation balances set*. 3 The “marked-choice maxim”: Make a marked code choice which is not the unmarked index of the unmarked *rights and obligation balances set* in an interaction when you wish to establish a new *rights and obligation balances set* as unmarked for the current exchange. 4, The “exploratory-choice maxim”: “When an unmarked choice is not clear, use *code-switching* to make alternate exploratory choices as candidates for an unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an *rights and obligation balances set* which you favour.” (Myers-Scotton 1993: 113-142). Further on page 22.

*Strategy of neutrality* - in their endeavour to be socially neutral, a speaker tries to find an appropriate and acceptable code for a given situation. It is in a context of Myers-Scotton markedness model, marking the *strategy of neutrality* (Myers-Scotton 1976: 914-941). Further on page 23.

*One person one language* - is a strategy that was described for the first time by Grammont in 1902 and many times after, lately in popular bilingual parent handbook *The One-Parent-One-Language Approach* (Barron-Hauwaert 2004). The strategy means that each parent speaks to the child who they want to raise bilingual in one language. The important thing is for one person not to speak to the child in two different languages, in other words not code-switching or code-mixing. Keeping to this strategy means to teach the children to separate the language and therefore not code-mix or even code-switch. The strategy is widely used through bilingual families. Further on pages 11 and 31.

*Socialisation through the language and socialisation to use the language* – a term which I use to explain the language as a tool to learn in the same time as a think to learn. Socialisation through the language is interesting point when talking about two languages, which helps the socialisation process to be brother. Language is a major source of information for children learning the ways and world views of their culture. Language socialisation starts from the moment of birth in human beings, if not before (Schieffelin, Ochs 1986: 183). Further on page 15-16.

*Conversational analysis*- based on Harvey Sacks conversation analysis of speech (Silverman 1998). The basis of the analytical approach is similar to Myers-Scotton's functional and non-functional *code-switching* and mixing. *Code-switching* and *code-mixing* is used to establish various kinds of marks, which provide the basis of conversation to be intelligible. Peter Auer (Auer 1984 a). Further on page 23.

*Bilingual first language acquisition* - (Cantone 2007: 6-11), they are still learning to use both of their languages, while at the same time learning to be bilingual. The children are socialised to use the language as well as being socialised through the use of language (Ochs, Schieffelin 1986: 163-164). The bilingual children have something to learn not only towards speaking English and speaking Czech but also speaking two languages, managing to deal with two languages and that involves development. The children's bilingualism influences their social competences and has a great impact on formation of each child's identity. (Cantone 2007: 6-11). Further on pages 14-19.

*Tag switching* - refers to a mix involving an utterance and an interjection (or tag). Some examples of tags are *you know*, or *by the way*.

## Transcription characters

(0.1) Time in seconds

(.) Micropause

Underline Researchers comment

*Underlined cursive* Translation of Czech

*Cursive* Speech in Czech language

## **Bibliography:**

AUER, Peter. *Bilingual conversation*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1984. Pragmatics & beyond, 5:8.

AUER, Peter, ed. *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. New York: Routledge, c1998. ISBN 0-415-21609-5.

BITTNERights and obligation balances setVÁ, Dana a Mirjam MORAVCOVÁ. *Diverzita etnických menšin: prostorová dislokace a kultura bydlení*. Praha: FHS UK, 2012. Agora (FHS UK), 10. sv. ISBN 978-80-87398-25-8.

BLOM, J.-P., and GUMPERZ, J. J. Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code Switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 407–434). 1972 New York: Holt

CANTONE, Katja Francesca. *Code-switching in bilingual children*. Dordrecht: Springer, c2007. ISBN 1402057830.

COOK-GUMPERZ, J. *Situated instruction: Language socialisation od school age children*. 1977.

DURANTI, Alessandro, ed. *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. Blackwell companions to Anthropology. ISBN 1-4051-4430-0.

GENESEEE, Fred. Early bilingual development: one language or two? *Journal of Child Language* 16, 1989 161–179.

CHOMSKY, N. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1965

MEISEEnglish language, Jürgen M. *Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children*. In K. Hyltenstam & L. K. Obler (eds.), *Bilingualism Across The Lifespan: Aspects of Acquisition, Maturity and Loss*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 13–40.

MYERS-SCOTTON, Carol (1976) 'Strategies of neutrality: Language choice in uncertain situations', *Language* 52, 4 : 919–941..

MYERS-SCOTTON, Carol *Social Motivations for Code Switching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1993

MYERS-SCOTTON, Carol *Multiple Voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 2006.

OCHS, Elinor, SCHIEFF, English language IN, Bambi B. (1982): *Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories and Their Implication*. Washington: National Institut of Edication.

RAF, English language, Ben. *Language, Identity and Social division*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

SCHIEFF, English language IN, Bambi B. a Elinor. OCHS. *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986. ISBN 0521339197.

SILVERMAN, David. *Harvey Sacks: social science and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998. Key contemporary thinkers. ISBN 0-7456-1711-5.

SILVERSTEIN, Michael. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication* [online]. 2003, **23**(3), 193-229 [cit. 2017-06-25]. DOI: 10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2. ISSN 02715309.

SILVERMAN, David. *Harvey Sacks: social science and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998. Key contemporary thinkers. ISBN 0-7456-1711-5.

VOLTERRA, Virginia & Traute TAESCHNER. The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language* 5, 311–326. *Journal of child language*. London: Cambridge University Press. 1978

WEI, Li, ed. *The bilingualism reader*. 2nd ed. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-35554-4.

XU, Shufang . Conversational *code-switching* among Mandarin-English bilinguals in Brunei. In *Proceedings of the Malaysia-Brunei Forum: Expanding Horizons Together*, Kuala Lumpur, 20–21 May 2014